

in the immediate story connected with Joseph shows how you have, in my opinion, a foundation of fact which has been developed into a folk tale. Much more natural, I think, than to say a folk story has developed into a factual story of the type of the story of Joseph. So that is under our matter of derivation and what is probably best given under the general outline of the material aspects of his life.

O.T.History 141. ($\frac{1}{2}$) (2. Joseph's character?)

...there is nothing we can put our finger on and say here is a flaw. Now of course, he is a human being as others, and doubtless he had his faults, but they come out in the narrative less than perhaps any other character in the whole Bible. There are those who take the first appearance of him and try to make out that he was a conceited young fellow because he was father's favorite, he had given him the coat of many colors, and that it was this conceit of his which led to his having a dream in which the sun and the moon and the eleven stars bowed down before him, and no wonder the brothers would (1 $\frac{1}{4}$) and so on. But there's a lot of fancifulness in that sort of an interpretation. The Bible does not say that he was conceited. It does say he dreamed a dream and he told it to his brothers and they hated him more. And it says he told them how the sheaves there made obeisance to his sheaf. Well, it was the brethren who said to him, shalt thou indeed reign over us? They drew the conclusion from it. It does not picture him as trying (1 $\frac{3}{4}$)

And when he dreamed this about the sun and moon and eleven stars making obeisance to him, he told it to his father and to his brethren, and his father rebuked him and said what is this dream thou hast dreamed? Shall I and thy mother and thy brethren indeed come to bow down ourselves to thee to the earth? And his brethren envied him but his father observed the saying. It doesn't seem to me that there is ground there for criticism of his character (2) . He may have been but there's no proof of it. All that this says is that he told the story.

Now, there's a point here, there's a tendency many have to interpret all ^{prophecy} ~~problems~~ with extreme literalness. I think we must observe the prophecy in general literally, but in prophecy and in narrative, there's no reason why there may not be figurative elements.

Here his father said, shall I and ~~thy~~ mother and thy brethren come to bow down to you? He saw the sun and moon and eleven stars making obeisance to him. Now there is no evidence that his mother ever came and bowed down. The general incident, the depiction of this dream was exactly fulfilled when his father and his brothers came and bowed to him in Egypt, and perhaps even more realistically when the brothers bowed, not knowing who he was, but bowed down before the great Prime Minister of Egypt. But the mother, his mother died, the death of Rachel is described, before they went into Egypt. So you cannot take every detail of the ^{dream} and expect to find something for it (3¼) Yes? (student. 3¼. Doesn't the moon and the sun bow down, or the moon down in the sun, or the wife bow down in the person of her husband?) Yes. The sun and moon represent the parents, the parents bow down. Such parents as are still living. (student. 3½. If the head bows down then the wife would also in the head.) Well, the principle is there but I don't think specific and literal detail is required, but the principle is there, they both bowed down. Mr. Deshpande, did you have something? (student. 4) Yes. The dream of Joseph describes what happened in his life, and it was fulfilled when the brothers came to Egypt. But the prediction of Jacob described the fact that Judah's ~~was~~ descendants ~~was~~ to be over all the tribes, and of course David and Solomon were, and they all bowed to them. So it is a very different prediction, there's a similarity but it predicts about a different thing. One predicts about the individual and the other about the tribes. And it's very interesting to see that parallel, thank you for calling attention to it.

Well, these dreams he had but I don't think we can say they are an error shown in him. I don't know of any evidence in the scripture showing the faults which we know must have been in him because he was a human being. But he was a remarkably fine one, he was one of the finest servants who ever lived. The way he stood all this, that ^{it} he was brought on him through no fault of his own, and the way he, in Egypt, stood true to what was right and suffered for righteousness' sake without complaint and the way that when his brothers came down, he did not hold it against them, he did not try to punish them or to mistreat them or anything like so many people would've done, but on the other hand he didn't do the other things that many people would've done, a few people have done, many people would've

held the anger against their brothers that they would've just been ready to do anything they could to hurt them. I think the majority of people would've taken that attitude after what the brothers had done to him. But perhaps a third of the people or a fourth of the people would have taken the opposite extreme. They'd be so happy to see their brothers that they would just throw themselves on their necks and say oh it is wonderful to see you, and the brothers would say we're so sorry for what we did and will you forgive us and he'd say oh certainly, and it would be all over; and Joseph tested the brothers before he (6 $\frac{1}{2}$)

He gave them a test to be sure that they really had repented of what they did and would not do the same sort of thing to him again. He showed wonderful love, combined with wonderful wisdom, And so he put his brothers through a series of tests before they knew who he was, to find out what they would do about the other brother, Benjamin. When Benjamin's life seemed to them to be at stake, what would they do, would they give him up in order to save their own skin? Or would they actually try to do the utmost they could to save Benjamin, and when ~~the~~ found them actually willing to do anything they could to save Benjamin's life, he felt that there was a change in them and that he could trust them. And then he did what he did. He showed wonderful love and wonderful judgment. He was a most remarkable character and there is one verse in it here which I think shows a wonderful understanding of the divine providence. And that is where, when he reveals himself to his brothers and tells them who he is, that they then, he has tested them now, they words we're sorry, anything like that, mean nothing. Actually the question is, is there a change in their attitude? And he says this in relation to Benjamin and he finds that there is. So now, in chapter 45, verse 4, he reveals himself to his brothers and he says, come near to me, I pray you. And they came near. And he said, I am Joseph your brother, whom ye sold into Egypt. Now therefore be not grieved, nor angry with yourselves, that ye sold me hither: for God did send me before you to preserve life. And he says in verse 7, God sent me before you to preserve you a posterity in the earth, and to save your lives by a great deliverance. Verse 8, he says, so now it was not you that sent me hither, but God: and he hath made me a father to Pharaoh and lord of all his house, and a ruler throughout all the land of Egypt. It was

not you that sent me hither, but God. What an understanding of God's providence. It was God's providence that the children of Israel should grow to be a great nation in Egypt, that they should enjoy the prosperity of Egypt, that they should have the material means to grow from a few families to a great nation down there, and God sent Joseph down there to prepare the way for them. Now it was the brothers who had done it, it was the brothers who, in their terrible wickedness and jealousy, sold him and sent him away and concealed it, made it look as if he was dead, they were guilty of it, it was human wickedness, but it was part of the divine plan, and Joseph recognized that fact, he had an understanding of it. And I think it is a very fortunate thing for us, in all of our dealings in life, to recognize that wicked man will do wicked things, and we mustn't shut our eyes to them, and we must test people before we put our confidence in them. We must find out all we can of what sort of people they are, but we must recognize that even the wickedness that they do is part of God's plan, and we must not hold grudges against them for what they do to us, because God will deal with their character. God will handle it because the wickedness they do is toward him, not toward us. But God may use what they do for his good purpose, and we should praise God for what happens, even though it seems very bad to us, and is as far as the human instrumentalities are concerned. God does not incite human beings to do wickedness, no, God is not the author of evil, but God uses the wickedness that people do, and God directs the direction in which the result of the wickedness shall fall, which the people do, in order to accomplish his purpose. And so Joseph, instead of holding anger against his brother, gives praise to God for his ^{providence} brothers, and God truly works all things together his purpose. Now you will often hear it said Egypt stands for wickedness. Evil. Egypt stands for evil. I don't think that's quite right. Egypt stands for oppression. Egypt stands for bondage. And it therefore stands for the worst bondage of all, the bondage of sin. And Exodus tells how God delivers the people from the bondage and oppression of Egypt and it is a wonderful picture of how Christ delivers us from the bondage and oppression of sin. But that does not mean that in the Bible, whenever Egypt is referred to, it is a symbol for sin or wickedness, or a symbol for bondage or oppression. Here in Genesis the Egyptians, the Israelites going down into Egypt was part of God's plan. It

came about through the wickedness of the brothers but it was the plan of God, and God brought them to Egypt to prepare a place for them there, in order that they might be protected from the famine and might have a place where they could grow into a great nation, amid the prosperity. Then. A new Pharaoh came who knew not Joseph and after they had grown into a great nation, then the oppression came and Egypt became in Exodus a fitting symbol of oppression, but Egypt is in Genesis here a symbol of refuge and of God's provision. I think that's important that we realize. The symbol is important. Exodus is (12 3/4), really it's more important ~~to us~~ to us to see how God delivers us from sin through his great power, as he delivers the Israelites from Egypt, than the historic fact of the deliverance. But it is an historic fact. But the figure doesn't have to be taken the same way in Genesis. There was nothing wrong with the Israelites' going into Egypt because God commanded them. God spoke with Jacob in a dream and told him, fear not to go into Egypt, this is my plan, there in Egypt you will become a great nation and you will come back out of Egypt. It was his plan. Now there are those who in studying the different periods, or dispensations if you want to use that name, of God's dealings with the people who try to arrange the parts of it into exact parallels, and in arranging that they try to make this one end with a great error which is the going into Egypt, when the scripture nowhere says that is an error. It nowhere says that, and God commanded them to go. Egypt became the land of oppression, and it is a wonderful symbol of our deliverance from the oppression of sin, but to say it always is (14) is a picture of our salvation. Yes?

(student.14) Very good, too. This is a (14 1/2) There was no deliverance of Jesus out of Egypt, as a type he was not oppressed in Egypt at all, it was a place of deliverance in the case of Christ, and it is predicted in Hosea that Jesus would come out of Egypt to do his great work. It says, out of Egypt have I called my son, and there he was not speaking of delivering him from oppression, but of bringing him back from the luxury of Egypt into the less pleasant conditions of Palestine, in order that there he could do his work for God and could give his life for our sins. It is not a figure of oppression there, it is the great figure of the oppression in the Bible, but that is in Exodus and in the many places that refer back to Exodus. But it doesn't always refer to that.


Well, we'll, that is leading us quite directly then to our next section, which will be the deliverance of Egypt. I was hoping to get a good start on it today but will instead at the next meeting, so, Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

O.T.History 142. ($\frac{1}{8}$)

...well, I want to wish you all a Happy New Year, and in order to start the New Year right take a piece of paper and write your name on it (quiz to $1\frac{1}{8}$)

...and we note the general outline of the material aspects of his life and in that we discussed the matter of names and the matter of the story of the two brothers with the allegation that this was the origin of the story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife. But I pointed out to you why I believe it is much more probable that it is the other way around. Then did I start speaking about the spiritual history of Joseph. I think I said just a brief word about it, we won't say a great deal about it, because though the story of Joseph is replete with spiritual lessons, they are mostly rather obvious lessons, and there is no need in a class of this type, of going into them more at length. You can easily do that for yourself. He is the most perfect character in the Old Testament, there is no real fault displayed in him, in the scripture. I mentioned last time that some think that his dreams show a fault, but I believe that that is certainly not necessary, finding a fault in the having of such dreams. It's as though the dreams were a reflection of subconscious realization of being the favorite of his father, to some extent yet they certainly also were a revelation ^{from} of God to him and therefore he could hardly blame him for them. And he doesn't say they will bow down to him, but they themselves draw the conclusion. He certainly had faults as everyone does but the Old Testament does not show them, almost the only character of any importance in whom it does not show faults. His outstanding virtue of Joseph, aside from the general purity of his life, was his trust in God, and this is brought most vividly to display in Genesis 45, verses 5 to 7. Three verses that I believe deserve far greater emphasis than they have received among Christian people. When Joseph revealed himself to his brethren he said, Now therefore be not grieved nor angry with yourselves, that you sold me hither, for God did send me before you to preserve life. For these two

years hath the famine been in the land, and yet there are five years in the which there shall neither be earing nor harvest. And God sent me before you to preserve you a posterity in the earth, and to save your lives by a great deliverance. Twice he says, God sent me, God sent me to Egypt to preserve life. God sent me before you to preserve a posterity in the earth, to save your lives by a great deliverance. The brothers thought they had done it, the brothers had done it, the brothers' wickedness had done it, but God had brought it about. God makes the wrath of wicked men to (4 $\frac{1}{2}$) him, and we are responsible for our wickedness and will be punished for it but God uses it for his ^{good} purposes, it is all part of his plan. And therefore, while we should feel great desire to cut down the wickedness we do, and great penitence for, not only our sins but also our mistakes, yet we do not need to feel a personal anger at others when they sin against us and when they injure us, because though God will punish them for their wickedness, God will not allow us to be injured by their wickedness if it is not a part of his plan for our good. And here this terrible wickedness of the brothers resulted in the saving of the lives of the whole group and the preparing of a place where the nation could grow into a tremendous multitude that God wanted it to, ^{amid} among the prosperity of, and the provision of, Egypt, and Joseph twice says in those three verses, it was God's plan, and it would be safe to draw from it that Joseph even when going through those terrible experiences saw that it was God's plan, and he knew his brothers had sent him down but he knew that God had done it for some purpose, and now we find what the purpose is. And he ^{tested} kept his brothers carefully not in order to punish the brothers but--vengeance belongs to God and God will punish, but in order to find out whether he can trust, whether it is safe, to reveal himself to them, and when he does, when he finds that they are changed and their consciences are such that there must be a terrible (6 $\frac{1}{4}$) then he tells them not to feel badly about it because God did it. God (6 $\frac{1}{2}$)

It's a wonderful outstanding instance of the wonderful faith in God and the realization of God's marvelous plan that I know of. Of course, Joseph is strengthened in this by the other (6 $\frac{1}{3}$) great example  he had seen, for he was put in the dungeon, for no fault of his own but for the fault of doing good. A person might have thought, if I had given

into Potiphar's wife, if I had submitted to the evil that she suggested, I would still head of Potiphar's household, I would be running the place, I would be enjoying the prosperity and enjoying the fruits of ~~labor~~ wickedness, and here I refused to accept the wickedness and I land in this dungeon and this terrible misery. But the result of it was to make him ruler over all the land of Egypt, which he never would have been otherwise. God had worked through it, and he saw how God had worked through the wickedness of Potiphar's wife to bring about God's wonderful plan. And so (7 $\frac{1}{4}$)

Now, Egypt is, in Exodus, a symbol of the suffering that comes from sin. Egypt is the great land of bondage and a deliverance from Egypt all through the rest of the Bible. It's a great symbol of God's deliverance for his people and it's a marvelous picture of the way God delivers the Christian from the oppression of sin and from the hold of Satan. But that does not mean that Egypt will always in the Bible be a symbol for wickedness. There are those who try to make out that Jacob committed sin in going down to Egypt, but God definitely told Jacob in a vision, in a dream, not to be afraid to go to Egypt, because it was God's plan that he should go to Egypt. And Joseph saw that God prepared in Egypt a place to protect the Israelites through the time when they would be growing into a nation. And God prepared in Egypt a place to protect Jesus from the desire of Herod to murder him, and caused Joseph to take him down there for protection. Egypt is a great figure of oppression in most of its occurrences in the scripture, but certainly not in all, certainly not in the book of Genesis. (8 3/4)

Well, this trust of Joseph in God is one of the great outstanding characteristics. There are many others and they are fairly obvious, so we need not take the time in this class, but can instead, turn over a page in our Bibles and in so doing jump over a period of some centuries, and come to

Roman numeral V, The Deliverance from Egypt. A. General Background. The general background of the deliverance from Egypt, one of the great outstanding features of the whole Biblical history, we find ^{right} in the beginning of it, in verse 8, now there arose up a new king over Egypt, who knew not Joseph. And of course that could happen in any country. That can easily occur under normal circumstances, that a ruler will come to the front who

has no use for those who were the pets of the former ruler. When the young Kaiser Wilhelm of Germany, Wilhelm the II, became Emperor, Queen Victoria's favorite grandson, he became Emperor of Germany in a nation which had been built up through the wisdom and the cleverness and to some extent the untruthfulness perhaps of Count Bismarck, and Bismarck was a great hero of the court, the German Empire was built through his wisdom, his actions, and to some extent his untruth and his power of will, great brain, and one of the first acts of the new Kaiser Wilhelm was to dismiss Count Bismarck from his position on the court. A new king arose who knew not Joseph. The same thing happened in England when George III came to the throne. He turned against the people who had brought his great-grandfather to power, George I, and who had ruled during the reigns of George I and George II, he turned against them and gave his aid and support to the (11) and this was one of the great causes which led to the American Revolution and the ^{very} people who opposed him were called the (11) the name of the party which had brought his ancestors into power, and which he had turned against.

A new king arose who knew not Joseph. It is easy for such a thing to happen. But in the case of Egyptian history it is perhaps easier for us to understand it (11 1/4)

because it seems most likely, though it cannot be proven, that the king who favored Joseph was one of the Hyksos kings, and the Hyksos kings were a foreign group who were controlling Egypt and held them in bondage we now believe for about 150 years. It used to be thought it was about 1500 (11 3/4)

I don't think anybody today thinks it's more than about 150 years but that's a good sized figure to hold a people in subjection. And the Hyksos had conquered Egypt because of their use of this great new weapon with which they could make a lightning war on the Egyptians, the use of the horse. With horses attached to their chariots they had attacked Egypt and conquered them and with this weapon they held them. But eventually the Egyptians got the use of the horse for themselves and they built up sufficient power to drive the Hyksos out and after they did, Egypt never again let itself get short of horses. Of course, before that they hadn't known the horse as a weapon for war at all. But after that, Egypt

became the great land of horses. Never again was conquered in that way. And so the new king who came into power looked upon the Hyksos as terrible foreign conquerors and it would be quite natural that they would not feel very friendly towards the people who had been given a favored position by the Hyksos ruler. Now that is not certain, but that is highly possible. I mean that they came in in the time of the Hyksos. I believe that all scholars agree that Exodus was after the time of the Hyksos and it would seem highly probable that they coming in was in their reign.

Now the background of this period of the deliverance from Egypt, naturally will concern itself only with Egypt, because that's where we are at this point. All the events happened in Egypt, or in the desert near Egypt. And the first thought that immediately occurs to us of course is who is the Egyptian king who oppressed the Israelites. And all it says in Exodus is a new king arose who knew not Joseph. And then it goes on and refers to the king in chapter 2, and following, under the name of Pharaoh, and Pharaoh we know is a name which was used originally to mean great conqueror, and thus when we speak of Wall Street, meaning not a street, nor a wall, but the financial leadership of the United States, we call Wall Street, and we call 10 Downing Street, is the control of the British Empire because that's where the Prime Minister's Headquarters is, and they used to speak of the Sublime Court, (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) meaning the Turkish Empire. In ancient times the same custom was established in speaking of the great house and meaning the ruling power of Egypt and it came to be a term used to designate the ruler of Egypt who was called Pharaoh. But which Pharaoh it is the name does not tell us...

O.T.History 143. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...in Egypt who went by the name of Pharaoh, just as the President of the United States does not specify which one. And so Exodus does not tell us who this ruler is but it tells us that after a series of plagues, about two million Israelites left the land of Egypt against the wishes of Pharaoh. And Peet in his book EGYPT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT in which he tries to make out that the Old Testament is quite unreliable, feels that it's strange that in Egypt we have no record of the Exodus of the Israelites, but he does say in his

book, greater events than this have occurred ^{in Egypt} and left no trace in their records. He makes that admission which is a tremendous admission. And, of course, it is easy for us to see why that should be so in view of what I've already told you of the nature of our material from Egypt. Nobody put up a monument in Egypt to celebrate the great failure of Pharaoh to hold the Israelites there in subjection. You go to Paris to visit the tomb of Napoleon, one of the great sites of Paris, one of the great monuments in Paris. There you see the statue of Napoleon, around it you see these monuments to several great battles, but there is no monument there to Waterloo, absolutely none. They put up nothing in Paris to celebrate the Napoleon's fall at the Battle of Waterloo. You go to Berlin you'll find a great big statue of a Russian soldier, celebrating the conquest of Berlin but that is because it's being held under foreign bondage. You can be sure that if the Germans ever get their freedom that particular statue will disappear. No nation puts up monuments to celebrate its defeats, and the loss of two million slaves could hurt the economic life of Egypt rather badly and it might be mentioned a great deal in talking about it, but would hardly have a monument put up for it and our records from ancient Egypt are practically all in the ^{form} ~~type~~ of monuments to celebrate things for which they wished to be remembered. And so it is not at all strange that there is no mention in ancient Egyptian material that we have of the exodus of the Israelites. We do find in Egyptian records mention of a people called the Appareu (3 $\frac{1}{4}$) and this Appareu is thought by most scholars today to have relation to the Hebrew. Appareu, phonetically on close examination, very close to the word Hebrew. And the Appareu are slaves who are forced to do heavy labor and the difficulty with it is that we find the name applied to people of this type long after the Israelites had left Egypt. And so for that reason there are those who hesitate about being sure that there's a definite connection ~~with~~ between it and the Israelites. Personally, I think it most likely that there is. I would think it most likely that, having this large group formed called Hebrews, under forced labor, they came to speak of them under this name and then came to apply the name to people doing that kind of labor even when the particular group from which the name started had left the country. You find many similar occurrences in history where a name has been kept to apply to people other than those to whom it originally applied. So it seems to me not at all unlikely that the Appareu is a reference

to the Israelites as slave labor, but it is not certain, and particularly as the name does occur after the people left.

Now this period in Egyptian history, the general period, we might say, we might just glance for a moment at the period of Egyptian history from around 1600 to around 1200. Now this period in general is the period which is called the New Kingdom, and it is also called the Empire. And I'd like to ask you to keep those names in mind, that's two names applied to the same thing. We do not speak of the New Empire. We speak of the Old Kingdom, the Middle Kingdom, and the New Kingdom. They are three periods of Egyptian reigns, and all of them were to some extent empires. And in between each of them there is a period of disintegration. But the period of the New Kingdom is the period after the expulsion of the Hyksos, and this is a period of great power in Egypt. The Egyptians were expelled by the 17th dynasty, the brief period we call the 17th dynasty. They are followed by the 18th dynasty, which is a period of very great and powerful rulers. If we had time we could take two or three weeks telling you about the exploits and the periods of the 18th dynasty rulers because we have much evidence on them. It is a very, very interesting period of history. But in view of the shortness of the year, I think we will content ourselves with just a few words about them because it cannot be proven at present that this is the period, the 18th dynasty, when the Israelites left Egypt. And since it can't be proven their interest to us is more or less incidental. I should mention perhaps the fact that one member of this 18th dynasty was a woman named Hatshepsut. And Hatshepsut reigned for 21 years. She was the (6 3/4) for 21 years. Hatshepsut. We have many, many monuments but we don't have much but what was put up by the Pharaohs in order to celebrate the things they wanted celebrated. And therefore precise details are hard to get, especially the incidental details. But the general idea today of scholars is that Hatshepsut was the daughter of a previous Pharaoh and was therefore properly in line for the throne, but that it was not customary for a woman to rule, and the next man who would be in line was her half-brother who was much younger, and therefore that she married him and she ruled, but nominally he was co-ruler with her. And then after 21 years, in some way, he got rid of her, we don't know how. We don't know whether she was killed, whether she was driven away, what happened to her, but then he took over and he is the greatest of ruler of the

age of the time. His name was Thotmes III, that's the old way of saying it. Today they're more apt to say Tutmosis or Tutmosa, the Egyptian writing doesn't exactly correspond to our writing. It's hard to tell just how best to say it, but (student: How is it spelled?) Well, it depends, there are many who spell it in different ways. I mean I could write it in Egyptian hieroglyphics but that wouldn't tell you anything. But it means, you see, the ~~ga~~ is the name of a god, and then the last part whether you take it as mes or as mosis, whichever part you take, some take it Tutmosis, but that means gave birth, or had a child. This god had a child, see the name Mosis is rather common. It is used with a god's name, to mean the favored, or the descendant, or the child of the gods. So the Tut, the god's (9) or Tut, they claim, is the progenitor of the king. There was a theory (9) this man, one way they spelled it, Thutmone. The older books always spelled Thotmes, that was a Greek form, and I think the Germans often spell it Tutmosis, any one of the three, but don't mix them. Write down any one of the three, I'll be perfectly satisfied, but don't take it half one and half the other.

But this king Thotmes was a great conqueror. His predecessor Hatshepsut was not. But she did some great building work, she sent an expedition down to the land of Ethiopia which brought back gold and spices and put up a big monument to tell about it and in these monuments you see her seated on the throne with her long beard. Because she was Pharaoh she had a long beard, doubtless it was just fastened on to her, but in the picture it shows her with a long beard, the Pharaoh. The ordinary person wasn't allowed to have a beard, only kings and gods were allowed to wear beards. As a king she wears a beard. And over in the corner you have young Thotmes III waving ^{to} (10 $\frac{1}{2}$) some material, he was in a very subordinate position during her reign. She put up a great beautiful obelisk celebrating her great deeds. And after 21 years of her reign ~~it~~ ^{she} disappeared, we don't know what happened to her. But from then on we have Thotmes reigning and he calls it the 22nd year of the (10 3/4) but he claims to ^{have} reigned all the time she was reigning. And immediately he started leading expeditions up into Palestine, making great conquests, he was a great warrior, he'd evidently been held down by her all this time, now he goes out to be a great effective warrior and a very powerful Pharaoh. And he went all through

her pictures in the monuments up near (11 $\frac{1}{4}$) all these beautiful pictures, he had his men go all through them and erase her picture. So you have beautiful pictures of these scenes, but Hatshepsut, where she should be seated on the throne, there's just a blank, they've rubbed it off. Except in one place where they overlooked it, so we have one picture, all the rest you have just a big hole. And the obelisk he put a brick wall around it to hide the pictures, this beautiful obelisk, and during the succeeding ages this brick wall disappeared, and you have the beautiful obelisk telling of her greatness.

Well, now there are those who will tell you that this Hatshepsut is the princess who found Moses, and who brought Moses out from the River and who took care of him. And she's the best-known woman in Egyptian history. If you just want to make a blind guess, you might as well guess her as anyone else. She was certainly a daughter of Pharaoh. But I know of no other reason whatever to connect her with the story of Moses. I think it's worth telling you this much about it, because you will come across that theory. You will find some books that say it's proven. Now I don't know how it's proven, just because somebody (12 $\frac{1}{2}$)

She was a daughter of Pharaoh, but the Pharaohs had many daughters, and I know of no reason why to connect her with Moses. But she was a daughter of Pharaoh and she became a great queen. And no she wasn't queen, she was king, she was a Pharaoh, she ruled, and then young Thotmes III got rid of her somehow, and from then on he ruled, and he ruled with great power and effectiveness. Now the length of this period, the 18th dynasty is approximately from 1580 to 1347. That is approximate. There are those who will put it a few years later, at one end of the other. We can't be exact on these dates. We have a good deal of evidence but we don't have complete evidence. If you have a monument put up by a king which says the 25th year of his reign, we know he reigned at least 25 years, but that doesn't prove his reign stopped after 25 years. We have events given us in the reign and by those events we know a minimum but we don't know the maximum. We have quite a bit of evidence and many points we can be very accurate in, but there more often will be the relative distance between these events. (13 3/4)

Now, Thotmes III was a great conqueror and powerful ruler and a great builder. And Thotmes III, those who say that Hatshepsut was the daughter that took care of Moses

will say he's probably the Pharaoh of the oppression, and the reign of the two of them together, I notice one book dates it from 1501 to 1447 and another dates it from 1504 to 1482, and --no it was 1504 to 1450--I was thinking of the dates of Hatshepsut. Well, that's three years difference, so you can't be exact on dates, but you can be very near. You certainly can tell the centuries. Around 1500 B.C. Hatshepsut and Thotmes III reigned, just about 1500 before the beginning the 1400's. Now we have other kings that follow, but toward the end of the period of the 18th dynasty, there was a king named Amenophis III.

O.T.History 144. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...Amenophis. This king Amenophis III...reigned approximately from 1415 to 1380. He was quite a powerful ruler. I'll refer to him again in a minute or two, but I want first to go on to his son, who was a very different sort of man. His son was Amenophis IV. Amenophis IV reigned from 1380 approximately, to 1362 approximately. I would you like you to know the half century of these people, that is, whether they were the first half of the 14th century B.C. That is sometimes they are a little after the 1400 or about 1500, like that, but precise dates there is no use in knowing. But I certainly want you to know them within fifty years.

Now Amenophis IV was, some books will tell you the first individual in history. Others will say he's the first monotheist in history. Some books will just go into rhapsody, what a wonderful man he is, but others will say that he is a fraud and amounted to nothing, he was an epileptic, or anything you want to say about him. Though hardly anybody thinks of him as an average man in any way. He was either one of the greatest or one of the weakest of people in history. He was a real individual, there's no question of that. Certain things we know definitely about him. He turned violently against the previous religion of Egypt. In Egypt in the early days they worshipped Re the sun god. Then the god Amun, the god of the village of Thebes of Upper Egypt became the leading god of Egypt, when the kings of this little village became rulers of all Egypt, in the Middle Kingdom. These men kept constantly giving gifts to Amun until at the end of Egyptian history, the priests of the god Amun, of the temple of the god Amun, owned three-fourths of the land

of Egypt. Eventually the Amun leadership got practically everything in hand. But Amun was just one of many gods, but he was the leading one by far. He had a wife, he had a son, you have the pictures of the three of them, you have various, rather obscene pictures of Amun, and many of the gods of Egypt. He is not like Re, a great force of nature, the sun, or something like that. He's a man, not connected with any animals, but he was the god that came to be the most powerful god of Egypt. And the name Amenophis means Amun is gracious. The king is named after this god Amun. Yes? (student. Re was in the Middle Kingdom?) No, Re was way back in the early kingdom, the Old Kingdom. Re continues to the very end, but they say Amun is Re, they call it Amun Re. See, you spell it Amen, but the correct pronunciation is Amun, we now know. It was written down before we knew enough about it, but the Egyptians don't write vowels, just write consonants, but it's Amen, sometimes written Amo, should of course be double o or the u. But Amen was the great powerful god and ruler but he's just one of many gods and he's just a man with all kinds of human failures and frailties and everything. There's nothing ideal about the figure of Amen, ~~it's~~ whatever in Egyptian mythology, but except he's a god, he's powerful, he is Re, he is the sun god. Though ^{that} ~~in~~ connection comes later, they had Re long before they had him.

Well, Amenophis IV turned against this whole polytheism of Egypt. He turned against that, he decided there was only one god, that was the god Aton. He called himself, Eknaton. Well, you'll find that sometimes spelled Eknaton, sometimes Aknaton, sometimes Akna, all, you could find it under any vowel you want in the dictionary, in a book you have to know which the particular book starts with. I like the E perhaps because I first read about it that way. Echnaton. But he's just as apt to be in the particular book you look in, Ikhnaton. However you're going to represent the vowel, we know there is a vowel but we don't know exactly how to represent names by them. He turned against the worship of Amen. He declared the old Egyptian system of representing Pharaoh as a stuffed dignified form, always just so formalized that often a king would take the statue of a previous king and he'd rub off the name and put his name. It'd would do just as well for his statue, because the statues didn't look like the men, they were just great beautiful regal pictures. He said no, we should be natural. He told the artists, draw me as I am. He'd say no, you're making

me look too good, make me the way I look. And so probably in order to please him, they made him look worse than he did. Some of his pictures look pretty bad but his wife was a beautiful woman, Nephertasi, and the pictures of her are very attractive but very different from all the pictures we find before and after. He wanted things natural, he wanted everything to be in the sight of the god Aton, which is the material disc of the sun. You see him holding up his hands like this, and you see the sun's rays beating on the hands, he's connected with his god Aton, the material disc of the sun. And he fought the priests of Amen. And he decided to get away from the cities which had been cursed with the polytheism of the Amen worship of Egypt. And to build a new city which would never have had any worship in it but the worship of Aton, and consequently he built a new place to which he moved his headquarters. And this new town to which he moved his headquarters was a great boon for archeology, a very great boon. The reason is that you have the kings in Egypt living in a place and then you have it disintegrating, and new ones, a house gets old and falls down and others built on top of it, just one after another comes up, and so it's all in confusion as far as our finding out what it looked like when any particular man lived there. But he went out to the desert and built a new city and a brand new place. And after his death his successors deserted it and left it and it remained there and the Germans have excavated it, and we know exactly what that place was like when he was there. We have found many remains from his time. And we call it, the modern name of the place is El Amarna. There again, some spell it--this is the way I like to spell it, El Amarna. Now, that again, you look it up in the index of a book, it may be under El Amarna, it may be under Tel-el-amarna, because it is a tel, they may call it Al Amarna, instead of El. They may just call it Marna. It could be under any one of several letters. But El Amarna is a good way. And it's approximately that, whatever way you want to do it. You see it's in Arabic and they don't exactly correspond to our English. But Tel-el-Amarna has been very, very important for our knowledge of ancient Hebrew, because we have found all these remains from the Pharaoh, from this Pharaoh Amenophis IV, and there are things that were carried over from his father Amenophis III. His father was a great conqueror. He was not interested in war, not interested in conquest, paid little attention to the ad-

ministration off the empire, but devoted himself to trying to spread his philosophical and theological ideas. And when he died, the priests of Amen gained their power back. Oh, one more thing I should say though, about the importance of El-Amarna is this, back in the 1880's a peasant woman living near El Amarna which had then not yet been excavated, we knew nothing about it--this peasant woman tripped against something. And reaching down to see what had caused her to fall, she found a little rock jutting up out of the ground, but it looked different from ordinary rocks, she dug into it a little it had queer little marks on it, and so she called a friend, and he began to dig there, and they dug up three or four hundred little things about the size of a cake of ivory soap, some of them, some a little smaller, some quite a bit larger, and he said these are antique things, and there are people from Europe who are foolish enough to want to pay good money to get these things, so he put them in a gunnysack and made the trip three hundred miles toward ~~the~~ Cairo. And there in Cairo he went into a little shop and tried to sell these antiques. The dealer paid him a little bit for them, and pretty soon, an Egyptologist came in to buy some antiquities from the dealer, and he said here I've got some antique things found in Upper Egypt. And the man looked at them, saw these queer little marks on them, he said that doesn't look like any antique. It didn't look a bit like hieroglyphics or higher (11)

He said it's of no value at all. So it stayed there in the dealer's shop for a little while. And then a German who had been excavating in Mesopotamia made a visit to Egypt before going back to Germany, and he happened to go to the dealer's shop to get some souvenirs to take home to show something of Egypt. And he saw one of these and he looked at it and he began to read it right off, Babylonian cuneiform writing, the writing of a land several hundred miles away. And this was found in Upper Egypt, 300 miles out of Cairo. So the German bought all he could afford of them then, he bought a few hundred of them, couple of hundred I guess and then an Englishman came through, and he bought a few hundred. These were put in the British Museum. Most of them are either in Berlin or the British Museum, though a few aren't. We call them the Tel-el-amarna tablets. And in these tablets we have letters from Amenophis III or Amenophis IV to other rulers of the day or from them to him. They are the archives of state of Echnaton and his

father. And in these archives we read, we don't have a history, it is people writing official letters. They are mostly in the Babylonian language but it's a simplified Babylonian. It's like today. Well, I shouldn't say today. I speak from my experience 20 years ago, being ⁱⁿ Hungary and wanting to send a telegram ^{to Poland.} ~~home~~. I could send it in Hungarian if I wanted, the language of the country from which it is written, but I didn't know any Hungarian. I could send it in Polish if I wanted, the country to which it was going, but I didn't know Polish and neither did the American in Poland to whom I was sending it. Or I could send it in French, because that is (13) that is the official language of the whole world for diplomacy or for telegraphy, any treaty between any two nations is apt to have its official text written in French. That's the (13 $\frac{1}{4}$) language, like German is the language of science, French is the language of diplomacy, and English the language of business today.

Well, at that time Babylonian was that, but it was the simplified Babylonian that the scribes used in Egypt, and so the Egyptian pharaohs who spoke Egyptian, writing to Canaanite kings who spoke Hebrew, they wrote in Babylonian, both ways. And occasionally they have a little bracket and they have the Hebrew word written in Babylonian letters to show what the word is that they are not sure of the Babylonian word used. We call these (13 3/4) and they throw light on the early stages of the language. But these tablets tell us a great deal about conditions in Canaan during this period. And they tell us a great deal about the whole general set-up, many of them are (14) kings. We have many of the important cities in Palestine named in them but they also (14 $\frac{1}{4}$) beyond Babylonian kings, the Hittites, and so on. When Echnaton died his wife wanted to keep ruling, so she wrote the king of the Hittites and said, please send a son down to marry me and be ruler of Egypt. The King of the Hittites wrote back and said I don't have a son I can spare, my only son has got to reign here. Well, she said send somebody else and say it's your son, so that I can keep ruling Egypt, and marry him. And eventually they did send someone but he was killed on the way, so it didn't work out. And Echnaton's sons-in-law, you see, wanted to reign. ~~But-you-see-El~~

But you see, ElAmarna is of great importance for the material things found there with the light that they throw on the general life of Egypt of the day. It's of great importance for these important records that we have that contain just about the earliest Hebrew known (15) and that show the conditions in Palestine. It's of importance because others in these records are people named the Habaru, which is very similar to Hebrew, is mentioned as conquering Palestinian cities and some scholars say this is definitely the Hebrews under Joshua conquering, while others say it can't possibly be.

O.T.History 145. (1/2)

...raised the question and it's important — because we have the evidence of the monotheism of this king of Egypt, Acknaton. And Beyd Freud, Sigmund Freud, one of the last books he wrote, was a book called MOSES AND MONOTHEISM, and in this book he said how Acknaton originated monotheism, and Moses is an Egyptian nobleman who learned from King Acknaton and then after Acknaton died and it lost/out in Egypt, Moses this Egyptian nobleman went to a group of slaves in Egypt and taught them this teaching and organized them and led them out of Egypt on the exodus. And Moses, this Egyptian nobleman, did a great deal of good for these slaves but they were quite ungrateful to him and one time they got so angry at him they killed him. And they killed him and forgot him, so monotheism disappeared. But the act of killing the great father, leader, Moses, for his authority, made a trauma in the psyche of these Hebrew slaves with the result that though it was forgotten completely for many centuries, in the days of the great prophets, Amos, and the others who invented monotheism ~~amongst~~ according to the higher critics, it wasn't an invention out of their clever ideas, it came from this trauma in their brains from having destroyed Moses. Their ancestors having done this. And the result is that the old teachings of Moses, which had actually come from Acknaton, came back through Amos, and that is what produced our Old Testament. Now that's Sigmund Freud's brilliant theory in his book MOSES AND MONOTHEISM. As you see, there are many points in which it is pure, as in the idea of the trauma, (2) of that generation in certain

I don't think the admirers of Freud's psycho-

logical suggestions

this par-

particular book. But it had something of a when it first came out.
wh
 But this is the theory with which it deals and this is the theory which Freud built upon this. Now, to my mind, it would be much more reasonable to turn it around the other way and to say that if the Israelites were in Egypt at this time, as I think it is likely they were, it would not be at all strange if it was through them that the idea of monotheism reached Acknaton, rather than to say the opposite. It would seem to me much more natural but we can't prove it either way. But there have been many scholars, thirty years ago, who said you couldn't have monotheism before Amos, when it was invented. Moses couldn't have been a monotheist because there was no monotheism till the time of Amos. Here is absolute unquestioned proof there was monotheism as early as 1400, about 1400, yes a little after 1400, 1380 to 1360, there was monotheism in Egypt, it is a true monotheism, a belief in one god who had established and controlled everything. Then of course they go on from that to the view of derivation, they say, yes, there was monotheism there, this great individual, this brilliant individual, this pharaoh invented monotheism, and Moses and the Israelites just got it from him, like Freud did. But further investigation shows very clearly, that while it is a true monotheism it is utterly unlike the monotheism of the Old Testament. His god is the material disc of the sun. It is not an ethical God. There is nothing of emphasis in it at all. It does not call for any higher standard of life than does the god Amen. It may call for more naturalness, more openness of showing things, but it is not ethically related to Biblical beliefs at all. So you see, the relation of it to the theories of the invention of monotheism, and so on, is, it has many factors, many points involved in it.

Well, now after the death of Acknaton, a son-in-law succeeded him, a man who had married one of his daughters, then in a comparatively short time after he had succeeded him, he died and was succeeded by another son-in-law, and he only lived a short time and he died. His name was Tut-ank-amen, the living image of Amen. He was a son-in-law, he married the second daughter of Acknaton. He didn't live very long, and he died and they buried him in Upper Egypt, in a tomb where the 18th dynasty kings were buried, but

the others put their tombs up on the (5 $\frac{1}{2}$) and they all were found by ancient grave robbers, all the others ~~but~~ were robbed and we just have holes in the ground, all the ~~kings~~ of the 18th dynasty, except this one. But this one, one of the most minor heroes of all the 18th dynasty--evidently it was the confusion of the times, and the turmo~~l~~ that led them to hide his tomb. Instead of going into the side of the wall, they went down into the ground in front of the (6) so that the entrance was hidden. And though people knew about King Tut-ank-amon from Egyptian history and they had found the tombs of all the other pharaohs with the names up there on them, but nothing in them, the tomb of Tut-ank-amon was never found by ancient grave robbers, nor by any modern ones, until I believe it was 1924, and then it made a~~g~~ great sensation all around the world, when the tomb of Tut-ank-amon was found. And someone discovered it there, and when they went into it there, and there's a cave ^{that runs} ~~dig~~ clear back to it, and you go into the ground, clear back there, as far as perhaps ~~four~~ or five times the length of this room. A great ~~big~~ tunnel like a big mine, and in it all these rooms and all the things put in there with the dead ~~pharaoh~~. They took the jewelry from it and put it in a great big room in the Museum in Cairo, a friend of ~~mine~~ who has just come from London, told me that when he compared it to the crown jewels of England, it impressed him that the jewelry of the tomb of King Tut-ank-amon was more elaborate, more expensive, and more expensively decorated than the crown jewels of England, and that is what was put in the tomb of one of the lesser kings of the 18th dynasty. And with it there are beds and chairs of all types of things, and on every one of these wooden things, on the one ~~side~~ it says Tut-ank-amon, on the other side it says Tut-ank-~~amon~~. So his name appears ~~on~~ one side as the living image of amon, the leader of the (7 $\frac{1}{2}$) polytheistic gods of Egypt, ~~god~~ and ^{on} the other side as the living image of aton, the one monotheistic god, the only god who existed, the dire enemy of the gods of Egypt. I call Tut-ank-amon there the first modernist in history. He carried water on both shoulders. He was a true monotheist and a terrible enemy of one. What it means is simply he was trying to play both sides and stand for both. And when the excavators went in there in 1924, I think it~~w~~ was, they told about a great big inscription over the door which said, let no ~~one~~ enter this tomb, let any one who comes in here, the curse of

the pharaohs is upon him, and told the dire things that would happen, and they wrote that up in the papers, and it is a fact that within ten years, with fifteen years, let me say, after these excavators went in there--there was a part of about ten went in--there isn't a single one of those excavators but what within the next fifteen years, either an uncle, a second cousin, a grandparent or some ~~body~~ other relative died. Every single one of them. You hear a lot about the curse of the pharaohs.

(9 to ^{9½} 10 quiz) Did Moses get his monotheism from the man whose name you've just written down or did he get it from the Israelites in some measure? Is there a relationship after all between the two except on the basic one of monotheism, because there are such sharp differences in ~~o~~ other (10) Was Hatshepsut the daughter of pharaoh, who rescued Moses? They say that's pure conjecture, there's no reason to think she was, though she may have been. Was Thotmes III the pharaoh of the oppression? It's entirely possible, he was a great builder, but so were many of the pharaohs. ^{Did} ~~This~~, the Israelites leave Egypt, ~~go-te~~ during the reign of the man whose name is one of these slips of paper ~~you~~ you've turned in to me? It was a time when the administrative power of Egypt became greatly weakened, it was a time when he was so interested in spreading his philosophical and theological ideas that he neglected to administrate the internal disorders growing up. Externally, ^{as} we learn from the Tel-el-marna tablets, the power of Egypt was waning. His father and his great-grandfather's expeditions had given a great deal of prestige to the name of Egypt, and many nations remained subject to it because of fear of that prestige, but ~~the~~ the power of the prestige did not show itself during this reign. And many letters from sympathizers of Egypt came asking for help and none came, and so the empire pretty well went to pieces during the reign of his sons-in-law. And ~~the~~ of course it's of great interest to us, this reign, because the grave of Tut-ank-amon shows the tremendous wealth of Egypt at this time, (11¼) the great But during the reigns of these sons-in-laws the weakness which had come during the reign of this king, I don't know whether to call him Amenophis IV, Ichnaton, Echnaton, Achnaton (11½)

the power of Egypt became very small. These priests of Amon took over the power pretty thoroughly during the reigns of these sons-in-law. And they cut down most of the monuments

of these kings, these monotheists. They cut down his monuments, they went through inscriptions crossing his name off, as he had crossed the name of Amon off wherever he could before. But eventually one of the men connected with the ^{Temple} ~~seas~~ of Amon took over the kingship, and established the 19th dynasty. I won't bother you with the name of (12 1/4) nor of his successor Rameses I, who were fairly unimportant kings. His son Rameses I was a king of great power and historical importance but he only reigned 18 years. But he was defeated by a king called Rameses II, and Rameses II is one with whom you ^{should} ~~can~~ be familiar. He is the great outstanding king of the 19th dynasty. His reign has been dated from 1301 to 1235, at least present tendency today is to date is a little bit later, I think, 20 or 30 years later, but it will be approximately that. The early part of the, the first half or two-thirds of the 13th century, about 1301 to 1235 or maybe (13) a little later.

Rameses II took over in Egypt which his father had made great and strong. His father carried on expeditions to Palestine and Syria, his (13 1/4)

dynasty had reestablished, administering power throughout Egypt. Rameses II had a powerful nation, and a (13 1/2) body, and the habit of carrying on conquests already established, and he proceeded carrying on great conquests, which he celebrated with mighty monuments that he erected. Ramesis II, the name is ~~is spelled~~ spelled in different ways again. Those who want to stick as close as they can to what the original translation may have been, are apt to write Ra-mose, the sun god as a child. Ramose II. We are most apt to spell it Rameses, Cromwell putting 3 s's, esses. After all, we have the Egyptian writing (14 1/4) and we have no way of knowing exactly how he would've written it in English, if he had written. So that it's purely a matter of (15)...

O.T.History 146. (1 1/2)

...but Rameses II was a very powerful ruler, a great conqueror, and he put up many great buildings. And in Exodus 1, we read that the Israelites built for Pharaoh treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses. And so people say, Rameses II is the first great king with the name of

Ramesés. Rameses I, his grandfather, being comparatively unimportant. And the town named Raamses might have been during his reign, therefore he ^{must} ~~might~~ be the Pharaoh of the oppression. And surely he would fit it very (1) because he was a great conqueror, a great builder with many buildings all over Egypt, he built great statues of him, some of them nearly as high as this building, which he put up in different places, and made the name very, very prominent, and he must have had thousands and thousands, ^{perhaps} millions of slaves working under the lash, to put up the great buildings. (1 1/2)

Many think, say 60 years ago nearly all, that he was the Pharaoh of the Oppression. Well, he reigned as you notice from the figures I gave you nearly 70 years. He was over 90 when he died, and during the latter years he had been rather weak and the son who ^{succeeded} ~~defeated~~ him was nearly 70 and so he was a weak king compared to his own father. His name was (2) Mernethka, which again is spelled various ways, I will give you one spelling, Mernethka, who defeated him, used to be dated 1235 to 1220. Present tendency is to begin his reign about 11 years later, we're not certain today. I don't care about your knowing the exact date, but the approximate length of the reign. You see how much shorter he reigned than his father. His father reigned nearly 70 years, his son reigned only 10. An old man succeeded by an old man. And naturally his father, he wasn't as great as his father, but he put up monuments to try to look as if he was as great as his father (2 3/4)

he'd take some of his father's statues and instead of (3) for himself, he'd cross off his father's name and put his on the statue. He put up a monument to celebrate the conquest of Palestine and this monument is the first place where the name of Israel has been found in anything outside the Bible. He says Israel has no seed. Now the Egyptian word seed is just like the English word, has two meanings, may be the seed of grain, it may be the descendants of a man. And so people take this, Israel has no seed, they say he is referring to the destruction of the Israelite children in Egypt. Others say he is writing ^{a story} of the conquest of Palestine, and he mentions other nations in Palestine he has conquered and in the appropriate place between them he mentions Israel, and so they say this must mean, show Israel is already in Palestine. But then again the first ones

say, yes, but all the others have a sign before them which is the Egyptian ideograph for a nation, or for a land, while Israel has before it the Egyptian ideograph for a people, and so it shows that the people Israel who should be in Palestine are not there but in Egypt. And (4 1/2)

Well, the fact is there's too little material to build a conclusion on. But this monument which has on it the names of maybe a dozen people that he claims to have conquered, and Israel mentioned in the middle of them, because of the great interest of the modern world in Israel is called the Israel (4 1/2) in modern times. I'm sure Mernethka would have been amazed, that his great monument to his conquests would be called the Israel (4 3/4) when Israel is one of a dozen people mentioned, and that somewhere in the middle of it. But to us of course that's a great (4 3/4) the first mention of Israel. But it is (4 3/4)

for saying this is the time of the exodus, and for saying the exodus was already over and (5)

So there have been those who ^{thought} saw that the exodus took place during the 18th dynasty and there have been those who thought it took place during the 19th dynasty, and the attitude of most of the critics twenty years ago ~~would~~^{to} say it happened both times. In other words a little group of people left Egypt during the 19th dynasty and another little group of people left during the 18th dynasty, and Joshua was during the 19th dynasty and Moses was during the 18th, and the two separate little movements that went into Palestine have become confused in the story and put together as if it was one, Joshua actually was earlier and came later in our story. That's what most of the critics said about 20 years ago. But today the most of the liberal scholars who really deal with archeology much have reached the conclusion that the exodus was in the later period, in the 19th dynasty, and most of them are quite strongly convinced of that today. In one way it's a step forward because instead of thinking it's a composite story of two different movements, they hold it's one movement which took place in the 19th dynasty. But on the other hand, while the bulk of the conservatives 50 years ago took this position it was a later period, a good many of them have now moved back to the earlier period. Some of them wax vehement on it. In fact,

I am told that a man in this very seminary who, three or four years ago, taught a course in Old Testament History, spent maybe a third of the semester trying to prove that the exodus was in the early period rather than the later period. Personally, I don't see that it makes such a great @ifference which it was. The scripture doesn't say, it doesn't say who the Pharaoh was, and we don't know. And there is evidence pointing to the 19th dynasty and there is evidence pointing to the 18th dynasty, the ^{thing of} importance is that it did occur. And it occurred as described in the Bible but just when it occurred we may know some time, a discovery may be made that will prove it. There are those who wax very vehement that it's the late period, and there are those who wax very vehement that it is the early period. And I personally feel that ^{we} the advance the cause of Christianity better by sticking to what's clear and standing on it, and when we're not clear, saying, we don't know which it is. We may some time but the Lord has not yet ~~given~~ us enough evidence in the Bible or brought enough evidence to light from other sources, for us to know. Now I will say more about this later on. We will not take time to go any further than the brief mentions I've made at present about it, because from Egyptian evidence, this is just about all that can be said, as far as fixing the dates. Now, of course, the two questions hang together.

When was the exodus and when was the conquest? Now the exodus didn't take place and then the conquest a hundred ^{and fifty} years later. No conservative believes that. If the exodus was early, the conquest was early. If the exodus conquest was late, the exodus was late. So the two hang together, and there would be no point in our jumping ahead to look at evidence about the conquest now. So we will come back later at the conquest, and say a few more words about the whole question when we get there, but we will not say much. Because I personally am strongly convinced that there is so much that ^{it} is vital we know, that is definite and clear, that it is not worthwhile in the short space of three years spending a lot of time trying to prove what isn't true. Though, as I say, there are fine Christian scholars who differ with me in that approach. But at least in an undergraduate course, I don't think it should be a matter that ^{takes} makes a great deal of ^{time} difference. Now I don't want to go into any other phase of this particular question. If you have any question to

raise on this, please raise them in writing

Yes? (student.

9½) The Israelite conquest of Palestine under Joshua. I should've made that clear. I meant the Israelites coming out of Egypt and the Israelites going into Canaan, they are related. But our evidence on their going into Canaan will come from Canaan. But ~~evidence~~ ^{exodus} out of Egypt will come from Egypt, and so archeologically they are utterly distinct, but historically they relate, and are in relation as I said.

Well, now, then, this general background of the oppression, of the deliverance from Egypt, we have the king who ~~knew~~ ^{with that.} not Joseph. There's no difficulty. If it was one of the Hyksos it is easily explained, but even if it ~~weren't~~ ^{weren't} so easily explained, suppose they went out in the 18th dynasty, I don't think so, but suppose they had. The upheavals at the end of the 18th dynasty would make ^{it} perfectly (10½) plain about a king in the 19th dynasty who knew nothing about Joseph (10½)

connected with the 18th dynasty. So that is not especially difficult thing or especially strong corroboration (10½)

The one thing of background that is interesting is, the Bible describes the cruel oppression of the Egyptians to them, and the monuments of Egypt, while they do not mention the exodus and don't show definitely what had happened, do give evidence of the cruel attitude of the Egyptians toward foreigners. I've already mentioned this under Abraham, that the Egyptians detested foreigners, and that even when they're mentioning the king of Egypt's welcoming the king of the Hittites who came as a visitor and took him in state up the Nile to visit all sections of Egypt, and they put up a big monument in southern Egypt to tell of the visit of two great kings together. When you, in the Egyptian inscription, mention the king of the Hittites, you preface his name with an ideograph which means a foreigner, and this ideograph, which you use in all inscriptions (11½), even including that one, is a picture of a man standing with his hands ^{tied} clasped behind his back, pictured with a wound in his head from which blood is flowing to the ground, and they put that before the picture of the great foreign ruler who is the friend and brother of the king of Egypt in the land. That shows the general attitude toward the foreigner. After Rameses II conquered the Hittites he had a monument made representing the king of the Hittites, lying on the ground,

with a sword thrust through his back and they put that at the entrance to his palace so that everybody who walked in or out walked across the prostrate (12) of the Hittite king, that is the picture representing him. So the cruelty and oppression of the Egyptians described in the Bible is well illustrated and corroborated by what we find on Egyptian monuments. And Pharaoh stands out as a great dictatorial ruler in the early chapters of Genesis, who is oppressing the Israelites and doing what he takes a notion to without having consulted anybody else, that's the picture the pharaohs try to give us in their monuments. For instance, Rameses II shows a great battle, one great battle which we actually believe was a pretty close to a tie. We believe that it was a hardly contested battle in which he met some peoples up in Syria and did conquer them, but just gradually and by a very narrow margin, won the victory. Of course, after he really won it then he had (13)

But in his monument he shows the Pharaoh with tremendous pride holding a bow and arrow in his hand and shooting at him, and in front of him there are dozens of enemies whom this one pharaoh alone subdued for the day. Or you will see him standing, very large, holding a dozen men in his hands, or (13 1/2) bringing the others out on them to crush them to pieces. Thus the power of the pharaoh, the cruelty of the pharaoh, is amply depicted in the monuments of Egypt, and it's generally a corroboration of this general background of the Biblical account of the Exodus which has been fits in perfectly to the Egyptian situation, as we know.

Now there is one other matter of archeological relations ~~with~~ to the background which is very considerable interest, the matter of the bricks and the straws, but that relates not to the whole general background but to one specific instance described in the course of Moses' efforts to deliver the people from Egypt, and so instead of taking this under A as background, I will take it up as we look at the history of the deliverance a little bit later. And so we move on to B,

B, The Course of the Oppression. And this we will only glance at rather briefly. We find in Exodus 1 accounts of the conditions of the Israelites in Egypt there, with the pharaoh who knew not Joseph, afraid that they might become a danger within the land, and therefore trying to oppress them to such an extent that they will decrease and eventually die out. We find his putting task masters over them and afflicting them, in verse 11,

they built the Pharaoh treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses, but the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and grew. Verse 14, they made their lives bitter with hard bondage, in mortar, and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field, in attempt to...

O.T. History 147. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...latter part of the chapter. Then we have the account of Pharaoh and then after Pharaoh starts to try to deliver them, in chapter 5 we have Pharaoh making conditions even worse for them, till finally of course God delivers them. That is very much of interest, much of great homiletical value, much of emotion, spiritual value in lives, in this whole phase but in this course, we'll move on to C,

C, The Deliver^{er}ance. The coming of the deliver^{er}ance. (1) speak more about him a little further on in the history. The coming of the deliver^{er}ance. Now this/coming^{er} of the deliver^{er}ance would be interpreted two ways, it would ~~be interpreted as~~ refer to his coming to earth or it could refer to his coming to Egypt, and we will cover both senses in the discussion in this course.

First, how did he come to earth? Well, chapter 2 tells us ~~about~~ how, when the Israelites were there in bondage, God provided, miraculously and providentially, a wonderful deliverer. He provided that the daughter of Levi should take her child and should put him in ~~hiding~~ ^{the ark} in the bullrushes in the hope that some Egyptian would, in a compassionate attitude, save the child's life, because if she had him in her home he would be apt to be killed. And the daughter of Pharaoh finds the child and gets an Israelite to act as nursing mother for him, and his sister calls his own mother, who brings him up, and so he has an Israelite background for the child, and also an Egyptian background. And Acts 7: 20-22 tells us that he was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. He was brought up as a member of the royal family, he had a training which God gave him in order to carry out the great work that God had for him. There are times when the Lord takes one with no training and used them in a very great way, just as he used Balaam's ass with no training whatever, he used this animal to speak to Balaam. And there are times when God does that but they are comparatively rare. God can do what he chooses, but what he

ordinarily ~~choses~~ to do is to prepare people thoroughly for their task. And so we find that he had the Lord Jesus Christ living here on earth thirty years before he began his ministry. Paul went to Arabia for three years after his conversion before he began his great ministry, three years of Bible study and ~~meditation~~ ^{preparation}. (3 1/4) And Moses had the longest preparation and training of any, because first he was thoroughly trained in the court of Pharaoh, trained to lead be something, trained to be the great prince of Pharaoh's court, to understand the wisdom of the Egyptians, this great training in the best knowledge of the day, trained for forty years to be something, and then trained for 40 years to be nothing, 40 years of life in the wilderness as a humble shepherd, where he was learning humility, and we have him at the end of the first 40 years thinking he can turn the world upside down, starting out to deliver his people, at the end of the second 40 years so conscious of his weakness and inability that he said, send anybody you want, but just don't send me, I decline. Now of course both attitudes are wrong, God wanted ~~to~~ get him into the correct attitude which is his (4) which is not over-estimating what

but realizing that God has given him some ability and stepping forth with what ability he has, to do the task to which God called him. But the 80 years was a vital part of Moses' training, and in another sense the 40 years in the wilderness was training him to be something too. Because while it did not give him that ~~of~~ which he could (4 1/2) we can be sure that the intelligent, wide-awake Moses, highly trained in observation of the various sciences in Egypt, did not just sit and grieve for 40 years in the wilderness. He was leading his sheep here and there in the wilderness, and learning to live in the wilderness, he was learning to know the signs of life in the wilderness, learning to understand many, many things, that were of tremendous value to him when he led the Israelites through the wilderness.

We had a speaker some years ago who told ~~how~~ he had been, he had thought he would be an architect and had training in mechanical drawing, and then the Lord had called him to the ministry, and he had given up all this training he had and turned his attention to the literary ~~sort~~ of study preparatory to coming to seminary, and ~~working~~ ^{ed in} our seminary work here and he thought now that two or three years I spent on mechanical drawing and that sort of thing was just utterly wasted. And then, he became, in his second pastorate,

the people with comparatively resources but with big ideas of the kind of church they wanted to have, took a small amount or a medium/^{sized} amount of money to build a church, and he jumped into the job and found that every bit of his previous training was of tremendous help in understanding what was happening and making the money go far beyond what it would've otherwise, and I was in the church just recently, and thought that beautiful place in which to gather and in which to worship God was just delightful. God had used the training that he had thought would have no special purpose, in a very, very fine way. And here Moses in the wilderness, surely felt all my degrees have disappeared, this is just waste of time, but he didn't sit still and do nothing, and he was active, and God was giving him training and understanding that was doubtless of great value to him later. But Moses was well trained with his Egyptian education, and then with that effect which education so often had, he started out to turn the world upside down. And how often I have seen seminary students whose lives have been just like Moses in this regard, except that God didn't grab them by the scruff of the neck ~~an~~ in the end, as he did Moses, and force them back into the work in which God wants to have them. They graduated from/seminary, thought they knew everything, that they understood all the problems of the world, they knew exactly what was necessary to set the world right, and they stepped out to do it, and their ideas have been right, and they've been trying to do what was right, as Moses was, but trying to do it with (7 $\frac{1}{2}$) far beyond their training and ability. The result is just as Moses ^{got slapped} ~~felt flat~~ on his face and found it necessary to flee for his life, they have had a pretty bad slap in the ~~first~~ first two or three years, after they get out of seminary, thinking they could accomplish things far beyond their ability and their training, and then being slapped down, then they have been content with a simple humble position just following along the rest of their lives. Like Moses was in the wilderness, going along, he would've stayed there and died there, if God had not grabbed him and put him back. We need to have that spirit of stepping out, like Moses had, ^{to} ~~but~~ do the best we can for God, but we need also ^{to learn} ~~the~~ humility to use the ability that we have, and to observe and look, and to realize that our great accomplishments for Him will probably be later in our lives, after we have learned some more and had more experience, instead of right away. And if we can't set the world

on fire immediately when we start, it's no reason to decide that you'll never be a preach-^{er}, but (8 $\frac{1}{4}$)

I've been looking at Field-Marshal Montgomery's autobiography, and it's interesting to read how when the first World War, he said, there's going to be another World War, and he said the ~~position~~^{condition} of the British Army during this war has been preposterous, hundreds, thousands of men dying when, with better direction it would be entirely unnecessary, and he said, I, for one, am going to be ready when the next one comes. And the twenty years between the wars he worked hard and studied war and strategy and human nature, and he observed all sorts of things he detested in the arrangement of the British Army, and he never made himself obtrusive to the point where he got fired out, but he observed and he thought and kept quiet except when he had the chance quietly to say a word, and when the second World War started he was kicked around from pillar to post during the first couple of years of it, doing a good work in different places, but quite disgusted with the way things were going. And then they had a man all set to lead the Army in Egypt, and the man was killed suddenly and they said we've got to find a man to replace him and who's competent and ready and they picked on Montgomery. And when he got there he had 25 years of thinking and planning ready and he was put into that position and the 8th Army just ready to retreat before Rommel's force and, figuring there was no chance to do anything else, all the officers of it complaining about the inefficiency of their superior officers, and the morale at the lowest point imaginable, and he knew what to do, and he stepped in and he changed the whole set-up, and he planned it in such a way that he was able to galvanize, to revolutionize the situation and to drive the enemy back and to make the turning point in the war. And ~~we~~^{they} call him now Vice-Consul Montgomery of Alemein after his great victory there. Tremendously important to the rest of the war. But the thing that he did, was that he was ready with 25 years of thought about a problem, but he was able to do nothing before with it except to slam his head against a stone wall but was prepared to observe things and was ready and had the spirit and determination and knew his time would come and it did come and when it came he took full advantage.

Well, Moses here then, when he became of age, he stepped out to turn the world upside down and ~~when he became of age~~ ^{he found an Egyptian fighting} a Hebrew and he looked this way and that, and he said there's nobody to interfere with me now, I'm simply going to ^{put an} end these terrible afflictions, so he skew the Egyptian and hid him in the sand, and then the second day he saw two of the Hebrews striving together and he tried to make peace among them and they cast him aside with contempt and he realized his futility and he realized that he probably would be killed for having killed the Egyptian, and he fled. And so we have Moses, with this important part of his training, what to him looked like failure was simply trying to tone down that excellent quality he had of wanting to step out and do (11 $\frac{1}{2}$) for God, — but to tone it down, ~~and~~ to use his abilities and the ^{help} health and the plan that God had for him at that point. And later on, though, he was so reluctant to come back after he did this (11 $\frac{1}{2}$) and God his with great grace. Now we have him up there in the wilderness and he's up there and he's forty years there and he marries the daughter of the priest of Midian, and, Zipporah, and she bare him a son and he called his name Gershom, which is Hebrew for a stranger there, for he said I have been a stranger in a strange land. A

And then we have Moses up in the wilderness, seemingly having forgotten his own people, and the people in oppression, but God hasn't forgotten, God is getting Moses ready. And when it seems that nothing ~~could~~ ^{is} happening, very often God is working, God is preparing, God is getting ready, and it seems to us as if nothing is happening, and we push and we struggle and we shove, and we accomplish nothing, but maybe God is preparing the situation so that all of a sudden, maybe after pushing and shoving having accomplished nothing, a different person will just spread the thing wide open, and that tremendous things will be accomplished ~~in~~ in the course of a new plan, for which he's been prepared and for which he's been preparing us.

And so now God gave Moses that call at the burning bush, with its many wonderful lessons, and he gave, he told him there of his own existence, great, continuing, alone existence, and his power, and he was the God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and he was sending him down to deliver his people, and gave him signs to take in order to convince them, and

to convince Pharaoh, that he was God's spokesman, and so he takes his wife and his son and starts for Egypt, and then we have what the critical books/^{say} is one of the most questioned little bits of original material in the Old Testament. They say it shows us what the real nature of Jaweh, the real condition of the God whom Moses adopted, who they say was a foreign god, whom Moses adopted, and took over as (13 3/4) of the Egyptian god. And his real nature, they say, is wonderfully shown, by this little story which happens at the end of chapter 4 here. Yesterday I brought the (14) one of the personal books in which it gives their interpretation of this story. The story we find in verse 24. Before that we had this wonderful story of God's call to Moses and how Moses was to come, now, in Exodus 4:24, we read that Moses had started back, on his way to do the Lord's will in Egypt, and watch, and it came to pass by the way in the inn, that the Lord met him and sought to kill him. Of course the words "the Lord" (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)* is the English translation of the Hebrew word which is represented by the letters (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) * and nobody today knows how to pronounce. The critics say it is pronounced Jaweh, so in this case it would be the Jaweh the thundergod of Sinai, Jaweh is the one that Moses made the god of the Israelites. Well, this (14 3/4) * which the critics say is pronounced Jaweh, is the one who met him and sought to kill him...

O.T.148. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...they say this shows the original nature of Jaweh, Moses' name for the God of the Israelites, he was a thundergod, he was a wild sort of a being that would go on a tear, and he went on a tear, and the first one he comes across, he's on a tear, he's run amok this way, is Moses and he seeks to kill him. But Zipporah was a very clever woman, she was the daughter of a priest of Midian, she was brought up in the wilderness, and she knew that when one of these wild gods goes on a tear that the thing to do is to appease him. He wants Moses, he wants to kill Moses, he seeks to kill him. Zipporah says if you get some blood, a good sight of blood, that may satisfy him. So Zipporah took a sharp stone and cut off the foreskin of her son and cast it at his feet and said, surely a bloody husband art thou to me. So he let him go, that of course means Jaweh let Moses go. Then she said

a bloody husband art thou, ~~for~~ because of the circumcision. She had saved Moses' life by appeasing the wild thundergod Jawah, by giving him a sight of blood, giving him a little blood and then he was content without getting the big amount of blood that he would get if he slew Moses. So we have a precious bit of early tradition here, showing the real nature of Jawah, the thundergod of Sinai, whom Moses took over and made the national god of the Israelites and eventually Amos and the other great prophets of just before the exile, turned him into an ethical God and imagined he was the one God of the universe instead of one of these many gods, and our great Biblical teachings of the prophets got tamed from the new interpretation they gave to this old thundergod of Sinai that had been appeased by the sight of blood, when Zipporah took a sharp stone and showed him (2 $\frac{1}{4}$)

Well, that's one interpretation of this passage, and that is the interpretation which some people take, but, personally, I do not accept that interpretation. And it seems to me that a vital rule of interpretation is that we must consider that matters ^{should} ~~must~~ be interpreted in the light of context, and that we can assume elements of interpretation if necessary to make sense in the context. Now this is not true if you just go and pick up a lot of sentences and string them together. But I think we must give the writer of the book credit ~~for~~ having a certain amount of intelligence. Whether even if it wasn't Moses, even if it was a priestly writer, or a prophetic writer, several centuries later, as the critics would say, who gathered these stories together, and put them together, we must assume that he had a certain amount of intelligence. And when he found something that didn't make any sense, he would interpret it in such a way to show how it fit together and made sense, that things must be interpreted as a unit, that were written as a unit, even if, as they say, it was a compilation. The man who compiled it intended it to be a unit. If we believe, as I do, that Moses under the inspiration of God, wrote the ^{passage} ~~facts~~, then certainly I believe, that Moses had a meaning in it for us, and a vital one. And if that is the case, then we approach it a little differently than the critics do. We say, it came to pass by the way in the inn, that the Lord met him, and sought to kill him. Well, we say, who is the Lord? The Lord is mentioned in Genesis repeatedly, he is the friend of Abraham, he is the one who called Abraham out of Egypt, he is the one who gave Abraham the promise that

through his seed would all the nations of the earth be blessed. He is the one who gave Abraham the sign, the sign of circumcision, the sign that, and seal, of the faith that he had when he was yet uncircumcised, as we read in Romans, the sign that Abraham had saving faith, and that Abraham was the friend of God ($4\frac{1}{2}$) and He was friend to Abraham and he ordered Abraham to give this sign and seal to his children in order that it should be evident that they also could be saved through the coming seed of Abraham, through saving faith, and that it was Abraham who was to pass on that faith to his children, and that if Abraham did his part, God would do his, in bringing them to a saving knowledge of the Saviour as He had Abraham. Well, he gave him that sign of circumcision. And now we find from this that Moses had not circumcised his children, we learn that from the next verse, because it's conceivable that if he had done it, Zipporah could do it again. Very evident he had not circumcised his child.

8 Well, then we find in this verse that God met him and sought to kill him. Does that mean the Lord was the thundergod of Sinai who went on a tear and sought to kill him, or does it mean that God made things appear that Moses was in danger of death, ~~on~~ order to convey a lesson to Moses. That is not the ~~obvious~~ obvious interpretation, but it was the interpretation which in light of context is certainly the more reasonable one than the interpretation that's the picture of the thundergod of Sinai. The Lord met him in the inn and sought to kill him. What happened? Was Moses suddenly taken deathly ill? Did Moses suddenly have some kind of a fit or something kind of an upset, or something happened which to Zipporah's eyes and to his own, looked as if he was in danger of death? And Zipporah interpreted rightly, because it says the Lord sought to kill him, she interpreted rightly as a divine act. The Lord said to Moses, Moses I have called you to do my work, I have called you to do it and be my representative and lead my people, and you have not even carried out my command to circumcise your children. You have neglected this command that I gave to Abraham. How do you think that you can enter into a spiritual task, to serve God effectively when you have disobeyed a part of his plan in this way? Moses, you could go along in a peaceful life, not interfering with the devil, just living along, one person in a million, you wouldn't get into any trouble, but when you set out to serve the Lord,

effectively, then it is important that you carry out His will and His commands, and be a fit example for others. Now you have not circumcised your children, you are in danger of death for it. The Lord met him and sought to kill him. Well, when this happened, Zipporah knew what was involved, Zipporah knew what was wrong, because Zipporah immediately took action, Zipporah took a sharp stone, and cut off the foreskin of her son, and cast it at his feet and said surely a bloody husband art thou to me. So he let him go. Moses recovered from what appeared to be dangerous illness. Then she said a bloody husband thou art, because of the circumcision. One of two things ~~is~~ proven. Either Zipporah recognized that the thundergod of Sinai, on a tear, and something had to be done to pacify him, and here's the quickest way to get blood so she grabs some blood. I personally could think of many other quicker ways ^{to get blood than that.} ~~it doesn't matter~~ It seems to me she might have been able to also. But that was the quickest way, according to that interpretation she could think of to get blood, so she could satisfy the thundergod of Sinai. Or Zipporah knew what was involved because there had been discussion before. She and Moses had had long discussions about it. Moses said these children should be circumcised. God has commanded that the seed of Abraham shall be circumcised as the sign and seal that they are members of the covenant race. That they have the promise of Abraham given to them, that if we will look to him and bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord he in his time will bring them to have what this circumcision signifies, the saving faith in the coming one who will (8 3/4)

And he said we should circumcise the children. And Zipporah said, that's a bloody rite, that's a heathenish custom, I don't like that, wait till the children get older, when they can decide for themselves whether they want to be circumcised. Let them grow up and they can make up their own minds whether they want it. Don't make the poor little tots and do this to them now. And Moses said, well, I wish you'd do it the way I would like, but he said, after all, you're the mother and you have the greater part in the bringing up of a child, and if you insist, why (9 1/4)

And so when Moses was no longer just a person going along, but one stepping out to be active in the leadership of the Lord's calling, and he's doing it, with his own family not having carried out the Lord's command, then God met him in the inn and sought to kill him. And

Zipporah immediately knew what was wrong, and she immediately jumped in, she had to choose between sticking to her own views or hating Moses, and she preferred to keep Moses better than to keep her views, but was willing to give them up, in order to still have Moses. And so Zipporah jumped in and she performed the circumcision but she did it in rather bad grace. She cast it at the foot of her husband and said surely a bloody art thou to me. Called him a bloody husband (10) but she didn't do it with any very great joy. And after that Moses sent her back to her father, but she knew what was wrong, and she acted upon it, and then ^{he} let him go. And Moses went on, having performed that which was his due, in the relationship with Abraham and with the people of Israel. Having performed it he went on to Egypt and God used him in a great way.

Now this is reading some things into the story. There is no question of that. And the critics' interpretation is reading some things into the story, reading a little less into it than this one. But if you don't read anything into it you just have some meaningless words, some nonsense, in the midst of other things. That's true in reading anything. Everything has to be interpreted in the light of context. Every paragraph has to be interpreted as to what is its relation to other paragraphs. I know of ^{no} other interpretation of the passage except the two. The critics' interpretation and the interpretation and the interpretation that I have just given you. And so I think that we can find in it lessons for ourselves, as to our carrying out of the Lord's work, and our ^{preparation} ~~separation~~ for it, that we should study this word, in order to fulfill all righteousness and in order to make our lives to conform to his purpose, if they are to count for all that he wants us to count for.

Well, I think this is a vital part of Moses' preparation, and then when Moses gets to Egypt, and Moses meets with the people, you read in the succeeding chapters and you find that Moses not only has a fight with Pharaoh, but that he had to fight with the Israelites, because they were constantly saying you're just making things worse. You're making, why your oppression is worse, if you'd never come we'd be much better off than we are now. And how ready we are, when we start out to do something for people, to help them, and they don't appreciate it, how ready we are to say, oh, well, if you don't appreciate it

you can stew in your own juice, I'm going out and do what I can. But if Moses had done that, there would've been no deliverance from Egypt. Moses had his difficulties at every point, and so did Paul, and so did everyone who has served the Lord effectively. We are not sergants of the people, we are servants of God. We are giving the people what they need, not what they think they want. We have to give it in a way that will palatable, we cannot expect to have signs as Moses had, miraculous signs which ~~just~~ ^{should} convince the people. We can't expect him to give us some special providential care that he gave Moses in his great fight in the work of God, but we probably won't meet as much opposition as Moses did, ~~but~~ ^{when} we're going ~~into something~~ ^{to meet some}. We're going to meet plenty if our lives really count for God. And we can learn from the way Moses went through it and kept weak and kept his eyes on the Lord and followed him, and only God (13)

We can learn ^{from Moses} the sort of people he wants us to be, in yearning over the people as Moses did. After all they did against him, interceding for them as Moses did, and saying, Oh, Lord, blot me out of your book, but keep this people and deliver them, and lead them on. The wonderful spirit that Moses showed and the way that God used Moses, one of the great things in the Old Testament (13½)

I think for your own personal lives, for training, for the service of the Lord, one of the greatest things you can do is to study Moses' life, Moses' experiences, Moses' successes, Moses' failures, the lessons God gave Moses, and certainly it is completely (14)

O.T.History 149. (1)

...Now we were speaking about C, The Coming of the Deliverer. And under this heading we looked at something of the preparation of Moses, and we very briefly looked at his call. I want to say just a word right at this point about, in connection with the call, about a statement which has been very important in the higher critical theories. This is in chapter 6:3, this is not his first call, it is a little later, a discussion with the Lord, but it's quite similar to some of the material in the account of the call in chapter 3.

In chapter 6, verse 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ the Lord said, I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, to Jacob, by the name of God Almighty. That's another poor translation. The Hebrew is El Shaddai and the word El of course is the common word for God but (2 $\frac{1}{2}$) Elohim, the plural form, but Almighty there is the Hebrew word * which somebody who translated the Septuagint, the Greek translation, sometime after 200 B.C., in the book of Job where this name El Shaddai occurs frequently, in about half the cases translated it by the Greek word (2 $\frac{1}{2}$) * which means almighty. He did that in about half the cases, it was not done elsewhere, it was not done in Genesis, but it was just in Job, and only in about half the cases there, but when Jerome made his Latin translation, the Vulgate, he took that (3) * idea from Job and he accented it wherever El Shaddai occurred, and so we have it in Genesis now, in our English, from that. Actually, there is no way of proving, it's a name of God, just one name, but I feel that the way it's used that it means the providing God, the God who cares for his own, rather than the, having it stress on this quality of his almightiness. Anyway, this name El Shaddai is used in Genesis a good many times, God says I am El Shaddai, walk thou before me and be thou perfect. In the direct appearance and revelation to the people, El Shaddai is generally used. Otherwise the normal usage of Genesis is either God, Elohim, or it is the word which we translate the Lord, just as it is in later books. But here he says, I appeared, he says, I am the LORD, in caps, he means the Hebrew proper name that the critics call Jahweh, and which the American Standard Version calls Jehovah. I am Jehovah and I appeared to Abraham to Isaac and Jacob by the name of El Shaddai, but by my name JEHOVAH--here you have JEHOVAH in caps in the authorized version, one of the (4 $\frac{1}{2}$) where you have Jehovah in the King James Version. The American Standard, they use it regularly for this name of God. But by name JEHOVAH was I not known to them. Now the critics say that in Genesis then, when we find God called Jehovah, the LORD in caps, it shows that whoever wrote that did not know chapter 6, verse 3, which says he wasn't known by that name. And therefore it proves a distinct (4 3/4) and a contradiction. Which to me immediately (5) well, if that's so what about the man (5) who put them together? If he thought there was such a glaring contradiction as that what sort of a was he? I mean if he thought

Actually there are various

to explain, and one explanation which has been made, which I don't like particularly, is that toward the end of this sentence is a question. I appeared to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob by the name El Shaddai and by my name Jehovah was I not known to them? A question, rhetorical question. Now that is grammatically possible, but there is no sense to it. But I don't (5 3/4)

Personally what I think it means is that (5 3/4)

his character by El Shaddai, the one who cares, and that the character which the name Jehovah signifies, God of the Covenant God of the people he had redeemed would not be as expressive of the relationship with Abraham (6)

in connection with the coming out of Egypt. That's my interpretation. Now there are various interpretations, we can't be dogmatic about it. This I think we can be dogmatic about, that it is not necessary to interpret as the critics do, as proving that the man who wrote Genesis 6:3 considered this name was (6 1/2) If a man did consider that, he couldn't have written Genesis, could he? Neither could

But there are other possibilities. We should not be dogmatic about how it is, we can be dogmatic, it doesn't have to be the way the critics say it is.

Moses came to the people then and began working with the people. We called C, The Coming of the Deliverer. And we will call D, The Struggle With Pharaoh. And under this subject, number 1, would be The Attitude of the Israelites. As we know, Moses had considerable difficulty with the Israelites. And I think this is a wonderful example for our guidance, for our blessing and for (7 1/2) To know of the fact that people do not want to be delivered in such a way as (7 3/4)

they don't think we are competent

leaders

But ~~Joseph~~ ^{Moses} had the ^{task} ~~knack~~, in dealing with the people, of convincing the people that he was God's representative, and he immediately came to a very particular difficulty in chapter 5

here, where Pharaoh, seeing that Moses asked that the people be released, immediately made their tasks harder, and you will find that when you start out to do a work for the Lord, very often, at first, things get worse instead of better. Very often when you try to tackle a problem things immediately get worse instead of getting better. You try to get of an evil habit of yours, something that perhaps is not such a sin, you feel you're improving, you must get rid of it, something you feel definitely you'd be better off without, and you
(8 3/4) and you

immediately find yourself in misery and difficulty and say

(9) and saying is it worthwhile trying to get rid

of it and usually it is.

And that's what the Israelites do here. Pharaoh said, you're lazy, he said, Moses and Aaron are hindering the people from their burdens (9 $\frac{1}{4}$)

let the people, Wherefore do you, Moses and Aaron, let the people from their works? What average person today would use in that sense, let them. Of course, it is Old English. (9 $\frac{1}{2}$)

prevent them, Why do you keep them from their work? And so we read that Pharaoh said to the taskmasters in verse 7, Ye shall no more give the people straw to make brick, as heretofore: let them go and gather straw for themselves. And the tale of the bricks, which they did make heretofore, (that word tale is another Old English word, the Hebrew says number, the number of the bricks which you made before) you shall lay upon them; ye shall not diminish thereof: for they are idle: they've got to go and get their own straw, but they have to make just as many bricks as before. Let there more work be laid upon the men, that they may labor therein, and let them not regard vain words. And the taskmasters of the people went and they spoke to the people and said, thus said Pharaoh, I will not give you straw. Go you, get you straw where you can find it, yet not ought of your work shall be diminished. So the people were scattered abroad throughout all the land of Egypt to gather stubble instead of straw. What is stubble? How many of you know? Not many. When I was a boy it was a very common word (10 3/4)

and the word doesn't make much sense if you don't realize what it is. But straw, you cut

your straw into long pieces, but your stubble is just your little tiny short pieces, just the little bit that's actually left on after the straw has been cut, then it's the stubble. And so they went gathering these little tiny pieces of straw because the big straw had been gathered up and taken away for other purposes. To gather stubble instead of straw. And the taskmasters hasted them saying, fulfil your works, your daily tasks, as when there was straw. And the officers of the children of Israel, which Pharaoh's taskmasters had set over them, were beaten, and demanded, wherefore have you not fulfilled your task in making brick both yesterday and today as heretofore? The officers of the children of Israel came and cried to Pharaoh, wherefore dealest thou thus with thy servants? No straw given to thy servants and they say to us, make brick. And it's a common phrase today in our language to "make brick" without straw. It's common expression for trying to do something without the necessary materials. Make brick without straw. There's no straw given to thy servants and they say make brick, behold they servants are beaten, but the fault is in thine own people. But Pharaoh said, you're idle, you're idle, therefore you say, let's go and sacrifice to the Lord. Go therefore and work, for there shall be straw be given you, yet shall you deliver the number of bricks. And the officers of the children of Israel saw they were in evil case. They met Moses and Aaron in the way and they said, the Lord look upon you and judge, because you've made our saviour to be abhorred in the eyes of Pharaoh and in the eyes of his servants, to put a sword in their hand to slay us. Moses returned to the Lord and said; Lord, wherefore hast thou so evil entreated this people? Why is it thou hast sent me? For since I came to Pharaoh to speak in thy name, he has done evil to this people, neither hast thou delivered thy people at all. Exactly the (12 3/4)

Why do you treat us evil, you don't give us any progress, things are getting worse instead of better. I think I better look for another pastor, maybe (12 3/4) somewhere else. Well, maybe there is, maybe you don't have what it takes to the Lord's work

But right within this last year, I've had too many people coming and telling me, the Lord's been doing wonderfully in my church, we are just going forward and then I find (13 1/4)

and the people just didn't stand up with me. They made objections and difficulties and things have slowed down, and I'm getting disgusted and do you know of another place where I could candidate. And I just said had the feeling that if they knew the problem, ^{if} they knew the difficulties, and your prayers, your work, and your consecration, they would make a real step forward, instead of ~~looking for somebody~~ ^{leaving it to somebody} else ~~to~~ ^{come in and start to} candidate,

We're going to have difficulties and certainly ^{terrible difficulties,} Moses had them, but God saw him through them. The spiritual lessons in this, Moses' struggle with Pharaoh, this part of the attitude of the Israelites, are very, very important and vital for us. But there are other difficulties involved in this too.

Now before we speak of the difficulties, next we speak of a corroboration. When excavation began in Egypt it was immediately felt by some that there had been wonderful corroboration found of this. I read an article just yesterday written a good many years ago though, in which the statement was made that there were ~~treasure~~ houses in Pithom in which they found lower layers made with good straw, and next ones with just little stubble in, and the top ones with no straw at all. So (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) but you look at the Biblical account here and you could (14 3/4) interpret it as three stages ~~but it's not necessary, it may just as well be two.~~ They made the first with straw, then they were told we won't give you any more straw, you have to get stubble, they went and got stubble, and then they asked for help, and he said go at once, for there shall no straw be given, yet you shall deliver the number of bricks. That means (15) so whether two stages or three in it it is a little hard to be sure.

O.T.History 150. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...forty or fifty years ago which refer to three stages, I've not been able to find exact Egyptological background to back that up a good many popular books. But here is a statement which I found in a book published by Naville, Prof. Naville, who conducted excavations in 1883, in Egypt. In 1883 he conducted these excavations

in northeastern Egypt at a place called Tel-eā (1) --I won't bother you
 now to take time to write the name down--but, Naville's name, Naville, a Swiss archeologist,
 this place he thought would be ancient Pithom. He (1 $\frac{1}{2}$) it with the scripture
 this is the house of Phom. This Phom was an Egyptian god, and if they had the house of Phom
 there he thought this city would be Pithom (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

temples of this god and some other ^{god,} / so it
 didn't prove it was Pithom, but Pithom and Raamases are mentioned in Exodus 1 as the cities
 that the Israelites built for Pharaoh. And there in the little publication, the volume which
 I possess, called THE STORE CITY OF PITHOM AND THE ROOT OF THE EXODUS (1 3/4), published
 in London in 1903, on page 9 he has a footnote from an Englishman named
 Stewart who visited the place during the excavation, and Stewart said in this footnote
 that Naville quotes, I carefully examined round the chamber walls and I noticed that some
 of the corners of the brickwork (2 $\frac{1}{4}$) were built of bricks without
 straw. I do not remember to have met anywhere in Egypt bricks so made. So that Stewart
 felt, and Naville evidently thought well of it, because he printed it in his book there,
 with not a word of criticism of it, that here was proof, this was the Pithom that the Is-
 raelites built. Because here were the corners of the walls, made of brick without straw.
 Now I think that's going too far. Because if Exodus 1:11 says they built Pithom, and the
 story of bricks without straw is in chapter 5 and between that Moses has been born, had
 grown, and lived his life in Egypt and went into the wilderness and lived there, and came
 back before the end of chapter 5. So that the Pithom built in chapter 1 wouldn't ^{seem} be like-
 ly to be the place where the incident of bricks and straw occurred at all. And then of
 course we're not sure it's Pithom and most archeologists today tend to think that this is
 probably Raamses rather than Pithom, and that Pithom was about 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ miles further ~~away~~ in
 another place.

So, ~~whether~~ it's the exact place we have no proof of but the general corroboration
 would seem to be very interesting. Here we are told they make bricks without straw, they're
 forced to do it. Here we find a city where something like that happened. Maybe similar
 occurrences happened in (3 $\frac{1}{2}$) Who knows.

But right here we strike another difficulty. Here is Prof. Peet, Peet, who was professor in Liverpool and wrote this book I told you of, EGYPT AND THE OLD TESTAMENT, in 1924, in which he tried to show how unreliable in his opinion the Bible was, and in this statement he quotes Stewart's statement and then he says as follows, it is almost inconceivable that any traveller in Egypt should make this statement with regard to the use of straw in bricks, for though straw has been used both in ancient and modern times, its use is somewhat rare more particularly in ancient times. What is more, the writer of this passage of the narrative is certainly under some strange delusion as a function of the straw when used. Its purpose is to bind the mud more ^{tightly} effectively together, though as a matter of fact, ~~though~~ Nile mud coheres so well of itself that no binding material is really necessary. Consequently the refusal of the taskmasters to provide the Israelites with the straw ~~would~~ not in the slightest degree increase the difficulty of their labor. As a piece of local color the whole instance is unsatisfactory and goes to prove the writer's ignorance of Egyptian customs, rather than his close acquaintance with them as is so often averred. That's what Peet wrote. You notice what Peet says, the Bible said that Pharaoh said, you won't be given any straw and yet you've got to make just as many bricks as before, and they said how we going to make the bricks without straw, how can we make just as many, but Peet says straw was rarely used in Egypt anyway. You'll find it he says in ancient and modern times, but he says it was rarely used. And he says the purpose of straw is to bind it together and he says the Nile mud coheres so well anyway, you don't need anything to bind it together, and if you needed ^{it} for that it might make a difference to the quality of the bricks but hardly to the ease in making them. You might make lasting bricks with straw, you might make bricks that would not last so long without a good binding material, but how could it make it any harder. And so Peet goes on to say that some have said the purpose of the straw wasn't to bind at all but it was ~~only~~ their hands to keep it from sticking to their hands. It was an entirely ~~different~~ purpose for the straw. He laughed at that, ^{interpretation,} says it is quite absurd, says it is an attempt to evade the situation, he says as a piece of local color it proves the writer's ignorance of Egyptian customs. Well, it presents a rather interesting problem. And when I read Peet's statement, it stimulated me to look for further evidence

on it, and I did not look a great deal, I had many other things to work on, but I did have my mind open to the problem to see if I could come across something on it, and I didn't come across anything and I did not take a month off to investigate it thoroughly sometime, but with my mind aware of the problem, in 1946, when I was elected Vice-President of the American Scientific Affiliation, and asked to preside at the meeting since the President got a case of Mumps and couldn't leave California to come east for the meeting, I felt a thrill which I'm sure nobody else present felt, because they weren't aware of the problem about it, when a chemist who had been in the Department of Chemistry teaching (7) in Columbia chemistry/~~from the~~ University but was then Chief Engineer of a Wire Company in Massachusetts where he still lives today, he was then Secretary of the American Scientific Affiliation, read a paper which he had written on this subject of the bricks and the straw. And I was greatly interested in the material he presented, and I took the material and made further investigation of it, and read rather extensively in the matter to which he called my attention, and found what seemed to me to be a complete answer to Peet's statement, and a very interesting sidelight on a rather small feature, and yet of interest to quite a few persons, in the Old Testament.

Now what Dr. Copperthwaite (7 $\frac{3}{4}$) called our attention to there was the researches of a ^{prominent} ~~best~~ American chemist and inventor, early in this century, named Edward G. Atchison. I think his name is worth writing down, Acheson. I just looked him up yesterday again in Encyclopedia Britannica, the edition of 2 or 3 years ago, which I have, in order to see how much prominence he would get in that, and found that he was given a very considerable write-up for his discoveries that he made. He worked for a time with Thomas A. Edison, but his own work was in other fields, he worked in electricity with Edison for a time, but his own work was done in various other fields. He invented carborundum, his company, the Carborundum Company in Buffalo, is quite an active and successful company today. He discovered that graphite can be produced artificially, and he made various inventions that were ^{very} prominent fifty years ago, and many of which are used today. Well, he became interested in the fact that American ^{clay (?)} slaves were considered far inferior to those imported from Germany. And he investigated and found that often, in a German clay (?) which was considered very

excellent because of its far higher degree of plasticity and its greater tensile strength ~~was~~ chemically, seemed to be identical with an American, which was greatly inferior to it. And so he asked the question, why are the plates which are chemically identical superior, much more plastic, more easily worked and molded, why are they so much stronger, why are they so much better, though chemically on ordinary examination, they seemed identical? And so he looked into the best foreign clays, to find out where they got them and he found that they generally came from some secondary source to which they had been carried by a stream of water. And Acheson asked the question, why would the carrying them to a secondary place by a stream make them so much better, and then he thought of the possibility that there must be small amounts of organic matter suspended in the water, which would in some way have profoundly altered the workability of the clay, even though so slight as to be extremely difficult to detect by chemical analysis. So he took types of clay that were difficult to work and added to them small amounts of various types of organic matter and finally discovered a tremendous improvement when galatanic acid was used. And then he said he had long been interested in the story in Exodus, In the transactions of the American Ceramic Society, 1904, he described his experiments, and then he went on to say, I made an effort to find in the history of clay-working some record of the addition of vegetable or organic matter to clay. Only one instance could I find, that of the Egyptians as recorded in Exodus 1. The accepted theory of using the straw fibre as a binding agent for the clay never had appealed to me and it now seemed likely that those ancient people were familiar with the effect I had discovered. I procured some old straw, boiled it in water, decanted the resulting reddish-brown liquid and mixed it with the clay. The result was like that produced with galatanic acid and equal to the best I had obtained. This explains why the straw was used and why the children of Israel were successful in substituting stubble for straw. Of course, it would hardly be possible, were the fibre of the straw depended upon as a bond for the clay, but quite ^{feasible} reasonable where the extract of the plant was used. Now you see, what an different inclination it gives to the narrative. The children of Israel objecting, it makes our work so much more difficult. Now if the clay that they had was harder to work to mold, to form, it would be much more difficult than if, it was easier than if it was just

a matter of putting straw in in order to bind it, to make bricks that weren't as good, but it wouldn't be any harder, it would be easier, but the plasticity, that's what it is, it exactly fits with the narrative that it made it harder. Also to go and gather stubble, what good would the stubble do to bind it together, might do a little bit of good, but mighty little. But the chemical effect like this, the stubble would be every bit as good as straw. And then Peet says that bricks made with straw were very uncommon in Egypt, well, if you put the straw in for ~~binding~~ ^{binding} you would see the straw, but if you used the straw, mixing it for the effect on it, ~~you~~ ^{it} wouldn't necessarily leave any trace that you could see at all, and yet might've been used in making the bricks. And so it fits the situation very well and suggests that the Egyptians were aware of something that was not, which was forgotten until modern times. And we don't have the scientific matters explained here, but we have an evidence of the existence of the knowledge here in this story, and it makes the story clear and explains the difficulty there. ~~Not~~

Now Copperthwaite says that Acheson went on using this and that it made a great impression upon the American Ceramic Industry, that by adding this straw or galatanic acid they were able to take the clay that they used to have to work for months, to mold and mix ~~for months~~ ^{for months} ~~we-much~~ in order to get it suitable for the dishes they made from it, and other things, that now they could make in just a period of a few days, because of the great improvement by the acid. In fact, Copperthwaite gave it, I didn't come across it in the amount of investigation that I did, of cases in some Asiatic countries where he said there were ceramic ware they used to make, they used to mix and mold the things for years, one generation they used to save to prepare the clay, and in the next made these very fine expensive dishes from it, and that by adding this straw to it they were able to do it in the matter of a few months, instead of a generation. In the Encyclopedia Britannica, it ends the article on Acheson simply by saying that he was the inventor of Egyptianized clay, they called it Egyptianized after this story.

Now in my investigation of it, I looked up the articles I could find by Acheson in various scientific periodicals and I found one that interested me greatly, to show that the brick and the clay of ancient Egypt might be said to have given us our electric light

which gives us our light today. Or at least to have contributed greatly to it. There was an article in there, in, at the time of Acheson's death, telling about his discoveries and telling about his great interest in this matter of the bricks and straw, and his relations to it, which told how the principle he learned there of this organic matter, which reduced the size of the particles of the clay, made them much smaller, and thus made them more workable, and so on, he used it in making three lubricants which are mentioned in this Encyclopedia Britannica...

O.T.History 151. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...and though I'm quite out of the matter of my own field as far as automobile lubricants are concerned of that type, I've come across translators who have been familiar with it, they're called foildag, acquadag and dredag. The dag in it means defloculated Acheson graphite, and he named it after himself, the Acheson and the defloculated which is the term he used for what I believe is called colloidal now, the putting of it into smaller particles produced by the galatanic acid or the straw, and he made these three lubricants, which at least ten years ago were very widely used, and I have no more recent information on it. But in this obituary of him, in telling about his accomplishments, there was an article by a young man who told, he was young then, but had been much earlier at the time he speaks of, who told that he was working with the General Electric Company, in Schenectady, and the electric lights were then all made with ($1\frac{1}{4}$) carbon filters — as Edison invented, carbon filters — . And General Electric suggested an improvement to use tungsten filters, which was for two or three decades I think nearly all were made with tungsten filters, tremendous improvement over the carbon. But the General Electric was trying to make ~~light~~ with this tungsten filter, and they found that in order to do it they had to take this tungsten and they had to make it smaller ^{and smaller} and thinner and thinner, and in order to do that they put it through various things, very small holes they'd pull it through in order to get it smaller and smaller, and half the time they'd break. And the expensive tungsten filaments broke before they could get them drawn the right length and ~~light~~ narrowness, and they were not finding a satisfactory way of doing it, And when he was puzzling over this

problem, he visited his father in New York City and he said, there's a meeting of the Chemical Society of New York tonight, and a famous inventor and chemist named Acheson is going to give a talk and I want to hear it. He said he went and Acheson told about the bricks and straw in Egypt and the information he had found, his experience with ceramics, and how he had used it to make these lubricants, and he said he thought well, maybe there's the answer to our problem. And he went up and talked with Acheson, and Acheson gave him a little bottle of Aquadag which he had invented, following this process, and he took it with him back to Schenectady and they tried it out with the tungstenite and they found that with this lubricant they were able to make the tungsten into the small filaments necessary. And so our making of the tungsten lights, which were such a tremendous improvement, came directly from Acheson's discovery which was related to this of the straw and the bricks.

Now I thought that was an extremely interesting incident, where we have a scientific matter which was known to the ancient Egyptians and which is the background of the account here but not explained and people like Peet will look at it and take it to try to show the Bible is inaccurate. And yet when you get the whole background of the matter you find that it is accurate just as it is and that actually it did affect, not merely the quality of the bricks but the ease or difficulty of making them, and the stubble that they got would serve the purpose just as well as the straw. That is an archeological instance of this matter of the struggle with Pharaoh which I think is very interesting, showing the dependability of the Word of God.

Well, the attitude of the Israelites of course, comes out also later on in the whole wilderness journey. We won't go into further details of it now, but look at number 2,

Number 2, The Character of Pharaoh. And under that a, His Power and Authority. Pharaoh was the greatest monarch of the ancient world. It's interesting to contrast the pharaohs of Egypt with the kings of Mesopotamia. The pharaohs of Egypt calls himself a god. He is the great god, is the Pharaoh, he is the great god of Egypt, and when he dies he is enthroned with the gods in heaven, divine authority is paid to him, he is the almighty ruler, the supreme dictator of Egypt, that is the theory of pharaoh. Now the theory is different in Mesopotamia. In Mesopotamia, the king is never considered a god, either during his life or afterward. The king may be the son of the god, he may be the favorite

of the gods, he may be the one the gods like, but he is not a god. In Mesopotamia there are the laws which are important for the carrying on of life and the king has a certain duty to the law, just as the people, even though many of them transgress far beyond that, and gave themselves authority which the law does not permit them. But in Egypt the Pharaoh was considered to be the law himself. He was the dictator, the authority, Egypt is the great land of centralized authority. Well, now, this is a contest with Pharaoh who is the great god of Egypt. It is a contest with the greatest potentate of the day, as to whether the Lord can deliver his people or not. And so the attitude of Pharaoh with his great empire, his absolute power, the worshipful attitude of his subordinates, his faced with another power, the power of the creator of the universe, and the outcome of this contest is the background of the whole Israelite history thereafter. One great purpose of it is to fasten upon the minds of the Israelites a concept of God's almighty power and authority and of his (6 $\frac{1}{4}$)

And so, God could've simply given orders, let the Israelites all all of a sudden be picked up into the air and transported to Palestine, and the next morning Pharaoh would've waked up and no more Israelites. He could've done it that way. But God wanted to deliver the Israelites from Egypt but even more important than that, he wanted the Israelites to realize his power in delivering them. And to have them realize his (6 3/4) in order to keep alive the knowledge of God's power, God's supremacy, God's greatness, man's sin, and man's need of a Saviour, in preparing the way for the coming of Christ. And so these contests with Pharaoh here occupy a very important place in the Old Testament story, a very important place in laying a foundation for the New Testament teachings of God's deliverance of us from a far greater Pharaoh, from Satan himself.

Now, b, is His Personal Attitude. And here we come to a very interesting thing. It is something which is stressed in the book of Romans but which is brought out very clearly in many references here in Exodus. Exodus 4:21 lays the foundation of it. In Exodus 4:21, the first such reference, we read this statement, the Lord said to Moses, When thou goest to return into Egypt, see that thou do all those wonders before Pharaoh which I have put in thine hand, but I will harden his heart, that he shall not let the

people go. God predicts that he will ~~harden~~ Pharaoh's heart, that he will not let the people go. Does this mean God is going to make Pharaoh wicked? I don't think so at all. I think to harden his heart does not mean to make him wicked. It means to make him obstinate. It means to make Pharaoh who is wicked, Pharaoh who is a fit representative of the Prince of Wickedness, to make Pharaoh show his true character in such a way that the superiority of God to all forms of wickedness to be made evident. That Pharaoh won't just say, oh, well, it's a lot of nuisance bothering with these people, let's get rid of them, maybe we're better off without them, that Pharaoh won't just give in to a whim or a fancy, that Pharaoh won't on some inferior motive or inferior element release the Israelites without the contest making it absolutely clear, that Pharaoh is compelled to take his course because of the superiority and supremacy of God over the power of Pharaoh. And so this phrase is used very frequently in the account here, that God hardened Pharaoh's heart and that Pharaoh hardened his own heart. Both phrases are used, they are used about in equal amounts. There are three Hebrew words used for it, they are similar though, the general idea of hardening in English is quite satisfactory for them, it means to make hard. That Pharaoh determines that he won't give in to these things, he hardens his heart. Sticks to his guns, he determines to stick by his (10) and God, when Pharaoh might tend to say oh, it's not worth the bother, let's let them go, God hardens his heart, God carries him on in the direction to show human nature. We find in Romans 9:17, the apostle Paul used this as an example of God's supreme power, for the scripture says ^{unto} of Pharaoh, even for this same purpose have I raised thee up that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth. It doesn't mean God takes a person and makes him wicked. We are all wicked, we are all sinners. We are all (10 3/4)

But it means that God in his wonderful mercy chooses to give his mercy to some and to lead them to salvation through Christ, and then others who are themselves wicked, who have turned away from God, he (11) He uses their wickedness for his purposes, in order to accomplish his work that he intends to do and he raised Pharaoh up into this position of power, he raised up this wicked man into it in order that through

him it might be clear, God's power as against one who is far greater than Pharaoh in power and in wickedness.

Now I have a list here of all the uses, there are about 20 or 25 uses of the Hebrew word (11 $\frac{1}{5}$) * and who it relates to, but I don't think we need to take time for that here. The important fact is what the meaning really is, stiffening against influence for easy (11 3/4) to make a test case here, to impress on the Israelites' minds God's supremacy over the greatest potentate of the day, in order to strengthen their faith and encourage them to (12) and to keep the knowledge of God alive in a wicked world.

Now, this contest with Pharaoh consisted principally of the series of plagues. And so we look at, number 3, The Plagues of Egypt. There are ten plagues which are described in these succeeding chapters. And I might add here what are the plagues. Did God cause that there should be a tremendous blizzard, that all the land of Egypt would be frozen, and people would have such terrible cold as never experienced in that equatorial area, and did he cause polar bears to come down there and walk about through the land to damage? Did he do away with the law of gravitation there, so that the waters, instead of staying in their basins and their bowl would drop up toward the ceiling and be unreachable to them? Did he cause to (13 $\frac{1}{4}$) utterly irrational occurrences in the land of Egypt in order to enforce, to show his power, and to enforce his will against Pharaoh? Certainly God could have done these things if he chose to do so. But actually everyone of the plagues of Egypt is something of a type, that is except for the last of course, everyone of them is something of a type which is found in that climactic area, which is found in that geographical region at sometime or other. In P.H. Robinson's History of Israel, he makes this statement: none of these plagues except the last contains anything strange or abnormal. All are events which may naturally take place at the end of inundation of the Nile. The stagnant water left as the River goes down often (14 $\frac{1}{4}$) and becomes undrinkable. While fish that have been caught in it will, of course, die as the ground dries. Frogs naturally find their way through the water on to dry land and may easily be so numerous that they will be a nuisance. The pools breed

quantities of mosquitoes and these in turn produce distressing forms of skin diseases. Thunderstorms accompanied by hail are rare in Egypt but they do occur and are naturally alarming. Sand and such storms which produce deep gloom ~~may~~ quite well take place in the heat of the delta, while locusts are only too frequent occurrences. In all this there is nothing to awaken incredulity. The miracle will consist on nothing more, he says, than the coincidence of all these events and their exceptional severity. Well, I think the passage, the end of it, is going a little too far. But I think the general principle which he brings out is one which is worth noting, that God used the forces which he had already out in Egypt. He used a situation which was already present in Egypt in order to accomplish his will. He caused certain things to happen. But they were not what we would call bizarre fantastic events, they were events which made a certain...

O.T. History 152. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...in the plagues which make them miracles, make them indications of God's power and God's supremacy. The first of these is intensification, that Robinson brings out. They are most of them scourges that do occur at times in Egypt, but they are greatly intensified. They occur to a severity which would ~~be~~ rarely if ever occur otherwise. First is intensification.

Now the second is what is perhaps the most important of all. That is prediction. The fact that Moses was able to say this is going to happen, was the evidence that God had done this. The fact that something ~~extreme~~ happened, but what happened, Moses could say this is going to happen, this is God's command, he will (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

that was

that God's hand was in

this, that God

a. factors involved
So first is intensification, the second is prediction, and the third which is also in Robinson's narrative of the plagues is discrimination. There ~~was~~ darkness in all the land of Egypt but in the land of Goshen there was not. Where the Israelites were, there was the freedom from many of these things. There was the discrimination involved in that, to have them fall heavily on the Egyptians, and lightly or not at all on the Israelites.

So these are the three great factors which are involved in these plagues of Egypt. In the (2 $\frac{1}{2}$) Now, of course, under intensification there might be put the fact that so many come together at once too. You might have one say two-thirds as bad as referred to here, say in one ten-year period. Another two-thirds as bad in another ten-year period. But here you have, in a period of a few months, you have all these, and they were not very distant from one another, and occurring greatly intensified over the extent to which they're usually found in the land of Egypt. Now there are two other qualities that might be mentioned in connection with these plagues. There is, number 4, there is orderliness, there is a plan they were arranged in, there is an orderly occurrence. And number 5, there is a moral purpose involved. Now the statement is sometimes made that these plagues were a judgment on the gods of Egypt. Of course, that is true, they were primarily a judgment on the greatest god of Egypt, Pharaoh, the visible god, the one who was called a god, and had a dictatorial power over the land. Now many of the gods of Egypt ^{creatures of} were/animals, or the sky, they worshipped Re the sun-god and so darkness of course would be a judgment on the sun-god, and they worshipped various ^{COWS} ~~fowls~~, one of their gods has a body of a cow, and there are various animals which are involved with some of the gods of Egypt and many (3 3/4)

But primarily it was not against these various gods but against the one great god, against Pharaoh and of course the last one that came was particularly against him because Pharaoh's first-born was killed, as the first-born of all the Egyptians in the tenth of the plagues.

So we have then the judgment on the gods of Egypt on the plagues and we have the evidences in these plagues of God's power, the exhibition of the majesty of God, and we have the revelation in them of God as Saviour because God gave release from every one of the plagues in response to Moses' prayer. But Moses' prayer given at Pharaoh's request in most cases and with Pharaoh's promise of letting them go, and then as soon as it was over Pharaoh hardened his heart, or in some instances God hardened ^{Pharaoh's} his heart, ^{that he} and would not give in, it's a very easy thing in such a situation to say oh, I'll do anything to get rid of it, but once you're rid of it, then you think of the other thing. Like the Pied Piper of Hamelin where the people wanting to get rid of these rats, they'd ~~have~~ ^{him} given anything in

the world he wanted, and the comparatively mild things he asked for, oh, they'd be glad to give, but once he got them rid of the rats, then they could think of all kinds of excuses not to pay him. Then he took their children away and then they were ready to pay ten times over ^{but of course it didn't do any good:} what they had agreed, and Pharaoh of course did similarly in his character, as human nature so frequently does (5 $\frac{1}{2}$). The concept then is one that involves a good many chapters and there are many very interesting details in the chapters. But for our purposes I think we will be content with the aspects of it which I've already mentioned. We'll continue there again tomorrow morning.

(6 $\frac{1}{4}$) We were looking yesterday at D, 3, The Plagues of Egypt. And we noticed the supernatural elements in the plagues, and how they were, taken together, an evidence of the judgment of God upon the gods of Egypt and of the supremacy of God over Pharaoh, and of his ability to deliver his people from the greatest and strongest power in the world. The study of the plagues individually has been carried out by the critics in order to show that there are various documents. God tells Moses exactly what to do and what will happen, then Moses does it exactly and it happens and they give one of those to one document and one to the other, but of course it's a narrative, while it is a little contrary to our usual custom to have a full account of a command and then a full account of the carrying out, it is not contrary to the customs of many different peoples in many different types of literature. And there's no need we have to divide them up and make them parallel narratives, as is done by the higher critics. The study of the details of them, of how little by little, Pharaoh kept offering compromises and how Moses rejected the compromises, until finally that happens which God promised in the first place, that the people would be entirely free, not partly free, is a very interesting devotional study and one which has many messages to the Christian's life and to the life of the church, but we will not be able to take time to go into those lessons in this course, but go on to

E, The Passover. The last of the plagues is the death of the first-born. Under that of course is part of the struggle with Pharaoh but closely connected with it is that which we've just given, E, The Passover. And we find this in Exodus 12. The story there tells how Pharaoh finally said, get out, and take everything with you, don't leave the little

ones here, he said before don't leave your cattle here, as he said before, take everything^{and go.} And the Lord told Moses, now is the time to go, now Pharaoh has given the full permission, Pharaoh had completely capitulated, they did not wait for further discussion, but they proceeded to go, and yet before they went, the Lord ordered them to observe a special festival.

And now here we find something which, to my mind, is one of the great proofs of revelation. The difference between this passover festival and the (9 $\frac{1}{4}$) which you would find in just about, well, in any natural group. The idea of having a festival to celebrate a victory is nothing unique. That is of course very common. In every nation, when they have a great victory, after a situation in which the issue was long in doubt, it is natural regardless of their religious situation and viewpoint to hold a great celebration, or have a great festival of some sort. We have our national holidays, celebrating the victory in the wars in which we have participated. In the holidays we remember how brave were our soldiers who won the battle, and how terrible was the enemy whom we met. Every nation has such festivals, and it is natural that the Israelites, after a tremendous victory like this, would have a big festival to celebrate. Then, this of course is not really a war in the ordinary sense, it was a deliverance, a rescue, an escape, and it would be very natural to have a great festival to celebrate an escape. The French have their Bastille Day, remembering the day in which the great prison of the (10 $\frac{1}{8}$) was seized and the prisoners liberated, while that was no tremendous victory in itself, it was the start of the overthrow of the power of the French aristocracy which ground down most of the French people. In America, we have our Fourth of July, we celebrate not the end of the Revolutionary War with its victory, but we celebrate the liberty, the freedom, in the Declaration of Independence.

Now it would be natural for the Israelites to have a festival to celebrate escape, deliverance, freedom, victory over the Egyptians. But the central idea of the passover is no one of these, and the name itself signifies something entirely different. The word (11 $\frac{1}{8}$) * from the verb * means to or to spare, though some of the critics say that it starts from a dancing class in which the word (11 $\frac{1}{8}$) * means to leap around in the dance. But that is of course

...you find ~~something~~ ^{nothing} like it on Bastille Day. These wicked aristocrats have been driving down the good people of France. We will rise up and win our liberty to which we are entitled. But here we have the idea the people are all sinners, they deserve God's punishment, God is giving the punishment to all of them, he is not delivering these people because they have certain blood, because they are the descendants of Abraham, because they are a people which can be thought of pets, but they are being delivered because they have a sacrifice (1) because they are under the protection of the blood (1 1/4)

There is an idea there which is very, very hard to imagine on the ground simply of ^{natural} national development or natural reaction to the situation. To me is one of the great proofs of revelation, that the Bible is not ~~man's~~ man's seeking for something good, but God's revealing himself to man because we have something here which is so unnatural, and so contrary to all human natural human attitudes, and human emotions. I've never heard of any other people winning a deliverance who have been, thought of themselves as sinners, and thought of their unworthiness of having a deliverer. Of course the thought may come later but right at that moment the whole thought is how wicked the others are and how good they are. This is very different, Surely only divine revelation would provide something like that. Now the critics of course try to explain the passover as just the development of a harvest festival, or some of them say that the verse that puts it in the fall here is (2 1/4) and it's really a spring festival. They to take ^{from this idea of} it ~~as~~ a dancing festival, some they have all (2 1/2) on how to get it tied up with this idea of deliverance from Egypt and how it was tied up

and if you assume that the history is correct, how they would have had a (2 3/4) vessel of this particular type in connection with their leaving of Egypt. Yes? (Student. 2 3/4. It seems to me in this case that this is rather a bringing in of judgment by the Lord from which he has made a provision that his people might temporarily escape, that is with their earthly life. It doesn't seem to be (3)

that they would all be saved through their life.) No, the picture here is of an earthly deliverance from an earthly punishment, but it's punishment which

is due sinners, a punishment which is due to their wickedness and which comes upon the Egyptians and equally upon them, if they do not have the deliverance. As far as internal (3 $\frac{1}{2}$) things are concerned, it is a type of, a picture, rather than

It is the great type of our deliverance from the power of sin and the power of Satan

that you can imagine, but in its specific application here, it is from an earthly thing that they are delivered. Yes? (student. 3 3/4) The idea of there having been a proclamation through the land of Egypt that anyone should know about this and should do it, if they wanted to, certainly not unless (4) They

were not given any instruction (4 $\frac{1}{2}$)

But the Israelites were given

it as a sign not that you belong to this earthen family, but as a sign that you were under the blood so that it would certainly seem possible for those who had adopted their beliefs (4 $\frac{1}{2}$)

to participate in it. It would not be

to their being of a certain family.

As far as the type is concerned the Egyptians are here thought of as the forces of evil.

But they are not thought of as the forces of righteousness who are adhering

but they are thought of as equally (5)

But the whole

picture is of course deliverance of the Israelites. There is here no missionary message in this picture. But there is (5 $\frac{1}{2}$)

and a suggestion that anyone could be delivered. Therefore an eventual missionary idea can be derived from it but was not present in that immediate situation.

Well, the study of the details of the passover, it's interesting, we will not take time for it in this course except to point out its great interest, in the way in which the types do three things. They remind them of their leaving Egypt, there are elements in it which suggest haste. Thus shall ye eat it, with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your staff in your hand, and ye shall eat it in haste, it is the Lord's pass-over. This of course is the immediate situation (6 $\frac{1}{4}$) they want to get out of sight. But in the carrying on of it, it is the reminder of that situation that has tied them to the specific ~~step~~ definite historical situation, the deliverance of the people from Egypt.

But then the typology in it goes beyond, way beyond, the immediate historical situation of deliverance from Egypt. It suggests the necessity of deliverance from sin, that they also are implicated in sin, they have to individually be singled out, there must be a sacrifice for each one, a lamb without blemish, a male of the first year, a family is to eat this together, and the very details of it drive home to their minds the idea that they, like the Egyptians, are sinners. They must take all leaven out of their house and eat unleavened bread for this period of seven days. They ~~must be~~ like the Egyptians, are sinners: only God's mercy spares them.

Then, of course, there is the most important element of all in this, it is looking forward to the means by which they've been saved from something far greater than the deliverance from Egypt, by which they've been saved from eternal death. There is the recognition in it that it is God's provision. No lamb could save them eternally. No lamb, no mere animal could do it, but there is a provision, there is typology in it, there is a symbolism, a symbolism which might not be at first very fully understood, but which the more you look into it, the more you realize that God is driving home to the minds of (8) that he is going to provide something which will be the parallel to the Lamb, which is the (8) of the lamb, that he is going to provide that through which you can be saved, but it is provided for individuals, but not merely for individuals, but it is provided for families, that the families can participate in this, that there is a going on from generation to generation, not a merely individual thing, though there is a very definite and positive individual reception of it as well, and that there is the application of this, that God will provide for the individual as typified by the (8 $\frac{1}{2}$) of the blood on the sideposts and the upper beam of the door.

So we have the three of the symbolisms, of the looking back to the historical event, the looking to the situation of sin and of deserving of God's punishment, and then to them as well as the Egyptians, the looking forward to the provision that God is going to make, that will give a deliverance not merely to those who escape from Egypt, but to those who in future days shall preserve this and shall look back to the deliverance from Egypt, but shall look forward to the (9 $\frac{1}{4}$) a deliverance which God gives to each family and individual. So the passover became the outstanding

festival of Israel. It became the great celebration, the great memorial, the great occasion in the lives of the Israelites from generation to generation, to remind them of the deliverance which happened to them as a group, but more important, to remind them of the one who had given it to them, more important than that, to remind them of the fact that ~~the Egyptians~~ ^{He had given it} (9 $\frac{3}{4}$) to them, not as their right, which they had by heredity, which had they had by virtue of heredity, but ^{as} a kind promise which he provided for them despite (10) their sinfulness, and that he ^{wanted} to make a provision which would correspond to (10 $\frac{1}{2}$) ^{their specific}

So it is a most wonderful thing that here, at the beginning of Israel's history, such a ^{practical} thing as that did not merely deliver them, that would be wonderful, but deliverance from sin and God's provision for escape from it. So much then for E, the Passover. And then comes, then they immediately leave Egypt.

F, The Departure from Egypt and Escape Through the Red Sea. When were the Israelites delivered from Egypt? Well, they were delivered from Egypt when God sent the deliverer, when Moses came to them. They were delivered from Egypt when Pharaoh agreed you can go, and they observed the Passover, and went. But the full deliverance from Egypt did not come until they had passed through the Red Sea and seen Pharaoh's hosts sinking beneath the water of the Red Sea. There are three stages to the deliverance. It is a little absurd (11 $\frac{1}{2}$) that people have the idea that great events must occur at one particular instant, like when John Adams was President of the United States and he sat at his desk, signing orders to appoint a new Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to determine our future judicial policies for twenty years, and laid the foundation of it (12) John Adams signed the paper, he signed papers appointing people to offices for life, one after the other. They say that just at the stroke of midnight the door opened and Thomas Jefferson was there and said, Mr. Adams, you better quit signing those papers, it's now midnight, and I am President and not you. You cannot sign any more papers. There was an instant at which John Adams ceased to be President and Thomas Jefferson became President. Well, we make instances like that in various things, but ordinarily there is a period during which various events take place.

When was the deliverance from Egypt? We notice three points at which we might say it occurred. To me it's one of the most absurd things (12 $\frac{3}{4}$)

Christ could come back in one instant and everything that happened (13)

because there's only one return of Christ. Well, when did Christ come the first time? Was it at His conception? Was it as His birth? Was it at the dedication in the Temple? Was it thirty years later when he began his ministry? Was it at the crucifixion? When was the first coming of Christ? They're all different stages of his coming. And yet about everything that ever happened has stages in it, When Thomas Jefferson~~son~~ was elected President, John Adams was repudiated thereby, you might say it was at the instant of defeat of John Adams. But then some months went by before the Electoral College met and formally voted, that might be the time. And then there is midnight when Jefferson (13 $\frac{3}{4}$) and then there's the next day

Which point was it? You can't say (14)

And so here we've had deliverance, we've had the Passover, they've marched (14 $\frac{1}{4}$)

banks of the Red Sea. And so ^Fafter their departure from Egypt and the escape through the Red Sea. Now in connection with their departure from Egypt, there is a very, very unfortunate thing in our English translation, which I have strongly recommended be changed in the new edition of the Scofield Bible, and if I recall correctly it is going to be done.

O.T.History 154. (3)

...is that the incorrect English translation of at as (3) and is as be changed and the English have what the Hebrew contains. I don't know why the King James translators when they said (3 $\frac{1}{4}$) * they translated it

and when they said * translated it . Now it may be that they were following a tradition from the Vulgate, I haven't traced it; I'm not sure whether it's in the Vulgate or not. It may be that it was from some previous translation, that they simply took it over. Or it may be that it was their conclusion, but whether they did it originally, or some others, I think (3 $\frac{1}{2}$) more polite, instead of asking like children, asking for things, they have the Israelites borrowing, it sounds more polite doesn't it? Instead of your asking me to give you ten dollars, you say lend me ten dollars, knowing that you have no thought of giving it back, but it's a way of asking for it. It's much more polite, and they wanted to make it much more polite, they lent it to them rather than gave it to them. But it's not what the Hebrew says. And it seems very much more polite to do it that way, but on the other hand it seems much less honorable to do it that way. It is less honorable. And it has been a great problem with interpreters in recent years. The ethics of the Old Testament. The Israelites leaving Egypt and borrowing things from the Egyptians and then walking out and taking it away and never returning. And the Egyptians lending them things and never getting it back. Well, that would be dishonest and it is not what is stated in the Bible. It is an incorrect English translation that they borrowed of the neighbors all those things, and their neighbors lend them these things. It's an utterly incorrect English translation, which may add courtesy but which detracts, which removed honesty, from what we read, and it's very unfortunate we have it. Now, I was looking at an edition of the Bible last night, I forget which one it was, but I just happened to notice in the margin (5 $\frac{1}{4}$)

that that one had marginal, borrowed. Literally asked or * (5 $\frac{1}{4}$)

Well, if that's what the Hebrew said, it should be in the text, not just in the margin, in case somebody asks happens to look at the margin. And I hope (5 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Yes? (student. 5 $\frac{1}{2}$) Demanded. Ask can be demand, and to borrow What it says is ask, they asked. I think it should be in the text. Good to have it in the middle, that makes the answer clear to those who will look at the middle. Yes? (student. 6) They did not borrow,

they asked. The situation is such that the Israelites had been held in bondage for some hundreds of years, had been forced to do a great deal of hard work for which they were not given pay, proportionate to their work at all, they were held in slavery, unrightfully. And under these circumstances God compelled Pharaoh to let them go and to let them leave the land, and he tells the people to ask those around for gifts, and the gifts are a very, very small portion of the compensation to which they were entitled for the work which had been unjustly ^{1. (1)}robbed by the slavery into which they had been placed, and under those circumstances the Egyptians, I have no doubt, understood perfectly well what they were doing. They were saying we are leaving the land, we are leaving this bondage and it is only proper that you give us something, that we don't own anything. And when a person is released from the penitentiary in this country, I think they give them a suit of clothes and ten dollars and they give them something (7 $\frac{1}{2}$) that they don't go emptyhanded. In this case, instead of its coming from the Egyptian government, as a government, it comes from the Egyptian people, as individuals. But they ask for, not a recompense to which they might be entitled but for a small portion of the recompense as a help to them as they go. And the Egyptian people, having gone through² the plagues, and realizing the fact in which their nation is implicated, they give to them. Perhaps their feeling was a little bit like the feeling of the United States after the war with Mexico. The Mexican government was extremely weak and the land was overrun with bandits and under the circumstances, when the Mexican war came, the United States troops conquered the whole land, everything was in their hands, and then the government in Washington ordered them to set up a government to negotiate with. Personally, I think that if all that territory had been held and given the freedom which we have, not held as a country certainly but given the freedoms that we have today, I personally think that every Mexican would be far better off as a free American citizen than they were at least till a few years ago, with what they went through then. But the idea which was felt in Washington was, they are one nation, we are another, it is not right for us to take anything from them. There were three ideas, there were a few wanted to do what I think would've been right, given them freedom, justice, and placed them under the constitution we're under; there were a larger number who said let's

take the whole northern half of Mexico; there were a still larger number who said let's take the northern part of California and New Mexico and Arizona, this area; well this area wasn't taken, and the line (9 $\frac{1}{2}$)

But after that line was made and these large empty territories which were largely subject to banditry and confusion (9 $\frac{3}{4}$) by the

were brought into the United States right after that. Then a group of people who represented the United States Government went to the Mexican government and said we would like to buy a little area from Mexico in southern New Mexico, and in this little area, small section (10)

this little tiny bit of mostly desert land, some of it along the river there, was purchased with a very, very large price for that kind of (10 $\frac{1}{2}$)

but it was a sort of salving the conscience for those who felt that the Mexicans, a handful of Mexicans having been in that land first, it was wrong for us to take California, New Mexico and Arizona and so on, and they should (10 $\frac{3}{4}$) this big price for this little bit of land down there.

Well, this is an entirely different situation. There had been no question there, nothing of that type whatever, but in the Egyptians who gave to them, the feelings are somewhat the same, there is a parallel, an illustration. Of course New England, all the northern part of the United States, was against the Mexican War from the first, fought it all the way through. But there was a feeling there on the part of the Egyptians of the wrong which had been done, and they ask and they seek things as a means of giving to some extent a recompense (11 $\frac{1}{2}$) and providing them with what they need for their journey. But the idea of borrowing and lending is absolute-introduced, it is not in the original. The idea of taking and giving is the idea, taking and asking (11 $\frac{3}{4}$) and giving for these particular circumstances.

Yes? (student. 11 $\frac{3}{4}$) No, pharaoh kept saying you can't go and then a plague would come and then Pharaoh would say you can go if you'll only get us over the plague. You pray for us. And then Moses would pray, the plague would be removed and then Pharaoh would

change his mind and say you can't. And then he'd say you can go and sacrifice but you mustn't take your animals, or your little children. And then he said you can go and take your children but you mustn't take your animals. He was giving all kinds of concessions, but he would say in the middle of each plague, yes, go ahead, and when the plague was over he would take it all back. Now, in this case, when the first-born were killed, then you read that, in chapter 11, verse 4, Moses said thus saith the Lord, about midnight, oh, no, it's chapter 11, verse 1, the Lord said to Moses, yet will I bring one plague more upon Pharaoh and upon Egypt, afterwards he will let you go hence: when he shall let you go he shall surely thrust you out hence altogether. Speak now in the ears of the people and let every man ask of his neighbour and every woman of her neighbour, ~~and~~ jewels of silver and jewels of gold. They had gone through (13 $\frac{1}{2}$)

It was, the people knew, the Egyptians knew how Pharaoh had given him (13 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Most of these Egyptians who did this realized that (13 $\frac{3}{4}$)

now there is predicted one more plague, one more very great one, and so in verse 5, and all the firstborn in the land of Egypt shall die, from the firstborn of Pharaoh that sits on the throne, to the firstborn of the maidservant behind the mill, and all the firstborn of beasts. So then they hold the Passover, celebrating the fact that they were now going to leave immediately, and the tenth plague takes place simultaneously with the Passover, but then in chapter 12, verse 30, Pharaoh rose up in the night, he, and all his servants, and all the Egyptians, and there was a great cry in Egypt, for there was not a house where there was not one dead. And he called for Moses and Aaron by night, and said, rise up and get you forth from among my people, both ye and the children of Israel, and go, serve the Lord, as you have said, also take your flocks and your herds and be gone, and bless me also. And the Egyptians were urgent on the people that they might send them out of the land in haste, for they said we are all dead men. After the firstborn we'll lose everybody (14 $\frac{3}{4}$)

Under the circumstances they were very glad to give them something to help them go...

...celebrate their escape, but stresses the fact that God did not make them participate in the tenth plague, but that he does, even ^{so he} has them with their loins girt, having ready (3/4)

call your attention to it. Well, now the Departure from Egypt, then, comes right after the Passover, and also right after the tenth plague which happened simultaneously with the Passover, and they leave Egypt, and this great host of people heads up into the wilderness. And in verse, then of course we have the provision, the pillar of cloud, the pillar of fire and so on, the provision for the wilderness journey, which we'll look at a little later under consideration of the Wilderness Journey. But it comes right after their leaving Egypt. But then in chapter 14, the Lord says ^{to Moses} speak to the children of Israel, they turn and encamp before Pihahiroth, between Migdol and the sea, over against Baal-zephon, before it shall ye encamp by the sea. For Pharaoh will say of the children of Israel, they are entangled in the land, the wilderness hath shut them in. And I will harden Pharaoh's heart, that he shall follow after them, and I will be honored upon Pharaoh and on all his host, that the Egyptians may know that I am the Lord. And so God caused that the Israelites should depart in this particular way. Now I don't think it means that because they simply go in a different way, it probably would've been a bit difficult to escape out of the land completely with this great line of Egyptian forts stretched out between their land and the land outside, and with the various difficulties this probably was as good a way to go as any, but it was a way which made it, which perhaps moved them a little slower than they would have been otherwise. The main point here is that God is going to harden Pharaoh's heart. Pharaoh is going to continue obstinate, he's going to make one more try to hold them even though they've started. And so the king of Egypt takes his host and pursued the people and the people are camping by the sea, and they look up and see the Egyptians coming. They say to Moses, because there were no graves in Egypt, hast thou taken us to die in the wilderness? And of course, there is the thing in connection with any revolt. If it is possible for a people to escape from oppression, it is always the thing to do, to escape from oppression, but (3 1/2) a force's efforts to escape, before there is enough strength to accomplish it, it often leads simply to greater

oppression and greater misery, and greater difficulty than they had before, and People feel exactly like they did here. Is it because there were no graves in Egypt, in Egypt we were suffering, in Egypt we had this terrible oppression but certainly it was better than just being killed out here in this wilderness. And (3 3/4) the people would have been if God had not delivered them, but God knew what he was doing, He brought them to this place intending to bring them safely through, they could have gotten through safely if Pharaoh hadn't come but it would take them longer, Now in the situation there, Pharaoh seems to have them hemmed in, and he did not intend to kill them all, he intended to kill some of them and take the rest back as slaves, but they couldn't tell which ones would be killed, they were filled with terror, and Moses said, fear not, stand still and see the salvation of the Lord, which he will show you today. What a verse that is for our lives. Fear not, stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord, which he will show you today. They didn't just stand still down in Egypt and expect God to pick them up and put them in Palestine. They started out to go, they did their part, but they reached the place where there was nothing they could do. They reached the situation which was hopeless, ^{from a} human viewpoint, and God said, stand still and see the salvation of the Lord. And God does want us to do our part but he doesn't want us to worry or be anxious because he wants us to know that whenever the situation is crucial that we can stand still and see him work out what his will is in it, whether it be his will to honor him by faithful endurance of the situation that you have to go through, or that he will deliver us from it, we will see the salvation of the Lord and he will do what his will is in it. Here, he says the Lord will fight for you and you shall hold your peace.

And the Lord said to Moses, wherefore criest thou unto me? Speak to the children of Israel, that they go forward. Wherefore criest thou unto me? Well, doesn't the Lord want us to pray in situations and difficulties? ^{Yes, definitely.} /He wants us to pray but he wants us also to be active, he wants us to act in faith. He wants us to act, knowing that he is going to give the deliverance. And so he says why do you cry unto me? Well, he wants us to cry to him, but he didn't want him just to cry to him, he wanted him to go forward now, because the answer was here. Lift up thy rod and stretch out thine hand over the sea, and

divide it. What a wonderful power Moses had. God says lift up your rod and stretch out your hand over the sea, and divide it. Why didn't Moses do that in the first place? Why did he cry? If he had the power to lift up his hand and stretch it over the sea and divide it, why didn't he do that in the first place? It's perfectly evident here that the language the Lord uses, just like in most of the plagues, where he tells Moses to lift up his hand and wave it and bring frogs in from the wilderness into the land. Moses had no power to bring frogs in, but Moses is told to make an ^{indication} invocation of what God is going to do, and here Moses makes in ^{indication} invocation that God is going to divide the land because God has promised and Moses can see the indications of God's promise, but the language, $\frac{1}{2}$ if you take it alone, verse 16, if you're going to literally and strictly insist on the verse taken by itself without interpretation from context, surely makes Moses a magician; lift up your rod and stretch out your hand over the sea, and divide it. He couldn't do it, he indicates what God is going to do. And it does not tell us anything about how God is going to do it. If Moses ^{going to} ~~was~~ lift up his rod and say divide, you waters, and right away they began moving, and he says, stand up in heaps and here these waters stand up in heaps, they just walk right through, well, you couldn't get that from this verse. Moses, God said, lift up your rod over the waters and divide them. But it does not necessarily have to be interpreted that way. We have to study context, ~~but~~ to see what we have.

And so as we look on into the context we find that the Lord said lift up your hand and divide it, but then, verse 21, Moses stretched out his hand over the sea, and the Lord caused the sea to just lift up in two heaps, right that minute, no. And the Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea dry land, and the waters were divided. Somebody told me of a fine conservative Christian scholar who said it is ridiculous to say that the east wind divided the waters, because an east wind couldn't do that, it's impossible. Well, it's not a question of what we think is possible or not, but of what the scripture says. The scripture says that God caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night and made the sea dry land, and the waters were divided. It does not say that when Moses lifted his rod instantly the waters were divided. It said that God caused something to happen all night, and thus to divide the waters.

That's what it says. God caused something to happen all night, and it says that what God caused to happen was he caused it to go back by a strong east wind all that night, that's what the scripture says happened. And we have no right to read into it something different, from what the scripture happened. Yes? (student. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$) We don't know, it doesn't say. (student. 9 3/4)) We don't know, but I would say this, that it was known to the people what he did. It was known to the people, it was for an indication to the people and therefore, it is possible that he stood up in a high place somewhere, where they all could see him, or it's possible that the words he said didn't have anything to do with it. And some of them see him and they told others. But the point of it wasn't that there was a magical power in Moses rod, or a magical power in Moses, but there ~~was~~ it was an indication, that God gave a command. And the indication was given by Moses, it was like, it really is a prediction, it's like with the plagues of Egypt, you get a series of, last year we had two bad ~~snow~~ storms, one of which wrecked an awful lot of trees. Well, you get (10 3/4)

of nature in every country at some time, you get them, you sometimes become immune. But if it had been predicted through us, a month ahead, that for our sins and for our wickedness we were going to lose a lot of trees by a storm which you could not resist, then it happened, you would immediately ask who is this that made this prediction? Has he made others similar predictions? Is there evidence to think that he is a spokesman for God? in the situation? Now with Moses there were these repeated predictions which were fulfilled and that is the great part of the miracle, as evidence of God's will. The tremendous increase in the natural blessing, the intensification of it, was indication of God's power. But the fact that they were predicted and the predictions were fulfilled was proof that it was God's acting in a special way rather than just the way the forces of nature occurred that particular year. Now in this case it is the same thing.

There are many people whose idea of the Bible is that to be truly believing, to be truly Christian, we must think that the Bible is a miracle story from beginning to end, in which everything is contrary to nature as you see it, in which God is always doing the most grotesque and queer and unnatural things, as proof of what a great God he is, and the more you believe of that sort of thing, the more truly Christian you are. Well, God can

do anything that he chooses, but the Bible is not just a book telling of the type of world that none of us live in. It is the book to tell us how to live in the type of world we do live in, and the power of God is just as great today as it has ever been. And God occasionally has chosen in the past, and occasionally today chooses to display this power in ways that are utterly contrary to things that you normally see at all. But, as a rule, what he wants us to do is to see that his hand is controlling and directing everything, and that he works all things in us in accordance with his power and he is not bound by our rules but he does not have to every minute be changing the rules that he has made for the process of the forces of nature, but rather using the rules which he has made for the accomplishment of his purposes. And you take the Bible and you can go through page after page, chapter after chapter, book after book, with no mention of anything that is contrary to the normal working of the world ~~as~~ God has made it. We have a few places in which the miraculous has piled up, a few great places at which God chose to exert great supernatural power, but we have a whole Bible in which at every single point, he was exerting his control, and causing things to happen in accordance with his will. And in this case, God could certainly, if he chose, have said to these waters of the Red Sea, you stand up in two heaps there, right this instant, let that occur, (14)

and the Israelites walk right through. He ~~didn't~~^{could} choose to do that, if he wanted to, but the Bible doesn't say that's what he chose to do. The Bible says that he told Moses to divide the water, but then it says that he said to Moses lift your rod and that God caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night, that's what it says happened, and it was the wind that did it. And someone says, then, well it's impossible for the wind to do it, therefore the wind couldn't do it, well, the scripture says that that's what happened. And we should accept the scripture and not try to make the scripture more wonderful by changing it to fit our ideas of what would be more wonderful...

O.T.History 156. ($\frac{1}{8}$)

... Yes. Now I think we'll leave the end of it for the moment, we'll speak of the beginning part first. The, God caused it to go back the whole night, he did not cause it (1)

to happen at the one instant

The instrument he used for it was the wind.

Well, now the next point that might disturb us is verse 22, the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground, and the waters were a wall to them on their right hand and on their left. The waters were walls. Now what is a wall? Does that mean the waters turned into concrete? And there was a wall on each side, a concrete wall standing up there, you could reach out and touch that wall (1 3/4)

you couldn't be sure if you could put your hand through it because if it was solid and you could touch it (1 3/4)

Well, of course God could do that, a person in a tropical land, it might be inconceivable that God could make water stand up like a wall, but in a polar region you see the water the ice standing up there as walls, and God could have frozen the water into a straight up pile if he chose, but we're not told that he did it by cold, we're told that he did it by wind. ~~God~~ So I could not describe just what happened. I would think that the waters were a wall unto them does not mean the waters became a literal physical wall but the water took the part of a wall, and that is ~~what~~ that there was a defense, there was a protection to them by water on both sides, it was so they could pass over. And the Red Sea is a term which is used for a branch of the ocean which comes up between Egypt and Arabia and the term is not the term that's used in the Bible, the Red Sea; it is translated in English the Red Sea, but the Hebrew says the Sea of Reeds, and the Sea of Reeds certainly does not suggest a great deep sea, it must be a great deep sea with reeds along the shore, or it might be a sea which had shallow structures (3 1/2)

with sea weeds in it. As we don't know the exact location of the place through which they were getting, there are various studies and tests to learn just where they were, but it would seem that the term, the Sea of Reeds here, is used for the ^{succession} ~~extension~~ of areas which follow the general course of what today is the Suez canal. That in this area, north of what we today call the Red Sea, and south of the Mediterranean, there was a part of that that is today called the Bitter Lake (3 3/4). There is a region there where there were rather shallow bodies of water, and these bodies of water which, as it says, they got entangled in the (4) wheels, they got into this area with this big area of water, which they could not quickly get across, but which there were ways around and ^{perhaps even ways across if} ~~which they would have~~

they had time, and in that area we are told that the wind drove the water back all night, and the wind could easily, a persistent wind, could move the water over to one side, which would mean that those portions underneath which were very shallow could stand up, and those portions on the side which were deeper would be covered with water. And so that the description here can be explained as meaning that that's what happened. It certainly does not mean that God said let them stand up because that's not what it says, but what it says is let the east wind drive the water back, and driving the water back, you would lower the level to where you have an area there of land which could easily be walked across with deeper areas on both sides which you wouldn't get through. Now here I have a statement about it that such things have happened (5¼) and in that area in recent times. A traveler says, the sandy stretch between Suez and the southern end of Bitter Lake is raised only a few feet above sea level and was probably ~~wholly~~ wholly or partly covered with water in ancient times. Shallow water of this kind may easily be driven back by a strong wind, leaving the sand bare. With the dropping of the wind, the water returns, coming probably under the sand first, as it does in so many such places where this happens², and forming a quicksand, in which the wheels of a chariot would of course sink. Finally as the dry space fills with water the infantry and others would be caught and drowned. And so the going out would take a longer time, but when the wind stopped and the water started back, it would come underneath first, engulfing the chariot wheels and catching the Egyptians and then it would cover over them. And they of course, would never have gone in there under normal circumstances. They would have realized that it was not a normal situation, and a real danger, but they saw the Israelites going through and they impetuously rushed after them, and they were in the middle as the water starts to come back, underneath, they begin to get engulfed, and they say, let's get out of here, and they're too late and they can't do it and next thing you know, they're getting caught and the waters are coming over them. Now that seems to be what is described here and what the Lord showed them to do, though he could have said, now, here you people are, I want you to be over here, and instantly lifted them up and put them over. The Lord could've said, let this water all turn into a mass and stand up like a wall on both sides, stand high^{on} both sides, and you go through it (6 3/4) but that's not what it says here. What

it says here seems to be like most of the plagues. He used the forces of nature, in order to accomplish a purpose, which happened right at the particular time when it was needed. And which he predicted in advance would happen, and would thus give an indication to them and to the Egyptians of his mighty power, and of his control, and of his will. Now I've taken long enough on this...

(7 $\frac{1}{2}$ to 8 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ quiz.)

Now, what do we mean by a miracle? We have never explained in this class, it's a common English word, but I think it is used commonly in the sense a little different from the Biblical use, and that may have misled some of you. Mr. Tow, would you call the creation of the world a miracle? (student. 10 $\frac{1}{2}$) Yes, but the basic meaning of miracle the Hebrew word (10 $\frac{1}{2}$) ~~is~~ is a sign. A miracle is something intended to be a sign or an attestation. It is a proof of God's activity. The essential idea in the Hebrew word, translated miracle, is that it is a sign. Now as the word is used in English, the common sense of miracle is that it is something that is outside the ordinary events of nature. But that is not the meaning of the word in the Hebrew words which are used. It is a sign it is an attestation. But as we use it, it means a miraculous sign, that is a sign which requires the power of God to perform it, so that I would not call the creation of the world a miracle, because while it was an act of a marvelous supernatural power of God, yet it was not to give a sign or an indication to anybody, there was nobody there to give a sign, ~~to~~ or an indication to, it was simply God performing his work. And of course the sun rising every morning is miraculous, it's beyond what any human being could accomplish, (11 3/4) but that is the ordinary working of nature as God has established it. So we would not use the term miracle (12

Now, I'd like to ask you, how many of you gave a miracle from the book of Genesis, raise your hands. About three-fourths of you. Well, I wonder if you all gave the same one or if everyone gave a different one. What did you give? (student. 12 $\frac{1}{2}$) The birth of Isaac.) The birth of Isaac, a miracle. Yes, it was a ~~big~~ sign, God carrying out his accomplishment in a supernatural way. (12 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Who gave a different one? Mr. Deshpande? (student. 12 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Yes, when Abraham had his dream and the vision, fire came down and these animals which he had prepared were consumed. Who else? (student.13) Well, he actually prepared the creatures beforehand and they did burn. Yes? (13 1/2 student) Joseph interprets Pharaoh's dream. God gave Joseph supernatural knowledge as a sign to Pharaoh. Different one from Genesis. (student.13 1/4) Intended as a sign and attestation, ~~right~~ of God's power. (13 1/2)

That would be a correct definition of the English word miracle. But not a correct definition of the word miracle as used in the Bible, because there the translation of two Hebrew words (14)

In those Hebrew words the meaning of supernatural activity is not present, the meaning is a sign. In English (14)

Yes? (student.14 1/4)

they are signs, that very same word here, but the word is not translated miracle. Our word miracle is not a Biblical word, but it translates two Biblical words (14 1/4) * and *

It does not always mean a sign but in a good many it is, and it is used in the sense that there is something outside (14 1/2) (student)


O.T. History 157. (3/4)

...you're right. If I was trying to ^{determine} turn-in the marks of everybody present for an examination, it would be very important that I qualify precisely, but if I am trying to simply to see what your ideas are at present and what knowledge you have, it would not be necessary. For this purpose it would be no longer. Mr. Mitchell? (student.1) Well, now that's interesting but a little bit off the immediate direct line, so I won't repeat it for the rest of the class. The people thought they were missing your words of wisdom and they didn't like it. And now what about Exodus. How many gave Exodus? Let's have this, who didn't give Exodus? Everybody gave Exodus. There are many miracles in Exodus. Well, in Genesis we had about four or five ^{main ones} names, didn't we? Four or five and some of them there was a little question about, Genesis is not one of the great books of miracles, is it?

Compared with Exodus. You have far more in Exodus than you do in Genesis. Exodus is one of the great books of miracles. How many gave Leviticus? What did you give? (student. 2 $\frac{1}{4}$) Did any give Leviticus? Leviticus contains ^{the law.} ~~some~~. I don't think anybody gave Leviticus. Here's a whole book with not a single miracle. Many people have the idea that the Bible is a book that you open any page and you find ^{it full of} a miracles. Here's a whole book, not a single miracle. How many gave Numbers? Here! Only three gave Numbers. You would find not nearly as many as there are in Exodus would you? They are related to the ones in Exodus. They are closely related to the ones in Exodus. How many gave Deuteronomy? Mr. Jaggard what did you give in Deuteronomy? (student.3) Yes. Of course Exodus also has it. Deuteronomy has one given there, a good one, that's also in Exodus. Yes, that's already given in Exodus, it's merely recapitulated in Deuteronomy but perfectly legitimate in Deuteronomy. How about Joshua? How many gave Joshua? Quite a few. Joshua is one of the great books of miracles. How about Judges? How many? Smaller number. Mr. Cohen, how many miracles would you estimate are described in the book of Judges? (student.3 $\frac{3}{4}$) Four. You would guess four, does anybody think more than four? Mr. Soong, how many would you think? Ten miracles in Judges? Let's hear it, what are they? (Mr. Soong. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$) You mean when Samson pulled down the temple, that's one. (4 $\frac{1}{2}$) Mr. Welch? (student. 4 $\frac{3}{4}$) Well, you could count everytime that a soul's converted as a miracle. But what I mean is, that each time that a judge led the people and they conquered the enemy God was active, but I don't think in the ordinary sense a miracle. Mr. Cohen? (student. 5 $\frac{1}{4}$) I would have a little question there on the miracle, because Samson was, & God did a great work in giving Samson tremendous strength, that's true. Now whether that would be a miracle or not I don't know. I personally think it was part of God's plan. Well, the way the building was constructed he knocked over the central pillar, that took tremendous strength, but I believe there are men/ today who could do that. I don't think there are many, there are very few. Well, that's a matter of definition of a miracle. I heard of a man, an American Magician, who was ⁱⁿ Arabia, maybe I've told this story, have I? I told it last year. Illustration appropriate at this point. This American magician was showing in Arabia, and he was saying look at this little box here. He would say, I

will, I can make that box so heavy that you can't lift it. He'd call up a strong man to pick up that little box, it was like nothing. And then the magician would wave his wand and say now that box is ~~so~~ strong you can't lift it. He had a magnet underneath that had been connected with it, ^{by somebody underneath,} and the magnet held the box there, there was metal in the box, and the man couldn't possibly lift it. And nobody (7)

they said of course we ~~know~~ know they have some scientific fol-de-rol that can make a box heavy or light, it didn't impress them in the least. So he decided he would have to change his performance. So he changed it so the next place he went, he called up a big strong man from the audience and he said to the audience, you see this big strong man here, I can make him so weak he's weaker than a child, couldn't do what a little child could. He said look at that little white box, pick it up, see a little child could pick it up. Now he said put it down again, now, he said I'm going to make this man so weak he can't pick up that box, so he said, now, he waved his wand, now he said you're weak, you haven't any strength you can't ^{even} pick up that little box, and the man took and he tugged and he pulled, he pulled so hard he was afraid he would break the (7 3/4) but fortunately the (8)

held. The poor man was humiliated, in front of all his friends, that he could become so weak that he couldn't pick up the little box. It was just a different way of saying a thing, and there are ways in which you could say, but actually the Lord's activity is present everywhere. Everything we do, the Lord gives me strength to come here and teach a class. The Lord enables us to digest our food, ~~the~~ everything we do is his strength, without it we couldn't do a thing. But in the scripture there are certain signs which are so outside the normal activity, the normal manner of doing things, that they convince the people who see them, that there is a supernatural power present. Now of course anytime that God gives knowledge to somebody, he wouldn't (8 3/4) have otherwise, that is one in one sense, a  miracle, but we refer to that as a prediction rather than a miracle, though it is a form (8 3/4)

But when Samson was given supernatural strength, why of course that was a great intervention of God. Now when his hair, as far as the hair is concerned, of course, it does not say in scripture that the strength came from the hair and if he didn't have hair he

wouldn't have strength, nothing of the kind. But God gave him to understand that He would take away the strength once the hair was gone. And it is perfectly simple, I think that a modern psychologist would interpret that that he was so convinced of it that he lost his strength, that he got it back once it came. Now I don't mean that you can reduce it to nothing like that, but what I mean is that the Lord refused his (9 3/4)

I don't think it necessary ^{to consider} that God reach down

(9 3/4)

beyond what he told every one of us,

that we have blessings received. (10) The life of Samson does of course present the providential workings of God. But God did not enable Samson to turn a stick into a snake, or anything like that. No evidence of that sort of thing in this account. (student.10 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Yes, that certainly is a miracle. Though everything happens by the power of God. God gave Samson strength (student.10 $\frac{1}{2}$) Yes, well, then so much for Judges. Now how about Ruth? Nobody gave Ruth? I Samual, how many? What did you give? (student.11) God spoke ^{to} through Samuel. (11 $\frac{1}{2}$)

You find a very little of miracles in I Samual, very little. How about 2 Samuel? You find very little in 2 Samuel. How about 1 Kings? (student.11 3/4) Oh, yes, that's 1 Kings. The raising of the widow's son. (student.12) Oh, fire from heaven, yes. 2 Kings I'm sure someone gave it. Elijah and Elisha. Did anybody give any from 1 or 2 Kings other than what deals with Elijah and Elisha? (student.12 $\frac{1}{2}$) Then, let's see, 1 Chronicles? 2 Chronicles? Ezra? Nehemiah? Esther? Well, what I wanted to bring out was that the miracles occur in groups. God is of course active all through the Bible, God is dealing with man, he's active today, he's dealing with every one of us, he deals with us through the word, he deals with us in our lives, (13 $\frac{1}{2}$)

God is always active, but that which involves a group of what would seem to be supernatural power, that which is quite outside the ordinary force of nature, which the average person who knows nothing about the Bible, might think the Bible is just full of them, you come to the Bible and find three on every page. You find a fair number of them in certain places, and otherwise very, very few. In all the book of Genesis the number of events which would come under this heading is very, very small. You have the great outpouring of miracles in connection with the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, and their entry into

Canaan. There is a (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) of many miracles, the coming out from the power of Pharaoh, going through the wilderness, and going into the land of Canaan. Then, after you get into Canaan and become established there, you have God providentially working in the hearts of people and through his activity, and you occasionally have a miraculous sign such as Gideon and the fleece, the ground dry ^{and the fleece wet} and the ground wet and the fleece dry, but they are (15) they are very, very few.

Occasionally you have them, you have...

O.T. History 158. ($\frac{1}{3}$)

...deliverance with an occasional sign in connection with

Then, you have very, very few in connection with Elijah, Samuel, Saul, David. Very, very few in the early history of Israel, till you get to Elijah and Elisha. And with Elijah and Elisha you have a great outpouring of miracles, the second great period of outpouring of miracles. You see, you have a great crisis, Israel in Egypt under Pharaoh's power. To keep the true religion alive, to keep the knowledge of God, to prepare the way for the coming of Christ, it is necessary to bring them out and to protect them and to bring them into Canaan, and at that point where everything is ~~contrary~~ concentrated there in this one line there, then there is this great outpouring of miracles. Then, after they're settled in Canaan there is very little until this time when the Baal worship comes into the land and threatens to sweep through it and destroy the knowledge of God. And at that time great crisis, which if it had succeeded the knowledge of God in Israel, would have destroyed the knowledge of the true God in the world, and broken the line for the preparation for the coming of Christ, and there there is a great outpouring of God in connection with Elijah and Elisha. After that, you have very, very little of it, an occasional one here and there but very, very seldom, after the events of Elijah and Elisha, until you come to the exile. There, in connection with the exile, the maintenance of their faith in exile, you have a very, a comparatively few, particularly in connection with the book of Daniel, but a group, a fairly sized group, strengthening the Israelites in their

faith, there in that book. Your great amount of (2 $\frac{1}{2}$)

of the (2 $\frac{1}{2}$)

miracle was the prediction of God's

a means that he had created long before, to send a pestilence on them, a sudden pestilence which destroyed them, God provided it just in time to happen, and he gave the prediction in advance of when it was going to happen, so that there was definite evidence of God's

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

but it is comparatively seldom we have miracles in that period, until in the exile: in connection with Jeremiah I don't recall any miracles, in connection with Ezekiel he has marvelous dreams and visions, but of miraculous things to show to the people, other than telling them what he has dreamed, I don't recall any.

Then in Daniel you have a great number of miracles, the third ~~of~~ period of miracles. And then your fourth period of miracles is in connection with the life of Christ, and the beginning of ~~the~~ his ministry. And there you have a great number of miracles performed by the power of Christ (3 $\frac{1}{2}$)

And with the beginnings of the Christian Church, when it was very small, just getting started, to protect the little flame before it would spread and become a steady conflagration, there you have the outpouring of a number but you have very little of that type in the latter part of the book of Acts. Mostly in the earlier parts that you have them. And while God is active in the lives of all, and active all the way through history, yet the particular supernatural events of this type which we generally indicate by our English word miracle, are largely confined to these particular periods. I think that is helpful if we realize that and understand about the (4 $\frac{1}{2}$)

And otherwise God occasionally does that which seems to fall in this category, and he could if he wished me to give a talk in California tonight, he could pick me up this instant and put me there, but he does not usually do that (4 $\frac{3}{4}$)

Usually he has us use the normal means.

Yes? (student. 4 $\frac{3}{4}$) No, I wouldn't quite say that, no. I would say that we have no

but what the Lord might choose to do, at the end of the age, I don't recall if there are predictions of mighty events, but whether he would give specific signs I don't know. I doubt if he (5 $\frac{1}{4}$)

Certainly, during the

present period, it is not the usual thing. But I don't say God will not (5 $\frac{1}{2}$)

I say it may be

but he might choose to do something quite out of the ordinary. He certainly has the power to do so. (student. 5 $\frac{3}{4}$) I believe that if we have faith as we should, he can do mighty miracles in the sphere of dealing with people, reaching them for the Lord, causing great things to happen, but I do not think that he will ordinarily choose to perform that sort of thing that seems contrary to nature. But I don't think that we need necessarily (6 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Yes? (student. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$. What do you

mean, if we have faith, as we should?) Well, what I mean is that you will find, well, as we should, all right. There is no human being who is not greatly affected by sin. And our sin affects our selfishness, our unconscious putting of our own desires ahead, which is (7) really a lack of faith, and our failure to step out on the matter as we should step on it, and perhaps are willing to step out on the matter as we should. I would say, that if, I don't like to say that personally, I would say it rather in a general way, that if the Christian church today or ^{any} even a portion of it, had the faith it should have, we would see far greater changes in the world than (7 $\frac{1}{2}$)

(student. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$) I think (8)

I think an awful lot of us have a lot of weaknesses (8 $\frac{1}{4}$)

I think we're very ineffective

and you can't tell but what the Lord may yet choose. Then of course there's this about it, the Lord will not necessarily answer our faith immediately. There may be somebody here who has faith far surpassing that of most of the great saints of the ages, and yet you might see no fruit of it for the next thirty years (9)

You can't judge it. Yes? (student. 9) No, I didn't say that. A miracle is a sign or

an attestation which God gives to a message or a messenger. Usually by the causing of an event in the external world, in a way which is quite contrary to the normal course of observed events. Now it depends which way you look at the definition. If you look at it from the scriptural viewpoint, the emphasis is on the sign and the supernatural quality of the activity is very present ^{in some and much} ~~and somewhat~~ less present in others, but the thing is that it is a sign. If you look at it in the way the word ~~is~~ has come to ^{be} used ~~it~~ in English, the whole emphasis is on the supernatural character of the event, rather than on the sign, but the word in Hebrew is used here always means sign, it never simply means an act of ^{power} God. Now in Greek the word (10) * would mean just an act of power, but as

it is used whenever it is translated miracle, it means a power given as a sign, always. (student.10½) Well, I would say this, that the crisis days ~~of~~ the distinction between what is natural and what is supernatural, I think it's much more precise and gives you an idea of whether it can be proved in scripture, I think all (11)

is God-controlled and I don't see why it's any greater evidence of God's power that all of a sudden you do something utterly contradicting what you've done before, than that he would prepare ^{it} you in advance in order that at the time when it would (11½)

happen, it should happen. That before you pray the answer is already on the way. And it might have been on the way for a thousand years. God (11½)

And so we cannot say to be a miracle it has to be something which is just contrary to the nature God has made, because half of the miracles aren't. We can't say that, but it has to be so different from the normal workings that, especially if it's predicted, that it's clear that it shows God's activity. But not God's activity necessarily contrary to the usual way of doing things. Because he (11 3/4)

Mr. Myers? (student.12) A miracle I think has a greater effect on the people who see it. People later on hearing about it, can have an effectiveness, but you have to have (12½)

It is to the people who see it. Everything (12½)

But the miracle is particularly to the people who see it. Now it's part of the scripture

and all (12 3/4)

but not particularly more than the rest of it. Yes? (student. 12 3/4) It is very unusual that out of the (13)

and man has been confined to his place here on the earth. Now somebody has succeeded in getting a little thing started (13 1/4)

No, I would say that if God had predicted that shortly before the return of Christ, man was to succeed in sending something up to go around the moon, that would be a miracle, it would be a sign, if God had predicted that this mighty event would take place. I know of no such prediction so I don't think it's a sign in that sense. And I don't believe it could possibly be if it wasn't for the power that God put into the earth millions of years ago, but men ^{are} utilizing that power for their own selfish purposes. The power that God has put there, just ^{as} the power that he has put in my muscles to walk over here is the power which he put into the earth in the time of Adam, and I'm descended from Adam, through a number of days and by natural generation. No man has ever had power except he got it from Adam and ~~Adam~~ God gave it to Adam. It isn't a miracle, it's the power God gives.

Well, we were speaking about the Red Sea. And the Red Sea is a miracle. It is a marvelous sign of God's presence and God's power.

O.T.History 159. (1/3)

...and God's activity. It is a marvelous sign of God's activity. The way the scripture tells about it leads me not to think that God broke the laws of nature to do it. He could've broken them easily if he chose, but God caused forces which he already had in the world to work together at a certain time in a certain way, and he predicted that they would do so and it was an extremely unusual way. It is a true miracle, whether you accept this interpretation which I think is contained in the fact that it says, let, that caused a great east wind to blow and the waters to go back, or if you choose to ^{think} believe that the wind simply happened to be blowing that night, of course God caused it, but it had nothing to do with what happened here, that God made the water work in some certain way by some

other means. Whichever way you take it, it is equally ~~in~~ in my opinion a miracle. It is a sign of God's presence, of God's activity, it vindicated Moses as God's messenger who was able to predict. It took place at the time Moses said it did and was an extremely unusual occurrence. Yes? (student. 1 $\frac{3}{4}$) No, I don't think the wind held the water back, it pushed it back, the wind kept the water back there. It's not a matter of a great high water that the wind builds up, it's a matter of water that is moved back to that end, and that makes it higher there and deeper here. It doesn't take a type of ~~w~~ wind which would knock people over to do that. It would take a steady wind sufficient to move that water. Of course if it were a wind, it would be easy enough for God to send wind, and he does in many parts of the world today, that would lift water right up into a great heap here, that happens, in great hurricanes, and no man could walk through a hurricane. But there's no reason to think it's that kind of a wind. Yes? (student. 2 $\frac{3}{4}$) That's not what it says. It says the water was a wall to them, that ^{is to} ~~doesn't~~ say that the water was something that could not be crossed over to get them. (3) If you're going to take every word in the Bible literally you'd soon reduce the Bible to nonsense. (3 $\frac{1}{4}$)

said, when they said Herod sends to ask this question, Jesus said go tell that fox. Now if you take the Bible literally, you know from that that Herod was a four-footed beast, and you, of course if the Bible says it we believe it, and in some way this four-footed beast, this fox, was able to get control over that land and be recognized as their king, and he ruled, they called this fox Herod, whether it could eat human food I don't know, or whether they had to give fox food to it, but Jesus said go tell that fox, therefore that's what it was. Well, nobody interprets it that way. We interpret it he was like a fox in these qualities. And when he says the water was a wall, God could easily make the water into a wall. All he had to do was to freeze it, he would have a wall of ice on both sides. God could easily do that, if He chose. And a person has a right to interpret it that way. But since there is no mention made of the great decrease in temperature but there is mention made of a wind, to my mind the better interpretation is that the water was a wall in the sense that it was something which held others out, so that no one could come in on either side, because there was no water where they walked, it was dry, but on

both sides there was water, sufficient that nobody could get through, so the water was a wall to them. Now I don't want to be dogmatic on that interpretation, the other is a possible one, but to me, but to say the other is a necessary one would be just as false as to say Herod had to be a four-footed beast. It is a possible one, it's not a necessary one! But what I'm trying to stress now is that whichever way you take it, the way which seems to me to be the normal sense of the words as expressed, or the other way which disregards what it says about the wind, in either case we have a miracle. And the vital thing of the miracle here wasn't that God made it impossible for the Egyptians to kill the Israelites, because ^{God} could have like that have snapped his fingers and said the Egyptians drop dead where they stood. There was no need in the world of letting them go dry through the Red Sea in order to protect them from the Egyptians, and God could have snapped his fingers and had the Israelites all lifted up and put over there just like that, if he chose. But the great thing that God was trying to do was not to protect the Israelites from the Egyptians but to protect them from the Egyptians in such a way as to impress upon their minds his marvelous power and his dependability, to impress the fact that when he made a promise they could trust him. That's what he was trying to do, and the fact that Moses was his messenger and his spokesman and they could safely follow Moses, and they certainly needed that because they rebelled against Moses time and time and time again. And the purpose of the miracle was to impress these things upon their minds about God and about Moses and whichever way the miracle was done, the way the words say it in their most natural sense, the way the words say in another interpretation which is not an impossible interpretation at all, that he did not use the wind but that instead he simply caused the water to stand up and then froze it there so that it could stay standing up and had thus a wall of water between (6 $\frac{1}{2}$) either way it is a miracle. Yes? (student. 6 3/4) I'm afraid I didn't quite catch your question. Yes, I don't think it ^{necessarily} was/absolutely (7 $\frac{1}{4}$) They tell us out here in New Jersey, I've seen it myself in New Jersey, and in Maine, I've seen it where the tide goes down and you can go out two hundred yards further than you can when it's up. The water flows gradually, but as long as that water is over there, it's pretty hard to tell where it is

shallow and where it is deep, very hard to tell. Now if the land under there went like this, a comparatively little drop would be enough, that is say a drop of ten feet, would be enough to expose places that you'd never dream of unless you went out with a plumbline to measure where they were, where you could walk through easily, and at the same time to leave a hundred feet under a tide and to protect. The dropping of the level would be quite sufficient to ~~do-that~~ produce the situation described. But whether he produced it that way or whether he produced it by taking the water from there and then moving it to the side and making it ice, a person has a right to suggest either of these things as the more probable but not to be dogmatic about them. Yes? (student. 8 1/2) Doesn't verse 8 of chapter 15 seem to indicate that the waters were actually standing up in walls or heaps? No, verse 15 is the song which they sang in celebrating the event, and from the song which they sing in celebrating the event, you often can learn a great deal about the details, they're very valuable to adding to our knowledge of the details, but we have to recognize also that the song, are many, many more times apt to contain figurative language than the account, and it is almost certain in the songs and the poems celebrating that they would use figures of speech and metaphors and expressions which, it's perfectly clear what they mean but which you can't take literally. I'm not speaking about this particular verse which I haven't looked up, but about the songs in general. You will find that in the song of Deborah, you have, it's told how Deborah and Barak won the battle, then the next chapter has the song celebrating it, and it says God came from Edom, of course God didn't come from Edom, God is always everywhere, but what it means is that God caused the rain drops to come from Edom (9 3/4), but it says that God came from Edom. At his coming the water dropped down. It gives a figurative presentation of God coming and pouring the water down. But your songs are that way. You just have to recognize the nature of the passage which is labelled of course, and not to insist upon its literalness in it, which it would it would be perfectly right to insist upon, perhaps, in an account, you see, because that's different. Mr. Deshpande? (student. 10 1/4) That's right, that's the poetic language which Miriam and the others used in their song celebrating it afterward. I'm sure, in any of these poems, you'll find expressions which you can't take as literally

as you could in the other. But if you prefer to ignore the statement in the other about the wind, and be more literal and put the stress on this one and say God made the water rise up and then froze it there, why it's perfectly possible. I only thing the other is the more likely, I wouldn't be dogmatic. Well, now our time is up, this class runs till 25 after and it will be that in 7 seconds. I never like to run overtime if I can help it. (11 $\frac{1}{2}$ to end of record--class leaving)

O.T.History 160. (~~1/4~~) (3/4)

...we were still on V, which was the Struggle with Pharaoh, and the last thing we spoke of there was the deliverance through~~h~~ the Red Sea and the Departure from Egypt. We now, then, go on to number VI, which is Israel in the Wilderness. Now Israel in the wilderness and the escape from Egypt overlap. That is true of the great majority of events in life and of historical failure, ^{or} this idea that one ends at a certain instant and the other begins at a certain instant, just does not work. Usually there is an overlapping and usually one is in completion while the other is getting started. When you have a complete sudden sharp change between two things, you generally have some pretty bad (1 $\frac{1}{2}$) loose ends, and certainly God is able as any human planner or human worker, and usually while he is finishing up one era he is already starting the other, and the sharp precise divisions that we make are more for the purposes of convenience than that they actually correspond to any (2)

So, in going through the Red Sea when God said you will see his face no more, they were past the Egyptian army, the great army that tried to stop them was destroyed, and no more did they have to fight against Pharaoh, in getting to the promised land. And this was the end of that, but in a sense the end of it was when they left Egypt. Well, now this subject, Israel in the Wilderness, I think should be considered as starting when they actually leave Egypt, even though they still are in danger from Egypt for a little distance, so while I ended that section at Exodus 15, I believe we should stop this one at Exodus 12. Yes? (student. 2 3/4) Where does it say that? No but I mean what is your evidence that (3)

(student) Well, have you any evidence that he did? (student. That's what I'm asking you.) Oh, you're asking me. Well, what I mean to say is that any question that is raised about the scripture, the usual way to explain is to say, what does the Bible say? Did he or didn't he? But I believe that the correct approach is, does the Bible tell us whether he did or didn't. Does the Bible answer this question? Because there are millions of questions which we might ask, and perhaps a few hundred thousand that the Bible answers. And God has selected certain questions to answer, and many of the questions that he has elected to answer, we have never yet asked and therefore don't know the answer, but unfortunately there are many other questions that he has not selected to answer which men have asked and insisted that the Bible must give an answer to, because it doesn't say this it must mean that. All the indications point to this, yes, but maybe the indications aren't very much. You ask what is a certain person's habit in the morning, what is his habit of getting up in the morning. You visit him three times and you find that on those three occasions he got up at five in the morning. We'd say two of the three he got up at five in the morning, the other one at eleven. You say well the majority of them he got up at five, therefore we will say that five is his habit. Actually out of 365 days those might be the only days he got up at five and it might be that in most cases he got up at about 7:30. You have to have a certain amount of evidence to give an answer. Now if the Bible gives a categorical answer to a question that is definite. But if the Bible gives evidence about a question, and in relation to most questions, it is a matter of evidence, we should be sure we have sufficient evidence before we say this is what the Bible teaches. And in my opinion more unbelief has come than from any other one cause, of course the influence of Satan is the great cause of unbelief, he is trying to lead us away from the truth, but of any one direct cause, more than any other, more unbelief has come from our jumping to a conclusion that the Bible gives an answer to a question. Now, I believe that it is a general impression of the Christian world that Pharaoh and his army perished in the Red Sea. But I haven't made a really, what you might call, a careful survey to see whether this is taught in the scriptures. But I have in general had it in mind in reading and I do not recall any statement in scripture which says that Pharaoh perished in the Red Sea. It says that Pharaoh's hosts perished in the Red Sea. Now this certainly

does not mean all of Pharaoh's army perished in the Red Sea. The number that he brought in order to stop them was a group hastily gathered, how large it was we don't know, doubtless plenty large for his purpose since the Red Sea extends up into Syria. And he lost doubtless a considerable amount. But there have been those who have claimed that there was proof that a certain Pharaoh was the Pharaoh of the Exodus, because they claimed that his mummy showed evidence of having died by drowning. But we're not sure which Pharaoh it was and I believe it ^{would be} ~~is~~ rather hard to establish (6 3/4) of a mummy. There are some things that could be easily established but that question would not be easy to establish. Mr. Haffley has a verse in ^{Exodus} Genesis, that's good, what is it? (student. Well, they probably based it on this verse. 15:19. For the horse of Pharaoh went in with his chariots ~~and-wi~~) Yes, his horses went in and his chariots went in. Exodus 15:19. Now this English translation horse is a translation of the Hebrew word which is probably a collective one, and it refers rather to horsemen. He never rode a horse, nobody rode horses in those days. All of our evidence, until much later in history of the use of horses, was riding in little tubs, or wagons, or chariots pulled by horses. And there is no evidence that anybody in this part of the world ever thought of riding a horse, until much later. So there would be no one horse which was Pharaoh's horse. There might be two horses which he preferred to pull his chariot rather than any other two, but likely not, likely he had many changes of them, in order to have all his chariots ready whenever he wanted to go anywhere, frequently changing in order to go further than the ones he would ordinarily take. But this in English now, the horse of Pharaoh went in with his chariot, and with his horsemen into the sea. But it certainly is not a basis on which to build the idea. I don't think people a hundred years ago, two hundred years ago, endeavored to prove that Pharaoh had died. I think they just took it for granted. Pharaoh and his hosts were overcome. It's like the matter of Abraham's rescue of Lot. Abraham did not overcome the Babylonian Empire, he did not overthrow the Empire, he attacked the rear guard of the army. His purpose was not to destroy that, his purpose was to rescue Lot, and he not only fulfilled his purpose but a great deal more because he rescued in addition to Lot, the people from that little area and their stuff, and he

doubtless the sudden, it says he went with 318 of his trained servants, that would be nothing compared to the army. But it was sufficient to make an unexpected attack, a long distance from the place where they had taken them captive, and to make a sudden unexpected attack, to rescue and get them back, and the Babylonian chief would have had sufficient power to have gone back to reconquer Sodom, but the main purpose of their ^{expedition} ~~rescue~~ has been accomplished, and to do so would have meant a very great additional expense, beyond what they felt was worth doing, and they did not go. The New Testament refers to the slaughter of the kings (9 3/4)

Now, Mr. Deshpande has a verse, let's see what it is. Good. (student.10.)
 What's the reference? 136:15. Yes. God made Israel pass through the midst of the Red Sea, and overthrew Pharaoh's hosts in the Red Sea. Pharaoh suffered a great overthrow in the instance of the Red Sea. It was a calamity to them. There was a very considerable loss to his hosts. It is possible that Pharaoh may have been drowned. It is possible that Pharaoh may have been on the edge of it and that his chariot overturned and gotten out (10 3/4)
 It is possible that Pharaoh was on a hill on the edge of it, watching the progress and giving orders to his ^{lieutenants} ~~hosts~~, and (11)

and he suffered this great overthrow without himself being directly involved in it. I believe we can take Psalm 136:15 quite literally without being justified in necessarily drawing the conclusion that Pharaoh personally suffered death (11 1/2)
 I don't think the Exodus account gives that conclusion (11 1/2)
 Now of course we don't know who the Pharaoh was and I don't think there's any evidence (11 3/4)

But Egyptian history is an involved history. It is the history of which we know more than the history of perhaps any other empire, because we have more material, but all (12) the material we have, well, let's not say all, say 99 per cent, is the material either that was given to us in order to let us know what He wanted us to know, or that was given to the (12 1/2) of Egypt to let them know what He wanted them to know.

That is to say, most of our material is ^{from} monuments put up to celebrate great victories, and those usually don't give a lot (12 $\frac{1}{2}$) and they usually just give the desirable things and say nothing about the things (12 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Practically, the only additional evidence we have, and evidence from which a great deal of excellent material is taken, is the evidence of papyri which were written by the Pharaohs in order to show why he deserves great credit from the gods, for having conquered many lands and brought great amounts of plunder to give to the gods, and in these long papyri which a very few of the pharaohs wrote, they gave many details of their campaigns which we don't have on any of the monuments (13 $\frac{1}{4}$)

But these are (13 $\frac{1}{4}$) not in any sense of trying to give an accurate history but trying to show the gods how much the pharaoh has done and conquered. And so any (13 $\frac{1}{2}$) kind of defeat they would have no special purpose in giving in those papyri unless the defeat was followed by a great victory in which the pharaoh could describe his ability in snatching victory out of defeat. In such a case you learn of things you ordinarily wouldn't (13 $\frac{3}{4}$)

We are most fortunate but we're most unfortunate (14)

today we

have great gaps

We have some great Empires of ancient times of which we have all sorts of evidence of their great victories and their (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

and then the last hundred years or so before their defeat (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

and the actual details of the

defeat we perhaps don't know at all. ...

...it happens that one of the citizens who survived the Assyrian conquest--most of the people were killed--was longing for deliverance and expecting that they would be able to get some together, so he made out a list of the people who died (3/4) who were killed or taken captive, to remind them of this, and we have that list, and that gives an evidence

Mr. Welch?

(student.3/4) Well, no, I don't go quite that far. I would say that a passage which is given, a straight narrative, may contain a figurative element, any narrative may contain a figurative element. And the figurative element, we must ask the question, is this figurative or literal, but because a thing is figurative doesn't mean that it's no value for history. A figurative element may be clearer even than a literal would be, but it has to be interpreted in a slightly different way. Now a straight narrative may contain some figurative element, we must recognize that possibility, but a straight is in pretty much literal, and you can stand pretty much a literal interpretation in most of these words, though occasionally you have to recognize figurative elements in it. Now when you get a song, when you get a poem of victory, something like that, you still can expect that it will stick to factual history, and you still have a basis upon which you can gather very considerable amount of information. It is true if it's in the Bible. ~~The~~ ^{God} ~~retained~~ Bible contains it because it's true, it's just as true as a narrative portion, but in interpreting we recognize the fact that in poetry like this a much larger amount of figurative language may be used than in straight narrative. A much larger amount, but even so I would say the majority of statements in the poem are going to be literal. I would say that the majority of the words ^{used} are literal, I would (2 3/4) simply pushing aside any poem of victory, ^{or anything like that,} and saying well, this is figurative, we can't build on it, you may be able to (3) but you have to recognize that there may be a much larger, there's sure to be a much larger figurative element than in a narrative, and take that into account when and if (3)

details. So that 15:19 here, now when he says there that the horse went in with his chariots, if he said, if it means the individual horse of Pharaoh, I wouldn't expect the Lord to omit that in the song of victory, unless the individual

horse of Pharaoh did. But when he, I would think that that would not be the ~~severe~~ sort of statement in which the matter of more figurative speech would come in. But I would think that there would be more likely (3 $\frac{1}{2}$) of using a term, using Pharaoh as a symbol for his multitudes, or something like that, than there would be in straight narrative. I don't think (3 3/4)

Mr. Welch? (student. 3 3/4) 14:27 says Moses stretched forth his hand over the sea, and the sea returned to his strength when the morning appeared, and the Egyptians fled against it, and the Lord overthrew the Egyptians. Now this word overthrow does not necessarily mean take a man standing up and knock him over, so that he falls down. Nor does it necessarily mean to take a man living and kill him. But it means a defeat. He caused the Egyptians to be defeated in the midst of the sea. I would take that to mean that a lot of them were killed, but not necessarily all from that statement. Then verse 28, and the waters returned and covered the chariots and the horsemen and all the host of Pharaoh that came into the sea after them,-- all the hosts who had gone into the sea, they were covered over. There remained not so much as one of them. There wasn't one of them who went into the sea that succeeded in coming out on the other side to be a menace to the Israelites. I don't think we necessarily gather from this that there wasn't one of them who managed to get out on the side toward Egypt. (student. It says there remained none of them) Yes, it says there remained none in the force that was menacing Israel. Of this which was attacking Israel, coming through the sea, there was not a single one got through, they all were overcome. I don't think it says all the hosts went into it, I think it's entirely possible that all that went into the sea were destroyed, I don't think it's necessarily true that all that went into the sea were destroyed, I think it's entirely possible. I think it's certain that not even one came out on the other side to be a menace to the Israelites. And I don't find anywhere in the verse a statement that Pharaoh himself was included. (student. 5 3/4) I think it does, but I don't think it necessarily would. I think we are justified in looking to the other passages to see if anything more is added. (student. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$) Astonished, no I wouldn't say he was astonished. I'd say you can expect, I would say that in a poetic passage there is a possibility of more literal language, more figurative language, than in a narrative. A possibility, I

don't say that it's certain. That is, you can't turn it around and say there's certainly more literal language in this than in that, they may both be literal, but there may be more figurative language in this than the other, and we might very well get further details of importance, we might, but I don't think we do here. Well, I took more time on this than I should have (7), it got too long, but some were probably interested, and for their sake I'm glad we did.

But now Israel in the Wilderness overlaps with V. It covers Exodus 12 to approximately the end of Deuteronomy. That is to say the beginning of Joshua you might consider they're still in the wilderness or you might consider that they have left the wilderness and are on the edge of the promised land, you can't go on exact number (7½) but I think it's a pretty safe at the end of Deuteronomy. And so you have, this section that we're now taking up covers a much larger portion of the Bible than any section (7½) Israel in the wilderness. This material then from Exodus 12 to the end of Deuteronomy, from the viewpoint of Old Testament History is one phase, Israel in the Wilderness, and a phase which covers a smaller number of years than the patriarchal period, though larger than the contest with Pharaoh. But in this section the majority of material in this section of the Bible is not historical, and the tendency of people today is to run over this whole section, very rapidly. We have many, many times the attention of our Christian world paid to Genesis than we have to the section from Exodus 12 to the end of Deuteronomy. Many, many times as much again. Now this is unfortunate. There is much material in this section that deserves a great deal of attention. Now this section includes the latter part of Exodus, that is Exodus from chapter 12 on. The incidents in the early part of that are well-known to you, they are used a good deal, but after the giving of the law in Exodus 20, the remainder of that is comparatively little-known (9)

Then the book of Leviticus is the law book for the priests, telling about the detailed material that they need for their sacrifices and it is not a book that is--most of it--that is very helpful for public discourse. But for personal lessons there are many (9¼)

far greater value in the details in the time of Moses than it is today (9½)

The last book of the five, the book of Deuteronomy is the recapitulation of the law by Moses, and the word deutero nomy is the Greek word meaning the second law, not a new law but the second presentation of the law, and so while this contains some historical material in Moses delivering it, actually there is just about as much history by the end of Numbers as you have by the end of Deuteronomy. So that leaves the book of Numbers. And the book of Numbers is a book which is very largely neglected by the Christian world. And I think one reason it is neglected is the very, very unfortunate name that is given to the book. The book of Genesis, the Hebrew calls it In the Beginning, and the Greek ^{calls it} ~~of~~ In the Beginning, the Greek word beginning is Genesis and we call it Genesis. Genesis describes it, but perhaps your average Christian if you translated it and said Beginning, it would be more useful, because many of them may not think that's what Genesis means. The book of Exodus, the Hebrew simply calls it, These Are The Names, because it starts with the names of twelve who went down into Egypt, the Hebrew name tells us nothing, the Greeks gave it a title, Deliverance, or Going Out, Exodus. We take over the Greek word Exodus, and it's a good description of the book of Exodus. I think there again, if we translate it into English and say Going Out, the average person would get more meaning, because many of them do not immediately recognize that Exodus means the Going Out. The book of Leviticus, the Hebrew takes the first few words which don't tell us about it, the Greek says the book of the Levites, Leviticus, and it is a pretty good descriptive title, Leviticus. The final book Deuteronomy, the Hebrew takes the first few words which don't tell us anything much about it, And God Called. The Greek has given it a descriptive title, The Second Law. And there again, the average Christian knows nothing of what Deuteronomy means, but it would be better if we called The Second Law, Repetition of the Law, then we would know what it was about. The average Christian doesn't because he hasn't learned Greek. But the fourth book, the Hebrew calls it In the Wilderness, not the first words of it, but words taken from the first sentence, and that is a wonderful descriptive title of the book, In the Wilderness, because it covers a greater part of the story of the

wilderness wanderings. The Greeks, unfortunately, reversed the process here, in other cases where the Hebrew has a very poor title, the Greek has a good title. In this case the Hebrew has an excellent title, but the Greeks glances at the first chapter, saw it was full of numbers and called it (12 $\frac{1}{4}$) * Now, if we in this case, as in the other four books of the Pentateuch, had taken over the word * why the average Christian * would mean no more to him than Genesis or Deuteronomy, in looking through the book to see what it's all about. But, unfortunately, in the one case of the five where the Greek have given a very, very poor title, which doesn't fit the book at all, we have translated the title into English so that everybody who reads can know what the Greek says, and in their very inept and poor description, of this wonderful book. And so in the one case of the five where the Hebrew has a first-class title, (no there are two, Genesis) but in this case, the one case where the Greeks have a very poor title we not only kept the Greek title, but translated it to make it ~~tell~~ intelligible to every reader, and I am sure the average reader is scared away by the terrible title of Numbers, unless of course he's a mathematical expert, then (13 $\frac{1}{2}$)

And of course it wasn't originally a separate book. This is a section here which got divided up in very recent times, quite a logical treatment (13 $\frac{3}{4}$), but it's unfortunate that the division happens to fall at a place where the first chapters, in this part of the section, do include lists of numbers. And toward the end there is another chapter with many numbers, but most of the chapters have very, very few numbers in them, there is law, there's a considerable of law in it but far less than Deuteronomy or Exodus or Leviticus. And the great bulk of material in the book of Numbers is the account of the wilderness journey. That's where we have Moses (14 $\frac{1}{4}$)

And so that description, In the Wilderness, to anybody who might read and loves the wilderness, there's nothing I'd rather do at any time than travel in the wilderness, to me it would be a far more attractive title than Numbers. And I think that ^{to} the average person with a general leaning toward adventure, even though he doesn't share it he likes to hear about it, the title Wilderness or In the Wilderness would be much more attractive than the title Numbers.

...and there is a reason why I particularly regret this but we'll give that as number 2, under A. A is The Importance of This Section. Now the importance of this section, number 1, Historical. Historically, it is a section of a fair amount of importance. Through it we have the Israelites in Egypt, we have them in Canaan, how did they get from one place to the other? It tells the facts, the historical facts, and this has a certain amount of importance to us, ~~and~~ perhaps not as much historically as the events before and after. Not quite as much because we have no other material with which to compare it, which can throw further light upon it, we have studies made of places where they were, and so forth, but that's very, very hard to prove, where certain places were. But the historical evidence is, historically, of some interest, this fact which occurred, that they went through the wilderness. And of course the statements in it, the historical statements, are historical facts. It's of importance to us because it gives us the law God gave them, and much of that law relates to sacrifice looking forward to the death of Christ and we have our own form of ceremony looking back to it, so they're not such a strange folk to us. But other parts of it give the great principles of God's dealing with man and the kind of life he wanted man to live, and they are of tremendous importance to us, and deserve far more attention than they get. But that's not a matter of Old Testament History particularly, just noting it.

So historically, this section may be a section of somewhat less importance than some other portions, but Numbers 2, Spiritual Lessons. There is nothing in the scripture that does not have spiritual lessons. But from the viewpoint of spiritual lessons, this is one of the most important sections we find. We read in the New Testament that all these things in the Old Testament happened for our edification. They are historical facts which occurred, but they also are facts from which God gave us lessons and understanding, and they are facts that are illustrations of spiritual facts, even ($2\frac{1}{2}$)

from that viewpoint this is one of the very most important sections of the Old Testament, from the viewpoint of ($2\frac{3}{4}$) spiritual lessons.

The book of Exodus, the first part of Exodus, well Genesis tells of our beginnings and it's very interesting to know how we began, and there is much of tremendous value in

the book of Genesis. Exodus, the first part, tells of the deliverance from Egypt and that is a most wonderful symbol and illustration of our deliverance from the power of sin, of our deliverance from the oppression of Satan, it's a wonderful illustration of it, and of great importance to us, from that. But the Christian has gone through that, he wants to always look back and celebrate how God delivered him from sin, but he doesn't want to stop there. There's many a Christian who is always worrying about ^{his} sin, wondering if he's truly saved, he's back in Exodus all the time, and he should get on past that and recognize that God has delivered him out of that, and that he has been saved, and that the Passover has been accomplished, that he has gone through the Red Sea, that he has been delivered, he looks back and praises God for it, and he looks back and tells others how to be saved, but God wants him to go forward to another stage of his Christian experience. Now there are other Christians who think that they have already come into Canaan, they have already come into the Promised Land, into the symbol of perfection, into the illustration of the heavenly rest which we are to have, they think that they are there, and they are mistaken. Because our Canaan, our heavenly rest, is ahead of us, it is (4½) millenium. But every Christian has a wilderness journey through which he has to go, he looks back to the deliverance from Egypt, he looks back to the deliverance through the Red Sea, he looks forward to the Promised Land, toward which he is on his pilgrimage journey, but he is now in-between, and so for spiritual lessons, the wilderness journey from Exodus 12 to the end of Deuteronomy exactly corresponds to the position of the Christian in this life after he is saved. And therefore, from the viewpoint of spiritual lessons, there is no section of the Bible more important than Exodus 12 to the end of Deuteronomy, and no book of the Bible more important for the Christian than the book of Numbers. So I think it particularly unfortunate that the book of Numbers should have been robbed of a great part of its appeal to the average American Christian, by the very unfortunate misnomer which we apply to the book. If only we had stuck to the Greek and called it (5½) *

at least some people would know what it meant (5½)

Mr. Welch? (student. 5½) No, I didn't make myself clear, thank you for calling our attention to it. I said that there is many a Christian, I don't think the

average one does, I think it's the minority, but you will inevitably run across some very glaring instances of Christians who do not get the assurance of salvation they should have, but are always worrying about their sin and how they're going to be saved, and I say they are back in Exodus, and I ^{say we} should ~~be~~ through Exodus, we have it to look back to and praise God for, and to look back to and tell others of it, but we should be through it and I think most true Christians are, but there are some who are not, and quite a number. Then I said that there are some, again it's not the majority by any means, who think they are already in the Promised Land, they've reached perfection, but that for most of us realize and all of us should realize we are on the pilgrimage journey, we are like Abram who seeks a heavenly city. Of course Abraham was comparatively smaller in illustration, the Israelites we have here are a better one, because they have the Egyptians' experience to look back on. Yes? (student.7) A very good question. There are these symbols of the Old Testament, and the spiritual lessons are primarily historical matters. It is only a secondary and yet a very important part of their meaning, is their symbolic meaning. And Egypt is the great symbol of oppression, it is the great symbol of the power of sin, of Satan, in the book of Exodus. But Egypt in Genesis is the means God provided to save the people ^{through} ~~from~~ the famine, was to give them a good place to enlarge in. Egypt is historically a certain land where certain things happened, and it has this great meaning to it as a symbol but that doesn't by any means exhaust the meaning of Egypt. Now Canaan, as they go through the wilderness, is the great thing they're looking forward to, the Promised Land, the rest toward which they are going. And to that extent it's the symbol of our eventual life of perfection, the land flowing with milk and honey, to which we are going. But it is more than that, it is a historical place into which ~~the~~ a historical people came at a certain time and when they came in they were still unsanctified, and they still had a long ways to go in their lives, and the historical place is very far from being perfection, but it is the Promised Land to which they look and in comparison with the wilderness it was the perfect land ahead. And the life in Canaan, while filled with many important spiritual lessons for us, does not have quite as close an analogy to our situation in our spiritual life, as that in the wilderness. So it is particularly useful to us,

^{lessons}
 for use in our own life, but I don't mean that everything about it, by any means, must be an actual comparison with something spiritual, by any means. And certainly not of either Egypt or Canaan. Egypt was a place where the Israelites were blessed, wonderfully treated down there for quite a while (9 $\frac{1}{4}$). The comparison should not become Yes? (student.9 $\frac{1}{4}$) To some extent. (student.9 $\frac{1}{2}$) Not entirely; partly, not entirely. They had to go through Egypt, they had to get from Egypt out. The wilderness was there which had to be gone through, and we go through it too, and victorious living is a great purpose of the scripture, that we don't need to be struggling and failing, that we can have victory, but complete, continuous, uninterrupted victory is something that we don't have in this life. The most victorious Christian has his faults. And I still believe the wilderness journey is the best symbol of the whole life in the, though there are many parts of it which (10 $\frac{1}{4}$) and when you get to Canaan you will find other evidences. I think in general (10 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Well, the spiritual lessons, then, and we want to mention under that, small a, For the Church as a Whole. We will barely mention this now, but I do think that in all our problems of the Church as a Whole, we should look at the story of the wilderness journey and see what illustrations God may have for us there. In Acts 7:38, Stephen said, speaking of Moses, this is he that was in the church in the wilderness, and he refers to them there as a church, and what a wonderful symbol of a church. And that is much in this wilderness journey that is replete with (11 $\frac{1}{4}$) for the Christian Church either taken as a whole or taken as ~~a~~ groups of Christians.

b, For the Individual Believer. Here is where we as individuals will profitly greatly by the spiritual lessons of the wilderness journey for our own individual lives.

c, General Features. c, I want to look at very briefly. But under c, General features of the spiritual lessons, number (1) Foundation of Redemption. The Israelites, in the wilderness journey, are not just a group of people that God is leading, they are a group of people whom God has delivered from Egypt. They are a group of people whom God

has rescued supernaturally with his wonderful signs of miracles of great power and enabled them to escape from the power of Pharaoh, and this is always in the background of everything that happens in the wilderness. When they become discouraged, they say did you bring us out in the wilderness to die? Was it there were ~~no~~ graves in Egypt. Their thoughts go back to Egypt, and when he give them his law, he says I delivered you with a mighty hand from Egypt, now if you will honor me here's the kind of people I want you to be. They are always, they are constantly referring back to Egypt, they are living in the shadow of the deliverance from it, and though the Christian has been redeemed, his salvation is an accomplished fact, his justification is complete, Satan cannot enslave the Christian in ^{to} such bondage ~~as~~ that he would be lost. (13 $\frac{1}{2}$) Yet the Christian should always live in the memory of that most important fact in his Christian experience, his beginning, he is one who has been redeemed by the power of God from the terrible oppression of Satan. And that should overshadow and illumine everything in our wilderness journey, the foundation of Redemption as it did on those who had come through the Passover experience and through the Red Sea.

And Number (2), The Goal. The Israelites looked back to Egypt, they looked forward to a goal. God has promised them not to bring them out to the wilderness but to die there, but to take them into the Promised Land. This goal was according to God's plan, God told them what way they should go in getting there, God had planned where it would be, the details of it were in His mind. When the spies went up there, those with faith saw what a wonderful land it was but those without faith tried to depreciate it to some extent, because they saw the dangers and the difficulties of getting there. The goal is not something we would imagine but something God has planned. And God has planned the direction in which we are ~~to~~ go, he has planned the preparation which we need for (14 3/4)

And I think we could say, if we trust him, that God keeps us here in this life, after we are redeemed because he has, not only work to do for us here, but he has also lessons for us to learn...

... an important part
 In our progress to be
 as to worship
 make in being (3/4)

in this land. I think it is as important
 the growth in our understanding, the advance we

The wilderness journey had a definite purpose in ~~that~~ ^{God's} plan in bringing them to the Promised Land. This group of people that came out of Egypt, this big multitude, these people who had had trouble and oppression, they were not ready (1)

They came out and it says that he did not lead them in the direct way, lest they war and become (1 1/4) He led them a different way. He led them the way that would prepare them for what he had in mind for them. And so it is well for us to learn that lesson from our study of this passage, about our sojourn here, as we go through the wilderness and the Red Sea. And you say well, why didn't they go right up here through the land of the Philistines, it was a direct line right straight up, but God has led ~~them~~ out through this way because God knows I'm not ready to go right up, he wants me to go here because he has experiences for me here (1 3/4)

Then number (3), God's Care for His People. They had the Pillar of Cloud, the Pillar of Fire there all the time. They had Moses receiving His word, they had the tabernacle, they had the food that was given, they had water given on special occasions. God was caring for his people all the time, and the Christian in his wilderness has God's care with him and over him, and God's leadership, and access to the Lord constantly (2 1/4)

and must recognize that the Israelites failed time and time again to recognize this and to (2 1/2)

And the Christian becomes despondent, discouraged, and sometimes even wants to go back to Egypt, but God's marvelous care is there and He shows it in wonderful ways sometimes, but it's always there, and there's many a lesson in this wilderness journey that we can learn. Yes? (Student. 2 3/4). Beyond this, though, this rest for the people of God begins on earth and to that extent Canaan might be, it is a figure of heavenly rest, but the scripture in the 11th chapter of Hebrews declare that Abraham ~~dwelt~~ in the land, sojourned in the

land, for he looked for a city which had foundations, whose builder and maker is God. That is, that the goal to him was not an earthly goal. It may have begun there, rest may have begun there, but it was established, consummated in a heavenly city.) Exactly. And when the Israelites got to Canaan they found that Canaan had been the wonderful symbol of their goal, the Promised Land, but when they got there they found they were still on earth and the actual goal is in heaven. It's a symbol here for us, of our life in the wilderness. And then number (4), The Giving of the Law.

God took the Israelites out of Egypt, he delivered them from Pharaoh, he didn't say now you've got to prove to me you deserve to be delivered. You've got to show me what fine people you are before I rescue you from Pharaoh. They were pretty bad people. They were mixed up in all the wickedness of Egypt, and none were (4 $\frac{1}{2}$) but God delivered them. They didn't have to show a perfect life, they didn't have to show an obedience to his law, but he delivered them. He delivered them simply because they needed it and they wanted it, and his great power provided it. He delivered them from Satan, not because of their goodness, but because of his ^{grace} greatness. But having delivered them, he brought them to Sinai. And there at Sinai he said if you will be a peculiar people unto me, if you will be an honor to me, I want you to obey my laws. And God does not deliver the Christian because he's a good person, because he keeps his law, because the Christian before he was saved was a sinner, and he fell very far short and many of those who were saved are worse people evidently than a lot of people that God never saved. He delivered the Christian by his own great love and mercy and goodness to him. It's purely of his grace that we are saved, but after we are saved he wants us to be sanctified. And if we're truly saved, we're going to be sanctified. The Israelites could have said, oh, no, you've brought ^{us} out of Egypt, that's fine, but we don't want to stay here long, no don't give us your law. We don't want it. They might have conceivably have said that. And if they had said it, it would have showed that they never actually had left Egypt at all, Egypt was still very thoroughly in their hearts. The one who is saved, who is justified, will inevitably go on with to be sanctified, and he needs a pattern. He needs to learn what the sort of life is that God wants him to live, because

he doesn't naturally know. His conscience says do good, it doesn't tell him what the ~~god~~ God is. And he, the image of God that is in him has been so obscured and hidden by sin in himself and round about him that he does not know how he should live. And God proceeded to give him his law. To give him his law to show him the sort of life that he wants him to live. Not that he'll get God's favor by living it that way, not that he will be saved if he lives that way, but that if he is saved he'll want to live that way, and if he's truly saved he'll go on to be sanctified. And so a very large part of this is taken up with the giving of God's law and a very large part of the Christian's life will inevitably be devoted to learning how God wants him to be sanctified, what sort of life God wants him to live, how God wants him to deal with the very problems that come before him in such a way as to honor and glorify God.

And then number (5), The Story of the Wilderness Journey, is a story that has many accounts of terrible ~~scourges~~ ^{Discouragement} and rebellions. And as we read how the Israelites whom God had delivered from the terrible oppression of Egypt, and had brought out into the land from there, to bring them up into the Promised Land, ~~to~~-freedom as we read it, we just can't help thinking how terrible the way those people acted, the way they said, oh, what did you, weren't there graves enough in Egypt, the way they longed for the fleshpots of Egypt, the way that they turned against Moses and criticised him and rebelled against him, and worshipped the golden calf and we read all this, and say well, what a terrible people they were to be brought out of Egypt. Isn't it a wonder that he didn't destroy them instead of ever bringing them into the land. And then, he wants us to look at ourselves. We're every bit as bad. And every one of us in our Christian life, and every goof-off (8) in our Christian life have been terrible discouragements, and we have rebelled against God. But his power is great, is sufficient to see us through them, as he saw the Israelites through the wilderness, if we will turn and look at him. Now, of course no figure walks on all fours. A figure is a figure. The Israelites are not in every detail a figure of the life of the Christian. But a great bulk of what we find here is a wonderful symbol of the great features of the Christian life. Now it is true that many of them died in their rebellion, and many of them showed that though they had physically come out of Egypt

they/d never had been truly saved. But as a symbol of the Christian's life, we know that the one who has truly gone through the experience of deliverance is not going to die in this rebellion, he is not going to be killed, but he may have some pretty tough experiences in getting through some of the ^{backslidings} backbitings and some of the discouragements that he's apt to face. And these stories will help us from getting an over-conceit in thinking that we have arrived and we cannot fall as the other person did, and will help us in having sympathy for the Christian (9 1/2) that falls into sin. And maybe that sin he falls into we'd never dream of falling into, can't understand how that Christian would do that terrible thing, how he'd fall into it, we just can't understand. We don't have that particular temptation, we may fall into something else just as bad as in God's sight, though perhaps not in man's. And we need to look with sympathy and compassion and help him in true Christian love (9 3/4), and look to God to give us the help in the things which we've been falling into. But to realize that even that thing he's falling into, impossible as it appears to us, we might ourselves fall into it, if we don't stay close to the Lord. Well, we continue there...

O.T.History 164. (1/2)

... looking at number VI, Israel in the Wilderness; A, Importance of this section; 2, Spiritual lessons; c, General Features: (5), Discouragement and Rebellion; (6), The Duration. The Duration of the wilderness journey, according to God's plan. God told them they would wander forty years in the wilderness. He did not tell them that when they came out of Egypt. I'm sure if he had some would have felt pretty discouraged. But after they'd been out two years, ~~he~~ told them that they would wander forty years in the wilderness. Now he does tell us how long our wilderness journey is going to last. Some of us are ^{pilgrims} left on this earth for a very brief time after we are saved, and some of us for a long life, we do not know, but it is helpful to know that it is according to His plan, whatever it is. There are various factors that enter into it, but it is strictly according to His plan. So much for A, the Importance of this section!

Now B, From Egypt to Sinai. This is the account that we have from chapters 12 to 19.

Under that, number 1, The Start. And the start of the wilderness journey is described in Exodus 12. There are the, this was before the last plague, that they actually started their journey. In Exodus 12:37, this is right after the actual killing of the first-born, that Pharaoh has called to Moses, told him to get out, and verse 37, the children of Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth, about six hundred thousand on foot that were men, beside children, and a mixed multitude went up also with them, and flocks and herds, even very much cattle. A mixed multitude, there were many of them Egyptians who sympathized with the Israelites, who saw that the Israelites were right in this situation and joined with them, went with them out of Egypt, and probably many also of conquered ~~people~~ ^{groups} of other people who were not Egyptians. So there was a mixed multitude that went with them. And, chapter 13:17-20 continues with the start, in-between we have the account of the Passover. But in 17-20 we read that it came to pass, when Pharaoh had let the people go, that God led them not through the ~~land~~ of the Philistines, though that was nearer, for God said, lest peradventure the people repent when they see war, and they return to Egypt. But God led the people about through the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea: and the children of Israel went up harnessed out of the land of Egypt. And Moses took the bones of Joseph with him, for he had straitly sworn the children of Israel, saying God will surely ~~deliv~~ visit you, and ye shall carry up my bones away hence with you. And they took their journey from Succoth and encamped in Etham in the edge of the wilderness.

Thus in chapter 12 and 13 we have these two passages describing the start of the journey. There are three points we ought to note about it.

a, The Mixed Multitude. The mixed multitude is mentioned, the mixed/multitude continues with them, there were those who came from varied situations in background and in outlook. And some of them doubtless became very true Israelites and very godly people. But there were many of them who caused great difficulty to them in the course of their journey. And whatever you do there is always a mixed multitude. That is a strange thing but you can never get rid of the mixed multitude. You can cut down your group as much as you want and you'll still find there's a mixed multitude. You will find that your problems, whatever the size, whatever you do, there is always the mixed multitude, always

your hangers-on who may be attracted by your great basic central purpose but who may be out of sympathy with some of the lesser purposes, and this may cause great trouble. Or who may be attracted by the lesser purposes and therefore give lip-service to your main purpose and not really be at one with you. In a world of sin, in which we all are sinners, and we all fall short, you cannot get people to be identical, to a walk in life, it is absolutely impossible. And you have to decide with any group, two things. You have to decide what is the range which will be permitted in the leadership. You have to decide that. What will be the range which will be permitted in the rank and file. You have to decide that. There is a range. There is not an exact line in any group, but there is a range. The range of your rank and file can be and must be broader than that of your leaders, or else your leaders have nobody to follow them. It must be somewhat broader, and you're trying to train them into the range which your leadership has. You have to think those through carefully. And if you don't think them through, you have misery. You have misery anyway because it's a world of sin, but you'll have more misery unless you think them through. But they have to be thought through rapidly and seriously, and that's very difficult to do because circumstances vary and new ones come up that you never dreamed of when you started out. And so we find the Israelites facing this problem right from the very beginning of their wilderness journey.

Then b, The Route Taken. Verse 17, chapter 13, very interesting verse. It came to pass, when Pharaoh had let the people go, that God led them. ~~not~~ Now we're not reading here about Moses' ideas. Moses took a notion, maybe he was right and maybe he was wrong, but it was Moses' feeling. No, this does not say Moses, it says God. These people were afraid to go the right way, the direct way, straight up through the land of the Philistines, so they chickened out and went down through the wilderness. No, it doesn't say that. It says God led them. This is what God did. God led them, not through the way of the land of the Philistines though that was near, for God said, lest peradventure the people repent when they see war, and they return to Egypt. And here you have the infinite God stooping to the weakness of man. You have the infinite powerful God who could have picked the people up and had them be in Canaan in the next minute, if he chose, You have the

infinite powerful God who could've taken thirty people and given them power to overcome the great Egyptian forces in the region that later he called ~~the~~ way of the Philistines. The land of the Philistines, that region up and down which Egyptian couriers were constantly going, from the Pharaohs to their representatives in ~~Ph~~estine and elsewhere. Which was heavily fortified, and heavily garrisoned. Thirty men with the Lord's strength could've overcome ~~that~~ and destroyed it and by pure force, because the Lord can do whatever he chooses. But the Lord stooped to man's weakness and it says God led them, not through the way of the Philistines, though that was near. Sometimes God leads us right on the direct straight route, right to the nearest way to reach the goal, but there are many others when, as in this case, he stooped to our weakness and leads us by a circuitous route, in order that we may take the difficulties more gradually and overcome them one by one, instead of facing them all at once. And so God said, lest peradventure the people repent when they see war and they return to Egypt. God knew the people were not yet ready for the difficulties to be faced in going through the land of the Philistines, even though God's power was fully adequate for the accomplishment of them. And so he led them this other way. And it's ^{so} mighty important in all our Christian life, that we decide how God wants this done, instead of doing what may seem to be opposite, it may seem obvious to us to go by the direct route, it may seem obvious to us go ~~by~~ the circuitous route, but either one may be wrong, while the one God wants us to go on, is perfect.

And then, c, The Bones of Joseph. Here were these people wanting to escape from Egypt wanting to get away from Pharaoh, in this struggle with Pharaoh, and they stop to take time to get Joseph's bones. What a queer thing. Moses took the bones of Joseph with him, for he had straitly sworn the children of Israel, saying, God will surely visit you, and ye shall carry up my bones away hence with you. Well, was there any importance to this heap of Joseph's bones? Was there any importance to Joseph's asking them to take up his bones. ^{Was it} ~~It's~~ just a matter of kindness to Joseph? Joseph had done a great deal for them, this was his dying wish, it's a foolish idea, but it's his dying wish. Let's do it, let's carry them up. They didn't take the bones of the other people, there must have been thousands who had died in Egypt and were buried in Egypt. They didn't

take the bones of Joseph's children, they were buried in Egypt. They didn't take the bones of their own ancestors, thousands and thousands of them buried in Egypt. But Moses took Joseph's bones and they carried them up. Why did they do it? Well, over in the book of Hebrews we have this referred to. In Hebrews 11 we have an account of the heroes of faith, and there in that wonderful chapter we have the great things picked out of various great men in the Old Testament. The great instances of their faith. By faith, Moses, when he came to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season. How wonderful, what it says about Moses, what it says about Abraham, what it says about some of these. But what does it say about Joseph? Does it tell about Joseph's trust in God in Potiphar's house and standing true there. Does it tell about Joseph and (11 $\frac{1}{4}$) the dreams? The only thing it says about Joseph himself is verse 22, by faith, Joseph, when he died, made mention of the departing of the children of Israel and gave commandment concerning his bones. This is the one thing about Joseph singled out in Hebrews 11 to show the great faith of Joseph, that he gave commandment concerning his bones. Well, it seems strange, as many things in this chapter do. But if we want to find what the truth is, it isn't what seems strange to us and what seems sensible to us, but what does the scripture say? And what does the scripture teach? And one thing the scripture teaches, that Joseph gave a wonderful exhibition of faith when he gave commandment concerning his bones. And so this is a vital thing. Joseph led the people to Egypt, Joseph prepared the way for them, Joseph was the one whom God used to prepare the place for them of preservation from famine, and the place where they could grow into a great nation with all the natural advantages of Egypt around them. But Joseph knew that in this, it was a temporary device for God's good purposes, from the great purpose for which God had called them, the purpose which requires their being isolated from the heathendom of the other nations. Separated, by themselves, in their own land, where they could keep alive the true religion, and prepare the way for the coming of the seed of Abraham that was promised, through whom all the nations would be blessed. And though Joseph saw the people prospering in Egypt and getting more jobs and increasing in numbers and influence, he knew this was not

where they belonged, and on his death bed, his great wish was not that they put up a big monument to remember Joseph by, not that they tell people about what a fine man Joseph was, but that when they returned to the land they carry his bones up with them. And so through the years, after-~~Moses'~~ Joseph's death, when people would tell the story of Joseph, this would be the thing they would remember, this queer thing, that on his deathbed this was his request, that they carry his bones up there, and I'm sure many of them said, what a silly thing, a great man falls into his dotage, a great man who did wonderful things for our people, and God has established in the land a home, but yet he had this queer hanker- ing back for the land of his infancy, and when he died he asked not that as the sons of Jacob they take him right up and bury him then, but that when we go up we carry his bones with us. How silly, we're going to stay here in Egypt. We have the fat of the land. We have fine provisions and God has made us leaders in this great nation, we can influence as great leaders. Why should we ever want to ever go off to Palestine. But God had to send a great oppression to break them loose from the bands of Egypt and (14 1/2)

God had to bring a pharaoh that knew not Joseph, had to raise him up and have the conscious- ness of the conflict between God and his representative Moses, and Pharaoh, in order to break the people loose and make them willing to leave Egypt, and (14 1/2)

when they left Moses remembered the great faith of Joseph, that God would work a miracle and transport these many people from this land of Egypt, up past the (14 3/4)

to the land of Canaan, the land to which he had called their fathers.

And so it is the great evidence of the faith of Joseph, this command which he gave in Genesis 50:25, which he gave on his deathbed, and which we are here told in Exodus 13:19 they took the bones with them. In Joshua 24:32 we read how, after they conquered the land, they buried the bones of Joseph there in that parcel of ground, and then Hebrews 11:22 reference is made to the great act of faith of Joseph...

O.T.History 165. (1/3)

...these references

and what a parallel it is to our present situ-

ation where we have thousands and thousands of evangelical people who believe the scripture

and who want the gospel preached, who are belonging to churches where the ministers are trained in seminaries where their faith in the scripture is torn down, they are taught the scripture is just a combination of errors and flaws and that it's the newest philosophies that is the thing the people need. And these people sit there in their congregations and ~~do nothing~~, ^{feel} uncomfortable, but this was their ancestors' church and they will continue attending, and after all the family gave so much ^{money} to build this beautiful building here, and they couldn't leave where they have all these signs of what their family has contributed and their children sit there and do not get the truth. And to move away from all this, and can we have faith as Joseph had? That if it be God's will that our Lord tarry, He will provide a means ~~through-when~~ ^{to move} many thousands of people will go out from the place where they do not (1 3/4) into fellowship that will be true to His Word and (1 3/4) carrying on the traditional

Joseph's command about his bones, only mentioned briefly, but mentioned in these places so far apart in the scripture, has a very real meaning and importance to us in our present situation today. It shows the faith of Joseph, the faith of Moses. Have we similar faith today? Well that's number 1, The Start.

Number 2, The Divine Guidance. Immediately after reading about the Start in Hebrews 13 there, the next two verses tell us how God led the people. They started off into the wilderness. God led them, not ~~to~~ ^{through} the land of the Philistines, but down ~~through~~ the way of the wilderness, ^{to} the Red Sea, because it was God's purpose that they should meet their difficulties one by one, rather than too many at once, when they weren't ready for them. And so God leads them down and how does he lead them? Verses 21 and 22 tell us, that the Lord went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, to lead the way, and by night in a pillar of fire, ~~to~~ give them light, to go by day and by night. He took not away the pillar of the cloud by day, nor the pillar of fire by night, from before the people. Exodus 13: 21, 22. Now we have books written today by men who wish to show that the Bible is good history, and therefore in order to make it believable as good history, they try to take all of the supernatural out of it. I had a professor in the University of Berlin, Professor (3 1/2) who was considered a hopeless conservative because he believed the Ten Commandments were actually written by Moses. He didn't think

anything else was written by Moses but the Ten Commandments were, so they thought he was a hopeless conservative. But Professor _____ in order to make the Ten Commandments such that Moses could have written them, reinterpreted every one of them until they were such primitive laws that a most primitive backward society might originate them, and they had very little relevance for anybody in our present day. And there are those, Professor Garstang, University of Liverpool, who did some very fine excavation in Palestine, has written a book on Jericho, and he has an Appendix to the book written by his son, telling about the coming of the children of Israelites from Egypt, and he makes the Pillar of fire to be a volcano which they saw, they saw this flame going up from the volcano ahead of them (4 1/2) _____ and he takes all these things and tries to give a naturalistic explanation of them. Now we don't want to make the Bible seem believable by misinterpreting. We must not do that. On the other hand, we must not say we want to make the Bible just as strange as possible in order to show our great faith. We want to see what it says, and when God says for instance that he moved the waters back by a great wind which blew all night, I don't think we're honoring the Lord by saying the wind had nothing to do with it, it was something entirely different that happened. But when it says that he used the pillar of fire to lead them by day night and a pillar of cloud by day, it seems to me that the logical natural interpretation, is that God gave a remarkable, unusual sign, it's not, it is a sign made up of material elements it's the sort of thing that you might say, a cloud or pillar of fire could occur any time. There are various ways it could occur, but for it to occur regularly and constantly for this length of time, leading them in the way he wanted them to go was certainly an event showing the direct intervention from God in human affairs. And I think it's very important we find the correct ^{place in} ~~place~~ between these two--of making the Bible as bizarre as possible, thinking to show our faith that way, and on the other hand explaining away that which is clearly divine intervention in ways very contrary to that which God usually acts in the affairs of men. Now we have this pillar of cloud and pillar of fire then which is very briefly mentioned here, but when we get into the book of Numbers we find it mentioned much more fully, and here we have, we have two verses here in Exodus, over in Numbers we

have a long section dealing with it, verses 15 to 23, a section of nine verses. And these nine verses don't give us much more than what we have here. They tell us what happened about this when the tabernacle was reared. Now it's not new because it had happened before the tabernacle but it continued afterward. The cloud covered the tabernacle by day and the appearance of fire by night, and when the cloud was taken up from the tabernacle, then after that the children of Israel journeyed, and in the place where the cloud abode, there the children of Israel pitched their tents. At the commandment of the Lord the children journeyed, and at the commandment of the Lord they pitched, as long as the cloud abode upon the tabernacle they rested in their tents. And when the cloud tarried long upon the tabernacle many days, then the children of Israel kept the charge of the Lord, and journeyed not. And so it was, when the cloud was a few days upon the tabernacle, according to the commandment of the Lord they abode in their tents, and according to the commandment of the Lord they journeyed. And so it was that when the cloud abode from even unto the morning, and the cloud was taken up in the morning, then they journeyed, whether it was by day or by night that the cloud was taken up, they journeyed. Or whether it were two days, or a month, or a year, that the cloud tarried upon the tabernacle, remaining thereon, the children of Israel abode in their tents, and journeyed not, but when it was taken up they journeyed. At the commandment of the Lord they rested in the tents, and at the commandment of the Lord they journeyed, they kept the charge of the Lord, at the commandment of the Lord by the hand of Moses. Nine verses, and it says practically nothing ^{but} of what's in the two before. Very, very little more. Numbers 9, verses 15 to 23. Nine verses telling what was in the two. You notice the repetition. Frequently it tells us the same thing. It expresses it, it enlarges it, where they stayed a day, the cloud stayed a day, they stayed a day, if it stayed two hours, they stayed two hours, if it stayed a month, they stayed a month, if it stayed a year they stayed a year. It just enlarges, dwells upon it, repeats the same ideas over. We have to do that in our preaching. We have to repeat the ideas to get them across to people, to drive them into their hearts. And so here is a thought the Lord wished to drive home to our hearts. That the pillar of cloud and the pillar of fire led and that it was his will that the people should follow as the pillar

of cloud and pillar of fire led, and should stay as it stayed. It is a tremendous stress upon the divine leadership upon the people there and the tremendous stress upon the divine leadership that he wants us to realize in our lives. We had a speaker in our chapel once some years ago who read this passage and stressed it and dwelt upon it and he carried it to a very, very advanced point about being absolutely certain about of getting a new pastorate or anything, to get the one the Lord directs you to, the Lord leads you to, that you're absolutely sure, the best human wisdom can err, but if God leads then you have the right one. And it is a very, very important thought in the scripture and worth stressing and repeating over and over again in the nine verses. And yet it is possible to take that thought which is stressed here and to carry it to such a length that you get something which is not the scriptural teaching at all, and that chapel speaker I speak of gave the impression that he did carry it to such a point. Now, I've heard chapel speakers talk in such a way that you would think that if the Lord said step this way they'd step this way, if he said that way they'd step that way, and if he didn't say anything they'd just stay still for the next few years until they were sure he did speak, and that they never used their brains in any way, shape, or form. They always waited for the Lord to directly lead and immediately to lead them. Now that, I think, is a carrying of a very great and vital truth to the point where it becomes simply a grotesque misunderstanding, and there is a danger of our doing that, because if Satan cannot get us to steer away from the truth and leave it, then he'll try to get us to carry it to extremes in the other direction. And so we must--right in the scripture here we see how much this is stressed and we must not think we can overstress it, it is vital, it is important. Without the Lord's leading our work can amount to nothing. Except the Lord build the city they labor in vain who build it. Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain, as the Psalm says. It is very, very important, we need it in our own lives, to be constantly be watching for the Lord's leading, the Lord's direction and the Lord's (11)

But does that mean that we just sit back and wait and do not use our brains, do not do anything ourselves about it. Well, it's interesting that here in Numbers, well, in fact, I think to bring this out clearly, the divine guidance, we might make small a,

small a, The Pillar. And we won't go into the aspects of it, which is represented in other ways through the scripture, where God definitely leads in many, many ways, but at all times he enables his people to have a certainty of following him if they truly desire to do so.

But we have, I will make a number b, under this heading, The Divine Guidance, the very next thing in the book of Numbers, b, The Trumpets. Chapter 10:1-10. The Lord spoke to Moses saying, make two trumpets of silver, and when you blow with these the assembly assembles themselves, and when you blow in a certain way they start in to march, and in a certain they halt. They were to have these trumpets to signal to the people when to go and when to stop. And if all they had to do was watch the cloud and follow^{it}, why did they need the trumpets? Why did they need the trumpets if the leadership of the cloud was all that was necessary? But the leadership of the cloud shows one very vital truth, but there were other aspects and so we have the trumpets provided in order that the leader who knows God's will here better than the followers, shall be able to communicate his ideas to his followers and show them how to go together for the glory of God. And then, in that same 10th chapter of Numbers we have Hobab, c, Hobab.

We read in Numbers 10:29-32, and Moses said to Hobab, the son of Raguel the Midianite, Moses' father in law, we are journeying to the place of which the Lord said, I will give it you. Come thou with us and we will do thee good for the Lord hath spoken good concerning Israel. And he said to him, I will not go but will depart to my own land and to my kindred. And Moses said leave us now, I pray thee, forasmuch as thou knowest how we are to encamp in the wilderness and thou mayest be to us instead of eyes. And it shall be if thou go with us, yea, it shall be, that what goodness the Lord shall do to us, the same will we do to thee. And then it does not go on to say that Hobab did go with them, but neither does it say he left them. But when we get on to the later books, we find the descendants of Hobab living with them in the land of Palestine. So that seems to make it definite even though not stated that he did go with them as Moses asked him to. Moses said you know all about the wilderness, you've lived here all your life, you've traveled through the desert. You will be to us instead of eyes. What do you need Hobab instead of eyes, you have the

...but I don't think there's a contradiction. I think there are two facts there which can easily be thought of as a contradiction. I am sure the critics do think of them as a contradiction. And I think it's a warning to us that in life very often we will hear different stories of the same thing, which contradict each other, simply because each has details not known to the other (3/4) and there may be no contradiction at all

but I've heard

people called liars on this matter of exactly that sort of thing, but (1)

(student.1) Well, we'll look into it more fully later on, but this is very interesting

Then, number 5, is chapter 16, Manna Given. A rather general heading for chapter 16. It's a long chapter, so I've made a few subdivisions. Small a, Murmuring. Verses 1 and 2. We've already had some murmuring about the water. Now we have the murmuring about the food. The people said, would to God we'd died by the hand of the Lord in the land of Egypt, when we sat by the flesh pots, and when we did eat bread to the full, for ye have brought us forth to this wilderness, to kill this whole assembly with hunger. And you say, after all Moses did for these people, leading them out, rescuing them from Pharaoh, bringing them safely out. Of course he did it as God's representative, but he was a human instrument and he did it, he brought them out, he risked his life, he went through tremendous endeavors and efforts and sacrifices, to bring them out, and now they turn on him and talk that way. You say, what a terrible people those Israelites were, to act that way, toward him. Well, it's given for us as a history of the fact those Israelites were human beings who had human characteristics and human (2 1/2) But it's very important for us, in our pilgrimage journey, because everyone who ever accomplished much for God, has exactly this experience that Moses had there. You will have people saying the silliest things to you, and forgetting all the good things you've ever done for them, because of some miserable, little situation, that may not be your fault at all. And they forget everything that you've done, and many a Christian worker has become bitter and hardened by it and quit the Lord's work and gone off and lived as a recluse thinking how miserable have treated him. And it's mighty good to know in advance that that's what we can expect,

that we're not serving human beings, we are serving the Lord. And the Lord has the work for us to do and if the people we're doing it for say that's wonderful, how we appreciate it, praise the Lord, we enjoy appreciation. But if they don't ever say it but on the contrary they talk like these people, well, let's just thank the Lord for letting us share a little bit of suffering for Christ, and go ahead. But Moses had it here and repeatedly through these chapters and every one who is truly serving the Lord will have it. a, Murmuring. b, Quails. The people murmured and Moses said in verse 8, he said, this shall be, when the Lord shall give you in the evening flesh to eat, and in the morning bread to the full, ~~for the~~ and then in verse 12, he refers to it, at even ye shall eat flesh, and in the morning ye shall be filled with bread. And in verse 13 we have the only mention of quails in the chapter. It came to pass, that at even, the quails came up, and covered the camp. It doesn't even say they went out and killed any of them or anything. It's very interesting how incomplete (4 $\frac{1}{2}$)

like every other book ever written is.

Here are two long statements, you're going to have flesh to eat in the evening, and bread in the morning. Two precise statements. Flesh at evening, bread in the morning. And then we have maybe twenty verses talking about the manna, and all we have about the quails is, it came to pass in the evening that the quails came up and covered the ground. Nothing more said about them. Absolutely not another word. To the people there, the quails were just as important as the manna, perhaps more so. To them the fulfillment of Moses' promise was a tremendous thing, the quails came up and covered the camp. We can imply, we can assume, they went out with their sticks, these quails that had been flying over the sea for a long distance, had become almost hypnotized by the long effort, tired and there, just landing over the camp. They went out with their sticks and they beat them down and they got all the flesh they wanted. And it was a very, very enjoyable experience to them, the next morning they looked out and said what's this, what's this on the ground. What's this, in Hebrew becomes manna (5 $\frac{1}{2}$)

and so the manna to them was far less important than the quails. But the quails are covered in one brief sentence and the manna has all the rest of the chapter, because the manna continues for forty years. But they didn't know then ^{how much} ~~it was~~ more important it was, but

the writer realizes how tremendously important the manna was so he goes on and tells us all about it. So the quails, all we'll do now is to mention the quails.

But then c, The First Manna. Verses 14 to 18. When the dew that lay was gone up, behold, on the face of the wilderness there lay a small round thing, as small as the hoar frost on the ground. And when the children of Israel saw it, they said one to another, It is manna, for they knew not what it was. And Moses said to them, this is the bread which the Lord has given you to eat. Here is the first appearance of the manna, 14 to 18 tells how they went out and they gathered every one an omer, that is about 6 pints, gathered manna, and you go to the Arabian peninsula today, and you will find a little thing on the ground, a little small thing that somewhat corresponds to this description, and in the course of the winter, in the whole peninsula there may be about half a ton of it, in all, at that time, which of course would be--it only comes for about two months of the year, and it's a tiny bit compared to a whole multitude like the Israelites, it certainly is not a continuing thing today, but there is something a little bit similar, It's probably not the same manna they had, because this, what there is today that looks somewhat like it, it has quite a strong, it tastes rather nice but you can't eat much of it without upsetting your stomach. It certainly is not the manna he gave, but there is something a little similar to it there today. And they went out and they said what's this, so he called it ~~anna~~, but it was their food for forty years. And (7 $\frac{1}{2}$)

they weren't extremely enthusiastic about it but it was all right, and it kept them alive for these forty years. The first manna, verse 31 says, the house of Israel called the name thereof Manna, and it was like coriander seed white, and the taste of it like wafers made with honey. And then d, A Day's Provision at a Time. The Lord gave them the manna, he said gather this much, don't gather any more. And don't leave any of it till the morning. And verse 20 showed ^{some of them} ~~was~~ weren't paying any attention to Moses, after all who was Moses? Their own brains were better than what Moses said, even if he was God's spokesman. So they hearkened ^{not} to Moses but some of them left of it till the morning, and it bred worms and stank, and Moses was wroth with them.

e, The Sabbath Day. We have nine verses here about the Sabbath Day, verses 22 to 30.

Some people say the Sabbath is simply part of the law given at Sinai. This is before Sinai. This is before the law was given at Sinai. The Sabbath was not given at Sinai, it was given at creation. And we're told about it at creation, but there's no further mention of it till now, but here before Sinai, we find that the Sabbath is very strictly observed here in connection with the manna. Well we can't look further into that now. We'll look at tomorrow morning. But we have nine verses, 22 to 30, and the importance of the Sabbath before the law of Moses.

O.T.History 168. (1 1/2)

...Israel in the wilderness and we know that the type of spiritual lesson is involved in this section. It is important historically but far more important to us because it is so full of spiritual lessons, both for the church as a whole and for the individual believer. Now we took up B, From Egypt to Sinai, and we were on 5 of that, Manna Given, and under that we were at e, The Sabbath Day. And we notice that before the law was given at Sinai, when the manna was given in the wilderness the principle of the Sabbath Day was made very clear, because they were not allowed to gather manna on the Sabbath Day. In fact, the Lord worked a miracle there, the Lord caused that this manna which he caused to come every morning, an abundance for the whole people, should not come on the Sabbath Day, and I would imagine some of these people got pretty angry about this, and said, looka here, we haven't yet had the law given, haven't been told about the Sabbath, Sinai is not here yet, how can he enforce it then by not giving us any manna on the Sabbath Day? But it's very clear from the incident that the Sabbath had been given, the fact that it's not mentioned between the creation and here does not mean that they didn't know. It was known to them, it doubtless had been largely neglected, but they knew of it, and now was the time when they were to be God's people, he had delivered them from Egypt and he wanted them to show forth his righteousness in their lives. And so he wished them to devote one day in seven apart from secular activities entirely and on this seventh day there was no need of collecting manna, but they were able to collect on the sixth day enough for two days, and it lasted, other days it did not last, he wanted them to collect each day for that day.

But this day he made it last. Here was supernatural activity/ on the part of God. In order, not simply in order to accomplish an historical purpose in giving them something to eat and getting them to Palestine, but in order to give a spiritual lesson to them, of the importance of his principle of periodism. The principle of recurrent rests. The principle of recurrent periods when they would turn aside from ordinary secular activities and devote their thoughts entirely to him and his purposes for them. And of course it is quite in line with this that when the ten commandments were given it does not say the seventh day of the week is a Sabbath Day, it is to be a day of rest, it says remember the Sabbath Day. Remember it. You knew about it before, Adam knew about it, it was part of the teaching of creation, but now you are to be a holy people for God, be mighty sure that you remember it, keep it holy. So much for e then.

f, A Pot of Manna to be Preserved. Yes? (student/4½). There's a question here on whether or not the manna was spoiled supernaturally or preserved supernaturally.) Yes, it is a very interesting question. Does the sun go round the earth or does the earth go round the sun. A very interesting question and of course actually the sun and the earth go round each other, but when you draw a mathematical line to show the sun going round the earth, there's such an irregularity in it, such complexity in it that there's a much simpler way of looking at it and saying, the earth goes round the sun. Now in this case God caused that the manna would last on certain days and that on one day a week, and then on other days it wouldn't last. Did he first make a rule that manna only last day, and then make an exception to the rule that it would last two or ~~three~~, ^{did he decree that} manna which would ordinarily last two and then make a rule that except on the Sabbath it would only be one. There may be a logical preference to one or the other, but I'm not at all sure myself that we have evidence enough (5 3/4)

Certainly it was God's decision, whichever way it was done. Interesting question, but with my present knowledge I'm not capable of answering it. (student.5 3/4. If we had to discuss it though as a miracle it would be acceptable either way then?) As long as you weren't dogmatic. Yes, I think that's an important point that Mr. Shellabarger is bringing up. It is the relation between the natural and the supernatural. People a century ago had the

feeling, we know all of God's laws, they're all perfectly obvious, these laws God has made, everything is interpreted by these laws, and whenever there is anything different that must be a miracle. (6 $\frac{1}{2}$)

said there can't be anything different, now we know that the complexity of the universe God has created is so far beyond what anybody ever dreamed of a century ago, that we just can't tell what is God's habitual way of doing things, and what are the particular exceptions that he makes for his special purposes. Sometimes you can tell, but we know that in 99 cases you can't. But we know that it's all of God and that when something is so contrary to our normal methods today, as to find that one day of the week is something actually different from the other days, one side or the other the Lord was working in a very special way. I think there's no doubt about that.

Well, the Pot of Manna to be Preserved, f, chapter 16:32-34. Have to talk fast if we are to get to Deuteronomy (7 $\frac{1}{4}$) 32-34 there is right in the situation God orders that there be preserved something to remind them of it, and I think he wants to show us the importance of preserving evidence of (7 $\frac{1}{2}$) his faithfulness. He wanted them to preserve this evidence for future generations to show his faithfulness to them in the wilderness. He wants us to preserve mementos to show his faithfulness and to pass it on to the next generation. Somebody said one picture is worth a thousand words, and it is true that often a tangible thing gives you a reminder much more than a whole lot of discussion and description with it. And here, right at this point, this important pedagogical principle is illustrated. We go back and I think fifty years, sixty years ago, every cigar store practically in the United States had a great big statue of a wooden indian standing out front, and that was the emblem of the cigar store, there were thousands and thousands of them. The time came when the people got tired of them and they cut the wooden indians up and used them for fuel, and they disappeared, and then someone decided that something that was so common in American, we should have some memory of, and they hunted and they had a terrible hunt to find even one. They had just about completely disappeared. And our lives are constantly changing in little ways, and we lose the evidence of it. Here was manna every day, who'd ever think of saving a pot of that for future generations. Why every day we get it, we've got plenty of it, we're sick of the stuff, we wish we'd

never see it again, why do we want to keep it? Well the time comes when you don't see any at all, and ^{it's} you might ~~even~~ find to have preserved some. Some people go to the opposite extreme and they're always saving everything, cluttering things up, I'm afraid that's my natural characteristic, but you notice it's only one pot of manna they save, they didn't tell all the people to save them for their families. There was one saved to recall ~~to~~ the whole nation, ~~of~~ the future generations, God's providence and God's care at this time. Now it's easy, you get a group of people together and you start a Christian organization, and you could just say let's get together and let's pray. We'll do this in just a very informal fashion, why have forms about it. Well, forms impress people's minds. You have a day when you organize, you have a day when you ~~dedicate~~ dedicate your building, you have a day when you lay your cornerstone, you ~~could~~ have a sign, this was dedicated this day, you have a picture of it, and it helps to impress people's minds, the sign of what's been done, and the sign of God's faithfulness (10 $\frac{1}{4}$)

And so this was given, like other matters, for an illustration for us, for our spiritual lives.

Number g, oh, one more point on that, I think a very good point in connection with that, I ²hurry to suggest it, if you have something that you want to do, that you're determined to do and it's hard for you to do, it's a very good thing to make your resolution, write it down, show it to somebody, get it, have it definite, you're sort of committed, you have that thing, you ^{'ve} committed ~~yourself~~ yourself, it's a little help to your growth (10 $\frac{3}{4}$)

But on the other hand, don't just tell everybody about it, talk with everybody about it, pretty soon you're satisfied you're (11)

There's a point in between, just like the pot of manna is.

God gave it to us an illustration.

g. The Duration of the Manna. Right here at this early point we are told how long they had the manna. Do you think that Moses wrote verse 35 here? Did Moses write Exodus 16:35? which says, the children of Israel did eat manna forty years until they came to a land inhabited, they did eat manna, till they came unto the borders of the land of Canaan. Well, he ~~hardly~~ hardly wrote it when the manna was first given, because then I think he was expecting to get into Canaan within the next two years. He hardly wrote it then. But after (11 $\frac{3}{4}$)

after God had said they're going to wander for forty years,
 God said, then (12) Moses surely could have written this statement, as

an account of that which God had predicted would happen (12)

He could have done that. He could have done it at the end of his life. Or it is possible that he said to Joshua, now Joshua when you quit eating manna put in a verse right here, say how long it's to be eaten. And Joshua after he wrote Joshua 5:12 which tells how the manna ceased to come when they entered the land, then inserted this verse here. I think that it's more likely Moses wrote it. But even if Joshua wrote it, it is part of God's word, inspired by him, written either by Moses or very soon after, and intended by God to be part of the book of Exodus, therefore true and dependable. But there's just as much a problem here as you see, as there is in the account of Moses' death. You can make a great deal out of that. Deuteronomy ends saying how Moses died. They say how could Moses have written that, how could Moses have written the Pentateuch; how could he write the account of his death. Well, God said, Moses you go up in the mountains here, I'm going to gather you to myself, I'm going to give you a good look at the land but you can't go into it you're to go up here and you're to die there, and nobody will know where you're buried. Well, the last thing he did before Moses went up, he could have sat down and written the account of it, just as it had already happened, every ^{newspaper} human-being does that constantly, so that when the newspaper comes out it's ^{up to date} ~~seen~~ ~~it~~ ~~say~~; Moses knew this, God told him what was going to happen, he could have done that, and maybe he did. On the other hand, it's entirely possible that the next day he died Joshua did. I don't think it matters. What matters is that God led, and if it's God's Word it was not inserted a century later, but was right at the time whether by Moses or by Joshua. Well, so much for g, The Duration of the Manna.

Number 5 was Manna Given, number 6 is Water Provided, chapter 17, verses 1 to 7. There was no water for the people and the people got pretty thirsty and they said give us water that we may drink, and there's nothing worse than to be without water. You can go without food for a good many days but if you don't have water, you don't last very long. You last a few days (14 1/2)

You've got to have water. The

people felt pretty bad, but they didn't say well now Moses has got manna, Moses is leading us, we know that he's going to give us water before we're desperate, let's put our trust in him and not get excited. They got excited. They were quite stirred up. Moses said they tempted the Lord, and the people murmured against Moses, and Moses called to the Lord and said what will I do, this people are almost ready to stone me. And God said to take the people and his rod and to go and, behold, I will stand before thee...

O.T.History 169. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...there upon the rock in Horeb, and thou shalt smite the rock, ^{God indicates the pro-}~~and there shall come water~~
gram. Moses struck the rock, and there came water out of it, ~~that~~ the people may drink.

Well how did this happen? Did God show Moses, this is the rock I want you to smite. Now you smite this rock, this particular one; all right, Moses went over and smote it. And the instant that Moses smote that rock, God created some new water so that this water coming into existence there on the edge of that rock, pours down there onto that field enough water for two million people to drink. And God was creating it, ~~we know~~, at that instant there, right on the edge of the rock? Maybe that's what God did. It's entirely possible, He certainly could've done it. God could've had water in the air, he could've had water condensed ^{caused it on} sent in some form in the air and he could've polished the surface of that rock to change into some substance which would attract the moisture from the air and would condense it and cause it to flow down rapidly at once. That could be the way God did it. Or God could have planned ten thousand years before, I'm going to bring the children of Israel to the wilderness, I'm going to bring them to this place, I'm going to bring them here to show them that they need not be discouraged, they need be disheartened when there's no water, ^{when} God is leading them he will provide, and therefore when they get to this point, I'm going to have it all ready so that when they look all around, the desert is dry and parched and barren and there's no sign of water anywhere, but I'm going to have water under the ground preparing all through these hundreds, maybe thousands of years, in such a way that it is eating away under the surface of this rock and it's gradually being worn away so that there's a tiny bit more to be worn out, that if the people came back a year from now

the water would have forced its way through and there would be a fountain coming out, and now, that when Moses with his rod at the precise point which I indicate, the water which ^{God} has been preparing all this time, will come out. Now the Bible doesn't tell us which of the two God did. We know that God did it, we know that God provided water when it appeared to the people that there was no possibility of water anywhere in the area. God provided it and he provided it by showing ~~Moses~~ where to do and by telling Moses to smite on the rock. The fact that Moses didn't just lift his rod and say let water come, but smote on the rock suggests to me the possibility that the way God did it, was to prepare the place for them, so that the water would be there ~~and~~ already to come out, and the space between the rock holding it back small enough that Moses' rod could break it through, and (3 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Now that is purely a conjecture, the other two are also conjectures, and anybody prefers one of the other two, I think ~~they are~~ just as good as this one. It's a matter on which you cannot be dogmatic between them. But to be dogmatic in saying, no, God created new water the instant that Moses smote the rod is certainly going beyond (3 3/4)

If you want to say, it seems to me likely that way he did, you have just as good a right to guess what you think ^{is likely} ~~about it~~ as I have to guess what I think happened. But the mention of smiting the rock suggests various (4)

that was the method which God used in providing the water. The important thing is that God showed where it would happen, caused it to happen just at the time he said it would, caused water to be given to the people at a time when ^{all that} ~~as-far-as~~ their eyes could see suggested that there was just no water available at that point. Well, so much for 6, Water Provided.

7. Victory Over Amalek, 17:8-16. And here we have the Amalekites, those rather wild wandering people, who came and attacked, and Moses said to Joshua, choose men to go out and fight with Amalek, and God could have said here to these people, I don't want you to fight because it's not nice to have to fight, much nicer to be peaceful, you just go straight ahead and forget Amalek. And I can take care of Amalek, and he certainly could take care of Amalek, but he chose to take care of Amalek by using the Israelites, as ~~his~~ instruments to do it. Some people say we should just let Stalin, or now Krushchev go ahead and

attack us, destroy us if he wants, just go ahead and be peaceful and ignore him and hope for the best. Well, that may be their opinion as the best thing to do, but they cannot use scriptural evidence that it's the right thing to do, because we have Amalek coming and attacking and the Israelites, God could have said I'll take care of Amalek, you go ahead, and there are cases where he does exactly that, many of them, but in this particular case, what he did was to say you go out and fight Amalek and he used the Israelites as the means, the Israelites as the means of protecting their families from this terrible menace of the attack of the enemy. And God used this to drive home to their hearts the fact that they are living in a wicked world, a world of sin, a world where evil is round about us, and where pacificism is something that is something that is beautiful and desirable and necessary in the world when God entirely controls/sin ^{and has been} ~~just-is~~ ^{from us} eradicated, but as long as God permits sin to continue and permits Satan to continue, it is necessary that it be held in check. And God showed the Israelites that pacificism was no part of his teaching. Certainly aggressive war is no part, but to say that preventive war is not a part, to me, is utterly nonsensical. ~~War~~ If war is ever justified, surely preventive war is justified. Well, in this case God said to the Israelites now you are to go out and you are to drive back Amalek, and they did it. But God could've caused that Amalek would just simply die out without the Israelites going into it, he could've caused the Amalekites to have turned the other way and ignore them, he chose that they should do it with fighting, but then he could have chosen simply to give them power and that's that, he added something else. He had Moses go up on a hill and hold his arms up. And Moses' arms being uplifted didn't physically help the Israelites the slightest bit in fighting Amalek. It is a sign and a symbol. ~~beat.~~ And like so much of this section, it is signs and symbols, not merely for the people then, but for us today, to give us the lesson that God wants us to fight against evil, and God wants us to use physical means to hold back and push back the forces of iniquity, but that even when we are doing so he wants us to realize that the strength comes from him, and the victory comes from him and it is only by his grace that we are able to accomplish anything in this war, and therefore he had Moses hold his arms up, and as long as Moses' arms were up, Israel beat, and once Moses' arms would get tired and go down Amalek would

beat, and it is perfectly, as you can see, that there is no physical relationship, it was simply an indication of the fact that spiritual forces were at work and he wants us to fight our best and think our best how we're to do it and use the best ways and efforts we can, but if we ever get to thinking we're winning the victory by our strength and our effort, we can be pretty sure the victory won't last very long. He wants us to realize that though we must fight our best against the forces of iniquity, it is he that gives the victory, and (8 3/4) he gives the victory and our prayers the mighty force

. And so he caused that Moses holding his arms up, Amalek is defeated; Moses' arms down, Amalek is victorious. And they took two other men out of the battle line, they took Aaron and Hur, and they stood on both sides, the one on one side and the other on the left, to help Moses to keep his arms up, and our nations have taken the attitude at certain times that the idea of the ministry, chaplaincy, and so on, is just a way of dodging the draft and we have to put up with a certain amount of it but we need all the men we can get, and in 1944 they told us, they said, anybody who isn't actually in Seminary by July 1, 1944, is going to be drafter, and we would have no students except those already in because they needed every arm to fight, and that was the decision, but then on maturer thought and more careful consideration, it was decided that, and has become a definite policy, that the chaplaincy is a necessity, and the investigation they have made has convinced them that the number of draft dodgers among seminary is very, very slight, and that actually it is a great service to the war, to the defense of the nation, to prepare to give spiritual help as it is to prepare to fight (10 $\frac{1}{4}$)

And that is the attitude our government has taken simply on the basis of experience, but if that's the attitude that they have found necessary in the world, as it is constituted, how much more important it is that there be spiritual work done of a type that is real and not the way that so many of the chaplains (10 3/4)

And here we have three men taken out of the battle, Moses to hold up his hands, Aaron and Hur to help him hold up his hands, and it is necessary in carrying on our great conflict with evil that we devote a great part of our efforts to the spiritual end of the battle to be sure our hands are clean and being sure that our prayer efforts before God are maintained aright. I used to find when I was in seminary that, as I am sure you find, that there were

times when it was easy to neglect the devotional life, and easy to slip into lax habits about the devotional life and to not give as much time to it as one should. But I found this, that every time that the examination period came around it was impressed upon my mind, the absolute importance of maintaining the devotional life, and for the sake of passing an examination, to skip one's devotional life and one's time with the Lord, is something that the Lord could not possibly honor, and so the attitude that I should have kept up all the time and wished I had and would like to have all the time, it was impressed on my mind in these times of crisis that then above all things, it must be kept up, that we must keep up the spiritual end and not think that we can allow the physical service or the intellectual service to push it aside from its proper place. That's not of course to say that a lot of prayer will take the place of proper study, not at all, we have to do the work, but our work is worthless if we do not have the proper relation with God. Except the Lord build the city they labor in vain that built it.

Then, number 8, Jethro's Advice. Here in the book of Exodus we have a whole chapter telling how Jethro, the priest of Midian, Moses' father-in-law who was with them, and he saw Moses dealing with the individual problems of the people and sitting there from morning to night, helping the people in their big problems and their little problems, and you cannot divide between them, because sometimes what is a mighty petty problem has such a big place in a person's mind, that it's more important to solve it perhaps than the big problem. And Moses was sitting there from morning to night settling the problems of the people and many of them, the wisdom that he could give, any one of their friends could just as well have given, but they couldn't see it themselves and they needed (13 $\frac{1}{2}$)

and they took the _____ from Moses, and Moses was doing a great service in this, but it was just too much. And Jethro gave him the advice to get assistance and to divide part of his authority up, and have the things done by others that they could just as well do but under his authority and general supervision, knowing in order that he would have time for the more important tasks. Some people say this was all a mistake, Jethro was just a worldly man giving this advice, and it just has no place in the scripture (14) _____ whole chapter

If it was God's will that we should realize Jethro was wrong, certainly he would have given us some indication. He take the whole chapter to tell us how this advice was given, and how it was done and how little (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) bit later God introduces a slightly improved form of the same thing, a little later. But the general principle here, God caused the (14 $\frac{1}{3}$) to become aware of this advice of Jethro, it is a very important thing. If a person is any good, it is pretty easy to get the idea that nobody else can do (13 $\frac{1}{3}$) as well as he can, and often it's true. A person of real ability will find that he can do a thing in half or two-thirds the time that somebody else can, and ~~do it~~ ^{maybe} twice as well. But he can't do everything. He has to learn to have a lot of things done less well than he could do them in order to have time himself for the more important things. It's a lesson for us particularly in the spiritual field, a lesson that activities and accomplishments (15) in the church of God. There have been churches, in the last century, there have been churches to which thousands of people have come and great progress has been made and (15 $\frac{1}{4}$) and tremendous accomplishments, and then the minister has died and things just dropped down to nothing.

O.T.History 170. ($\frac{1}{3}$)

...and when you see a case like that it may be that the whole thing has been built upon the popularity of a man and wasn't a spiritual enterprise at all. It may be that, but it doesn't necessarily mean that. It may be that that man built everything upon himself and did not follow Jethro's advice and build an organization that could carry on the principles to which he was devoted without his having to do everything himself. So when God gives a whole chapter in this book of Exodus, God wants us to study it and to apply it and to realize that it is important or it would not have a chapter in His Holy ~~Book~~ ^{Word}. I think that, I think the next chapter begins, in the third month, when the children of Israel were gone forth out of the land of Egypt, they came to the wilderness of Sinai, we shall finish B here, about coming to Sinai, From Egypt to Sinai, and we will C, At Sinai.

C, At Sinai. Now we had three months which covered these seven chapters, no about five chapters I guess, covered three months in their lives. What experiences they had in

those three months. Typical of the bulk of the experiences during the four years were these experiences. Now they come to Sinai and they stay there two years. And their experiences at Sinai, C, At Sinai, are described in the areas from Exodus 19 to Numbers 10:10. Exodus 19 through Numbers 10:10 discusses their experiences at Sinai. There is also, there's a little reference to it in Deuteronomy but that (2 $\frac{1}{4}$)

But this is the narrative of the time at Sinai, these two years. And at the rate we've been covering chapters lately, this ought to take us the next five months to cover. But our course is Old Testament History rather than Consideration of the Law, and we will not have time to go into ^{the many important} ~~very many~~ points of the law which is very valuable to your own study, but we're looking at the historical elements of it, and so we will run through this noting its main features. But before we look in detail at the features, I want to call your attention to a few ~~preefe~~ crucial points in it.

It starts in with chapter 19, and I'm dividing, I will call number 1, The Covenant. And The Covenant will run from chapter 19 to 24, verse 8. Now this is a section which would be good for you to have in mind as a section of the scripture. Exodus 19 to 24:8. A portion of this section is called by the critics, ^{the} ~~a~~ book of the covenant. It has a very important place in higher criticism. We're not dealing with that in this class. But we are (3 $\frac{3}{4}$) building the unity as it stands in Exodus 19 through verse 8 of chapter 24. The Covenant. Now at chapter 24, verse 9, you begin an account of the giving of detailed instructions to Moses in the Mountain and this runs, this will be called, number 2, and this will run from Exodus 24:9 to the end of chapter 31. And then the section which I will call The Golden Calf will run from Exodus 32 to 35:4. And then, from 35:4 to the end of 40 is The Tabernacle Built. Now those are the first sections, all that there are in Exodus, of this account of what happened at Sinai. The two pivotal points (5) that we see, are chapters 24:9 where Moses goes up into the mountain, and chapter 32:1 where he comes down from the mountain. Those are the pivotal points and I think you should have those in mind, because they give you a grasp of the main divisions of this section of Exodus. Yes? (student. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$) Those two points that I'm stressing in it, are chapter 24:9, and 32:1. 24:9 starts my division two here, 32:1 starts my division three. They are

the points which divide certain main sections. In Sinai, first, The Covenant; second, the detailed instructions given in the mountain; third, the golden calf; and fourth, The Tabernacle Built.

Now the first of these, The Covenant, is one of the most important sections of the Bible. You might say, God has brought the children of Israel out of Egypt, he has rescued them from Pharaoh, he has delivered them from their oppressors, he is feeding them and caring for them and leading them through the wilderness, now why doesn't he take them to the Promised Land, and give them the things he's got for them instead of stopping them for two years out in the wilderness there at Sinai? Why doesn't he do that? Well, the answer is that God did not simply bring the children of Israel out of Egypt just to show favoritism and to deliver them from the oppressor. God brought them out of Egypt in order that they should be a peculiar treasure to himself. He brought them out in order that they should show forth his righteousness, that they should keep alive in the world the knowledge of the true God, that they should prepare the way for the coming of His Son into the world. And so that he redeemed them, he delivered them, he brought them out of Egypt, he promised to bring them to the end of the wilderness journey, to bring the nation into the Promised Land and he carried out his promises and he was determined he would carry out his promises, yet he stopped and took two years at Sinai in order to teach them what kind of lives they should live, and what sort of people they should be, in order that his redeemed should show forth his praise, and the spiritual example here for the church and for the individual Christian is very marked and very important. It, there is nothing more important in our Christian witness than the fact that by simple faith we can believe in Christ and instantly be saved and delivered from darkness. There's nothing more important. But it is often presented in such a way as to give an utterly false impression, to give the idea, here are the people who are lost. All right, somebody comes up to the front and says, yes I accept the Lord, all right, now you're saved, and now go on and get somebody else saved, because this is done, the task is finished. Well, the task isn't finished. The most important part of the task is finished, yes. The eternal decision is made, but it is not God's will simply to take wicked people and call them righteous and be done with it. God does justify

us instantaneously and give us complete freedom from the guilt of sin, instantaneously. But for everyone for whom he does that, it is his will and his desire and his determination that that one shall go on to learn how to live as he wants them to, and to grow in grace and in the knowledge of the Lord, and so after God delivers the people from Egypt, and brings them out into, through the wilderness to a place where they're a safe distance from Egypt, he then says, now you don't start in conquering Canaan now, you sit down here and learn my law. You sit down here for two years and find out what kind of people God wants you to be, and it's a great injury done to Christian work, time and time and time again, because some wicked man has been converted to the Lord and it has been a genuine conversion and has come to really know the Lord, and had a wonderful testimony, and then instead of saying to the man, all right, now you sit down, you study the Bible, you learn to live the life the Lord wants you to, and to make progress in your sanctification, instead of that, we take that man and say look at this wonderful trophy of grace, let's him go all around and everybody see him, this terrible criminal who now is a great fine Christian, and hear his testimony, how many banks he robbed and how much wickedness he did then, and when you hear all this story you will see how great God is and you will want to come to him. Yes, God may use that testimony wonderfully, and it may be of a tremendous thing that this man has been saved to witness to the Lord, but before he is ready to do much of that, he wants to learn God's law, to learn the kind of life God wants him to learn, and to make substantial progress in his sanctification, and many a man who has been truly converted has had his head turned by the adulation of the people who are brought to hear him tell about the wicked life he lived before the Lord saved him, and has drifted back into the life of wickedness, when humanly speaking it was the fault of a poor adviser who took and used him in that way before he was ready to be used in that way. God stopped for two years at Sinai to give the Israelites the knowledge of what sort of life they should live if they would glorify him and to be a peculiar people for his honor. And he wants us, not to be content with justification, but to go on to sanctification, and in fact, if we really are justified, we will go on to sanctification, and he wants us to learn what kind of men we should be, and what his righteous law for us is. And therefore,

we find that this which we might call The Covenant, is the very first thing that was done at Sinai, and the name covenant is a good name for it, and yet it is a name which can lead to misunderstanding because it can give the impression that Israel there became God's people, which they did not. Israel became God's people when God called Abraham out of Mesopotamia. And Israel as a people itself was redeemed unto the Lord by their being out from the power of Egypt. He has brought them out, they were his people then, and this covenant is not a covenant by which they become God's people, but a covenant by which they can learn how to be sanctified, and how to go forward in the knowledge of the Lord.

And so under the Covenant here, we have 8 divisions, which I will call a, b, c, d, and so forth. And a, is The Covenant Presented. That is in chapter 19, verses 3 to 8.

The Lord said, verse 3, thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel. Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, if you will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then, ^{what?} ye shall ~~be~~ Then ye shall be ^{saved? Then you will be} ~~a-peculiar-treasure~~ ^{mine?} Then you will be brought into the Promised Land? Nothing of the kind. Then you will be a peculiar treasure, above all people. ~~Then~~ you will be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation. And some Christians think that just because they have raised their hand in an evangelistic meeting, they are automatically a holy nation, and God has brought them blessing. If they truly have accepted the Lord, they will go on to be sanctified and they will receive the blessing (13½) but they have to go on. Yes? (student. 13½) Reference, Exodus 19. And he said, these are the words thou shalt speak to the children of Israel, and what did the people do? The people said, oh no, we don't want that, we don't want that, we want God to do everything for us and not have to bother about keeping his law. No, they didn't do anything of the kind. The people said, all the Lord has spoken we will do. And over in the book of Galatians somewhere, there is a footnote in the Scofield Bible which says that Israel rashly accepted the law. And I think when Dr. Scofield wrote that note, that he was overtired, he was overtired and a bit irritated and he made a slip of his pen, because there's nothing like it in the Old Testament (14½), in connection with Exodus. And there's nothing

in the scripture here about it, whatever. But ~~any such~~ thing as that, there was no rash acceptance of anything, but there was an attitude of the people which any people delivered by the Lord would have to have, if they really were delivered.

O.T.History 171. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...to be what God wanted them to be in order to be a holy nation and a peculiar people. And so the people said all that the Lord has spoken we'll do, that is, we want to be a people ($\frac{1}{2}$), we want to be a holy nation, we want to be the Lord's.

Now how can we do it? So the covenant was presented in Exodus 19:3-8, and then number 2, or b, Arrangements for the Declaration of the Moral Law, the rest of chapter 19, 19:9-25. And in these verses you read how God wanted to impress on their minds the seriousness of his law, he wanted to impress on their minds the importance of his standards of holiness, and that is something that we want to do ^{with} Christians, we must, to impress on their minds, not his law that we will be lost if we break and say that we keep, nothing of the kind. Because we've all broken it and we're all lost for breaking it, and it's only through the grace of Christ alone that we can be saved. But his law which is the representation of the type of life we must live if we are to be glorified to him. And honoring to him. And to see what the standards of holiness of God are, and how far short we come of them, and how great his power and his majesty and the importance of his will. And so he had the mountain shake and flames and smoke ascend and a line out about that nobody must cross over and nobody could touch the mount, and if so much as a beast touched it ^{it} would be stoned and shot through, and so on, all this and the rest of chapter 19 in order to impress on their minds the tremendous importance of what we're talking about. And so then, c, small c, is The Moral Law Proclaimed, chapter 20:1-17.

In chapter 20, verses 1-17, God speaks in such a way that all the people can hear his words, he speaks with all this background of this fire, smoke, this noise, this setting apart of the mount, in order to impress on their minds the tremendous importance of his moral law. He did not now promulgate the moral law, he declares to them the principles which are established in the nature of the universe that he has created. Those principles

which are true and binding upon all people whether they know the Lord or not. Those principles for breaking of which, all mankind is lost. He declares ^{these} moral principles to them in verses 1 to 17. We call them The Ten Commandments, but different people disagree as to what are the particular ones of the ten, that is, the division of the ten, there are three different places you can divide them. It isn't so important how you divide them, as ^{that} if you take the whole thing that's there and realize its importance. The Presentation of the moral law, which is contained in it. And it is tremendously important to be familiar with the moral law, we understand it, we attempt to follow, we pray the Lord to help us in following. If we take it and make it a means of salvation, if we make it a means of winning God's favor, if we take it as that by which we are saved and forget the death of Christ, then of course we are using it utterly wrongly, and of course that is what is said to be being under law. We are putting ourselves in a relation to the law which God never intended us to be under, and which Paul strongly attacked but he's not attacking the Old Testament or attacking anything God ever set up, he's attacking the misunderstanding of the Scribes and the Pharisees and the false attitudes which they had and which many, many, many a person has had and does have today. But that doesn't mean we should scrap it as the law (4¹/₅) but that we should understand what it is, and use it rightly. And so we have this wonderful moral law presented on which we could take about six months looking into the details of each part of it but we will have to leave that to other courses, or to your own study. And to go on to d, The People's Fear.

This is only three verses of chapter 20, 18 to 21, four verses, but it is a little separation between the giving of this great moral law and the going on ~~that~~ to give application and (5)

The people's fear, 20:18-21, and then small e, Regulations for Worship. Here we have verses 22 to 26. And 22 to 26 is an arrangement for temporary situations there in the wilderness. How different in importance from what preceded. The principle of worship in it is tremendously important, but the particular rules here given in 22 to 26 is a temporary rule for the special situation of the 40 years in the wilderness. He is saying now you should keep my ^{moral} law, yes. It's wonderful, we're going to keep this great law, yes, but now you're in a particular situation, here's what you do now. Here's your

immediate situation of worshipping God. Your immediate situation of the kind of altar you build here in the wilderness. It is a local, temporary enactment for the forty years immediately following, and God wants us not to get our heads up in the clouds so much in his great eternal values that we forget immediate, necessary matters that apply only to this immediate time. And so chapter 20 has got the great moral law, the statement of the people's fear, and the regulations for worship, principles of lasting validity, but the application applying only to that immediate situation of those forty years. That was e, 22 to 26.

And then f, The Judgments. Now these are the judgments which thou shalt set before them. The judgments are chapter 21:1-to 23:19. And the judgments are applications of the moral law to the immediate situation of the life of the people. They are far less vital, you might say, because they are immediate dealing with much temporary situations that no longer existed, in other cases repetition of great important principles, but applying these principles to their immediate situation, and the Sabbath is brought out again there, brought out a little more fully, applied here through the day and through the year. The principle of alternation, not only in our days but in our years, planning our lives to make them accomplish the utmost for God. Now you notice this doesn't run to the end of chapter 23. It runs to 23, verse 19, and that is very important. The Judgments, 21:1 to 23:19, and then comes g, The Promised Conquest. Chapter 23, verses 20 to 33. After these laws given, then 14 verses that tell us how God is going to bring the people into the promised land, and he's going to drive out the enemy before them, he's going to establish their territories there. A wonderful promise here, one of the gems of the Old Testament, but buried away and lost to most critics, who never look at because it comes right at the end of a long period of temporary judgments dealing with particular situations, which most people pass over. It's too bad the Archbishop didn't start a new chapter with verse 20. 20 to 33 should be a chapter by itself. It is distinct, it is vital, it is important, if we had three years to give this course instead of one, I'd take a whole week to study those fourteen verses. It would be well worth while, I hope you'll all do it sometime. ^but now I want to get this important matter of the general structure of this passage before

you, and so the Promised Conquest, and then h, The Covenant Formally Ratified, chapter 24, verses 1 to 8. They, Moses writes the words of the Lord, he presents them to the people, the people say, all the words the Lord has said we will do. He has a sacrifice, takes the blood and sprinkles on the people, reads the book of the ^Covenant to the people, he presents it formally, and that is again--it isn't to advance their salvation, the fact they did this, forms and ceremonies don't determine our life but our relation to the Lord. But these forms and ceremonies help to drive home to our minds the things that God wants impressed upon them, and they have an important place there. It gives an example of the orderliness which he wants us to observe in our churches, in our religious life, to have orderly forms and methods and a help to the carrying out of his will. Now we'll have to stop for this semester. We won't be able to examine the rest of the structure of this passage but keep in mind the divisions in the rest of Exodus which I've already given you. And I'll be much interested next week to see whether you really know them, whether you have an understanding of these matters, and we'll meet again after exam~~s~~ period.

O.T.History 172. (1)

...We are starting the second semester of O. T. History but we have a very few new students with^{us} this semester and so I should say a word or two introductory to the semester, although in general I would say that the work is to be continued (1 1/4)

our enumeration will go right on from here, and new students will just pick up at this point as we proceed on. It's not like entering a language in the middle of the year, ~~entering~~ because in a language every day builds on the day before and if you don't have the day before you can't get the things following, but in this course we're dealing with different sections of the Bible. I have even sometimes given this course in reverse order, and started with the last half and given that first, there are certain real advantages (1 3/4)

we get certain very valuable matters of method in the last half of this that we really need before the first. That's why I gave you just a brief glimpse into the archeological connections of 1st and 2nd Kings last semester, just a very brief glance I gave you into it in order to show how archeology first began corroborating the

scripture before taking^{up} the more involved ~~section~~^{selections} in Genesis. I often find it difficult to decide in which order to take it. There's a great advantage in taking the second half first and yet I think perhaps it's more natural to go the way we are now. (2 $\frac{1}{2}$)

are not at this point at a great disadvantage, it is simply we are dealing with a different portion of the history. It's like in Church History I don't care which semester a person stops in Church History, because each is a different section of the whole body of the church. But now for new students with us I would say that our method in this course is to survey the main ~~concepts~~^{contents} of the historical books of the Bible, and to notice particularly the history contained in those books. We are interested in giving an idea of the main features of it, that is very vital, most of that I'll expect you to get yourself, ^{what} but we need class for is to study particular points of interpretation. To get the proper focus on the history, to see its meaning (3 $\frac{1}{4}$)

and to see the way to answer certain of the vital attacks that are made upon the Christian religion by way of attacking certain features of that history. And so I assign matters of skeleton from time to time, and I am very strict that you get them, but we don't need to spend much time in class on that. We need them, they're very vital, but they don't have to take a lot of time. Like your bones, if you don't have your bones you'd just fall in a heap, but we don't have to see the bones. We spend the greater part of our time dealing with that which is above bones, that is the way that we are continuing in this course.

Now this is the study of Old Testament History and in order to learn Old Testament History you have to go to the sources of it and the main source of it is the Old Testament. That is where Old Testament History originated. The English, like any translation, can only be an approximation, there is no such thing as an exact translation. And hence this course should require a year of Hebrew before it, We find it convenient to give the course to all the students at once and consequently, for those who are in the first year we make certain allowances. But we expect all those who have had a year of Hebrew to use it in connection with this naturally, - of course, and the others, now being in the second semester, will of course be able to use it to some extent, this semester. (4 3/4)

Anyone who is entering who hasn't yet had Hebrew will be able to get a great part of value from the course, ^{and} will need to do certain special work ~~which from time to time will~~ ^{before final grades can} be given, because (5)

in connection with the course. Now the work of the course consists of assignments, lectures reading in the Bible and reading in other sources. It is a three-credit course. That means, three-credit hours, does not mean that you sit here for three hours a week and one course you sit there for three hours a week and the professor assigns you twenty hours of work outside, but in another course you sit there three hours a week and do nothing else. That's not what three credit-hours means. Three credit-hours means you do approximately nine hours of work per week, now it may be a little less than that, but approximately nine hours of work a week. And of that nine we might spend the whole nine here lecturing, or we might give you the whole nine to spend in reading and in study. We divide it up in whatever ways seem best adapted to the material. So if we have four or five hours of lecture in one week, don't think you don't have time to get the lessons, you're not expected to put over nine hours work in any week. It will average (6)

Some other week, like two weeks from now, you may not have any lectures (6 1/4)

I know you like good recreation and start the first day of school this semester in this hour. Mr. Smitley said you certainly didn't need ordinary type of recreation since you had Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday for that, and I will be away week after next and was anxious to (6 1/2)

Now maybe I should say before we proceed with the lecture, just a word about the final examination. (6 3/4 to 13, remarks on final examination.)

Now we continue then ~~with~~our discussion and before going to a new (13)

I will say that we have been dividing the material of our lectures into Roman Numerals. And we are on Roman Numeral VI, which is entitled, Israel in the Wilderness. And this section we are (13 1/2) from Exodus 12 to the end of Deuteronomy. Under that A (which we don't need to worry about), The Importance of This Section; B, From Egypt to Sinai; C, At Sinai. We were at Sinai ~~looking down over~~ when the examination

overtook us. So C, At Sinai runs from Exodus 19 to Numbers 10:10. And we discussed last semester under that 1, The Covenant. I believe we were right on the Covenant, I believe we had taken under that a, The Covenant Presented, Exodus 19:3-8; b, Arrangements for the Declaration of the Moral Law, Exodus 19:9-25; c, The Moral Law Proclaimed, Exodus 20:1-17. Had I gone beyond that? d, The People's Fear; e, Regulations for Worship.

Now f, f, was a section which we called The Judgments, that was a very interesting section which would be well worth the time to study carefully but it is not...

O.T.History 173. (3/4)

...had I mentioned f, I mentioned it in the last few days, I didn't say much about it, I think I will just repeat that much about it, thank you, Mr. Adams. But yet, the Judgments is a section of three chapters, two and a half chapters, which we would mention at length in a course in Old Testament Law, but in this course we merely note ^{its} ~~the~~ presence (1 1/2)

to note its presence and its difference from section c. c, was the Moral Law Proclaimed. That was given by God's word laws, that was the declaration, not of some particular rule that God wanted people to maintain, but of the moral law which always has been binding upon all people but which was presented in clear form by the Lord at Sinai. Now this, number 1, The Covenant, includes both, includes the moral law which was c, and it includes the judgments, f. But the difference is that the judgments are specific applications of the moral law to particular circumstances. And so there's some overlapping between f and c. In ~~it~~ giving a regulation for a particular circumstance or situation you may very well stress a part of the moral law which is binding at all times. But you also may give something which may have no validity except in the particular circumstance in which you find yourself. And so these judgments contain elements of moral law, but they are given for a particular time. The moral law is not given for any particular time, it is timeless, it is a declaration of the character of God. But the judgments, which are contained in these chapters are given to the people as they are starting their wilderness journey, and so they deal particularly with situations in the wilderness. Now they do not give you a full detailed account of (3 1/2)

That comes later.

They give you that which is vital to know immediately. They don't give you the precise detailed regulations that the leaders need to know. They give you the matter that the people should keep in mind in that situation. Now that is extremely important for the study of higher criticism, we're not studying it in this course, but this course should to some extent lay a foundation for that course. And so it's very vital that, I believe, that every Christian teacher should know just where the book of the covenant is, this section of Exodus, in contrast with other sections of Exodus, which would be called by different names. And that it includes the moral law and the judgments, as separate divisions of different nature. Then I mentioned g, The Promised Conquest, chapter 23:20 to 33, 14 verses telling them that God is going to bring them in to the promised land. In other words, what precedes is a temporary legislation. Critics will tell you that when you have, in chapter 23, verses 14 to 19, three great national feasts described, and that when you get over into Numbers and find six (record jumps) ...you can't have three feasts and seven feasts, it's a contradiction, therefore there must be two different documents, written at different times, and contradicting each other. Now you see, this is the judgments, or the laws given to the people as they start the wilderness journey, to drive home to their minds that which is vital ^{they know now,} ~~though maybe not~~ Much of it may be very important at later time, but some of it may be of no importance later, but it all is very important they know right away, and it's not very vital they know about the (5 $\frac{1}{4}$) less important feasts which can be mentioned later in the wilderness. But these that they must have in mind right now are stressed in the judgments, so there's no contradiction, though later more detail is given. The book of the covenant is a law for the whole people at a particular situation, as they start their wilderness journey. Then Moses, when 20 to 23, at the beginning of their wilderness journey, turns their eyes to the future and tells them, gives them the assurance that God is going to take them into the promised land, that God will deliver them from danger, that he will protect them, that he will indeed bring them in to the land of their journey. This is a peculiar thing, right here at the beginning of the wilderness journey, to give the assurance of the conquest. But I think it is given as a guide to us in our Christian life, as \neq (6) in the Old Testament. It has a

definite important historical meaning in the immediate situation but they also have a spiritual meaning. And as we begin our wilderness journey through this life, after we have accepted the Lord, been saved through his precious blood, been redeemed from evil, it is vital, not merely that we know what God's law is, how he wants us as the redeemed by the blood of Christ to live, but that we know that the end and the goal is certain, that he has promised to bring us in to the promised land, that we can depend on it, and that he that has begun a good work in us will carry it out. The person who begins the Christian life in immediate, great confidence, grateful for all that the Lord has done, tends to think I'm going to live a perfect life right from here on, I'm never going to sin any more. Then they fall into some sin and immediately they get discouraged and despondent and they think how am I ever going to (7½)

How am I ever going to reach the goal,

And right at that point, just as God at this point in the covenant, gave the assurance of the conquest and the deliverance, of his bringing them into the promised land, he wants us to lay hold on his promises that he who has done a good work in us will complete it and will carry it out. We do not have to say, oh my, if I can/d keep my eyes on the Lord, if I can/d follow him, if I can/d do his will I'm ^{going to} be safe, but/d my, I've got to be careful I don't slip. We don't have to say that, we mustn't say that, we must say I have been saved and I'm his child, and I want to do my very, very best to live as he wants me to, and I want to do my best to grow in grace, but I know I'm going to slip, I know I'm going to fall, but I know he won't let me stay down, I know if I live close to him that all will be well, but I know he's going to bring me in to the promised land, because I'm his. And so this is vital in their journey, even though it had no immediate relevance in physical fashion to their lives, but great relevance to their ideas and attitudes, and to their understanding. And it has great ~~relevance~~ relevance to our understanding, to have this at the important beginning of our wilderness journey, and to hold it before us constantly through our wilderness journey. And so then, we have the covenant formally ratified.

Chapter 24:1-8. h, The Covenant Formally Ratified. The Lord said to Moses, come up unto the Lord, thou and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel,

and worship ye afar off. Come up, Moses, Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and seventy elders of Israel, and worship afar off, and Moses alone shall come near the Lord. And they came and Moses got the words of the Lord, Moses wrote all the words of the Lord, and rose up early in the morning and built an altar under the hill, and, verse 6, Moses made sacrifices and took the blood and put it on the altar, and took the book of the covenant and read in the audience of the people, and they said, all that the Lord has said we will do, and be obedient. Weren't they rash, though, to say all the Lord has said we will do? Wouldn't they have been wiser to say we won't do what the Lord has said. It all depends on the tone of voice in which you say it. If you'd say, in self confidence, all the Lord has said we will do, it would be very rash; ^{and very wrong,} but to say, showing the purity of (10)

and your desire to serve the Lord, all that the Lord has said I want to do, I will do my best to follow him, that is the attitude which a true Christian not only can take but must take. If you say, all that the Lord has said we won't do, in a tone of defiance of God, it's pretty good proof you've never really been saved. But if you say, all that the Lord has said I know I won't be able to keep it now (10 $\frac{1}{2}$) but I know that he's going to change me from glory to glory until I reach that stage when I can do it, then you have a picture of your Christian life. And so whether it is in determination or whether it's in (10 $\frac{3}{4}$) prediction, makes all the difference in the world. They ratified the covenant here, they declared their desire to accept the Lord's provision, and Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people and said, behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord has made with you concerning all these words. These words are not the words they said, they're the words of God, the words of the ten commandments, the words of the judgments. And as a Christian, we are sprinkled with the blood of Christ, we are saved from our sins to Him, every one who is a sinner, but we are tied to the word he has given us, we are tied to the picture of the great moral law which he wants us to carry on as well as we can now, and eventually be carried on fully, and we are tied to the judgments of his law, these declarations that we find in the Bible, and for us particularly in the New Testament, giving us the detailed (11 $\frac{3}{4}$) emphasis of our Christian lives, as it is necessary if we are to walk as he wants us to.

And so you have here the covenant ratified and this concludes then the giving of the covenant.

2. Detailed instructions given in the mount. Here we have included in this section Exodus 24:9 to the end of chapter 31. Detailed instructions given in the mount. There are (12 $\frac{1}{2}$)

for this particular time. And so under that there is 24:9-18, a, Moses Goes up into the Mountain. And, verse 9, Moses, then went up Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel. And can't you imagine Moses, 38 years later, at the approach of the end of his life, looking back to this occasion when the covenant was ratified, ^{and} as he reads some of these letters, or as he writes them down, or dictates them to his secretary, he says, then he says at the beginning of the chapter, he said to Moses, come up unto the Lord, thou and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel. They went up Moses, and Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and 70 of the elders of Israel. And when Moses comes to the end of his life, Aaron has already died, but Aaron previously had rebelled against Moses and God had strongly rebuked Aaron for this rebellion. And Nadab and Abihu had rebelled against Moses and God had killed them, and yet here in the book of God's (14)

of his great

of Moses, and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu

It is a terrible warn-

ing to us (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

and it is a word of encouragement to us which we need to have because it gives (14 $\frac{1}{3}$)

unto the Lord, and if he allows you to live many years in this life, you can look back on your life and say I remember that day that I went up before the Lord with Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu. (14 3/4)

...

O.T.History 174. (1 $\frac{1}{3}$)

...^{some sort} ~~sort~~ of a manifestation which God gave to these men which he did not give to the ordinary people. They did not see God as you and ^I see each other, because God does not

have a body in the physical sense the way we have. And, for that matter, when we see each other, what we see is an external manifestation, it's not the real you. The clothes that you're wearing today, when I look at you three-fourths of what I see is clothes. And the chances are that ten years now you won't have one of those particular clothes that you have now. Three-fourths or five-sixths of what I see is clothes. And they say that, in the course of seven years, that our whole body, that every cell is replaced and so it's different cells, different (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

What you see of

each other is a manifestation of, we have a permanent manifestation as long as we're in this life, that God's given (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

but God is not tied to a body. We can only reveal ourselves through the body he has given us, but he can reveal himself in whatever way he chooses, and it would be interesting if he had given more details. That bald statement, they saw the God of Israel is difficult to understand. When I was a boy up in northern Michigan, they had a long series of letters in the newspaper. Somebody wrote and said, how can you believe the Bible, such a book of contradiction? It says no man has seen God at any time in John, and here it says they saw the God of Israel, and they went ahead and quoted statements to show how many contradictions there were, but whether you see God or you don't see God, the fact is you don't really see God but you see such manifestations as God chooses to make known to you, and we must infer that God gave them some very wonderful, special manifestation beyond what (2 $\frac{1}{2}$)

These, if
-These

you're going to (2 3/4) verses, contradictions, and the Bible's full of them as any other book (2 3/4) that ever was written, you have to interpret a book as a whole, to relate

but that takes time, it takes thought, it takes consideration,

and so when we come to (3)

like this, please don't hesitate to

raise

because if it's

vital

It's hard for me to know

just which particular one is bothering you at a particular time. We can't take them all, it would take forever, but the outstanding ones (3 $\frac{1}{4}$) that occur to you, please raise

them. If I'm intending to ~~raise~~ ^{deal with} them in the next day or two I may just go ahead with them then, and skip them days later, or I may tell you we'll have them later, or I may decide I will deal with them when I wouldn't ordinarily take the time. But that is a point I think we need to be clear on. God reveals himself to us, we can see the God of Israel. We cannot see God as we see another human being. And ~~that~~ there's a sense in which even that, he can be seen, because we don't really see each other, the real you is not this flesh or these clothes, it's something deeper and more elusive than that. Well, a, Moses Goes Up In To the Mount, 24:9 to 18.

And then b, Directions for the Tabernacle, Exodus 25:1 to the end of chapter 27. Now here are directions given for the tabernacle and then when we get over a few chapters later we have the account of how the tabernacle was made, and you find verse after verse repeated almost word for word. It gives you in great detail God's commands how to build the tabernacle, and then in great detail how the tabernacle was built. Why all this about the tabernacle here, what difference does it make? Why is it important? Well, it was important for the wilderness journey, that the Israelites be taught certain lessons there. And the way to teach them, one way to teach them those lessons was through visual objects, that's a thing we're just learning now, that you have to work out systems of visual objects to get thought across, but God knew it from the beginning and put it right there in the wilderness, gave (5) gave them these visual objects to teach them lessons. Well, now the tabernacle was important, not simply for the objects, it was important for the activities which were in themselves objects, it was a place where the worship could be carried on, it was a place where the people could be gathered together in unified worship of God, where the great truths he wanted them to know could be driven home to their minds and their hearts, so that the directions for the tabernacle are important simply from the viewpoint of having a place to worship God. They are important simply from the viewpoint of having a way of carrying out the service that God wants you to do. And if you're going out and organizing a group of people together and serving the Lord, you may have to find a place for them to meet, you may have to build one, but it's a real Christian service to do so. God gives all these chapters

to telling how they did this. And it's very important. Some people scoff at building, they say the church isn't a building, the church is a lot of people. Well, the fact is, our word church means a building, the English word church is derived from the Greek word (6 $\frac{1}{4}$) * which means the building that belongs to the Lord. So it is a building. But of course the real church is the building made without hands, the building made up of believers, but as long as we're in this earthly journey, there is a real importance of having a decent place to meet, although very secondary to what you do when you get there. And it's necessary to have the material arrangements made and a missionary, a minister, must give a reasonable amount of thought to it. So we have these many chapters here about the tabernacle, to have a definite arrangement for carrying on the work. Then beyond that of course, ~~is~~ the worship itself is ~~the~~ direct the people's hearts to the Lord, the important thing is that the lifting up of a sacrifice is the relation of the heart to the Lord, but the sacrifice conveys ^{and} lessons ~~the~~ ideas to them now and portrays in advance what God is going to do, in the real sacrifice, to open up the new and living way into the Lord's presence. So it is primarily a matter of teaching, a matter of representing that, and so it is important that every detail of the tabernacle be just right in order that it be substantial and strong and able to last, to give them a decent arrangement for worship, in order that it carry out the lessons he wanted given to all people in all lands, and in order that it carry out certain particular lessons that might apply only to them in the wilderness journey. And you can't always tell in which detail of it a particular matter lies. Now there are people who study the tabernacle and who try to find a meaning for every little tiny detail of the tabernacle. Every tiny detail, ^{they think} ~~it~~ has a meaning, which of course is absurd, but certainly the details are for the purpose of having a continuing place that would last and they don't have any meaning. And certain of them may have had a meaning for the people at that time and have no meaning for us today, and to try to find a meaning in every detail of the tabernacle is very absurd. And I have known graduates of the Seminary who've gone out and taken a little church somewhere and found that some of the people there were concerned with working out every little tiny detail of the meaning in the tabernacle, and I've known

certain graduates who've been so disgusted that they seemed to think their greatest duty in this life was to get those people ~~away~~ from that habit of mind, and it grieves me when I see it. Because even though it is an error to try to find a meaning in every little detail of the tabernacle, it is a far greater error not to see the great ^{meaning} ~~need~~ that is in the great essential features of the tabernacle. And far better to find too much meaning than too little. I think ~~instead of~~ ^{you'd benefit} people by getting them out of the frame of mind that looks for too much detail of meaning, but don't do it by attacking it. Do it by putting the stress on the big points which are so definitely (in the tabernacle, representing the (9 $\frac{1}{2}$) great brazen altar ~~law that~~ by which alone you can come before the presence of God, (9 $\frac{1}{2}$) and showing the way into the Holy of Holies that can only be made through blood. And there in the Holy of Holies no statue, no heathen~~ly~~ representation of any kind, but there the ark of the covenant containing the Word of God. The (9 3/4) where the blood is entered only through the blood, and the Word of God enshrined there in its central place in the life of the believer. These are only a few of the great lessons that are in the tabernacle and it's good to know the great lessons, and don't go overboard trying to get meaning out of every little detail, but when someone else does, don't take silly attitudes of thinking that you can give them a great blessing by attacking them. Take rather the attitude of praising God they're interested, but getting them to put their stress on the big things and not ~~the-w~~ to read into little things meanings that aren't there at all. So we're not going, in this class, into details of the tabernacle but I want you to know, because this is history, but I want you simply to know where the tabernacle is in the scripture. The Directions run from Exodus 25:1 to the end of 27. That was b.

And then c, Directions for the People. You need the building but you need people in building. You need people doing a service for the Lord. You need people carrying on the work of the Lord. I was reading Marshal Montgomery's account of his victories in Africa, and he said he put fully one-third of his time studying the character of the men who were in subordinate positions under him, in order to determine who was fit for one sort

of position and who was fitted for another, and who would make a first-class captain but who would be very, very poor as a major, and who there was who was a fairly good captain but who had the qualities that could make him also a good major. He spent one-third of his time studying those men in order to fit the right man to the right position. If you're going to serve the Lord effectively, it's going to be a great part of your work in dealing with other people, and learn^{ing} what are the gifts God has given them and how can those gifts be used most effectively in his service. How can you lead them into the place where they can serve the Lord effectively, and how can you keep them from wrecking themselves and the Lord's work by trying to do that most particular aspect of the work which they may be tremendously anxious to do, but are not actually, do not have that particular gift to carry out. Well, now the Lord (12 $\frac{1}{4}$) priests for them including the arrangements about the incense, are chapter 28:1 to the end of 30. And then d, Workmen Provided by the Lord. Chapter 31, verses 1-11. The Lord told Moses how to build this great tabernacle, gave him the directions for it all, but the Lord said, see, I have called by name Bezaleel the son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah, and I have filled him with the spirit of God, in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship, to devise cunning words, to work in gold, and in silver, and in brass. That Old English cutting (13 $\frac{1}{4}$) is sort of tricky skilful, to devise skilfully, cutting (13 $\frac{1}{2}$)

God has prepared the workman for this work. We want to learn what the ~~work~~ work is to do. Where each of us fits in. And we want to help others to get into the work, and to prepare for it, but we must remember that it is He who prepares us. And if God has called you, to do a work for Him, it is important to know what the work is, and how to do it, but it is also important to find the work which you might

. If He has really called you to that work He has prepared

. But it is a mighty good thing for most of us to realize that

God has prepared those to lead us who

IF Moses took 40 years studying at gem cutting, he might have become very skilled. That's

not what the Lord called Him to do. The Lord had called him to other things. The Lord had prepared him to do his specific work. We have those people who are , and who are builders , who are agriculturalists, men who are doing all sorts of work. Men who

175.

I think I've mentioned it, but I think it is worth mentioning again. A man I knew who was such a wonderfully young evangelist. I don't mean he went out and held campaigns and was noted as it, but he went out and he spoke to the fellows and whenever he gave an evangelistic message people listened. He was a wonderful evangelist. But he felt the Lord had called him to be a semitic scholar. He spent the last thirty years now studying Semitics, and made a contribution to the Lord's service. But he hadn't made a fifth of the contribution that someone else might to whom the Lord had given the gift for this work. And I've known other men who had the gift for the Semitic studies, who have definitely had it, but who have felt that nothing counted except direct evangelism. And ~~an~~ who have spoiled a good scholar, in order to make a third rate evangelist. What you and I feel like, doesn't tell us what God wants us to do. He wants us all to be his spokesmen, his representatives. But the particular part of the work, whether it is cutting gems, whether it is arranging the (2), whether it is fixing up the tabernacle, whether it is giving the sermon, no matter what it is, God has a work for us. It isn't necessarily the thing that we feel like doing. But the thing that He fixted us for, and very often, others can tell better than we can what the specific gift we have for it. Well, God provided the workmen. d. 31:1-11.

And then e. The sabbath rest. This is interesting here, that in the midst of these detailed instructions, after speaking ~~of~~ about the priesthood, and the tabernacle, ~~before~~ ^{wording} mentioning the ~~making~~ of the tables of stone, there are six verses, 31:12-17, in which the sabbath is stressed. We've already had the sabbath given, in the ten commandments. But before the ten commandments were ever given, God had told them in the wilderness, they ~~of~~ must not break the sabbath by gathering manna on that day. And when he gave the sabbath commandment, He didn't say I'm going to establish a sabbath. He said, remember the sabbath day which God established at creation. And here, in the connection with the preparation for the tabernacle, He puts this special stress on the

sabbath. Now there is a very definite reason for that in connection with Israel, because Israel was going to be God's people to keep the memory of the true God alive, through those years, in which He was hardly known outside of Israel. And Israel was to have that great work to do for Him there, and they were to have the sign as an evidence of God and of standing for Him, and of course the greatest sign is true Christian love, and of a life of purity and of the carrying out of His law. That's the greatest sign to the unbeliever, but we all fall short of that at times. But here was a sign which was a visible sign which set Israel apart ⁱⁿ ~~from~~ the heathen world, was their setting aside of the sabbath. And it made people all over the world think of them as a very peculiar people. A people who one day in seven, stopped and rested, and worshipped the Lord. And they were known in Rome, at a very early time, as the people who would not work one day in seven. It was a very special sign that God have these people to call other's attention to their religion, and to the amount that they were willing to stand for that religion.

And then there is a great importance in the stressing of the sabbath, here, and at the beginning of their wilderness journey, to stress the lesson that the sabbath signifies. That God wants our time arranged in orderly fashion. He wants it not to be hit and miss. He wants a regularity, things done in their proper time, and in their proper place, and He wants a certain time set apart, at regular intervals for His service, for His worship. And a certain time set apart at regular intervals for rest. Now the people at large might worship God on the sabbath day and might rest on the sabbath day, but the priest that had to slay all those ~~many~~ sacrifices didn't get any rest on the sabbath day. They had their rest on some other day. But the principle, there are two principles, there is the principle - of course, we should always worship the Lord, but we should have recurring periods of special stress for worshipping the Lord, and the other is that God has so made us, that we need recurring principles of rest. And if we are specifically in the Lord's work, and can't take the time of rest at the time when others do, we still should take the time of rest in order to keep the body that God has given us and the abilities that He gives us in such condition that we continue to be useful in His service. God's teaching was never a matter of here are these precise regulations. You ~~thought~~ follow the exact thought of that and you are

right, but if you depart a little bit from that, you are in danger. They always were great blessings, great principles that He wants us to learn, and to follow. And the sabbath principle is a principle that is mighty vital ~~in the life of every believer.~~ in the life of every believer.

(Question: Couldn't we interpret the sabbath thinking that God was trying to prevent man from working the day, the seventh shall we say, because he could reason that they were working for the Lord and building up the temple. They could bring this ~~excuse.~~ excuse.) Yes, it is a thing that it is very easy for a seminary student to fall very short and it is very easy to figure that all of the Lord's work is your work anyway, so you might as well make Sunday just like every other day. Well, you are definitely not doing what the Lord does not want. He wants you to have particular times set apart for your worship, for your private devotions, and He wants you to have the [?] courage, period of rest. But for the people in general who are not in the specific ^{service} direction of the Lord, there is a much more rest than for the Christian worker. You may be rushing from church to church on Sunday, and you get the rest some other day. But it is a mighty good practice as a general practice to rest as much as possible from that which is specifically connected with your lessons on the sabbath day.

(Question: Don't you think that this was not only for our spiritual rest, but also for our physical rest.) Very definitely it was, and for the average person you can very easily get them both on the one day. But for the Christian work it is very necessary to get them on different days. ^{As?} If it is, you are carrying out the spirit and the purpose. Many a person says, ~~the~~ the spirit kills, that is the letter kills and the spirit gives life as an excuse for ignoring the whole business, letter and spirit. And God does not want us to ignore the ^(8 1/4) . The principle is true, that it is not a specific minute carrying out of regulations, but it is the understanding of the principle and the applying of the principle in a way that is often . Well, this is the sabbath stressed. C.31:12-17.

f. The tables of stone. That's only one verse, but that certainly is worth a special heading. "He gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God."

3. The Golden Calf. And what a contrast. Moses on the mountain, worshipping God. Receiving the tables of stone, written with the finger of God, and the people, down in the valley saying to Aaron, "Up make us gods, which shall go before us; for this Moses, the man that brought us out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him." And so he is going forward with the Lord's work, and they instead of following him, are ~~turning~~ turning away and leaving. And how different the Bible is from what you and I would look. What a beautiful Utopia, men ~~and~~ ~~men~~, ^{have written} the picture of perfection that they imagined that it ought to be, but God gives us a picture of life as it is. And despite rebellion, despite turning aside, despite fallings by the wayside, He pushes forward towards the goal. And here is Moses, up on the mountain, receiving a message from God, and then coming down to see the people turning away, and we will have that experience. But don't let it make you bitter. If your eyes are on human beings you are going to get bitter soon enough anyway, but if your eyes are on the Lord, there is no reason to ever get bitter, because you will find that the ~~man~~ person that you trust, will prove to be made of flesh. And don't make it make you feel too bad, because he is probably feeling the same way about you. But God is the one you can trust. And you can learn that lesson from Exodus, and if you learn it there, you are going to be saving yourself a lot of heartaches from now on.

A man said to me once, a woman said to me once a few years ago, oh, she said, when we found that our idol had feet of stone, she said, it just about ruined our lives, she said. To see that one we trusted so much, who fell in this error. And I felt like saying - I dián't, but I felt like saying, serves you right for having an idol. We should not have a human being at mind. Praise the Lord when someone is wonderfully used of Him, but we are still falliable weak human beings, and they may fall. You keep your eyes on Him, and not on man. (End of class.)

O.T. History. 176.

Last time we were speaking about number 3. The Golden Calf. And this runs from Exodus 32 through 35:3. So under this, subhead a would be the first great apostasy of Israel. Exodus 32:1-6. Who would ever have believed that a people so recently rescued from Egypt, with the recollection behind them of the plagues of Egypt, of their

deliverance from the oppression, and of the rescue through the Red Sea, would fall into this worship of the golden calf so quickly and so easily. It is hard to believe if one knows nothing about life. It does not fit with the simple scheme that any of us would make to explain how life ought to be, but as life is you find it repeatedly. It is simply the way, the fact that sin is in the human heart, and there, even when we are saved there still remains plenty of Egypt in us, and you will find that any group that you work with, that repeatedly you will have experiences similar to this one. You will not have as bad as this, this was the worst that perhaps Moses had, but he had many others which were very bad. And so we have the first great apostasy of Israel. And that describes of course the story that doubtless is well known to every one here, how the Israelites got Aaron to make this calf and they said, these be thy gods, O Israel, that brought thee ~~me~~ out of the land of Egypt. And when Aaron saw it, he built an altar before it, and Aaron made proclamation, and said, To morrow is a feast to Jehovah. And they rose up early on the morrow, and offered burnt offerings, and brought peace offerings, and the people sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play." If he turned away from the worship of Jehovah in order to worship a golden calf, why, did he say, well now, is the ~~feast~~ feast to Jehovah? And they proceeded to have this festival. Why did he introduce it that way? There are scholars today who say that this was not a turning to another god. That they considered this to represent the god Jehovah, who had brought them up out of the land of Egypt. They say that the invisible God of Israel was imagined as standing over the calf, over the golden calf, and we do have of course, in the Northern Mesopotamia, we have found remains from around this period, in certain places where they did worship, where they had the gods represented as standing on the backs of animals. And that's what gave the idea to certain modern scholars that this is $(4\frac{1}{2})$ thought of that until recent years. It was also, I imagine, was thought by most, that this was simply another god, substituted by Jehovah, but you notice Aaron says, "Tomorrow is a feast to Jehovah." Prepare for it, and the next day they had this festival. If this idea of these scholars is true, then it was not a breaking of the first commandment, but in such a case, it was certainly a breaking of the second commandment. It was the making of a calf and bowing down before it, and a breaking of the second commandment, if not of the

first, and actually it is pretty hard to break the second without breaking the first. Because you may think you are worshipping the same god, but when you worship Him in a method different from what He has prescribed, and when you depart from what He has designated, it is pretty hard to be sure you are still worshipping Him.

There are missionaries who go to Mohammedan lands, and say, well, the Mohammedans believe in one god, we believe in one God, we all worship the same God, it is just a matter of difference in how we worship. Well, Mohammed ~~na~~ claims that it is the same God. He claims that Allah is the God who was active in the Old Testament days and leading the Israelites, and who was active in the time of Christ, and he represented Christ as the greatest of all the prophets next to himself. But he denied His deity, He denied His atonement, but he would claim that this is the same god. Actually, the missionaries say that when they see how the worship of Allah is carried on, and when they see the teaching of (6 $\frac{1}{4}$), it becomes very apparent that Allah is not the same god as Jehovah at all. He is a different god from Jehovah. It is actually a breaking of the first commandment. And if the god of the Mohammedans and the god of the, gods of the Hindus are different gods from the gods we worship, much more is it true of the modernists. They do not have the God that we worship. So whether this is a breaking of the first commandment, or of the second commandment, in the end it amounts to a breaking of the first, and it is a definite apostasy against the Lord.

b. Moses' first intercession. It is very interesting that immediately we have this first great instance of Moses intercession. The Lord says to Moses, "Get thee down. Thy people which thou broughtest out of the land of Egypt, have corrupted themselves. They have turned aside quickly, out of the way which I commanded them: they have made them a molten calf, and have worshipped it, and have sacrificed thereunto." The Lord said unto Moses, "I have seen this people. Behold, it is a stiffnecked people. Now therefore let me alone, that my wrath may wax hot against them, and that I may consume them, and I will make of thee a great nation." Immediately Moses doesn't say, isn't that awful. Isn't that wicked? Those people ought to be destroyed. They ought to be wiped off the face of the earth, for what they have done. Moses speaks mighty strictly to the people, when he comes down. He deals very fully with their sins. But before he deals with them

in judgment, he deals with God in intercession, and He prays to God that He will ~~spare~~ spare the people, that He will deliver them, that He will rescue them, out of the wilderness. Moses is the great instance of the great righteous man standing for God, surrounded by these wicked people, but Moses is a great example of the intercessor and would be an excellent study, to study Moses, the intercessor, to see through these chapters what we learn about how he prayed for the people and he sought the Lord, and thought of all the arguments and reasons he could why the Lord should spare these people and should not entirely destroy them. And we read in verse 14, "And the Lord repented of the evil which he thought to do unto his people." This word repent here, is a word which in the Old Testament, has a very different meaning than the word repent in the New Testament. Now this word repent in the New Testament is used of man. It couldn't be conceived to be used of God. God could not have Godly wrath and Godly sorrow for sin and desire to turn away from it. That's what repent means. Sorrow for sin and the desire to turn away from it. God could not repent in that sense. God does not sin. God does not sorrow. He has sorrow for our sins, but He has no sin for which to be sorry for. But this English word, repent, I think is quite unfortunate that the translation of the Hebrew word נָחַם, and נָחַם as I mentioned in connection with Genesis 6 in the light of the context, seems to me, seems definitely to be the turning away from an unhappy state to a less unhappy state in view of something that has happened or something that one has decided to do. It is an emotional .10

The same word is translated, be comforted in Numbers. And the meaning is much nearer, be comforted, rather than he repented, but it is not exactly like comforted. And it is used in the Piel, it is used in two cases in the Niphal, and in the Piel. The Piel is the causative. That is what we have in Isaiah 40, where it says, "Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people." Before I knew Hebrew, I thought it meant, when you say comfort ye, comfort ye, my people, what is meant was, be comforted by comforting my people. That's not what it means at all. That's with the niphal. That's with the Piel, which means comfort my people. My people is the object of it. It is the causative idea. To cause that they should be comforted. And so the same sense can be applied. If you take the people in exile and show that God is going to lead them to less unhappiness

because they know what God is going to do.

(Question: God does not go back on His promises. God says to Abraham, I will make of thee a great nation. Now suppose that God should destroy all the descendents of Abraham, except Moses, and then made of Moses a great nation, Moses is still a descendent of Abraham, but still a great nation shall be made of Abraham.

Well, now that's b. Moses' first intercession. c is Moses return to the camp. 32:15-24. And in the course of these verses here, concerning Moses return to the camp, there are two particular matters that I want you to notice. One⁽¹⁾ of them is the destruction of the first tables of stone. "Moses turned, and went down from the mount, and the two tables of the testimony were in his hand. The tables were written on both their sides; on the one side and on the other were they written. And the tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables." And then, in verse 22 19, "And it came to pass, as soon as he came nigh unto the camp, that he saw the calf, and the dancing, and Moses' anger waxed hot, and he cast the tables out of his hands, and brake them beneath the mount." And so Moses destroyed the tablets of stone that God had prepared. And Moses (13½). Was it God's purpose that these tablets should be destroyed? That some ~~nampa~~ good purpose would be gained by it? Was it an object lesson to the people of how terrible they had done by it? To break these tablets. We are not told. Was it simply a reaction of Moses, which anyone of us is apt to have in a situation like that, to be terribly disgusted and angry at something, to just destroy that like a little child. And so we can't build anything upon this when we are not told. But this we know, that God had given these sacred, precious tablets to Moses.

177.

(Question: Yes, that's a very good point. God says, I will destroy this people, and make a great nation out of you. And yet, as Mr. Myers points out, Joshua was among them. Doubtless many were irritated and disgusted about what was happening. We can get into all sorts of difficulty in the Scripture if we take the strong statements and take them as (1). I got a letter once, which said, how can you believe the Old Testament? It is full of contradictions. Rehoboam took the golden shields out of the temple and they were attributed to Shishak and he put bronze ~~shields~~

shields in their ~~pm~~ stead, and then it tells about another king later on when someone came and attacked them, he fought him off, with taking all the precious vessels out of the temple, and selling them and giving them the money, and it tells that about six of them, and then it tells at the end that all the precious things in the temple were carried off to Babylon. And he says, how could they carry off these to Babylon. They'd given all these things wholly to others. He tried to make out that there was a string of contradictions. Actually the language is not meant to mean every single one. And it is a very easy error to fall into. There are some who say, that ^{it says} God is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance, and there are those who make strong application.

Here, Moses had been given these commandments by the Lord, and Moses was serving the Lord, and leading these people here, and after this was all over, God takes Moses up into the mount again, and gives him two more tables of stone. But very seldom are you and I in a ~~mm~~ situation, at all prominent to that. And it is very easy for us to be angry and upset in the emotional excitement of a particular situation to destroy the work of a long period. It is very, very easy for us to do. I think that we should watch and guard against it. Here were these precious tablets which God had written. The ten commandments, for us. What a momento, what a treasure in days to come, what a wonderful thing they were, and just to take it and throw them down and destroy them, might it not be more important to preserve the tablets of stone, the moral law for all future ages, even if all of Israel were to ~~gm~~ go off to their sin, and how would it hinder their going off. How were they spared in this that Moses did. Eventually Moses gave way to this sudden rage that came up in him, in a situation that would have tried the patience of anybody, and God told him, Moses as a result of this, you aren't to go into the promised land, eventually in a very similar situation where Moses gave way to wrath. In this case, it may have been just the same trait in Moses. Moses was one of the greatest man who ever lived. He was a man of flesh and blood just like ourselves. And God does not mean us to take any person except the Lord Jesus Christ as perfect, and that everything that he does is worthy of imitation. He wants us to see what he does right, and imitate it, and see their mistakes, and notice the results. And I think that it may have been God's will that Moses break those tablets. We don't know.

But it certainly is His will, that in general we take it as a horrible example to avoid, and not ⁱⁿ an immediate situation ^{to} let ourselves forget things that can be very important, permanent lasting importance. Well, the tablets of stone were now broken. They were ^p replaced.

(2) Aaron's lame excuses. This is one of the most natural things, human things, in the Scripture, and when you read all the wonderful things about Aaron and what a great man he was it seems hard to believe that anyone who thought so highly of Aaron, as the writer of this book did, would have included these verses. But the Bible was not written by a man who admired somebody and therefore tells us everything good about him, or detests somebody and therefore knocks him all the time, but it was written by God's representative who told us things exactly as they were. So we read in verses 21-24, "Moses said unto Aaron, What did this people do to you, that you brought so great a sin upon them? And Aaron said, Let not the anger of my lord wax hot: thou knowest the people, that they are set on mischief. They said to me, Make us gods, which shall go before us, for this man Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him. And I said unto them, Whosoever hath any gold, let them break it off, so they gave it me, then I cast it into the fire, and there came out this calf." And Aaron is trying to make excuses, and they are just about as silly, as most people's excuses are. Aaron had sinned, he had done wrong, and the more he tried to excuse it the worst he was.

(Question: The people said, make us gods. You means as to whether it was the first commandment or the second? What do you mean? I'm afraid I don't get the point. That that would prove that in Aaron's mind these were actual gods than representing actually what the gods were ^{under} ~~resembling~~. And on the other hand you have Aaron saying to the people after he made this. Come all to the feast of the Lord. Come all together in front of this and celebrate. So I think we can draw opposite conclusions from two statements Aaron made. I doubt if the evidence is sufficient to one of them for us to reach a conclusion. Aaron probably wasn't a hundred per cent clear in his own mind in the whole situation. I certainly don't think Aaron was a ring leader who planned this thing, and tried to lead the people into apostasy, but I think that Aaron went along with them into it, and in going along, he probably partly convinced himself, and partly didn't.

(Question: Does the Hebrew have make us the gods?) There is no the. But it could be, make us God, or make us gods. As far as the Hebrew is concerned the form would be identical, whether it would be make us gods, or make us God, or make us a god. That is God, may be just the same thing as the God. But often, the word God, has a the before it. So you can't say it isn't the God, but you can't quite as if it had a lee way. Yes.

d. Vengeance on the people. 32:25-29. "Moses stood in the gate of the camp, and said, Who is on the Lord's side? Let him come to me." And we read that all the sons of Levi gathered themselves together with him. And he commanded them to go through and to slay of the others, and they did it according to the word of Moses and there fell of the people that day about three thousand men. The vengeance on the people at that time. It was very, very small compared to what the Lord had suggested, wiping out the entire nation, and making a great nation of Moses, even though of the entire nation, there might still have been maybe a hundred thousand left that had not bowed the knee to the golden calf. It was very small compared to them, and yet it was a terrible punishment, and it is easy to look at it from one of two views. Here we see Moses, persuading the Lord, interceding with the Lord not to ~~ha muna ah him~~ destroy the nation, and only this small number being killed. And on the other hand, here we see Moses in his wrath and standing for the honor of God causing that this number should be killed. The fact is this, we can't go to the Bible and judge whether the Bible is moral or not, to judge whether its principles are right. That's the habit the modernists have. So the modernists say, well now, I don't like the ethics of the Bible. The Old Testament has got a low stage of ethics. It hasn't reached our high exalted viewpoint, and so they start in trying to criticize the ethics of the Bible, criticizing this, that, and the other thing, and then they go on, and the next step is they lose their ethics altogether. In the early stage of modernism their claim to have a high ethics that goes down in their writing, in the later stage you will find that they wrote exclusive, and explain away any sin whatsoever. There is no ethical standard left, as modernism goes on. But the question is, where do you get your ethical standard. You must get it from the Word of God. You must not try to take a standard, that is not a true standard, or is not a workable standard. We don't get our standard out of our head,

we get it out of the Bible. There are those people who make up a standard of ethics, that it is sinful to have any use of alcohol. There is no such statement taught in the scripture anywhere at all. It is clearly taught in the Scripture that drunkenness is a sin. That is clearly taught. And of course, in a civilization like our present one, there is a very good argument that can be made, that it is a wise policy to abstain from alcoholic beverages altogether. But there are people who make very much of any touching of alcohol as being sinning, and that they overlook the really great moral principle by insisting on certain a, b, c's, that they say are very clear and simple to the Christian, but are not the Divine standard. We must get our standard from the Bible, not from other individuals.

Well, vengeance on the people then. The Levites stood true. The Levites had been the cursed by Jacob. Certainly Levi had been cursed. He said, I was scattered abroad ? of God in Israel. Simeon was scattered abroad and disappeared. Levi stood by the Lord and was scattered abroad, for blessing as God's representative. The curse was turned into a blessing. Levi stood true to the Lord. God will fulfill all of His promises. He will fulfill all of his blessings. What He declares will come to pass. They will come to pass, but no one can say, "I am under the curse. There is nothing I can do about it." He has mercy for anyone that looks to Him regardless of their background. No one is lost, except by his own fault. There is no one who can say God would not (14). Jesus said, I would gather you under my wing, and you would not. Every man is lost who would not have the blood atonement.

C. Further intercession. And we have further intercession, described from chapter 32: 13- 33:23. "On the morrow Moses said to the people you've sinned a great sin. Now, I will go up to the Lord, peradventure I will make an atonement. And Moses went, confessed their sin, and yet, now if thou wilt forgive their sin, and blot ^{me} ~~them~~ out of thy book-".

The Lord said, to Moses, take the people up. I'll give them the land I promised. I'll send an angel before you, and I'll drive out the people in front of them, but I won't go up in the midst of you, for they are a stiffnecked people, lest I consume them in the wilderness. When the people heard these evil tidings they mourned and no man did put on his ornaments, For the Lord had said unto Moses, Say unto the children of Israel, Ye are a stiffnecked people. I will come up into the midst of thee in a moment and consume thee. And ~~we~~ we have Moses' intercession continuing, described to the end of chapter 33. Now there are two matters, we won't take time to go into detail on this. I hope you will all spend at length sometime, but I want to bring out two points, in this here, we have already had a section in which God has described how the tabernacle shall be built. You recall, just a little bit earlier. Now when was the tabernacle built? Read verse 7. "And Moses took the tabernacle, and pitched it without the camp, ~~afar~~ off from the camp, and called it the Tabernacle of the congregation." Was the tabernacle made in between the directions that were given in the mount; to Moses? And the time when Moses came down and found the people worshipping the golden calf? Or was it between the time when they were worshipping the golden calf, and the time when this is described in this verse, or when was it? Mr. Kurtz, would you have an idea? How did the tabernacle get into this verse? That he took the tabernacle and he pitched it outside, where did it come from? Mr. Myers?

Here we find it in Exodus 35.4, begins the making of the tabernacle, it is described in 35, and in 36, and in 37 and in 38. And 39. And the setting up of the tabernacle ^{chapter?} is described in verse 40. And he made it all according to the pattern shown to him in the mount. But he did that after he went up to the mountain again. It was after this time that he built the tabernacle. Yet here it said, he took the tabernacle, and he pitched it outside the camp.

The English word, Tabernacle, is to my regret, was used by the King James translators, to translate six different Hebrew nouns. And the long description that we've already had, of the building of the tabernacle, includes perhaps 15 or 20 cases where he speaks of the tabernacle as the ~~tabernacle~~ ^{מִשְׁכָּן} the dwelling place. And later on where it tells how the ~~tabernacle~~ tabernacle was built, it includes maybe 15 or more where it refers to the tabernacle as the ^{מִשְׁכָּן}, the dwelling place.

But there are in both of those a very few cases, I believe only two or three, where it is not called the תְּבִינָה , but the תִּטְיָאֵל , which means tent. The English word tabernacle simply means a tent. But the tent that Moses put up, we call it a tent, because it had these coats, skins on the outside, so it looked like a tent. So we call it a tent. But it is ordinarily not called a tent. It is ordinarily called the dwelling place. God's dwelling place. The תְּבִינָה . The place of the Shekinah glory. And to my mind, the King James version would be far clearer, if ~~it~~ when they had

תְּבִינָה they would say, dwelling, with a capital D, and if when they said תִּטְיָאֵל they would say tent, instead of saying tabernacle in both cases, Now in this particular case it is the word ~~תְּבִינָה~~ תִּטְיָאֵל , the word which is not a common word, the word tabernacle, but is occasionally used for the tabernacle, that Moses used. And it is rather peculiar ~~ammmmmmm~~ the way it simply says here, that Moses took the tabernacle and pitched it without the camp, and called it the tabernacle of the congregation. It doesn't tell us what tabernacle ~~it~~ is, but if you translate it as it literally is, took the tent, you can conclude, it isn't the great tabernacle, they built according to the directions on the mount, because that wasn't yet built. It must be some tent. Now was it Moses' tent, in which he ordinarily lived, or was it a tent, in which he had ordinarily used as a center for worship? Which is it? Now he took it, we don't know. Now I have a commentary here, the New Bible Commentary, so called, published in England, by the Intersarsity Fellowship, the commentary on the section of Exodus there, I looked up this verse, and what it says about this verse is, Moses removed his tent outside the camp. His tent, which the Lord was going to use as the place for meeting the ~~man~~ $(7\frac{1}{2})$

, and Moses would make his intercession to the Lord. But it was Moses' tent. Now, that's that man's view. Maybe he is right. In fact, I think he is right. It is Moses tent. But is it his ordinary tent, his dwelling tent, or is it his second tent, he had near, which he had used for this ~~purpose~~ purpose all along. I don't know. But it says, he called it the ~~tabernacle~~ tabernacle of the congregation, and I think that that is extremely unfortunate, that the King James writer translates it, the tabernacle of the congregation. I think they were great scholars and did ~~it~~ a grand job with the King James version, but I think they made a few rather serious mistakes. And I think this is quite unfortunate. The word that is here translated congregation, well the word

congregation, the King James translators used to translate six different Hebrew words. And this word is used very rarely, except in this connection. כּוֹנֵן it means a meeting place, or the meeting itself. Now there is an entirely different word, קָהָל which is used for the assembly called together, which is more of what we think as the congregation. But this is not a congregation in the modern sense. We say a congregation, we mean a group of people together, but the word congregation can just as well mean, the coming together, as actually this is doubtless the coming together of God and Moses. Or Moses making intercession with God and God revealing Himself to Moses. The tent of meeting would be a more literal rendering. The tabernacle of the congregation is all right if you understand congregation as being the sense of congregating, Moses and God congregating together, rather than in the sense of a lot of people coming together. So it is an unfortunate term as far as modern usage is concerned. Now maybe in the King James day it would fit exactly the right idea. I can't say. But I think that it is too bad anyway, they used the word congregation, to give three or four different Hebrew words, and they used the ~~one~~ word tabernacle, for the six different Hebrew words. So in this case, it is a different tent, and it is quite important that you have it in mind, because all the critical books bring out that this is a ~~monstrous~~ contradiction. Here is a tabernacle already there, taken out of the camp, and yet you read later on that they built the ^{tabernacle} ~~tabernacle~~, so it shows that you have two different documents, that they just combined together. Of course, the thing that always impresses me, when they give those arguments is, if they are from two different documents that had different stories, what kind of an idiot was it that put them together into one book, that he couldn't see that he made a contradiction when he put them together. In the eyes of the man who put together the book of Exodus, there is no contradiction. I mean if a man put it together. Or in the eyes of the man who wrote it, and I believe Moses wrote it. Certainly he wrote Exodus. And it is up to us to figure out what he means, because anything that any of us writes, can seem to have contradictions in it, and it may have because none of us express ourselves perfectly, and the English language is not susceptible to perfect expression anyway. Any (11) is pretty sure to have contradictions in it, if people want to find them. But if they read it to try to get

the meaning, you put them, and assumed you were an intelligent person who wasn't making a contradiction, then they can usually figure out what was meant. And that is true of the Bible.

To say there are no contradictions in the Bible is ridiculous, because there are contradictions in everything that have every been written. But there is no case where it is necessary so to interpret the Bible as to find contradictions. There is always a reasonable interpretation which does not involve a contradiction. And there is no book ever written which ~~can~~ cannot be so interpreted as to find it contradicting at different places. So I think that it is very important to have this in mind, because the English is very unfortunate in this mixing of the word tabernacle. Or maybe it was all right in the King James day. Maybe everybody used it. ~~Maybe~~ Maybe a little boy said, I'm going out and spend the day in my tabernacle with my dog. Maybe they were customed to the word, so that it was just a common word to all, and it fit perfectly, but today, it has come to be a word with a very specialized meaning.

It is used in the Old Testament to translate תִּשְׁבֵּץ a great many times, to translate תִּשְׁבֵּץ a great many times, and then it is used a very few times to translate תִּשְׁבֵּץ, which really means a booth. And over in Amos we read that God will raise up the tabernacle of David~~s~~ which is false. And it is neither the word תִּשְׁבֵּץ or תִּשְׁבֵּץ. It is an entirely different word. The critical argument today about eschatology is based upon that passage and its quotation in Acts 15, and usually failing to recognize the fact that it is taking our English word tabernacle which is not really the sense of the word at all. It simply means a booth. It has nothing to do with tabernacle in the modern sense.

9. The Covenant reestablished. C. 34:1-35:3. And in this 34th chapter - wait, I should briefly mention the last 6 verses of Exodus 33, which I include under the heading further intercession, where there is a revelation of God's glory to Moses, a rather peculiar passage, showing that Moses could not see God actually face to face, although it does say later on, never again came a man who like Moses saw God face to face. They are allegorical. They are figurative. They have to be, because God doesn't have a face that we could see. But here we find that God reveals His glory to Moses in

a very special way, but in a way in which surely only a portion of

.(14).

Then ~~f~~. The covenant reestablished. C134:1-35:3. Here the Lord told Moses, "Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first, and I will write in the first tablets, which thou brakest." And come up to the mountain and don't bring anybody with you. And he did this, and he went up, and then the Lord proceeded to give him a series of statements, and according to the critics, this is the oldest part of Exodus. This is the J document. C.34, and in chapters 20 is the E document, which is a little later. And according to some of them this is the original of the ten commandments. O.T. History, 179. (0)

They figure ten statements out of ~~these~~ these. I think it was ~~the~~, the German poet, who was one of the first, to work out ~~this~~ this theory. It was not a theory accepted by all the critics by any means. You will occasionally come across some. According to their theory, these are the ten commandments, in the most primitive, rudimentary form. Now to compare these with the moral law, really shows how ridiculous it is. These are particular ~~things~~ things that God wanted stressed, and they were matters like seething a ~~goat~~ goat in its mother's milk, as an imitation of a Canaanite custom, and a warning against falling into that particular type of heathenism. And there were particular things that were vital at that time. And then, he wrote the ten commandments, not the words that we have now, but he wrote the words which were originally ~~here~~ here. But this is the reestablishment of the covenant of Moses, here, and it ends in chapter 35: verses 1-3, with a renewed stress on the Sabbath day. The sabbath day was originated at creation. It was part of God's ~~plan~~ plan. But Israel being the people out of all the ones, wanting to keep alive the memory, the knowledge of the true God, it was an important ~~thing~~ ^{sign} for them, something that set them apart from others, and therefore stressed as one specific thing that sets them apart and makes it easy for them to preserve their peculiarity and their distinctness. And so the stress in these three verses, and then in verses 4, we start a new section, which will not ~~be~~ ^{be} g, but 4. Now 4 is the tabernacle built. And that is five chapters. 35:4, to the end of chapter 39. If this were a class in architecture, we would spend a few months

on this. And it would be very interesting, and probably very worth while. But actually this was a sign of forms of worship, with the altar. But in Old Testament History, all we deal with is that ~~he did all things according to~~ ^{he did all things according to} the patterns that the Lord showed him in the mountain, and ~~he~~ ^{go on} to section 5, the tabernacle set up. They had made the tabernacle. Now they put it up. Exodus 40. And it describes how they put up the tabernacle, and put the different things in their right places, in it, and established the worship, and the chapter ends with a repetition of the statement about God's method of leading them. The tent of meeting which now seems to be used from hereon for the central portion of the tabernacle, where God is thought of as actually meeting with the representative of the people. That is called the tent of meeting in the side of ^{which ~~is~~ ~~the~~ ~~tabernacle~~?} tabernacle ~~of~~ the ~~tabernacle~~ as a whole. And the cloud covers it, and the cloud leads them. That is as we see it here.

6. Laws regarding sacrifices. And these laws were not given up in the mountain. Because in the first verse of Leviticus, it says the Lord called to Moses, and spoke to him out of the tent of meeting saying, and so God there in the tabernacle, (5) proceeded to give directions to Moses as to how the sacrifices were regularly to be done. That is Leviticus 1-7. And I was, when I was 12 years old, I started to read the Bible. I read a chapter of Genesis in the morning, and a chapter in the ~~evening~~ evening. A third chapter the next morning, and a fourth the next evening, and I went right through Genesis, and right through Exodus, and then I got to Leviticus 1-7. I think when I got to 5 I got bogged down, and it was about 6 months later that I proceeded on. Many people get bogged down in the beginning of Leviticus, because it is a section of detailed law, which was very important for their proper observance, by the priests, but not intended to be, for light reading by the people, or for exhortation. They are for study, not for easy reading. And so you have seven chapters of laws regarding sacrifices. Very interesting to see the typology in it, but that again is not the subject of this course. Number 7, is the consecration of the priests. C.8,9. We had the directions back in Exodus, ~~show~~ how the priests should be consecrated. Now we have them consecrated in chapters 8, and 9 and then 8 gets back into the history again.

These are accounts of the beginnings of services, and accounts of laws, but now, 8 is The rebellion of Nadab and Abihu. Chapter 10. We will look at this tomorrow. (Next class).

Yesterday we had just reached number 8. This is in C, at Sinai. This is almost the only narrative section of the book of Leviticus. Most of the book of Leviticus is made up of law, and of a special kind of law. They are laws for the priests. There are laws for the carrying on of the service in the temple, Laws for the lives of the priests. Or laws for detailed observances, such as it would not be necessary for the average person to have thoroughly in mind. The critics make contradictions between the fact that you have such great complexity of law in Leviticus, and such comparative simplicity of law in Exodus. And make it out to be ~~an~~ one of more primitive law, and the other more of an advanced law. The fact of the matter, if you ~~take~~ take the Bible as it stands here, that they are different. They are different kinds of law. But the difference is not in primitiveness. The difference is in the purpose of the law. The laws in Exodus are mostly laws for the people to have in mind. Laws to be driven home to their minds and hearts, and remembrance by them and applied. The laws in Leviticus are laws which apply to particular situations or particular groups of people, and need ~~an~~ not to be known by everybody, but should be available for application. And consequently naturally they are more complex, and more detailed, and less interesting. And you have all the material of this type together, because it is necessary to have the general law driven home to people's hearts, and you don't want to mix in it that law which is for reference, rather than for constant memory. Thus you have in Leviticus, you have a law that every ~~minimum~~ fifty years is a Jubilee. (9 $\frac{1}{2}$). as the land lie fallow. Well, if you took the people in the 53rd year, and you taught everybody, now remember the fiftieth year, the land lie fallow, and from the 53rd, 54th, 55th, through the next ten years, you've drummed that into the people's minds, so nobody would ever forget it, after ten years of that, people would be so sick of hearing it, they'd quit saying anything about it. It would have no relevance to their lives. And 35 years later, when the Jubilee came, the ¹⁰ that everyone would have forgotten them. But if you have it in the law book, which the leaders are supposed to read, and refer to, frequently, then it is their responsibility as the time

commanded, but let's try a different way. Here is something that looks to us as if it would be more effective. Let's do it our way instead of doing it God's way. And right at the very beginning of the sacrificial system, God gave an object lesson, not that Nadab and Abihu were worst sinners, than perhaps 20% of the priests in subsequent years. But that that they were doubtless bad citizens. They showed an attitude, a wicked attitude, but not that they were the most wicked men by any means, but that right at the beginning here, of the sacrificial service, it was vital that the first ones who would do it be men whose hearts were right before God. And it was vital that the thing be established on a proper foundation. And somebody may say it was God who punished Nadab and Abihu this way, two men who are sinners like many a man is, bad citizens, not the worst by any means, there were worse sinners than they, but that they in subsequent times should honor God, because everyone of them deserves death. Everyone of us deserves eternal punishment for our sins. It is only the grace of God that enables any of us to escape from death.

O.T. History. 180. (0)

But sin in many cases brings inevitably certain consequences in this life of suffering, but in ~~many~~ many cases doesn't. Often the suffering comes in many cases to the innocent one, rather than to the one guilty of sin. But in this life, when you have punishment which is a specific intervention of God, ~~the the~~ which you do not ordinarily have, but you do some~~times~~ times it is given, not that he is giving now the sin, the punishment it deserves, and showing a just attitude of punishing sin in this life, because all men are judged, when you look over eternity, but that it is done for specific purposes, here for its affect upon others. And so in this case, the punishment of Nadab and Abihu was right at the start, to show the extreme seriousness of carrying out God's law as He gave it. And it is not just a matter of, you want to watch out. You get these details exactly right because if you make a mistake you are going to be ~~punished~~ punished. It is nothing of the kind. But it is a matter of a heart before God that desires to do God's will instead of all this thinking that we've got to work out a better way than our own. That's exactly the sin that caused Satan to fall. It was Satan's desire to be God, and to put himself in the place of God. It was Adam's sin that he could see better what was right than what God gave and it is a fault which people make beginning work over and over. Every young fellow that amounts to

errors?

anything when he begins his life work, immediately sees the areas and mistakes that everybody ahead of him has made, and so he thinks he can do a tremendously lot better, and maybe that's true in some cases. And we can all see mistakes in those ahead of us, and we should see how to remedy it, when we get into positions where we can remedy it. But we fail to see that those ahead of us, have a tremendously lot of good points, which we haven't even been able to observe. If we would only realize ~~them~~ their ^{defections} ~~good points~~, and we start in immediately where we start something to revolutionize and change it around and do what we think is our way, and we introduce two good points, that ~~are~~ our predecessors did not have and in so doing, we get rid of 50 good points that they have that we don't have, and this attitude, the attitude of desire to improve, is something the Lord wants us to have, but the attitude of changing things around to our way, right away, before we've had a chance to learn to do it the way others have thought about it, is an attitude which often leads to misery and trouble and complete failure on the part of many individuals. And Nadab and Abihu here started out and the whole thing would have been changed before long, but God wanted us to know that this was not just some other man's idea. This was God's revelation as to how He wanted His work done, and their part was to do this work in just the way He said, and in other aspects of His work, they have plenty of opportunity there in Israel, as they matured in experience, and reached the point where they could do it effectively. So the account is of what actually happened here, is quite brief. It is quite brief, but it is very, very strong, when we realize what happened. There went out fire from the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord. So here right at the beginning of the priest hood, the first and second son of Aaron, had been killed as soon as they started to their worship. And it was necessary to the younger sons to take over.

So the rebellion of Nadab and Abihu here in Leviticus is a vital part of the history of the rebellions of the children of Israel in the wilderness against God. And a vital part of the narrative of God's dealings with His people, though it is rather buried in Leviticus, most of which is just another type of material. And I'm going to skip over the rest of the book of Leviticus.

I'm just going to call it number 9. Other laws. 11-27. Now that of course is a

very summary title and it should be divided up but this is a course in Old Testament History, rather than in law, and for our purpose I want you to know the general nature of the book of Leviticus, and to know where the rebellion of Nadab and Abihu is described. And these other laws are well worth study, but for this particular course, we have to skip over them. I only want however, to call your attention to one of the chapters which you should be familiar with. That is Leviticus 16. And Leviticus 16 is a very important chapter because it is the description of that great and important day, the day of atonement. The day of atonement, when the high priest entered into the Holy Place, with the sin offering, for himself and for his people when he killed the goat of the sin offering, and when he laid the sin of the people on another goat which was driven out into the wilderness to carry the sin away, and thus there is represented here the fact that even the high priest must have an atonement for his sin, and

(6 $\frac{1}{4}$) and that all the people must have their sin borne by another, or they cannot possibly receive God's acceptance. The great day of atonement for His wonderful, pictorial representation of the work that Christ would do. Everyone who saw this must have realized who thought at all about it, that the killing of a goat, driving another goat out into the wilderness, to say a few words over it, that ~~wasn't~~ ^{couldn't} affect their sin. That couldn't affect their reception before God. Little mumble jumble, that's not going to affect your eternal destiny, but it represents something that will affect their eternal destiny. It is a picture of something which will have vital affects upon all the forces of the universe. Something that will be providing for the universe, whereby you can be saved from your sins, and can ^{be} received into the family of God. And so all of Leviticus speaks of atonement. It all speaks of Christ. But this chapter is one of the outstanding sections on the subject.

Now we move on to number 10. Preparation for leaving Sinai. Our section on At Sinai, C which is covering the equivalent of two books of the Pentateuch, and this tenth portion of it, I'm including in it, nine chapters or a little more, it is the first part of the book of Numbers. And I don't think we properly understand this first part of the book of Numbers, unless we see its place in the history here. ~~But~~ So I think it is very vital that we understand just what these ten chapters are. These 9 and a fraction chapters. They are preparations for leaving Sinai. Well, what does that mean? It means that numbers, chapters 1-10:10 is not a story simply of God's dealing

with these people. There is comparatively little narrative in this section. It means that it is not a presentation of God's moral law for His ~~ma~~ people. The moral law is the Ten Commandments. Other sections to some extent apply the moral law. It means that this is not a section simply of worship to God. That it is not a section simply of describing how God dealt with His people at various times. It is specific~~d~~ preparation before starting on the main portion of the wilderness journey. And therefore it had a great importance historically as showing how God equipped the people and started them out. And it has a great importance spiritually for us, in showing us the sort of preparation that is vital in our wilderness journey. And these nine chapters are full of important lessons for today. But they are apt to be missed, if we don't realize the meaning of the section. Now this section then, the preparations for leaving Sinai, section number 10 here, has a number of subheads in it, and the first of these, a is the men of war numbered and their positions assigned for the march. 1:1-2:34. It is from this section that the book receives its name. That is to say that, the Greek in it, arithmoi, a name which does not describe the book, a very poor name, but it does tell us, what we find in this first chapter. Now it is interesting historically to note how large the tribe was. But what importance does it have to us? Why do we care about this section? Well, I think it is important to note that God in preparing the children of Israel, for their wilderness journey, caused that Moses should take stock of what they had. He ~~am~~ ordered him to take inventory, of the number of men who were capable of taking part in the service of the army, in defending them against attack, and in carrying the equipment, with them. They had come in a more or less helter skelter fashion out of Egypt. Each family was a group to itself. Each tribe simply came the best they could. They were a mixt multitude. And they got along that way, with God's help, as far as Sinai. But it was not His will, that they should try to do that ^{anentlly} ~~permently~~. With this enthusiasm of youth, or at the beginning of a new task, you could often jump into it, and grab this or that, and take ~~mm~~ hold here, and there, and you can make a mighty good job in a short time, but you can't keep that up ^{anentlly} ~~permently~~. You have to put things on a steady well organized basis. And the Lord is showing us that for our Christian work, ~~he~~ wants us to take inventory of our resources, and find out what we have, and note what is available for the various tasks, before us.

And it is one of the tragedies of Christian work, both of the lives of individuals, and of the lives of groups of Christians, the amount of waste there is in ability and talents that are not used in the Lord's service, because we do not take inventory and realize what we have and then seek means of use of it in order that his work may be forwarded. And so there is a vital lesson for us in the preparation for the wilderness journey, that God wants us to make similar preparation. But when David made his census God sent pestilence on the land and punished him severely. But here God ordered that a census be made, and so the critics try (13) explanation, they say the census here is simply David's census. They say this is David's census which we have in Numbers. Well, that's a pure conjecture but most of the present-day critics hold that view. And they say that the census at the end of Numbers, chapter 26, is very similar to this. You change a few figures here and there and you can get it the same and they're simply two different editions of ^{David's} ~~the same~~ census. Well, that's trying to find an explanation out of pure human (13 $\frac{1}{2}$) Actually, this we're told is the census of the people at one period, David made his census centuries later. The difference between the two is the most--this is God ordering an inventory for the purpose of carrying out the task which he has assigned. David's is a census in order to prove his glory and his power, to increase his ego, and to gather in the forces that he might carry on offensive war against other nations (14 $\frac{1}{4}$)

But Moses' was different, and the punishment (14 $\frac{1}{4}$) because God ordered it himself here but that maybe Moses was wrong.

with the wrong motive and (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Well, we won't go into the details of the census. The, not only does it tell us here how many there are in each but the order in which they are to march. It is very...

O.T. History 181. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

... and then to find ten other important tasks that nobody is going to take. Now God does not want to have everything regimented. He does not want it. But he does want us

to endeavor what our resources are, and so arrange them to cover the greatest possible ground, so we find here a very well-worked-out ^{system} for the moving in the ^{march} hearts of the people in general.

Then b, is The Levites numbered and their ^{duties described.} ~~positions-assigned~~ That is from 3:1 to 4:49. The Levites numbered and their duties assigned. The men of war were numbered and the Levites were not included. Now the Levites are numbered. The age from which the men were numbered was an age selected with a view to the purposes of the war. Now the Levites are numbered from a different age arrangement because they had a different, they did not take part in the war. The Levites directed the service of the people, and the Levites carried the tabernacle, and each of them is given a section to do, each particular group of Levites, a section to carry of the tabernacle. It is a great thing for a man to be a wonderful preacher, and able to give messages that will reach people's hearts, and I've known instances where men have preached with such power and such ability that the people have come from miles around to hear him. And it was, I think, two different times in United States history, up in Brooklyn there were men who preached and the people would come for many miles around, thousands of people would come every Sunday to hear him preach, but where when the man died, the work just disappeared to nothing, almost immediately. Because it was simply a preaching work, and the two instances I have in mind, I believe, were real Christian preachers, who gave the Word of God and did a great deal of good. But it was simply a matter of preaching, and when the man was gone their work disappeared. I've known cases where ministers have left a church and where the work has ended and what was a big, fine work was just dropped down to practically nothing, because it was all built around the preacher. I've known other cases where a man has not only been a preacher, maybe not nearly as great, but in addition to that he has known how to organize his people in order that their talents would be utilized, that their ability would be harnessed to the task of Christian service, and where the minister has died or moved to another place and the church work has gone on even under great difficulty for a long time, or perhaps he was succeeded by another man very different from himself, but the work has continued as good as it was. The work of the Lord re-

quires excellent preaching but it also requires organization and here were the Levites willing, anxious to do the work, here's the tabernacle, let's move it, and they all jump in and take hold and do the best they can and they could get into quite a mixup, but each one has an assigned task, and the order in which they do it ^{is} described here, the work can be done quickly, can be done expeditiously, it can be carried forward effectively. And it is a thing that is worth giving our thought to, how to organize our lives to make all our time count and our effort count, and if you really get to work on this problem, and work on it, you'll find that when you get to the end of your life you'll wish you could start over again at that point, ^{because} when you could do it so much better, keeping on and continuing (4 $\frac{1}{2}$) from there. But we can all constantly improve in this regard, to organize ourselves, and it's also true of organizing that which we have to do. If God puts you into a subordinate position learn the work that's your work to do and learn to do it well. And have your eyes opened to see how to other parts well when they fall to your lot, but don't try to interfere with them now and upset the forward going of the organization. If the time comes when he puts you in a position of leadership then it is vital that you have some experience and some observation particularly in knowing how to take hold, and to avoid the friction and the unnecessary difficulties that always come when people try to work together. And so this section here does not have a great deal that in specific detail is helpful or important to us today, but the general purport of it has a very real meaning and importance in all the activity of Christian work today,

And then c,-verse-5, chapter 5, we have a section which I call, Removal of uncleanness and defilement from the camp. That is chapter 5:1-31. And hereafter the organization is described we immediately have this law regarding defilement and uncleanness. And at first sight you say well, here's another part of the moral law given. Here is another part of God's law given for Israel. Well, it is part of that but that does not give the answer. This is not a part of the Levitical law, and it is not a part of the books of the covenant. This is a part of the preparation for the wilderness journey, and so this section should be thought of in its relation to the section as a whole, that the Lord is making clear here, he is showing the vital fact that ^{splendid} ~~when an~~ organization, excellent

planning, carefully worked out systems can be completely ineffective, in fact, can be completely destroyed by failure to maintain purity and cleanliness within the organization. Now it's very easy when we disagree with someone else for us to immediately decide that that other person is unclean or is wicked, but we are too, and whether there's enough greater wickedness in them than in us to be the cause of our failure is a thing that has to be examined carefully. We should not jump to conclusions as people are all too prone to do. But we must recognize the fact that neither they or we can fall into spiritual uncleanness or defilement or sin, which can wreck the whole work, and it is important to be on the watch for that. If you are called to a church and everybody's happy and you have a unanimous call, everybody's a hundred per cent for you in it, and everything just looks as if you're going to have just a perfect time for the next twenty years, all working together and winning souls for the Lord, there's no reason to ever think of any friction in the future, don't let that lead you to go to sleep and say well any arrangement is quite OK with me about the organization. Don't try to dictate everything but get a clear idea immediately exactly what the organization is. Where the control lies, what is the machinery for settling differences of opinion, and what is the arrangement in that particular church for taking care of matters of immorality or of wickedness or of sin which may develop on the part of pastor or of people. Have the thing clearly in mind. Understand what it is, ask yourself this question. Supposing that one of these people here falls into serious sin, and even one of the leaders of the church, what should be done about it? Ask yourself the question suppose that some terrible difference comes within the church, what is the machinery for handling it? And when everything is smooth and nice and there's no difficulty at all, think the thing through and make a suggestion here and a suggestion there, in order to have things prepared to take care of some developments if they should occur. And we can hope that they never will occur but when they do occur it's too late then to do anything about it. You have to struggle with the resources that you have. And so God, at the preparation, the beginning of the organized portion of the wilderness journey, that is, just after this short beginning of it (10)

at the beginning of the main portion of the wilderness

journey, God here is giving laws for removal of defilement from the camp, not here punishment for specific defilement, as in the case of Nadab and Abihu being killed, but giving laws which are available for taking care of situations when they begin, and before they become serious. I remember in the early days of the Seminary when we had a comparatively small group of students and our faculty was a comparatively untrained group, and we were working together in directing it, a number of different sorts of matters would come up and we would get very excited about different problems that arose and I reached the conclusion then that one of the most important things in administration is distinguishing between those difficulties which arise which, if you just let them go on they will naturally settle themselves and everything will be all right and there's nothing to worry about; and those things which begin to arise which you've got to nip in the bud and take hold of immediately, and it's very, very easy to do if you act soon, but if you let them go they develop into something that is very difficult to handle and it isn't nearly so hard to handle a thing as it is to know what the things are that have to be handled soon, and what the matters are which it's much better to sit back and forget about and let them take care of themselves. Otherwise you make unnecessary trouble for yourself and for others. To learn to make a distinction. And so here the Lord outlines certain types of uncleanness and of difficulty which are very apt to arise, and he gives the procedure for dealing with them at the very beginning of the wilderness journey. And so right after the organization and the evaluating of their resources, next comes the rules for getting rid of defilement and uncleanness when it occurs. Did you have a question? (student.12. Yes, I did. You said that this was not a part of the Levitical law, you said this is a preparation for the journey. However, some of these laws would be carried through the ^{whole?} old time of Israel, so what I was wondering, just what do you mean by the book of the covenant, and how does it differ from this particular part?) Yes, the Book of the Covenant is chapter 20 to 24 of Exodus. The Book of the Covenant is the first presentation of the Covenant to the people, at which the moral law was given first, and then laws were given which were vital ~~to-the-law~~ for them all to have in mind immediately as entering in to the basis of their conduct. That's the Book of the Covenant. Then the Levitical

law is the detailed law to be kept in the book for the leaders to refer to and apply as the case may arise. That's in Leviticus. Now in this particular law there may be laws given which are meant to be of permanent validity. But that is the secondary portion of their purpose here. The purpose here is for their immediate application to the wilderness journey and we should not exclude the permanent validity unless we have evidence that they are (13 $\frac{1}{4}$)

Now this section then, chapter 5, is not a section which is ordinarily studied from. But it is a section which has a real meaning for us in its place here, that has a very great meaning and significance for us. But there is more to it than that, there is a very definite problem which comes up in connection with it. And this problem relates particularly to the section from verses 11 to 31. The chapter as a whole includes three parts, first is the removal of defiled~~ent~~ persons, verses 1 to 4; then is the removal of guilt of trespass, verses 5 to 10; but then verses 11 to 31 are the law of jealousy. The law of jealousy, and this is a very interesting section. I hope most of you have your Bibles open in front of you. I won't take time to read this whole section but I will try to glance over it with you in such a way as to bring out the main thought...

O.T.History 182. (3 $\frac{1}{4}$)

...and the spirit of jealousy come upon him, and he be jealous of his wife, and she be defiled: or if the spirit of jealousy come upon him, and he be jealous of his wife, and she be not defiled: Now I don't know whether you caught from these^{three} verses the divisions because it's only the last verse which has a contrast to all that precedes. First we have a situation where a woman commits sin against her husband, and there's no witness, there's no proof, there's no evidence, but the spirit of jealousy comes on the man, he is suspicious. And she be defiled, that is, his suspicion is justified but he has no way of proving it, or the second part, of if the spirit of jealousy come upon him, and he be jealous of his wife, and she be not defiled. In other words, he is suspicious of her but he has no real reason to be, she is innocent. This is a case then in which there is no evidence available. Well, why not say, if a woman is guilty of this terrible sin, let her

be taken out and stoned, and the defilement taken out of the camp. But in order to protect the innocent, let us make it so that absolute proof is necessary and no one shall be punished in this place unless there's absolute proof. Well, in this case there is not only not absolute proof, there is no proof. The man is suspicious and that's all, there is no evidence on the matter. Well, then, why not say, well, the woman is ($2\frac{1}{2}$) presumed innocent? Because in this there is not just a matter of whether a woman is guilty or innocent. There is a matter of a spirit of suspicion on the part of ^{someone} ~~the-husband~~. That is ~~the-law~~ ^{involved}. And you see this is not a matter of ordinary life, though it has its lessons for ordinary life. It is a matter of a march. It is a matter of a progress through the wilderness, it is preparation for that. How is the army going to move forward there without difficulties arising which can be fatal to the progress of the whole group. And it is not merely that defilement, wickedness, on the part of this woman, can bring an uncleanness into the camp, which must be dealt with, it is that a spirit of jealousy on the part of the husband which leads him to be sure in his heart the woman is guilty, even though there's nothing he can do about it, can introduce into the army an attitude which can be fatal to the success of the work. And so this is not so much the law of uncleanness here as it is the law of jealousy. It is a matter of handling that sort of a situation here in order to stop it and not allow it go go on and fester and cause great harm. And so in this situation, here is, we are told what is to be done. Then the man shall bring his wife to the priest and he shall bring her offering for her, the tenth part of an ephah of barley meal, and it describes the offering. And so there is an offering that has to be given. Everything that we do should be done in relation to ($4\frac{1}{2}$)

It should be brought in relation to that. We should remember that we also are guilty. We should remember that it is only the grace of God that keeps us all from being destroyed, and we should take that into consideration when we proceed to bring charges against other people. We should make mighty sure that we ourselves are under the blood. But then it continues after this offering is made, and the priest shall bring her near and set her before the Lord, and the priest shall take holy water in an earthen vessel, and of the dust on the floor of the tabernacle he'll take and put into the water, and he'll set the woman

before the Lord, and uncover the woman's head, and put the offering of memorial in her hands, which is the jealousy offering, and the priest shall have in his hand the bitter water that causeth the curse, and the priest shall charge her by an oath, and say to the woman, if no man have lain with thee, and if thou hast not gone aside to uncleanness with another instead of thy husband, be thou free from this bitter water that causeth the curse. But if thou hast gone aside to another instead of thy husband, and if thou be defiled, and some man have lain with thee beside thine husband, then the priest shall charge the woman with an oath of cursing, and the priest shall say to the woman, the Lord make thee a curse and an oath among thy people, when the Lord doth make thy thigh to rot, and thy belly to swell, and this water that causeth the curse shall go into thy bowels, to make thy belly to swell, and thy thigh to rot, and the woman shall say, Amen, amen. And the priest shall write these curses in a book and shall blot them out with the bitter way, and shall cause the woman to drink the bitter water that causeth the curse, and the water that causeth the curse shall enter into her, and become bitter. Then the priest shall take the jealousy offering out of the woman's hand and shall wave the offering before the Lord, and offer it upon the altar. Verse 27, and when he has made her drink the water, then shall come to pass that, if she be defiled, and have done trespass against her husband, that the water that causeth the curse shall enter into her and become bitter, and her belly shall swell and her thigh shall rot, and the woman shall be a curse among her people. And if the woman be not defiled but be clean, then she shall be free, and shall conceive seed. This is the law of jealousies, when a wife goes aside to another instead of her husband, and is defiled, or when the spirit of jealousy comes on him and he be jealous over his wife, and shall set the woman before the Lord, and the priest shall execute upon her all this law. Then shall the man be guiltless from iniquity and this woman shall bear her iniquity. Now here is a law then which is not a part of the Levitical law, that is, it is not contained in the law book which set forth the law that was established for the conduct of Israel in the days to come. It is a part of the preparation for the wilderness journey. We go on into the history and we find no further reference to this law. There are many situations where it might have been invoked but there is no reference to it

in the long history through this time and the time of David, or between David and the going into captivity, or up to the time of the Maccabees or on, there is prior to the destruction of Jerusalem, we find no reference to this anywhere. Mr. Myers, you had a question? (student. 7 3/4) Yes, that's one question, now what's the second one? (student. 8½) No, she doesn't. Verse 31 is that, if the woman has iniquity in this regard, she's to bear it, and the man is guiltless from iniquity. The implication is that if the woman is innocent the man is not guilty. She bears her iniquity, but if she doesn't have iniquity to bear here, she drinks the water and she's perfectly all right, nothing happens, she goes ahead living a normal life after that, why the man admits I was wrong in my suspicions, there were things which looked to me, made me suspicious, I was entirely wrong in it, it was a wrong attitude on my part and I'm going to turn aside from it. The thing is to get rid of the spirit of jealousy and dissension by suspicion, by making a means whereby it can be proved that it is a groundless suspicion and eradicate it or by proving that it is a deserved suspicion and giving it the punishment which it deserves. But the thing is that this was not given as a law which was enforced through the history of Israel. I believe there's no evidence that it was. And after the destruction of the Temple, a generation later, we have the rabbis writing the Talmud, going through the Old Testament and considering every little detail of law very, very carefully, and trying to understand it. And when they come to this, they say well, now, we don't do this, why don't we do it? And I forget the exact explanation someone gave but he said that shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem that some theory had been advanced on which it had been discontinued. And they went ahead to say that there was a certain room in the Temple in which this was performed and certain things like that, but all evidence is after the destruction of Jerusalem, it is a theorizing (10¼)

We have no evidence that this was done afterward. It is my personal conviction that this was not intended as a law for Israel's history, but as an arrangement for the wilderness journey. Mr. Welch? (student. 10 3/4. In verse 23, how do you blot out writing with water?) You have the writing which would be made with some sort of a pigment which was placed on the papyrus, and then you put water over it which probably would remove the writing and take

the ink or whatever it was into the water. And then you would give this water to the woman to drink. Which contains the pigment which had expressed those words. Our present word blot means the exact opposite, it means to dry ink. Well, in this case it would remove the ink, blot it out, by washing it off. It's not perhaps altogether clear in modern English. But there's a real problem involved in this, which Mr. Myers has pointed out. Is, supposing that one of us was in a situation like this. Could we go and sacrifice something on an altar and then take the dust from the floor by it and take that dust that had some of the remains of the charcoal from the burnt offering and put that in with some water and then take some ink and put it into the water and write something with the ink and make the woman drink it, and not only would she get terribly sick and die if she were guilty, but if she were innocent it wouldn't hurt her at all. I've never heard of anybody trying to apply it in our age. There is no reason that I know of to think that the combination of charcoal with ink in water would produce this effect. And certainly there was nothing poisonous in the combination because if the woman was innocent it wouldn't hurt her, so there was nothing poisonous in the combination. That which to one woman would mean death and misery, to another woman it wouldn't injure her at all. So it was not a physical effect which certain chemical elements would produce. It was an effect which varied according to her guilt or innocence. And that is contrary to our normal experience, because normally physical effects come from physical causes, rather than from the question of whether the person is innocent or is guilty that was involved in it. I would say that it would have to be a direct miracle, a direct intervention of God. That God in the particular case, not that the water did it, but that God did it, but that in order to stress what he was doing, he had them drink the water and go through this form. And we are told here that during the wilderness journey, God is going to work a miracle, that he is going to do something which he does not need to do ordinarily. Ordinarily he expects us to use evidence and to consider a person innocent until proven guilty. But in the wilderness journey, in order to eradicate this cause which could produce such great difficulty, this spirit of jealousy, in order to eradicate it, he provides a means of (14)

and he works a miracle during this journey in response to this particular (14½)

But it is not part of the law of Israel ^{that} during the long generations ahead God promises to work a miracle in every case where a man is jealous. This was one of the great periods (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) of miracles that we note, there are only a few periods, ordinarily God does not work by miracles, but there are a few great periods of miracles and one of them, one of the great ones was the coming out, going through the wilderness of Paran, and during that time God works in His providence. God used means which he had prepared long ago, but he also worked with specific supernatural power to bring (14 3/4)

and this...

O.T.History 183. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...this little group was assembled

and brought up through the wilderness in this crucial time, God worked his miracles when necessary in order to prevent the jealousy and the defilement from coming in and wiping out the work and destroying the testimony. Now we can't pray, at crucial periods in our Christian work, that God will work in remarkable providential ways in order to give us such a system that we cannot ordinarily (1) but at crucial times we can pray for very unusual assistance in order that a work that we're sure is his work will go forward without being wrecked, and every true work of God would be wrecked if the Devil had his way about it.

I have briefly discussed certain Hebrew words lately and I'm sure my pronunciation would be clear enough ^{that} ~~to~~ the Advanced students would have no difficulty in getting them, but for first-year students, it might be a little better to write them out. And so I will write one or two on the board now. This word (2 $\frac{1}{2}$) * was discussed, I believe, at our first meeting this week. * is the word which is translated repent. It's not a very good translation but I know of no other word which exactly describes it. We notice that in the (2 3/4) * it means to be (2 3/4) but it is not simply it is the change from an unhappy state to a less unhappy state, which is the result of something that has occurred or something which one has determined to do. That definition fits,

I believe, all the Israelites. And in the (3 $\frac{1}{2}$) * it is positive, and is used in Isa. 40, where he says, comfort, comfort ye, my people. It means cause the people to change from their unhappy state of their present misery to a less unhappy state in view of the fact that God is going to deliver them. So that word (3 $\frac{1}{2}$) * then we discussed day before yesterday. Yesterday we mentioned the word for the tabernacle. One of them was the (3 3/4) * . It is very common in Hebrew to form a noun by prefacing a name to a verb. There are various methods of doing it, just like in English you say, eat, the verb, and you say meat is something that you eat. Well, ^{that's} about the only instance I know of in English, it's rather common in Hebrew, to take a--in English we're more apt to add something on the end like ship or some or something like that, to make a noun out of an adjective. But here, in Hebrew, you can take a verb very often and put a name before it and it very generally indicates the place where something occurs, though it has other meanings possible, but it is a noun derived from a verb. So that (4 $\frac{1}{2}$) * is the place where God (4 $\frac{1}{2}$) * and * means to dwell, the Shekinah glory is a term used, the glorious dwelling of God. And so the (4 3/4)* is a term that is regularly used for the tabernacle in the directions to Moses to build the tabernacle and the account of its being built. Occasionally in those passages the tabernacle is called an (5) * This is a word which is used a good deal in Genesis. I don't recall ever striking (5 $\frac{1}{2}$) * in Genesis. But * is used in Genesis a good many times, because Abraham lived in a tent, and * simply means a tent. But we read over in the New Testament, the book of Hebrews, Abraham was dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, and that doesn't mean they were in religious services all the time. It simply means tent and would be a much better translation to say tent. But the word (5 3/4) * is used occasionally for the tabernacle in the instructions for its building and in the account of its being built, but it's used right in between the two regularly for Moses' tent, the tent of meeting which he moves out from the center of the camp, out to a place outside the camp. And we (6) that this tent of meeting which the King James Version unfortunately translates as the tabernacle of the congregation, the word

* they translate congregation, and in Old English perhaps congregation was a good rendering, but in today's English it does not. If Mr. Steele wanted to discuss with me something that the student body was going to do, we'd get together for the purpose we wouldn't say that he and I held a congregation. Not in modern English, but that is what this word means, a meeting, a designated meeting. This is the meeting of Moses and the Lord. The tabernacle of the congregation does not convey that meaning today. Tent of meeting is much better for it. Now, those I believe are the principal words of which we have spoken.

Incidentally, it is one way in which you can derive great profit from even a little knowledge of Hebrew, is in the ability to note the precise Hebrew word which is used and to see how that word is used elsewhere, and you will find as in this case, it may mean tabernacle, and it may be * or (7 1/4) * or in a few cases it's * Maybe I should write that. The word (7 1/2) * means or tabernacle. It's nearly always translated booth, a booth, a little temporary shelter, a succoth. And it is used in Amos, the tabernacle of David which is borrowed. (7 3/4) of the great empire of David as something which was temporary and (8) which God is going to restore after the return of Christ. And people try to make out that it's a picture of the Christian church rather than a picture of the millennial reign of Christ, and a good bit of their argument is based on the fact that it uses this word tabernacle, but in the Hebrew it is not the word translated tabernacle for the place of worship at all, it is the word (8 1/2) which means a booth and has quite a different meaning. It's unfortunate that the King James Version used the same one word for all three. But, as I say, you'll find an English word which translates two or three different Hebrew words and when you know what they are, you have a distinction there which is very helpful in interpretation, even if your knowledge of Hebrew may be quite limited. And on the other hand, when you know what the Hebrew word is you'll find that it has various possibilities of meaning which the particular English word may not, and that (8 3/4) So that a person with just a little

knowledge of Hebrew can use it extensively for word study and find it extremely helpful. Unfortunately, I have known people who have known a great deal of Hebrew (9) much understanding of Hebrew forms and how to give them ~~correctly~~ and all that, who have not seemed to learn this simple thing about it, to use it for word study which perhaps is one of the most useful ~~plase~~ ways in which it opens up the Bible and clarifies our understanding. The other ways are important too, but this is one of the simplest ways and one which has about as many applications as any point there is of ~~the~~ ^{the} use of the Hebrew language. Well, I think it's a good idea when I used Hebrew words ~~that~~ ^{since} we have a portion of the class that only had a semester of it, to write them on the board. I hope you can read my writing, it's not particularly good in any language. Perhaps better in Hebrew than it is in ~~English~~, that is, if I take pains with it. Yes? (student.10) Oh, well, we will take a moment on that, not because it's unimportant because it is tremendously important, but because actually it should be covered in the course in Introduction to the Pentateuch. That should go into it, it s extremely important in that connection, although unfortunately I have found, when I teach that course, that the very important matters of literary development, to get them clear, is apt to take so much of the semester that this part on the laws, when they get rushed/toward the end, and it is also very important. So in view of that danger of getting rushed there, I'll take a minute here, but I don't dare take much though because it is a bit afield from our present subject, but it is very important. The critical view of the law, of the Pentateuch, is a matter which developed separately ^{originally} from the literary division of documents. And then the two were ~~combined~~ together in this combination, is what we call (11¹)

But according to this matter of the law the simple things were expected to be called earlier, and complex were expected to be called later. Well, as you read the law of Leviticus, it's very complex, many little details given very precisely. And ~~as~~ you read the laws in the early part of Exodus, it is far simpler, great principles simply expressed. And of course, thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk, nothing complex or involved about that. And the laws in Exodus, most of them were felt to be much simpler,

therefore, the critics said that these developed first, were written down first, and then that the laws in Deuteronomy are somewhat further along and were ~~the foundation~~ ^{written down later}, represent a later stage, and then that these various complicated laws of Leviticus represent the (12 $\frac{1}{2}$)

And so you have the three main stages of development of the law, the simple, early, primitive law; the somewhat more advanced law, Deuteronomy; and the very involved, detailed law of Leviticus. That is the critical view. Now there is a minor sub-section of that (12 $\frac{1}{2}$) that involves Exodus 34, right along in there somewhere. I mentioned the chapter yesterday but I don't remember what it was. That those laws there given after the incident of the golden calf, are still more primitive than the laws contained in Exodus 20 to 24. And therefore represent a still earlier stage. That would not be agreed to by all critics but it is pretty well, because you get a more primitive impression from 34 than you do 20. Now the way I interpret those (13 $\frac{1}{4}$) that first you have the great general proclamation of the great principles of the law, given to the people as a whole. For all the people to understand and therefore given in comparatively simple form and stressing those matters of permanent validity, together with some that are of special importance to the immediate situation. That's the book of the covenant. Then that after the incident of the Golden Calf, you have a great repetition of some of the laws involving those which are particularly important to stress again. Therefore (14) it's not as complete, it sticks more to immediate physical matters, doesn't touch on the general principles as much and ^{can} seems more primitive but I take it as actually a repetition of those matters which need more immediate attention in that situation. And then, you get the book of Leviticus and that is the law book (14 $\frac{1}{4}$) for priests — with the details involved for looking things up, rather than the simple law to impress on people's minds so that they will obey. So that is the natural reason why it is (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) And then, that the law of Deuteronomy, which we haven't come to yet but I'm going to at this point, that the law of Deuteronomy is Moses repetition of the law to the people just before his death, with those great messages he gives them.

...but it is **fairly** simply because it is a matter of a spoken message given the people to drive it home to their minds and to urge them to obey, and so we have the great stress on exhortation, much more than you find in (3/4)

To ^{my} mind that is the natural interpretation of the four sections as they stand independently, and gives a very satisfactory reason for the difference in their manner of presentation, much more so, in my opinion, than the viewpoint which ~~always~~ the critics have, that they represent stages of development from the simple to the complex. Now that is not our primary purpose in this course, to deal with ~~this~~ critical problem but since it deals so much with the very material we're dealing with, and is such an extremely important thing today if you deal with anyone who's had any work in religion in almost any college, other than very definitely Christian colleges, you will find that these principles are taken for granted, and taught as fact. And they may not understand the, what's involved, but it's what has been given them and that way it's a fact. Here are the early laws, here are the later, and so on, and it is necessary, if you're going to deal with college students that you have an understanding, so it's well worth not only covering and mentioning that point of view, but touching upon when we deal with relative points here. Thank you for the question. Now someone over here had a question also. (student.2) For which? Yes, for all Hebrew words mentioned in class, the class will be expected to know all Hebrew words mentioned in class, because these are, this is very important (2 1/3)

Yes? (student.2 1/3) Yes, now Mr. Cohen has a further question dealing with this matter which I think it's worth our taking a little bit of time on right now. This is something which should be covered eventually, I mean further addition to this point (3) right here. But I think it is worth taking a little time on now, it leads us a little bit afield, but yet it is vital for our general understanding of the principles. You notice

You notice in these four types of laws here, that no one of them has consisted of the Lord simply giving a perfect picture, perfect balanced picture of moral principles you might say apart from human action. The law is given in a situation, given in a situation. Man is fallible, man is weak, when Adam was created, God didn't immediately give

him an understanding of the whole mind of God. God proceeded to lead Adam by gentle stages by which Adam would have come in time to a full understanding of God's purpose if Adam had not sinned. A development is necessary that we be led forward step by step, so that fallible man may acquire the knowledge God desires ^{him} ~~us~~ to have. But now a new factor is introduced, man has sinned, and man's mind and man's attitude is corrupted by sin. And the result is that man's whole inner being is set to do evil. His natural bent is away from God rather than toward God. The whole world ~~took~~ put God out of its heart, (4 $\frac{1}{2}$) only Noah did not, and then after the flood, among his descendants (4 $\frac{1}{4}$) and God picked Abraham to form a people ^{through} / whom he will keep alive the knowledge of God and bring his son into the world. ^{Thus} ~~But~~ the Bible is not a book in which God has proceeded to simply paint a picture of a perfect righteousness in order that a perfect man may survey it and fully understand it. He has proceeded to deal with man in a state of sin, and the state of weakness, and to lead a man forward, giving him information and understanding, little by little. God never gives man that which is wrong, but he is often giving man that which is incomplete, ~~an~~ fact he always is, because if we had something that was complete we would have the perfect mind and the mind of the infinite God already, which none of us could understand. We go forward from glory to glory, we go forward ~~and~~ from the incomplete to the less incomplete. We go forward in the situation in which we are, to learn to handle the problems and situations that are there before us. Now that is true of all of God's revelation, it is true of all ~~that~~ of God's laws.

Now the natural attitude of modern man is to think that he understands ethics perfectly. He knows exactly what is right and what is wrong, and he looks at the Bible and he says how can this be God's word, this imperfect book, this book the best men commit ^{that} sins, / the man might lead us to imagine he wouldn't commit, the man who is saying ^{it} / perhaps some of them (6 $\frac{1}{2}$) he wouldn't, that this book contains ethical standards which he doesn't think are ~~in~~ line with his understanding of the proper ethical standards. Well, the question is what is a proper ethical standard? A proper ethical standard is that which God reveals. God has implanted a feeling for ethics in our hearts but it has been terribly corrupted by sin, and in order to get an understanding of what is

right and what is wrong, you have to go to the source of the author of right and wrong, the maker of the universe and see what he says. And so we study his word to know exactly what he means and what (7)

And we are accustomed in our civilization to find things smoothed over and ignored and thought terrible in another civilization. And the fine things that are thought to be so absolutely clear that no sensible man could ever doubt them, which in many/other periods have been greatly doubted, and we go from our viewpoint of our civilization to judge. And that's wrong. We must go to the Bible to find what the standard is. So we needn't expect to find it fully given at any particular period because God is dealing with sinful man. Now we find, as we go through this law, that God gives us the condensation of the moral in the ten commandments, and it's very condensed. Thou shalt not steal. What does that mean? Well, the principle of private property is surely there. Thou shalt not steal. The principle of individual ownership and that you have no right to take that which belongs to someone else, that is there. But how does something become one person's rather than another's? What is the basis of transfer? How great is the authority over it? That is not entered into. We have the general principle given, without the precise details. Thou shalt not commit adultery. There is a principle, the principle of keeping family relationships clear and clean. There is a principle enunciated, the general moral principle, strongly set forth. But the detail of it is not gone into. And I've seen books and statements which will take those few words and will build you up a whole system of ethics on it. And it's good to build up your system but don't say you get it all out of the ~~own~~ verse. You're using a lot of other sources from which to get it. Well, the principles are in the moral law, in the ten commandments, but they're given in a very brief condensed form. We need much more for the full understanding of them and we have to apply them to particular situations. Now in one period, or in one group of people, one of these principles may tend to be completely disregarded and in another group another.

I remember being with Professor Albright, of Johns Hopkins University, Professor Lee of (9 1/4) University in China, Professor (9 1/4) of Breslau University in Germany, and myself, we were going horseback through the back country

of Palestine in 1929, examining archeological sites and in between a place where we stopped to eat, and have our rest and so on, we would discuss all sorts of subjects under the sun, and I remember being much interested in hearing Professor (9 3/4) discuss the situation in Germany as he told the different professors and how a person got promoted and so on, because the professors in their universities are paid by the state, not what we call well but compared to what other people got there, they were paid very well, and there was a tremendous lot of honor connected with it. And he made this statement, he said, now, you take some of these professors of archeology, professors of Babylonian things and Egyptian things, and he can give you the gossip, telling of the immorality in the lives of some of them, and the flagrant sin into which they fell, (10 $\frac{1}{2}$) some of these individuals who had great names in these fields of archeological study or other branches of science and history, and he was describing and pointing out what he knew about the lives of these men, and then he said when you get into the theological faculties of the different universities in Germany, those theological faculties were under the state too, and they were paid by the state and they carried a great deal of honor. He said when you get into the theological faculties, you do not find there these immoralities that you find among the professors in linguistics and oriental studies and these different scientific studies, you don't find that. He said if a professor of Old Testament or a professor of Church History were to have a marital situation like what I've described in connection with that other man, or something like that, he'd lose his position immediately. Nothing like that would be permitted in the theological faculty. But, he said, when you look at some of the underhanded schemes that some of those men do to advance themselves, and ~~you~~ get their positions as professors of theology, and ~~that~~ the dirty ways in which they treat their competitors and ~~they~~ pride and vanity and conceit that some of them show about the critical books they've written and different things, well, he said, to my mind, the character shown is not a bit higher than that of these other men, if anything lower. And it seemed to me that it brought home very forcefully the fact that there are certain types of sin which, in a particular civilization in which certain aspects of Biblical truth have been expressed, comes to be the ~~best~~ of thing that

you immediately think someone is beyond the pale if he falls into it and yet other types of sin which are every bit as bad in God's sight, if not perhaps worse, tend to be overlooked and ignored. Actually, in the Lord's sight, one type of sin is just as bad as another, and there's no type of sin that is worse than pride and self (12 $\frac{1}{2}$) whether it be intellectual pride or spiritual pride, there's no sin that is worse in God's sight. Well, now, it is then very difficult for us to ~~exavate~~^{estimate} the ethical standard, I mean to say whether good or bad, that comes from God. We must go to get our standards there, and then judge our own lives and our own activities and judge the standards of other books according to what we find there. Now, as we find it, we find that Jesus Christ, when they came to him and said that Moses permitted a man to put away his wife in a certain condition, we find that Jesus said to them, this was not from the beginning. He said it was for the hardness of your heart that this was permitted. He said it was on account of that this was permitted, but he said in the very beginning, God said that a man shall leave his father and mother and cleave unto his wife and they shall be one flesh. There, then, is the principle which God has laid down ~~from~~ⁱⁿ the beginning. It is a principle of monogamy. The principle of absolute devotion of one man to one woman. That is the principle laid down in the beginning, that ~~was~~^{is} the ideal which God has always intended. But man has never, through the ages, attained the ideal in any field of knowledge. Since the coming of Christ, as a result of Christian influence, the ideal of monogamy has come more and more to be stressed and to be accepted as the proper and right thing, until today (14 $\frac{1}{4}$) bigamy here is just about the worst thing that could happen, in this country. Actually, I think we ~~could~~ have others sins even in this sphere that are perhaps worse than bigamy which are tolerated, but bigamy has come to be, our laws are very, very strict on it. I believe they ought to be, but it is not the attitude (14 $\frac{3}{4}$) and for some reason, in the ~~providence~~ of God, God felt that there were certain other matters which were more important stressed in that area than he did...

...relationship clean and guiltless, that he stresses very strongly and stresses throughout the Old Testament, but a certain amount of polygamy seems to have been permitted through the Old Testament, and the New Testament writers did not go out with their great polemic in life, their great purpose of doing away with polygamy or of doing away with slavery. Both were in the Roman world, very widely distributed when the apostles began preaching, and we don't find much stress laid on that as a definite objective to get rid of these two evils, but we do find that as a result of the preaching of Christian principles both of them very soon disappeared from the Christian world, and it was reckoned by the Christian world that both of them were ^{utterly} out of harmony with Christian principles. And not something that would be recognized in line with the Christian (1/2)

They are wrong, they are evil, but they are not the (1/2) at which the primary attack was made, and the Lord does not say to Moses, now you go out and just attack all sin everywhere you find it and don't work with anybody that isn't a perfect man, because if you did that Moses would be all alone for about five minutes, until he looked at himself and find he couldn't work with him either. We have an imperfect situation in which God is dealing ^{in this} ~~with an~~ imperfect world with greed in man and bringing them, as he says, to Christ we can receive justification and we can begin the long road to sanctification, which most of us have a long, long ways to go on, and once in a while you'll find somebody who things he has very little, he's already pretty near there, and often, if you look at him closely, you'll find he has further yet to go on the road. But it is a long course which he's leading us through rather than saying how we can step right from here right into perfection, in an instant, Nobody has ever done that.

Well, now that, I think, deals with the Christian principles we have in mind at this point, and they're very vital principles for our understanding of the law, and, in fact, of the whole Bible. Let's remember that the Bible is not a complete presentation of ethics, or of the character of God or of anything. That's impossible to a finite mind, but it is a perfect presentation in that it is free from error, there is nothing that is untrue, but everything is incomplete, and the early is less complete than the later because he teaches us more and more as we go through. But even at the very end, we find

some expressions which are incomplete and have to be filled out with going back to the earlier. Somebody has said, you take the great theme of God, the one great creative power who controls the universe, the very center of our religion, and it's presupposed all through the New Testament, but not explained or gone into to any great extent. The New Testament rests back on the Old, on this whole tremendously important area of theology. And if you're going to understand it you have to get it from the Old Testament. The New Testament believed in it exactly the same but did not go into the explanation of it much, that was already done, while the New Testament explains other very vital truths which were already present in the Old but not fully explained, the exemplification and enlargement, and fuller interpretation. Well--yes? (student, 4 $\frac{1}{2}$) Yes. It is true to an extent. That is to say, all sin is rebellion against God, and so there is a sense in which all sin is black and there is no comparison between. There is a sense in which that is true. That all sin is equally (5) . But there is another sense in which some sin reveals the sinful character of the man more than other does. And that which is wrong, but which is done all around a person, he may fall into doing without revealing as much of the sinful character of his own heart, as if the whole culture around him were against (5 $\frac{1}{4}$) it, and consequently it does not, in a community in which it is customary to think very lightly of human life, and to kill on slight provocation, in a community like that, it does not reveal near as much a murderer, a murder, the wicked nature of a man's character when he gets angry and kills another person as he does when he's in a community like our own, where the general attitude is that human life is sacred and that murder is just about the worst thing there is. And I think that is erroneous, the Bible nowhere says murder is the worst thing there is, there are other sins every bit as bad, if not worse. But that is the habit of mind of our culture, and therefore the man who breaks that in our culture reveals more definitely the sinful nature of his heart than he might in another, while something else that in the other culture would reveal immediately strike him as (6 $\frac{1}{4}$) would reveal there more clearly his sinful nature than it would here, though it would be wrong in both places. So there is an element of real truth to that statement, but as it is meant by most of those who use it, it reduces

all sin to a relative matter of fitting into the culture and that is of course utterly
 (6 3/4) (student.) It ~~was~~ ^{would} because it was in error. Paul says I
 did not know sin, till the law came. I did plenty of things not realizing they were
 wrong, but once the law came and I knew they were wrong, then I'm a real sinner if I keep
 on doing it. So in a way we are making a merit of (7 $\frac{1}{2}$) but the fact is
 that they're already sinning against the things that their culture recognizes. They're
 already clearly sinners and we ~~already~~ only make it the more clear by showing them how
 they're doing it in other ways as well as in the ways of their own culture. And in a
 way, they see the disadvantage, but of course over against that they ~~see~~ ^{receive} the tremendous
 advantage of learning how to be saved from all sin, which they don't have in their culture
 at all. So that would far more than outweigh it. That is the tendency of modernism,
 is to take the relativistic attitude where~~ver~~ everything just depends on how people (8)
 around. Black is black over here, but the same thing is white over
 there. It doesn't matter which you use, just a matter of custom. Carried out logically,
 nobody carries it out logically, because if they did (8 $\frac{1}{4}$)

but they carry it far enough to do a lot of harm. Yes?

Well, maybe we can get back now to our--Mr. Shellabarger? (student. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$. The basic
 question here, why is it essentially that men are convinced that the laws (8 3/4)

regarded in scripture is right as against the choice of any other
 matters, viewpoint or any God is right be-
 cause essentially he is right and, not because he has might to enforce his standards,
 or enforce We're convinced
 that God is right, otherwise we wouldn't serve him. I mean we might ~~give~~ lip service
 but we would not serve him. We're convinced that he's right, we're convinced that morally
 he is right and ethically he is right, and
 he is right, why essentially are we...) Dr. R. A. Torrey says in one of his books, if
 you talk with someone starting~~ing~~ with the fact of the existence of God and he says when
 you find somebody who does not admit the existence of God, then take up the question with
 them that there is a standard of right and wrong, there's an essential difference between

right and wrong. He said when you find somebody who says there is no ^{difference} God you don't need to waste with them, they're just (9 3/4) In other words, his belief was that all people have within them somewhere a belief there is a fundamental difference between right and wrong. Now this relativistic ethics, which is widely taught now, is, does a great deal towards concealing that belief and hiding it from us, but I believe that it would be found to be true, that examination (10 1/2) that there is in the human heart a remnant of the image of God, but there, such that everyone has within them a real recognition that there is a difference between right and wrong, and I think when you take the meanest person, the most brutal person, the person that ordinarily pays no attention to anybody else's rights and rides over them roughshod and does whatever he feels like, you might think there's a man who believes might means right, makes right, and nothing matters but the power of the (11) when you find somebody like that, you wouldn't be with him very long, if you'd stay with him all the time because before you'd find him complaining that somebody else hasn't treated him fair at some point, which of course is utterly inconsistent with his whole background, but will reveal the fact that he has within him a belief in a fundamental difference between right and wrong. I think you'll find that is universal. But, when it comes to the attitude of considering the Bible (11 1/2)

I think we find that rather widening differences in our country, and in countries with (11 1/2) background, that it's just part of the cultural environment. I doubt if that would naturally come to a person, a specific person, impressed upon his mind. I believe it is true and very important to get out but I don't think it's (11 3/4)

Well, these are very important principles and relate to much of what we're dealing with. But in our outline we are still at Sinai, and C, was At Sinai, and we last looked at c.

And then d, The Nazarite Vow. And that is chapter 6, verses 1 to ²¹28. Here is a matter we do not know a great deal about. We had some very detailed laws given here in chapter 6, but the general bone of the laws seems to imply that the idea of a Nazarite

was already known. If somebody wants to become a Nazarite, this is what he is to do. Now that may mean simply God is introducing a sort of thing which we'll call Nazarite. And here's what it is. But the impression you get from it is that it is already present, that they are familiar with it. Now the root of this work means separate, a person wants to be separate, separated from, it's (13 1/4)

An interesting thing about this is that the principles laid down here for the Nazarite vow explicitly limit the length of the vow. It is a setting oneself apart for a special consecration to God for a limited amount of time, that it comes to an end after a certain amount of time. There are very few cases like Samson, who was a Nazarite from his mother's womb, and John the Baptist, of whom there were special promises made to Zachariah (13 3/4)

But in general, it does not seem to be described as something which a man could pick for himself, to have his life as a whole be the life of a Nazarite. It is a limited thing, which has a specific length of time, during which a man agrees that he will live in this somewhat abnormal fashion. I don't believe that the scriptures has any real foundation for the very common thing in Roman Catholicism of leading people to take vows upon themselves for their whole life, which they often do not realize the importance of, when they undertake, and which lead them to attempt to live in an unnatural way and a way which often results in great error...

O.T.History 186. (1 1/2)

...and found it beneficial to them, but there are many individuals who have found it very contrary to them, and the scripture would seem to give (3/4)

for a person (3/4) to put himself into an abnormal situation thinking that thereby he would have a chance for greater development of his spiritual life for a limited period of time. But not as a permanent vow, as the vows of the orders of the Roman Catholic Church are. I think much harm has been done by forcing on people who desire to serve the Lord, vows of abstention from normal life, often not realizing their (1 1/2) implications.

Now an interesting thing about this Nazarite business is that the two main things

which the Nazarites kept from, were not matters, in fact the three, were not matters which were wrong in themselves. The Nazarite had three obligations. The first obligation is that he separates himself from all use of everything that comes from the grapevine. He must not use wine or strong drink, but neither must he use vinegar, ordinary grape juice, fresh grapes, or raisins. Anything which comes from the grapevine, he declares that he will not touch. This is all in chapter 6: verses 1 and 2. Everything of that sort he abstains from for this limited period of time. No one can get from the Nazarite vow the idea that all use of alcohol is per se wrong. If it is so are raisins, and they are equally included in this. This was an abstention from a certain phase of life for a limited period of time. The second requirement is to let the locks of his hair grow. Now certainly there is nothing wrong in cutting the hair. The Nazarite for a certain length of time let his hair grow, and was a public indication of the fact that during this period of time he was set apart. And the third requirement was to keep himself from any contact with a dead body. Ordinarily, members of a family of a dead person were expected to touch the body. There are cases in Jewish writings where a Jew was considered as having done a very (3 $\frac{1}{4}$) thing by defiling himself in order to give someone decent burial. So he was set apart for a time, as unclean, for having done it, he had taken upon himself that uncleanness for a (3 $\frac{1}{4}$) purpose, to give the other person a decent burial, so that touching a dead body was not per se sinful, or per se wrong, but if the Nazarite even by the most utter accident, if he's walking along where there's a group of people and one of them suddenly falls over dead and touches him as he falls, the Nazarite is thereby no longer a Nazarite. If he's out in, if he made a vow for six months and five of them are gone and this happened, he touched a dead body, he has to start all over. His time is all lost that he has spent when it happened. There are very strict rules laid ^{upon} ~~for~~ the Nazarite but they are not moral rules per se. It is a type of a separation unto the Lord, but it is for a limited period of time. We don't know a great deal about it, this chapter seems more to be regulating than it is, regulating it to avoid the extremes to which it probably had gone in certain cases, making a definite basis of it, something which was established and which had certain good

results is kept under control. So much for d, The Nazarite Vow.

Then, e, Arrangements for the Religious Life of the Camp. Chapter 6:22 to 9:14.

The first of these (1) The formula for blessing the congregation. Here we have a chapter of 27 verses and the first 21 deal with the Nazarite, and so when a person is thumbing through the Bible, he comes to the section about the Nazarite, he's not at the moment interested in learning about the Nazarite, he passes on to another chapter. But as our chapter headings have been put in, the last six verses are left in that Nazarite chapter which have nothing to do with it. They are part of the arrangements for the religious life of the camp. And God there gives that beautiful formula of blessing, the way in which they are to bless the congregation. It is a very beautiful thing there, Numbers 6:22 to 26. We have two verses introducing the formula of blessing. The Lord spoke unto Moses saying, speak unto Aaron and to his sons, saying, on this wise ye shall bless the children of Israel, saying unto them. And then verse 27 ~~is~~ the end is the conclusion, and they shall put my name upon the children of Israel and I will bless them. And in between we have this beautiful formula of blessing, which the critics declare represents one of the highest points of spirituality ever attained in the Pentateuch and consequently must be part of the P document, the document which contains Leviticus, the advanced, living, more spiritual, more complex section. The Lord bless thee and keep thee, the Lord make his face shine upon thee and be gracious unto thee. The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee and give thee peace. A very beautiful blessing which God gave at this time for use in connection with the pilgrimage journey. And how interesting it is to note that this very advanced, highly spiritual formula of blessing which the critics put in the later part of the Pentateuch, while they put the anthropomorphism, where God came down and talked to people, and God is dealt with under form, anthropomorphic, they put them in the early simple (7 $\frac{1}{4}$) and this which they put late for its highly spiritual form, is as anthropomorphic as anything in the old testament. The Lord make his face shine upon thee. The Lord lift up his face upon thee. How definitely anthropomorphic that is. God does not have a face. It is figurative language but it is a beautiful figure to give a meaning which is very easily understood. And anthropomorphisms

are not a sign that something is primitive at all, they ~~are~~ most advanced and highly spiritual material is (8) ~~anthropomorphic~~ as

Now it is interesting to note how in this wonderful blessing, there are three ~~phrases~~ ^{stages} in it.

The first, the Lord bless thee and keep thee. This Hebrew word keep, you probably all know, atleast it's one of the first one I used to give when I taught Hebrew (8 $\frac{1}{2}$)

* it really means to guard, or to protect. And this, you might say, is the lowest stage of religious life. The Lord bless thee and guard thee. The Lord protects the believer, it is a vital thing in the Christian life. I have found many people have Christian experience without having this enter in very definitely to their thoughts, that God protects them from the evil of the world, something we ought to have before us in this world we live in now of airplanes, and rushing automobiles, and dangers of every sort, if it ~~were~~ ^{is} not for the protection ^{that} of the Lord gives us, where would any of us be? It is a very important thought but it is the lowest level of our Christian life. The protecting hand of the Lord, without which we would all perish.

But in the second we move up to a higher step, the Lord make his face shine upon thee and be gracious unto thee. Make his face shine upon thee, be gracious unto thee. This can be thought of, very easily, as God's attitude toward the whole world. He makes his rains to fall upon the just and the unjust, he pours out blessings, and without them, where would any of us be? It is ~~a~~ a step in advance of that in the first verse, but it is still God's dealing with all men. Of course, this verse surely contains ^{with it} that which is referred, the greatest in which God has been gracious of all, the grace he showed in sending Jesus Christ to die for the sin of mankind, in sending him to die on the cross that, whosoever believeth on him might not perish but have eternal life. Involved in this second, surely.

But then, the third reaches a still higher point, the definite, personal application to the individual, of that which God has done. The Lord lift up his face upon thee, the word here translated comes from the same root translated face in the verse before, the

Lord lift up his countenance upon thee and give thee peace. Now peace, shalom, is in the Hebrew not simply cessation of war, but it means well-being, it means everything that is good, a whole, a life that is as it should be, is involved in this word peace. Give thee peace. The peace which the Christian has when the Lord nods toward him, lifts up his face upon him, this is the blessing of coming to know that Christ has not merely died for sinners but that he died for him personally, and that through Christ he has been saved, and that through Christ he has peace with in his heart, and that through Christ he has the possibility of moving forward in sanctification and developing his life as it ought to be. And so there is a progress within the blessing, and it is a wonderful program which God gave here at the beginning of the wilderness journey. That's number 1, the Formula.

Number 2, The Offerings of the Princes. chapter 711-89. The whole chapter. The whole of chapter 7, all 89 verses of it. We'll look at that at 8 o'clock tomorrow morning.

O.T. History 187. (7) (3/4) (1)

(assignments for the two weeks he is to be away)

The course, as you know, is a three-credit course which means that it represents nine hours a week of work. Now we cut that a little... (1 3/4) Now next week we'll have one hour in class, that will be the section hour, the juniors together and the middlers and seniors together. And probably the same will be true of the following week... We (2 $\frac{1}{2}$) Well, then, for the time ~~time~~ from now and the rest of this week and next week and perhaps the whole of the following, the work will be mostly in assignments rather than in class lecture. Of course if we don't take the full time in class for assignments, naturally there is time available for your own study, but some time should be given in any event to the lecture, not enough (2 $\frac{1}{2}$)

where you lose the greater part of the value of it. But in the assignment, one difficulty is use of books... (2 3/4 to 3 3/4) Now the two books in which these assignments will be, one of them is the International Critical Commentary.

Now the International Critical Commentary is a series which was begun, I don't know, maybe sixty-seventy years ago, and it is called international because it includes books

by British scholars and books by American scholars, and it's critical because it is definitely and outspokenly written from the liberal view. Of the International Critical Commentary, it's my impression that the commentary on Luke is quite good, and one of the editors of the New Testament ($4\frac{1}{2}$) wrote it, and contains some very, very valuable exegetical material. When it came to Matthew they asked a man named Allen to write the commentary and he proceeded to write one which was almost entirely devoted to the study of the synoptic problems in Matthew, what parts of Matthew were taken from Mark, what parts from Luke and so on, and ($4\frac{3}{4}$) of exegetical value in the International Critical Commentary on Matthew. I think Palmer himself, one of the editors was dissatisfied with that, because he wrote a commentary himself not in the (5)

which had some very excellent material, even though there are points where his critical viewpoint greatly cuts down the value of the material. Now the series as a whole is not of near the value that I wish it were, in fact, I would say that it's not one of the most valuable commentaries for a Christian, because it has a definitely liberal viewpoint, from beginning to end, it accepts the higher criticism, it follows it. And, therefore, some or many of the books are just discussion of critical theories and are of very little value for interpretation, getting to the verses and seeing what they really mean, but in others of the volumes, there is some very good material of study, the actual material and seeing what it means. And it is always of value to us from this viewpoint, of getting usually quite a good presentation of the critical viewpoint. Now it has not covered the whole of the Bible, yet, They have been getting out the volumes one by one, only the first half of Isaiah is covered, there's no volume on the rest of Isaiah, there's no volume on Jeremiah. The one on Ezekiel came out about ten years ago. There are a good many of the books that we don't have in the Library. The one on Kings came out, I think about ten years ago. That is one of the most valuable volumes in the series, because it was by Professor Montgomery of the University of Pennsylvania, who, while generally accepting the liberal theories, was very careful about them, very accurate, a man who was interested in gathering data, gathering facts. Unfortunately, he died before ~~has~~

work was finished, another man edited it for press, and I think that detracts very definitely from its (6 $\frac{3}{4}$) and yet, I attended many courses under Montgomery while he was preparing the material (7) had much of tremendous value even though (7)

Now in the volume on Numbers is by George Buchanan Graves, and Graves was an English Professor, was a Professor in one of the great universities in England, who was, accepted the critical theories thoroughly, was a man who did a great deal of study, work, and there are certain points at which you'll find a very good presentation of the critical theory relating to the details of the presentation in this (7 $\frac{1}{2}$) and there are two sections of it in which I want you to get the evidence on which he claims that you have two distinct stories contradicting one another, which have been interwoven into Numbers as we have it today. I want you to get his theory, that's what I want. What are his evidences that there are two distinct contradictory stories interwoven. And some of his evidence at first sight is quite difficult to answer. I don't want you to go through it with the viewpoint, well, here's a lot of foolishness, let's see what crazy stuff these people have. That's the attitude that many people take, many Christians take, toward these critical theories. And I believe it is true, there's an awful lot of foolishness in it, but I believe that in it there's some pretty clever thinking at certain places. And I believe that many a man has lost his faith in the scripture, because instead of examining the principle critical theories carefully to see what the evidence is and to see whether it will stand, he has rejected the whole thing as a lot of nonsense, and taken an attitude of just laughing and ridiculing it, and then he has some day come face to face with a problem that he couldn't answer, and doing that he decided he was wrong in his whole viewpoint, and ^{crossed} flopped over and accepted the whole business. I believe that we must recognize that it has certain basic problems which cannot be answered just offhand, but must be carefully examined.

Now I think it's a waste of time for Christians to spend months and years studying through the Old Testament, studying all the theories the critics present. I think that's an utter waste of time, I wouldn't recommend it to anyone, but I think it is

very valuable to take a few key points and see at each key point, what is their evidence and what is the nature of their argument? And see whether their argument stands. And if you find at a few key points that it can be reasonably answered, then there's no need in the world of looking into all the rest. On the other hand, if you're not familiar with the key points why you could spend your life arguing about the other points and get nowhere. To know a few key points is very vital. Well, we won't look (9 3/4)

criticism in this class, but there are two points in Numbers that are very, very interesting from this viewpoint. One of them is the story of the sending of the spies and their impressions, their reports. Now in that the critics have a very clever theory worked out. They have a number of evidences which they claim shows proof (10¹/₄) of two distinct stories. ————— One of them has this viewpoint, the other has that viewpoint, and according to one of them there were two spies that slipped through, Caleb and Joshua. According to the other, there's only one. According to one of them, they went clear to the north of Palestine; according to the other, they only went halfway up. According to one they said the land was no good and of no value and foolish to try to take it, according to the other they said the land was very valuable, ^{but} ~~the land with~~ the people in it were too strong. Different (10¹/₄) different viewpoints, different historical events with the same general background. That is the critical claim.

Well the assignment in the International Critical Commentary will be, find the evidences on which this claim is based. To list those evidences. That assignment is not a matter of answering them or of investigating them, but of simply knowing what they are. So it's not a long assignment. It is ^{to do that} ~~due-back~~ with the story of the spies, and also do it with the story of the rebellion of Torah, Dathan, and Abiram. ~~In-connection~~ This is not the rebellion of Ahab and Abihu, we've already looked at that, but of Torah, Dathan, and Abiram. In connection with that rebellion you have there a very involved situation. We haven't come to that yet in our account. You have a very involved situation, in the account of Numbers, and they try to disintegrate the two different strands and make two theories from it. I think we must recognize there are, in a way, two different rebellions there, but I think you must recognize that in just about every rebellion, there are

two different, or five or ten, different movements. That is to say, there are people who are in it from this viewpoint, others from this viewpoint. The people who have this objective and who have that objective, but they get together and they accomplish something! If you do not find a large enough group of unified viewpoints to accomplish the results as a rule. Possibly there are different groups, there are these different groups which cooperated together ($12\frac{1}{4}$), or are they two different stories? Well, Grey gives his evidence to show they are two entirely different stories.

And that will be the assignment in ~~King~~ the ICC commentary on Numbers, which I will give certain men...($12\frac{3}{4}$ to $13\frac{3}{4}$)

Now there will be another assignment, distinct from this one, and this other assignment will deal with my personal examination of this evidence. This will be a little longer assignment, but the examination which I gave of this particular evidence is contained in a rather large book. This book is called The New Bible Commentary. It was published a few years ago in England by the British Intersarsity. It is a one-volume commentary on all the books of the Bible, and they asked me to take about 30,000 words on the book of Numbers, and so I have in it a discussion of Numbers. This book ($14\frac{1}{2}$)

Unfortunately, it's only a fairly small...

O.T.History 188. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...unless you take between two and three hours on this particular assignment. A little longer than the others but we'll give the other assignment first and ($\frac{3}{4}$ to $1\frac{1}{2}$)

Now, in our discussion, we are on C, At Sinai, and in that we are in the Preparation for leaving Sinai, which is 10, and there under 10, we yesterday spoke of small d, the Nazarite Vow. The material on this is in the chapter. I merely stressed a couple of factors about it, which are not obvious but I think are clear when you examine it carefully. Then we went on to e, the Arrangements for the Religious life of the Camp, and I told about number (1), the formula for blessing the congregation. Number (2) is the Offerings of the Princes, one of the most tiresome chapters in the Bible. The offerings

of the princes. If you want to listen to a tiresome half hour, or fifteen minutes, whatever it is, on the radio, or on the television, you listen when some local program congratulates all the little children who have birthdays that day. And you hear how Kenneth Smith is four years old, congratulations Kenneth. You hear how Henry Brown is six years old today, congratulations, Henry. And so on. And if you were to listen to half an hour or an hour of that, I am sure you would be absolutely bored to death, but I can assure you that in every one of those programs there is at least one listener who is tremendously interested, and gets a tremendous thrill out of hearing his name given there on the radio or on the television. Now this chapter is like that. In this chapter we have the offerings of the princes, at the beginning of the tabernacle service, and the prince, the leader of each of the tribes, comes and brings a royal gift, he gives animals he gives jewels, he gives precious things, he gives wagons, it's wonderful what he gives, and it's all listed in full detail. And you read the whole listing once, and it's quite, you might say, you could find it interesting, but then you read that so-and-so the prince of the tribe of Issachar and he gave, and then it lists what he gave, and it's identical with what the other one gave, it's absolutely identical. And you have twelve times repeated the same identical list of the offerings which he gave. And, as I say, it's therefore extremely boring for us, but it would not be the least boring to the man who gave the gifts. He would be tremendously interested in every little detail of his service. And I believe it is placed here in connection with the law of God, placed here just as they start on their wilderness journey, to show to us the Lord's great personal interest in each individual one of us. And how minutely he records our offerings, how minutely he records our services, our relations to him, he never forgets any of his children.

I had somebody come up to me the other day and say, Dr. MacRae, don't you remember me? Well, I couldn't remember the face, but I never remember faces anyway. But I hate to admit it to an outsider like that. ~~I am sorry,~~ And so I said, well, I'm afraid I don't. Now was this somebody who I was supposed to have known very well? Just don't place her. Well, she said, don't you remember that time down at Harvey Cedars, when I asked you to explain a certain verse of the scripture? And I'd given a message about ten years ago, and about

ten people came up to ask about different nurses, and she was one of them, and I never saw her before or since. But I found out later she was terribly hurt that I didn't recognize her and didn't remember her. Well, I would feel much worse if ten years from now, I would be speaking out in Nebraska ~~of~~ somewhere and someone would come up and say, Dr. MacRae, don't you remember me? And I would find that it was someone who for a whole year had sat in this group, and had sat here in the group for a whole year, and ten years later I didn't recognize them. I would feel very badly. But every one of you, if you have much contact with people, are going to have that experience. You're going to have people that you're interested in, you want to help, you're anxious to do what you can for them, but you just don't recall them. You just lose the recollection of them. Your mind is not able to keep the personal interest that you're anxious to have in each one of those which the Lord enables you to bring something of blessing to. But the Lord never failed that way, he remembers every single one of us individually and is interested in every aspect of our lives and every detail of it, and I believe that this long, tiresome repetition here in this chapter which I read through when I was writing this commentary on Numbers, verse by verse, word by word, trying to detect minute points of value, and I could find none. I believe that it is written for the purpose of driving home to us that ^{important} ~~which~~ fact about the Lord's relation to his children, and his personal interest in us each one, and I think it's a lesson we should derive from it, but I don't think that you'll read it over for devotional reading every day, not for many days. So we will not go into the details of this particular chapter, but we note ~~de~~ its place in the preparation.

And then (3), The Lamps Lit. That's chapter 8, verses 1 to 4. It is a very brief section in four verses, but the tabernacle has been put up, it is necessary to put things in operation, and the commands have been given before, they've been described in detail in Exodus 25, now they are lit before the journey can properly be commenced, and I see quite frequently I see out in the hall there, I see a great big box of stuff addressed to one of our students, and it says from the Mount Vernon Foundation, and I see that great big box of filing stuff and I say, oh my, there's somebody that's going to do a lot of

work filing, and you can buy the most elaborate, expensive, and splendid filing outfits that there are, you can put them ^{up} on your shelf and you can look at them every day and think how much money you spent on them, and it won't do you a bit of good. Personally, I never felt there was much need of spending all that money on filing. I'm inclined to think that a comparatively simple filing outfit might be just as good. But I would say I think perhaps it would be very wise for a person to get the most expensive one you can find, because if you put all that money into something you'll feel that you've got now to use it. The important thing in a filing outfit is using it. It's working. And any filing outfit that is worked and used is of tremendous value, and any filing outfit that's put up on the shelf and forgotten about is of absolutely no value. There are many people who have the most beautiful Bibles which stand on the shelf and is never looked at, and it'll never do them any spiritual good, so long as it's not used. And here we have all the instructions for the tabernacle given, all the details, it's to be made according to the ^{pattern} ~~details~~ shown in the mount, it's to be made exactly that way, it stands up there, it's finished, but now they've got to light the lamp, you've got to use it, and the same is true of your spiritual life. You can't light your lamp and expect it go on burning, you accept the Lord, you are His, you are saved through him, you're redeemed forever. But you've got to keep lighting your lamps every day, you've got to keep your devotional life bright and clean, you've got to keep your fellowship with him constantly. It's a thing that must be done day by day, and moment by moment, steadily and constantly. And so here is all the (10 3/4) of making the tabernacle and now we pause for the (11) to light the lamps. The operation is necessary, not merely the possession, and that's true of your Hebrew too. You can put in two or three hours a year getting a good foundation knowledge of Hebrew, and you can graduate from the Seminary, and say look at there I've got a diploma, it shows I've learned some Hebrew. I got a mark of 95 or 85 or 75 or whatever it was, in Hebrew. I've learned that Hebrew. You close the Hebrew book and you put it on your shelf, and that Hebrew is not going to do you the least bit of good. It's just, maybe you got some (11 1/2) training, I don't know. But I don't care what mark you got in Hebrew, I don't care whether

you were a top student or a poor student in it, if you will light the lamp day by day, if you will take a few minutes every day, using that Hebrew, reviewing a little bit, reading a little bit, seeing what light it throws on the meaning of words, and on the syntactical construction, you will find you've got a tool there that will illumine your understanding, that will strengthen your spiritual life, that will be a blessing to you all through life. It's not a matter of what you get in it but of whether you use it. And it's important that we keep our lamps lit. I've seen a lot written about learning to read faster. Most people read too slowly and it's very fine, you can pay, there's a place where you can pay a hundred dollars and they'll teach you to read faster, and they claim they've doubled and tripled the reading speed of people. And I read some about this, they have, there are bad habits some of us get into, and there are ways of remedying those bad habits. It's mighty good to find out if you've formed those bad habits and get them remedied. But I've found this, that seventy per cent of the accomplishments in teaching people to read faster amounts to this, of getting them to go to a book, to open a book or a magazine and say I'm going to read faster. It is doing it. It is opening it up and saying now I'm not going to dilly dally over this, I'm going to go through it fast and still get the point, I'm not going to go so fast I miss it, but I'm going to go so fast that I'll get all it (13¼) and it is that going at it and determining to do it that is seventy per cent of even a comparatively technical matter, like learning to read faster. And so to light the lamps. It's a simple thing, but it's (13½) it's important. Not just to light ^{them} and they're lit forever, you have to keep furnishing oil, you have to relight them every morning, you have to tend them (13½), and the Christian life is a life of rest in Christ, it is a life of ceasing from our own works but it is a life of constant going forward and a constant renewing as we relight our ^{lamps} ~~eyes~~. So this is a little bit in Numbers but it's very important.

(4), The Cleansing of the Levites for Service. Chapter 8:5-22. And in these verses here we have the Levites cleansed, the ceremonies, and physically prepared for their work. Again an important part of the religious life of the Camp, the preparation of the men who ~~were~~ ^{are} to carry on the direction of the religious work. And again ^{a reminder that} ~~are we reminded~~

we may preach to others and ourselves become (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)
 importance here for God's servants, it's important for any (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)
 keep his life clear.

There is an
 to

O.T.History 189. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...a special importance that we serve the Lord in such a way that we do not by our own mistakes and errors bring contempt upon the cause we serve, and how many a person does that. I will be tremendously surprised if, within the next ten or fifteen years, I do not receive from one member of this class a letter which says to me, there was one examination in Old Testament History in which I sat nearer to somebody else than I should, and at an important point in that examination, I just couldn't think of the answer and I was trying to think of it and my eyes strayed over and I saw a word out of his paper which told me the answer to this, and I wrote it down and I passed and got a good mark on that exam. And for the last eight years it's been bothering me, and I don't feel I'm accomplishing what I should in Christian work. Shall I send back my diploma, what should I do about this? And it would be, a group of this size, if there isn't one who might be like that, I will say there's at least one who has not gotten up the courage to write, there's at least one, And what you get on an exam, whether you passed the course, whether you had to take it over again, whether you get a 95 or a 75 is not one-hundredth as important as whether you sullied your cleanness and your testimony before God, and put yourself in a situation where it is difficult for him to use you as he should. And if there is one who, it preys upon his mind for a few years before it reaches the point where he writes to me about it, that is a hundred times better than for there to be one who covers it over, and is hardened to it and refuses to pay attention to the fact that he has sinned. We all sin, we all are guilty of that. But, oh, let us keep cleansing ourselves for service, and let's pray the Lord to cleanse us, and let's see to it that we keep away from where it will be easy to look on somebody's paper, try to get a place where you'll not be led into temptation, try to avoid these things, and look at every moment to keeping yourself

clean and pure, in order that God may use you. He couldn't use the Levites unless they were cleansed and he can't use us unless we are cleansed.

And then (5), The Age of Levitical Service. Chapter 8:23-26. A rather important thing from the viewpoint of the Levites. It doesn't tell, mean a great deal of us except it shows God's interest that these things be done right. The Levites served until the age of 50 and after that they did lighter tasks, they did not do the heavy tasks. I've known of churches which have had a minister greatly beloved, wonderful man, but he has kept on after his strength was not sufficient for the work, and he's kept on and the church has gone down, and gone down because he was at the age when he should be using the wisdom accumulated to advise others, rather than trying to carry a heavy task. It is hard for us to realize what God's will is in these days, but this chapter shows that it's a matter we should give consideration to, and we should think not only of ourselves, not only of how things look to us but how do they look to others and what is best for the work. Mr. Welch? (student. 4½. Was most of the Levitical service of a manual nature?) Yes, there was not, oh, I would describe it, half or two-thirds of it, they had to lift those heavy animals, they had to kill them, they had quite a bit of ceremony, though they had a great deal that physically was much lighter.

And then (6), The First Passover After Leaving Egypt. Before leaving Sinai, we have a long description here in chapter 9, verses 1 to 14, of the first passover after leaving Egypt. The first passover. They had been delivered from Egypt, but now they are remembering the deliverance. They are remembering how God has redeemed them from Egypt and they are pre-figuring, in their service, the death of Christ, the Lamb of whom not a bone was broken, the Lamb through whom we find atonement and entrance into the family of God. And they struck a problem here, we read. We read that they found certain men who had touched a dead body, and according to the law a person who had touched a dead body was defiled. These people, it was no sin in their having touched a dead body, it was necessary, it couldn't be avoided, but it did create defilement. And according to the law, a man who was defiled could not take the passover, and yet they were commanded to take the passover, anyone could be cut off from his people who did not take the pass-

over, and yet one who was defiled could not take the passover, what would they do? So they brought the problem to Moses and Moses ~~took~~^{put} the problem before the Lord and the Lord gave them an answer. They had a special passover a month after the regular one, for the sake of those who'd been unable to participate for this reason or they'd been off on a journey or something in the first one. It's an illustration of the principle stated by Christ, the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath. The principle, man is not to obey ~~the new~~^{minute} ordinances. It is not our purpose, the reason God brought us into existence, that we can carry out minute details of service, minute details of Sabbath keeping or any such thing. All these things are for our development, for our spiritual development, for our edification, and the Lord wants us to follow the spirit of the matter. Now, ordinarily, you follow the spirit you will follow the letter, but there are many times when it's very easy to follow the letter and lose the spirit altogether. I was studying at the University of Pennsylvania one time with a group of very brilliant students who were doing some excellent work in the Babylonian study we were doing together. And nearly all of them were Jews and one of them said to me, they made a remark which I didn't understand, and one of them turned to me and explained, he said, you know, he said, there are certain feast days on which the first-born are supposed to fast, and we don't like to fast. And he said there are certain days on which they are not allowed to eat anything because we're first-born. And he said there's another law that says that when you've finished reading an important portion of the scriptures, you are called to have a day of celebration, and so, he said, when it's just a few days before the day in which we would fast, he said, we start that many chapters before the end of Isaiah or some other portion of scripture, and we start reading, and then he says when the fast day comes, we've just finished this important part of the scripture and we're entitled to a day of celebration, so he said, instead of having to fast that day we can eat an extra good meal instead. Now there is an example of conflict of laws, there ~~is a true~~^{are the two} laws, one of them you have to fast, the other you're allowed to celebrate, and he said, in such a case we just take our pick, we can follow either one we want, so this is the one we follow, the one we like. And that is the situation these people were in with the passover.

They were required to take the passover, but they were forbidden to take the passover. What would they do about it? Well, in our lives, we will often find conflict of laws (9 $\frac{1}{2}$) probably, but the answer is that it is to be solved according to the scriptural purpose of the law, rather than according to the minute details. I was out in Montana in the farming area, after I graduated from college, and a woman said to me--I understood they were good church-going people, but came Sunday and their folks were out there harvesting their grain, working hard from early morning till late night, and I said well I thought you were Christian people and were much interested in the church and worked in the church, and she said, yes we are, but she said, the scripture says if your ox falls into a pit on the Sabbath day, pull it out. And she said if we don't harvest grain every Sunday during harvest season, she said we won't have enough to keep them through the winter, and she said if they die of starvation that's as bad as falling into a pit, so she said we have to work on the Sabbath day. Well, that is taking the letter of the law and ignoring the spirit. It's an emergency regulation. If your ox falls in a pit on the Sabbath Day of course you're not to let it die. You're go go and pull it out. The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath. But you should plan ahead so that you can get sufficient work done in the six days of the week without having to profane the Sabbath by doing it. You should plan ahead and you shouldn't, if you can't get enough grain by harvesting on the six days of the week to keep your oxen through the winter, you've got too many oxen, you'd better sell them. You are, it is easy to follow the letter and ignore the spirit. It's easy to pretend you're following the spirit and ignoring the letter but you usually aren't, when you pretend to be doing it.

So that we have very important principles here even if the immediate situation doesn't directly apply to us. They were very important in the life of Israel and they're very important for us too. That was (6). And then we take f. e was The Arrangements for the Religious life of the Camp.

And f, The Divine Provision for Direction and Guidance. Here there is (1) under this. (1), The Pillar of Cloud and Fire. That's 9:15-23. And (2) is The Silver Trumpet.

10:1-10. And you see, the two of them together take up 9:15 to 10:10. It's the divine provision for direction and guidance, the right thing to give just as they are about to start. It's not the first account of the pillar of cloud and fire, we've had that explained two or three times before. It's a thing they were well familiar with, but it is stressed again, and as we begin any journey it's important for us to stop and seek of the divine guidance. Does the Lord really want me to make this journey. Am I doing it for my own pleasure or for His glory? Is He ~~a~~^{the} pillar of cloud really going before me on this journey? Am I going in the direction He wants me to go? It's important to start ~~any~~ journey (12 3/4)

And the second part, The Silver Trumpet, we should think of the details of the journey. Have we planned it properly? The Lord wants you to do this, you're quite convinced. But he wants you to work out the details. And he may work in a wonderful, providential way, to work out details in a way you'd never dream of, but he wants you to do your best to ~~work~~ them out as far as you can. He doesn't want you to fail in your work because you haven't worked out the details satisfactorily. So we have the Silver Trumpet, and the pillar of cloud and fire, both together here, and I'm just sorry the Archbishop put a chapter division between them. Because they certainly belong together, here at the beginning of this phase of the wilderness journey. It was, it is an extremely important truth for us, it is a problem which any group of this size, we ~~re~~^{is} going to have some who will be greatly bothered with. How does the Lord lead? What is his guidance for me? What is His plan? The principles are here. We won't take more ~~than five minutes~~^{time on it} now because we discussed this when we first had the pillar of cloud and fire earlier. At that time I looked forward to this material, and utilized it in that session.

And so we can now consider, as far as our discussion in class is concerned, consider capital C to be complete, and go on to D, which is From Sinai to the Plains of Moab. Now I want to give you, before we go into detail on this, I want to give you a rapid survey of the rest of the book of Numbers. D, From Sinai to the Plains of Moab, that's 10:11 to 22:1. And then E, is the...

...22:2 to 25:18. A very, very interesting interlude, that will be E, quite a ways ahead, but I want to give you the general survey of the rest of Numbers. A very interesting incident, one that takes a little study to really understand, but is full of important matters for the church. E, The Balaam Incident. And then F, Preparation for Entrance Into Canaan. That's 26:1 to 36:13. In other words the last 11 chapters. Now these are three major sections yet remaining of the wilderness journey, no, of the book of Numbers, and practically all of it is the wilderness journey, we'll have one more section on Deuteronomy. And the first section of this, D, From Sinai to the Plains of Moab, is a section which covers about 38 years, but it is not a dated section, that is to say, when we start it we know where we are, we're at the beginning of the 38 years. And when we finish it we know where we are, we're at the end of the 38 years. But exactly where the 38 years comes in the middle, we are not told, we're not given a precise chronology on it. One of its outstanding events is the great rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram. That is chapter 16. It's an outstanding event, in chapter 16. The great rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, but did it come right near the beginning of the 38 years, or did it come near the end of it. We do not know. Perhaps one of the most important incidents in this section is the sending of the spies and what happened at Kadesh Barnea. That, we know, happened early in it, that was very soon, near the beginning of the 38 years, was the sending of the spies and God telling the people you're not going to Palestine now, this whole generation is going to die in the wilderness. We know that happened near the beginning, a very interesting incident and a very important one. That happened near the beginning of the 38 years. But what happened between that and the final incidents of it, the last few chapters of it. We're told they would wander 38 years, we're told at the end they did wander. Did they during this period, the whole camp, move around through the wilderness. It's entirely possible they did, using up the pasture land in a certain area, then moving on to another, making perhaps a regular route around each year. That's possible. On the other hand, it's possible that they kept the center somewhere near Kadesh Barnea

and that they went off in groups together, to what pasture they could take care of their animals but coming back to regular services. That is possible. We know they were together when the rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram took place. But did it take place because they were together all the time, or was this one of the times when they came together after scattering (4) we' just aren't told. I've been asked the question, was the tabernacle moved constantly during these 38 years, or was it kept there at Kadesh Barnea, with the people spreading out and returning to it. The Bible does not tell us. It's one of the silences of the scripture. It is like the matter of the early years of Christ. We know a great deal about him between the ages of 30 and 33, far more than we do all the rest of his life. Between, when he was a little boy we know very little about him and between the age of 12 and 30 we know practically nothing. There have been books written telling how he went to India during this period and learned the wisdom of the Indian sages, and came back and built his gospel upon it. Purely imaginary. There have been imaginary stories written about miracles he did. Purely imaginary. We just don't know the detailed life of Christ during this period. We're just not told. And during these 38 years there is nothing, we are not told. To my mind, one of the most important lessons we can possibly learn in connection with Bible interpretation is this: not to approach the Bible with this question: Was it this way or that? But with this question: Does the Bible tell us whether it was this way or that. In other words, does the Bible answer this question, is the approach, rather than what answer does the Bible give? If you find that the Bible does answer the question, then it's very important to find out how it answers it. But, as John tells us, that if the Bible told us everything that Jesus did, probably all the books in the world could not contain it. He did many, many, many things that are not mentioned. God didn't intend to give a complete encyclopedia on it, so the Bible, is the Bible complete? It is complete because it is the entire revelation that God desires to give us. It is what He thought we need for this age, for this revelation we need nothing more. It is complete. Is it complete? Does it give us a full answer to any question? No, it does not. It is not complete in that sense. It gives us as much answer as we need in this present life, and we may have to dig, to dig out that.

But a great part of the unnecessary confusion in the Christian church ~~that~~ comes from people going to their Bibles with a question the Bible doesn't answer, and somebody says well, look at this, this looks as if this is the answer. Somebody says look at this, it looks as if this is the answer, and soon you have two arrayed forces opposing each other because one says this is it, and the other says this is it, dealing with something that the Bible did not answer. That God did not wish to have become a divisive point among his followers. So that this section here, if you want a complete detailed history of the 38 years, it is rather baffling, it does not give you that. But let me ask any one of you to give me a history of Philadelphia in the last ten years, you wouldn't be able to do it. You could go to newspapers and study them out and then you wouldn't be able to do it. And you will find forty years from now that some of the most important things in Philadelphia that happened in these ten years, were not even noticed by people ^{then} ~~now~~. And people then will be wondering about them and trying to figure them out, and you won't have the evidence because nobody bothered to keep it, ~~they~~ didn't realize its importance. God has kept that which is important and necessary for us to have, and this account of Kadesh Barnea is of tremendous importance in our Christian lives. There's very little in the Bible that's more important than the account of the events of Kadesh Barnea and what it can mean to us. And the account of the rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, is of tremendous importance to us, in our Christian life, but there are questions about it that are not answered. And maybe we can find evidence on which to make a guess as to the answer and maybe we can't. But let's not be dogmatic about them unless we have the evidence. To my mind, it is very, very important that we stand on what the Bible says, that's ~~one~~ of the greatest things we can do, to learn to have absolute confidence in the Word of God. But for Christian leadership there's another lesson that is second in importance, or maybe third, but it's very high, and that is, to learn not to stand on what the Bible doesn't say, but to investigate, and to be tolerant of what it doesn't say, looking for more information, but ~~looking~~ recognizing the fact that it is one of the ~~fallacies of~~ ^{thousands and} thousands of matters on which God has not chosen to give us precise information. Well, I don't know when we'll meet together but I'll post enough to keep you busy so you won't have to worry.

...I tried to give you something to keep you busy for this time so that you would keep learning, and the last assignment that I had given out should have been handed in this noon. And for most of you that was assignment H, getting you into Joshua, which I hope we will reach soon. For a few of you, a very few, it was assignment B, which I spread out, the A's and B's, in order to give you opportunity to use the books. I didn't want to assign everybody to buy a copy of this big book, simply for a small section of it that I had written on the book of Numbers. And especially since the present assignment only dwells on a few pages in it. Now we were looking, when we last met, at Numbers ^{VI}~~p~~, which was the wilderness journey, and under that at D, From ~~Sinai~~ to the Plains of Moab.

And on that we looked at 1, The First Stage of the Journey, and we discussed part c, under that, The Ark and the Blessing. The critics try to make it out that this teaches that the Ark flew in front of the people looking for a place for it. But of course that is only a grotesque mis-interpretation of the passage here, the passage where it says it went before does not mean necessarily that it went under its own power. And we look at the details of the blessing which is given there, blessings which have many lessons for us today. Then number 2, Rebellion and ^{Disaffection} Dissatisfaction. This was the first of the dissension and rebellion. In the assignments have covered great rebellions during this wilderness journey. And then there was one assignment which you turned in which was a comparison and discussion of these. And so we will not need to take time to discuss except certain points, that I want call to your particular attention. This section, Rebellion and Disaffection, which I discuss on page 176 of the commentary, I divided this into four subjects, Disaffection on the outskirts of the camp, then, In the Midst of the Camp, and then God's twofold answer to Moses' prayer. But I want to discuss with you, you've studied all that material in the book, but I want to, in the Bible, but I want to discuss with you simply the section D, Rebellion among the leaders. The others, while important, don't ^{require} ^{time} ~~particularly~~ ~~only~~ here for discussion. Yes? (student. 11 3/4) Point 1, under D, was The First Stage of the Journey. (student.) I thought I discussed the question at ~~some~~ length. Well, number 1, The First Stage of the Journey, that's chapter 10, verses 11 to 26. Under that, small a, The Departure from Sinai, 10:11-28. ~~Small b, Moses' Re-~~

Small b, Moses' Request for Help from Hobab. Chapter 10:29-32.

And c, The Ark and the Blessing. Chapter 10:33-36. And this section, a, the ~~help~~ from Hobab, we discussed at length. ^{On God's guidance,} ~~We looked forward to that.~~ And c, The Ark and the Blessing, which I just mentioned, it says that the ark went before them to seek out a resting place for them in their three days' journey. And this, the critics interpret, as being a different plan and a different account, where instead of being guided by a pillar of cloud and a pillar of fire, this is a different ~~version~~ which says they're guided here by the ark flying on ahead of them, hunting for a place to have their camp. But that's not what the Bible says, it says the ark went before ~~them~~, to search out a resting place. And you see, in interpreting anything there are various possibilities of interpretation. It is rarely indeed that anything can be so expressed that it is absolutely certain from a few words ~~alone~~ exactly how they must be interpreted. Human language is susceptible to various interpretations and must be interpreted in relation to context. And it is only sensible to seek an interpretation which fits with context rather than one which contradicts it, of one which is grotesque and contrary to the general teaching of the passage which we were taught elsewhere in scripture, that God so made the ark that it could fly and could hunt things out and so on, it would be reasonable, but it ~~says~~ ^{the Ark} here, ~~God~~ went before them to seek out a resting place for them, to interpret it that way. But when from what is said about the Ark anywhere else, it is reasonable to interpret it as meaning that for these three days, through an area which was not (15)

in having the ark carried in front of them...

O.T.History 191. (½)

...the other interpretation is not required by the words but would be possible if you take the words ^{alone} ~~seriously~~. And if you take it that way it introduces something that has no counterpart elsewhere in the scripture, and fits in ^{of course} with the critics' idea of a grotesque, mythological account of various contradictory stories. But then you have that beautiful blessing there, which is given to bless the people with, and it is well worth your study but we won't take time here but will go to number 2, Rebellion and Disaffection.

And this section, rebellion and disaffection, you have studied under two different assignments, and I'll really give you an outline for it now, and look at the 4th part.

a. Disaffection in the outskirts of the camp. 11:1-3. Notice how it begins with this disaffection in the outskirts of the camp. That is the way such things do begin. And it is the great function of a leader to be aware of such things and to decide whether they are matters that will blow over, because you cannot deal with everything, it's impossible. And if you try to deal with everything, you will simply cause confusion, and do more harm than good, you have to pick the things to deal with, and there's always a certain amount of disaffection in the outskirts of the camp. Some of the most loyal and devoted people are very free with their comments and criticisms and it means nothing, but occasionally begins in the outskirts of a type which, if not stopped, will go right into the heart and be very, very dangerous. And a leader who is qualified by his ability, among other things, to detect that which is vital as it starts and deal with it before it becomes serious.

Now in this case, (record not clear) we're told how dissension began in the outskirts of the camp in three verses. Then we're told how it came right into the camp.

(2 3/4) b. Trouble in the Midst of the Camp. 11:4-15. And here we have the people weeping, sad because of the misery they're in now, and wishing they were back in Egypt.

And then we have c. God's Twofold Answer to Moses' Prayer. chapter 11; 16-35. It is very interesting to note the two parts. How he gives Moses ^{help} ~~health~~ which he asked for, and he also provides the food that the people asked for. He gives him, he answers the two (3 1/2)

in prayer, you have studied this under the assignments, I trust all those assignments have been turned in, I haven't checked with Mr. Blizzard yet on it. If they haven't, they can still be turned in with a slight reduction in mark. The reduction becomes greater for every day that any of them are late. (student.4) And I expect that about 95% of them are in. (to 4 3/4), discussion about assignments.)

Now d. Rebellion Among the Leaders. And this is a very important chapter for a number of reasons, chapter 12. In this chapter 12, we find that the disaffection and difficulty which was among the people had come right into the very leadership of the group. And the leaders probably had stood with Moses against the difficulty among the people. At least they seemed to stand with him, as far as he had any reason to think.

But now he finds that there is great difficulty for Moses, in the attitude of his brother and sister, two of the top leaders of the whole group. And the cause of this, which you doubtless have dealt with in your discussion of the various rebellions, the causes you noticed are a bit complex. They are not simple, they are like most things in life, there are various factors that enter in. And so it starts with verse 1, tells us what they said about Moses, it says, they spoke against Moses because of the Ethiopian woman whom he had married, for he had married an Ethiopian woman. This is the only reference in the Bible to this marriage of Moses. It would seem that his first wife, who had been with him on the way to Egypt, in that important incident, had now died. And he had married again, but we are not given detail about it. We're simply told that on account of the Ethiopian woman whom he married, they were criticising him. Well, the second verse gives us another reason for criticising him. It says that they said, Hath the Lord indeed spoken only by Moses? Has he not also spoken by us? And here you see the real reason. When you find that the leadership of a movement of the Lord attacked by personal attack from individuals in it, by others who should be in positions of leadership, the reason, ostensible reasons, are like this in the first verse. They are standing off and objectively criticising things about them, but the second verse shows the real thought and what is wrong in the majority of cases. Personal jealousy. Has the Lord indeed spoken only by Moses? Has he not spoken also by us? And so here we have two types of attack on Moses. And these two types of attack on Moses, as long as they were just the attitude of two members of his family, you might say it's nothing to get concerned about. There always are misunderstandings in families and relatives are getting impressions. If you find a really great person who is looked up to by the nation, then you're pretty apt to find that some of his relatives don't see why there's all this fuss about him. They think they're just as good as he ever was, it's pure accident that he ever got in this position where he got all this prominence instead of their getting it. It's a very common phenomena. But here it's much more than that, it is an important matter because there is a vital movement going forward in which these people are in position of leaders. And if they want to criticise Moses to feel in their hearts that Moses shouldn't make the

marriage he did, or to feel in their hearts that Moses isn't any better than they are and yet he's in a better position, in a way that's something within themselves. But when they are talking about it, they are arousing dissatisfaction in others and making it more difficult for Moses to have the authority he should have. Therefore it's an important matter. And so the verse ends, And the Lord heard it. And then we have a verse which the critics say prove that Moses did not write the Pentateuch. Now the man Moses was very meek above all the men which were upon the face of the earth. And they say that of course ^{Moses} couldn't have written a thing like that, perfectly obvious somebody else must've written it. And there's a book written by a very, very fine orthodox Professor of Old Testament in Europe, a book written by him against the critical theory, taking up the division into documents and trying to show that it rests on insufficient foundation and after he does that, then he has a chapter he calls, Post-Mosaica and A-Mosaica, in other words passages that were written after Moses and passages ^{Moses} /didn't write anyway, and he mentions this and puts great stress on it. He says Moses couldn't possibly have written such a statement as this, and he also uses an earlier statement in Exodus where it says that the man **Moses** was very great in the eyes of Pharaoh and the eyes of Pharaoh's house. He says Moses would be one of the most conceited men on earth if he wrote those words. And I take sharp issue with him on that, I think his statement is absolutely false on the matter, because it seems to me that the earlier one, that Moses was great in the eyes of Pharaoh and in the eyes of all his servants, the statement is absolutely required in order to understand how Moses had such great access to Pharaoh's presence. The ordinary person would never get inside the outer gate, and Moses ^{we read} /came right into Pharaoh and talked to Pharaoh and presented to Pharaoh the cause, and you just can't understand how it could happen unless there's a reason and the reason is that Moses, in the first place, his background, his connection with the royal family, which would make the servants very reluctant to do anything against him, unless they knew they had explicit ^{from Pharaoh} orders /to do so, but secondly the way he had come and had done the miracles before Pharaoh and shown that a supernatural power, Pharaoh looked upon him, Pharaoh didn't believe in God, and did not look upon him as God's servant, but he was very great in his eyes, he was a factor to be

reckoned with, and so there's no (11 $\frac{1}{4}$)

that's not a

it's merely a statement of his standing, but

this is a moral statement, this is (11 3/4)

The man Moses was very meek

above all the people on the face of the earth. If a man ever wrote that about himself,

is he not one of the most conceited men that ever lived, if he wrote a thing like that.

Of course, Moses, we know, wasn't conceited so we know he couldn't have written it. ^{So} Well,

this ^{isn't} ~~is~~ by Moses anyway. Well, it seems to me that one thing we notice is that the Bible

differs from all other books, in that it speaks frankly and objectively about the weak-

nesses and the sins of its characters. You'll find David sinned, David the man so close

to God, his sin is told in clear terms without any glossing over of anything. And you

find that the evil that Moses tells about his sin, about God's rebuke to him, about his

weakness as he starts, about his murdering a man in Egypt, it tells the evil of the great

characters, of their sins in their lives, and it is an objective book, the Bible, which

gives us the facts as they were under the leading of God. And if it's going to tell the

bad points, it's only reasonable it should also tell the good points. Not only tell the

evil points about them, but tell the good points about them, so it's not at all out of

place for it to state frankly what the situation was. Well, now, in addition to that,

there is this, that Moses is not a meek man, particularly, when it comes to standing up

for God's cause and declaring God's will. Moses speaks the Word of God with power. And

he attacks wickedness in strong language. Moses is meek when it comes to standing up for

himself, and as Moses went over these words or as he wrote them at the end of his life as

he looks back, and he describes how these people were criticising his marriage, criticis-

ing his family, saying that he should not have married this Ethiopian, and so on, he mar-

vels at his meekness, he marvels that he could have, in that situation, stood still and

done absolutely nothing about it. And in order to ~~make~~ make it intelligible to the reader,

it is necessary to show the unusual situation. But Moses here who was standing with bold-

ness and with fear of nothing for the Lord, here when his own honor was so attacked that

it was even entering in to his own family relations, and criticising his wife, the
 were, that he, in that situation, simply sat still and said nothing. The
 man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth. Moses
 said nothing about it, but it was the Lord who intervened, as verse 4 tells us, The
 Lord spoke suddenly to Moses, Aaron, and Miriam, and said, come out ye three to the tab-
 ernacle of the congregation. And the three came out. And so the statement there is
 not a parenthetical statement inserted by someone at a later date, or anything // like
 that, but it is a necessary of the narrative to show what happened in that situation,
 where practically anybody else, when someone started criticising his marriage this way, would--
 sometimes a man may have misgivings and wish he hadn't married the one he married...

O.T.History 192. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...but here in this situation where these people were interfering ⁱⁿ with a matter which
 was between him and the Ethiopian woman and the Lord, no one else had any right to inter-
 fere in any way, Moses simply kept quiet and said nothing, but the Lord--Moses stood up
 for the honor of the Lord and when it was Moses' honor at stake. Moses kept quiet and the
 Lord intervened for Moses. Yes? (student.1) There's nothing in scripture anywhere
 that says it is a question of anybody except between the man the woman and the Lord,
 if they're being married. And there would be no legitimate argument based on any scripture
 verse. And whether the argument was legitimate or not, the Lord showed by the way he
 intervened and dealt with them. Now of course, that's not to say that people don't make
 mistakes in marriage. Many a person does. Many a person marries whom they should not
 marry. Many a person is very hasty in marrying. And it is a good thing for friends to
 sometimes give a wise word of caution if they can. But it's better to give the word
 when they start going together, before they become infatuated, to the point where they
 won't listen to anything that anybody else says. Don't need (2)
 but in that case--but it's between them and the Lord, I would say, and there's nothing
 in the scripture anywhere that says that the color a person's hair or his eyes or any-
 thing of that type, has anything to do with whether they are right people to get married
 to. Nothing in the scripture anywhere that does, but this would argue against it. (2 $\frac{1}{2}$)

wouldn't it, that it's between the individuals and the Lord. But now that's aside from Old Testament History, we can't take much time on that. Yes? (student. 2½)

It forbids the marriage of the Israelites with those who did not believe in God. It forbids the marriage of believers and non-believers very strictly but in our Lord's ancestry we find Rahab the Canaanite woman, we find Ruth the Moabitess woman, we find many of other races who were involved in the ancestry of our Lord himself. The only restriction made on marriage in the Bible, and that is a very strong, is that the believer has no right to marry with the unbeliever. That is very, very strong and plain in both Old and New Testament and that distinction is a thousands times more important than any other distinction of language or background or any sort whatever. (student. 3½)

When Nehemiah came back from captivity there were people (3½) people outside the covenant altogether, and Nehemiah made them put aside such relationships. In this case we can believe that Moses brought this woman to a knowledge of the Lord, before he married her.

Well, Moses was very meek; instead of stepping out with anger and he might well have done, and practically everybody else would have, he was very meek but he was not meek when they honor of the Lord was at stake. It was when his own honor was at stake that he was meek. When the honor of the Lord was at stake, Moses was bold and fearless. Mr. Shellabarger? (student. 4½) I'm not sure how good an argument that is, but it is true, that John would be offering, it may be a minor offering, that if certainly doesn't mention himself in a book, I mean, if a man isn't mentioned in a book, that doesn't prove he is the author, but it might (5½) you have others with it, that a man is the author of a book and not a book about his activity but the activity of a different person. Then the fact that he rather played references to himself might be a good evidence of the truth of the argument. I mean it wouldn't be a major argument. Now in this case, Moses is the main actor in this story, aside from the Lord. There's no question of that. You couldn't tell this story without mentioning Moses because Moses is the one whom the Lord used. And it tells us that the plagues which Moses was God's instrument in bringing, it tells us the great strife Moses had and the way he ^{stood} came through

it. It tells us of case after case where Moses ~~seul~~ (6) in the book, but in this particular case it shows Moses acting in a way which would impress the average person who didn't look into it, as out of character, because they see him standing up boldly for the Lord's honor and opposing people without education, and here he doesn't oppose anybody, he's just quiet, but the reason is he was meek as regard to his own personal honor. And he gives the explanation here so that we won't think it's out of character. It's an interesting matter but I don't think there's a contradiction between it and the ~~argument~~ (6¹) I think there's an interesting relationship there. (student. 6¹) Yes. I think it's probably a question of how you interpret the verse. If you're saying, now look at this wonderful man, Moses. Here, want you to see ^{this} ~~new~~ wonderful quality about Moses, how meek he was. That is rather hard, to think of Moses saying it. But if you're saying, I want you to understand this unusual situation, that in this particular situation where Moses personally was assailed, Moses displayed a meekness which you wouldn't expect hardly of any other man on earth. The man Moses, in this situation, was meek above all the people of the earth. He just sat down and let them, and took it. He just took the personal attack and said nothing, it was the Lord that intervened, not Moses. Well, then, we have this verse which I don't think is a valid argument against Mosaic authorship, either of the book or of the verse, but which is required in the situation, to understand that Moses did nothing of his own honor, but let the Lord intervene in this situation. And so the Lord called these people out, the three of them, the Lord was going to show people which one it was he stood with, so he called the three of them out, and then the Lord said ~~hear~~ any words: If there is a prophet among you (that is, if either of you is a prophet, if you ever are used by the Lord as his mouthpiece, for giving his message) I the Lord will make myself known to him in a vision and speak to him in a dream. He does not say that Miriam and Aaron are not prophets at all. He says I may use thee as my spokesman, but he says, if I do, they are in a different category from Moses, because I speak to them in a vision or in a dream. But Moses is different, Moses he said is faithful in all my house. Moses, he said, with him I speak mouth to mouth, even directly, not in dark speeches. Why then, he says, were you not afraid to speak against my servant Moses? So he's taken up the second part of

their complaint, has the Lord indeed spoken only by Moses? And the Lord says no, I don't speak only by Moses, I speak by other people, I may speak by you, but he says I speak with Moses a different way than I speak with you, he's in a different category altogether from you. But then he takes up the first part, why are you not afraid to speak against my servant Moses? One whom God so used, why were they not afraid to take something that was only the affair of God and Moses and the woman involved and spread it out like this and attack Moses on such a ground, and tend to lower his dignity and his influence among the people he must lead. And so the anger of the Lord was kindled against them, and the cloud departed from off the tent and behold, Miriam was leprous, white as snow. Aaron looked on Miriam and she was leprous and Aaron confessed his sin, and asked Moses to pray for Miriam. Moses prayed! the Lord would heal her and the Lord said yes, she'll be healed but she must be shut out from the camp seven days and after that be received again. So they waited seven days until this was over. Yes? (student.11)

Yes. I heard Dean Inge ~~is~~ / (17) speak, Dean Inge, the gloomy dean they call him, ^{from} ~~in~~ London. I heard him speak in Union Seminary when I was a student (11¹/₂), and his message was on the verse in Genesis, shall not the judge of all the earth do right?, and he took up various explanations ^{people} ~~he could~~ give to show there's justice for it, and he showed that no one of them are done (11 3/4). And then he said there are some people who say it'll all be straightened out in the life after death but we don't want to think about that. So his conclusion, in answer to the question in Genesis, shall not the judge of all the earth do right? was we don't know whether he shall or not. That was his sermon given in the chapel of Union Seminary. The great English Dean, Anglican Dean, from London. But I think, the Bible point of it is, that the judge of all the earth does right, if you take the picture as a whole including the life after death, and that as far as this earth is concerned, punishment in this earth is not a matter of right and justice being done. There are two aspects of evil, that is of physical evil in this world, one of them is the direct result of action, which we do something that is contrary, and it may hurt, bring a result to us. Three young fellows commit a very serious sin and two of them are quite careful and the one is not and the one gets diseased which puts him in misery,

and the other two do not get diseased. That is not in relation to their rightness or wrongness, it comes as a direct result of what he did, that is one way, and then another thing is that God in this world brings suffering to us for various reasons, one of which may be as an example to deter us. But it is not in this life necessary as a punishment, a punishment for our moral evils. A dentist told me once that he had a girl patient who was a spiritualist, and he did like to have her, because, he said whenever his drill was a little bit dull and the tooth began to hurt as he drilled in, she instead of asking him to be careful said, don't you worry, don't you worry, I'm just suffering for some sin I've committed. And she always felt that she was getting the just result of her desserts and it wasn't his fault if it was hurting her. Well, in picture (14)

there is justice, but in the picture just in this life

is from these two other reasons. And so when God (14 $\frac{1}{4}$)

cruelty it ~~shouldn't~~ ^{didn't} mean that there was no one else in the people of Israel who were not (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

but it meant that she was in a position where

(14 $\frac{1}{2}$) was making a special effect

and as far as they! Aaron was concerned we don't know how much suffering he may have gone through

but if you take the picture as a whole he

got his deserved punishment. But in these two particular situations, in the one situation

where Aaron, the meek man, gave in, submitted to these activities, he was very helpful

(14 $\frac{3}{4}$) but in the situation Moses

jumped in to stand for the right and Aaron after wavering (15)

then turned over and helped Moses...

O.T. History 193. (1)

...well it's a good general question. I don't know as it's vitally connected with this chapter but it's good to have it brought up. Somebody else had a question. Same one perhaps. Well, we go on. That's all we'll say now about this rebellion among the leaders.

And then 3, The Crisis at Kadesh Barnea. And on that, I assigned it to you for study and to study the facts involved, and also the principal arguments about it, as

contained in the International Critical Commentary and they make it sound like a pretty small argument, that there are two different stories interwoven. And then I assigned you my discussion of their argument, which I think deals with the matter rather adequately, and we won't need to repeat it here. The crisis at Kadesh Barnea I've asked you to outline it, I believe. I have an outline here in five parts which is also taken from the commentary here. I don't think I will give you the details of the outline, but one point in it I want to draw your attention to rather particularly. That's what I've called e in the outline, small e. The Unsuccessful Repentance, chapter 14:39-45. Notice that God had told the people to go up and conquer the land and they refused, they were afraid, they said why did you bring us down here to kill us in the land of Egypt, they refused to go up. Then Moses gave them God's judgment, that they were the generation to die in the wilderness, and now in chapter 14:39-45 we have the people now saying, we will go up, we don't want to stay here and die in the wilderness, we're ready to go up and conquer the land. We will go up to the place which the Lord has promised for we have sinned. And Moses said, wherefore now do ye transgress the commandment of the Lord? but it shall not prosper. Go not up, for the Lord is not among you, that ye be not smitten before your enemies. For the Amalekites and the Canaanites are there before you. Before this they were saying we're (3) well able to take the land. Now he says the Amalekites and the Canaanites are there before you and you'll fall by the sword, but the difference is because you've turned away from the Lord, therefore the Lord will not be with you, but they presumed to go up to the mount, up ^{unto} ~~over~~ the hilltop; nevertheless the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and Moses, departed not out of the camp. The Amalekites came down, and the Canaanites which dwelt in that hill, and smote them, and discomfited them, even unto Hormah. The unsuccessful repentance, and in it there is a very, very important message there for every one of us.

The people were told to go up, God was well able to give them the land, they refused. They were afraid, they lacked faith in God, they were disobedient. Now God punished them, now they turn around and they're going to do what he said before but what God said before no longer held now. Now the situation is changed, and they just make a

failure of this and suffer from it, and God gives us opportunities in life which we have opportunity to take hold of, and possess the land, opportunities which never come back again. Opportunities which if we try to take them later on we are sinning against the Lord and we will fail. This is, I think, a wonderful example of the fact that there is a time element in God's plan. The opportunity comes, we have his orders, we are to do it, if we don't do it it may never come again. But then another thing I think we should notice about this, Kadesh Barnea, a more general thing, is this, that Kadesh Barnea is not simply a case where a person is confronted with two alternatives, and he picks the wrong one and so he's up against it. The people here made the wrong choice, they believed the ten spies instead of the two and so God says you go over and die in the wilderness. It's not that simple. The people, by their ^{rejection} ~~rejection~~ of the spies' attitude, including these ten spies (5 $\frac{1}{2}$) show that they were not yet ready to go into Canaan. They made clear and evident the fact that they were not, they were out of Egypt but Egypt was not yet out of them. They were not ready for God to bring them into the promised land. They are in the situation that most of us are in in our wilderness journey. God has brought us out of Egypt, we are redeemed, we have been justified, we have the merits of Christ applied to us, but we in our actuality, in our state we are far short of what we should be, and there are many things we should be able to do that we are not yet able to do, and we need lessons, we need training, the Israelites needed that forty years to get Egypt out of them, before they were ready to go into the wilderness. They needed that forty years to develop their faith in God to the point where they could go into the promised land and to follow Joshua and to conquer. God revealed by the incident at Kadesh Barnea ^{not merely that} ~~that~~ the people make a wrong choice and that's that, no. But that the people reveal their characteristics and the attitude of their heart, and that being revealed that result comes which is necessary in (6 $\frac{1}{2}$)

I think that's a very important thing for us to have in mind in all of God's dealings with us. We're all too ready to think of things that, whether you say the right magic words, you have to take the right attitude in one particular situation, and it's very

easy for people to fall into that error of making little details be the vital thing, instead of the big issue of their relation to God. Well, so much then for this long and involved and important section, number 3, on the crisis at Kadesh Barnea.

And then Number 4, Laws after the Crisis, Chapter 15:1-41. And this is a peculiar thing at first sight, here we have this very interesting story of Kadesh Barnea in chapter 13 and 14, then we have the great rebellions in chapter 16, but chapter 15 is a chapter of law, but I believe it is put right here for a purpose. The laws are given here after the crisis, starting with rules of sacrifice for Canaan. That is a, Rules of Sacrifice for Canaan. 15:1-21. And these rules of sacrifice for Canaan are given here at the beginning of the wilderness journey, not to add any new information, there is very little in them that isn't already contained in the laws given at Sinai for the priests, but it (8½) on the certainty that God is going to bring his people into the promised land, just when they failed so miserably that God has had to place this doom upon them, of a whole generation dying in the wilderness, now he gives them a specific and detailed regulations ^{about} of what's going to happen after they enter the Promised Land. A renewed assurance of the ^{fact} that God is going to carry out his promise and that their children are going to go in. I think that's a very interesting thing that that should be given right at this point, and then b, is Provision Regarding Sins of Ignorance. That is verses 22-31. Where the Lord gives special rules for the people for the cases where they sin through ignorance or through carelessness. This also gives, at the beginning of the wilderness journey, a very important thing for them to recognize, they are sinners, they ~~are~~ ~~been~~ ~~saved~~ continue to be sinners and the sin needs to be repented of as we do, as Christians. We sin, we fall into error, we need to watch for our errors, we need to repent of it, but that God has a provision for our sins (10)

He wants to teach us to get over them entirely eventually, but he is giving us a provision for them as he did then to them. But the passage ends with verse 30 which says But the soul that doeth ought presumptuously, whether he be born in the land, or a stranger, the same reproacheth the Lord, and that soul shall be cut off from among his

people. The presumptuous sin is not included in this provision for sins of ignorance. And then we have an instance.

c, An Instance of Presumptuous Sin. 15:32-36 is an instance of presumptuous sin. This was a man who went out and broke the Sabbath law and was ordered to be stoned to death. They found a man that gathered sticks upon the sabbath day, and they that found him brought him to Moses and Aaron and put him in ward, and the Lord said to Moses, this man shall surely be put to death and all the congregation stoned him. It wasn't that gathering sticks on the sabbath day was such a heinous sin that the man had to be stoned to death (11 $\frac{1}{2}$) it was that this sabbath law had been frequently reiterated, during the wilderness journey, and thousands of people were observing the law around him, it was a case where there could be no ignorance involved in it, it was a clear case of flagrant, presumptuous disobedience to God. And clear cases of that sort must be dealt with or they can introduce a contagion that spreads all through, and so it was not that everyone who had to gather sticks on the sabbath was stoned, nothing of the kind, but that this case was taken as an instance, an example to show the terrible nature of presumptuous sin.

And then, d, The Ribband of Blue. 37-41. The Lord told them, told Moses to tell them to put a fringe on their garments, a ribband of blue, which they would look at and it would remind them of their duty to the Lord and what he had done for them. And it is a good illustration of the importance of object lessons. That the Lord wants us to put things up before us which will remind us of his law, his purposes, of his promises, and of his commands. All this given at the beginning of the long wilderness journey, after they had sinned and are told they're all to die there in the wilderness. That, then, is number 4, Laws After the Crisis.

And then comes number 5, The Great Rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram. Chapter 16: 1-50. And this is a very involved story, and a very --so many different elements enter into it and God deals with them one by one, and the critics try to divide it up into two, say there are two separate stories but actually you can get three or four if you divide that way. But it is a fact that in every true life situation there are various elements

that enter in, and the followers of Krah had certain things, the followers of Dathan and Abiram had other things, they did not necessarily have great sympathy with each other's viewpoints but they were joined together in a common activity at the moment. And it is true of every (14 $\frac{1}{4}$) in life, that there are various factors which enter in. And God deals with the factors often individually.

I remember hearing a man tell me, who was President of a Christian college and he was there 13 years and he tripled the student body of the college, and he tremendously increased its endowment, and he did a great deal for it and then suddenly he was fired. And he told me this, he said, I've never since the day I came here ~~to this college~~ was there a time when there not several groups here who were loudly declaring that I should be fired. But he said, this time they all got together. That is they had different objectives, different viewpoints. He was during those years (15) doing what he thought was right and stepping on many toes, and I know the forces that got him at that time, I was quite (15 $\frac{1}{4}$) with several of them and I saw the viewpoints were absolutely opposite...

O.T. History 194. ($\frac{1}{3}$)

...though their were different, their objectives were different, they strengthened one another by their common opposition. There are many things that are important in this section but it entered into three of your assignments and so we can assume that you are thoroughly familiar with it and go to number 6. The Aftermath of the Rebellion. 17:1 to 19:22. That section involved particularly the reaffirmation of the privileges and responsibilities of Aaron and the Levites. And God caused Aaron's rod to bud in order to show Aaron was God's chosen one for the High Priest, Aaron and his descendants. The ^{prophets} ~~thought~~ did not come of any one family. God ~~can~~ ^{could} call this man, the other man, different persons to be a prophet. He might make a man a prophet a few days, weeks, for a year, or for a lifetime. If a man was a prophet and God chose to use him, ^{if God called him} he might be of any background whatever, but the priesthood which was supposed to perform the ceremonies that show, illustrate, these great truths of God's plan, that had to be kept

in a certain orderly fashion which could only be done by keeping it in one family and passing on some very strict regulations about it, and therefore it's not so much here a matter of exaltation of Aaron as a man as it is the singling out of his family to carry forward that particular aspect of God's plan until the time should come when we knew the facts about Christ and we didn't need so much of form and ceremony to suggest them to the mind. And so there God insisted on this particular arrangement of a family and it wasn't so much Aaron personally as it was Aaron the beginning of his family who was to have this function to perform. Well, we continue there tomorrow morning.

(3 $\frac{1}{2}$) Assignment for Friday. (to 5 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Yesterday we were speaking about number 5, The Great Rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, and we did not take time to go into that in class here, it is a very interesting subject and one replete with lessons, but-if you have studied in two different assignments in the last two weeks and it is included in your paper, in comparing these different rebellions, the material is very interesting, very important to your own spiritual welfare lives, for your own relations to Christian leadership in days to come, and for your own situation, if God puts you in places of leadership in days to come, so it is extremely important material, ^{but material which} ~~so-it-is-extremely~~ you will get more value from if you study it yourself than if I simply were to dictate it to you.

And then number 6, The Aftermath of the Rebellion, that is the result of this rebellion. We learn in it that the Lord vindicated Aaron, his right to the priesthood and the privileges and responsibilities of Aaron and the Levites, and this was not done on the ground that Aaron was a better man than (?) not on the ground of any particular desert on their part, but on the ground of God's divine right to arrange things as he thought best, Justice the receiving of your deserts is something that God works out perfectly in the world to come, but in this world we need not expect, in this world, we are in Satan's world, many will get many good things they don't deserve, many will have suffering far beyond others who would seem to deserve it more. If we are sinners, if we have not accepted Christ, all the suffering we could possibly get in this world is nothing compared to our ^{deserts} ~~deserts~~. And consequently no one who has not accepted Christ can say that he is unfairly treated in this world, because compared to his

sin, compared to his wickedness, he deserves far more than he gets in this world. If a person has accepted the Lord, has become a Christian, then he can be assured that there are tremendous physical blessings for him in the hereafter, and in this world, there are tremendous spiritual blessings for him. There may be physical blessings for him, in fact, in the majority of cases there are. You take any community which has a lot of ordinary people and you change them into Christian people, and over the course of fifty or a hundred years, with very few exceptions, the physical and natural situation improves, and the people are better off in this world's prosperity than they could possibly have been if they had not become Christians. That is not an invariable rule, but it occurs in the majority of cases. But I don't think it is this way is because God blesses them and rewards them for being Christians, that may enter to some extent, but it is more a direct result of the improved character which Christianity gives, because God does not promise us material prosperity. If we truly are his that's not what we're seeking, we are seeking to honor him and to do his will, and to oppose the works of Satan, and sometimes ~~that~~ can do that best by enjoying material prosperity, whereas in other cases we can do it best by tasting of adversity, and God decides which is the way in which we can serve him best. And then there are certain matters in which it is not so vital that the man best prepared do the job, as that the job be done. There might be many who (9 3/4)

but if you have many trying to do it, you have chaos and anarchy and it is necessary that there be a certain assignment of tasks, and this task be done by the one to which it has been given, and that, I believe, was the case of the priesthood. The prophets' work required very particular ability, God picked a prophet here or there, wherever he might see him, and the prophet/^{hood} was rarely passed from a father to a son, very, very rarely. But the priests' work was the matter of an ordinary carrying on of certain prescribed ceremonials which anybody of ordinary decency of character, and ordinary ability could handle, but it was vital that it be carried out as prescribed. And that it be kept in orderly fashion, and therefore the Lord selected a family for it. Not as a reward for special goodness on the part of this family, but simply as a means of carrying it on in orderly fashion. And God prescribed that Aaron's family should be

the ones who did it. And when Korah opposed them, it doesn't say that Korah was the a worse ^{necessarily} man than Aaron because none of the deserved anything good, except through the merits of Christ, but God had assigned this task to Aaron and Korah was not rebelling against Aaron, he was rebelling against God, in his attitude. And so we have now, in this next chapter, the aftermath of this rebellion, is a strong vindication on God's part, of that fact that he had given Aaron the priesthood and given Aaron and the Levites the particular responsibility that they had, and then there is the reproof of the unclean - priest ness resulting from the rebellion in chapter 19. So chapters 18 and 19 are the aftermath of the rebellion, and then,

Number 7, Incidents on the Way to the Plains of Moab. That's a long section, 20:1 to 22:1. It's not so long in the Bible, and that's why we give it only one head, although the Rebellion of Korah actually had two heads, but it is long in the sense that it covers a long space of time, and it is long in the sense that there is a great deal of material involved in it. Yes? (student.12 $\frac{1}{2}$) The pastor today is a different, really a different work, than either one, but I would say that the similarity was greater between ~~the~~ his work and the work of the prophet than that of a priest. I should say it was very much greater but there is a definite part of his work which is like the work of the priest. We believe that the universal priesthood of believers and every believer is a priest and that there is no man who has a right to represent us before God, as the priest did in ancient time. But of course the biggest part of the priest's work wasn't representing the people but carrying out the ceremonies. And there is a certain amount of carrying out of ceremonies which impress people's minds, which is a part of his task today. And in the episcopal church that becomes a very, very large part of his work, but in most of our other churches it is an extremely small part of his work. And there is an interesting thing there, in the episcopal church, in recent years, there has been a great turning aside from the faith. And in the episcopal church, I've gone to an episcopal church and seen ceremonies gone through in which everything suggests the death of Christ, and what he meant for us, and the most beautiful prayers, summarizing our relationship to God and His relationship to us and a service which took of the things of

Christ and put them before us in striking fashion, and have it spoiled by the same man giving a sermon in which he took a strong modernist position or of simply social gospel which practically denied everything he said, and it must be said that for the last 30 years the Anglican church as a whole, even teaching, has laid very, very little stress on Biblical teaching. But it is remarkable how often you come across men who were brought up in the Episcopal Church and had a background of those ceremonies, the most beautiful prayers and all that, and some of it found lodging in their minds, and the Spirit of God later took that which was lodged in their minds and used it to bring them out to a full understanding and knowledge of God's plan and a full relationship with His truth. Now many men whom I know, who are that way, have a great dislike for the episcopal church from which they came, and of course it is true that it fell down badly on the task it should have had of bringing this understanding to them...

O.T.History 195. (continued on next page)

...far rather go to an episcopal church, with forms and ceremonies suggesting the truths of God's Word, and then even if there is a sermon which denies^{it}, than to go to a modernist Baptist or Methodist church, in which you don't have the ceremonies to drive home the truths, but have the sermon that is (3/4) attached to that. ~~denying-the--truth.~~
I don't think God wants either one, but the work of the priest in the ceremony, which is the main thing in the present episcopal services---I don't think should be in Protestant churches in this age, it should not be---but it does have a definite place but not (1/2)

It is more like the work of the prophets. The prophet receives his message from God, gives it to the people. The minister receives the message from God through the Word, and gives it to the people. So he's not identical with the prophet, but the ^{ultimate} ~~only~~ objective is identical with that. Well, the, number 7.

Number 7, The Incidents on the way to the Plains of Moab. It is only two chapters, and it is rather hard to date these two chapters. It starts in with a dating, it says In the first month but it doesn't say what year, and some people say it's the first month of the fortieth year and some people ^{say} it's the first month of the third year, and we do not have absolute proof. I incline personally to think it's the fortieth because of the fact that it comes so far along in the account. Those who put it the third year think it happened before the crisis at Kadesh Barnea. That seems to be not impossible but unlikely. But there is a space of 38 years between the events at Sinai and the arrival at the plains of Moab, and the scripture does not tell us where that 38 year space occurred. Was it before the rebellion of Korah and Abiram, was it after that rebellion? The scripture does not tell and so we do not know. My personal guess is that the rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram was somewhere in the middle of the 38 years, but that's only a guess. In that case the 38 years would come partly before that and partly after that. What we know is that the arrival in the plains of Moab was 40 years after (3)

We know that. And just where these things space we don't know. But we find that in the first month, Miriam died, and does this mean the first month of an early year or a late year? I would think it likely a late year, likely the fourth, but we cannot be dogmatic. But that is a, under 7.
a, The Death of Miriam. I think it most likely, during these 38 years that the people

roamed through the desert, stayed in one place till the forage gave out, then moving to another, and probably they passed through Kadesh several times. But the 38 $\frac{1}{4}$ year wandering began and ended at Kadesh.

Then b is a very interesting subject. b, The Sin of Moses and Aaron. Chapter 20:2-13. And if you would open either your English or your Hebrew Bible to Numbers 20 we will look at this passage. And there was no water for the congregation and they gathered themselves together against Moses and against Aaron. Now this is a rebellion. We've had a number of them of course. You've been dealing with the others in your discussions. And the people chode with Moses and spake, saying, Would God that we had died when our brethren died before the Lord! You'd think why on earth do these people so often say things like this, but when you realize that it's spread over a period of forty years and realize that people who fall into certain (4 3/4) phrases they're apt to fall into them repeatedly, I would simply suggest that when you make an error, when you fall into some sin, when you make some foolish statement, and you regret later what you've done, write it down, write down what you've done, and put down the date, and just watch and see if you don't, within the next forty years, do the same thing perhaps a hundred times instead of maybe ten, the way the Israelites did. Maybe if you write it down once, by about the fifth time you'll be ready to make a positive effort to stop. But people repeat the same things over and over. You'll find it inevitable, you'll find it constantly. And it drives it home to our minds here where we have the forty years condensed together, to see how often similar events happened in their relationship. You will find, if you have a church, you'll find somebody in your congregation who has a problem, he is discouraged, he just can't believe that he, the Lord will save him, he thinks it doesn't look as if it's possible, things are just going wrong. Well, you help him. You're apt to find the same man having the same difficulty, six months later. You're apt to find him having that difficulty over and over. Somebody has a different one. You're apt to find that one repeated over and over. Sometimes it sorely tries your patience, and I'm sure it sorely tried Moses' patience to see these same things that these people said, over and over. And Moses could remind them of God's hand in Egypt, he could remind them how God

delivered them, he could remind them of what God had done to give them water and give them food through the wilderness, and so on, and when they get their eyes on these things their difficulties seem small and they're ready to forget them, but then they come back, and it's the same with the people with whom you deal and it's the same with ourself. We want to learn what our difficulties are and bring them to the Lord and get them settled, instead of pushing them aside and then going through the same thing over and over, without ever realizing. But here the people said this, why have you brought the congregation ~~alone~~ ^{of the Lord} up into the wilderness that we and our cattle should die there? And wherefore have ye made us come out of Egypt, to bring us into this evil place? It's no place of seed, or of figs, or of vines, or of pomegranates: neither is there any water to drink. And Moses' ~~and~~ patience must have been sorely tried with all the times they had talked this way after all the Lord had done for them. It's very easy to say, oh, those Israelites in the wilderness, weren't they terrible, how superior we are to them, how we look back and look and say how we never would've been that way. Chances are we are exactly that way, now, except for the grace of God. And the people with whom we have to deal are exactly that way. The person who himself is most that way is apt to be the one who is most impatient when God puts him in a position of authority with others, when they show this sort of attitude. Moses wasn't that way. Moses was a very humble man, a meek man, a very patient man, when everybody turned against him, when God was going to destroy the people, time and again Moses interceded for them before the Lord, said, Lord, blot me out of your book but spare this people, bring them up. Time and again, Moses did that. But Moses simply lost his patience, as any human being would, and Moses and Aaron ~~went~~, went from the presence of the assembly unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and they fell upon their faces; and the glory of the Lord appeared unto them. And the Lord spake to Moses, saying, Take the rod, and gather thou the assembly together, thou, and Aaron thy brother, and speak ye unto the rock before their eyes: and it shall give forth his water, and thou shalt bring forth to them water out of the rock: so thou shalt give the congregation and their beasts drink. God said to Moses, speak to the rock before their eyes. And so shalt thou give

the congregation and their beasts drink. You notice God said, so shalt thou give. Of course, Moses knew that that meant, so will you be the instrument for God to give the congregation and their beasts drink. And Moses took the rod from before the Lord, and he commanded him, and Moses and Aaron gathered the congregation together before the rock, and he said to them, Hear now, ye rebels, must we fetch you water out of this rock? And Moses lifted up his hand, and with his rod he smote the rock twice: and the water came out abundantly, and the congregation drank, and their beasts also. And the Lord said to Moses and Aaron, because ye believed me not, to sanctify me in the eyes of the children of Israel, therefore ye shall not bring this congregation into the land which I have given them. There was God's rebuke to Moses and Aaron. Because ye believed me not to sanctify me in the eyes of the children of Israel, therefore ye shall not bring this congregation into the land which I have given them. What had Moses done? God said speak to the rock before their eyes and it shall give forth water and thou shalt bring forth the water out of the rock. Moses said to the people, Hear, you rebels, must we fetch you water out of this rock, and lifted up his hand and with his rod he smote the rock twice and the water came out abundantly. Now if you are dealing with electrical things, and you pull the right switch, the machinery begins to work. But if you pull the wrong switch or touch it the wrong way, you may get a shock and be badly injured, instead of accomplishing the things you wanted. You have to know just how to handle it. I^I went into a big electrical installation and started in to try to make the thing go, very soon I probably would have a bad shock, and yet I might be a better man morally than the grained electrician who ^{would go} was in there and do it without being injured. Is this a situation like that? Is this a situation where if Moses had only done it a little different way, he smote that rock twice, now suppose he struck it once, then he would have been all right, wouldn't he? But he made a mistake and struck it twice. I think that is a very easy mistake for us to make about the scriptures. The scripture gives certain ceremonies which are to be done exactly so, but it always makes it very clear. If they are ceremonies, if they are vital, they are done in this way. That is comparatively (11 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Ordinarily, what God deals with is the spirit and attitude of people. It is

our spiritual attitude, ~~of-see~~ it is not a matter of precise details of wording or form. In this case, God did not say smite the rock at all. Well, then, is it wrong if Moses smote the rock. Previously God had said smite the rock, and it will bring forth water. Why did Moses smite it ~~twice~~ instead of once? I think the reason is perfectly evident, it was his patience giving way. He was filled with emotion. Hear, ye rebels, must we bring water for you out of the rock. Moses thought, these people, all the things God had done for them and still they're rebelling, still they're murmuring. Here they can't trust God to bring them water, God loves them, God won't let them starve, he'll supply water, and yet they come and murmur this way. Hear, ye rebels, must we bring water to you out of the rock, and he brings down his rod and he hits it hard twice. It's the expression of the emotion. And God says, Moses you should have shown forth to these people the patience of God. You should have shown to them the character of the loving God, that looks at their weakness and realizes their infirmities, realizes their sin, but brings them the provision for it, and gives the glory to God for it. Must we bring you water. Well, God said so shalt thou bring water. Moses did bring water, but he brought it (13) and he should've sanctified God, he should've given God the glory. Moses failed at his strongest point. How easy it is for us, when we're with somebody else, to feel uncertain, and think oh I don't need to help this man in this regard, he's stronger than I am in this regard. I can just let myself go and relax here, I don't need to try to help him, he may be having a struggle on that very point, when you could give him a word of help, but instead of that you just take for granted his strength, and you become the straw that broke the camel's back in leading him to fail at his strongest point. And Moses failed at his strongest point. And what was his strongest point? His humility. His recognition of God's power as being everything, and his power as being nothing. His absolute subjection to God and his sanctifying God all through is a matter which has never been surpassed, or even attained perhaps by any other person who has ever lived. But I-fear here, in Moses' strongest point, Moses failed, and God said you have not sanctified me and I am not going to permit you to take the people into the land. Well, now that is certainly sin, and it is failure, failure in patience, failure to give God the

glory, (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

assumption

that he was giving the water instead of God, and that is not a word in the passage to suggest anything else. While we're on that, please turn to Numbers 27. In Numbers 27 we read, verse 12, and the Lord said to Moses, get thee up into this mount Abarim, and see the land which I have given to the children of Israel. And when thou hast seen it, thou also shalt be gathered unto thy people.

O.T.History 196. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

as Aaron thy brother was gathered. For ye rebelled against my commandment in the desert of Zin, in the strife of the congregation, to sanctify me at the water before their eyes: that is the water of Meribah in Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin. And then Moses goes on there and his whole heart is for the people. He does not complain of God's judgment, he doesn't object to it, he simply asks that God shall appoint a proper shepherd to take his place. There's nothing more there about his sin. In Deuteronomy 32:48-52, And the Lord spake unto Moses that selfsame day, saying, Get thee up into this mountain Abarim, unto mount Nebo, which is over against Jericho, and behold the land of Canaan, which I give to the children of Israel for a possession: and die in the mount whither thou goest up, and be gathered to thy people, as Aaron thy brother died in mount Hor, and was gathered unto his people: because ye trespassed against me among the children of Israel at the waters of Meribah-Kadesh, in the wilderness of Zin: because ye sanctified me not in the midst of the children of Israel. Yet thou shalt see the land before thee: but thou shalt not go thither unto the land which I give the children of Israel. And then in chapter 34 we read how he went up into the mountain and he looked at the land across into Palestine, and then he died there. Well, these are the passages which tell about Moses' sin. And there's not a single word in one of them that says anything about whether he struck the rock once or twice or no time. The striking of the rock was an expression of the emotion within him. It was not itself a thing of vital significance. God said speak to the rock, on previous occasions God had said strike the rock, on previous occasions he had struck the rock and the water came out. This time he spoke to the people and he struck the rock and the water came out. It was identical this time

with the previous time. Yes? (student.2 3/4) If Moses had had a right attitude in this case, he would not have, and still have smote the rock twice, I doubt if he would've smitten it twice if he had a right attitude. Because I think the smiting of it twice was the emotional feeling expressing itself, and I don't think he would've expressed it that way. I think the smiting of it was an expression of his feelings, I don't think it in itself (3 1/2)

. Mr. Deshpande? (student.3 1/2) All of the good things that we have come from Christ. Christ is the rock that followed the children of Israel in the wilderness. He's the rock in whom they found protection, he's the rock from whom they received their nourishment, he is similarly the manna, and he says in John I am the bread that came down from heaven, and he is similarly the brazen serpent which is lifted up that they may be saved through him. Whether the additional point that the rock was smitten is intended of the Lord as a symbol of Christ being smitten on Calvary and our blessings flowing from that, I don't recall whether there is any passage in the Word of God that draws that particular picture, but I'm sure the children of Israel on this occasion would not have thought that. They would get that picture from the sacrifice which represented what God was going to do for them, they would get it from some other things when it's pointed out to them, but here where they are filled with their thirst, and they are in this ^{terrible} situation there, their rebellion, and Moses said God is going to bring you water, I am sure they were thinking of God's provision of water, I don't think they were thinking of atonement for sin then. It's a figure which might conceivably be used somewhere but it certainly would be in prominent place, the figure of Christ as the manna or of Christ as the brazen serpent would be a much more prominent one because a much more easily understood one, and the figure of Christ in the tabernacle would be much more suited to them. Yes? (student.5 1/4) God said speak to the rock and Moses spoke to the people instead of the rock. He smote instead of speaking to it, but on previous occasions God had said smite the rock and he had done that. There were two cases, one or two before, where they didn't have water, God said smite the rock, Moses smote the rock, water came. Now in this case, he gets up there, he stands before the rock, he looks at the rock, he holds his rod, the people are there, he's all excited, now he says, now here we are a

third time, just like the other two, I should smite this rock and bring water out. No, that's not right, he didn't say smite this time, did he, he said speak this time, I shouldn't smite the rock, I should just speak to the rock, well now is that right, did he say smite or speak, and he'd try to remember what were the exact words and if he remembered them wrong, God's going to punish him. I mean, I don't think that's the figure at all. (student. 6 $\frac{1}{4}$) Yes, but I doubt if that is a type of Christ, I doubt ~~that~~ very much. (student. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$) The rock was following them in the wilderness, yes. But the rock is a type of Christ, just as the brazen serpent is a type of Christ and the manna is a type of Christ, there are many things that are a type of Christ! But whether the particular thing of smiting would be to the people then/as a type of Christ, I really question it. But to us now. So that for us, now, as a type, we could be given, if Moses would carry out the directions in the new command, but if he made a mistake and carried out the directions in the previous directions instead of that one, then he got this terrible punishment. Hardly seems in line with God's normal being, does it? Yes? (student. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$) No, it doesn't say that, it says he was punished because he did not sanctify God before the people, that's the phrase that's used (7 $\frac{3}{4}$) (student.) No, but to the expression of his emotions. (student) I don't think that sanctify would be the word for that. Now there's a matter in which there might be variations of interpretation, that word sanctify. My own impression is that the word sanctify means, what is that phrase there, he says in chapter 20 here, he says, because ~~he~~ believed me not, ~~he~~ sanctified me in the eyes of the children of Israel, to sanctify me, does that mean to watch out and not, of course, the directions were not to smite the rock at all, there's nothing in the directions about smiting the rock at all, the directions are speak. Yes? (student. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$) I don't think it was the fact of his speaking to the people, I think it's the way he spoke to them. He says, hear now, ye rebels, must we bring you water? I think if he had said to the people, if he had said to the people, now as on previous occasions, you are losing faith in the goodness of God. God's always given you water before, don't you think he's going to give it now? God is not going to let you die of thirst, or your cattle either. God has a provision for you. God is going

to supply. Now see this rock here. God has revealed to me that he is going to bring water out of the rock. Now in that case whether God meant him to smite it and a little touch might have made it come or whether God would have increased the force back of it so that it would have burst out at that instant without a touch, I don't know. But I'm quite certain that it was the attitude he showed to the people which sanctified God or failed to sanctify God, rather than the particular detail of what he did. Yes? (student.

10) God (10 $\frac{1}{4}$) a lot of rebels. Certainly

(student.) It is not a crystal clear thing. I think we must say that. It is not a crystal clear thing. But it would seem to me that one thing we can be tolerably sure of is, that it was Moses taking a certain part at least of the glory from God for himself, of the credit to himself, instead of giving the whole glory to God. You did not sanctify me before the eyes of the people. That that is the principal first catastrophe. It seems to me that that must be important. It seems to me that the impatience and the general attitude shown is (11)

Beyond that I can't go, but I can say this, that it does not seem to me to be God's character, after Moses has led the people for forty years and has done so many things that no other man in all history has done, and been true to God so marvelously in so many, many ways, and has served God so wonderfully and shown such humility and such patience, that God would now say if you don't follow the precise exact words that I've given you, in the precise exact form it's to be done, but you vary it a little bit, you're going to get terribly punished. The reason must be something other than that, ^{I would think} very definitely. Mr. Decker? (student. 11 3/4)

In order that he might show, yes, show his complete faith in God by watching the new directions carefully. We had a meeting two weeks ago, there was a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Independent Board, and we have met for years in the office of the Board down on Walnut Lane. I was talking to the General Secretary, and he said we're going to save you time this time. I had told him I had to be back for class, I couldn't stay very long. He said we'll meet in the home, which is about three miles further up in Germantown, we'll meet in the home, and there we will meet and we'll have part of the meeting around the luncheon table. We'll eat together and that way we'll save time. Well,

I got the notice from them, that it would be at the Independent Board Home at that time. I went there, I was there the 27th, I said, am I the last one to get here (I ^{guess I} was two minutes late), or the first one? Well, two minutes later another one came. We waited there, and then we got a phone call, and I think the other five or six, every one of them went to the office, though the directions said the Home. But everybody went to the place they were accustomed to going and had to be told to come up here, and we lost time instead of saving it. Simply because, in planning the meeting, it had not been realized the inertia of human beings, even very effective, very successful human beings, in noting a change in their ~~1/4~~ (14)

Now, to say that had Moses done the thing in a precise way (14)

then to

say, now you speak to the rock, and then, look at here, you didn't do this the way I said, but a different way, well, why didn't you tell me, why didn't you underline it in red, why didn't you make a special postscript, why didn't you make (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

I'd be more careful then. But to say, now, this is a sin that results in your (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

I think in

a young ² person it might be a very good thing, to change the directions slightly and then you'd be sure to do ~~it~~ the other way and not follow (14 $\frac{3}{4}$)

and then give a fairly sharp discipline in order to impress ^{him that he should} on ~~them~~-to be very, very careful in observing the right...

O.T.History 197. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...well, now, there is one more thing I think we should say about this, why is this in scripture here, why did this happen? Why-d There are two, you might say, general ideas. One, which I don't think is expressed in people's minds but perhaps is in them to some extent, is this: Moses sinned, proved himself wrong, deserves tremendous punishment, he gets it. Just the bald facts. Now there's an element to that, just the bald facts, that way. It certainly is a tremendous change from the general ^{picture we have of} ~~principles-on-which~~ Moses.

Now the second idea, God wanted to show a type, that Moses would strike the rock once,

that would represent Christ. Now Moses struck the rock twice, that ruins the type, therefore we've got to punish Moses ~~for~~ ^{and} lett~~ing~~ him be killed and not ~~have~~ ^{do} the wonderful (1 $\frac{1}{2}$) things he wants, because he wrecked the type. Well, we should explain the type (1 $\frac{1}{2}$) in such a case, Make it clear to him, so he won't make any mistake about it, so that it will be plain what (1 3/4)

rather than bring a big punishment to him. I believe that the true explanation is to be sought in a different direction, and that is this, that Moses, up to this point, had been pictured in the scriptures, as he was, as such an outstanding, such a, so loyal to God, so true, so humble, so efficient, so much of all the virtues you could ever ask, leading the people wonderfully, standing alone against them when necessary, interceding for them, blot me out of your book, spare this people--the wonderful character of Moses, that it would be very easy thing for people to make a sort of a god of Moses, to make a great saint out of Moses, and take him as ^{is} a perfectly natural, consider him as a sort of man that never lived on earth, except the Lord Jesus Christ, the most perfect man that ever lived. Well, it would be very easy to get the impression that Moses is a perfect and almost to put him in the place of God. Like Mohammedanism is the religion of Mohammed, Mohammed is a prophet of Allah, yes, but Mohammed is in the center. Where it would be very easy for Judaism to have Moses in the center, and brought up on Moses' great deeds, on Moses' wonderful character, taking him as an example, put him in a place almost like God. The Lord did not wish that to happen. The Lord wanted it to be very clear, that though Moses was a great and good man, one of the finest men that ever lived, yet he was a sinner like ourselves, a man of flesh and blood, a man who committed error, a man who deserved to die, as we all do, and therefore, instead of his life ending in a great festival of jubilation over the wonderful things Moses has done in leading the people out, in carrying them thus far, and all of the wonderful eulogies that we're apt to say about a grand old man who's had a great life (3 3/4)

instead of that, it ends with punishment for sin on Moses to offset this. That is to prevent that very real danger of the idolatry of a man, of putting a man in a position which, if any man who ever lived deserved it, Moses did. But no man deserves

it. And secondly, I think that there was this in it. That Moses, his eye was not abated, his ~~eye~~ was still clear, his natural strength was not abated, as we read at the end of Deuteronomy. He was an old man but strong and vigorous and Moses felt oh I want to take these people into the land of Canaan. I want to lead them in and conquer the land and do this great work that must be done. But Moses had done his work. It was necessary to have a younger man for this work. It was necessary now to turn him out (4 $\frac{1}{2}$), Moses was getting old, his temper was shorter than it used to be. He just didn't have the physical strength he used to have, even though outwardly he seemed to, he didn't have the nerve force he used to have. Moses needed to be replaced by a younger man, and this failure on his part, which may have been due to quite an extent, from the tiredness of the long strain of all these years and all he'd gone through, this failure on his part, was evidence to him and to the world of the fact that he was not the man to lead the people, that they needed another man. It's, to my mind, it is part of God's plan for these reasons I've mentioned, to replace Moses by the man who is God's choice for this other work, though Moses has done these works in a way that perhaps no man that ever lived could have done them. And to ruin any possibility of people idolizing Moses, or putting him on a pedestal when he should not be on one, by making the fact that he was a sinner like other human beings ^{be} prominent at the end of his life. And clearly put out before them. No, you have sinned, you have not sanctified me as you should, you cannot lead the people into the Promised Land. It's all part of God's plan. And I believe that Moses right today is ~~grateful~~ ^{praising} the Lord for his good sense. He's recognizing his sins and his weaknesses that he has like all of us, he's praising the Lord for saving him as he couldn't have been saved, as none of us could have been saved, except for the Lord's salvation. He's also praising him for this part of the plan in making his sin become evident in this way, in connection with his death, in such a way as to be a help in saving people from that danger which they might so easily have fallen into.

Martin Luther, when he was on his deathbed, said, destroy all my works, read the Bible, don't read what Martin Luther wrote. Martin Luther, the last thing in the world

he wanted was to have churches named after him. He wanted them named after Christ, he wanted them to follow Christ. But within forty years after Martin Luther's death, he was made such a saint to many of his followers that if you varied by two words from what they figured Martin Luther had taught, you might be thrown into the dungeon, or even be hanged. He was made an absolute standard among a great part of the church in Germany, and while most of what Martin Luther said was good, and it was a wonderful thing for Germany to have his teaching, yet at this point the church erred very, very badly. Calvin, John Calvin, was great afraid because of the way, towards his death, the people of Geneva would take anything he'd say, and in fact there were leaders all over Europe who would ask his advice about most anything, and whatever Calvin said that was the last word, and Calvin was afraid that they might make him into a sort of a saint, so when he was on his deathbed, he secretly gave orders that when he died, his body should be taken out in the middle of the night and buried with only two or three people knowing where it was. So nobody knows, there's a place in Geneva today with a big monument to Calvin, called his grave but nobody knows where it is. It was put up a hundred or more years after his death. Nobody knows where he was buried, because he was afraid of this danger. And if there was that danger with Luther and Calvin, far more with Moses, because Moses accomplished a work which at least in the eyes of the world was far greater than they did. And it was part of God's plan, to do it this way. It wasn't that Moses was a greater sinner than ^{other} ~~most~~ people, because he was probably a less sinner than most people that ever lived, but he was a sinner before God and deserved eternal death, and God wanted that fact given, and God wanted to make it clear even to Moses, that he was not the man to lead the people into Canaan.

And so, now you will find people in almost any church you go into, you may find people who are very, very strict on this. Here was Moses great sin, he smote the rock twice, that ruined the type, he should have done it once. Now personally, I don't think that's the reason, but there are people who get very excited about it, and it's very, very easy to go into a church and find somebody very excited about that and think that your greatest duty in life is to clarify their idea, to change them on that, and

I think that's an utter mistake. It is, I think that is a comparatively minor foible and I believe that it is very, very foolish to make a ~~see~~ fight about such things. But I think that in the course of time, to bring people to an understanding of the great principles of the scripture instead of the little details, that God makes his actions in accordance with his doing people a favor. And I don't think you want to come head on on any one point about it, but to ~~win~~^{bring} them gradually to an understanding. I've known two or three graduates of this seminary who, having gotten what I thought was a thoroughly trained sane attitude toward the Bible, and getting out into a church where they had a number of very godly, earnest people, who were very hepped on certain word-for-word systems which I think were in error in certain points, but who thought that was the big thing (10½)

And I think they made a big mistake. The great thing is to present Christ, and His atonement, and what blessings we have through him, that is the thing that we're there for, and we are gradually to lead them into attitudes of interpretation which will result in their getting greater blessings from the scripture than they did before. Well, this new schedule, I'm always forgetting that class ends at quarter after, so we only have another 30 seconds. So I'll give you that thirty seconds...

(11 3/4) We have nine empty seats on the first two rows, and nine people back of Mr. Jaggard, what a coincidence that is.

We were speaking about the Wilderness Journey, and under that we're on 7 which covers a rather large amount of material but probably all incidents that were on the way, the final trip probably from Kadesh, when they left (13) and headed over toward the plains of Moab. And so we mentioned shall a, The Death of Miriam, and then b, The Sin of Moses and Aaron, not just of Moses, but of Moses and Aaron who are together involved in this. Moses struck the rock but Aaron died as well as Moses. They are together in it and they are together punished for it. It is their attitude, it would seem to me (13½)

ways, there are other things that happened that some of us might think were worse than this, perhaps they were, but this was not their greatest sin but the point at which the Lord showed

chose to make an example of these two men, to show that they, though great leaders, were also sinful human beings. We looked ahead at the other passages that touched on this, and then, the next matter (14) dealt with in this area here

is c, Edom's Refusal to allow Passage Through the Land. 20:14-21. You've read it in connection with your assignments, and I merely mention it now, point it out (14¹)

And then d, The Death of Aaron. 20:22-29...

O.T.History 198. (1¹/₂)

...and then e, The Victory Over Arad. 21:1-3. Thirty-eight years earlier there had been the attack on the Israelites after the death of the spies. Now this defeat is avenged and some of the Canaanites destroyed, at the start of the march toward the plains of Moab, the Lord gives them this earnest of the eventual conquest of Canaan.

Then f, The Incident of the Brazen Serpent. 21:4-9. This is a very interesting incident. It's interesting that today that area through which they went is still an area infested with serpents. On this way between Sinai and the plains of Moab, there's an area there you pass through, T. E. Lawrence describes it in his book, THE SEVEN PILLARS OF WISDOM, I don't know how many of you have read THE SEVEN PILLARS OF WISDOM, it was quite a famous book not so long ago, oh I guess it was twenty years now, isn't it, he was a leader in the first world war in rousing the Arabs against the Turks and he went out and conducted guerilla warfare leading the Arabs and as a young man he had started to write a book on the verse in Proverbs, Wisdom has built her house, she has erected her seven pillars; he didn't get very far in it, so now he decided to use that title for an account of his war experiences, so he called it THE SEVEN PILLARS OF WISDOM, and he only printed I think about a thousand copies or less for his close friends, and wouldn't let anybody else see it, but in order to make some money, he issued an abridged edition which he called I believe THE WAR IN ARABIA or some such title. Lowell Thomas made him famous, went all over the world lecturing about him. And ~~if~~ this abridged edition was published but after his death, the other was made available to the public, and it's an extremely interesting book about the war in the desert there, and his experiences and I

think well worth anybody's reading for the insight it gives there into that section of the near east. But in it I was very much impressed with one incident where he was going through this area. He said ^{as} they camped at night he said every morning the first who would get up would get up very, very gently and watch closely that he didn't dislodge a serpent that might be lying right next to him because during the night the serpents in that area ~~would~~ ^{for warmth} come up and would lie right next to them who were camping there, stretch out right next to them, and of course if you turned over suddenly and aroused it and excited it and scared it, it might bite you, and they did lose some men through that, so the first one that got up would get up very, very gently and easily and then he'd go and take a big pole and he'd come and pole the serpents away from the edge of the other men so they could get up too, and it was quite an experience they had coming through there and they had a very vivid picture of the situation in this region into which the Israelites came. When we read that the Lord sent fiery serpents among them, as a punishment for their murmuring, and then the Lord used it in order to give an object lesson. He told Moses to make a serpent of brass and put it up on a pole, and the Lord gave them the instruction that when any one of them was bit by one of the serpents if they'd look up at this serpent of brass on the pole, the Lord would heal them. And of course it was an object lesson of the way in which ~~the~~ ^{through} faith in God's provision they would be healed from sin. Later on, the brazen serpent became an object of worship, it was a wonderful thing, what God used as an object lesson for his, to show this lesson of God's providence, but it became an object of worship and like any ~~thing~~ ^{symbol of} that God ~~used~~ truth, it can become harmful if what is supposed to be in a secondary place gets the primary place. You can even take a glorious (5) or a fine aspect of God's truth and put it in the primary position and it can become an object of harm. And we know that this happened because in 2 Kings 18:4, we read that Hezekiah took the serpent of brass and destroyed it and broke it in pieces to keep it from being misused. The thing was right in itself but it was becoming misused, anything can be misused. And this was, and so he had to destroy it, it had become a snare, a source of injury instead of a beautiful symbol. And that is so

often true in religious history. Something that starts out as a wonderful source of good, it has its use perverted and it becomes an instrument of evil. Then the sad thing is that people, after seeing the evil of that, so often will attach the idea of the evil to the particular thing instead of to its misuse. We had a man right in our chapel, a man who was a member of our faculty at the time, who was referring to a church once, and he said you know it was the sort of a church where they burn candles. Well, what's wrong with burning candles. He said this is a church where they had evensong. What's wrong with having evensong and burning candles. Both of them can be helpful, they can be an aid to our service to the Lord, but they can be so misused as to become evil. When they are we have to drop them, but we can use most anything for the service of God, if it is used rightly.

Now this serpent of brass, of all things, you wouldn't think could be misused, but it shows how terribly it was misused, and yet it remains a vital part of the history and people forgot the fact that it was misused and destroyed, it was mentioned in Kings but it wasn't nearly as widely known as the story of its actual good use, and so it was possible for our Lord to take this, which had become misused and had to be destroyed, it was possible for him to take and to use it as a symbol of himself. He said, as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but have eternal life. John 3:14, leading up to that wonderful summary of the gospel in John 3:16. Here we have an interesting illustration, too, of the nature of types and symbols. What is this a symbol of? It's a symbol of the fact that Jesus becomes sin for us, that he who knew no sin becomes sin for us. So the serpent there, the brazen serpent stands for the sin laid on Jesus. It hardly stands for Jesus, to compare him to a serpent, to compare him to that which bit them, that which destroyed them, would certainly be ridiculous. He is not like the serpent, but the sin which is laid on him is like the serpent, and as the serpent was lifted up, even so the sin of man must be lifted up, that the sin be placed on him, and the sin is represented by the serpent, but it is not the sin we look to, it is the Christ we look to, it's an illustration of the fact that you cannot expect a figure to be exact-

ly identical with the thing it represents. A figure represents a thing in one way, it may in two, it may in three, it may in four, but rarely does it in more than four, and usually not more than in one or two. A figure takes one aspect of a thing and drives it home to the material. So let's not try to make the figures walk on all fours, because they ^{usually} ~~simply~~ won't, they will be deceptive and misleading if we try to take them that way. So this incident in the wilderness was a very important thing to the people, their being delivered by the brazen serpent, and it's a wonderful illustration to us of how we can too be delivered from all of the miseries of life through the Lord Jesus Christ, and it is a wonderful example of more than that, not merely of Christ's sacrificial death for us but of the central Protestant doctrine of salvation by faith alone. There was nothing these people did, absolutely nothing, they just looked at the serpent. They could not earn their freedom from it, they could not earn their deliverance from the serpent's bite, all they could do was just look, in faith, to the God who provided deliverance. And that of course is the central theme which Luther stressed in the beginning of the Reformation, a thought that has been known to all true Christians through the ages, but perhaps was never so physically stressed as it was by Luther then. And it certainly is very, very clearly taught in this picture right here. Then

Then, g. The March around Moab. 21:10-20. Instead of crossing Moab they go clear around. The results were that they asked the Moabites to let them through as they asked the Edomites, and when they refused they went around. There are cases where, in life, we should force our way through obstacles, there are many cases where we should do that, regardless of the outcome, for the sake of the Lord's work we must force our way through, and let nothing stop us. But there are other cases, like the cases of Edom and Moab, where an obstacle is in the way and the thing to do is to go around the obstacle, rather than to waste our time in fighting over secondary issues, to go around it, to leave it for a time, it may be necessary to deal with it sometimes, it may have to be dealt with later, but if we're going to clear every obstacle out of our way, we'll never get to the basic thing, to the main thing. The Lord wants us to use strategy and prayerful thinking in what we do. That is a thing you'll find in all kinds of Christian work, in

anything you'll do, you'll find too many people who have some minor thing that they're so aroused about that they forget the big things on account of these minor things, or perhaps things that aren't so minor, but that are not the major things. I've known men who were so strong in their Calvinistic convictions that they could recognize an Arminian three blocks away, and yet could walk right straight up to a modernist and not see anything wrong with him. I've known people who could do that. They were real Christians, they were earnest Christians, and their effort, I believe, was true on the truth they were stressing, but they were stressing it out of proportion, and the result was that with this disproportionate stress upon a secondary thing they came not to put the stress they should on the primary thing. I've known many people who were exactly that way. I think the Lord wants us to guard against (12 $\frac{1}{2}$)

that is a secondary thing. There are times when we must push on things, times when we must fight them right straight through, but we want to be mighty sure it is such a time before we divert our energies from the main thing for the sake of the secondary thing. And so we have long tiresome marches around Edom and around Moab, instead of going across. Rather than meet this secondary issue now when it is God's will that they should go around.

Then, h, Victory over Sihon. Here was a king who was reigning over the southern part of the area, the southern part of the northern half of the area across Bashan, an area that formerly had belonged to Moab but had been conquered by Sihon not long before, and the area beyond it that he had owned before that. He was asked to grant passage and refused and came with an army against Israel and this time the Israelites attacked. He was differently placed than Edom and Moab. They could be gone around, he could not. To go around him meant to ~~go~~ give up your ⁽⁴⁷⁾ plan of reaching your objective, and they attacked him and destroyed him and conquered his territory. It was their first real conquest of territory. Victory Over Sihon, 21:21-32. They could have stopped at Edom or Moab and could have spent five years here, conquering those territories, but God directed them to go around them, but with Sihon they stopped and conquered.

Then i, (not a capital I which is built like a Roman (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) but a small i which is quite insignificant), Victory over Og, King of Bashan. 21:33-35,

A fine territory north of the River the region of pastureland, the region a region which has been one of the most fertile and valuable sections of Palestine at many times in its history and at other times it has been practically deserted...

O.T.History 199. (1¹/₂)

...and great attractiveness but such a drawback that more than makes up for it. And that drawback in the world of peace would not be a real one, but in the condition the world has usually been in it was a real drawback, and that was that it had no natural (3/4)

It was a territory just about impossible to defend. And these cities with these big walls, and these big strong gates and so on, were necessary over there because there was no natural frontier. It edges out into the wilderness and how far it's fertile depends on how much rain comes at any particular time. It's the finest part of Palestine, the most fertile ^{and} in many ways the best, but not a defensible section, and consequently there is a great civilization there which has not lasted long, but has been destroyed. And Og's civilization had not been continuing very long, before the Israelites came, they conquered it, and now they had the whole area across the Jordan in their hands,

And so we come to j, Arrival in the Plains of Moab. Here they have conquered Trans-Jordan, that is the area just across the Jordan, edging up to the desert, they have conquered that, but the Jordan River is between them and Canaan proper. This is the arrival in the plains of Moab, and yet under our section of the Wilderness Journey, we have two more parts that I'm going to include. This finished j, under 7, under D.

And so we go on to E. D, was From Sinai to the Plains of Moab. They have now reached the Plains of Moab, but there is a bit more before the actual conquest of Canaan, so we include this in the Wilderness Journey.

E, The Balaam Incident. It's an interesting interruption to the main narrative. We suddenly introduce a man we haven't heard of before, and yet we find him to be a worshipper of God, we find him knowing the Lord, calling him by his covenant name, the LORD. And we are introduced to a situation which the Israelites could have learned of only by hearsay because they had no direct contact, but it is a very interesting section,

and one which in the Christian circles, as a whole, is not properly understood. And so I asked you to turn in to me a statement on this, in which I asked you, two or three, I asked you two distinct questions, in other words, four categories. List all evidence that could be used to show that Balaam was (1) a true prophet, (2) a false prophet (3) a good man, and (4) a bad one. Now to many people, prophets and good men are synonymous. That is to say they don't think necessarily that every good man is a prophet but they think that a prophet is necessarily just about a perfect man, and we're nowhere told that a prophet was a perfect man, there never was a perfect man except the Lord Jesus Christ. But what is a prophet? Well, it's interesting that our explanation of what a prophet is is given us in the scripture according ^{to} the law of second occurrence, we find the second occurrence of the word prophet gives us a very clear idea of exactly what it means. I say second occurrence because the first occurrence tells us nothing about the word. The first occurrence is where God says to ^{was it} Pharaoh or Abimelech, he says Abraham is a prophet and he will ~~favor~~ (4¹) pray for you. And all we learn from it is that Abraham is a man whose prayers count with God. And we don't know anything ^{more} about what a prophet is. But the second occurrence of the word prophet is in Exodus 7:1. There was only one occurrence of the word in Genesis. In Exodus 7:1 we have the second occurrence of the word prophet. Well, first before mentioning that let me call your attention to the fact that the present-day idea of prophet is not a scriptural idea, if somebody today says a man is a prophet they mean, in secular life, he is able to predict the future. And that is not the Biblical idea of a prophet, we have prophets in the Bible who did practically no predicting of the future. A prophet is the only man who can correctly predict the future, and therefore it's easy for the transition to be made from the prophet to a predictor of the future. But the prediction of the future is only a part of the prophet's work and not even a necessary part. Well, what then is a prophet? Well, this tells us right here. The word is used figuratively, and yet the figure shows exactly what it is, and the Lord said unto Moses see I have made thee a god to Pharaoh. Was Moses a god? Certainly not. Well, what does it mean then, I have made thee a god to Pharaoh? He meant he had put Moses in a position like the position of a god. He put him

in a position where Pharaoh would recognize him as possessed of tremendous power, as a factor, that Pharaoh who claimed to be the god of Egypt, Pharaoh had to recognize him, to reckon with him. Have made thee a god to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet. That means Aaron is in a position, not that Aaron was a prophet, but that Aaron was in a position in relation to Moses, that a prophet would be in relation to God. And in fact, I believe it was in chapter 4, the same thing was told in more literal language. Without the use of the figure of speech of God and the Prophet. We find it in chapter 4 verse 10, Moses said to the Lord, I can't speak, I'm not eloquent, I can't go and do this work for you. And the Lord said I'm perfectly able to make you able to speak, Moses said, oh Lord, send by the hand of whom you will. And the anger of the Lord was kindled, and he said, is not Aaron the Levite thy brother? I know that he can speak well. Behold he comes to meet thee and when he sees thee he will be glad in his heart and thou shalt speak unto him and put words in his mouth, and I will be with thy mouth and with his mouth, and will teach you what you shall do and he shall be thy spokesman unto the people. He shall be to thee instead of a mouth, and thou shalt be to him instead of God. And over, in relation to Pharaoh, Moses is in the place of a god to Pharaoh, and Aaron in the place of a prophet. It makes it perfectly clear that a prophet is one who is a spokesman for a god. A prophet is a mouthpiece for God. A prophet is one whom God uses to express his ideas, to pass on his ideas, he is God's mouthpiece. What is a prophet. Well, now, that I think is made thoroughly clear here, in this use. Now, if a prophet then speaks as God's mouthpiece, it stands to reason that he's the only man who can predict the future correctly because no one but God knows it. No one else can predict it correctly. And since God can predict the future correctly, and there are many things which he might say in which it would be a useful thing to give some prediction of the future, therefore, it is quite natural to expect a certain amount of prediction of the future from a prophet. And it has developed into a modern idea that that's what a prophet is, a man who predicts the future. But ⁱⁿ the Bible a prophet is a man who speaks for God.

Now the modernists like to say, a prophet is not a foreteller but a forthteller. And this is one of those statements which we every now and then find, which the

Modernists make, which is a correct statement but which as they use it leads to wrong interpretation of emphasis. When they say that he is not a foreteller but a forthteller they are right, that the essence of a prophet is not one who predicts the future but one who speaks out the message that God gives, one ~~who~~ is a forthteller, but if he speaks for God then if ~~he~~ is entirely right to expect that God may choose to foretell the future. And so he is not a foreteller in the sense that ~~a~~ foretelling is the primary thing for which he exists, the reason for his being a prophet. But he is a forthteller in the sense that, as a foreteller he can predict the future if God chooses to have him to do so, and he very often did choose to do so. So that a prophet, whenever he speaks of the future, is a foreteller, but he is secondarily a foreteller, he is primarily a forthteller, one who speaks the message God gives him.

Now in the Biblical sense a prophet is not one who thinks over what he thinks God would want said and then says it, nor is he one who reads the word of God and studies it and determines from the word of God what he wants said and says it. In the strict sense, a prophet is one to whom God directly gives his message and he passes it on. That's what a prophet is. Now we can be prophets in a secondary sense, because we must get our message from the Word. It has come in the first place to prophets who were God's messengers. We are not prophets in the true sense, but we perform the function that prophets perform, we take God's word and we ~~give~~ give it out. Consequently, there is a great deal that is said about the prophets that properly applies to anybody who is a true spokesman for God today. But the main, central essence of being a prophet is something that God has stopped for this age, he has given us his word in its completeness. Now he wants us to study the word. He does not in this age, choose to give ~~this~~ this message directly, that is not his habitual way of doing things. I don't say that he can't, if he chooses. I don't say there may not be cases where, in relation to particular situations, God speaks directly, but I would say that if there are, for every one or two of them, there are a hundred others that seem to be (12 $\frac{1}{4}$) and therefore I would be very skeptical and go very slow about accepting anybody's claims today to receiving a message directly from God. We have the word and that is our source for our message.

'Now then, if a prophet is a mouthpiece for God, what's the difference between that and the priest? Well, a priest has stated service to perform at regular intervals. A priest has service to perform on specific occasion, he has a definite regular routine work to do. A prophet speaks whenever God gives him a message. And therefore, a man may be a true prophet if God speaks to him once. But ever after, as far as his being a prophet is concerned, even one who was a prophet, we may continue to call him a prophet but he is not being used as a prophet any more. God may choose to use a man as a prophet when he's twenty and again when he's sixty, and never in between. Or he may choose to use a man a great deal as a prophet. But that is a basic distinction between a prophet and a priest. The priesthood is an office. A man is put into the office of regular ceremony. He is inducted into that office. It is understood that he is the one who has the right and the duty to perform these ceremonies. A priest is an officer, a prophet is not an officer, no such thing as the office of the prophet, despite the many books that have been written in the last three hundred years ^{claiming} explaining there is. They do not rest on any Biblical foundation. The Bible never says an office of a prophet. A prophet, it is an activity rather than an office. God directs this man, to use as his mouthpiece, and it may be that God will put a man through a long course of training before he uses him as his mouthpiece, because if he didn't ^{some situations} ~~go-through-that~~ (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Or maybe he just picks him up and uses him (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

It is not an office, it is a function of representing God as God's mouthpiece. That is extremely important for us to study (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Old Testament and a good many

Yes? (student.13 3/4) Yes, that is in the English translation is used in exactly the same sense as when we say that there's a ^{school} ~~peer~~ of fish. In some places it's said you can't swim there because there's a school of fish. We use the term school in the sense of being an aggregation...

...others gathered round in order to learn from him. So that ^{there was a} ~~the~~ school for prophets in the sense that these people spent their time with, and learning from, one whom they thought of as a prophet. It doesn't say necessarily he was a true prophet: he may have been, he may not, but Elijah was a lone man, yet Elisha was there part of the time. He left the school of the prophets, the sons of the prophets it calls it there, and they were very skeptical all through then. Later on ~~Elijah~~ got into more friendly relations with them (1)

but still Elijah and Elisha were prophets, and other individuals whom God selected ^{to} give a message. They might go once, they might go twice, they might go a hundred times. But it is a function rather than an office. Yes? (student. 1 1/4) Yes, and that is one rather difficult task. It's just about the only one. I should say the only two because the thing is repeated twice. But it is, people try to get the meaning of this prophet by the etymology of the word. Now etymology sometimes tells you exactly what something means. Like constitution, is that which constitutes of the nation, so that the etymology tells you what constitution means. When you get to a word like dandelion and mushroom why the etymology doesn't tell us anything about the word. Very often the words have developed in the direction away from their etymology. Now in studying any Hebrew word, use is the way to determine its meaning. But etymology is worth looking into and very, very frequently etymology is tremendously helpful. In this particular case this Hebrew word (2 1/2) * comes from a very * or

something like that and the only meaning ^{they} I can find for such a ^{in Hebrew} root ^{is} ~~to~~ * so they think of a prophet as one who is just so filled with his message that he bubbles over. Whether that's what it comes from I don't know, nobody knows. We know what the word (2 3/4) * means but how it developed in Hebrew before that, nobody knows. Some of the Modernists have written extensive books trying to figure out from the etymology what the prophets really were, and they try to make out that they were groups of ecstatic men who went around, got into all kinds of emotional upheavals and then giving forth torrents of words, and it's purely imaginary. But there are two passages in the scripture which can be drawn upon to give support to their viewpoint.

And in these two it describes Samuel as being with a group of people with him who evidently had certain ceremonies they went through which sound like a rather ecstatic sort of thing. And the first place was where Saul was finding out, searching for father's asses that had been lost, and with Samuel he joined the prophets and they were going to these, whatever it was they were doing, and he joined in with them and they say, that people said, is Saul among the prophets? The second case was where Saul was pursuing David and he came to the place where Samuel was presiding ^{over} these prophets and he was caught with the emotion of the thing to so great an extent that he threw off his clothes and joined in with them in it and stayed all night and joined in with it, and people said is Saul among the prophets? Well, if those two were the only references we had to follow in the Bible, we would tend to think that prophets were something like the dergishes might be in the Mohammedan world, or something, people that would whirl around and say certain words and think of thoughts that might be of great cosmic significance, or something about great spiritual ideas, they were driving home by this tremendously emotional thing they were going through. But we have no other case in the Bible anywhere, except these two, and so it would seem to me likely that under Samuel's direction, this group of people did go through certain occasions when they allowed their emotions to run free as they thought on the great things of the Lord and Samuel kept a close hold on them to keep it from getting of hand, and to keep it in the line of its central thinking and Saul was just carried away with the emotions on those two occasions, but we have no reference to anything like it anywhere else in the Bible. So it certainly is not the primary thing about the prophets, or even the usual thing, or we would have references on it, but something that seems to have developed about Samuel there. And it was that giving just a little bit of support to this idea of some of the scholars that it is the bubbling over that represented the prophets. It's not impossible, of course, in the development of languages that the word describing a man sort of bubbling over came to be applied by people who didn't understand certain individuals and later (5 3/4) it came to mean a ^{mouthpiece.} ~~prophet.~~

But in the scripture to mean a mouthpiece, that's per-
fectly clear from context, in every case except these two and since in these two Samuel

is the leader and he was a mouthpiece for God on many occasions, there is these two don't contradict the others but simply bring in this one additional idea. So that these prophets then, in scriptural sense, is the one whom God uses and he is actually a prophet only while God is so using him, but it's rather natural to speak of a man as a prophet if he's ever been used in that way. But he's not a, he's a prophet in the sense that we give a man a title if he's ever exercised a certain position, but actually he's only entitled to it when he's exercising the position. A man is a governor for four years, he's elected governor for four years, ~~that's~~ after that he's not governor any more but people are apt to call him governor the rest of his life. Well, a prophet is actually a prophet only when God is using him. Mr. Shellabarger? (student.6 3/4) Yes. Well, that's a matter of semantics. I have no objection of course, if somebody wants to use the word office in a broad sense in which office can apply to any function whatever, like if I got thirsty and Mr. Rund went and got me a glass of water you could say he had the office of cup-bearer, bringing me a glass of water, but if he only did it on the one occasion it would be quite different from what, if he had agreed to do it every day. If he agreed to do it every day regularly, that would be an office in the proper sense of the word. But if he just on one occasion did it, he'd be performing an office, but he wouldn't have an office in that rigid sense. And my objection to the term office in relation to the prophets refers to the rigid sense of course. But the priest is an office in a rigid sense, and there's that difference between the priest and the prophet, but whether we use the word office or some other word, I think ^{distinction is a} ~~the~~ real distinction, I want to emphasize that. Yes? (student.8. There was a certain amount of training that the prophets did receive from Samuel though, wasn't there?) There are instances where the prophets received a very considerable amount of training. But there are other instances where we have no evidence of their having any training. And there are some instances where we have pretty good evidence they received no training at all. Amos says, I was not a prophet nor the son of a prophet but God spoke to me. He says, I was a keeper of sheep and a dresser of sycamore trees, and God spoke to me as I followed the flock, and said go prophesy to thy people Israel. And so Amos picked up and went. God just

picked him ~~and~~ in that situation and used him. And there are times when God chose to do that but ordinarily when it is, it is not a long extensive prophetic ministry. When he chooses to have, like Jeremiah or Isaiah with a long difficult ministry, he's apt to give them a rather extensive preparation, but it's in no sense required though it is sometimes (9) it's not a ~~primary~~ ^{part of the} requirement for being a prophet. It is part of requirement for being a priest. And of course today, we'd say a minister is different from a prophet because he gets his message in a different way but he has the same ultimate purpose as a prophet. Well today since the way of getting the message is different, therefore, today training is almost always a requirement. Today God does not speak right to the man and say here's ~~and~~ message, give it out now. In which case sometimes a man will do that in the historical sense. (9 3/4) Today God says here's the Word, study it. And one man can become a Christian and in three days study the Bible, can become so filled with love of Christ and knowledge of the basic things of the cross that he may go out and preach wonderful sermons and be wonderfully used of the Lord. But if one is going to be not simply a presenter of the basic truths but a leader of prophecy, he has the whole book which should be mastered, and under ordinary circumstances it is far safer for him to have a thorough preparation to know how to interpret the book and how to present it in a way that will (10 1/4)

So a prophet is different because God says here's the message, give it. And the preparation there was not so much a preparation for understanding the message as it was preparation perhaps for withstanding the efforts to persuade him to change the message or to stop him from giving it. Yes? (student. 10 1/4) Yes, that's right. I believe that there was a tendency doubtless, on the part of the king, and on the part of the leadership, when you had a crowd and he was very successful, it was a tendency to want to have somebody else to perform that function. We have, you remember when Ahab was visited by Jehoshaphat, and when Jehoshaphat said shall we go, Ahab said we must go above ^{the mountain} the rim of Gilead, it belongs to us, and Jehoshaphat said well, I'm in league with you, whatever you say I'm willing to do, but Jehoshaphat said, is it the Lord's will we do this? Cannot we find a prophet to tell us? And Ahab said sure, I've got a lot of prophets here. Come in here.

So he called in his prophets. The prophets came in and they said, sure, go up to Ramath Gilead and take it, the Lord is going to give it into your hands, and so on. And Jehoshaphat, they had the office of prophet, they had them there for the occasion, ready. But Jehoshaphat was suspicious. Jehoshaphat said, isn't there another prophet of the Lord who could ask of too? And Ahab says, well, there is one here, but I don't like him, he always says what I don't like. See, he didn't have an office with Ahab, he was one whom God was using as a prophet. And so they called Micaiah in, they gave him good advice when he came in. They said, all the prophets ~~have~~ ^{agree}, now you say the same thing they do and you'll get along. So Micaiah came in and he said the same thing they did. But he said it in such a tone that it was perfectly obvious that he didn't mean it, so after he finished that then Ahab had to say, well, how often must I tell you, say what the Lord says. Don't give us anything just because you think it will please us. Then he went ahead and gave the truth. And then Ahab said to Jehoshaphat, didn't I tell you, he always says things I don't like. But there was a man who had the office of a prophet but it wasn't a (12 3/4)

Here is another, whom people recognize that God had used him as a prophet and there was a strong possibility (13) but he got put in prison

Well, the question then is, is Balaam a true prophet? Or was he a false prophet? And the question isn't, is he a good man? It certainly isn't, is he a perfect one? (13 $\frac{1}{2}$)

But this question is, is he a true prophet? And a man may be a ^{true} prophet a-true-~~one~~, greatly used of the Lord, and then prove to be a bad man. That has happened. I know a man, when I used to speak at the Bible Institute of Los Angeles, just before I was there, there had been a student there who spoke on the street at what they call (13 3/4) and there he spoke on, out on the sidewalk in front you could speak to the crowd coming by, and this man gave a wonderful evangelistic message, and a man passing by accepted the Lord. And I knew the man who passed by and he became a fiery spokesman for God, and he was a tremendously active fellow, very, very earnest and the Lord wonderfully used him. But the man whose message led this man to the Lord, soon after, before I got there but

I think it was right after, was proven to be a thief, a man who was (14 $\frac{1}{4}$) and who was lying, he was fired from the Institute, and nobody ever heard of him again that I know of. But it was his message the Lord used to reach this man who was such a sincere, earnest believer that nothing would stop him. One time he was in a (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) store, he was a methodical man, and he says are you saved, and the man says I'm the governor of California. He says that doesn't make any difference in the Lord's sight, are you saved? And he was rubbing into the man's knuckles, and the governor had to at least give an answer to the question...

O.T.History 201. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...Well, he says, praise the Lord, he says I can glorify him, he says, it means not getting my bonus. Then they came and gave it to him, they had just held up temporarily in order to try to scare him. He was really devoted to the Lord. And he had been won by a man who was a crook. That man was performing the part of the true prophet, because it was a true message he gave. So a true prophet, though, here (3/4) with the Bible, can be used in two different senses. Is he a true prophet in the sense that he's one whom God really has spoken to, or is he a true prophet in the sense that he is one ~~who~~ is giving the message God wants him to give? Now of course the two are, in a way, identical, but they are two different aspect. And now when we ask of Balaam, is Balaam a true prophet, did God give Balaam messages? Did God call on Balaam to speak for God? I don't think that anybody can deny that he did. Certainly Balaam was a true prophet in that sense. Secondly, was Balaam a true prophet in the sense that he gave the message God wanted to give him? Or did he adulterate the message? Did he say the things that Balak wanted him to say instead of the things that God gave? Nobody can deny that Balaam fearlessly faced Balak and gave the message that God gave him. Balak said I'm ready to give you great rewards and Balaam said I can only say what the Lord gives me to say and he did. And he gave wonderful messages for many gerses. It was the word of god given through (2 $\frac{1}{4}$) Balaam was a true prophet and there's much evidence ^{that he was a} ~~for the~~ true prophet, no evidence

whatever that he was a false one. And this is absolute. There are matters which are absolute, there are matters which are relative; as to whether one is a prophet or not, it is absolute. He is or he is not. But when it comes to the second question, is he a good man? That is relative. Because there is no man living who is a good man living who is a good man in the sense that he is free from imperfection. There's not. And there's no man living who is as bad as the devil. We're all somewhere in between. And so, is he a good man or is he a bad man, you cannot specifically say he's a good man or a bad one. But you can find evidence of good points and you can find evidence of bad flaws, and the sad thing is that in the end the bad flaws predominate. So that in the New Testament he is pointed out as a terrible example. But if you take away the bad things he ^{did} ~~said~~ at the end, you could find plenty of good things ~~there~~ Balaam did that are wonderful examples for us to follow. He was a complex character as all human beings are, but a character who gave in to the bad things, and who in the end was mastered by them and in the end his name became a word of reproach, despite all the good he had done before. He became a castaway. And he's a terrible example of what can happen, even to one who has been greatly used of the Lord. Now that of course is not entering in to the question of his salvation. Whether God will ever use as a spokesman one who is not saved, I don't know. If he would, then it would be possible that Balaam ^{might have been} ~~was~~ one who was going along interested in and trying to do good, but not really saved. ~~That~~ is hard to believe because we find God actually telling him at night whether to go or not, or we find him asking the Lord, we find the evidence which to me is pretty hard to reconcile with his being lost. But at any rate, he certainly departed very, very far in his life from the life of the Saviour, and toward the end he departed extremely far, and he is a bad example for us, but if you leave out the bad he is about as good an example in the good part as anybody we'll find, almost, in the scriptures, of fidelity to the Lord even at the expense of terrible loss. There's one bad thing at the beginning. And that of course is not obvious to the outsiders, but ^{as} we read the story it's obvious to us. So that I think that this passage about Balaam is helpful for us to distinguish those ideas. Is a man a true prophet, or a false prophet? Is he a good man, or a bad man? Certainly Balaam was a true prophet. And his prophecy

was fulfilled, the predictions, literally. And the statements in them are God's message and can be taken as God's message and we can rely upon them, but in his life he, in the end, sought ways of fulfilling Balaam's wish, and in the end he suffered. In his wonderful prophecy he says, let me die the death of the righteous, and let my ~~last~~ end be like his! And in the actual situation he died the death of the wicked, in the midst of the wicked, where he was helpless ^{^ (2)} to try to lead astray to different gods. Well, we continue there at 8:20 tomorrow morning.

(61) ...the general question, first, was Balaam a true prophet? In other words, two ways that may be interpreted. Did he give the message God gave him, or did he just pretend to have any message from God? And the answer of course is that the scripture definitely says God gave Balaam messages. And then the second question was, did he give God's message, or did he twist it around, did he change it? Well, there's no evidence in the least that he changed the message God gave him. He certainly, as far as the scripture presentation is concerned, he was a prophet, that is a mouthpiece, one who received a message from God and passed it on. And he passed it on precisely, there's not the slightest evidence that he made the slightest change in any message he received from God. Then the other question was, is he a good man or was he a bad man? And as far as that is concerned we notice that he, like all other human beings, is neither utterly depraved nor absolutely perfect. As the story of Balaam starts, we have evidence to think that he was a good man, because he knew the Lord, he used the name, the covenant name of God, it's not just God in the general sense, it is (8) *

I don't know whether you're all familiar with that word (8)

it is a Greek word meaning four letters, and it is the fourth letter which stands for the name of the God of Israel. In our King James Version it is represented by LORD ^{in caps.} When you have Lord in the King James Version, it means Adonai, a Hebrew word which means Lord. But when you have it in capitals, four capital letters, it is *JAWA, and the critics are all agreed today that is pronounced Jawah. We have no idea how it was pronounced. It may have been that, we don't know. Just about everybody is agreed that it was not Jehovah. And the ground on which they agree it was not Jehovah is the fact that we have evidence

as ^{to how} the form Jehovah came into existence. We have the Hebrew *
 they stopped pronouncing at a very early time, lest someone should take the name of
 God on profane lips. And very frequently when they came to it in the Bible, they just
 said the name, the Name. But then the habit developed, instead of saying the ~~name~~, of
 saying the Lord, and we also have God called the Lord, Adonai. But where this occurred
 they would just say the LORD. Then our Hebrew Bible was originally written with just
 the consonants written. That doesn't mean the Hebrew Bible was originally just ~~conson-~~
 ants. The Bible is words, but in the writing of these words only consonants were written.
 And the vowels were recognized usually from the consonants. And when the (10)
 somewhere between the fifth and eighth century A.D., fearing the vowels would be forgotten
 began putting these little marks above the letters to indicate what the vowels should be,
 they did not do that in synagogue manuscripts, but in ^{popular} copying manuscripts. When they came
 to a word which they pronounced differently ^{than} ~~from~~ the way it was written, they put the
 vowels of the way they pronounced it rather than of the way it's actually written, so when
 they come to (10 $\frac{1}{4}$) * they put the vowels of aleph *

and so they put the vowel

and they'd say when they came to it. Now this next, thus far it has ^{absolute} been fact,
 now here is perhaps a conjecture. Some monks/in the early middle ages, knowing a little
 Hebrew, but not too much, when he came (10 $\frac{3}{4}$) * with the
 vowels of * under it, he put the consonants *
 and the vowels of Adonai together and got Jehovah. Now that's conjecture. But it is a
 very reasonable conjecture because Jehovah is exactly that. You can get Jehovah by mak-
 ing it that way. Now it seem therefore quite unlikely that they actually pronounced the
 name, when they did pronounce it, as Jehovah. They pronounced it as Jawah. I should say
 they pronounced it differently from Jehovah. Now how did they pronounce it? Well, when
 you ask how a word is pronounced, I think one ^{thing to remember} ~~significant method~~ is, that ~~pronunciation~~
 are constantly changing in all languages. English has got a great many vowels in it,
 (11 $\frac{1}{2}$)--someone coughed) comparatively few vowels in it. Our vowel quality is changing.
 The pronunciation of our consonants is changing, all languages are constantly changing

in their pronunciation. Consequently, if you know, chances are that if somebody said George Washington came to life today and began to talk like he talked when he was living, perhaps nobody could understand him, because the pronunciation of each letter would have changed just enough in these two centuries to make it very, very difficult for us to understand anything that he said. Whether it's changed quite that much, I don't know. But it is a fact, that for you to say exactly how anything was pronounced in the past, is v-ry, very difficult. You could give perhaps an approximate pronunciation but hardly an exact one. And so it really isn't very important to know just how it was pronounced. But I think this is very important to recognize just what it is in the proper name, not a general thing. Crazy thing. In English we say God, and everybody thinks it's a proper name, God. But we say the Lord and everybody thinks it's like you say the automobile, the president, the employer, the Lord, and actually when we say the Lord, it represents the Hebrew proper name, and when we say God it represents the Hebrew general term, the God, just like the term for the house, or the book. So it is exactly reversed from what it originally was. Now if you found Balaam talking to God in general, say, if you use that term in the Bible for the heathen god, then we translate it god. Somebody could say Balaam is a prophet of a false god, but when he speaks to (13 $\frac{1}{4}$) *

however you pronounce it, the Bible is representing him as speaking to the very same God who was leading Moses. And when we find somebody who is offered a tremendous reward and says I can't touch a thing until I have found out what Jehovah says, First of all, since we don't know how the word was pronounced anyway, and we couldn't pronounce it exactly as they pronounced it in those days, probably differently at different times. Personally, it doesn't seem to me to be of a great deal of importance how it was pronounced, but I rather like the word Jehovah because there is no question what it is, it is the proper name for the God of (14)

You don't take it for a common word like people

proper name, represents that, and if it isn't the correct pronunciation nobody knows the correct pronunciation anyway. And Jawah (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

though it's probably a great deal nearer to the correct pronunciation I don't like anyway, because it's used in so many critical books which talk about the Thunder-God of Sinai and one of them declares (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

and it uses mythological concept,
 so much in that sense, that for me it has a flavor I don't like, but yet it's difficult
 (14 3/4) But when you say Jehovah,
 men have come, what shall I do, that is the mark of a good man...

O.T.History 202. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...very hard to think he's utterly depraved when he asks Jehovah what he shall do, and to my mind we will get more benefit out of the study of Balaam if we think of it as ~~the~~ a man with very, very fine qualities who went astray, and take him as a terrible warning to us, than if we think of him just as a bad man from the start, if we just kind of look askance ^{at} him, and that's that. I don't think that's the way the scripture represents him. I think he had wonderful qualities, and there is many a true Christian leader who, as far as all the evidence goes, ~~they~~ except for about three or four verses, would be far inferior ~~to~~ a man, but those three or four verses ~~are~~ tremendously important. But at the end of his life we find him falling into this terrible sin, and he didn't fall all of a sudden, ~~people have these~~ previous tendencies when they do fall, but it pictures him, the great bulk, though not the most important part, is good. Yes? (student.1 $\frac{1}{2}$) In chapter 24:1? Joshua 13:22. Yes. Well, of course, the word soothsayer is an English word which means truth-teller. The word sooth is Old English for truth. And in Old English a soothsayer was a truth-teller, but what it meant was a man who could predict the future. And I'd have to look up the exact Hebrew word but I don't think calling a man a soothsayer necessarily ~~proves~~ him a bad man. But it does represent a man on a definitely lower level than a prophet, but a--well, the same thing exactly is done with Samuel, when Saul went to find where his father's asses were, the seer was ~~in~~ this town that people went to, to ask questions like that. I think it's very likely that many of the people had that idea of Samuel, that he was a sort of a soothsayer. Actually, of course, Samuel wasn't, he was serving the Lord, but he was misunderstood by some of the people. This of course, the judgment given upon Balaam at his death is a critical judgment which he fully deserved at that time. But the earlier statement here, to seek enchantments, there again we would have to check what the original word

was, but in the previous cases he put up altars and he made sacrifices, and so on, but after doing so he gave a message directly from God and strongly against Balak in each of these cases, so the meaning of this particular verse you point to here is, that now, he just goes right out and starts giving the message. And he isn't seeking for a message. God ~~is~~ coming upon him in force, and he's giving, so that I don't think this particular verse here is against Balaam, though the particular word would appear in that position (4 $\frac{1}{2}$). But on the strength of this verse, I would think that, this particular verse

But as to his character, there are two or three things I think it's rather vital for us to note.

And the first is that very, very excellent thing which Balaam did, when, in almost his first appearance to us, when the messengers came, verse 8, is a wonderful verse. Verse 8 is a wonderful verse and ~~verse~~ verse 19 is a terrible verse. Verse 8 is a verse which shows him acting as a true man of God should, and verse 19 shows him acting ~~as~~ as a true man of God should not, and yet the two verses are almost identical. That's a very interesting thing. Here is the same thing exactly done, and it shows a great man doing what a true man of God ought to do, and then almost the same verse later and it shows him ^{a man} doing what a true man of God should never do. And yet the two verses are identical practically. In verse 8, he says, Lodge here this night, I will bring you word again, as the Lord shall speak to me: And then in verse 19 he says, Now therefore, I pray you, tarry ye also here this night, that I may know what the Lord will say to me more. Almost the same, and yet one is on the credit side of the ledger and other on the debit side. Here ~~these~~ these men came to him and they said, Balak wants you to curse this people. They're too mighty for me, peradventure I may prevail, you come and curse them for me, and I'll give you a big reward, ~~///~~ Now Balaam might have said, I know this man, Balak, he's a bad man, I won't do anything he offers. He might have said that. But he didn't have enough knowledge to say that because sometimes a bad man goes before the good cause. You need further evidence before you give a categorical no, simply on your knowledge of the man.

A man came to me in Wilmington and he was a man who had a lot to do with putting Dr. Laird out of the Presbyterian Church. He lived there. And Dr. Laird was one of our leaders in the Seminary. And this man had a church a little ways away, thoroughly modern-

istic preaching, and he came to see me, and he said I've already gotten Dr. Laird to join with me in signing a petition and he said I'd like you to sign as President of the Seminary--a petition to keep them from having a taproom open down here at a place that's half-way between the Seminary and my church. Well, I gladly signed it. He said well I'm glad Dr. Laird and I can still cooperate on something. Well, we would not want to get in any religious endeavor but an endeavor to keep our part of town clean, he could carry weight as pastor of a church, or I could carry weight as President of a seminary, to try to keep the liquor out of that area, and we were glad to cooperate. Anything that he came to me with, I would investigate extremely carefully. I wouldn't think of saying, well, now you asked me to do this, fine I'll do it. I'd examine it very carefully. But I would not turn it down simply because he suggested it. I would examine it. And Balak here has sent these people a long way, and Balaam might have investigated very carefully before he would join anything with Balak, but just to say, no, it's from Balak, I'll have nothing to do with it, that was not the proper answer. And then ^{the} second answer which he might give, which he would be less apt to give, but which some people give. The elders of Moab and the elders of Midian came with a big sum of money and they said here's a reward for you. They said you ^{come and} promise you'll get all this money. Now a person might readily say, well if he's going to pay me all this money to do this, that's asking me to serve money instead of serving the Lord. I, of course, won't do that. I will say no immediately. And that is a tremendous lot better attitude than to say, yes, all this money's involved, I will do that. Better than that, but neither one is the correct attitude.

I had a friend studying in Germany when I was who told me that ministers and Christian workers are too much looking for money. And he determined that the right way to serve the Lord, was to say if I have offers of positions, I'll always take the one that pays the least. I'll take the position with the least money, the least honor, in every phase, and I can honor the Lord in that way. And here was a man of great gifts and remarkable ability, and I gained the impression from the way he spoke, that he would soon be pastor of a little tiny church down somewhere and he would insist on never taking anything any larger, for fear that it was the money or the prestige he was after. But I didn't hear of him for

about fifteen years and then I heard he was the President of a theological seminary, of his own denomination. And if he is holding to the fine Christian learning that he had before, I haven't had opportunity to know, but if he is, I'm very glad for him to be in a position of real influence instead of a position of little influence. I don't think the right attitude is the ~~aesthetic~~ ^{ascetic} attitude, that we must do whatever brings us least money or least honor. But it is a far better attitude than the attitude that looks to see how much the salary is and then feels that must be the Lord's call to go. It's a far better attitude. The salary and the prestige, and all those things, should not be an argument for or against, but the sole purpose ^{should be} ~~to see~~ how can I honor the Lord best, how can I serve him best? So in the situation, money from Balak might make Balaam look askance at the thing. Very definitely. But it should not decide him. He should investigate. He might even decide, it's a good thing to do, I won't take money from Balaam, but I will do the thing.

But he said, wait, and I will bring word again, as the Lord shall speak to me. So that night, God came to Balaam and said, what men are these with thee? Why did God have to ask Balaam that? God knew what the men were, but that helped Balaam to get the thing clarified in his mind, to express it clearly. It's always a good thing, when you're thinking a thing over, or when you're praying, to express it clearly in full, to see the full situation. And Balaam told him what they were, and then God gave the answer, thou shalt not go with them, thou shalt not curse the people, for they are blessed. And the next morning Balaam said, Go to your land, for the Lord refuseth to give me leave to go with you. And they went. And up to this point he has acted as a good man should, exactly. He did not jump to conclusions without investigating carefully, he found out what the Lord's will was in the matter, once he found the Lord's will he used perfectly clear language what he was going to do. This is an example of a good man thus far.

But now Balak sent more princes, more honorable men, with more money, and greater (12)

and he said I will promote thee to very great honor, and I will do whatsoever thou sayest, and I pray thee, curse me this people. And Balaam answered and said, if Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the word of the Lord my God to do less or more. What better could you ask than that? Why did he make a state-

ment like that? There is the example that a good man should set. His critics give him all the blame, everything he's died couldn't go against the word of the Lord but though a tiny bit even more or less that he gives exactly the right attitude, but then they come to the next verse which is the bad one. Now therefore, tarry this night, that I may know what the Lord shall say to me more. I've got to pray about this matter. Why does he have to pray about it. God's word is clear. Before God's word wasn't clear, he had to pray. He had to investigate. He would be foolish to give a decision before he knew what God's will was. Now he knows, God has told him, he found what the word of God is. There is no new element in the situation requiring further evidence except that Balak had promised more money. The only thing in it that's different is larger reward for his help. Under these circumstances the statement, I will have to pray about it, to see how the Lord leads me in the matter, where the Lord already had given his clear word, is an unChristian statement, an unChristian attitude, a dangerous situation. Now this alone does not mark Balaam as an evil man. There is no man living who has not fallen into that much of error. But that much of error led him on into worse error eventually, and it is a warning to us to avoid that sort of thing, when the Lord's word is clear, we should step out and stand on it, and not wait for more light if we've got the light already. Never move without sufficient light, never move back when you have it, but step out. And so this is the evil verse thus far, and the only thing, thus far, that's the least bit questionable about Balaam, is verse 19.

But then when we come to verse 20, God came to Balaam at night, and said to him, if the men come to call thee, rise up and go with them, but yet the word which I shall say to you, that shalt thou do. Now what is this verse here? God said before, don't go, don't curse this people, they are blessed. Now God says go. Has God changed his mind? Well, he says but yet the word I shall say to thee, that shalt thou do. Well, he certainly has a wonderful chance to serve the Lord by going down there and speaking God's message...

...could witness to the Lord here. My observation is that nine out of ten people who talk that way about being in a wrong situation, where they can witness to the Lord, don't really witness to Him very strongly. They give a clear message up to a point, and then as soon as there's the least bit of danger to themselves, they keep quiet, and they do give a certain amount of push to the denominational program, which may include a lot of modernism and unbelief, instead of coming out strongly against it. Very few carry through on that plane. But Balaam did carry through. But God said go. But yet what I say to thee, that shalt thou do. Now what sort of a God do we have pictured here? In verse 20, he says go with the men, and in verse 31 he sends the angel of the Lord to strike him because he went. He tells him to go and then he puts him in real danger because he went. And in verse 34 Balaam says I have sinned in starting out on this trip. How could he sin in starting out to do something that God had told him to do? There is here a definite sharp contradiction in the Bible, unless we infer, and we cannot say, let's just grab a sentence anywhere in the Bible and you've got God's leading, you have to interpret ~~everything~~ sentence in every book ever written, in the light of context. And we mustn't explain away the clear from the obscure, but explain the obscure in the light of the clear. Here is an apparent contradiction. And the answer to it, of course, must be on the grounds, though not explained here, that God in his statement in verse 20, granted the desire of Balaam rather than expressing the will of God. That God said to him, not go, but if you go, the word that I say unto you, that shall you speak. That God said, Balaam, you're insisting on this, well, go ahead. Not that gave him the plan, but that God granted the wish of the man which is contrary to what the man knew was God's desire. And it's very easy for each one of us to know that something is contrary to God's will, and yet to see the rewards in it and pretty soon to rationalize and convince ourselves that it is the Lord's will for him to do it. Now in this case, that's not just that, it's not just that Balaam convinced himself, because it said God did say that, but it is God's stooping certainly to Balaam's desire in the matter, but God's actual will was known to him already. Yes? (student. 3 1/2) Yes, there's a push on Balaam's part to go ahead and get those rewards. Seems to be that undoubtedly, but you have to infer that, it's not clearly, Mr. Shellabarger? (student. 4 1/4) Yes, God says go, I'll save him. So God saves (4 1/2)

and then after he'd been there ^{for a day} / he got frightened and left it anyway. Same sort of thing.
 God never told him to go (4 3/4) to _____ didn't want him to go to _____
 but he granted his request for _____ and then Lot found out later

It didn't bring any harm to Lot, as far as we know,
 but it was foolish as shown by the fact

In this case (5)

but the two are very interesting parallels.

Now, Balaam went then and you read the Lord's anger was kindled because he went, and anybody who takes the Bible as a book that you just grab three words and here it is instead of taking the words and examining them in the light of context, has certainly got a contradiction here to face. God says if the men come to call you rise up and go with them. Verse 20. Verse 22, God's anger was kindled because he went. God's anger was kindled because he did what God had told him to do. It's perfectly clear in the context of what follows, that the tone of voice in which God told him to go, was one which Balaam should have been able to recognize as meaning, if you insist that's, so long as you stand true and give the word you may go. But he's already said don't go. Mr. Deshpande? (student. 5 3/4) I would (6 $\frac{1}{2}$) _____ about that. I incline to think that's a little too much of an argument from (6 $\frac{1}{2}$) _____ . That is to say, I do think there is an impatience shown in his going. There's no evidence that he held back, but to say it would have been all right to go if the man came and called him and not right if they did (6 3/4) it doesn't seem to me that there's evidence here of that. It said he went with the elders. That's expressly stated in the next verse. Did he go without any breakfast? It doesn't say he had breakfast. Did they run off without. My guess is that he had breakfast. My guess also is that they put some clothes on before he went. And those things are not mentioned and whether he woke up himself and didn't have to be called, or whether his servant who regularly called him, it doesn't seem to me that when people were visiting in the house, that the Lord would say now if these visitors come and call the owner of the house. No visitor would ever do that. These men had come to call, to fetch him, to get him to go. They were there for that purpose. That was very clear, their purpose, their

objective. The minute he saw them in the morning, naturally they would say, well, are you going with us? And he said the Lord said, if you ask^{ed} me to go I can go with you. It doesn't seem to me that it hardly could mean, that if they come and wake you up, certainly would do anything in the world to get him to go, but it certainly would be wrong to get, in^a home to wake up the host. It usual^{ly} is the other way, just common courtesy would tell you that. But it is true, as Mr. Myers and Mr. Deshpande have pointed out, that the whole situation does show an attitude of Balaam that I've got to get this money, I'm going to go, but I'm going to stand true. I've known plenty of young fellows who've taken exactly that attitude.

I remember one fellow fifteen years ago, twenty years ago, he graduated from another seminary. I was teaching there at the time. He graduated and he took a strong position against the modernism^s in the church. It was a year before he broke with the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. He went into before the Presbytery and they questioned him on his loyalty to the (8¹/₂) agencies and he spoke in such a way as to show so long as they're true to the Lord I will support them, but in such a way as to make it clear he was going to stand for what was true, he was very^{ly} uncertain whether he would get in to the Presbytery, in those day we didn't have (9)

at that time and he was making, oh, he was so concerned with the stand for the word of God, that I remember he developed stomach trouble, his doctors told him it was the sort of thing they find in bandit^s chasers, policemen, ~~be~~ It was because of his nervousness, his concern, the stand for the Word, he was out and out. And it was a year later that the rest of us went out and left the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. Well, he stayed in it, and he said I'm going to stay in, I'm going to stand for the Word of God, I'm going to stand absolutely true. That's twenty years ago and I didn't hear of him for twenty years till last year, when there was the union of the Presbyterian Church and the United Church, and I'm not even sure which of the two he was in now, but in the General Assembly at the Union Meeting, he was the one who spoke most strongly against those who wouldn't come into a union, and who ^{(6) opposed?} opposed taking their property away from them. He had gradually moved during the years, till that man who was so out and out, giving in a little,

and then a little more, and a little more, and always saying I'm going to stand for the Lord and ~~for~~ ^{say} His Word and not make any compromise. In the end he's actually one of the first to. And that's what happens, so often and it does happen so easily. It's not the great crimes that make a crook, it's the first step in that direction. And it's not the great step that determines in our lives, as a rule, occasionally we stand at a great crossroads, but as a rule there's a little deviation, a little bit, a little, a little, and we can always say I'm going to stand absolutely true. Well, Balaam said I'm going to stand absolutely true, and I would interpret what follows here, now, this way. I would interpret it that the Lord said, here's Balaam, and he could say no and stand here and not work with these forces of evil against Israel at all, but he thinks you can stand true to the Lord and at the same time get the rewards of iniquity. Well, he can't get them as long as he stands true. Balak says you've lost your chance. I would have given you great honor, now you don't get anything. And in the end Balaam got his reward only in doing what was wicked even though it was not the changing of the word of God. But he did other things that were wicked, in the end, or he'd have gotten no rewards. These rewards that are promised usually don't come unless there's actual promise, even though the pretense is made that they will. But Balaam here has determined to do what is wrong. He's going. Now the Lord says, the Lord used the wicked act of wickedness to serve Himself, and he uses the errors of good men to serve Himself. He uses all things to accomplish His will. Now here's Balaam, Balaam is going. All right, the Lord says, I'm going to use Balaam, even though he shouldn't go, I'm going to use his testimony as he goes. And therefore, the Lord says, I'm going to do everything in the situation to strengthen Balaam's determination to speak only the Word of the Lord. And so, as Balaam starts out and he starts to go, God's anger was kindled because he went. God had just said go, in his permissive will, but God's directive will was against the going, and God was determined to use what he did for God's purpose and so to strengthen his determination for this particular situation, that would not eventually make Balaam a good man, but it would strengthen for this particular vital situation. And so the angel of the Lord stood in the way for an adversary against him. And, of course, Balaam

couldn't see him, the ass could though and the ass turned out of the way, and Balaam smote the ass to turn her into the way. And then the angel of the Lord stood further on and the ass saw the angel of the Lord and thrust herself unto the wall and crushed Balaam's foot against the wall, and he smote her again. And the angel of the Lord went further and stood in a narrow place where there was no way to turn either to the right or to the left, and when the ass saw the angel of the Lord, she fell down under Balaam and Balaam's anger was kindled, and he smote the ass with a staff. And the Lord opened the mouth of the ass. Did the Lord give the ass a human intelligence and understanding and a knowledge of the Hebrew language? It doesn't say so, it just says he opened her mouth. But the Lord opened the mouth of the ass so she could talk, and she said to Balaam, what have I done unto thee, that thou hast smitten me these three times? And Balaam was so upset and so excited about the way the ass had been treating him that he didn't even notice how strange it was that it began talking. He answered it back, and said to the ass, because thou hast mocked me. We may laugh at Balaam but we all do the same thing. If we're really concerned with a situation, we'll talk to an automobile or a horse or anything else, and we'll treat them as if they were human beings, and it's a silly thing to see people taking out their anger on animals and mistreating animals because the animals haven't done what they wanted them to. When the animal couldn't even understand just what they wanted them to do...

O.T.History 204. (1 $\frac{3}{4}$)

...another inanimate object. Very foolishly but a thing I think we all should be alert about. Well, anyway, Balaam answered, and he said, because thou hast mocked me: I would there were a sword in mine hand, for now would I kill thee. And up to this point he doesn't actually have to speak (3/4) but it certainly is exactly what you'd expect an ass to speak in those circumstances. But now the ass has a real understanding when it proceeds with verse 30. The ass says, am I not thine ass, upon which thou hast ridden ever since I was thine unto this day? was I ever wont to do so unto thee? And he said, May. It's really intelligent now. The ass just doesn't just say, look there's an angel

in the way, I can't just go here. He-asks The ass brings a socratic argument, presents to him a reasonable argument, that he, before becoming angry at the ass which he had known a long time and it had not (1 $\frac{1}{2}$) that he should investigate, and it's a good lesson for all of us too. It's so easy for us when we have been with people and have reason to have confidence in them, then to get all upset and to turn upon them about something they do, instead of first investigating the circumstances, instead of saying maybe this person just went haywire all of a sudden and does things that actually are contrary to what I would expect of them, but more likely they have a reason. Before I show anger against them, I should give them the benefit of the doubt and see if the reason is one (2 $\frac{1}{4}$) worth knowing. And so the ass shows very fine intelligence in this approach here, Am not I thine ass upon which thou hast ridden ever since I was thine unto this day? Was I ever accustomed to do this way? And he said, Nay. Then the Lord opened the eyes of Balaam and he saw the angel of the Lord standing in the way and his sword drawn in his hand, and he bowed down his head, and fell flat on his face. And nobody seems to, that I ever heard of, thinks it was a very strange thing that the Lord opened the eyes of Balaam so he could see the angel of the Lord. That's perfectly simple. To realize that God has forces that people don't see, and that God could open our eyes that we would see/and believe ^{them} ^{them} ~~that~~-~~ed~~ but with God there's no difference (3)

But that he opened, not the eyes of Balaam as he did not, but that he opened the mouth of the ass so it could talk, that is something which at present people (3 $\frac{1}{4}$)

And of course it is of a different pattern, it is a much more complex thing, and a matter with much less (3 $\frac{1}{2}$) in other situations either in the scripture or in human life. It's a common thing for us to have our eyes opened so that we understand something we would not understand otherwise, so that we see aspects of truth. I've known people who heard doctrines presented in seminary, and they hear and they hear and they hear it and they offer the same argument against it over and over and over, maybe for three years, always the same argument, same argument, same argument. They're never satisfied, and they're given the answer

and it's always the same answer and they come up with the same argument, and sometime all of a sudden, they say, now I see it. Their eyes are opened, they see, they understand. It's a common factor of life. And if there's a God, if there is an unseen universe it is not at all strange that God should open a man's eyes that he could see the angel of the Lord. That we have no difficulty with. But that he would open the mouth of the ass and cause the ass to talk, that is something which is very unusual, something would say, the Bible is just a bunch of fables, it's like Aesop's fables, talking animals, and all that. Well, anybody that says that doesn't know much about the Bible, because I only think of two cases ^{in the Bible} where animals talk. Of course we have occasionally a parable that is clearly a parable, clearly figurative, but in something given as straight history we only have two instances in the Bible, that I know of, where animals talk. And in one of these instances it's clear that Satan used the serpent for his purpose and the serpent was Satan's spokesman even though the serpent spoke in its own person, it was Satan's instrument. In this case, the ass of course is God's, even though the ass speaks in his own person. (54) So as the anatomical, physiological and psychological elements involved, we simply don't know what they were. Did the ass now acquire the power of speaking, so that for the rest of his life he kept on talking? Did the ass now get a power of speaking so that it was able to have human intelligence the rest of its life? We certainly have no evidence that either of those things is true. We would certainly have no reason to think that the ass had ever talked except on this occasion. That there was any permanent change in the mind, the intelligence, the linguistic knowledge of the ass, or in the ability of its mouth to frame words. And whether God produced a change in the vocal chords, in the mouth organism, in the nerves, in the situation in the brain for a minute, and then changed it back again now, or whether God caused that sound should come through there by some miraculous form that seemed to come from the ass, but it was produced in a different way than if the ass's vocal chords were working in exactly the way that a man's or a parrot's would. Or whether the Lord would cause the sound waves to come to Balaam's ear directly but in such a way anybody in the neighborhood would hear it, or whether he caused it to come to the sinner ear

as when God talked to the prophets sometimes in the presence of others, and no one heard except them, these details we're not told in scripture and so we don't know, but we do know this, that God caused that a sound should come to Balaam, which Balaam understood as the animal speaking, and it said words that it was normal for the animal to say under the circumstances, including circumstances that were unknown today, and so it is a marvelous instance of the intervention of God, but just what the particular aspect of (7)

and I don't think that anything is gained by our trying to guess. We could make a hundred different guesses and one might be right and the other wrong. The result was what God intended it to be. And the result was much more effective on Balaam's mind than if God had said, ~~that~~ if the angel of the Lord had stood there such that Balaam looked and saw the angel right away, perfectly clear and obvious, and the angel said Balaam you shouldn't have gone. That would impress him, but this impressed him a hundred times more. And it impressed Balaam to such an extent that that man who was wavering in his loyalty to God was strengthened in his determination to stand and say only what God said and when he reached Balak the very first thing he said when he got to Balak was, he said, Balak said to Balaam, verse 37, did I not earnestly send to thee to call thee? wherefore camest thou not unto me? Am I not able indeed to promote thee to honor? And Balaam said to Balak, Lo, I am come to thee, have I now any power at all to say any thing? the word that God puts into my mouth, that shall I speak. And he proceeds through all these before ~~that~~ and he defends Israel and he attacks Balak's people in the strongest of language, and it was God's intention that this prophecy should be given at that time, in that way, presenting this and if Balaam when he'd finished had left and gone home, he ~~wouldn't~~ not have been as deserving of credit as if he had stayed home in the first place. But still he would be a ~~man~~ ^{up} who would ~~come~~ ^{be a} to a point ^{of} wonderful example of one who was true (8 3/4) but we find that compromise

leads to compromise, and though God strengthened Balaam so that he would give the prophecy exactly as God wants him to, yet after that, Balaam's mind was so filled with all the rewards he could have had, that he proceeded to show Balaam how without in any

way changing the word of God, yet using the word of God to destroy Israel. He said God is a good God, God is supporting these people, now he said you put (9 $\frac{1}{2}$) enticements to wickedness in front of them which they won't be able to resist and God cannot defend a wicked people, he will have to destroy them. God did destroy them eventually, but he was acting still in belief in God's great goodness and holiness, that God would not look upon wickedness, and so if you could make them people wicked, naturally God would destroy them. It was a perverted form (10) in the end he became a thoroughly bad man. We don't have much evidence of the details but enough to make it (10 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Mr. Shellabarger? (student.10 $\frac{1}{4}$. How do we know that? I know that Peter declares that, but he doesn't declare it on the basis of anything actual in the Old Testament. There's another thing ^{that} suggests itself to me and that is that the very actions of Balaam himself in talking to these men, that there's possibility of buying off Israel as well as Balaam. That they've seen a principle in this action that led them to use a compromise.) Of course they didn't actually up to this point buy off Balaam, that is he said the message. (Student.10 3/4. As far as they were concerned they had bought Balaam out. He did everything they wanted him to do. They had the man, they had him, their conquest there was perfect, but their conquest of God certainly wasn't. He overcame them but they got the man.)

Now we have in chapter 25 immediately after this, an account of the wickedness of Balaam. But chapter 25 does not state that Balaam showed them how to do this wickedness. But if it were not for other statements I don't think you would know, but there is that statement that Balaam the son of Peor they slew with the sword. We have, as you said, that statement in the New Testament, that he showed them how, that he led them astray, and of course we have it here in 25 exactly what happened. (11 3/4) And ^{if} he had gone to his home as he should have, instead of staying with them, he wouldn't have been there to be killed when they were (12) (student.12. And it says also in Peter, it says the madness of the prophet.)

Well, now, the Balaam Incident, then, we divide into three parts naturally. Number 1, The Summoning of Balaam, chapter 22:2-40. Number 2, Balaam's Prophecy^s, 22:41-24:24. and number 3, The Aftermath. There are one or two of the prophecies I want to look

at very briefly, and then we must rush on. There's the summoning of Balaam, 22:2-40. Balaam's prophecies, 22:41-24:24, and then the Aftermath, 24:25-25:18. That is the seduction of the Israelites which was produced through Balaam's advice. Then, we have to stop and we continue there next Monday.

O.T.History 205. (3/4)

...VI which is The Wilderness Journey (student.1) Now under E we spoke first about the questions that I had given you in the assignments. Those questions were (1) to list all evidence that could be used to show that Balaam was a true prophet, a false prophet, a good man, a bad man. Now we notice that there is abundant evidence that Balaam was a true prophet. He was one who knew the Lord. He uses the covenant name, he asks the Lord what he shall do. He declares he can do nothing except what the Lord tells him. We are told that the Lord spoke to him. The Lord gave him messages and he passed on those messages. A false prophet may be one who pretends to receive messages when he does not receive messages, or he could be one who perhaps receiving a message, falsified it, gave it incorrectly. We have not the slightest suggestion that Balaam did either of these things. There is no suggestion he ever pretends to be a prophet when he was not or that he ever gave a message ~~that~~ God's word which had not been given him by the Lord. And you take all the messages that he gave as from the Lord, and it's pretty hard to conceive of any of them as having been invented by him, because no one of them contains a word that would be for his interest or for his wealth, they were all against his welfare, but for the welfare of what God desired and (2 3/4)

The fact that they were against his welfare wouldn't prove they were true. But certainly, if they had ^{to} been for his welfare it would've been easier to prove they were false.

(2 3/4) Well, then we have no evidence that he was, we have much evidence that he was a true prophet. Is there any evidence that he was a false prophet? Does anyone have evidence to suggest on that point? If there is evidence that can be presented that he was a bad man, but that does not prove him a false prophet. But is there evidence to suggest he's a false prophet. I know of one piece that might be presented. Mr. Myers?

(student.3½) Some examples of false prophets. One example is where Ahab calls in the prophets. 1 Kings 22, right along near there. And Ahab called in the prophets and he said, shall we go to capture Ramoth Gilead or shall we forbear, and all the prophets said, with one voice, go up and conquer Ramoth Gilead, the Lord is going to give it in- to your hands. And Jehoshaphat said is there some other man we could ask what the Lord's will is, and they called in another man and when Maicaiah came they said to him, make your word like these men if you're going to get ahead with the (4½) Well, Maicaiah came in and he said that what the Lord had given him was the exact opposite of the message he had given them. So either they are false prophets or Maicaiah was a false prophet, because their message was the exact opposite. Now of course there are false prophets of Baal, who prophesied in the name of Baal, that would be one kind of false prophet, one who claimed to be a prophet but a prophet of a false god. But these in 1 Kings 22 who prophesied there, are men who claim to be prophets of the Lord. But whose claim is belied, they were false prophets. There are a good many instances in the Old Testament of false prophets. And there are people who say Balaam was a false prophet, but we have noticed much evidence that he was a true prophet. We notice a great deal that he was a true prophet. Now does anybody have some evidence to present on the other side? I think it is very foolish to take any question and go to the Bible simply to find evidence on one side of it. The Bible is a book of truth and your conclusion should be definite on anything on which the Bible gives us a definite answer. It does not answer all questions of course, but if it does your answer should be definite, but you should go looking for evidence on all sides, not just on one. Too many people have been deceived with knowing before they went to the Bible what they wanted to find. They go for proof instead of going to know what God's word is. And so no matter how sure you are of your answer you, if you do it right, you should look for evidence on the other side and see anything you can find that might, from any conceivable way be interpreted as being on the other side, and then having done so, examine it carefully and see just how definite it is. And of course the Bible being a book of truth, in the end you'll find it all fits together one side or the other. But do it carefully and ~~thoroughly~~ fairly

Now, surely, some of you must have given evidence on your paper that he was a false prophet, because I don't believe you can get together with a group of Christian ministers of this size, anywhere, without at least a third of them saying that Balaam was a false prophet. In fact, I spoke once in a seminary less than ten miles from here, I spoke in the Seminary to the students on the subject of Balaam and I met considerable criticism when I said he was a true prophet. They had it drummed into their heads that he was a false prophet. Mr. Shellabarger? (student. 6 3/4. I thought that the only one that I couldn't explain, it would be possible to charge it over to "bad man", either, was the "words of divination" and then the enchantments. Those two seemed to suggest that possibly, and then the fact that God overruled in this case, those taken together might suggest that there was approach made from the standpoint of a heathen man, or prophet, unto the gods.) I think those should have been observed by everybody. I would be pleased if everybody listed them on your lists. I said list evidences to show (1) he was a true prophet, (2) he was a false prophet. Now as Mr. Shellabarger has pointed out, that it says these messengers came to him with the rewards of divination in their hands. They came to him with money as a reward for divining, and certainly that sounds as if he was one who was performed heathen rites. I think that it is true that these heathen who came to him looked upon him as a wonder worker who could do marvelous things and who, for a reward, might give them what they wanted. But that doesn't prove that's what he really was. Because an exact parallel to it would perhaps be found in the case where Simon, in the New Testament, in Samaria went to the apostles, he saw them laying their hands on people and they received the Holy Spirit. He offered them money, he said give me this power, ^{that} I can put my hands on people, and they would receive the Holy Spirit. Well, these apostles didn't have the power to put their hands on somebody and they'd get the Holy Spirit, they didn't have that power at all. God simply used them as indications of his intention to give the Holy Spirit. It was not a power which was in them. But Simon was utterly confused about the matter. He had an entirely heathen viewpoint on it, but the thing of which he had the heathen viewpoint was not heathen. And so their coming with rewards of divination, they might be rewards for divination to them,

but if the prophet proceeded to do what was entirely right ^{and true to} ~~to prove that~~ God, and they still gave him that, he couldn't consider it as a recompense for his time and effort, even though they considered it as something else. It would be much better (9 $\frac{1}{4}$)

that he didn't consider it as they did. But the use of the term in this case, I don't think ^{proves} he is a false prophet but it certainly is a point to look at.

Yes? (student.9 $\frac{1}{4}$) No, I wouldn't think so at all. For one thing, they thought they were doing differently. Balaam said I must ask Jehovah what his will is, and the next morning he said Jehovah says I may not go with you. The witch was one who had a familiar spirit, she did not think she was dealing with the Lord. She knew she was doing something the Lord had forbidden, so ~~you see it was~~ ^{the two are} quite different. Now she would be similar to perhaps what Balaam thought they wanted, but not to what he thought himself

(10) . Yes? (student.10.) Yes, that proves he was a bad man,

very definitely. (student.10 $\frac{1}{4}$) No, unless he gave the counsel as coming from the Lord. If ^{it} he said the counsel ^{which} as he presented as the Lord's message, that would prove he was a false prophet, but I don't think that is a (10 $\frac{1}{2}$)

in fact, I think it's not correct. ~~A certain amount of~~ ^{It's certainly not in that case.}

Mr. Worley? (student.10 $\frac{1}{2}$) Well, I would say it's like this, here is a man who is a good artist, and here is another man who is a bad artist. Well, I'd be a bad artist. I'd stand up here and I would try to make a picture of one of you and somebody might think it represented an entirely different person here, someone else might think it was the picture of a dog or a cat. I would be a very, very bad artist. But here is another man comes in here and he is a wicked man, he is a thief, he is indecent, he is immoral, he is perhaps a murderer. ^But he can come in here and he can take a piece of chalk, he fubs it over this board and in a few minutes you have a picture that thrills us as we see the symmetry and the beauty of that which he has presented on the board. I would say he was a good artist ~~but~~ a bad man. Myself, I'd say I was a bad artist, I'd hope you'd say I was a good man. ^But you see, our term good can be taken as being a moral term or it can be taken as being a term of being skilled or correct in the thing you claim to be. It all rests on the interpretation of the word prophet.

Now if the word prophet means a good man, then there might an argument be made that Balaam was a bad prophet in the sense that he was a bad man. But if prophet means one whom God used as his mouthpiece, we have a tremendous amount of evidence that God used Balaam as his mouthpiece, and then when Balaam said that he was giving God's message, he was giving the message that God gave to him. So that just as a man who was a bad man could be a good artist, I would say ~~that~~ Balaam, even we have evidence in 31:16 that he proved to be a bad man, we have no evidence in these three chapters that prove to be a bad man. But we do have evidence in these three chapters that prove ~~that~~ he was a true prophet. Yes? (student.13.) Yes, well, by their fruits ye shall know them. The fruit of Balaam's prophesying was a message which came out absolutely true, and his predictions of the future which were literally fulfilled, and which gave the message that God desired him to give about his chosen people, ~~by~~ his fruit as a prophet you would know him to be a true prophet. By his fruit as a man you would know him to be a bad man. I think it would be true (13 3/4)

Of course, right there I think of a word of warning to give. The bad things that Balaam did there is something which might be taken to immediately prove that he was a thoroughgoing wicked man who was lost. Now I don't think that necessarily follows. I'd rather leave that for chapters a little further on. But it is possible that he was a man who had fallen into sin, or at least into serious error. It's entirely possible that that was the situation and that ordinarily his life (14 1/4)

But under this head of the true and false prophet, Mr. Shellabarger has mentioned to you the rewards of enchantment, and whenever you hear of a man being offered rewards of enchantment you immediately suspect him of being (14 1/2) one who is performing sorcery, that which is contrary to God's teaching, and in most cases you will be right. But there are cases where there is a people's idea of what the man is and what the man is are entirely ...

...and Christian people having an idea of a man, which when you hear it prejudices you very much against the man, but when you get to know the man you'll find they were entirely wrong in their judgment. You occasionally come across cases like that, not often, but I have occasionally done so, and I wouldn't take other people's judgments too much one way or the other. You'll find people that they are convinced that ~~they~~ a thoroughly good and wonderful man may prove (1)

But now Mr. Shellabarger referred to another (1) which I think also is very important to know. It says in chapter 24:1, when Balaam saw that it pleased the Lord to bless Israel, he ~~want~~ not, as at other times, to seek for enchantments, but he set his face toward the wilderness. And Balaam lifted up his eyes and then he gave a message about Israel. And he ~~want~~ not as at other times to seek for enchantments. That certainly sounds as if on~~y~~ the other times he had done that which dealt with the nature of enchantments, rather than with the nature of a true deliverance of God's prophecy. But we look at the other times to see what he did. What would this word enchantment mean? Right here we come face to face with the central problem of the difference ~~between~~ magic and religion. And it is a very vital difference, and sometimes it is difficult to be sure whether something is magic or whether it is religion. But a difference is that magic is an attempt to compel the deity to do what you want him to do. That is magic. While religion is an ~~attempt~~ to bring yourself in line with the will of the deity and to have his will become effective in your life. That is the difference between the two. Magic is taking supernatural forces and thinking you can control them for your purpose. Religion is seeking to bring yourself into proper relation to the supernatural forces in order that they may work their will in you. That is the vital difference, though there are many, many Christians, at least nominal Christians, who have an idea of Christianity which is a magical idea. They ~~think~~ that by going to church, that by going to a service, by performing certain rites, they secure for themselves ~~that~~ which will make them happy and successful. I saw an article once, about twenty-five years ago in a magazine on tithing. And this magazine mentioned certain great leading business men, one of them was tried for bribery and I'm not sure

h

whether he or the other in the case, there were two of them, one was convicted and one was not, but one of them was convicted and sent to prison. The one I have in mind is Sinclair, the father of the Sinclair Oil Company. Now he and Johinni were both tried and one of them was sent to prison, I forget which. The evidence would seem to be they were both equally involved, in the teapot dome matter. Well, at any rate, this article I'm quite sure I remember correctly, said that Sinclair had made a pledge as a young man that he would tithe with gifts, to God, one tenth of everything that he earned. And it mentioned others who had and then it went on to show how these people had become very wealthy. And then it had a psychologist's discussion, and this psychologist stated that these individuals thinking of themselves as in league with deity, because of their pledging to give a tithe, were thereby strengthening their emotional attitudes and as a result showed greater skill and greater ability than would otherwise be the case, and that that was the reason why these men had become so wealthy, these men who tithed. Well, of course, if a person would tithe and because thereby he would force God to make him wealthy, I'm sure he wouldn't get the least bit of credit in the hereafter for tithing, and the same is true of any other Christian thing that we do. If we do it to force God to do something good for us, that is magic, that is not religion. Well, now, in this case, now enchantments then are usually magic, they are usually the attempt to do something that compelled deity to do what you want him to do. And there are many, there are Christians that (5 $\frac{1}{4}$) most important services of the Christian church can be treated as magic and understood as magic and are by some of the people in any large group of people, there are some who consider them as magic, ~~that~~ that which they do and thereby force God to do something for them. Well, now was that the nature of what Balaam had done before? Well, Balaam said build me seven altars and prepare seven oxen and seven rams; and he said stand by thy burnt offering and I will go, peradventure the Lord will come to meet me, and whatever he shows me I will tell thee. He does not say, the Lord will come and will give you the victory over Israel that you want. He says, perhaps he will come and whatever he shows me I'll tell you. It was an attempt to learn, on Balaam's part, to learn God's will, not an attempt to force

God in line with his will. And the three times that it was done, that he put up altars, and then the Lord spoke after the answer which Balaam gave was just the opposite of what Balak wanted in every case. And now we read here, what is his purpose now, when he saw that it pleased the Lord to bless Israel, he went not as at other times to seek enchantments, but he set his face toward the wilderness, and lifted up his eyes and saw Israel abiding in his tents. He had, now did not need sacrifices or altars or anything in order to try to find what the Lord's will was, he could simply look at Israel and God would give him the answer. There is in it not ^{an attempt} to force the deity to do his will and accomplish his purpose, but it is a means used to try to get God to tell them what his will is, and we find an exact counterpart to it in the case of Elisha. When Elisha was in the wilderness and King of Judah and the King of Israel came to Elisha, and said Elisha we are here and there's no water, has the Lord brought these three kings out here, the King of Edom was with them, in order to have us die of thirst in the wilderness? Elisha looked at the King of Israel and he said if it wasn't for the presence of the good King of Judah I wouldn't look at you or say anything, but he said now, he said I will try to find what the Lord's will is, for the sake of the King of Judah. He said bring me a minstrel, and they brought him a minstrel and he said play, and he played and when he played Elisha prophesied, and Elisha said you will see no raid, you will hear no water coming down, but the ditches will be full of water, build ditches here, dig dams here and they will be full of water, and they immediately got busy and dug the ditches, and it rained way up the country where they couldn't see it at all, and the water came flowing down and filled their ditches and they had plenty of water. Well, in that case, Elisha used a means, which in the hands of the heathen would be an enchantment, but in Elisha's case, I would say, he played the instrument of music in order to quiet his own soul which was so upset in the presence of this wicked king of Israel, to the point where he could hear the voice of God and see what his will was in the matter.

This word enchantment suggests that he was a false prophet but examination of the passage yields up the opposite conclusion, though it certainly be set down as an evidence looking at first sight in the direction of being a false prophet. But on examination

not proving it. It doesn't prove the opposite of itself, but the context proves the opposite. Well, anyway, the two questions, is he a true prophet or a false prophet, the third and fourth, was he a good man or was he a bad man? And when you take the first thing he did, he certainly was a good man. People come with rewards and they say you come, you're to curse this people and I'll give you a reward, and he says you wait, I'm going to go and see what the Lord says. That was a good act of a good man, to go slow and get the Lord's will before acting. And then the next morning, Balaam said to them, go to your land, the Lord refuses to give me leave to go with you. That was the act of a good man, refusing to be led by the gifts into doing that which was not the Lord's will. But then they came back with more money and more honorable messengers, then they asked him to come, and then Balaam said to the servants of Balak, if Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold I cannot go beyond the word of the Lord my God, to do less or more. That certainly was the act of a good man to say that, but then he said, now therefore, I pray you, tarry you also here this night that I may know what the Lord will say unto me more. That was the act of a bad man. It was the act of a good man to say exactly the same thing before, now he knew the Lord's will, it was the act of a bad man. But there's no man living, no matter how good he is, who has not occasionally lapsed and far as that, there's no man except the Lord Jesus Christ who ever kept (11) that he did not do that action some time. Then Balaam spoke to the Lord and evidently in such a way, and the Lord said go. The Lord gave him ^{permissive} ~~tremendous~~ will, go, but say the thing I say, don't give in to them. That was not the Lord's directive will, Ever, for a righteous man to go under wicked auspices, where wicked men think they are going to use him. It's never the Lord's will. But there are men who under those circumstances, under the permissive will of the Lord, do and do a real service, but it's not the best. Then the next morning the Lord caused the ass to speak and then the angel spoke to Balaam, and the purpose of it there of course, was to strengthen Balaam in the intention that Balaam had already spontaneously, if he went, to say only what God wanted, because the Lord was determined to use him for God's purpose. So at this point, the evidence is a little bit on the side of his being bad rather than good. But I mean

everyone has that much evidence in their lives. Now

Now he goes and here he faces Balak and says exactly the opposite of what Balak wants him to, he gives four messages and everyone of them he praises Israel, he says that God is going to bless Israel, he says everything exactly opposite of what Balak wants--a wonderful example of constancy and determination and standing for the truth of the Lord. And if we had nothing more beyond chapter 24 I would think undoubtedly we must say he was a very good man. But when one gives in to the point he did and follows the permissive will rather than the directive will of God, even though (13)

stand true to God, and he does, he puts

himself in serious danger as Balaam did. And so when the chapter ends, he rose up and went to return to his place, and Balak also went his way, you would think from that that Balaam had gone back up to where he lived in Mesopotamia and left the whole business, but when you get over to chapter 31 you find that's not true, where he went to his own place must have been he went to his tent, in amongst the forces of Balak. Because in chapter 31 there you find that, when the Israelites fought against the Midianites, verse 8 says, Balaam also the son of Beor they slew with the sword. So we learn he was still down there in those wicked (13 3/4) and that's the great danger, when one goes to bear a testimony to the Lord, under auspices under which he should not go, he may accomplish something for a time for the Lord, but there's grave danger of his staying there to eventually be caught up with their faith.

And then verse 16 we learn much beyond that because verse 16 says, behold, these caused the children of Israel, through the counsel of Balaam, to commit trespass against the Lord in the matter of Peor and there was a plague among the congregation of the Lord. And so we know that Balaam gave them advice which led to their seducing the children of Israel. Well, now it's not easy to see what his advice was. Balaam said, God is holy, God is righteous, God cannot bless iniquity. Now then, he says, God being so holy and so righteous, he said, Balak, I can't curse Israel because God blesses them. I can't give you a prediction from God that (14 3/4)

because God has given me opposite, but he said, Balak, God is a holy God, he is a righteous God. // If you should lead the children of Israel into iniquity God can't keep on blessing them, he will have to start cursing them...

O.T.History 207. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...and God will spew them out of his mouth, and Balaam's idea was entirely right, God will spew them out of his mouth those who do wickedness, but it was not the action of his message to lead them to wickedness. That was a case where it could just be that Balaam must have been so disappointed when, with all his loyalty to the Lord and his standing true and giving the message, he ended up with absolutely nothing for his pay. And he said, well, he said, what's the use, he said I'm going to get something out of this for myself, he said I can at least tell them how holy God is, and they can get their result by this approach which will recognize the holiness of God instead of opposing it, and Balaam there advised ($1\frac{1}{4}$)

and brought upon himself the terrible fate that came. And there's many a man that has been marvelously used of the Lord who has spoken for the Lord, and presented his word and stood for his truth and was used of the Lord, who has become discouraged and disheartened and dissatisfied and has let himself become an agent of iniquity. It's very easy for us to sit in chairs and say well now, here's what's right and there's what's wrong, and I would never think of falling into a thing like that but many very, very fine people have, and we need to live very, very close the the Lord in order to avoid that.

I was talking with a man not long ago who was working for a very fine Christian organization and he was working for that organization and doing publicity work for them and I was much interested in the work he was doing and I said to him, now I said, I wonder what experience you've had at this, what is your background? Oh, he said, I worked for this institution for five years and for this institution for five years, in their publicity work, and the two institutions he named sounded to me like institutions that would take quite a different stand than the one he was now working in, and I was a bit surprised and I said to him well, you must have found it rather difficult to write

publicity material and advertising material to raise money and get help and so on, for those two institutions which have such a different view from the one you're working for now. Oh, no, he said, a person can do this work objectively. They tell me what the ideas are they want to get across, and I prepare folders and articles and statements to get those ideas across. Well, actually, I believe I'm right in thinking that he now is there working for that in which he believes, and is doing what he wants to do now, but along the way, when no position opened up to use his talents for that in which he did believe, he felt that he could objectively use them in favor of that which was just a little bit removed from what he believed. And I think he was putting himself into a terribly dangerous situation. I think he was putting himself in a situation which could easily have led him into sin just as bad as that of Balaam. Very dangerous position. But it's typical of the sort of temptations that will come to every Christian sometime in his life, if he's any good at all, along the way he's going to have that sort of temptation. So I feel that instead of saying, oh, look at that wicked man Balaam, we will just have nothing to do with anybody like that, I feel that instead of that we can look at him a little bit sympathetically and objectively, and we can see warning for ourselves in it, in the way that a man who had so much good in him, as Balaam did, could fall like that. I don't say that any of us who really believe in the Lord could ever be lost, but I do say we can be saved as by fire, and have much more to regret in our life than we have to be thankful for, and unless this group of people facing me today is very, very different from any group of ^{equal} ~~people~~ size that I've ever faced in my life before, there will be some here who thirty years from now will look back and it will be obvious that they are in exactly that situation. I've never known a group of this size of young people anywhere in my life that some have not, in the course of the next thirty years, fallen very, very far away from the things of--I've never had any one, and I've been in some mighty fine groups of people. But those that I've known twenty or thirty years later, there have always been some, and often some of those whom you would least expect, some of those who seem strongest and clearest in their testimony, who have been one of the ones who have drifted along. Yes? (5 1/2 student) I don't think he went

beyond God's message. (student.5½) No, I wouldn't say that, I would say-- (student. 5 3/4) No, I would say that a disobedient--well, now, take the example of an artist. Supposing I got an artist in here to draw a picture of a strong man up here, and instead he drew a picture of a beautiful woman, he would be a disobedient artist. But if I got an artist in here to draw for me and that man had promised his wife that he would bring her beef for supper and he brought her pork instead, he would be a disobedient husband but not a disobedient artist. That is I would say that Balaam, as a prophet, was obedient as far as we know because the prophet's work was taking God's message and passing it on, and he passed on, as far as any evidence goes, exactly the message which God gave him. There is not the slightest evidence anywhere that he gave anybody a message which he said came from God which didn't. But that he went to the Moabites and said to them, here is God's message, he's going to bless Israel, he says I have not seen iniquity in Israel, I have beheld no perversions in Israel, God is going to bless Israel. Now, he says to them, my advice to you is, see if you can introduce perversity into Israel and then the God who can only bless goodness and can't bless wickedness will be unable to bless Israel any more. He was advising the Moabites as a man, he would not be giving a message as a prophet, unless he went to the Moabites and said thus saith the Lord, you go ahead and do this, well there is certainly not the slightest evidence that he did that. I wouldn't say he was a disobedient prophet at all, but that he was a disobedient man who was also a prophet. Now the case is different, in 1 Kings 13, where we have a prophet who received a message from God which was, go into the land of Samaria, give a message there and come back without eating or drinking anything in that place. The prophet went up there and gave his message but he stopped and ate with them, he disobeyed the specific message that God had given him. He was a disobedient prophet, but there's no evidence of anything of that kind with Balaam. Yes? (student.8) Balaam did the same thing. The Lord told him not to up and Balaam went up. Well, that should be listed on the side of false prophet. Yes? (student.8½) Yes, that would be my impression. Yes? (student.8½) But there's definitely more of a connection. But I believe that we should separate in our mind. I think that it is true that a man who is

a spokesman for God should be a man of high moral character. I think that is true, and I think that it is also true that those who speak against God~~s~~ will, in the course of time, invariably, into less moral characters, but I don't think there's always a correlation. I think you will find men who are preaching the gospel and God is blessing their (9 3/4) and souls are being saved and people are being wonderfully edified and they perhaps are taking a great stand for the Lord right straight down the line. And perhaps they aren't. I mean I've known people of both kinds, who, you get to know them, and you find meanness and underhandedness. I know a man not connected with any group I'm connected with, but he told me of a couple of groups he was with, where there were two men who were just outstanding. He said to me, it's lucky those two men are Christians, because he says, if they were~~not~~ and they did the things that they do in Christian work that they did in other things, they'd both be in jail. Now that's what he said about them and he was working very closely with them, and thinking very highly of them. I notice now he's broken with one of them, so I don't know why that is. I haven't seen him lately. But the fact is that there are men whom God wonderfully uses who in their personal life have many reprehensible characters, and God will judge them for these characters, but he is using them.

I know of one evangelist who is remarkably used of the Lord, who, I was told that he went to a church and he held a service and the minute that they brought up the plate, he said to those folks in the church, now, he says, you bring it and put it right here. It goes right here, I'm going to have them right in my hands until that money is taken up and counted. Well, he's been cheated somewhere, but it put him into a situation that certainly made him seem pretty avaricious, and I'm afraid that the Lord won't continue to use him with that sort of an attitude towards the money that's brought up. He gives most wonderful sermons, on self-denial and loyalty to the Lord and wonderfully used. And I've known of many people whom he has led to the Lord. But he fell into a sin, now he shouldn't but he did. On the other hand, I know of modernist preachers who are among the finest, most gracious, most lovely people you'd ever want to know, and who in their ethical life and in their character just seem to be just the finest example. Now it's

my contention that in every case that they're like that you will find a real Christian background, and they're living on the Christianity of their parents of of their upbringing, but that would be difficult to prove. But it is a fact that there are very, very good people, ethically, who are working against the Lord and there are people with very serious faults whose message the Lord has wonderfully used. Now these are the exceptions, they are not the rule. I've had lots of people say to me, well the fundamentalists have got good ^{doctrine} ~~backing~~, but ^{most of the} ~~the~~ modernists have got ^{the} ~~good~~ character, they've got the real love in their hearts and the real character. Now that is absolutely false. Because if you take the fundamentalists, and the modernists, and take them all, my contention is that you would find that the ethical character of the fundamentalists is two or three hundred per cent higher than the ethical character of the modernist, but there are striking exceptions in both (12 3/4) very striking exceptions.

And so I think it is helpful to us in our thinking to separate between the two. And that's why I tried to make four sections here, (13) as a prophet and yet also as a man. And I think it would be a shame if, on account of the great detestation which he should have for the wicked ending of Balaam's life, if on account of that we would fail to see the wonderful example he set up to a point, that he stood so true to the Lord and gave his message so faithfully. Now of course he did very seriously fall when he asked the Lord ~~whether~~ he should go and the Lord said no, and he said I won't go; then he asked again but it is true that when he asked again, the scripture says the Lord said if the men come and ask you to go, go with them. It is true that that is said, Now that is the permissive will of God, not the directive will. But as was stated, the Lord gave his permissive will, he didn't say God says not to go but I'm going anyway. The Lord said go and he went. But then the Lord stood in the way to (14) and to show him that this was only the permissive, not the directive will. Yes? (student.14) He mentions Balaam as one, he says (14 1/2)

the people who follow greedily after the example of Balaam, but he speaks of certain people (14 1/2) I don't think he says Balaam

(student.14 1/2) ...

(student.)...He says, verse 12, but these as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil ~~of the things that they understand not~~ and receive the reward of unrighteousness, and so on, having eyes full of adultery, then, verse 15, which have forsaken the right way and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam the son of Bosor who loved the wages of unrighteousness, but was rebuked for his iniquity, the dumb ass speaking with man's voice forbade the madness of the prophet. It certainly shows the evil in Balaam which we should avoid, but it does not seem to me that that shows that he was a false prophet. It is true that it didn't accomplish (1 3/4)

Yes? (student.2.) Yes, any false prophet will cause people to err, but that doesn't mean that when one causes them to err he is necessarily a false prophet. That is to say, Balaam as a prophet gave the correct message, but Balaam as a counselor certainly showed them how to err. We can't (2 1/2)

(student.2 3/4) Would there be a time element in that a prophet is a prophet only as he is speaking, as God leads him to speak, and once he is through speaking he is no longer a prophet?) I think we have to say that. (student.3. If that would be the case then--) I believe we must say that, just like a man is a colonel in the army as long as he's in the army. When he is discharged from the army they may call him a colonel the rest of his life but unless he stays in the reserve he's not a colonel. Now a priest is a priest as long as he's in active service. He has his times of relaxation between the service, but he is a priest. But a prophet is a prophet when God is speaking through him, and God may use a prophet for one day, for two days, for a week, for a year, or for a lifetime. But the great majority of them are only used for a brief time. I think that we have to say there's that difference between a prophet and a priest, looking at the evidence. Well

Well, now, we must go on, these questions I asked you about evidence that he was a true or false prophet, a good man or a bad man. And then I asked you to discuss each of the following verses. Numbers 22:19, 20, and 22, those dealt with, of course, his going and we have discussed those here. But then in chapter 23, I asked you to look in 23 at verse 10, where he says, who can count the dust of Jacob and the number of the fourth

fourth part of Israel? Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his! And that is a wonderful thing to say, let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his, but unfortunately we find that his death was among the wicked and it is an example of one's testimony, ^{and} one's word, and his life may not fit. And a great warning to all of us. In this case he gave the word now, and I've known many a man who has stood up and declared how loyal he would be to the Lord, he would stand for him to the death and give a wonderful example of his absolute loyalty to the Lord, and then has refused to stand up for the Lord when it came to a matter of losing his pension. That has been, he was ready to risk his life but when it came to his pension why he has stood with that which he knew was wicked and which he declared was wicked and had criticized. But when he saw some personal loss to himself he just subsided and was quiet and submitted. Balaam is to that extent an example of many men in our own day. And then in verse 21, a very interesting verse, which I asked you to discuss. What do you think of verse 21 here? Behold, I have received commandments to bless, and he has blessed, and I cannot reverse it. He hath not beheld iniquity in Jacob, neither has he seen perverseness in Israel. What do you think of that verse? God has not beheld iniquity in Jacob, nor has he seen perverseness in Israel. Well, somebody says yes, Jacob, Israel, were absolutely holy, free from all evil, up to when Balaam advised them how to lead them astray. In chapter 25 we find all kinds of Israelites falling into wickedness, but before that of course, God did not behold iniquity in Jacob. Would that be a true statement? Anybody who has read the earlier chapters of this book of Numbers has seen instance after instance of the greatest wickedness among the people, and in Exodus, look how they fell away in the case of the Golden Calf. Look at the murmurings, look at the instance of the spies, look at the occasion of the rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, and yet Balaam says, God has not beheld iniquity in Jacob, he has not seen perverseness in Israel. What can you do in a case like that? Does that prove that Balaam was false in what he said? I don't think so in the light of the rest of the things he said, that worked out so exactly. What does it prove? Yes? (student.7. Just like God does not behold sin in us because we're in Christ.

However. (7 $\frac{1}{2}$) he still blesses us.) I think that is a perfect example. In fact, I've given it in the commentary here in Numbers. It was a very perfect example. It's not an exact parallel but it is a good example. ^{The} parallel is not exact but the case is quite similar. God looked at Israel and saw what his intention was, rather than what the actual situation was of the people. Then, this whole generation had died in the wilderness, these people were in all sorts of iniquity and perverseness and the next chapter shows what they fell into, but God saw them in the light of his purpose to make of them a holy nation, a kingdom of priests, those who would keep alive his name, and he did not behold iniquity in Jacob nor perverseness in Israel, and that of course is where Balaam in his later counsel got confused. He thought, you lead the people in sin and God will have to destroy them. God ~~was~~ not blessing because they were righteous, but because of his purpose of grace, and it's exactly the same way with us. Misery loves company, and a man ^{who} with a Christian background, has fallen into sin and unbelief you will find often, (8 $\frac{1}{2}$) to lead others astray, to lead others into sin and to lead others into unbelief. But God sees us, if we're in Christ, he sees Christ in us and he looks at us and we are justified. He does not behold iniquity in us, and yet he also looks at our state and sees all sorts of iniquity that he is anxious that we shall get over and be cleansed. So then the next verse I asked you to look at was chapter 24, verses 17-19, and here is a passage which is very, very widely misunderstood, in my opinion. ~~Here-we-find~~

Here we find that he says, I see him, but not now: I behold him, but not night: there shall come a Star out of Jacob and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel and shall smite the corners of Moab and destroy all the children of Sheth. And Edom shall be a possession, Seir also shall be a possession for his enemies, and Israel shall do valiantly. Out of Jacob shall come he that shall have dominion, and shall destroy him that remaineth of the city. When I was teaching in another Seminary, before Faith was founded I remember one time, just before, right at Christmas time, when the President of the Seminary, in the chapel service read this passage, as an appropriate Christmas passage, Evidently thereby taking the interpretation of it, which is very widely taken, that this

is a Messianic passage in which Balaam predicts the Lord Jesus Christ. Now is it a passage in which Balaam predicts the Lord Jesus Christ? What does he say about him? I see him, but now now, I behold him, but not nigh~~t~~. And certainly Christ didn't come for centuries after Balaam's prophecy. There shall come a star out of Jacob, well, Jesus was certainly a star out of Jacob. A Sceptre shall rise out of Israel, he was certainly a sceptre out of Israel, wasn't he? And shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth. Well Christ brought salvation to all people of all lands. And Edom shall be a possession, Seir shall be a possession, Israel shall do valiantly. Out of Jacob shall come he that shall have dominion. Is this a picture of Christ? Well, I think that if you say somebody is going to be born in Bethlehem, that doesn't necessarily talk about Christ, though Christ was born in Bethlehem. If you say something that could fit Christ, it doesn't necessarily prove it's talking about Christ. You have to ask what is it talking about? And in this situation here Balaam is talking about the fact that ~~this~~ Balak and the Moabites and the Edomites want to destroy Israel. And Balaam says, no, you will not succeed in destroying Israel, but on the contrary, he says, I see a king coming~~ing~~ out of Israel, not in the immediate future, he's not near, but I see a sceptre rising out of Israel, who will conquer Moab and conquer Edom, and a few centuries pass and David was born in Bethlehem, David became king of Israel, David conquered the Moabites and conquered the Edomites, and it was an exact precise complete and full and literal fulfillment of this prediction. And it is a prediction of Balaam. Now you can say well Jesus is like David to some extent, and anything that talks about David can also be about Christ. Well, if you wanted, you can say that. You can say that when Samuel went and anointed David and said this is going to be the king, he was predicting Christ, that Christ was going to be anointed to be king. You can say that if you want. But it seems to me that if ~~you~~^{we} say it, we should recognize it as only a secondary sort of interpretation, that ^{it} whether it is talking about David or it is talking about Christ, that ordinarily we don't speak of both of them with the same type of

(12 3/4)

and in~~this~~ case the prediction of David fits the context exactly. It's the thing they were dealing with. Is Moab going to be able to conquer Israel? No. A king will come in Israel that will conquer Moab. And so this is a prediction of David and I personally think it's wrong to use it as a prediction of Christ. Well, our time is up...

We were speaking yesterday about E, The Balaam Incident, and under that we had three heads, if you remember, number 1, The Summoning of Balaam; 2, Balaam's Prophecies; and 3, The Aftermath. But instead of going through that step by step, since it had been assigned to you, I've been looking at the sections of the assignment. And we were looking yesterday at chapter 24:17-19, at the end of the hour. And we notices that there, in that section, the predictions which are made are in relation to a situation, and that is true of most prophecy, it is in relation to a situation. God has given his book for all ages, it contains the material that he wants to be available all through subsequent history, but very seldom, if ever, does a prophet sit down and say now I'm going to write something that will be useful to people three thousand years from now. The prophet dealt with the immediate situation. And God caused that from the many messages the prophets gave, those should be reserved which had in them special value for some future age, perhaps for all future age. And so here, this immediate situation with which they are dealing is a situation when the Moabites and the Midianites want to destroy Israel, and the answer that is given is, no, you are not going to be able to destroy Israel, in fact, Israel is going to continue, and will continue for a long time because I see him, but not now. A long ways off, one is coming, one who will lead Israel in destroying you, and Moab and Edom will be conquered by Israel. And we have the account in 2 Samuel of the details of how David conquered Moab and Edom, an exact, literal fulfillment of this promise, and of course you could take any good statement that's ever made and you could say, well, that could fit Christ. Certainly. You can take any good thing in life and you could find a comparison to Christ. But that this is actually dealing with Christ here, is certainly reading into the scripture something for which there is no warrant. It's very clear that ^{it} he is dealing with David. And when David becomes a great type of Christ, naturally, most anything about David can, in a secondary sense, be applied to Christ. But this is not a prediction of Christ. It is a prediction of David and it says David is going to conquer Moab and Edom, and then he goes on and says that out of Jacob shall come he that shall have dominion, and shall destroy him that remaineth of the city. And we find David conquering the great cities

of these nations and destroying multitudes of their peoples. And then we read, he looked on Amalek, and he took up his parable, and said, Amalek was the first of the nations, but his latter end shall be that he perish for ever. And this has nothing to do with Christ but it's literally fulfilled in the history of Amalek. Amalek was completely destroyed. And he looked on the Kenites and took up his parable, and said, Strong is thy dwellingplace, and thou puttest thy nest in a rock. Nevertheless the Kenite shall be wasted, until Asshur shall carry thee away captive. Well, so the Assyrians carry them away captive. Asshur, you know, is the god of Assyria. The Hebrew word is Asshur, which is used for the god Asshur, the land Asshur, and the people Asshur. In English if we mean the god, we say Asshur, if we mean the people, we say Assyrians, if we mean the land we say Assyria. In the Hebrew the one word represents all three. In Babylonia, one word represents all three but they put a ($4\frac{1}{4}$) * up there to show whether they mean a land or a people or a god. Of course we don't have * in Hebrew.

And so we look forward to the Assyrian captivity. What book of the Bible describes the Assyrian captivity? How many of you could tell me? What book describes the Assyrian captivity? Is there no one but Mr. Tow who knows when the, who knows what the Assyrian captivity ($5\frac{1}{4}$) . No one but Mr. Tow and Mr. Blizzard? Evidently I selected the right ones then to help with the organization. But the northern kingdom was conquered in 721 B.C. by the Assyrians who took them captive. Then the Babylonians conquered the Assyrians and they conquered the southern kingdom in 587 B.C. Those are two dates that we will, by the end of this semester, have as two of the four five most important dates in all Biblical history, because they are dates that are definitely fixed by archeological evidence. But the Assyrians conquered the northern kingdom in 721 B.C. There was a great marauding force of several ($6\frac{1}{2}$) centuries, the greatest aggressor _____ force in the world. I-r

I remember reading an article by a young fellow who was one of the leading Assyriologists of Germany, back in 1936, and he called it The Rise of Assyria to a Great Conquering Power, and of course he was trying to curry favor with the Nazi lead-

ers by showing how the Assyrians had conquered the world and now the Nazis were rising in similar fashion. And the Nazis were utterly destroyed and so were the Assyrians. But the Assyrian aggressive conquest, one of the most ruthless in all history, one of the most bloody in all history, lasted for three or four centuries, while Hitler's lasted for not over three or four years. I saw this same man recently, in Munich last summer, he was with the Nazis actively working with them, and then when the war came to an end, he was imprisoned as a Nazi and there in prison, in suffering, someone came in contact with him, gave him the gospel, and in the condition he was in, he was ready to listen to him. He is a Professor of Assyriology in Vienna now and ^avery active Christian, and one of the, if I had picked the ones I knew in Germany twenty years ago, I knew him very slightly, if I had picked the ones I ever thought would become active Christians, I'm sure he'd have been very low on the list. It shows the Lord's working in His wonderful way. ~~It~~

But the Assyrian conquest is described in 2 Kings and also in, no, very little in 2 Chronicles, mostly in 2 Kings. 2 Chronicles deals mostly with the southern kingdom, while 2 Kings deals with both. So that here Balaam was way forward to the Assyrian conquest. Many centuries before the end of the Israelite kingdom, of the northern kingdom. Until Asshur shall carry thee away captive. Asshur was way across the desert. And then he looked still further, took up his parable, and said, Alas, who shall live when God does this, and ships shall come from the coast of Chittim, and shall afflict Asshur and shall afflict Eber, and he also shall perish for ever. Here you have Alexander the Great's troops, forces, coming, way from the Mediterranean, attacking, and they also coming to their end.

So, Balaam had a view of the distant future in which he touched upon important ~~things~~ changes that were going to take place in the political history of the world. But there's no evidence that he actually had any vision of (9)

Now, number 3 is the Aftermath of the Balaam Incident. And that's chapter 25, and chapter 25 ^{would} was hardly impress a reader as having anything to do with what preceded if the book ended with chapter 25. Chapter 25 tells of how there was--these people

began to commit whoredom with the daughters of Moab, and they called the people to the sacrifices of their gods, and the people ate and bowed down to their gods. It shows, instead of war between Moab and Israel, it shows infiltration. It shows the Israelites being led away in sin, a much more effective method of destroying the witness of God than war. But you would never dream from this chapter that Balaam had anything to do with it. It follows the previous chapter which tells about Balaam. You say well, the book talks about Balaam and then they go and they tell about this. You'd never think there was a relation till you get on to Numbers 31 where you read how Balaam had counseled them to lead people into wickedness. And that one verse in 31 and the references ^{to it} in the New Testament show us that the order of the chapters here is not just tying together two unrelated things, which happened about the same time, but that there's a definite positive relationship. And that Balaam who gave these wonderful prophecies, who presented God's word so faithfully in his messages, yet in his private life and private counsel, sought for his own advancement. Some people think that Judas took a similar attitude. There are those who think that Judas Iscariot felt absolutely certain that Christ would assert his power and would not be injured, but that meantime he could pick up a few extra pieces of silver by playing along with the other side for a little bit, giving them the information they wanted. Well, we can't see into the heart of Judas, certainly he must've had some feeling of great interest in Christ for a while, or he wouldn't have followed along with him, and become, or seemed to be so ardent a member of the group that they gave him the (11 $\frac{1}{2}$) of treasurer. He gradually began taking out of the bag a little for himself, and then he found himself in financial difficulties and perhaps just for a temporary thing, he tried to help himself out, thinking perhaps that he couldn't hurt Christ after all, but in the end he got himself a name of being the son of perdition, the very one who is detested throughout the Christian world ever since. And Balaam, here, standing so true, giving the message so faithfully, yet ruined it all, by ⁱⁿ his private life, having this covetousness for money, and giving the people a very reasonable argument. God sees no iniquity in Israel, and he blesses them. Introduce iniquity into Israel and God will purge them.

I can't purge them, but God wants to bless them and we can't (12 $\frac{1}{4}$) change God's attitude. It is true that God's attitude toward the nations does change, when a nation goes into iniquity. He no longer blesses it, but woe to him that leads it into iniquity.

Well, we won't take time to go into the details of this chapter 25 but we will go on to F.

And capital F, Preparation for Entrance into Canaan. And the slowness of information about perhaps one of the most important things in the history of the Israelite Kingdom shows that we must carry on a little faster to get in all the historical facts which are very vital, so I'll run over this Preparation for Entrance into Canaan rather hastily. Chapter 26:1-36:13. It is the last ten chapters of the book of Numbers and it is much less interesting reading than the earlier part, though there are many lessons in it for us. We won't take time for these lessons, just mention very briefly one or two of them. The preparation for entrance into Canaan, my heading for that includes ~~not only the rest of Numbers for that includes not only~~ but also the whole book of Deuteronomy, because Deuteronomy is not primarily a historical book. It is mostly legal and that's not essential for this particular course. So it is included under this heading, Numbers 26:1 to the end of 36, and the book of Deuteronomy. And we'll briefly outline the rest of Numbers, Number 1, The New Census. That's chapter 26. The book of Numbers is so-called for having a lot of Numbers. Well, where are they? Chapters 1 and 26. 1 and 26 are all numbers, most of the rest of the book has very few numbers. It is a very poor title. But chapter 1 gives the census as they left Sinai, ready to make the conquest. Then they failed at Kadesh Barnea, the whole generation died in the wilderness, so the generation later were to make the conquest, and so a new census is necessary. We've already told you in that other (14 3/4) how God punished David for making a census...

O.T.History 210. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

1..because the people were going forward to accomplish God's purpose and preparation is necessary for a purpose. There are times when God will bring great results suddenly and

sporadically, but they are rare, but ordinarily great results come as a result of careful preparation. So the census is a vital part of the preparation. He wants us to survey our resources and understand what they are and see that we're ready for the task we undertake for him and if we're not ready to get ready. You don't need to worry about finding opportunities for serving the Lord, the world is full of them. You need to worry about being fit to meet the opportunities when the time comes. Mr. Welch? (student.1 $\frac{1}{4}$) Yes, the word for thousands, thousands is not the word for family, but the word thousands is used to represent a unit, it's not a unit of an ordinary family, but it's used for a large unit which probably comes from one ancestor. It speaks for instance about Bethlehem in one of the predictions, though thou art small among the thousands of Judah. So the term thousands is used in the sense of a division of people which could conceivably be more than a thousand or less than a thousand, could be a lot less. And there are places in the Bible where undoubtedly that is what the Hebrew word ($2\frac{1}{4}$) * should be translated as meaning. But in this particular case it is not true at all, because it gives the figures of the tribes and then it adds them up to give the total. (student.2 $\frac{1}{2}$) Well, there are places where people have tried to make a mathematical figure out of where it isn't, because the word doesn't mean thousand in those cases. But in this chapter it does. Well number 1, then, is the New Census.

Number 2, A Special Problem Regarding Inheritance of Land. This is a matter of law, I only mention it here for completeness. It's a very interesting problem. It's chapter 27:10-11, but we won't have time for it in this course.

Number 3, The Appointment of a New Leader for the Conquest of Canaan. That is Numbers 27:12-26, and that is a very instructive passage. I have asked you for last Friday, to turn in a study of everything we learned about Joshua previous to this time, and to see how thoroughly God prepared him for his work. The average Seminary student of intelligence and energy, when he graduates from Seminary, is already to turn the world upside down and whatever church or situation he goes into, he wants to make everything different in it, to make it exactly right and the most efficient possible. Very fine ambition, but unfortunately after he gets a few hard knocks because he finds

the people don't move quite that fast, and a lot of his good ideas, or he thinks they are, in practice prove to need considerable rethinking before they're in shape to put through. The average fellow loses all that, and is ready to fit into a groove and carry on in strictly normal fashion the rest of his life. Now Joshua had a long period of work with others and under others, in which he learned how to do things well, and then he had ~~the time~~^{time} when he was in a position of leadership, when he could use all his initiative and all his energy in thinking things through and doing it the very best way possible, and it is well to conserve that energy and that initiative until the time when you're in a position properly to use it and not to lose it by thinking that you can immediately do things that you're not yet ready for. It's all right to try things, but when you get a few knocks don't lose your desire to go forward. Simply realize that it just means you weren't ready. Now here's Joshua who has gone through all this long preparation, and he has been ready to be subject to Moses and to assist Moses in every conceivable way. I know a young fellow, twenty years ago, out at Seminary, who went out to Southern California, started a radio program and he was able to get some money to support it, he had a good gospel message, and was doing a good piece of work, but in a very limited way. Young people heard the program and they said there's no life to it, no real, there is some good stuff but there's nothing really to hold you in it. It really wasn't going as it should, and the man who had a very successful radio program invited this man to come and assist him, to work with him. And he told a friend of mine, he said no indeed, I'm going to be the head of my own show. I'm going to run my own program because I'm not going to be assistant to anybody. Well, in a very short time, his program failed, I don't know what became of it, but he had a lot of good thoughts, and a lot of fine ideas, but he needed experience, he needed what he could learn from others. And he was not willing to take a second place, until the Lord would show him that he had secured the necessary training, and the necessary qualities to be ready to take a primary place. Well, Joshua had been willing to take the low place, and to work harder for years here, and now the Lord said to him, at the beginning of this passage, verse 12, the Lord said to Moses, get thee up to Mount Abarim and see the land

which I have given to the children of Israel. And when thou hast seen it, thou also shall be gathered to thy people as Aaron thy brother was gathered. For ye rebelled against my commandment in the desert of Zin, in the strife of the congregation, to sanctify me at the water before their eyes, that is the water of Meribah in Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin.

Now can't you just imagine Moses, nothing in the world he's more anxious to do than to lead the people into Canaan. Nothing in the world that he wants better to do, than to carry on the work to completion, and God gives him this message. And if you or I were in his place we would say oh God, can't you forgive me for that? I made one misstep but think of all the good things I did. Why can't I keep on a bit longer? After all, I'm just as strong as I ever was, even if I am a hundred and twenty years old, I'm just as strong as I ever was. Can't you let me keep on and lead them into Canaan and have the joy of that conquest? But what does Moses say? Moses said to the Lord, let the Lord, the God of the spirits of all flesh, set a man over the congregation, which may go out before them, may go in before them, which may lead them out and bring them in, that the congregation of the Lord be not as sheep which have no shepherd. Moses' thought was not for himself but for the people. Moses, in a position where his work is finished, instead of complaining, or arguing, or seeking release from the penalty, his full concern is that the work may go forward and that God will provide proper leadership for it. And it is a wonderful example for us here. Those that honor the Lord the Lord will honor and those whose interest is in the Lord's work rather than in their own success or ^{effectiveness} failure will find themselves honored of the Lord in the end. No one has been more honored than Moses aside from the Lord Jesus Christ. But he did not seek honor for himself, he sought for the success of God's work and here his first thought, faced with this situation, is oh, the people left without a leader, may the Lord provide a leader. And the Lord said to Moses, Take thee Joshua the son of Nun, a man in whom is the spirit and lay thine hand upon him.

I heard a great Jewish scholar, three or four weeks ago, speaking on Bible translation and he said that in Genesis 1:3 it shouldn't be the spirit of God moved on the

face of the water, he said it was a mighty wind, the wind of God, moving on the waters. Because, he said, it wasn't until (9 $\frac{1}{4}$) about the time of Christ, that they began thinking of that as spirit, but he said the word (9 $\frac{1}{2}$) * means wind in early days, it was only later the idea of spirit gets added. I wonder if he would translate this, take thee Joshua the son of Nun, a man in whom is the wind, and lay thine hand upon him? Certainly the word means spirit in many of the very earliest illustrations, if you look for them. And here the Lord says, take a man, the important thing is that he has the spirit of God, that's the most important selective point. But unfortunately, when a church is selecting a leader, the big problem is does he have a nice voice, does he know how to mix pleasantly with people, and does he make a good impression, and all those things, even with good Christian people who should be thinking first, does he have the spirit of God. But that is what God gave as the primary thing for Moses, for Joshua. Now this was no surprise to Moses. Moses had been working with Joshua for years, but the final decision was not made, as far as Moses knew, until this time. Joshua had a chance to prove himself, and it's all too often that we take an inexperienced person and we say, now you be my assistant, you be my, you study with me and work with me and you'll step into my shoes when I retire. It's all too often that decisions like that are made earlier instead of giving a person a chance to prove himself. I don't know what sad experiences in that line Professor Robert Dick Wilson may have had, but I think at least he had the thought well in mind, because when he was getting near the end of his life, and he was very interested in my training, my preparation, and interested in my going over to Europe to study as I did for two and a half years, the Semitic language and so on, and he got me a special fellowship from the President of the American Bible Society to pay for my first year in Europe. And he was thoroughly interested, yet whenever he would speak of the future, he never made a definite committal to me that I would eventually be his assistant or his successor. He never did. And he would always say, well, the Lord will lead, the Lord will show us where He wants you to work. And I got a letter, from him when he joined with others in starting a new Seminary, I got a letter from another member of the group asking

me to buy some books in Germany for the new Seminary, and saying that we are starting and of course Dr. Wilson expects you to be his assistant. But he himself went very, very slow in any committal for the future, in order to give me full and complete chance to prove myself before any committal was made. And that was what was done here with Joshua. Joshua did the task before him and did it well, not receiving any promises of advancement for the future until the time came. And then it was plain that he was ready, that the spirit of God was in Him and the Lord gave the definite word and before Moses died, the successor was recognized. The successor, not one picked at random, but who had been thoroughly proven. New

Now I know of one minister who was a fine Christian minister and a very, very excellent pastor, and he left his church and I said to him well, now, who is going to succeed you in this church. Oh, he said, when I leave a church I believe in leaving it. He left the people absolutely like sheep without a shepherd, and they looked around and they got a man with a nice pleasant voice, and an attractive fellow, who came in and gave them good modernistic sermons, and tore down everything this man had built up. Now of course, he was reacting against the attitude that some have of leaving a church and trying to keep their finger on it, and there's many a minister who has had his ministry wrecked by a previous minister talking to people in the congregation about how this is done and that's done and the other's done, and interfering. That should never be done. When you leave a church, you should leave it. But it's a very good idea, when you leave it to try to do something about being sure the next leader is one who is true to the Lord, not just --there's a middle ground between these two extremes. And Moses went up to the mountaintop, knowing that there was a leader ready and able to carry on. He didn't have to try to keep a finger on it, you can't do it, you can't keep your finger on it. When you're out, you're out, any attempt to keep your finger on details just wrecks things. But you can take an interest in helping them to get a proper leader to follow, and that's what Moses did here, and set a wonderful example for us (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

^{Notes. 2.1.18}
(student.14 $\frac{1}{2}$) Very good, this proposition

explains, is made the instrument by means of which

Now as far as the Holy Spirit is concerned about the Holy Spirit coming into a man but that is a figure of speech. The Holy Spirit does not geographically go into a man. God is everywhere. The Holy Spirit is everywhere. But when you say he enters in, we mean that he takes possession...

O.T.History 211. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...and so in this case, probably in accordance with our present usage it is ($\frac{1}{3}$) the Holy Spirit is dwelling in him, not only for salvation but also for service. But in the true sense it probably is ($\frac{3}{4}$) That is, that the Holy Spirit is controlling him, he is directed by the Holy Spirit, so that I would say that in this case, either translation is correct. But the "in" would be in line with our normal usage, but the "with" would be more what it really means, even though we usually say in. So that the Hebrew (1) in this case we don't have to say is it this or that, but to recognize the wealth of meaning in the preposition and see that it ($\frac{1}{4}$) in this particular case. That then is number 3, the leader.

Then, number 4, Laws Regarding Sacrifice and Vows. Again it's legal and I only mention it here in order to have our outline complete in this section. It's chapter 28: through v. ~~to~~ 30. Very interesting and important if you want some discussion on it, you will find it on page 192 of New Bible Commentary, which I figured out with a great deal of care. Some day you may be dealing with this section and as you read it, it's an involved thing. You can spend three or four hours getting the exact relationship of its parts. But I put in the three or four hours myself and I summarized the results in this column, this one column here, so that if you're ever wanting to study it, ^{this particular passage} that I think you'll find very helpful, what I did with it. It's not really history so we merely mention it here for the sake of context.

We go on with number 5, Vengeance on the Midianites. chapter 31 which we have already referred to in connection with Balaam. Because it tells of his death and gives us the hint that it was he who counseled them how they could win out against the Israel-

ites. But they didn't win out and actually it meant his own death. Yes? (student. 2 3/4) His death is in verse 8, isn't it? I think it's verse 16 that says he had counseled. But the whole chapter tells about the conquest of the Midianites, it is, it tells how the women were spared and then were killed, and then Moses heard how they spared all the women and he was very angry and had them kill the women too. And of course it goes contrary to modern ideas because, I can just imagine a modernist preacher of today pointing this out as an example of the bloodthirstiness of the God of the Old Testament in whom he does not believe. Because it is a God who ordered the Midianites to be ruthlessly exterminated and not only the men but also the women, even to kill the women. How terrible. Well, the fact of the matter is, of course, that in heathen, most heathen lands and most heathen religions, there is a ruthlessness about human life, and a killing people and a letting them die that to us with a Christian background is very, very disagreeable. And the callousness about human life in heathen lands and heathen backgrounds is something that is a terribly disgusting to people with a Christian background. But the Christianity teaches the worth of a human soul, and teaches, has the command thou shalt not murder. Not merely you shall not kill the king, you shall not kill the person of importance, but you shall not kill, shall not murder anybody. And Christianity as against the callousness of the heathen religion puts a standard of value on a human life and a human soul. And then the modernist, taking one point, taking a few points of truth, out of scripture and neglecting the scripture as a whole, takes these few points and elevates them into being the most important thing in the world. And we get pacificism and we get the attitude of various modernist groups of the day, that the only thing that matters in life almost, is keeping from having anybody killed. And that that is more important than our relation to God or than eternity, or our belief in Christ, or than all the great central things of the scripture. They take the opposite error from the error of the heathen and it is a much better error of the two, but both are errors, the proper ground is in between. Here is a fact, that human life is sacred before God and should not be taken without a reason. On the other hand, it is a fact that every human being has to die. That death is the result of sin, we all

have to die sometime anyway, there are more important things in life than whether we die a little sooner than we might otherwise. Much more important things in life than that. And the Bible teaches the value of the human soul and the importance of safety from ruthless killing, but it also teaches that there are circumstances under which the situation is very different. The Bible teaches that war for true principles is justified, right and necessary in this age of sin in which Satan is so powerful in the world. And when the pilgrim fathers came to Massachusetts, if they had arrived there five years earlier they would've been wiped out in a year, and there never would've been a great Christian nation founded in this continent. We might eventually have had a nation here, we might have had many people, but it wouldn't have been established on Christian principles on which it was. But they got there and within the previous three years there had been a pestilence which had killed thousands of those Indians, and the pilgrims had a tough time to subsist against the opposition they had, or the difficulties, with the few Indians that remained. Not to show what the situation would've been if there'd been forty times as many Indians all through that area. There had been a pestilence which killed them off. Well, God prepared the way for them at that particular time. I don't think there's any question, that God chose to cut down the population in preparation for them, and when the Israelites went into Canaan, God ordered them to completely destroy the Canaanites who had sunk in wickedness to the point where the contagion of their lives and their attitudes was a very, very terrible thing. The scripture does teach that there are ~~certain~~ circumstances under which the taking of human life is not only permissible but is required. And if we look at it from the viewpoint that God's purposes are the important thing and not some particular principle that we set up that's impossible in this world anyway and can't be carried through, we do not find reason to set out to judge the God of the Old Testament, but rather to take the God of the Bible and see what he holds and try to mold our lives in accordance with it. His penalties for murder are very, very severe, but it does seem that there are circumstances under which the taking of human life is entirely justified and right. Yes? (student. 8 1/2) They are entirely different people who were temporarily working together. The

Moabites are a settled people in this area. The Midianites are a nomadic people, mostly in the Arabian desert who at this time evidently were working together with the Moabites against the menace of the coming of the Israelites. Later on we find the Midianites conquering the Israelites after they're settled and it's the Midianites whom Gideon's band attacked. But they're two distinct people who were working together at this time. So in this particular section of Numbers you'll speak of the Moabites and the Midianites more or less indiscriminately, because they're both working together. It's as if somebody in the German army in either of the world wars were to speak of the French soldiers and the British soldiers and the American soldiers. They might have a group of them, one of them next to this group, and the other next to this, and their enemies would include all three, and you might speak rather freely of whichever happened to be involved, in the particular situation. Yes? (student. 9 1/2. Why were the little boys killed but not the little unmarried girls?) The determination here was to wipe out the plague which these Midianites had brought in and the attitude which had been taken by them. The women were killed because they had been the very instruments of the seduction of the Israelites, and they in this case were very thoroughly involved with the attitude. The boys in this particular situation would have grown up to be a menace while the girls would probably have their whole attitude pretty thoroughly changed before they grew up. So in this particular instance (10 1/2) Now, that is not given as a rule for conquest by any means. You will find various attitudes taken in various commentaries. This is one of the most thoroughgoing of the conquests you find anywhere but when you read chapter 25 and ~~see~~ ^{see} what they had produced among them it's thoroughly understandable. Well, then that's five.

Number 6, The apportionment of Transjordan. chapter 32. We already before the Balaam incident read about the conquest of the land of Sihon King of the Amorites and Og king of Bashan. And so the whole northern portion of Transjordan, north of even the north, was now in the hands of the Israelites. And two and a half tribes came to Moses and here they are in this lovely country. Why do we have to go and fight and fight and all this? We've got this lovely country now, let's take it, let's be satisfied.

And it's very easy for us to take that sort of an attitude. We get into a good situation, it's good enough for me, why go further. Well, maybe it is. No use chasing will-o-the-wisps all our lives. But on the other hand, if God's will is something further we should not be satisfied to stop there. But these people saw that wonderful land and they said why can't we have it? Actually, it was from the first sight it was the best part of Palestine, but if you knew the facts it was one of the worst parts. Because though it had as much fertility as any section, it had fine land, lots of space a grand place for raising cattle, yet there were two objections, which we've already noted. One, its dependence on the varying rainfalls for crops. They didn't know it when they first came in, but the clouds may come that far and may not, from the Mediterranean. So some years it's tremendously fertile and other years it's almost sterile. And the area that is reached by the rain varies tremendously. And it gradually levels off into almost complete desert, and the people on the fringes would have a very, very uncertain existence. So that it's a very sporadic sort of a place to live. ^{Wonderful} ~~One-good~~ ^{when} ~~thing~~ you have the good rain. And a greater difficulty even than that was no natural frontiers, exposed to the attack of Bedouin tribes from the desert and of the attack of people from other lands. And the result was that the civilization built there, all through the three centuries before the time of Christ, even subsequently, there are great civilizations built, everything built up wonderfully, and then wiped off by invasion and they have to build from scratch. And there are long periods in which there's nothing there. And so it was necessary somebody take it, but for these people to be so anxious to get it for themselves was shortsighted. They simply didn't know the basic facts. We're always better to advance the work of the Lord, but as far as what we're going to get out of it, let's just leave that in his hands, and we'll probably be better off than if we try to work it out for ourselves.

Well, they came to Moses and immediately there was a great danger. If two and a half tribes settled here, forget the rest of the tribes, will the rest be enough to conquer Canaan? And so Moses makes the promise over and over that they, it was their

are you going to desert the rest, are you going to settle here, and leave us insufficient to conquer Canaan? Oh, no, no they said, we just want this land after you conquer Canaan, they said. See, they haven't thought of that before. Maybe they'd even thought of it, but they were so anxious to get it. They said, oh, no, no, we hadn't thought that, we're going to go over Jordan and join in the conquest of Canaan, but then we want to come back and have this be our land...

O.T. History 212. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...he makes them promise over and over, and he makes the promise so absolutely clear and strong that there is going to be no question about it, and it's a mighty good idea to look ahead and see dangers and see even if the people with whom you are dealing would never dream of such a thing, get it ~~set~~ ^{definite} while things are going smoothly, get the definite

(3/4) so that when ^{things} ~~they~~ get involved you've got the promise

(3/4) and Moses knew of the temptation that would come to them to not bother about the rest of them when they had their own land there, they already had their good land, and he made them repeat and repeat and repeat the promise that they would go over and join in the conquest and they had this land but they had to help get the land for the others. And there are very good lessons for us in it and the fact of the matter, of course, is that in subsequent history, ~~we~~ time and again, we find the Israelites from Canaan having to come over and rescue them when they've been taken by the Assyrians or by some other. Remember we saw yesterday about how Ahab said Ramoth Gilead is ours and why don't we take it. What's Ramoth Gilead? One of the finest cities over here in Transjordan, taken by the Syrians because it was open and exposed. And they had to come over from Canaan and rescue them time and again. Their selection was too early, but they were so anxious to get it that they were just ready to promise anything to get it and Moses made them sign on the dotted line, good and faithfully, over and over again. Very easy to say, oh we trust ^{people} ~~them~~, we have absolute confidence in them. Don't have absolute confidence in any people, because all people are sinners, all people are far short of sanctification, trust the Lord only, get things clear and

understand what you're getting. It's very easy when you first go into a new situation to everybody treats you so wonderfully that it's very, very easy to just have perfect confidence. You say, well now I wish this was, oh, certainly, certainly, we'll fix it, just do anything in the world to get you. Well, don't assume that's going to last forever. Don't be fussy and foolish and demand things that aren't sensible, but the things that are reasonable, get them done, have it understood, know what your authority is, how far it goes and where it stops. Because the time will come when situations will be different. It always does and Moses got it definite here and thereby spared them an awful lot of misery in the future. That's number 6.

Number 7, The Summary of Journeys. Summary of the journeys from Egypt to the Plains of Moab. Chapter 33:1-49. That is a summary of the journeys written by Moses at the express command of God. Here they are leaving one important part of their experience and going to enter another. They're leaving the wilderness journey and going to enter on the conquest of Canaan. And so he makes a summary of what has been done. Somebody has said that if you want to develop a good memory one of the best possible ways to do it is every night before you go to bed to think through the events of the day and see how much you can remember of them then when it's still fresh in your recollection. It develops your habit of recall. It's very, very easy to finish up a stage of our life or our experience and everything is so prominent and so clear, so well-known to you that there doesn't seem to be any point in thinking it through, you just know it all, at an instant you could answer any question about it, but then you enter another phase of your experience and you don't have any occasion to think of these things and you're in the other phase for a few months or years, and then you think back to this and you just can't remember, it's just gone. And it is very helpful to stop and to survey a stage of your experience, see what the advantages have been, see what the disadvantages, see what the mistakes are that you don't want to repeat, see the things in it that are worth carrying on with you. Survey as you leave one stage and go into another. It's a very, very useful thing. And here at the end of this important section there is this survey.

Then, number 8, The Plans for the Division of Canaan. Chapter 33:50-36:13. The plans so that when it is taken they will know what they're going to do with it.

Now they don't worry ~~about~~ the details, but they work out the system for determination of the details, and before they start the conquest they work these things out. A very, very wise procedure and an excellent example to us as we undertake different areas of our lives. Well, we won't go into the details of this, it's well worth your study and you can find lessons from it for your own life that are of value. That's section 8.

Section 9, gets into the book of Deuteronomy, Moses' Farewell Address. We won't look at that until this afternoon at 2:30. (word about assignments)—and test Monday)

(7) I'm going to make a change. I announced at the end of the morning hour that we would take number 9 next, but I'm going to change it to G, because it is I think important to come under a separate head rather ~~than~~ Preparation for Entrance to Canaan. I'm going to make it G, Moses Last Days, and under that will be number 1, The Addresses in Deuteronomy. The book of Deuteronomy has a name, a Greek name which translated into English means second law. It is the second giving of the law, and this giving of the law is simply a reiteration of the law with certain changes, an attempt to drive home to people's hearts and minds, what it amounts to is the farewell addresses given by Moses there in the Plains of Moab, and there are three main addresses. The first of those is chapter 1, verse 6 to 4:40. 1:6-4:40. This one is mainly a historical retrospect to God's dealings with them, and then a call to obedience. Then after a brief section telling of the appointing of the three cities of refuge you have the second discourse, which is from 4:44 - 26:19. As you see it is a very long section, including many exhortations to fidelity and obedience, and much repetition of laws that he wanted to drive home to their hearts and minds. Then comes the inscription of the law, with the blessings and cursings, followed by Moses' third discourse, which includes chapters 29 and 30, two chapters only in this third discourse. It is a discourse in which he presses home to them strongly the difference between life and death and the choice of whether they will follow the Lord or not. Yes? (student. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$) Which, the third discourse, all three? First, 1:6-4:40. Second 4:44-26:19. Third chapters 29 and 30. Those are the three discourses. In between them there is a free period between the first and second, telling of the appointment of the cities of refuge:

between the second and third there is a longer passage, telling of the writing of the law, and the putting up of the blessings and the curses, for obedience and disobedience. Then after the three discourses you have Moses' song, Moses taking leave of the people. Now this book of Deuteronomy is a very important and interesting study, very vital for Christian understanding, but for our particular course in Old Testament History we will have to merely glance at it. The view the critics support is that Moses never gave such addresses, but it was written in the time of the later Israelite kingdom, that it was palmed off on the people at the time of Josiah in order to get them to agree to a centralized worship in Jerusalem. This is very important in the study of criticism, this theory of the critics which is accepted by all liberal scholars, though there are details of it on which they differ slightly, in the main features of it they agree, but this, we in this class cannot go into it, because there're no certain matters which are vital from the viewpoint of history. One of these matters we note is the great literary quality of these addresses. It is pretty hard to believe that the men wishing to get more income for the Jerusalem Temple and get people to worship there instead of making sacrifices other places, would be able to prepare for this purpose addresses supposedly by the great lawgiver of a thousand years before which were so fine that Professor Moses of the University of Chicago, the author of the Modern Readers Bible, said, that after reading the great orations of Demosthenes and Cicero and the other great orators of secular history, he turns to Moses' farewell address in the book of Deuteronomy, and feels that just from the viewpoint of literature alone, he is on a higher level of oratorical grandeur in Moses' addresses in the book of Deuteronomy. Now it is pretty hard to think that is written just for the viewpoint of getting more income for the Jerusalem Temple at a time long after it was (12 $\frac{1}{2}$)

They show the transcendent ability of Moses, that great leader, one of the greatest leaders in the world's history. They have this wonderful literary quality and this fine presentation of the alternatives of life and death, between obeying the Lord, following his will, and going on to have the sins that lead to destruction. So the literary quality of these is something that is unfortunately little realized in our present day, but ought to be realized.

Now in addition to that we'd like to say about these addresses, that ^{d.} there are in them certain marks of the fact that they are approaching the entrance to Canaan. The certain marks are there. I want to mention four. Four marks in these addresses of the near approach to the entrance to Canaan. ~~One of these,~~

The first of these is ⁽¹⁾ that they constantly mention towns instead of the camp. The Israelites in the wilderness naturally centered their life around the camp. But they were going into Canaan where they would be scattered about from these different sections of the land, and Moses in giving these addresses is urging them to obey God's law in Canaan, and so there is a background of reference to towns rather than to camp. Now naturally the critics say that's because it was written at a time when (14)

were all living, but it certainly is not at all unfitting to the time of Moses.

Then second ⁽²⁾ there are minor changes of law. You'll find ~~contradictions~~ among them ^{between} saying the law in Deuteronomy or the law in Exodus or in Leviticus. They are not contradictory, they are minor changes in view of the new situation into which they are going.

When I used to live in Los Angeles we used to go downtown and on the way there was a cul-de-sac under a large hill, and (14 3/4) as you came up to the entrance you saw a big sign: One hundred dollars fine for (14 3/4)

...

O.T. History 213. (1 1/2)

...24 automobiles, but when I was there I never saw a car go through that tunnel less than 30 miles an hour, but there was the sign still there. The last time I was in Los Angeles I was glad to see that sign had been taken down. But I'm sure that when the tunnel was built people would've been scandalized at the thought of going through that tunnel at a rate faster than 8 miles per hour. I was told when I was a student in Los Angeles that it still was written on the statute books there that it was illegal for streetcars to shoot rabbits from the vestibule of the streetcars. When I was ^{living} there it was already much too urbanized to think of such a thing. ~~1/4~~

But conditions change and ^{the} great essential principles of God's law never change

but the application of the principles change as conditions change. People talk as if there were no fixed principles. They are absolutely wrong, there are great fundamental principles that are inherent in the nature of the universe that God has established. But then people who recognize this great fact of the essential great absolute principles of the universe sometimes go on from there to think that every little tiny detail of life is exactly so and remains static, and that is not true. Life is constantly changing and small ~~changes~~ or questions of law and habit are absolutely necessary, and so we have contradictions between Deuteronomy and Exodus and Leviticus, but it is a contradiction simply of application to a different situation. ~~They~~

Number (3) there is an interest taken in Deuteronomy in the well being of the poor classes, such as you don't find in Exodus and Leviticus. There are special regulations given like leaving the corners of your fields so that they can pluck what's left there, leaving some of the grapes so they can glean, there are restrictions that would have no application in the wilderness where they were altogether under one closely-centralized body with a close oversight, but spread out over the land it is very easy for oppression and for mistreatment to spring up and this anticipates and special consideration is given.

And then number (4) in Deuteronomy we find an insistence on one central altar. The unity of God, the fact that there is one God that Israel is one nation, worshipping one God was stressed by the insistence that they were not to break up into little separate communities in Canaan, but that they were to covenant together to worship on the one altar, that once a year they were to come to this place and make, all their sacrifices were to be made on this one altar. And so we have insistence, number 4, on one altar in the book of Deuteronomy which fits the situation, as Moses was speaking there just before they went into the land of Canaan. The critics say that the book of Exodus, the book of the ~~Covenant~~, as they call it, permits an altar anywhere, anywhere that God gives his name, because in the book of the covenant, it says when you make an altar make it in certain ways, but the fact is they were moving through the wilderness and they made altars at different places as they moved. It does not mean chaos as the critics

allege, it simply means the situation where they were on the move, and the altar naturally moved. And then in Leviticus there's nothing said about it, it is assumed that there is one altar. It is not stated, Leviticus is the law book (4 3/4)

But now we have the command given as they enter the land, and this is vital, that the people realize this and understand it, because it will be a vital factor in keeping them as one nation, worshipping one God and enabling a central control to keep heretical ideas from getting in and spreading through the land. So it is reasonable the way it stands. And the critics claim that Exodus shows the early situation when you can worship anywhere // that God put his name, that Deuteronomy shows the change made to get the worship in one place, and that in Leviticus it already was established in one place so it's just taken for granted and not mentioned. It is not the necessary way of interpreting it.

Well, these addresses are very much worth reading and studying but not for this particular course, so we move on to number 2 under Moses Last Days.

Number 2, The Death of Moses. And the death of Moses is chapter 34. And there in 34 we read how Moses went up into the mountain and there the Lord took him and nobody knows where he's buried. And then it has a eulogy of him at the end that no one rose up quite the equal of Moses, thereafter. This little section about the death of Moses has received discussion far out of proportion to its merit. Those who have said that the five books of Moses are by Moses have found a tremendous problem, how could Moses write the account of his own death? And so there've been arguments at length whether Moses wrote these or whether he didn't. And actually what difference does it make? The book of Deuteronomy is God's Word and it is true and it gives us the addresses that Moses gave. Well, did God say to Moses, now you're going up in the mountain and die, finish out the book and write it in there and tell what happened. Tell it in advance. God has already predicted it, it is told in Numbers, it is told in Deuteronomy, it's perfectly clear what's going to happen, you go ahead and tell about it before it happens, Moses, and then after it happens they will have the account. Did he do that? Or did Moses stop the book and go up in the mountain and Joshua write the next part of it, tell about his death, and nobody knows where he's buried, and Joshua say nobody rose

like Moses. Well as far as I can see both are possible, and I don't see what difference it makes. God wrote it, it's God's word, God led whoever the human author was. God directed in what to put down, it is God's word, it is one complete book that is free from error, the book of Deuteronomy, and so I don't see any reason why there needs to be great argument. But people will ask me, do you believe in that Moses wrote the Pentateuch? Well, what about the end of Deuteronomy? How could he have written the last chapter? Well, I think he could have personally. Well, but I don't think believing Moses wrote the Pentateuch necessarily means you have to believe he wrote those last few verses. It ^{would be perfectly proper} ~~is perfectly possible~~ for him to have instructed Joshua (8)

But this end of Moses life, his death there, was done in such a way that they would not have a place to worship, a place where they would be tempted to worship a man rather than God, because he was a very great man, a very wonderful man, a tremendous influence on Israel, and he is revered by the Jews as perhaps no other man is, and deservedly, but he certainly is in utterly different class from Christ, God. And so Moses is off the scene and we move on to number 7VII, Roman Numeral VII.

Roman Numeral VII, on which I have hesitated. I did not devote a day to the determination of the problem but I did hesitate as to whether to call VII the book of Joshua, or The Conquest of Canaan. And I think we'll call it The Book of Joshua. But either title would be quite satisfactory because they cover the same ground. The conquest of Canaan, now I didn't say the conquest of Palestine. The term Palestine we use to include Transjordan. The land of Israel certainly included Transjordan, but that was conquered even before the incident with Balaam. That was conquered under Moses' direction. But the conquest of land west, the land west of the Jordan River, between there and the Mediterranean Sea is Canaan proper, and this is the land which God had promised to give Abaraham, and it was a land filled with strong cities which had existed there for hundreds of years, it was powerful and highly civilized people, the Jews had been slaves in Egypt and now they've been forty years in the wilderness, it took forty years to get Egypt out of the people, ^{though you could} ~~to~~ get them out of Egypt in a few days, but it was not only to get Egypt out of the people but while you were doing it they lost their

arts and craft, there was no opportunity for the exercise of them, there in the wilderness. And so you have a comparatively uncivilized people about to enter the land. A people which the Lord has led, they are following him, but from the viewpoint of culture, from the viewpoint of training in arts and crafts and all that, they are not in a class with the Egyptians or with the Canaanites. And those tremendous walls around those great Canaanite cities and their strong armies they had, it was a real problem in the conquest of Canaan. And this problem is dealt with, the conquest and the division of the land are dealt with in the book of Joshua. So we can say, the Book of Joshua, A, Introduction. Under that, 1, Authorship and ^{Typed} Material. It is quite generally assumed that ~~Joshua~~ wrote these books of Joshua, but that is certainly not a necessary principle of the faith. I do not recall anywhere in the Bible where it says Joshua wrote the book of Joshua. We do have the statement that Moses wrote the five books of Moses. Moses was the author of these books. The book of Joshua is the book which tells about Joshua. It tells about his activity as leader, his activity while he was directing the people and about the subsequent life of the people as long as Joshua lived. So it is a book about Joshua, about Joshua's leadership, but that doesn't necessarily mean that Joshua wrote it. I have never heard any suggestion of some other who may have written it. It is, I would think, quite probably that Joshua wrote it, but I don't think it is proven. At least it is a true book, a book which tells the facts about the career of Joshua. And so the authorship of the book of Joshua is not a point of near the same importance of the authorship of the Pentateuch. It is important that they both are God's word. The critics used to talk about the Pentateuch, and then they talked about the documents of the Pentateuch, and then they changed their language and started talking about the Hexateuch, that is a six-fold division instead of five. And the critical theory, as it has been held for many years, includes portions of Joshua in the various documents, but any critical ^{student} ~~theory~~ will readily admit, ~~the~~ if he has done any special study in this field, that it is much harder to be sure which sections of Joshua belong to different documents than ~~which~~ sections of the different parts of the Pentateuch. There are points of similarity of style and of (13 $\frac{1}{4}$) [?] prose

of different parts of Joshua than of different parts of the Pentateuch, but they do not have the same criteria they think they find in the Pentateuch, and while (13 $\frac{1}{2}$)

speaking about the Hexateuch, you look in a critical Bible dictionary of the last two years and they won't even have an article on the Pentateuch, they call it Hexateuch, and they extend the documents through Joshua, but they don't have (13 3/4)

that they have about many parts of the Pentateuch. But we don't need, of course, to believe (14)

to believe he wrote the first five books and I would say most likely Joshua did. I don't know of any proof. Well, now, the ~~type of~~ ^{type of} material. Authorship and ~~type of~~ ^{type of} material.

Well, the material in the book of Joshua is very different from the material in Deuteronomy. The last part of it, there's a chapter and a half of Joshua's last days which contains ~~when he~~ two addresses that he gave the people exhorting them to follow the Lord. Now this is naturally similar to Deuteronomy. Moses gave addresses and so did Joshua. But most of the book, at least shall we say most of the first twelve chapters of the book, the first half of the book, is narrative. And that naturally is similar to Genesis...

O.T.History 214. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...narrative, then we have the account of the division of the land, and this account of the division of the land which takes up ten chapters is very largely a matter of precise details of the borders of the different tribes, very important, very interesting for them, showing the long period of Israel's history in the land, but it's largely just a matter of interest to us now. For us in this course it won't take nearly the (1)

But these twelve chapters are the account of the conquest, therefore it is an orderly, organized, systematic presentation of a series of closely related events and, as such, is one of the most interesting portions of the Bible, perhaps one of the best-known parts of the Old Testament. So much then for type of material.

Number 2, External Evidence ^{Regarding the History} I'm not meaning by that external evidence as to the

authorship and type of material, I mean external evidence as to the events ^{described.} ~~which~~. Perhaps it would be better to make the title a little longer so as to make that clear. External Evidence regarding the History. Now we are not in one of the places in the Bible where we have a great deal of external evidence. There is considerably more for Genesis than there is for Joshua, there's not a great deal for Exodus, there is some in the early part of Exodus. Numbers and Leviticus and Deuteronomy, of course (2 $\frac{1}{4}$)

Now in Joshua there is a little but not a great deal. What is it? Well, from the viewpoint of the great empires, the book describes events that occurred off on the borders of a primitive civilization. You take a cultivated Roman system in the days of Christ, and he was much interested in the great events that occurred in Rome. To a much less extent, and yet definitely in the great events that occurred in Athens and in Alexandria and a few other great centers. But Palestine he thought of as sort of out on the fringes of civilization, something would have to be very, very important there to be apt to attract much of his attention. Palestine has been an important crossroads between the great empires, but it has not normally been a great center of civilization and life itself. H.G. Wells wrote an article twenty years ago here in the Current History Magazine, America, taken from H. G. Wells in which--he wrote it about English education and regretted greatly that English education busied itself so much with Palestine. He said why don't we spend that time studying England, studying something important. He said nothing of any importance happened in Palestine. He said Palestine has never had any real greatness except just a very small period under the time of Solomon, and he said the importance of that period is greatly exaggerated. He said the pride of Solomon was a little temple that Hiram of Tyre built for him, and that he compared to the pride of a negro chauffeur on the gold coast of Chicago, in a new automobile that his employer purchased. Now that's this famous English writer, H. G. Wells' idea of the importance of Palestine. And of course, his idea is tremendously overrated, tremendously exaggerated. It is easy to show that it's quite absurd. But yet there's an element of truth in it, that Palestine was not one of the great imperial centers, when Abraham left Ur

of the Chaldees, I'm sure he felt that he was going to the outskirts of civilization, and when his father got as far as Haran he said, if you want to go any further you go alone, this is as far as I'm going to go. He thought he was going out to the wild west of the jungles, when he went out to Palestine. Well, under the circumstances then, we do not have big monuments in Rome or in Egypt or in Mesopotamia, telling of great events occurring in Palestine. So that in our great amount of material we have from ancient civilization, we don't have references to the conquest of Palestine by Joshua. The material has to be sought in Palestine itself almost entirely. And, as we've already noticed in our survey of archeology, Palestine was near enough to Egypt to have access to Papyrus. But was enough damper than Egypt that the Papyrus didn't last. It doesn't last in Egypt unless it's buried, but even if it's buried in Palestine it doesn't last. The result is that over in Mesopotamia almost everything that anybody wrote was preserved, because it was on clay tablets, while in Egypt only the things they put up on monuments, they wanted the ^{future} people to know, were remembered except when a papyrus got buried. But in Palestine the monuments have not been extensive, they've been destroyed in the many wars, and so on, that occurred there, they weren't as finely built as in Egypt anyway, and the papyrus on which most of the writing doubtless was made, has had entirely--I don't think there's any almost about it--has entirely disappeared. And when you find scholars get all excited when, got all excited fifty years ago when excavating at Gezer in Palestine, McAllister found the little piece of pottery, a piece of a broken dish, on which somebody had scratched the name of the months and telling the kind of work he did each month. This is the month for plowing, this is the month for planting wheat, and so on, and they call it the Gezer calendar and they were all thrilled about it. The chances are it's just somebody that, in an offhand moment, scratched on a piece of clay, not having some papyrus handy, some offhand thoughts, he was doodling perhaps. And that was preserved, and the very fact that somebody was able to do it, and bothered to do it, is pretty good evidence that there was tremendous amount of writing done on papyrus, that has just disappeared. So we do not have actual evidence in words from Palestine from this period. And, that is, very, very little, practically none.

Occasionally they used clay tablets, because they were quite under the shadow of Mesopotamian civilization, and (7 $\frac{1}{2}$)

So, the external evidence regarding the history ~~in~~ Palestine is actually very slight. Most we know about it is from the book of Joshua, except for the excavation of cities in Palestine, and there we have a tremendous amount of material, but very, very little writing, and it's not easy to tell from material without writing when, what time it comes from, ~~hard~~^{or} to tell a great deal about. You can learn much but there are many, many very vital things you ^{just} can't learn at all.

Well, I wanted to mention under this subject, external evidence, a small a, The El Amarna Tablets. We've already spoken of the El Amarna Tablets. In this book, The Ancient Near East, there are translations of a few of them. The El Amarna Tablets were clay tablets and therefore preserved, they were preserved in Egypt, because of the fact that King Aknaton moved his court away from the great centers, and then when they moved back to the place he made, they were ruined and the archives were wrecked. There must have been tremendous archives from other periods in Egyptian history which were not preserved, but these, through that action of (8 3/4) have been preserved. And so we have the El Amarna Tablets which come from the reign of Amenophis III and IV. Amenophis III, Albright states, from 1406 to 1370 and ~~he~~-his successor of Aknaton ~~and~~^{or} Amenophis IV, whichever name you want to use, succeeded him. Well, these tablets suffer, of course, from the disadvantage that letters suffer from.

I used to get, when I was in Jerusalem studying, I'd get a letter, that's before the days of airmail, I'd get a letter from my mother in Los Angeles, and she would say last evening Sam came over and we had a very interesting talk. And I would get that six weeks after she wrote it. It took that long for the letter to get to me. And I would read it and I would wonder, now Sam came over, what Sam was it, was this Uncle Sam, a very good friend of ours, or was this Sam Sutherland, who'd been my classmate in college and Seminary and was pastor of a small church in the neighborhood then and is now President of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles. And so I would write, I'd

be curious, which one was it, to me they were so different, and yet Sam could fit either, so I'd say which Sam was it came over that evening? She'd get the letter six weeks after she wrote and she'd say well now which Sam was it, so she'd make inquiries around and they'd figure it up, they'd write back, and six weeks after I wrote the question I'd get the answer, and I'd completely forgotten the question. But it brings home to you how in letters you speak in abbreviated fashion. You discuss things and take a great deal of knowledge for granted, and if it hadn't been Sam, if it had been a name that we only knew one person with the name, she would know who she was talking about, I would know who she was talking about, but anybody ^{else}/reading the letter, even I myself thirty years later, might have great difficulty in figuring out what it was all about. Now that difficulty, of course, is less when you get official political letters and that sort of thing but yet it's there, and so these El Amarna letters often don't explain the most important things because they're letters from people to other people who know a good deal already about what you're speaking of and you don't have to explain the full details about it. And so they are a very unsatisfactory source for history, though a very important one. There's this about them, that nobody in them is trying to fool us, it's not as if somebody puts up a monument to tell how great he was and you may think that he was just bluffing, and pretending for future generations. Though in these they may bluff each other, as the kings of Canaan try to get Egyptian help and they say things that aren't true, you can't tell about that. But they are a fine source of historical information and yet a very, very fragmentary source. We can date the El Amarna letters and that's of tremendous importance about them. They come from about 1400 B.C. And these letters, the bulk of them, are between kings of Canaan and Pharaohs of Egypt. Men always start, to Pharaoh the great god, the sun of the universe, I bow seven times and then I bow seven times again, I who am nothing but a worm of the ground, want to bring my petition before the great Pharaoh. And then he goes on and tells how he's the only one in Palestine that's still loyal to Pharaoh and all the others have turned against him. Pharaoh should send him a lot of money and a lot of support so that he could stand true by Pharaoh, and then you get another

letter from the king of the other town ten miles away, and he says exactly the same thing about himself, and you don't know which one is telling the truth, or whether either is, and Pharaoh is too busy spreading his new ideas of philosophy to bother with any of them. So the Egyptian empire in Palestine, around 1400, went to pieces. But in the course of these letters these kings will make a statement like this. All the territory under Pharaoh (13 1/4) has fallen away to the (13 1/4) ^{Habiru} ~~Hobalou~~ I only am left or the ^{Habiru} ~~Hobalou~~ has taken such and such a city. This word Habiru sounds a good bit like Hebrew, the Habiru, and we see that the Habiru are a marauding people who are conquering ⁱⁿ Palestine.

I remember in 1925 picking up a magazine of Biblical study and finding an article by two great archeologists on the Habiru, and one of them said when you examine the evidence on the Habiru it becomes absolutely certain that the Habiru and the Hebrews are identical, this is the Hebrew under Joshua (14)

And the other article by an equally famous archeologist said, when we compare what we know about the Habiru with the evidence about the Hebrews in the Bible, it becomes absolutely clear that they are an entirely different people, entirely different situation, with no reason in the world to equate them. They (14 1/4)

as to whether the Habiru and the Hebrews were the same

Well, since that time we've learned a good deal more about the Hebrew, and we know this, that when it says in Genesis that Abraham (14 1/4)

that's pretty good proof Abraham wasn't even a Hebrew. You don't call a man the Hebrew if he's the only one, and there are references in various parts of the Old Testament and in most of them Hebrew is a wider term in the Bible than (14 3/4)

...

O.T. History 215. (1 1/2)

...sons of Eber but if so

^{are} Jews ~~is~~ called the sons of Abraham. Others take it that the word means a nomad,

one who is a wanderer, possibly so. But we have tablets from various places in which Habiru are mentioned and we find that there are various sections of the world in those days in which there are people called Habiru, and then in Egypt we have a people called the Apperiu, which I mentioned in connection with the entrance which some think are the Hebrew and some thing aren't, but it's quite clear that the word ($1\frac{1}{4}$) is much wider and so that if these Habiru are found there in Palestine at that time, that doesn't prove they are the Biblical Hebrews although it offers a starting point for the suggestion that they may be. And so, from the viewpoint of the study of the conquest the El Amarna tablets present material of real importance. They mention cities in Palestine, they mention the kings of these cities, they tell us incidentally something of the life of the people there, something of their situation, and if we could be sure that that's when the conquest occurred, it would tremendously enrich our knowledge of the conquest. But if it isn't, if it's two hundred years before then// they actually don't throw much light on the conquest but merely on the general condition in Palestine, and nobody knows which it is, so that the El Amarna should be mentioned here in connection with this matter of external evidence and one of these days we may discover something that will tremendously increase our knowledge and understanding of this area and if we do, the El Amarna tablets may become of far greater importance than they are now, because we'll be able to understand them better and to get many facts from them that at present escape us. At present, I do not consider them any tremendously important source of understanding about the conquest. But at least they are a source that must be mentioned.

Then b, we should mention// a stela (sometimes spelled with an a, sometimes with an e) a stela is a rock or something like that that's put up as a monument, like the ($3\frac{1}{2}$) Blackstone images. It's put up, an inscription is put up. And there is this inscription which honors the Egyptian king Merneptah, and it is generally called the "Israel" Stela. Now the term "Israel" Stela certainly would have amazed King Merneptah, if he ($3\frac{1}{2}$) because the-- it's the only instance of the name Israel in ancient writing, and that's why, naturally,

people who are interested in the Bible are far more interested in that than in anything else about it, so when it was discovered they called it the "Israel" Stela. Now this was put up about 1230 B.C. You see, it's 200 years later than the El Amarna Tablets. And this King Merneptah, as we already mentioned, I believe, in our account of the Egyptian background of the Exodus, is the son of Rameses II. And Rameses II, who reigned for about fifty years, was about ninety when he died, was succeeded by his, I think he had fifty sons, I think it was the twelfth one that succeeded him, and he was already a rather elderly man when he succeeded him, and it's very interesting to go in to a museum of Egyptology and look at things about Merneptah. Because Rameses was a great conqueror, a powerful king, and there are all sorts of things celebrating him, but Merneptah, his son, by the time he became king, was too old to do anything much, so the main thing he could do was to boast and bluff and pretend that he was as great as his father, and they'll actually take a poem written to celebrate his father and copy it word for word only putting his name in instead of his father's. And I've seen statues on which they have on the front the name of Merneptah, and you look around in the back somewhere and you find there in small letters the name of a Pharaoh a few hundred years earlier. He found this beautiful statue and he just stuck his name on it, and so there's so much bluff about him that it's a little hard to be sure just how much is true. Rameses II also had an awful lot of bluff and bluster but he had the facts to back up most of what he said. But Merneptah had put up this monument, this stela, and let me read you a translation of it. This translation is from the book, *The Ancient Near East*, which many of you have, on page 231. You can read it at your leisure, it's also in the library. Page 231, I'll just read it rapidly, note how much you learn about the conquest from this:

The princes are prostrate, saying: "Mercy!"
 Not one raises his head among the Nine Bows.
 Desolation is for Tehenu; Hatti is pacified: (Hatti is the Hittites)
 Plundered is the Canaan with every evil:
 Carried off is Ashkelon; (you all know Ashkelon of course, one of the Philistine cities) seized upon is Gezer; (another city of Palestine)
 Yanoam is made as that which does not exist:
 Israel is laid waste, his seed is not:
 Hurru (the Hurrus) is become a widow for Egypt!
 All lands together, they are pacified:
 Everyone who was restless, he has been bound

by the King of Upper and Lower Egypt: Baen Re Meri Amon; the Son of Re: Merneptah Hotepir-Matt, given life like Re every day.

This tells you then how great this king Merneptah is, that he's had a great conquest and this is what has happened. Well, it doesn't help us a great deal, but it names cities in Palestine. It names various cities and various people in Palestine and it uses the word Israel, Israel is laid waste, his seed is not. Now that's funny, that mention of seed there, very strange thing in a celebration of a victory. His seed is not. Does it mean that his soldiers went through and destroy all the Israelites' farms and in the course of doing it they destroyed the grain so completely they don't have any seed to replant. Well, of course, that might occur but it would be a very unusual thing to mention in a writing like this, celebrating a victory. To me, it is very tempting to bring it together with the fact in the early part of Exodus about how the Egyptians determined to kill all the Israelite children, all the sons of Israel. To me the word seed there, just like our English word, can mean grain seeds or it can mean human posterity. To me it's very natural to think that he, in describing a raid which conquered a number of towns in Palestine, or at least made them pay tribute not to destroy them, that Israel which belonged in Palestine, had come from Palestine, and which he was oppressing in Egypt, he mentioned in its proper place in the list, and mentions what he is doing to them, Israel is laid waste, his seed is not. Now an interesting thing too about this is that all the people here, the lands and the cities, they have a determinative before them which indicates a place, but Israel has a determinative here which indicates a people. Some take that as meaning that Israel was not yet a settled people, if it was the land of Israel it would have a determinative for a settled people. But it could be used if Israel was still in Egypt and being still oppressed at this time. Now that's only a possibility, we don't know. If you believe the Exodus was two hundred years earlier, why it must refer to some reign in which he claims to have destroyed all the seed of the Israelites, but if so we have no mention whatever ^{of it} /in the Bible. And so the Merneptah Stela, the "Israel" Stela doesn't throw much light on the conquest, but it is interesting because of its mention of Israel, and it is one of the few things that are much discussed in this connection simply because we have so little (9 $\frac{1}{4}$)

Now, c, Excavations in Palestine. And that's a much bigger subject. You would

think those would tell us exactly what the facts are, wouldn't you? But it is a sad thing that when great nations have been destroyed it has not usually been true that they immediately stop to put up a big monument, to show just how they were destroyed and who did it and what happened and all about it. The people who have been destroyed have been too busy seeking shelter for the ~~few~~ survivors trying to escape to think of stopping and making a big record for history. And a new people who conquer them, unless it's a great empire that simply adds it to their empire, if it's a people coming in, they're apt to be so busy getting themselves settled and established that they don't time to leave records.

I remember when I was in Budapest and there I saw a monument to anonymous, the only monument to anonymous I've ever seen in my life. I was much interested. The monument was in the main park there in Budapest and there was a monk with the cowl sort of hiding his face, ~~or~~ you saw the monk sitting writing but you couldn't see his face. It's a monument to anonymous, but it's a very interesting idea, unique as far as I know. But the reason for it is that when the Magyar people came into that area and conquered them and settled themselves and established themselves there, they were too busy getting settled and established to stop to write a history of who they were or where they came from and what they built, and so on, and the result was that later on a monk wrote a history, and this history goes back to a much earlier time, but it's passed on by tradition, it's not very complete, and of the manuscript that he wrote, the first few pages got torn off, and that included the name of the author, so since we don't know his name we put up the statue to anonymous. But it's, I think, a striking illustration of the fact that in early settlements like that, ordinarily the records are extremely scanty, and so here of course we have the, in the Bible, we have an unusual situation because God ordered these men to write an account of his dealings with them, and God led them in this, but as far as other evidence~~s~~ is concerned we have the remains of the cities, but we just don't have writings ^{there} that tell us about the conquest. They were too busy conquering to try to write, and so we don't have the writing there, and we have though these tremendous cities and I remember Dr. (12 $\frac{1}{2}$)

that he thought that a visit to Palestine was ~~not~~ ^{good} in itself a destruction of many of ~~the~~ the liberal theories because he said, you read how the (12 $\frac{1}{2}$)

that the Israelites drifted in the wilderness (12 $\frac{1}{2}$)

you've seen those great ~~strong~~ walls they've built there and how they were knocked over and destroyed and you know that that took a big organized group of people to ever succeed in doing that, that was no little part in making (12 3/4)

And so you have the remains of great cities in Palestine that have been excavated but we have practically no writing, and at just about 1230 B.C. we have most of them destroyed, and that fits with the (13 $\frac{1}{2}$)

But we also have certain destructions that may have taken place about two hundred earlier but to much lesser extent than that, and so the evidence is not such as to be able to build very secure historical conclusions on. The excavation, you never know what a new excavation, a new discovery in Palestine, may give us the evidence that will make it absolutely certain when the conquest was, and once you have such evidence you will find a great deal that's already been ^(13 $\frac{1}{2}$) accepted and excavated and published, that will fit in with it and can be explained in the light of it and throw further light on it and it will be tremendously important. But up to the present we have some remains which may be about 1400 B.C., of a destruction but not a tremendously great destruction, and then we have a far greater destruction up to and before 1200. And we have those (14) types of destruction, and we have some cities which we can't be sure just when (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

And, I must say personally, some of the arguments that are given by people who are very determined to maintain the early date of the Exodus have done more to drive people to the late date than any arguments for the late date. That is, I've known people who were so determined to keep the early date that they advanced what I think ^{are} ~~is~~ a very silly arguments. Like Professor Garstang in the University of Liverpool, he ~~was~~ very anxious to prove the early date, ~~he was at Liverpool~~ ^{even give us the exact year} (14 3/4)

And he was going to a place where you have a temple which was destroyed about 1400 B.C.

and you have two temples which were built on top of each other. One was built and then it deteriorated and they built another, and there on the same plan as the first one, and then you have on top of that a building that's entirely different, built about 1200. Now he would say this...

O.T.History 216. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...and then you have the Israelites turning to the Lord and turning away from (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Well, maybe he's right, but to me it sounds like an argument just made because you're determined to prove an early date on the evidence, and Marston, the motorcycle/^{King,} who was supporting the excavations was a determined supporter of the early date of the Exodus and he was furnishing the money which Garstang was using to excavate.

Garstang was very much (3/4)

And Garstang

had some very good arguments and he had some not so good (1). The evidence from Canaan, then, throws interesting light on some aspects of the conquest. But the vital thing of just when it happened we do not yet have sufficient evidence either way, the early date or the late date. The critical scholars used to say, many of them, the story in the Bible is a compilation of two conquests. It has some incidents from the conquest of 1400, some from the conquest at 1200, two different ^{groups} that came in, that's what they used to say, and they tried to combine that way. Well, ^{I think} that view is rather largely given up, but at present most of the critical scholars hold to the late date. There are a great many conservative scholars who hold to the early date, but some who hold to the late one. And actually I feel we don't know which date it is. But we do know this, that the Bible is true, and when the Bible says that God enabled the Israelites to conquer the land, that is a fact which occurred, and we know from archeology that there was a conquest at about 1200 and there was a lesser conquest at about 1400 but which of the two it was, we don't know. To me, it's a little hard if it was the early date to imagine where the later conquest came in, because we don't know (2 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Well, we continue tomorrow.

...consideration of the book of Joshua and we were on A, Introduction, and under that 2,c, Excavations in Palestine, and we notice there that the excavations are not a very good source for information about the downfall of an area, or about the early beginnings of one. Excavations and also historical writings are best when an area is at its height. The times of downfall and of start are not times, ordinarily, when either there are a great number of writings, most of them have to be made up later from very difficult (4) position as a rule, or from the destruction of a land, people are too busy, too excited, as a rule to do much in trying to leave historical records and things are just wrecked when something is destroyed and so it is not so easy to get results from it. We have quite a few cities in Palestine that have been excavated from this period, and they agree in showing a tremendous destruction around 1230 B.C. Now of course that date is rather an estimate because you don't have anything to base exact dates on, but that is the time, shortly before 1200, when most archeologists agree that great destruction took place. But there is another destruction which is found to quite an extent, not as great as this, around 1400. Now of course these are general terms because the cities vary, and naturally one city might be destroyed at a time no other was. But at least this can be said in general on the book of Joshua, that sometime between 1400 and 1200 there was a tremendous destruction of not one city but many, many cities, such as is represented in the book of Joshua, that much is clear. But now, I don't like personally, to try to work out precise details in order to try to prove the date of the conquest, from the materials, because it is too scant and you're soon arguing on very fine points, on which finespun arguments are made on both sides and there just is not enough data. But one of these days some new discovery may put us in a position where much of this data will come to be of tremendous importance as we see how it fits or doesn't fit, with some new discovery. We have not got that yet. There are points at which archeological information from these excavations relate to particular events and those we'll go on to now.

B. The Entrance into Canaan. I'm using this title, the entry into Canaan, as to describe the first portion of the book of Joshua. The portion that runs from 1:1 to

5:12. And we'll subdivide that into the first part, Joshua's Commission, chapter 1:1-9. This is one of the best-known passages in the book of Joshua. It, particularly the last two or three verses. It's a wonderful passage, full of lessons for us in serving the Lord. The Lord said to Joshua, Moses // my servant is dead; now therefore arise. Moses is dead, everything is gone to pieces, there's no great leader--no. Moses is dead, go forward. Go ahead, God's will, not Moses' will. Yes? (Student. Call this d?) B. A was Introduction, B Entry into Canaan.

And God promises that they shall succeed. Now God has not promised us that we will succeed in winning any particular individual, any particular city, any particular area for Christ, he does not promise that. He promised the Israelites they would take Canaan. He promised them that, that was his definite promise. They knew that plan because he had revealed ^{it}. Now his plan for our age is that we are to have a written message, and we are to win those whom he has chosen for eternal life, but we have no way of knowing who they are, and we have a right to claim for him a great witness in any particular area, we have a right, like John Knox, who cried, Lord give me Scotland or I die. Well, the Lord enabled him to make tremendous changes there in Scotland, but there were many unbelievers left, many unregenerate. The Lord has not promised that any particular individual salvation, but he has promised that if we are faithful he will give us many souls and we can claim that, we can claim a city not in the sense that everyone in that city we claim will be saved, but in the sense that we will be able to establish a real witness through which many will be reached for the Lord. And so, the ~~ex~~ example of Joshua here is not an exact analogy of what we have a right to claim. Because we don't have the Lord's specific statement, this city is going to be yours in the sense that they took everything in Canaan. But we have his promise which we can claim that we can raise a real and effective witness in any area of the world to which he leads us. And then, however, it is very (9 $\frac{1}{4}$) his commission to note the stress on the Bible, the book of the law. This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou may observe to do according to all that is written therein. Here is a man starting to lead the

slá

soldiers to conquer a territory. You might say, well, after Canaan's conquered, then we sit down and we take Moses' laws and we apply them, but no. He's starting the conquest and the Lord said that this book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth. It is important ~~that~~ every stage of the work that the Bible be at the foundation and we have it not merely as a banner but as a guide. The modernists like to call that Bibliolatry, worship of the Bible, which of course is ridiculous. There have been people who have worshipped the Bible, there have been ignorant people who have worshipped perhaps a church building, or the pulpit or something like that, but they have been very, very few, and no large group of people has ever worshipped the Bible. But true Christians put the Bible in a primary place as that through which they learn about the One whom they are to worship, and how to worship. And the stress on the Bible at the beginning of Joshua here must be in every successful work for Christ. He says, then he goes on, have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of good courage, be not afraid; neither be thou dismayed. Four times, be strong, be of good courage, be not afraid, neither be dismayed. Talk about repetition, four times the same thing is said. And ^{if} that was necessary to get the thought across to a bright, intelligent leader like Joshua, how much do you expect to have to repeat to get it to the minds of poor ignorant people. Any minister who thinks he comes to give somebody the gospel, thinks now they've got the word, we can shake the dust off our feet and go on to some other area because they've had the word and they've refused. It's just because (11¹/₂)

Because you have to repeat in order to get anything across, even in a highly intelligent class like this one, I have to repeat (11¹/₂)

And the Lord repeats it four times, be strong, be of good courage, be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed. And we need that as much as Joshua. How easy it is for us who ~~wee~~ ^{wee} ~~the~~ not with flesh and blood, to be pretty cowardly at times, to lose our courage, fail to push forward, but we couldn't do it in our own strength, the commission ends, for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest. And if you're not sure that you're in a relation to God in which you can know that he is with you, as you go, you better stop and ~~get~~ ^{get} that clarified before you try to accomplish anything for Him, for that

is absolutely necessary. So much then for the commission, 1:1-9.

Number 2, The People Mobilize, chapter 1:10-18. First the leader is given, nine verses of instruction, information, above all an exhortation. Then you have nine more verses in which the word is passed on to the people and especially the Reubenite, the Gadites and the half tribe of Manasseh, they get five verses out of these nine, because they're the people that Moses was afraid would stay there and not take part. They promised over and over, but now Joshua gives them very explicit directions, you leave your families but you come across and join with us in the conquest as you have promised, and they answered Joshua, we will do it. So that the preparation is made before they march forward. Many a Christian minister ^{who} is content with a little tiny work, drags along and accomplished very little because he is just satisfied to have a little candle in a small place and nothing more. There are many, many who could reach out for God and accomplish much larger things, but there's a smaller number, perhaps a fifth as many, but yet a very real number, who go to the opposite extreme and they start right out, without any preparation, any mobilization of their resources, to have a big work for God, and they start out, start big things, and they naturally all fizzle out. Joshua here is commanded to be strong and of good courage, but then he proceeds to mobilize and prepare and it's all too common for us when we're young to be led to attempt all kinds of things which we haven't got the training for, and then when we get a little older our courage...

O.T.History 217. (1 $\frac{1}{4}$)

...mobilizes the people, he ^{to} says be strong and of good courage, and you might say all right, let's ~~go out to~~ ^{cross the} Jordan, no before he crosses the Jordan he sends the spies. He's mobilized the people, but he also sends the spies in order to be sure what ~~they~~ they've got to meet over there in order that he can be ready for them, and the survey of ~~our~~ the opposition, the job we're to do, the inspection, examination, to determine just what the facts are, will be often of tremendous help as you go about. And these preliminary

surveys are usually very wise.

I've been reading a little bit about advertisers, I think it was the man who made such tremendous money out of Pepsodent advertising. He made up a plan for a big advertising campaign, and then he took just one city and he carried on his plan, and in that city, he found, he examined very, very carefully to see just how much the sales of pepsodent increased with this advertising plan, and then from it he learned how to improve his plan before he started on a nationwide tour. And we're all too ready to jump out with the big plan before we have made our survey and worked out the situation and have some reason to know whether it's going to be effective or not. ~~Now~~

Dr. McIntire started a radio program and was three years on one station, and the one station he learned a great deal of technique, he learned what sort of thing would reach people and what other way of presenting the same truth would get it across quite as well, he learned how to interest them in sending in the funds to carry on the work. And for three years, every day he got up at 6:30 in the morning and was busy working on getting his mind prepared for that and then put on his broadcast. After three years, then, he told me yesterday, then the thing began to open up to extend to other stations, how in one year he jumped from one station to about 25 stations. He told me that two years ago his whole radio budget for the year was about \$7,000 and they'd raise \$7500. Now his budget, his actual cost that he's committed to now for stations is \$84,000 instead of \$7,000 and the money is coming in at a rate now that should bring in about \$100,000. He did not start in to get a lot of stations and to reach out with this tremendous force, he started in to work it in a way to see how it worked, to learn the technique, to see whether this was the way that would reach them. He's been working with his paper, he's been working with his meetings, he's doing all sorts of things through these years, some of them have had great effectiveness, some of them less effectiveness, he hardly tried radio in all these years. Of course he had his sermon on radio, but the radio for daily rental, he never tried that. When he did, he went at it slowly, started as a small thing, he got into it and learned details and methods and now he's ready to branch out. He tells me he believes it's the Lord's will to give

him a hundred stations and, if so, there'll be a way of really getting the message to the people that will make (3 3/4) the modernists also recognize him because while they know how to get their message to the ministers most of whom are conditioned pretty thoroughly in their seminaries with the modernistic outlook. They have no message for ~~the~~ rank and file of people. But they have most of the church pulpits so that we have a very difficult chance to get to the people directly. Now this may give a wonderful way to get to them. But he didn't just start out on a big scale and do it, he started out, he surveyed, he worked at it, and gradually it has developed but he was wide awake, watching and waiting to make the Lord's will known, and to (4 $\frac{1}{4}$)

And so Joshua here, over across the Jordan there, the Lord has said follow, be of good courage, go forward. Yes, that's what he ^{must} ~~wants to~~ do, but he must also use all the visible means he has at his disposal, all the intellectual resources that he possibly can use, he must use, because he needs all the power of God beyond that, and God wants us to use what we have and (4 3/4)

He doesn't want us to sit still (4 3/4)

And so he sent ^{2.} the spies into Jericho. Now this story in chapter 2 is one that I expect all of you are quite familiar with. Then, of course, you studied it in your assignment two weeks ago. ^{in addition.} It is a story here, that these men came into Jericho, they sought out something of the morale, the attitude of the people, and it's mighty good to be aware of the attitude of the people. I've known ~~many~~ ministers who have gone into a town and started ~~a~~ testimony that was absolutely loyal to the Lord, and have been just against a stone wall as far as reaching others is concerned. But they've given everybody else in the community the impression that they thought that these others were utterly wicked because they didn't see the whole truth immediately when it was first presented to them. I've know of others who have gone to a community and started there a testimony that was absolutely loyal to the Lord but who have looked around and gained an idea of the ^{general} ~~the~~ situation, and have seen for instance a fine evangelical church in the area which belonged to an apostate denomination and instead of trying immediately to tell the people in that church they should immediately come out, they've gotten acquainted with the minister and

learned a little bit of how he's been trying to stand true to the Lord in the face of great difficulty in the denomination, and then the time has come as it will in every case, when this man moves on or when he dies, and when the hierarchy of the denomination put a modernist in, and then in that situation they could immediately start a campaign and take ^{perhaps} half the people from that church over into a sound testimony, because they were in a situation there where it was easy to make clear what was going on in their denomination. Now of course, something else may make the opportunity. But watch for the opportunity, utilize it, rather than just charging in without a clear situation that you could make clear to the average person that doesn't understand it. Now Joshua wanted to know what is the morale of these people, what is the situation in Jericho.

And so he sent the spies and it's one thing about any war, that spies are used. Personally, I don't see how a Christian could be a spy, but it has to be done in a war, there's a mighty difference (7½)

But in any war spies are used and the side that doesn't use spies is at a tremendous disadvantage. Now how much dissembling these spies did, we are not told a great deal about them, but they came into Jericho and they went to a harlot's house, named Rahab, and lodged there. And here was a harlot, here was a wicked woman in Jericho, but this wicked woman had a dissatisfaction with her life and with her whole situation and is longing for something better. And this wicked woman threw in her lot with the people of God and helped these spies, saved their lives, gave them good advice. She let them out when the king of Jericho sent to inquire whether there was anybody in her house like that, she hid them upon her roof, and then when they went she let them down with a rope over the wall, her house was upon the wall. And then she gave them good advice, ^{she said} ~~to~~ go not hence toward your own people, go in the opposite direction, because if they'd gone down to the Jordan they would have met the forces the king of Jericho had sent there to pursue them, to try when ~~de~~ he thought they had gone. Go in the opposite direction because there there are mountains right next to the town, within half a mile and these mountains are full of caves. It would be easy to hide there so you couldn't be found for months. And she said you go up there and you hide for three or four days and these forces from

up in Jericho and Jordan will come back and give up the search. And then you can get out. And for her good advice, her help in getting them out, they said to her you put a special indication in the window that you let us out, and we will spare you and your family. She had the faith that God was going to give the Israelites the victory to take the city, she asked them to help her when they did, and her family, her relatives, and they agreed to do it, and she actually became an ancestor of the Lord Jesus. And it seems terrible to think of a woman of that bad character and that bad situation as actually an ancestor to the Lord Jesus Christ, but the fact is that every one of his ancestors was a sinner, every single one of them. And some of them were less obvious sinners, in fact most of them, but in the heart many of us are much worse sinners probably than Rahab ever was. God only sees the heart. Yes? (student. 9 3/4.) Yes, God did not commend Rahab for her life. God took a wicked woman who had a glimmer of faith and saved her and her family. In the course of that he proved this woman without any training in sound ethics, without, with this wicked background, she did the best she knew how, and God used her but he did not commend her, and if this woman had not done that, you might say, well then, suppose she hadn't done it, the whole thing would've failed. Well, that's not true, God would've worked it some other way. (student. 10 3/4) Yes, well, there are a lot of people who run and hide for years, they never show their head. I'm not sure there's anything wrong in hiding for two days, as long as you don't put on a false mask, and claim to be something you're not. But there are times when it's right to make a big battle and there are times when you should just quietly wait two or three days. But not to actually pretend to be what you're not. But to lie low (11 1/2)

Yes? (student. 11 1/2. I think that a time of war^{it} ought to be accepted as a good plan.) War is per se wicked, but this world is a world of wickedness and it is necessary, in this world, to have that which is not good in itself. Killing is bad but in war it becomes necessary, and the Christian can kill in war, he has to, but to most of us it's (12)

The Christian is, a soldier profits

to start a big pronouncement to him of how I disagreed with him, how I thought that after all that if he had a job like they had, which depended on his signing ~~anything~~ ^{a creed}, I'm not sure that he'd be so honest as he claimed to be now, he didn't have to, his livelihood didn't depend on it. But I didn't see any necessity of entering into it. Now, certainly I think that to witness to that man is a fine thing, but I don't think that there's anything wrong in simply listening and letting him talk to you, and getting information under these circumstances, without (1 $\frac{1}{4}$) ~~getting~~ ^{entering} into a big argument. I think there were many ^{places where} ~~statements~~ it is foolish to enter into a big argument, but for me to have gone into him and talked as if I agreed with him, and started saying things to him that would give him the impression I had things I don't have, I don't see how a Christian could possibly do that. That would seem to me like a lie. But these are matters that everyone has to work out in the light of the word himself, and where you're in doubt, it's better to stay on the side of the inducement than to lapse over (1 3/4)

much better. But we do recognize that Joshua sent men to see what the situation was, and if these men had walked in through the gate there, and had said Gentlemen, we have come from the Israelites in order to destroy your land, and we want to know what your attitude is here and what your situation so we can carry word back, they of course would immediately have been killed. Or at least put in jail. And so the Israelites would've failed. But they didn't do that, they went in, saw what they could find out and brought the information back and then the attack was next.

Well, nothing that Rahab did is here commended but the glimmer of faith she had, the fact that she in her ignorance yet decided to align herself with the people of God and to turn against her whole background in which she was, and my guess is that not so much later she looked back with detestation on her previous life, including her previous deception. But the men followed her advice and hid in the mountains for a few days, and then made their way down to Jordan and they said to Joshua, truly the Lord has delivered all the land into our hands, for even all the inhabitants of the country do faint because of us. Why did they faint because of them. It was because they had heard how they conquered Sihon, king of the Amorites, and Og, king of Bashan. They had made a

good start. The New Testament verse, to him that hath shall be given, but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath, is true in every aspect of life. The start is the hardest thing to make. Having made a decent start, then many things grow like a snowball. And here having made the start they'd heard of them and they knew they were a force to be recognized and there was a fear there which always gave a kind of a good start. And so, number 4--

Number 4, The Crossing Over Jordan. Now this takes two chapters, chapter 3: verse 1 through 5:1. And this is a very interesting account. Here was a problem, forty thousand armed men, go get them across this river. If the people of Jericho, looking from the top of the wall, glimpsed (4 $\frac{1}{2}$), there they see the encampment over on the other side, they can see the movement as they start toward the river, they see these people coming. The people of Jericho are going to stay behind their walls, where they think they're safe behind those tremendous walls, going to stay there until they give up the siege. But if they see them trying to cross a rapid muddy river, to get all those people across, it's an ideal plan to go out and attack and drive them away. It's a very, very dangerous thing in war, crossing a barrier like a big river. And here the people would be at a tremendous disadvantage, and here the Lord chose to give a marvelous sign to the people in order to strengthen their courage, to increase their faith, to lead them to realize that he was with them and he had promised and he was going to carry them through safely. The Lord gave them this marvelous sign, and so Joshua came and commanded the people to sanctify themselves because tomorrow the Lord was going to show them his marvelous blessing. And the Lord told Joshua to tell the priest to take the ark and come to the brink of Jordan and he said these priests are going to stand still in the Jordan River while you cross over. And of course that sounds fantastic. How could they stand, priests holding the ark stand still in the middle of that river. It was, would carry them off, sweep them off their feet, perhaps over their heads, we're not sure, but at least it would sweep them off their feet, and be impossible for them to stand alone (6 $\frac{1}{4}$), if they hadn't been ~~they'd have to be~~ standing holding the ark, in the river, while all the people go over. But the Lord knew what he was going to do and so he told them to come and they came and as soon as their feet were dipped in the river, in the brim

of the river because Jordan was overflowing all its banks at the time of harvest, we read in verse 16 that God caused that the water right ten feet above them should stop and stand up in a high heap and just stand right there, and they could walk over. Is that what it says? Anybody have their Bible open to it? (student. 6 3/4. Yes, I think so.) Be sure (6 3/4) because there's no ^{special} point in what I tell you but it's what I covet you understand the Bible (6 3/4)

And that's not what it says. Read it and see what it says. It says, that the waters which came down from above stood and rose up upon an heap very far from the city Adam. Well, isn't that a funny thing to say, very far from the city Adam. You might say that the American troops landed in Normandy very far from the city of New York. What would be the point of it? Very far from the city of Adam. I don't know why the King James' version translated it this way. The Hebrew is that they stood up in an heap very far off (7 $\frac{1}{2}$) Adam ~~the city~~, Adam the city which is beside Zaretan.

Now when did (7 3/4) * ever mean from? Very far from the city of Adam. It's very far off in Adam the city that is by Zaretan. And there (8)

is a place today a few miles up the river, above Jericho, which today is called Adamia. And that's just an ending, you see, that is, it's Adam with an ending, Adamia, is the present name of that place. And there is a tel there which would have been a city or a town in ancient times. And this place which they today call Adamia would seem most likely to be that place which this refers to when it says at Adam it is a few miles up the Jordan from Jericho. And it says it is across from Zaretan, and we know Zaretan which is near that same area, which is a few miles across the (8 3/4)

And what the Hebrew says, I don't know how the King James ever came to say very far from the city Adam, there's no foundation in the Bible here at all. (9)

But it's very far off at the city of Adam, where the water stood still on a heap. And those that came down toward the sea of the plain failed and were cut off and the people passed over right against Jericho. So the account here is not an account of the priests stepping into the water and right there where they are the waters stand up as a heap, that's not what it says here. But what it says here they stood up as a heap at the city

Adam, very far off, that is a few miles up the river. Well, now when you're down there at Jericho you have a fairly wide valley, Jordan Valley down there, quite a wide galley, but you go a few miles up the stream and you come to Adamia and today there is a ferry at Adamia. I crossed at Adamia at the end of a three-weeks' horseback trip through the back country of Palestine. We got into the ferry, I think we had about 8 horses and there were four professors that were born on four different continents, ^{in our party,} and then some Arab muleteers, to take care of the horses and the mules. Well, we crossed in this ferry, and it was a fairly narrow place where the ferry crossed there, and on both sides the valley goes only a short distance instead of the wide valley of Jericho it's a fairly narrow valley, and then there are high cliffs on both sides. These cliffs go up two or three hundred feet, and it looks almost like just a dirt cliff, it didn't look like a steep rock cliff at all, it looked like a dirt cliff. I didn't stop to examine it carefully but I mean that's the general impression given. And there is an Arabic account in Arab history, of one time in the Middle Ages when they say that there was a landslide there which filled up the river and held it back for many hours. Professor Garstang, professor at the University of Liverpool, tells of finding evidence of similar occurrences in this very setting. Garstang in his book which he calls, The Foundation of Bible History, Joshua to Judges, Garstang who is professor at the University of Liverpool, and he was the director of excavation for the Palestine Mandate for a number of years. He says in here that in the year 1266 when the Sultan (11 $\frac{1}{2}$) ordered a bridge to be built across the Jordan and enable them (11 3/4) Adamia, the task was found to be difficult owing to the rise of the water, but in the night preceding the 8th of December, 1267, a rocky mount which overlooked the river on the west fell into it and dammed it up so that the water of the river ceased to flow and none remained in its bed, the waters spread over the galley across the dam and none flowed down the bed for some 16 hours. He said there was another similar occurrence about the year 1906 and the most recent during the earthquake of 1927. On this last occasion the high left bank immediately before (12 $\frac{1}{4}$) collapsed, carrying with it the roadway as seen in our photograph. He had pictures of it. And

just below a section of the cliff which here rises to a height of 150 feet fell bodily across the river and completely dammed it so that no water flowed down the river bed for 21 $\frac{1}{2}$ hours. Meanwhile the waters gradually filled up the plains around (12 $\frac{1}{2}$) and found a way eventually back to the river bed when the temporary (12 3/4)

and normal conditions were gradually resumed. During this time it is asserted by several living witnesses, that they crossed and recrossed the bed of the river freely on foot. Now that is what Garstang claims to have happened in 1927 when he was there shortly after, and he got pictures of the situation and he talked with people who claim to have crossed it at that time.

Now the Bible here doesn't say that at Jericho God caused the river to stand right up but he says at the city Adam he caused it to stand up in heaps. Well, now God could stand them to stand up in a heap by putting an invisible shield there very easily. God could put an invisible shield there that no one could see that would hold the waters back and stand them up in a heap. Or he could put a visible shield there, and since it mentions Adam it would sound as if what God did was exactly what happened in 1927. I don't say that it is certain but it would sound as if that is what happened then. It happened just at the time when God had the people there, they had already spied out Jericho, they were ready to try, he caused this to happen to stop the water going down Jordan and make it easy for them to cross over. Yes? (student. 14 $\frac{1}{4}$. Did the same thing happen at the Red Sea when almost the same words are used, that the floods stood up upright as an heap?) Well, at the Red Sea, see, here you have a river ^{flowing} and if you put a dam across a river, the water will stop. The Red Sea is not a river flowing. It's a solid body of water so I wouldn't think there would be an analogy. And here it mentions the place that God used, there it mentions that God used a wind. And the precise details of it, I wouldn't say, I don't know in either case, but the same thing that I notice here is that the scripture mentions the means, a natural means, in this case it mentions a place. Now God could put an invisible shield right there...

O.T. 219. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...and chosen to happen just when they needed it so that it is a sign, it is a miracle,

regardless of what the means was, whether he used the means and pushed the dirt over into the river and stopping the river or whether he caused the water to stand up there (3/4)

There are people who try to get all the supernatural out of this picture // they can and explain everything away. There are other people who try to make everything just as different from ordinary life as they possibly can. I don't think we should try to do either, I think we should see what it says and try to understand it (1)

but it is my personal impression that the Lord is anxious that we realize not just that he did wonderful works, long, long ago, and that nothing like this happens today, but that is always ^{interested} ~~the same~~ and directing everything in accordance with his plan and for his purpose, and that his hand is just as real in our lives as it was in the lives of the Israelites, even he may not choose to ^{do} use things in a way that seems the same type of miraculous today as it did then, yet it is ^{providence} ~~providence~~ and sometimes (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

he is doing what he chooses for his purposes in the lives of his children. But that is the statement here in verse 16, that it was a heap very far, I don't know they said from the city Adam, because I've never heard of (1 3/4) * translated from in my life, but in Adam, now of course when it says in, it means in the area, close by (2)

Yes? (student 2 $\frac{1}{4}$) Oh, it stood on an heap very far ^{at} ~~from~~ the city Adam, I see. And then ^{that} ~~as~~ it wasn't that it was very far from Jericho; but that it was very far back in Adam (2 $\frac{1}{2}$)

I'd have to look at this passage again, perhaps there is a commentator's suggestion. I ^{hadn't} thought of ^{interpretation} that / but offhand it seems to be that it is a possibility of (2 3/4) this word. Yes? (student 2 3/4. Or it could be it stood very far unto, reaching unto the city of Adam.) It doesn't quite seem (3 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Well, this is a very important incident in the story, you notice two chapters are given it. It is one of the great events of the conquest of Canaan, it was a great sign God gave them right at the beginning to show them he was with them, leading them, and

making them bold to go forth. It's a very great sign, it gets two chapters in the Bible. Of course, you say two chapters, it would just mean where the Archbishop divided it, but actually it is a long two ordinary chapters in the book of Joshua. It is quite as much material as we have in, even about the conquest of Jericho. The conquest of Jericho has twenty-seven verses altogether describing it, the crossing of the Jordan has 17 plus 24, that's 41, about fifty to sixty per cent more space given to it than was given even to the great conquest of Jericho. The conquest of Jericho was a much greater event but this was in some ways even more striking. To get this great body across that river without any difficulty at all, because of the marvelous means that the Lord had provided, and so he tells us how God commanded they take stones and they make a monument in the middle of the river, so they could say we put up a monument right in the middle of that river, and they took stones from the middle of the river and made up a monument on the side that people could see, and he says in Joshua 4:21, he spoke to the children of Israel, saying, when your children shall ask their fathers in time to come, saying, what mean these stones? Then ye shall let your children know, saying, Israel came over this Jordan on dry land. For the Lord your God dried up the waters of Jordan from before you until you were passed over, as the Lord your God did to the Red sea, which he dried up from before us, until we were gone over. Most of these marvelous works of the Lord will be remembered through all eternity. Yes? (student. 5 $\frac{1}{4}$. Would you happen to know what type of soil, what type of river bed it would be? I'm thinking if it was rocky they wouldn't have any problem, but if it was sandy, after all the watery ground would be bound to be quite moist.) Oh, yes, you mean at this place? Well, my guess from the description is that it must have been rocky. I don't see how it would quite fit the description if it was muddy and very difficult to cross, so my guess is that it was rocky, but I don't know. Yes? (student. 5 $\frac{3}{4}$) Yes, I don't know, it's a long time ago. And There have been wars and disturbances and upheavals in Palestine beyond almost any nation on the face of the earth. (student. 6. No later trace of it?) Not that I know. Yes? (6 $\frac{1}{2}$) That is a possibility. It might be a rocky place there. I know a place in western Pennsylvania where a stream comes down and then it reaches a place where

there's a solid rocky bottom for ~~about~~ half a mile, and then it breaks through the rocky bottom and becomes a slough, it could be rocky or it could be a type of sand that would more easily be crossed. But there certainly are types of soil that would be muddy and difficult to walk on (6 $\frac{3}{4}$)

But I have assumed that, I think you'd have to (7)

Well, I don't know as we'll look at any more detail on these two chapters. The crossing over Jordan.

Number 5, The General Circumcision and the Encampment at Gilgal. Here we find that the people, chapter 5, verses 2-12, the people have been in the wilderness under God's wrath, he's ordered they must go forty years in the wilderness and the whole generation must die there and under those circumstances they had not been circumcised, and so now the order is given for the circumcision of all the men before they begin their actual attack on Jericho, and so here at Gilgal we have this circumcision of all the men and just as Moses when he began, he was already circumcised of course, it was necessary that his child be circumcised, before he began his great work, here the whole nation had to be circumcised as the evidence given they were a holy people, set apart to the Lord, ready to undertake the (8 $\frac{1}{2}$)

And the camp here at Gilgal, a name meaning rolling, and he said, called it that because there they had rolled away their reproach of Egypt from them. Well, now to call it rolling doesn't seem a very natural thing, that they rolled away the reproach, so my guess is that the name may have been Gilgal (8 $\frac{3}{4}$) *

but that they said how appropriate is the name Gilgal, here is where the reproach of Egypt was rolled away from us. Now I'm not sure, maybe they give the name first there, but there are cases where a name is connected up by its appropriateness rather than it's just (9) name given. ~~So that would be a~~ So that would be a guess on my part about that. That takes us through B.

Next will be C, very appropriate, C for conquest or C for Canaan. C, The Conquest of Canaan. 5:13 to 12:24. But that we will not enter till next week.

...test this morning to the juniors... to 10 $\frac{1}{4}$)

Now we were talking last time about, I think we just started C, didn't we, The Conquest of Canaan? Under that I think we'll just take a second to look at the general strategy, Number 1, The General Strategy. If somebody will draw a map of Palestine on the board we can look at it there, otherwise look at the back of your Bibles, see if you have a map of Palestine. And on this map of Palestine, you'll notice that the Israelites came up from the south, which they would have done at Kadesh Barnea, and attacked the land at one end of it, but they came around the Dead Sea and conquered TransJordan and then came in from the east, and they came in there at the northern end of the Dead Sea so that it was more or less in the middle of the land that they came. So that they attacked Jericho a little south of the middle of the land, and from Jericho then they moved north up the Jordan Valley which was hardly settled at all at this time, a few miles and then go up to Shechem which is just about in the very middle of the land. Right there near Shechem, or a little south of it, they start their conquest, that is they continue the conquest, they've already conquered Jericho, and Ai, but then they conquer the states to the south of that first, and then the states, the cities, the different groups to the north of it. So that they do not attack all the groups of Palestine at once, but they take them piecemeal, and they take it, in the center, divide it into two sections in such a way that the two have no communication with each other. You could start in attacking in the south, in the very south and the word might spread from one to the other all along about this attack, this danger to come, if it started in the middle to come south, and the north only gets slight rumors about it, and then when you're through with the south then they take up the north. So in three different movements, that is if you count TransJordan, four different movements, it was taken piecemeal. It was a very effective strategy. Good to have that in mind as we look at the whole procedure, the attack upon Palestine, as they are planning to take it for God. They did not go in there and send notices to every section of it, we're now going to conquer this whole land, take it all over, we're going to meet you all at once. They took it piecemeal, section by section, they conquered it. So much for number 1, The General Strategy.

Number 2, in this section, we have a very interesting brief episode. I call it, 2, The Divine Commandment. 5:13-15. We do not have the whole story given here. We hardly could, because there's something in it that we just don't have fully explained. But it came to pass when Joshua was by Jericho he lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold there stood a man over against him with his sword drawn in his hand. Joshua went unto him and said to him, Art thou for us, or for our adversaries? And he said, Nay, but as captain of the host of the Lord have I come. And Joshua immediately said who are you to come in here and take hold of this force (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) capture a guard, probably a spy, or something, put him under bond until he manages to get information. That is what would normally happen if anybody came and said things like that. And so we read that Joshua fell on his face and did worship and said to him, What saith my lord to his servant? It's perfectly obvious that there is some further evidence given to Joshua. It wasn't just any man who could make this statement and Joshua immediately accept it at face value. It is perfectly evident that there was some indication, some way in which Joshua had absolute proof that this was not an ordinary man but this was a (15) vision from the Lord.

O.T. History 220. (1 $\frac{1}{3}$)

...but at least there's no suggestion to take that anything else came in between. So that there is doubtless further detail that we are not told because the purpose is not to give us all the facts that occur. To give all the facts that occurred anywhere in any one year would take several encyclopedias, but it is to bring out the main fact here which is that at this point God gave Joshua a special vision. He had a truth he wanted to drive home to Joshua, and so Joshua fell on his face to the earth and worshipped, and says what says my lord to his servant. And the captain of the Lord of Hosts said to Joshua loose thy shoe from off thy foot, for the place whereon thou standest is holy and Joshua did so and nothing more is said. So we are not given to believe that this was a vision to bring information to Joshua, God could have sent him ^{facts,} ~~back,~~ given him information if he chose at this time, any way he chose, but the passage does not suggest

that that is the purpose of this incident. The passage, as far as the passage goes, he had no reason to think ~~the Lord~~ ^{anything more} is involved in the incident than is here described. Except as they say, that there was some way in which Joshua knew who it was. But that there was any purpose in it other than what is here described. And if that is so, the purpose of the incident was simply to reinforce Joshua's understanding that he was not the great one who had the power to do these great things, but that he was merely an instrument in the hands of the Lord, and that if the Lord chose to send somebody else to be his superior that was entirely up to the Lord. It was to help keep Joshua humble. And to help keep Joshua looking to the Lord for his leadership and giving the Lord the glory. And the Lord was like every one of us when we begin any great deed for him, any great work for him, would like us to have a similar realization, brought home to us, that the Lord is the one who is doing it and we are only an instrument in his hand. And our place is not standing up and saying I am the great mighty one who is doing this, but I am an instrument in the Lord's hands. I was reading how General Grant, when he was brought east to take over the command of the United States forces, he went to the army of the Potomac which McClellan had trained so wonderfully and they were drilled so, and they just loved McClellan and he couldn't bear to think of anything happening to this wonderful army he'd trained, so they never were much good for fighting, just for drilling and marching and obeying the commands of this great leader, and when Grant came in he went to the headquarters and he found the tents all out with their beautiful signs and insignia and everything so wonderful, and he says what is this, is this the headquarters of imperial Caesar, and Grant lived about as simply as any one of the soldiers. He did not conceive of himself as ^{a great} one on a pedestal above them, but as a man who had a job to do and he was getting to work to get the job done. And that's of course the attitude that Joshua had but at this very important point, at the beginning here of the actual great conquest, God wanted to drive it home to Joshua's mind that he was nothing but an instrument in the Lord's hands for the accomplishment of the Lord's work. So he gave him this vision. That is to say, was this Christ who came and appeared to him there? Was it, it surely was not an ordinary man, it was a vision from God, was it

a tangible being, something you could touch, ~~what~~ was it? We're not told, but we are told this occurred to drive home to Joshua's mind that important fact at this important point.

Remember Alexander the Great, when he took the wonderful armies that his father had organized and trained and started out to conquer lands going further and further eastward, he started out as one of the men, he was excellent at handling horses and very fine fighter himself, and the men just loved him, but he started out leading them and they conquered land after land, and when he came in contact with the Persians, ^{pretty soon} Alexander decided that ^{if} the Persian king was a god, he was one too, and he told his comrades in arms they must come and kneel before him and do him all sorts of homage ^{and treat him} as if he were a ~~god~~ or some high imperial figure lofty and above them and it went to his head. Who knows what might have happened if he hadn't died when he was only about thirty. But in the history books man after man has done a great work and then the success has gone to his head. It never did with Joshua. To the end of the history here he remains a humble man, devoted to the service of the Lord. But God gave him these experiences in order to reinforce them, just as he gave Balaam experiences to reinforce Balaam's decision to say only what the Lord told him to say. He gave Joshua this vision to reinforce his realization that he was ~~was~~ merely an instrument in God's hands. He does not ordinarily give us experiences like that in these days, but he wants us to study his word and see what he did for Joshua and to get the same results for ourselves from the study of the word, that we would get if ~~he~~ actually interfered in such fashion. Now ~~number~~ 2, then, was this brief passage, The Divine Commander.

Number 3, The conquest of Jericho, chapter 6, one of the most interesting, one of the best known passages, probably, in the whole Bible. There's never a Sunday School course that goes through the Old Testament that does not deal with this particular chapter. So it is very, very well known, and it is interesting how the men march around Jericho every day and on the seventh day they march around seven times, and they blow the trumpets and the walls fell down, and Joshua said Shout for the Lord has given you the city. And they just marched right straight up over these fallen walls and took the

city, as the Lord had given it to them. Now this does not happen in the other cities they conquer. They didn't march around the later cities. People read about a marvelous experience in the life of some man of God, where God has just handed him the thing with no effort on his part and then they think that that should be their normal experience. But it was not, they had to fight hard for the other cities they conquered. But here at the outset of the conquest of Canaan, God gave them this wonderful sign of his presence with them. And in this marvelous way he turned it over to them with no effort on their part except the marching around which certainly played no part in the actual conquest of the city. It's merely going through something the Lord commanded and the Lord handed it over.

There are times when the Lord does things like that for us but we are not to expect it to be the normal thing, because normally he expects us to work for what we accomplish, as the Israelites had to work very hard for what they accomplished later on in this conquest. But the Bible tells us the supernatural story of how this happened. And naturally people who have not believed in the Bible would find this a very natural place to stop and ridicule, the idea that such a thing as this would happen, that marching around could make a city fall down or the blowing of trumpets could knock over the walls of the city. And so it is interesting to see what archeology has to say about the conquest of Jericho.

Well the place Jericho has been known for a very long time. The name has been preserved though the town was moved a short distance. The New Testament ^{Jericho} is about a mile and a half away from Old Testament Jericho, in different places but in the same general locality, and the present little town of Jericho where there are a great many refugees is a little removed from either of those. But they're in the same general locality, but this there wasn't much difficulty in finding the place of the Old Testament Jericho, and it was very early in the history of archeology that in the years 1907-09, the ^{Deutsch} ~~Dutch~~ (10)

began excavation of Jericho. In English that would be the German Orient~~al~~ Society. The German Orient Society began excavation of Jericho and carried on ~~from~~ 1907-09, digging about three weeks in the spring of 1907 and about three months in the years of 1908-09. And digging in there through the city, they found many

interesting things, they really only made a start in excavation in that small amount of time but they did enough to map the walls and to compare different strata and to tell a certain amount about it and it used to be customary to discuss how the Canaanite Blue City was destroyed in around two or three hundred years before the Israelites came but the Canaanites Red City was the city that Joshua destroyed. And so once I remember asking an archeologist with whom I was visiting Jericho at the time, why it was that one was the blue city and the other the red city. Well, ~~the other~~ ^{he said the first} excavator marked one set of walls in blue ink and one in red, so that's how those names came to be applied, and very often names are given in that sort of fashion, and sometimes become established and people think they have historical significance. But the red city was the last city that was found there in the early period. And there ~~was~~ another city on top of that and what the Germans noticed was that the type of civilization found in the red city and the city above it did not come immediately after one another in other places in Palestine. Papyri of the two had a great, at least two or three centuries in between. And the remains which they found from the period above that, the Canaanite red city, was similar to that that was found in other places from the time of the later Israelite kingdom, say the time of Ahab. And that was very interesting, to bring the connection with Joshua 6 here, with the end of the chapter, where it says and Joshua adjured them at that time, saying, Cursed be the man before the Lord, that rises up and builds this city Jericho: he shall lay the foundation thereof in his firstborn and in his youngest son shall he set up the gates of it. Verse 26, chapter 6. And then if you turn over to 1 Kings is it 15 or 16, 1 Kings 16:34, you find this statement about King Ahab, in his days did Hiel the Bethelite build Jericho, he laid the foundation thereof in Abiram his firstborn and set up the gates thereof in his youngest son Segub, according to the word of the Lord which he spake by Joshua the son of Nun.

Here then we have a prophecy given and the prophecy fulfilled but the prophecy implies that there was no lost city there in between, because he said cursed be the man that rises up and builds this city, which they had destroyed. And then this says that the curse he laid upon him was fulfilled when he and the Bethelites built it in the days

of King Ahab. And so according to the Bible the city, the place was unoccupied by a fortified city during this period from Joshua to Ahab, and there was a gap found there, by the German excavators in the remains during this period of at least three hundred years and some would say six hundred. And so that is an interesting element of confirmation of the Biblical account.

Now somebody told me several years ago that they saw an account in an article in a Sunday supplement of a newspaper, telling how in the excavations that were going on in 1932 at Jericho, that they had found buried under the base of the city, these skeletons of a young man, which they claim confirms the story that he laid the foundation thereof in Abiram his firstborn and set up the gates in his youngest son Segub. Now I've never...

O.T.History 221. ($\frac{1}{4}$)

...hadn't come across it and my guess is that it was a bit of writing, I don't know, maybe ($\frac{1}{4}$) .

but I think more important than that is to note what this means. Joshua laid a curse on it and said this would be done. This says it was done. Does that mean that he helped sacrifice his sons? His two sons. Well, that would hardly fit the curse, would it? The curse is some misfortune. It seems to me it's much more reasonable to think that what it means there is that in connection with the laying of the foundation of the city the eldest son was killed in some accident, and then in connection with the setting up of the gates the youngest son was killed in an accident. Now whether that happened, they were then buried under the place, under the gate or not, we don't know. And if you found the skeleton of a young man there that wouldn't necessarily prove, it might be someone else. But I think that's what it means, how Joshua predicted two accidents happening to the two sons of the man who rebuilt it, and in Kings it says that that actually did occur, there were these accidents.

Well, the vital thing there is that this period in between when there was not a fortified city at Jericho. Now after the excavation carried on from 1907-09 there were many interesting things discovered there, details, nothing especially important at this

point in connection with the story of the conquest, but in 1930 and 1931 further excavations were begun at Jericho, and this excavation which began in 1930 was carried on for a number of years. It was carried on by Dr. John Garstang who was a professor of the University of Liverpool, who had been the director of antiquity for Palestine Mandate so it had oversight over all excavations in Palestine for a time, but an interesting thing about it was that Dr. John Garstang received a great part of the funds necessary for the excavation from Sir Charles Martin, a motorcycle manufacturer in England, I think it was London, I'm not sure. And Martin was a very earnest Christian anxious to discover evidence supporting the dependability of the Bible, and I think Garstang was anxious to please Martin. I don't think Garstang himself had any special interest in this phase. Now Garstang excavated there for a number of years and Martin and others supported him. But Martin withdrew his support from him ^{after a time} and I believe the reason he withdrew it was because they got down to where they were excavating and lower strata, far before any connection with the Bible and Garstang was tremendously interested in that, and I don't think that Martin was. But Martin spent a good deal of time there at the excavation, taking considerable interest in it and one thing that was sort of hobby with Martin was to prove that the date of the Exodus and the conquest was the so-called early date, about 1400 B.C. And Garstang wrote a book to prove that the destruction of Jericho took place in 1407 B.C. And you can't be as exact as that on anything, but that's the date he gave, 1407 B.C. And he took a series, he took all the events of the conquest, Joshua and Judges, and he gave them dates and then he took, Garstang took the events of Egyptian history of this period and he took the dates of them and tried to show over a period of a century or more how it just fits together, Egyptian history and Biblical history fits together and fit with this date of 1407. Well since we don't know these exact Egyptian dates, we know approximately relation to each other but scholars vary within a period of thirty or forty years (5) and the Biblical dates, scholars vary within a period of about two hundred years, so I think we're far from ready to begin that sort of investigation. Garstang's book which he wrote on it, The Foundation of a Bible History, is the title on the book here, but on the

^{paper}
/jacket it says the foundation of Bible history, Joshua and Judges, and that's a much better title, because the book is on Joshua and Judges. And in it he says in the beginning that of course it is only the J and the E documents which are at all dependable for his purpose because the P document is far too late, and so in this book he's not going to deal with those portions of Joshua and Judges which belong to the P document but only to those in J and E. Although he says it is a strange thing that at many points he found evidence to show that statements made in the P document were (6)

but he's not going to bother with those in this book because the P document is so late, but he just takes the parts at those points that critical scholars assign~~ed~~ to the J and E documents. But then those parts he gives the evidence as known to him from archeology very well, and the book is a book well worth study, because in the field of archeology, at actual excavation, Garstang was very good. And he was in Palestine many years and he studied each one of these locations very carefully and especially the last part of the book in which he takes up the places in Palestine mentioned in Joshua and Judges and he tells about where they are, what the situation is, what kind of pottery they found there, whatever excavation has been done there and so on, and that material is extremely valuable in the latter part of the book, even though now of course it's already, well it was about 1930 it came out, so it's already--about 31 or 32 it came out--it is already nearly thirty years old, but the material up to that time is very well given there, and in the discussion ⁱⁿ of the book, he takes up the events in Joshua and Judges, particularly in Joshua, and he discusses the evidence and there's much of real value in the book, although his theorizing based on his fitting together with Egyptian dates, and his strong support of this early date which leads him I think to confuse evidence in many points, is a very definite detriment to the effectiveness of the book. But Garstang tells in the book how he excavated there at Jericho and excavated there, he was particularly interested in the walls of the latest Canaanite city there, and he examined the stone of the wall, as they excavated it. There were other cities on top later so all this was buried. He excavated them. One point that someone raised against it, was, they said; how could an army march seven times around the city, because if you

got too near to it naturally you'd have rocks and things thrown at you from the wall and you couldn't march too near it, so you'd have to be a little distance away, and to march seven times around in one day, you couldn't march seven times around Philadelphia, you'd have a job doing it once. But of course Jericho was not a large city, it was a very, very ^{strong} ~~small~~ city. The walls, the stones in them, are tremendously large and it was a double wall. It was built for protection but the people would gather together there behind those strong walls, in case of seige, and they had a wonderful fountain inside, later called Elisha's fountain, the water gushes out at a tremendous rate and there's plenty of water and they were able to withstand a very, very long seige, but they'd be mighty (9)

for this seige. It was not a large area at all in the city, so that it's not at all difficult as far as the task is concerned, of marching around it.

(9 $\frac{1}{4}$)

That's one

thing that light was thrown on by it, but then Garstang was greatly interested in examining the nature of the wall, and he found that indeed the walls had fallen down flat as described here, that the walls were not standing up to a certain height except in one place which we assume is where Rahab's house was, but that in the other places the walls had fallen over, the inner wall had fallen over into the moat, because if they could get in the outer wall, it would make it easy to get across the moat, and the outer wall had fallen outside down the slopes of the outside, so that you could climb across the ruins of it and get into the city very easily. Now there are a couple of very interesting

pages here about it, I want to read you, what Garstang says. He says that ^{collapse} ~~the last~~ of the wall of Jericho is not attributed by the ^{Bible narrative} ~~physical~~ to a physical agency, but we should not overlook in this connection the possible effect of earthquake, which in themselves would doubtless have been regarded at the time as direct manifestations of Jehovah's powers. Notice ~~the shade~~ of (10 $\frac{1}{7}$)

Of course, he's

with Marsten to prove the Bible is correct, but his attitude toward the religious life is not very satisfactory to my mind. He says, Walls of the period both at Ai and at Jerusalem on excavation, showed signs of subsidence and dislocation such as might be attributed to earth tremors; but there is no indication as to the date of these shocks,

which may even have happened since the abandonment of the sites. We have already noted that earthquakes are said to have heralded the arrival of the Israelites, and we have seen that in recent years an earthquake produced at El Damieh the very phenomenon which is said to have made possible the crossing of the Jordan. Palestine is subject to earthquakes, some of which have wrought great damage. In 1837 four thousand people were killed in the district of Safed. The havoc caused by the earthquakes of 1927 amounted to a national disaster. Violent tremors were felt throughout the country on both sides of the river. At Nablus two whole streets of houses completely disappeared, ^{this is 1927} and in all several hundred houses fell leaving thousands of people homeless. At Amman also the shocks caused much material damage; while at Jericho itself a hotel collapsed, with fatal consequences, and the ends of the Allenby bridge over the Jordan were displaced. Jericho lies particularly within the earthquake zone, and on that occasion violent shocks were recorded on four days out of seven. Theoretically, then, the possibility of the walls of Jericho having been damaged or destroyed by earthquakes is to be admitted. But an examination of the remains of the walls themselves hardly substantiates the suggestion. ~~That~~

That's very interesting that he rather expecting to find that earthquakes did it, would find that in his opinion the evidence looked away from that rather than toward it. He says an examination of the remains of the walls themselves hardly substantiate the suggestion.

Both lie in ruins, but the lowest courses are preserved to a height varying from one to three yards according to the depth of ground. Neither shows much sign of transverse fracture. Dislocation of the bricks is noticeable in certain sections of the inner wall along the western side, but not to an extent that cannot be explained by normal subsidence arising from the unequal strength of its foundations. Moreover, the collapse of a wall of this thickness, standing upon relatively level ground, would probably begin with a lateral splitting from the top; and in this case the process would involve not only the crumbling edges of the main wall itself, but the rooms or houses built thereon, and the debris might be expected to fall ~~inwards~~ almost as much as outwards. But in those few places where the inner face of the wall has been discovered undisturbed, this is not

found to have been the case. Ruins and signs of burning are found against the wall in plenty, but they are apparently the last traces of houses that rested against the wall. Signs of damage and destruction are more apparent on the outer sides, in the space, that is, between the walls, and outside, down the slopes. Here several sections cut through both walls and into the ground below them tell plainly a consistent story which was summarised at the close of the excavations in the following memorandum.

And now there's a memorandum which was written describing what they found and signed on March 2, 1930 by the Pere Vincent and Garstang and endorsed as to its archeological conclusions by Dr. Clarence Fisher. Dr. Fisher originally from Norristown, Pa., spent I guess 30 years in Palestine. He began nearly every big excavation with-which Garstang was started in those years. Was counselor and archeological adviser on practically every expedition during those years. He's considered (14 $\frac{1}{4}$)

thorough ^{master} ~~knack~~ of the art of excavation and interpretation (14 $\frac{1}{4}$)

Pere Vincent, maybe some of you don't know about enough French to know how to spell it, Vincent, was a Dominican who lived in Palestine for many years, visited at the French school in Palestine, visited every archeological site and was recognized as a man of tremendous knowledge and understanding in, giving accent to facts that very few...

O.T.History 222. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...Well, they two and Garstang signed, that is Vincent and Garstang signed this memorandum, and Fisher endorsed it as to its archeological conclusions. Now here is the memorandum which they signed. It says, The main defences of Jericho in the Late Bronze Age (that is from about 1600-1200 B.C.) followed the upper brink of the city mound, and comprised two parallel walls, the outer six feet and the inner twelve feet thick. Investigations along the west side show continuous signs of destruction and conflagration. The outer wall suffered most, its remains falling down the slope. The inner wall is preserved only where it abuts upon the citadel, or tower, to a height of eighteen feet; elsewhere it is found largely to have fallen, together with the remains of buildings upon it, into the space between the walls which was filled with ruins and debris. Traces of intense

fire are plain to see, including reddened masses of brick, cracked stones, charred timbers and ashes. Houses alongside the wall are found burned to the ground, their roofs fallen upon the domestic pottery within. After quoting this, Garstang continues:

As to the main fact, then, there remains no doubt: the walls fell outwards so completely that the attackers would be able to clamber up and over their ruins into the city.

Now that's very interesting that these men would have signed this memorandum and declared that this is what they found evidence of there at Jericho which remarkably corroborates the Biblical statement, that the walls suddenly fell over and they say they do not think that it looks as if it was the result of an earthquake. There was one English writer who, after this came out, told how he thought it actually happened. He said, the Israelites marched around the city in order to divert the attention of the people of the city, so that they people on the walls would be noticing the Israelites marching around and wouldn't see the fact that a few of them crawled up to the wall and dug and undermined so it would fall, which of course is a fantastic idea. If they ^{were} ~~if~~ ever ^{to} do that with the outer wall, they'd certainly never be able to do it with the inner wall, and I'm quite sure that the people inside would be watching much more keenly than to allow that to happen. Yes? (student.3) It is true that the soldiers marching across a bridge, a metal bridge, in unison, the vibration could be very harmful but marching on dirt, half a mile or so away from the city, and the walls of the city made of stone, it would seem to be an extreme unlikelihood that would enter in. Now I couldn't say what the Lord might use, but at least I don't think it entered in sufficiently that at any other time in history people have felt safe in thinking they could knock walls down with marching around them. (student.4) I don't think so. (4½)

It is true that a train, something like that, or a jar, shaking would be like an earthquake, in the course of time it could cause a break at one place, but I certainly don't think it would cause the walls to fall outward one bit. Mr. Tow. (student.4 3/4) Now it doesn't say on ^{day of} what the week they marched, does it? I don't think that we have evidence on that point. The Lord said you shall conquer the city and go round it once, thus shall you do six days. What day did they start on? It doesn't

say. And the seventh day you shall compass the city seven times, and the priests shall blow with the trumpets. Now was the seventh day the seventh day of the week? The one on which they went around it seven times? I don't believe it says anywhere here, so I would think that there are three possibilities, one possibility would be that they started in on a Monday, or a Sunday rather, and that on the sabbath day they marched around it seven times, thus doing this very special work of the Lord on that day, the result of a very special command. That is one possibility. A second possibility is that they started out on Wednesday or Thursday and when it came to the sabbath they marched around once that day as other days. And the third possibility that they started out on a Wednesday or a Thursday and that the, say the third day of marching was Friday, then Saturday being the Sabbath, they did not march that day, but the fourth day of marching would then be Sunday, and that way they would march around on six consecutive work days, skipping the Sabbath. Now I think any one of the three is a possibility, we do not have that quite clear. Yes? (student. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$) We just have no evidence on that. We do know that in the time of the revolt of the Bar (6 3/4) Koch, I believe it was, there was one time when the Roman soldiers say that these Jews wouldn't fight on the sabbath and so a group that they were unable to conquer they attacked on the Sabbath day and the men did not resist and were slaughtered. But that's a long, long time after this, and as to what the attitude was at this time, we're just not told. I don't think we can say. There's no explicit statement about it in connection with the sabbath, and I imagine which of the three was the situation was made very clear to Joshua and to the people there. It has (7 $\frac{1}{2}$) not been entered in the account. Yes? (student. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$) It is entirely possible that one day around, one time around, would still come within the sabbath day journey, but certainly impossible the seventh would. It couldn't be the seventh day. But it could've been if it started say on a Wednesday or a Thursday. I don't know whether it could then or not, because they would camp quite a distance from Jericho anyway. They had to go over ~~through~~ the wall and then go around. So I rather doubt, the sabbath day journey is very, very short, I rather doubt it but it may be. But to me the biggest difficulty of its being on the seventh day isn't so much the marching as it is the fighting, to take

it, which would be rather strange. Well, that is a problem then, which ~~we~~ answer in a way that we must answer problems on which scripture does not give us light, by saying we don't know. I think it's always good to note the facts and see whether it is we do not know, or whether we have evidence. But now we have a little more development about this.

This statement is made, one thing I imagine some of you noticed, that this memorandum began with a statement, the main defences of Jericho in the Late Bronze Age (about 1600-1200 B.C.)--but Garstang himself goes on to say that it was about 1400 when it fell. In fact he said in some places specifically it was 1407 when it fell. Well the statement here says the Late Bronze Age (1600-1200). Pere Vincent is one of the strongest contenders for a date just about 1200. He feels that it was much later than 1400. He takes the late date for it. Garstang takes the early date, but this memorandum was a statement on which they agree, ~~but~~ it does not speak specifically about the date. Well, this was the beginning of about 1930 when these excavations took place in Jericho, and Garstang continued for a good many years. He ~~claimed~~ for instance that at Jericho powder was invented. He traced it back to show its history as a prehistoric going back to a very, very early time. He was much interested in those facts which don't have much to do with our particular course now. But Garstang did this work from 1930 on and made this memorandum which was signed by himself and Vincent and was endorsed as to its archeological conclusions by Clarence Fisher. Now within the last five or six years an English archeologist, Miss Kathleen Kenyon, daughter of the man who was Director of Antiquities in the British Museum, and who was one of our greatest authorities on paleography, on Greek paleography, and who has very strongly written against the radicals in England who deny the (11) of the Bible. His daughter, Kathleen Kenyon, who is a very very fine archeologist but she has issued some amazing statements, and there was an article of five or six years ago in Life Magazine, a brief article in which ~~it~~ it told about Dr. Kenyon and her associates who excavated at Jericho and found there was no city there at all in the time of the Israelites. She says there was no city there at all, and I have friends who have been working in Palestine and they have talked to her and they ~~say~~ claim

she has admitted having found a certain amount of material from that time. But that she admits this but yet ignores it. Now she's in Philadelphia I believe right now, wish I'd hear she was speaking somewhere on the subject, I'd like to go and hear her on it. But I think it's the most remarkable thing that three men of the standing of Garstang and Vincent and Fisher can sign a statement like this and then that somebody twenty years later can ~~say~~ ^{talk as if they} all three just dreamed it up. They certainly believed they were seeing evidence such as Garstang describes here. And I can't understand how she can take such an attitude. It would seem a more normal thing, surely, to think that when they excavated this area they removed what they found, and possibly she is excavating on a section they hadn't excavated, a section in which there might have been erosion or something which had removed the material from this period in that particular section. But there's been quite a bit of publicity in these last five or six years that there was no Jericho. On the other hand Garstang claims that ~~its~~ 1407 when it was excavated and most scholars believe that the great change in Palestinian culture takes place about 1200, and there was a professor of Old Testament in the University of Southern California who had an article in a paper fifteen or twenty years ago in California, in which I remember he said, how remarkable to find that when Moses led the children of Israel into Palestine Jericho had already been destroyed two hundred years before. That was his interpretation of it, which of course would make the whole Bible ^{utterly} unreliable. To my notion, we do not know whether it happened in 1400 or whether it happened in 1200, we do not know. And there is ~~isn't~~ much evidence which has come to light in recent years which points toward the later date, yet it may be wrong, it's not conclusive, there's not enough proof, but there certainly is enough to raise very, very serious questions about the ~~early~~ date.

At Lachish, I told you about Garstang's ^{argument} ~~writing~~ about Lachish. Lachish was destroyed about 1200, the second most important fortress in Judah. Destroyed about 1200. But Garstang says that (14) two hundred years before and the Canaanites (14)

Well, it may be right, I don't think we're in a position to say it's wrong, but it looks

questionable. I believe we can say that evidence was (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Garstang

I believe that Garstang and Vincent found evidence which remarkably corroborates the Biblical statement that when the Israelites marched around the city of Jericho the walls fell down in one great cataclysm which does not look at all like what we would expect an earthquake to do to them. They suddenly fell down and fell outward, making it easy to march in and conquer, but that we do not yet know just when it was.

I talked with Garstang about the matter in Chicago, he had just written a book on Jericho...

O.T.History 223. ($\frac{1}{4}$)

...I took the book came back to him but before I could say anything he said, now before you say anything about it, I want to give you this further statement, and here the thing was, in the book he gave his evidence that Jericho was destroyed about 1400, he had a picture which he took in Jericho showing one building which was the most prominent thing in it, in his reconstruction, and then Dr. Albright issued a statement in which he pointed out various matters about the architecture, the pottery, and so on, of this particular building which showed that it fits two hundred years later, didn't fit 1400. So now in the little mimeographed statement he handed me he said Albright, of course, his argument is conclusive but this building doesn't belong to the original Jericho, but was built on the ruins, and it's what's called the city of Palm Trees in Judges where one of the oppressors lived, and that was this village, no fortified city. Well, having a book just issued with a beautiful picture showing that building as one of the most important things in it, and then to just take it right out and say the building was later, it did not impress me particularly. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

He still may be right. It is not impossible in the light of anything known yet, that the conquest might be around 1400. But at present there, it impresses me that the evidence is somewhat more toward the 1200 date than the 1400. In view of the fact that we have very, very little writing from this whole period (1 $\frac{3}{4}$)

it makes it very difficult.

// You can see two things of the same time, but to tell just when it was is often very difficult. But there are a good many other evidences which enter in, we could spend (2)

I think I mentioned it to you that, not many years ago, this class of Old Testament History was taught right in this room by a different man who spent I think six weeks trying to prove the early date for the conquest. And he had some very interesting evidence but I think there's more on the other side, I think there are much more important things to do in Old Testament History than to argue over the two dates. One of these days the Lord may give us evidence so we can know with certainty. At present I think the vital thing is it did happen, and that is quite evident and now I think we can rely upon it quite solidly. Now our time is up...

(3 1/2) Very good question. And I think there is a basic thing about archeology which is very important. I think it's worth taking two or three minutes on now, the basic principle in back of that, that enters into that. That is, that when a city is buried, all sorts of things are there in the ground, there may be important documents. Of course, we haven't found much in the way of documents in Palestine, in other places there may be. There may be in Palestine, we just haven't found them. But there may be important documents, there are different sorts of walls, of buildings, of kinds of pottery, there are all sorts of things. These things have a meaning for the one who knows how to interpret them. Not only do they have a meaning but their relation to one another has a meaning, the way they lie and what is next to one another. The line in between is not like the floor of this room, it is a curved line, it is quite a different line because you have a city here that is destroyed, that is left in ruins, and another city built on top of it. Or during the period when the city isn't destroyed, they may take a big building and tear down three fourths of it and rebuild it, and so you have a new stage. And all the evidence is there and if a man is a first-class interpreter he may be able to figure it out, but of course for every one that is examined thoroughly there is a basis laid in increased knowledge for doing a better job with the next one. But once this material is taken out of the ground, it is then no longer of value as far as interpreting

is concerned. Of course, if there is a piece of pottery, that's important. If there is something with writing on it, that's important, but where it came from you have only the excavator's word, and any pictures which he may have taken, and it is mighty hard to go much further in your interpretation than was done when there was something there to see. Now of course you may notice certain facts that he doesn't understand and others may interpret those facts in a true way, but it's only what he ~~knows~~^{notices} that is available, and therefore there, ~~in~~ the early days of excavation, there were some excavators who were right on the ground constantly watching everything that happened, did an excellent job of excavation but when it came to the record of it, it was very poor and it was very difficult for people later to be sure. There were others who were so determined to get the record just right that they spent all their time making the record and left it to the local people who were doing the digging largely to do the digging up for them, and consequently the digging wasn't done right. Today they try to have different people doing but it has to be organized. Well, once your city has been dug up the possibility of re-doing that job is lost. ~~No~~

Now when I was at Megiddo in 1929, there was there in Megiddo half of the city of the time of Solomon was visible because standing to half the height of this room were visible in all its layout, you could see it, and the director of the excavation, took me all over and pointed out everything and explained it, but the next day his expert foreman ~~were~~ arriving from Egypt who would take the local people and direct them in clearing all this away in order that they could get at what was underneath. ~~Now Garstang~~

Now Garstang examined these walls very, very carefully, did the best he could to interpret them. Then, having done so, he dug up the stuff and threw it out in the dump in order to get at the next one, and he went at least ten levels below ~~these~~. The next one, You see, this would be somewhere between 1400 and 1200 B.C. and he dug down to maybe 3500 B.C. So that he was perhaps forty or fifty feet below this (7 $\frac{1}{2}$) and it all disappeared. Now, I thoroughly agree with you, that you can't understand, I can't either, how Miss Kenyon can cast aside statements ~~made~~ by three men of high standing in their field like these, how she can cast it aside and say there was no city

there at that time, I can't understand how she can do that. But as far as the actual evidence is concerned, she can well say I don't find any evidence. Well, he's dug it up, it's not there to find. And, of course, it does seem to me that it is, the possibility must be admitted that there's a part of the city that he didn't excavate, that she has excavated, and it would be possible that in that part there had been a little stream coming down the side and eroded away one section, or something, so that she didn't find there evidence of a city at this time. Something like that might be, I don't know. But I've talked to two or three different Christian archeologists who've been there and talked with her and say she has admitted finding a certain amount of things from this period, which they think are sufficient to prove that there were things of this period in the parts she excavated, but which I suppose she thinks were left there by some traveler, just this little bit left there by some traveler, carried there by accident. They used to say, I know, when I was in the American School in Jerusalem, we would go and visit a mound that hadn't been excavated, and would go up and down and pick up pieces of pottery and then we'd bring them to Dr. Albright, and he'd say well this one comes from about 1450 B.C., this one comes from about 700 B. C., this one from about 1100 and so on. And we would look at them and try to learn something about the method of interpreting them and we'd fill our pockets with the best specimens. Then we'd go on to another mound, maybe ten miles away, we were on horseback, we'd get to this other mound and we'd find more interesting specimens so we would take these out of our pockets and put the others in. Then an archeologist comes along a month later and he finds remains on this mound from that period which (9 3/4)

How could somebody have broken a pot on a mound over there and then it get over here ten miles away. Well, if you'd never heard of the American School of Oriental Research you'd say it's absolutely impossible. But if you know how people travel around, visit one and the other and fill their pockets up and then had to make space for others later, you get twenty people doing that, you carry quite a bit of pottery. So that, I don't say that Miss Kenyon is dishonest, I don't say that at all, I think she's thoroughly convinced of what she says. But it does seem to me that she is going pretty far when

you have a statement by, Garstang is not I wouldn't call him a top-ranking archeologist, but he's not far below it, he is a solid man. He makes his mistakes and most everybody laughs at his idea, saying Jericho was destroyed in 1407 B.C. But he's done a lot of good solid work, he's a man of high rank, well-established. And Pere Vincent, Dr. Albright has always called the best authority on Palestinian archeology. He's a French Dominican monk who has lived in the land for thirty years, highly trained, constantly working on this, visiting every excavation, talks with all the people, and he signed this paper with Garstang, and it was endorsed by Clarence Fisher as to its archeological conclusions and everyone recognizes that Clarence Fisher was one of the best authorities on Palestinian archeology there was. Now when they sign a statement, it seems to me that for her to just dismiss it like that is really going too far. I feel that we can rest upon it that what they said is proven, but I do feel that our position will be a more pleasant one five or six years from now when I'm confident (11 $\frac{1}{2}$) that more things will come to light that even Miss Kenyon will have to admit prove it. Yes? (student. 11 3/4) Pere Vincent? Vincent.

This section was a very important one, one which I dealt with briefly yesterday, but which I'd be glad to expand, and which I hope everyone has in mind. It affects not only Jericho but the whole matter of the background of Palestinian history.

Now to go on then to number 4, Attack on Ai. And Ai is said in the Bible to be a much smaller place than Jericho. Jericho was a great fortress (12 $\frac{1}{4}$) which was, seemed unconquerable. Ai they said is just a small town, they said, ^{let's send} just a little force to take it, it's not much. Ai is a much smaller place than Jericho according to the Biblical account and yet Ai has two chapters and Jericho has only one. And the reason for that is, of course, well known to those of you who have studied Joshua much, those of you who have not studied it anything to speak of before this year, I hope have well in mind from your studies two weeks ago, the assignment on Joshua there, the details of the situation at Ai, as I do not wish to repeat what is simply given in the scripture but to call your attention to certain basic things and above all to deal with explanation of matters which may not otherwise be obvious. N

Now chapter 7 begins with a statement which is, you might say, behind the scenes. We were told at the end of chapter 6 that they burnt the city and destroyed everything there except the metal and the metal they ~~couldn't destroy~~ ^{put into the treasury} of the house of the Lord. And then everything there was to be destroyed and it was the first city conquered and it was left absolutely desolate. But the beginning of chapter 7 we find that Achan, the son of Carmi, the son of Zabdi, the son of Zerah, of the tribe of Judah, took of these things which were supposed to be utterly destroyed or put in the temple, that is put in the treasury of the house of the Lord, but he took of this and hid it and the anger of the Lord was kindled against the children of Israel. We read that in the first verse. Now of course that is something which nobody there except maybe Achan and maybe a few friends knew. It is something which came out later, which at the beginning of the story was unknown. But the Bible tells us this right at the beginning, and then it goes on to tell how Joshua sent some men from Jericho to Ai, which is beside Bethaven, on the east side of Bethel. Now I expect you all have Bibles with maps in and it would be helpful to have that in mind, if any of you do not have it in mind. You see Jericho on the map just a very short distance north of the Dead Sea. And then if you will move a little bit to the left of Jericho, you will go from a place that is maybe 600 feet below sea level, the Dead Sea there is about...

O.T.History 224. (1½)

...north of the Dead Sea and most of the maps have something to indicate a mountain, well it's a plateau sort of, but it's very steep in there, it's 2500 feet above sea level, so compared to Jericho it's up on the top of a mountain and that's where Jerusalem is. Jerusalem a bit south of Jericho. But you follow that hill country, the top of that, north a short distance, well it's a distance of maybe thirty miles, and you come to Bethel and I imagine Bethel is on all your maps. And this says that Ai is east of Bethel. It's definitely sloping in here so you see, that means you'd have to pass Jericho, go north up the Jordan Valley, and then you would turn west, up through a side valley there, in those hills, and you would come up there to Ai. Well, that's where it says it was, and

we will ¹learn something about it if we

But we notice the story, it was a little distance from Jericho up there to Ai which is beside Bethaven on the east side of Bethel. And he said to them go and view the country and they came back and said don't send all the people, send two or three thousand, and go up and smite Ai. Don't make all the people go to the trouble of going up there, climbing up this valley, going clear up to that place.

I went up it in 1950 and it's quite a walk up that valley. Up through the crest of the hill there where the ruins of Ai are. They said don't go up there because it's just a little place, send two or three thousand people to smite Ai. Well it won't be much of a place if two or three thousand people could do it, would it? So the Biblical impression is that it is just a little place. It's not an important place, just send two or three thousand.

Well in this we already begin to see an attitude don't we? Here's this great fortress of Jericho and they march around Jericho and after marching around Jericho for seven days, seven times they just march around and they blow their trumpets and the wall falls down. Well, there's nothing to worry about now is there? Any difficulty will just disappear before us, we don't need to work any more. All we need to do is blow the trumpet and look at it and it's gone. Life is just simple, just go forward and everything just drops like this great fortress of Jericho. So why sent a lot of people, just send two or three thousand, that's all. And that is one of the things that can beset the believer in his life for the Lord very easily, is over-confidence. Before dealing with that, God dealt with another thing that can beset him which is fear. We have to have confidence in the Lord. If we have fear and terror the people could easily have fled before Jericho, they never dreamed they could take that big city. God caused Jericho to fall before them, but that doesn't mean now they could go to the other extreme and, having won a victory be overconfident and think everything is just going to fall into their hands. God wants us to work and toil and struggle and to think and to plan, but to know that he in the end will control whatever happens in his ¹²providence.

(3 3/4)

and then at certain crucial points he may choose to cause the walls

of Jericho to crumble before him and give a great unexpected victory by his power, but that doesn't mean we can become over-confident and say oh two or three thousand men will do. So that was one lesson that God wanted to teach here was the lesson of over-confidence. Now it is complicated by the fact that there was another very important lesson he wanted to teach them, that is the lesson of strict obedience. And here in Jericho one of the people had taken of the cursed thing and probably in just about every battle there was one person out of thousands who committed sin. There probably was nearly always something like this that took place. But God wanted to drive home to the people's minds how important it is that such things be kept to an absolute minimum. That they follow his will and obey his command and that they avoid the unholy and the wicked just as far as they possibly can, and to keep it out of their midst so on this occasion God makes a terrible example of Achan. I don't think that we can go on from there to say that every time that they succeeded there was no Achan present. This one wasn't. But there certainly, in as great a group as that, there were other wicked people. I don't think he wants us to think that in every battle after this every Israelite was strictly true in his dealings. But probably they were a great truer than they would have been if they hadn't been frightened by what happened to Achan. And it is very easy for us, when things go wrong through our poor planning, it is very easy for us to say oh well, there's an Achan in the camp. Well, there may be, and if there is we want to find him and get rid of him, but that doesn't mean that we can put ourselves up as holier than thou and say the whole thing is that there's someone who is a pretty bad sinner because there's sin in all of us, and if God won't use anybody who is a sinner he wouldn't use any of us. He uses wicked, weak people, who are sinners saved by grace, who accomplish his work in the world. So his main purpose in this incident of Achan was not to show that as long as we're perfect we can succeed, and if we're not we're going to pick out one person in our group and say he's the Achan and get rid of him. It doesn't mean that at all, I think many people draw that false lesson, but it means to teach the lesson to all of us, that we should avoid the sin, that we should avoid wickedness and that we should try to live close to him and do his will and when there is any clear evidence

that there is an Achan in the camp, well of course we must get rid of him, because the Lord cannot bless that sort of thing.

But this Ai attack is complicated by the fact that the two lessons are in it which God wants to teach us. And the lesson of Achan is such a very, very important lesson that most of us, seeing that lesson, completely overlook the other lesson. But if the other lesson wasn't there too I don't believe the Lord would have needed to take two chapters to give us the story. The other lesson is brought ^{out} very, very clearly in the course of the chapter, though not explicitly stated in words as the Achan one. Yes? (student. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$) Yes, that's very good. We want to see the indication. Don't take it on just my word, that would be very foolish (7 $\frac{1}{4}$)

But what I am saying is, look for the indication, and the one, the Achan matter, ^{the} indications are very clear. The first verse tells us that it happened, in the last part of this chapter it tells how the Lord said that it happened, the Lord said in verse 11 on, he said, somebody has done this terrible thing, he said I cannot bless you while this sin is there, then there are a good many verses given of how the Lord showed them gradually who it was, how they found him, how they got rid of him, and then after they finish all that in verse 26, we might have had a verse 27 that said the three thousand men were then sent the next day up to Ai and they took the city without difficulty, now that they were rid of Achan, and there ~~would~~ be no need of an eighth chapter. One more verse in the seventh would have been quite sufficient for it if that was all there was to it. Now that is a very important part of it. But we do have a whole additional chapter, 35 more verses we have, no not 35, it's not the whole chapter, it is 29 verses, but that's longer than the seventh chapter which has 26. We have 29 verses about the (8 3/4)

And we find that the first time they sent two or three thousand men, that's all that is necessary to take it, and it didn't work. Then they prayed the Lord and the Lord told them about Achan and they got rid of Achan and then the Lord said in chapter 8, fear not, neither be dismayed, send another three thousand people, and you can take Ai, no. The Lord said fear not, neither be thou dismayed, take all the people of ~~the~~ ^{WAR} ~~the~~ Lord with you and arise, go up to Ai, see I have given into thy hand the king of Ai and his people,

and his city and his land. Don't send two or three thousand, take all the people, that's tremendously different, isn't it? They tried with just two or three thousand, but now after they get rid of Achan they have to take them all. Well, they should have sent a lot of them in the first place. They, why see if you can do it with two or three thousand, unless you're overconfident. Then, he says take them all, and what do they do not? They send two or three thousand people up to take Ai and they fled before the people who were driven back and thirty-six of them were wounded. But in this case, now they don't just send even all the people to go straight up and take Ai. They plan an ambush. And we read here a very detailed account about how they send this group which goes up and gets around in back of Ai very secretly during the night, gets up to a place where they can't see them, and then how the others come in the other direction, and they attack and we read in verse 12, he took about five thousand men and set them to lie in ambush between Bethel and Ai, on the west side of the city. See they've gone way past ^{it} them. And then they took all the people, all the host, they sent them past it the other way, to the north of the city, and this great crowd is on the north of the city, and they made an attack and the people of Ai, we read, thought that they would be driven back like they drove back the previous force and they all rushed out of the city, this time we'll finish them up so they won't come back again. We got 36 last time, this time we'll kill them all, and we read they rushed out and in verse 17 we read and there was not a man left in Ai and Bethel that went not out after Israel, and they left the city open and pursued after Israel. And the Lord said to Joshua, stretch out the spear that is in thy hand toward Ai, for I will give it into thy hand. And verse 19 and the ambush arose quickly out of their place and they ran as soon as he had stretched out his hand and they entered into the city and took it and hasted and set the city on fire. And when the men of Ai looked behind them, they saw and behold the smoke of the city ascended up to heaven and they had no power to flee this way or that way, and the people that fled to the wilderness turned back upon the pursuers.

So here we have a very complex system of strategy worked out with not three thousand people used as the total attacking force, but with five thousand, nearly double the

three thousand as just an ambush to hide, and then the whole mass of the people come in from the opposite direction and then attacking and running and working this trick on the people of Ai, and of course the previous ones had run, they thought well they're running again, this time we'll finish them, and so they, being over-confident, rushed out of the city and left it for the others to get in, it was sort of a Trojan War stunt, almost, which got into the city behind them that way and wrecked it. And here we have careful planning, a well-worked-out system, sufficient resources used to accomplish the purpose, all the people instead of just three-thousand, double the three-thousand in ambush behind, we have a carefully worked-out system. And I'm not saying that God would've allowed a carefully-worked-out system like this to have worked in the first place, because there was Achan, and the Achan matter had to be dealt with, but after they dealt with the Achan matter, then they went ahead not over-confident any more, but looking to the Lord at each stage of the way for help and using the best intelligence the Lord had given them to work out a way to do it. And so it seems to me that, while the Achan lesson is a tremendously important lesson and one we must not overlook, that the other lesson is also important, and it is also an important lesson for us, to have them both in mind and to use them in our Christian life and in our Christian walk. The lessons of faith, that God will knock down the walls of Jericho is a tremendously vital lesson we must have, without it we are nothing, but sometime, I've heard men speak right in our chapel, and give a message that sounded as if all you need to do is to look to the Lord, have faith and step forward and everything in the world will just fall before you. I've heard them give a talk like that and I've talked with the same man over the luncheon table and heard him tell how he worked out a plan, how he worked it out in all its details and everything, where he'd made a mistake and how the next time he'd avoided that mistake, and I had seen that he was stressing a vital lesson we all need to get, the first lesson that we must have faith and that if the Lord does not build the city they labor in vain that build it, and that the Lord is going to accomplish anything that is in His will to accomplish. But we also have the second lesson ^{in the scripture.} That we are first to (14 $\frac{1}{4}$)

but second to use the brain given us and

use all (14 $\frac{1}{4}$)

So I believe that we would not have two chapters here if we did not have the two vital lessons. If ~~We~~^{would} only ~~have~~ the one chapter and I, this long ~~8th~~ chapter (14 3/4) that is all except the last six verses of it, is not dealing with Achan's lesson but it's dealing with (14 3/4)

OIT.History 225 (on next page)

...and we use it as an excuse for ~~not~~ looking at other people to see what sinners they are and say the Lord can't bless because this other person ~~is there~~ ^{failed}. Now that may be the case, but in the majority of cases, I think what the Lord wants us to do about it, is to look into our heart and see if we're the Achan, and look in your own heart and see whether your sanctification is proceeding at the rate it ought to proceed at, and whether you've fallen into sin, that you need to repent of and turn to the Lord for forgiveness, and to get you right before you can go forward, and while they may be occasional cases where we fail because there is one ~~there~~ we have to get out, there are a lot more cases where we fail because all of us need to live a lot closer to the Lord and seek his will, a lot more. Now, I may be a little bit prejudiced on this, presenting it this way, but I've had a good many experiences where people have made a criticism of some other individual who was imperfect, but so were they. But had made that an excuse for their own failure to do things the way they should have, and accounting for their non-success in that

(1 1/2) instead of looking into their own heart first to be sure they weren't an Achan, and second going ahead and planning and working, to do the best they could with the resources the Lord had given them.

Well, now there's one thing here I'd like to ask you after what we've now looked at. How many of you would be in a position now to tell us everything to which I have called attention this morning about the city of ~~Bethlehem~~ ^{Bethel}? Would you raise your hand. All who are now in a position to call our attention to everything to which I have called your attention, that is every reference I have made this morning, to the city of ~~Bethlehem~~ ^{Bethel}. Say, let's not make one person conspicuous, let's everybody ~~take~~ take a piece of paper and write on it your name (2 1/4, quiz, to 4)

I had a course in Old Testament Criticism, ^{7,} some in Old Testament History, from Dr. Robert Dick Wilson in Princeton Seminary, who was the great master in the defense of the scripture, having devoted fifty years to it, and after having been there with him for three years, I went over to Germany and studied with a fellowship he got for me and after one year there I came back and paid a visit to the Seminary and I visited one of his classes, and I got more ~~out~~ out of that one class than I got out of any (4 1/2)

class when I was a student, and I figured what while it may be true that my presence in the class led him to give more material than he usually did, maybe, I having had the year in Germany, my opinion is that a great part of the reason was because I had had this additional graduate work and had had my eyes opened to problems that he was dealing with, but that most of the class didn't have enough background, and I didn't when I was an undergraduate student, to get the full value of it. And so a thing like this gives me a little interesting evidence of how alert you are in class. I have not specifically stressed Bethel at all today, but in the first place I showed you where Bethel was on the map, then I did not today, of course, refer to our previous contacts with Bethel, Jacob's dream and so on. We didn't refer to those today in class, but I stressed where it was on the map today, I stressed that it was an important city, I stressed two or three times when Ai is mentioned it is mentioned as being east of Bethel. It is identified by showing its relation to Bethel and I mentioned it as being about two miles east of Bethel, on the high ridge of the hills. Then there is one thing which is very (6) which I would be surprised if many of you noticed because I didn't stress it at all, but I purposely read a verse of the scripture to bring it out. I wonder how many of you noticed that when the people fled before the men of Ai, it said in verse 16 the people that were in Ai were called together to pursue after them, but verse 17 says there was not a man left in Ai or Bethel that went out after Israel. And that's the only mention of Bethel in the chapter, except for the fact that Bethel is used for location, except for that, it is the only mention of Bethel. But I read the verse purposely to you to see how many of you would be surprised that when they're attacking Ai there's not a man left in Bethel, that doesn't run after them. It's a strange thing, isn't it, why would the people leave Bethel and not just Ai. It's a very interesting thing, I don't know whether until recent years it ever was noticed, but I believe it's a very important fact. Yes? (student.7.) Bethel and Ai, yes, it's about two miles. Yes the maps vary in the different Bible, vary tremendously, how good or how poor they are. But I think now we'll look at the archeology for a minute.

Oh, yes, one more word about Bethel, that I had not pointed out to you. If you

look over at chapter 12, you read about the kings that they conquered. Chapter 12, verse 7, these are the kings of the country which Joshua and the children of Israel smote in this area. Now what are they? verse 9, the king of Jericho, one; the king of Ai which is beside Bethel, one. Then you read down in verse 16 it says the king of Bethel, one. But in the account here it tells of the conquest of various cities and does not mention Bethel. It is not till you get over to Judges 1, where you read about the cities that the Israelites had not conquered in the conquest, or at least that were now standing there unconquered, and you read about a lot of cities that had been conquered by Joshua, that had to be conquered again, so my opinion is that they conquered these cities and they did a certain amount of ruin, conquered them, and they went on to others and a lot of them the people came back and reestablished themselves and the backbone (8 $\frac{1}{2}$)

But in Judges 1 you have an account of a conquest of Bethel but none of Ai. Back here in Joshua 8 you have an account of the conquest of Ai but no account of a conquest of Bethel, but you have this one, you have the mention of the king of Bethel and you have this one word here about all the men came out of Bethel and Ai. And if all the men came out of Bethel and Ai, it would be rather strange for them to just take Ai and make no effort to take the far more important city of Bethel. Yes? (student.9 $\frac{1}{4}$) Well, probably because (9 $\frac{1}{4}$) (student) No, I would think likely that the city was, the local people's name for it was Love. The Israelites names it Bethel probably because it was near where Jacob had had his dream, but the name that carries back, just like we say (student.9 $\frac{1}{2}$) Yes, we would carry the name back. Yes? (student.9 $\frac{3}{4}$. Do you think it could be that they didn't mention the city of Bethel as being captured because they were specifically trying to capture Ai?) Yes, as far as the chapter is concerned, that's the ^{interest here is in Ai} inference here, that it's Ai, that's what they were after, primarily. But Bethel is mentioned this way which raises the question, did they conquer Bethel too at that time? Later on, we read they had conquered but we don't read of any conquest. Yes? (student.10 $\frac{1}{4}$) It might be, yes. Yes? (student.10 $\frac{1}{2}$) Yes, well it's a very hilly country. You see, from down in the valley, this Jordan Valley,

there you look^{up}, just like up in the mountains, and there are all these (10 3/4) ridges very steep, and they were in the galley between Bethel and Ai, but the area between Bethel and Ai has hills and valleys here and here and here and here, and the other (11)

comes from the north, so if they were between the two cities here, they could go out from both cities to attack the other (11) from the north. (student.

11) Without seeing, oh, they were doubtless pretty well hidden. It's very easy to

hide there. I spent a whole night in (11 1/4) I spent a whole morning, ~~the~~ hunt-

ing for Ai, afraid. I walked up and down one valley after another and all around that day, and I

didn't find it. I had an Arab with me who knew English, and he had a good map of the country but he'd left it home that day, didn't have his map with him, and we hunted all around for Ai, and we didn't find it. I came back in a car two or three days later,

and this time we came up from the Jordan Valley and we camped to quite a town there, and we left the car there, we had to leave the chauffeur with the car because it wouldn't be

safe to leave the car there, there might be nothing left of it when we came back.

But we left him with the car and we went up and then pretty soon we had people from around following us up, and we had quite a (12) before we got back.

But the first day there wasn't a soul in sight. I hunted for half a day, we didn't run into any of these people, because we were in that desolate country going through valley after valley and we didn't come near the village which was a few miles down there, where there's all this great mass of people ~~to~~ ^{that} followed when we went back another day.

But it's very hilly country through there and very easy to hide.

But now the thing I want to bring out to you is that in the early 1930's Madame (12 1/2) --I don't think you need to bother with her name,

this is the only instance where I know of her being ~~connected~~ ^{mentioned} in archeology, but she conducted a French expedition to excavate a mound which was called Ec-Tell. Now the Ec is just the Arabic The. So Ec-Tell means the Tel and you know what a tel is in archeology, but the word tel as we use it in archeology is simply the Arabic word for a mound. The ruin, the mound, that's the name which has been attached for centuries, perhaps for milleniums, to this place on the high ridge about two miles east of Bethel.

Which is thought to be Ai, we call it the ruins. The city was never repaired. We call it the ruins. (13 $\frac{1}{4}$)

And they reported that they found no remains whatever later than 2000 B.C. That the (13 3/4)

They excavated along, there was a strong fortified small cities, only about two and a half acres, but they report no pottery evidence of occupation after 2000 B. C. Now previous to that Garstang had visited the place without excavating this and in his book on Joshua and Judges he says he found pottery there from this city, but just from the (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) he decided that somebody else had dropped it there in a previous visit or something, but he says that, he found pottery, he made no excavation. And this report was given and it is today accepted by all archeologists I know of, that the city was destroyed about 2000 B. C.

(14 $\frac{3}{4}$) And we have a problem. Now theirs was taken by the English H. H. He said the problem of Ai is more complex. That city is said by archeologists to have been destroyed long before the earliest date (14 3/4) from about 2000 to about 1200 B.C. ...

O.T. History 226. ($\frac{1}{4}$)

...writers is fictitious. If any of you have a list of about six writers down here, we say it's fictitious. Or as the transfer as Joshua of the ancient story of its destruction long before his day, and then he quotes the writers who say that. For Hebrew has a reflection back to Joshua's day of events of much more recent occurrence and then he quotes one writer who says that, that the conquest was a long time afterwayd of the story that's put in the book here, when the critics say the book was written centuries later. Then he goes on, some writers have preferred to follow a harmonizing path and have conjectured there has been a confusion between Ai and the neighboring Bethel. I think Albright said that it was Bethel that was about to be conquered and the account is confused and says Ai where it means Bethel. But you notice in that one verse it mentions both. Everywhere

else it just mentions Ai. Which (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Or the natural strength of the position of Ai may have made it a temporary stronghold in the time of Joshua and here he quote (1 $\frac{1}{2}$) who presents that theory and that impressed me as an excellent interpretation. Well, continuing what he says, he says, a further suggestion is that the identification of Ec-Tell and Ai is not secure. New light may yet be shed by further excavation on this site but meanwhile the ~~case~~ of Ai is of equal embarrassment to every view of the Exodus and cannot be integrated presently with any Biblical or non-Biblical material, it must be left out of the ~~conquest~~. He's trying to work up a theory, and he says, was the conquest in 1400 or 1200 B.C.? Well, Garstang says Jericho was conquered in 1407 B.C. Albright excavated at Bethel briefly, just dug a trench in to see what he could find, but he says that Bethel was destroyed a little before 1200 B.C. Lachish had a big destruction before 1200, a little one about 1400. ^{Which is it--} ~~Big-difference-between~~ 1200 and 1400? Well, what does Ai say, Ai says 2000. So it doesn't throw any ~~light~~ on either one, but I was there in 1950 at Ai, and I went, a group of three of us went, including (2 3/4) Father McCallahan, [^] a Jesuit scholar who has written on archeology, he was killed in Iraq shortly afterward, but a very able young fellow, a very interesting chap, but I ^{suggested} ~~said~~ to O'Callahan, this theory which (3 $\frac{1}{2}$) Vincente presents. I don't believe I realized at that time Vincent had presented it. But I presented to him evidence from the book of Joshua to support it, as it seemed to me, and he seemed very impressed, had never heard of such theory. His ^{feeling} ~~theory~~ was well Ai, don't know what to do with it, destroyed in 2000, so just something wrong with ~~story~~ probably. I don't think there's anything with the story, I think the Bible is true in every detail. I think it's entirely possible that any particular version may have been corrupted in the course of transmission, because we have evidence that verses have, but when we ^{find Ai} ~~mentioned~~ ^{thirty times} ~~at-men~~ in the chapter I don't think there's any error there. If it was once that they mentioned Ai there might be an error. Now this one verse, that they came out of Ai and Bethel is the only such reference to Bethel. It could be a mistake. I would readily admit it might be a mistake, but it certainly is more likely it isn't because the errors in

transmission are few, though there are errors. My guess is that the brief mention of Bethel here calls our attention to the fact of the matter, which my guess, is that what happened was that the people of this important city of Bethel, seeing the entrance of the Israelites, seeing them coming and hearing of their preparing to attack, their marching around them at least, which they probably could see from some outpost on a hill, that they went to this town of Ai not far from their town, and in the direction of there, and hurriedly built a little temporary addition to protect them in it, strengthened the walls, that still lay there, lay there for six or eight hundred years, and put a force in there under command of a man who ^{would then be} ~~had been~~ the king of Ai. And that his force was there as an advance force to protect Bethel, and then when the Israelites, their observers came up the valley to see what was in their way, they looked up and saw these old walls of Ai the city that had been quite a strong city though not a large city, six or eight hundred years before, and they saw people looking out from the top of it, watching for them and they went back and said it's just a small city, it's just a small city, two or three thousand people take it, it was just a small city, but it was an outpost of a strong city, and the men in it were strong men and they were prepared to resist attack, and when they went up against it they were driven back, and then maybe they were driven back the men in Ai who had been protecting it went back to Bethel and were replaced by another contingent. We don't know. But when they made their attack this time and they went out, Ai and Bethel were left without anybody because they said we're going to end this thing right now, we drove the first attack, there's a much larger group now, we're going to end it, drive them back and be done with it, and they all came back, not knowing about the ambush which took over their city and wrecked it. Now that's my guess. Now that is a guess which, I believe, does no violence to the facts as stated here, because we read later on Bethel had been taken but we read no account of the taking of Bethel. It does no violence to the scripture facts as stated here, it may be true, it accounts for their being no archeological evidence at Ai of a settlement at this time, because men living in it for a few weeks or months wouldn't leave enough evidence to say here's proof it was occupied at this time. If the people occupied it for a period of a few years, we'd

have pottery evidence of the city there at that time. So that it does no violence to the evidence, it is a possibility, it is not proven, it is only a suggestion. Now it is possible that there is a mistake on the identification, it is possible that there is another place near there somewhere that is the actual Ai, but it is quite unlikely, because that area has been pretty thoroughly ~~covered~~ examined looking for ancient sites, a place important enough to play this role in the book of Joshua would surely leave more evidence of it, enough evidence that somebody would find it. And this is ⁱⁿ exactly the place described, east of Bethel, where you would see it coming up the valley there. Now we don't have time for a discussion of this now. This afternoon at 2:30 we can discuss it if you want. I do not give it as a fact, but I give it as a theory which reconciles the archeological data and the Biblical statements and leaves us not having to say either one of them is false. We'll continue there...

(9) ...C, The Conquest of Canaan, and under that number 4, The Attack on Ai. And I had completed the presentation of what I had to give on Ai and there were a number who seemed to have questions about it, and we don't want to take much time on it because we have much more ground to cover, but if anyone has, if there is anything that wasn't clear in what I presented, or any point at which you think it could well be improved, or interpreted otherwise, why let's take just a couple of minutes for such. Mr. Jaggard? (student. 9 3/4) If people were killed at Ai? Scripture says that they came out of it to chase the Israelites and then that behind them the ambush went into Ai and burned the city, and the other people were killed out there in the plain. There's nothing said of anybody being killed in Ai. I could say this, that ancient bones in a country with as much dampness as Palestine, if left on the ground or in a burnt city, do not last, they have to be pretty well buried to have any trace, to be found at all.

I was in a class once in the University of Pennsylvania some years ago, in which they asked a girl who was an anthropologist to give a discussion of the evidence from bones in Mesopotamia and in Egypt, and she came in and told us how in Mesopotamia there had been three races that came in, judging by the bones, people that had a certain bone, of a certain length and a certain proportion, and the face of the skull had come from

the north and another group had come from the east, told how they met and came together and all that. And she said in Egypt the evidence is so complicated that I just couldn't do anything with it. She said this is the situation in Mesopotamia. So then they began asking her how much evidence in Mesopotamia did she base this on, and found out it was five skeletons she had studied and brought this evidence about three different races in Mesopotamia on the basis of the observation of five skeletons. Because in Mesopotamia your skeletons don't last much on account of the dampness of the climate. Now in Egypt it's a much dryer climate and they have thousands of skeletons and consequently it's too complicated to build anything on. I thought it was very interesting in showing the difference of the preservation of skeletal material in Mesopotamia and in Egypt. But it also was interesting as showing how when you have enough material to prove something it's pretty hard to prove much from skeletons.

The chances are, with all the wars and fighting there's been in Palestine, that there's not an area as big as this room anywhere in Palestine that hasn't had a person killed in it in the course of the last four thousand years. There have been bodies all over, but they've disintegrated and disappeared. It's only when they're very carefully buried and thus protected that you find much there. Any other question?

I did not want anyone to get the idea that I feel at all dogmatic about Ai having been an outpost of Bethel at the time. The only evidence in the chapter to suggest this is this statement, and from Bethel. If Ai and Bethel were two distinct cities, independent cities, and Ai was thus under attack, and the men of Ai thought the others were fleeing from them and went out to pursue them, it would seem quite ^{un}likely that Bethel, another city two miles away, would join in. The fact that they came out from Ai and from Bethel looks to me as if were either two cities working together or else Ai was simply an outpost of Bethel, one or the other. Or vice versa. But of course those words may not be in the original. "And from Bethel" is the only mention of Bethel aside from the geographical reference in the chapter, it's a strange thing there, there's nothing else in the chapter to explain it, and perhaps those words have gotten in there by mistake, that is always possible in anything that occurs only once in scripture. It

is possible but not likely. The scripture has been remarkably well preserved, and you have no right to say something only occurs once therefore it isn't genuine, most of it is genuine, but there are cases where errors have come in, sufficient of them that I would not dogmatically build anything whatever on anything that occurred in only one verse of scripture. I merely make it as a suggestion. And it is entirely possible that those verses might be wrong there. But it also possible that there is, that the archeologists are completely wrong and this place (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) at this time. It is possible. But in view of the excavation having been made as recently as 1930, there had been a great deal of work before that, much has been learned, and much has been proven correct from what archeologists have done...

O.T. History 227. (1 $\frac{1}{4}$)

...that also seems extremely unlikely but this exactly fits the description of the place, and certainly if there was another place, another fortified town in that area, it would be strange indeed if somebody didn't find it. Fortified towns in Palestine are usually pretty easy to find. A tel gets a pretty typical formation. When I'd been there only two or three months I could look out over the country where there several high hills and you could see a tremendous area and I could pick a tel here and a tel there, and a natural hill you'd rarely take for a tel, because they get a very distinct shape, and an archeologist who has worked there for years, ^{explained} it would be very, very strange if there was another city of this time in that area that had not been (1 $\frac{1}{2}$) And yet, I don't say it's impossible. It is possible but I think extremely unlikely. And I would not be at all dogmatic that Ai was ^{at that time} an outpost for Bethel, hastily fortified in order to be ready for the (1 $\frac{1}{2}$) I would not be at all dogmatic. It may not be the case at all. But I say here is a possible interpretation which fits with that reference to Bethel, that one verse in the chapter, and I don't see much explanation for that reference to Bethel, which fits with it, which does not do violence to the text, like the theories of those who say Ai was destroyed earlier and the story ~~and~~ was put in here 800 years later, or this represents some other destruction later, or those who say it's

all a mistake for Bethel, it isn't Ai in the first place. The suggestion that I make requires no change of ~~any~~ single word in the passage, but take the passage as it is, take the archeological evidence as known to us today as it is, it is a theory which can be accepted and both of them accepted without having to change anything in them or to change a single word of the text. And therefore it impresses me as an altogether possible interpretation of what actually happened. There may be some other interpretation that is more correct, that nobody has yet found. But to me the most important thing is to try to find out exactly what happened at Ai. To me the most important thing is to know that I can take the Bible as it stands and to read it and don't have to throw aside any section of it, or say this is a mistake, it was about Bethel but they got it all mixed and said Ai, or anything like that. So I wouldn't want you to think I was dogmatic on this at all, but it impresses me that it is not necessary for somebody to say, well, archeology proves Ai was destroyed 800 years earlier therefore the Bible is wrong. It impresses me as not necessary to say that, nor to say archeology says it's earlier, archeology is infallible, (3 1/2) but to say in the light of present knowledge, with all the facts at present known from archeology, and the precise statement of the Bible as it stands, here is a suggestion which accepts both and doesn't have to deny, to change any verse of the Bible and does not have to deny the validity of the results which are agreed upon by all archeologists today. I certainly wouldn't be dogmatic on it. Somebody comes along and proves ten years from now the archeologists were wrong, I don't want them to say that I said that the Bible proves the archeologists were right. But the Bible can be interpreted in such a way that it fits with their present presentation of facts. Yes?

(student. 3 3/4. Dr. MacRae, are there any ways in which one town or one city could notify another very quickly of such an army coming upon them, and then withdrawing, and if they should attack, in a short enough time that an army coming from another city would be able to be of some help? In other words, is there any evidence to show that they used certain types of runners or a communication system between these two cities or between any two cities, which would be proficient enough to unite the two so that they could go out and do combat in a short period of time. Because if the Israelites came up and they saw them out there and then when they saw them retreat, right away they'd rush

out after them, well how could the others tell, or the other city know that they were withdrawing at that time and that they should come?) Well, my guess on that would like this. My guess would be that the people of Bethel knew about the crossing of the Jordan and the coming of the Israelites. Then they said let's protect ourselves by a line some distance from our town. Here's this strong old fortification that's been abandoned for many, many years, let's fortify it as a protection for us. And that they put men into it and had a king over that area. Then that the two or three thousand men attacked it and were driven back. Then after that happened of course, Bethel would have heard all about what happened. Then, naturally they'd all be excited wondering if they were coming back again. Then, that when they came back, according to the statement there, you have here the Jordan Valley, and here are your hills and valleys which come down through here, very uneven like that, all kinds of ridges and valleys and so on, and you have such a line of ridges back here and you have Ai on one of the ridges out there somewhere, and you have various gorges in between. You have the one army comes up here at night, five thousand men and hides in one of these valleys here somewhere in between the two. And then to the left of Ai, not seen by the people from either one, then you have the army you read the main army came from the north, so they come down probably in here. They come from the north and make an attack against Ai, the men of Ai come out and attack and begin to flee and all this time the people in Bethel are up on the highest point they could find watching to see what happens, and when they see them begin to run and these people coming, they say let's finish them off so we won't be attacked another time (6 $\frac{1}{2}$)

So these armies coming up through here attacking, these armies come up through here and join them and they both attack. That would seem to me to be the probable way that it was. Because the scripture ^{says} that they were north and that would be north of both of them. Perhaps more or less equi-distant. We don't know exactly, we'd have to study the exact terrain to make a guess, but it's very rugged country, as I described, how I walked up and down through those valleys, looking for it, at some, really (?)

and not finding it. Then I came from a town down below where there was a good trail going up, and found it easier, but had the nuisance of the people of this town. Yes? (student. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$) Yes. Dr. Albright used to waiver between the idea of a

conquest about 1400, a conquest about 1200, and a mixed story which had some elements from one conquest about 1400 and some from another conquest about 1200. Then he conducted a brief series of excavations at Bethel. And in those excavations they merely dug some trenches and went down to try to get some evidence from different areas, it wasn't a thorough and complete excavation by any means. But from it, this was about twenty years ago, he got sufficient evidence that Bethel had been destroyed at about 1200 to lead him to revise his previous theory and to adopt the view that the conquest all occurred at a little before 1200, about 1250, and that is the view which he has held very strongly ever since. That doesn't prove his theory is correct but he is a very able scholar and of course there's much evidence that's not yet found, but the interpretation of the evidence at present in hand, he feels very strongly, points in that direction. And it was Bethel that led him to adopt that view. But Joshua tells nothing of any conquest of Bethel, except it says, all the men of Bethel came out, and then at the end of the section when it lists the kings who were conquered, after the next great campaign, it lists the king of Bethel, though it says nothing about the conquest, and that doesn't prove this is a true theory, but it fits very well with it. Well, unless there's some other vital point we'll move on to the next section here, which is number 5.

Number 5, The Ceremony at Shechem, and that is a brief section which is found here in the latter part of chapter 8. We read in verse 29 that the king of Ai he hanged on a tree until eventide, and as soon as the sun was set, Joshua commanded that they should take his carcass down and cast it at the entering of the gate of the city, and raise thereon a great heap of stones, that remains to this day. That is, till when the book of Joshua was written, there still was that heap of stones. When the French excavators excavated they tore down the heap of stones, it was among the many other heaps and they didn't recognize which one this one was. But then verse 30 says and Joshua built an altar to the Lord God of Israel in mount Ebal. And here we have an account of something in verses 30 to 35 which was commanded by Moses in the book of Deuteronomy. He told the people there, that when they came in to the land they should go to Shechem and there at

Shechem that they should give certain blessings and certain curses. We find it in Deuteronomy 27 and 28. In Deuteronomy 27, Moses said, he commanded them, after they'd gone over Jordan, go to Mount Ebal, and to put up a monument with the law of God on it and plaster it with plaster. And on this altar there, he said, to put up the law of God and it says in Deut. 27:8 that thou shalt write upon the stones all the words of this law very plainly. And then it says in verses 11 and 12 that Moses charged the people that same day saying, these shall stand upon mount Gerizim to bless the people, ~~when ye are~~ certain tribes, then 13, these shall stand upon mount Ebal to curse certain tribes. And then he tells the curses and blessings which they are to give. Well, that's the command in Deut. 27 and 28, and here we find in Joshua 8, that they did it, Joshua 8:30-35.

It says, then Joshua built an altar to the Lord God of Israel in mount Ebal, as Moses the servant of the Lord commanded and wrote there on the stones a copy of the law of Moses, and they read the blessings and the curses, half of them against mount Gerazim and half of them against mount Ebal. Those are the two mounts there near the present town of mount (11 $\frac{3}{4}$) and is the Arabic pronunciation of Neapolis and any of you who've ever had Greek would immediately recognize that Neapolis means new city and that's the name that the Romans gave to this city which was at the place of the old Shechem. And though Shechem is not mentioned here, it is the old Shechem. It's the place which was the headquarters of the Samaritans through the Middle Ages, and the Samaritans are still there to this day. And they are the two high hills, mount Gerazim and mount Ebal, and they put the armor on mount Ebal, but they have the cursings given from one of the hills and the blessings from the other, you can imagine how the voice would resound against those hills, back and forth, to impress on the people's minds the law of God. Just another illustration of the fact that God wants us to take these truths and drive them home to our hearts, and put ourselves in a position where we know it, where it's living to us, where it's real. Make it so that it impresses our minds. Somebody said

Somebody said that, why is it, he said, that when our preacher reads the Bible I go to sleep and when Orson Wells reads it I see stars? Well, the fact of the matter was

that the minister was a man who evidently felt that reading the scripture was just a part of the service, get up and read it. Orson Wells was a man who was trained as an actor and to try get across the thoughts that he was reading, it it was the Bible he wanted to get it across. And I fear that nine-tenths of us read the scripture in such a way that it does not into people's minds particularly. But if we look back of this and think about it and pray about it and learn to read the scripture in a way that impresses people's minds, and drives home the thoughts in it, it can be more effective than any word that we can probably give. It is, I think, disrespectful to the Word of God to just get up and read it off in any old way. It is not accomplishing its purpose.

Well, here they (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) the Word of God in this very impressive way, to drive it home to the hearts of the people. And so we have this description here, and it describes here after the destruction of Ai, actually it's quite a distance from Ai, Because if you go from (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) Gilgal is north of Ai but then you have to go even further than that, quite a bit further north to get to a valley where you can go up into the hill country and come out at Shechem, and at Shechem you have mount Ebal and mount Gerazim.

O.T.History 228. $\frac{1}{4}$)

...then we go on to number 6, The Gibeonite Deception, chapter 9. We find, in verse 3, that the inhabitants of Gibeon, Gibeon is a town a few miles north of Jerusalem, quite a town there to this day, town of Gibeon, up on that hilltop, north of Jerusalem. And the inhabitants of Gibeon hears what Joshua had done to Jericho and to Ai and they did work wily, reminds you of the wiles of the devil (1) they worked wily, I don't think we use the word wily in modern English any more. In English we say wiles. They made a trick. They made as if they were ambassadors and took old sacks on their asses and wine bottles, old and rent and bound up, and old shoes clouted on their feet and the bread as if it was dry and mouldy, and went down to Joshua to the camp at Gilgal, they could reach it in a few hours. But when they got there they said we've come from a far country, ~~and they said~~ ^{make a league}. And the men of Israel said how do we know

you don't live here in this area? And they said well look at our provisions, look at how old they are, look at how our soles are worn. They said we've come from a very far country and we've heard of the wonderful things you've done and the wonders of your God, now we want to make an alliance with you. And so we find that, though Joshua had been commanded to make no alliances with the Canaanites, that they were to be wiped out completely, that they had fallen so deeply into sin that it was necessary that they be entirely removed lest the temptation of their wickedness spread among the Israelites who were to keep alive the knowledge of God. That seeing the evidence of his eye, which led him to believe that these people were not Canaanites but came from a long distance away that he made a league with them and swore to them that they would have a non-aggression pact, they would be friends, allies, and three days after they made this league, they found out they come from right in the very center of the land of Canaan. And they made a trip up there and they came to their city the third day, they must have gone pretty slowly because it's pretty far for one, but if you move rapidly you can do it in one day. And they took three days and found them there and found where they were, and they some of them said, the congregation murmured, ~~and wanted to~~ ^{that we've sworn} to destroy all these people, now these should be destroyed, but the princes said we swore to them by the Lord God of Israel we must not touch them. We must stand by our oath, and so they said, let them live but let them be hewers of wood, drawers of water unto all the congregation, as the princes had promised. And so Joshua said, wherefore have ye beguiled us, saying we are very far from you, when you dwell among us? Now therefore you are cursed, none of you shall be freed from being bondmen, and hewers of wood and drawers of water for the house of my God, and they said well, we're in your hands, do what's best in your eyes, and so they agreed to make them slaves, make them servants to the nation, but allowed them to live and in fact protected them and the result was that there were five Canaanite cities in the middle of the land, separating the north from the south, which made it easy for the two sections to lose close contact with each other, to draw apart, to get separate viewpoints on things, and eventually we find division among them, coming up now and then in the book of judges. We find in the times of David that the northerners kept

on with the house of Saul while he was in Hebron and had the house of Judah, eventually they were united, but only during David's and Solomon's reign, and then they split, and they remained two separate kingdoms every after, and thus great harm came to the people of Israel because of their failure to investigate before they acted. Their failure to know what they were doing, their making the agreement with these people made under false pretenses but yet stood by, stood faithfully by, to the Israelites in the main, and when they failed to stand by it, the Lord punished them for their failure so to do. We find over in 2 Kings 21, that there was a famine in the days of David, three years, year after year, and David inquired of the Lord, and the Lord said it is for Saul and for his bloody house because he slew the Gibeonites, and the king called the Gibeonites it says in 2 Sam. 21 and said to them, (now the Gibeonites were not of the children of Israel but of the remnant of the Amorites and the children of Israel had sworn unto them, and Saul sought to slay them in his zeal to the children of Israel and Judah) wherefore David said to the Gibeonites, what shall I do for you? and wherewith shall I make atonement, that you may bless the inheritance of the Lord? And as a result seven of the sons of Saul had to lose their lives here, a very sad story in chapter 21 here, of the results that came there as a result of the non-keeping of the oath which had been made long ago, which had been entered into rashly and yet which the Lord compelled them to maintain and obey after they had made it. Now there are cases, I've heard it said, that a wrong promise is better broken than kept, and there is an element of truth in that, there are people who make very, very foolish statements, foolish promises, not knowing what they are doing, which they should not stand by, they should (6 3/4) or make a revision of it.

But such cases are comparatively seldom. God wants his people to be known as those whose word is dependable and when they make a promise stand by it, even if they themselves are injured by it. And he gave us a lesson here of the importance of standing by our word which we have given even, even though we've given it wrongly in this instance here. So we have these great truths brought out in this ^{story} ~~book~~, first of the great error of acting without knowing the facts, and of proceeding to make alliances with those whom you think it is all right to make alliance to, before making absolutely sure that it is, and that

they are not those whom God does not want to make alliances with, but second it shows the importance of not giving the word rashly or lightly but standing by it, your pledged word that you've given. Yes? (student. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$) I don't know. I couldn't say. The Lord can tell them to stand by it and enable them, but he certainly rebuked them for having made it. Yes? (student. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$) I don't know, it's sometimes hard to regulate the amount of deception. Of course, in this case the deception is absolutely clear, there's no question of deception at all. And yet they did stand by it. And we certainly get the impression in 2 Samuel that the Lord forced them to stand by the oath which they made. They made it as a result of false representation, but they should have taken a longer time and investigated the representation and known before they acted upon it. It was possible for them to do so. Though it's involved (9) and takes a little more time and being mighty sure. (student. 3 $\frac{1}{4}$) That is a hypothetical question, I'm not sure. This is what happened. They certainly were deceived. If you ever have a right to say I was brought into this under false pretenses they certainly had. Well, that is number 6, The Gibeonite Deception.

Now, number 7, The Conquest of the Southern Confederates. That's chapter 10:1-43, and in that we find that it immediately begins with the Gibeonites being that which drags them into the first attack. Gibeon was a royal city, much greater than Ai, and the men thereof were mighty and when Adonizedec king of Jerusalem (what does the name Adoni-zedec remind you of?) No, Adoni-zedec would surely remind you of Melchizedec. Melchizedec which means my king is righteous, was a king of Jerusalem at the time of Abraham. Here at a later time we find Adonizedec, which means my Lord is righteous, as the king of that same city, and it fits together as the natural expectation that there might be a similarity of names of two kings of the same city, now there wouldn't have to be, but there might be, and there was in this case. And so we have Adonizedec, or if you prefer to say Adonizedec, more like Melchizedec, but I think Adonizedec is probably nearer the original-- that he the king of Jerusalem, the king of Hebron, the king of other cities to the south there, hearing what the Gibeonites had done, came up and attacked Gibeon because they had made peace with Joshua, but this was a foolish on their part to do. They should first have sent messengers to the north, to the cities of the north, to invite them to come and

attack too. But evidently they felt all of us together are far more than enough for Gibeon, we will attack Gibeon and we will destroy these Gibeonite cities and we will hold them and be in a position to resist Israelite attack and so they came to attack Gibeon. The Gibeonites immediately sent messengers down to Gilgal where the Israelites were, and they said we are attacked by this great body which is encamped here against us, if you don't come soon we will be in a desperate plight. You have sworn to protect us now come and help us. And here is a case where Joshua acted quickly in an emergency. If Joshua had waited now the southern confederacy could have destroyed the Gibeonites, taken over their cities, strongly entrenched themselves there, and it would have been much more difficult for Joshua to carry on the conquest. They could have kept them, they would be at the top of the hill country, the Israelites trying to come up, it would be much easier fighting down hill against them than to come up. But instead of that, the Israelites now have an outpost right in the middle of the land through the Gibeonites, and so the Gibeonites are holding this great force of them but they can't hold them long because it's much too large for them and the kings there figure before the Israelites get there in any substantial force they'll have the Gibeonites at their mercy and be in a good position to stand off the Israelites. But instead of that, we find that Joshua when he heard this acted immediately, and Joshua went up, we find in verse 9, that he went up ^{from} Gilgal all night. And so when the southern confederacy thought they had only the Gibeonites to fear and they were going to conquer them quickly, Joshua and the men of war came up speedily through the galley^u up to Gibeon, through the night, and the next morning when the southern confederacy had no idea they could do that rapidly or be anywhere near the great host of them yet, they suddenly attacked, we read, in the early morning. See, verse 9 says that he came to them suddenly, went up from Gilgal all night, Verse 10 says the Lord discomfited them before Israel and slew them with a great slaughter at Gibeon, and chased them along the way that goeth up to Bethhoron, and smote them to Azekah, and unto Makkedah. And it came to pass, as they fled from before Israel, and were going down to Bethhoron--see, they're going up to (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) going up through the pass there, that's the ascent of that forms the top of the pass, the descent

of that forms the bottom/^{part}of the other side of it. So they came up the pass and started down the other side, helter skelter, with the Israelites pursuing them, and as they went down through the descent of Beth Horon there, the Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them to Azekah and they died. They were more with died with hailstones than they whom the children of Israel slew with the sword. And so here we have the great victory over the southern confederacy, which was the result of the agreement with the Gibeonites...

O.T. History 229. ($\frac{1}{4}$)

...and attacked with his rapid forced march at night, which resulted in the early morning when they were just rather ($\frac{1}{5}$) being suddenly attacked and their camp torn to pieces, and the people were running helter-skelter and the Israelites pursuing them and destroying them, and then the Lord intervened in the way of letting them be ($\frac{3}{4}$) with this hailstone and it says those who were killed with hailstones were more than those who were destroyed with the sword. So we have this book of Joshua which is so full of great spiritual lessons, such a marvelous book of the way God used the Israelites to accomplish his purposes, despite their errors, of the way he used them, blessed them, gave them the land, a wonderful book but unfortunately the next two verses after this have gotten more attention from the Christian world than all the rest of the book put together, at least if we leave out the falling of the walls of Jericho. And they are two of the most cryptical, difficult verses in the whole Bible, very hard to know exactly what they mean. Now the most reasonable interpretation of what they mean I have ever heard is one which probably none of you have ever heard. And I will mention it to you and you will be surprised and aghast because you probably have heard so much about these two verses. But after ~~it~~ I'll mention it then we'll come back and look at these verses and look at other possible interpretations of them and I certainly ($1\frac{3}{4}$) of the interpretation I mention to you now but merely say they are two very difficult, very difficult verses from any viewpoint. But then we read that those who died with

the hailstones were more than those whom the children of Israel slew with the sword. So God worked ^{this} with the weather to overcome great numbers of the enemy and the southern confederacy is pretty completely wrecked and then of course they come back and then they meet the northern confederacy and that ends the conquest.

But now we read in verse 12, then spoke Joshua to the Lord in the day when the Lord delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel and he said in the sight of Israel, Sun--the Hebrew is (2 $\frac{3}{4}$) * be silent. Sun, be silent, upon Gibeon. Gibeon is of course to their east. Sun, be silent upon Gibeon. We can just see the scene there, they have come up all night up the valley from Gilgal. They have attacked in the early morning and they pursue them and they are running and then they begin to see the sun show over the side of the hill, and he says, sun, be silent, be silent, be quiet there, sun, on Gibeon to the east, and then he looks off to the west and he sees the moon just going down, and he says moon, thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon.

No verb (3 $\frac{1}{3}$) ^{Don't} ~~These~~ give these people light that they can pursue safely. We've attacked them in the dark and pursued them and if we're going to put an end to them it looks like, now don't come up and give them light that they can see where to go and how to escape, sun, be silent, and moon, in the valley of Ajalon, sun to the east don't come up, moon over there in the west, don't shine to give them light so that they can see to get down, it would be a full moon of course if he saw it in the west, just before sunup or just after (4 $\frac{1}{4}$) in the morning.

And so he says be silent, and literally, and the sun was silent, and the moon stood, the moon stopped giving its light, the sun was silent until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. Is not this written in the book of Jasher? Jasher, as you know, literally means let's sing, it is a book of songs, it is now lost, but it was evidently a book of songs celebrating the victory, and in this book of songs these two verses occur. Is not this written in the book of Jasher? So the sun was silent in the midst of the heavens and did not hurry to go down about a whole day. And there was no day li--now this word to go down, literally means to come in--it did not hurry to come in. The word is sometimes used where you see the sun and then it comes in to the mountains, out of sight,

it's used of the setting sun, but it's also used if I come in to a room, if I rap at the door, you immediately say (5 $\frac{1}{4}$) * come in. So I enter. * come in. And the sun at night, you say the sun goes in, goes in out of sight, but this is early morning, and here in the early morning the sun is just beginning to come over and cast light upon them and he says, sun, be silent, and the sun didn't come in for a whole day. That is to say they had the hailstones, hailstones coming, they had the big storm. Have you ever been out on the farm, in the fall, on a bright hot day and then the cloud comes over all of a sudden and it gets almost as black as night, and then these hailstones begin to drop and--

We saw a man out in Montana, he was driving his horses in the farm, the hailstones, some of them nearly as big as oranges dropping, and his wheat there, he had this wonderful wheat out there, and ~~we tried about~~ ^{inside of I think} 15 minutes all of his wheat was just absolutely flat on the ground, completely wrecked by those hailstones. Not many about as big oranges, many about as big as your thumb. But all of a sudden in this country they come and the work of a whole summer is just wrecked like that. Well, here we read that more people died from the hailstones than died from the sword of the children of Israel. And the people couldn't see where they were going, it was dark, and the night was continuing and the sun didn't come up for about a whole day, nearly the whole day, that they were at the mercy of the Israelites and even more of the hailstones. And so it says there was not a day like that before or after, that the Lord hearkened to the voice of a man, for the Lord fought for Israel.

Now it impresses me, I would not be dogmatic about it at all but it impresses me that that is what those words (7 $\frac{1}{4}$) * probably mean in the context there, what they probably mean. The thing that looks against it is that the word (7 $\frac{1}{2}$)* the sun didn't come in for a whole day because that is any/did idiom frequently used to mean go in out of sight at night, but this started in the morning, it didn't come in all night. And of course it translates it here, sun, stand still, but the Hebrew isn't stand still, the Hebrew is be silent, the word regularly translated be silent, or it may be cease from whatever you're doing, Be silent from work, or be silent, cease from whatever you're

doing. It would fit exactly with the sun starting to come up, stopping coming any further with that. But the people have grabbed these two verses out of context, with no relation to the battle, with no relation to the situation, with no relation to what meaning it would have, because we don't find in scripture that God performed big miracles just to do wonderful things, arouse excitement. He didn't cause polar bears to walk around in Egypt in the time of the plagues. He does not ordinarily do things that are just bizarre and strange and queer, he does things that have a purpose, they may be things requiring power beyond what any human being would ever have but they have a purpose in the situation. Christ did his miracles, not simply to excite astonishment but to heal people, to produce to cause some good to be done, God could work a miracle in order to help to win the battle but in this case the hailstone and the darkness helped in the complete routing of the southern confederacy. Now if instead of that ~~fa~~ in the morning then, the sun stopped coming higher in the heavens, instead of its ~~simply~~ not showing itself, it stopped coming ~~anywhere/morning!~~ ^{more} and the sun stayed in that place so that twelve hours later it began to come up and you had a day twice as long, I'm afraid the Israelites would have been utterly exhausted by the end of that day because they'd gone all the night before, and now if they fought all day and then had another whole day to fight, the Lord would certainly have to work another miracle in order to give them the strength to get through that day, and I don't see why it was necessary, the people were already running anyway, and they were pursuing them and anyway the hailstones, we read, killed more than the sword of the Israelites killed anyway. And so, to me, I do not see the purpose in this connection of working a great cosmic change in all the forces of nature. Now, that's not to say but what the Lord could work such a thing if he chose, he could pick up polar bears and cause them to walk in Egypt, if he chose, he could cause the water to stand up just absolutely straight up in the air, if he chose, he could say well how could God cause the sun to stand still, it would upset gravity and all the buildings would fall over, well, if God could make gravity he could interrupt the gravity for a day if he chose. If God can create the world and cause it to go this way, he could cause it to go a different way if he chose. I have no difficulty

in believing that God could cause the solar system to start going the other direction, or to stop going at all and cause no results to happen from it, if he chose. But it does not seem to me that that is at all a required interpretation of the verses. It seems to me that it is an interpretation which doesn't take the word in quite the literal natural sense, and more than that, it seems to me that it is an interpretation which makes a miracle which would be simply a great exhibition of force and not in any way a help, because they got all the help they needed with the hailstones and with the darkness in the situation. I don't see any need at this point in this one of all the battles they had, how there would be any great help by a great cosmic miracle of that type. So that, as I say, I personally regret very much that people have spent so much attention on two verses which are difficult verses at the least, from any interpretation and instead of spending it on the many spiritual lessons, the many important things for us, in this book of Joshua as it's written. I certainly think the Lord could do if he chose, it's just a question what does the passage say, and I personally do not think that that is what this statement has said.

Now there was an instructor in military science, I think he was a lieutenant in the army, who was sent to Yale University to drill the boys there, a good many years ago, and while he was drilling the fellows in marching and so on, at Yale University, he set to work studying astronomy and he worked out a theory to prove that there is missing in the history of the sun, the length of time that it took the sun to move this distance here. I've never been able to figure what that would mean, what the sense would be to it. I've often heard him quoted as this great professor of Yale University, but looking into it, he was I think a lieutenant, he may have been a higher officer, sent there to instruct them in the manual of arms, and he wrote this and all it says the sun was over Gibeon, the moon was over, the sun was east and the moon was west (13 $\frac{1}{4}$)

telling the exact time or anything? It is certain such evidence is not involved in it. Now a man named a few years ago wrote a book called WORLDS IN COLLISION. And in this book he advanced the theory that the sun used, the earth used to revolve in

the opposite direction to what it does now. So the sun would rise in the west and set in the east. And there was a planet came near the earth and caused, the planet Venus caused a change so that the earth stopped going to the west and started going the direction it now is. And he wrote a book called WORLDS IN COLLISION which got a great deal of attention and many people think this (13 3/4) prove the Bible is true, the dealing with this one thing particularly. He was a man who I think was very well trained in the theories of education. I think that was his field, he had a doctor's degree. Suddenly he got tremendous attention (14) when his book first came out. After they read it, most people recognized he ~~didn't~~^{didn't} know positively, he (14 $\frac{1}{4}$) doesn't have any particular knowledge in that field, he has a lot of theory. I don't see how the cause of the Lord is advanced by taking these verses and insisting on interpreting them in a way that I don't think the context calls for, and then making a big effort to try to prove them, and anything like that is very difficult to prove unless you were there at the time it happened. It seems very ^{un-2}likely that any other proof could prove it. If God's word says it happens, you have no difficulty in accepting it, no difficulty in believing, but I don't see how it can be proven to the unbeliever in any event, and if it isn't what it says, I don't see how we're glorifying the Lord any more by interpreting it in that way. / Of course, there is one further word of caution...

OIT.History 230. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...mistake, the thing we are to convince the world of is that the lost in sin need a savior, Jesus Christ (1 $\frac{1}{2}$) the one through whom they can be saved. — And after they're saved this book is entirely dependable and reliable and glorious. Everything it says is true and it can show them how to grow in grace and how to follow Him. That's the thing we need to convince them of. And if somebody comes along and thinks, they tell you this man is such a great Christian and thoroughly believes that Joshua made the sun stand still, I'm not going to raise (1)

But I don't think anything's gained

by our going out and making it a point of argument that the sun did stand still, because I (1 $\frac{1}{4}$)

And I think that in

the end we understand God's way better if we try carefully to see what~~ver~~ the Bible really does say, rather than grab superficial interpretations and spend a lot of time trying to prove those superficial interpretations are correct. Yes? (student.1 $\frac{1}{4}$) I think--it says it's taken from the book of ~~Jasher~~^{Jasher}, it's taken from the book of poems. It was like if you compare the song of Deborah in Judges 5 with the story of Deborah's and Barak's conquest in Judges 4. One is a prose account, the other is a poetical celebration. This is taken from this poetic celebration of this great victory, and it seems to me that what~~ver~~ it's saying is that Joshua said oh my, now, we've got a wonderful chance to get these~~s~~ people and here's the sun coming up, oh Sun, don't come up, don't come up and make them be able to see to escape, stay back there. And then we read the hailstorm came and the darkness continued, I would say it continued for about a day. That would be my guess, I wouldn't be dogmatic, but I just would say that I personally do not believe that it teaches that God stopped the sun. What it does teach I wouldn't be dogmatic on that point. Now the time is up again, if you have questions we'll have to take them up tomorrow.

(4 $\frac{1}{2}$) I'm going now to give you, not the assignments for today, nor for Friday, but for next Monday. (from here to end of record (15) is the giving of the assignment.)

O.T.History 231. (1 $\frac{1}{4}$)

...(assignment continued to 1 3/4)

Now we were speaking yesterday about the conquest of the southern confederacy, and we have a very interesting chapter which tells us about this conquest with many details given, but people have picked two verses out of the middle of this chapter and they're better known than all the rest of the book of Joshua, at least all the rest if you leave out the conquest of Jericho. And personally I think that's a mistake because if these two verses were meant to be the most important I think they would have been stressed in a different way than they are. They're not referred to, as far as I recall, anywhere

else in the scripture. They're not put in an emphatic part of the chapter, they're rather incidental, as you come to this point they stop to quote a couple of verses from this book of poetry in celebrating the victory. In the case of Deborah and Barak we have the account in Judges 4 of their great victory, and then we have the beautiful poem describing it in the next chapter. Here we have two verses quoted from the poem here, and I personally think that these two verses are a description of the hailstorm that is described in prose in the verse before, but I wouldn't be dogmatic on that because very often in poetry it is hard to be sure of the exact significance. If you have any doubt of that statement, read Judges 4 and get the definite history of Deborah and Barak. Then take Judges 5 and tell me what every verse in it means. And you'll find that Judges 5 is quite easy to get the general idea of a poem of praise to God ^{for the} ~~through~~ victory in 4, and it even adds interesting details for our understanding of 4. But the statements in it some of them are highly figurative and there are instances where it's hard to be sure which aspect of the battle it is referring to in the statement (3 3/4)

Now if somebody prefers to believe that these two verses mean that God caused the whole solar system to stop for 24 hours or for a substantial portion thereof, and all the planets to stop their motion and stand where they were for that length of time, I do not believe that that is the least bit beyond the power of God to do, I would have no difficulty whatever in accepting that God did that if the scripture says he did. It does not seem to me that that is the correct interpretation of these two verses. I don't think the verses as they stand require it at all, more than that I don't think that the context shows in this situation such an interpretation. But I certainly don't want to be dogmatic about it because I don't think the evidence is sufficient to be clear. There may be another interpretation than the one which I suggested which is the true one instead of the one I have given you. But if you prefer to take it that it means a cessation of the turning around of the earth on its axis for a length of time, well, maybe it was, but I just would recommend not being dogmatic about it because it's far from certain. Well, the rest of the ~~chapter~~ chapter is interesting details about this conquest, I don't think we need to take the time in this class to go into these details. It is very important

that we have the main strategy in mind, how first it was the Jordan Valley in the center then it is the southern ~~section~~, then the northern section. And this conquest of the south continues, it took quite a while, though the first stage of it, the first day of it was one great overwhelming victory which made a ~~good~~^{big} start to the conquest, but there is described the many cities that were taken and a list is given of the kings who were taken and among ^{them} the king of Bethel is placed in his proper geographical situation. Although there's no mention of the conquest of Bethel here as there is on the other cities. That is important but that's more important to us in connection with the matter of Ai than with this matter of number 7 here.

Then number 8, The Northern Campaign, and the kings of Canaan made that mistake which is so common in history, so very, very common in history. Seeing an aggressor coming, instead of uniting to drive him off they let him ^{take} them piecemeal, and we find that over and over and over in history, that forces which could easily have won a victory, I don't say they could've in this case, but I say in history there are many cases, where forces which could have easily have won^d victory if they were united have lost it because they allowed themselves to be conquered piecemeal. And I think that aside from the matter of the Lord's help that would be true in this case also, that humanly speaking if these Canaanites had stood together the probabilities of the Israelites defeating them, would've been very, very slight. Somebody will say well, it would have been a far greater display of God's power if God had caused the Israelites to stay over in the plain of Moab and send a message over asking them all to surrender and then they all got together and stood together and the Israelites would have had to meet them all at once instead of piecemeal like this, and then God might have had the sun stand still and a few other things happen all at once to cause a tremendous display of God's power to show that he could display ~~all~~ the Canaanites together at once but that is not what happened. What happened is that God did intervene with his marvelous power as in the fall of the walls of Jericho, but that he caused that Joshua^y should use his best intelligence he could, and that they should move forward according to a reasonable plan in order to make it clear to us that we are not to simply to expect him to walk us to the sky on flowery beds of ease and to

cause everything just to open up before us, but that he wants to train and develop us in character that amounts to something, and while he will give us very special help at crucial points, it is his desire that he plan things in a reasonable way and that we struggle forward against odds and gain the victory ^{for Him.} And so in the book of Joshua, along with the wonderful display of the marvelous power of God, ^{that} we all-should have we also have the evidence of a ~~the~~ reasonable plan carried through in a reasonable way. And so we have this strategy here and we have the land reduced now to the point where everything is in their hands except the ~~the~~ northern area, north of Gibeon. And now the kings of the northern area who, humanly speaking, should have from the viewpoint of their own welfare, disturbed themselves long before this to help the southern kings, or even to help the people of Jericho, they, now, when everything else is gone, they now ~~bestir~~ themselves to do something. Remember when Hitler began moving, when he took Chekslovakia, first when he took Austria, the powers could easily have stepped in and stopped him. When he moved into the Rhineland which according to ~~the~~ treaty was supposed to be de-militarized, they could easily have stopped him, a force 1/20th as big as the final forces that had to oppose him could have put a stop ~~to~~ to him with no difficulty whatever, in fact his troops were ordered to move back from the Rhineland quickly if they saw opposition developing because he knew they couldn't resist. But as he topped ~~the~~ the treaties one by one by one the western powers just stepped back and let him do it, one after another until he got stronger and stronger and stronger and finally they had to use a hundred times the power to overcome that they could've earlier. And it's exactly the same situation today with the Communists. We let them grab one thing after another, one after another, and if we ever do keep them from destroying us it will require many times the effort that it would have to have done the sensible thing and finished the thing up ten years ago. But the ~~in this~~ case of course, right is on the side here in the Bible of the aggressor. There's a common idea today that the worst thing in the world is aggressive war. And we would never fight a preventive war, that's said by our leaders in Washington over and over. We would never fight a preventive war. If somebody else attacks us then we will fight, but they can do anything they want to until they attack us, and we will do ~~anything~~ nothing, and

of course it's a perfectly silly, ^{ridiculous} nonsensical attitude. If war is ever right, it is right for a principle not just because somebody else attacks you personally. And if there isn't a real reason to fight, there shouldn't be fight even if they did slap us. We should take the slap if there's not a principle. And if there is a principle involved we should fight over the principle, not wait for them to slap first. But the, if anybody told that it is a Biblical principle, it is of course the teaching of modernists today which takes the Biblical teaching of the sacredness of human life, which God has established, which is not recognized by any other religion except Christianity, unless you take Buddhism which carries that to the extreme of even thinking of the flies and the insects being sacred and must not be injured, but aside from that, the religions do not recognize human life as sacred and are very, very callous about their treatment of human life, and Christianity teaches a care for human life, thou shalt not murder is a command that we have which has not been observed by other religions. And that being the case it is the right thing to take in its true perspective. Of course, the modernists carry it to extremes, make a religion out of it, leaving the other things of Christianity out and develop their pacifistic theories and one part of it is this, we will not fight unless we are attacked. And of course it's utter nonsense. But it is the stand which they are stressing and which is having a tremendous influence upon our leaders in Washington. Now if anybody is to say that that is a Biblical principle, all they have to do is to look at the book of Joshua in order to see that it is a ridiculous thing, that it is not scriptural teaching. There was a principle involved here, the Canaanites have sunk into such wickedness and degradation that it was God's will to wipe them off the face of the earth. There was a principle involved. And God was giving that land to the Israelites and ordering them to take it. And under the circumstances they moved forward to take it. The people of Jericho didn't do that of course, they just got behind their walls and stayed there and hoped to be safe. It was not that they were attacked but that there was a principle involved and they proceeded to act upon it. So we find here that the northern, people of the northern part of the land, who had sat back and hoped that the thing would blow over, and hope that maybe the Israelites having conquered the rest of the land, they might be willing to live in peaceful co-existence

with them, now at last saw that was impossible, and gathered themselves together and Joshua attacked them. ~~From~~ ^{So now} all we have in chapter 11, verses 1 to 20, we have number 8, The Northern Campaign. Yes? (student.14. Something just came to mind about this. Now in Canaan, we are not told, but are there not some who would be innocent, such as the Russian people, a lot of the Russian people are innocent in effect, thereby if we fought it as an aggressor nation--) The Russian people have had for ~~some~~ centuries the influence of the form of Christianity, very corrupt and degenerate, but nevertheless a form, and there has been an influence on character and (14 1/2) which the Canaanites did not have. And ~~it's~~ ^{it's} my personal opinion that the Russians as a people are about as nice a people as you'll find anywhere. I don't think there's anything wrong with the Russians as a people but I think there's a gang of thugs that's hurting them and controlling and using them for its purposes, and I think it's an awful shame to have to kill any of the Russian people in order to get at the thugs but it's exactly the situation they had in Germany, who are among the finest people on the face of the earth, who fell into the control of a gang of thugs and it is easier for a nice people to fall into the control of a gang of thugs than for a people that isn't nice, as a matter of fact. It is easier. If they sit back and surrender they can be forced into line and use to form a instrument of terrible wickedness...

O.T.History 232. (1/4)

...yes? (student. responsibilities for relaxing in any tense situation doesn't that bring on its proper retribution. I mean the people relax into a situation and become part of it, don't they come a responsibility for the whole thing themselves?) Yes. Yes? (student.3/4) (record not clear to 1 1/2) Some thing maybe they'll get it.

It's bad enough. It's plenty bad but it's not quite that bad. (student.1 1/2) I'm not sure. Maybe all we've got. Well, we hope we don't have it. We could've prevented it. But the northern campaign here, if you'll read what the Israelites had to ^{face} pay, you will almost feel that this is the greatest thing they ever had to face. In chapter 10 we found that there was a great force that came against the Gibeonites, but the southern force is not described as anything like as great as this northern

force. Read what it says in verse 4 of chapter 11. They went out, they and all their hosts with them, much people, even as the sand that is upon the seashore in multitude, with horses and chariots very many. As the sand on the seashore in multitude. The people of Jericho weren't in that category, the people of Ai weren't in that category. The southern confederacy was not in that category. These forces that the Israelites had been meeting had been growing in strength and in intensity. And that is true in the Christian life, a person, God is apt to give us situations to meet within our strength to meet, or at least our strength increased by his enablement, but he's apt to give us more difficult situations as we become more advanced in our Christian life and more able to take them on. And so each situation that the Israelites met was larger than the one before and this is the largest yet of all. As the sand of the seashore for multitude, this tremendous force that met the people. But God said to him that, don't be afraid of them, that tomorrow about this time I will deliver them all up to you. And so Joshua came and Joshua met them and Joshua overcame them. There is no account in this chapter of any miraculous intervention of the Lord and this chapter has received less attention than most of the chapters of Joshua but actually the victory which he gained was the greatest victory in the whole book, because the force that he opposed was the greatest force that he met anywhere in the book. But God gave him the complete victory over them. And so the northern confederacy being overcome the whole land lay before them, but it was a tremendous land for a people of this size, and they did not have the garrisons and their forces or the training or the knowledge to immediately take it over and occupy it and hold it, and so many, many people who had fled to the hills came back and reestablished themselves in these cities and much of the land had to be conquered over again. But that we look at later. The Northern Campaign, we won't go into detail (4 3/4)

we've already noticed about it, and then that's number 8.

Number 9, Summary of the Conquest. And this is chapter 11:21-12:24. It describes the summary of the conquest. And it's very interesting though to note how in this summary, in verse 23 of chapter 11, says, so Joshua took the whole land according to all that the Lord said unto Moses. Joshua took the whole land. Verse 22 says there

was none of the Anakims left in the land of the children of Israel: only in Gaza, in Gath, and in Ashdod, there remained. Leave off the last^{1/2} half of the verse and it seems that every single one had vanished, but then it says only in Gaza, Gath and Ashdod there remained. Well, now you take this statement here in verse 23, Joshua took the whole land, and then you look over to chapter 13 verse 1 and what does the Lord say? Now Joshua was old and stricken in years and the Lord said to him, Thou art old and stricken in years, and there remains yet very much land to be possessed. Who says there's no contradiction in the Bible? Here are two verses a chapter and a half apart, one says that all the land was conquered, the next says that there remained yet very much land to be possessed. This is the land that yet remained, and then he goes on to describe areas which remained. The fact of the matter is that we have to recognize that statements in the Bible as anywhere else have to be taken for their significance rather than taking them word by word and an extremely literal interpretation of each word. You have to get their significance each time. This was a tremendous victory of Joshua's which overcame these mighty forces opposed to the Israelites, which broke the backbone of the power of the Canaanites and laid the whole land prostrate before them. But there were outlying sections, some of them very important which Joshua's force didn't get into at all. And there were many sections in the midst of the land which the Israelites, the separate tribes had to overcome and in some of these it took them a couple of hundred years to do it. So there was a long, the actual conquest/^{there} was a great deal left, but the big main affected portion of it was done, and with that understanding there is no contradiction between the two statements, but take each of them by itself and it would rule the other out. And that is true often with doctrine in scripture. The Lord takes one side of a doctrine and he stresses it, and he speaks in such language that you'd almost think, Paul says we are saved by faith without any works of the Law, and James says we are not saved by faith alone, he says that faith without works is dead. Show me your ~~werke~~ faith without your works, I'll show you my faith by my works. And each of them is stressing a vital truth, and the fact is there's no contradiction between them if you understand correctly what they say. But verbally there is a contradiction, there is an apparent contradiction if you take the Bible

as a set of mathematical formulas, each of which can be pulled out from the rest and taken alone and looked at and (8 $\frac{1}{2}$) the extreme significance of each word alone. But if you take them as a presentation of God's truth, stressing various aspects of it, and each to be interpreted in the light of the other there is no contradiction. Well, so much then for the summary of the conquest, at the details of which we will not look here. It lists the kings at the end, you notice, the kings whom they have taken, and then we have section D, The Division of the Land. chapters 13 to 22. Almost as much material as we've already looked at. And the division of the land, if you read it carefully is not something which the Lord simply gave to them and had it all fixed and set and here it is. But he gave them some principles to use and they proceeded to apply the principles and in the application of the principles there were certain things they did which later had to be revised and changed. First he assigned the material in Transjordan, the two and a half tribes over there, that had already been done. But now it is repeated as a part of the general distribution of the land. They've been given that land by Moses, now it is stated again and they, the area of it is listed. The two and a half tribes, that is the tribe of Reuben, Gad and half the tribe of Manasseh, which had the territory across the Jordan. And then we have the children of Judah in chapter 14. The children of Judah coming to Joshua in Gilgal, and they ask for a certain part of the land which Caleb had spied out when he'd been up to Kadesh Barnea forty years before. And Joshua agrees to give them this section of the land. And so this section is given to Caleb and to the people of Judah and then in chapter 15 we have the division given to Judah. And it describes the southern portion of the land that was given to the tribe of Judah, and so the tribe of Judah gets this large section, the southern portion of the land and there and then later on we find that the section they have is too big for them. And they take the southern part of it and they give it to the tribe of Simeon. And so they give them a section out of what they had already given to Judah. You find that mentioned in chapter 19:9. Out of the portion of the children of Judah was the inheritance of the children of Simeon, for the part of the children of Judah was too much for them: therefore the children of Simeon had their inheritance within the inheritance of the people of

Judah. The system of dividing up the land is not a thing that came down from God ready-made, but it is like most things in our lives, it is, we have the principles and we have to apply them and when we find it doesn't fit this way we regulate it that way and we change it and try to apply the Lord's principles. And so they found Judah had too much, they took part of it and they gave it to Simeon. And we must, in everything we do in life, we must have established principles we can't switch too easily. People come to me and say I think we should change this about our time of classes or something ^{like that,} ~~or that~~ and so ~~king~~ on, and I say I'm tremendously interested in all the suggestions that anyone has to make, but we have to make our definite plans at the beginning of the term and carry them through the semester, we can't be changing back and forth up and down during the semester, but the situation established for one semester does not necessarily run into another. You have to use the experience gained in one semester in making your plans for the next and try to make it better. Now there are some times when people will make a plan and they think they've got to stick to it (12 3/4)

We must not go to one extreme or the other, ~~doing~~ all of our activities for the Lord. To keep a certain stability you have to have it. If you have, are too ready to change, we have no order, no (13 $\frac{1}{2}$) but to be watching for means of improvement and making from time to time such improvements as are necessary, and anything you do you will find that your changes will move this way and that way, that you'll decide to go that way and you'll go too far and then you have to back up and then you may back up a little too far, but eventually you may find the correct situation.

And we should learn a lot about methods from this account of the division of the tribes. The children of Judah were the largest tribe, they had Caleb who was one of the two faithful spies, and they gave the section he asked, but they gave too big a section, and then they didn't say well we've given it to Judah, there's nothing we can do about it. They'd given him too big a section, they took a part of it out now and they gave it to Simeon, but Judah would not be the largest tribe if it were not that Joseph had been divided into two tribes. Joseph would be the largest tribe probably otherwise. But Joseph had been given two tribes, two sons, and each of them had a very large section,

and consequently if you look on the map of the tribal boundaries over in Transjordan you will find the tribe of Reuben and the tribe of Gad and then the half tribe of Manassah almost larger than either of the other two whole tribes, because Manassah was a larger tribe. And they had a large area of Transjordan, half the size tribe, as the other half is over on the other side. So now after he took up Judah, then he took up Joseph, chapter 18. And after Judah was taken then Joseph came and Joseph is two tribes, Ephraim and Manassah...

O.T.History 233. ($\frac{1}{4}$)

...here it names Manassah first, we don't usually name Manassah first, Manassah was the oldest but Ephraim was the most important so it was usually Ephraim first. And they were given territory and then after they were given their territory and Judah their territory, then they give Benjamin the territory between the two. That's in chapter 18. Benjamin comes between, then they put Simeon to the south in the part of Judah, and then they gave Dan a territory which was west of Benjamin, between Judah and Ephraim, and we find in chapter 19:47 that the area of the children of Dan was too small for them, so we find the children of Dan given the territory between Judah and Ephraim, migrating eventually to the north and taking a territory way up in the north, so here is a change which was not part (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

One other verse I should call your attention to here in this section is the, telling about the tribe of Judah in chapter 15:63, As for the Jebusites the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the children of Judah could not drive them out: but the Jebusites dwell with the children of Judah at Jerusalem unto this day. What does that prove about the authorship of the book of Joshua? that one statement. It proves it was written before the time of David, because David drove the Jebusites out, David conquered Jerusalem, but all through the time from Joshua to David, Jerusalem which had been one of the prime movers in the original attack of the ten tribes, I mean of the southern confederacy, in the time of Joshua, Jerusalem was left in the hands of the Jebusites a great fortress right in the middle of the territory (2 $\frac{1}{2}$)

and it had a

good deal with allowing the northern section and the southern to develop separate individualities which eventually led to the division of the kingdom. It was a great mistake. Jerusalem had been conquered but the people had come back and reestablished themselves. And Joshua should have reduced Jerusalem and put a garrison in it and held it, it was a great mistake on his part, and that mistake brought serious controversy to Israel. Yes? (student. 3¹/₄) It does, doesn't it? We are not told who wrote it. It is the book about Joshua. I don't think it says anywhere in it that it is the book by Joshua. But it was written at least before the time of David. And I would say that most (3¹/₂)

would seem

to be sometime after Joshua

That was chapter

15, verse 63. Of course that phrase, unto this day, doesn't mean too far along because back in Deuteronomy it tells how Og king of Bashan had an iron bedstead which was so large that it says you could see unto this day. And the critics take that as a proof that Moses didn't write it. But it doesn't seem to me that it is because they have conquered it maybe a year before and Moses says there it is, you go and see and it reminds you of our conquest years ago, and it continues unto this day, it's still there and it will continue to be for some time to come. So it doesn't necessarily mean a long time but it does at least mean a certain time. It probably means (4¹/₂)

Yes? (student. 4¹/₂) During the time of Joshua, Caleb came to him and asked for the southern area, and we read in chapter 14 how Caleb conquered Hebron, we read that in chapter 14. The name of Hebron before was Kirjath-arba, but Caleb conquered it. Now the children of Judah conquered Hebron but it says they were unable to drive out the Jebusites from Jerusalem. Well now, that may have been in the lifetime of Joshua that they did not drive them out, but after the death of Joshua they kept on leaving them in there. Now it may be that after the conquest Joshua lived a number of years, the Bible doesn't tell us how long he lived but it certainly doesn't imply that he died right afterward. And that's one place in the chronology where we don't know, but I hope you'll all notice that in your list he-lived, that there may be a period of years in between, and it may be that this is not after the death of Joshua but that it is a bit of time after the conquest. But it might

be after his death, we don't know. Yes? (student. 5 3/4.) Oh, you mean could not this statement, the Jebusites dwell with the children of Judah, unto this day had been inserted later? The rest of it.. (student. 6 1/4) Yes, I would say that it is entirely possible that there are places in the historical books where a sentence or a part of a sentence is inserted somewhat later, being true, is equally inspired of God. It is entirely possible just as the account of Moses' death was written later, but I don't think there's any great number of places like that. I think the number is comparatively few, so I don't think we can be dogmatic that they are, I think in most cases it's actually part of the book because I think we have the integrity of the books, and they are God's word and in the main as originally given and what changes may have been introduced like that by others who were also inspired would be minimum rather than maximum. So that this might have been inserted later but I don't say that it must have been, and I incline to feel that if it's not absolutely necessary to think that it was, it's better to think that most likely it's part of the book, but we can't be sure.

Well, you could look into the Division here for method and spend quite a bit of time on it. If we had three years in this course instead of one I would certainly do it, If you're studying Palestinian geography this section is one of the most important sections of the book, There is no section of the Bible more important to Palestinian archeology than chapters 13 to 42 of Joshua, because it lists the cities and the borders of the different tribes, and tells the names of these places and how they lay in relation to one another, and so on, it's tremendously important for archeologists, but we won't take time to go into that, that would take a month or two to really go into it satisfactorily, but it's good that you be aware of its presence and of its importance.

I think we should also note chapter 18:1. Chapter 18:1 should be noticed, that the whole congregation of the children of Israel assembled at Shiloh and set up the tabernacle there. That was the place where they took the tabernacle for its final resting place, was Shiloh. And Shiloh during the period of the judges, during most of it, until Shiloh was destroyed, is the place where the tabernacle is, and that's a very important historical fact to be aware of. And that's brought out in chapter 18, verse 1. Very

important fact is the tabernacle in Shiloh. I/~~W~~

I knew a man who was very anxious, he was a Dane, a very fine Christian man, very anxious to excavate the tabernacle and he dig at Shiloh, I visited when he was excavating there, and he had another very fine archeologist who wasn't so interested in the Bible but who was a very fine archeologist working with him, and they had some funds from Denmark, largely given through the other man who was connected with a ^{big} museum there, and they began excavating, looking for ^{evidence of} ~~everything~~ the original tabernacle which was destroyed by the Philistines. And as they began to dig there they dug a while and then they came to the remains of a Byzantium church, and of course it may be that why the church was put there was that is was the place where the tabernacle was, we don't know, but anyway this had a beautiful mosaic floor and this man wasn't the least bit interested in the Byzantine history or Byzantine churches or mosaic floors in Byzantine churches, but the only way he could get at what was underneath was to take this up bit by bit and photograph it and chart it and make it clear so that it would be available for students of Byzantine history, and they worked for weeks on it, greatly disappointed in having to put all their time and energy and money on it, and then just as they got that finished, the other archeologist died and the excavation had to be discontinued, so we never have learned yet whether it was the place where the Bible says the tabernacle was, the place at Shiloh. It would be very interesting to find out, but it's one of the hazards of archeology, looking for something and you find something else and you're not interested in but you have to deal fairly and examine the other things and deal with it properly unless you want to leave it for someone else to recognize, but you cannot just dig it up. The earliest archeologists did that, they were interested in one thing, and they would just dig off what was left, throw it out and get rid of it, but that we consider vandalism and no honorable person would do that today. Well, we have to stop now. We've had questions at the end of each hour, can you hold them till the beginning of... (11¹/₂) ...that way. If God's purpose was, if his primary purpose was to establish a kingdom with certain ^{divisions} ~~conditions~~, he would give them exactly. But that's not his primary purpose, his primary purpose is to train people, it is to develop human beings, and

consequently he does not take us off to heaven where we would be in a perfect environment to accomplish things exactly as he wants, he leaves us in a world of sin, and in this world of sin leads us to his will as best we can, and we could do it far better if he simply pressed a button and did it himself, but we would not get the development he wants us to have. Consequently everything ^{human} ~~in it~~ is partly good and partly bad, there is nothing human that is one hundred per cent good. And here in connection with the division we have an excellent illustration of this. God laid down certain principles, but he left to these men the application of the principles. Of course there was one very serious error which had been made. That ~~was~~ making the treaty with the Gibeonites. That led a space right in the very middle of Canaan which was occupied by these foreigners, it made a break between the two parts of the kingdom and contributed very strongly to the division of it into two kingdoms in later years. That was a very serious break. ¶

Then Judah as the largest tribe was first given its territory and given a large territory south of the Gibeonites. But they found the territory was too big for them so they gave Simeon a section out of Judah and then the section that Simeon had proved to be a very unsatisfactory section and so the prediction of Jacob was fulfilled. They were scattered through the land of Israel and lost their identity as a tribe in (13 $\frac{1}{2}$)

and so that southern area was simply Judah, it was not particularly Simeon. When we have the kingdom divided, Judah is to the south and then there is a northern tribe, and although Simeon's territory is to the south, it is not counted as part of the southern kingdom. Then Joseph was given us, and Joseph of course is two tribes, Manassah and Ephraim, and these are north of the Gibeonites. And then Dan is given a section, just west of Benjamin, but Dan's section is in comparatively powerful Canaanite territory and the Danites find themselves unable to master it, and so they migrate almost wholly, way up there to the very north of the land. And so neither Simeon nor Dan occupies to any extent the territory given them in this division. The rest of the tribes follow pretty closely the lines given, but Simeon and Dan do not.

Dan mostly migrated north to a place very far north, the furthest they could get from the section he'd given them. Now you're familiar, most of you, with the fact, that two and a half tribes had territory across the Jordan. They had been given that territory, but they had, the military men had to come, all men able to bear arms, to come to help conquer Canaan. I suppose they left a little group over there (3/4) but most of them had to come in the conquest.

And so the division was made while these men were still with them, and then in chapter 22 we find a section which tells how these people from Transjordan went back home again. And when they went back home, we have a very interesting event that occurred. This chapter 22 is one of the least known chapters in the Bible, very few people know anything about it, Chapter 22 of Joshua. I think if more people were familiar with chapter 22 of Joshua it would not be quite as easy for the critics to lead people astray as it is. Because many a young man goes to college, or goes to Seminary, from a Christian background, know all about the story of the conquest of Jericho, but never having the slightest recollection of the events described in Joshua 22. I ~~think~~^{confess} I didn't have myself. And many a young man thrown in that situation, and gets into a class in which he is told that the book of Deuteronomy was written at the time of Josiah by the Israelite, the Jerusalem priesthood, in order to centralize worship at Jerusalem, and to get a bigger income for themselves that way, and a mighty big argument can be made for this by the critics. And having made this argument they go on to say that this idea of one place to worship is unknown for the time of Josiah. That's a new thing in Josiah's time. There was no such thing as one place where they must worship before. Now the book of Deuteronomy does not mention Jerusalem as the place to worship, Jerusalem was the place to worship, everybody knew at the time of Josiah. But Jerusalem had only become the place to worship in the time of Solomon. Perhaps of David. But previous to that Jerusalem had been a heathen city and Shiloh for a long time was the place to worship, the one place. Now they say Shiloh was way back in the time, the dark times of early days, we don't know much about it and it's a fact we don't know much about it. Jeremiah speaks of the terrible destruction of Shiloh and the book of Judges and Samuel never mention the

destruction. Jeremiah speaks as if everybody knew all about it. Well, it isn't mentioned as an effective city after the time of Eli and so it's quite a reasonable assumption that Jeremiah is speaking truth, but it isn't mentioned in this early (3 3/4) which simply means it is a dark period of the history of that period, we don't know a great deal about it. So the critics say, this idea of centralization of worship and Shiloh is purely mythical, we have no evidence on it, we know it was centralized in Jerusalem, but this came about gradually on account of the importance of the Davidic kingship, and eventually the book of Deuteronomy was written in order to centralize all worship in Jerusalem.

Now if a student went into a class and heard a professor say that and was familiar with Joshua 22, he would not be nearly as ready to accept the theory as he is if he has no knowledge, because Joshua 22 tells us how the people of the two and a half tribes, Reuben, Gad, and half of Manassah, after their conquest was over and the land was divided, how they departed, it tells us in verse 9 and they went over, to go into the land of Gilead, to the land of their possession, and when they came to the borders of Jordan, there in the land of Canaan, the children of Reuben and the children of Gad and the half tribe of Manassah built there an altar by Jordan, a brick altar. Well, this fits of course, doesn't it, with the critics' idea. That they did not sacrifice just this one place, like the book of Deuteronomy commands, but that this command was not even given till the time of Josiah because here we have right in the time of Joshua, when if there was any one place to worship, it wasn't Jerusalem at all, it was Shiloh, right at that time we have these two and a half tribes building a big altar over there by the Jordan. That fits with the critics theory, ^{doesn't it?} ~~But~~ ^{So} ~~But~~ we read on, what happens? Verse 11, they built (5 3/4) and verse 12 says when the children of Israel heard of it the whole congregation of the children of Israel gathered themselves together at Shiloh, to go up to war against them.. Why did they want to go to war against them? After all, if they could have various altars in various places ~~what~~ was the harm in building a great altar there? So they went up to go to war against this two and a half tribes that had just been helping them ~~and~~ conquering Canaan.

And the children of Israel ~~sent~~ to the children of Reuben and the children of Gad and to the half tribe of Manassah into the land of Gilead, Phinehas the son of Eleazar the priest, and with him ten princes, of each chief house a prince throughout all the tribes of Israel: and ~~each-ere~~ ^{they came to} the children of Reuben and the children of Gad and to the half tribe of Manasseh, and they said, ~~thus~~ saith the whole congregation of the Lord, What trespass is this that ye have committed against the God of Israel, to turn away this day from following the Lord, in that you have builded you an altar, that you might rebel this day against the Lord?

Well, if the command to have only one altar wasn't given till the time of Josiah, how could these people of Joshua's day know about it? To talk this way to Reuben, Gad and Manasseh for building their great altar? Is the iniquity of Peor too little for us, from ~~wh~~ which we are not cleansed until this day, although there was a plague in the congregation of the Lord, that ye must turn away this day from following the Lord? and it will be, seeing ye rebel to day against the Lord, that tomorrow he will be wroth with the whole congregation. They say in the end of verse 19, rebel not against the Lord, nor rebel against us, in building you an altar in addition to the altar of the Lord our God. Did not Achan the son of Zerah commit a trespass in the accursed thing, and wrath fall on all the congregation of Israel? So here we have what fits with the critical theory, that they had many altars, that Reuben, Gad and Manasseh built another altar, instead of sacrificing at Shiloh but then we have what absolutely denies the critical theory, that the rest of the Israelites immediately prepare to make war on them, they're so determined it shall not go through and they send to them the son of the high priest, to go over there to ask them not to do this terrible thing, because the altar of the Lord their God is at Shiloh and they should not have another altar of the Lord.

And then we see what the children of Reuben, and Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh did about this, verse 22 tells us what they said. They said the Lord God of gods, the Lord God of gods knows and Israel shall know, whether we are in rebellion or in transgression against the Lord, and whether that's why we built an altar to turn from following the Lord, or if whether it was to offer offerings thereon, let the Lord himself

require it. They say let the Lord see if we've done the terrible thing you think we have and let him judge. Because, they say in verse 26, we said, Let us now prepare to ~~by~~ build us an altar, not for burnt~~y~~offering, nor for sacrifice, but that it may be a witness between us and you and our generations ~~after~~ us, that we might do the service of the Lord before him with our burnt offerings, and with our sacrifices, and with our peace offerings: that your children may not say to our children in time to come, ye have no part in the Lord. Therefore said we, it shall be when they so say to us, that we may say again, behold the pattern of the altar of the Lord, which our fathers made, not for burnt offerings nor for sacrifices, but it is a witness between us and you. God forbid that we should rebel against the Lord and turn this day from following the Lord, to build an altar for burnt offerings, for meat offerings or for sacrifices, in addition to the altar of the Lord our God that is before his tabernacle.

Well, here then we have the situation that the people are incensed against this, and Reuben, Gad and Manasseh say we didn't think of ~~going~~ what you're accusing us of doing at all, we had an entirely different purpose in mind, it's only a memorial, it's only for a witness, it's ~~ant~~ a place to sacrifice, we have no thought of break~~ing~~ the command of God there. So they wouldn't talk that way if they didn't know it was God's command there be one place to sacrifice. The children of Israel wouldn't go to attack them, they wouldn't give this defense ~~if~~ ^{that} they never dreamed of such a thing as defying the Lord in this way if it had not been known then that it was the Lord's command. So anybody who is aware of Joshua 22, and hears the theories about Deuteronomy, immediately says, well now that contradicts Joshua. Joshua shows Deuteronomy was already known. Of course, the critics have a very, very easy way to get around it. For them it is very simple. They have said that because Deuteronomy requires only one altar, it must be the time of Josiah when they say the command was given. Now you say yes, but Joshua 22 proves they already had that, that command. Well, they say, Joshua 22 must have been written in the time of Josiah also. So that's what they agree on, that Joshua 22 must also ~~have-been-written~~ ^{be later--} --and of course you can prove that anything is late if you put everything forward that way. You can prove that George Washington never existed, if

you take everything that was written that mentions his name and say it wasn't written till the year 2,000 A.D. If you do that why you can prove there never was any George Washington. But we have enough different things referring to George Washington from an early time to be pretty good evidence that he did exist at that time, and is not a figure of later imagination. And here if it's just a matter of Deuteronomy well then the critics can make an argument. But then when, in addition to that, they have to take Joshua 22 and push it forward, it weakens the argument because the argument has to account for so many more things. Somebody comes along and says I don't believe that George Washington ever cut down a cherry tree. Well, you say what's the evidence. And if we find that the first evidence of such a thing is forty years after his time, when Parson Weems wrote the story in his book of fables for Children, if we find that and if we can't find any earlier mention of it, we say we don't know, maybe it is just a story that somebody made up in order to point a moral, it didn't really happen. But if we would come across a letter written by George Washington's father to his cousin in England telling him about what the boy had done, if we would come across that and there would be evidence of the genuine letter, if we would have a history book written at say 1880 which told, 1780 something like that, we would have a situation that would be very difficult to deny.

Now Joshua we have no other evidence from that early period. So Joshua is late too if you want. But the more things you have to say that about, the weaker your argument becomes. So I would think that a person who is going to meet the critical argument ought to be familiar with this fact, that this occurs. And I think it is very unfortunate that in our Christian schools, our Sunday Schools, our churches, instead of obeying the Lord's command to study all his word, we ^{have} taken Jericho and Ai and two or three things like that and talked about them a great deal and utterly neglected this part which would have prepared people not to be so ready to swallow the critics' theory. Well, so much then for our present historical purpose with this chapter 22. The altar which they put

up, which they set there for a witness not a place to sacrifice, and the others accepted that, there was nothing wrong with ^{it if} that is what it was for. But at first sight it appeared to be a contravention of God's commands, and the others immediately prepared to make war, and how ready we are to do that. How ready we are to prepare to attack other believers before we have investigated fully their action and found out whether they really are in defiance of the Lord or not. We will find people who are doing that which is very, very harmful to the Lord's work which you have (14 3/4) to find the evidence. And you will find those who at first sight seem to be quite contrary to our attitude who, on investigation, are found to be doing the same thing we are but in other terminology.

O.T.History 235. (1/2)

...they sent the priest to investigate and he brought back the record and they were all well satisfied (1/2) It's a lot easier to shoot first and make inquiries later, but the wise thing is to make inquiries first and when you're sure then move forward with vigor to accomplish your purpose. So much then for D, the Division of the Land.

Then E, Joshua's Last Days, and Joshua's Last Days then is chapters 23 and 24. And here we find that Joshua had led these people into the land, had conquered the land for them under the Lord's direction, with the Lord's help. They have got what God has promised, and yet Joshua is not satisfied. Chapter 23 begins, And it came to pass a long time after the Lord had given rest to Israel from all their enemies round about, that Joshua waxed old and stricken in age. And Joshua called for all Israel and their elders, and said to them I am old and stricken in age. Now did this happen--if the conquest was in 1400 B.C.--did this happen in 1399? Can we date this 1399, when Joshua called for the people? How many would think that we could? I'm saying we don't know the date, but supposing the conquest was in 1400, supposing that was when the land was divided among the people who had conquered it, then we read in chapter 23:2, Joshua called for all Israel and their elders and their heads and their judges and he gave them

address, was this in the year 1399 if the conquest was finished in 1400? Would that be a fair estimate of the date? How many think it would not be? 7 or 8. How many could give a reason why it's not? How many were listening when I read verse 1? Verse 1 says it came to pass a long time after the Lord had given rest, a long time after it says. Now I gave you in your assignment which was to be turned in for today, by this noon, an assignment which had two parts in it but the first part, chronological part, I can't possibly accept late because we have to discuss it now in preparation for today's discussion. The second part, if it is not in yet, we will simply take off for each day's lateness. The first part we discuss now, so we just can give you a zero on that, we can do nothing else because it is a basis for discussion, but in that first part of it I asked you to look up chronological statements in Numbers 32:13 and you should have found in that the statement that the Lord's anger was kindled against Israel and he made them to wander in the wilderness forty years. Then Judges 2:7 was the second reference which I gave you to look up for chronological statement and in Judges 2:7 we read that the people served the Lord all the days of Joshua and all the days of the elders who outlived Joshua. And the question there is how long is this period? There's no number given for this. How long were the days of Joshua after the forty years? Well, they would include the time of the conquest and then this verse says a very long time, we can't tell what it is. So anybody that tells to give precise dates in here is simply using his imagination. Precise dates are not given and so you cannot add these figures up and get an exact figure, but this you can say, that when it says a very long time here, it doesn't mean one year or two years or five years. Now maybe some of you might think it means ten but I don't think anybody would think it means eleven. So we would have to say surely that the days after the conquest were at least ten years, ~~sh/~~ the period time, whatever time the conquest took, plus at least ten years is involved in the life of Joshua, and then there is the period of the elders who succeeded Joshua and how long was that? Again it doesn't say. But that was for a few years, surely at least twenty or thirty. The elders who succeeded Joshua. That would certainly would be over a few months. Yes? (6) student) So you would think it at least forty. Well, it's a sizeable number, we can say that.

We certainly, I would say it's a very, very long time, I don't think forty is too big for it at all. I think sixty might be it. Yes? (student.6 $\frac{1}{4}$. But this is after the forty years in the wilderness.) Well, what he means is that there were no elders who were come out of Egypt, they all had been born in the wilderness. (student.6 $\frac{1}{2}$. No, my thought is that God said ye will wander forty years in this wilderness that none of this generation shall live in the promised land.) Yes, that's right. But of course there might be people who were born say five years after that began who would be 35 when they went out, so then if they lived another twenty years they'd be 75. 75 is a pretty good age for an elder, although I think some of them were that. Yes? (student. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$.)

Verse 8 of which chapter? 2:8 says that Joshua when he died was 110 years old. But how old was Joshua? When was he born? We know that Joshua when he died was 110, and we know from the present passage he was old and stricken in years when he died, and I think at 110 most of us would be old and stricken in years. But how many years (student.7 $\frac{3}{4}$)

Yes, you mean if he was 35 when he spied, he'd be 75 when he conquered and that would leave him 35 more years, if he was 35? (student.8 $\frac{1}{2}$) I don't know. A man told me-- I was at the Mayo clinic in 1915 and the man told me there that one of their doctors there had retired at the age of 70, retired from the clinic, and he was a mountain climber, he'd go and climb these very difficult mountains with peaks on them and all that sort of thing, where you pull yourself and tremendous acrobats and so on, and he said the man has now been retired over ten years and he's still at it as strong as ever. I don't think you can quite make it a rule that a man couldn't go spying when he was 35. The idea you suggested would make this period at least 35 years, but now suppose instead of being 35 he was 55, then it would cut it down to 15, but I think ten would be an absolute minimum but I don't quite see--I think your argument that it might be as much as forty is a very good argument but I don't think we ^{can} ~~should~~ say it had to be. Yes?

(student.9 $\frac{1}{2}$) when they _____ him out. He directed the army while Moses sat up on the hill and held his arms up. That was before they came to Sinai. (student.10)

That was forty years before it began, he was then a commander in chief, so that he was at least twenty, but I was amazed to note for the first time that in 1864 the commander-in-

chief of the Union forces, General Grant was only 42. Lee I think was, how old was he? 57? Quite a bit older, but Grant was only 42. That is to say some of the greatest commanders-in-chief have been very young though as a rule it will not be so. People vary. Well, the thing I wanted to bring out here is there is a period under this second one, which you can say not less than this, more than that, but you can't tell exactly. You certainly can't ignore it when you're adding up to get the total of these figures. Yes? (student.11) I don't think there's any evidence given. (student.11 $\frac{1}{4}$) Just a general impression. It seems to show that these people came over across the Jordan (and left just a small garrison) to fight and go with them in the conquest and then at the end went back, it did not sound like something that took ten or fifteen years. And then the general impression of the story is that it's something that went fairly rapidly, and then the fact that later on they found an awful lot to be mopped up, that hadn't been done, and a lot of these people had come back (11 3/4) it looks to me as if it was done quite quickly, but I --of course most of the critics today say that it is a tremendously foreshortened account of something that might have taken a hundred years, slow conquest--I think they're entirely wrong in that, but ^{if} somebody wants to say that it was 8 or 10 years involved in it, I don't think you can disprove it but it's not my impression, my impression would be maybe a couple of years, ^{maybe a year and a half,} maybe a year, that would be just my impression. I don't think we have any basis. Of course most of the critics today say that the time from Egypt to Palestine was about two years, but I think (12 $\frac{1}{4}$)

Well, here

then, Joshua is an old man, some years have passed since the conquest but still he was there, he knows the people, he has these good elements, and yet he calls the people together and he gives them a ^{charge} sign and urges them to stay true to the Lord, he doesn't even take for granted they will stay true, he assumes there is a great danger that they will fall aside from the Lord. But he urges them to stand true to the Lord and he makes a great exhortation to them, trying to impress and stress it to their minds, how different from the attitude of those who make a great ^{victory} ~~mystery~~ and then say the thing's done, we've won, we've conquered, the world is safe for democracy, let's tear up our battleships and

forget about it. He realized that in this world every battle has to be fought over and over till our Lord comes back. You do not win a conclusive victory in this world. You overcome the evil and it begins to come up again in another way, because we're in a world of sin and there's sin in the heart of each one of us and the (13 3/4)

and we can't fight them all at once. We have to see what the Lord's will is for us at a particular time and go forward on that, and keep exhorting one another as Joshua did here, to stand true. Now ~~if~~ ^{that} we can lose our salvation, but that we can easily fall into a situation or an attitude in which our lives will accomplish very, very little for the Lord's cause. And so we have this great exhortation in here to the people and he says that they can choose what they will but he is going to choose the Lord. And they declare that they will do the same. He repeatedly makes them declare their intention to stand by the Lord.

O.T.History 236. ($\frac{1}{4}$)

...time and again in organizations where I have said well now this organization stands for this, let us make ~~a cleavage and~~ ^{it clean} and strong. Oh, everybody knows that, that's what we've always stood for, there's no question about it. Why do we need to reiterate that? Before I was here I was on the faculty of a different institution at one time, and we had a discussion at a faculty meeting about our entrance requirements for the next year. We had a certain financial situation which made it necessary to discuss them, and to discuss certain things, and in the particular situation there were things in the arrangement made that no one of the faculty liked. They actually, out of a faculty of 8 there were only two votes for the arrangement at the end. None of the others, I think it was one vote, I don't think another person voted. But nobody ^{voted} ~~was~~ against it so it was passed. Everybody there had things in that they didn't like. But they didn't know anything better to do under the circumstances so they were quiet and let the thing be adopted but they didn't vote. But when they were discussing it, I said at

one point, I'd like this written in, here's a section I don't like at all, I'd like this written into it, it being understood that these arrangements apply only to the academic year 1933-34 and the chairman says why we know the whole thing is just for 1933 and 34. It has nothing to do with any subsequent year, why put that in there. Well, I said I don't like this particular thing, I can put up with it for one year but I'd like that written in so it's understood. All right, if you'd like it we'll put it in, so they put it in, it being understood. And for the next four years that thing stood and was never questioned. I was gone before ^{four years} that, I don't know, it may have stood for thirty years for all I know, but I know that as long as I was there the whole thing stood. ~~Yes~~ This was the established rule of the Medes and Persians. Even though it was explicitly stated in it, it being understood that it was for only that year.

Well, it's so easy for people to change their minds, so easy. Joshua came and presented these things to them and called upon them to consider and it is a mighty good thing for us to do for ourselves and for those with whom we are associated. Get back to first principles and consider the first principles and when you get into a big struggle over some temporary issue, something which has arisen, which is important and has got to be dealt with, and it may take two years, five years, ten years, twenty years before this thing is settled, nevertheless, ^{keep} getting back to first principles, getting the main things that are of all things vital, that you don't forget them, in order to handle your immediate situation, for it is so very easy to do.

And so these two chapters of exhortation as Joshua gave to the people and the way he made them repeatedly pledge that they would stand for the Lord, probably resulted in their standing true a little true than they would have otherwise, and were a vital factor in the Lord's work. Well, that covers then the book of Joshua. That was number 7.

And number ~~8~~ ^{VIII}, instead of (3 3/4) calling it the period, no I guess I will call it The ~~a-couple~~ Book of the Judges. I'd thought of calling it the Period of the Judges, because the period runs over into the book of Samuel, and yet there are special problems relating to the book of Judges and so perhaps it might be good to make the heading ~~eight~~ ^{VIII},

VIII. The Book of the Judges) be limited to one book. But the book of judges then, number

A, under that, is Introduction. This book of judges is a book which includes some of the best known sections of the Bible, and some of the least known sections of the Bible. There are chapters in it that are practically never discussed, practically never mentioned in churches or in Sundays schools or in Bible classes, and there are chapters ^{in it} which are mentioned repeatedly and which are constantly dealt with. It is a very uneven section of the Bible, a section uneven in its interest, and as I mentioned a few minutes ago, the book of Judges is the darkest period in the history of Israel. It is the darkest period, it is the period of which we know the least. There are certain points in it of which we know a great deal but many of which we know very little.

Now, number 1, under introductory, there seems to have been no established continuous political organization in this period. No established continuous political organization in this period. Now that is the impression you get from the book, you read this man judges Israel so many years, this man judged Israel so many years, and the word judge does not mean simply that he dealt with cases, it deals with, covers more than that, more than our English word covers. He was a leader, he was a rescuer, he was a military leader, he was much more than just somebody who had to have a settler of cases brought before him. And yet it is hard to tell just what the limit of his authority was. There's much reason to think that it was quite limited, and we find in chapter 17:6 the statement is made, in those days there was no king in Israel but every man did that which was right in his own eyes. And the same verse is repeated in chapters 21 and 25. In those days there was no king in Israel, every man did that which was right in his own eyes. Well, if every man would do what was right, if every man was really doing what was right in his own eyes and would spend a bit of time clearing out his eyes so he could see fairly well, you'd have a fairly decent community, but there are plenty of people who do not try to clarify their ideas of what is right--I don't think we can take this, every man did what was right in his own eyes as meaning what was righteous, it means what he chose to do. Every man did what he chose to do, if he was a good man and what he chose to do was good, and if he was a bad man what he chose to do might be very evil. Every man did what was right in his eyes. What he wanted to do rather than what he, after careful consider-

ation, decided was a true and upright thing to do. Well, that's the reason we have to have political authority is because people don't see what's right and people don't do what they see that's right. And in this period we have a great deal of confusion and some of the chapters in this are very bad in the account of the events that occur, but some of them are wonderful examples of loyalty to the Lord and of following him very closely. In this book we have evidence the law existed, the people knew God's law, many of them tried to follow it very definitely, others did not. You have two examples, we have Samson, who lived in many ways quite an immoral life, Samson who in utter disregard to God's command, married a Philistine woman, an ungodly woman, and risked his life in his living with her as he did until finally she succeeded in ^{ferreting} ~~carrying~~ out this secret and eventually in destroying him. We have Jephthah who was described as a near-do-well, a man of rather wicked type, sort of an outlaw, but when the people came to him for help, he became a rescuer and a judge. And both of these men strangely are named in the New Testament in the great heroes of faith. It's a pretty good evidence of the fact that the heroes of faith were not perfect men, no man is perfect except the Lord Jesus Christ. And Jephthah and Samson were men who were very, very imperfect, and even Gideon built an ephod which became a snare to the people, which they came to worship. But Gideon and Jephthah and Samson are named in the heroes of faith, because to a point at least they followed the Lord with single heart, or rather at a certain time of their life they did, and the Lord used them and used their efforts. And of course we have other characters in the scriptures who are far, far better than any one of these three, but these were heroes of faith, they were men whom the Lord used, that doesn't mean certainly that the Lord is going to rate them higher than many other men who were far better characters, but who lived in a period when a hero of conquest wasn't necessary and who consequently do not display the particular qualities these men do. We'll continue there tomorrow morning. Yes? (student.10¹)

(12)...Took up Judges at the end of the hour and the book of Judges, A, Introductory, number 1, there seems to have been no established continuous political organization in this period. Guess that seems a little bit long ^{strong}. There would seem to have been a

continuous ecclesiastical headship, though very little is said about it. The prophets were raised up here and there, as God called a man from one area and in other areas, but the priesthood would seem to have continued, it's ~~not~~ ^{hardly} mentioned during the book, but at the beginning of ~~the~~ 1 Samuel we find ~~Eli~~ the high priest at Shiloh, the place which Joshua tells us was established as the ecclesiastical head of the land, and we find Eli there carrying on the sacrifices, and it would seem a reasonable assumption that it had been carried on at Shiloh all through the long period of the book of Judges. But there's very little evidence in the book of Judges bearing directly on that. It deals, not with the affairs of the priesthood but with the affairs of the political situation, and of the prophets and of the deliverance of Israel from the oppression into which they fell.

Number 2, I mentioned yesterday, yet the law existed and judges ruled irregularly. We are not told of a political continuous organization, but we are told the various judges, that he judged Israel 40 years, he judged Israel 20 years, and so on, and the word judges as used here does not mean simply settle cases, it means more than that, it means also directing their life, particularly as regards here protection against enemies. And then number 3, The book has a succession of cycles. It has a succession of ~~series~~ ^{cycles}; of apostasies, oppressions, penalties, deliverances. These four stages appear over and over and over in the book of Joshua. The people fall into sin, they forget the Lord. The Lord permits a foreign enemy to conquer them. The people in captivity call out in anguish to the Lord for help and repent of their sins, the Lord sends a deliverer. This cycle appears in Judges over and over and over. The principle of the book of Judges would seem to be quite clear. The main purpose to impress upon our minds (14 3/4)

It is quite evident that the book was not written to give us victory in the ordinary sense, not as if someone were to write a book to list the presidents of the United States and tell of their main accomplishments and of their relations one to the other...

O.T. History 237. ($\frac{1}{4}$)

...give a list of political leaders and their relationship to each other. It is not that you might have, that the purpose was to show how the United States gained freedom

from Great Britain and how it became established as a nation. Such a title might refer to Joshua but not to Judges. Judges, the deliverances in it are very important, but they are not the main purpose of the book. The book is very clear, to show Israel's relation to God and how they fell into ~~apostasy~~, how the Lord permitted them to be taken captive and oppressed, how they repented and how the Lord delivered them. And this cycle is repeated over and over. Who wrote the book we do not know, there is no statement in it to say who wrote it. The critics used to talk about the Pentateuch, but they never refer to the Pentateuch any more, they usually refer to the Hexateuch, including Joshua, but some of them talk of an Octateuch including eight books and one of those is Judges. They think that various documents they ^{claim} find in the Pentateuch run on to these books. Now in the case of the five books of Moses, we can say we believe Moses wrote these books, the New Testament refers to them as the work of Moses, but there is so far as I know no evidence anywhere to say who wrote the book of Judges. I would think that the one who wrote the book of Judges doubtless had records telling him a good many facts about these different tribes and facts about the, about various judges, doubtless had heard a good deal by word of mouth. And as he wrote the Holy Spirit inspired, kept him from error, guided him in the selection of his material and in his arrangement. But his purpose in arranging it was not specifically to give us political history in the ordinary sense. His purpose was to tell us of their relation with God. And so I believe he had in mind very, very strongly this cycle of apostasy, oppression, penitence and deliverance, because it is repeated so often in the book. That he had this in mind as an important feature of God's dealing with his people and that he was interested in giving illustrations of it and showing us how it had worked out. And this then is, I would say, the outlook, the outlying plan, the general purpose of the author of the book. Of course it's true of the whole testament, the purpose of the Old Testament is not to give us a history of Israel, it is to tell us about God's dealings with mankind. Israel is very important in this purpose, but it's not the real purpose, it is incidental to it, though very, very important. But the purpose is to tell us God's relations with his people, not to give us a political history on the basis of which we can reconstruct

details of chronology, to know what, ~~to do~~ how can we know what the dates are, of course dates are purely a modern invention. But to say how many years, then, exactly before the time of Christ, to show the exact relationship chronologically to each other of the events, to show exactly what conditions were in every part of the land at any particular time, that's not the purpose of the book, the purpose is to show their relation to the Lord, and how the Lord dealt with his people. So this cycle is very, very important, and it is important for us of course to study the book as a book of history, but it is still more important that we study it as a book of God's dealings with man, and that we get from it the many spiritual lessons ~~for man~~ which are there which he wants us to have, and which we will look at some of as we go along, but we will not have time to look at more than a fraction of them because ^{after all} this is a course in Old Testament History, and while the spiritual lessons are more important than the history by far, yet the spiritual lessons, many, many of them are quite easy to get by oneself, and in some cases when they are not, they are much more easily gotten if one has an idea of the background or skeleton of the history. We are dealing, you might say, in this course, in many portions of the course, mainly with material that is less important than the spiritual lesson, but that is helpful to get the spiritual lessons, therefore has a derived importance of great moment, because of the light it may show on the spiritual lessons. So much then for 3, the cycles that are in this book of Judges.

Now B. The Chronology of ~~What~~ the Period. You have listed from the references I gave you, you have listed the statement which you find here about early judges and how long they ruled and here (5 3/4) and adding these statements together you cannot get an exact sum because we're not told how long Joshua lived, after the conquest. We're not told how long the conquest took. We're not told how long the elders ruled after Joshua before the people fell into apostasy. But then after that we have a number of dates. We have dates when the people were in bondage, we have dates when the land had rest, we have dates when certain men ruled as prophets. And if we add all these dates together, you get a, if you add all the dates together that you can figure from the account, you get a list that runs you up to nearly

six hundred years, somewhere between five and six hundred years, and if you figure that back from the time of David and Solomon ^{at the beginning of the period,} you would get the Exodus at about 1600 B.C. and I don't of anybody who has ever taught the Exodus took place in 1600 B.C. Those who take the early dates think it was nearer 1400, those who take the late dates think it was about 1250. But I know of no one who thinks it is as early as this. If the Bible clearly said the Exodus is about 1600 B.C. I would have no question but when we get complete evidence, if we ever do, we will find that it is correct, that this was true. But the only evidence on which to make such a long period for the period of Judges is adding these dates up one after another. It does not fit with evidence from other sources, it does not fit with Biblical statements, such as the one in 1 Kings 6:1 where it says that it was 480 years after the coming out of Egypt that Solomon dedicated the temple. It is about a hundred years less than you get if you simply add all these figures together. And so it seems to me that as far as the chronology is concerned we have to ask the question did the Lord intend to give us a complete chronology which the figures could quickly be added together and give us precise chronological history for this period. We notice how many, many of these are forty years. The land had rest forty years, he reigned forty years. Now forty in the first place sounds like a round number, now it may not be, and man may rule exactly forty years. There's no reason in the world why it cannot be exactly 40 years. But when you have a series of them, and you note that ordinarily in life that these things do not run exactly the same, ordinarily there is more variation. You have this series, you wonder in the first place whether the 40 is a round number in a good many cases, and another thing you wonder whether 40 might even more than that, you might say would be a rounder round number. That is to say the figure 40 is often used for testing. A period of testing is often suggested by the number 40. Now did he mean here to say, I don't think when he says Solomon reigned 40, that David reigned 40 years, that he means there was a period of testing of 40 years, I think that's the length of time David reigned. I don't think there's any question of that, but when you have a whole series of ^{Judges of whom} ~~questions~~ and variable detail is given, except ^{their} ~~these~~ fitting into this cycle of deliverance and oppression, and in case after case they reigned 40

years or the land had rest 40 years, the question well may be asked does he mean a precise period of 40 years or does he mean there was a long period in which this was the case. I don't think we can answer the question, I don't think we can ^{say} that they did not reign exactly 40 years each. I think it is extremely unlikely it means exactly 40 to the day, it might be $39\frac{1}{2}$ or $40\frac{1}{2}$, ^{in fact} it might be 37, 38, or 43 or 44, but whether you can go further than that, I don't know. I merely call attention to the number of 40's with an occasional 20 which is half of 40, and which would fit into this general method of speaking if that is what is meant here. Now that I simply mention as a point on which we cannot speak with certainty, but I think we must notice it, and another thing is that, I think is equally important with this as I have already mentioned, that if we add the dates together, it gives you a period which seems to be much longer than fit together without evidence from other sources in the Bible ($11\frac{1}{2}$)

And so my personal opinion is that on the chronology of the period we just ^{have} ~~can~~ not been given by the Lord in the book the evidence on which to build up an at all complete chronology, we just do not know. And I believe that the reason for this, aside from what I've already mentioned about the possibility of local judges we've mentioned here that two other factors may well be mentioned. One of them is that it is entirely possible, in fact I think extremely probably, that many of these judges were local judges rather than completely national judges. That is to say that ~~when~~ Othniel, the first of the judges, who lived in the extreme southern part of Judah, ~~may~~ ^{have} ruled over Judah, possibly over a somewhat larger area, rather than necessarily over the whole nation. And then we have a series of judges who are mostly in the northern section and we have some who are over in Transjordan. To how great an extent these were men who ruled over the whole country, and to how great an extent they were men who delivered a particular section of the country which had been overrun by an enemy and delivered and moved in that section, I don't think we're in a position to say, so it is altogether possible that two of these judges may have been operating at the same time in different parts of the country or even three, on certain occasions, though probably not as a rule. This of course is a matter again of the purpose of the book. If the Lord had intended to give us a one-two-

three chronological account that we could tell exactly what happened in what year right straight through, I think he would have added further detail in order to (13½)

on which to establish that for a certainty, and would have given us ^{detail} ~~else-~~ elsewhere in the Bible on which to feel definitely that this is a six-hundred year period, from the Exodus to the building of the Temple, rather than the only other statement we have about it says 408, which again some people notice is 1240 and wonder whether it is to some extent a round number. Personally, I hesitate very much about saying a thing like that about a number of stories, I hesitate very much about it, but it is an isolated number, we have no other reference to it anywhere, no other evidence that fits in with it, I never like to build an argument on one verse of scripture by itself. I feel that there is always a possibility of an error in any one verse. I think it is a slight possibility, I think the Bible has been wonderfully well preserved, but there are cases I could point to a good many cases where there is absolute proof where an error has occurred in one verse, like where you read about Ben-Hadad in one book and Ben-Hader in another one. Now his name was not ^{spelt} Ben-Hadad ~~nd~~ and then Hader particularly when we know that Hadad was the god of the Syrians and Ben-Hadad was from Hadad...

O.T. History 238. (¼)

...for the others. But we have only those inscriptions where he's called Ben-Hadad, but it certainly wasn't Ben-Hader. To change a d to an r is the simplest thing in the world in copying in Hebrew because the two letters were so much alike that very often on your own papers it's hard to tell which they are, and I always when I teach Hebrew try to get students to always write their d so that there is a line across up there and always to make (1) *the resh* but most make it like this, or more like this, or it's very hard to be sure which it is. And that is a fault in students which I did my best to correct when I taught beginning Hebrew but there was no possibility of my getting back and reaching the writers of Hebrew in ancient times with my ideas on the subject, and you find that the writers of ancient Hebrew and Aramaic both, in their writings, quite generally write (1½) *the daleth and the resh*

in such a way that it is very, very difficult sometimes to tell which is which. And so there are more variations in the Bible text between dalet and resh than anything else that I know of. There are cases where you read the Septuagint text and you compare it to Hebrew and it sounds like two entirely different things. You think there's no relation whatever between the two statements. But you take the Greek and the Septuagint ~~and~~ in some of these cases and you translate it back into Hebrew and you find that it can represent a word which is identical with the word we have in the Hebrew ~~except~~ for ^a the dalet and a resh. And when it does ^{that can't} you ~~can't~~ be sure whether the manuscript the Greek was translated from had had an error in copying or whether the one that ours has been copied from had had an error in copying. We (2 $\frac{1}{4}$)

I would say that probably the Hebrew is correct rather than the Greek, but not necessarily. There doubtless are cases where the dalet and resh have been confused in our Hebrew manuscripts since the time when the Greek was taken. And so we have many cases where there is one verse in which a slight error has come in, and I think the Lord intentionally caused it to be that way. Because it is very, very easy for you to take a sentence out of any book and on that sentence to build up dogmatic statements which you're building on a sentence which were never intended to be in the sentence. And I think it is the Lord's will that we compare scripture with scripture and have more than one verse for everything that we feel at all dogmatic on. So when we read only in one case in the Old Testament that it was 480 years I would say well probably that is correct, unless I find some evidence which differs from it. If I found it is repeated two or three times, I would say definitely it is correct, I have no question in the world that it is. But when I find it only once it may be incorrect, I will accept it as correct unless there is some evidence against it. Now I find the judges listed here run into 570 years, contradicting it and that raises some question about it, then I find archeological ~~evidence~~ which lead most archeologists today to think the conquest was about somewhere around 1230 or 1200 B.C. which would make the period around 250 years instead of 480 and I say it's only the one verse. I don't like the (4 $\frac{1}{2}$) saying it's 1240. Seems to me that is reasonable to consider with the 140, especially when you

have a lot of them in different verses. But when you have a number like that, 1240, I don't think that is a great (4 $\frac{1}{2}$) I would prefer not to use that of course, if I can help it, I don't say it's impossible, there may be a figure somewhere that's meant that way, but I think it unlikely. But it is an isolated number and it may be exactly right and we may find evidence that it is exactly right sometime. But at present I do not feel that we can stand upon it, I feel that we can say what does the evidence look (5) and the present, the external evidence that we have in my opinion, looks about 60% in favor of the date between 1250 and 1200. That's not enough to feel that it's established, it may very well be that the earlier date will become established, but it is enough to I think lead us not to be dogmatic.

At any rate with the 40 or with any date that archeology seems to fit with, you cannot get all these judges one right after the other. And the evidence of the judges, many of them being local judges as far as any evidence goes, seems to me to be very reasonable that it was not a period when the whole land was under one king. The judge came more or less spontaneously into position, people recognizing his wisdom, needing a leader and they come from different sections of the land, and my guess^{is} that they are many of them active in a certain section rather than in the whole country. Yes? (student. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$) Yes, it sounds like the whole nation, judging Israel, but I think it could be used of judging a substantial portion of it. As a matter of fact, when you get on into the time of David, after Solomon's time, the land of Israel is divided into two parts, and the northern part is regularly called Israel, although they both were Israel. And after the northern is taken into captivity then the southern part is regularly called Israel, and in between we generally call the southern part Judah to distinguish it from the northern part. We often call, that is, that is a case where Israel was definitely used of one part when of course there was a specific political division. Now that isn't proof that it could be ~~this is~~ this way but I think it suggests (7 $\frac{1}{2}$) Yes?

(student. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$) Yes, that's right, and it may be that it was exactly three hundred years, it may be. But I personally hesitate about putting too much weight on Jephthah's statement. For one thing, we have no evidence that they had, that they were maintaining pre-

else records there to know exactly how many years it was, Jephthah was a rather ^{wild} sort of a fellow whom they had called to be leader. He was called out to give this talk when he said 300. Had he consulted evidence to get the exact time. Does he mean 300 years or does he mean centuries? Jesus was three days and three nights in the grave. Most protestants believe, and most Christians believe, not all but most that when it says three days and three nights, it means three periods, each of which period is called a day and a night, and ^{not} that it's three whole but that it's parts of three periods. Most of us observe the remembrance of his death on Friday. That is a tradition which goes back to the very early days of the Christian church. It may be wrong, but there's no proof that it's wrong. Most interpreters believe that when he was three days and nights in the grave it means a portion of three twenty-four periods. And actually the portion in that case was so small that the total is less than two 24-hour periods, but it was a part of one and part of the other. Now what I mean to say is that a century, you say the United States has been here for two centuries. Well, I guess you'd say that's now, from 1776 -- it's getting near, about 15 years short. We'd say two centuries, we wouldn't be apt to figure the exact number of years when we speak in centuries. If somebody said it is 212 years since the United States was established, we wouldn't mean it is 227 years, but if we say 200 years, we're using round numbers. Now it is possible that we may find that that period of which Jephthah speaks in his talk with the king of the Ammonites was exactly a 300 year period. It is possible, but personally I'll be rather surprised if we find it works ^{out} that way. Yes? (student.10 $\frac{1}{2}$) Well, I just don't know. I just personally don't feel like contradicting all the evidence of archeology on the strength of a statement of Jephthah in a heated argument with this king when he was starting to deliver them and had no time for research, for investigation, or anything like that. And especially a statement of round numbers. Now if Jephthah had said, it's 272 years, something like that, I would feel that surely the Holy Spirit would not have preserved to us the precise number that he used unless that precise number was correct. But I incline to think that the 300 years means three centuries, that's it's just his way of saying it's a long time ago. Yes? (student.11 $\frac{1}{2}$) 450, yes. Yes, now this

statement in Kings is 480 from the Exodus to the time then. This statement from Acts says 450 years from the end of the conquest, that's 40 short on that end, up to when? Till Samuel the prophet, and so that would make it not 480 but nearer 600 wouldn't it? That wouldn't fit with the 480 statement in Kings at all. You'd have to say that either that or the statement of 480 is not a precise statement. But we'd better not take time on this, this is a matter that (student.13. I was thinking that it's possible that a judge could rise in a local area and then later become recognized in the whole, have jurisdiction over the whole, and appeals be made to him from other portions, which he would (13 $\frac{1}{4}$) and then when his history was made up, his history would state his total judgeship ~~from~~ⁱⁿ the other (13 $\frac{1}{2}$) from the time of its beginning, and that would overlap that other judgeship where another man would be rising up in another portion of the country and these would overlap.) That's an interesting suggestion. The suggestion of Mr. Shellabarger as I understand it is this, that these judges were recognized throughout the land but maybe not for a very long time, and if the period of their judgeship is their ruling in their local area, which periods might very well overlap. Now that is entirely possible and a very interesting suggestion. But (13 $\frac{3}{4}$) mentioned here, the possibility that ^{some} have suggested that these are inclusive figures. That is to say that when it speaks of the men who judge Israel so long, it does not just include the period after the deliverance but also includes the period before the deliverance, the period when they were under the hands of the enemy, that the figures may be inclusive figures in that sense. There's But you can't add them all up, one below the other, but in some cases one of them, the figures you have in your list, include another one, dealing with the same period. And that is (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

I don't think you could make that as a rule with all these judges. It certainly is a possibility in some cases. Personally I could take a month studying these figures of the judges, studying all such figures in the Bible, trying to work out a precise chronology through this period, trying to fit them together and decide whether to consider these two overlap or these don't, which ones might be (15) for a part of the time and which not, and so on, and work up a system after...

impression of the situation, that I feel that I should do far more in the Lord's service at present, spending that month, working on other matters, which I feel will advance the Lord's cause more. That is to say if the Lord should bring us further evidence to relate to it, it might be well worth someone's time taking up what is left afterwards. (1) But I don't think we have enough evidence at present to bring us a worth while conclusion on it. My feeling at present is that we have figures, some of which are round numbers, some of which overlap, some of which are either in part or in whole, logical in judgship, and that the Lord simply has not given us the material toward a complete and a correct chronology on this. The same thing is true of the archaeologist. The archaeologists have constructed a system upon which they give us rather precise dates for a great many events. There are many points at which their evidence is water tight. There are other points, at which their evidence rests upon building a great deal upon a little bit of evidence. In some cases, these conclusions which are built upon a very small amount of evidence affects only one city or one particular area. In other parts, they may affect the whole period. It takes a great deal of study to know exactly where these points are, where there have been inferences and guesses without sufficient evidence on which really to base anything. There is not sufficient evidence as yet to prove that their general conclusions are right, or are wrong. I see no point at present, in trying to maintain that they are wrong. We may very well ~~genu~~ get new evidence from archaeology which will change or clarify things very greatly. But when the Biblical evidence that we have upon the matter is quite scanty at present, and the little we have based ~~an~~ a number of cases on only one statement, it is very differently put together, and there are places where ~~it~~ just ~~is~~ not ~~so~~. The Old Testament no where tells us ~~where~~ ^{how long} Saul reigned. We have this statement in Acts that says he reigned 40 years. But the Old Testament no where gives us evidence on that, and it certainly does not give us evidence on the length of Joshua's reign. Then we have this evidence that the Lord did not give it to this (3) I think that as far as this class is concerned, the important thing to have in mind, is what the situation is, that in the light of present archaeological discovery, there is a great deal of evidence which could fit with an exile, about 12 - with a conquest, somewhere between 1230 and 1200 BC. And that if we get more evidence from archaeology fitting in with this

evidence, enough to make it seem almost water tight; if that is the case, I do not believe we can have any Biblical statement that flatly and sharply is sufficient to say this is what the Bible says. All of the archaeologists may say this, but I'm convinced they are wrong.

On the other hand, we have a little archaeological evidence which would fit with a somewhat earlier date. And a somewhat earlier date would fit with this date 480 years, which is given in I Kings. But it would be very difficult to fit that figure of 480 years in I Kings there in with the 450 years statement in Acts. We would have to do some juggling, (I don't mean juggling in a bad sense), but some not taking it in a straight literal way, to fit it into that, and at present the evidence for an earlier period in Exodus has many serious questions, though it may prove to be right. And then it may prove that the statement in Kings, there is wrong, the 480, and somewhere in the archaeological history there is a big gap, of something the archaeologists have overlooked, and the whole thing can be moved back long enough to make the period of Judges 600 years. That also is not impossible, but it would seem to me very unlikely, and it would seem to me, also unlikely, from the Biblical viewpoint, that our big evidence, that is in the Bible, is God's bringing the people into the land, and then of David's leading of them, David the man after God's own heart, and the dealings with the people during the Kingship, are so specifically detailed in so much of it, that this period which took comparatively little given , was such a very long period, twice as long as the whole kingship, and so little given on it, would hardly seem what you would expect in line with the general plan of God. Now that doesn't prove it is wrong, but I think that as far as chronology is concerned, we just do not know. I feel that the purpose of the book of the Judges is to show how God dealt with His people. To give us vital lessons of individual judges and their relation to God and to the people, to show us how wonderfully God delivered on certain occasions, and to show us a general idea of the progress between Joshua and the time when he begins to give us far more detail about Samuel, Saul, David, and the rest. So much then for this question, chronology of the period on which I feel that as we say that we must simply say, we do not know, the Lord has not told us.

C. The Completion of the Conquest. Now this C is a glance at several sections. As you read Joshua 10, and the chapters just before it, you would easily get the impression that the whole land was conquered, and was at their mercy. The Canaanites were done for. You would get that impression, and then you start Judges and you find there is much land yet to be conquered. In fact, the Lord even says that to them when they begin the division of the land. He doesn't say to them in Joshua after the Conquest, here is the land. It is all in your hands. Take it. He says there is much land to be conquered. Now divide it up. In other words, let each tribe take on the individual responsibility for mopping up in its own area, now that the backbone of the opposition ~~is~~ has been broken by the great campaigns of Joshua. But the beginning of Judges tells us that the different tribes failed to drive out the Canaanites from certain big cities. There were others who take this area, that area, and the other area. There is a great deal of the land which was not - they were not able to take, and it wasn't until the very end of the period of the Judges that they did succeed in taking it, or it was still later than that. A good many of the critical scholars ~~are~~ today will say, here are two stories flatly contradicting each other. Joshua says the whole land was conquered. Judges says, there is a good deal of it not yet conquered. They say the story in Judges must be a rapid summary of the whole thing, while Judges is more in detail, and actually instead of it occurring in a few years, it was spread over several hundred years. Personally I think that is wrong. I don't think that is the correct approach to it. I believe the account in Joshua describes one great conquest, but in the light of the rest of Joshua and of Judges, I think we have to say this - this is not a conquest, which was complete in the sense that the Canaanites were done for and everything was in their hands, but it was a conquest which broke the back of the opposition, which conquered many of these cities, but they did not have enough garrison or organization to hold them and the people drifted back into them, and they had to be taken over again by the local tribe.

(Question: Isn't that exactly parallel to our trouble in Korea?) There is a certain analogy there. Of course there are other factors that enter in, such as the Chinese communists coming in. There is an analogy there. I think there is a definite analogy to a certain extent there.

(Question:) Well, the analogy has its strong points and its weak points, but fortunately there was no United Nations at the time. The compension of the Conquest though is interesting to notice, that at the beginning of ~~the~~ Judges there is still a great deal that needs to be conquered. And it wasn't all conquered by any means. And when you get to the very end of Joshua you find a strong Fortress in the very heart of the land, held by the Canaanites, a Jebusite~~s~~ Fortress, and it continued so during the whole time of Samuel and during the reign of Saul, who was only about 5 miles south of Saul's capital. Saul's capital at Gibeah, just about 5 miles south of it you have this fortress of Jerusalem, which remained unconquered. And it remained unconquered until David becomes king, and David says, I'm going to conquer Jerusalem, and the people then are still strong enough, that they say, the lame and the blind can protect this city so your men can't get in it. But David, the great military conquerer, conquered Jerusalem. But this great central city worthy to be the capital of the land, remained right in the heart there unconquered all through the period of the Judges, and through the reign of Saul. And there is no evidence of any strong effort to take it. Now Joshua says it was conquered. But it was there of course. So either Joshua was wrong, which I don't believe to be the case at all, or the force from Jerusalem was conquered but the city was not held, and the people came back and reestablished it. Well, the completion of the conquest then - it was not complete until into the time of David. However, I think it is important to note at this position that it was ^{complicated} ~~manifested~~ by a new factor. The Israelites conquered the Canaanites. We have no mention of Joshua, of any conflict between them and the Philistines. And archaeologists do not believe that there were any Philistines in the land, at all, at the time of Joshua. And consequently from their viewpoint, it is a mark of genuineness, and authenticity on the part of Joshua, that it does not describe any conflicts with Philistines. They went in to conquer the land from the Canaanites. And they conquered the Canaanites. But at some time between the time of Joshua and the time of Daniel, the Philistines came into the land. Now archaeologists believe they can tell us when they came into the land, because at around 1200 B.C. or a little later, we have in Egypt an account of the great attack upon Egypt by the people called the people of the sea.

And these people of the Sea attacked Egypt by sea and land, and were driven back. And there are many reasons, why archaeologists believe that a strong component of these people of the sea, was the people which we call the Philistines. And that these Philistines, driven back from Egypt, settled on the coastal area of Southern Palestine. There is certainly no evidence that they were there a hundred years before that. That the Egyptian references to the area speak of the Canaanites there before that time. But now we find that the Philistines landing there, as we've seen, and establishing themselves. And in the early part of the book of Judges, you don't read about the Philistines. But in the latter part the Philistines become the primary force with which they have to reckon. And it would seem that when the Philistines came in, the Philistines were enemies of the Canaanites, just as much as the Israelites were. In fact there are even some who think that the two were friendly in their time. We have no evidence of that, so that is purely a guess. But at any rate, it wasn't long before the Philistines proceeded to take the Israelites into subjection to themselves. And in the story of Samuel is the story of a time when the Philistines held most of the land in subjection all through the period of Samuel. Samuel was going about from place to place among the people who were under constant oppression from the Philistines. And after Samuel we find Saul always facing a great Philistine danger, and eventually destroyed by the Philistines, and yet David isn't king very long before the Philistines almost disappear as a menace. We have them referred to occasionally later, but they seem to disappear just like that, as far as an important menace is conered. They are such a tremendously important force and yet they are not very important (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) and in a very short time ^{why} by this quick change? The ~~an~~ idea of archaeologists is that the Philistines were a people who were not very numerous, that they were not a great numerous people like the Canaanites. They were comparatively small people numerically, far less of them than of the Israelites, but the Philistines came from a land to the west, where they had discovered the use of iron, and that the Philistines knew how to make iron weapons. And from our archaeological effects from this period of the knowledge of this time, we begin to find iron agriculture in Palestine.

... the Judges, for a long period because of their superior weapons. And then that after David was down among the Philistines, lived with them and worked with them, for a time he learned the secret of the handling of the iron, and the making of weapons, and after David became king, before long the Israelites had just as many iron weapons as the Philistines, and with equal weapons and far superior numbers, the Philistines ceased to be a vital menace, from that time on. In King's they are mentioned, but there are many other people mentioned just as much or more. Now this is not purely an extra-Biblical theory. In I Samuel 3: 19-22, we have statements which throw great light upon this situation and upon which this situation throws great light. That's only about four verses, our time is up for this morning, so maybe at the beginning of this afternoon hour, some of you can tell me, through writing or orally, just what light I ~~Sam~~ Samuel 13:19-22 throw upon the situation I have just described.

O.T. History. 240. (2½)

First part of the hour is taken up with a test.

Now the decision that I made about the Philistines, about their effectiveness being due to their, despite their small number, their use of iron weapons. You note that this was borne out by these four verses. It is a very interesting case. Where we have an extremely important fact in cultural history, and military history, which is not discussed in the Bible, but is just barely touched upon in another purpose here, to show how it came about that Jonathan and Saul had armour and the rest didn't. So why was that? Your reason was, because the Philistines were in the place where you had to get the armour. You had to get the strong iron weapons from them, and naturally they wouldn't give them to equip the Israelites to fight them with. They had more sense than some modern nations do in that regard. But at the same time, the leaders, the king and his eldest son, naturally they couldn't refuse to give it to them. That we find in modern times too. The leaders can always get ahold of that. They are almost sure to be given that, as an honor when they come together in times of peace, but it was kept from the people here. Mr. Shellabarger.

5½ (Question: In addition to that, they could have taken them as trophies of warfare, and they would always go up to the king wouldn't they?) Yes, that would have been another way they could have gotten it. Naturally, as Mr. Shellabarger says, they might ~~be~~ ^{have} captured some and if they did, naturally the King would have the first chance.

Yes, Mr. Haffly? (I kind of doubt if they have weapons that the rest don't have, ~~because~~ ^{that} they are going to give it over to the other side, even to the king. We don't give our atomic bomb over to another country.) Yes, well, this here is the secret of making it. You mean we shouldn't give it over. We should not have given it over. Yes, Mr. Kang. (Question!) That was a good guess that somebody made 80 years ago. Ellicott's commentary is a good commentary and it has excellent suggestions on many points, but if you get particularly into anything dealing with archaeology it was written before the discovery was made, and consequently in that area you might just find just guesswork. And that would be a pretty good guess, ~~but~~ before we realize that iron was just beginning to come in before we excavated cities and towns that they did not have iron until about the time and then they begin to have agricultural ~~manan~~ implements before they have - it is an important thing to have in mind about commentaries. A good exegetical or spiritual commentary can be 200 years old and be very, very excellent. But when you deal with archaeological matters or anything like that, it has to be reasoned, or naturally it does not have material in that line. Yes, Mr. Deshpande.

(Question!) Yes, that's right. That is, Tubalcain is spoken of as having iron and copper weapons and that of course is a real difficulty in the acceptance of this part of Genesis, because it is perfectly clear that it was very long after the flood before iron or copper weapons were used. But it is on the understanding that what happened before the flood, is lost to us. We have no remains of it. It was not, Noah and his sons would not have had that knowledge, that we understand, that high culture in this regard, before the flood, because after the flood, according to any estimate of the time, there would have been at least a thousand years after the flood, before iron weapons were used. I say it may have been 10,000 years. But they had it before, but afterwards, it was just about 1200 B.C. that iron began to come in. About 3000 years when copper began to come in. But the iron weapons were just at this time they were coming in. We have another trace of the coming of iron at the time, in one of the books of the Pentateuch, which is something which is not, which used to be considered by the critics as a proof of that Moses didn't write it. And that was the statement that Og had an iron bedstead. Well now, why bother to mention that this

king had an iron bedstead. You wouldn't bother to mention that Hitler had an iron bedstead, but the thing was that it was not known at that time. It was not used. This king had a rare treasure, which he had secured which was just in advance, of the coming in of the use of the iron. He secured the bedstead but he certainly did not have knowledge of how to handle iron or to forge it together or to make weapons with it. But it is just a trace of the beginning of its time.

Well, these verses, maybe we should glance at them, a little more fully, although I think we've covered everything that is vital in them. We read in them that there was no smith in all the land of Israel, for the Philistines said, lest the Hebrews make them swords or spears. Now that Ellicott, whoever wrote this chapter in Ellicott, writing 80 years ago, would read this, the Philistines said, lest the Hebrews make them swords or spears. That's why there was no smith found throughout the land of Israel. And this commentator a hundred years ago or a little less, would say well, the Philistines destroyed the smiths, they said, lest they make swords or spears they'll just destroy them. That would be a natural interpretation. But it is not the correct interpretation. The correct interpretation is that they didn't have smiths because the Philistines didn't let them learn that. Incidentally it ~~was~~ would not be particularly easy to destroy the smiths that they had. It is not an art which requires a great deal of difficult equipment, and it is not an art which was fairly widely known, and could easily be destroyed, and it would not be easy to destroy all the smiths, but if you keep them from getting them in the first place, was fairly simple. And so the Israelites went down to the Philistines to sharpen every man his share, and his coultter, and his ax, and his mattax. They had agricultural things first, and that is what archaeology shows.

12(Question: The Egyptians before the iron age probably. But the art of smelting copper in a cold mold was only introduced in the Egypt by the Hyksos, only about 1600 BC. ~~So we said that~~

So it came to pass that neither sword nor spear were found in the hand of any of the people that were with Saul and Jonathan but with Saul and with Jonathan

(13 $\frac{1}{2}$) That was a very peculiar situation, but under these circumstances

. There's one little side line here that

we should look at some time during the course and since we're glancing at this passage now, I might save time by doing it now. Yet they have a file - that file is a guess. The Hebrew word was Pim . And it occurs nowhere else in the O.T. And consequently it was a guess. They had a pim for the coulters and the axes etc. A file was a good idea, a good guess, so they put it in. After all, in translation there is often an element of guesswork, particularly when the word only occurs once. How else are you going to know what it means? You know by context, and when you come to proving exactly what a word means the best guide as to the meaning of the word is context. How was it used? If you have a theory that a word has a certain meaning if you find a usage that contradicts that, that proves that you are wrong. But when the word only occurs once, you have to look at the context.

Now you have Pim given. What was a Pim?

O.T.H. 241. (e)($\frac{1}{3}$)

...but we now know. Yes? (student. $\frac{1}{3}$) Evidently it was in the commentary. I'm not sure. (student.3/4) No, but this word is Pim. They had a pim for the mattocks. Well, in one of the excavations there has been found a stone, a weight, on this it said Pim. So we know that a Pim is a weight. What good would a piece of stone be to sharpen the mattocks and the swords. A good whetstone would, but just a little piece of stone that seems to have no purpose except to be a weight, it is a measure for money, it shows how much money, how much silver you had to pay to get it sharpened. It shows that the Philistines kept the prices high on the agricultural implements, naturally having a monopoly, they kept the price high on the agricultural implements but they didn't let them have the spears and the swords at all. Yes? (student.1 3/4) Yes. Does it say sharpen? Oh, they went down to sharpen every man his spear. That's an interesting question. I have not looked into it. I couldn't say. Whether it was just to sharpen or to act (2 $\frac{1}{4}$)

I don't know. Yes? (student.2 $\frac{1}{2}$) Yes, and the Israelites. But they're not nearly as good, as a good suit of armor has a real source, in fact, it's an interesting thing, that when Protestantism got a good start in Czeckslovakia, one of the most sedate and solid people in the world, Protestantism got an excellent start there in this land of Czeckslovakia which is also sometimes called Bohemia. And it had a good

start there, and then the forces determined to destroy it, and they set to work to utterly destroy Protestantism in that area, and they did eventually destroy it. 95% of Protestants were wiped out but it was a long time before they succeeded, and there was quite a period there in which the local peasants came out with their agricultural instruments, with their hay forks, with their hoes, and they were so filled with zeal for their cause that they fought back some of the best armies of Europe, with armor and with swords and with spears. Of course they did not permanently succeed in the end, in the end it was made so that 20 years, 30 years ago, 95% in Czechoslovakia were Romans. But that was the situation then when 80% of them were Protestants, they were so zealous for the cause that they, with these agricultural instruments, fought back the best they could, and it made such a stir, this story that was told all over Europe--in Germany to this day people fear the Bohemians, and in Paris the story was told about these wild people with agricultural instruments, fighting back seasoned armies, and just at that time a group of gypsies happened to enter Paris, and they said oh they must be the Bohemians, and the result is that today people speak of Bohemian life meaning sort of Gypsy life, sort of wild sort of life, and the word they use for it, Bohemian, is as unfitted for it as any word could be, because actually it is the name of one of the most solid and substantial groups of people in the world anybody could stress in that way. But that simply illustrates the fact that though agricultural weapons have been used for weapons and ~~very~~ very effectively, it's only rare that it's been done. They are not fitted for the purpose particularly well, and have--an equally good force with equal enthusiasm will easily wipe them out if they have good regular (5 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Well, the conquest then is not really over until the Philistines are out of the way, but of course when the conquest came there were no Philistines there, ^{as far as we know.} ~~practically none.~~ It was the Canaanites they were to possess. And when God says he'll drive out seven nations greater and mightier than they from the land, several times these nations are mentioned and the Philistines are not included in the list. And it would be very strange for God to promise to give them the land of Palestine--the word Palestine is derived from Philistine, but to promise to give them the land of Canaan and say he'll drive out

the great enemy, seven nations greater and mightier than they, and not name the Philistines if the Philistines were the most important one of all. But if the Philistines weren't even there when God gave that promise, those promises, that explains it. And our archeological evidence would be that they came in later. And that for a time they were overcoming some of the Canaanites and the Israelites were overcoming some of the Canaanites. ~~For~~ For all we know they may have had a very friendly feeling toward each other, as people usually do when they're fighting the same enemy. Roosevelt felt that the Russians could do nothing bad at all, they were against Germany as we were too, so he could trust them perfectly, on everything. That's a usual feeling, so long as two people have the same enemy, but it's not a wise thing. We don't know whether the Israelites took that attitude toward the Philistines or not but if they did they were speedily lost it, because the Philistines, in the last half of Judges are the great enemy of the Hebrews and the Hebrews do not overcome them in Judges or in 1 Samuel. But you get into 2 Samuel and pretty soon the Philistines almost disappear and it's other people that David is fighting because he got (7) and it was a much larger force. With equal weapons they were no longer a great factor. Well, the conquest then was complete by the time of David as far as the land of Canaan is concerned.

And then we'll go on to D. A Few Points about Outstanding Judges. You will see from this that we are not going to take time to go into details on the portions of the book of Judges. We could spend a year or two on it easily. But for this course in Old Testament History, we will have to move on rapidly and there are other matters we must spend a good deal of what time we have on, and I want therefore just to touch on a few vital points here. And so D, is a few points about outstanding judges. And number 1, there, 1, Deborah and Barak. And we find in Judges 4 that it tells about Deborah and Barak, and how the Lord said, how Deborah said to Barak, go and draw toward mount Tabor, and take with thee ten thousand men of the children of Naphtali and of the children of Zebulun. She didn't say anything about taking any people from Judah which was the largest tribe of all. She didn't even say anything about the tribe of Ephraim and Manasseh, which were larger than the tribes of Naphtali and Zebulun. It would seem to be a north Israel-

ite occurrence here, and of course Hazor was in the north and it was the northern part of the land that he held. And she said I will ~~go out to~~ ^{drag unto} thee to the River Kishon Sisera the captain of Jabin's army. And then we read how Barak did this and they got on mount Tabor and then we read that Deborah said to him, in verse 14, up for this is the day in which the Lord hath delivered Sisera into thine hand: is not the Lord gone out before you? And that means of course that when she said this he looked up and he saw the (9 $\frac{1}{4}$) clouds, — and he knew that she was right in her prognostication that the Lord would send rain at that time, to make it possible for them to conquer Sisera's chariots and horses. And then we read on how Barak's men rushed down mount Tabor among the chariots and horses down at the bottom which would have completely and easily destroyed them had not the Lord sent the rain, which caused the ground to be all clogged up so that they were unable to maneuver, in fact the horses got mired in the wet clay soil there and they were discomfited and the great mass of Israel were able to overcome the smaller group of Canaanites which could've easily destroyed them because of their horses and thier chariots and their far better weapons that they had, if it were not for these/ weather conditions. And then in chapter 5, Deborah and Barak sing their song of victory, and in this song of victory, we would never know what really happened if we just had the song of victory, never. It's a story in chapter 5 that tells what happens and yet in chapter 5, some of the most important parts of it are passed over so rapidly, we couldn't be dogmatic what they were if we didn't have the reflections of them in chapter 6, I mean in chapter 5, in the straight story in chapter 4, some are passed over so rapidly. And they speak in here of how the Lord came, verse 4, Lord, when thou wentest out of Seir, when thou marchdst out of the field of Edom, the earth trembled and the heavens dropped, the clouds also dropped water, describing how the rains came, and then when it came it put it so that the horses could not be used as they should, verse 21, the river of Kishon swept them away, that ancient river. Verse 22, then were the horsehoofs broken by the means of the pransings, the pransings of their mighty ones. Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of the Lord, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty. We are not told in the previous

chapter what Meroz had done, but here in the song we learn that the people of Meroz ~~are-meticulously~~ ^{although wishing} to stand with the people of God against Sisera's force, had not dared to do so. The appearing that it might be an abortive uprising which would fail and they themselves might lose out by it, they have stayed at home, ready to espouse whichever won. So they sang curse ye, Meroz, said the angel~~s~~ of the Lord, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof, because they came not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty, and there are many today who are in just that situation, like Meroz. Well, maybe, I gave a talk in chapel last fall in which I discussed prophetic aspects of these two chapters and dealt with some matters which are very important from the viewpoint of prophecy, and of understanding of the (12 $\frac{1}{2}$) work of a prophet, that would not particularly enter into this course in Old Testament History so I do not hold you at all in this course for that knowledge of the prophetic aspect. But the historical aspect which I gave ^{then} ~~you~~ I very rapidly looked at again now because I think we should (12 3/4) Yes? (student.13)

Deborah and Barak were the deliverers together, but as to the judge, what does it say? Deborah, a prophetess, the wife of Lapidoth, judged Israel at that time. I do not notice anywhere that it says that Barak judged. It says definitely that Barak assisted Deborah when she (13 $\frac{1}{2}$) and it's interesting the way some people have the attitude today that woman's place is in the home and taking care of the children and she should ^{not} ~~have~~ any active part in church (13 3/4) It is true that woman's place is in the home taking care of children when there are children there for her to take care of. She makes one of the most vital services to the world that she can possibly make in her work with the children. But the idea that women are constitutionally unable to help in other phases of the work is something for which I think there is no support anywhere in the scripture. Women are piled up with the activities of the home to the extent that they cannot do the work that men can, and it is certainly the Lord's will that there should be a head in the family, and the man is the head in the family, and it is normal that in other activities he should be the head. But here is the Old Testament which is a very, very vital definite part of God's Word, and most of the judges were men...

...that in Christ, there is neither bond nor free, male nor female, Jew nor Gentile, and we are all one in Him. Mr. Deshpande has a suggestion at this point. Have you not? Hebrews 11 speaks of the heroes of faith and Barak was a hero of faith (1) and led the troops in deliverance. I don't think it says there he was a judge. But he was one of the heroes of faith, there's no question about that. And he may have been a judge, but I don't think we have any evidence of that. But I think the fact that Deborah, in her clear and vital decisions, is something which he (1 $\frac{1}{2}$) from God

Yes?

(student. 1 $\frac{1}{2}$) I would advise every man who is going to be in the active ministry to try to be careful to get a wife with a little less intelligence than his, because it is a bit embarrassing when she can give a Bible talk that is better than his sermon--a bit embarrassing. But it doesn't need to be embarrassing because after all we have different gifts and ~~a man~~ ^{the Lord} may have given a man a gift for pastoral work that is extremely important in the work and he may be better in this phase of the work and not so good in another. And if the wife can help out in that phase why (2 $\frac{1}{2}$) but just for your own ease and comfort it might be a good qualification in selecting your wife to try to make sure her intelligence is less than yours. Mr. Shellabarger? (student. 2 $\frac{1}{2}$. Yes, sir. Raise a point right here, that it's a pretty embarrassing thing for Israel to be so lacking in men that a woman has to spring into the gap in a case like this. What's this going to do before the other nations who are witnessing this thing?) Well, as long as they won the battle (2 3/4) (student. that's worse.) Sort of like Abraham ~~and the~~ ^{Lincoln}, you remember, when they came and they claimed that General Grant was a drunkard and should ~~be~~ be dropped from the army, that was before he became commander-in-chief, and (3) till Lincoln sent investigators to examine it and found that the criticism was not a true one. But when people brought that criticism against General Grant, Lincoln said well I'd like to know what brand he used so I could give some to all my generals, so they'll fight like he does. And I think that it would have been very embarrassing for them if a woman had stepped into the gap and they'd lost the battle. But in this case they won. So in this particular case

I don't think there'd be any embarrassment. But I think that it certainly definitely denies ^{some of} the extreme attitudes taken that a woman's ability should not be used in some way in the Lord's work, I certainly believe that. Yes? (student 3 3/4) The thing that I'm saying is that one of these judges had a stone dropped on his head from a wall, and he was very embarrassed that a woman had killed him, so this feeling was there.) He (4)

(Well, now his embarrassment had taken place just before his death. (4 $\frac{1}{4}$)

He had himself killed because he didn't want to be exposed.) Of course that ties up with what Paul said about women in Corinthians. And I think we should note that Paul says that a woman should not pray without a veil over her face, and people take it as meaning a hat, it isn't a hat, it's a veil. She should not pray without having a veil over her face. Well, I don't think that Paul meant that there was a special merit in a woman being dressed in any certain particular way. I think that what was meant was that in the custom in Corinth in which the Greeks had the very wicked practice of thinking that all decent women had to be as ignorant as possible, and keeping their women at home, shut up, where they never had any contact with other people hardly at all, and keeping them in utter ignorance, and then the men starved for intelligent companionship, went out with loose women, and they had loose women who were highly educated and under the circumstances for a woman to take a prominent part in any discussion of subjects or anything like that, that would be interpreted as her being that type of a person. And under the circumstances which were in Corinth, Paul advised that they act in such a way as to avoid giving unnecessary offence. And if people are going to think that you're a loose woman because you don't wear a veil in that particular area well, why not wear a veil? What's the harm in it? But as a practice to be kept up permanently, it is silly sort of a thing.

Now, as I say, when I was in Palestine in 1929 I could see how some of the feelings the Arabs against the Jews would naturally arise. Because I would come along, and we'd come through an Arab town, and here would be these Arab women with skirts that would drag on the ground and with their face covered with a veil, and just covered up like a Roman nun, and as if there was something that was unholy and wicked in your seeing her,

And then you'd go a mile down the street and you'd come to a Jewish colony and you'd see the girls there all out like you would on the streets of New York, with high skirts and rouged lips and painted faces, and the contrast was so sharp that naturally the Arabs would become highly incensed at it, the impact that it would have on their children and on their general situation. I don't think the Arabs there had any higher standard of morality than the Jews, but they had a much different custom (7) and it is wise for us to avoid giving offence in unnecessary ways. That doesn't mean that we need to be bound by the ideas of other people which are often very silly ideas but in situations where people have strong ideas which there's no harm in, there's no reason why we should not cooperate to some extent. Well, this is, I think Deborah is an important factor in this whole discussion, but I think we can go on ~~with the~~ and look at Gideon now. The clock is still moving.

Number 2, Gideon. And Gideon is far better known to the average Christian than Deborah is, because the story of Gideon is one that we tell over and over. But even that we don't talk much about. A few main aspects of the story of Gideon are repeated over and over. Now of course Gideon is a very interesting story, a vital story, a story filled with important spiritual lessons and it is well worth all the time that is given it. But Gideon is not a typical story, it is a very unusual story, and the Lord richly blessed in these unusual ways, it's good for us to be aware of, but not to think that the Gideon story is any example of what everything should be. Of course, you often hear people say I'm going to put out the fleece, and sometimes what they mean is I mustn't do anything until the Lord gives me a miraculous sign. I don't think that we have a right to expect the Lord to give us a miraculous sign at every decision of life. And to some extent Gideon's attitude might be taken as an attitude showing lack of faith when the Lord had specifically spoken to Gideon, Gideon said you're the one who delivered Israel and Gideon said I'm from a very small and unimportant family, how can I do it. Well, the Lord said you're the one I've chosen for it and I want you to do it. And then Gideon went and knocked over one of the idols and he got away with that without being destroyed but then there was the question about what to do about facing the Midianites. God had

told him he was to go and lead the people and deliver them. Then Gideon said, Lord, if you're going to give deliverance by me, show it by working this miracle. The fleece to be wet and the ground dry and the next time he said let the Fleece be dry and the ground wet. Well, was Gideon so lacking in faith that even when God had said this is what you're to do he wouldn't believe it until God would work a miracle. Personally I incline rather to think that the purpose of this particular thing was different, that in this case Gideon was asking the Lord if he would choose to give him a marvelous sign to assure others of the fact that he was the one through whom God would give the victory, and thus to lead the others to join with him in the work, rather than that Gideon himself didn't know what to do, because God had told him very specifically. And then in this particular case God wanted to show them that God can win with few as well as with many, and so he told him the army was too big, everybody that's the least bit fearsome tell them to go home, and he went home. And then he said it's still too big and they cut it down to just those that were alert, on their toes, picked by the way which they would drink their water. And it was, God cut his army way down. Well in the case of Deborah and Barak he said bring 20,000 men, he didn't ask to cut it down. Ordinarily God uses the resources that are available. And he said, Joshua send all the force against Ai, in the end. It is not usually God's plan to cut them down. I've known people that have done foolish things that have alienated others from them. And when the others have been alienated and have left them, have said, oh well we'll get down to Gideon's 300 pretty soon and then we'll be able to accomplish, and I think that's a wrong attitude. If somebody really doesn't belong with us they shouldn't be with us, and if we lose people because they don't stand truly for the cause, praise the Lord, He'll make up the loss some way, but let us not alienate people by our stubbornness or by our foolishness and then rejoice that they're being alienated because we're getting down near to Gideon's 300. It's a misuse altogether of the story of Gideon. God wants us to (11 3/4) as many as possible for his truth and for his cause. To act in such a way as to win men for the cause and to lead them to stand for the cause. And so we have different lessons we learn from different ones of these judges. And the great lesson from Gideon

isn't that it's a good thing to have a little group, not at all. But it is that God can use a little group, if he chooses to do it that way. God can work in such a way as he may take a notion to. Of course in this case he worked in that very unusual strange way, that clever strategy of having them fight the Midianites till where the Midianites got to fighting among themselves, and of course ~~was~~ prepared for that by the spreading of the rumors among them, which Gideon heard when he went down and spied, that these people had the dreams that it was Gideon, they had even used the name, that was going to attack them. He scared them. The Lord caused the rumors to get around, and scared them, they didn't know what was ahead and then this sudden attack with breaking the pitchers and blowing the trumpets, and there have been battles in history won in very, very similar ways, but it doesn't happen often. If you did it very many times it would completely lose its effectiveness. And so the story of Gideon up to the point of the victory is a story that is filled with very important spiritual lessons but not a story that is really a straight pattern for us. There's a very interesting thing in this story of Gideon that we ought to note, which is in chapter 8. In chapter 8 it reads that Gideon said, to the princes of Succoth, in verse 5, ~~MMMM MM~~ Gideon said to the men of Succoth, "Give, I pray you, loaves of bread unto the people that follow me; for they faint, and I am pursuing after Zebah and Zalmunna, kings of Midian. And the princes of Succoth said, "Are the hands of Zebah and Zalmunna now in thine hand, that we should give bread unto thine army? And Gideon said, Therefore when the Lord hath delivered Zebah and Zalmunna into mine hand, then I will tear your flesh with the thorns of the wilderness and with briers." And then he went on and he defeated the Midianites, and captured the people, he had defeated them but now he mopped them up, and captured Zebah and Zalmunna, and disposed their host and then he came back, and we read in verse 14 that he returned from battle before the sun was up and he caught a young man of the men of Succoth, and enquired of him. How did he catch a young man of Succoth? Well, it was just one young man from the town who had been carried, had gotten out in this time of danger, outside the wall. He wasn't a man carefully selected. He was a man who just happened to be there. And he caught this young man and we read that Gideon said to him, he enquired of him, and he described unto him the princes of

Succoth, and the elders there, even 77 men. And maybe some of you would find a description of that nature helpful but I'm sure that I wouldn't. If I was in Gideon's place and I grabbed a young man from Succoth and I said to him, describe to me, the leaders of Succoth, and this young man said well, he's John Jones, he's a tall fellow, 243.

he has a scar on the left side, on his head. He is very good in counsel but he is not too good as a natural fighter etc, and he describes the 77 men. When he got through I wouldn't know the one from the other. I don't think there would be much point in it, and I doubt if ~~himself~~ if would be to Gideon, too. And the fact of the matter is, that the Hebrew word here translated described, is also translated describe where it tells how they described the borders of the different tribes. They men went out and they described the borders going from this town and that town and that town of the different tribes, but aside from those cases, in connection with the making of the border, and this one in here, the word is always translated in a different way in Hebrew, in a way that I trust practically everybody in this room could immediately tell me. The word is כָּתַב. What does that mean? To write, and what the Hebrew says, is he wrote down. That's what the Hebrew says, and there is some sense to that. If I were to say to a young man, you write down these 77 leaders, and I had them written down, I would have something I could use, and would be of value to me, and that's what (1 $\frac{1}{2}$) did. Why did not the King James version translate it, wrote down. The RSV does. It translates it as it stands, wrote down, because that's what the Hebrew meant. The American Standard Version of 1901 says described and then has a foot note that says, Hebrew, wrote down. Well, if the Hebrew is wrote down, why do they say described? Why don't they say wrote down. And of course, in making the Tribal borders it is writing down. But the only reason it was ~~translated~~ translated described was that people couldn't quite believe that a young man caught at random outside of Succoth, would be able to write the names of these 77 people. And actually it shows the high state of liberty in that day, that just a young man picked at random like this, a man who he was able to get, he could say, write them down, and he could write them down, and show that all these ideas from a preliterate age, when every thing had to be passed on by word of mouth, are simply not true to the facts. We had literature in Palestine

probably far superior than what it was 30 years ago in Palestine.

Next day. (5)

We were noticing Gideon and we noticed how God gave him the victory in a very wonderful way, from which we learn many extremely important spiritual lessons, but that it is not an example which we can take as always applicable. And I think that the tendency to think that Gideon is a supreme example, Gideon is a man like ourselves who had his mistakes, A man who had his wonderful faith and was wonderfully used. But the tendency to take him as an extreme example, is offset by a final account of Gideon in which we find that Gideon after he was - the deliverance, that Gideon made an ephod to put it into his cities and all Israel went awhoring after it, which thing became a snare to Gideon and to his house, and then we read in verse 30 that he had 70 sons of his body begotten because he had many wives, and his concubines, in Shechem also bare him a son, whose name he called Abimelech. ~~mm~~ He wasn't satisfied with his many wives. He also had a concubine in Shechem. From her came Abimelech and our next chapter tells of the misery that came to the land through this Abimelech. The whole chapter is devoted to the account of Abimelech, and it is an interesting story, about Abimelech and Jothan, I don't know what spiritual lessons are derived from it, there are probably some, and it certainly was not a very good thing for Israel. Though there are some interesting things in that chapter, but Gideon was an imperfect man, but he was a man who did allow himself to be used of God to a certain extent, at certain times, in a very real way. And of course that is one of the bad things, about this life, and in this imperfect way, Satan does succeed in leading away many very true believers into so action and the results of their lives are tremendously cut down. And I believe that we should take him as an example in regards to us to keep our body under lest we become a ~~h~~ castaway, and to especially watch for the pride of life which can mislead us more easily than anything else. But with others, to be very sympathetic with them when things happen and to do our best to help them. But to remember that we also can easily fall.

(Question: Nobody knows. The word ephod is a word which is used a good many times for a sort of apron, that a man wears. And it is put on, a linen ephod.

Now this ephod here was not made of linen, because he made it out of the metals that they gave him, They gave him golden earrings, a thousand seven hundred shekels of gold, besides ornaments and collars and purple raiment, and the chains that were about the camels' necks. And Gideon made an ephod thereof, and put it in his city, even in Ophrah. And all Israel went thither a whoring after it. It sounds as if it was a kind of statue, which some of the people came to worship. It doesn't say that Gideon worshipped it. There is no evidence that Gideon ~~had~~ ever fell into idolatry. There is no evidence of that. He began his career with over throwing the idols. But this which he put up, which doubtless was for his pride, they came a whoring after. What does that mean? That they made it a sort of an emblem of idolatry, that they came to worship it, or does it mean that they revered this symbol of Gideon in a way that they should not, apart from actual idolatry. The term is not very clear. But it is quite evident that it became a snare to Israel, It was injurious and harmful to the people of Israel. And that is evident and it sounds as if it was some sort of a statue. But since ephod usually means something more like an apron, it is just a thing that we need more evidence on. There is very little evidence on it, in fact, I don't think we have any on it except the Bible. Just a few references. So that in cases like this where we have only - we have to guess from context. And we have enough guessing from context to do with the best kind of a translation you can get, and therefore to my mind, it is extremely unfortunate, for us to have to use a translation that was made three hundred years ago, in which I don't care who it is, today that reads it, that they have to guess a great many words from context, that are perfectly clear in the original, and that are perfectly, and were perfectly clear to the people then. And it seems to me that we are making a great mistake in going through every effort to try to have a version that is really dependable, that is in our present day English, because I don't think we should take something that is uncertain, like the ephod, to translate it statue or translate it apron would be foolish, because here, we have to guess from context so we'd better keep the word, and then everybody could make a guess. But when it comes to a statement like, I do you to whit with the grace of God, there is nobody here who would ever say, I do you to whit. That is, that the class hour is finished, nobody here would think of saying that. And therefore we just have to guess it from context, and we're guessing

from context of a word that we don't know, and you have enough of that to do anyway and then to add the words that are simply old English, and are perfectly clear if you knew Old English, it is just putting an unnecessary cloud between us and the understanding of the Bible. You can't/expect everybody to learn Greek and Hebrew, to know it in the Original, so I think we have a right to an English translation that where it is not anywhere near as good as in the original is at least as true to the Original as we understand it and also in a language that is intelligent to the people of today. Of course, it is one thing to say that, it is another thing to get one. To get one is a tough, hard job, and the RSV meant a tremendous lot of time, effort and study, and work, and what a shame that it wasn't done by men who believed the Bible, instead of by men who were mostly unbelievers, and who with their study and work doubtless in case after case give us a good English translation of the original where the King James is obscure or where the English has changed so we don't recognize the meaning today. And in case after case, yet in between these, you will find verse after verse, where they've abandoned the original and given us just what they thought it ought to be, with no reference to what the original said, and unless you know Hebrew you can't tell which verses are in one category and which are in another. So that it is a snare. It is a snare to those who use it.

(Question:) I would say that the people of the 17th century, we are in a better position to know the meaning of words today than they were in the 17th century because we have gained a certain amount of knowledge since of antiquity. But that would not affect more than 2 or 3 percent known of the Bible. There was a tremendous lot that was perfectly clear to them and it is clear to us when we see the original. That they expressed it well, is perfectly clear to those who read it. And when they said ephod they didn't know exactly what it meant because it was a Hebrew word put into English letters, and that's the sensible thing to do when you don't know what it means. And anyway when it is a thing like that it is good to take the Hebrew word and carry it over. We never called Hitler the leader, we took the German word that they used, and called him the Feuther, we called Mussolini the Duke. We took their words and used it, and it is a good thing to do with something that gets its specific

meaning in one language and takes the word over.

Oh, the word "To Whit" was just as clear to them as the word "To Know" is to us, today. It meant exactly the same thing. I do you to whit, meant, I want you to know. And anybody in that day would not have the slightest question what it meant, I do you to Whit. They said he wot not. Well, we say he didn't know. It was just the same, it is just as clear to them, but today we use the phrase to whit in legal documents. The word has just dropped out of use. And so today when a man today comes to it, there is nothing obscure about it, it is perfectly clear to anybody who knows Elizabethan English, but to a person today reading it, you say I do you to whit of the grace of God, and you think it has something to do with the grace of God.

O.T.H.244. (e)-(1/2)

...no way of knowing what it means because it's not something that occurs in the language that he speaks, and he wot not, you can pretty well guess from context what that is, but he guesses, he doesn't know the word. Well, the, if we had time to look at this story of Abimelech, it's a very interesting story and would have value for us (3/4)

this fable that Jotham gave, but all we can take time for now is to see that Gideon was a great hero of faith. And it's interesting that it doesn't say after, at least in Judges 8, it doesn't say that he judged Israel. It says, and the country was in quietness forty years in the days of Gideon. That's what it says here in verse 28. He did say in verse 23 when they were asking him to rule over them, he said, I will not rule over you, neither shall my son rule over you, the Lord shall rule over you. Of course that's exactly what it should be, the Lord's rule, but how's ~~the~~ Lord going to rule. He's either got to appoint a king to rule or appoint judges to rule, or the people have to get together and try to determine who they think is the man best qualified to interpret the will of God and rule. But in a world of sin you've got to have somebody to rule, not to direct people and tell them what to do, but to protect them from the violence and crime on the part of those who do not obey God's law. And this would sound as if Gideon prefers not to assume that responsibility. How they were ruled during this time we're not told, but it says that they had quietness forty years, got rid of the Midianites and did a tremendous thing for them and gave us many, many

spiritual lessons, he was a great man of faith, but he is not the example that we should follow in every regard, nor is his battle the example of how we are to win all our (2 $\frac{1}{2}$) for the Lord, though it has points given, it's valuable illustration and it~~s~~ may be the way in which God would work in any particular case, but not the prescribed way that he's declared to do in every case. Yes? (student. 2 3/4)

Yes. Unfortunately we are not in a position to know a great deal about what the office of a judge was. We have, our evidence is quite scant, but it would seem to me that probably the difference between a king and a judge was principally this: that a king was established in such a way that there was a hereditary situation. That would seem to me to be the principal difference. The judge was more easily gotten rid of if he proved unworthy and the king's ~~showing~~ power would descend to his son. And the descent from father to son of kingly power was something which we have no record that the Lord established but it being an established thing among men, the Lord did not permit it to work out in Saul's day but allowed David to have a ^{house that} ~~son-who~~ would continue and gave us the ^{great} ~~very~~-climax of this house in the Lord Jesus Christ, but the hereditary method of determining rulership is ^{one which} ~~when this~~ has sprung up spontaneously all over the world, quite naturally, because no matter how good the man is he is very apt to be very anxious that his power descend to his son. And such a system gets established, but it is inherently not a good system. You take almost any line of hereditary rulers and you find that the bulk of them are not particularly good. It's ~~not~~ a very good way of selecting leaders and you look at the history of ancient Rome and you find that when they had emperors who succeeded, they gave their power to their son, usually it went bad pretty quickly. The time of the best rule that Rome ever had was in the 2nd century A.D. And they had a very good system which they used for a brief time. There were about six or seven of the rulers who each one adopted a man who was an outstanding man who seemed to be splendidly equipped to be emperor, he adopted him and then he succeeded him. And there was a series there: (5 $\frac{1}{3}$) Hadrian, Antoninus, Pius, Marcus Aurelius, they were five of the best rulers that any nation ever had anywhere, and each of them adopted his successor, and picked out a man of prime character and great ability. Until

they got to Marcus Aurelius the philosopher, the last one, and he had a son he couldn't bear to pass over his own son and adopt somebody for emperor, and so his son became emperor after him and he was one of the worst emperors ever. But the hereditary system is a very, very poor system. As far as getting good rulership is concerned. It is a good system for promoting security, simply because of the reason that the people get in the habit of adoring a person, they can easily pass that over to his son, and in England in some way they have managed to keep that part of it without the other, and the average English person is just crazy about their royal family. And almost worships them and yet wouldn't let them have any power in government whatever. They're nothing but a figurehead, they haven't even, 50 years ago when Edward VII made an expression about a political thing, he was condemned from one end of England to the other, because he had no right to say anything ~~as far~~ ^{about} government. He was simply a figurehead, but as a figurehead they worship them and it gives them a unity and a security and a coherence which is a valuable thing to get, very valuable. But it's the only country I know of, well, almost the only one I know of, where they've gotten that thing about the hereditary ruler, without the evils that come from a descendant line. And they had to go through an awful lot of misery before they (7 1/4) Yes? (student. 7 1/4)

Not in the sense in which the word judge is used in Judges. For there is the difficulty in discussing any problem, ~~if~~ ^{is that} the words have different meanings in different contexts and often you can't be sure exactly what the meaning is. You have learn more about the context, have to maybe learn about the people's attitude, because words change their meaning so from time to time.

I remember 30 years ago, 20 years ago, down town here, there was a great big building down town here which had a sign on it the Pennsylvania Company for Insurance on Lives and Granting Annuities. It was one of the three largest banks of Philadelphia. It was just an ordinary bank and nothing else, but that was its title. And at the same time I visited New York and a man there told me that one of the biggest banks in New York is the Chemical Bank, and he said that was an organization founded for chemical work and they had a little room down in the basement where they had a man mixing some

chemicals together because they had to be doing chemicals but 99 99/100ths of their work was banking, it was just an ordinary bank, but the word changed its meaning as far as that place was concerned. Now one of the big banks here used to be called the Corn Exchange Bank of Philadelphia. I imagine years ago they used to exchange corn there. Today it is just an ordinary bank but it's still the corn exchange. And words gradually change their meaning. As the thing changes the situation changes and instead of saying we've got to get a new word the change comes gradually and we keep the old word. Now in English a judge is a man before whom cases are tried, and he gives a decision about each case, and that is the specific meaning of judge in modern English, but the Hebrew word (9 $\frac{1}{4}$) * the verb * or the noun *

we learn from the context as a man who ~~made~~ and probably does judge cases, but that's not his primary activity, his primary activity is he's a leader of the people in gathering them together and delivering them from their enemies and helping them maintain peace and order in the community. That is, he's more like the policeman perhaps, or like an administrator in modern times. He is pretty much like a king except that he has none of the honors of the king, none of the prestige of a king, none of the hereditary powers of a king. And not being established so solidly as a king it's easier to get rid of him if he proves (10) Though there are great advantages of having a judge over a king, if you have a godly judge it's a great advantage, but there is a disadvantage, that there is not that continuity, that security, and so the time of the judges was a wonderful time when they judges who were really godly, but a time of confusion and turmoil when they didn't. While under the king, if you got a good godly king to reign, and he followed the Lord and you got things into pretty decent condition, if he was succeeded by a weakling or by a fellow of small vice, his general good situation which he'd established would continue by its own momentum for quite a period, you'd have to get two or three kings in a row to ruin him. If he had a son unfortunately who was a very wicked man or a son who was a man of great ability and was a wicked man, he would change the situation rather quickly. But under the kingship you have more stability, more continued--of course it worked the other way too. You get a wicked king and he would establish a situation that was pretty much changed the other way. We have an example of that

which we should look at later on, but which is very important just to mention now. The last kings, who before the end of this semester I want you to know the names of, the last kings of Israel were Josiah and his two sons who (11 $\frac{1}{2}$) and Josiah was a very righteous king, good man who had a great revival, and Josiah established righteous leaders in the land. He did an excellent piece of work. Josiah died and was succeeded by his son but the king of Egypt came and seized the son and took him to Egypt and put a second son in power, and this second son was a wicked man, Jehoikim. But Jehoikim had the righteous good princes ~~princes~~ that had been established by his father in power and he could not remove them immediately. That is, I suppose, he had the power to say all of you get out but it would have made such a stir in the land that he might have lost his own position, it was too dangerous, so he had to do it gradually. And the result is that in the days of Jehoikim, though he was a wicked man who hated the prophets of God, he was unable to do anything to injure or destroy the prophet Jeremiah, because of the good rulers established by his father Josiah, and it's explicitly said in Jeremiah, that the king Jehoikim wanted to kill Jeremiah but that the godly princes protected him. But then Jehoikim gradually changed these princes and by the end of Jehoikim's eleven-year reign when he was succeeded by his son who reigned just three months, and then succeeded by his brother Zedekiah, the brother of Jehoikim, Zedekiah was a good man, that is to say, he was a good man in the sense of one who's good but not good for much. He desired to do right. He is spoken of as a bad king and he was but he was a good man who desired to do right, he desired to follow the prophet Jeremiah, to do what Jeremiah said, he protected Jeremiah, he was a man who in ordinary peaceful circumstances might be considered a good man, but the princes and the leaders, the able, efficient, effective king had gotten in, during the course of his last years, were evil men, and the result was that Zedekiah was a prisoner of the princes and the nobles, and he was unable--he would call Jeremiah in and talk with Jeremiah and then he'd say now Jeremiah don't you tell them what I talked to you about, don't you say anything that people can understand what I talked to you about, and he was just afraid of these nobles, and rightly so, because he was not a man of such ability and power that he could overcome them, and they were established and if he'd had the good

nobles that his father had, put in, he probably would have been a very good king. But he didn't have the power, didn't have the determination to step out and to make a change, and he was a prisoner (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

And you see, both ^{ways} places it/

illustrated the stability that you get with a monarchy that you can't get with just a judge. Yes? (student. 14 $\frac{1}{2}$) Yes. There are three terms here which we should define. First, the men of Israel. I don't think (14 $\frac{3}{4}$)

O.T. History 245. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...because you have delivered us from the hand of Midian. But Gideon refused to rule or to have his son rule, and thus far we think of George Washington (3/4) who refused to become king. But on the other hand, after George Washington retired and got a little bit of rest after the terrible labors of the Revolutionary War and thought he'd settle down and finish his life in peace, he found the country in considerable confusion because there was no established settled government and George Washington got busy corresponding with people ^{working and} and got a constitutional together and helped in getting a better system of stable government established, and then they elected him the first President and he went in and tried to rule for four years, the worst four years of his life because half of the people were reviling him and criticising him and calling him names and when--I guess it was 8 years--and when he finished one of the newspapers had a big headline from the Bible, now lettast thou thy servant depart in peace, because I have seen the end of the evil days. George Washington as President. There was no president in our history ever reviled more than George Washington. But Washington gave up his peace and his security and his pleasure in order to try to do for his country, so he's rightly called the first in war and the first in peace, that is up to that time. He was certainly one of the very best we've ever had. But-Gide

But Gideon here, he refused to be kind as George Washington did, but did he go further and fail to take an interest in the well-being of the country? We don't know. But there's that he didn't, so we're not sure. But in war he was certainly first. He was able, he was helpful, he did a wonderful thing for the land, he was truly one of the

heroes of faith. But then Gideon said to them, he said I don't want kingship. But he says I'll tell you what I would like, that every one of you would give me the earrings of his prey (For they had golden earrings because they were Ishmaelites.). Well the ones, that is their prey, the people they had captured, people that had been (2 $\frac{1}{2}$) attacked, had golden earrings because they were Ishmaelites. Well, now how did the Ishmaelites get in here, this is Midianites they've been fighting about and now we read all of a sudden they had golden earrings because they were Ishmaelites. Does any one of ~~you~~ think of any time in which the word Ishmaelite and Midianite have been used similarly together. I see one does, there are more than one, two, three, four, five, six, any more than that, seven, eight, very good. Now I want to tell you now, because I don't want to leave it ~~to~~ till too late, but every time I give a course in this history, the exam at the end of the second semester covers both semesters, because I don't believe in teaching a course to be taken like a pill, swallowed and forgotten. I see no advantage in that. Whatever is worth while should be gotten firmly, but if Mr. Deshpande was the first to raise his hand, if I had called on him he would have explained, that back in the book of Genesis the critics say there are two documents because it says the Midianites passed by but Joseph's brothers pulled him out of the well and sold him to the Ishmaelites, and they say here's two documents, one says it was the Midianites and one says it was the Ishmaelites, that took him. And that's a real problem in the study. But here we have this verse in which we're talking about Midianites all through the chapter and then it says they had golden earrings because they were Ishmaelites and this verse here is proof, I appreciate Mr. Welch's calling our attention to it, this verse here is proof that the Ishmaelites and the Midianites are overlapping terms, that these men who were Midianites ~~were~~ could also be called Ishmaelites. That doesn't mean they are the same thing, not at all, but they are overlapping terms. The same man could be both, both an Ishmaelite and a Midianite, and like if somebody said in Europe oh here comes a Texan, somebody else says oh, it seems good to see an American. Well he says what you talking about, this man's a Texan. Well he's both. He's a Texan and he's an American. And someone else would say yes, it's awfully good to see an Indian again. I don't ~~mean~~ the Texan, I mean the Oklahoman, this Oklahoman is an Indian, an

American Indian of course, but he's an American, he's an Indian, and he's an Oklahoman, yet it's the same man, and there are different overlapping areas which may apply. Some people would call me Scotch, because my ancestors are Scotch, but yet I'm American. Other people are American who aren't Scotch and most who are Scotch are not American. Our terms overlap, and the Ishmaelites and the Midianites are overlapping terms, the exact ($5\frac{1}{4}$) significance of either one of them we don't know because we don't have enough evidence. But here's proof they're overlapping terms, and evidently from this we learn that for some reason those who were Ishmaelites particularly rejoiced in having these big golden earrings. Now Mr. Welch is raising his hand to ask if these were the descendants of Ishmael but it would seem that most likely, that the descendants of Ishmael became leaders among the Bedouins, among the Arab people and that the term was extended to mean other people of similar type. Now it is possible these ^{Midianites} ~~Ishmaelites~~ were descended from Ishmael, but I don't think there's any proof of it in the other (6)

One might think, here you say Ishmaelites, Ishmael is the uncle of Israel, you're confusing the term Ishmael and Israel but you see they're quite unrelated here. The Ishmaelites describe the people from the area to which Ishmael went, people of a certain type. Maybe Ishmael became quite an outstanding leader and became very vain with his decorations and those who followed in his footsteps were the same, we just don't know. ($6\frac{1}{4}$)

That's the trouble with any history. There is much you understand and much you don't, because we don't have sufficient evidence. (Question:) We don't have any. (Question: What is our proof at all that -) Well, I would say that this passage here is pretty good proof. The whole chapter is talking about the conquest of the Midianites. They've taken these Midianites. They've killed them. They've taken the plunder from them. Now he says, every one of you, give me the earrings from your captives. And it says, for they had golden earrings, for they were Ishmaelites. Well that tells us here that their captives were Ishmaelites, but everything else in the chapter said they were Midianites. Well, either the sentence was inserted by somebody who didn't know anything, or else it means that you understand that they were overlapping terms. (Question:) That's entirely possible. But the exact relationship we don't know. It may be like the Scotch and the American can overlap, or something like that.

It could be like American and Texan, that the Ishmaelites refers to the whole group of nomads, and the Midianites were one branch of them, because after all, you say, why should the whole group be named after Ishmael, when only part of them were descended from them. Why should we all be named after Amerigo Vespuccius. Only comparatively few of us are Italians, yet we are called Americans.

(Question:) Yes, in Genesis 37, in that passage to which Mr. Deshpande referred to a few minutes ago, there the word Midianite and Ishmaelite are both used several times, and they use one and they use the other, and they pass back and forth, and the critics say this is a perfect example of two stories that have been confused, and they take a sentence from one and a sentence from the other, just anybody with any sense wouldn't do a thing like that. That is, if a person combined the two stories, that's awful. Or if he did, he'd make them fit together. He'd take one term and use it, not just take what he found in the book, unless he thought it meant the same thing. So, whether one person wrote it originally, or whether it was two stories combined is not proven by the use of the two terms. Whoever combines them, if they were combined, thought they meant the same thing. Not the same thing, but that they could be applied to the same man. And if you question whether it was possible to pass from one term to another like this, read a Russian novel. I read one once and I was dizzy before I got through with it, because I think the leading character was Peter Alexandervitch, Devitevitch, Henrodeze, or something like that. And they'd call him one time by the whole name, one time by the first name, one time by the fourth, and one time by the second, and they'd be in the same sentence. Henry came in the door, and the friends were surprised to see how pale Alexandervitch's face was. And that would be in the same verse. It is their custom. They used different names just for variety, and we use different terms, too, but not as much. I'll say, I'll refer to my wife's father, as your father, my father in law, Johnny's grandfather, there are different terms, we'd refer to him by his name. Different terms. And I may use 12 or 15 different terms about him. And you don't think a thing of those, as long as you know who it is, and what it means, but it is strange to one who doesn't know the terms. But this Ishmaelites and Midianite, anybody who takes the Bible as true, from Genesis 37, will find proof that they are overlapping terms. Anybody who raises a question about that on the critical

theory, will find over here in Judges, a similar thing done, which is a proof that we are correct in taking it as overlapping there. Well, I think that maybe, unless there is some other vital question of Gideon, we should go on to number 3, which is Jephthah, and I dare not take very long on Jephthah. We could spend a long time on him, but again we are not told much. That's a rather frustrating thing about the book of Judges. We are given glimpses of the situation. We are given glimpses of important events, but we are blessed with much in between, and we just don't know.

Jephthah here was a rather wild sort of man. He had been driven out of his home, and he had, was sort of an outlaw, but he was a good fighter and when the Ammonites were fighting against Israel and when they needed the help of somebody who was a good fighter they went to him and asked him to lead them, and unlike Gideon who refused to be their king, Jephthah said, now if I come, and be your captain, he said, how do I know that you won't use me just as long as I could help you and then get rid of me. I want some guarantee of permanence of our relationship. And he said, if you bring me home again to fight against the children of Ammon, and the Lord deliver them before me, shall I be your head. And they guaranteed that they would do that. You win the victory for us, and you will be our head. Gideon won the victory, and he said, I don't want to rule over you. The two were different in that regard. But of course their background was different. Gideon was a member of a respectable family, well, established and secure. And he risked losing that in order to rescue the people. He wanted to go back to this. Jephthah was an outlaw who was invited by the people that hated him to come and help them. He wanted to be sure that it wasn't just a temporary deliverance. So he came, and he led the people, and he delivered them. But then he made this terrible vow. He said, that "if the Lord will really deliver the children of Ammon into my hand, then whatever comes forth of the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, shall surely be the Lord's, and I will offer it up for a burnt offering." And he went over and he fought the children of Ammon, and the Lord delivered them into his hands, and he won a tremendous victory, and he came back to his home, and his daughter came out to meet him with cymbals and dancing. She was his only child, and when he saw his daughter he rent his clothes, and said, "Alas,

my daughter, my daughter. Thou hast brought me very low, and thou art one of them that trouble me, for I have opened my mouth unto the Lord, and I cannot go back. And she said unto him, My father, if thou hast opened thy mouth unto the Lord, do to me according to that which hath proceeded out of thy mouth; forasmuch as the Lord hath taken vengeance for thee of thine enemies, even of the children of Ammon. And she said unto her father, Let this thing be done for me: let me alone two months, that I may go up and down upon the mountains, and bewail my virginity, I and my girlfriends." Very poor English translation, my and my fellows. It was perfect in Old English, because in Old English, a fellow means an associate. My associates. The Hebrew word is feminine. I and my girlfriends, is what it means. But in the English, in Modern English, a fellow which previously meant an associate, regardless of sex, had come to mean a man, a boy. And so it is a very unfortunate translation. I and my fellows. It is not one of the passages read in the most, but ~~it~~ if was it surely would bring confusion, uncertainty and misunderstanding. To translate a Hebrew feminine word, it was perfectly all right in Old English, but it is extremely bad in Modern English. And so she says, "Let me alone two months, that I may go up and down upon the mountains, and bewail my virginity." "And he said, Go. And he sent her away for two months, and she went with her companions," here we have it translated companions, "and bewailed her virginity upon the mountains. At the end of two months, she returned unto her father, who did with her according to his vow which he had vowed, and she knew no man. And it was a custom in Israel, that the daughters of Israel went yearly to lament the daughter of Jephthah the Gileadite four days in a year."

246. (0)

Here Jephthah made a very, very rash vow, a very foolish vow. Whatever comes out of my house first. Whatever the first thing is, I suppose he thought it might be his favorite dog. Or it might be that cow that he was so fond of. Certainly there was the risk, if it was not a member of his family, that it might be a servant, it might be another human being. And it was a very, very foolish vow, to make. And Jephthah is a great hero of faith, but he certainly was not an ideally (1). The Lord wants us to keep our vow, but he wants us to . Yes? (Question). They would use it to show there was human sacrifice, yes. But the thing is, as far as religion is

concerned, that they can not find enough other in that
 Of course when you get on to the Kings, we read about some wicked king who made his
 sons pass through the fire to Moab, and that would seem to me, that this Israelite
 king followed the heathen practice of sacrifice. We find that the king of Moab,
 when the Israelites were attacking, he killed his son, as a burnt offering on the wall
 of the city. And the Israelites were so thoroughly disgusted that they left and went
 home. But it is not anything that has ever proven anything in religion, of Moses and
 the religion of those who gave us the Old Testament. It was a common practice among
 the wicked idolaters around them, into which they came to fall. Now the critics will
 say, that when Abraham offered Isaac, what it means is that that is when Abraham
 learned that human sacrifice was wrong. And they will tell you that that is an utter
 misinterpretation against Genesis 22, because the whole story as it is told is
 that Abraham was ready to do whatever the Lord actually wanted him to do, and he under-
 stood the Lord wanted him to offer Isaac, and actually what the Lord wanted was for him
 to show that he was willing to give up even his own son, Isaac. And the Lord intervened
 not to say Abraham, human sacrifice is wrong, not to say that. Human sacrifice was
 never taught in the religion of Abraham, but to say I have seen that you hold nothing
 back, not even your own son. And so their interpretation is a false interpretation,
 but one can easily see how they arrive at it.

Now in this case, you have a vow made, ^{we} ~~you~~ have no other instances of a vow being
 made. But it was a part of the heathen religion, and this poor man Jephthah had no
 education, he had been driven out of his home, mistreated by the family, by his
 relatives, by the people of the area, and all that, and now he was, now when they were
 in this difficult spot, and they know he is a good fighter, they want to help him.
 And he came and he seems to be a man who had a real knowledge of the Lord, but a very
 limited knowledge, and he came and he wanted to serve the Lord. He wanted to do what
 was right, and he made this very rash vow, but it is certainly not an example in any
 way. And of course that is the difficulty. Many people get the impression, the Bible
 is the book, where everything in it is an example for us. It is nothing of the kind.
 The Bible is a book that how in a wicked world in which sin is wide spread, God brought
 the knowledge of Christ, and prepared the way for His coming, and in which He showed a

little by little what we need to know, because he couldn't give it to us at once, because of our sin and our wickedness, and it is the same situation today. We have to lead people little by little. We know that the human heart is enmity against God, and even the heart of the converted man, is still to some extent, enmity against God, and even the heart of a man who is fighting for the great doctrines of the faith, he still has an awful lot of wickedness in him, that he has to watch out for and the rest of us have to look out for, too. And be sympathetic toward him, because we all fall into such a thing, and God has promised that we will get rid of them, and we want to go forward in sanctification, but we want to know that our character is very imperfect and our knowledge is ~~human~~ imperfect, and you cannot take Gideon or Jephthah, or even David as a perfect example. Anybody who sets out to do everything that David did, is very, very foolish. David was a man after God's own heart, but that meant that he had an attitude of really repenting of his sins, and looking to the Lord for help and trying to get over it. And a lot of other people who don't have sins but in the eyes of the world are anywhere near as bad as David are, are a lot worse in God's sight than David ever was, because of a heart attitude, they have and a pride of heart.

And so Jephthah here makes a very serious error, in making this vow which we are told about here. And we are told about the wonderful attitude of the daughter. She says, "Do what you vow." There was no evidence that she even knew what it was. That she was ready to trust ~~him~~ to what her father had vowed to the Lord, she ought to do. Then ~~after~~ evidently he tells what it is, and she says, "Let me go two months on the mountain and bewail my virginity. I and my companions, my girl friends." And at the end of two months, ~~she~~ returned to her father, and he said to her, according to his vow which he had vowed. And if it had stopped there, no body would have any question but what it mean ~~and~~ is, that he did kill her. But then it says, "he did with her according to his vow which he had vowed, and she knew no man," and the simple way of interpreting that is, this girl died, and she was still a virgin. She had never been married. She died a pure virgin, she knew no man. But giving it right after, the account here, and not saying he killed her, he did according to his vow, and she knew no man, some people take this meaning, that as a result of his vow, she knew no man. Always she had to give up normal life and be shut away like a nun for the rest of her life.

And there are those who feel that that is the correct interpretation, of it, and it is a rather peculiar way to state it. Maybe they are right. I can't say that they are wrong. I must say this though, that the more natural way of interpretation ~~of~~ of the words as they stand seems to be but I don't think that it is ~~conclusively~~ conclusively certain that it is. I would personally reserve judgment on it, as I like to do on anything which is the evidence is not sufficient. Yes, Mr. Haffly.

(I don't see why it is not clear when it says that he makes a vow and he says, he does according to that vow, and the vow/^{is}that he'll sacrifice her.) That is the way many take it, but there are those who take it the other way. (Mr. Tow. (Question) Well, in our civilization where women can get out and be dentists, technicians, and store clerks, and all kinds of things, many women have a successful life, apart from marriage, but in many, many lands, there is no such possibility, and particularly anywhere where there is a more or less - where there is a life of less security, where you have to have more protection, the tendency is for women to get shut off so that the only fulfillment of their life, ~~the~~ consists in marriage, and in such an organization the fate of a woman in not fulfilling her natural physical function, becomes a thing that is greatly, she is felt as having been extremely unfortunate. And whether it was that way there I'm not ready to say. But at least there is a possibility. (Yes. (Question) But it is always limited in time. The Nazarite vow can never become . (9¹/₂) (Question) Well, I think that we could discuss this for three hours. At the end I don't know whether we would know anymore than we do now. So my feeling is each of you read the passage, and make your own guess, but I don't think it is an article of faith, or a matter to divide churches over. And I personally think that it sounds more as if she was slain, than it is that she was shut away, but I think the arrangement of the phrase, is such that it gives at least some possibility to those who take it that way. That's my guess here. But I doubt if we could gain anything by expressing all our opinions on it, because I don't think there is any further data to be found on it, than what we have. (Mr. Mitchell). (Question). No, I don't think so. I think that we should be extremely careful about making vows. Be sure they are in the Lord's will when we make them. I think that if we make a vow and we promise in good faith, and people take it in good faith, and we later find that

it is disadvantageous to ourself, ~~if~~ we should go through with it anyway, if we are obligated to it. But I think that if we have without realizing or even with realizing have done something which is contrary to God's moral law, or injurious to His purposes, I think that we should renounce it, but I think such cases are very, very few. And it can not be made an excuse of any (11 $\frac{1}{4}$). But I don't think the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church in making little children, that don't know what they are doing, take a vow of chastity for life, and think they've done a wonderful, noble thing, because they take a vow of chastity, a little girl of 14 or 15, and she shows her wonderful devotion to the Lord, by taking a vow of chastity, for life. I don't think that is a right thing and a proper thing to do, and when women? Martin Luther told those people to come out of those places that were closed up and live normal lives, those women did. The Roman Catholics said these monks have not taken vows on chastity, and it is bad that they left the monestary, to follow Martin Luther. It is bad, but it is excusable, but these nuns. They have vowed chastity for life, and that was wicked for them to come out, and Martin Luther said that that vow was a wrong vow, they should never have taken those vows. And I think he was right.

(Question: If a sow had come out of this house or a dog, well now, there's another thing, what alter is it to be offerred on, if the place of sacrifice is at one place here? Should men offer sacrifices apart from that? How much did he know about Israel's law? How much would Israel tolerate of this man?) It is true, we don't know. It is possible that everything he did was over there in Gibeah, but it was still in Transjordan. He never had any connection with the people on the other side of the Jordan. We don't know. It is altogether possible. But he was a hero of faith. Because Hebrews says so. He was a man that had great good qualities ~~towards~~ ^{the Lord blessed} ~~life~~, but he also had mighty little power in connection with that. Well, I fear we will have to stop. I'll post the assignment, and we'll have to stop. I'll post some kind of assignment.

...last time about D, which was A Few Points about Outstanding Judges, and we looked at number 1, Deborah and Barak; Number 2, Gideon; and number 3, Jephthah. We glanced at Jephthah.

And then number 4, Samson. And Samson is a very interesting history, one that is given with much detail, with much narrative, a history which has many interesting incidents in it and a considerable number of important spiritual lessons. It is a history which we cannot add to our understanding of from any external source, where we don't have it. The only source which might add to its understanding would be information about the Philistines. Because Samson is the first of these (1 $\frac{1}{2}$) named who had any relation with the Philistines as far as the Scripture account is concerned. Now if we had full detailed history of the Philistines it, a full detailed history, would throw a great deal of light on the life and history of Samson. If we had a fair amount of material about the Philistines it would, even if Samson wasn't mentioned, it would throw a good deal of light on his background. Unfortunately, we know very, very little about the Philistines aside from what was stated in the Bible. The reason we know very little about the Philistines is because of the fact that they occupied mostly that fertile valley section, next to the Mediterranean, the finest part of Palestine, the part in which the Jews have their best colonies today, the main part of Israel today was Philistine land in Biblical times. And this region was such a fine region that after the Philistines died out it continued to be a very important section. In the time of Christ, Athenians came to Gaza in southern Palestine to study Athenian philosophy, because the best teachers of it, many of them were in Gaza and this area which formerly had been the Philistine land. It was a great center of Hellenistic culture. Well that means that every one of these Philistine cities now has had other cities above it and archeologists are not greatly interested in those later cities. You could learn a great deal about Greek and Hellenistic culture of the time of Christ by careful examination of Philistine cities from that period. But if you want to learn about Greek culture of the time of Christ, most people would rather go to Greece, there's plenty there to study where you get it at first hand. And therefore there not much interested in this, but you can't go in with a steam

shovel and dig up that material and get down to the Philistine material. If you're going to excavate the Philistine period you've got to carefully excavate the periods that are later on the same place, you can't just throw the stuff away. And nobody has felt enough interest in those periods to go and make a thorough detailed study of them, going down inch by inch to get to the Philistine period. So there probably is a great deal in these places of tremendous importance to the history of the ancient Philistines, but it will not be available to us until or unless somebody gives sufficient ^{money} to take a few years first to study the later Hellenistic culture that is above that, and I doubt if that will ever happen. Hellenistic culture was brought, was after Alexander the Great's conquest of the east, Greek cities were established all over and there's Hellenistic culture in many of them and many of them have been excavated, very interesting, and very important, we've gained so much knowledge here and there, I question whether anybody would want (4 $\frac{1}{2}$) to examine the upper part of these Philistine cities. Now that's true of most of the Philistine cities, not all. There are one or two cases where they were abandoned after a comparatively short time, before there was this great Hellenistic culture but in which it so happens that the people who lived right above them dug a lot of storage pits which have been dug down into the remains of the Philistine period and thus have cut it all up into pieces and left so much trash in it that attempts to excavate at them have just proved not too worth while. A very, very careful excavation of those cities, one or two like that, probably would reveal a great deal but it would take a tremendous amount of money and careful effort to do it because it's a very unusual difficulty. And so we just don't know much about the Philistine cities and we know practically nothing about Philistine history except what we gain from the Bible, and the result is that Samson stands rather isolated. His constant activity was in relation to the Philistines, we learn a great deal about them from his account but very little, nothing about him, from their sources. So the story of Samson stands rather isolated, there's much in it that we would understand far better if we had other information throwing light on it, as we read it in the Bible we do not get a very high idea of Samson's character. God had set him apart for his work from before his

birth and he was ordered that he should be a Nazarite all his life, he should never touch strong drink, and he should never cut his hair. And he was given these particular, not only strong drink shouldn't be touched, any kind of grape juice, anything that came from the grape, ^{raisins} ~~grapes~~, anything from grapes should not be touched. He was to be a Nazarite from his birth all through his life. Now that's not an ordinary Nazarite, because in the book of Numbers the description of the situation of the Nazarite lays down explicitly how long one is to be a Nazarite. It was a limited thing. Samson was an unusual situation, a very unusual thing, not a pattern for others, ^{it's} ~~not~~ described in Scriptures that people shall make themselves Nazarites for life and say they'll cut their hair, never touch a dead body, of course he touched many dead bodies so he certainly broke that part of the Nazarite's vow. But it is not prescribed as a vow to be taken for life, and it certainly is not described as something that parents could set aside their children for. But in his case it was a special revelation from God, that in this particular case God had set him apart for his special work but to how great an extent did Samson do the work for which he was set apart, I mean how great, it says that he set himself to do a work, but to how great an extent did he simply do what he felt like and the Lord used him for the purpose that the Lord had in mind? It's pretty hard to make much of an example for us of Samson. If he avoided strong drink there were plenty of other things he didn't avoid, that the descriptions suggest, are certainly not a pattern for an ideal follower of the Lord. But the Lord used him and the book of Hebrews lists him with the heroes of faith. And it lists these others, Jephthah and Barak and Gideon, they are all four listed, they were varying characters, they had their weaknesses. Barak had his weakness of faith, Gideon also. Gideon had his strength of character. Jephthah and Samson are characters that seem to be morally and as general examples far inferior to Barak and Gideon, but all four are heroes of faith, all four of them our God greatly used for a specific purpose that he had in mind in this period of the judges. I think they are a warning to us, the fact that ~~these~~ ⁱⁿ these four are listed, ~~these~~ heroes of faith, that it is only God who can see the heart and really judge who really is a hero of faith.

And they are very imperfect as all heroes of faith are, because every human being is very imperfect, and we see the imperfections in other people and don't realize that

we may in ourselves have far worse ones than they have in the Lord's sight. The Lord judges the heart, the Lord knows who are the heroes of faith, we've got a big job in keeping ourselves in the category of truly following the Lord, avoiding compromise with that which is wrong, that which is sinful, that which is evil, that which is contrary to His will, if others who are truly followers of His pretty well (9¹/₂) that we should leave judgment of them to the Lord, and ~~that~~ as to our own, the extent to which we work with them ~~and~~ ^{or} don't, that is a matter which has to be decided in each particular case by the situation and by the knowledge of the case, because all men are imperfect and there is no one but has his faults. And these four are the outstanding characters, perhaps, in the book of judges, at least they are the four/^{of} whom more is told than of any others, and they are the four who were picked for the book of Hebrews to list as heroes of faith, and we have many lessons to learn from all of them, but one lesson we learn from all of them is that it is only God that is perfect, and of course his Son Jesus Christ. And we learn from men's weaknesses as well as from their strength. Now in the light of Samson, I trust you all are familiar with the details of it, I don't think there's need of my going over it in class, but there is value in your own study of it and in your own meditation on these lessons which you can derive from them.

The incident of Samson killing with the jawbone of an ass, some people have tried to make out that it wasn't a real jawbone of an ass, that was the name for something else, it was the name of the place where it occurred. But I don't see what the difficulty is there, because the jawbone of an ass is a pretty large instrument, and it's a pretty/^{strong} thing and especially for a strong man like Samson (11), even in those days without modern weapons it could be a very (11)

Now we go on then to B, The Closing Chapters of Judges. And these closing chapters of the book of Judges are indeed a sorrowful section. They are a section in which we are given an account of certain events which took place, in which the two sections of the land sunk into a pretty low state. In chapter 17 we have Micah's wicked worship, and the Danites taking him and making him their priest. They move north, leaving the territory where they could not conquer, the Canaanites and the Philistines, and moving

up to the north into a new territory. And then, that's 17 and 18, and chapter 19 we have the story of the Levite and his concubine and the way in which she was terribly treated and how all Israel was aroused against the Benjamites because of the very low standard of morality to which the Benjamites had sunk, and how all the people of the land gathered together against the Benjamites and fought against them and destroyed a great many of them, destroyed their cities, and then in chapter 21, we find the Israelites mourning because they lost one of their tribes. The Benjamite women were all dead, comparatively few of the Benjamite men were left, and they had sworn that not one of them would give his daughter to a Benjamite to wife, and so it looked as if a tribe was to be utterly destroyed and so they worked a subterfuge in order to give the Benjamites wives. They took women from Jabesh Gilead and they had them go out and be available where the Benjamite men could come in and seize them, supposedly without the rest of the Israelites knowing about it. So it was a rather silly subterfuge, but it made it possible to maintain the tribe of Benjamin. Was the tribe of Benjamin of any great importance in subsequent history? in Israel? How many would say it was not? Would anybody say the tribe of Benjamin was of very great importance comparatively soon after this? Why?

(student.14) In 1 Kings we have evidence ~~that~~ think of Benjamin as a rather important tribe, as Mr. _____ correctly pointed out, but does anybody think they are of importance earlier than Kings? Right in the very next major book, 1 Samuel, you have the people asking for a king and God gives them a king, and the king he gives them is from the tribe of Benjamin. So we have the Benjamites being the leading tribe in the land by the middle of the book of 1 Samuel, and in the last two chapters of Judges, we have them almost annihilated, (Ruth is of course a very small book dealing with a couple of individuals so that as far as the general (14 3/4)

O.T.History 248. (1 1/3)

...and 1 Samuel not going very far before you find Samuel anointing a man from Benjamin as a king over all the nations. What does this suggest about the chronology? Do you

think that the last three chapters of Judges are the last thing that happened in the period covered by Judges and previous to 1 Samuel? Does not that suggest very strongly that after describing various judges, these events, the Danite migration and the Benjamite war, are just you might say stuck into it at the end of the book. Now that's nothing wrong with that, there is no history that ever was written that is a history and not a (1 $\frac{1}{4}$) mere chronicle, — that went strictly in chronological order. If it did it makes mighty uninteresting reading. If you wrote the history of the last ten years and you told what happened on a certain day in ~~Seem~~^{China} and in India and in Africa, and in Tennessee and in Montreal, and then you told what happened the next day in all these areas, and the next day, it would just be confused if you tried to read it. We would take one of these areas and we would trace it through for a month or a year or maybe five years, and then we would take another and trace it through. That is the only way to write intelligently. You have to deal with areas to some extent and you can't be strictly chronological because unrelated areas things are happening at the same time but you don't understand it (2 $\frac{1}{4}$)

And so it is quite natural that in Judges there should be two important events which they want to tell us about but they don't want to interrupt the story of the individual judges to tell us, and they put them at the end. I doubt if there's a history book ever written that won't have plenty of parallels to that sort of thing. And that doesn't mean these are not the last events of the time of the judges, but it does mean that we can't be sure they are, we have to look for evidence and the evidence I've just mentioned is pretty strong in the other direction. Yes? (student.3) Well, I wouldn't say that would be the sole purpose, that may be a purpose. (student.3 $\frac{1}{4}$) Mr. has mentioned Eli. Was Eli a judge? He was, wasn't he? He judged Israel a good many years. When does Eli become judge? Is he mentioned in the book of judges. And when 1 Samuel starts, is Eli just beginning his work? He's an old man in 1 Samuel. So we have most of Eli's life, his active life, almost entirely before the beginning of 1 Samuel. Now did that come contemporaneous with some of these judges, or later, we just don't know. We're just not told. But the fact that Eli is one of the, is the judge, and yet it's quite incidentally

we learn of him in connection with Samuel, would suggest there may have been other judges who were not even mentioned, besides the ones we have. It suggests that possibility rather definitely. And Samson is a judge but was Samson a judge in our modern sense, one who settled disputes? Maybe, maybe not. He certainly was a judge in the sense of one who led the people and delivered them from an adversary. He was a judge in that. But

(4 3/4)

just doesn't mean anything, but the Hebrew

word shows that (5)

Yes?

(student.5) Now my recollection is a bit hazy, but it's my impression that it says he judged Israel a certain number of years at the time of his death. Am I wrong? It's always good to get the precise words (5 $\frac{1}{4}$)

and where does it tell about Eli's death? It's in the fourth chapter. 1 Sam. 4:18,

He had judged Israel forty years. You see how incidentally it's mentioned. He had

judged Israel forty years. It's quite incidental, we are not previously told that he

was a judge at all. He was an old man at the beginning of the book. His main activity

(6 $\frac{1}{4}$)

previous to that time.

Well, these closing chapters of Judges then end with the words in verse 25, in those days there was no king in Israel. Every man did that which was right in his own eyes. And many Bibles that have notes in have a statement that Judges is the lowest point of Israelite history, that every man did that which was right in his own eyes, there was no king. I think there's a large element of truth in that and yet I think it's a little exaggerated. Because, after all, if every man will do what's right in his own eyes, if his eyes are trained to see what's right in God's eyes, you could ask nothing better, and there are some pretty low points in the time of the kings too. But judges is a period of confusion and this period of confusion, we don't know how long it was, it may have been 200 years, it may have been 60, but it's a period with some high points and some great victories and some great blessings, (7 $\frac{1}{4}$)

of a very considerable amount

and the chronology of it is not clear in the book. These two ^{incidents} instances at the end may have overlapped with the activity of two or three chapters, we don't know. But (7 $\frac{1}{2}$)

came all during Eli's time as a judge would seem to be quite un-

likely. They both seem to me to be events which may have taken place fairly early in the period of the Judges. So much now for E, the closing chapters of Judges.

Now I'm not going to give a special head here for Ruth, I'm just going to say a few words at this point about the book of Ruth. The book of Ruth is a book which gets probably as much attention as the book of Judges. And it is a very interesting story and a very worthwhile story. They say that Benjamin Franklin when he was in France, as you know Benjamin Franklin was very popular in France, they had his picture all over, constantly the people were quoting him, he was idolized by the people there, but it was in the period shortly before the French Revolution at which there was a very low point in religious life in France and nearly all of the brilliant people boasted of being Atheists and having no use for the Bible or for anything religious, and the church which had destroyed the Protestants, wiped them out, was at a pretty low ebb ^{spiritually and} ~~morally~~ ^{morally}. But Benjamin Franklin used to attend various meetings with French intellectuals who would occasionally scoff and sneer at the Bible and religion in general but who were brilliant men and had much of value in their discussion and Franklin enjoyed his association with them. And one day going to one of these groups, he said I've come across an old story which I thought you might be interested in hearing. And he proceeded to read it to them and the story that he read to them was the book of Ruth with the names changed. He changed the names so they wouldn't know what country it came from or have any suggestion that it was from the Bible except what is there, ~~what~~ ^{that} is just leaving out the names of the places and (9 3/4) and when he finished it they were enraptured and said what a wonderfully, beautiful little story, where on earth did you get it? And then he told them that it was taken from the Bible, and the book of Ruth is a beautiful idyll, it is an interesting account of events here which are probably of importance historically, principally ^{because} they relate the history of the ancestry of King David, and it was most likely that the book of Ruth was written down after David became king. That would be a good guess. The events in it were remembered but they were written down at that time because that's what gave them importance, historically, that ^{the} Ruth was an ancestor of David's. Of course it was very interesting that

with the great exclusiveness of the Jews that this woman Ruth, who came, who was a Moabitess, should have become one of the ancestors of David, and not only one of the ancestors of David but one of the beautiful characters of the scripture, one whose loyalty to the Lord and whose loyalty to her mother-in-law and to everything connected with her mother-in-law led to the events which are described in the book of Ruth.

Now Professor Millar Burrows of Yale University wrote a little pamphlet about 10 or 15 years ago which he called *The Basis of Israelite Marriage*. I have not read the pamphlet but I heard Burrows give a paper at the American Oriental Society describing a little of how he came to write the pamphlet. And the problem was this that as Burrows studied the book of Ruth the marriage custom described in it did not seem to him to fit with the regulations about marriage in the Pentateuch, or with the evidences we find of the marriage customs later on in the Bible, and he had various problems that he couldn't understand as to what the situation was in this regard. If any of you are interested in making a careful study of marriage customs through the Bible ~~that you find~~ ^{any time}, you'd certainly want to study this pamphlet which I don't say it necessarily has the correct answers but he is a careful scholar and would have much of real value. I only mention it here with this in mind, that it brings out the fact that the book of Ruth gives us a glimpse of the life of Israel at a time at which doubtless many things were very different from what they were when they were first settled in Palestine, and also from what they became later on, under the rule of the Kings. And culturally there are very interesting problems in the study of the book of Ruth. For most of us it is important along the two lines, first it shows the ancestry of David, and the place of this Moabitish woman in the ancestry not only of David but of the Lord Jesus Christ, a place which is shared by the Canaanite woman, Rahab, harlot of Jericho, who is an ancestor of the Lord Jesus Christ, on account of her fidelity to the Lord, a woman of (13 $\frac{1}{2}$)

but a woman of deep desire to join herself to the (13 $\frac{1}{2}$) and God marvelously blesses her desire, and saves her life (13 $\frac{1}{2}$), not only that but gave her a place in the Lord's genealogy. That would be our first (13 $\frac{1}{2}$) the second, of course, would be the example of her relation to Naomi, and those verses

of course we often quote, of where she refused to leave Naomi but declared that she would remain with her and stand ~~by~~ ^{beside} her, stand true to everything that Naomi believed. It's not the high level of her reasoning to worship the Lord, to God the creator of the universe (14) but it brings home to us (14) the great importance in the Lord's work of our lives, of our personality, of ~~o~~ our lives, and our, of the way in which we show forth the beauty of the Lord in our lives. Ruth did not know much about the Lord God of Israel, but she knew that Naomi was a woman that she'd want to stand by and if this religion was good enough for Naomi it was good enough for her. And while we want to point people to the Lord and see the great worthwhile evidences of Christianity, we want to remember that for every one we reach that way there probably would be six people look at our lives and be either drawn to the Lord or repelled from the Lord, from what they see in our lives.

O.T.History 249. (1¹/₂)

...well that is all we will say ~~on this course~~ of Old Testament history about the book of Ruth. And we'll go on to Roman Numeral IX.

Roman Numeral IX, The Life of Samuel. And here there's an imbalance in my outline. I made a minor error. When I made Roman Numeral VIII I hesitated whether to make it the Book of the Judges, or the Period of the Judges. And I made it the book of the Judges to go on and discuss the book specifically. But I now realize that was a mistake, because that means that between ~~it~~ and the next main head which should be the United Kingdom, between those two we have only the Life of Samuel, so we have to give him a whole Roman Numeral to himself. I should have included him under Judges(1¹/₄) and made it The Period of Judges, — but rather than have you have to go back and make any changes in your notes (1¹/₂) we will have the minor inconvenience of having Roman Numeral IX, the Life of Samuel.

A good question to have asked instead of the one I asked about miracles would have been this. How much do we learn about the life of Samuel from the book of 2 Samuel?

Which of you that we learned more about Samuel's life from 2 Samuel than from 1 Samuel? Shouldn't because it's a shorter book actually. But is anybody here so bold as to say we learn nothing about the life of Samuel from 2 Samuel? Would anybody say such a thing as that? There seems to be one or two, three, four. I wish you would all immediately raise your hand. That 2 Samuel tells us nothing at all about the life of Samuel. Well, 2 Samuel is not called Samuel because it's about Samuel, because it isn't, tells nothing about Samuel. Then, why is it called Samuel? Is 2 Samuel the 2nd book that Samuel wrote? How many think that Samuel was the author of 2 Samuel? Dees Is anybody here who is quite convinced he was not the author of 2 Samuel? Very few. I wish everybody was because Samuel died about two-thirds of the way through 1 Samuel, and it would be rather difficult to write 2 Samuel unless he had the gift of prophecy beyond what any of the prophets ever had. The book of 2 Samuel is entirely about the reign of David. A much better title for the book would be The Reign of David. It begins with David beginning to reign and it ends shortly before David's death. 2 Samuel is the book about the reign of David. Why then is it called 2 Samuel. Well, it's about the poorest name for the book that you could possibly imagine and the Septuagint improves on it, it calls this the second book of Kings. In the Septuagint 1 Samuel is called 1 Kings, 2 Samuel is called 2 Kings, 1 Kings is called 3 Kings, and 2 Kings is called 4 Kings. And what do you think of that designation, Mr. ? (student.4) Except for the first book of Samuel it's very good and even the first book, the last half or two thirds of it is about Saul's reign, so it's much better than the way we have it now. But it has not gained, been accepted much outside of the Septuagint. The Hebrew calls it 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2, as a matter of fact, the Hebrew doesn't call it that, the Hebrew calls it Samuel and Kings, and the division of Samuel is an arbitrary thing, in fact some of our manuscripts differ as to the place where the division comes. Because you have one book the book of Samuel and you have one book the book of Kings. And that being the case, there's nothing wrong with the book of Kings starting with Solomon the third king and ending with the downfall of the kingdom, but the book of Samuel starts with Samuel but you take the two together and not more than a fourth or a third of it is about Samuel, it just keeps on until it gets nearly to the end of David's reign.

The names are arbitrarily set. But this book of Samuel has been divided into two parts, 1 and 2 Samuel, and the division is a very good one because the death of Saul made a real vital dividing point in the Israelite history. But our number IX is the life of Samuel and we have two books named after him, the first very aptly, the second very inaptly. And under him we will call A, Ancestry and Youth.

The book of Samuel starts with, at the time of, with a certain man, but it's really his wife it's talking about, a certain man of Mount Ephraim, his name was Elkanah, the son of Jeroham, the son of Elihu, the son of Tohu, the son of Zuph, an Ephrathite. Well an Ephrathite means one of the tribe of Ephraim, doesn't it? And this Mount Ephraim is the land that belongs to the largest of Joseph's tribes, the tribe of Ephraim. And this man up there from the tribal region had two wives, one was Hannah and the other was Peninnah. And Peninnah had children and Hannah had no children and then we read how Hannah prayed and the Lord gave her a son and she dedicated this son to the Lord.

Now this boy Samuel when he grew up he came to judge and was leader of the people for a long time and he carried on sacrifice at Shiloh, the place, that place having been destroyed, he carried it on in various parts of the land, and the critics have two big problems about it, that is, I don't think it's a problem to them, they present it as a problem against our (7) . One of them is that Samuel had sacrificed in various places, we'll look at that one later because Deuteronomy says that they had their sacrifice all in one place, and secondly that Samuel was a man of the tribe of Ephraim and how could a man of the tribe of Ephraim offer sacrifices, when sacrifice was supposed to be restricted to the Levites, and in fact to the family of Aaron. Well, it proves that we have references to him in other books, which tell us that his family were Levites, and so we know that in this case his father was an Ephraimite because he lived in Mount Ephraim rather than because he was descended from Ephraim. He was a member of the tribe of Levi, that is brought out, I believe, in 1 Chronicles 6 where we have the genealogy of Samuel. I believe it's also in 1 Kings 11 that there is a reference to it. Am I right in that? No, it's not 1 Kings 11:26. It is 1 Chronicles 6:27 and 34, where we have the mention that he was a Levite. Where it gives his genealogy and shows that he was a Levite.

Now the story told here in the beginning of Samuel tells about this godly woman Hannah praying for a son and promised that she would give, dedicate her son to the Lord, to the Lord's service. There is no example here in the story of Samuel for every Christian to dedicate their child to be a believer in the Lord, because this is the story of a child whose mother gave him up to go and live in the Temple as a very young child, to have his whole life devoted to the Lord's service. This was not a dedication for salvation, it is a dedication for service. And it is not a dedication for partial service, it is a dedication for complete service, for an entire life of devotion to the Lord. And so Hannah has this son but she gave him up almost immediately, she brought him to Eli. And then we have Samuel brought up by Eli but we have Eli's wicked sons, wicked because they were selfish, they were taking from the sacrifice what they were not entitled to, wicked because they were immoral, as described here.

And so Eli, this godly man, this man who had served the Lord and been a judge and example in so many ways, had neglected the upbringing of his sons, and it is a terrible warning to us, this, the Lord promises his blessing for our children, but he does not promise those blessings if we simply neglect the children. He promises that if we do our part, if we endeavor to bring the children up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, we teach the children, we pray for the children, we endeavor to bring the children to know Him, that we as Christians' parents can trust Him to fulfill his promise and to bring the children to the knowledge of the Lord, we have blessings promised but they are not blessings promised apart from our ^{playing} ~~doing~~ our part in the carrying of it out. We do not need to be full of anxiety and wonder ~~whether~~ the children will be heathen all their lives or whether sometime they may accept the Lord, we have a right to know that they will be His, but if we do our part, that the Lord will bring them to himself. But Eli evidently did not do his part, and so this godly man who neglected his children, and I've known evangelists, great evangelists, godly men whose children have, their parents were always so busy serving the Lord they never had any time to teach their children to know about the Lord, and the children have grown up in utter ignorance to God.

But Eli's wicked sons, Eli had this little boy Samuel there ministering in the Temple, and evidently he did his best to teach the child, and when the Lord appeared to Samuel, we have Eli dealing with him in a very beautiful fashion, when the Lord speaks to Samuel and Samuel thinks it's Eli and runs to Eli and Eli says he hadn't called him, and then when the Lord calls again and he runs to Eli again and Eli sees that the Lord is speaking to Samuel, and he tells him that if this happens again, say, speak Lord for thy servant heareth. And so Samuel did it and the Lord told Samuel how he was going to punish the house of Eli for the wickedness of Eli's sons. And then when Eli made Samuel tell him what the Lord had said, Eli accepts it as from the Lord. And then of course you have the cutworking of it, that terrible incident in the early life of Samuel. All who were from Dan even to Beersheba knew that Samuel was established to be a prophet of the Lord. We read in chapter 3, verses 19 and 20, Samuel grew and the Lord was with him, and did let none of his words fall to the ground. How many years involved in this, we don't know.

But in chapter 4 we have the Philistines coming to attack them while Daniel is still a young man and there you have the fulfillment of the prediction God had made through a nameless prophet in chapter 2, and also through Samuel in chapter 3. We have the battle, and the people pray, the people show their superstition (13 $\frac{1}{4}$)

let us fetch the ark of the covenant of the Lord out of Shiloh unto us, that, when it comes it may save us out of the hand of our enemies. And any prediction (13 $\frac{1}{8}$)

into superstition. The finest things, those which are most used in the Lord's service, can become objects of superstition, as the ark became here. These people instead of getting on their knees before the Lord, asking what was wrong, and trying to get their hearts right before him so that he can give them the victory, simply say bring the ark in and then we will have the victory, and it didn't work that way. The Lord not only let the Philistines defeat them but ^{let} ~~have~~ them take the ark and let them (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

come and capture Shiloh and destroy it though that's not mentioned here at all. We find over in Jeremiah that Shiloh, the destruction of Shiloh, was (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) a terrible example of God's wrath.

At any rate the Israelites were terribly defeated and the people ran, and here was Eli 98 years old, when did he judge Israel for forty years, when he was 58 to 98? Or had he finished his judgeship sometime before this? He surely must have been retired for some time, because he was 98 years old and when he died he could hardly see, we are told.

O.T.History 250. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...judged Israel forty years. And so here is the youth of Samuel ending with a terrible situation, the ark taken, the people overcome by the Philistines, the land at about as low an ebb as it's ever been, Eli the beloved leader is dead and Samuel has to take a hold. And so ~~the~~ B, will be:

B, The Return of the Ark. We'll look at that tomorrow morning. And I trust the miracles in connection with the return of the ark will be mentioned in all of your papers.

(1 3/4, two very brief questions, quiz, to 2 3/4)

We were looking yesterday at A, which was the ancestry and youth of Samuel. We notice something of his ancestry and his tribal membership, his call of the Lord, his relationship to Eli, the wickedness of Eli's sons, the problem of chronology involved here and the situation which led to his being recognized as a prophet throughout the land and the death of Eli. Now those are a good many things under ancestry and youth of Samuel. I hope ~~that my~~ if I ask you in the final exam to discuss the ancestry and youth of Samuel that none of you omit any of them.

B, is the Return of the Ark. And the return of the ark is the outstanding miraculous event in the book of Judges. In the book of 1 Samuel, I mean. There is very, very little that would be marked as miraculous in 1 Samuel. There is much of men's relationship with God, there is some of God's revelation to man, but there is very little of God's doing things in the sphere of the physical world in a way that would be designated as miraculous in the book of 1 Samuel. But ~~there~~, under the return of the Ark there is more than at any other point.

We have of course first, the matter of how they came to bring the Ark back. The Philistines had captured the Ark, God had let them capture it because the Israelites

had been using the Ark in an entirely wrong way. They had been making a thing of magic of it, and God is always grieved when his people change what he has given for religious purposes into an object of magic. And it can be done with anything whatever, the Bible can be made an instrument of magic, we can think that by having the Bible on our table, by putting it out where people can see it, by carrying it around with us, even by reading a certain amount of time out of it a day, that thereby we are winning God's favor. God is interested in getting the ideas which are in the Bible into our heads, not in our going through a form of reciting ~~spiritual~~ ^{certain} words, excellent to recite words, it is helpful in getting the idea into our heads, but if we think that the reciting of the words, or that the spending a certain amount of time on it, is something that in itself secures God's favor and improves our position in life, we are making it magic rather than religion. And of course the extreme instance of this is that when the Ark of the Covenant which was supposed to be in the tabernacle as a means of teaching the people lessons about God and showing them how they can approach to God, was used to take it out into battle with the thought that then they must win the battle, was making it strictly a thing of magic and God did just what could be expected under those circumstances--he allowed it to be taken prisoner by the Philistines and allowed the Israelites to completely lose the battle, so now the Philistines had the ark and naturally they took it as a great trophy and put it into the house of Dagon their fish God and they set it up there. Whether Dagon is a fish God or not, we don't know, we don't know much about the Philistines, but does anyone here know of a reason why it might be suggested that he was a fish God? Yes. The word we know about it is from a book in Hebrew which calls him Dagon, and Dag is the Hebrew word for fish. And so his name in the Hebrew means fish. Well, it may have been a Philistine name which this is just the nearest the Hebrews could come to pronounce it, it may have nothing to do with fish, on the other hand it may be that this is a translation of the name in the Philistine language. Yes?

(student. 7 1/4) That this Dagon was the grain god. I haven't checked on this particular point in the (7 3/4) material, but the material might well throw light on it. I don't recall this particular name in the material but it may very well be there. The (8) material has Baal in it,

and it has it has various heathen gods mentioned in it (8)

and Dagon is certainly not as outstanding but it may be there, I just don't know. I mentioned to you yesterday that we had practically no archeological material about this period. I perhaps should modify that slightly and say that the (8 $\frac{1}{4}$)

material may throw some light on this period, but I doubt if it would throw a great deal on this period because the (8 $\frac{1}{2}$) material comes from a much earlier time, it comes from at least two or three hundred years earlier. It comes from a region much northward from this, and it comes from the Canaanites and it would tell much about the Canaanite. The Philistines were not Canaanites, they were a people who had migrated in there, unrelated to the Canaanites and unless they took something over from the Canaanites the (9) material would hardly throw light on that. Now it is possible that the (9) might have taken over a god from the Canaanites, but it would seem not at all impossible but certainly not far from certain and likely it would be the other way, they would bring their own gods with them. ^{when they came.} And we know so little about the Philistines that actually it is pretty hard (9 $\frac{1}{2}$)

There may be men who make theories about them, some are pretty ~~dogmatic~~ ^{dogmatic} on their theories but we don't have much evidence on the Philistines, for the reason I gave yesterday.

Mr. Myers? (student. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$) No, thank you for that question, that is good to have clarified. The word (9 $\frac{3}{4}$) is a word which designates a kind of dye which was found along the coast of Syria, what is now Lebanon, north of Palestine. This dye there was sold all over the ancient world, very valuable, the Phoenician purple. At an earlier time it was called Canaanite purple. We have it mentioned way over in Babylon as the Canaanite wool, Canaanite purple. The word Canaan includes what we speak of as Palestine, and also the region to the north, Lebanon, they were both called Canaan in ancient times. Now Phoenicia is used only for that northern section. Phoenicia is what is today Lebanon. It is the area north of Palestine, on the coast, the coastal plain, that was called Phoenicia. Now Philistia is entirely different from Phoenicia. They both start with F, with the F sign, but the rest of the word is entirely different. The Philistines are a people who occupy mainly the coastal plain in the southern part of

Palestine, not to any great extent the northern part of Palestine, and not at all in what we call Phoenicia, which is present-day Lebanon. The Philistines came there from either Crete or Anatolia, somewhere to the West, they had a culture, they brought the knowledge of the use of iron with them, how to handle it, to make good weapons of it, and good implements, they had a culture very different from that of the Phoenicians. The Phoenicians were the great traders, they were the great sea-faring people of that (11 $\frac{1}{2}$)

One of the leading Phoenician cities is Bibla and they got papyrus from Egypt and exchanged it for cedars of Lebanon, and then the papyrus they had left over after they had all they wanted, they took to Greece and sold it, and so the Greeks called it after their city, Bibla, and we get our name Bible from the Phoenicia, which should be carefully distinguished from Philistia, the two are entirely different.

Well, now these Philistines then put him in the temple of their god, many today think that he was the grain god, and he may have been, we know very little about it, aside from what is told here in the Bible. But this, next morning they found that their statue of their god was fallen on his face to the earth before the Ark of the Lord. Well, that could happen once, a (12 $\frac{1}{4}$) wind statue could fall over. But it happened again the next night. And that's pretty hard to explain as pure happenstance. The next morning they found Dagon on his face before the Ark of the Lord, and the head and the palms of his hands were broken off.

And so, in addition to that, we find that they began to get emerods, they began to have a disease, have boils, and they decided that this was an unhealthy thing for them to have this ark and to hold it down there. Their god was broken and they themselves were diseased, they thought we'd better get rid of it, and so they said let's get rid of this thing, what will we do with it? And so they took it over to another town, Gath, up in Ashdod and there at Gath there was a great destruction, they had an epidemic, these boils again. So they went it to Ekron. In Ekron by this time, people were afraid as soon as they saw it coming, didn't want it in their place. And there they had the boils, so it was seven months in this country of the Philistines, and the Philistines called for their priests and diviners and said what shall we do with it? Up to this point,

there had been wonderfully (14 $\frac{1}{4}$) repeated miracles (14 $\frac{1}{4}$)

The spread of disease also might be a miracle, certainly it was God's activity, God's providence, whether he acted in a way contrary to normal procedure in nature, whether the epidemic had been prepared long before and right at that time it would come in, whether it even was on the Ark and God (14 3/4) it in that way, we don't know.

O.T.History 251. (1 $\frac{1}{8}$)

...brought the epidemic to the people and caused them (1 $\frac{1}{8}$)

whether the spread of the pestilence would be called a miracle, but certainly the falling over of the statue was a miracle, miraculous intervention of God, and the other at least the providential action of God to show his displeasure, and then the Philistines having this impressed on their minds, decided to send it home. Now what is the next miracle? Who knows? (student.1 $\frac{1}{4}$) The oxen going in the right direction. They said, these Philistines' diviners were men of considerable intelligence, they said don't just take this ark and give it back to the Israelites, they said put an offering on it, a certain amount of gold on it and images of the boils and (1 $\frac{1}{8}$) and then they said, take two milch kine, that is a cow which has recently had a calf, take these two milch cows which had never been tied to anything, we read in verse 7, had never been used as offerings, to pull a plow or to pull a wagon, take these milch cows and tie them to the cart, take their calves away from them and lock their calves up. And then let go of it and see what happens. And what is apt to happen to a cow like that when its calf is locked off. Is it apt to go off in the opposite direction? Two of them going right beside each other, pulling the cart.

One time I was in the High Sierras in California, a friend and I, and we rented a burro, to carry our packs, we were going over some pretty high mountains. We didn't want to have to carry two week's provisions on our backs. So we rented this burro. We never used a burro before. We had quite a job in learning the tact of how to get on and get all packed up and everything. And when we got everything packed on this burro, then the man said, "Oh, he said, you won't mind if the colt just follows

behind. We didn't know the burro had a colt. We started off with this burro and the colt followed along behind. And he didn't give us a very decent pack strap. He didn't have anything to hold it in front, so as we went up the mountain, it would slip back and back and back further and over its rump until finally it would slip off. And when it would get half way back, we would get on both sides and try to hold it, but usually you couldn't hold it, the only thing you could do would be to take it off and fasten it again up in front. We found later that we should have had a thing in front to hold it, so it wouldn't slip back, just as we had one in back, so it wouldn't slip front as we went down hill. But we came to one place where there was a pass we wanted to go over, and the men in the neighborhood said, you'll never get over that pass with the burro. You'll slide down the side. It is impossible. You just absolutely can't go through. When you hear stories like this, I never take it at face value. I always go up and see what it looks like close. We got up close and we saw that we could get across it. It wasn't too bad. But we just didn't have any shovel with us. We had to take our pots and use this to dig the snow out, in order to make a path along the side of the slope there, and it was getting along in the afternoon, as we started across this slope. And we had quite a job getting it across, the stuff We had to pick ~~it~~ up and carry it, and then half drag the burro. And when we got it across, the pass, and got it repacked, one of us remembered the colt, so we went back and we looked for the colt, and there was the colt on the other side of the pass, and we tried to drive it across. It just wouldn't go. And we tried for about 15 or 20 minutes, the sun was getting lower and we had to get down out of the snow area of the camp, before dark, so we just went on. So for the next two days we had the experience of what it was to take the burro with its colt taken away from it. That burro which was very easy to lead before, was quite difficult now. And we had quite a job handling the burro and getting it to go where we wanted it to do, with the colt back there behind. The next day we tied the burro up, carefully to a tree, and left it there, as we went back up the pass and we took a rope with us. And there we got the rope around the burro's colt, and the one got behind him and shoved, and the other one pulled in front, and we ~~manged~~ managed to drag that burro across the pass.

And once we got it across, then it was all that we could to hold it back, because it was in a hurry to get to its mother. And we got it down and we got the two reunited and then from there on it was much easier to go across. Well, it was a vivid experience of what it means to have a burro with its colt left behind, and here there wasn't one problem in that situation but two. Two that had never dragged and before, never had been (6) by it, they are yoked together by this cart, and the calves are kept at home, away from them, and they, the heavy cart with the ark on, and with these on, and they let it go, and see what happened. And the ark went straight up on the hill, up to the Israelites. And Professor Amstead of the University of Chicago wrote his book on the history of Palestine, and in it he said, the cows went up there, lowing as they went, as if in protest against the Divine compulsion that forced them to go away from their calves. Of course, Amstead doesn't believe a word of it. He is ridiculing the story, although he does it in such a tone, that you would never know it, unless you know his view point, for it was an entirely unbelieving view point. But in his history of Palestine and Syria, a book which is one of the most exasperating books I have ever seen, written 25 years ago, and it was at that time the most up to date thing on Palestinian archaeology, because Amstead knew the archaeology thoroughly, and knew the material of Palestine, and from Assyria. If you would find all of the material up to that date that was known in his book, with good pictures, too. It was an excellent production in a way, but a most baffling, disgusting producing for this reason - that Amstead in his book, History of Palestine and Syria, when he would deal with something that everybody knew, and which is just common, all archaeologists knew it. Nobody else would know it, he would incidentally mention it, just very briefly and pass on. And when he would mention something on which there were two or three theories about it, he would take the one he preferred, and he would stress it quite strongly, and then he would come to a matter where he had a brand new theory that nobody else had ever heard of, and nobody had ever accepted it, and nobody else would accept it, and he would give that in such a dogmatic tone, making two or three arguments for it, to drive it home in such a way, the person not trained in archaeology would think, now here's a thing that is really certain. Look at all the evidence that

Amstead gives for this. Look at how he stresses this. And you have to know about as much about the archaeology as Amstead did, in order to evaluate his statements, and ~~which~~ know which to depend on, and which not. Then when he speaks of this, he tells how they went up there, lording as they went, as if in protest against the Divine compulsion. Anybody knowing nothing about it, would think, here's one thing that Amstead just has no doubt about. Of course, knowing his view point, you know that this is one thing that he thinks is just a pure fiction, it has no basis in it whatever. But we ^{who} believe the Bible, ^{read} ~~hahaha~~ that this happened, and we have no reason to doubt that it did, but I think that we can consider it definite here, unquestionably a Divine intervention in human life, causing something to happen which is contrary to the ordinary forces of nature. If a homing pigeon flies back to the place it came from, that is a thing that we are accustomed to. It happens repeatedly. But when these cows go in the opposite direction, pulling the cart, the two working together, with their calves left behind, the only way that anybody can do, is either to say that this is a story that is a legend and there is no truth to it, or to say this is an instance when the God of the universe, is intervening in order to accomplish his purpose in human life.

So we have here one of the very, very few miraculous events that occurs in either first or Second Samuel. (Question: Then a miracle is: a phenomena that a thing that happens that is contrary to nature?) Now unfortunately the word miracle is used in different senses. In a strictly Biblical sense, the word miracle you want to see what does the Hebrew word mean? And the Hebrew word, the two words used מֵיִן and מֵיִן and מֵיִן means a sign. It means an evidence. It means no more than that. Out of 200 uses, perhaps 40 of them refer to what we call miracles and the others to simply indications ~~and~~ or inferences. So that that one word does not ~~mean~~ mean anything supernatural. The word מֵיִן, the other word which is only used about 9 or 10 times, usually means something that is very unusual, but even it does not always mean a supernatural event. The idea of miracle as an event which shows power of thought beyond what He providentially used, is not taught by any specific Biblical word. But it is an idea which has passed into our Theological discussion for many centuries, because of the fact that some of the signs

which God gave, undoubtedly were acts which utilized the power beyond or different from what God normally used in the providential control over life, and in common use the word miracle has come to mean one which is clear proof of supernatural intervention. Some people define it, I think theologically it is usually defined as the sign in the external world which is beyond the ordinary nature, and ^{which} shows ~~from man making~~ the immediate power of God. You see, there is no Hebrew word which designates that particular idea, but of the signs in the Bible, many of which are God's providentially causing things to work in a certain way, there are some and a very specific amount which definitely means that he did repeat it in the interest of the other (12) and so I think it is permissible to use the word in the common sense, but it is helpful to see in which sense we are using it, so I think Mr. Mitchell's question was a very good question. Very appropriate.

Yes? (Question). The difficulty there, the way the word miracle is most commonly used is, a supernatural activity. The way the really Biblical usage is, simply an indication of God's power. Now there is no established terminology for the

(12 $\frac{1}{2}$). Usually when people say, "Is it a miracle?" they mean, did God interfere with the normal processes of the world. But of course, I personally believe that God is always interfering in the sense that he providentially controls everything, and causes that all work together to accomplish his purposes. And I also believe that His power is so fast and so varied that no man has any ability to know about exertion of His power, supervening the normal course of nature. We have no way of knowing. We are constantly discovering more about the possibilities of nature, and it is perfectly easy to imagine that there may be a hundred times as much as we know already about nature. This is part of God's ~~normal~~ ^{normal} providentially working. Of course, He works in such a way that it is hard for us to tell, sometimes. So I don't think we can always distinguish them. But certainly we can say that these two, the falling of the statue, and the going of these cows is something which is so vary (14) that it is an intervention in a very unusual way. Now in the case of the shutting up of the Jordan, that was just as much a wonderful sign of God's activity, as anything else. God could have said to the water, you stand right up, and they could have done that. He could have caused a - God could have caused an invisible line of sound waves to be

placed right up and down there, that the water couldn't get through, and the water would have stood right up there. I went to the dentist yesterday, and a woman cleaned my teeth, and she said, I'm using sound waves to clean your teeth. Now ten years ago people would have laughed at this. They would think it was a silly idea. She said to me, another five years, and people will be washing their dishes with sound waves. Now I've never seen a dish cleaned with sound waves. I never before saw a tooth cleaned with sound waves. I held the mirror in front of my mouth and it looked to me as if she had succeeded in cleaning them. She said, it was the sound waves that did it.

O.T. History. 252. (0)

line of sound waves could stand right there and cause that water to stand right up on a heap and you could not see anything holding it back. But the Scripture doesn't give us to think that was the way He did it here. There he caused it to happen by Adam, which is the ~~same~~ place where in 1927, an earthquake caused earth to ~~stand~~ hold it back rather than sound waves. Now how are we going to distinguish which is a use of God's power, and which he exerts in nature, and which he uses beyond the nature. To me, nature is God's constant exertion of power, ^{and there are no laws} that bind God, that God can break. But there are ^{habitual} ~~judicial~~ methods ⁱⁿ which God ^{causes that the} forces ~~is~~ that it shall work. ^{And they do work that way,} God chooses to work in certain ways. As far as I can see in the Bible, in the bulk of cases where He gives a sign, He causes the ^{he put here} forces ^{to} work in such a way, as to give us convincing evidence rather than ~~think of~~ ^{introduce} necessarily to ~~think of~~ a new course at any particular time, a new course which he might only use once in a million years, or something of the kind.

2 (Question: Is the element present ^{always that it} - will it always arrest the attention of the observer?) ^A miracle, that is the central idea of a miracle, the miracle, our word miracle is taken from the Latin word ^{miraculum} miracle which means a sign. It is something which causes the observer to feel that there ~~is~~ the power of God. It is an evidence of something startles your attention. Now, of course, too, I think we can say this about it, that God has as much sense as an advertiser of today, probably a lot more. But our advertisers put on the television every day, put on a lengthy description of the scientific ^{means} by which they would undertake to prove that Viceroy cigarets have a better filter than other kinds

of cigarets, and chances are that everybody would turn off their TV when the explanation starts, but instead of that they have a man stand up and say, now remember, Viceroy has a thinking man's filter. See that man, he thinks for himself, he uses Viceroy, and I've probably heard that a thousand times on the TV, I'll probably have to get it to my dying day, but I have never heard any evidence given of any sort, but it probably has sold many more Viceroy cigarets than the other would. Now God has given us evidence, he has given us evidence which the thinking person can work out and study and see the evidence of the existence of the power of his being. But he is working with human beings who are sinful and who do not want to know about him, and he is using means to attract their attention and strike God's truth to their minds, to drive it home to them, and while the evidence is there for the person who will bother to look into it and examine it, for the bulk of people who won't bother he uses the striking example to drive the thing home to their minds. So we need not expect these miracles in the Bible to be presented in the manner of a carefully worked out logical evidence. That is there that we can find, but the way it is presented to the people ^{is the way} to get it to their hearts and minds, and attract their attention. (student. 4 1/2) 1 Samuel 5:8,9. Let the Ark of Israel be carried about unto Gath. And they carried the ark of the God of Israel about thither. And I've looked that up in the Hebrew. I believe it's simply Old English, they took it there. That's my impression, it's Old English. It's possible there's an unusual Hebrew phrase there, but it's not my impression. (5)

But my impression is that it's simply the Old English way of saying they took it to Gath. They carried it ~~about thither~~ about thither. About thither, that could cause somebody today to wonder just what on earth it's driving at, if you stop to think about it, it's another of the many evidences of the fact that we need a Bible that is dependable, that really translates the original, in this present day a great need but a difficult one.

Well, the ark then was brought back to Bethshemesh and the people of Bethshemesh looked into it, and they found, they saw there, they looked into it and we read in verse 19 that he smote the men of Bethshemesh because they had looked into the ark of the Lord, even he smote of the people 50,000 and 70 men, and the people lamented because the Lord had smitten many of the people with a great slaughter, and the men of Bethshemesh

said, Who is able to stand before this holy Lord God? and to whom shall he go up from us? And they sent messengers to the inhabitants of Kirjathjearim, saying, the Philistines have brought again the ark of the Lord, come you down and fetch it up to you.

And there's an interesting critical problem about verse 15. Yes I think I'll take a second for it, in verse 15, of chapter 6, if you look at that in your Bible it would be helpful, chapter 6, we read in verse 14, and the cart came into the field of Joshua, a Bethshamite, and stood there where there was a great stone and they clave the wood of the cart and offered the kind a burnt offering unto the Lord, and the Levites took down the ark of the Lord, and the coffer that was with it, wherein the jewels of gold were, and put them on the great stone, and the men of Bethshemesh offered burnt offerings and sacrificed sacrifices the same unto the Lord. What's the problem there? Mr. Deshpande? (student. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$) Yes. There's an offering made there not in accordance with the specific command of the Lord. But of course this offering is only given by, in an unusual situation, it's not an ordinary offering (7 3/4)

so I don't think it should be taken as evidence that the law of God was not known. But aside from that the problem is the arrangement here, in which there is a logical arrangement rather than a chronological arrangement of events. And one critical book says, you see here, how ridiculous this is, it says in verse 14 that they cut the wood of the cart and offered the cows a burnt offering to the Lord, and then verse 15 says the Levites took down the ark of the Lord, it says they took the ark of the Lord down after the cart had already been torn up and burnt, for a burnt offering to the Lord. And as it is given the order is not chronological, the order is not chronological, it first tells about what the men of Bethshemesh did, took the wood of the cart and then they offered the cows a burnt offering, and then it tells how the Levites took down the ark of the Lord and the coffer with it, wherein the jewels of gold were, and put them on the great stone, and then it says the men of Bethshemesh offered burnt offerings and sacrificed sacrifices the same day, so that you have here not a chronological arrangement, but a logical arrangement, what the men did and what the Levites did, and then how the men of Bethshemesh continued through that day. And of course the critics claim that it's evidence that you have two

narratives put together, because they say it doesn't make sense the way it stands. But if ~~as a statement~~ ^{it is as obvious} as they say, that it doesn't make sense, it would have been obvious to the man who put the two narratives together. He wouldn't have put them together in that way. He must have thought that it could reasonably be taken as it is, if there was such a man who put it together. And ^{if} a man could put it together and think it was reasonable, a man could write it and think that. So we simply have to take from it that we cannot take everything in the Bible in chronological order, it is often in logical order rather than in chronological, and the same is true with our own accounts. We don't always deal with things as definitely in the order in which they happened but we deal with what one person did and then what another did and what another, and there can confusion come from that if we try to insist that it is chronological. Well, the ark then was taken up to Kirjathjearim and stayed there 20 years. Why didn't they take it back to Shiloh? 1 Samuel doesn't tell us. It just says here that they took it Kirjathjearim, and told the men of Kirjathjearim it was there, come and get it, they came and got it and it stayed there 20 years, why didn't they take it to Shiloh? 1 Samuel doesn't tell us. In the light of Jeremiah we think we know, in the light of the fact that the earlier part of Samuel tells about the battle which the Israelites lost and that Shiloh does not again be the place where the ark is, Jeremiah gives us a hint that actually there was a tremendous destruction of Shiloh by the Philistines at this time. After Eli died the people fled, because the Philistines didn't just win the battle and go on home, they did as any sensible force did, after they won the battle, they pushed forward in order to win the peace as well as to win the war, and they pushed forward and they destroyed Shiloh and they subjected the Israelites to them, and so they sent it not to Shiloh but to Kirjath-jearim. Yes? (student. 11 $\frac{1}{2}$) Yes, well, who has their Hebrew Bible with them? Mr. Rapp what is the word there, 1 Samuel 1:9? The end of the verse. Eli the priest sat upon a seat by a post of the temple of the Lord. It is (12 $\frac{1}{4}$) *

Another warning--very important---another warning against a very easy tendency, to insist that the Bible always uses words in a specific technical sense. I know of a man who insists--he's very much against pre-

millennialism and one of his reasons, the argument he gives, he's a theological professor, he insists that the word "the end" when this phrase is used, that it means the end of the age and that the return of Christ in glory to (12 3/4) all people under him is no millenium. He insists the end must mean that. Well, when I refer to his end or the end of the age, he says I mean the end when it's used absolutely, without any (13)

So then when we found a case where the word end was used absolutely (13 $\frac{1}{2}$) he said oh in that case it's used (13 $\frac{1}{4}$)

and we have to recognize that in all sciences we try to use words technically, we say this word will have this specific meaning, and we'll only use it in that sense, but the very scientist, once he gets out of his laboratory is probably using those same words in common language, without that precise technical use, and science moves forward and it's necessary to change the technical meaning of the words. We used to use the word "positive" as meaning the place from which electricity comes and "negative" to mean the place to which it goes. Now we still use the word positive only we ^{mean} use exact opposite by it, we mean the same end of the battery we meant before, but we have the opposite idea of what happens, because we now know that electricity goes in the opposite direction to what we used to think, when we made the terms. We haven't changed the terms, we use the terms in a wider sense, they're used to mean the exact opposite of what they say, but all they way through (14 $\frac{1}{4}$)

and rather than to try to change the use of words we simply use a word to mean the opposite of what the natural word means. ^{It gives} ~~De-give~~ an illustration of how the technical meaning changes from time to time (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

have precise technical. It's most interesting to see what people do when they try to tell what the last days are. The last days are a technical term for this particular time. Well, (14 3/4)

After all, it means after a time, it means later on, that's all it means, it doesn't mean a technical period at all...

...pre-millennial, post-millennial, a-millennial, whatever it is think insist it's a technical term but they take a different sense for it each time, and every one has to say certain things are not technical or they don't (3/4)

Now these words, it's important for us to have in mind, let's say a word about them. Our English word tabernacle to us means a religious place, but in the Hebrew there is no word tabernacle, in the Hebrew there's a word (1) * which means a tent, and in the Hebrew there's a word (1) * which means a dwelling place. Well, any place where they sacrificed to the Lord is simply called a * but ordinarily it wasn't, ordinarily the word (1 1/4) * is designated a rather permanent dwelling place when the tabernacle was actually set up it then was called the (1 1/4) * Before that I don't recall a place where God was worshipped called the (1 1/4) * But the word * a tent, a tent could be used of the tent where Abraham lived, it could be used of the tent where they had the center of worship previous to the tabernacle and it is used of the tabernacle a great deal of the time. We read in Hebrews about how Abraham lived in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob. Of course to us it gives an idea of a certain amount of religious ceremony. Actually all it means is a tent, much better if it would be translated that way. But the Hebrew is tent and dwelling, either of which could mean any place, but both of which are used after the erection of the tabernacle, very commonly for the tabernacle. Now the temple of the Lord is ordinarily called the house of the Lord, and the word house of the Lord could be used of the tabernacle. It could be so used, but it isn't ordinarily, ordinarily it's simply called the tent. Ordinarily you think of a house as a place more fixed and the word house of the Lord is commonly used ~~at-the-temple~~ (2 1/2) very often is meant the house of the Lord. But the ordinary word for temple comes from two Sumerian words, (2 3/4) means house in Sumerian and dal means great, so a great house in Sumerian means the biggest house, much more than the ordinary person had and it means a palace, a palace of the king, called the (3) and then the palace of the king,

the the Babylonians called an which is derived from (3 $\frac{1}{4}$) a palace, and then that word has been taken over into Hebrew as (3 $\frac{1}{4}$) * but in Hebrew it's used not for the palace of the king but for the palace of the Lord, so our ordinary word for temple is (3 $\frac{1}{4}$) * which is derived from the Sumerian word for palace. Well now this derivation then as you see comes to be the regular word for temple, (3 $\frac{1}{4}$) but it could be used before the great temple of Solomon. From this use here, there are those who think that at Shiloh they had fixed up a permanent thing rather than just a tent for a tabernacle. It's altogether possible that since they expected to be permanently there in Shiloh for the center of worship that they built a wooden structure around the tabernacle, that in some way the tabernacle was encased in wood, something like that. Maybe wood put in certain places to make it stronger, so that it could be called a temple, because that word temple is used for Shiloh. But we have no evidence, we have very little evidence said about Shiloh, but we have no evidence ^{of} ~~that~~ any important change in the tabernacle. (student. 4 $\frac{1}{4}$) Yes, because they are told in Numbers how to carry all the--who's to carry this, who's to carry that, who's to carry the other. All described in Numbers. And then when the people came across the Jordan they carried the ark first but it would be reasonable to take all the rest. It would seem that the tabernacle must have been at Shiloh but here we have no further mention about the tabernacle, just the ark we read about, until the temple of Solomon was built. Well, what happened in the meantime, did the Philistines come up ~~and~~ destroy Shiloh and the tabernacle get destroyed with it and all of it lost? Did the Israelites, knowing the Philistines were coming, take the altar, incense and the laver and some of the valuable things out of the tabernacle and flee with them? Did they perhaps take the tabernacle itself and flee? Had they put the tabernacle at Kirjath-jearim, is that why the people of Bethshemesh sent to Kirjath-jearim and said fetch the ark, because the things of the tabernacle were there? We just don't know. There's so much we don't know about the history, that it's interesting to conjecture. I think it's important to recognize the limit between what we know and what we don't know. Yes? (5 3/4) student) Did he reconstruct all of it? I don't know.

Certainly the temple he built, the great bulk of the temple was a new production, and it's built after the general plan of the tabernacle, but are some of the parts of it the same, I would think they would be. After all, during David's time they used it, they had it in a tent in Jerusalem, all through David's time. David said shall the Lord dwell in a tent and I dwell in a house of cedar. It was there, and I don't think they just had the ark by itself. They must have had something similar to the tabernacle during those 20 years or more under David's reign, but how much of it they had, we just aren't told. Yes? (student. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$) Yes, I've mentioned that before. I'll just briefly mention it again. Two Danes went to excavate Shiloh in 1928 or 1929, I'm not sure when they started, they were working in 1929 when I visited them. Shiloh, Beirut of modern day. These two Danes, one of whom was a very godly man and tremendously anxious to get down to the part where the tabernacle had been, evidence of it, the other was a museum expert who was tremendously interested in ancient things, not particularly in religion. These two were working together and every few days of working they'd get into a big squabble and have to come up to Jerusalem and Dr. Albright would pacify them and get them settled so they ^{could} continued working together. And I visited them with him in 1929, the work was going nicely, but the trouble was they dug down to the Byzantine period and there they found a Byzantine church and this Byzantine church had a most interesting mosaic and the museum man from Copenhagen was tremendously interested in this Byzantine material, but to take that up bit by bit, bit by bit, would take two or three years, take a lot of time, a lot of effort, a lot of funds, and the other man was not a bit interested in that but you can't just destroy things of a later period to get to the bottom so they were frustrated in getting to the bottom by having all this of the Byzantine period to take up first, and then before long the museum man died, and a good part of the money, of course, had come through him ^{by} the people who had confidence in him, and the work had to stop. So far as I know it's never been started since 1929. So that the work at Shiloh was begun but only carried that far, we just don't know. Whether if we were able to carry it on down, take two or three years to get all this Byzantine stuff out of the way and find what's underneath, we would find things of great importance on this, or not, it's hard to say, because the Philistines burnt or destroyed

it, they might have taken away everything of importance the others had at first, and there might be little, on the other hand there might be a great deal. Yes? (student. 8 3/4) Yes, oh that wouldn't be difficult, that in the present stage of things, that is the fact that the excavation has been carried down to maybe 500 A.D., 400 A.D., something like that, in view of that, it would be absolutely impossible ^{to say} with absolute dogmatism, it was not occupied from about 300 A.D., but it would be possible to say it was perhaps 90% certain, for this reason, that in two or three places they would dig pits and in these pits they would find pottery and material from the different periods, and therefore if they find pottery and materials from about 1200 B.C., and right above it they find some from about 300, that is proof that at that spot there was no settlement between 1200 and 300, ^{well} but if they look at two or three spots, that's a fairly good evidence, ^{now of course} but it is not impossible that the section of the city that has not been excavated, had a small (10) in between, but it's quite unlikely in two or three places. An archeologist, before they excavate a place, always makes trial pits (10 $\frac{1}{4}$) they always do because they have to have a general idea of what they're apt to find in order to make their plans as to how to arrange it, how to divide their time, and so on. But it's always done and it's not final but you can be at least 80% certain. So I would think that a statement like that, that between 1200 and 300 it was not occupied, is a statement that we can make, not with absolute certainty but with pretty tolerable certainty, in view of that. And of course in the Bible (10 3/4) scripture.

Well the ark, then, is brought back.

Number 6 is the Victory of Ebenezer. Now this does not come for some time because, first--no, it's chapter 7, the victory of Ebenezer, we read here that the Philistines gathered against the people, that Samuel called the people to Mizpah, and that the Israelites had a victory over the Philistines at Ebenezer, and we gather from this that the Israelites had a powerful measure of safety during the succeeding years, but they certainly were not independent altogether. They were subject to Philistine raids, they probably had to pay tribute to them, they were in constant danger from them, they were

not in a very good situation, but this was the scene of the victory of Ebenezer, 1 Sam. 7 and this victory of Ebenezer established Samuel as the leader of the people, and we read in verse 15, Samuel judged Israel all the days of his life and he went from year to year to Bethel and Gilgal and Mizpeh, and judged Israel in all those places. And his return was to Ramah for there was his house, and there he judged Israel. That is probably the (12 1/2) which is about twenty miles north of Jerusalem (12 1/4) though we're not sure. And there he judged Israel and there he built an altar unto the Lord. And of course those who say Deuteronomy wasn't written till later say the fact he built an altar at Ramoth proves that Deuteronomy wasn't yet written. But there's no reason to take it that way, this was the period when they were subject to the Philistines, they had to carry things the best they could, and it was better to have (12 3/4) not under the ideal conditions in Deuteronomy, and Samuel did the best he could to maintain the life of the people during this time. This is Samuel's Circuit.

D, Samuel's Circuit. 1 Sam. 7:15-17. We have had no judge yet of which we've been told that he made the (13 1/4) circuit. Here we have the three places named, four places named, he went to every year, made a regular circuit, he was the leader of the people, he was trying to keep them together and to help them, but they still were not in a very excellent situation, and so it's quite natural that, E, we have,

E, The Selection of a King. Israel demanded a king. Samuel became old, and he made his sons judges over Israel, the name of his firstborn was Joel and the name of his second Abiah, they were judges in Beersheba, but they didn't walk in his ways but turned aside after lucre and took bribes and perverted judgment. Samuel was so busy with this circuit around, these four places, and trying to carry on the direction of the whole nation by himself that he did not take the attention to the upbringing of his children that he should, he did not learn from Eli's unfortunate example, but followed his bad example and his sons took bribes and perverted judgment and the elders of Israel gathered themselves together and came to Samuel and they asked him to give them a ^{king} ~~change~~, to judge them like all the nations. And it displeased Samuel and Samuel wanted them to con-

tinue as they were but the Lord gave them a king, the Lord tried to comfort Samuel, he said they haven't rejected you, they've rejected me. They had rejected men, and God raising up leaders (15) but they had never followed

O.T. History 254. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...number IX, the life of Samuel, and D, Samuel's Circuit. We are ready to look at E, The Selection of a King.

The test that we had not long ago, many of the papers were very excellent and did very well indeed. There were a good many though that were very different, at least (1) Quite a number which surprised me greatly at the small amount of information they contained. And I hope that the next one will be much better. ($1\frac{1}{4}$)

Now, E, then, the selection of a king. We've noticed the situation in which the people asked for a king. The situation in the days of the judges was not satisfactory, from any viewpoint. Ideally, for God to raise up a man to be his representative in time of crisis would sound like an excellent situation, far better than picking a man by a hereditary basis; which in most countries has resulted in very, very poor selection of leaders, on the whole. The hereditary principle is not a good principle. But the system in the days of the judges had no continuity and it had no unity for the nation as a whole, and the judges were sinful men even as the king were, and many of them fell into very severe sin, and the people were ~~constantly~~ ^{constantly} falling away, and when a few people would influence others into wickedness, there was no strong central authority to try to meet the problems at once, and while the king situation is a very unsatisfactory one, the judge situation was perhaps an even more unsatisfactory one. In both situations the man's failure and his sin became very evident. It was not God's purpose to raise up an ideal commonwealth of Israel, it was not his purpose to establish the kingdom of God on earth, it was his purpose to keep alive the testimony and to prepare a way for the coming of his son, the Lord Jesus Christ. And to show by his dealings

with the different individuals, to show us many things we should know about ourselves, about God, about our relationship to Him. And here we find a rather mixed situation, we find Samuel the great leader, the one who has been such a blessing to the people, feeling that he is rejected. Actually if he would think about it a bit he ~~would~~ getting old, and a man can't always be as good after his power has left and when he was younger. And more than that, his sons were proving very inferior. It was more his sons who were rejected than he. Perhaps the very fact that the people needed strong leadership was to some extent a testimony to the value they had received from the strong leadership that Samuel had been able to give them in the past, which he could no longer give, and which his sons were certainly not able to give. At any rate, Samuel was very much hurt, and you will find some of the finest men, some of the very best men, will have their weak points, will be hurt where there's little reason for them to be, and here God tries to comfort Samuel, and says Samuel it isn't you that they are turning against, it is me. Of course, people are always turning against the Lord, and God lets Samuel tell the people all the bad side of a kingship. The way that a king is apt to lord it over them, the way he's going to have heavy taxes, he will take away from their good things, and all this, the bad side of a king, but the people were conscious of the (4 3/4)

and oppression, and anything seemed better than that to them. The people said Nay, but we want a king to rule over us. The Lord said, Hearken to their voice and make them a king. So here we have the request of the people, then we have the selection of the people. Samuel was to give them a king, but he looks to the Lord to show the man. And the Lord picked a man whom the people would not have picked, he picked a man who was not outstanding, he was not well-known, but he was pretty close to the ideal that the people had in mind. He was strong, able man, an effective leader, a man who would be a good soldier and he was a man of great humility. And you find in Saul's character that he refuses the kingship, tells how he's unworthy, tries to run away from it, you see the most wonderful illustration of humility, and what a lesson is this for us, because Saul the man who was so humble that he could not possibly accept the kingship, was the man who after he became king was carried away by his pride. Carried away by

his pride, to where he looked for his own glory and refused to follow the Lord's will. How easy it is to be mistaken in people's humility. As long as people don't have much they're apt to be very, very humble, they're (6 1/4) there are some who have nothing who are very, very proud, but many, many a person is very humble when he has nothing, but the minute you put him in a position of power, he gets tremendously conceited and tremendously overbearing. You just cannot predict until a man has been in a situation like that how he is going to react. It was Lord Acton, the great English Roman Catholic historian who was so disgusted that they tried to declare that the Pope was infallible and Acton had been defending Roman Catholicism all his life and was a great Professor in Great Britain, made the declaration when he saw the effort to put so much power in the hands of the Pope that he said that power, he said, leads to corruption, and absolute power leads to absolute corruption. And I don't think that Acton left the church afterward but I think like most of the Roman Catholics he swallowed his words, though many of them had opposed the tendency tremendously ^{of absolute power.} Thank you very much, I couldn't think of the word soon enough. Mr. Deshpande comes from a British speaking country, where they would be more familiar with these British situations than we in the United States. I know that a few years ago here, it was very widely (7 3/4) I imagine it is still

there. It was a great statement that he made and very true.

The humblest man you can't always tell how he will react. Somebody, a man said once, he said to me, When I was in Seminary I was told, I heard this statement made in a class of pastoral theology, don't trust when you first go to a new church, the first man that seems to be so friendly and so kindly, and so helpful, don't immediately proceed to give him everything you can and put yourself ^{right} in his hands. He's apt to be very ~~disappointing~~ ^{disappointing}. He said ~~he~~ I forgot those words when I went into this church, and when I found this young, this humble young man who was so fine, I just did everything I could to get him into the position of leadership where he could help me, and then he turned against me violently. And we ourselves have to be in a position of stress before we can know how we will react to it. We're all weak vessels, and Saul seems to be an ideal man, but, judged by every external standard he was, but when he'd been in this awhile what the heart (9)

God gave the people a man after their own heart.

Not the man they would have picked but the man was the type they wanted. And then he it proved how wrong they were. Yes? (student.9 $\frac{1}{4}$) Yes, God blessed David the king and promised him that he would always have a son to sit upon the throne, and when we read later in the Bible that that occurred, we can know from that that it was not contrary to God's will that they have a king, and if you just read this one chapter alone, you'd think that Samuel, God says to Samuel they haven't rejected you, they've rejected me, you would think that he meant the kingship was not his will. The later events prove that that is wrong. We have to interpret scripture by scripture, and compare it together. I would say that in the end any kingship is wrong, except the kingship of God himself. That is Jesus Christ who is God, but we live in an imperfect world, the world of sin, the world of human beings, and in this world, any (10 $\frac{1}{2}$) is imperfect. In their situation there they needed strong leadership and there was no system, known to give it to them then/except the system of the kingship. Yes? (student.10 $\frac{1}{2}$) I don't think so. I don't think that God felt they rejected him, I think God was trying to comfort Samuel, I think he was saying to Samuel don't you feel bad^r about this. Samuel was a great and good man. And Samuel felt hurt that the people wanted a king, but after all he should have realized that he was too old to be their judge any more and his sons were not worthy, and God is comforting Samuel. God is saying to Samuel the people are not satisfied with God being their king and a human being raised up like Samuel to do it. Well, that was an excellent system so long as you have the right man raised up but there's only been one Samuel in all ^{their} of history. You can't compare Eli with him or Barak with him or Gideon or Jephthah or any of them. They did a good work in their own place, but not a work like Samuel, and the kings, most of them, were not like Samuel either, but the ideal system would be God ruling direct. The people said no, we want an earthly ruler, the people were putting a faith in an earthly ruler which an earthly ruler does not warrant. So that in a sense they were rejecting God, but I don't think, I think we have to compare it with what he says elsewhere, he says David is king, the people must obey David, David's son, God is putting his support on, God does not change, but God expresses himself partially in situations. [^] think we have to interpret. Mr. Deshrande? (student.12 $\frac{1}{4}$)

Yes, that's right. And he tells them what the king will do, these are things which a good king won't do, but most of them, some kings are very bad, and most of them have a tendency that way. It's the wickedness in the human heart, ^{that} give a man the possibility of doing these things (13 $\frac{1}{4}$)

So God shows them the evil and the danger of kings, but at the same time he grants their request and gives them a king, which is what they need in that situation. Mr. ? (student. 13 $\frac{1}{2}$) No, I don't think so.

O.T. History 255. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...the people's concern on the whole is not on their relation to God, it's on their deliverance from (1) It is on the political situation. Of course they got, they wanted deliverance ^{from the Philistines.} they didn't get it right away, they didn't get it till David but they did get it. But God had given deliverance from other (3/4) through judges, but this was, the Philistines, was a greater more difficult

Well, I don't think we can learn a tremendous more about this particular matter of God in relation to kingship, but I think we can get a very valuable warning against taking one verse of the scripture and building too much on it. Compare scripture with scripture. When you find one verse don't try and twist the rest of the Bible to fit it, but take all the verses and see what they teach, and get the balance of them all (1 $\frac{1}{4}$)

one statement here, they've not rejected you, they've rejected me, and from that you could make the whole business of God's blessing on David to be contrary to God's will. (1 3/4)

you have to fit the two together and balance (1 3/4) to see what God's will really is. God's will is that he be king, but with an earthly representative, and the earthly representative, the hereditary system is a pretty poor system, but perhaps it was as good a system as any in that evolved yet. Any system (2)

Well, we won't look at the details of the selection of a king, they are very interesting and very worth studying. It's interesting in connection with this ~~tb/v/v/e~~ ^{know that} in general people seemed to think of Samuel more or less as a soothsayer. And you can go up to him and he'll be able to tell you where your asses are. A way of getting help for the ordinary affairs of life. Of course, that wasn't what Samuel was at all, Samuel was God's leader, but you will find that all through life, that people are using God's leadership trying to make it just a means of meeting their own immediate needs. God is interested in our needs, but he's more interested in the great problems of the kingdom, and he wants us to be too.

The story of the selection of Saul, his anointing and all that, is a very beautiful story, and as you read you just about feel that now it's perfect, they've got a man who is ideally suited, a man of humility, a man of ability, a man who is just perfect for the situation. But later on we find how Saul changes, as so many men change, when they have power.

Well, we're not looking at Saul right now, we're looking at Samuel, so we go on to number F, Samuel Rejecting ^{the} King. And Samuel who had to go against what he wanted in order to give the people a king, now has reconciled himself to it, rejoices in the king, now he has to go against the king they've got and tell them it's not the Lord's will they have it. So poor Samuel is in a position there, has to in order to represent the Lord rightfully, he has to change his attitude several times, it is necessary as situations change. And Samuel finds here in verse 15 that Saul is not serving the Lord right, Saul is putting his own will ahead of God's will, Saul is not obeying the Lord fully, Samuel had to rebuke him and had to tell him that the Lord is ~~coming again~~ ^{going to punish} him for it. That is, if you want to find contradictions in the Bible, chapter 15 here is a very interesting example. Because here in chapter 15 we find that ~~the~~ Samuel said in verse 29, he said to Saul, the strength of Israel will not lie nor repent, for he is not a man that he should repent. That's what it says in verse 29. But right back in verse 11 we find, the word of the Lord came to Samuel, saying I have repented. Now there's a verbal contradiction if there ever was one. The Lord says it repenteth me

that I have set up Saul to be king. Samuel gives the message to Saul, he says the Lord has rent the kingdom from thee and the strength of Israel will not lie nor repent, for he is not a man that he should repent. Here we have verbally a flat contradiction. In actuality of course we don't. Because the first means God is grieved at what Saul has done, in view of the changed circumstances, it is necessary that God change his attitude toward Saul. God has not changed but Saul changed. In the second, Samuel says to Saul, God is going to remove you from being king, now he says no sacrifice or presents or bribe or anything you can do is going to make a change, God is not a man that he can be moved in that fashion. He's not man that he should repent, the Strength of Israel will not lie nor repent. You have to take the implications of these things. In view of the implication of them, there's no contradiction but the flat verbal statements certainly seem like a contradiction. God says I have repented, Samuel says that He is not a man that he should repent. He won't repent. There's no contradiction but there appears to be ~~and instead of~~ Another warning against grabbing three words out of a verse and building a whole theology on it. We're all too ready to do that, we must compare scripture with scripture and see what it's really talking about.

Well, the message is given by Samuel, God has rejected Saul, he's going, as he says in verse 28, the Lord has rent ^{from} thee this day and given it to a neighbour of thine, he has done it this day; but it was years later before it ~~happened~~ ^{actually} worked out, but in principle he had done it that day. So we have, in chapter 16 then, we have a selection of the nucleus which is part of this rejection. Samuel represented the Lord and the rejection of Saul as king.

The Lord said to Samuel, how long wilt thou mourn for Saul, seeing I have rejected him from reigning over Israel? Here we see the character of Samuel. Samuel was against having a king. ^But when they got one and the Lord enabled him to pick him, Samuel was thoroughly loyal to Saul. And God says how long will you mourn for him, I have rejected him. Fill your horn with oil and go, I will send you to Jesse the Bethlehemite for I have provided a king among his sons. So now we have him going down to Bethlehem in order to anoint the new king. And then it's interesting here, from the viewpoint of

prophecy to see how God reveals himself. Here was Samuel, if there ever was a man that knew the Lord, that lived close to him, that followed the Lord and did his will, it surely was Samuel. But look at Samuel here, in verse 6, they bring Jesse's oldest son, Samuel sees him and he says surely this is the Lord's anointed, but the Lord said to Samuel, look not on his countenance nor on the height of his stature because I have refused him, for the Lord seeth not as man seeth, for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looks on the heart. Then Jesse called Abinadab and the Lord said, No, this is not the one. And he called the next one, and Samuel did not know who the one was. Each one he saw, he thought surely this is the one. God said it will be a son of Jesse. Now which one will it be? It shows us that the prophet does not have the mind of God. He was not omniscient. He didn't know everything. He knew what God gave him, and then he tried to figure out what it meant. And here God says it's a son of Jesse. All right, let's see the sons of Jesse, here's the oldest one, this must be him, look what a wonderful looking fellow he is. God says no, that's not the one. So he tries the second, no it's not. And when the Lord said to Samuel, it's going to be a son of Jesse, and then all the sons of Jesse have come, and every one of them the Lord said no, Samuel is in a quandary. How can it be? The Lord says it's a son of Jesse, and yet every one that comes the Lord says no. So Samuel has to find an answer, so Samuel says to Jesse, are these all your children? There must be another one. And Jesse says well there is the little one, the youngest one, he's out keeping the sheep. So Samuel said, fetch him. We won't sit down till he comes. So they find him, and the Lord said, arise, anoint him, for this is he. And so he anointed David to be the future king. The Lord thus enabled Samuel to anoint the first two kings. The first one, the one that represented the ideal the people wanted, the second, the one who didn't seem so much but yet when you got to know him better was found that he was every bit as much the ideal the people wanted as Saul was, and in addition to that he had a heart that was tender toward God. Though he made great mistakes and fell into serious sin, he repented sincerely from the heart and sought to do better, sought to follow the Lord. Instead of becoming hardened in sin and in his pride as Saul did.

Well of course we look more at David later, we are now looking at Samuel, so we go on to,

G, Samuel's death and appearance to Saul. /of Saul/ And for this we have to skip clear over to chapter 25 which tells of his death and the beginning of 25 is his death. Samuel's death. There have been many years when Samuel has been there with his little group of followers serving the Lord, but having little influence in the nation. Now in chapter 25 Samuel dies and all the Israelites gather together and lament him, bury him at Ramah. And then in chapter 28 we find that the Philistine power has become so great and ~~Saul~~ ^{Saul} has gone on in his pride, though Saul has been very zealous in carrying out the Lord's will and in tearing down everything that was clearly contrary to the Lord's will, he has in his pride and in his own desire for his own power, turned against David and hated him and tried to kill him, and now Saul inquires of the Lord and the Lord doesn't answer, either by dreams or by urim or by ~~the uim~~ ^{prophets,} and he sees the hosts of the Philistines in verse 5 of chapter 28 and he's afraid and his heart trembles. Verse 3 tells us that Saul had put away all those that had familiar spirits and wizards, out of the land. Saul had enforced God's command that they should not be tolerated, but now Saul gets no answer from the Lord, and instead of humbling himself before the Lord and seeking to find what's wrong with him before the Lord will answer him, he turns to the forces of iniquity for his answer to the problem. And he has put the familiar spirits out ~~of~~ the land but now instead of humbling himself before God, he goes back to that which he himself had forbidden, ~~in~~ order to seek an answer to the problem. And he said to his servant, seek me a woman that has a familiar spirit and I will go to her and inquire of her. And the servant said, behold there's a woman that hath a familiar spirit at Endor.

When my aunt was in Los Angeles and her brother was living in Montana, she was taken ill, very ill, with a cancer in her breast from which it spread from there into the lung and eventually killed her. And when she was in a very serious situation with that, but far from the end, her brother in Montana, who had wandered from his parental state, and he and his wife had been looking into all kinds of interim phantasies, they went to a spiritualist, and as soon as they came into the room, the spiritist put a hand

right on the spot where my aunt had the cancer. And said oh the pain, the pain, the pain. And they said, well, what is going to happen. He said oh terrible, but I don't see any death.

O.T.History 256. (15)

...his sister was going to recover, went down to Los Angeles and saw her, then ^{as a re-} ~~told her~~ result of her testimony and her death, eventually he himself turned to the Lord. But it was interesting that this Medium way up there in Montana, as soon as he came into the room, pointed to the place where his sister who was on his mind so much, was suffering. Now one of two things is proven, either they had the speed of finding out information about the people who were going to come, ^{if} in order to palm it off on them and make them think they had some supernatural power, which certainly often is the case, there's a terrible lot of fraud in that sort of thing. Either that, or the demon or whatever it was that was speaking through this spirit medium, was able to read his mind, and to see that thing that was burdening him and to express it. But certainly they had no power (1 1/2) to predict death. So while they pointed out exactly what the present situation was, the prediction of the future was entirely (1 3/4)

Now in this case, was this woman of Endor a fraud who worked tricks as many people of that kind do today? Or was she in relation with a familiar spirit, was there a demon who was speaking through her and using her. I heard Sir Oliver Rod the great Physicist in 1919 or 1920, about then, who was the head of the spiritists in Great Britain. His son died in the first World War and he thought his son would come back through one of these mediums and talk to him, and I heard him speak and he spoke many things that were very difficult to explain on the ground simply of fraud (2 1/2)

They told one thing, I remember, which I thought was very amusing, he told how the people in his spiritist organization, the men, in order to prove that it was their spirit after death, they would write a message and they would put it in a piece of paper and seal it up and no other human being knew what it was. Then he said, if they get a message through a medium, some part of the world, and that message gives that, they

know that's from that spirit. They know the person who ^{is dead} ~~said~~ is actually communicating with them, of course it doesn't prove anything of the kind, because if they actually were demons they certainly can read what's being written, or what's hidden in the ~~paper~~. He said he hadn't written any such message but he was sure if he did he would forget it and wouldn't be able to give it after he died. But he told how one time the President of their organization at that time was off on a vacation, and he said he came back from his vacation and he came to the headquarters in London and they said we've got a message came in through a medium, I think the medium was in India, I'm not sure. But somewhere a long distance away this message came in and it was sent there and they couldn't figure what it meant, and they tried to figure out what the message meant, and they couldn't make any sense of it and ~~the student~~ ^{as soon as the} President saw it, he said why that's my secret message he said, that's what I've written and put in an envelope, so that after I die when it comes in it proves I'm communicating. And here he was still living off on a vacation and the message had come in. I think the demon overreached himself and proved the exact opposite of what they wanted him to in that case. But he gave that, he was a man of honesty, he gave that as a true incident, which he said had happened. Mr. Deshpande has something here. (student. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$) Yes, and there are those events which take place, while there is a tremendous lot of fraud in it, there's no question of that, there are those events which certainly seem to go beyond that, and it might be the actual spirit world, the world of the demons that is trying to injure us through it, and the Lord has said we are not to tamper with it, and he commanded that this should not be permitted in Israel and Saul forbade, and yet Saul himself, in his extremity, looked for one. A lesson for us, to watch out that our lives keep up to our testimony, instead of falling short of it as they so easily can. And so Saul looks for this woman, and he put on a disguise so she wouldn't know who he was. And he came to her at night in this disguise and he said, I pray you, bring to me your familiar spirit, and have him bring whom I will name to you. And the woman said to him, well you know Saul's done, has cut off all those that have familiar spirits and wizards out of the land. Are you, she says, from the police, trying to lead me into doing this thing, so I can be arrested?

And Saul's swore to her, as the Lord lives, there shall no punishment happen to thee for this thing. And the woman said whom shall I bring up to you, and he said bring up Samuel. And when the woman saw Samuel she cried with a loud voice, the woman spoke to Saul then, why are you deceiving me, you're Saul, and the woman evidently was tremendously surprised, and most interpreters, most Christian interpreters, I believe, think that God ~~showed~~ in this situation to cause that Samuel should come back and speak, otherwise that spirit, that lying spirit would have pretended to be whoever they wanted it to be, pretended to be, and given such information that he would know, it might be more than a human being might know, he might see things that happen, he might read things that were secret, he might be able to give information that we wouldn't have access to, but we would have no way of predicting the future except guessing. But he might have pretended to be ^{Samuel} Saul, but the woman was amazed that she saw, when she realized that it wasn't her spirit trying to make a pretense, it really was Samuel, and she knew this was King Saul. And she described Samuel as she saw him and Saul bowed before Samuel and Samuel did just what you might expect him to do under the circumstances. If he wouldn't get right with God and get a real message from the Lord, how can he expect that God will send his holy prophet Samuel to give him a good message. Samuel told him that the Lord had departed from him, taken the kingdom from him, given it to David, and that he himself would die in the battle. So Saul got his answer, he didn't profit by the experience, but just the way the average person will do. Even Christians, when they get into situations, instead of turning to the Lord, will possibly turn to all sorts of folly and all sorts of

(9) that doesn't really bring them anything.

So this, the way it's told in the scripture, I don't think we can dogmatically say that Samuel actually came back and talked with Saul, but I don't know of any interpretation that looks to me half as good. It's my inclination to think that this is the correct interpretation of it. I certainly don't think that a lying spirit was pretending to be Samuel, and saying the true thing, that Samuel said in this situation.

It reminds me a little of what John Wesley said about the Bible, somebody asked John Wesley who wrote the Bible, and John Wesley said well, there are five possibilities,

He said it might have been written by good men or by angels, by bad men or by devils or by God himself. Now he said let's look at the first two possibilities, he said if good men or angels wrote the Bible they couldn't write a book which was full of lies. And he said for them to say thus saith the Lord God says this, this is God's word, when it wasn't God's word, it was their word, it would be lies that good men and angels couldn't stoop to. So he said good men and angels can't have written the Bible. Now he said, if bad men or demons wrote the Bible they couldn't hold all the high ethics and the fine principles that the Bible contains. They wouldn't have the fine moral standards the Bible has, so it can't be bad men or demons that wrote it, so he says the only possibility left is that God himself wrote it. Because God can truly say God was writing it and God could uphold all the high standards. Well, in this case it seems to me the only explanation that appears to me reasonable here is that it actually was Samuel, otherwise it would be an angel representing him and that doesn't seem at all likely. Certainly it was not a demon.

So ^{that's} at the end of the account of Samuel in the book of Samuel, and we move on then to a major heading, number X.

X, The United Kingdom. This is a much larger heading than IX, covers much more ground and a much longer period. The United Kingdom we divide into three parts, according to the three kings. A, Saul. Saul is described in 1 Samuel. He is not the principal character of 2 Samuel. He appears in 2 Samuel only in the lament over him in the first chapter. He is dead before the beginning of 2 Samuel and is Samuel himself. But the whole last half or two-thirds of 1 Samuel has Saul as its main character, or as a character who is very prominent. 1 Samuel has more to say about Saul actually than it does about Samuel. And Saul is seen here as a man who made a wonderful start, a man who gave every promise of being just what Israel needed, and yet a man who was terribly disappointing. And Saul was the first king, but from a historical viewpoint it's interesting to note that the kingdom was a comparatively weak thing under Saul. Saul became king, he bravely led in rescuing Jabesh Gilead which is over at the opposite side of the Jordan where the Philistines were. Then he and his son had victories over the Philistines, they did some excellent work but in the end they were destroyed by (13) the

Philistines. And they did not win a complete independence at any time, as far as any (13) real peace. Israel was always under the shadow of the Philistine danger, always threatened by them, always inferior to them, and of course a big reason for this was the iron weapons that the Philistines had. Saul was a king of a petty kingdom, struggling to maintain its existence, struggling valiantly and to quite an extent successful, but he is altogether different historically from David. David is a character of far greater power as far as human power is concerned, a king than Saul.

The character of Saul is an important thing for our study and for our application, to ourselves. The rejection of Saul was the rejection, as we have seen, for incomplete obedience. A rejection for putting himself, his intelligence, ahead of God's commands. Putting his will ahead of God's and then trying to rationalize. He tried to represent how (14 $\frac{1}{4}$) would make wonderful sacrifices and so on. Samuel said to obey is better than sacrifice. It's easy for us to rationalize, there's much humor made, a rather mean kind of humor, about ministers who work and wangle and scheme and plan to get a call to a bigger church. And then when they get it talk about how it's the Lord's will and there's nothing they can do but accept it. Well, there is much hypocrisy of that sort but there certainly are many of whom that's not true at all, who are anxious to find the best possible opportunity of serving the Lord, regardless of whether it is a large church or not. It's very hard for us to guess of an individual

O.T.History 257. (13)

...in Saul's case the Lord sees the heart of Saul. Man looks on the outward appearance, God looks on the heart, if our heart isn't right we can't accomplish anything for God. But we should remember that men don't see our heart, they see the outward appearance, so it's worth our giving some thought to the outward appearance too, in order that we may accomplish for the Lord. The outward appearance is important in our testimony, the inward reality is important in our acceptance with God and his blessing. Both have

their place. But Saul was rejected of the Lord and eventually was killed in this great battle. There is a problem that the critics raise about ~~how~~ Saul was killed. How did he die? They say there's a contradiction in the Bible. You read the end of 1 Samuel, and you read that Saul said to his armour bearer, draw thy sword and thrust me through with it, and his armour bearer would not for he was sore afraid. Therefore Saul took a sword and fell upon it, and when his armourbearer saw that Saul was dead he fell likewise upon his sword, and died with him. That's the account we have here in the end of the book of 1 Samuel. In 2 Samuel we have an Amalekite who comes to David and he says to David that he saw Saul and Saul was not yet dead, and Saul said to him, stand, I pray thee, upon me and slay me, for anguish is come upon me, because my life is yet whole in me. So I stood upon him and slew him because I was sure that he could not live after that he was fallen and I took the crown that was upon his head and the bracelet that was on his arm and have brought them ~~high~~ to my Lord. Now there's a contradiction in the Bible isn't it?

Chapter 31 says that Saul killed himself, chapter 1 of 2 Samuel says the Amalekite killed him. It's a contradiction. What is it a contradiction between? It's a contradiction between what the armourbearer thought he saw and what the Amalekite said. And which of the two is true, I don't think the Bible tells us. The Amalekite may have lied, thinking that he would win favor from David. He may have seen Saul dead and taken his things and brought them to David, thinking he'd get a reward from David, and said he had killed him thinking he would surely get a reward, when he had taken them off a dead body. And on the other hand, the armourbearer, Saul said to the armourbearer kill me, the armourbearer wouldn't do it, Saul jumped on his sword, and the armourbearer thought he was dead and the armourbearer killed himself. I don't think the armourbearer stopped to make a clinical inspection to feel of his pulse, to make a real check, I think the armourbearer sincerely thought he was dead but that doesn't ~~prove~~ he was. He could very conceivably have appeared dead to the armourbearer, yet have been scared of his life that the Philistines would get him and torture him (4)

so that which of the two is true I don't think the Bible has told us,

but in either case there's no contradiction in the Bible. The Bible says the Amalekite says one thing, it says the armourbearer thought another thing. Then of course it tells how the armourbearer was killed, it says, so Saul died and his three sons in the next verse, but that doesn't necessarily mean the armourbearer's opinion that he was dead at that instant means that on that occasion he died and the three sons died in that battle.

Sa/ I don't think that that says that the armourbearer necessarily was correct in his interpretation. Perhaps the better guess of the two was that the armourbearer was rather than the Amalekite, but we just don't know. Mr. Shellabarger? (4 $\frac{1}{2}$) student)

I'm sure he did, I'm absolutely ^{sure} that he thought he'd gain favor but that's where he was mistaken, David killed him. But he thought he would gain favor by it and he may have made up the whole story entirely. (student. 5 $\frac{1}{4}$) Was it fair of David to do what he did? That would be a matter for the Lord. I don't think we're in a position to say. My own personal guess is that David was very shrewd (5 $\frac{1}{2}$)

My guess is that David felt that he was the next king, that for him to kill the killer of the previous king, even though he was an enemy, made him all the safer. That's my guess. It may be doing an injustice to David. I don't know. Yes? (student. 6)

Yes, that's right, there are pastors who feel that they are the supreme authority and nobody should say a word against them, and I think that this is true, that the pastor who is presenting the word of God and truly seeking to follow that word and standing by it, ^{people} he should hold up his hands, rather than to criticize him, but I think if they see ways in which they think that he's done wrong, they'd do him a kindness to come to him privately and mention it to him, and if he's the man he ought to be, he'll take their private criticism and be grateful for it. Unfortunately most men aren't what they ought to be. But if he is, he will be grateful for the criticism, but in any event, when a man is serving the Lord, and truly seeking to serve him, and standing by his word, it is a sad thing that other people who believe in what he believes will let themselves notice petty little things and criticize him in such a way that they injure his influence, and hurt his effectiveness, and they are doing wrong instead of going-- It's usually thoughtlessness, but it ~~is~~ hurts the cause of Christ. I don't think we can take it to

an extreme. I think, I don't think that the minister is a god by any means, he makes his mistakes and he should^d be able to get away with them too easily, that is if they're bad mistakes. But in general I think we should hold up his hands, rather than (7 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Using this verse for that (7 $\frac{1}{2}$) but that's not what this is talking about, this is talking about the king. Well we have another two minutes to go, and I ran over this morning, so we'll stop now.

O.T.History 258. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...something of the (1 $\frac{1}{2}$) of Saul and something of his great disappointments, and if you live very long and have much contact with people, you're going to see many instances where you will be equally disappointed, and there's not much you can do to prevent it. You can, in some cases, perhaps prevent it. But the important thing is that you see to it that you yourself do not turn out that way. That's the responsibility on each one of us, and on many of us it proves to be too great a responsibility.

Then B. David. And David, Number 1, His Character. And his character is certainly not at all like the character of Joseph. Joseph is the suffering one who suffered patiently, stands adversity, and who in prosperity also is free from blemish, there is absolutely no blemish recorded of Joseph in the Old Testament. Some people try to make out that there was a blemish in thinking he was conceited on account of his dream. That is not impossible that it's right but it certainly is going beyond the evidence to say that it is. The evidence would seem to be that God gave him the dream and they predicted something that was going to happen in the future and it isn't fair to blame Joseph. So I don't think that we have any evidence that Joseph was conceited, though there are those who think that psychologically the dream proves it. But that is the only attempt I've ever heard of to find a flaw in Joseph. He is the, about as near a perfect man that you find in the Bible outside of the Lord Jesus Christ. But David is a very different kind of a man. No one can read very much about David without finding that he has plenty of

flaws. He is a man whose character would be cast out of the synagogue in most groups, if they only knew the outward aspect of his character. He was a bloody warrior, he was a man who at the end of his life took revenge on people who had done their best to help him through his life, but who had failed him in one point perhaps, and he took revenge on them and had them killed. He committed adultery and caused that the injured husband should be murdered by having him put in the forefront of the battle. He is a man of very great faults and very great sins. And yet he is known in the Bible as the man after God's own heart, the man who was true to the Lord, the man who followed him faithfully, and the fact of the matter is that David's wickedness while it was very, very great, was wickedness in matters that are easily observed and which those of us who are pure from the particular vices of which David was guilty, there are sins of the spirit very often, selfishness and meanness and spiritual pride and other matters which in God's sight may be just as bad, or almost as bad as the sins that David was guilty of. So that from the viewpoint of the judgment of his character in its external features, he probably was in the external appearance far worse than most Christians, but in God's sight who sees the inner character, he may not have been much worse than a great many who seem very, very fine. But there's another aspect of character which is perhaps even more important than this one, though this one is very important, and ~~this other aspect~~ ^{this other aspect} of character is the sincerity ^{of} the repentance from the sins into which he fell. And of his desire to be as the Lord wanted him to be. In great, while the main point, he showed his pride and his arrogance and his selfishness yet in great crises very often there was revealed a real inner humility of character. His refusal to injure Saul when he was right in his hands, when to most people it would look like an ideal opportunity to get a kingdom that had been promised to them and they would feel plenty of excuse for injuring Saul after all that Saul had done to them. He said Saul is the one whom the Lord has put into this position, the Lord can take him out if he choose, but I'm not going to take the thing into my hands. And when Saul died, David knowing God had promised to make him king, left it in God's hands to do it, did not himself endeavor to bring it about. He did not try to advance himself in the particular way where the

Lord had promised that the Lord would do it and he left the personal matter for the Lord to bring him the glory that the Lord would give him. He's a wonderful example to us, when we get deeper into his character, and when we see his behaviour in crises and when we see his attitude toward the Lord in particular, and it just shows that you have to look deeper in order to see what one's real character is. Of course, in the days of Christ, today the word Pharisee has come to be a term of reproach, but in the days of Christ the Pharisees were the religious people, the pious people, the people who were looked up to and esteemed by everybody, the people who wouldn't even step into the room with people of low moral character, who were considered so excellent in their character, and Jesus poured out his denunciation upon them Pharisees and showed how others whom the Pharisees looked down upon often had a spiritual attitude which was far superior to that of the Pharisees. And it's the same lesson that we find here in relation to David. And of course along with that, David was a man of accomplishment, he was a man of energy and a man of ability, and a man who used his ability to accomplish something he didn't, he wasn't just somebody who happened to be picked up from a life of lazing around and find Goliath challenging the armies of Israel and step out in faith in God and overcoming him. He did step out in faith on God when nobody else would dare to do it, but he doubtless had been practicing with that slingshot as he took care of the sheep a very great deal. In fact, as he told Saul, that he would go, he told him how he'd met the lions and a bear, and had destroyed them in order to protect the sheep. And that took courage for a young fellow, with the type of weapons they had then, no guns or anything, not to run from the sheep and the bear, and just try and protect the sheep, to step out and fight them deliberately in that way, showed that he was a man of character and of ability, and of practice, and he took the ability that he had developed and put it in the Lord's hands, when he stepped out ^{with his slingshot.} ~~in faith.~~ After on, of course you never read of him fighting another battle with his slingshot. He used the armor after he had practiced with the armor. He had to learn how to use it, but rather than take Saul's armor when he had not practiced with it, he took a little instrument that he was well-practiced with, and he used the thing that he had already for the Lord.

But his character then, he was, in addition to the spiritual matters we've been mentioning he was a man of real ability and of real accomplishment (8 3/4)

In fact, you read how when he went down to the Philistines you read how he tried to make himself appear to be an insane person, in order to save his life. He was thinking things through, studying what to do, and after he spent this time with the Philistines, when he came back he understood their secrets about iron and it wasn't long, after he became king, before the Israelites had just as much use of the iron as the Philistines had. And in addition to that of course (9 1/4)

and the Philistines rather soon disappear, as a source of danger. It was not the bravery and courage of Samuel and Saul that freed them from the Philistine menace but the technological knowledge which David acquired and made available, combined with of course his good military leadership. It made the Philistine menace that for at least 70 years had been almost insuperable become largely a thing of the past.

Well, so much now for the first matter of David's character. Then number 2,

2, The Summary of his Early Career. You of course, most of you are quite familiar with most of the details of David's career, this is one of the points where a good deal of attention is paid in our Sunday Schools. There are so many interesting stories and illustrations of spiritual facts contained in it, that while some elements in it are neglected, most of it we are fairly familiar with. The critics of course find a great problem that in chapter 16, after you have, in the first part of the chapter, you have David anointed, then in the second part you have Saul asking them to bring him somebody who could play well, and when he needs music, and they find David and bring him and David plays with his hands and Saul is refreshed and well and the evil spirit departs from him, and then the very next chapter it tells about the defiance of Israel by Goliath, and David comes from feeding his father's sheep in Bethlehem, and Saul asks who he is and they say that this doesn't fit together and that one of the other stories doesn't belong there. But it's not necessary to reach that conclusion. Some try to get around it when Saul meets David just before the battle with Goliath, in saying that when he said who is your father, that he remembered David but just had

forgotten his father. His father's name. That's possible, but in a place where so much stress is placed on a father's name as there was there, it does not seem extremely likely. However, it doesn't seem to me that it is necessary to consider that the two stories cannot both be true. It is necessary to consider ~~whether~~ the question of whether chronologically they go in this order, whether they are necessarily told in the order in which the things happened. Very often we have events told in a different order than the order in which they occur. Very often the order is logical rather than chronological. And it's not at all impossible that it was after the fight with Goliath that he became the musician who played for Saul. We don't know, I don't think that difficulty is one sufficient to make a serious obstacle to accepting all of the scriptures in the Bible here as true. But if it said after he worked with Saul he went back to his home and then he come up to the army, that would be one thing but it doesn't say that, and we are reading into the scripture to insist on chronological order where there is not a clear statement that the chronological order is there.

Well, in David's early life then there is his anointing, his playing before Saul, his fight with Goliath, of course after he had fought with Goliath he becomes a man of prominence in the land, there's no reason he couldn't still play on the music for the king, that was a very prominent position anyway, but chapter 18 we find how ^{David} ~~Saul~~ and Jonathan become such close friends but how Saul becomes jealous because he hears people saying Saul has slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands. Which of course shows the smallness of the man. A great man is interested in developing his subordinates and is happy when people speak highly of them, but Saul was displeased and became jealous and how much of that there is in Christian work. People wouldn't think of falling into the baser sins of the flesh, will show the utmost jealousy time after time. We're all still in the flesh, we're all far (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) from being completely sanctified, and again I implore you to take these as warnings to ourselves and get (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

But as far as others are concerned, help them if you can, but learn to expect and when you find it not to be (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) I've known people whose faith has almost been shattered when after receiving great spiritual blessing from some great evangelist

or Bible teacher, they had been put into a position where they could have a little more intimate contact with him and have heard him speaking of some other one in a jealous way, or showing what seemed to them a mercenary attitude

C.T.History 259.

simply, you might say, relieving their feeling without meaning it quite like it sounds. What it means, what it says, all too often. I've known people who have almost lost their faith because of the people who have been such great spiritual blessings who have proven to be human and sinned. It is very important that we rest our faith, not in other human beings. If we rest it in other human beings we are bound to fail. If we rest it in the Lord we cannot fail.

Well, this friendship of David and Jonathan of course is a very beautiful picture and it is unfortunately sometimes taken out simply as a humanistic thing, and that's all we get ~~now~~ out as far as David is concerned. I have a friend who was president of a large Christian organization, and he had another friend who had brought him ~~now~~ originally into this fellowship, and he told me just recently how this other friend had brought him into this fellowship years ago and led him to take the position and the viewpoints that he has now taken. This other man had been working in different circles and he heard he was in the area, and he thought, how wonderful it would be to have him come and speak to the students so he invited him. And he said the other man came there and he gave him a wonderful build up and told how it was through him he came to his position and his outlook, and how much blessing he received him and all that and then he said the other man simply started in and gave a message on the friendship of Saul and of David and of Jonathan and what friendship can mean in our lives. Purely a secular humanistic thing based on David and Jonathan. Evidently the other man had so changed that he did not want to be known as

(2 $\frac{1}{2}$). But it is sad to see one who in his early life is presenting the word of God so truly and faithfully, now giving beautiful little talks on the glory of friendship such as the friendship of David and Jonathan.

It is a beautiful story but it certainly is one of the lesser lessons given, rather than one of the greatest. God wants us to have a friendly attitude and love toward all believers and desire to help them, but he wants us also to realize that even though he seems most friendly to us, he may prove to have sin in such a way that it will cause them to turn against us, and so the story of David and Jonathan is well worth knowing, but it certainly is not one of the major lessons of the Bible.

Then we have a long series of accounts of the incidents as Saul gradually turns more and more against David until finally he is going to kill David, and David escapes, partly through Jonathan's help, and then we have that long account of David's wandering in the wilderness, where he is hiding in the wilderness, with a band of outlaws about him, and Saul hunting with an army to get him, and time after time he nearly gets him, and eventually the danger becomes so great that David gives up that sort of effort to avoid Saul and goes right down to the Philistines, the enemies of Israel, and spends his time down there, where he would at least be safe from Saul, though perhaps he is in some ways in greater danger. In order to avoid those other dangers he had to pretend things that he wasn't, and do things which we certainly can not take for examples.

Well then, we find the death of Saul, and one of the great battles between the Israelites and the Philistines, and David not even being able to be there to help, because of the situation. There's much in these events that is helpful for study but we will look on to number three, the summary of his career as king, and this covers the book of II Samuel. This is in some ways one of the greatest books in the Bible. The book of II Samuel. The book that is filled with most interesting spiritual lessons. I commend it to any of you for devotional studies. Take it and go through it chapter by chapter, and in each chapter notice the examples to follow and notice the errors to avoid. You will find plenty of both, and notice the lessons in the book. I don't think of anything that we would call miraculous in the strict sense in the book of II Samuel. It is an account of the reign of the king, with his relations with other kings around, in relations to his family. But it is a section in which you learn much about this man's successes and his failures. His good points and his bad points.

His relation to the Lord and it is well worth careful study. From the viewpoint of the history of Israel it was not the highest point of glory in the history of the nation, but it is that which produces its highest point. It was the highest point of success in the history of the nation. David took Israel as a little group of down trodden people subject to the Philistines, and under constant danger of destruction by the Philistines, and he built them into a people that were now entirely independent but that ruled over an empire which included three or four times the area that they themselves lived in. He developed it from a little group of tribes that was hardly heard of more than a few miles from where they were into an empire that for a brief time was willing to rank beside the great empires of the world. It so happened that at this time the empire of Egypt was at a low ebb, and the empire of Assyria was at a low ebb. David's power was certainly not at all comparable to either of the empires at its high points, but at the low ebb at which they were then, his power may even have been superior to their power for a brief time. And so a good part of the account of David's reign as king is made up of how he conquered one nation after another around, and established this empire and made the independence and safety of his people clear and definite, and strong. And that's the (7½) for a good many chapters through the book.

We have practically nothing of archaeological background that helps us in our understanding or in our corroboration of the career of David. I spent a whole morning once in Palestine just a few years ago looking for the place where Absalom kept his sheep shearers, and found the place which is mentioned in II Samuel, as the place where Absalom kept his sheep shearers. And the fact that it would be so interesting to find a place like that of so comparatively little importance, shows how little evidence we have on the big things of the time of David. The relationship with the big empire was not yet established to any great extent, and we have no evidence from other countries referring to David or to his empire. And as far as David, as archaeological remains are concerned, nothing has been found that throws light on David's reign, David was too busy fighting to put up many monuments to celebrate what he was doing and the Israelites weren't so much for putting up monuments anyway as the Egyptians and the Babylonians. They spent a long time putting

up great monuments. The Israelites were a little more practical as a rule. They were interested in doing what they could and when they put up a monument they would just put some cement on the front of a rock and make an inscription on it and it would look very nice for a while, but pretty soon it ~~wasmanned~~ disappeared, and it certainly did not stand until today, and we don't have archaeological evidence on David's reign but in the Bible historically it is not so important as to what happened then as to what it built up, the empire which Solomon received from David. The interest of most Christians in the book of II Samuel was not so much in David's political experiences and his relations to other nations, and his conquests of them, as it is in the religious life of Israel, of which we have so comparatively little in the book but we have a little. And more particularly in the relation of David to his family and the great rebellions which came against him when Absalom tried to make himself king. In the religious life here the outstanding event is the bringing of the ark up to Jerusalem. Before mentioning that we should notice the political event which one from necessity precedes after. That is the establishment of Jerusalem as the capital. David originally became king just of one tribe, just of Judah, a little area around Judah. The area down here, - David was from the tribe of Judah, and after Saul's death the people of Judah received him as king, but the other 11 tribes made Saul's son king over them. So David for 8 years was simply king over one tribe but this, the strongest of all the tribes. It was about a fourth, or a third, of the whole of Israel. And David reigned there in Hebron and Ishbosheth reigned in the North, but then after Ishbosheth is murdered and the people begin coming over to David, then they make him king over all Israel. Then he in statesman-like fashion looks around for a better capital, and he saw that Jebusite fortress which had stood in the midst of the land ever since the conquest. It's told in chapter 5 verse 5, "In Hebron David reigned over Judah, seven years and six months: and in Jerusalem he reigned thirty three years." This of course is a summary statement. It is not chronological. It summarizes the whole thing, because verse 6 goes back to the time when he had just become king over the whole land and says, "And the king and his men went to Jerusalem unto the Jebusites, the inhabitants of the land, and spake unto

David saying, "Except thou take away the blind and lame, thou shalt not come in hither". Of course it means, our city is so strong. The rest of us can just stand back and let the blind and the lame ~~attack~~ ^{protect} us, and you can't get in, except I don't think the average reader gets that is what it means, but it is obvious with a little thought. "Except thou take away the blind and the lame, thou shalt not come in hither." It means, ^{David} ~~you~~ can not come in hither, an explanation which in the English ~~language~~ translation doesn't add much to the understanding. Nevertheless David took the stronghold of Zion, and named it the city of David, and David said on that day, whoever getteth up to the gutter, and smitest the Jebusites, the lame and the blind, that are hated of David's soul, he shall be chief and captain. Certainly they said, the blind and the lame shall not come into the house. It is a rather cryptic statement of it/ but with a little examination you find that what it means is that the gutter was a place through which they got water, the water supply. A small, narrow place which nobody thought of anybody climbing up and the walls were so great and so strong and there were sides of hills. They never thought anybody could get up there, just a few blind and lame men on the top could throw rocks down if anybody tried to get up there, but here was this narrow gutter, where a man could crawl up in the middle of the night, and nobody would suspect it or know it, and Joab and a few men went up the gutter and got into the city, and once they were in they were able to open the gates and make it possible for the others to come in and it was taken quite easily by this expedient of entering in a way that they never dreamed that they would be able to enter.

I heard maybe 20 years ago, I read a story which somebody wrote as ~~how~~ showing that he considered the rather backwardness of the Chinese. He said that when the British took Hongkong, that the Chinese had had strong bases and fortifications at the southern end of it, ^{but} ~~that~~ the British had come around and entered from the north and some of the Chinese had yelled at them, "You are coming from the wrong way. It is the other way that you are supposed to come in. I was interested when I read that story about 20 years ago, and then a little bit later, I read that the British fortified Singapore spending a hundred million dollars on it in order to make it

absolutely safe from attack, and then this world war came and we found that they had repeatedly done the same mistake that some of them had been laughing at the Chinese, that in Singapore they had made such fortifications from the sea side, that it was almost impregnable, and the Japanese instead of attacking from the sea side, they came down from the north, and came down through Malaya, and attacked Singapore that way and took it over.

O.T. History. 260. (0)

laugh at other people for making a mistake and then making exactly the same mistake ourselves. The people of the Jebusites here, they thought it was absolutely safe. There wasn't any chance of them coming that way. They came in a different way. And we in our spiritual life will find that the place where we never dreamed Satan can attack is the very place where he attacks. It is good for us to study these stories of David and these others and see where the Devil got ahold of them and see if we aren't in danger of the same places ourselves. So the Jebusite city was over confident but I think it would have been taken anyway. David was a very capable soldier and had now abundant forces and could have seized it, if nothing else, but he took them in this way, through their over confidence.

(Question: Isn't it possible that they are suggesting here that David's own forces are both blind and lame?) It would be by inference at least that you wouldn't use blind and lame men against blind and lame men. The American Standard Version says here in the note, "The blind and the lame men shall not come into this house.) Yes, well that is the last part of the verse. "Wherefore they said, the blind and the lame shall not come into the house." It may be that that is what they said or it may have had some other interpretation. I don't know, but the first part says "Whoever gets up to the gutter and smites the Jebusites and the blind and the lame that are hated of David's soul, that one shall be chief and captain. Wherefore they said, except thou take away the blind and the lame you shall not come in hither."

(Question: blind and lame with blind and lame. It would be an insult. The inference would be that we are not opposing anyone but blind and lame men so we didn't put blind and lame men on our buttresses.) I don't know. I don't know how anybody could ~~make~~ think of the forces of David as blind and lame, because they were pretty capable soldiers.

(Question: Well then, why would they put blind and lame men up there?) I think what they meant was we wouldn't need a strong force. We've got such a strong wall and such a splendid fortification that you don't need to, even if all of our other men would take sick and die and be unable to fight; simply just the blind and the lame would be enough to keep you out. Except you take away the blind and the lame you can't come into the city. We don't need our strong men. Our blind and lame are quite sufficient to protect us. It was a boast of their, of the strength that they probably had and how easy it is for us to make similar statements. Oh we are perfectly

(3). I've talked with people making constitutions for organizations. I'd try to get them to put something in, in the case of some misunderstanding or some dispute or some division. They would say, "Oh, we don't need anything here. Why, we all love each other so much that such a thing couldn't possibly come here. Well, the thing is, you never know what might happen. It is just unthinkable. And four years later I've seen the same people at each other's throats, and in the situation where each one of them was just looking for statements in the constitution, things that they could take hold of. But when they were making their plans it just never entered into their heads, that such a thing couldn't happen. As long as you have human beings, Satan is going to look for a chance to get ahold, and to get them to fighting over non-essentials and opposing each other on personal matters, and we've just got to recognize the fact ~~what~~ and not let him ⁽⁴⁾ the matter, but recognize he will use others even some times. He'll probably ~~use~~ use us too if we don't watch

. Mr. James?

(Question:) No, I don't think so. I think that they were taunting. They were saying, we don't need to worry about your soldiers. Of course, they've been at least a couple of hundred of years with the Israelites around them, with probably ten times as many Israelites within a few miles as they were then, but they'd been all these years they had never had any real danger from them and of course the reason was their walls were so strong and the situation was so evident that nobody thought of the possibility of taking it. When somebody said, well now, David is looking for a good capital for his land. He is not satisfied with this little place of Gibeah that Saul had as his capital and he is thinking that this would be a nice place to take and make

a ~~capital~~ capital. Oh, don't worry about that, they said. Our blind and lame people alone is enough to keep him out, with our strong fortifications. It didn't mean that he didn't have a good army. Yes? (Question). No, I wouldn't think that. I would think that it simply, they say except thou take away the blind and the lame thou shalt not come in hither, but that it a rhetorical statement. Now it is just possible that they did not bother in putting their best force there (6). They might have left it in protection. They ordinarily would have particular people for it. But I don't think they would purposely put incapable people in. (Question). The Hebrew is a ~~senoir~~, (6¹/₃) a ~~senoir~~ which would seem to be a way up inside where they had water, and nobody ever thought of anybody coming through there. It would probably be quite easy to defend but it would be very difficult to go up. So difficult that they never thought of the possibility, and Joab and a few men made their way up through the gutter. David probably saw the possibility. David had probably been thinking of this even in years before when he was going back and forth to Saul, one of Saul's men. He was looking at that place and thinking, if I was ever king, that would make a wonderful place for a ~~cap~~ capital, but how would you ever take it, and he looked at it all around, and was constantly on the watch that he was aware of this. And David said, whoever will go up the gutter and smite the Jebusites and (Question). Well, no, that's not what gutter means here. It is not a gutter in that sense. It is a gutter that goes up and down. Shaft would be better, a water shaft. They have found a place they think is probably it, it corresponds. It could be it, and they think that is where it is, but of course, the city was used so long after, and so many changes came in, that it would ~~hardly~~ be hard to be dogmatic, but it is, but it fits with the statement, that they went up the gutter.

Well, that was the first great statesman-like act of David, to seize the city of Jerusalem and make it his capital. It is very interesting how in later history Jerusalem is the great center of Israel. "Oh, Jerusalem, you let my right hand forget its cunning, if I ~~g~~ forget thee." All this tremendous attachment to Jerusalem. Here they were in the land all through the period of the Judges and Jerusalem was a foreign city. Jerusalem was in the hands of the Jebusites. It became the great Israelite

center later, and was one of the last cities that they took. It was a foreign city all through that period. I was talking with a German last summer over in southern Germany and ah, he said to me, Bonn, that's no place for a capital for a country. He said, Berlin ought to be the capital. I said, why? Because the Hoenzalers lived there? Oh, he said, we don't care anything about the Hoenzalers. Berlin is the sort of a place for a capital. Well, Berlin is because the Hoenzalers made it such, and they happened to live there and they made it the great capital. It is probably more centrally located than Bonn, but the attachment comes around the place from its use. And Jerusalem was nothing up to this time of David after all the years of the judges and the reign of Saul. But it became the great center. Today when you speak of Palestine you think of Israel, and you automatically think of Jerusalem. When the arrangement was made for the establishment of Israel they weren't supposed to have Jerusalem and they were supposed to have their capital down on the plains somewhere, and it would have been much more sensible, but they moved up and took, just outside the wall of the old city, they made their new settlement there. They established their capital there, not because it is the ideal place now, of the arrangement of Israel now including the old Philistine land, that fine plain land, but because of the tradition, because of the name that was attached to it. But names come to be attached that way, but Jerusalem is this late in the history that it becomes an Israelite city. But it becomes a great city. David had a good eye, in picking it out and seeing its importance and establishing it. Then of course the very fact that it was the city of David (11) standing, but he is the great hero of Israelite history. So he establishes Jerusalem as the capital. Then he fights with the Philistines and puts them down as a vital force and then he says, now we've got to have Jerusalem which is the political center of the ~~many~~ country also be the religious center of the country and so David proceeds to get the ark moved up there to Jerusalem. And he has a great ceremony, a great celebration, in which they bring the ark up, to Jerusalem, and here we read that David rose, and went down to the house of Abinadab, where the ark was, and his sons, Uzzah and Ahio, his sons drove a new cart, and they put the ark on it, and they started to bring it to Jerusalem and as they came along on the cart, there, with the cart pulling the ark, the ark began to topple over

and Uzzah put forth his hand, and took ahold of it, to keep it from falling over, and the anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzzah and God smote him for his error; and there he died by the ark of God." Some people will say right away, how unjust and unfair to take this man who was simply trying to do a good thing, to keep the ark from falling and killed him. How wicked, how unfair a thing. An Englishman said to me, he said, the God of the Old Testament is not my God. The God who would do the things that are recorded in the Old Testament is not my God. Well, if you want to set up an ideal of what you think God should be it would be easy to say the God of the New Testament isn't your God either, because it isn't a question of what we think God ought to be, but what He is. In finding out what He is, we have to interpret the Scripture as a whole; not just let one verse or one statement tell us, drive us into a conclusion. God was angry because Uzzah ~~man~~ tried to hold the ark and he smote him. What kind of a ~~m~~ wild thunder God of Sinai is this? You've just got to watch everything you do and you try to put out your hand to try to keep the ark from falling, he may smite you dead. What a treacherous sort of a being you are dealing with. Well, you can get all that in this verse, but take it in the context, and see what it means, and it is a different thing altogether. Uzzah may have been a wicked man who deserved to die. Uzzah may have been a righteous man who deserved nothing good. Nothing but good at God's hands. God said, I would like to have him up in heaven, and He took him. I don't think we are told whether Uzzah was a good man or a bad man. We've all got to die sometime. Suppose Uzzah died of sudden heart difficulty at this instance instead of ten years later having three years of agony with cancer. Well, he would be much better off, than he would have been to live ten years longer. There is no great punishment of Uzzah involved here, but there is a lesson given to the people as a whole, that God wants His regulations observed and the ark moved the way that He said it should be moved, and He intervenes in this violent way at this point, which is not a punishment upon Uzzah but it is a to David and the people as a whole, that is to see what way God wants it done instead of simply going ahead as it just seems to them the right way to do it. It wasn't Uzzah's -

...he was trying to keep the ark from falling off the cart, the fault was on putting it on the cart in the first place, because God had given clear prescriptions in the Pentateuch that the ark was to be carried on staves with men bearing it, and the people who deserved the punishment were David for not taking care to see that it was done right, and the officials to whom David had committed this task, who simply had them take a cart and put it on that way. But this isn't a matter of punishing individuals, this is a matter of giving an object lesson to the people that right at the start of the establishment of Jerusalem as the ecclesiastical center, it was important they go back to the regulations in the law and see exactly how God wants things done. They've been through a period of what you might call religious inter (1 1/2) They've been through this time when with the Philistine bands going ~~a-period-of-what-you-might-call-~~ over the land they couldn't have one established center of worship, they couldn't follow their regulations minutely. It was God's will that Samuel should go from place to place, the word of God should be proclaimed, the sacrifice should be carried on, the religious life of the people should be kept alive. But now they are established, they're settled, the time of inter(1 3/4)

is over, now they should look into how things should be done exactly right. And men ^{could} have gotten up and given speeches about that, and discussed it for years to no effect, but the one act of the Lord in causing that Uzzah should suddenly die at this point--of course he was doing the only thing he could do in the circumstances, he couldn't let the ark fall over, but he was doing what should never have been necessary for him to do, because the ark should have been carried in different way. It drove the lesson home to the people of the importance of doing things in the way that God had prescribed. Yes? (student. 2 1/4. Well, he was still breaking the commandment of God by touching it and God said if anybody would do that they would die, and God had to bring that out, he had to do it.) That's right, it was an object lesson, that they should follow the regulations (2 1/2) It

was an object lesson/given for that purpose. Now Uzzah may have been a very wicked man who deserved death at this point. On the other hand he may have been a very righteous man, we just don't know. But the important thing here wasn't the effect on Uzzah, we

can be sure that God in his mercy deals justly with Uzzah as he does with everyone of us individually but not necessarily in this life. The best of us may suffer in this life and go to an early grave, and the worst of us may have a happy healthy prosperous life and die wealthy and full of years in this life, but we can be sure that in the perspective of eternity each one of us will get what we deserve. And in the perspective of eternity Uzzah got what he deserved. And in that the matter of his dying at this moment was a matter of very, very small importance of God's dealing with Uzzah. But it was a big part of God's dealings with the nation here to drive home to them the lessons that he wanted them to have. There were doubtless many others who had done far worse things than Uzzah whom God did not strike dead, just as in the wilderness there was the one bad case of the man who was gathering sticks on the sabbath, there were doubtless many far worse of sabbath breaking but this was an object lesson to drive home the importance of the matter. Yes? (student.4 $\frac{1}{4}$) Yes, very true. Ananias and Sapphira in the beginning of Christian history, at this vital point in getting the church started right they lie to the whole church, and God struck them both dead immediately, at that point. It was not altogether for the effect on Ananias and Sapphira but was for its effect on the church. There have been many many, since that time who have lied regarding the church affairs, many, many who have not been struck dead. And Ananias and Sapphira God's ~~and~~ dealines with them in eternity out of that, the fact that they died at this particular time is comparatively small part of it. But it was done to impress upon the church at the beginning the importance of sincerity and uprightness and truth in the dealings in the church, and doubtless had a great deal to do with Satan not getting such a foothold in the church in the very beginning that he might have destroyed it. Yes? (student.5 $\frac{1}{2}$) But this is a definite part of God's plan for a specific purpose, whether he did it by causing that the thing wall of one of the sections of Uzzah's body which was getting thinner should at this point break through, or whether he caused it by taking a part which was strong and had absolutely no weakness in it and suddenly broke through there by forces which are not otherwise in use in the world, we are not in a position to say. I personally would just not know whether it was a supernatural act of

God or whether it was a providential act of God, but I do know this, it was a sign, in that sense, in the true sense of the word miracle, it certainly was ~~any~~ sign, a sign to the people of God's displeasure and of God's direct control of the affairs of men. So in the true meaning of miracle it was a sign, but in the meaning of miracle as a supernatural event by the direct interposition of God, whether we can say that, I don't know.

Well, I guess we'll continue there next week and I'll post the assignment.

[7 1/2) ...said that the proportion, said that everything in Kings and those chapters had a parallel in Chronicles, would you raise your hand? How many said 90%, 80%, 1 80: 70%, no 70's? One 70. 60%, several 60's. 50%? 40%? 30%? 20%? One 20. 10%? None? (student.8) About how many? (student.8 1/2) I was just interested in this question, the last part of 1 Kings. How much of that was paralleled in Chronicles. Now what was the principle involved? Mr. Cohen? (student.8 1/2) That would be one aspect of a comparative treatment, but what I was interested right now was, what material is parallel? Did you find all, nobody found all the material parallel. One found 90, I think, and one only 10, but I think we all agree there is material here in Kings that is not parallel in Chronicles. And some of the parallels are very very close. Some of them are almost word for word. Now why does Chronicles parallel some material and not others? Mr. ? (student.9 1/2) Well, there is a special interest in Chronicles in the Temple and the altar of Chron. and the worship service. Though I doubt if that enters particularly into this section, that would enter more into other sections. Mr. Welch? (student.10) Referring to the kingdom. Yes, I think that is what, how many of you had that idea? The fact of the matter is (10 1/2) is that you will find that nearly every chapter in Kings that deals with the history of the kings of Judah is paralleled in Chronicles. And I don't think you'll find any chapter in Kings that deals with the history of the kings of Israel that is paralleled in Chronicles unless it also is extremely vitally concerned with the kingdom of Judah. That is to say, that is the vital difference at this section, is that the book of Kings tells you about one king and it tells you about the other king, it goes back to the one, it goes back to the other, but Chronicles takes the one kingdom and goes right straight through. And ignores the other

except as it relates to the one. Now it would be interesting to see how many of you noticed that, that is not, was not required for the preparation today, it simply was an interesting matter to see how many noticed that principle. Yes? (student.11) I hadn't counted up. I'll take the (11 1/2)

But from the viewpoint of what I just stated, it would seem to be likely that about 50% would be nearly right, except that when you realize that a large part of this material in Kings is about Elijah, and Chronicles says nothing about Elijah except where it is specifically connected with the southern kingdom, and there isn't much as it is, so in view of that, maybe 40% (11 3/4)

I certainly don't think

it's over 40%. Well, we are not quite up to that. I'm trying to give you assignments a little bit ahead because otherwise we get to a ^{place} ~~point~~ where I want you to have material well in mind, and it piles up, it's too big to give in one assignment, so I want to keep a little ahead on this, so you'll have it in mind, as we discuss -- yes? (student.12)

I didn't bring my Hebrew Bible with me, one of the few days in this class I haven't, but I came directly here from the dentist, and I didn't stop along the way, but I forget whether there is a statement like that at the beginning of the book or not. Most of the books really don't have any title, (12 1/2)

I would say if you, by

properly what would you think was a good designation, I would say the chronicles of the kings of Judah would probably be an excellent title, but if by properly you mean what is the divine title, the original title, I don't think so, but it may be that I haven't (12 3/4)

Of course, when we ^{just say} ~~get-to~~ Chronicles and Kings it

doesn't give any idea of the (13)

but actually it is, it's really

it's a chronicle of the kings of Judah. From Kings, it's the kings of Judah and the kings of Israel. So the word chronicles applies to both, the word kings applies to both. They're very, very poor titles but the fact of the matter is one is the two kingdoms, the other is the one kingdom. And it is true, as it was pointed out here by someone, that there is a great interest in God's word (13 1/2)

There's much material given about that that's not given in Kings. But that doesn't

come into this particular subject more than other subjects. So while I'm going to speak about B, which was David, and we discussed, had already discussed his call, and his early experiences during the reign of Saul, and of Samuel. But we noticed last time something of the character of David, and that's very important. To understand the character of David and to see the very, very vital Bible teaching that this world is not made up of two kinds of people, moral people and immoral people. It's not made up of two kinds of people, righteous people and wicked people. But it's made up of two kinds of people, justified people and people who have rejected Christ. Both are sinners, both are wicked, and sometimes your lost are much better people than some of your saved. The important thing is not where they are, but what direction are they moving in. And your justified person...

...and may be a better moral man than your saved man, he may be a man with a fine Christian background, which has saved him from much of the temptation that others have, He may be a man who has been raised in a fine ethical environment. He may be a man who realized that honesty is the best policy and knows he'll be happier (3/4)

He may be any of those things, but his life is built around the self principle and is in general (1) though that
 may not be obvious. Those are the two kinds of people in this world, and if there's anything that God hates it's the Pharasaic attitude that I am holier and better than thou. Now the Christians are better than the unChristians, they are better on the average, but there are many of them who are inferior to many who are Christians. But they are moving in one direction, the others are moving in another direction.

And David is not an example of a moral man or ~~of~~ a naturally good man, he is not a passive, easy-going character who finds it very, very simple to ~~keep~~ keep from stepping on other' people's toes. He's an aggressive vigorous sort of a man, who does everything that he does wholeheartedly and energetically, and therefore his sin expressed itself more flagrantly and becomes more obvious than the sins of many another person who doesn't have the backbone, ~~the~~ push ^{that} as David had. And David was in many ways a very wicked man, but he was a man who was on the whole seeking to do God's will. He was often (2 $\frac{1}{4}$)

the sin into which he fell and not doing it insincerely, doing it in full sincerity, and he was a man who therefore in his attitude and in his progress was a man after God's own heart, and is so called in scripture.

And then from a historical viewpoint it is very important that we realize that in the history of Israel David made a tremendous change in ~~that~~ history because while Saul was one who was ~~resisting~~ resisting the Philistine oppression and doing it on the whole quite well, David was one who stepped out and overcame the Philistines and reduced them to practically a nullity and then proceeded to conquer all the nations around, and instead of having a few tribes oppressed and constantly under danger from their enemy, you now have a real empire with David's (2 3/4) with the territory two or
 three times as large as that of Israel substituted, and the people therefore living on

an economic basis far above what they were before David became king. He made a tremendous difference in the economic, political, and social life of Israel. He was very, very important as a historical figure but we have no other historical evidence on it than that in the Bible, because we have no references in any of ~~these~~ materials from the great empires of antiquity, and we have no archeological material of written kind that can definitely allocate him. We should also note about David, his trouble with his family, where he gave about the final example of how not to take care of children, as anybody could possibly give in his treatment of Absalom. His treatment of him which varied, like that of so many parents, from extreme giving in to anything they want, to extreme sternness about some particular matter. And he oscillated from one extreme to the other and had about the worst possible effect on Absalom that he possibly could have. And in the end when Absalom rebelled against him and the great part of Israel went out with Absalom to do it, when the loyal people who stood by David defeated the others, ^{and} David was again able to come back and become king, he was so filled with his sorrow that Absalom had died that he almost threw aside the whole situation, and Joab had to speak to him pretty harshly about it, about recognizing that the welfare of the millions of people in the kingdom was more important than his own personal sorrow over his son. And it is David ^{who} then saw and proceeded to act in a reasonable way, but there we have him giving way to this terror over Absalom, but he had not shown reasonable common sense in dealing with Absalom in the years before. It's not an example for us to follow, but an example to avoid. If you can see and study exactly where the errors came in and what the results were, and you can see on a far smaller scale, many of the same errors made in just about any parents you want to look at. And it's very helpful to learn something from mistakes we can avoid. You can often learn more from that than from the simple direction of how to do things right. And so that is a valuable thing for us.

And then of course in connection with David, there is the covenant with David, which is a very important thing, perhaps more from the viewpoint of prophecy than from history. But we find it brought out in 2 Sam. 7. There we read that when the king sat in his house and the Lord had given him rest round about from all his enemies, the King said to Nathan the prophet, see now, I dwell in an house of cedar but the ark of God

dwelleth within curtains. And Nathan said to the king, Go, do all that is in thine heart, for the Lord is with thee. And Nathan being a prophet, anything Nathan said must be right, mustn't it? And therefore he speaks as a prophet, as the inspired authority of God and this is God's will that David shall build. If so, then the Bible has contradictions in it, because Nathan proceeds to say the opposite thing a few verses later. Which simply shows that there's no such thing in the Bible as a prophet or an apostle ~~who~~ has an ^{indelible} ~~infallible~~ character that everything he says is right. The prophets and the apostles were sinful men like we, and they make mistakes, but God led them in that which they were to write as part of His word, to keep ^{it} ~~them~~ from error, and God gave messages, gave revelations to the prophets and to the apostles, and these revelations were directly from God, but in addition to the revelations, most of them said many things that were their own ideas. And here Nathan asks as a human being, and seeing what a fine attitude David has and how right he is, to think of the fact that God's house should be as well taken care of as his own, and ~~that~~ he should have this interest, it was a fine attitude on David's part and Nathan drew the reasonable human conclusion from it, and when we don't have the word of God, we have to draw a reasonable human conclusion, and that's what Nathan did. But his reasonable human conclusion was not what God's will was, in this particular case, and God gave him a revelation, to tell him ~~that~~ this wasn't what God wanted him to do. And so here we have Nathan the prophet speaking, but he wasn't speaking as a prophet, and no one was a prophet all the time, he was a prophet when God gives him a message. God does not give messages all the time, to his prophets. Because Nathan speaks out of his own heart, his own wisdom, and it's good wisdom, but just in this particular case, God's will is something else. And so that night the word of God came to Nathan and he said go and tell my servant David, thus saith the Lord, are you going to build me a house to dwell in? Why he says I've lived in a tent all this time, that is his headquarters has been. When did I command that I should have a temple built? Now therefore, so shalt thou say to ~~my~~ servant David, and ^{it} ~~he~~ goes ahead and tells how he dealt with David and he gives David a wonderful promise of what he is going to do for David. And he says David has been thinking of God's house. What is wonderful.

the whole line of David is described and also the one who is to climax the end of the line. We have that about the prophets there, we have it here about David, and so God as he gave these predictions often, as time went on, it became clearer what it meant. Not that anything they said was wrong, but that it could be better understood and fit together with other parts, and they saw that there was to come a great prophet, and a great king. But they didn't know, till the time came, that these two were the same man. Yes? (student.4 $\frac{1}{2}$) Well, that would be you see, that would be a forerunner before each coming. That would be the same sort of thing, only two comings, two forerunners. That wouldn't be like taking two unrelated things. Like for instance saying that a prophecy of Emmanuel was a son of the wicked king Ahab, and also the Lord Jesus Christ, those two would be absolutely unrelated! This would be the two very closely related things, the forerunner for Christ at his first coming, a forerunner for Christ at his second coming, neither of them actually like him, but they both might be representative/ symbolically by Elijah because of their similarity in character and actions. Yes? (student.5 $\frac{1}{2}$) Yes. This promises prophet-is a prophet and they say the prophet is Mohammed. Well, we have to examine given and see if Mohammed fits it. I remember Dr. Zwemer saying he thought that it was the promise, the prediction of a false prophet, rather than this one, that referred to Mohammed there, but at any rate, which it is we have to study the life of Mohammed, study the statements here and draw our conclusions. Mohammed certainly had a right to say the Bible has predicted that God will send prophets and that he will send a very great prophet, but whether he was the one or not, is a matter which needs investigation. You can't come to a conclusion on it without (6)

The Mohammedans of course recognize that Christ was a great prophet. They say he was one of the greatest of all the prophets, but they deny his death, they deny his saviorhood, they deny his resurrection, and they hold that Mohammed coming later was a still greater prophet, and some of them feel that Christ will come back again and then be even greater than Mohammed because he was still later in the line. I don't know how widespread this is but I do understand there is some. Yes? (student.6 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...who is ~~the~~ receive to the full — this promise to David, and so Hebrews is justified in quoting as $\frac{1}{2}$ referring to Christ, because it is referring to this line of David's and especially ^{to the} one who is ultimately the climax of the line. We have the same principle back in Deuteronomy, where there's a passage back there in Deuteronomy which deals with the matter of how are the children of Israel going to know God's will after Moses is gone? And that promise back there in Deuteronomy, Moses gives them the answer as to how they are to find out. It is ~~in~~ Deuteronomy 18:15. And there in Deuteronomy 18 we have the statement that when they go into these countries, verses 9-14, say, when they go into Canaan, they are not to go to charmers, or consultants, familiar spirits, wizards, necromancers, all these are an abomination to the Lord. Verse 16 says, the Lord thy God shall raise up unto thee a prophet in the midst thy brethren, like unto me, to him ye shall hearken. So there is promised a line of prophets, that there will be prophets like Moses, able to tell the people what God's will is.

But in verse 18, he repeats it, he says I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him, and it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words that he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him. This is a promise of a line of prophets who succeed Moses, to come and give the Lord's will. He continues in verses 20 to 22 to tell them how to recognize false prophets. But as time went on the people came more and more to realize that this was a promise not merely of the line of prophets but that there was to be the one who was to be the great climax of the line. And so in John 1 we find the Pharisees sending representatives to the wilderness to ask John the Baptist, are you that prophet? They asked are you that prophet that Moses promised, who was the climax of the line of prophets, the great ultimate goal of the line of prophets, the one great prophet. Of course that was the Lord Jesus Christ. And so we do not ever have in the Bible a prediction which means two unrelated things, Such a double prediction as that, you could make anything mean anything if such a principle were followed, and it's never followed in the Bible. But you have predictions of a line of progress which has various elements in the line, and

there's often a tendency in Chronicles to enlarge a little on Kings, but in this case there is not an enlargement, there is a decrease. Because in the passage in Chronicles, 1 Chron.17 that tells about this, much of this is repeated word for word, but the statement that when he commits iniquity, I will punish him, is not repeated. He says he will build me a house and I will establish his throne for ever, I will be his father, and he shall be my son, and I will not take my mercy away from him, as I took it from him that was before thee. And I will settle him in my house and in my kingdom for ever, and his throne shall be established for evermore. Now Chronicles is written later than Kings. Kings here tells us about Solomon and describes a continuing line. Chronicles tells us a little about Solomon but it's interested more in the continuing line because it is written later than Kings, and the interest is naturally shifting more further to the future. And then the 89th Psalm contains a somewhat enlarged presentation of God's covenant with David. Psalm 89, verse 3, I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant, and this is doubtless written by David sometime later in his life, giving the fullest statement of the covenant has made with David. And he says in it, over in verse 29, following, His seed will I make to endure for ever and his throne as the days of heaven. If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments, if they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments, then will I visit their transgression ~~with-th~~, you have a (14 $\frac{1}{4}$)

continuing line,

then will I visit their transgression with the rod and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless my lovingkindness I will not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail. My covenant will I not break, his seed shall endure for ever and his throne as the sun before me. Δ

And so we have these three passages to show us, first a promise to David of a son who will build God's house. Then the promise that his (14 $\frac{3}{4}$) is to continue there as a continuing line. And as time goes on that this continuing line is ~~to~~ have a climax...

Well, now it's not my will David should build a house, but he says it is my will that his son should build it. And he says David has shown this interest in God's house, I'm going to build David a house. He says, in verse 12, when thy days are fulfilled and thou shalt sleep with they fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever. I will be his father and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men, but my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before you. And ~~thou-new~~ ^{thine house} and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee, thy throne shall be established for ever. Who was he talking about, was it the Lord Jesus Christ he was talking about here? Is this a prophecy of the Lord Jesus Christ? Mr. Desppande? (student.10 $\frac{1}{4}$) Yes. You find it quoted in the book of Hebrews as referring to Christ, but here you have it given as describing the man who is going to build a temple for the Lord, and you have it said that when he commits iniquity he will be chastened with the rod of men but God's mercy will not depart from him as he took it away from Saul, whom I put away before thee.

So I think we have to see that in this case we have a prophecy to David that he is to be succeeded by a son who is his own natural son, and this son of David's who is his own natural son, this son is going to build a house for the Lord and if this son commits iniquity, God will not take his mercy from him as he did from Saul, but he will punish him but not remove his mercy.

But then we have it carried a bit further, we are told not merely that he will have a son, but that his house will be established forever, that there will always be someone to sit on his throne. Thy throne shall be established forever, and this doesn't mean that Solomon is going to live forever, it doesn't mean that. So we have here a prediction of a continuing line. We have a prediction of a continuing line. Solomon we're told these things, but then we're told there is a continuing line, his throne is to be established forever. And then we find over in Chronicles in the parallel to this,

1 Chron. 17:13 $\frac{1}{2}$. I read a minute ago, I will be his father, he shall be son, and I will not take my mercy away from him, as I took it from him that was before thee. In 2 Sam. what it says is, I will be his father and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity I will chasten him with a rod of men and with the stripes of the children of men, but my mercy shall not depart from him, as I took it from Saul. You see that statement about his committing iniquity fits with ~~Samuel~~, it does not fit Christ. And Chronicles does not repeat it, because the interest has shifted forward further by the time ~~Chronicles~~ is written. It was true of Saul but of course it's not true of Christ, because he did not and could not commit iniquity.

Well, this promise to David is something that people came more and more to realize the significance of. We find this referred to very specifically in Isaiah 55, where the great gospel call of Isaiah 55, one of the clearest presentations of the gospel anywhere in the Bible, includes in it these words, in verses 3 and 4: incline your ear and come unto me, hear and your soul shall live and I will make an everlasting covenant with you even the sure mercies of David. Behold I have given him for a witness to the people, a leader and a commander to the people. And here of course it's referring not to the king, the great king who lived in the past, but to the son of David, who ^{is} the fulfillment of the promise to David, who is yet to come. But it shows that at Isaiah's time the idea of the coming son of David was well realized, and people were looking forward to it even though not knowing a great deal about it.

Well this matter then of the covenant of David is quite important. Many historical details about David that we're not going to take time for in this course, there are many spiritual lessons also we're not going to have time for, they are very important but you can get them yourself, you don't need the class for them.

But we want to move on to Solomon. Just one more thing I have to say about David. To me ~~he is~~ one of the ~~most~~ disappointing things in the life of David is that at the very end of ~~the book~~ ^{his life} when he commands Solomon to have vengeance on the people, that he didn't feel like doing this himself (9 $\frac{1}{2}$)

so he called on Solomon to do it. I think that was a very unfortunate thing that on David's reputation that should be attached right at the end. And I think it's very

unfortunate, especially Joab who stood by David so truly, helped him time after time, did everything for him. He had his faults but no more than David had. And in the end David led Solomon to have Joab killed. That was very unfortunate, but again it simply reminds us of the fact that David was a very imperfect character, but he was a man after God's own heart. It is the heart that is the vital thing and the direction in which ^{we} you are moving rather than the stage which we have attained. Many a man seems to have a beautiful character but it's a matter of environment, it's a matter of what he's been brought, he's never been subjected perhaps to the temptations of (10½) therefore he feels much better than they are but who knows what he ~~would~~ have been subjected to similar temptations.

Well, then the next is C. Solomon. And Solomon ~~did the~~ ^{would be} absolutely impossible without David. That is to say Solomon inherited David's, what David produced. If Saul had died and Solomon had become king, what he would have done nobody knows. His situation was entirely different from the situation which either Saul or David found. Each of them took a struggling people under constant oppression and difficulty, needing a strong military ruler. Solomon took a people which had been established into a great empire and their leader had been so very effective in a military way that everybody round was howling, and was afraid to attack or to make any difficulty for him. And so Solomon was the heir/ of plenty of prosperity, of a well-established situation, which would normally keep going almost of itself for a period of time. It didn't have to be built up. And so Solomon succeeds to something very different from what David or Saul had. He comes into an entirely different situation, maybe he was ~~a~~ much better king for that sort of a period than David was. We have no way of knowing. But David's talents and abilities were of a different type. Solomon takes over a well-established kingdom, and taking over this well-established kingdom he proceeded to take the income ~~g~~ which came in and to utilize ^{it} in order to build, to make his capital glorious, to make his city beautiful, to enrich himself and his friends, and ~~he had~~ great accounts of how the land was divided up, to pay the heavy taxes that take care of Solomon's very expensive household. He lives on a very high scale, and for forty years, put a tremendous burden on the people

which they willingly and gladly bore because of their adoration for his father David who had freed them from oppression and given them this situation. So that's the situation into which Solomon comes. When Solomon becomes king he is quite a young man. He is one of the later of David's sons, I think the worst method, about, of establishing of determining who will run a country is to take the oldest son. That is making a mere matter of accident of birth the determination, apart altogether from qualities and abilities of who shall be the leader, and you can take almost any country I know of that's had hereditary rulers you find that most of them are pretty poor sticks to be ruling over their country. I don't know of any country that's an exception to that rule. But in this case it wasn't quite that bad because the king, from his many sons, designates a son to reign, and that of course (13 $\frac{3}{4}$) far better than ~~if it was~~ ^{would have}

been the ~~just-a case~~ if it was just a man who happened to be the oldest. And this was a comparatively young son of David's that David designated. He designated him because his mother was a special favorite of his. And so he designated ^{Solomon} for the king, and Solomon, ~~after~~ the early part of his reign, displays a wonderful character, in his humility. I fear it didn't last very long but in the early part of the reign he has such a wonderful humility and a feeling of insufficiency (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

So we have his praying to the Lord, the Lord promising him a gift, and he is so pleased that what he asks is wisdom to rule the people wisely. And then we have the account of Solomon's wisdom in dealing with the people, the wonderful account which is often (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) brought out in Sunday School lessons

master of psychology in handling the problems that came before him in his judging of the people. God does not promise to give him the revelation which (14 $\frac{3}{4}$)

God gave him wisdom

in order that he

O.T.History 264. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...that was the fine situation with Solomon at the beginning of his reign, which of course ($\frac{1}{2}$)

Now the Bible presents this picture of Solomon as a great emperor, a great ruler, and naturally there are many who question whether there is anything to it at all. The statement was made in the Current History Magazine, in 1928, an article was there which one of my students brought to me and I was much interested to see it. It was quoted from an English magazine ⁱⁿ which H. G. Wells, a noted English publisher, author of ^{the} The Outline of History, had written an article on English education. And he said in this article that he regretted greatly that in England they spent so much time dealing with ^{Palestine} ~~the life-~~ because he said nothing of any importance ever happened in Palestine, and then he went on to say there is only one period of greatness of Palestine and that was the period of Solomon and that that is tremendously exaggerated. That actually, he says, the pride of King Solomon in the little temple that Hiram built for him would be comparable to the pride of a negro chauffeur on the Gold Coast of Chicago in the new car that his employer had purchased. That's H. G. Wells' statement about Solomon and it's interesting to know that there is nothing ^{that} ~~in it~~ from written material from ancient times to disprove ~~this~~ ^{statement} ~~scripture~~. We have no monument that has the name of Solomon on it. We have ~~no~~ monument that tells of his greatness. Over in the southern shores of Lake (2 $\frac{1}{2}$) Armenia, we have many a monument that has been found saying I am so-and-so the great king, the king of kings, I have conquered many nations, I established my power over them and ^{as} ~~when~~ you read it you think he's one of the greatest kings in the world's history. And archeologists believe that these are copies from the inscriptions of ^{the} Assyrian kings, and actually they were very petty kings that put them up and they don't mean anything at all. And of course if Solomon had put up inscriptions like that there would be those today who would (3)

But we don't have any such inscriptions of King Solomon as that. Of course he doubtless put inscriptions up as we have some references in the Bible to the putting up of the cement on the rock, and writing on the cement, an easy way to make a monument. And we know that was ~~done~~ in some cases, and archeologists guess that Solomon may have done it. And if so the cement wears off, and the inscription is gone. The Assyrians and the Egyptians chiselled their inscriptions into solid rock, and those inscriptions, many of

them have stood for thousands of years. But we have no such inscriptions in Palestine at all. In fact we haven't found any that fits in with the idea that that's the way they put them up. We have in Syria, just north of Palestine, at the so-called (4) River, we have inscriptions put up by the Egyptians there, just a few miles north of Palestine, on the solid rock, chiselled in, which can be read now 2500 years after they were put up. Some of them as much as 3500 years after, though those as old as that are beginning to deteriorate quite a bit but you can still make out most of it. We have at Beth-Shan, just south of the Jordan, a few inscriptions which are about 3500 years old. And they have worn away pretty badly but you can still read most of them. But the Israelite kings, I don't know of a single inscription like that that we have put up on the solid rock to celebrate their victory. The Armenian kings did it, Kings of (4 $\frac{3}{4}$)

did it, kings of (4 $\frac{3}{4}$) did it, and of course the Assyrians and Egyptians, but the Israelites seem not to have gone in for that sort of thing. ~~1/4~~

Now to find something like that of course would be immediately hailed as a wonderful evidence of Solomon's greatness, but nothing like that has been found. (student.5 $\frac{1}{4}$) Well, now these Assyrian (5 $\frac{1}{2}$) would be just practically wedge-shaped characters, they would not be (5 $\frac{1}{2}$) The Egyptians, of course, were pictures, but the Assyrian would not be (5 $\frac{1}{2}$)

and the Hebrew writing (5 $\frac{3}{4}$)

I don't think that would apply. Yes? (student.5 $\frac{3}{4}$) Yes. Definitely. But I don't know of any reference to it in the Bible, any specific reference to Solomon's activities of that kind. Yes? (student.6 $\frac{1}{4}$) You mean about Buddha? (student.6 $\frac{3}{4}$) I didn't know that. (student.7) What was the date of Buddha? (student.7 $\frac{1}{2}$) 561 approximately, B.C. Well, you see Solomon was about 950 (7 $\frac{1}{2}$) so Solomon's much earlier. (student.7 $\frac{3}{4}$) There are many unbelievers today think that much of the monotheism in the Bible is taken from Zoroastrianism, but the Zoroastrianism is much later than the Biblical material, and of course the only way they can say it is to say the Biblical material is late, that it isn't at the time it claims to be. But if you take the Biblical material at the time it claims to be, and it cannot be disproved, it's

only conjecture that why both Zoroaster and Buddha are much later. Now it's possible for such things to arise independently. The similarity is not great enough to prove one has to get it from the other. Things can arise, very striking things can arise independently. I just was at the dentist and while, just as I was going to leave, talking to the secretary about another appointment and she ~~asked~~^{answered} the phone so I had to wait. Then she said to me, she said that was a very easy phone call to answer. She said a woman phoned and asked if she could have an appointment on May 3, and she said I had just this morning written a card which I hadn't yet mailed to her, telling her that it was six months since she had had a previous appointment and that I was making an appointment for her on May 3 at such a time and if she didn't want it let me know. And she phoned and asked for the identical same day. She said here I had it all ready and so when she phoned and asked for May 1, why sure she had it all ready. Well that is a coincidence. And life is full of coincidences. And it could be a coincidence that this story, a similar experience, could have occurred twice because it shows a knowledge of psychology which is not common, but it's not extremely rare. Others beside Solomon would have had this knowledge, but at the same time it's altogether possible that it made its way from ~~Biblical~~^{Israel} over to India. Not at all impossible that Buddha got it from Solomon, indirectly of course, and the same is true of Zoroastrianism. But you'd have to have more similarity to prove it. (student.10) But many of those people may have gotten the idea from Solomon I am sure. Well, we continue there tomorrow morning.

O.T.History 265. (½)

...I'm going to do something today that I haven't done for a long time. I'm going to assign a lesson for this afternoon. Now it will be a short lesson so I'm sure all of you can work it in. It's not going to be a lengthy assignment at all, it should not take you more than a very few minutes to do it, but I hope everyone will have it done by that time. I want you to be prepared this afternoon to answer two questions, which you can learn from the books of Kings and Chronicles. Your assignment yesterday covered the early years of the divided kingdom in Kings and Chronicles, and consequently you

know where it is, there is no need of my giving you specific references. But what I want is simply for you to have in mind and be able to prove from scripture, if necessary, the answer to two questions. First, who was the second king of Judah as a divided kingdom, that is who followed Rehoboam as king of Judah? I want you to be able to prove it. Secondly, what sort of king was he, was he a good king, or was he a bad king? What is your judgment, I want you to be able to prove it. Now, knowing where the material is, having this assignment for yesterday, why it should not take you but a very, very brief time to do this. Otherwise, I certainly wouldn't assign between this hour and 2:30. But I'm sure you can do it very quickly, but I'd like a specific and accurate answer to each of these two things.

Well, now we were speaking yesterday about King Solomon. And we noted that according to the Biblical account, Solomon was a very great ruler, a man with a large empire which his father David had won by two things, first by having learned the Philistine secret of iron weapons and thus having an adequate supply for his far greater force, ^{but} and second by claiming a very excellent army and leading them very skillfully. And so David had built this large empire and established his reputation so strongly that Solomon didn't have to fight to hold it. It's a wonderful thing if you can do things for those who come after you. You can make it easy or you can make it difficult. After I graduated from college and my sister followed me, she never had to do any studying for the first two years because I'd made a reputation as a student. She could get good marks without it. I don't think her marks were near so good the last two years as they were the first. But it's true in life, what you do established good or bad for the future. On the other hand if she'd gone first I think I'd have been a much greater social success than I ever was, because she would have established a reputation in that direction. But David, not only conquered, but established a reputation, and the reputation holds for a while. And so we have Solomon, according to the scripture, having all this (3¹) not having to fight for it, he's got it, he's got this empire, he's got this wonderful establishment, and a person could take that and could just bungle with it, or the person could handle it ably, and the Bible says he handled it ably, it says he was a man

of great wisdom, But that picture of Solomon in the Bible is one which H. G. Wells and others have scoffed at, because they say there's no evidence of it, it simply stands alone. The Bible says it. You can expect the Jews to want to glorify some of their kings. Here's one they picked, but what evidence is there? Certainly we've got great monuments in Egypt, in Mesopotamia, that their great kings built, there's nothing like that in Palestine. We have, how do we know there ever was a powerful ruler at this period in Palestine. Well, in 1929, when I was on my way from Berlin to Palestine, in January 1929, the report went out over the radio, that there had been discovered the tomb of Solomon's favorite wife, his daughter of Pharaoh, that in it there were writings telling about the greatness of Solomon and showing what a mighty ruler and a wise ruler he had been. This went out over the radio all over Europe, and then it soon was proven, that some correspondent, getting his calendar mixed, made an April Fool's joke three months ahead of time. That it was just a made-up story by some correspondent, out for a joke, and others took it seriously and it was radioed all over Europe. Nothing of that kind has yet been discovered. We have no writings with Solomon's name on it, from his time, no monument with specific references to him, no contemporary descriptions of his greatness other than the descriptions in the Bible. And consequently, naturally, H. E. Wells was one who had a sufficient reputation to speak out vocally and say what many others thought, that this just a Biblical superstition and mythology, that there was no evidence for it at all. But the evidence came from a most unexpected source, instead of the evidence coming from a monument put up by Solomon, or a contemporary account that came from a direction that nobody ever would have dreamed of. And to show where it came from, it's good to go back and look at this, an excavation that took place at about 1906.

At that time for a brief period there were some German excavators who excavated the town of Megiddo. Now you are familiar of course with the location of Megiddo. It is on the edge of the hill country that separates the central plain, the plain of Esdraelon, from the plain down on the coast, the coastal plain, up at the north, if you are going from Egypt to Mesopotamia, you go up the coastal plain, but then to get over to Mesopotam-

ia your coastal plain there, which is wide and fertile down at the bottom, the south gets narrower and narrower and narrower, until Mount Carmel comes right practically to the edge of the sea. And so an army coming up that plain, has got to cross over into the central plain before they can go on to Mesopotamia, or to Asia Minor. And the same is true of an army coming from Asia Minor or from Mesopotamia. They may get from the Jordan Valley up to the Coastal Plain, there's another important strategic place going from the Jordan Valley to the Coastal Plain, or they may come down from the North, down the central plain. But they have to get over to the coastal plain somewhere, if they're going to get down to Egypt. And so Megiddo occupies a very strategic point on--Sosthenes III the great Egyptian Pharaoh, in one of his accounts, tel's of his great battle at Megiddo at about 1400 or 1500 B. C. A great attack there at Megiddo, a great conflict which he had there, and it shows the importance of that city, and of course Theodore Roosevelt made Megiddo widely known. In one of his great political address, he said we are marching to Armegeddon and Armegeddon became known to the general American public in a way it had not been before and it continued to be used in political speeches for quite a while at the time ^{after} ~~that~~ he did that. But Armegeddon of course is the Greek for high Megiddo, the hill of Megiddo. Megiddo was often Armegaddon or the hill of Megiddo because of its strategic position on the hill there, guarding one of the main approach passes across from the central valley to the coast. Well, back in 19--the early part of this century, the German excavators realized the importance of Megiddo as a place from which something about ancient times might well be learned. And so they raised some money in Germany and went in to excavate Megiddo. But they did not have any very large sum of money and (9 $\frac{1}{4}$) nor _____ was the science of archeology advanced very far as far as excavation of the (9 $\frac{1}{4}$) _____ in Palestine as early as 1906. Their efforts helped to advance it, we owe much to the various expeditions of those years for learning things that we use later on, but ^{they} ~~we did~~ not have the information available to make their excavations yield anything like the information (9 $\frac{1}{4}$) _____ And so coming from Megiddo here, they rented the right to excavate for a season or two there, and they began to dig trenches. Now that is

a very poor method of excavation, it has now been given up almost completely, but at that time it seems to be a very cheap method of getting some good quick results. That was to make a trench because you don't just learn about one period, you get various periods, you can compare, and make your trench and go clear down quite deep and then you see a little from the different areas, you see the walls and the foundations, walls of (10 $\frac{1}{2}$) and the foundations from different areas.

In 1929 when I visited Megiddo it had recently rained and washed away the dust from the side of these trenches, and I looked down into one of these trenches and you see the foundations of 18 cities, one above the other, Megiddo. And that shows what an important place Megiddo was and they saw in this trench 18 different cities, one above the other, and another very fine thing about Megiddo is that the top one of them is before the time of Christ. There is nothing after that but just a little fortification on the top. And so that you get, you don't have to dig through a lot of material in the Christian era or in the Hellenistic era, you get right down to Biblical times quickly-- Another thing that makes Megiddo far superior to the Philistine area as a place for excavation. But the great difficulty with a trench is that you get too little of any one period to really make satisfactory judgments about it. And from the top of the hill you don't know what the lines are, you don't know how to dig so as to get anything completed. Now suppose somebody dug a trench 8 feet wide, 8 or 10 feet wide, through a hill that covered this building. You would dig down, say the roof was broken pretty badly, but the walls were here and the tables and chairs, at least some parts of them, you wouldn't know to dig straight back this way, or across (12) whatever you happened to, you might come across like this, get a little edge of this, you get a part of that wall, a part of this wall, a part of different things, and you don't have its relation to other things and it's pretty much hit and miss whether you hit things that are important or don't. And so it's a very, very unsatisfactory method of excavation and has now pretty well been given up. Now in making an excavation you always begin with digging deep, but you start not with a trench but more with like a square (12 $\frac{1}{2}$) section. You start with an area, definitely not expecting to learn a lot about any particular

period but to see how many periods there are in that section, and see something of the pottery in them, see what you can do about dating, and see their relative advancement in construction, and get a general idea of the period, you start with that, but then for your knowledge of each period, you take an area rather than a trench. Take an area perhaps nearly as wide as it is long and you cover that area for each section.

Well, they dig a trench method at that early time, and in it they found the third city from the top to be superior in its culture to the cities above and below, and they decided that period was from about 1000 B. C., about the time of Solomon. And they doubtless were correct in that reasoning. But they didn't find much to tell much about that period, but one thing they did find of real interest there, was a column, a square column, and this square column stood about 8 feet high, and it was about 1 foot and a half wide, and square, not a rounded column, and this square column standing there, they thought was a symbol of some sort of ancient worship. These men went up (14) to make the excavation, they weren't theological men, they were men whose idea was the gradual development of the religion of Israel according to the (14 $\frac{1}{4}$) theory and eventually about the time of Amos it gets monotheism. So at the time of Solomon you would have all sorts of (14 $\frac{1}{4}$) and beliefs. And they thought that this column there represented something to do with ancient worship. Now that was the custom at that time, whenever you found a column it was the symbol of ancient worship. Now there are columns which have been used for worship, no question of it, there are individual ones which were put up for that purpose, they were so designated, but they're comparatively few, but any book on archeology written before 1928, or 29, will contain quite a few pictures of columns representing ancient worship. In 1928 ...

...~~Prof~~ University of Berlin, one of our greatest modern authorities on material archeology, that is on the actual type of building and that sort of thing, proves that most of the columns found in excavations in Palestine are there to hold up the second story of the house or whatever sort of building it is. Most of the buildings had two stories in, second story disappeared, we have the first story a good bit of the first story in many of them, and the columns that were to hold up the second story, like you remember the story of Samson, how he tore down the columns on which the whole second primarily rested and that caused that the thing should collapse. Well, that's true of the great bulk of the homes, though not all by any means, in different places in Palestine. But they thought this was a symbol of ancient worship but one thing about ^{it was a} puzzled them, and that was that about three feet ^{up} from the ground, there was a hole going obliquely across, from one side to the other (1¹/₂) a hole about an inch square going obliquely across, and what does this have to do with an ancient worship. Well, of course the immediate idea occurs, if you have an altar it might be a channel to carry off the blood. But this wasn't an altar, it was too high for an altar. ^{in addition to that,} and ~~that~~ didn't reach to the top of it at all, it was just to the side, it was ^{horizontal} ~~holding-on~~, ^{so} but it wouldn't carry anything off to flow through it that way. What was the meaning of this hole, obliquely there. Well, ~~they~~ didn't have any explanation for it, there were no satisfactory, various theories were suggested but there was no satisfactory explanation for this hole there in this column. And there the matter stood for twenty years. Twenty years later about 1925 along in there, Professor William Henry Breasted, the founder of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, made an great impression on John D. Rockefeller Jr., and Rockefeller gave him 12 million dollars, some at a time, not all at once, but in the course of maybe 15 years, he gave him 12 million dollars for excavation and archeological study, and the scholars working with him in Chicago went on a wild spree with all that money in hand, spent it as if there was no end to it, and of course they did a lot of good things, but they all know now they could have accomplished nearly twice as much, if they had realized that even if you got a million instead of a thousand, you want to

handle it carefully and make it last as long as you can. Some of them there think that when Rockefeller stopped giving them large sums of money they were better off than they were before, because they had to stop and plan more carefully and they crystallized the work and (3 $\frac{1}{2}$) on the whole than before but they were able to do much more before than since, because they had all this money and they proceeded to excavate in Mesopotamia and in Egypt and in Palestine and in Syria, and they built a great beautiful museum and center for study at the University of Chicago which is the finest one building established for archeological study in the world today. I just love to work in the library there because they've got all the books all together and (3 $\frac{3}{4}$) in the one room and there about 50 scholars in the building who have their special offices, but everyone has to, no books may go out of the building, and one can keep a book in his office for years, but the card is there, available to everybody else to see where the book is. You can always go and get it, the books are, you don't have to wait a week for any book. If somebody's got it in his office you can always go and get it from him, so that the books are available on any subject you want to study in that field, the most wonderful place to study. Unfortunately, when they first planned the place, they got it half up they found they'd forgotten to leave a space for a staircase so they had to tear down a good bit of it, rebuild, put in a staircase, which was rather necessary, but it is today a very, very fine building, and it is a wonderful center for archeological work. When the money stopped coming in the quantity it had been, they had to sell off a lot of their things. Some of these sites that they had built wonderful establishments, they had to sell to other universities for a tenth of what they had to spend on them. But the greater part of the money is really helping archeological matters. Now one place they decided in, they looked over Palestine, and they decided one excellent place to build ~~in-Palestine-~~, to dig in Palestine, would be (5) and so they went there and instead of renting they bought the whole hill on which it was, which meant there wouldn't have to be, they excavate and then they're (5 $\frac{1}{2}$)

the other part of the year and they're always dickering for rentals and so on.

They bought the hill and they put up permanent buildings instead of living in tents and getting along as well as they could, they put up permanent buildings. When I visited it in 1929 I felt more as if I was in a modern mining town than any other thing I could imagine, because it was like a place you might be out in the mountains in Colorado or perhaps in Peru, you come to a fine mining town where there has been, there is still excellent establishments for the headquarters, evidently handled very well, it's the way it was there. There was a special building for their photography, and for their glass things, and for the library such as they used for the work there, and so on. And all the materials to do an excellent job, not to dig principally, but to examine everything that was there. They started out with Clarence Fisher as the director, who had started most of the great excavations in Palestine. He only directed it for a brief time and (6½) but he got them well started, an excellent archeologist. And then they had other directors after him, and it's not like a small excavation where a brilliant man can make brilliant deductions from a little material which often proves to be right but sometimes wrong. It is the sort of thing where you get a tremendous amount of material but no one mind can fully understand it. But it's printed up in fine fashion and is available to people to study in all the various parts in Palestine, and thus is helpful to everyone. ~~It~~

But there at Megiddo they began digging and they took one half of a mound and examined everything on it from the latest period and they mapped it and they charted it. They ^{they studied} photographed everything they could, from the latest city there at Megiddo. And then they removed everything from it, from this half of the mound and opened the next ~~half~~ ^{one} half. When they had all half of the city visible before them, when they charted it, and they photographed and they made studies quite thorough and wrote them up in extensive publications, and then they went on to further. And when they got to the fourth city, what they called the fourth city was so tremendous and so remarkable, that they decided before going on with this city, to start at the beginning again and do the other half of the first four. And the result was that the fourth city remained for a couple of years visible, which was an excellent thing, because it was the part

of the city which interested us the most, the part from the time of Solomon. And when I got there in 1929 they were just then about to start the new season's work. But the skilled Egyptian foremen, thoroughly trained in the practical end of archeology in Egypt, who was to arrive to direct the local people in the work, were due the next day, and all arrangements had been made for their coming. Dr. Dye who was in charge of the expedition had nothing to do that day except to wait, plenty of leisure to take our party, which consisted of four scholars from four different continents, to take us over the mound and explain everything to us in pretty full detail. And it just was the ideal opportunity to learn the exact situation of Megiddo in the time of Solomon.

And as we walked across the mounds with Dr. Dye, he said you remember that column that they found back in 1906 there, well, look at here, he says you can see hundreds of other columns just like it, and there they were, hundreds of columns just like that one, and here would be a long row of columns of maybe six or seven feet between each of them, one column after the other, and then out from this row of columns, maybe 7 feet over, there was another row of columns, and then back of these columns, about 12 feet there was a wall after the row of columns, and then back of that wall, another 12 feet there was another row of columns. And then about 7 feet another row of columns, and then about 12 feet another wall. And so on, on this tremendous area of the mound, these rows of columns and walls arranged this way, and you see the layout would be a wall, and then about 12 feet, 12 or 15 feet, another row of columns, and then about 7 feet a row of columns and then about 12 or 15 feet another wall. The same over again. Covering a tremendous section of this great mound. And Dr. Dye said as you look at them, it's perfectly obvious that these have nothing to do with worship. He said that these are stalls for horses and that the ~~hole~~^{hole} through the columns is to put the rope through to tie the horse, and then he showed us how the sides of the columns, oh, in some places there were ancient mangers still remaining. And they had even found bits of grain that had been preserved all through 2500 years, having been well buried and kept from the air, had been sufficiently well preserved that they could be examined and determined just what kind of grain they were. And so here was a great, a large extensive layout

of stables. And you remember how it tells in Deuteronomy that kings shall not get horses from Egypt, he is supposed not to do this, but they say as Samuel told them, this will be the manner of a king you'll have, he'll take your children for servants, to work for him, to build up his great establishment, ^{he'll} ~~he~~ have all the great horses and everything. And then Dr. Dye said, look particularly at 1 Kings where you have the account of the great king Solomon, and there he said, on 1 Kings 9, you read in verse 15, that this is the reason of the levi which King Solomon raised, for to build ^{the} a house of the Lord, and his own house, and Millo and the wall of Jerusalem and Hazor and Megiddo and Gezer. We read of all the different places that Solomon was carrying on building operations. Either building cities anew or rebuilding cities, re (11 3/4) them, reconstructing them, making them in line with his ideas, and one of these cities' names, in 1 Kings 9:15, is the city of Megiddo, the one which they were working on. And then he said, you look on a little further and you come to a verse 19, you have a general summary, and all the cities of store that Solomon had, and cities for his chariots and cities for his horsemen, ~~and~~ that word horseman (12 1/4) * there is some discussion whether it actually means a horseman or the horse the men used. It is you might say his cavalry work, his horse arrangement, including both, men and horses. Whole cities for the horses and horsemen of Solomon. Well that's ^a fantastic idea for the ancient orient, whole cities for the horses of Solomon. Nobody but a very great ruler could use whole cities over to his horses. This is one of these things that has been scoffed at by those who say that the Bible was a book of superstition, a book of mythology, magnifying some petty king to make him a very powerful ruler. But this extreme statement here in the Bible, whole cities for his horses, is proven not to be an exaggeration, because there is Megiddo one of the greatest cities in Palestine, and the greater part of the city is given over to the arrangement for horses and horsemen of King Solomon. No one but a very powerful king, a very powerful ruler, could possibly have been able to give over whole cities to his horses. And as a matter of fact, similar layouts have been discovered in other cities since that time. Yes? (student. 13 3/4)

Dr. Dye. Yes, he worked for a couple of years and he happened to be right there at that time, a very capable archeologist.

But the proof here then was found in a direction that we would never have expected. ~~Not~~ ⁱⁿ ~~the~~ monuments then (14 $\frac{1}{4}$) not some writing by somebody telling what wonderful things he'd seen, but the actual things themselves, the actual layout such as could not have been found, had not been found in ~~any~~ ancient cities from other periods. But from this period, showing there was a very powerful centralized government there in Palestine, at that time, just as described in the book of Kings and Chronicles. And so it fairly well established that there was nothing ~~exaggerated~~, that Palestine was at a high level (14 $\frac{3}{4}$) a high level physically commercially, economically...

O.T. History 267. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...of King Solomon. Well, the knowledge about Solomon has gone on beyond that point since then. Yes? (student. $\frac{1}{2}$) Yes, it included the realm of the 12 tribes, that was the Israelite tribes. It extended northward covering what is now Lebanon, most of what is now Lebanon, and it extended from that eastward, covering the area that is now Syria, he conquered, David had conquered ~~the~~ (1 $\frac{1}{2}$) Damascus, we're told, and even Palmyra in the wilderness there. And then it included further south, across the Jordan, it included the kingdoms of Moab and Edom. (student. 1 $\frac{1}{4}$) Well, it goes to the Euphrates, to the furthest western part of the Euphrates, not to the Tigris. (student. 1 $\frac{3}{4}$) Oh, nothing like that, no. You take our roads, our railroads, our steamships, there's nothing like that, as far back as 150 years ago, anywhere in the world. Today there is the possibility of more intensive (2 $\frac{1}{2}$) covering a far larger area. Now there is, I'm not saying either that the empire of Solomon was the greatest empire of ancient times by any means. The Mesopotamian empires were far greater, and the Egyptian was far greater, but those were both of them at this period in a time of decline. They probably covered a much larger area, each of them, at this time than the area of Solomon, but they were ~~at~~ ^{a time of} the decline, and he was a time of greatness. And his area was

an area which ordinarily was broken up into a lot of little kingdoms, this area--David had gathered it all together into one large area. (student.3) Oh no, Solomon's empire was nothing like that. Solomon's empire was the high point of the greatness of Israel. It was far greater politically and economically than any point that Israel ever attained, at any other time in its history. And it was greater than any other kingdom in this area attained at any other time. But this area from a viewpoint of wordly wealth, is a more or less insignificant area from that viewpoint. That is from the viewpoint of Rome at the time of Christ. The events in Judea were off in a little backwoods corner of the empire. The center of the empire, politically a power was Rome, the center of knowledge and science was Athens. This was way off in a corner, up in the backwoods. And the greatness of the area from a political and material viewpoint, ordinarily was that it was on the roads between the great empires of Egypt and Mesopotamia. It never was in a class with them, but at this period the whole areas were gathered together into one realm which was quite strong and extremely strong compared to anything that it had before (4¹/₂)

Yes, I think these questions Mr. Welch has asked are extremely important and we should all have a clear idea of them. (student.4 3/4)

Well, tremendous is perhaps a strong word. It was for that area. (student.5)

Oh yes, as far as trading distance it always was an important area, even in the time of Job, we find that they saw Midianites, merchantmen going by on their way to Egypt. The caravans between the great centers of Mesopotamia and of Egypt passed through Palestine, and between ~~Asia~~/Minor and Egypt. And there was always extensive trade passing through the area and a certain amount of it done with the people in that area. Though the trade between the two great empires was far greater and more important than the relationship to this area. (student.5 3/4) No, to compare it with Rome under Caesar or say better under (6¹/₄)

would be more like comparing Guatemala with the United States. ^{Perhaps} ~~That's~~ not quite as great as that, but here we have in Central American we have these little countries there, constantly squabbling and not amounting to a great deal. Now if Guatemala was to get all those central American countries together into one organization under their direction, it could be quite an important center. But it would

more than that. Yes. (student 6 $\frac{3}{4}$) They did, but the queen of Sheba, let's get that in mind too, the Queen of Sheba comes from South Arabia. Now whether she was in South Arabia then, whether Sheba was further north than Arabia, is a matter of which there is discussion, but even on the assumption that it was South Arabia it would be much nearer to Palestine than to either Egypt or Mesopotamia, than to either one. And as doubtless there would have been trade between South Arabia and both Mesopotamia and Egypt at all periods, but Palestine would be comparatively little heard of down there, and now they hear how this region has come forward, and they hear how strong it has become and above all, about the remarkable wisdom of the its ruler and it was particularly for the wisdom that she came, though doubtless she established trade relations (7 $\frac{3}{4}$)

And it comes right in this period here that you mention, that a few years ago we knew nothing about the South Arabia part, it was thought that South Arabia was, many people thought the whole story of the Queen of Sheba was another (8 $\frac{1}{4}$)

by Saul, but we have, South Arabia is very difficult to examine because it is today an absolute monarchy, Yemen, the of Yemen who just cuts a man's head off when he takes an ocean. He is the most absolute monarch in the world today. And this section, he allows no foreigners in whatever, And there have been very few who have gotten in there. There's very little examination of it, but there has been enough examination in the last four years to find thousands of inscriptions, mostly just brief inscriptions on tombs, but enough of them to give a good idea of the general background of South Arabia, and there have been found some of the greatest of irrigation arrangements in the Orient anywhere were made in South Arabia in that

9.

and this was a region of real ~~antiquity~~ civilization.

Not comparable to Egypt or Mesopotamia. Not like that, but a region of a very high culture, much greater than North Arabia at this time. And that of course would corroborate the Biblical story from that region the Queen felt that the establishment of commercial relationship etc with Saul and the personal knowledge of his wisdom and all that would work. That is an interesting corroboration of (9 $\frac{1}{2}$). But

that doesn't mean that his accomplishment was the great power of the Pharaoh of Egypt.

But the Pharaoh at this time was a comparatively weak one. He was as not one of the high points, of Egypt but one of the lower points. Perhaps Solomon in all of his greatness would perhaps be able to be on equal terms with the depressed Pharaoh in comparison to him, and the ~~ampan~~ depressed rulers of Assyria at this period. But at other periods the rulers of Palestine haven't the fifth the power of Solomon, while the rulers of Egypt and Mesopotamia had double the power that they had at this period. Well, the factor that in Palestine there was a ruler of such great wealth and power, that is comparable to anything in Palestine before or since, that was established by the discoveries at Megiddo. And that was 1929 when I was in Megiddo and at that time one of our party of four was professor Albright who has just retired as professor of archaeology in John Hopkins University. Well, he had just received his call at that time and he was planning to leave. That was his last year as director of the American School of Oriental Research. He had been there nine years. And they had 1 or 2 men for a brief time succeeding him, and then they had a man who was there a number of years, directing the American School for Oriental Research. He was called Nelson Glueck. Professor Nelson Glueck was for nearly ten years director of the American School for Oriental Research in Palestine. He was then called to be president of the Hebrew Union College of Cincinnati and he's been there as president ever since. That is, the reformed Jews, that is a very liberal Jews, very modernistic. His predecessor was an extreme modernist there. I don't know whether there is anything (11¹/₂). He wrote some of the most fantastic writings I've ever seen. In fact, the most of the modernists think he was much too extreme to pay much attention to. But it was a school of very great standing in Judaism and the reformed Jews, by no means the largest group are probably the wealthiest group, and it has great importance in Judaism. Glueck was called to be president of it and Glueck is a good excavator, an excellent scholar, and a very different sort of man in many ways from his predecessors. Well, before that, in the 30's he was director of the American School for Oriental Research in Jerusalem. Glueck had made studies in Transjordan, and was very familiar with the pottery over there, and had studied the material quite thoroughly over there. He was a very good scholar, and he was intrieged by this ninth

chapter of Kings. And in the chapter here he was greatly interested in the last part of the chapter where he read some most amazing statements ^{where} ~~when~~ he read some most amazing statements when he stopped to think about it. Particularly amazing when you remember they are told about Solomon who is supposed to be a very wise man. Well, verse 26. King Solomon made a navy of ships in Ezion Geber, which is beside Elath on the shore of the Red Sea, in the land of Edom. Well, by a navy of ships that doesn't mean necessarily, now maybe our old ~~England~~ English is deceptive there, modern English, a navy is a fighting force, but here in the Bible it means a squadron of ships. He made a lot of ships. It doesn't mean they were war ships. He made a navy of ships in Ezion-geber, and we are told where Zion-geber is. Beside Elath on the shore of the Red Sea, in the land of Edom. And we have Ezion-geber mentioned in Exodus, in this account of the one who was (13½) of Israel. And so between that mention and this it is easy to tell the approximate area of Ezion-geber. Now old maps made more than 20 years ago usually showed Ezion-geber about ten miles inland there up on the hill. It was a German investigating in Palestine about 1900, who found an Arab who was able to show him where two or three things were that he was anxious to find and so he got great confidence in the Arab, and the Arab found he got a pretty good reward for showing where these places were so his imagination began to work, and this German said, "Can you show me where Ezion-Geber was?" Sure, the Arab said, so he led him up into the mountain, and he got up into a high place in the mountain, where they found a little flat area and he said, "That's Ezion-Geber." And so he put it on the map. It was on ^{all} ~~some~~ of the maps ~~and~~ until this time. Well, it was completely wrong. It was just a means to get some money, but it was the general area. It is down there near the northern end of the Red Sea. As you look on the map which you are doubtless familiar with, most of you I hope, that the Red Sea which comes up between Arabia and Ethiopia and then between North Arabia and Egypt, divides into two parts, and one of them goes west towards (15) and the other one goes straight north.

...Huabah, and this modern town Achuabah is at the northern end of this eastern branch of the Red Sea and today it's often called the Achuabah branch because it goes to Achuabah and the Jews have built extensive harbor facilities near Achuabah today, and are shipping a great deal of material from there now. Well, this place of Achuabah is the general area where it says Solomon built his ships. And so Glueck asked why did Solomon build a navy of ships there? Now suppose you look at your map and imagine you're at Jerusalem, and imagine that at Jerusalem you want to get down to Ophir, because we read in verse 28 that they came to Ophir and fetched from thence gold, four hundred and twenty talents, and brought it to King Solomon. Well, Ophir is well known to be the southern end of Arabia, south Arabia, there, and the area across from it is Ethiopia, that section is the section of Ophir. It's also called (1 $\frac{1}{8}$) in ancient times and there was a queen of Egypt about 1400 B.C., Queen Hatshepsut who sent an expedition to (1 $\frac{3}{4}$)

and she built a great monument to celebrate, you can see it today there with the pictures of her and her young husband, Sosthenes III, receiving the incense and the gold and the other things from (2) and measuring them out, and it was a great thing for Egypt, to send an expedition to (2) which is the same general area as Ophir. It was ~~definitely~~ ^{evidently} not done often, that she put up such a tremendous celebration of having done it once. Well, now, here was Solomon who sent to Ophir and got 420 talents of gold and brought it to King Solomon, now how did he get all this gold, did he make an attack and seize it? Hardly seems likely. How did he get it? Well, you find that most of the gold of the world today buried in Kentucky. How did we get it? Well, it was given to us by nearly all the nations of the world gave the United States most of their gold. Did they do it because they loved the United States so much they wanted to give us their gold? No I don't think so. They gave it because they received manufactured goods which they paid for with this gold, and American people worked hard in manufacturing these goods, shipped them off to countries all over the world, in order that they could get gold for them which they could take and bury in Kentucky. There we have it buried (3 $\frac{1}{2}$)

There it is, and there it will remain I suppose, unless enough of us get toothache unless we need 1% of it to fill our teeth with.

Thomas Edison said once it's very strange that the economic foundation of the world rested on something that was actually good for nothing except for filling teeth and gilding picture frames. But we have the gold, it has been recognized for 3000 years as ^{of} tremendous importance gold as a measure of exchange. But now it's no more good for exchange because nearly all of it is in Kentucky. But there it is buried in Kentucky and we have to send goods for it. Well, now how much goods would you have to send to get a little gold, you'd have to send quite a lot. Not so much now as you would 40 years ago, before you had all this inflation, you' have to send perhaps 4 times as much now as you did then, but at that time or at earlier period a little bit of gold would buy an awful lot of goods. And so the question was, if Solomon was so ^{wise, why} ~~wealthy~~ did Solomon build a navy of ships down in Ezion-Geber in order to go ^{to Ophir} ~~exer~~ and get gold? Well, suppose his folks go to Ophir and get gold and bring the gold back up to Ezion-Geber. There in Ezion-Geber you've got the gold. Well, it's very expensive, you can put it on donkeys and camels and you can carry it 13 days across the desert, up through the rough mountains, through that disagreeable, difficult country, up to Jerusalem. You can do that, it's worth it, for the expense of that gold. But how about what you send to get the gold? If you send the fine textile products (4 3/4) to purchase gold, those textile products, it will take many, many times the number of camels and donkeys to carry the textile products down to Ezion-Geber, that it takes to bring the gold back. It just wouldn't pay.

I remember hearing 30 years ago about a (5) copper mining _____ company, which had used up all its copper _____ in this country and the stock which, when I was a little boy, was worth about \$20 a share had gotten down to where it was about 50¢ a share, ^{because} ~~pratically~~ all of the copper was taken out of the mines. And then all of a sudden that copper which had been 50¢ a share went up to \$4 a share, in just no time at all. And I asked why is it, what made that company worth so much more? And I was told this. One time, some years ago, realizing their copper would run out, they purchased a copper mine in Canada, and this copper mine in Canada which they purchased, had a fine supply of copper. They could go on digging the copper and selling it, but they found that by the time they transport the copper out from the copper/mine to a railroad, it would cost

much more than they get for the copper, so it was just worth nothing to them. So when they used up their copper here they got down to 50¢ a share, and then somebody discovered gold there in Canada, and that was worth building a railroad for, and they built the special branch of the railroad to go to the goldmine and it went to within 4 miles of where this copper mine was. So all they had to do was build a little spur, and they had access to this railroad to bring this copper out and their stock jumped from 50¢ to \$4 a share immediately. It made the copper worth something to have a means of getting it there.

Now anybody with any sense would say, if Solomon wanted to take his textile goods from Jerusalem to Ophir, it's perfectly simple what to do. You take them down to the coast, down to Joppa, as you see on your map. And there at Joppa you put them in boats and you go down the Mediterranean, it's very cheap to travel by boat, that is it was before we got inflation, now our palatial steamers, but ordinary shipment is very cheap. You get into your boats, you ship down to Suez and there at Suez you take it off and just a little portage overland, over Suez where we now have a canal, and there put it in boats and carry them down to Ophir. And there you could sell them, but to carry them 13 days with camels and donkeys through that disagreeable difficult country there, a very hot and miserable and rough country, hard to go through, and much of it full of poisonous snakes, we read in Numbers about what happened when the Israelites went through that area, how many died from the poisonous snakes. Lawrence of Arabia tells in his account, how going through there, when he and his men would camp at night, the snakes would come and lie up right next to them for the warmth (7 3/4)

He said that in the morning the first that got out of bed would have to get up very, very easily to keep from touching the snakes and then when he'd get out if he got out carefully without exciting any one to where it would bite him, they did, if he was killed another one would have to get up, why then when he'd get out, then he'd go and get a big stick and he'd come and he'd pull the snakes away from the other men so they could get up. Well, you had to go down through this area to get to Ezion-Geber, it's much easier to take the boat that way.

Boat travel, I was in debating some when I was in college and saw how much cheaper

boat travel is than land travel--I remember reading that before the Panama Canal was built, ~~you could~~ ship stuff from New York by railroad to (8 $\frac{1}{2}$) Nevada, cost two and a half times as much as to ship it from New York to San Francisco, 500 miles further going through (8 $\frac{1}{2}$) Nevada, on the way. And the reason was that if you shipped to San Francisco you had to compete with water transportation, and a boat could take your stuff in New York, carry it clear around South America, around the very southern tip of South America, clear up to San Francisco, and it cost so much less that in order to compete with it, you had to charge only 30% as much clear to San Francisco as it was necessary to charge in order to pay expenses and get a small (9) to ship just as far as (9) 500 miles this side. Water transportation is so much simpler than land transportation. I remember reading that they would take things in China thousands of miles up the Yangtze River, bring them down the River, clear across the Pacific, get them to San Pedro, California, take them off and ship them over land to Los Angeles, 20 miles, and it cost just as much to ship the 20 miles as it did all that distance by water. Well, why on earth then did Solomon build his ships up this end of the Red Sea, at Ezion-Geber, instead of the other end, by Suez, where he could ship his goods so much more cheaply to Ophir?

Well, I see the clock is quarter after and so we won't be able to go further at this moment. But was Solomon a wise king or not when he would do such a fool stunt as this appeared to be?

O.T.History 269. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...nothing like that, but it was for that area a very substantial ~~profit~~ ^{power}, and that's what the Bible represents, a power so great that the queen of Sheba came to hear his wisdom. As we are told again over in the book of Luke, we read in Luke the 11th chapter, we read there that our Lord Jesus Christ says, in chapter 11, verse 31, he said the queen of the South shall rise up in the judgement with the men of this generation, and condemn them: for she came from the utmost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here.

But if Solomon didn't have any more sense than to build his navy of ships at a place where he would have to carry all his material overland down there, at many times the expense it would have been to build the navy in a place where you could go directly to just that little port of Suez, it doesn't sound as if he was a very wise man. And as a matter of fact, back in 1928 when I had this article brought to me from the Current History magazine I looked up in the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, the edition I have is the first edition, I think the second is out since, but I looked in mind, I looked up Solomon, and I found substantially this statement, the wisdom of Solomon was ^{of} a rather droll order, consisting mostly of stories about animals. And that was a statement in the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia which was our most conservative Bible encyclopedia of recent date, of any length. Now the Hastings is much more liberal, occasionally you find an excellent, conservative article in the Hastings Bible Dictionary, but in general it's much more liberal than the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. While the Encyclopedia Biblica is a very radical one. But in the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia I was rather surprised to find this statement, whether it's in the second edition I've never looked. But that's what is in the first. And the author of that article I am sure would not have been a bit surprised if he noticed, which he probably didn't, that Ezion-Geber is so poorly situated for the purpose for which it is designated. After class this morning, Mr. Ruud came to me and gave me a more up-to-date illustration than the one that I gave you from the days before the Panama Canal was built. He said that when he came east this fall, he had 300 pounds of material to ship, which he did ship, instead of sending by train. But he found that he could ship it for \$35 from Seattle to Philadelphia here by water, while it would have been \$150 to ship it by land. That's another good illustration of the point I was making this morning, a very recent illustration of the point that land is always much more expensive than water transportation. And of course in that case it was still more expensive because it would mean going from Jerusalem down through those difficult ravines, down there to the Dead Sea, around the Dead Sea, and then down to that wilderness, that hot difficult wilderness country, all the way ^{South} down to that end of the Red Sea by land, as compared with just going down to Joppa and

getting into a boat and floating down the Mediterranean to Suez. It makes you wonder whether Solomon's wisdom was very present in putting his navy of ships, in building them there in Ezion-Geber. Yes? (4 $\frac{1}{4}$.student) Lumber for the ships? It's in the hills there, (student.4 $\frac{1}{2}$) Sell the ships? Then he wouldn't have anything to bring the gold back. Oh, I see what you mean. You mean if he had--this is a very good question--Mr. Welch says if near Acharabah there, there was an unusually fine amount of lumber, he could take the lumber and float it down and sell it for gold, and that would be a very good suggestion if that was an unusually good place for lumber, but frankly I had to stop and think when he said where did the lumber come from, because it is true that it is a rather desolate area, and my guess would be that either they would find sufficient wood in the hills near (5 $\frac{1}{4}$) or else he'd have to float it in.

Now if it were up in Syria, that would be different. Up in Syria, north of Jerusalem you find the cedars of Lebanon, which have been a great source of lumber from back before 3000 B.C., and they used to come from Egypt to get cedars of Lebanon and take them down. But that's north of Jerusalem, that's not this area. But I think Mr. Welch's question is on the track of the answer. And the answer was discovered by Professor Glueck, of whom I spoke this morning. Professor Glueck, shortly after he became Director of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem, decided to make an exploration of this area. I heard him tell how he went and how it took over 13 days on camel-back and donkeyback to make that long trip down there, then after going down, exploring and surveying all the way down he came back again, he'd been gone as you see for several weeks, a long tedious and tiresome trip, and he said when he got back to Jerusalem, this was in the days of the British Mandate, the high commissioner invited him to his home to dinner and asked him to tell about his trip, what he'd seen and so on, and he was greatly interested and he said to him, say would you like to see this country from the air, and oh he said that would add greatly to (6 $\frac{1}{2}$) So the high commissioner said to him, you be at the military airport in the morning at 7 o'clock and we will have a plane go and make a reconnaissance down in that direction, and you can see it from the air. So he said it was quite a thrill, after spending all that time going through that

rough country, to get in a plane only within a very few hours, to see it all ^{from} in the air down there and back again in time for lunch. So it was quite a thrill, but better yet was ^{that} the personnel of the plane said to him before he got in, said now are there some scenes you'd like to see, like to have photographed? He said, oh yes, there are many very valuable from the air, because often you see an archeological site, the ruins will be buried and it's very hard to find it unless you dig them all up, and where the ruins are fairly close to the surface the grass doesn't grow, and from the air you can see the outline and it's very helpful, and to take pictures of that. Well, the man said, as we go down, any picture you see, I don't care how many, you just say and we'll take a picture of it, and so he pointed out maybe a hundred pictures and made of pictures of it, and then they got back he said now, you keep a list of these and he says you write to the military headquarters and you say, you write to them in about three weeks, and say I wonder if by any chance you would have pictures of any of the following (8)

And so he did and got all the pictures that they had gotten for the archives at his suggestion.

But the thing that particularly interested Glueck in the trip was this, that as they headed down there to see if he could find Ezion-Geber, well before I mention the thing he was particularly interested in, I'll mention a matter that was almost as important, not quite, he found at the southern end of this depression in the land which reached from the Jordan River and then the Dead Sea, and then there's a depression found through, originally started by an earthquake fall from the hills on both sides, down at the lower end of that he could see a mound, from the shape of which it was obvious it was a tel, an artificial mound, where there had been an ancient city. And so the German who had on his map put Ezion-Geber way up in the hills was clearly wrong. You wouldn't build a navy up in the hills anyway, but this is the general area, but there was a city right near the water, which would be the appropriate place in which to build ships. But before he got there, when he was less than a day's trip away from Ezion-Geber, he found something which answered the problem about Solomon's wisdom, and answered it in a most remarkable way. Going down through that depression there he saw on the sides in the cliff at various places, holes

going in to the side of the cliff. Artificial holes (9½), tunnels and he went into those and he found that there had been digging into them and there had been fires out in the galley in the front of them and it was easy upon examination to find what they were, they were ancient ~~mines~~ ^{mines} ~~monuments~~, and there were bits of broken pottery and other things which could easily be dated and show that they came from the time of king Solomon. ~~It~~ ^{It} ~~they~~ were from that period that these ~~monuments~~ ^{mines} had been worked, and these mines were copper principally, and ~~here~~ were valuable copper mines, which were less than a days journey from the northern end of the Red Sea. Now this of course Glueck was very interested in for two reasons. One was because it immediately reminded him of that verse in Deuteronomy, I believe it's 8:7, isn't it, Deuteronomy 8:9 where Moses said of the land of Palestine, it is a land where thou shalt eat bread without scarceness, thou shalt not lack any thing in it, a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass. Now of course as you know the word (ll) * translated brass can just as well or perhaps better be translated copper, it is the Hebrew word for copper. Brass of course is an alloy of copper and copper is rarely found in that particular state, so perhaps brass is a reasonable translation for it, but it doesn't suggest to us the value and the strength that copper does, and this would be copper, probably it could be used and made into brass or bronze or used as pure as you might get it. A very important instrument for all sorts of building, all sorts of purposes for copper, even though they did not use it then as we use it principally today for carrying electricity, electric wire. There are plenty of other uses for copper. And here were these copper mines down there from which they could do one of three things, they could take the copper out of the mines, they could bring it up overland on this long trip to Jerusalem, but by the time they went to all that effort, it probably wouldn't be worth the effort to bother. Or they could take the copper put it in a boat, take it down the Red Sea a ways and then up the other arm of the Red Sea, carry the portage over the Suez and then bring it up to Jerusalem, and that way they could get it to Jerusalem, but they had some cypress, the very name of which means copper, they had access to ancient copper mines, which would give them all the copper they needed at a good deal less expense and only take one ship-

ment instead of two. And so here at hand was material of great value, but difficult to get to Jerusalem to use. But by building the ships there you could put it in the ships and float it down th Ophir where it would command a very large price in gold, and bring the gold back/ up and that would be well worth the expense of (13)

And so this shows that Solomon in building his navy of ships at Ezion-Geber, built them there for a purpose which the Bible does not explain. But a very wise purpose, a very excellent purpose, and as far as building his navy of ships at Ezion-Geber is concerned, he was wise instead of foolish in so doing.

Well, ~~they~~ ^{Flueck} found this tel down there and he wanted to find additional evidence of the wisdom of Solomon, if he could, and also oh the power of S Solomon and so he was anxious to excavate, so he came back to the United States, told about his experiences, raised a certain amount of money and the next year went back to excavate at Ezion-Geber. And there at Ezion-Geber he began the next year excavating, and when he began to excavate at Ezion-Geber, perhaps I should say after he had excavated quite a bit at Ezion-Geber, he found that he had there renewed evidence of the power of king Solomon. The power of king Solomon we notice has been greatly questioned by H. G. Wells and others, but here at Ezion-Geber he found on examination there was a city which was very different from Jerusalem, or from most cities in the world. It was a city like Washington, D. C., rather than a city like Boston. Boston they say is built along the old (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

I've always enjoyed visiting Boston because I like to go for a walk and (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

if I don't have to bother where I'm going. In Boston-you I've found, you can just start walking and just walk straight ahead and the next thing you know you're back where you started from. The streets are all twisted around so. I remember one night, I went for a walk, and for two hours in Boston I passed the same church three times..

O.D.History 270. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...most of our cities have grown up like that. Philadelphia here to quite a very large extent has grown up. I found when I first came here, in this area south of here, it was very easy to get lost, and if you were driving and you didn't notice where you were going,

very easy to get on the three directional streets we have down there. We have people here spend an hour hunting for this place when they were within half a mile of it, the first year before we put our signs up. It's very easy to get lost in most cities because they ^{have} just sort of grown up, but Washington, D. C., was not built that way. The United States hired one of the finest French architects to lay out Washington, D. C. It was built at one time according to ~~one~~ plan, and you have a definite plan there, with circles at certain definite places and roads connecting each circle to the other one, and all laid out according to a definite plan, a perfectly ideal plan for the days when they used horses and buggies. Of course it's a very, very poor plan for today because it doesn't meet the needs of auto traffic at all, those circles are just in the way, and you'd rather drive an extra half mile than have to go round one of these circles. But with a horse and buggy it enabled you to get to most any point from most any other point, by the shortest possible route, and save a great deal of time, and was a definite excellent plan easy to find your way in. And it means that Washington wasn't a city that grew up, but your 13 colonies united into one nation and the power of the nation was put behind the building of the city for its capital. Well, now Ezion-Geber is like that. The city is built hundreds of miles from Jerusalem, far from the main centers of Judah, all the labor practically would have to be imported for a long distance, and much of the material would have to be taken. ¶

Here's what Nelson Glueck says about it. "One can easily visualize the conditions existing about 3000 years ago when the idea of building this place was first conceived and then brilliantly translated into reality. Thousands of laborers had to be assembled, housed and fed and protected at the chosen building site. As a matter of fact, most of them were probably slaves who had to be guarded and goaded to work. Skilled technicians of all kinds had to be recruited, great caravans had to be collected to transport materials and food, an effective business organization had to be called into existence to regulate the profitable flow of raw materials and finished or semi-finished products. There was, so far as we know, only one man who possessed the strength, wealth, and wisdom capable of initiating and carrying out the ~~job~~ highly complex and specialized undertaking. He

was king Solomon, he alone in his day had the ability, the vision, and the power to establish an important industrial center and seaport, such a comparatively long distance from the capital city of Jerusalem."

So here you have this city built at one time according to one definite plan, not a city that just sort of grew up. You have far greater cities that grew up over a period of time. It's like you find up in Alaska somewhere, ^{a layout} ~~they~~ that the United States airforce or the navy has made, where a great amount of material has been brought and laid down according to a definite plan. You ~~know~~ there's a strong force, there's power, there's resource back of it. Here you find that at Ezion-Geber, but as Glueck began to dig at Ezion-Geber, renewed doubts of Solomon's wisdom began to occur. Solomon's power there was no question of, to build a city according to a definite plan like this, so far away from the other principal cities. No question of his power, but renewed doubts of his wisdom began to come. As he saw exactly where this place was built, he began to wonder. Because they found, naturally if you're going to have a place to live, you have to have water supply. If you're going to have a place to work you have to have water supply, and his men who were digging had to have a water supply, so they dug a well and found they struck salt water. They weren't very far from the sea, from the Red Sea. So they went a few ~~yards~~ over here and they dug again and they struck salt water and they went further and they struck salt water, and further and they struck salt water, and they had to go a mile and a half to get to a place where they could get fresh water; and they went over this way and they dug and they had to go a mile over there to get fresh water. And in those days without the pipes we have today it would be an awful lot easier to build your place right by a good water supply, than to have ~~the~~ haul all your water to it and it would have been a lot nicer for the excavators too, if they had had it right by a water supply instead of having to take their donkeys, camels, and haul all the water there that they drank. Well, why did he build it right here instead of where the water supply was more accessible? But in addition to that, when they began to dig there, they found that they hadn't much more than begun to dig when they began to realize the discomfort of the particular situation. They were just at the southern end of this (6) draw that comes

all those many miles down from the area, the southern end of the Dead Sea. And this draw comes down through the mountains. Of course it's half buried in different places, there's no stream in it or anything like that, but through this draw they found that a heavy wind usually came, a heavy hot wind was normally coming down there, and that wind would strike them as they began to dig and cast the dirt into their faces, their ears, it got in their mouth, their nostrils, it was extremely disagreeable. And he said that ^{as} they began to dig and they got a little of the sand out from the top of the soil which had become hardened, and began to lift it up, the wind came and lifted that sand and soil up and it went up into the air and out to sea, and as they saw that stuff going out to sea, they said the only thing they could think of was the pillar of cloud that directed the Israelites, as they came up out of Egypt. And here they didn't need to be directed anywhere, they wanted to stay here, but it made working very difficult.

As you'd go a hundred yards this way you'd be out of the ^{end of the} draw, away from the end of the draw and there'd be no such wind, and you'd go a hundred and fifty yards this way and you'd be out of the end of the draw, and there'd be no such wind. But right here, where the town was was where this wind came and made it so disagreeable and unpleasant. Well, as I heard Dr. Glueck tell, when he first got back, about his experience ^{with} of that, I couldn't help think of a story I heard when I went to Occidental College, and over there, I remember hearing the story told about Andrew Carnegie. They said that Andrew Carnegie had given money to a good many colleges and Occidental College which I attended in Los Angeles, the President (7 3/4) Carnegie and Carnegie had given them a very substantial sum of money. And they said that the president of Pomona College which was about 50 miles inland from (8) went to see Carnegie and asked him for money for Pomona College (we'd better wait till the mounding is over).

So Carnegie (laugh)...to Occidental College, the President of Pomona College about 50 miles inland there, asked him for money and Carnegie, they say, sat in his office there, he was a very wealthy man, head of some of the largest steel mills in the United States, one of the wealthiest men in the country, he gave libraries which are found in towns all over this country, he gave much money to colleges--and they say that he turned to the Presi-

dent of Pomona College and he looked at the big map up there on the wall, and he said, look here, I've given money to various colleges, ~~and~~ now here I gave money to Occidental College, and it was about 15 or 20 miles from the Pacific Ocean, and on that big map of the United States, Pomona about 50 miles inland looked as if it almost touched Occidental, he said why ~~did~~ you want to build a college here, he said why didn't you put it here where there is no other college near, and he put his finger right in the middle of the Mohave Desert, where you could go a hundred miles without ever meeting a soul. And though he was a great steel-maker but not a great educational sort, and he looked at the map, he had the power, he had the money, he says here, put your college here.

Well, now did Solomon sit in a swivel chair in Jerusalem and point to the map of the area and say here is where I want the city built? And so the men who go down, all these resources, all this equipment, all these ~~(10)~~(9 3/4) and specialists, they build it at the place where he points. It shows the power of Solomon, but does it show a lack of wisdom to build the city where he did. Well, Glueck said their doubts of Solomon's wisdom were soon resolved. Because as they found that as they dug, not only did they find the city built according to a definite plan but it was a plan different from that of any other place that ever had been excavated from antiquity. They found that the principal thing in Ezion-Geber was a group of factories. A group of buildings which were so arranged that the northern wall of them was facing toward the north where this wind came from, and there were windows in it which could, that is wooden windows which could be lifted and lowered to allow the wind to enter or to keep it out, and there were holes in the wall, so that the wind the northern wall could receive the wind that blew down there and could direct it, so you could direct as much as you wanted to the first room, other parts through the walls into the second room and to the third and so on. There were flues in the walls and all arranged so that that (11 1/4) and wind could be directed and directed at the very spot where you wanted it in the room. And then on the floor of the room, they found the charcoal and the evidence that they had there the refinery for the copper. The copper would be taken out from the tunnels, from the mines and would be roughly smelted before the mines, so as to get rid of as much of the slag as they could, and then

the rock would be brought down to Ezion-Geber not such a long trip, but there they would get a ~~far~~ greater heat with the use of this forced draft, and they would be able to adjust it in such a way as to refine the copper and get rid of all the slag and to melt the copper and to mold it into such shapes as were convenient for shipment and for sale. It was the principle of the modern glass furnace, the principle which I understand was only discovered about the middle of the last century and became the foundation of our modern steel mills, and we have no evidence of its being known previous to that time at all, certainly not from ancient times except this one case where we find Solomon utilizing it. Yes? (student. 12 $\frac{1}{2}$) Well, how extensive I don't know. I mean I'm not in that field at all myself, but the statements I make in it have been made by others in it who are specialists in the field, and what there is of similar types, somewhat similar types, I don't know, but there's certainly nothing at all (13) there's nothing anywhere on so large a scale, that's on a smaller scale, the general principle may have been known to some. But it wasn't used on an extensive scale, I understand, anywhere in ancient times, anything like this. And it was quite amazing to them to find it here, and Glueck makes the statement in his book here, that the wise ruler of Israel was a copper king, a shipping magnate, a merchant prince, and a great builder. Through his manifold activities he became at once the blessing and the curse of his country. And then he goes on and speaks about the result of his (13 3/4) But the utilization of this wind and the way that it's utilized here, he says here the entire town in its first and second periods was a phenomenal industrial (14) A forced draft system for the furnaces was employed and later abandoned and forgotten to be rediscovered only in modern times. Ezion-Geber was the Pittsburgh of Palestine, in addition to being its most important point. (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) Its rooms were air-conditioned for heat. And...

O.T. History 271. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...to have the use of the wind available, which you wouldn't have otherwise. ^{And which} ~~But-you~~ evidently hadn't been thought of by anybody in any other site that we know.

But the idea of Solomon thus, in the last 20 years, among archeologists and historians,

has undergone quite a change. This book of Glueck's, THE OTHER SIDE OF THE JORDAN, in which he tells the detail of his discovery, published by the American School of Oriental Research, in 1940, is not considered by anyone as the book of a propagandist or of a theory^{1st}, but as a very dependable study of the actual material found. Now I read in one of our best Christian magazines about the time these discoveries were made, I read the statement there by their then archeological editor, he's not now, the man who then was, about the discovery of this, and it said that of course this in the land of Edom and the wisdom is from the Edomites. It was interesting. But Glueck went back and made a further exploration there so that the whole city was examined right to the bottom. There were two layers above this from later periods which tried to utilize some of what was already there but they are much inferior to the first. Most cities start primitively and become stronger and better. This starts with the best right at the foundation. And there, at the foundation there, examining the pottery and other materials, the evidence was found that the material is exactly like that--the material of daily life--exactly like that which you find in Jerusalem and other parts of Palestine at this period. And entirely different from what you find in Edomite towns a little distance away but much nearer than the main Judean towns. So that Glueck felt justified in saying, as he says in his book here, there's not the slightest evidence of any Edomite influence here. It is strictly Judean and he feels we are justified in attributing it to Solomon. Now we read in Matthew that our Lord speaks of the lilies of the field, and he said that the glory of Solomon, he said, consider the lilies of the field, how they grow, they do not, neither do they spin, Matthew 6:28, 29, and yet I say to you that even Solomon in all his glory, was not arrayed like one of these. The glory of Solomon was not a mythical matter, not an imaginary matter, not somebody simply glorifying the man. It is not of course a power like that of the great empires of antiquity, Rome or Mesopotamia or Egypt. Perhaps it's as great or superior to what any of the cities of ancient Greece ever succeeded in achieving, as far as power, but the glory of Solomon is not an imaginary thing but a

very real thing which Jesus is using here as a comparison. And Similarly in Luke 11:31 the queen of the South shall rise up in the judgment with the men of this generation and condemn them, for she came from the utmost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon and behold a greater than Solomon is here. Solomon's wisdom was not wisdom of a low order but wisdom that ^{would} ~~was~~ surpassed most anything that we have evidence of from ancient times. And here there is a greater than Solomon, a far greater son of David, to whom we have access today who can do far greater things than Solomon ever dreamed of doing.

Now that paragraph that I read you from Glueck in which he told of the wise ruler of Israel is a copper king, a shipping magnate, a merchant prince, and a great builder, it's interesting that in the Bible, as Glueck points out, we have no evidence of his being a copper king or a merchant prince. We have no evidence of that. We are told that the navy was built, we're not told why it was built, we're not told about the copper mines. It simply illustrates the fact that the Bible is not given to be an economic, a military or a social history, or even a political history. The Bible is given to show God's relations with his people and show how he prepared the way for the coming of His Son. And therefore what we learn in these other fields is incidental to the Bible. We learn a great deal about them, they are vital as background to the main purpose of the Bible, but it is not the purpose of the Bible to give a complete picture, a complete presentation of these matters. And so when we find hints, like this one, of the building the ships there, well, it either was a very foolish thing to do, or a very wise thing to do and if it's a wise thing it means there are other facts about him that the Bible doesn't give. Now we find those other facts and we see how they fit in with the other. And it's that way with the Bible even in the spiritual realm, the Bible doesn't undertake to give us a complete account of everything in the spiritual realm, that would take many encyclopedias. It does not explain the full nature of God to us, the full character of God. It gives us what it is vital that we know is vital for our spiritual lives, and not merely we, but will be vital for the various ages on through history. And consequently when there are things we don't understand because we don't see how they fit together, we can know there are other facts that haven't been given, which if we had we would see perfect-

ly how they fit together. But now

But now Glueck goes now in this paragraph and he says, through his manifold activities he became at once the blessing and the curse of his country, with increased power and wealth came a centralization of authority and a ruthless dictatorship which ignored the democratic positions of his own people. There resulted a counter-development of forces of reaction and revolt which were immediately after Solomon's death to rend ~~the~~^{his} kingdom asunder. During his lifetime, however, Solomon reigned supreme. The evil he did lived after him. His far-flung net of activities extended from Egypt to Phoenicia, and from Arabia to Syria. Ezion-Geber represents one of his greatest, if indeed up to the present time, his least-known accomplishments. That's what he said in 1940. Ezion-Geber is much better known now than that. There have been articles by Glueck himself in the Reader's Digest and by others who tell us, not only about ~~some~~ of this material but telling how Israel today is coming to reactivate some of these copper mines, and Achiabah, which is right by Ezion-Geber, today is one of the principal shipping outlets of Israel, and they say that there is a great amount of shipping going from there just within the last few months, since the Suez situation two years ago. Since that it is possible for Israel to use that as it wasn't before. Before that they were hemmed in there, that's the one thing they gained there, the right to use the Achiabah port freely. ~~But~~

But Shlomon was the most powerful of the three of the divided kingdoms, though his power came from his father's exploits, and Solomon's empire continued with no physical sign of difficulty until his death. Yes? (student.8½) You mention the source of water supply. Could it not be possible that in those days the water was more plentiful than it is today? Well, there's plenty of water but it wasn't right there. You mean that the water there might have been better. That's entirely possible. But of course this wind would be a far more important factor than water. If you didn't have the matter of the wind to contend with you would be very foolish not to find a place that had a good access to water (8 3/4) But the great saving of that wind would more than make up for the disadvantage of to haul the water. Yes? (student.9) I didn't catch that. No, the copper would seem to have been shipped to Ophir. I don't think they have

found finished copper at the place. They find bits of it, they find refuse, some of it, enough to show clearly what they did, but as far as I know, no finished copper has been found (9 $\frac{1}{2}$) perhaps

Yes? (student.9 3/4) I don't know, we're not told. The Bible doesn't even tell us they shipped from here, it just says they built the ships. It does say they brought the gold back which is what they were more interested in. Copper was a means of getting the gold and whether they shipped the copper in shape of ingots or of sheets or of finished articles we are not told. I don't know whether they were able to decide from the remains or not.

Yes? (student.10 $\frac{1}{4}$) Well, Ophir is a rather large area. They could probably, the term is considered to cover both sides of the southern end of the Red Sea. There's quite a large area there, there probably would be very considerable (10 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Well, let's go on to number XI, now.

XI, The Divided Kingdom before Jehu. A period of about 90 years, from 931 to 841 B.C.

Now a history of this period will naturally start with A, The Destruction. Number 1,

1, The Background of the Destruction. Under that a, The Gibeonite Wedge. The destruction goes back to Joshua's foolish action in making the agreement with the Gibeonites. God had told them to make no agreement with any of the Canaanites but to wipe them all out. Joshua acted hastily in doing what seemed wise to him instead of considering very, very carefully to make sure he was not breaking the prescription God had given him. God insisted, having made the agreement, it be kept, and faithfully kept right on through the centuries but it meant a group of alien, a group of people out of sympathy with their traditions and outlook right in the midst, a closely knit group in the middle of the land which naturally made a division in the land. That in itself alone didn't, but that contributed, so Joshua's mistake contributed to the destruction of the kingdom (12 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Now the second thing that contributed to, is the fact that we had two leading tribes; one south of the Gibeonites and one north. Of course you have your 12 tribes but some of them are very feeble, some are very weak, but two are very strong. Judah is a very large and influential tribe south of the Gibeonites, and Ephraim is a very large and in-

fluent north of the Gibeonites, and right by Ephraim you have the very large tribe of Manasseh, the two together being the ^{descendants} ~~sons~~ of Joseph, and so you have two distinct groups, and even back in Judges you find a certain amount of division comes between the people of Judah and the people of Joseph. That is 6. Two ^{Leading} Different Tribes.

c. Previous Divisive Tendencies. This is not something which simply comes all of a sudden, with no background for it whatever. We find certain fights between the south and the north in the book of Judges. There's not a great deal told about them there, but there is a little. You remember the story of the shibboleth. There were two Israelite groups, one of them fighting against the other, and trying to catch the refugees by the way they could pronounce the word shibboleth. There was a sound in it that wasn't in their dialect. They could immediately recognize the enemy. It seems strange how these dialects spring up, but they do. Here we are and the people of Canada, a great part of the people of Canada, are people who used to live here in New York and New Jersey and Pennsylvania and through here, but many of the people who were well-to-do, prosperous and educated in these colonies here, did not agree with breaking with England, and (14 $\frac{1}{4}$)

and they were deported, and there were many, we know of in our history of individuals of low character who were Tories, but there individuals of that type on both sides, but there were many fine, respectable citizens who were Tories and when the end of the war and the colonies had independence from England, thousands of these people migrated north and made the foundation of the province of Ontario.

O.T.History 272. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...around there was largely populated by United Empire Loyalists, ^{as} their descendants probably call themselves today. They went up there from this section. Now what I mean by that is they're the same people, the fundamental center of the people of Canada and the people of the United States, are the same people, the background, the language, everything is the same, but they have been living with the Great Lakes between them now for a period of a century and a half and a distinct dialect has sprung up to such an extent that the

United States immigration officials don't bother a great deal on the border about demanding passports (1 $\frac{1}{4}$)

but when we came down from Canada they asked us where we were born, my wife and I where we were born, where we come from, and so on, and my little boy was there, he was then 8 years old, and we started telling them about him, no, they turned to him, they said, son, where were you born? They had to hear him talk, because once they heard him talk, and they heard us talk, there was no question, we were United States citizens, it was absolutely unquestionable we didn't come from Canada. And a person brought up in Canada would have a mighty hard job talking in such a way that an American immigration official would let him through without a pretty thorough examination and some papers. They come down here and they are naturalized, they have just the same rights as anyone else in this country, but if they go up to Canada again, they better take their papers with them, as proof, because immediately they'll be recognized. Well, here we have the growing up of distinct dialects, north and south of the Gibeonites, recognized in the book of Joshua.

And so you have the beginning of a division there. Then you have, after Saul's death, David became king in Hebron and he ruled over Judah for 8 years, and the northern section was subject to the followers of Saul, subject to Saul's son Ishbosheth. You have the division there already. Then, after the death of Ishbosheth, the two were united together, David ruled over the whole realm, but you remember when Absalom revolted that after the revolt of Absalom the people from the north said, to your tents O Israel, what have we got to do with the son of Jesse. And they went back up there and there was a brief time when there was a division against David but David's name and standing, their loyalty was great enough to overcome it in a fairly short time. Well, now, as long as Solomon lived there was no division, there was no difficulty, but underneath the surface, there was beginning to be dissatisfaction, with the tremendous taxes that Kings tells us, and the tremendous amount that he was raising of taxes and of forced labor for his building. And so when his son came into power, it was natural that they would want to know what the situation was going to be. c is Previous Devisive Tendencies.

And 2, Solomon's Defection From God. Solomon was a very fine young man, but his power went to his head, and in later days he was not the fine man he'd been before. The Bible tells us that his foreign wives turned his heart away from God. He had wives from the many other countries with which he had alliance, that was customary in those days, to cement an alliance the rulers would marry someone from the other country. That was very common until comparatively recent years, it was common among the great powers of Europe so that to marry to make a friendship between the two lands. Well, Solomon had these foreign wives and naturally each of them had a right to carry out their own worship and we read that his wives led Solomon astray and Solomon's heart was turned away from God, and so we find that even during Solomon's lifetime that a prophet told a man that God was going to give him a part of Solomon's kingdom, and when Solomon heard that Jeroboam had to flee to Egypt, because it wouldn't have been safe for him any longer in the land of Israel. But here we have Solomon's defection from God, which of course is the immediate occasion of the division, not the immediate occasion either, but next to the immediate occasion. Is Solomon's defection from God. And we read about it in 1 Kings 11, that the prophet Ahijah the Shilonite came and we read, any of you, if you look at your Bible, you'll find this a very interesting thing, that in chapter 11, verse 29, it came to pass that when Jeroboam went out of Jerusalem, that the prophet Ahijah the Shilonite found him in the way and he had clad himself with a new garment. Who had? And they two were alone in the field. Anybody who can tell me who had, I'll give you a plus. The Bible doesn't say. And Ahijah caught the new garment that was on him, on who? and rent it in 12 pieces and he said to Jeroboam, take thee ten pieces, for thus saith the Lord, the God of Israel, Behold, I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon and will give ten tribes to thee. Well, if he took ten how many would Solomon's son have left? Read verse 32, but he shall have one tribe for my servant David's sake, and for Jerusalem's sake, the city which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel. How do you divide it into 12 parts and have one have ten and the other have one? How's that? (student. $6\frac{1}{2}$) But it says he divided it into 12 parts. And he gave him ten and then he says the other is going to have one tribe. And of course what it means is that the case of Simeon is ϕ one,

Dan is another, and Benjamin was divided sort of between the two. We speak of the southern kingdom as being ~~entirely~~ ^{Judah and} Benjamin, but actually it probably was only part of Benjamin, Benjamin was probably divided between the two. After all they were the feeblest (7)

So we have the division with ten tribes in the north and one main tribe in the south, and probably some sections (7 1/4)

It probably wasn't an absolute tribal line, but in general it gives the principle. Well, I see we have to continue there tomorrow morning.

7 3/4) We were speaking yesterday of the divided kingdom before Jehu, number XI; A, The Destruction. We mentioned number 2, Solomon's Defection from God, and noticed that even while Solomon was reigning, the Shilonite told Jeroboam that God was going to take away the kingdom from Solomon but that he would leave one tribe for his servant David's sake, and for Jerusalem's sake, the city which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel. The tribal line of Judah goes right through Jerusalem, half of Judah and half on Benjamin. So that this was the promise given to Jeroboam and when Solomon heard, Solomon tried to kill Jeroboam, and Jeroboam fled into Egypt, we read, to Shishak king of Egypt, and was in Egypt until the death of Solomon. Quite a change in the attitude of Egypt. Early in Solomon's reign the Egyptians made friendship with him, Pharaoh gave one of his daughters to be the wife of Solomon and Pharaoh gave him populous cities from the Canaanites and gave them to him, for a wedding present. Now we find that various ones who are refugees from him have fled to Egypt, and are living there with Pharaoh and one of them of course is Jeroboam.

And so we have then number ^{REHOBOAM'S} 3, Jeroboam's Foolish Attitude. We find it told in chapter 12 of 1 Kings and in chapter 10 of 2 Chronicles. And many of the verses are almost word for word. Rehoboam went to Shechem because all Israel were come to Shechem to make him king. Is Shechem in the northern part or in the southern part? Actually Shechem is just about in the middle of the land. As you know, the word Shechem means shoulder, and the name Shechem comes from the shoulder of the mountain there. It is in the very, just about the central part of Canaan, this place of Shechem, it is where today the Samaritans live. It is right at Mount Ebal and Mount Gerizim, where the blessings and the curses were

given, it is the place where the sons of Jacob had that trick by which they conquered the people, and for it Jacob cursed Simeon and Levi because of what they designed, killing the men of Shechem. We have no account of any conquest of Shechem in Joshua and so many scholars think that when Jacob conquered Shechem that the people just held it and that through the time in Egypt the Israelites were holding Shechem, we have no proof of that whatever. There are things that look slightly in that direction I have mentioned, but at any rate Shechem was an important place for a central point for the whole land, and so it was to Shechem that Rehoboam went, to be crowned king. Jerusalem was the capital but Jerusalem was not so centrally located. And Jeroboam heard of Solomon's death, and he was down there in Egypt, and some of the people who were dissatisfied sent and got him. And brought him back, and Jeroboam became the spokesman of the people in speaking to Rehoboam. There was a bit of time had elapsed, getting him all the way out of Egypt, and the people knew as long as Solomon lived there was no point in making insurrection, but now Solomon was dead, there was a possibility and so Jeroboam said your father made our yoke grievous, now therefore make thou the grievous service of thy father, and his heavy yoke that he put on us, lighter, and we will serve thee.

And he said go away for three days and then come again to me, and he departed. Rehoboam didn't know what to do. He didn't know what answer to give in the situation. And so he consulted with the old men who had ~~stood~~^{stood} before Solomon his father, and ~~after~~^{asked their} advice, and they said, if you'll be a servant of the people this day, and will serve them, and answer them and speak good words to them, then they will be your servants forever.

I heard of a man just recently who became pastor of an independent Baptist church, I forget the name of the town but it was in the eastern part of the United States, and he started in there and he did an excellent piece of work and he was ~~living~~^{winning} souls, enlarging the church, and the people were enthused about him, and as he went ahead with various little innovations he made and they willingly came along, and then he said now we've got to build a new building here for our Sunday School, and for our work for the extension of our work as it should be, and they said what'll it cost? And he said we can do it for about 300,000 dollars. Oh they said we don't have that money, ~~He~~ said we can save and

we can get it. Well, they said that's more than ~~you~~^{we} can ~~pay~~ on. Well, he said, he preached a big sermon, my whole ministry depends on this, it's got to be done, I can't work here if we don't. He said if you don't do it I'll resign. So they (13 $\frac{1}{8}$)

He'd been there about six or seven months in the church, the people were enthused about him, he was going an excellent piece of work. But he got the impression that he was in a position to give the orders and say what he wanted done and you have to go ahead and do it. Now maybe if he'd been there six years and everybody loved him he could have done that. But it is a mistake that many a man makes. Now of course this is nothing like as bad as what Rehoboam did, but the same principle is involved. The old men advised Rehoboam, when you are getting established don't try to run things. Gradually introduce your ideas, don't do what's wrong, but don't think that it's got to be done your way. Fit in, and make people happy and win their affection and their interest and then when you have it, then you are in a position, if there are things that are important to speak more positively, that was the old men's advice to Rehoboam. And it's mighty good advice too. Anyone that starts a work for the Lord, this case I mention because I just happened to hear of it last week.

But I have known of a dozen cases in the past where the same sort of thing has been true. A person has started in and immediately everybody's got to do things the way they want and maybe their ideas are better than the other people's, maybe they aren't, but they are not in a position to try to insist on their own way.

O.T. History 273. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...even take a group of people that ~~is as~~^{as as} devoted to their pastor as the Collingswood Presbyterian Church, fine Christian church is to Dr. McIntire, it seems as if many of the people there, just about anything in the world he asked they would do, and yet two years he spoke to my church government class and he said to them, he said, to make any change in the Collingswood Church usually takes about three years. He said there's something that seems a good improvement in general arrangement or in almost any point of more than minor importance, he said I discuss it with the elders and discuss it with the deacons, and discuss it with the Trustees, they discuss it with their friends, it goes down through the church, and he said that in the

there was nothing ^{kind} ~~amazing~~ about him , but he made the people think he was kind. Now the old men's advice to Rehoboam here might not have saved the situation because the thing had gone for a long time, and people had gotten pretty disgusted, but it would have been much more apt to, than what Rehoboam did. Well then the, then he asked, he listened to the old men but then he said these ~~must be~~ old conservatives here, he said, they are out of touch with life today. He asked the young fellows who had been his associates and maybe if he had gotten some progressive young men represent~~ing~~ the country as a whole, he might have gotten good advice, perhaps even better than the advice of the old men, but he had gotten young men here who had grown up with him. Young men will test ^{it} him to enjoy~~ing~~ the fruits of what Solomon was doing, and to feeling as if they were entitled to it, as if it belonged to them, and he asks these young men, what shall I do about what the people have said? And the young men said, say this, my father made your yoke heavy. But you say to them, my little finger will be thicker than my father's hips, and whereas my father laden you with a heavy yoke I'll add to your yoke. My father chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with ~~many~~ scorpions, and in other words he said, give it to them hard. Ride straight ahead and make them do what you want and there are times when that is the wise policy. There are situations where it is necessary to push forward, vigorously and overcome resistance, but those situations among a group of associates are comparatively few. And as a rule the other policies are much more apt to get what you want. It is the tendencies of the young men. I remember one fellow ten years ago, who became pastor of a little church, and he wasn't satisfied with the superintendent of the Sunday School so he got him removed, and somebody else put in that he wanted there. He wasn't satisfied with something in the order of the service, so he changed that. He wasn't satisfied with something else, so he changed that, and one day, he didn't like the way the person was playing the piano, the hymn, so he said here, I'm going to play, so he jumped down and played, and he got up and he said now, you've got to change that pianist or I won't preach here anymore. I resign. So they accepted his resignation. He just pushed ahead and they took it for quite a while. Next I knew he was out working on a railroad, a seminary graduate, a man that loved the Lord and wanted to serve him, but he just didn't have common sense in dealing with people.

course of about three years the people come to feel it's a vital thing and do it. But that is in his judgment after 25 years, 20 or 25 I forget, as a pastor to which the people are just utterly devoted. And yet I've known graduates of this seminary who have gone into a church and immediately they're going to change everything around to make it what they think is better. Now of course a lot of their ideas are immature, they haven't had much experience. Maybe a lot of things, after they see how things are going, they'll find they had it there is better. But many may think they may be just right. But you can't take people and just drive them like that. If you could you wouldn't have any continuity in your church, because your people would get dissatisfied one week and the next week there'd be nobody in church. But people are conservative, they tend to go on the way they are, and if you have them there they're apt to keep coming unless things get pretty bad (2)

But if they're not there (2)

and it's a good thing or you wouldn't have any continuity. That being the case, it's good to remember to not try to be in control until you're in a position where people have reason to have confidence in your judgment and (2 $\frac{1}{2}$)

So the advice of the old men gave to Rehoboam is advice which all of us could well have in mind, if our lives are to be effective. And Solomon had been too severe with them by far, but Rehoboam couldn't possibly expect them to be loyal to (2 $\frac{3}{4}$)

But Rehoboam had a most wonderful opportunity here to win the people by making all kinds of concessions. Solomon had been so extreme, he could have made tremendous concessions and still had plenty. Henry VIII set a very bad example in most things he did, but he certainly showed cleverness at this point, when he became king of England, he had been-- one reason that Henry VIII was able to have a very successful rule was the physical condition of the country was first class because his father, Henry VII, had taken a disorganized country at the end of the Civil War and had gotten things organized and settled and established and raised the taxes and had gotten the government so that it was solvent and thoroughly in good shape, but Henry VIII took the two leaders of the tax administration and hung the two, which of course made the people think that he was blaming these men for all these actions of his father and he was going to be very kind

Now a man like Rehoboam, it's natural that he shouldn't have. He was raised in a sheltered environment and considered himself the coming king, everybody ~~better-kowtow~~^{ed} to him and try to please him, had little contact with people with in general. But a Seminary graduate should learn something of human nature, should learn ~~how~~^{to} deal with people, and how to plan things right but to arrive at them in a way that will win people instead of driving them away. Now there are occasional cases where you have to deal with laziness, or you have to deal with indifference, or you have to deal with an attitude which represents a small minority and you have the large majority with you, and where a strong firm attitude will not only override opposition but sometimes bring their support. I know a man in California who had a big clothes store and --it wasn't very big I guess, but fairly good size in a small town--and there was a man there who came and bought a suit from him and a month went by and the man never paid for it, and everytime he'd see him he'd ask when he'd pay and the man said oh one of these day I'll be around. And he said finally one day he went down town~~y~~ and he saw this man with a big suitcase and he said where are you going? And he said I'm leaving town. Well, he said you haven't paid for that suit ~~he says~~, he says you come in here and pay for that suit or I'll see to it you don't leave town, you pay for that, he went after him good and hard. And he said the man came back and paid for that suit and turned around and bought a lot of other things. He hadn't bought anything from him for eight months because he was ~~abashed~~ to buy anything because he was a deadbeat in not paying for it, but when he forced him to pay, he turned around and bought a lot of other things and became a good customer. There are times when the young men's advice is good, but be mighty sure that it's one of those times. Because if it isn't good it may have an effect like it had with Rehoboam. And so Rehoboam came back the third and answered the people roughly and said as the young men said, and all the time they had Jereboam there urging them not to follow this fellow who was going to have all of Solomon's bad points without any of his good points, and when all Israel heard the king// hearkened not to them, the people answered the king saying, what portion have we in David. Neither have we inherited from the son of Jesse. To your tents, O Israel, now take care of your own house David. So they departed to their tents. But the children of

Israel who lived in the cities of Judah, Rehoboam reigned over them. Their pride in their tribe, their loyalty to David, was enough to keep them true, despite the foolishness of Rehoboam. And of course all this had been predicted when Ahijah the Shilonite had come to Jeroboam and told him that God was going to give him ten tribes and leave only one tribe for the house of David. One tribe to fulfill the promise ^{that there} ~~to David~~ would always be a son of David to sit on the throne. But the bulk of them given to Jeroboam. So we come to B.

B. The First Three Kings of Judah. And the first of them of course is Rehoboam.

B. Rehoboam. And we have in 1 Kings here, after telling about the division here, then we have a little about Rehoboam and then we go on with Jeroboam. We will look here at what it says about Rehoboam. Rehoboam became king and immediately he assembled the people, to fight against (10 3/4) of Israel, to bring the kingdom back. But the word of God came to Shemaiah the man of God, saying, speak to Rehoboam saying ye shall not go up, nor fight against your brethren the children of Israel, return every man to his house, and they returned. A very sensible thing to do. One tribe couldn't fight against ten tribes and accomplish anything to amount to anything. Under Rehoboam, number 1, then is his attempt to reconquer Israel. He wanted the people to attack Israel, he wanted to take Israel, but his power was insufficient for it. And he had a chance to keep them and he lost it. Many a man loses a wonderful opportunity and then spends the rest of his life fighting to regain it. And perhaps failing to accomplish anything else, because he's always fighting to regain the opportunity that he has lost at some earlier time. Better to recognize facts. Rehoboam was forced to recognize facts, but he was so interested in trying to get the rest of the kingdom back that he didn't bother to try hard to rule very well where he was. We have it stated in verse 30 of chapter 14, there was war between Rehoboam and Jeroboam all their days. And that contradicts a statement which we had back in chapter 12, that the people hearkened to the word of God and returned to depart according to the word of the Lord. If you'd take either one of them and carry it to the extreme--the fact is you have to put the two together to know what happened. What happened was that Rehoboam was constantly trying to win. He tried to get the crowd to support him, that it was God's will to reconquer the land, and they refused to do it, because God

had said Jeroboam was to have the ten tribes. They refused to do it, but there were many people who stood with him. He made effort after effort to (12 $\frac{1}{2}$)

There was constant hostility, no all-out war. In any all-out war Rehoboam would've been utterly vanquished, because Jeroboam had three times the strength that Rehoboam had. He had most of the land, Rehoboam just had one tribe. So number ~~one~~^a is attempt to reconquer Israel.

b, Relations with Egypt. Now we have had in our account of the victory in relation to archeology, we notice that in the time of Abraham we have Babylonians records which throw considerable light. In the time of Moses we have Egyptian records which throw considerable light, though in neither case are they direct and complete corroboration. But through the exodus up to this time we have practically nothing in the way of written material from archeology relating to what is in the Bible. We have remains in Palestine, but without writing, which in many places (13 3/4)

interesting problems, in many cases they are very important but written records from archeology relating to it are lacking ~~to~~^{through} this long period. But now we begin again to come to them. We have account here of Shishak and it says that in the fourth year of Rehoboam that Shishak, king Shishak came out against Jerusalem, verse 25, chapter 14. Now you take that verse just as it stands and try to make (14 $\frac{1}{4}$)

King Shishak came up against Jerusalem. You could go on, you could build a whole treatise on it. Shishak was against Rehoboam, Shishak decided to help his friend Jeroboam up in the north. Shishak came to attack Jerusalem, he came against Jerusalem. But that isn't what the verse has to mean, the verse can mean that in the course of a campaign which Shishak made, he attacked Jerusalem.

O.T.History 274. (1 $\frac{1}{4}$)

...the greatest error in Bible interpretation is taking one verse and squeezing it to get more meaning from it than you can, get possibilities from it and then compare them with other passages. If other passages give the answer, fine, if they don't, say you don't know. Well, at any rate, in the course of his campaign he attacked Jerusalem, whether

that was the main purpose of his campaign or not, and evidently Shishak got into Jerusalem because he took away the treasures of the house of the Lord, the treasures of the king's house, he even took away all, and he took away all the shields of gold which Solomon had made. And King Rehoboam made in their stead brassen shields & copper shields. This old English brazen here would mean brass, but what alloy of copper ($1\frac{1}{2}$) it was we don't know, copper would perhaps be a safer rendering for the general term-- (Copper shields) and committed them into the hands of the chief of the guard. Now this is very little said about Shishak's captain, just these couple of sentences here. But I saw a paper, a newspaper 25 years ago which had a heading: theories of fundamentalists disproved. Underneath that was a subheading: Bible shown not to be free from error. Well that's a great heading for an article in a paper, makes you wonder just what it's about. So I read underneath it and it said, the Bible is not free from error and never can be proven to be free from error. These words were stated by Professor James Henry Breasted of the University of Chicago, in connection with his giving to the world the news of the discovery by one of his archaeological expeditions in Egypt, of a monument telling how Shishak conquered Jerusalem in the reign of Rehoboam as described in the book of 1 Kings. So that the discovery was something which exactly fit in with and corroborated the book of Kings, and Breasted was afraid people would draw the natural conclusion from it, so he made the exact opposite statement of what the facts proved, and his statement got the headlines and you had to read the article to find out what the true facts were. Unfortunately many, many people get their news from headlines instead of reading underneath. If you have any connection with newspapers you soon learn that the headlines are often made by someone who hasn't even read the article, but who has special facility in getting words of the right length to exactly fill the space that's available for the headline, and it may have very little to do with what's in the article. But most people don't know that and get their news from headlines and I confess I myself read all the headlines and very few of the articles. But ~~there~~ that shows, is a point where again we begin to get written materials, throwing light on the Bible. Now this does not throw a great deal of light on the Bible. I had you last semester read this statement of Shishak. Shishak tells in it how he made a great

conquest, and he mentions the cities he conquered, and he has these things like round sort of oval things, to represent the city, with the name of the city in it. Then he names a few hundred cities that he says he conquered. And people said that Shishak was just a minor Egyptian kinglet, in the days of Egyptian degeneracy, and that he went right around the corner there at Luxor, to the monument that Sosthenes III put up, a few hundred years earlier telling of his great exploits in Palestine and he just copies there the names of the cities. Of course they don't say the king did that, his scribes, put up a monument to celebrate him. And there are places where the names follow verbatim. Maybe the scribe did copy from it. But one thing they said shows we can't believe Shishak's inscription is the fact that it includes not only cities in Judah but cities in the northern kingdom. And after all, if Shishak went up there to help his ally Jeroboam who had lived at his court before he became king in the northern kingdom, he would go up and help them by attacking the southern kingdom but not attacking the northern kingdom. So they said Shishak's inscriptions are not dependable. And then there was found in Megiddo, way up in the northern kingdom, there was found a stalag, a monument there, put up by Shishak, celebrating his victory there. So it just shows how we must not jump to conclusions. Shishak conquered just as much in the northern kingdom as he did in the south. It was not a conquest in the sense that he conquered and took it. It was more like a raid, but he came with a strong force and raided and plundered and the people probably were not expecting him, they weren't prepared to put up vigorous resistance and in addition to that, some of them realized it was just a raid, not a real conquest. And he made this raid, made this conquest, to win glory for himself, and to get plunder. But it corroborates the statement in Kings. These statements we discover there in Kings have been passed on, copied and copied and recopied. The name of Shishak was unknown all through these years except for this mention in the Bible. Of course the way they spell it it's more like Shishon but you can't expect a thing to be spelled the same in two different languages that use different types of writing. They can't be spelled exactly the same. That's about as close that you would expect the similarity to be, with two such utterly different types of writing. When you try to get exact comparison between two languages, it reminds me of the

time in Berlin when I went to a Bible conference. There were two men having a big argument and they said here comes an American, ^{we'll} ~~you~~ ask him to solve it for us, they said what is the correct pronunciation of the name of the Falls, of course they, in German, they said Felle for Falls. Is it Niagara or Niagara? Which is it? When I told them it was neither one, it was Niagara, my Niagara sounded to them just like a mouthful of jelly in German, so utterly unlike any German sound. Their argument was meaningless because they did not know the sound. When you translate from one language to another, and particularly with utterly different styles of writing, you have to look at a good many different things to see how the correspondence is apt to be made. And here ^{Shishonk and} ~~Shishak~~ and nobody raises a question about its ^{being unau. in} ~~exact~~ representation under the limits of that representation. ¶

I remember one time in Germany when a man told me he had relatives in North America and I said what state are they from. He says I-yo-ho. Fort Doge, I-jo-ho, and that's very different from the way I'd ever before heard anybody pronounce Fort Dodge, Iowa. But English and German are very similar languages. Think what it is when you get two such different languages as Egyptiaa and English.

Well, this matter of Shishak was a real loss to Rehoboam, taking so much of the treasures out of the king's house and out of the temple, but it was just a passing raid. Its principal interest for us is that it is a corroboration and also it helps in dating by an exact fitting together of Egyptian history here and the history of the Bible.

And then we have in chapter 15 of 1 Kings and in 2 Chronicles 13, we have yesterday's afternoon's assignment, and there we are told in Kings that Abijam reigned over Judah and in Chronicles we are told that ^{2.} Abijah was the next king. One says that it was Abijah and the other says that it was Abijam. And you read on further and you find that after his death he was ^{succeeded} ~~defeated~~ by his son Asa, and that you read in both. So this man was the son of Rehoboam and the father of Asa and that would be pretty good proof that he was the one man. You might have two different men who had the same ^{father, but} ~~qualities~~ hardly two different ones who had the same son. And so it proves that he is right there in the line but one book calls him Abijah and the other Abijam. And that is an evidence of the care of the transmitters of the Old Testament in their copying. Those copyists knew the Bible,

some of them knew the whole Old Testament by heart. They were fairly familiar with the material in it, they knew that Kings called him Abijam and that Chronicles called him Abijah. Well why didn't they make it one way or the other then? Because they found their manuscripts one way and they kept copying it the way they found it. And that is an evidence for trusting the Bible rather than the contrary. When we find obvious differences retained carefully it shows that, not that error hasn't come in because it has, at very, very few places, but there are errors in transmission, but it shows that the scribes copied what they found and didn't try to correct it. Because when you start correcting it, you're apt to correct the wrong way and make it much worse than it was, unless you have clear and absolute evidence. Well, now, I didn't mean to say that in this case it was an error. It may be an error, but we are not in a position to know. Was his name Abijah or was it Abijam? Well, you will find that people often abbreviate their names, in our language, they often abbreviate and use various forms for their names, not so much now with printing which tends to crystallize forms, but there are often various forms which people use of their names. And it's altogether possible that in some way not known to us, Abijah and Abijam are forms of the same name. Maybe the end might be some kind of an ending, such as comes on our names too. You will find that there was a man called William Sutton, and a book was written about him recently, called I, Willie Sutton. He became known to the police and known to people in general as Willie Sutton. And yet I read a statement that his associates never called him Willie, they always called him Bill. And there, the book doesn't call him ~~William~~ Sutton, it calls him Willie Sutton, takes the form which he was so generally referred to as. And we, it may be that there was a reason why Abijah and Abijam were two forms of the same name. On the other ^{it may be} hand/~~that~~ there's an error, that in the early writing of one of these books or the other, the letters got changed in a very early copy and the change was retained. But who was the second king, was it Abijah or was it Abijam. It was the man who was called by both of these names, and I don't know of any way we can prove which was the correct name if one was the correct one, they may have been equally correct. An interesting case of this is later on where we find in Jeremiah where he speaks of King Nebuchadrezzar, and he speaks repeatedly of Nebuchadrezzar,

and then when you get into Daniel, he talks about Nebuchadnezzar, and the thing told is such that it's perfectly obvious that it's the same man, Nebuchadnezzar or Nebuchadnezzar. Which was he? Well, in Babylonian he is Nabucheduro-Utsur, which would certainly sound more like Nebuchadnezzar than Nebuchadnezzar. It means Nabu protects the (13 1/4) There is the name. Well, what about the Nebuchadnezzar. Well, we find in other sources which have reference to the king that he is quite generally called Nebuchadnezzar or Nabuchusnosser or some such form but it had the end, and so in that case we feel quite sure we have the answer. That his official name is Nabucheduro-Utsure and putting that into Hebrew it was naturally contracted Nebuchadnezzar and that is what people would say, like Jeremiah, who lived in Palestine and read about King Nebuchadnezzar. They would take the official name and intend to use it but the people like Daniel who were at his court and heard the way it was commonly spoken became accustomed to the way that it was usually pronounced, in which the r was changed to an n for facility in pronunciation, and Nebuchadnezzar was almost certainly the way that his associates called the name which would be written Nabucheduro-Utsure. So both forms are right, Nebuchadnezzar and Nebuchadnezzar, but Nebuchadnezzar is the official form it takes, Nebuchadnezzar the way that everybody spoke of it. (14 1/2) histories of it instead of just reading about it. Yes? (14 3/4) student) That would be a very good suggestion...

O.T. History 275. (1/2)

...as to actual acceptance of it, I would incline to think that there might be ~~circumstances~~ (1/2) circumstances under which that would be an excellent answer. But that in this case, since he was king of the southern kingdom only, and his realm did not extend over the northern kingdom, my guess would be that it wouldn't apply to this particular case, that in this case he was known in the southern kingdom and not a prominent enough figure in the northern kingdom to have a special form there. That'd be my guess but we can't be sure. Yes? (student.1) In the Bible? They're both given. Well, I haven't found ^{it} it would be interesting too to see what the Septuagint said. It is a case where it would be very,

very easy for errors to come in because a copyist would be copying those and get used to one or the other and it's very easy to have a thing in your mind and write it down even when you have something else. I've found myself sometimes thinking a number and writing a different one down, very easy to do. Put down, I want to write down page 18, I write down page 17. I don't know why but the mind plays tricks that way. And it's probably because I have the zone 17 or something else in mind. And people having the one name in mind would very easily make the shift. Yes? (student. 1 3/4) Yes. There is a difference as Mr. Kang points out in the mother's name as given. That, however, if there is some similarity, that is nearly so decisive, because the mother's name, an uncommon thing (2 1/4) describe, wouldn't have something particular in mind. It would be more easy for errors to creep in. But now we look at those. We have it in 1 Kings 15 that three years he reigned in Jerusalem and his mother's name was Maacah the daughter of Abishalom. The other says in Chronicles, he reigned three years in Jerusalem, his mother's name was Mechaiah. Well now this difference between Maacah and Mechaiah, the first part of it is simply a matter of the vowel which in (2 3/4) wasn't written, and in a common name naturally it would be easily preserved but in something like this that occurs once in the Bible the Ma and the Mi, that we often have a variation in the same name. So I wouldn't worry about that part. Now the last part one says Maca and the other Mecaiah, and many names end in aiah which are often shorted to a, shortened form. We have that a good many times. And so the mother's name I'd say was the same. But her father, one says the daughter of Abishalom and the other says the daughter of Uriel of Gibeon. I don't think there's any question the mother's name is the same, but her father is given differently in the two places. And that of course immediately raises the question is this a different Maachah. Well, it means that his mother's name, I did not mention as a proof that Abijah and Abijam were the same. It is not proof that they are the same, but it is not proof they aren't the same, because after all the mother's name as given is the same, and the mother could be referred to by her father or by her grandfather. That's very often in the Bible, the daughter of, you speak of a person relating to their immediate father and mother, or you may speak to the group they belong

immediate parents, or

to, and that, one might be the father and one the grandfather, so I wouldn't think that that, it does not prove it's the same man, because the mother's patrimony is different but it doesn't prove it's a different man because it could easily be explained. We have various other cases where they are used in that way. Yes? (student. 4 3/4) - As you know, Abijah died as a child, so maybe they called Abijam Abijah for that reason.) Oh, you mean a different Abijah, you mean the son of Jeroboam. But this is the king of Judah.

Yes, that's the son of (5) It is a fact there could be a certain relationship in people's minds. (student. 5 1/4. Mr. Welch I think brought this error about because he said both Abijah and Abijam were in 1 Kings, but the Abijah of 14 is the son of Jeroboam.) Yes, that's a thing we always have to watch out for, a name can refer to a different one. And you notice in the Bible here, you find the name of a king of Judah, you find the same name in Israel, about the same period. Very often you find that, but it doesn't mean anything, it is just true in life, we get a habit of using certain names. My father was John and it seems in his generation nearly three-fourths of the people I knew were John. I think they named so many boys John that people got sick of the name. Because in my generation there are comparatively few Johns. I don't think there is one in twenty in my generation that's called John. Now you come to the next generation it's coming back again. When I named my little boy John I knew very few who were called that in his generation. Since then I've run into them all the time. I think the name is coming back. These names, they go in streaks. People get the habit of using a name and it spreads and you'll find in the kingdoms here you'll have the same name occurring for a king in the northern and a king in the southern. Not at the same time but right near. And you don't find it some distance off, it's apt to be quite near. Yes?

(student. 6 3/4) Yes. You mean that the name of (7) would be the Lord is my Father, but of (7) could possibly be something else. But I don't know what else. It may be but I just don't know what it'd be. It may be something we're not aware of. But since I don't know, my guess would be the m is an ending to (7 1/4) rather than a distinct word. Now that would be a possibility.

For instance, Abiram, that is my Father is exalted, and ram is a word, but I don't know of any word jah, except of course the word lake, which could be my father is a lake, and

that wouldn't fit at all. Well, the question then of the name is minor question on which I wouldn't take time except that it is similar to many, many other similar problems and therefore we ought to have it in mind for the many cases rather than just for the one. But this is perhaps a particular outstanding case of it, a greater problem than that is the question was Abijam a good man or a bad man, and if you read Kings, all you read is He walked in all the sins of his father which he'd done before him, his heart was not perfect with the Lord his God as the heart of David had been. Nevertheless for David's sake did the Lord give him a lamp in Jerusalem, to set up his son after him and establish Jerusalem, because David did what was right in the eyes of the Lord. And there was war between Rehoboam and Jeroboam all the days of his life. And the rest of the acts of Abijam, all that he did, are written in the book of the Chronicles of the kings of Judah. So you turn over to Chronicles to find the other things he did, and over there you find that there's much more told about ^{Abijah} ~~his life~~ and there you have an account of a war between him and Jeroboam and in the course of that war, you have him standing up and rebuking Jeroboam for his disloyalty to the Lord, and you have the Lord giving him a marvelous deliverance in it, and you certainly would get the picture of a successful effective God-fearing king in Chronicles. But in Kings you have a brief statement that he was a bad man. So if you say he's a bad king, I think you read Kings and didn't look at Chronicles. If you say he's a good king, I think you read Chronicles and didn't look at Kings. But that doesn't mean there is a contradiction between the two books. It does not mean that, it means that he, like most human beings, was a complex personality, who had his good points and his bad points. And the general summation is bad that Kings gives, but there were his points of real loyalty to the Lord and real blessing from the Lord which Chronicles tells us. And that is true of most of us. There are is hardly any of us that is found to be all white or all black. We have our good points and we have our bad points. But when we are mixed like Abijah was, we're apt to deserve just about as little attention as he did. He did not follow the Lord with his whole heart, he had an occasional real example of loyalty to the Lord that deserves credit, but on the whole the record he makes is rather spotty. So it just shows again how im-

portant ^{it is} to get all of that before reaching a dogmatic conclusion. You can get a conclusion from Kings and a dogmatically opposite one from Chronicles. Now suppose that we were on him like we are on the kings of Israel, that we only had kings and we don't have chronicles for the kings of Israel. Suppose you were in that situation. Well, that doesn't mean that what you read isn't true, but don't read into it more than is there. And don't try to make it give you more information than it does. Recognize the possibility of other facts that we do not have. Well, then, number 3.

Number 3, Asa. Abijah only reigned three years. He is a minor king, he didn't live long enough to be a major king. But he had a son who is a major king, Asa. And Asa is a major king because he ~~lived~~ ^{reigned} 41 years. ~~That's~~ a long time for any king to reign, comparatively few reign that long. It is longer than Saul, David, or Solomon, any one of the three reigned, not a great deal longer. I hope you all know how long each of those three reigned. But, each of them was 40, he reigned 41 years, and there are comparatively few kings who reign anywhere near as long as 40, either in Israel or anywhere else. But Asa we read, quite in contrast to him, now here's an interesting thing. Look at verse 11, chapter 15. Asa reigned over Israel, he reigned 41 years in Jerusalem, and his mother's name was Maachah the daughter of Abishalom. Notice that in chapter 15, verse 10? And then you look back at chapter 15, verse 2, and what was the name of the mother of Abijah? His mother's name was Maachah the daughter of Abishalom. Well then does Maachah marry Rehoboam and then after his death marry, no it couldn't be after his death, because Asa became king after the other had reigned three years. ~~He~~ must have been born while his grandfather was still living. And the mother has the same name. Is she the mother of the son and also the mother of the grandson? It would be extremely unlikely, I don't say it's absolutely impossible, but it's so unlikely I think it is almost certainly not the case. Do we have two Maachahs who were the daughter of Abishalom? ~~That~~ seems very unlikely. If that was the case, being right next to each other here, you'd think they would attach some designation to show what the facts were. So that it would seem to me most likely that here we have a case where a scribal error has come in. That would seem to me extremely likely. ~~That~~ a scribal error has come in here.

That in one case the father's name is different, the mother's name may be the same in both cases, that's very frequent, to have two women of the same name. But that the father's name was different and a very early scribe made an error in copying. What does Chronicles give for the name of the mother of Asa? Do you remember? Mecaiah the daughter of whom? The mother of Asa. But we read about this woman over in 2 Chronicles 15. There we read and also concerning ^{Maachah} ~~Asa~~ the mother of Asa the king, he removed her from being queen because she made an idol in a grove. So we have Asa's mother called Maachah over here in Chronicles, and earlier we have Abijah's mother called Mecaiah. When we have these slight differences (14 3/4) these slight contradictions, it is very likely that there has been a scribal error. Yes? (student.14 3/4) Because ordinarily you designate, especially in a polygamous society, you designate the man by his father and his mother...

O.T.History 276. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...here you have a man designated, the son of the king, and his mother was so-and-so. Well, now if you have thirty other cases where it gives his mother's name and in this one case it is not giving his mother's name nor his mother's father's name, but giving the name of the father who has already been king and already been discussed, it would be a contradiction to the custom in all the other cases. It just wouldn't fit. (student.1) No, his mother could very well be (1 $\frac{1}{4}$) but it still would be the mother's name, not the father's name. See what I mean, it's the way of designating a man, is giving his two parents. Well, now if you've only one parent and then that parent's parent, wouldn't designate (1 $\frac{1}{4}$) You wouldn't say that you were the son of your father and your father's mother. You would say your father and your mother. Now if your mother's parents were of greater importance you might mention them instead of her, but it's to mention your two lines not just to mention one of your two lines, it wouldn't fit. You think it over.

Now Asa, then, is designated in Kings and Chronicles as a good king. And we'll learn a little more about him next Monday afternoon.

...at different times which are in part of the land, which are in all of the land, now we are in the section in which you have far more detail. There's much detail we don't have about this (2 3/4) the king, a tremendous lot we don't know.

But the author of this section was interested as the author was not in giving us the precise interrelation of the kings. Now that was natural because of their coming successively in two parts of the land. There was a more of a consecutive interrelationship. For that reason we have much more information though we still are lacking with a great deal of information that would be very helpful to us if we had it. Now of course that is true in any field of history. History is written by people and if you wrote everything you would fill dozens and dozens of encyclopedias. You can't do it. You take what you think is important and later ^{much of} what you gave proves to be unimportant. And later ages are greatly interested in ^{many} things you knew perfectly well and didn't bother to put down. That's always true in history. And so here we have this particular area written by one who was interested in the interrelationship and yet not so interested as to give us precise details. He tells us in this year of this king that one reigned, and this year of that king this one reigned, and so on, and it's very interesting but when you fit them together they just don't fit, and it has been said by scholars that the interrelation of the figures of the kings was certainly the most difficult thing to accept in the Bible. That there were so many places where they just didn't possibly fit together. That was said until recently by all liberal scholars and many conservative scholars. Now this book, THE MYSTERIOUS NUMBERS OF THE HEBREW KINGS, published by the University of Chicago Press, by Dr. Edwin R. ^{Thiele} ~~Seid~~, represents the result of a doctoral dissertation which he wrote for the University of Chicago Press for his doctoral treatise. His name is Thiele. Dr. Edwin R. Thiele took his doctor's degree at the University of Chicago studying the chronology of the Hebrew kings, and the book which is published by the University of Chicago Press called THE MYSTERIOUS NUMBERS OF THE HEBREW KINGS, has an introduction to it by William A. Irwin. William A. Irwin was for a long time the professor of Old Testament in the University of Chicago. He was a man who stood 100% for a higher critical view of the Old Testament. He was absolutely convinced of it, he is yet I believe. He

was in a big lawsuit over it, they had a big article in the Sunday School Times, 20 years or so ago, about it. He is a strong supporter of the higher critical view of the O.T. Now Professor Irwin, I believe, has now been retired from the University of Chicago, and is teaching at some southern university. I think that's purely a matter of --they have an age limit when they retire and there are schools that don't and that fill up their ranks with men with big names from other places where they are retired at a certain age. But Irwin was at Chicago when this book came out in 1951. And he wrote an introduction for it. It's interesting that 20 years ago, I was at the University of Chicago doing some work in the Oriental Institute there and Professor Heidel who spoke on Genesis, on the flood story, not the creation story, we studied some last fall, is a Missourian Lutheran, a very orthodox man. When he first wrote his book on the Genesis story of creation he was trying to get it published. And he wrote a great many publishers and he got this same professor Irwin to write him a letter of introduction and he showed me a letter which he was just about to mail to the Sunday School Times, signed by Professor Irwin. He got Irwin to write recommending his book which he was sending to various publishers. And as I read it Irwin said of the book that this is a book which will appeal to all students of the Old Testament. Its careful accurate scholarship will appeal to liberal thinkers, while its warm emotional glow will appeal to conservatives. And I recommended him not to send that letter to the Sunday School Times because I didn't think it would predispose them in favor of the book. And I--it certainly wouldn't me, if I didn't know more about Heidel than what I get from that letter, but it shows you what Irwin's attitude was toward conservatives. And therefore it makes it particularly interesting to me that he would write such a glowing praise of Thiele's book as he does. In his introduction to Thiele's book here he points out the many, many cases of apparent contradiction in the chronology of the kings. And then he says that, it seemed to be the very most difficult problem in the Old Testament and now in view of Professor Thiele's study, it becomes one of the simplest problems rather than one of the most difficult. And that is pretty strong commendation to be given from one who is not looking to find the Bible accurate, but looking to find it inaccurate. Now, personally, I'm not ready to say that

Thiele is necessarily correct in all his conclusions. To me what his book proves is not that these are the correct statements that he gives, what it proves is that it is possible to construct the system using the Biblical material and explain it in such a way that you can take the figures as they stand and fit them together in a perfectly ^{reasonable} ~~agreeable~~ way, a way which will seem reasonable, even ~~though~~ a man like Irwin who is so pre-disposed against it. For the present I am going to use Thiele's ^{dates.} ~~dates.~~ I know of no better dates to use, but I'm not going to dogmatically say they're right. I think he has ~~worked~~ ^{worked} out a possible system, it may be the correct one. The departures from it will not be great thought there may be some place where he's wrong. But it is interesting that Thiele's interpretation rests upon this assumption, that the chronology of the kings in one kingdom began a new reign as soon as the old king died. And in the other began a new reign at the next new year's date. And in the other kingdom they used the ^{7 (10)} ~~that~~ ^{was} the system and that the time came when it was reversed. And that is the principal thing that he holds and it explains a great number of the apparent contradictions. Now I don't know whether that's absolutely clear, I've given it before in earlier times, rather briefly, whether it's absolutely clear, but the point of it is, I was mentioning about history in general, this would be a thing that everybody would know, and yet the author of Kings didn't bother to mention it. It's perfectly obvious, that's true of history. Things that are perfectly obvious we don't bother to mention, later ages have forgotten it. We mention things that we think are important and put down, that we don't think are perfectly obvious. Now this theory of Thiele's is a very good theory. We know that both systems were in use, we have evidence in other countries of their being in use, and on that assumption the greater part of the apparent discrepancies disappear. Now the main point of it, everybody understands what the main point is of Thiele's assumption. Let's state it once more: let's be sure, I mean it's not so obvious. I would think there might be many of you who, unless you listened very closely when I gave it before, last fall, would not realize what it is, and I think it's very good to be sure you have it in mind. Here is a man who dies on the 25th of December, he dies. His son becomes king then on the 25th of December. Well are the remaining six days of the year the

first year of his reign? Then on the 2nd of January, do we say this is the second year/ of this man's reign? Or do we say he finished out the last year of his father's reign and this is the first year of his reign which begins on New Year's Day. Which method are we going to use? Neither one stands to reason, both of them have their disadvantages. In the case I just gave the king died the 25th of December, anybody'd say why it's perfectly silly to call six days the first year of the next king's reign. Naturally we'll start his reign the first of January. But then he died on the 10th of January. What are we going to do with his time? Are we going to say his first year is from the 10th of January the rest of the year? Or are we going to say that his reign doesn't start until the ^{end of the} ~~next~~ year/? You see, either one of them is unworkable in many cases. It all depends when the man happened to die. And so it's very easy to start using one, depending on conditions, the time a king happens to die, and once you get started you're apt to use it until something happens to make you change. And Thiele's theory is that they used ^{two} /different systems. Now we know that in a series, for instance, they used ^{the} ~~a~~ system of starting the first year with New Year's Day. There a king would die, his son would take over. Then when you make a contract, you would say this contract was ~~made~~ made in the accession year of King Ashurbanam. The accession year, that might be five days, it might be 300 days, but it was the accession year, the year in which he became king. Then we'd say this contract was made in the first year, that's the first year after the first (13¹/₂)

While in the other country they'd do it the opposite way. Well, now this is Thiele's theory and it's a good theory, it's a very simple theory when you get the point of it in mind. A very simple theory, but the author of Kings didn't bother to explain to us which ^{way} ~~system~~ it was that it was done. And so when he says in the third year of King so-and-so, the king so-and-so in the other country began to reign, we don't know which system he was using. Everybody knew then, taken for granted, nobody bothered to explain. Now we need to find it out and that's our big problem in any kind of history, is to figure out the obvious thing that the author of the history didn't bother to put down. Well, we are, however, with this difficulty, in a ^{period} ~~series~~, which in many ways is much more satisfactory to us than the Judges period

for instance, because we can fit these together to such an extent, even before Thiele's theory. We can fit them together, we are told, this ^{man} was king in Judah, this man was king in Israel, this man died and was succeeded by his son, we have a continuous history for a period of about 200 years.

O.T.History 277. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...certain problems, certain things we're not sure of, but in general it fits together with many (1 $\frac{1}{3}$) detail that we have, for instance, for the period of Judges. Now we took a section, Roman XI, the divided kingdom before Jehu, which we are calling from ~~941~~⁹³¹ to 841 B.C. And under that we took the Destruction and we noted 3 points under that, and then we took B, the first 3 kings of Judah, number 1, Rehoboam; number 2, Abijah, or Abijam, whichever his name was (the King James Version says in the heading, the chapter that tells about him, Abijam's wicked reign, and I think whoever made that heading was looking at Kings and not looking at Chronicles at the time, because if you only look at Chronicles you get the idea he was quite a godly man. If you have Chronicles in mind I don't think you'd head it his wicked reign, you would head it his reign. It was a reign of wickedness but a reign in which there was at least one period where he showed what could be taken as a great example of godly trust in the Lord. And the question is which is preponderant, the character in Chronicles or the character in Kings. Well, all human beings are mixed characters, and in his case one chapter, one book gives us one side, the other gives the other side of the picture, and since he only reigned a couple of years, we are not in a position to know which is preponderant. If he reigned thirty years probably one or the other would have come to the fore.

But then Abijam was succeeded by his son, Asa, number 3, Asa. Did we begin to speak about Asa last time? We began to speak about him but we did not say a great deal about him. There is a good deal that is of interest and importance regarding Asa. Asa is described in the Bible as a very good king. He's a very important king because he reigned 41 years. That's enough to make anyone important. It's a long period to be king. Every Bible student ought to be familiar with King Asa. He is a good king, the

Bible says he did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord as did David his father. And he is well spoken of in the Bible, he is a good king. Verse 14 says the high places were not removed, nevertheless Asa's heart was perfect with the Lord all his days. That's pretty strong praise. If that's all we knew, Asa's heart was perfect with the Lord all his days, we would think this man was about as near to a perfect man as ever lived. And yet over in Chronicles we find him very strongly criticized at one point. So we know that when any man's heart was perfect with the Lord all his days, that is giving a very fine judgment of a fallible human being, and should be taken with that understanding ^{that} of ~~the~~ ^{it's a} fallible human being and that therefore the words are not to be taken in the extreme sense. Well, Asa was a good man who reigned for 41 years and did much that was good. And one of the first things we're told he did that was good is in verse 13, chapter 15, and also Maachah his mother, even her he removed from being queen, because she had an idol in a grove, and Asa destroyed her idol, and burnt it by the brook Kidron. Well, a man who would not let even his mother, even his mother, stand between him and the Lord but would remove her from being queen, and would break down the wicked things she had done, that is something which a great many very good fellows will not do. A great many good fellows are misled by bad mothers, and a far greater number probably of bad fellows have their badness ameliorated, or perhaps are won to the Lord by good mothers. But Asa here stood against his mother when his mother was wrong in the situation.

Well, that brings us of course to the problem we mentioned briefly last time, who was his mother anyway. And if we only had, if we had not the first part of chapter 15 here but only the last part, I'm sure we'd have no problem about it at all. Verse 10 says his mother's name was Maachah the daughter of Abishalom, and verse 13 says also Maachah his mother even her he removed from being queen. There'd be no problem at all if we did not go back to verse 2 and read that Abijam who reigned 3 years, his mother's name was Maachah the daughter of Abishalom. And so immediately we ~~think~~ that Abijah and Asa are brothers, they both have the same mother. But unfortunately it says that when Abijam dies that Asa his son ruled in his stead. You don't call a brother a son. So that here is the same woman, Maachah the daughter of Abishalom, who is listed as the

mother of King Abijam and the mother of his son King Asa. And naturally in a list of kings like this, we have the father's name and it is quite natural to give the mother's name particularly in a polygamous society like this, to give the mother's name and to indicate her, precisely who she was. Over in Chronicles we have a contradiction. In Chronicles we read in chapter 13 that Abijah's mother's name was Michaiah which can certainly be the same as Maachah, the iah at the end is often shortened to ah, the beginning of it, Micha and Maacha is a change of vowel which could easily come in in the course of transmission, but she's the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah. And that is what is given as the mother of Abijah. Now is the mother of Asa given in Chronicles? I don't think it is. In 15 and 16 it merely says and also Maachah the mother of Asa the king he removed from being queen, but it doesn't say who her father is, but that does say Maachah, and this says Michaiah the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah. Are we going to say now Chronicles is right, Asa's mother is Maachah, Abijah's mother is Michaiah the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah. And Kings is right when it says that Asa's mother is Maachah the daughter of Abishalom. Adding to Chronicles the name of her father. And that Kings is wrong when it says that Abijam's mother is Maachah the Abishalom, that there has an error come in in copying and the name of the mother of Asa has gotten put in an earlier place as also being the mother of Abijam. Are we going to say that? It's possible. If so, there is a scribal error here. Do Maachah and Michaiah being such similar names, the scribe got down to where he was going to copy Michaiah the daughter of Uriel and he made a mistake and he copied from the next page the mother of Asa, Maachah the daughter of Abishalom, and so that got copied under the father's name. That's a possibility. It's an error in transmission. It is what the (8 3/4)

It's a possibility. I do not

think it's an extremely probably thing, it seems to me it'd be much easier to get the second name wrong than the first in copying, you copy the first, you have it in mind, you get to the second and you might copy the first over again in the second place, but to copy the second back in the first, that seems to me rather unlikely, so that does not seem to me to be the correct answer but it is a possibility. Yes? (student. 9¹/₄)

2 Chron. 11:20 says Rehoboam loved Maachah the daughter of Absalom above all his wives

and concubines, and Rehoboam made Abijah the son of Maachah the chief to be ruler among his brethren. Well now that (student.9 3/4) You mean whether Absalom and Abishalom are the same? Well, I would say this, that when we say Absalom the Hebrew is Abshalom, so the s of our Absalom represents an sh, so the only difference between Absalom and Abishalom is having the i in between. The consonants are identical. The i there poses a little problem, my guess is they're the same. I wouldn't be dogmatic about it because of the i. But when you read in Chronicles that Rehoboam loved Maachah the daughter of Abishalom above his wives and his 60 concubines he loved her above all the rest of them and he made Abijah the son of Maachah to be ruler among his brethren, when you have all that detail about Rehoboam and Abijah, that certainly would sound as if Maachah the daughter of Abishalom was the mother of Abijah rather than that there is a mistake at that point in Kings and that (11)

That would sound very

much that way, and if that's the case, where Kings says the mother of Abijah was Micaiah the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah, wasn't it, when it says that my inclination would be to think that in some ways those were the same, that is the Micaiah and the Maachah can easily be the same. And the Uriel and the Absalom would not be the same individuals certainly, but it could be that one was called by her father's name and one by her grandfather's, something like that. That would be easily possible. And so it would seem to me entirely possible that the first one actually is Maachah. In that case, however, you have the problem of the second, and in that case somebody suggested to me after class last time, that when it says Asa's mother it doesn't mean his mother, it means his father. And I thought that would be a very unlikely interpretation because a man is designated, the son of such a man is designated by his mother. Now it might conceivably be his grandmother on his mother's side but to put in the mother on the father's side would certainly be a very abnormal, unusual thing to do, but in this case there is a reason why it might be the right thing to do and that is this, that this Maachah is prominent, she's the one he removed from being queen on account of her idolatry. Well, if he was such a very good man, they don't usually have mothers who are idolaters like that. It would seem to me that it might very well be that she was the queen-mother, she was

actually his grandmother who was removed because of her idolatry and that made her prominent and for that reason it came about that when they mentioned him, instead of listing his own mother that his father's mother was mentioned. Now that's a possibility. Between the two we can't say which it is. Now it's not tremendously important which it is, but it is important that we recognize the fact that belief in verbal inspiration does not mean that we know all the details of ancient history, it does not mean that, it does mean that there is much that we are absolutely positive about, we can stand upon, but that there are other matters that we simply do not know, and in this case, I, at the present moment, do not see any way, I see no way to interpret it without there being a scribal error unless it be that it is giving his father's mother for this reason of her being so important in having been the one removed. Now maybe that's the case, and in that case you can take it that the text is preserved as it originally was, maybe so. Yes? (student.14) That would look very much like it, very much like it. In that case, I would expect, when it says Abijah's son became king, and his mother was so-and-so, that it was his own mother, rather than give the name of Abijah's mother...

O.T.History 278. (1/2)

...but it might be that the scribe did it that way, that full mention of Maachah the daughter of Absalom looks very much like that. Yes? (3/4) student) No, it would throw us back that there was an error in the copying of one mother's name, and if you can avoid that I think it ^{is to the} ~~would-be~~ good, I think it's probably best to say that is probably what happened. And that it isn't an error. But there are such errors. There's no question about it but the errors are not in the original, they are in the transmission. But the number of them is often greatly exaggerated, and it is very good suggestion that this is not an error but simply a different use, a very strange use, to mention his father's mother instead. It's a very strange use, one I know of no parallel to, and yet one that due to her prominence, might very well be. I think there is a good possibility that it is.

Well Asa's act here is part of the history of his righteousness. He followed the

Lord, There is in Chronicles an account of an act in Asa's early life that is not even mentioned in Kings. It says in Chronicles that Zerah the Ethiopian came against Asa with a host of 100,000 and 300 chariots and Asa went out against him to battle. And Asa cried to the Lord and said Lord it's nothing with thee to help, whether with many or with them that have no power, help us, O Lord our God, for we rest on thee, and in thy name we go against this multitude. O Lord, thou art our God, let not man prevail against thee. So the Lord smote the Ethiopians before Asa, and before Judah, and the Ethiopians fled. There is an account, with three more verses in it, of a great victory which Asa had had over vastly superior forces, simply through his trust in the Lord, which is in Chronicles and not in Kings at all, a great story of Asa's goodness in Chronicles not in Kings. Most of the critics take the attitude Kings is fairly reliable history, Chronicles is late and unreliable. We of course do not take that attitude, we say, here, there is additional information about Asa, which the author of Kings did not include in his book, but which the Chronicles gives us. It fits in though here with the character, the good character, of Asa designated in Kings. Not like what Chronicles tells us about his father, which doesn't at first sight fit with what Kings tells us. Yes? (student. 3 1/2)

The authorship of both is unknown. The Kings was evidently, clearly not originally, neither of the books, was written entirely by one man because they cover a much bigger period than one man's life. In both of them the man had to have sources. But in Kings, the critics say that Kings is written from the viewpoint of the prophet and Chronicles from the viewpoint of the priest. That's what the critics say. I don't think they could prove their point, but this we can all agree on. Kings is an early book and Chronicles is a much later one. (student. 4 1/2) Is it after the exile? That is quite generally assumed in this case, I'm not sure we can dogmatically say that it is, but I certainly would not feel that we're in a position to disprove it. The bulk of the material in Chronicles is put in the book of Chronicles long after the events described, unquestionably, and so is Kings. But whether it was actually after the exile, I don't know. Most of the critics would say it was long after the exile. I think Dr. Albright thinks it was the author of the book of Ezra that wrote, I think he feels it's the same author. Well, it doesn't make a great deal of difference who wrote it, if it's God's Word

and it's true. But I don't see any reason to doubt but what they ^{are} ~~was~~ at different times, with probably Chronicles much later. Yes? (student.5) I don't think that those are references to our Biblical book of Chronicles. I think that that means the word in Hebrew that's translated Chronicles, literally book of days. And I think that that was an official record kept, giving the events, and that the author of probably both books had access to it, and utilized it in their writings. But the author of Kings, assumed that that was available, because he says you want to know more about this king why it's in the book of the Chronicles ~~and~~ ^{of} the Kings of Judah. And that of course looks like an early date because after the destruction of the kingdom it wouldn't be available, I wouldn't think. At least there wouldn't be an official source like that.

Well, Chronicles then gives this extra additional material in favor of Asa. Now, both Chronicles and Kings tell of events that happened very late in the life of Asa. We find at the beginning ~~of~~ the 16th chapter of Chronicles where it says it was in the 35th year of the reign of Asa. Long after he became king. Baasha king of Israel came up against Judah and built Ramah, to the intent that he might let none go out or come in to Asa king of Judah. Then we have the account given us in both Kings and Chronicles of how Asa wrote to the king of Damascus, Ben-Hadad, and sent him silver and gold, and asked him to help him against Baasha. And then we find that Ben-hadad attacks Baasha from the other side and Ben-hadad had to take his forces to defend himself against the great attack of the king of Syria, and in so doing he left his southern end unprotected and Asa went with his army and destroyed the fortification that Baasha had made at Ramah, and took the material away from them and brought it into his own kingdom and built fortifications there, with this material. We have that told in both Kings and Chronicles, that he came back ~~and~~ that he took the stones of Ramah and their timber wherewith Baasha was building, and he built therewith Geba and Mizpah. That is he took the material from the fortifications on the Israel side, against him that were being built, and built fortifications on his side. Chronicles has one feature at this point which is not-- I mean Kings has one feature at this point, which is not in Chronicles.

Chronicles says he sent to Ben-hadad king of Syria, but Kings says that King Asa

sent to Ben-hadad the son of Tabrimon, the son of Hezion, king of Syria, sent to Ben-hadad the son of Tabrimon, the son of Hezion, king of Syria. In other words, it gives the father and grandfather of this man. Now in the bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, about 8 years ago, there came out an article about a monument which had been discovered in north Syria, a monument which was discovered there, which said a stela set up by Bar-hadad. And Bar-hadad is the Aramaic which would be translated into Hebrew as Ben-hadad. There's no doubt the man's name was not Ben-hadad, it was Bar-hadad. Ben-hadad is a Hebrew translation, that is, it keeps the name of the god, hadad, but it puts the son into Hebrew, ben, instead of in Aramaic, bar. Well, this says a stela set up by Bar-hadad, the son of, and then it is broken. It is broken. But there are some tracings of the name of the father and grandfather. And Dr. Albright who was then the editor of the bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research, on the basis of 1 Kings 15:18, says that this name of the father of Ben-hadad which has only traces of certain letters, that that could be interpreted as being Tabrimon, and the next one which has only one or two letters in it, could be filled out as being Ezion. And this you have a monument found which has a broken part with certain letters that you can read, but not enough to tell what it is. That is the names of the father and grandfather. You have a clear statement in the Bible on the basis of which you can reconstruct the stela. And then the stela in turn corroborates the Biblical statement. You see the situation? It is not a complete corroboration of the Biblical statement, because we do not have a full (10 1/2)

But we have the stela which we don't have any other suggestion for. And this fits perfectly, so it is a very interesting instance of the inter-relationship of the archeological evidence and the Biblical statement. It is a helpful corroboration but not a full corroboration of the Biblical statement. Now that stela is copied in your book **THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST**, on page 219. Pritchard says, the stela on which this inscription was discovered, apparently in 1939, in an ancient cemetery about 4 miles north of (11) Aleppo, — probably is not the place where it originally was. Probably the monument had been carried out and left there. He says, ^{it may} however have been originally set up somewhere in the neighborhood of Aleppo, its date from about 860 B.C. And I read

you the first part of it, it's a stela set up by Bar-hadad, the son of Tabrimon, the son of Ezion, king of Aram, which we translate Syria in our English Bibles, but the Hebrew is Aram, king of Aram, for his Lord Melqart, which he vowed to him and he (then) heard his voice. Now this stela is very interesting for the corroboration of this detail in connection with the life of Asa. It is also interesting to us for another reason which is of great importance, not ~~for~~ ^{with} the reign of Asa but ~~for~~ ^{with} the period of a few years later in Israel. And that is this, that Bar-hadad is the king of Aram which is the modern Syria with the capital in Damascus. But this stela which is found near the Mediterranean and which we now call Lebanon, is put up by the king of Syria, but it is for a god not of Syria but of Tyre, his Lord Melqart. The word Melqart is Melloch-aret (12 $\frac{1}{2}$) the king of the Tyre, and the king of the Tyre, Melqart is a name that is for the god of Tyre, that's not his name, I mean it's a designation, the Lord of the city. It is, we have other evidence of the name of the king of Tyre. Now to have a king of Syria putting up a monument in honor of the god of Tyre is a very interesting thing. What does it show about the god of Tyre. It shows he was a god, a proselyting god, it is very interesting in relation to our next event in the history, so keep it in mind, that this stela throws light and corroboration upon that feature, an extremely important thing, its full implications not yet visible, we'll come to that. I don't want to give it now because I give it again later. Yes? (student. 13 $\frac{1}{4}$. Was the monument to the honor of the king of Tyre or the God of Tyre?) The god of Tyre. The words mean king of the city (13 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Now Asa made this great victory there, not as a victory it wasn't, it was a matter of diplomacy, but a diplomacy which he followed up quickly, with going and seizing this material and moving ^{it} and building these fortifications, it was a very wise thing to do, it would seem, and we find it in Kings.

But in Chronicles after it tells about this, it proceeds to tell us something else that wasn't in Kings. We've noticed how Chronicles tells us good things about Asa that aren't in Kings. Now it tells a bad thing. It says that after he did that Hanani appears. Hanani, the seer, a prophet, came to Asa and said because thou hast relied

on the king of Syria and not relied on the Lord thy God, therefore is the host of the king of Syria escaped out of thine hand. Were not the Ehtioptions and the Lubims a huge host, yet because thou didst rely on the Lord, he delivered them into thine hand. For the eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to shew himself strong in the behalf of them whose heart is perfect toward him...

O.T.History 279. (1¹/₄)

...foolishly, therefore from henceforth thou shalt have wars. Then Asa was wroth with the seer and put him in a prison house, for he was in a rage with him because of this thing, And Asa oppressed some of the people/the same time. Now that's Chronicles.

Kings says, Asa's heart was right with the Lord all his days. Chronicles says the Lord's prophet rebuked him and he was angry with the prophet and threw him in prison. And then Chronicles goes on and says and Asa in the 39th year of his reign was diseased in his feet, until his disease was exceeding great. Kings tells us that also. Kings says in chapter 15, the rest of the acts of Asa and all his might and all that he did, ~~ad~~ and all the cities he built, are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah? Nevertheless in the time of his old age he was diseased in his feet. That's all Kings says. But Chronicles says his disease was exceeding great, yet in his disease he sought not to the Lord but to the physicians. And Asa slept with his fathers and died in the 41st year of his reign. So you have Chronicles telling us ^{good} ~~this~~ things about Asa's father that Kings doesn't tell us, and telling you bad things about Asa that Kings doesn't tell us. And to get the full picture you need to put the two together. Asa as a good king, a king after the Lord's own heart, he did in the good deeds of David his father, but like David he had his bad features, not nearly as bad as David. But he had his bad features, he came into conflict with this particular prophet, he put him in prison, the prophet rebuked him for his ^{scheming} ~~being~~ there instead of trusting the Lord. And then Chronicles says that when he had this disease of his feet, he looked to the physicians instead of to the Lord. Now does that mean that when we get a disease we should never go to any physician? We should go to the Lord for it. Well if our physicians

were no better today than they were in those days, perhaps we would be very foolish to go to them for much help. I'm sure that the physicians didn't know very much in those days, they knew a little, but they have been gaining constantly in knowledge but there still is a tremendous lot that the physicians don't know. And if you put your trust in physicians instead of putting your trust in the Lord, you are making a very, very great mistake. But that doesn't mean that you should not avail yourself of the best information that physicians have. There's many, many a thing can be wrong with you that a physician can immediately tell what you need, and you're very, very foolish not to avail yourself of it. And there are many other things that could be wrong that the physician has not the slightest idea of what to do. Of course in such a case if he's a very, very business man he'll tell you so, but if he's a good business man as most of them are, he'll look very, very wise and give you a pill that is perfectly harmless, at least we hope it's harmless, and know that nature will cure you three chances out of four. And we, the Lord wants us to utilize the best that physicians or scientists of any type have available and it would be perfectly silly and wrong for a Christian to fail to avail himself of what people have learned of God's handiwork, but we should not put our trust in physicians, or in fact in any kind of scientist. Our trust must be in the Lord, because with the best that human men can do there is a tremendous lot they don't know and there are many points where things can go completely wrong despite the best they can do or can work out right in spite of the worst they can do. And our trust must be in the Lord. So the rebuke of Asa here is a correct rebuke and a rebuke which any of us need if we put our trust in the physician but it must not be taken to lead us to think that we should not avail ourselves of whatever the physicians know. (student.4 $\frac{1}{2}$. Well, it seems to me that it means here that he completely ignored the Lord. In other words a Christian would go to a doctor, even if it were incurable, cancer, and there's nothing a doctor could do, he'd still probably go to a doctor, to alleviate any pain. But at the same time he'd put his trust in the Lord. So this could mean that he just completely ignored the Lord.) It looks to me that it must mean that. It's a bit hard to believe because he is listed as such a godly man all through. (student.5 $\frac{1}{4}$. Do you feel that he ^{it}

was wrong that he did not seek the Lord in helping him?) Well, the Lord sent a prophet to say so, I think it must have been. (student. 5¼. We're not told, though, that, could it not be possible that God he sought help from his allies in the case of his enemy, but at the same time)5½. Well, it wasn't really an allie. He asked this & silver to do it, man to break his alliance with Baasha, and he sent him a lot of gold, and I would think that here, since the prophet rebuked him here, the work would have (5:75) in another way. I would think a mistake here. I would definitely think so in that case, because we have the rebuke given.

Well now, we've touched on a number of things about Asa. Probably some of you would get them better if I had numbered them, a, b, c, d, e, f, g, and h. And you could give me the 8 different things about Asa that we have discussed, but in this case I did not write them down, a, b, c, d, e, f, g, and h, but I hope that you will remember all of them, because they are all important. Asa was succeeded by a Godly son. Asa and his son, Jehoshaphat are two ~~ama~~ of the best men in the whole history of Judah. No question of that. They are two of the very best men in the Bible. Asa and Jehoshaphat. And they both had long reigns. Now we are not now dealing with Jehoshaphat. We will look at him later, but I want you to have it in mind, that Asa was succeeded by a very godly & good man, who made errors as Asa did, but he was a good man, a godly man, at least so the Bible says here. Then C, I shouldn't say at least so, I should say that's what the Bible says. It's not I who am saying it. I'm not drawing a judgment. I'm repeating to you the judgment the Bible gives. 7¼

C, The First Two Dynasties of Israel. We have covered a period of 90 years in Judah. How many dynasties have we dealt with in Judah? We've dealt with one dynasty, we have dealt with three kings of the same dynasty. But during the same period in Israel there were two dynasties. Now what is a dynasty? A dynasty is a rather loose term, but in general it means a group of related kings. That's the general meaning. A group of kings who succeed one another, who as a rule are father to son or close relationship, so there is no sharp break between them. It is pretty unlikely that you'd call two the same dynasty if they were not related. But certainly you wouldn't if one ~~one~~ of them

killed the other and started a new line. I don't think you'd ordinarily call one king a dynasty. I believe it takes two kings as a rule to use the term dynasty. Well, here is 90 years and you've still got the same dynasty in Judah. But in Israel you already have two dynasties. And the first of these is the dynasty of Jeroboam.

1, The Dynasty of Jeroboam. Under him I have divided into a,b,c,d.

a, Jeroboam becomes king. We've already noticed how Ahijah of Shiloh went to Jeroboam and told him he was to be king and then Jeroboam had to flee to Egypt. We've noticed that. Then we have noticed how when Solomon died they brought Jeroboam back from Egypt and head up the opposition to Rehoboam and how he became king.

b, Jeroboam Forsakes the Lord. Jeroboam, we read in 1 Kings here, turns against the Lord. He was anxious, his interest seems to have been primarily political. He was anxious to be a strong king, and he knew that if all his people kept going down to Jerusalem to worship, it would be easy for Rehoboam to win a great many of them back. And so he said we don't want you to go to Jerusalem to worship and he put up golden calves, one up at Dan in the extreme north of the Kingdom, to draw the people northward instead of southward, down to Jerusalem. The other one he put at Bethel in the extreme south of his kingdom to stop the people on their way to Jerusalem. And he said these are your gods, O Israel, that brought you out of the land of Egypt. Yes? (student,10). I was just wondering, did he have in his possession a copy of the law? I mean, think how that was condemned when it was done by Aaron, how would they do it again? Yes, he had that in his possession but he probably was like most people are, they read the parts of the Bible they liked and the others they more or less ignored (10 $\frac{1}{4}$)

and it's an amazing thing how you can go through the New Testament and note the references to the second coming of Christ and it's just over and over and over and over. I challenge anybody to go through the New Testament with a pencil and mark all references to the return of Christ and not be amazed at the number that you will find, and yet the number of godly Christian ministers who have preached the true gospel, month after month, and year after year, and never once given a sermon on the return of Christ, is tremendous. It's there, they read it but they don't notice it, they pass over it, it's very, very

easy to do. Jeroboam did much worse than that because this is not a matter of many individual references but of one very extremely stressed reference. And then of course you have the ten commandments, the second is they are not to make any graven image. And he broke the second commandment. Well, there's nobody living hasn't broken one of the commandments. Jeroboam broke the second, but did Jeroboam think of himself as breaking the first? That question might be raised whether he did or not. He certainly believed in the exodus from Egypt, he said these are your gods that brought you out of Egypt. An argument can be made that he did not think he was breaking the first commandment. Dr. Albright suggests, on the basis of some monuments we have in northern Syria where we have statues of animals with God standing on top of them, that what Jeroboam meant was that these golden calves were the foundation, the pedestal on which the invisible God of Israel took his stand. Now that is a theory that Dr. ~~Abur~~^{Albright} advances on the basis of statues which we have in northern Syria, showing animals with God standing on their backs. It is not a proven theory, but it is at least worth noting as a possibility. Now these chapters here speak in very strong condemnatory terms of Jeroboam. What was the greatest ~~condemnation~~? Was it that he set the worship up there instead of in Jerusalem? Was it that he made the statues? Was it from his turning away from many parts of the law? What was the outstanding feature of the condemnation? We are left with a certain amount of ignorance on it. ~~But what~~ he was an evil man who turned away from God, is clearly taught in the Bible and we read at the end of chapter 13 that he took of the lowest of the people and made them priests of the high places. Whoever he picked out he consecrated, he did not have the family of Aaron to be the priests, he picked out people to be the priest, and this thing became sin unto the house of Jeroboam, even to cut it off, and to destroy it from off the face of the earth. That's b, Jeroboam forsakes the Lord.

c, The Prophet from Judah. And we'll have to wait till tomorrow morning to look at that.

...announcement of the assignment for this week, there was nothing to hand in this time but for yesterday to have the incidents in the rest of 1 Kings well in mind, and for this afternoon I gave a series of Hebrew verses. Now the Middlers and Seniors will have no difficulty whatever with those verses, once you've done one of them you know them all, because there is the same formula used in all of them, you get the construction of one, see how the English Bible translates it, or see what the meaning is of that particular idiom that fits in the context and it's the same all through. Now two of those I underlined. On one case there were two verses in one chapter and I underlined the second of those. In the other case there was only one verse in the chapter and I underlined it. Those two I wanted to be sure you know the numbers. You may not all know Hebrew numerals (14) and it may be that it says he reigned 45 years and you'll read it 63. Well, that's not nearly as bad an error to say 63 for 45 as it is to fail to get the main idiom of the verse, which is common all through. And you ought to all know the numerals but that's not our primary interest now. But I do want everybody to know the numerals that are in those two verses without question or failure. Now that assignment is not due until noon today. I won't give you a test on it at noon today, I might later on. The Juniors not having so much Hebrew as the others, may find that that number of verses is too many to go over, but if they have the two thoroughly that are underlined, that certainly would be easy for them to do, and if they have those two thoroughly then the others there, why they could at least get the idiom of the verse, if I should call for one of them, even if they didn't know the numerals, so I hope everybody will have those two, at least, in good thorough shape and the Middlers and Seniors have the rest of them also in tolerable shape. And that is the assignment for today then, and naturally there are one or two here that haven't had Hebrew yet, I believe, and we won't expect them to know the Hebrew if they haven't started it. But that's the rare exception of course. Because this class requires Hebrew as a prerequisite and it is only under special arrangement that it is permitted to take it now and receive credit for it after they have learned the Hebrew. Now we were discussing yesterday the reign of Asa.

And we noticed a good many interesting and important things about Asa's reign. There probably are many people in our churches who would have no recollection of ever having heard the name of Asa, but we notice in Kings and Chronicles how many important historical questions there are, we notice one very important archeological matter, and we notice a number of very important questions from the viewpoint of their spiritual lesson, or of the teaching for us, in connection with the life of Asa. I didn't number those ^{a, b, c, d} ~~in sequence~~ in connection with Asa, but I trust you will all have them in mind, so that if in the final exam I should ask that you discuss the reign of Asa, nobody would omit any of the various matters that we discussed yesterday in class.

Now we went on from there to capital C, The First Two Dynasties of Israel, which of course occupied the same time as the first three kings of Judah. And under that we had looked at 1, The ^Dynasty of Jeroboam; a, Jeroboam Becomes King; b, Jeroboam Forsakes the Lord. And then we come to c, The Prophet from Judah. And this, he is called the prophet from Judah because he is not named in the Bible. It just says a man of God out of Judah. It is found in the 13th chapter of 1 Kings. It would be a good idea if you would open either your English or Hebrew Bible at this point, to 1 Kings 13.

And, behold, there came a man of God out of Judah by the word of the Lord to Bethel. You all know where Bethel is. It is the southernmost important place in the northern kingdom. And Bethel, you also of course recall, is the place where Jacob had his vision of God. Where he saw the ladder stretched up to heaven, a very appropriate place then for Jeroboam to put up his false worship. A place which was holy because of the fact that God had revealed himself there. The very name Bethel means House of God. But this place is polluted by the fact that Jeroboam puts up his wicked altar there, worship is supposed to all be in Jerusalem, and he there puts up the golden calf. But this man of God came up to Bethel and got there when Jeroboam was there, standing by the altar to burn incense. And we read in verse 2 that the man of God cried against the altar in the word of the Lord. God gave this man a message to give and the man gave it in the rhetorical form of addressing the altar. He said, O altar, alter, thus saith the Lord, behold, a child shall be born unto the house of David, Josiah by name, and upon thee shall he offer the priests of the high places that burn incense upon thee, and

men's bones shall be burnt upon thee. This is a terrible thing that is declared here by the prophet, against this altar. This altar which is the center of worship for the northern kingdom is going to be polluted, men's bones are going to be burned upon it, and this is going to be done by order of a child born to the house of David named Josiah. The man of God does not tell us when this will be fulfilled. We know of course that Josiah came about 200 years after this time, that there's a long period in between. Now suppose instead of saying a child shall be born unto the house of David, he said a child shall be born unto the house of Jeroboam. What would the implication of it be? The implication that Jeroboam's house would still be important when this time came. But he doesn't say when it will come, we know it's 200 years later. But the most important part of this prophecy is the fact that these things will be done under the order of a man who belongs to the house of David. He gives it in the reign of Jeroboam, 200 years pass by. The house of David is still reigning in the land of Judah. In the land of Israel, when that happens, there have already been four dynasties and a number of kings unrelated to any one of them. One dynasty continuing all that time in the southern kingdom, four dynasties one after the other and then various unrelated kings, before this time takes place when this happens. And thus this comparatively simple prediction which he makes which seems to be simply a prediction of pollution of the altar is actually a carrying forward of God's promises to David, that David will have a son to sit upon his throne. Four dynasties in the northern kingdom, one continuous all this time in the southern kingdom. Now he says what the name of this man is going to be. It is going to be Josiah. It gives a man's name 200 years in advance. The critics say that it is impossible that the second part of Isaiah be written by Isaiah because it gives the name of King Cyrus, twice it names Cyrus the king of the Persians. And they say that you couldn't have a king's name given 200 years in advance. And we say, yes, if you believe in God, God could declare anything ^{as long} in advance as he wanted, he certainly knows the future from the past. He knows everything and he can do it, and then they become very pious and say oh, of course, we believe that God knows everything in advance, but they say it's contrary to the analogy of the prophecy. Prophecy does not give names in advance,

they say, and when they say that they say it with such a great air of tremendous knowledge and scholarship, the average conservative is simply overawed and says oh, that's right, that's right, it can't be by the one Isaiah, instead of looking back into the scripture and saying well look at here, at Josiah's name is predicted 200 years in advance. It is not alone in prophecy to have Cyrus's name given 400 years in advance. Josiah's name is given 200 years in advance. It's not merely that God could do that if he chose, God does do it in this case. Now of course some of the conservatives will go on beyond that, they'll say yes and Christ is given in advance, it says in Isaiah that he shall bear a son and I shall call his name Immanuel. Well, that sort of argument just beclouds the issue, because it is a wonderful prediction of Christ given there, but the name Immanuel is a descriptive name, it was not a personal name, which he bore on earth here. And it is not an argument in this connection, but it is used by most conservatives in this connection. I think there are the two errors we need to avoid, one is of accepting the statements of the liberal without investigating the facts. Because time and time again when they make their unbelieving statements, you look into the facts and you find that the answer is right there, that when you get all the facts, their arguments simply don't stand up. It's an error for us to avoid, thinking that simply by talk and by discussion we can answer them, or by appeal to emotions. We must get the facts and give the facts, and in most cases the facts are there. But the second error into which many of us fall is that we don't make a few clear strong facts that give the answer, but we add to it a lot of other arguments, which confuse the issue. If you will give against an opponent six excellent arguments, and one very, very shaky one, if he's a good debater he'll take the shaky one and pay no attention to your six good ones, and when he gets through making fun of your shaky one, people decide that your intelligence is no good whatever. It's much better to leave out our shaky arguments, and stick to the solid ones and make them strong and clear. And so Immanuel is a wonderful prediction of Christ but it's not in a category with this. It describes his character, while Josiah is a specific name which this king of the house of David has.

Now this is a prediction here ^{of} what's going to happen to that altar and the predict-

ion ~~of~~ that the man of God gave was fulfilled 200 years later. And when it was fulfilled somebody might say well look here, here is the proof this man of God was a true follower of the Lord, the Lord spoke through him, he was God's prophet because God enabled him to give this prediction and he fulfilled it. But somebody answer and says no, look here, here's a man named Josiah, how do we know that his father didn't read this prediction and just give him the name Josiah in order to fulfill the prediction? How do we know that? And then Josiah commanded them to take and burn men's bones on this altar, well he's read the prediction, he knew about it, he's just purposely fulfilled it. What's the good, as far as evidence is concerned, of a prediction that a man just purposely fulfills? How does that prediction prove anything? Well, I hope the answer is obvious to most of us. Suppose that he had said, altar, altar, King Rehoboam of the house of David is going to burn men's bones on you. What do you think Jeroboam would have said? Jeroboam would have said, I'd like to see him do it. Jeroboam had three-fourths of Israel in his kingdom, He had ten tribes. Rehoboam only had one, though that one was a big strong one. It was not over a third the force of Jeroboam. Jeroboam had his power (13 $\frac{1}{2}$) Rehoboam fought and could not overcome him. Jeroboam, his force was much too small. This was in Jeroboam's kingdom and to say that Rehoboam of the house of David, is going to do this would have been utter nonsense. That is unless the Lord intervened, with remarkable power, in a way that he did not

(14) of Rehoboam.

The prediction is made that when there is a king of the house of David named Josiah, at that time it will be possible for him to come up here and do this. And so the fact is that the northern kingdom is destroyed by the mighty power of Assyria in 722 B. C. and some years after that, when Josiah is king, it is possible to get in there because the land has been destroyed. The Assyrians aren't guarding it very closely. Their center of power is far away. And so that the prediction is fulfilled by the Assyrian conquest of Israel which nobody ever would have dreamed of reading the prophecy, but when it takes place you see how it happened. And then...

...of the house of David and that means that through these 200 years the house of David continues to be the ruling force in Judah ($\frac{1}{2}$) all these different dynasties. No human being could know that would have happened. And no man could make that happen, that was God's providence that worked that out, over 200 years. So that those two elements of the prophecy are the divine prediction that no man could have brought to pass. And then of course in addition to that, how would somebody know that Josiah this man 200 years later, would be a man who'd want to fulfill the prediction. He might be like Julian the apostate, the Roman emperor, who desired to make prophecy prove false. He might be an indifferent fellow who didn't want to bother. The fact the prophecy says Josiah's going to do it, even if Josiah purposely did it, it still is a proof of the divine knowledge. Well, now as far as Jeroboam and the northern kingdom was concerned, this prophecy is not much of an evidence that their worship ($1\frac{1}{4}$)

Because after all, they have to believe in God's Word to have faith it's going to happen, it happens 200 years later, it is no evidence now, just what a man says. Unless they believe in God they don't need ($1\frac{3}{4}$) this evidence. If they don't believe in Him they don't accept it. The value of this evidence is 200 years later when it happened. And you look back and see what happened, and that God was in it. But that's not all that happened. This man of God, we read in verse 3, gave a sign the same day, saying this is the sign the Lord has spoken. Behold the altar shall be rent and the ashes upon it shall be poured out. He has given one sign that will be fulfilled 200 years later. Now he gives another sign--300 years later--now he gives a second sign. The second sign is the altar will be broken and the ashes on it will poured out. Well, that could happen to any altar. If you have ever camped out, like I like to do, and if you had done like I used to do, take some stones and build up sort of a little fireplace with the stones, and put your fire right in the middle of it and put your kettle across two big stones, so that the fire comes up between, and heat your dinner, why you've had the experience I'm sure, because I used to have it occasionally, that when your fire is good and hot and the stuff is nearly cooked and you're looking forward to a good meal pretty soon, all of a sudden you hear the explosion of a gun it sounds like. You hear

a terrible explosion and one of the rocks just splits in two. The heat there heats up the outside of the rock, the temperature becomes so different from that of the inside that the strain is too great, and the rock holds on as long as it can, and when it can't hold any longer it just breaks with a bang and your kettles and everything turn over and dump your food on the ashes, and you eventually if you're like me decide to give up that sort of arrangement for cooking your food. I put mine directly on the wood now (3 3/4)

even though it does dirty the pans a lot worse.

But for an altar with a fire under it constantly to break like that is nothing that requires supernatural power of God. It's just something which probably happened every now and then. But in this case, it happened right away. The supernatural element here is the timing. Now the prophet doesn't say it's going to happen right away but the prophet, when he's given a prediction 200 years later and it isn't fulfilled, now he gives a prediction and Jeroboam immediately is frightened because he knows that this might happen to any stone altar and the prediction is made, now suppose it breaks. Everybody will think this prophet here is right and Jeroboam is wrong. And he doesn't like this and so we read in verse 4 that when king Jeroboam heard the saying of the man of God, that he put forth his hand from the altar, saying, Lay hold on him. And his hand which he put forth against him, dried up, so that he could not pull it in again. There was a supernatural act of God, the Lord touched the little nerve in his brain in that instant so that it couldn't operate and his hand ^{that} was sticking out there couldn't come in again. It was obvious to everybody that Jeroboam was in a bad plight. And just as that happened, the altar was torn, the ashes poured out from the altar according to the sign the man of God had given. So we find in verse 5 that the king shows his penitence. The king in the face of the divine power repents, but as you read on about Jeroboam you find he didn't repent, he merely pretended to. He thought here was a power we must submit to, or risk disaster. He's like so many a man who does not have true repentance in his heart but who tried to use religion for his own end. ~~The~~

The Bolshevik government did its best to destroy religion in Russia. They made it a crime to even tell your own children that there's a God. And it is today a crime to do so. That is counter-revolution to tell your own children that there's a God. The

constitution of Russia guarantees religious freedom to perform religious ceremonies. It does not guarantee freedom of religious propaganda. It guarantees freedom to perform religious ceremonies and freedom for anti-religious propaganda, but no freedom for religious propaganda. That is considered counter-revolution. And a man may be thrown into torture because he tells his own children that there's a God. And the Communists did their best to destroy religion in Russia. But they found they could not destroy it, it was too deeply rooted in the minds of the people, how much of it is real religion, how much of it is superstition I don't know, can't tell, but the belief there is a great number of people who have a thorough-going superstition and there are certainly many true believers in Russia. And being unable to root it out, they decided to use it, so they infiltrated the offices with their secret police, putting them in the top positions of the church and they use it for their ends, for their purpose.

Rehoboam faced with this thing, knowing that he will go down before it, prefers to try to compromise with it. And it is a mighty good thing for us to figure out in each case, is here true repentance, or is here an attempt to use religion. Even if there is an attempt to use religion it is good for us to use for the glory of God such advantages as we can get through that, but certainly not to trust those who are guilty of that attitude. And so the king, we read in verse 6, answered and said to the man of God, pray for me, intreat now the face of the Lord thy God, and pray for me, that my hand may be restored me again. And the man of God besought the Lord, and the king's hand was restored again and became as it was before. And this had a twofold effect, as far as Jeroboam was concerned it had a good effect, He had the full use of his hand again, but as far as the people at large were concerned, it was another evidence that the prophet spoke from God. First the king's hand was made ^{helpless} ~~hearth~~, now in response to the prophet's prayer, the king's hand is again made able to work. And so the king, in verse 7, sees that now the thing to do, if you can't destroy them it's good to join them. If you can't destroy the religion that this man from Judah represents, then he should make the man a buttress for his own force. And so the king said to the man, come home with me and refresh thyself and I will give thee a reward. Isn't that wonderful? A man who has

been a shepherd, a man who has never had much promise, much luxury, here he has a chance to eat at the king's table, to get a reward from the king, to tell his friends all the rest of his life he actually ate with the king of Israel, had the great honors given to him, what a wonderful privilege for the man of Judah. But in this case it is a privilege given for Jeroboam's purpose. And the man of Judah refuses to let himself be used that way. And so the man of God said to the king if you give me half your house I won't go in with you, nor will I eat bread nor drink water in this place. For so it was charged me by the word of the Lord, saying, eat no bread, nor drink water, nor turn again by the same way that thou camest. And so the king was unable to lead the man astray. The great leader of the forces of evil used his efforts to lead the man astray, and he failed.

So Satan, unable to use a bad man for the purpose, decided to use a good man for the purpose, and succeeded in his effort. The king man of God then went another way and started back for home. And now we read how Satan, failing to succeed in using a bad man for his purpose, proceeds to use a good man for his purpose.

Now there dwelt an old prophet in Bethel. Some people say this is a false prophet, what right do we have to read that into the scripture? If we have evidence somewhere that he's a false prophet, yes, but what evidence do we have that he is a false prophet? Well, he told a lie. Yes, he told a lie, but if everybody who ever told a lie is a false person--if everybody who ever told a lie is not a Christian, then there's not a Christian in the world. Every man had his sin, every man has his faults, we should avoid them, we should flee from them, we should pray God to deliver us from them, but we should recognize that other people are fallible and weak as we are, and that God has to use pretty weak instruments for his purpose, or he wouldn't have any to use. The important difference is not that this is perfect, and this person has sin. Because we all have sin. The important difference is that ^{David} they,--that when they falls, repents sincerely and tries to go forward and serve the Lord, while other men who were twice as good as David, as the Lord considers goodness, are proud of their own goodness and go forward doing what they consider to be right, and don't have that tenderness of heart in seeking the Lord's will that David had. And so here we have an old prophet who did lie, but as over

against that we have that God ~~spoke~~ through him, God gave him a message which was fulfilled, and I think that quite overshadowed the other as far as proof he's a true prophet. Personally my opinion is that the old prophet of Bethel was a fine old man who had stood for the Lord and done a wonderful work in his day but ^{now} he was old and crippled up with arthritis and he couldn't get out to see the things that were happening, he only heard them from his sons and there in the quiet of his home where nobody'd hear what he'd say, he was always saying to his sons, well, now if I was young~~r~~ if I had my strength I used to have, I'd stand up and tell Jeroboam what to do. And they'd look at him and they'd say well it's good that he is kind of weak because I don't think he'd have the courage, if he actually had the physical (12 3/4) he talks about now that he is in this condition. But they didn't say that to his face. But the old prophet is there and the sons came in and told what the Lord had done through the man of God that day. The sons came in and said Dad, you're always talking about the good old days when there were prophets who were ready to face the king and stand for the truth, you should have been down there in the main square today and seen what happened. You should have seen this man from Judah who came up here, who actually faced the king and told him the truth and the king invited him to have dinner with him and he wouldn't do it, you would have seen a great example of loyalty to the Lord. And the father immediately thought oh I've got to have some Christian fellowship with that man, I've got to. So the father said which way did he go? And the sons had noticed which way he went and he said to the sons saddle me the ass. They saddled him the ass and he went after the man of God. He found him, he'd gotten away from town a little ways, he was tired, ~~he~~ was a heavy strain he'd gone through and so when he got away from the town he sat down under an oak. There he was resting. And the worst time in the life of a Christian worker, the time of greatest danger is right after he had done a great service to the Lord. Right after he has given a wonderful evangelistic message. Right after he has made a remarkable testimony, right after he's faced the forces of evil and stood true. Then he's tired and there's a reaction. There may be loneliness and there may be weakness. And that's the time the devil may get ahold of him as he did of Elijah later on. And so the man

was now just sitting resting, which is perfectly all right, but in that condition the prophet comes up to him and says, are you the man of God who came from Judah, and he said I am. He says come home with me and have lunch with me, and the prophet said I can't go back with you, nor go in with you, I can't eat bread or water, even water, in this place, because it was said to me by the word of the Lord, thou shalt eat no bread nor drink water there, nor turn again to go by the way that thou camest.

O.T.History 282. (1¹/₄)

~~...as to actual acceptance of it, I would incline to think that there might be circumstances under which that would be an excellent answer but that in this case that he was~~ ...he said I'm a prophet as you are and an angel spoke to me by the word of the Lord, saying, bring him back with thee to thine house, that he may eat bread and drink water. But he lied to him. The prophet said well now what's the harm in just a little white lie. He said, of course he shouldn't eat with the king, that was wonderful of him, to refuse to compromise with this leader of the forces of iniquity, that was wonderful. But now I'm a prophet too. I'm standing for the Lord the way he is. Of course I'm in a different organization than he is, I'm in an organization that's loyal to the king, but I don't really feel like the organization does, he said. There's no reason he shouldn't have fellowship with me now. And I'll just tell him that an angel spoke to me and I think an angel probably would say this if he did come and speak to me. I'm not really telling a lie, but just leading a man to give me some Christian fellowship that I need so badly. And so he tells what he thinks is a white lie but which means the death of the other man. It leads to his death, the fact that this man told him what he thought, and there's a mighty strong warning for us there, that what seems to us perfectly harmless, can lead to death, if we don't watch out. We should obey the word of the Lord and follow it, seek His objectives. And even though it would be wonderful to have some good fellowship, if the Lord's work is not helped by it, let's abide in our room rather than lead someone astray. So he tells them that, and of course as soon as he heard that the angel had told him, then of course he knew it was all right. How many people there are, which take anybody else's word for anything,

just so they say (2 $\frac{1}{4}$)

and they say that

they've gotten it from the Lord, why I read it in the Bible, look here, the Bible says so-and-so, ~~re/d~~ Well, you read it for yourself. Don't take somebody's word for it, they may be taking it out of context. They may be grabbing one verse and building a whole system on it. Study it for yourself. Anyway he was touched, and so he went back with him. And what a relief to relax, sit back in a chair, no king to face, no wicked

(2 3/4)

He doesn't have to sit out under a tree, he sits in a comfortable chair, and they bring him some ice water to drink and he relaxes, feels comfortable, and then they bring in a nice lunch, and as they sit there at the table the man who brought him back looks him in the face and says thus says the Lord, Forasmuch as thou hast disobeyed the mouth of the Lord, and hast not kept the commandment which the Lord thy God commanded thee, But camest back, and hast eaten bread and drunk water in the place, of which the Lord did say to eat no bread and drink no water, thy carcass shall not come unto the sepulchre of thy father. You're going to die before you ever get home. And the prophet sits there and he hears this man rebuking him and it's the very man who has prevailed on him to come back. He now gives him the word of the Lord. And when somebody persuades you to do what's wrong, persuades you to compromise with your conscience and do what is contrary to the Lord's command, that's the very person that's apt to turn around and criticize you, afterwards when you suffer the results of what you've done. It's the very person who will. Don't trust human being, trust the Lord only. Follow His word. Human beings are often ready to change sides when it's ^{to} their advantage. Now of course in this case, it wasn't that, he really got the word of the Lord and gave it to him. So after eating he started back and before he'd gone very long a lion had him in the way and slew him. Well, we don't need to take time perhaps on the rest of the story. We all know it I believe. Verse 27 is worth noting for the point about italics that's in it. Verse 27, he spoke to his sons, saying, saddle me the ass. And they saddled him, the him is in italics. And anybody not familiar with Bible purposes, used in all other books, we make italics to mean emphasis. Here we put italics to mean it's not in the original. The exact opposite

purpose. Once you know it, the italics are a tremendous help in the Bible, but the person who is not familiar with it can get an utterly false idea of the Bible from his reading of italics. A warning to us, that whatever we read, learn the principles of it, which make it different from the principles of other things. Just like if you work in electricity, when they say negative they mean positive and when they say positive, they mean negative. How can anybody criticize the Modernists for their double talk, when they do that sort of thing. But every electrician when he says negative means positive, and when he says positive he means negative. Well, it's the rules of the trade and once you're familiar with it, it doesn't confuse you, you understand what they mean by these particular things. But here the italics mean it is not in the original. They might well have translated it, and they saddled up. That was good old English, whether we still use it or not, I'm not sure. At least they did the saddling. But in modern English we say, what did they saddle, they saddled the ass. And so the King James translators put in the word in order to fill out the sentence. Well, the old prophet went and died and they brought him back and buried him in his own sepulchre, and gave him all kinds of honors but that didn't do him any good, he was just as dead as if they'd left him there for the lion's lunch.

And so we have here the prophet from Judah giving his denunciation of Jeroboam's action and giving this prediction that the house of David will continue, even while the northern kingdom, the dynasties will follow one after the other in succession, and then the prophet, having done his great work, he fails in what seems to us a little point and is cast on the scrapheap. And when you get a little older you will all of you know cases where men have started out wonderfully and have represented the Lord and stood true to him, and then they've been taken in by some representative of the ecumenical movement, or some other form of Modernism, and led astray to where they become a tool in its hand, and they're no longer an effective instrument for God. The world is strewn with individuals who have done a fine work for the Lord up to a point and then have fallen astray over some comparatively minor point.

I spoke in a university to a group of students just last week, and before I did

they had one of the students give a testimony. And this young fellow told how he had not wanted to know about the Lord but he'd heard about him and he had rejected it but the Lord had kept after him and the testimony had come and he told how he had finally cast aside all his ambitions, and desires for life, reached the conclusion the Lord was calling him to his ministry, had forsaken the work he had looked forward to, and all his ambitions and decided that he was going into the Christian ministry. And so now he was graduating this year from that university and next year was going to enter Princeton Seminary. And as I heard him tell that I thought of the many others I had known, few who had quite as bright and shining a testimony as he seemed then to have, but many who had very fine testimonies of the way the Lord had led them, who'd gone to Princeton Seminary and gotten that mixture of a little truth and a lot of unbelief given there today, until when they come out ^{if} they say they believe the word of God, you've got to believe in Christ to be saved, their mind is all full of doubts and questions and things running around inside that they're trying to squelch and hold down and not doing very effectively. And sometimes they go on one year, two years, ten years, twenty years, preaching what sounds like a true gospel, perhaps winning souls when all of a sudden they just turn over into rank modernism. And you wonder how they could turn so suddenly. They didn't turn suddenly, their mind was full of doubt and unbelief which they were trying to hold down and you can't do it (9)

Or others turn right in the midst of their course, and it's just tragic to me to see a man with such a wonderful start going off in the direction which, if he continues in it, will mean the utter loss of his testimony and of his stand for the Lord. Here was this prophet who did such a wonderful work here and then his life is just taken and wrecked because he failed to follow the Lord all the way.

So let's not throw stones at others because we're all weak. But let's resolve to guard ourselves that we don't make the error that this prophet made. Well, that was c, the prophet from Judah.

10. d, Ahijah's Warning.

In I Kings 14 we find that the very prophet who had told Jeroboam he would have the kingdom now tells him that God is going to utterly destroy him. "Him that dies of Jeroboam in the city shall the dogs eat, and him that dies in the fields shall the fowls of the air eat, for the Lord has spoken. The Lord says, I'll take away the remnant of the house of Jeroboam as a man takes away dung until it be gone." A terrible prediction about the house of Jeroboam. No matter what wickedness the house of Judah did they were never given a prophecy like this because God had promised that for David that he would keep the line, even though individuals in it became very degenerate, God had promised to keep the line ~~anna~~ true in Judah. And thus the promises of God are not just for us but are for our children, and the Lord's mercy is with the children of those who believe in Him. And so Ahijah gives this warning against Jeroboam. We won't go into detail about it, that I trust you all have thoroughly in mind.

e. Nadab's reign. I K. 15: 25- following. Nadab the son of Jeroboam reigned over Israel two years and did evil in the sight of the Lord and walked in the way of his father. ~~a~~ very unimportant king. He only lived two years, and yet there are very few of these kings who are unimportant. I/~~d~~ might say I'd like you to learn 90% of the kings of Judah and Israel and don't bother with Nadab and Elah and two or three others very unimportant. There are so few that are unimportant that I don't say that. I want you to know all the kings of Judah and Israel in order. And last semester I asked you to learn all the historical books. That is, you are not learning for this course, the names of the poetic or the prophetic books, but the 17 first books of the Old Testament are the historical books, should be known in order. And I want also the names of the kings of Israel and Judah to be known in order. Now if you have a perfect exam paper in every other regard but if you get one of the kings of Israel or Judah, or get one of the first 17 books forgotten, I will pass you in spite of it, ~~hmmmmmmmm~~ perhaps with a 70. But if you don't have a perfect paper I don't really feel I should pass anybody in the course, who does not know those first 17 books perfectly in order, and does not know the names of the kings of Israel and Judah in order to be perfect. Now those who were not here last semester I think can still learn the names of the first 17 books. We'll hold them for that too. (Are we supposed to know the prophets?) Answer. The important ones. But I don't expect anybody to know the name of the man of Judah who came up and spoke to ~~Jeroboam~~.

(Question: The Old Prophet had a message from the Lord. What was it?) To tell the other prophet that because he has come back and has eaten with him and disobeyed God's word, therefore he will die. His message came right as the two men were sitting at the table.

~~(Question)~~ Well e, then is Nadab's reign, a very unimportant reign. If half the reigns were as unimportant as that I would not be half as insisted on your learning the names of all those kings. But there were very few that were unimportant.

So, number 2 is the Dynasty of Baasha. a. His accession. I K. 15: 27-30.

Baasha brought the conspiracy and killed Nadab and ~~announced himself~~ established himself as king, and we read that he smote all the house of Jeroboam. He left not to Jeroboam any that breathed, until he had destroyed him, according unto the saying of the Lord, which he spake by his servant Ahijah the Shilonite. And so the prediction that God had made through ~~Ahijah~~ Ahijah was fulfilled by Baasha. He seized the power and he became king and he reigned 24 years. He was just as powerful a king as was Jeroboam. And so we are told that he is becoming king in the end of verse 15, while in the early part of verse 15, we're told ~~himself~~ of some of the things that he did as king.

O.T. History. 283. (0)

Does that sound reasonable? The fact of course is that the book of Kings tells about the kings of Judah and ~~himself~~ comes back and tells about the king of Israel. And when telling about the king of Judah he tells about what the king of Israel did even before he told about this man becoming king. And then he goes back to the king of Israel, and then he tells about his accession. If anybody says that the things in the book of Kings are in chronological order, he is simply going contrary to the facts. The order is a combination of logical and ~~himself~~ chronology. There are logical sections taking one king and then the other king, within the logical it is chronological. But there is an intermixture of purpose, and that is very important when it comes to understand the prophetic books of the Old Testament, because many a person looks at prophecy and thinks it has got to be right straight through in chronological order. And that if two things are mentioned one after the other, that means the second one must be later, but it is not that way in history, so why should it be in prophecy? Well, b. His wars against Judah. 16:32. "And there was war between Asa and Baasha king of Israel all their days." This whole period of 90 years

is a period of more or less constant warfare between the two. They are like Israel today and Jordan. Israel and the various Arab states around it. They are constantly at war. There is only an army. There has been no peace. The Arab nations do not admit the right of Israel to exist. Well, that was the situation for 90 years between Judah and Israel. We call Israel the Northern Kingdom, because it is the larger part of Israel, though Judah is just as much Israel as the Northern Kingdom. c. Jehu's Prophecy. Now do not confuse this ~~Amrah with~~ Jehu with the Jehu who is named in the head of our section 11. The Divided Kingdom to Jehu. That is a different Jehu. This is Jehu the son of Hanani. This is a prophet unrelated to the king. So if I ask you to discuss Jehu the son of Hanani, don't tell us anything about Jehu the king. The same name is used of two different men. I've been amazed in America how often it is that when a man comes in one line they'll be another man of the same name comes in another line. And you'll see the ~~ma~~ two names in headlines at the same time. Sometimes they are very unusual names. I remember once in the seminary here, in our entering class we had two fellows named Bragan. I don't think we had any Smiths or Jones or Browns that year. But we had two fellows named Bragan. One from the West coast, one from the East, no relations as far as I know. But they both came the same year to the seminary. Those things happen. Life is full of them. And do don't be surprised if in the scripture we have a prophet, Jehu the son of Hanani, and 40 years later a king named Jehu. They are unrelated. So let's keep them straight. But Jehu's prophecy here is that because of Baasha's wickedness, God says, I will make thy house like the house of Jeroboam the son of Nebat. Him that dies of Baasha in the city shall the dogs eat, and him that dieth of him in the field, shall the fowls of the air eat. And then d. Elah's reign. Most of the events of Baasha's reign that interests us particularly we looked at under Asa. So we don't need to look at them again here, but we have d. Elah's reign. Elah, the son of Baasha reigned two years, and then e. Zimri's usurpation. His servant Zimri, captain of half of his chariots, conspired against him, as he was in Tirzah. No body knows where Tirzah is. But Tirzah is the capital of these two dynasties. Jeroboam began his kingdom in Shechem, after awhile we read, he went back to Tirzah. Well, had he moved his capital, Tirzah. When? We are not particularly told? But Baasha had Tirzah as his capital. We have not yet found it,

some archaeologists have theories, but they are not proven. We don't know just where Tirzah was, but that is the capital of the first two dynasties. And he was drinking himself drunk in Tirzah, in his capital, and Zimri, the captain of half of his chariots killed him. So Zimri's usurpation is told, I K. 16:9-13. And Zimri slew all the house of Baasha, left him not a single individual, of all of his descendents or of his kinsfolk, nor of his friends. And so the prophecy against Baasha's house was fulfilled. And the

f. The Inter-regnum. Yes. (Did you say that Tirzah was the capital city for Nadab?) I would say so, yes. Probably for Jeroboam too, but when he moved it there we don't know. For these two dynasties, but not from the very beginning, but we don't know how soon, but for most of the time in the two dynasties, Tirzah seemed to be the capital. Well, f in the Inter-regnum. Most people don't realize there is an inter-regnum here. Some people trying to fit the chronology together, made an inter-regnum of 20 years here. Well, as the chronology is stated it seems to be about only 3 years, but we do read here that in the 27th year of Asa Zimri reigned 7 days in Tirzah. We read that in verse 15, and then in verse 23 we read, that in the 31st ^{year} ~~day~~ of Asa, Omri began to reign. So the next king according to these statements began to reign 4 years after Zimri, so there is a time of 4 years of inter-regnum. Omri, one of the leading generals of the army, comes up through Gibbethon and besieges Tirzah, and when Zimri saw the city was taken he went into the palace of the king's house, and burnt the king's house over him with fire and died. But the people of Israel, half of them followed Omri, and ~~the~~ the other half followed Tibni the son of Ginath, and evidently it took them 4 years to fight, of which details are not given here in the Scripture, before the followers of Omri prevailed. 4 years of inter-regnum. And after these four years, Omri had succeeded in becoming king, in some ways the most important king in the whole history of the divided kingdom. A man of, from a political viewpoint, perhaps one of the greatest rulers that the near East has ever seen. And we will look at the reign of Omri this afternoon. We will start then,

B. The Dynasty of Omri.

(Afternoon Class)

II Kings 8:26, Mr. Vannoy would you translate it for us please? The word year in Hebrew is used in the plural with small number and in the singular with large numbers. It is 65 of year, but we would translate it 65 years. That's the regular Hebrew usage.

It is five years. But it is 65 of year. But in English you say 65 years or 5 years. And a son of, there is nothing here about a son involved in it. It is the idiom that means that's how old he is. He is the son of so many years, so the correct translation of this would be, "Ahaziah was 22 years old ^{יָבִיאָ}. Yes, that's the literal. What it means is when he began to reign. At the beginning of his reign. When he began to reign he was 22 years old. He reigned one year in Jerusalem. Well, suppose the one wasn't there, what would you say? And he reigned a year in Jerusalem. But this makes it explicit. He reigned one year in Jerusalem. He reigned a year. He reigned one year in Jerusalem. Yes. Then let's look at the second verse I asked you to do, 21:19.

(Question: What exactly is this word ^{יָבִיאָ}? Isn't it just a noun?) No, that is the infinitive construct. The infinitive construct with the suffix his, and the preposition, in his reigning, when he began to reign. Mr. Mosher. (Question: Couldn't it be infinite absolute?) Because the infinitive absolute always has the form ^{יָבִיאָ}. It never changes in the absolute. And this is ^{יָבִיאָ}. It is not the form used in the absolute. Secondly the infinite absolute is absolute. That is, it ~~am~~ never takes a suffix of any kind. And thirdly it never takes a preposition. The infinitive absolute is an unusual form. I don't know of any language that really has it except Hebrew. And it is absolute. It never takes an ending, it never takes a preposition. It stands by itself. But this is the infinitive construct. Yes? The word means to begin to reign. no, it means to begin to reign, but it ^{has a meaning} ~~means~~ to continue to reign also, but fundamental meaning is to begin to reign. Yes? (If the infinitive absolute is always used alone, what is the translation?) By alone, I mean that nothing is connected tightly? It is usually used with another form of the same verb, which it strengthens. It is as if you say, he will kill, you use the infinitive absolute, in addition, it is as if you stress that kill, he will kill! We often translate it, he will surely kill. (Question:) No, that doesn't make a decent translation. That can be just a word for word thing, but it doesn't give the idea. It emphasizes the verb idea. But it also is sometimes used as a substitute for the finite verb. ~~am~~ As if you just say kill without saying who does it, or when or how. Yes. (I translated it in his reigning. I compared this with the King James and I said, well now the King James says, he was 22 at the beginning of his reign. And I thought that coming from the Hebrew I would have gone to say that the King James

~~here did not have a~~

Version did not have a basis from the Hebrew to translate.) The King James gives the correct translation that the Hebrew gives. In his reigning means when he began to reign. In his reigning means nothing. (Well, the way I thought it was, in other words, he was 22 years old in ~~this~~ reigning, or at this period of his reign, he was 22 years old.) If anybody got over these 15 or 20 verses, every single one of them is translated when he began to reign, because every one of them tells how old he was. The word אָבִיב means to begin to reign, but then it is used for continuing to reign also. The fundamental thing is to take over the meaning, to begin to reign. Well, we must move along, we have much ground to cover. Let's look at the new verse I gave you. I Samuel 13: 1, Mr. Rapp?

O.T. History. 284. (0)

~~אָבִיב אֶתְּחַלֵּץ מָחָר מִיְּמֵי גִּדְיָהוּ~~

Instead of one year it would be a year. He was a year old when he began to reign. Yes? And Saul was a year old when he began to reign, and he reigned 2 years over Israel. That's what the verse says. It is an exact parallel to all these other verses, I gave you. The exact idiom. The exact form. He was a year when he began to reign and he reigned 2 years over Israel. Now of course, as Mr. Rapp noticed, the word a year is not ~~אָבִיב~~ common. It is usual to have another word before it telling how many years. He was 25 years old when he began to reign, he was 15 years old, he was 30 years old. Whatever it is. But there is no such figure in Mr. Rapp's Bible. It just says a year. Now it is a reasonable conjecture to think that there may have been such a figure there at one time, but I've never seen a Bible that contains such a thing. Yes? Well, somebody's guess and put a footnote in. Don't just trust the footnote. You have to see what the footnote says. Saul was so old when he began to reign, but it doesn't say how old. Footnote. I Sam. 13: 1 has an LFR before it. If you look up in the back, it will say that L means read and FR means perhaps. In other words, in this case they are giving a guess. Now they may give what the Greek means, what the Syriac gives, what some of the versions give, but in this case, they give a guess. They say, we think it would be good to assume that it means he was 20 years old. And maybe their guess is right. And on the other hand maybe you or I could make just as good a guess. It is only a guess, not in the original. It is interesting to know their guess, but the Bible itself does not say. Now if they

said three manuscripts or something like that, that would mean that there is some evidence. Yes? (Well then the King James here is different than the Hebrew text.) In this particular case, the King James has a translation which has no warrant in the original. In this particular case. He was a year old when he began to reign and he reigned 2 years. That is what the verse says. Now the King James version translates it, Saul reigned one year, but that is not what it says. It says, Saul was a year old when he began to reign. And then the English goes on, and when he had reigned two years over Israel, and there is no when here, whatever, it just says he reigned two years, and then it goes on, Saul chose him 3000 men, and the Hebrew says, and Saul chose. In other words, the translators here simply tried to get some kind of sense out of this, for their reader who didn't know Hebrew, and so they said, Saul reigned a year, and he reigned 2 years, and he chose some men. Well, why say that? Why say he reigned a year, and then he reigned 2 years and chose some men. Why say that? If you want to say that after he reigned 2 years he chose men, why make it one year. There's no point. The translators here had a problem, They must have known what the Hebrew meant, but they were preparing a version for people that didn't know the Hebrew, and didn't want to stop and spend a long time over the problem, and they simply took the words and made something that would give ~~them~~ it. A fairly good idea of what the words were that were there, but it doesn't convey any sense at all. Saul reigned one year and when he reigned two years, he did that. It is a summary statement of Saul's reign, at the beginning of his reign, such as you have at the beginning of all these other reigns. And the only thing that is needed to make sense in it, is to insert two figures, and the Kittel Bible here, which has some footnotes that are very excellent, because it gives us sometimes what the Greek, or Syriac, or what some other version has, or what some extra manuscripts have to say, on other cases it simply gives a guess, which may be worth a tremendous ~~lot~~ lot or may be absolutely worthless. In this case, they guessed that he was 20 years old, and they may be right. We don't have any proof so far as I know. But the fact ~~that~~ is, that the Hebrew verse as it stands, says he was a year old when he began to reign, and he reigned 2 years. And the probabilities are, that there was a manuscript written which said he was years so many old when he began to reign, and he reigned 2 and so many and then that the corner of the page got torn, and the result was that the next copyist, did not have the figures to copy and

so he copied what was left, upon the page. And it is an error, and an obvious error, I would say of transmission. It is a case where a scribe has made an error, where the error was made very, very early, and it is a wonderful truth of the care with which our manuscripts have been copied. That all through thousands of years, something that made absolutely no sense, that Saul was a year old when he began to reign, and he reigned 2 years, was copied exactly as it is, because the scribe didn't make a guess to put it in. They copied what was there. And it is very easy for us to think we find a mistake in something and fill it in, and fill it in wrong. They didn't fill it in. Everybody knew it was a mistake, but they did not try to fill it in. Now of course the New Testament says he reigned 40 years. Now that 40 may be a round number. It may have been 2 and 40. And the 40 is gone. It may have been. We don't know. And how old he was, maybe there was a 20 there that was dropped, but it is one of the obvious cases, of a scribal error. There are not many scribal errors in the Bible. The Bible is wonderfully well preserved. The copies of it have been done more accurately than any other book from ancient times, by far, and yet there are errors that have come in. And this is one of the obvious ones. We have at least 25 cases. Others I did not give you, where this formula is used, at the beginning of a reign. It is a common formula but in this case, the figure got torn off. Or at least they are not copied in any of our copies. So the error must have taken place in copying at an extremely early time.

(Question.) No, because it has a ך , a son of a year. It is their way of saying how old. He was one year old. He was a son of a year in his reign. No the word does not mean reigning. The word means becoming king. The infinitive of ך means to become king. To take the throne. To be enthroned as king. We have all these other cases, where it means that. There are perhaps a hundred cases in the Bible where the word means to become king. And we have a formula at the beginning of most of the king's reigns using precisely this formula which is used here. (Question). The when in the King James is not in that part of the verse, it is in a later part of the verse, where there is no ך . The King James says he reigned one year. The Hebrew says he was a year old when he began to reign. Then the King James says, and when he had reigned two years. The Hebrew says, and he reigned. The ך of the first part, has nothing to do with the when in the second part. There is no relationship. They are different parts altogether. (Question). There are two scribal errors in this one verse,

and therefore my guess is that what happened is that the side of the page got torn. (Both of them could be on the side of the page there.) Why, of course they could. He was 20 years old when he began to reign and reigned 42 years. And this little section of the corner gets torn off. It is very, very easy to happen. That little corner gets torn off, cutting off the two figures. It could very, very easy happen. Now there could be two scribal errors in one verse, when a man gets sleepy and makes mistakes in copying. That's the very time when he is very apt to make more than one. When a man is real careful he is not apt to make any. When he gets tired, and he keeps at the job too long, and he should stop and rest, ~~am~~ but he is supposed to do this much today and he didn't start as early as he ought to, and he has got to get it finished, that's when he is apt to make mistakes. If he makes one mistake in a verse, he could very well make a second in that verse. He is much more apt to, than in some other verse the next day. But this, it is a guess, only a guess, but I think a very good guess, that a corner of the page gets torn, and the two figures are lost. (Question). Well, I think that corner could get torn off as well. Well, let's assume that he was a year old and reigned 2 years. Maybe that is something that is easier. Mr. Soong? And with all these statements, these 25 or so, it states, a man was so old when he became king, and he reigned so many years, and after that introduction, they go on to tell the first thing he did after he was king, which might be in the first year, the second year, or the third, so it is just natural that next comes something early in his reign. But to say that he reigned one year, and then he reigned two years, I don't know of any parallel to that in Hebrew. It is now the way they say things. Mr. Tow? Everyone of these statements I gave you at the beginning, all of these verses I find, today, are at the beginning of the reign, every single one of them. They could have put it at the end, but it also is the natural thing to adopt the form that is given at the beginning. It is a matter of which is their custom, but every verse I gave you for today, is at the beginning of a man's reign, it tells us at the beginning of the reign how old he was, and how long he reigned. Every single one of them. Mr. Mosher. Oh, you mean if it was written in Hebrew it would go this way, and this would be the corner that would be torn instead of that one. Mr. Cohen? It could have been in the middle and they ~~mmh~~ ~~am~~ dropped some acid and it cut off the two words, the one was above the other. Yes?

No, I would say this. The question is, what it affects. That's what we are interested in here now. Now it is easy to build a theory. Here's a nice theory which some people build. I know of a fellow not so awfully far from here, who has written a book on New Testament criticism. He says this, If God gave us a Bible that was free from error in the original it stands to reason, he would keep it free from error, and therefore he says we can know that the Greek speaking church, which had the charge of the Bible, kept it from error, and therefore the Textus Receptus is free from error, but you point out that in the Textus Receptus, there are all kinds of variations, in the Greek manuscripts. Well, it is the majority. The simple majority gets it. But then towards the end of his book he says, however, he says, the Textus Receptus differs from the Byzantine Text, there are a number of places that are different, and he says, in each of these places, I can give an argument to show that it probably is in the original. But when you get around to it, the only thing that I can figure is that he ~~thinks~~ thinks that the Lord inspired Erasmus to give us a text that was free from error, which I

O.T. History 285.

to give us such a text, but we have no evidence anywhere that the Lord did. Now I think that the Textual Criticism goes much too far, that on the basis of \mathcal{R} and β , throwing aside all the things that are in all the other manuscripts. I think that goes much too far. But I don't think that we can go in the other direction and say, what we have in the Textus Receptus is free from error, unless we have a Divine Word that says it. Now if God said it I would accept it instantly, but I find no place in the Scripture, the statement that the Bible will be preserved free from error, and the fact of the matter is, that we have variations in our manuscripts, thousands of variations, but it also is a fact that we have so many of thousands of manuscripts, that we have material for checking most of the variations, and it also is true that none of the variations affects any of the important doctrines. It is not going to make the slightest bit of difference in your salvation or mind, whether Saul was one one year old, when he became king, or whether he was 20 years old when he became king. It is not going to make the slightest difference to our salvation. And it is not going to make the slightest difference ~~mm~~ to our salvation whether he was crowned king in April or in May. Now if the Bible said one of them, we would know. But if it doesn't say it, we don't know it. Here's a case where I think

it did say, but it has gotten lost. Now we are ignorant on that point. The Lord has not seen fit to preserve that evidence for it, on this very minor point, and I personally believe that the Lord did it, because he wants us to know that while the Bible is free from error in the original, that it is written in human words which men can easily misunderstand, and therefore that the doctrines that are important, he has repeated and expressed in different ways, so that we compare scripture with scripture and see what it says, and when somebody builds a whole doctrine on one verse or two verses, watch out. It is very easy to misinterpret it. And in order to give us an extra guard against misinterpreting he has caused just enough mistakes to come in, to lead us to know that when you have only one verse, there is the possibility of a mistake having come in, in transmission, in that verse. And so I think, it is helpful for me to bring out in the course of this class just a few cases where there is absolutely no question, that an error has come in. Just a few cases, so that we will understand that that is the fact. Now it is a far more important fact that the Bible has been preserved better than any other book and that when we compare scripture with scripture, we can depend upon what it says. That we can believe that it is inspired and free from error in the original writing. We can believe that. It is a far more important fact. And I think it would be very silly to go out this summer, into a church some where, and start in giving them a series of talks on errors in transmission of the Bible. You would just confuse Bible. There is nothing gained by it. But if people are going to be Christian leaders it is advisable for them to know the facts, and to know that God has given us a Bible, preserved as no other book from ancient time has been preserved, but not a book that has been preserved so that every vital detail is just like in the original, because there are a few cases that are absolutely certain, that there are minor errors that have crept in, in transmissions, and one of them is this case, and whether there is a tear on the side of a scroll or whether it was an ink blot in the middle of a scroll, or whether a little insect ate it off there, or what happened, we just don't know. But it is a case, where with all these other parallels, there is no question that that is the correct translation. He was one year old when he became king, and he reigned two years. But of course that is not what it said originally, All that is necessary is to assume that two figures have been lost. And what these figures were, the second one in view of the New Testament, we can

guess should have been 40, because the New Testament has he reigned 40 years, so we can guess that he reigned 40 years. And the first one, how old he was, the account describing him as a young man; if you want to give 20, there's no harm in that, but I don't think we have any proof. (Question:) It is all oral tradition. (Well, what record do we have of oral tradition?) We don't ~~have~~ have any. My guess is that 99% of the oral tradition is false. Just like the Roman Catholic Church today claims to have oral tradition. And my guess is that 99% of it is false. I put absolutely no stock in oral tradition. But when from the mass of oral tradition a New Testament writer selects one thing, and that is included in the Book which is inspired of the Holy Spirit, I say that the Lord put the seal on that fact, as being a fact that we can depend upon, or He would have kept it out of the book. But the other 99% of oral tradition that is lost today, most of which probably sprung up half way in between, I wouldn't be interested if I found it. It would be interesting, but it wouldn't be of value. Mr. Deshpande? We do not necessarily expect the order of other kings here. But when we have exactly the phrases that are used of other kings here, in exactly the ^{places} ~~phrases~~ ^{phrases} where we find the part of the (6 $\frac{1}{2}$) the first thing in his reign, the natural way to interpret it, is as meaning the same thing, ~~but~~ that it means in the other cases, and to assume that it means something else, well, I mean, it is the sort of argument that I don't think gets us anywhere at all. I got a letter from a person once, and he said, don't you realize that every paragraph in the Greek New Testament has a number of letters divisible by 7, and a number of words divisible by 7, and a number of verbs divisible by 7. He said, it is the greatest proof of inspiration that there is. Well of course, the paragraphs are inserted nowadays. They are not in the original anyway, but just for fun, I opened my Greek New Testament, and at random picked out the first paragraph I came to, counted the number of words, and it wasn't divisible by 7. I opened it again at random, and counted the number of letters and it wasn't divisible by 7. I opened it again at random, and counted the number of verbs, and it was not divisible by 7, but this poor fellow was told, you can believe the Bible is inspired, because every paragraph in the New Testament, the Greek New Testament has a number of letters divisible by 7, a number of words divisible by 7, and a number of verbs divisible by 7. The Lord could have put it that way if He wanted to, but He didn't do it, and when poor people are given to believe that it is a

certain way that it isn't, and sometimes one of them gets energetic, and opens the Greek New Testament, and finds out that it isn't, he is apt to lose his faith in the things that are so. If, the Lord could have made all the manuscripts of the Bible, so that once you hold them up in front of a certain kind of electric light they would glow with a blue tinge, and that would be proof that they were inspired. He could have done that if He chose. And you could go out and you could tell poor ignorant people, that we know that the Bible is inspired, because the original manuscripts all glow, with a blue tinge. But once anybody tried it, and found out it wasn't so, he would decide, that not only was that a fairy story, but all the rest of the things he was saying were fairy stories. And when we have to take a verse, of the Scripture, and twist it around, to mean something different, from what the plain meaning of it is, that is parallel with 25 other similar cases, why it is much better to simply frankly admit, there is a mistake in transmission. I think we hold the faith of intelligent people far better, than when we try to invent some kind of involved system to show that this one is altogether different from the other 25. Well, I hadn't figured on spending nearly this long on this particular matter. I'd rather take a little time with a few other similar cases, but I would still rather get on with our history, because we have a lot of important matters to cover. But right at this point, I did want you to see all these parallels and to note this case where to my mind, a very simple explanation, is to tear off the end of the page, but maybe some other would do it much better.

Now we were speaking this morning about the dynasty of Omri and Omri is probably one of the least known to the general Christian public of the kings of Israel, but his son Ahab is one of the best known kings of Israel after the United Kingdom. And yet his son Ahab, it is a reasonable conjecture that in the main the son Ahab followed along the lines put down by the father. Now that is not absolute proof, but it is a reasonable conjecture, that he did. And so in what I say about Omri, since there is not a great deal stated in the Scripture about him, a certain amount of inference, but it is inference that I believe is very well founded. Now under the dynasty of Omri, 1. The reign of Omri.
a. His accession. Now this we already mentioned this morning, how he was the general of the army, and when Zimri killed Elah, Omri came in and besieged him and Zimri was burned, and then Tibni gathered a lot of people to make him king, and after 4 years of

fighting, Omri prevailed. The Bible doesn't say 4 years, but it says this began in the 28th year, I forget the exact number of Asa's reign, but it ended 4 years later, so that the Bible shows that there were 4 years involved between the time of Zimri's death and the time when Omri became undisputed king. b. His new capital. Now here there is no conjecture. It is a fact. Omri immediately did a very statesman-like thing. He established a new capital. There he was similar to David. When David became king, he looked for a new capital. A capital that would be centrally located, it would have a strategic location, easy to defend. Omri did the same thing. This town Tirzah which was the capital of the first two dynasties, we don't know just where it is, so we cannot judge it. It may have been a very good place for a capital. It may not. We don't know, but this we know, that the new place, that Omri chose to build a capital, was ideally located for a capital, and the capital city which he built there was soon three times as big as Jerusalem. It was one of the great cities of Palestine for many years, although eventually when it was destroyed, it ceased to be a great city. It did not come back again, but during these years, it was a very great city. Now we have, most of these other cities go way back into early days. This city seems to be, probably not a city at all before Omri's time. Why then would Omri have been able to build a fine new capital on a place where there was no city before. Because of the advance in technology. Most previous cities were built on a hill which was easy to defend. This hill is also. But an important point in defending a city, is a supply of water. You get on a hill, with an enemy around you, and you don't have water, then they don't have to worry much. You won't stay there long. So that the early cities of Palestine, are all on hills that have a great spring. Now this city is on a hill that has a very small, and unimportant spring, not situated in a good place for an early city because of lack of water, but by this time a new technique had been discovered, the technique upon which Jerusalem today relies for its water supply, the technique of digging, building cisterns. Any home in Jerusalem in recent years has on the roof, an arrangement to catch the rain water, and inside or under the house, you have a large reservoir, a cistern, and the rainy water is gathered in the rainy season, and preserved for use in the dry season. Now this technique seems not to have been used in the earlier days, but in Samaria, with the technique of building cisterns

they could take this place and make a very big city out of it. And it was on a hill, with a fine slope on all sides, easy to defend, centrally located in the land not far from Shechem as a matter of fact, centrally located, and one of the most beautiful locations for a city that I have seen. And it was important there even in Roman days. There was a fine Roman gateway there at Samaria. Now this city then of Samaria was founded by Omri and it was the capital of the northern kingdom to the rest of the

O.T. History. 286. (0)

who did not merely think of having authority over people and of getting luxury for himself. He seems to have planned to make his dynasty last and establish his power. One thing that Omri says was this, through the reigns of Baasha and of Jeroboam there was almost constant war between Israel and Judah. What's the good of that? Constantly fighting. He said, we don't want to conquer Judah, and subject them to ourselves, but they cannot possibly conquer us. They are much too small. What's the use of this constant fighting? So he made friendship with Judah. He said, let's cut out this constant fighting between our kingdoms. Let's become friends. Now we have no record that he said that. But we have the record there was constant fighting in the reign of Jeroboam and Baasha, between Judah and Israel. We have the record in the succeeding years that there was no fighting during the whole of the time of his dynasty, but friendship between the two. So that would seem almost certainly to be the product of the statesmanship of Omri. At least it was the plan of either Omri or his son Ahab. And it certainly was one or the other, and I think we are justified in saying it was the fault of both. Secondly, he looked to the other kingdoms around and he said let's make friendship with them, too, and he utilized the method that Solomon had followed. Solomon married the daughter of Pharaoh of Egypt, and made friends with Egypt, and he married many strange women from foreign lands, these were doubtless members of the royal family, in order to establish friendship with those lands. Omri married his son Ahab to the daughter of the king of Tyre. And she came down from Tyre there to live here as queen in Samaria. And from the viewpoint of the secular statesmanship, that was an able plan to make friendship with this powerful ruler to the north. He thus changed from the policy of Baasha and Jeroboam to constantly fighting to try to establish a staple relationship with his neighbors.

d. His importance. The importance of Omri is not brought out in the Bible. We have more about his son, than about any other king of the northern kingdom, and that would lead us to think, that one or the other of the two did things of great importance and actually I believe that the son's importance was due to what the father established but as an evidence of that there is the fact that in far away Assyria, from which we begin soon after this time to get records, which refer to this area, we find that the land of Israel is called, even after all the dynasty has died, is called the land of Omri. So the name of Omri penetrated to far away Assyria, the land of Omri. And we find that after four kings of the dynasty of Omri reigned and then a usurper named Jehu killed the last of them, and established himself in power. When the Assyrians referred to Jehu they called him Jehu the son of Omri. Now he was actually the man who killed all the descendents of Omri, but he was a successor on the throne of Omri. But there were three kings in between, so you see how the importance of Omri spread as far as distant Assyria. But Omri in his planning, one thing he did, was to bring the daughter of the king of Tyre down there to be the wife of his son, and Amstead of the University of Chicago in the History of Palestine and Assyria^{some} that Jezebel coming down from Tyre to Israel must have felt like a Christian woman in the early days from Rome, a Christian woman from Rome, marrying the chieftian from some distant backward tribe and trying to bring the knowledge of her more advanced and sophisticated thought to these backward people. Well, that is what Amstead said, and while the fact of it is utterly different from that, I think that the impression which Jezebel had was probably exactly the way that Amstead described it, that she came from the great metropolis of Tyre, with its merchandise all over the seas, and the great god Melqart and she wanted to get these Israelites to turn away from their backward notions about Jehovah, and to worship her god, and she tried to introduce it. But we have no evidence that Ahab himself adopted the religion of his wife.

(Next class).

We spoke yesterday about 2. The accession of Ahab. And under that we noticed a. His character. The character of Ahab is not generally understood, ~~ha~~ Ahab is probably the best known of the kings of Israel. But he is not well known. He is known to the average Christian as simply, the one very wicked Christian. And that's all that they know about him. And that is naturally because he is not the central

figure in the Sunday School lessons we have that deal with him. The central figure is Elijah, and Ahab is the wicked king against whom Elijah carries on his ministry. And Ahab was indeed a very wicked king. But if you read the whole story, if you read all the chapters that deal with Ahab, most of which, not all of them, perhaps 3/4 of them have Elijah in, others have other prophets in, but if you read all of them, and if you study the situation carefully you will find that the idea of Ahab as simply a man just of determinate wickedness, ready to do anything evil that he can. That is a ^{Caricature} ~~character~~ rather than a character picture. Ahab was a wicked man, but I believe that as far as religion and morality are concerned, he would be more characterized by the word weak or the word indifferent, than by the word wicked as far as an aggressive positive force is concerned. It would seem likely that as a statesman, as a general, as a leader in political things, he may have been a strong character. He may have been a man who did good for his land, for purely secular viewpoint. However, in view of the weakness that we find in his character, in not only morally but in regard to his readiness to advance himself in wickedness. You remember in the case of Naboth, he wanted Naboth's vineyard. What did he do? He lay on his bed, and ~~sp~~ ^{sulked}. And his wife said, what's the matter with you. Are you a man or a mouse? Why don't you step up and do something about ~~this~~ this, she said. And she took his seal and she wrote letters, to them, about it, and ^{hired} she ~~manipulated~~ people to go as false witnesses and get Naboth assassinated, that is judicial murder, accused of a thing that he wasn't guilty of by false witnesses and he was killed. And she said to him, now go take your vineyard, it is yours now. Naboth is dead. It was Jezebel who did this, and Ahab in that situation, simply did nothing. Now that is not the act who we think of as simply a sample of aggressive, wicked, nor is it the act that you would ordinarily think of as one who is a strong leader. You would either expect him to say, this is wrong, I won't do it. Or to say I'm going to do it anyway, and then proceed to do it, and take ~~him~~ ^{him} the attitude that he did there, it seems to give the impression that Ahab was a rather weak man, and strengthens me in my ~~m~~ impression that it was Omri who was the strong character, and that Omri laid the foundation of the system and Ahab carried on the system as Omri laid it out. At any rate it was carried on from a secular viewpoint, he was an ^{successful} acceptable king. From a moral and a spiritual viewpoint, he was a weak king. A king who had plenty of wicked

impulses as every unregenerate man does, but who being in the position of king, had more opportunities to satisfy them, more than most men have.

b. His leadership of Israel.

I've really covered that pretty well under the heading of his character.

The Assyrian records tell how the king of Assyria came and met a coalition of forces including Syria and Israel and most of the nations of this area and they fought him to a standstill. Of course the Assyrian king said he utterly defeated them, annihilated them, tore them to pieces and filled the rivers with their blood. But he doesn't say he went any further and so historians take it as meaning that the Assyrian was not successful in his (12½) when he didn't go any further and he didn't actually take over (12½) any of them. He merely defeated, annihilated, destroyed, wrecked them and filled the rivers with their blood, then turned around and went home again. Which means, and historians agree, that they fought (12 3/4)

and that meant that for nearly a hundred years more they didn't have much to fear from Assyria. And Ahab is mentioned by the Assyrian king as one of the 4 kings in the coalition. I believe he's the first Israelite king to be mentioned specifically in a contemporary document. And so as a leader in Israel, from a secular viewpoint, he was successful but his weakness in the situation regarding (13½) Naboth leads me to think that he was mostly carrying on his father's faults rather than showing his own leadership.

c. His Wife. I'm not sure that Ahab is altogether to blame for his wife. My guess is that it was Omri who made the match. And Omri made the match I believe, not in order to get Ahab a good wife but in order to make friendly relations with the strong maritime powers of the north, the powers of Sidonia. The two leading cities of this region were Tyre and Sidon, and they seem to have been united at this time to (13 3/4)

but the whole people are called the Sidonians, after the other of the two large cities, Sidon. This is the area which is today called Lebanon. It is an area which is shut in by the high mountain wall of the Lebanon

mountains so that there's a fairly narrow area, rather barren, next to the sea. But on the shore there you have little bays, inlets, islands, and it's tempting to learn to go out to sea. It was the headquarters of the Phoenicians the great seafaring people of ancient times. Israel has a rocky coast, and a straight coast with hardly any decent harbors, and the Israelites were always a land people, they never went to sea much, the sea is little mentioned with them, but the Phoenicians were a seafaring people, whether the nature of the land forced them to it, or whether it's in the blood, I don't know but I believe they're still the same way today. Because I went on horseback up through Palestine and came to that area we crossed the border of Palestine into Phoenicia--I think my first day there I met more travelers than I met in Palestine in two weeks. I think the first day there. I ran onto a man...

O.T.History 287. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...I said how do you come to speak English with such a good American accent? He said oh I spent twenty years in Denver, Colorado. Next man I met and he spoke English and I said where did you learn English like that. Oh, he says, I lived twenty years in Lansing, Michigan. He said my name's Mohammed Hammed but over there called me Sam Gillis. And just person after person I met there I met there who had lived even more in South America than in North America. But in most sections, many a person in that area, had gone away and worked hard and saved and then come home to spend the last part of their life here. And so in these days, even 3000 years ago, it was a great seafaring area, and at those times it was a very wealthy area and Omri, from the political viewpoint, did a very fine thing when he made a marriage relationship, a friendship with the people of Sidon. But it brought in Jezebel who was a determined character, a woman whose background was a background of ruthlessness in seeking to get what she wanted, and as the daughter of the king there, accustomed to having just about anything she wanted, not accustomed to the moral scruples of the Israelite people, but doubtless thinking of them as a

backwoods people, and from a viewpoint of culture and sophistication they doubtless were very much behind the wealthy and progressive and sophisticated people of Tyre and Sidon, and she especially thought that this very strait-laced religion that they had, worshipping a god that you couldn't even see, was a rather fantastic thing and she was anxious to bring them to knowledge of her more enlightened deity, Melqart, the god of Tyre, whom the Israelites simply called Baal which means master. The gods of the heathen in Israel were generally called by the name Baal/ It's not the name, it's just the title for master. God himself is occasionally in certain parts of the Bible referred to as Baal (2 3/4)

But when they got to referring so much to this particular heathen deity as Baal, they quit altogether applying the term to the Lord. You see, it's not a name, it's a title, like master (3)

But through Jezebel there came in her ideas of morality to some extent, but particularly came in her zealous missionary interest in spreading the knowledge of her god. There is no evidence that Ahab/^{ever} actually was a Baal-worshipper. He gave in to his wife, he permitted her to have her deity there, to have her worship of Baal there, to favor those, in many ways, those who went along with her and associated themselves with the worship of Baal. But his two sons were both given names which include the name Jehovah. His sons were Jehoram which Jehovah is exalted, and Ahaziah which means Jehovah has (4) , Jehovah takes ahold. Well now why would a worshipper of Baal, a worshipper of Melqart give Jehovah names to his two sons who became king after him? It does not show that Ahab was a zealous worshipper of the Lord at all, but it certainly does show that he was not a zealous supporter of Baal. My impression is that he gave in to his wife to quite an extent and permitted her to push the Baal worship without interfering with it, perhaps even gracing some of the functions with his presence, but not giving any indication of himself going over to them.

Well, 3, The Menace of the Baal-worshippers. This is one of the greatest

crises in the history of Israel. And it is interesting to note that Jereboam put up the golden calf, he was rebuked for it, and the prophets criticized him, Baasha went on worshipping the golden calf and was further rebuked for it. But that the Lord did not bring in his strong opposition, religiously there, until the Baal-worship came in, and then He sent the prophets Elijah and Elisha, perhaps the two greatest, certainly the two greatest prophets of whom we have much told in the historical books. The great activities of Elijah and Elisha were directed not against the compromising worship of the golden calf but against ~~the~~ heathen worship of Baal from Tyre. And it was against that that Elijah and Elisha came. More than that, the Lord has ordinarily done comparatively few what we would call supernatural works. Ordinarily ~~he~~ ^{he} works through the influences of moral suasion, of the presentation of the word, through acts of providence. But as we notice, there are a few occasions on which there was a great outpouring of miracles, one of those of course was the bringing of the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt and bringing them into the promised land. One of them is around the life of Daniel in the exile when there was danger of the religion, the worship of God being wiped out from the people in exile, that's the third. The fourth one is the work of Christ in the early times of th⁴ disciples. But the second of these great outpourings of miraculous works was in connection with the work of Elijah and Elisha. It was because of this great crisis of the Baal--incursion of the Baal worship--the greatest crisis religiously in the history of Israel between the entrance into Palestine and the time of Christ. The menace of the Baal-worship. The golden calves were bad. They were wrong. The Lord opposed them, and in the end he destroyed them. But they are not to be mentioned in the same category with the Baal-worship~~ers~~. The Lord opposed them but he did not bring His strong opposition against them to the extent that he did this, and in fact during the period of Elijah and Elisha they are never ^{little} mentioned because of this far greater menace that was facing them. And ~~after~~ the Baal-worship was rooted out and destroyed, we find the golden calf still there in

the northern kingdom. The northern kingdom was degenerate compared to the southern kingdom. But the idea that some people have that God paid all his attention to the southern kingdom, and the northern kingdom was simply apostate and outside and God was not interested in it is utterly disproved by the fact that two of his very greatest prophets did 98% of their work in the northern kingdom, that Elijah and Elisha came to the northern kingdom and that there were more miracles done in connection with their work than with that of any other prophet. Aside of course from Moses who was more a leader than a prophet. So with number 3, it's important for Old Testament History that we realize what the Baal worship is, where it came from, how it came, what a tremendous menace it was, and that it was on account of this that God did one of the greatest works in the whole history of his dealings with Israel.

Now when we get into how God destroyed the Baal worship, there we're getting to the lives of two of the greatest prophets of all. And I wish that we could take a semester on it because there is so much of tremendous interest, of great importance in connection with the work of Elijah and Elisha. We have the Old Testament History to finish this semester and we'll have to barely mention them. But I would like to mention a number of the salient points of both which were not understood. We'll put the general discussion of it under number 4, Elijah the Prophet. We'll put under that a,

a, The Work of Elijah and Elisha. That will just be a brief general discussion of the work of Elijah and Elisha. When Elijah came, the Baal-worship was beginning through Jezebel's influence to spread over the land. We have no evidence Ahab helped her, but neither did he do anything actively to oppose her. But she was spreading it and she had a good deal of influence in advancing people in the land and they knew that politically they'd get ahead if the queen liked them. And the people, seeing a chance of advancement by supporting the Baal-worship, and you hear enough about it and some of them would become very enthusiastic and fanatical about it, some of them would like to break away from the strait-laced regulations of the Jehovah-worship and

found this more pleasing to them and the movement was underway and the land would have gone, humanly speaking, as many another land has gone, in the face of a thing like this, completely away from the true religion, if it had not been that God was determined to keep alive the knowledge of God in this land, in order that he would keep the word there as a center where the Lord Jesus would come, and from it the word to go out to ~~all~~ the earth, and consequently the Lord here intervenes in a way that he ordinarily does not. He intervened with this miraculous work of Elijah and Elisha.

But Elijah and Elisha, it is important for us to note the difference between the two of them. If there ever were two men who were temperamentally and as far as their general activity was concerned, thoroughly different, it is Elijah and Elisha. You all doubtless have some general idea about the two of them. Elijah, you might say, is a wild man from the desert. The man who wears the goat's skin, the man who suddenly appears in the king's palace and says, as the Lord lives before whom I stand, it will not rain these years, except according to my word, and goes out, and they think some old fool, some crazy crank has come in here, and they think nothing more about it until they find that it doesn't rain. The rainy season comes and it doesn't rain. And another year and it doesn't rain and it gets to where the cattle are beginning to die for lack of water and the crops beginning to go to pieces, and pretty soon they'll all be in very dire straits and then everybody remembers (12)

which this crazy man from the desert had spoken and they say let's find him, he's responsible for this, let's find him and find out how to get over this thing. Well, of course, that's a very unusual sort of a thing. And Elijah was that sort of a man. He was a gruff sort of a fellow. He was a wild sort of a fellow. When he called Elisha, what did he do? He walked by there and he took his coat and threw it over Elisha's shoulders and he walked on. And Elisha ran after him and he said, Elijah, for everybody knew who he was by this time, they'd all heard about and it had been described what this crazy fellow had done, and then actually it hadn't rained. And it continued this long, and so on, and then of course they'd heard about what happened up

on Mount Sinai, and so on, so Elisha doubtless had been thinking about it, wishing he could be with a man like that, thinking how he'd like to serve the Lord, and then all of a sudden the wild fellow comes walking by and throws his coat over him, and Elisha runs after him and says just a minute, he says will you wait till I say goodbye to my parents and then I'll come and go with you? Elijah says what have I got to do with you? Answered him abruptly. But Elisha goes ahead and has (13 $\frac{1}{2}$) a feast ————— for his parents, says goodbye and Elijah I suppose sat out in the barn somewhere waiting till he was through. He walked off without him. And then for the next couple of years, we don't know how long it was, Elisha simply poured water over the hands of Elijah, in other words he did the lower, menial tasks, and he picked up what knowledge he could. And you remember the last day of Elijah's life, Elijah says to Elisha, I've got to go to Bethel, and Elisha says I'm going with you. He says you stay here. He says I'm going with you. And, well, he says, you better stay here. No, he says, I'm going with you. So he goes. He gets to Bethel and Elijah says I've got to go into Shechem. Elisha says I'm going with you. Oh you better stay here. Oh, I'm going with you. And he kept right after him, and finally when they were down by the Jordan and Elijah said to Elisha, this is the day I'm going to be taken up. He said ask whatever you want. He said what present do you want. Elisha, instead of asking for some nice thing for himself, he says I'd like to be a copy of you, I'd like a double portion of your strength. Now people do the crazy thing of interpreting that as meaning Elisha said to Elijah I'd like to be twice as great a man as you are, I'd like to be double what you are. Of course that's fantastic. Elisha had more sense than to ever say a thing like that and it would be ridiculous anyway. Elijah is a great prophet, Elisha is probably equally as great, but certainly not greater. Some people count up and say Elijah had seven miracles, Elisha had fourteen, so he had double. I don't think we honor the Lord with that sort of thing. But anyway, this shows ^{the} gruffness of Elijah. He says well have you asked (15)

but if you see me as I'm taken up...

7/8 O.T.History 288. (1)

...but Elijah was this sort of a wild fellow that would attract attention and stimulate interest and he stood up and he fought valiantly for the name of the Lord and when he finished, if he had disappeared and there had been no ~~Elijah~~, his work would have been like a flash in the pan, a brilliant thing for people to remember but to have no effect on their lives or their thoughts, on their activities. On the other hand, Elisha was the exact opposite. Elisha was the kindly gracious fellow who was ready to do the menial tasks for Elijah. He was ready to go with him and to help him and to learn all he could from him and Elisha after Elijah's death had a course of itinerating tours he made, up and down through the land, gathering little groups together, presenting the word to them, explaining to them God's will for them, dealing with them, helping ~~them~~ people who were sick, dealing with ~~their~~ problems. He was the wonderful pastor, he was the fine, kindly man who did so much for people. And if Elisha had come and there had been no Elijah he would have started out doing these kind things for the ~~people~~ and they'd have received his kindness and gone on worshipping Baal just the same, paying no attention to him. ~~Elijah~~ without ~~Elijah~~ would have practically no influence in this ¹ life. Elijah without Elisha would have made a great pyrotechnic display which would be forgotten in a brief time and would accomplish nothing. If ~~Elisha~~ had come first his work would have accomplished practically nothing, and if Elijah had come second the work of Elisha would have made no preparation to amount to anything for Elijah. But God sent them in the order in which they could be effective. Elijah was the battering ram that pushed the way through into people's consciousness, that ~~peared-out~~ ^{tore down} their attitude toward the Baal worship, that showed the wrongness of Baal, that called everybody's attention, through the land, to the great problems and issues, and then Elisha followed with a gracious, kindly presentation of the word of God, which came into the people who had already been reached and stirred and moved by the activity of Elijah,

and the work of Elijah and Elisha together was a work which was sufficient to not only break the back of the Baal worship but to destroy it out of the land and make it no longer (3)

And it's most wonderful the way the two work together there, and in the providence of God sometimes a person fulfills one of these functions, sometimes the other one. Most of us are not (3 1/4)

neither one of them as either of these two great men are and we have to, to some extent, fulfill both functions. But it's good to have an idea of how the functions relate to each other and to see that there are times when the one function is what is vitally needed and times when the other is vitally needed. But unless you have some kind of a foundation the work of Elisha doesn't do a great deal. The work of Elijah may lay the foundations but the foundations disappear if you don't have Elisha's work to follow. Yes? (student. 3 3/4) There is quite a similarity.

Well, so much then for the general summary, perhaps one more thing we should say on the general summary. When Elijah died, Elisha said, my father, my father, the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof. And it's very unfortunate for our interpretation that he made this remark right after Elijah had gone up in chariots of fire, because it leads people superficially to think he's talking about the chariots of fire. The chariots of fire may have something to do with the presentation of the idea but that is not what he is referring to. When he says, my father, my father, the chariots and the horsemen thereof, what he is saying is, oh, Elijah, you are the bulwark of the nation. If it weren't for you this Baal worship would've spread over the nation to the extent that God would've had, in disgust, to remove his favor completely from the nation. You are the great bulwark of ^{Israel} ~~this nation~~. But Elisha said that to Elijah when the two of them were alone in the desert. And then when Elisha came to (5) die, — it was the king of Israel who came to his place and who said, my father, my father, the chariots of Israel, and the horses thereof. And there were no chariots there, there was nothing like that to be the occasion of the remark of the king of Israel. He ^{meant} ~~said~~ exactly what Elisha had meant, he meant that Elisha was the greatest bulwark of the

nation. I don't know how sincere he was in saying it, but he at least represented what the people of the nation as a whole recognized as the fact. But Elishah began the work and the work would've accomplished little apart from what Elisha did following.

Now another thing, though, still under the general summary, there's another fact that I think ought to be brought out, that is very hard I find for people to realize. I find in class that there's much resistance to this point, and that is this, that these were human beings. The average Christian seems to have gotten the idea from his Sunday School, some way, that these are not human beings but they're figures, they're representatives of qualities. And Ahab represents simply wickedness, he's just black. Well, now Elijah represents white, so he's just white. And everything Elijah does is right. And therefore to criticize anything Elijah does is like criticizing the Lord Jesus Christ, in the attitude, I have found ^{of} the ~~attitude~~ average seminary student. But I think it is wise we understand that is a false attitude, that even the prophets were human beings. And that the apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ made mistakes, the only man who ever lived who never made a mistake and never did anything wrong was the Lord Jesus Christ. I think that in saying that about the apostles it is worthwhile to guard it by this. That the apostles had permitted to them a very vital task of beginning the work of Christianity, beginning the spreading of it, establishing the foundation and therefore I believe we are justified in assuming that when the Lord tells us of their work, he is giving us an example, except when he labels it or makes it clear that it's not an example. And therefore we recognize that the apostles made their mistakes, we know Peter and Paul quarreled publicly, certainly they couldn't both be right. We know that the apostles made their mistakes. But that when the Bible says that Paul presented a sermon in Athens, it is an example for us unless it is definitely labelled. I know ^{there are} other people who say Paul made a great mistake in his sermon at Athens. When he got to Corinth he resolved to know Jesus only, to preach Jesus crucified and him only. Well, I think that

is wrong. I think he always preached Christ crucified and him only, but I think at Athens he used an approach to reach the sophisticated, intelligent Athenium, in Corinth he used one to commercial minded Corinthians. And probably he made mistakes in both places. But I don't think the Bible gives us his mistakes, unless it labels them. But in the case of Elijah and Elisha, we are not dealing with the founding of the Christian religion, we are not dealing with those who laid the foundation of our church and who spread the word, we are dealing with the two men who fought the Baal-worship and most of what they said was undoubtedly right but it is not (8½) to say they could not make mistakes, nor even to assume they did not make mistakes. And I'm convinced that Elijah made a very, very glaring one which we will look at. But first, a, the work of Elijah and Elisha, that's the general summary, and then b, Elijah's First Appearance. And we've noticed how he suddenly comes out of the desert, appears in Ahab's court, says it will not rain these days, except according to my word, as the Lord liveth before whom I stand. Of course the Lord is here Jehovah, it's the prophet name of God, and before the people got over their--before the sophisticated, well-dressed, people sitting around in state there, in Ahab's court, got over their amazement of how this wild fellow ever got in there in the first place, to make this remark so publicly, he has disappeared from among them. And somebody said well, let's put him in the asylum, we don't want a fellow like that walking around, you can't tell what he might get people stirred up, so they sent for the jailer and said go on get ahold of that fellow, better lock him up for a few days, till he cools off and the bailiff couldn't find him. And God cared for him down by the river there. And he went down to a desolate place in the desert and there he drank the water from the river and the Lord had the ravens bring him food.

I know a fellow who went to Wooster College, a fine Christian fellow he was, earnest, desiring to serve the Lord, he went to Wheaton College and gradually got his faith torn into and torn into, and still he was clinging to

all he could of it, and then he got into, he went to McCormick Seminary, and there at McCormack Seminary, he was the sort of a fellow who didn't make a gradual turnover, like some of his close friends did, he just gradually changed, instead of a sudden turning. And he was at McCormack and he was telling how the Professor of Old Testament said one day, he told me the Professor said that in the story of Elijah there by simply changing the vowels you could have it that, not that the ravens brought him food every day, but the ⁿArabs. And he said he was just grabbing for that as a straw to keep his faith in the Bible without believing what they were ridiculing as these fantastic myths and legends, and he said oh that's great, and he said the professor didn't hear him say that though. He said, yes, but if any of you think that's a correct interpretation I have absolutely no regard for your intelligence whatever. He just pushed the fellows back, and it was a blow to them. And he is today a modernist leader in a big Presbyterian Church, the largest in one of our states. Very, very nice fellow, fine Christian, but through his education just gradually turning against everything.

Well, now it seems to me that that approach that professor had toward this was wrong. It could be ravens, it could be Arabs, the vowels would simply make the difference. But the picture of Elijah is one of God interposing with supernatural ways at point after point in his life, I don't think we have any way to be sure which of the two it is. (12) * has been preserved as raven, God did many other things in Elijah's life more unusual even than having the ravens feed him. I think it is just as well to take it as ravens as to consider the possibility that it is Arabs. I'm not even sure there were Arabs in that area. But at any rate God cared for him marvelously, when the water dried up there he went up north into the land of Phoenicia, and went to the little town of Phoenicia there and there he came to a widow who, they were just ready to die from the famine, practically no food left, and you remember he went in with her and he promised her that the wheat and the oil would last till the famine was over. He stayed with her there and the

Lord caused that their food was marvelously multiplied and so it lasted. And then after three years, remember, the famine got so bad that it was all through that area and, by this time, Ahab was tremendously interested in getting ahold of this fellow Elijah and he sent to all the countries around asking if anybody had seen him. He was hiding in this little town in this northern area, there. There's a time to suffer martyrdom and there's a time to hide. And God did not order Elijah to go up there and to face Ahab and be killed. He didn't order him to do that, He had him hide until the time was ripe for his work to accomplish something, and when the time was ripe then Ahab appeared, and when he appeared, you remember, Obadiah saw him and Obadiah was terrified. Obadiah and Ahab were hunting for water, just some little bit of water, that he might give the animals, and he said to Elijah, oh Elijah. He said, go tell Ahab I'm here. Oh, Elijah, he said, I hid the prophets of the Lord and protected them, he said. I'm a true believer, don't do this terrible thing to me. He said if I go and tell Ahab you're here and Ahab comes to kill you, I know the Lord will just lift you up and carry you off somewhere where Ahab couldn't get at you and then he'll turn all his wrath on me, and kill me. But Elijah promised to be there. Then you remember, he had this conflict up on Mount Carmel. Now if Elijah had appeared in the first place there, and he had said to the king, King I want to challenge you and your Baal-worshippers. Let's have a contest on Mount Carmel and find out who is God, Jehovah or Baal, Ahab would say what's this foolish fellow talking about. He'd say get out of the palace here, you're making a nuisance of yourself, he wouldn't have paid any attention to him. But it was the prediction of the famine which made people have an evidence he was the Lord's messenger. And then it was the famine which brought difficulty and trouble to people. And as a rule when people are prosperous and happy they're not interested in the Lord. And when you can give them...

...they will pay no attention and they go on ^{they ignore it and} and ^{they're not interested} they're not interested but if you give them a testimony and it's in their mind when trouble comes, they may think of the word you've given them and the Lord may use that word to lead him to Himself. And if they don't have the testimony there's nothing to lead them to the Lord no matter how bad the trouble is. But it's in time of trouble that people come to the Lord. Now you can't tell, of course, when you meet them what trouble they may now be enduring which you don't know anything about and your testimony may have an immediate effect. But as a rule, it is only in times of trouble that people are even interested in the Lord. But the testimony given before is available and ready and can be used.

Well, now the people were in trouble with the famine. They were ready to face the problem and in that situation, now Elijah challenges to the contest. I've known young fellows to go out and they're going to prove to the world that the Bible is true, and they go up to some great Modernist and challenge him to a debate or something, and the fellow laughs at them and ignores them and they just make fools of themselves. There's no preparation for it, there's no foundation for it (1 3/4)

~~It~~ ^{They} may accomplish something sometime, ~~as~~ far as that goes, but as a rule that sort of an approach needs a preparation such as there was here. The preparation was there. The whole nation was filled with the interest. Elijah was the evangelist type, Elisha was the pastor type. We need them both.

Well, they met on Mount Carmel and you remember up there how the prophets of Baal called out to Baal to set fire to the sacrifice and Elijah hounded them and laughed at them and said he's probably on a journey, maybe he's asleep, call a little louder and see if you can wake him up, all that kind of talk, which of course made them all the angrier and they yelled all the louder and then you remember that Elijah, after a whole day of that sort of thing, with a great host of people around him, then that Elijah, his turn came, and he took and built again the altar of God that was fallen down and he put the sacrifice on and poured water on and then he prayed, calling for fire, prayed to the Lord to send the fire and to light it, and the fire came down and it

was lit and the people yelled the Lord is God, the Lord is God, and then he took the prophets of Baal and killed them and then you remember there was the matter of the drought. You can do this but if the drought continues what has it accomplished? The people may look to the Lord for a brief time but you need a removal of the great sign the Lord has given, and Elijah sent his servant up to the top of the mountain seven times, looking and no sign of rain. And finally on the seventh time they saw a little cloud way in the distance and Elijah was (3 1/2) And Elijah said to Ahab, get started, he said I hear a sound of an abundance of rain, get started. And he'd done his day's work, he'd made a great display, the nervous energy that man had poured out on that day is tremendous, the tension, the excitement, the thrill of it all is tremendous, and he felt just exactly as you and I feel after you give a great evangelistic message or do some ~~thing~~ tremendous work, we just feel like, just got to work this energy off, we feel like running, jumping, talking, any fool thing to get it out of our system, and what we need is to learn to relax and to get rested and over it and ready for the next day's work. And that's what Elijah needed. There there were caves in the mountain there where you'd be dry from the rain and sheltered. Elijah could have gone into one of those caves and slept a month. Elijah could've gotten a good rest and been ready to utilize that, because that great scene on Mount Carmel is followed up by an itinerating campaign, talking to the people, driving it home to them, would have done the work. You wouldn't need Elisha. If Elijah could've gone on right after that with his itinerating pastoral work, following up that, but instead of that ~~he~~ ^{the girl} ~~stripped~~ up his loins and ran 30 miles before the chariot of ^{Ahab} ~~Elijah~~ and (4 3/4)

this wild hairy man from the desert running in front of the chariot of the king, and people looked and said well, he sure is wild fellow isn't he? They said that's wonderful the testimony he gave to God up there, but look what he's doing now. And Elijah after running and working off the nervous tension that he'd gotten up in that wonderful work he'd done up there on that day,

getting that nervous tension up, he got to the town where Ahab went to his palace, Elijah went, probably went to a flop house somewhere, and spent the night, we have no reason to think he had friends in that town--but he stayed somewhere there but he spent the night and woke up in the morning half dead with tiredness and the strain of what he'd gone through the day before, added to it all this silly, senseless ^{physical} ~~business~~ exertion of running that way before the chariot of Ahab. The ^{he put out was} energy was so great, it says that he ran in the spirit of the Lord. It just seemed as if nothing could stop him, it was that outflow, that nervous energy, that we have when we're in a situation like that, if we throw it away and waste it, as he did there. He woke up in the morning in that situation and Ahab of course was saying what can we do, what can we do. The people have all yelled Jehovah is the God, they've killed the prophets of Baal, the people are all ready now to stand behind Elijah, why if Elijah gives the word they'll topple me from my throne and put somebody else in. What can we do? Jezebel was made of sterner stuff. Jezebel sent a messenger, the messenger said Elijah, if you're still here 24 hours from now you'll be just like these prophets of Baal you've killed. And Jezebel hadn't the least power to fulfill that foolish threat that she gave to Elijah. The people would've torn her limb from limb if she'd begun to touch him, if she sent soldiers to try to hurt him, the people wouldn't have let them touch him. Ahab wouldn't have cared do anything against Elijah in this situation. The whole country knew how Elijah had faced the prophets of Baal. If they had tried to do something vigorous at this point against Elijah, Ahab and Jezebel both would've had to flee for their lives. But Jezebel puts on a bold-looking front and sends the message to Elijah and he's just too tired out to think sensibly and so he gets up and he starts walking and she says we'll give you 24 hours to get out of the country. Lucky for her he got up because if he'd stayed she certainly couldn't have touched him. He rushed southward fast as he could walk and he could walk fast. He headed through Israel, south through the southern part of Israel, south into Judah, through Judah, down into the

desert, and he lay down, and he went to sleep and he woke up and the Lord's angel said, Elijah what are you doing there, your work is up there in Israel, taking the work you've done on Sinai, bringing it home to the people, teaching them as a message of God, utilizing the work that you've done, not just letting it peter out and throwing it away. Poor Elijah says, they've killed the prophets, they've broken down the Lord's altar, now they seek my life. He says Lord let me die, I'm no better than my fathers, and the Lord in his mercy gave him some food and let him sleep again for a few more days, he was just worn out and he slept there and then the angel touched him and said Elijah, it's time to start moving. So Elijah got up and started and he walked 40 days, south into Sinai, and the idea of saying, well, now the Bible is just a group of puppets pulled on a string, here's what Elijah did, he did the great work upon ~~Sinai~~ Carmel, now he makes this wonderful trip down to Sinai. It's not interpreting what you've got there, it is not realizing that Elijah the great godly man did not sin in this, but he made a mistake. He made an unfortunate mistake. He made a mistake which should be a warning to us. When we do our great work, then to stop and relax and get in shape for the next stage of our work for the Lord, and think ~~what~~ what is the next thing that will advance the Lord's cause best next, instead of just being so wrought up with the emotion of this thing that we can't think about the next stage and work it out reasonably and in such a way as to be effective. The work had to wait, we don't know how long, was it five years, was it twenty years, was it twenty-five years, before Elisha's great work commenced? God had to take another man altogether and start in and train him and get him ready to carry on the work and the work could have been carried on twice as well and twice as effectively right after Carmel as a few years later when Elisha was (9 3/4)

Elijah ^{jal} was wonderful for the work he did, but he proved himself incapable of the work that was needed ~~at the beginning~~ ^{by his flight} to succeed by his flight before the silly bluff of the clever queen in this situation. And so Elijah gets down there to Sinai and then we read how God deals in tenderness with his

overwrought prophet. Elijah was not sinning he was erring, he was making mistakes in not thinking things through sensibly, and understanding, and God help us, we all make mistakes, but we should learn to avoid them, and learn to do things in such a way as to be effective, and so he's down there at Sinai and the Lord lets him get rested, lets him get filled with the spirit of the desert again down there, lets him get the feeling of great distances and the high mountains and all that, and to forget the little queens with their big bluffs, and then the Lord says to Elijah, what are you doing here Elijah? Elijah says, oh, he says, I'm no better than my fathers. He says they've killed the prophets of God and broken down his altars, now they're seeking me to kill me. Well, why didn't he talk this way when he faced Ahab before, when all the people were with Ahab and Ahab had all the power and Elijah was nothing, no, then he faced him boldly. But now he has faced it, he killed the prophets of Baal, he made his wonderful exhibit on Mount Carmel, now he was giving way to senseless weakness. And it got into his mind and gripped him when there was nothing he could do, and the Lord in tenderness and in gentleness caused him to see a great fire and the Lord wasn't in the fire, and hear a tremendous wind and the Lord wasn't in the wind, and then at the end a still small voice, showing that God could work not merely in the great tempestuous thing, but in the little quiet movements of thought, and of reason, and of intelligent consideration. And the Lord spoke to him in a still small voice and the Lord said what are you doing here? And Elijah repeated that they were trying to kill him, ~~if~~ they'd killed all the others, and God said no, Elijah, you're not the only one left. I've got 7000 men up there that have never bowed the knee to Baal. There are lots of people in ~~the~~ Israel still that stand for the Lord but they need leadership, they need someone to give them the truth and to lead them, not simply to denounce them for their errors, they make the errors, you make errors, we all make errors, but to lead them, to teach them, to bring them over to the attitude that they ought to take. The 7000 of them are nothing without a leader, you should be there to lead them, instead of running off (12½)

And then the Lord shows Elijah his power. The Lord said Elijah you go off and you anoint a new king for Israel. You go anoint a new king, you're afraid of the threats of this petty foreign queen, who hasn't the power to do a thing except with her husband's permission, ^{and he hasn't} ~~we haven't~~ got the power to go beyond a certain point with the people. You notice what he did when ~~the~~ it came to Naboth's vineyard. Ahab ~~didn't~~ dare take that. They had to make up a whole lot of lies and things to convince people (13)

Jezebel couldn't possibly have hurt him. God said, so far from Jezebel hurting you I'm going to permit you to name a man who will replace Ahab as king. Not only that but the kingdom of Syria, twice as big as this one, I'm going ^{to} permit you to name a man to replace that king. And he said Elijah it's too bad you failed. You did a wonderful work up to this point but we'll have to put somebody else in to carry on now. You go and anoint Elisha, the son of Shaphat, to take your place. Poor Elijah had to go and spend the rest of his time training Elisha to do the work that he should've been doing. Well, we have to stop there. I'll post the assignment.

O.T.History 290.

...I was sorry I had to be in Chicago last week so we weren't able to have any hours together but this afternoon we'll be able to make up for some of those hours at 4:30 to 5, and therefore we will not have any section today. There will be no Senior-Middler section this afternoon. There will be a lecture instead in this room.

Now we were speaking about D, The Dynasty of Omri. Under that we looked at 3, The Menace of the Baal-Worshippers. And notice how differently God dealt with the matter of the Golden Calves which were explained to be the worship of Jehovah but in a form contrary to the Bible. It was wicked, those who did it were punished, God opposed it in a strong way, but when the Baal-worship came, that was a far greater menace and against that he raised up two of his greatest prophets and that was such a great menace that while it was in progress the other is hardly notified. The Baal-worship would have

utterly destroyed true religion if it had not been rooted out. And so we want to stress the importance of The Menace of the Baal-worship, and the fact that this is one of the four places in the Bible where God pours out great numbers of miracles. It is, by that we see the tremendous importance of this Baal-worship. And so we went on to look at 4, Elijah the Prophet, and under that we looked at a, The Work of Elijah and Elisha, and I summarized the work showing the difference between the two men, showing the importance of the order in which they came, showing a little bit of their character, and a little bit of what our attitude should be toward the stories that are told about them. That was a. B, is Elijah's First Appearance. I don't know whether there is much to add in that to what we've already given under a. Elijah's first appearance, one of the most dramatic things in the whole Bible. Suddenly this man from the desert appears before Ahab, makes his great declaration, it will not rain, there'll be no rain nor dew except according to my word and disappears. And many a person since has followed his example and suddenly stood up before people and given a great denunciation and a terrible prediction, but in most cases the prediction has not been fulfilled. And they have been proven to be people following their own imagination instead of those whom God has raised up for a specific purpose as He did Elijah. Elijah's making this declaration and carrying it out the way he did is not an example for us in precise detail unless God speaks to us as he did to Elijah. But in the principle involved it is an example to us, that God used means to draw attention to Elijah, to put him in a position where he would be heard, before the great contest on Mount Carmel. That contest on Mount Carmel could~~n~~/~~o~~ have been held if Elijah had had a friend at court who persuaded Ahab to give his approval to a contest on Mount Carmel. It is not probably it could have but it is possible, it could have been held when Elijah first came and very little attention called to it. Most people look on it as a fairy tale, it would have little effect on the land, it would have some, but it was preceded by preparation which attracted people's attention and interest to this man Elijah and

what he could do, and while we cannot ordinarily make the preparation like that with the miraculous work that was there, we can find other ways of preparing for the great contest and declaration of this day. So in this case, God worked it supernaturally because of the tremendous menace. In lesser situations we have to use our brain power to work it out. But I have known ~~a~~ very wonderful meetings, with very splendid messages given, given to a handful of people because there had not been proper preparation made to attract attention and to find the means of reaching a larger group.

Dr. McIntire has a very particular gift of finding ways of reaching out and getting attention, and it gets his excellent messages a far greater hearing than they would ever have if ~~it were~~ he did not combine this other gift with them. So much then for b, Elijah's first appearance.

c, Elijah's Great Work at Carmel. We spoke about that at some length under the work of Elijah and Elisha. It was a vital stage in the work of Elijah and Elisha. It would have been just a flash in the night ~~and left~~ left little effect if it were not followed by the great work of Elisha after. These things are very, very important and very valuable but the follow-up is also tremendously important.

I remember hearing 30 years ago, or a little more than that, when I was a student in seminary, I had heard about ~~Nathan~~^{Nathan} Alexander who was then a few years before that pastor of a great Presbyterian Church in Pittsburgh, and they said that Billy Sunday had been holding great campaigns in different parts of the United States and that some of the ministers in Pittsburg wanted to have Billy Sunday come to Pittsburg for a campaign and others said it would be very silly to have him. You just get people stirred up and there's nothing
(6 $\frac{1}{2}$) to produce. And they said look at this town where Billy Sunday went and they had a great campaign and hundreds of people went forward and nothing was accomplished. Two years later the converts had all disappeared. Well Nathan Alexander said I don't think that was Billy Sunday's fault, I think that was the fault of the ministers participating in the

Billy Sunday.
 campaigning and he threw the weight of his influence ^{in a kind of} of getting him. And for
 nearly a year before the campaigning he was having classes with his people in
 personal work, how to deal with inquirers, and so on, and he had his people
 all ready and when Billy Sunday came and they had the campaigning the people of
 the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh were ready to reach them when
 they were stirred by Billy Sunday and ~~could~~ help them and to give them an
 understanding and to get them to his church. And he ^{found} ~~viewed~~ that out of--a
 year later--out of about 300, I believe, new members his church had as a re-
 sult of that campaign, out of that 300 they ~~found~~ ^{found} that a year ~~later~~ about
 295 of them were still in the church and over 200 of them were very active
 in the church. And other churches might have hardly any (7 3/4)
 and I'm speaking of good sound churches as his was then. The difference
 would be in the follow-up and in the preparation. And so this thing at Carmel
 was absolutely essential, it is vital, that sort of thing must be done, but
 the follow-up and the preparation are absolutely necessary to its having its
 real effectiveness. One man could stand as Elijah did and can hound the
 prophets of Baal and can attract the attention of the whole nation to his
 great stand, and without him not one-tenth of that which he accomplished was
 accomplished through (8 1/2) But others who in a quiet way
 are following up and carrying on may be just as important and perhaps some-
 times even more important in the Lord's recognition of what is actually
 accomplished. Well, d, Elijah's Flight. We noticed last time how Elijah
~~MA~~de this great mistake here. I don't call it a sin on Elijah's part, except
 in the sense that we're all sinners. Every human being falls very far short
 of the ideal and I think we should be very careful in excusing others in
 where they fall short of the ideal, but it doesn't mean that we can imitate
 them when they fall short there because we fall short probably in plenty of
 other places where the other people didn't. But in this case it certainly
 is important for our understanding of our own Christian work to notice that
 this great man of God, one of the most effective workers in the world's

history, and one whom God used in a most remarkable way, fell so utterly short here that if it were not for God's further supernatural intervention the results of the work would practically have disappeared. He killed the prophets of Baal but Jezebel (9 3/4)

For a brief time the people were turned against Baal but Jezebel's influence continuing constantly and nothing to offset it, that would have amounted to much, right at that point if Elijah could have gone and hid in one of those caves and slept for a month, and gotten himself in first-class condition and then come back and gone about through the land, talking to the people here and there and driving home the meaning of the work at Carmel, what was accomplished could have been many times what actually was accomplished, but was accomplished as a result of divine intervention was enough to destroy the Baal-worship out of the land in that particular message (10 $\frac{1}{2}$), but it was God's intervention which prevented Elijah's flight from utterly destroying the whole thing. So in Elijah's flight we have him fleeing from the bluff of a woman who could have done nothing to hurt him, fleeing from her bluff and running for his life. And God mercifully followed him even though he was out of the will of God, going where he never should have gone, God was along the way feeding, caring for him, protecting him, and helping him, and preparing to bring him back to the place of (11)

And then e, Elijah at Horeb. And there we have a story which in some ways is even more dramatic than the occurrences on Mount Carmel. On Mount Carmel we have the great thing that was before the whole nation, down here we just have one man. But God shows his wonders in order to reach the heart of this one man and in order to lead him and show him His will. And so down there at Horeb, the mount of God, Mount Sinai where God had given the ten commandments, there he saw a tremendous wind, but we read, the Lord was not in the wind. Well the Lord directed the wind, he directs everything. What does that mean, the Lord was not in the wind? It means that God in some way showed to the heart of Elijah as he saw this tremendous wind that was break-

ing the rocks in pieces, God some way impressed it on his mind, that this was merely God's fingerprint, God's activity, that he wasn't actually coming face to face with God in it, but merely his working. And then he sent a great earthquake and the Lord was not in the earthquake. And after the earthquake a fire. The Lord is in all these, and when it says he was not in them it means that in the sense of deep (12 $\frac{1}{2}$) knowledge of God. He saw God's power in this but he didn't see God's person. And so right after thesek Elijah wrapped his face in his mantel and went out and stood in the enteringⁱⁿ of the cave and a voice came to him and said, what are you doing here, Eli~~jah~~? Remember when Elijah said what can I do here and the people of Israel had prayed against the Lord and even I alone am left. The Lord said how foolish to think that you are the only one left. For when you have got God with you that's more power than all the people of Israel put together. And so the Lord didn't just say that which might be just words, he put it into action. He said, Go, return on thy way to the wild~~erness~~ of Damascus, and when thou comest, anoint Hazael to be king of Syria. When did Elijah anoint Hazael to be king of Syria? Can anybody tell me what ch~~apter~~ of the Bible tells how Elijah anointed Hazael to be king of Syria? How many think there is such a chapter? How many think there is not such a chapter? A number think there is not. I had intended to give a certain time to find out. Maybe we better read (14)

He says to him here, he says, when you come to Damascus, when did Elijah come to Damascus, anoint Hazael to be king of Syria. And then he says, And Jehu the son of Nimshi shalt thou anoint to be king over Israel. When does he anoint Jehu king over Israel? And then he says Elisha the son of Shaphat shalt thou anoint to be prophet in thy place. When did he anoint Elisha? I don't think you'll find in the Bible anywhere stated that Elijah anointed any of these men. The statements of the Lord here given in a formal command but what it means is not a command but a prediction. It is a prediction that through Elijah God is going to show his will, that these...

...is he afraid of Jezebel the wife of King Ahab? Well, God is going through Elijah, directly or indirectly, to show that the whole dynasty of Ahab is to disappear and an entirely new dynasty come into being. And before he even says this he refers to a greater land than Israel, a stronger, a more powerful land, the land of Syria up there around Damascus, why even will God cause an overturn in the dynasty of Syria. The Dynasty in power in Syria will disappear and another king unrelated to him will take his place, and the Assyrian records confirm this statement because they say Hazael son of a nobody seized the throne, that's what the Assyrian records say. Notice the difference between Assyria and Syria. Syria is our modern way of speaking of Aram, the land of the Aramaens around Damascus. Assyria is the land over across the desert from which the Assyrian conquerors come, but it's from that land we get most of our written records for this time, and the Assyrian record says that Hazael son of a nobody became king of Syria of Damascus. And then after these two wonderful statements of the way in which God's ~~power~~ power is going to be shown by overturning in the rulership of two great nations, and when God can do that why should ~~Elijah~~ Elijah flee for his life as God's messenger and God's representative, unless of course God tells him to. After saying that, then he says, and poor Elijah, you've made a wonderful start but you have to appoint someone else to carry on the work that you deserted when you fled down here. So when you go back, anoint Elisha the son of Shaphat of Abelmeholah to be prophet in your place. Elijah hung his head and walked up knowing that his ministry had accomplished much but that it was necessary share in it. And we read, of course, of how he anointed Elisha. Funny way to anoint a man, to throw a coat over his head. We have no record of any other anointing that he ever did to Elisha. Elisha is spoken of as the man who poured water into the hands of Elijah. Elisha is willing to do the most menial tasks in order to help the great prophet. Elisha didn't say well, God has appointed me to be the great prophet, now Elijah is a has-been. I'm going to take over ($3\frac{1}{4}$)

Elisha said if I can help that great godly man by just doing the little menial errands for him, going along with him and learning from him, I'll be glad to serve the Lord in this way, and Elisha was the man whom God called to carry on the work.

Like I've known graduates of this seminary who have become assistants to experienced men and have been very, very happy to have the position and then after a little while have begun to see the weaknesses of these experienced men, and we^{all} have weaknesses though probably they have many strengths that these assistants didn't see, didn't realize, and think well that fellow ought to get superannuated. I should be the pastor of this church, that man should just, he'd be all right to help out around, give a talk (4)

I've known instances, but ordinarily that's not the attitude the man of god really (4 $\frac{1}{4}$)

Well, we're not talking about Elisha yet, we're talking about Elijah. f, Elijah's Declining Years. Now we have this story of Elijah's calling Elisha, or rather of Elijah's throwing his mantle over Elisha, at the end of chapter 19. Chapter 20 we don't have Elijah even mentioned. Chapter 20 we jump back up to the land of Israel. We find Israel and Aarah Aram, of course it's here called Syria, fighting and in that fight we find unknown prophets who come and speak to Ahab, that is by unknown I mean men not mentioned^{by} name but we can safely say that Elijah is not included in the number here, but men who were true prophets, who came to King Ahab and told him what to do in order to win the battle. And some people overlook that and think of Ahab as the great example of wickedness in the Bible and certainly Jezebel was a great example of wickedness, and he as her husband was her willing ally in most things, but they think of him as so utterly wicked that it's hardly conceivable that God would help him, and yet here you have God sending his prophet to tell Ahab how to win the battle against Syria. God was using even as imperfect a man as Ahab here for his purposes. And so through this chapter we find God sending prophets to tell Ahab what to do, and Ahab doing what the

prophets tell him to, through most of the chapter and then at the end of the chapter we have Ahab going ahead and using his own intelligence as to what to do, and doing something that was utterly contrary to what the Lord wanted, so that the Lord sends a prophet to make an object lesson to show Ahab what he can expect after God has given him all this, and then he just goes ahead with his own brain instead of looking to the Lord for His will as to what to do with the victory that the Lord has given him. And he works an object lesson, he doesn't come like Elijah to the face of him and denounce him, he gives an object lesson, and then when Ahab is giving judgment on the object lesson, he says that's exactly the way with you, the Lord said (6 3/4)

And that way he gets to hear it without having the prejudice raised against it first. And that's the thing we find over and over in the Bible. There are times when, like Elijah, God commands one to go straight into the presence of the enemy and denounce him. But in the majority of cases in scripture we find the Lord providing a tactful way for a man to get a hearing. ¶ I think one of the greatest instances of this tact of the Holy Spirit I know of is in the book of Mark. The book of Matthew is the great gospel for the Jews and it can be summarized in the words, Behold your King. And the Jews struggling under the oppression of the Romans are told God is going to send them his conquering king, and Jesus Christ is that king. And then you turn to the next book, the gospel of Mark, which is written for the Romans. And the Romans are the ones who have the king, that the Jews are struggling under, and the Holy Spirit doesn't come to the Romans in the gospel of Mark and say, look, behold the king. You're going to lose your kingship, Jesus Christ is going to take it. He comes to the Jews who are struggling for lack of kingship and says God's king is coming. He comes to the Romans who have the kingship and find it difficult to get the things done right, and presents the picture of a servant, the one who can do what they need. And then, after they get the hearing in that way, they go on and give them the other side of the picture. And in the end the Romans (8 1/4)

then comes to throw his lordship at the

feet of Christ and recognize him as king. But that's not the first approach. And so here as where Nathan appeared before David also after David's sin, we find an oblique manner of presentation~~k~~, such as is calculated to win approval of the principle before it is made specific and applied. And then having won a yes answer to the principle it's easy enough to point out the application, and one is much more apt to get a yes answer to the application than if one starts with that point. We find instance after instance of this in the Bible. But chapter 20 doesn't have Elijah in it at all. Perhaps we should have left chapter 20 to the later head about Ahab's reign, but right here in the life of Elijah, since 20 has so many prophets in it, it's good to know about it at this point.

Chapter 21 has Elijah in it, but he's rather incidentally in it, he doesn't appear until pretty near the end of the chapter. We have here in chapter 21 Ahab wants Naboth's vineyard and he can't even take a vineyard from a man that's next to his palace unless the man is willing to give it. Ahab does not have as much power you see as our present government has today. Because all governments today have the power of endless domain. And you can have a lovely house that you wouldn't sell to anybody under any conditions but if the city wants to build a school house there they will send assessors in and put a value on your house and pay it and take it whether you like it or not. But Ahab could not do that, his power as king was much inferior to the power of our government here. He as king could not take the land away from Naboth. He tried to get Naboth to sell it and Naboth wouldn't, and then when he sulked his more energetic wife Jezebel borrowed his signet ring and proceeded to produce a judicial murder of Naboth, by bringing false witnesses to accuse him and causing him to be killed, and then as soon as Naboth was out of the way she said to Ahab now you can go and get the vineyard, Naboth is no longer in your way. And here we find that God said to Elijah, go and meet Ahab. And he said Ahab is in the vineyard of Naboth. Go and meet him there and say to him, thus saith the Lord, in the place where dogs lick the

blood of Naboth shall dogs lick thy blood, even thine. And they licked the blood of Ahab Naboth here in Jezreel beside the palace of King Ahab, and-- that's when Naboth was killed, and Elijah went on, this day I'm going to utterly destroy your house, make it like the house of Jeroboam, not a person left in it, and of Jezebel the Lord has said that dogs will eat Jezebel by the wall of Jezreel. And so these terrible predictions were made by Elijah, but we read in verse 27 that when Ahab heard these words he rent his clothes and put sackcloth on his flesh and fasted and lay in sackcloth, and went softly, and the word of the Lord came to Elijah, the Lord didn't want Elijah to see his prophecy unfulfilled and think that God had forsaken him. The Lord didn't tell Ahab, as far as the record goes here, he told Elijah. Do you see how Ahab humbles himself before me, because he humbled himself before me I will not bring the evil in his days but in his sons' days will I bring the evil on his house. So when the Lord has said it won't come till the son's days, some people try to prove the Lord was wrong and that it still did come in Ahab's day, and that when Ahab was killed not at Jezreel but way over across the Jordan, over where he was fighting in Gilead, that because the chariot was brought back and washed in Samaria, which also is not (12 $\frac{3}{4}$)

that that is the fulfillment that dogs will lick your blood, but it says in the end of the chapter that God said the evil will come in the days of his son, in his day. So it was not (13 $\frac{1}{4}$)

There's a very obscure verse there which one version has rendered (13 $\frac{1}{4}$)

Another version has rendered the dogs licked his blood. And in neither case it was, when the chariot was washed has nothing to do with Ahab himself. But I've had in Prophets course a big struggle (13 $\frac{1}{2}$)

But this Old Testament History (13 $\frac{3}{4}$)

all we can do is ignore the passage. But we notice that (13 $\frac{3}{4}$) the thing here is Elijah's activity. Elijah is rebuking Ahab, you

might say he is declaring the end of Ahab here, and after what he did here and Jezebel (14) undertook to kill him

But that, people all over the land knew about Ahab's wickedness towards Naboth and now, no doubt it was repeated all over the land what Elijah said and that helped to keep alive in people's minds the memory of (14 $\frac{1}{4}$)

the memory of (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) what God had done for Elijah until (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

And then chapter 22 tells about the, about Ahab's death, and in that there is a great prophet (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) and that prophet who is mentioned in this chapter is Micaiah, a man who is mentioned nowhere else except in this chapter, a very great prophet of the Lord, but we know nothing about him except what we find in this chapter here...

O.T.History 292. ($\frac{1}{4}$)

...refer to this chapter again briefly when we take up Jehoshaphat. And then we go on to 2 Kings which really is just a second part of the same book. It was originally one book, some manuscripts have divided it here, others have made the division at a different place. It was too long for one work and so it was divided but it's really one book. And there we find in the days of Ahab's son, we find in the first chapter here that in the days of Ahab's son Ahaziah who was king, we'll look at them a little later, but in his day he fell and was injured and told messengers to go inquire of Baalzebub the god of Ekron, whether he would recover from the disease. And the angel of the Lord said to Elijah the Tishbite, arise, go up to meet the messengers of the king of Samaria. And say to them, is it that there is no God in Israel, that you go to enquire of Baalzebub the god of Ekron? The Lord says you will never be able to get off that bed that you are on, you will surely die. And the messengers told Ahaziah, the son of Ahab, about this and Ahaziah told them to go and look for him and bring him in to him, and he sent

fifty men and we read that they called him, Man of God, the king says, come down, Elijah said if I'm a man of God let fire come down from heaven and consume thee and thy fifty, And this happened and those fifty soldiers and the next fifty that were sent, and then the third fifty that came had a godly captain, or at least a ~~god~~-fearing captain and he bowed down before Elijah and ~~said to~~ ^{pled with} him not to do this way, and the Lord said go down with him, be not afraid. What a blood-thirsty God we have in this chapter, to kill a hundred soldiers that were merely doing their duty in obeying the command that was given them (2½)

I got a letter from ~~a~~ a man some years ago. He seemed to be a fine Christian man, he was very active in Christian work but I got a letter from him, he was an Englishman, he said, I've just been listening over the radio to a man on the Old Testament, talking on the Old Testament about a God that is is not my God, he is not the God of the peaceful, kind achievements. Well, it simply shows that he did not understand the Bible. God is the loving, ^{the} king God but He is a God that hates sin and must destroy it. As far as these hundred men are concerned, they had gone into the army, they were soldiers, ~~they~~ were wars constantly there, to be destroyed by one blast of lightning in this way was probably not half as painful for them as it would have been to be killed by the enemies' swords and spears, hand to hand fighting, and they had to die sometime and it was not particularly cruel, the fact that God caused their deaths to come a little early this way. But in the economy of God's plan it was another thing done to keep alive the memory of what Elijah had done, to preserve the impression made on the land by the ~~drought~~ and by the victory on Carmel, until Elisha could be ready to carry on the follow up as it should be carried on. And so I think it's important we realize that the purpose of this is practically unparalleled. We have nothing like it ~~anywhere~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~Bible~~ else in the Bible. But it is here to fulfil a function in God's fighting against the Baal worship, to keep alive the attitude toward Elijah so that Elisha may take over the work of Elijah and do the second phase of it as it needs to be done.

And then g, Elijah's Rapture to Heaven. I think it is rather unfortunate that the word rapture, a Latin word which means being seized away, has come in modern English to be used mostly in ordinary English to mean simply for somebody to be so taken away with joy that they enjoy something tremendously. There was a man just a couple of days ago saying that he ~~thought~~ came across people who in speaking of the rapture of the church said they thought it meant the time when the church has its greatest joy and happiness. Of course it will be great joy and happiness, but that's not the meaning of the word. The word rapture means the snatching away, and Matthew Henry's great devotional commentary, written a long time ago when it discusses 1 Thessalonians, says this rapture of the church, and goes on and speaks of it, using the term in what may have been a rather common sense at that time, which has now disappeared from our language, except ~~in~~ connection with the rapture (5 3/4)

But if it is proper to use~~x~~ it of the rapture of the church, it's equally proper to use it of the rapture of Elijah because that's just what it was. God reached down and carried Elijah away to heaven, just as the church will be taken away when our Lord comes back. And so I entitled g, Elijah's Rapture to Heaven. And we have it described in chapter 2 here, how Elijah tries to shake Elisha and Elisha wouldn't be shaken, and he followed him as he walked back and forth across two¹/₂ thirds of the land of Israel. It was good preparation for Elisha for the itinerating work (6¹/₂)

but he followed Elijah back and forth across and then when they came over across the Jordan and as he walked across Elijah took his mantle and wrapped it together and smote the waters that they were divided into two parts, so they went over on dry ground. And when they were gone over, Elijah said to Elisha, ask what I shall do for thee before I be taken away from thee and Elisha said let a double portion of thy spirit be on me. And of course anybody would know it's utterly silly to think this means he said I want to be twice as great a man as you are. If he thought that he'd certainly have more sense

sense than to say it. Although I have known people who didn't have any more sense than to say exactly that sort of thing.

One time Dr. Machen was asked by a Modernist, Joseph Fort Newton, of the Episcopal Church in Philadelphia here got out a book on great sermons of I think it was 1926 or 7 one of those years. And he asked Dr. Machen to give him a sermon and when~~x~~ the book came out Dr. Machen, referring to the book, said it's fine, Christian sermon by Dr. Machen alongwith the Modernist sermons of various people, which Newton called "Great Sermons of This Year" and in the beginning Dr. Machen was one of the leaders of the Modernist-Fundamentalist Contraversy, now happily subsided, and Machen was pretty disgusted about~~x~~ that introduction, and about the fact that in the book there was one other man who was quite conservative though~~x~~ not nearly as definite a leader for the truth as Machen was. Machen said 8 rank Modernists and--he called himself (8 $\frac{1}{2}$) --8 rank Modernists and And I remember one of the students said to him, yes, he said, you can see the attitude of the editor of the book, why he said if he wanted to really show the Fundamentalist view he'd ask a great preacher like McCarthy to write it instead of a professor like you. Machen wasn't as great in his delivery as McCarthy but he certainly was--when it came to writing he was as fine as anybody you'd every find. And I don't think Machen appreciated that at all.

But I'm sure that Eligah was not showing that sort of lack of tact when he said that I would receive a double portion of thy spirit. There are two suggestions that have been made for interpretation of it, one is a parallel portion, a duplicating portion, another which is more likely the case here, is it refers to the laws of inheritance of the day. If a man had one son, that son received the man's property at his death, but if a man had two sons, the elder son received twice as much as the second. If he had three sons, the elder son received twice as much as either one of the others. Thus if a man had seven sons they would divide his property into 8 parts and put two of those parts together, so that the oldest son would receive a double portion,

twice as much as either of the younger sons received. And that is certainly the reasonable interpretation here of what Elisha meant. Some people take it, I've heard it said that I think Elijah they count had seven miracles and Elisha fourteen, and that was the double portion, but I don't think the number of miracles is the full criterion of the greatness of a man, certainly not of his spirit, but I'm sure that's not what is meant here. That he asked that he should be the successor, the elder son, the one to carry on the spirit and work of Elijah, and Elijah said to him, that's a tremendous thing you've asked for. That's what we can expect a great man to say. When he comes to the end of his work he just can't see how anybody can possibly carry on properly, take his place. That's a tremendous thing he said, but, he said, if you see me as I'm taken up then you will, you can know God has given you the surety that it is granted. And if not then it won't be so. And as they still were talking a chariot of fire and horses of fire, separated them and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven. And Elisha said My father, my father, the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof. And as we noticed when we were last together he is not speaking here about the chariot of fire that took him up, he is speaking about Elijah as the bulwark and defense of the nation. And he saw him no more. Elijah was gone. And so that's the end of our section on Elijah the prophet.

Number 5, Ahab's Reign. We had previously only noticed the accession of Ahab. Now Ahab's reign we have fairly well touched upon in connection with Elijah's work, but there is an important thing to note about Ahab's reign, and that is that Ahab is mentioned in Assyrian records. Not only that but the mention of Ahab in the Assyrian records gives us our solid point of chronology for this period. Because the Assyrians, if you leave out the account of the book of Kings, well, leave out of account ^(12½...) the Israelites altogether, of the great empires that ^(12½) the Assyrians are the first to show what we would call a feeling for history. They had an interest in telling about the great events of their reigns, their kings issued accounts of their reigns, giving details year by year. The Egyptians did not

do that. We have some records of the Egyptians written to be put in their tombs in order to show the gods what great men they had been, but the Assyrian annals are written and distributed through the land. We have many copies of some of them and they tell us the events of their reign, written of course from a highly prejudiced viewpoint, the viewpoint of the Assyrian king, but giving us a great deal of historical data, and since they are written on clay tablets they have lasted through the ages. Other lands may have written them too but if so they wrote them on papyrus and they disappeared. And the Assyrians had a very interesting system of dating, they, when a king became king, the first year after he became king he was called the lemu, so they called it the lemu year of this king. That is, the year is named after the king and so you will say the king was (13 3/4) or the lemu of

That means Ashurbannati is king and this year is named after him. Then his leading officer would be the lemu for the next year, and the next leading officer would be the lemu for the next year, and so on, so every year they named after a man, so that all Assyrian contracts, of which we have thousands and thousands in our museums, have at the end of them the name of the reigning king and the name of the limu. Well then naturally in order to, when you find that a man rented some land, twenty or twenty-five years ago and you see he's fallen behind in his payments and you want to bring him into court and collect it all, you want to know how many years it is, and so the Assyrians made lists of the limus, of the reigns. So you have lists of the limus of a certain king's reign, and we have a few lists that give the limus one after the other for a period of some hundreds of years...

O.T.History 293. ($\frac{1}{4}$)

...year by year chronology that we have in the Assyrian limus lists, they are very, very highly regarded by historians, And so we find the name of the kimu year in which one of the Assyrian kings came to the west and tried to conquer the lands on the shore of the Mediterranean Sea. We find that in

the 18th year, no this is not the 18th year, this is the 6th year of King Shalameneser III, which he calls the year of the Limu ($1\frac{1}{4}$) he departed from Nineveh and headed westward with his army and conquered one city after another, and he came to the city of Karkar, and there at Karkar, he tells us, there came against him certain forces and among them he names 1200 chariots, 1200 cavalrymen and 20,000 foot soldiers of Adad itsurt ($1\frac{3}{4}$), that is Hadad-ezer of Damascus. 700 chariots, 700 cavalry and 10,000 foot soldiers appear (2) from Hamath. 2,000 chariots, 10,000 foot soldiers of Ahab the Israelite, this is on page 190 of this book **THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST**, of which there are several copies here in the Library, and a good many of you have copies. I should have mentioned today, if you have a copy you should bring it to class, you might find it easy ($2\frac{1}{4}$)

This passage here on page 190 has the name of Ahab and he gives in parentheses the way it's spelled in the Assyrian syllabic writing. ($2\frac{1}{2}$) of the land of Ahab with the u ending which is the nominative ending, of the land of Israel, Sireliah, it's got the s ($2\frac{3}{4}$)

And we notice in this that Ahab, though he had only half as many ~~as-many~~ foot soldiers as the king of (3) had, had nearly twice as many chariots. And next to the king of Damascus is the onēy who has the largest contingent in this ($3\frac{1}{4}$) of kings against whom the King Shalamaneser fought. But King Shalamaneser after fighting in his 6th year against these kings, tells us about the battle. He says they rode against me for a decisive battle. I fought with them, with the support of the mighty forces of Asher which Aher my Lord has given to me, and the strong weapons of which ($3\frac{3}{4}$) my leader has presented to me. I did inflict a defeat upon them between the towns Karkar and Gilgal. I slew 14,000 of their soldiers with the sword, descending upon them like Adad when

he makes a rainstorm pour down. I spread their forces everywhere, ~~will~~ spreading the entire plains with their widely scattered fleeing soldiers, during the battle I made their blood flow down through the stream into the distance, the plain was too small to let all their souls be sent into the nether world, the vast field gave out when it came to burial. I ($4\frac{1}{4}$) span the Orantes River before there was a bridge. Even during the battle I took from them their chariots, their horses broken to the yoke--this is the propaganda that the king gave out ($4\frac{1}{2}$) but it is 12 more years before we find him becoming less ($4\frac{1}{2}$) and so historians consider that these kings fought him to a standstill. He says he utterly defeated them and annihilated them but he didn't hold their land and he didn't go back to their land. They fought him to a standstill. And the Bible doesn't mention the Assyrian at this point, but the Assyrian records mention Ahab and Hadad-isri, king of Damascus. We have Ben-Hadad mentioned in the Bible but whether these are two forms of the same name or whether one of them is the son and the other the father, we don't have evidence, but they're the same type of name. Add this gives us our fixed date, 852, the Battle of Karkar. There's been a big struggle among scholars, half ranging on the side of thinking the Battle was in 854 and the other half that it was 853. I'm not sure that it's completely proved yet, but in Thiele, in his chronology, in the Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings, accepts 853, and since his chronology is worked out pretty much in detail, ($5\frac{1}{2}$) I'm not ready to stake my life that it was 853 or 854. But it is a fixed date which is tremendously ^{helpful} in arranging a chronology ($5\frac{3}{4}$)

(discussion of spelling of Karkar.) Karkar is a famous battle because it's our first in connection between the Assyrian empire and the Israelites, though not mentioned in the Bible. ($6\frac{1}{2}$. student) That is, we have to figure it out, and for a period of two or three hundred years we have all the L~~im~~us' names so it's not difficult, but after that period ($6\frac{1}{2}$)

It may even be 50 years
pretty clear (6 3/4)

but the evidence is

Well, Ahab then is important in Assyrian history for this battle of Karkar. Ahab was evidently a rather able ruler, he gives that impression from this chapter toward the end of Kings. You remember that great statement, let not him that putteth ~~on~~ his armor boast like him that taketh it off. It's a wonderful statement for any of us. You know who said it? It was King Ahab. He ~~said~~ it when the King of Syria sent and said hand over everything you've got to me. He was going to take it. Ahab said, let not him that putteth on his armor boast like him that taketh it off. (7½)



But Ahab was ~~probably~~ a rather able ruler, but carrying out the plans of alliance with neighboring lands, which his father Omri had probably initiated in marrying Ahab to Jezebel, meant the downfall religiously and morally, it brought in the Baal-worship and it was a terrible think for the land, and also for Judah a little later. Well, Ahab's reign ended with his battle over in Gilead, in Ramoth Gilead where he was killed, and King Jehoshaphat was fighting with him in that battle. We'll glance at that again when we come to Jehoshaphat.

But then we look at number 6, Ahab's Son. Ahab was succeeded by his son Ahaziah of whom we read in 1 Kings 22, that Ahaziah the son of Ahab began to reign over Israel and Samaria the 17th year of Jehoshaphat king of Judah, and reigned two years over Israel. Ahaziah was an evil king like his father but after two years he has this fall from which he died. And Ahaziah was succeeded by his brother Jehoram. We read that Jehoram the son of Ahab began to reign over Israel and Samaria the 18th year of ~~Jehoshaphat~~ king of Judah, and he reigned for 12 years. So he has a longer reign than Ahaziah, there's a period of 12 years in which he reigns. He is a wicked king, but it says that he wrought evil in the sight of the Lord, but not like his father and like his mother, for he put away the image of Baal that his father had made. I think

we see here the work of Elijah and Elisha beginning to come to fruit. He put away the image of Baal that his father had made. And then in chapter 3 here we read about how King Jehoram found that Mesha king of Moab rebelled against him and he asked Jehoshaphat to go with him and they went over and Elisha the prophet was in the (9 3/4)

(11 $\frac{1}{2}$) ...Ahab's reign and we notice how the Assyrian referred to him. It is interesting to have this corroboration of his name. Previously we have no mention of him from any other source than from the Bible. But now we have this interesting mention from a land way across the desert, with the name spelled out just about the way we have it in the Bible. Of course we learn from that more about Biblical history and that's a very interesting point, that the Bible is not a book of history, it is a book to give us God's relation to his people. And into that history enters, but history in the usual sense is political, and this is not primarily political history. Political history, there are certain things that are of great interest, other things of less interest. The history of the relation with God, there are things of great interest and things of less interest. These may overlap to some extent, and they do. We have a great many of the most important political events in Israel's history in the Bible but not all. And here this great battle of this great Assyrian conquest, you'd think would be of tremendous interest politically, but it's not even mentioned in the Bible. It is a warning against thinking that your account is complete, the account is only a part of the story. (13 $\frac{1}{4}$)

you don't have everything about the life of Christ. John says if everything which Jesus did was written down it would fill all the books in the world. You haven't got it in the gospels of ~~John~~ or in Matthew or in Mark. So when you find two events which sound very much alike, it often means the case that are very similar things which he did on two occasions. And yet not (13 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Well, then, we noticed Ahab's death in that battle, and we go on to number 6, Ahab's Son. And Ahab's sons followed in their father's footsteps. The first of them, Ahaziah, reigned only ~~two~~ years as we noted. Then he was succeeded by his brother Jehoram. Now I hope that you will not get these names confused. I want everyone to know the names of the kings of Israel and of the kings of Judah. They are (14½) skeleton , they are not tremendously important in themselves but they are skeleton  for the understanding of the Biblical history of this period. And if you don't have the skeleton you're apt to get things all confused. If you're going to study the Old Testament prophetic books you should know the kings because many of the prophets relate to the kings. You should know the kings in order.

Now this is a point in the Kings where it is easy to get it confused for this reason. King Ahab was succeeded by his son Ahaziah who was succeeded by his brother Jehoram. Ahab's contemporary in Judah was King Jehoshaphat who ^{succeeded} was ~~defeated~~ by his son Jehoram who was succeeded by his son ~~Jehoram~~ ^{Josiah}...

O.T.History 294. (½)

...there's a Jehoram and Ahaziah in Israel, there's a Jehoram and Ahaziah in Judah. And they're right at the same time, in the one case they're two brothers, in the other case it's the father and son. Now I just this afternoon looked it up again in order to make sure that my mind hadn't tricked me on it since I last went over it, and gotten confused, and in doing it I noticed an easy way to remember, so I'm going to pass this on. King Ahab is succeeded by his son Ahaziah. And King Jehoshaphat is succeeded by his son Jehoram. Now that's easy to remember, isn't it? Ahab succeeded by his son Ahaziah, who is followed by his brother Jehoram. Jehoshaphat is succeeded by ~~his~~ son Jehoram who is succeeded by his son Ahaziah. You see you have the two names in reverse order but nobody every thinks of Jehoshaphat as of Israel, or that Ahab was in Judah, so knowing the names of the fathers, you have the others too. Just remember that little mnemonic device that I just noticed this afternoon. Mes? (student.1½) I haven't the slightest

objection to your calling either one of them Jehoram or Joram because the name often occurs in an abbreviated form. The Jeho, Jehoshaphat sometimes occurs Joshaphat, but I do object to your distinguishing them by calling one Joram and one Jehoram because both are used in both forms, and it's misleads you. So that I would rather you would use either form, but call them both by it, simply because otherwise you could be confused.

The two sons of Ahab then, Ahaziah who reigned two years, but Jehoram had a much longer reign. They were both wicked men like their father, but we notice that Jehoram had, took away the image of Baal that his mother had built. The very name Jehoram means Jehovah is exalted. With a name like that he certainly ought to be a worshipper of Jehovah rather than of Baal. Jehovah is exalted. Jehoram. Of course, for that matter, the name Ahaziah, (3) * means the Lord has taken hold of him. That again is a name that should not be held by a worshipper of Baal. If Jezebel had succeeded within a couple of generations they'd be naming their kings after Baal. But the great mass of the people never gave in to the Baal worship, and it would not have been politic to name your sons after Baal, but the Baal worship would have won out eventually, if it had not been for the work of Elijah and Elisha. It did win a great many of the leaders, but the mass of the people were doubtless, would have taken a good bit longer to win. Yes? (student. 3 1/2) No the word Baal simply means lord and it applies to God but it came to be applied particularly to this Baal and this Baal which she brought in was the god of Tyre, and he is usually called Melqart which again is not a name. It means the king of the city. (4) I forget what his real name was. But the people of Tyre called him king of the city, and Melqart comes from that, and then when he got down to this land they called him Baal. But often the same individual goes by different names. It is clear who was meant, it was this god of Tyre, this god of great sophistication, very advanced, highly cultured, highly intellectual, very capable of much that passes for art, much in our own day is considered sophisticated and

advanced but really is very degenerate. Yes? (student. 4 3/4) No, that's entirely different. Yes, the word Baal we use for everybody. Just like the word god is used in English, for Wotan, for Thor, for Venus, they're all called gods. God doesn't mean any particular god. We Christians use God to mean our God, whose proper name is representative of .

But master is often (5), well, it is just like the Lord, what is the Lord? Well, in English they say, in England you ask a man "Can I pass through this state. Can I walk around and see it? I'll go and ask the lord. They call every man of any standing over there /as the lord. He is called the Lord. But of course we use the term the Lord to mean God. (5½)

Jehovah is not the correct pronunciation but it represents (5 3/4)

Now

doubtless it's the same development we have, that in Tyre they didn't call him by his personal name, they probably were afraid what would happen to them for using it with profane lips (6) so they called him the king of the city. Then down in Palestine they just called him master. But the word Baal in itself there's nothing wrong with it, but the one they refer to by it (6¼)

Well, Ahab's sons then, by the time of Jehoram the work of Elijah, followed by the work of Elisha was very, very considerable proof there was still a good deal of Baal-worship left, but it was no longer in a position of growth and going forward, gaining control, it was being vanquished already, in the reign of Jehoram.

Number 7, Elisha the Prophet. We noticed Elisha's call and I think we are perfectly safe in inferring that Elisha had been thinking about it for some time. He wasn't just plowing, never a thought of the work of God, when all of a sudden this wild man comes by and throws his coat over, and he says wait a minute and I'll come with you. That of course is naturally not what

happened. He had heard of him, he recognized Elijah, perhaps many people wouldn't recognize him, he recognized him, he'd heard about him. He may have been at Mount Carmel and seen what happened there, if he didn't he'd heard all about it. He knew about it. He was one who was wishing that his life could count for the Lord. And he thought, if I could have been with Elijah when those things happened, if I'd just had a chance just to pour water on his hands, just to do the simple menial tasks to help that great man of God, how happy I'd be. Elisha was the son of a rich farmer. He was plowing with several yoke of oxen. Now the ordinary person couldn't own all that cattle. He belonged to a wealthy family. Yet here we have Elijah the wild man from the desert that goes around rudely dressed in this desert outfit, speaks roughly, and we have the cultured wealthy young man who goes around and makes himself the menial servant of Elijah. It's a wonderful picture of a man so devoted to God that he is willing to take the low position with no future involved of any kind, in order to make his life count by helping Elijah. But when Elijah threw the coat over him Elisha immediately ran after him and said just wait till I say goodbye to my family and I'll come with you. Elijah said what have I got to do with you? Well Elisha knew he had something to do with him or he wouldn't have thrown his coat over him. And Elisha had probably just been thinking then, oh I just wish I could help in that great work Elijah started. I wonder where Elijah is. He did this great work up on Mount Carmel and now he has disappeared. Nobody has heard anything about him for some months. I wonder where he is. Surely God hasn't done that work just to have it disappear and be forgotten. Surely there is going to be some follow-up on it. Oh, I just wish I could help him. And just as he's saying that and coming along with all these thoughts, all of a sudden here comes this Tishbite (9 $\frac{1}{4}$)

and he looks around and he recognizes Elijah. The Lord has been preparing him. And so he left and followed Elijah and we don't know how long it took. We've no idea just how long it was after this before Elijah is taken. Probably not too long because the work needed to be carried on and Elijah wasn't the

man to do it, but there needed time for preparation. He needed to learn what he could learn from Elijah and then he would go with a different attitude, a different type of (10) but following up the work that Elijah had begun. And so we have Elisha called, and then we have Elisha following Elijah as the menial servant, doing everything he could for him, and then--that happens in 2 Kings there, in 1 Kings there, and the next chapter we noticed, chapter 20, says nothing about Elijah. In 21 we have Elijah mentioned but no mention of Elisha at all, in 22 we have Micaiah the great prophet, no mention of either one of them. In 2 Kings 1 we have Elijah meeting the captain of the fifty and killing the hundred soldiers, no mention of Elisha there. But in chapter 2 Elisha appears again so we know that during this time he has been with Elijah, just doing menial tasks for him, and learning what he can. And now we have chapter 2, we've already noticed his request to be his heir in the work, and the promise Elijah gives him, if he sees him going up then as Elijah is taken up his mantle remains. The coat was thrown over Elisha and (11 $\frac{1}{4}$) , must be getting pretty ragged by this time but it's still there, and he got the mantle of Elijah that fell from him as he went up, Elisha got that into his hand, he comes over to the water, he says, Where is the God of Elijah and strikes the waters (11 $\frac{1}{2}$) And nobody saw the miracle, probably, unless these sons of the prophets may have, we're not told they did, they were some distance away. But Elisha is the one person where the miracle occurred. Now how does that fit with the meaning of a miracle? A miracle is a sign. A miracle is given in order to accredit a messenger of God. Well, then why would God perform a great miracle like this when there was nobody around? What would be the reason? The reason was the most important reason of all. It was far more important right now to get Elisha oriented right than it was to reach the thousands of people. Elisha was the one God was going to use. Now to get Elisha was important. Elijah said if you see me go-up-

go up you will be my successor. He saw him go up. Yes, but ^{if} a person didn't know (12 $\frac{1}{2}$) maybe I imagined it. It happened so fast, are you sure you saw it? Was it your great desire that you should, that made you think you had? It's very easy to ~~have~~ have all kinds of fantasies and illusions on things like that, it's very, very simple. God wants this man grounded, solid, absolutely certain that he is the one whom God has appointed to go on with the work, and so he takes the mantle, he strikes the water, divides it, crosses again. I doubt if that ever happened again in his life, but it happens now to give Elisha the certainty that he is going to (13)

God wouldn't do that for many but (13 $\frac{1}{4}$)

be in a position of the tremendous fight with the Baal-worship. God needs him for this work and God performs an extra-ordinary work to put the man into the position that only one man can ever fill. No man in all history has ever done this particular work that Elisha did there.

So now this miracle, then, we understand the meaning of. He comes out now and he sees the sons of the prophets who want to send somebody to look, maybe the Spirit of God has taken up Elijah and dropped him down on some mountain, on some valley, couldn't we go and look for him? Just think, if the Spirit of God has lifted up Elijah and dropped him way off in the heart of the wilderness somewhere the poor man may starve to death. Hadn't we better go and look for him and find him. What an idea these men had of the Spirit of God. Very, very zealous, earnest people, anxious to do something good but they were very, very poorly trained, very poorly trained.

And Elijah's been stomping through the land, talking roughly to everybody and making no attempt to teach these people who want to do what's right but they don't know what to do. You notice the difference in Elisha's attitude. Before long we find that Elisha is helping the sons of the prophets. He's instructing them, he's leading them. They've got all kinds of crazy ideas, they are men of good desires but no proper training or understanding. Elisha does little kind things for them, shows a friendly attitude toward them, wins th

their confidence, and proceeds to help them&to get the proper relations (14 3/4
and probably many of them were a great comfort in days to
come...

O.T.History 295. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...we have here, after these people, he'd told them not to send and yet they sent anyway and hunted, he waited at Jericho and they came back, said didn't I tell you don't go? Then the men said to Elisha, this city is a pleasant place but the water is terrible. And he said bring me a new cruse and put salt in it. He said thus saith the Lord, I heal these waters, there shall not be from thence any more death or barren land. So the waters were healed unto this day.

And I slept one night there in the ruins of Jericho and there's that great beautiful fountain gushing out of there, and it's as lovely water as I have ever seen. The cruse of salt that Elisha put in there, if it had been a chemical reaction it probably would have disappeared long before this time, but it was the Lord cleansing the water and it's still good. Mr. Welch? (student. $\frac{1}{4}$. First they say there is no water and then) No, the water is naught means the water is terrible, it doesn't mean--it's naught, the water is no good. It could be interpreted the other way of course, but ($1\frac{1}{2}$)

There's no good water. There had to be some or they couldn't live there, but the water was bad water. Well, then we have three of the verses that have puzzled people as much as anything in the Old Testament.

And he went up from thence to Bethel--that's a long walk in the Jordan Valley, down to Jericho, up through the valley, up to Bethel,--and as he was going up by the way, there came forth little children out of the city and mocked him, and said to him, Go up, thou bald head, go up, thou bald head. And he turned back and looke on them and cursed them in the name of the Lord. And there came forth two she gears out of the wood and tare forty-two children.

Now in the first place the word isn't children, it's young men. And so we don't need to think of just innocent little children here, just engaging in a little (2 $\frac{1}{2}$) and this wicked man Elisha has the bears kill them. That's terrible. Well it doesn't say it killed them either. It says tore 42 children. Question is how bad the tear was. Were one or two of them badly hurt and were others scratched? Just what was it? We just don't know. It doesn't say the 42 were killed and it doesn't say they were little children. And it seems utterly out of character with Elisha, it seems more like Elijah. Elisha was the man that healed the waters. He's the man that fixed the pot when there was death in the pot. He's the man who did all these kind things for people all his life, and here somebody calls him, old baldy, and so he calls the bears to come out and kill them. Well, that's not the picture at all. The thing is that here is Elisha beginning his work and these young delinquents come out here, and start reviling him and right at the beginning of his own ministry here, it is the Lord's will to tie together the ministry of Elijah and Elisha, so that the terror which gathered around the name of Elijah the one who stood against the prophets of Baal on Mount Carmel, the one who declared the coming of the drought, the man of forceful character that people were afraid of, that they recognized was from God, that that would cling to Elisha as the foundation for his other type of ministry, so that the two would make one force between them, and so there is at the very beginning of Elisha's ministry, people are given to understand--Elijah, nobody thought Elisha was a nature lover who understood how to whistle so the bears would come and kill somebody. Nobody thought that. Everybody understands that God has given this sign that Elisha is his prophet like Elijah, carrying on Elijah's work and not a man to deal lightly with or tamper with. That the curse of God would be on you if you interfered with Elisha's work. It would have meant nothing if it had happened at the beginning of Elisha's work, it would have meant nothing if it happened without Elijah's ministry. It's just a carrying on. Yes? (student. 5 $\frac{1}{4}$) That's quite an argument to prove they

were little children. But it doesn't say they killed them, it says that two she-bears came out of the woods and tore 42 of them. And ^{a bear is} ~~there is~~ a pretty powerful creature, some of them, some aren't. If you take a she-bear that thinks you are after her young--I've heard it said if you get between a she-bear and her young you can be in a mighty difficult situation. I've heard of people that a bear with just one stroke of its hand have knocked over. They're very, very strong when they're really irritated, I don't think they often are irritated,

But one day down in Virginia I was walking in the hills ~~and~~ a foggy afternoon and walking along on the trail and all of a sudden, just ahead of me, as near as that blackboard is, not a bit further, why three forms jumped up and rushed over and they stood over there at a distance, and it was a great big bear and two little tiny ones. And I thought my I'm glad that the two little ones weren't on one side of the trail and the big mother bear on the other when I came between them, but they heard me fortunately just before I got near and then they ran over there and they stood over there, maybe as far as to that door, till I got by. But I have heard that a she-bear, thinking that its cubs are in danger, can be mighty ferocious, and they don't realize their strength, they can do a lot of harm. It doesn't say that they killed them, they could've scratched the 42 of them. (student. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$)

(7 $\frac{3}{4}$)*

small u, young men. Yes? (student. The 8.

The author doesn't say that the bears weren't killed.) That they weren't killed in the end. Maybe there were 50 kids there and the other 8 ran home and their fathers came out with a big gun and shot the bears. But I doubt if 40 men without weapons, at least good-sized clubs, could do much against a powerful bear. With a big club you could, certainly. Yes? (student. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$) Yes, well if these 42 ~~man~~ were well-trained and had good ropes, they probably could have done it. But the important thing here is what is the purpose of the miracle? It is a miracle in the sense that it's a sign. It's not a miracle in the sense that Elisha had power to call bears. It's not that at

all, it is God calling the bears to come out at this time. Now maybe the same thing happened a week or two before, in the same area, maybe these were particularly vicious bears that were in the habit of injuring people, we don't know anything about it. But this particular occasion happened right after these people had been making light of Elisha in a way to connect his work up to that of Elijah in people's minds, and lead people to realize this is not just a man who wants to serve the Lord. This is the man the Lord has appointed as the successor of Elijah. ¶ Well, then, Elisha then immediately after that, we find that in chapter 3 King Jehoram, the son of Ahab, brother of Ahaziah, finds that Mesha the King of Moab has revolted after Ahab's death against the king of Israel. And King Jehoram went out of Samaria and numbered all Israel and he said to Jehoshaphat king of Judah, he said, the king of Moab has rebelled against me, will you go with me against Moab to battle? And Jehoshaphat said I'll go, I have an alliance with you, we have a mutual friendship pact, I will go and help you as I expect you to help me if somebody revolts against me. And so the Israelite army came south to Judah, and then from Judah they crossed over south of the Dead Sea into the Wilderness of Edom and up through the wilderness to attack Moab from the south. Now this story about the attack on Moab which is contained here in the Bible, up till 80 years ago stood absolutely alone. Nobody had any other evidence about it whatever. ¶ But then about 1880 there was a German missionary, I think it was 1868 actually, when this German missionary in Palestine came across a stone which had some Hebrew characters on it, over in the land of Moab. And he tried to get possession of it and the native people there agreed to sell it to him for about a hundred dollars which he was glad to give them for it. He bargained with them, I suppose they started with an astronomical figure and he started with a dime, and they gradually approached each other, they came together at about \$100 and everybody was happy, except the French. There was a French Vice-Consul in Jerusalem named (12)

who was a very able man, he has written on Semitic studies, very valuable things, he studied Palestine, and made some very important discoveries. And when he heard that this German missionary had purchased it, he didn't even have it yet, but he had been negotiating with the natives and it looked as if they were going to sell it to him, this stone with these marks on it, he decided that he ought to get it for the French Museum, the Louvre, and so he sent a couple of representatives down to see them, and got the Arabs to let him make a squeeze of it, that is they take paper and they wet it and press it against it in such a way that it makes an impression (12 3/4) of the writing. And so they made this squeeze that shows what the writing on the front of it looks like. And they made that and they told them oh you shouldn't sell that for \$100 to this German, why the French will give you a thousand dollars for it. And so they raised, it was well worth it, it was one of the great discoveries of modern times. It would be well worth \$1000 for the Louvre Museum, in fact it's in the Louvre today. If you ever go to Paris be sure and see it, the Moabite Stone it is called. And ~~so~~ they offered them \$1000. Well, that was bargaining but it was foolish bargaining because the bulk of people there were not educated, didn't understand about an ancient history, about the rivalry of Museums, the French and German rivalry and so on. And they said if this thing is so valuable it must have magical properties and if it's so good that they're willing to give a thousand dollars for it, it would be very, very foolish of us to let it get out of our possession at all. And so they said now probably this is an amulet that will cure disease and if each of us had a piece of it, think how well we'd be, that's much better than if we'd get \$1000 from it, and if we divide it up among us and we get sick and what good's our money if we die. (14 1/4)


So they made a big fire and got this thing blazing hot and they poured water over it and it broke into a hundred pieces, and each of them took one of the pieces, so that they would have something to keep them well. Well, that meant that the Germans

didn't get it for their museum, the German missionary's funds were, he had offered all he could afford for it ...

O.T.History 296. (½)

...celebrate his gaining his liberty from Israel. And it begins with, I am Mesha son of (3/4) king of Moab. My father reigned over Moab and I reigned after my father, and so on, and he tells how Omri had occupied the land. He names Omri and he refers to his son, which of course was Ahab, and there are many interesting historical matters in it that--Jehovah is mentioned. It's translated Jaweh here, the name Jehovah appears in the (1¼)

the critics today call it Jaweh. Maybe they're right, we don't know, we've no idea, it probably wasn't Jehovah, but what it was nobody knows. But they call it Jaweh and he has Jaweh in here for it. We know those letters represent the name of God, they are represented in the Roman pictures of the conquest of Jerusalem, pictures of the letters referring to the name of God. And when they represent it in Greek records they put the letter (1 3/4) * which is you see, reading from left to right a little bit like from right to left (2) *

But the (2) Tetradamothon  is mentioned in here, places are mentioned in ~~Meab~~. It is a very important historical record and it was 1868 according to Fritchard here ~~that~~ it was discovered intact, but in 1873 is when it was taken to the Louvre. And it should be placed somewhere between 840 and 820 probably, the time when it was written. We don't have many such monuments from Palestine, and it is therefore a very important thing, an interesting corroboration of the history in this chapter. I perhaps should have told you that about the Moabite Stone under Jehoram the son of Ahab. We are now looking at Elisha and Elisha comes into this chapter, in this chapter where Jehoram and Jehoshaphat and the king of Edom come up through the wilderness of Edom, against Moab, They find themselves without any water, or with very little water, insufficient

water for the army, for their cattle, for their equipment, and so on, and the king of Israel said alas ! that the Lord has called these three kings together to deliver them into the hand of Moab! But Jehoshaphat said, Is there not here a prophet of the Lord, that we may enquire of the Lord by him? And one of the king of Israel's servants answered and said, Here is Elisha the son of Shaphat which poured water on the hands of Elijah. Thus we see how Elisha was not yet particularly widely known. He was working in a quiet way among the people. The king had no idea he was even with the army, that he'd come along with the army and here he was, with the army, over there in the wilderness. And so over there in the wilderness they found that Elisha was there. Jehoshaphat said the word of the Lord is with him, and so the three kings went to him and Elisha said to the king of Israel, what have I to do with thee? Get thee to the prophets of thy father, and to the prophets of thy mother. And the king of Israel said nay, for the Lord has called three kings together to deliver them into the hand of Moab. And Elisha said, As the Lord of hosts lives, before whom I stand, surely, were it not that I regard the presence of Jehoshaphat the king of Judah, I would not look toward thee, nor see thee. But now bring me a minstrel. And it came to pass, when the minstrel played, that the hand of the Lord came upon him. Do you see the method now? If you want to get a revelation from God, get a minstrel, you see. But that is an inference which could be drawn from this passage. And if we found other similar passages it would be a (5)

but as far as I know this is practically alone in scripture, of this type. He says, get a minstrel and when the hand of the minstrel, when the minstrel played the hand of the Lord came upon him. What was the purpose of the minstrel? I think it's plain that Elisha found himself so discouraged in the presence of the son of King Ahab that he could not quiet his soul enough to listen for the still small voice of God, and he asked for a minstrel, for music, to quiet his heart and to help him to forget the disturbing influences around him, in order that he might listen to the still

small voice of God. The music would never bring the voice of God, the music would never produce a revelation, but the music would help him to forget the earthly things around him and (5)

I think that's important about all things like that. We cannot consider music or colors or pictures or anything like that as a magical thing that will bring God's blessing upon it. But you can use anything of that type as an incidental thing for a purpose of helping to turn our attention away from the earthly things and make it easier for us to listen for the voice of God. It's often difficult to draw the line between where these things become harmful, where they become jazzy or where they become subjects of worship, where they become that which is wrong, and the place where they are right instruments which are useful. You have to use a certain amount of trial and error in our handling of them.

I know one man who spoke here once about a church, oh he said that was the sort of church where they had candles. Well, to him that just marks it as another pagan church, to have candles in it. On the other hand I was at Columbia Bible College one time, when I gave their Commencement address, and in the evening there, they had all the students that were going to graduate and they had a lot of candles out there and they had each one, one by one, light their candles, representing the way they were hoping to be sending out messengers for God to lighten the dark corners of this earth. It was a most impressive service. There's nothing wrong with candles but the candle can be so used, it could be so easily become an instrument of superstition. And that's true of most anything. Things are not right or wrong in themselves. I remember one church I heard of nearly split over the question, should you kneel when you pray or should you stand when you pray. The Lord doesn't care whether we kneel or whether we stand, but if we find that it helps our heart attitude, that it makes it easier to get the right heart attitude to use a certain posture, it's a thing to use as a means but never as an end. Well, here then was Elisha quietly working, the king didn't even know he was there, but you

can be sure ~~the King~~ wasn't wasting the time on this long trip. His work was finding a success. And then the next few chapters tell about Elisha's work and there are many miracles and there are many wonderful deeds but running through it in the main is this emphasis of the kindness and the helpfulness, there is usually a helpful purpose in most of the miracles which are performed through Elisha. He is going about among the people, he is itinerating here and there. He is speaking the word of God everywhere, and bringing the message that Elijah had brought into the land, that Elisha is bringing into the heart of the people.

In chapter 5 we have the story of Naaman the Syrian, how the story penetrated of Elisha even up to Syria, and this great captain came down and he came down expecting that Elisha will be so honored to have a great Syrian captain come to see him, that he will come out and he will stand in front of him and he will make a great ceremony and heal of him of his leprosy, and Elisha doesn't even bother to come out, he just sends a messenger. Tell him to go down and dip in the Jordan seven times. And Naaman's feelings are so hurt he's going to go back home, saying what do I want to do with a fellow that won't even bother to stop and speak to me. Elisha was not awed by the presence of the great captain. He wasn't looking for the honor of the great captain coming to see him. Probably if it was a little insignificant person he would have lifted up their ego a little bit by going out and making a little over them. Naaman didn't need his ego lifted any, he needed the healing and Elisha provided what he needed. He sent the message out, telling him how he could be healed and the Lord worked the miracle and healed him.

Then, chapter 6, we have the political events coming. And we have Elisha helping the king of Israel. Now here is this wicked king Jehoram, that Elisha wouldn't even speak to, but now back in the land, Elisha is helping him in the deliverance of their land from Assyria. He is sending the message to the king, the Assyrians are coming this way or that way and the king is able to protect them every time. And then the Assyrians inquire

and finds where Elisha is and sends to get him and God struck the soldiers with blindness and Elisha took them and he says this isn't the way, follow me and I'll bring you to the man whom you seek, and Elisha walked ahead and the blind soldiers walked behind, every step they took took them nearer to Elisha the man they were after, but every time they took a step he took a step forward so that while they were always behind him they never caught up to him and then he ^{got} ~~took~~ them into Samaria right before the king, but you notice that he didn't let the king smite them, so they gave them a dinner and send them away. And then after that, we see in verses 23 and 24, of all the crazy places not to have a chapter division you ever saw, here is chapter 6 with several isolated events, and then here is one continuous story that begins in 624 and runs to the end of chapter 7. And the Archbishop put his chapter division at the end of 33 right in the middle of a paragraph, not even a paragraph division in this long story. I think that day surely he had something on his mind, when he made this chapter division other than making a reasonable chapter heading. If anybody things the chapter divisions of the Bible are inspired here's one of the finest proofs that they are purely a human thing. They're mighty useful to find a reference but certainly I think it is always wise, whenever you read a chapter that starts with the verse before, and when you finish you run on to the verse after, at least in your mind, so to see whether there is a division or whether there isn't, whether you are missing something important by not getting the connection. Here, the chapter certainly should have started at 24. There is a big break between 23 and 24. 23 ends, So the bands of Syria came no more into the land of Israel. 24 says, It came to pass after this, that Ben-hadad king of Syria gathered all his host, and went up, and besieged Samaria. The two sharply contradict each other. They didn't come any more, and after this they came right away. Some people try to explain the contradiction by saying he didn't send little bands, he sent his whole army. It doesn't seem to me a reasonable explanation, I think the fact of the matter is there's a break between

them. They stop for a while, and then after a while they decide to make an all-out attack. And so we have the all-out attack here and Ben-hadad comes and besieges Samaria and the things get so bad there, that the king is going to blame it all on Elisha. You notice, why should he blame it on Elisha? Well, previously Elisha told him when the Assyrians were coming, he was able to be saved from them. Now Elisha hasn't given him any word so Elisha's responsible. That's what you meet in this world. Don't ever look for the gratitude of this world. If you're serving the Lord you'll get gratitude, not in this world perhaps, but you'll get it eventually, worth more than anything in this world but if you're serving human beings you can do a hundred things for them and then you fail at one point and they'll throw you out. And that's what's going to happen to Elisha. He did all these things to help Jehoram and then when an attack came that he hadn't given warning of, and they were [^]starving (14 $\frac{1}{4}$) you read that the king said, God do so and more also to thee if the head of Elisha the son of Shaphat shall stand on him this day. And so he sent a messenger to Elisha and the messenger comes in ~~and says to~~ ^{in verse 33, & chapter 7:1} ^E Elisha answers. Of all the crazy places for a chapter division. But here the Lord enabled Elisha to predict the end of the siege through a marvelous interposition of God. And we're not going in this course in Old Testament History ^{right} ~~going~~ now here ~~as~~ we see how God used Elisha here and how God saw that in this case, through a development that it's easy to see how these developments produced it, is to do something so wonderful that the man said, why if the Lord ~~wadld~~ make windows in heaven it couldn't happen like this...

O.T.History 297. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...had to pay fabulous prices for things. One day for three slices of hamburger you had to pay \$6 and the next day they could get the best steak for 20¢ a pound. And when he predicted that's what was going to happen they just said the Lord will have to open the windows of heaven, yet it happened

exactly as he said. Those things happen. But of course ordinarily a man can't predict them like Elisha did. God spoke ^{through} ~~to~~ him in a way he doesn't speak ^{through} ~~to~~ us. But we see the way that the prophet was working. Chapter 8 has further--oh yes, in chapter 8 we have the change in what happened. We have Elisha going to Damascus for a visit. And up there in Damascus we have a very interesting incident. The king said to Hazael, take a present in your hand and go meet the man of God and inquire of the Lord by him saying shall I recover from this disease. Hazael went to meet him and took a present with ^{hi} him, even of every good thing~~k~~ of Damascus, 40 camels' burden, that was quite a present, and he stood before him and he said thy son Ben^hhadad, king of Syria, has sent to me saying shall I recover of this disease. And Elisha said go say to him thou mayest recover, however the Lord hath showed that he shall surely die. What a crazy thing to say. He says go and say to him thou mayest certainly recover, how~~be~~it the Lord has showed me that he shall surely die. Did Elisha tell a lie or did he tell Hazel ~~to~~ tell a lie. Actually, ¹ neither is true. Then Hadad asked, what is this disease, is this a disease that will kill me or not. Elisha says this disease will not kill you. You can recover from this disease. But he says to Hazael the Lord has shown~~ny~~ me that he's going to die, (2 3/4) from a different cause.

And he settled his countenance steadfastly until he was ashamed and the man of God wept. Hazael said why do you weep, and Elisha said, and here God had told El^{ijah} to anoint Hazael. This is Elisha. But Elisha is El^{ijah}'s representative. God must have told him to do this, he was carrying out the command previously given to Elijah, but God told him when to do it. And so Elisha comes here and Hazael says why are you weeping? And Elisha says because I know the evil you'll do to the children of Israel. Their strong holds wilt thou set on fire and their young men wilt thou slay with the sword, and wilt dash their children and rip^u up their women with child. And Hazael says, But what, is thy servant a dog, that he should do this great thing? What did Hazael say, was Hazael saying ~~do~~ you think I'm such a mean person I'd do

such things like this. If he had, is thy servant a dog, that he should do this awful thing, ^{but that's not what he said, he said,} is thy servant a dog that he should do this great thing? In other words, what am I, I'm just a king's, one of the king's generals. I'm just a member of the staff, you can't blame me if the king orders me to do these things, it's not my fault, I'm just carrying out orders. Why do you blame me for it, why are you looking at me this way? I'm just a dog, I'm just a little underling. How could I do a great thing like this? And Elisha answered and ~~said~~ said the Lord has showed me that thou shalt be king over Syria. Was that anointing Hazael to be king over Syria? You notice how God gave the command to Elijah, what he meant was I have power to raise up a new king over Syria. And then he allows Elisha to show knowledge of the fact.

I doubt if this put the idea into Hazael's head. My guess is that Hazael intended all along to kill his master if he could get away with it. I doubt if what Elisha said had a thing to do with his position. He probably had been planning it for some time. But Elijah predicted and Elisha showed he had an idea what was in Hazael's head. Well we continue there tomorrow...

(5 3/4)...well, this is very important material and we hope that those who aren't here will get it thoroughly for I hate to have any of it missed. We were speaking yesterday about, we were still on Elisha the Prophet, which was the D, The Dynasty of Omri, 7, Elisha the Prophet, and I will now continue on that theme of Elisha the Prophet, even though it runs into the next dynasty. Rather than to divide the material on Elisha and deal with part of it under the one dynasty, and part under the next since ^{his} ~~the~~ work extended over and he as a unit is almost more important than the dynasties, we will continue with him, but I want you to ~~have~~ in mind what we're doing, because in the outline it's a choice between two. I want you to ~~have~~ a clear idea of these dynasties and I want you to have a clear idea of his work. And in a political history it would be much better to divide his work into the two, but from the viewpoint of God's work in the world, his work the great outstanding portion of it was done by the ^{end of the} ~~the~~ dynasty of Ahab, the dynasty of Omri.

And his work continued and there were very important parts of it that continued into the next. But the great bulk that was done, that was a continuation of the same thing rather than a new thing. So we'll simply deal with it as a unit here. We noticed yesterday, in the time of the (7 $\frac{1}{2}$) how he helped in so many different ways in the difficulties with the Syrians. And then we noticed when there came that siege from Syria, how the king turned violently against him. But still he made that marvelous prediction of the end of the siege. And then just at the end of the hour, we noticed how he went clear up to Damascus during the period of ~~Siege~~ ^{Peace} there, and King Ben-hadad sent Hazael to see him. Can you imagine Elijah down there in Sinai. When the Lord said, when you come to Damascus anoint Hazael to be king of Syria. Elijah never came to Damascus, Elisha came to Damascus, and when Elisha came to Damascus he didn't have to go and look for Hazael because Ben-hadad sent Hazael to him, and when Hazael came to him of course he didn't anoint him. He ^{wouldn't anoint} ~~was a wicked~~ heathen king, ~~that~~ ^{but} is a prophet of God wouldn't. He revealed to him his knowledge of the fact that Hazael was going to be king of Syria. And so the Lord's word to Elijah, though in the form of a command, are to be taken as really a prediction. God says to Elijah you anoint him, what God ~~means~~ is an anointing indicates God's determination. I am revealing to you my determination. I am revealing to you the fact that you're afraid of this woman Jezebel who has no power at all except as she can move Ahab to something, and his power is strictly limited. I'm not only going to change the rulership of Israel, I'm going to change the rulership of the greater nation of Syria, way up there in Damascus. So he says anoint Hazael, and those words are not literally fulfilled but the meaning of them, the full meaning of them is carried out, that God is going to change the rulership of Damascus for God controls all the affairs of history. In this case, the way that he controls the rulership there is that he makes it possible for this wicked man Hazael to do the wicked thing he has in mind. And he reveals to ~~this~~ prophet the fact that Hazael is going to be king. And so when Hazael comes to see

Elisha and Hazael has never seen Hazael before, he's just a messenger of Ben-hadad, and so far as Hazael knows he's never heard of him before, and he probably never has except for the message that God has given him, he looks at him and says I know the evil you're going to do to Israel, you're going to set their strong holds on fire, you're going to slay their young men with swords, you're going to dash their children and rip up their women with child. And Hazael says well now that's the sort of thing our army would do if it got a chance, but I'm just a member of the army, I just carry out my part as I'm commanded to do, I wouldn't have any, you couldn't blame me for that, that's just the way our army always fights. And the fact that it's going to be done against Israel, well that the king decides, I have no place in that. But the, he says I'm just a dog, I'm just an underling, how could I do anything like this, and then Elisha looks him straight in the face and says, I know that the Lord has revealed to me that you are going to be the king of Syria.

So then we continue and find that when he went back to his master, his master said what did Elisha say, and he said he told me that you could recover. This English translation, that you, thou shouldest surely recover, is hardly a proper representation here of the infinitive (11 $\frac{1}{4}$) absolute. _____ As a rule the infinitive absolute may be translated sure, but that is only a paraphrase, we have no English exact equivalent. And it does not by any means fit in all cases. It is emphasizing the word recover. In this case, what it means is the question is, is this disease, this sickness, something that's going to kill me? The answer is no. As far as this disease is concerned, you can recover. So Hazael passes on accurately the words that Elisha gave him, the words that Elisha gave were not in any sense a lie. They were the answer to the specific question that he had asked, would he be able to recover of this disease? Yes, he would be able to recover from this disease if something else didn't come in between first to prevent it. And so on the next day Hazael took a thick cloth and dipped it in water and spread it on his face, so that he died and Hazael reigned in his stead.

And of course we know that just any servant in the house of King Ben-hadad couldn't take a cloth and dip it in water and put it on his face and kill him and reign in his stead. You remember that Zimri killed the son of Baasha and what happened to Zimri? Did he reign in his stead? He did, for seven days, and then he was killed. And ~~if~~ an ordinary servant did a thing like that he ~~wouldn't~~ reign for a minute. He probably would immediately be thrown into prison or immediately be beheaded. The fact ~~that~~ Hazael could kill Ben-hadad and reign in his stead was proof that Hazael was established in such a way that there were enough of his friends ready to support him, that with Ben-hadad out of the way (13½)

It proves a long preparation on his part, whether it's (13½) preparation for this, at least a preparation to make himself powerful, to make friends who liked him instead of Hadad, perhaps increasing dissatisfaction with Ben-~~on-the-part-of~~ Hadad on the part of others, all this (13½) years before when he made the ~~statement~~ to Elijah that when you come to Damascus anoint Hazael to be king of Syria. It was a wonderful accreditation of the fact that the prophet spoke from God and a wonderful assurance of the fact that God knows all things from the beginning and that He controls. (14)

in causing this wickedness to be done. And it did not mean that the prophet ~~was~~ did the wickedness in putting into power ^{in Syria} the man who was (14½) from Ben-hadad. Maybe the reason he (14½)

and ~~more~~ more successful, we don't have enough information to know why, but it's evidently (14½)

that Ben-hadad ever had. And so, in this, what Elisha is carrying out, the first of these commands given to Elijah at Mount Sinai, and then we have the next great event in the life of Elisha, told in chapter 9...

...but we have noticed here the parts that Elisha had in it. Chapter 9, the beginning, Elisha the prophet called one of the children of the prophets, and said to him, Gird up thy loins and take this box of oil in thine hand, and go to Ramoth-gilead. You know where Ramoth-gilead is, the word Ramo means it's feminine plural of Ra which is high, so it is the heights, and Gilead as you know is that large fertile section over across the Jordan, so Ramoth-gilead is one of the important towns over there across the Jordan. And it was a town which had a wonderful situation.

I remember when I stood there at Ramoth-Gilead seeing the beautiful fertile country around, and in many ways it was far more attractive and superior to any of the towns over there in Canaan proper. And yet the town which had a very, very checkered history for two reasons, for one because the rainfall over there is very uncertain, and some years they have tremendous prosperity and other times they drop and the second reason, probably more important, is that they have no natural frontier. It is open in every direction to attack, and so that region over across the Jordan, has been swept across with armies, time and again, it's been a region that has been settled and prosperous for a century or two, and then absolutely desolate with hardly any one in it.

I was much impressed in 1929 when we went on horseback down through that area, to notice that in Palestine proper, you just never saw anybody then, just the soldiers with guns, it was strictly forbidden to have arms, except for the soldiers and the police of course. And things were very well policed in Palestine at that time. But when you went over to TransJordan nearly everybody you met was carrying a rifle. The region is so open and exposed that it was more like our wild west. They had to do a good deal of defending themselves. Because it would take a very strong force to police it with the easy way of attacking and getting away, with no good natural frontiers around and a lot of open country, from which to make attacks and run away.

And so this town of Ramoth-gilead, you remember, was a place where there was many a battle, and here at this time Jehoram's soldiers are over there facing the soldiers of King Hadad and there the army is occupied over there, and Elisha takes one of the children of the prophets. Now this is not a very good English way in here of rendering this figure, the expression does not mean this was a man whose father had been a prophet. Nor does it mean this was a little girl who was one of the children of the prophets. It means that this was one of the disciples of the prophetic type, one of the people who had gathered together to learn how (3 3/4)

the word son in Hebrew is often used in the sense of disciple, in the sense of follower, and that is of course how it is used in this case. He called one of the younger men of the prophetic company, whether he was a prophet himself we don't know because a prophet is one to whom God directly speaks, and there were very few through whom God directly spoke. But there were sons of the prophets who followed the prophets and helped the prophets and wanted to serve the Lord and the Lord might select one or more of them to be the recipients of his message. This one, we have no evidence that he was actually a prophet, but he was a man who was interested and glad to carry out what Elisha ordered him and Elisha said to him gird up thy loins and take this box of oil in thine hand and go to Ramoth-gilead. And when thou comest thither, look out there Jehu the son of Jehoshaphat the son of Nimshi. Now you remember that Jehu is ordinarily spoken of after this, as Jehu the son of Nimshi. I think this is the only time that I recall where he is called Jehu the son of Jehoshaphat. ^{the son of Nimshi} It's another example of how Hebrew custom, using the word son to mean a descendant. It does not mean the one in the next generation, necessarily, but it means one who is descended, and he is ordinarily called after his grandfather instead of after his father. In this case, where he is first introduced it gives his full name. Jehu, the son of Jehoshaphat, the son of Nimshi. And go in and make him arise up from among his brethren and carry him to an inner chamber, then take the box of oil and pour it on his head, and say,

Thus saith the Lord, I have anointed thee/^{king}over Israel. Then open the door and flee, tarry not. So here we have one of those commands God gave years before, at least 15 years before, well, yes, at the very, very least 13, it might have been 12. I think we can safely say at least 15 before. When Elijah was~~d~~ down there at Mount Horeb, the Lord said, when thou comest to Syria, to Damascus, anoint Hazael to be king of ~~D~~amascus, and when thou, and he said anoint Jehu, son of Nimshi, to be king over Israel. And anoint Elisha the son of Shaphat to be prophet in your place. And this command given 15 years before to Elijah, and Elijah has gone to heaven, now 15 years later Elisha is active, and Elisha doesn't anoint them, Elisha sent one of the prophets. Now it is true he is anointed. The only one of the three, whom the command would specifically be carried out to anoint him, because he was the one who was to be the king of Israel and needs to be anointed, and the command is specifically carried out but Elijah didn't do it, neither did Elisha do it, but it was~~d~~ done by Elisha's representative and Elijah was (7) representing Elijah. Yes? (studnt.7. On this point, do the critics, because of the similarity of the prediction of the command given to Elijah, that they would say that a redactor or someone has gotten this Elisha confused with Elijah, and really this is something that Elijah did, but that there is a confusion here with names and persons?) That is what they would probably say if this was a part dealing with strict political history, but these whole stories of Elijah and Elisha the consider as ~~fictien~~ folktales, myths and legends. So I doubt if many of them feel sure that there's hardly anything they can retain as true. I think they would undoubtedly say that there was a dissatisfied group who had tried to cause a revolution and that they got a man named Elisha who was prominent to assist in it, and then when later these stories were written it was imagined by somebody that this (8) But there is so much of the narrative in these and they're not dealing with men of whom we have any evidence elsewhere, and so the critics quite unanimously take them as folktales. But in this case there's nothing of the miraculous in this particular story. God works wonderful miracles through these men, but in this case the miraculous is the fact that

it was predicted long in advance. It certainly wasn't something that occurred to Elijah just on the spur of the moment. Let's make a new king, let's make Jehu king. You can see by what had happened here that people had been thinking, there was general dissatisfaction with Jehoram. He was being blamed for he was not as bad a man as his father Ahab or his brother Ahaziah, the scripture tells us, but he was a man who was in general following in their footsteps and all of the wickedness of the house of Ahab was being blamed on him by the people and as Elisha's work was leading people more and more to turn away from Baal and to be loyal to the God of Israel, they naturally, they realized that the Baal worship had come in through Jezebel and this was her son Jehoram who was the king, so it increased dissatisfaction with the king, and now in this situation the people are all ready for revolution, at least this group of the army, they probably had been planning it, perhaps not decided exactly when it was going to happen, because we read ~~that~~ what deterred was, that when this man came in to Jehu and got him along and told him that he was going to be king over Israel and going to smite the house of Ahab and gave these predictions and then fled that the people asked Jehu well what did this man say and Jehu said, you know the man and his communications. Why did he say that? unless their minds were already working in this direction pretty strongly? And they said no we don't, tell us. And he said this is what he said to me. Then they hastened and took every man his garment and put it under him on the top of the stairs, and blew with trumpets, saying, Jehu is king. And so Jehu the son of Jehoshaphat the son of Nimshi conspired against Joram.

Now we look at this revolution more under another head, we look at the political history, but this point we're noticing Elisha's part in it, and Elisha's part was not actively to promote it, as far as we have evidence, except that this one way of anointing the man as king. And of course that gave a tremendous spurt, but the soldiers did the rest and probably they had been planning ~~it~~ for some time, ~~but the soldiers did the rest~~ probably they had been conspiring and this simply united them and spurred them on, and the revolution occurred and you have the new dynasty of Jehu. And that we want to look at in detail. But we'll go on now and briefly look at the rest of Elisha's life.

The rest of Elisha's life is not so much described in the books of Kings, we can gather that he continued as he had been before. Itinerating, going back and forth,

talking to the people, telling them of the true God and what God desired them to do and carrying out the work that Elijah had begun. The two together form a unit that accomplished the work for which they came. They destroyed the Baal-worship. They did not destroy the worship of the Golden Calf. They did not bring Israel entirely back to God but they destroyed, utterly destroy this terrific menace of the Baal-worship. The worst danger that Israel had ever faced in religion was completely eradicated as a result of the work of Elijah and Elisha.

Now if Elijah instead of fleeing to Mount Sinai had gone on with the work immediately instead of there being a number of years passing till Elisha could be trained to carry on the work as it needs to be carried on, who knows but what it might not only have done away with the Baal-worship but also have done away with the worship of the Golden Calf, and brought Israel back to God, so that it would have been a great center as (12 3/4) that we cannot say, but we do see that while the work accomplished a tremendous lot, it did not accomplish nearly what it might have. We can say that of course of every Christian worker, there is no one who has ever accomplished all that might have been done. Everyone has made mistakes, everyone falls short, even the truest fall short. When one is untrue to the Lord, when one does that which is contrary to His will, it is right for us to oppose his wickedness, but when one makes mistakes which hinder his work, if we're in a position to help them with those mistakes, we should do so, but if not we should hold up his hands, rather than to do anything to interfere with his work. Everyone makes mistakes, I don't mean sin, I mean mistakes, the two are different things. We all do some of both, but it is the sin we must judge, but the mistakes we must study, not criticize, but study, because we will make plenty of our own, and if we can learn to avoid the mistakes that others make our work will accomplish much more than it would otherwise. And so this great mistake that Elijah made here is one which most Christian workers make to some extent, at some time. I believe the Lord gave us these things for our learning, not merely to show us wonderful examples to inspire us but also to show us where this man fell short, so that we can learn from him to avoid making similar errors in our own lives.

Well, now, Jehu became the king, now I'm speaking of this not only from Elijah's viewpoint, we come back to Jehu in a little bit, but from Elisha's viewpoint simply to

see what happens. We know that Jehu became king and Jehu reigned for about, nearly 30 years. And then Jehu was succeeded in 1713 by his son, Jehoahaz...

O.T.History 299. (15)

...17 years and then Jehoahaz was succeeded by his son Joash or Jehoash, it's called both ways. And Joash was king when in verse 14 in 2 Kings 13, Elisha fell sick of the sickness whereof he died. So to see that Elisha's ministry continued into the new dynasty for a long period, there were many years of his activity. His work was felt all through the land, he reached many people, he completely ended the Baal-danger, he did a tremendous work. And now in the days of Joash the grandson of Jehu who had not even become king until 15 years after Elisha began to serve Elijah, Elisha falls sick of the sickness with which he died, and Joash the king of Israel came to see him and wept over his face, and said, O my father, my father, the chariot of Israel, and the horsemen thereof. And so we have here Elisha dying in the wilderness, not dying, going up to heaven, but ending his earthly life, in the wilderness with nobody there but Elisha, and Elisha says O my father, my father, the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof. Elisha recognized what Elijah meant to Israel. This man was worth more to the defense of Israel than a tremendous army was, because he was God's instrument to try to bring him back to God and if they continued in their wicked way they were bound to go on to destruction. But now Elisha had continued the work of Elijah, it had gone much further and the value of his work is recognized now, not by simply another prophet but by the king himself. And the king comes down to see him and weeps over him and says, my father, my father, the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof. And so the king recognizes the value of Elisha to the nation, and that is true of Christian leaders. True Christian leaders start in and they struggle and they work and they are disliked and people do everything they can to keep from helping them but if they push and go on in the Lord, if they live a long time, usually in the end the value of their work is recognized, widely recognized. John Wesley when he began his work was stoned, persecuted and everybody was against him, the bishops criticized him and the political authorities thought he was a queer crank and he had all kinds of difficulty and trouble, he continued his work preaching in the fields and never found (3 1/2)

anyone to gain a place to preach but going right out where the multitude was and preaching and giving the witness and building new places for them to come together and after years of his itinerating and his preaching and his work he describes in his journal toward the end of his life, he said he just couldn't understand it, he said people weren't knocking him any more, they were praising him. The king invited him to the palace to honor him, the bishops spoke highly of him, the work was recognized throughout the country, he had never compromised with evil in his work in any way, but he had pushed forward steadily in it and had accomplished so much that the value of his work was recognized even by those who didn't agree with his views at all. ~~4~~

And here is Elisha at the end of his life and the king recognizes that this man has done more for the defense of Israel than the generals and the great military leaders have done. Now of course that can be recognized even by an ungodly man, an ungodly king soon comes to recognize that it is the people with Christian character, the people who are steady and dependable, who constitute the source of strength and power in the nation, and no matter how hostile governments may be to true religion, if they don't succeed in killing them, after a time they usually come to see its value for the nation, and they come to desire to get the values, so then they often proceed to try to get them to water down the testimony to the point where in the end it won't have the value that it had.

But Elisha, what he had done, was recognized at his death, after this very long life, and then we read at the end of chapter 13 that after Elisha had been buried, the next year, as a man was being buried people saw a band of men coming. They were the Moabites, they were creeping through the land, and so they said, we'll be killed if these raiders attack us, what are we going to do with this dead body, the place where he is supposed to be buried is half a mile down, well look here's a tomb, oh that's the tomb of Elisha. And so they rolled away the stone from the tomb of Elisha and they took their dead body and they lifted it up there on the shelf which was the way of burying in those days, and they put him up there and as he touched the bones of Elisha, we read here that the man came to life, revived and stood up on his feet. And why would this happen? We don't even know who the man was or anything about him. But God gave this evidence again to continue the name, the reputation, the influence of Elisha. Miracles followed this man all through his life

and even after his death. And, as we've noticed, this does not mean that the Old Testament is a book of fairy stories which has a miracle on every page and just grotesque sort of things that don't happen in the world any more, the Old Testament is not that sort of book, you can look at page after page after page, and it is godly men working by means that anybody could work with today if they were loyal to God. Page after page with no miracles, but the miracles are poured out in four great periods of the Bible, of special crises, when it was vital for God to work, that something be carried out, and one of these was this great attack of the Baal-worship in Israel, which if it had been successful would have entirely destroyed the worship of God in Israel and in Judah and would have ended with their being no nation on earth in which the memory of the true God was preserved and in which God could bring his son the Lord Jesus Christ into the world to die for our sins. And so amid these terrible dangers God kept the true religion alive in Israel and Judah and at this point, the greatest crisis in all the history of Judah and Israel, he sent Elijah and Elisha and sent many miracles in connection with their lives. But we don't find anything like it in connection with the life of Isaiah or of Jeremiah or of Ezekiel. We don't ordinarily find this sort of thing but this was the greatest crisis of all. And at this time God sent the miracles as he did in connection with the coming out of Egypt, and as he did in connection with the danger in the exile and as he did in connection with the life of Jesus Christ and the beginning of the spread of the gospel. So that finished our rapid survey of Elisha the prophet. There's one thing we passed over which if you studied this material last week as fully as I hope you did, many of you surely would have questions in your mind about it, and that is the incident of the arrows in connection with Elisha and Joash at Elisha's death. But that we will look at under the political history, rather than under the prophetic history. It could be taken under either but I think perhaps it would fit in a little better in our discussion, taken there instead of here. That will close then our discussion of number 7 under the dynasty of Omri, Elisha the prophet, which we carried on into the next dynasty of Israel.

Oh, just one more thing I want to say about that before we leave it, which is not specifically about Elisha but about the general subject. I heard a Bible teacher speaking some years ago, in which he spoke very dogmatically and he said that, he said, after

Israel separated from Judah the godly people left Israel and went down to Judah, the ungodly left Israel and went up into Judah, so that you had all the godly people in Judah and God's favor was with Judah and not with Israel. Now that, doubtless there were people who moved, doubtless that happened to some extent, but that it happened to such an extent, that God's favor was entirely with Judah and not at all with Israel, is utterly disproved by the fact that the two greatest prophets, at least if judged by the amount of miracles God did in connection with their lives, and judged by the effectiveness of their work, they certainly are the two greatest prophets, Elijah and Elisha, came to the land of Israel, not of Judah, and ~~if~~ ^{that} God had cast off his interest in Israel is inconceivable, that his two greatest prophets whose lives are described more fully than those of any other prophets in the whole Bible, that is any man who (10 $\frac{1}{2}$) and whom he blessed with so many miracles, and who accomplished so fully the work for which he sent them, you take Isaiah he died, his work seemingly a failure, Jeremiah died in exile, in bondage, with the people having turned against him, no other prophet had anything like the apparent success that Elisha had in what he undertook to do, and their work was in Israel not in Judah. Well, we go to ^{Judah} ~~Israel~~ now, E.

By Judah Under Jehoshaphat and Jehoram. And the reason that I have taken this specific section of the history of Judah for one heading is because I mean the kings who reigned during the time of the dynasty of Omri in Israel. Now it's not exactly, but it's practically the same length of time. Asa reigned into the dynasty of (11 3/4) Jehoram's son Ahaziah reigned a little bit still with the dynasty, only a year. On general this was the same period and I want you to keep the two in mind, how they parallel each other and so that's why I'm taking just that section today. Yes? D, was the Dynasty of Omri, 7 was Elisha the prophet, under D. You see, I've been dealing in D with the northern kingdom, it had the 7 heads under it. And of course ~~if~~ there's a great deal of material under one section, but it is a period of tremendous importance, all this work of Elijah and Elisha, so we put it under that section. Now we'll have far less to say under E than under D. But we give it the same size heading in the outline because it covers approximately the same period but it is Judah during this period we are now looking at.

I thought of calling it Judah during the reign of the dynasty of Omri, but that hardly fits, the title Judah (12 3/4)

Why don't I say Judah under the dynasty of the main Judean dynasty? How many could tell why I don't call it that? Because God permitted one dynasty to continue all through the history of Judah, that is rare in the history of any land. That a dynasty continue for 300 years. You will find very, very few instances of it in history, and in Israel we have four main dynasties and some individual kings separate, during a period of about 250 years. And in most countries there are many dynasties, but in Judah God promised David he would always have a son to sit on the throne, and the line continued (13 3/4)

And so E, is Judah under Jehoshaphat and Jehoram, and under that, number 1,

1. Jehoshaphat. We do not have a great deal told about Jehoshaphat in Kings. We have a certain amount told about him, but we have twice as much told about him in Chronicles as we have told in Kings. And the reason for that is because of the different orientation of the two books. Kings is a book that describes God's people, the house of Israel, even though divided into two sections, they are one nation, and they are all God's people and Kings tells about both nations, and in Kings, at this period the center of interest attaches to the wickedness of the house of Omri, and to the terrible menace of the Baal worship and to the way that God provided Elijah and Elisha to overcome this. And so this section we have more told about the kingdom of Israel during the dynasty of Omri than all the rest of its history put together. It is the period of central focus in the history of Israel...

O.T.History 300. (3/4)

...we were speaking about the dynasty of Omri which was D, then we went on to E, Judah under Jehoshaphat and Jehoram, under that 1, Jehoshaphat, we noticed the difference between the impression you get of Jehoshaphat in Kings and Chronicles, far more stressed in Chronicles than Kings. Yet practically everything that is said about him in Kings is good, while in Chronicles we have some good things told that aren't told in Kings but we also have some of the other side shown that is implied in Kings, because of his close affinity with Ahab. And Kings and Chronicles both give in full detail the story of how Jehoshaphat

...and at this time it stands out so prominently that Jehoshaphat in comparison seems of comparatively minor interest, we are told a fair amount about him, but we have a little about Jehoshaphat and then a lot about the northern king and then a little more about Jehoshaphat and then a lot about the northern kingdom and then a little more about Jehoshaphat, but the book of Chronicles is oriented differently. Chronicles is about Judah, not about Judah and Israel together. And in Judah, in Chronicles we only have Elijah mentioned once, far as I recall Elisha is never mentioned in Chronicles, now I wasn't quite sure on that so I looked up in the concordance and I didn't find Elisha mentioned at all in Chronicles in the concordance. And yet I have a feeling in the back of my mind he is there. So I think the concordance may have slipped up, but I don't recall the place and since the concordance says he wasn't we can take that as a positive statement, he probably is not, but if he is it's not more than once or twice at the most. -Chroni

Chronicles does not tell about the work of Elisha. It tells about one letter that Jehoshaphat ~~that~~ got from Elijah, that's the only mention of Elijah according to this concordance, or as far as I recall. And Elisha according to this concordance never is mentioned in Chronicles and yet they were two of the very greatest prophets. Chronicles is oriented on the history of Judah. And in Chronicles then, without the interest in the dynasty of Omri, without the interest in the Baal-worship as it came into the northern kingdom, and in Elijah and Elisha, Jehoshaphat stands out as one of the most important characters in the book of Chronicles. He was one of the greatest of the kings of Judah, he was --well I don't know if I should say greatest, one sense you say greatest, he was one of those who reigned longest, he had a very long reign, he was one of those who was truest to God, his loyalty to the Lord is highly praised in Chronicles and in Kings. You put these two together, a long reign and a loyalty to God that stands out above nearly all the kings of Judah. If you take all the kings of Judah and you pick the best five any list would include Jehoshaphat. He certainly was one of the best ^{five} ~~three-five~~ Where he'd be in that list would be difficult to prove and we might not be in a position to say, but he certainly is praised in the Bible as one of the finest kings in Judah. And therefore in the book of Chronicles he is given much attention to show us how good a man he was and

also to show us ~~how~~ even ^{this} a good man ~~made~~ grievous errors. So we have both of them stressed in the book of Chronicles. Now Jehoshaphat was the son of a godly father. Asa you remember was a very good man. We read nothing about Asa in Kings but what is good. In Chronicles, some people say, that Chronicles was a late book, written to glorify Judah and to glorify the kings of Judah and so on, and it just magnified and makes everything beautiful and wonderful in this land, written by somebody long after. Well, that critical interpretation does not stand up when you look at the situation. Because when you find the greatest kings like Asa and Jehoshaphat, who are (4 $\frac{1}{2}$) kings, Chronicles does tell more about them, it has much greater interest in Judah than Kings does. Yes, that is the center of (4 $\frac{1}{2}$) but it tells of their errors and weaknesses which don't come into Kings. Kings is occupied with the great terrible menace of Baal-worship in the face of which all this would be of ~~minor~~ ^{minor} importance, if it had succeeded. But Chronicles gives us these men in more detail and consequently gives us much more of their errors and their weaknesses and their sins instead of (4 $\frac{3}{4}$) it simply gives a fuller picture of them.

And so we find much in Chronicles about Jehoshaphat and his son right straight along, it isn't interrupted ~~by~~ the story of the northern kingdom. And in Chronicles we find that the (5 $\frac{1}{4}$) of Asa had done a very great work, and Chronicles places him in the main, though it doesn't criticize for the weak point of faith toward the end of his life, criticize him for his treatment of one of the prophets, shows he fell into certain grievous errors, as every sinful human being has who ever lived. Shows that alongside of the good qualities of this great and good man, ~~there~~ ^{there} were some very serious errors but yet not serious enough that Kings found it necessary to mention. His son Jehoshaphat we read here, the Lord was with Jehoshaphat because he walked in the first ways of his father David and sought not unto Baalim, but sought to the Lord God of his father, and walked in his commandments and not after the doings of Israel. Therefore the Lord established the kingdom in his hand, and all Judah brought to Jehoshaphat presents, and he had riches and honor in abundance. Everybody through this period praised Jehoshaphat. He was a great and godly and good man.

But Jehoshaphat did not think certain things through clearly. Rehoboam and Abijam and Asa, till the end of Asa's life, constantly fought against Israel, they kept saying we've got to reconquer this land that has revolted from Rehoboam. The Lord said don't try, it is my will that you separate. But they kept on. And they, when Israel would attack them, the Lord would deliver them from the Israelite attack, but it wasn't the Lord's will they be conquered. Now as you remember, Omri changed the whole political basis. Omri made friends with Judah, and he made friends with Phoenicia to the north, and he married his son to Jezebel the daughter of the king of Tyre. And this new relation there was much better for Israel, Israel could grow it could be prosperous without constant fighting with its neighbors, they were much better off in this situation. But Omri, very sensibly, followed a principle which is wise for any of us. When you want to do a thing, don't be satisfied with just barely doing it. Go beyond so that it is well enough done to last. If you want to learn the kings of Israel and Judah, don't learn them well enough that you think you can remember them to write them down on the test an hour later, because if you learn them well enough for that and you pass this course, you take prophets next fall and you're asked it again you'll probably fail prophets for not knowing them. And if you don't do that you will at least not have the background in mind to understand the events of the prophets because you don't have these kings in mind in the background. Learn them so you know them thoroughly, learn them so they are absolutely part of your nature. And then all of this will inevitably disappear. And what's left will be enough to carry on the purposes that you need. That's true in anything you do. If you want to get to church to conduct a service at 11 o'clock, it's wise not to plan on getting in at half a minute of 11, it's much wiser to plan on getting there at twenty of. And then if you get held up by a red light on the way, or if something happens that you can't avoid being a little later, than you planned on, you still are on time.

Well, Omri wanted not to have the constant bickering with the kingdoms of the north and south, but he said the best way to do it is to make real friends of them, and he did. He made marriage alliances, he made close friendships with them. From Omri's viewpoint, an ungodly viewpoint, but politically a valid viewpoint, that was a wise thing to do.

Now from the viewpoint of Asa and Jehoshaphat the fact that Israel was ready to live at peace with them was a good thing. If Israel had announced a policy of conquering Judah, if Israel had its envoys going through the world trying to gather groups to stand for Israel and stand with them and overcome Judah eventually and declare (9 3/4) it would be very, very silly for Judah to embark on a policy of coexistence. But with Israel clearly not seeking to conquer Judah, it would be very wise for Judah to devote its attention to ~~Israel~~ its own development, its own effectiveness, and not to constantly have the enmity and warfare against Israel, and so it was very wise of Asa and Jehoshaphat to ~~accept~~ the proffered hand of peace on the part of the house of Israel. But it was very unwise of them to go beyond accepting the proffered hand of peace and to make a close alliance with them, and that brought tremendous difficulty and danger and trouble to Judah. In fact, it almost meant that Judah was swept over by the Baal-worship and if the Baal-worship had conquered Israel it would have destroyed Israel too. In fact, it almost did. And that's where Jehoshaphat made his mistake. Just like our nation in the last war. Faced with the tremendous power of Hitler against us, it was wise to do every sensible thing we could to destroy Hitler, and in order to do that it was very wise to give lend-lease help to Russia, to do what we could to help the Bolshevik people, in resisting Hitler on the other side and leading to his destruction, but to go beyond that and make friendship with another dictatorship every bit as bad as Hitler's dictatorship, to make friendship, to join an alliance with them, to give their atomic secrets, and other secrets, to lay everything open to them, was a very, very foolish move and one which has brought us untold difficulty and trouble everywhere ^{since} ~~where~~. Now that is the same sort of thing exactly which Jehoshaphat did here. For Jehoshaphat to say to Omri I'm glad that you are ready to renounce all ideas of conquering us, and we are ready to renounce all ideas of conquering you; and ~~that~~ live at peace as far as our borders are concerned, when Israel was not a power that was set on world conquest, there was no evidence of it on their part, was a wise thing to do. But to accept his overtures to the point of joining in an alliance with him, making friendship with him, ~~growing~~ ^{going} up and working with him, even marrying Jehoshaphat's son to the daughter of Ahab, that was the very, very foolish thing to do, and the thing which if it were not for God's mercy would in the end have meant utter/ruin and destruction

to Judah. It nearly did. It nearly meant utter ruin and destruction to the house of David.

And so Jehoshaphat who deserves tremendous praise for his loyalty to God, and for his great work for the Lord, deserved tremendous blame for his compromise in this regard which nearly meant the destruction of everything that Jehoshaphat held dear. Now Chronicles does not bring that factor out clearly, but the results of the factor are perfectly plain in both Kings and Chronicles as we find this daughter of Jezebel eventually trying to kill every descendant of Jehoshaphat, in order that she may make herself the queen in Judah, and almost succeeding ^{except} ~~except~~ that one of the nurses stole away one of the little babies, before she could get to it, and she lost count of them and didn't realize there was one left. And that one grew up to keep alive the house of David when all the rest had been killed by this wicked woman that Jehoshaphat brought right in there to be the wife of his child. It was her own grandson whom she failed to kill when she killed all the rest of her children and grandchildren who were descended from the house of David.

And ^{bringing} ~~when~~ this wicked woman writes right into his family was a deed which politically seemed very expedient. (14) must have said, well now, Omri has arranged to make peace, let's make peace with them, and they wanted to cement the peace with a marriage alliance. Well, we'll do it, yes make peace with them, but stop short of alliances. Keep your eyes on them, make a peace, but don't go beyond that. It nearly destroyed the land, carrying the peace on to the point of alliance. And then Jehoshaphat we find, he was loyal to the Lord, he was serving the Lord, he was trying to do what was right but he was giving his support to Omri and to Ahab in their land, and helping them because he said these don't have anything to do with (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) here, these are separate, I'll keep their friendship (14 $\frac{3}{4}$)

and so on. And the result of it was that (14 $\frac{3}{4}$) Jehoshaphat himself was nearly killed, the result was that his grandson was killed, the result was that the Baal-worship came into the land and if it wasn't for the mercy of God would have utterly destroyed them. Well, we continue there...

...we were speaking about the dynasty of Omri which was D, then we went on to E, and under that 1, Jehoshaphat, we noticed the difference between the impression you get of Jehoshaphat in Kings and Chronicles, far more stressed in Chronicles than Kings. Yet practically everything that is said about him in Kings is good, while in Chronicles we have some good things told that aren't told in Kings but we also have some of the other side shown that is implied in Kings, because of his close affinity with Ahab. And Kings and Chronicles both give in full detail the story of how Jehoshaphat

with help from Ahab in Samaria, when Ahab wanted to go over and fight in Ramoth Gilead and in both of them we have the full details--a very long chapter in which Micaiah the prophet appears, it's a very interesting account, very valuable to have them both, and yet it's interesting that ^{it's} just about the only thing that's just in the northern kingdom that is given in Chronicles. Of course it's about Jehoshaphat, he's quite active in it, so that doubtless explains. But it's almost word for word. In both of them we read how after they went into the battle, we read that Ahab said to Jehoshaphat you put on your robe and I'm going to disguise myself, and the king of Israel disguised himself and ^{they} went to the battle. Now the king of Syria had commanded the captain of the chariots that were with him, saying fight ye not with small or great save only with the king of Israel, and it came to pass that when the captains of the chariots saw Jehoshaphat they said, it is the king of Israel. Therefore, they compassed him to fight but Jehoshaphat cried out and the Lord helped him and God moved them to depart from him, for it came to pass that when the captains of the chariots perceived that it was not the king of Israel they turned back again from pursuing him. How did they see it was not the king of Israel when he cried out? And what sort of a warrior was he anyway, that as soon as all these people gather on him he cries out? I don't think the translation brings out the meaning to us very well. The word cry out in English tends to mean being in difficulty, to cry out for help, but in Hebrew it is to cry out is more like in our English to call out. It may mean to call out in difficulty, it may mean to call out in help, it may simply mean to call out. And I believe that in this case what it means is that Jehoshaphat when these people gather together against him, and there he was in his kingly robes, that he gave the battle cry of Judah, that he cried out the battlecry and when they heard that they recognized it was not the battle cry of Israel but the battle cry of Judah, because it says that when they saw it was not the king of Israel then they turned away from him. I think that's a minor point but I think it is worth knowing, that the English word could give a false impression which is not required by the Hebrew word, and which is certainly not implied by the context which says they saw it wasn't the king of Israel, well how did they see it. I would think it quite certain that the crying out was a part of their becoming aware of that fact. Yes?

(student. 4¹. It would seem to me that they would have gone ahead and taken him because he was equally as great as Ahab, and that they would at least have taken him and then continued on.) Yes, they doubtless would have if left to their own initiative, but we read in the verse before, that the king of Syria had given them orders fight not with small or great, save only with the king of Israel. And they were looking for the king of Israel who was the head of the opposition, now if those directions hadn't been given the chance to get one of the leading associates of the king of Israel would be something worth taking ahold of, but with those directions they followed them and as soon as they saw this wasn't the man they were after they headed off to hunt for him, because the king of Syria very rightly knew that if they got the king of Israel it would take care of much more than killing a good many of the people. I don't know whether I have ever mentioned to you what I've read about the Duke of Windsor, that when he was in World War I he joined the army and he marched and practiced and everything with the troops and then they shipped the regiment over to France and the day before they left orders came that he was to leave that regiment and go to another. He marched with them and practiced and trained and then they went to France and the day before they went, orders came he was jerked out of that regiment and put in another. And he didn't like it so he went to see the Prime Minister, and he said to the Prime Minister why can't I go and fight in France the same as these other young Englishmen are doing? Why should I have to stay home here and if I'm in the army just have to keep marching and training. He said, why can't I go over there. He said, suppose I should get shot? He said I've got several younger brothers and one of them could be the heir to the throne just as well as I. And the Prime Minister said, yes indeed, he said, if you'd guarantee you'd be shot over there, we wouldn't hesitate about sending you, but he said, there's no way to know, you might be taken captive and he said you in the hands of the enemy would do us more harm in the war than the killing of a whole regiment of soldiers. And so they had to watch out because of the effect of the war of the one individual.

And in this case Ahab was the directing head, and to kill Ahab meant a big setback at the least. He was the trained director of the forces of Israel, he was the one they all rallied around, the king of Syria was aware of the situation, and he was striking for the

strategic point. And to have killed Jehoshaphat would be a loss to Israel but not a serious one, and they weren't really fighting Judah. Israel was between them and Judah and there was no great point in their being much concerned about Judah, except as Judah helped Israel. Yes? (student. 7 1/2.) Yes, well, if he had his royal robes on they would recognize he was some sort of king, then they saw he wasn't the king of Israel. They maybe didn't know the battle cry of Judah but they knew it wasn't the battle cry of Israel. And it would give them the clue. Well, Ahab was killed in that battle. And then they brought the chariots back over across and they washed his blood up in the chariot, but that is certainly not the fulfillment of Elijah's prediction, but chapter 19, in Chronicles is immediately followed, this gives us something we don't have in Kings.

Jehoshaphat the king of Judah returned to his house in peace to Jerusalem, and Jehu the son of Hanani the seer went out to meet him and said to King Jehoshaphat, shouldst thou help the ungodly, and love them that hate the Lord? therefore is wrath upon thee from before the Lord. Here he was rebuked strongly rebuked for this alliance with king Ahab. and Jehoshaphat was right to desist from feudal wars against Ahab but he was wrong to make alliance with him, and the evil effect of this came in a way he never dreamed of, and far beyond his realization in the (8 3/4)

Then we find in the rest of the chapter the account of how ^{Jeho}Jehoshaphat set judges in the land who were to be upright and follow the Lord, how he urged the Levites to do the Lord's will in everything, and the way in which he advanced the Lord's cause, he was evidently a very sincere man, very earnest man, a very godly man, one whom the Lord blesses in many ways, but whom the Lord rebuked for this compromise, and the blessing though is stressed in Chronicles but the rebuke is very strongly mentioned two or three times.

Now the next chapter 20 tells something that we're not told in Kings about a great attack from the Moabites and the Ammonites against Judah and the people were absolutely beyond any human help, but Jehoshaphat prayed to the Lord and the Lord gave him a most wonderful victory in that situation. And then after that, at the end of that chapter, we have the word that after this, did Jehoshaphat king of Judah, join himself with Ahaziah king of Israel, who did very wickedly. And he joined himself with him to make ships to go to Tarshish and they made the ships in Ezion-gaber. Then Eliezer the son of Dodavah of

Mareshah prophesied against Jehoshaphat saying, because thou hast joined thyself with Ahaziah the Lord hath broken thy works, and the ships were broken, that they were not able to go to Tarshish. (10 $\frac{1}{2}$) at Ezion-Geber remains of an attempt to rebuild in the days of Jehoshaphat but nothing comparable with what Solomon had there before, an attempt which didn't get very far.

So that Jehoshaphat is one of the great figures in the history of Judah, one from whom we can learn much, much good, but one who was strongly rebuked for the mistake he made, for the compromise that he showed and we see later on what the effects of that compromise were.

Number 2, Jehoram. He was ~~defeated~~^{succeeded} by his son Jehoram. And here is where the results of Jehoshaphat's compromise began to come. We read in Chronicles that Jehoram had many brothers, sons of Jehoshaphat, and their father gave them great gifts of silver and gold and precious things, but gave the kingdom to Jehoram because he was the first-born. Now when Jehoram was risen king he strengthened himself and slew all his brethren with the sword. Jehoram had a wife who was the daughter of Jezebel and he proceeded to make himself strong by killing all his brothers. He was 32 years old when he began to reign and he reigned 8 years in Jerusalem and he walked in the way of the kings of Israel. Jehoshaphat took him with him up there to meet with Ahab and when they would be along, he would say now Jehoram don't you let these folks mislead you, they're an ungodly crowd but it's necessary for our well-being that we work with them in this thing, but don't you let them mislead you and I suppose he looked very pious in front of his father, but actually he was thrown into temptation that there was no sense in his having been thrown into,, if Jehoshaphat had kept the line of distinction between him and the evil forces of the northern kingdom, as he should have done. And the son, when he took over, as soon as his father was out of the way, walked in the way of the kings of Israel, and he had the daughter of Ahab to wife, his wife was Athaliah, the daughter of Jezebel, and he wrought that which was evil in the eyes of the Lord. Howbeit the Lord would not destroy the house of David, because of the covenant that he had made with David, and as he promised to give a light to him and to his sons for ever. We find so frequently during these centuries here how God's mercy was with them because of David, in blessing upon the children, because of the ancestor.

And then in his days the Edomites revolted, David had conquered the Edomites, the Edomites had been subject to Judah, and when Moab revolted against Israel, the king of Israel, the king of Judah, and the king of Edom (13 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Now the Edomites had revolted too. (2 Chron. 21:8) And we read here about the evil of this king and we read in verse 12, there came a writing to him from Elijah the prophet, saying thus saith the Lord God of David thy father, because thou hast not walked in the ways of Jehoshaphat thy father nor in the way of Asa king of Judah, but hast walked in the way of the kings of Israel, hast made Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem to go awhoring, like to the whoredoms of the house of Ahab, and also hast slain thy brethren of thy father's house, which were better than thyself, behold, with a great plague will the Lord smite thy people and they children and thy wives and all thy goods. Thou shalt have great sickness by disease. And so it tells in Chronicles how after 8 years of reign Jehoram died, and was succeeded by his youngest son Ahaziah. ^{The inhabitants} ~~It happened~~ of Jerusalem made Ahaziah his youngest son king in his stead. Well, we won't look at Ahaziah now. This was E...

...under Jehoshaphat and Joram, that finished the period we're looking at, the Divided Kingdom before Jehu, which was a period of about 90 years, from 931 to 841 B.C. A period a little longer than the period of the reigns of David and Solomon together, was this period with these three dynasties of the northern kingdom, the third of them as long as the first two put together. And with these kings we've looked at in the southern kingdom. Now we take Roman Numeral XII, The Divided Kingdom From Jehu to Hoshea. That begins in 841. And 841 is a date that would be well to keep in mind. 853 is a date of great help to us for chronology because it is the date of the battle of (1 $\frac{1}{2}$) But 841 is the dividing point in the history of Judah and of Israel because it is the date of Jehu's revolt and so 841 is a date worth remembering.

Now in 841 we begin this section with A, The Dynasty of Jehu. This is the 4th dynasty of the northern kingdom. It is the longest continual dynasty of the northern kingdom. The dynasty that lasted for about 80 years.

Number 1, The Revolution of Jehu. We have already noted in connection with Elisha the part that he played in connection with the revolution of Jehu. It was a complete overturn, ~~like~~ an overturn like the case when Zimri killed his master, and nobody was with him and Zimri was killed within 7 days and then there was 4 years of fighting by two of the generals as to which of them would gain the ascendancy, this was altogether different from that, this represented a growing dissatisfaction with the house of Omri, a dissatisfaction which reached the point that the people were ready to look for some other house to reign, and it is the great evil of every system of government that I know of except democracy, that it is just about impossible to make a sharp change, when the people want it, except with bloodshed. Many people have the idea that democracy means that all the people determine what is to be done. That of course is utter nonsense. The recent researchers ask questions in the United States here about the general events to see what people knew, and they found that half of our population did not know whether Berlin was in the west section or the east section of Germany. That is the crucial point today in the whole world history, the situation of Berlin there, which has been over ten years, and half of our people didn't know anything about it. Now democracy doesn't mean that all of our people are determining

what's going to happen. There never was a government that was run in that way. It is impossible, there are too many events in view, even if people try and half of them don't, to know what's happening, and keep abreast of it, there are too many things happening, people can't keep track of it, people we don't know the inner details of things, we can't determine them. The people as a whole do not govern, it's ridiculous. But what democracy means is that when situations move far enough one way or the other to induce a general dissatisfaction, the people can express themselves by votes instead of by bullets. It means that it is possible to oscillate among people in command, in a peaceful way, that's a principle about democracy. The idea ~~about~~ ^{voice of the} that the/people is the voice of God might be true if all the people were born again Christians, and if they were I think they'd probably want the Lord to come back and rule anyway, rather than that they would unanimously decide all the problems, but the more there are intelligently watching, the nearer the government comes to expressing what we want, but any government in a real democracy knows it can't go too far off the main line without getting an adverse vote in an election, and so it is a means that makes possible repeated bloodless revolutions, and this is really what democracy amounts to. Now democracy is comparatively recent development, and the situation there is that people in the country were increasingly dissatisfied but there was nothing they could do about it, except by force.

Now God might have intervened; in fact, as you read this history of Judah and Israel you wonder sometimes why did not God raise up (6) perfect kings ~~~~~ for Israel and Judah, with all his sins, David was probably the best king either of them ever had. And Jehoshaphat and Asa and Hezekiah, perhaps Josiah, the next best. Aside from them they're all pretty inferior. Why didn't God raise up perfect men to be king, or even why didn't he raise men of very fine character, a succession of them to be kings. I think the answer to it must be found in the fact that God was not undertaking to establish the kingdom of God on earth at that time, any more than he is today. That in a world of sin, God was dealing with individuals as he is today. He was sending Elisha through the land to win individuals, to the knowledge of the truth. And he was allowing things to go on in a world of sin and interfering only to such an extent as was necessary to keep alive the knowledge

of God there and prepare the way for the coming of His Son. And so in political matters we should do our best for what is right, but we should not feel too badly if in the world of sin, things go wrong, because there will always be great disappointments through these years until our Lord comes back and we have the only perfect one reigning here.

And so we have a situation here where Ahab or Omri's dynasty had degenerated to perhaps its lowest point (7 $\frac{1}{2}$) under Ahaziah, and then it came up a bit, Jehoram was definitely better than his predecessors, but still pretty bad. But as those things were improving to some extent in the government the people more and more were becoming dissatisfied, and this dissatisfaction here expresses, was felt in the army pretty strongly and things were just ripe for a revolution. Perhaps it was all planned, perhaps they were ready to make it, we don't know, but in any event what galvanized them together and set their hearts to move forward vigorously was when this young prophet appeared and poured some oil over the head of Jehu, and they saw him come out of the inner chamber with the oil going down over the side of his head and they said who was this man, what did he say, and then when he told him that he had said that he was to be king of Israel, they said well let's proceed at once, they immediately took control of things, and headed back over to ^{Jezebel} ~~Jerash~~ (8 $\frac{1}{2}$) where Jehoram was convalescing from the wounds he had had in the battle. So they went back over there to Jezreel, across the Jordan, it must have been a trip of several hours, and we read how Jehoram and his cousin, young cousin Ahaziah, king of Judah who was up there, not cousin, his young nephew Ahaziah, (his cousin, Jehoram's sister was Ahaziah's aunt) they were there where Jehoram was recovering from his wounds and they saw them coming at breakneck speed and somebody said who is it, and the watchman said he rides like Jehu the son of Nimshi, so evidently Jehu was well known as a dashing soldier, a man who makes headlong attacks, he was evidently well known and highly regarded, but perhaps the king had a bit of suspicion of him, at any rate, it wasn't long before the king and Jehu were together there and as soon as he heard what Jehu said he began to flee but Jehu followed him and Jehu killed him and killed Ahaziah both, and so Jehoshaphat's alliance with Ahab resulted in Jehoshaphat's grandson, the king of Judah being killed when the people turned against Ahab, one of the results of this compromised. Yes? (student. 10 $\frac{1}{4}$)

That is a prevalent attitude in all nations that have kings. But the attitude can be greatly reduced after a time when the king proves unsatisfactory. It is ~~isn't~~ an attitude which you find even today wherever there is a king, there's a great deal, some don't connect it up with religion that way, but there's a, Shakespeare says, there's a divinity that hedges a king, it may be, it is an attitude of people's minds, the average Englishman has almost an veneration for his royal family. There's an attitude toward it, even on the part of the labor members of parliament which is just ~~is~~ inconceivable to us. Yes?

(student.11 $\frac{1}{2}$) No, Jehu, we have no reason to think he was related to the king of Judah. His father was a man named Jehoshaphat, but this man's father was a man named Nimshi. While Jehoshaphat the king of Judah, Jehoshaphat of Judah was the son of Asa, but Jehu's father Jehoshaphat was the son of Nimshi. So it probably was a fairly common name. Different person altogether. Yes? (Welch student.12 $\frac{1}{4}$) Yes, Jehoshaphat son of Nimshi means that Jehoshaphat was the son of Nimshi, he was at least two steps back, now he could have been three or four for all we have proof, but probably two.

Well, this revolution then resulted in the death of Jehoram, Jehoram was fleeing, he said ^{to} Ahaziah, there is treachery, they were fleeing and Jehu drew a bow with his full strength and smote Jehoram between his arms, and the arrow went out at his heart, and he sunk down in his chariot. Verse 25 of 2 Kings 9 says then said Jehu to Bidkar his captain Take up and cast him in the portion of the field of Naboth the Jezreelite, for remember how that, when I and thou rode together after Ahab his father, the Lord laid this burden upon him. Surely I have seen yesterday the blood of Naboth and the blood of his sons, saith the Lord, and I will requite thee in this plat saith the Lord. Now therefore take and cast him into the plat of ground, according to the word of the Lord. And Jehoram ~~instead~~ Omstead in his HISTORY OF PALESTINE rather jeers because he says that is fulfilling prophecy intentionally, it's setting out to fulfill prophecy. He had heard Elijah's prophecy, the blood of Ahab ~~will~~ flow in the field of Jezreel where Naboth was, and now he killed the son of Ahab and takes ~~it~~ him there, so he is just working out the prophecy. Well, he jeers at it. The fact is that under ordinary circumstances nobody would have the chance to do anything. The fact that he would get the chance to do it and be willing to do it, is just as much a fulfilling of prophecy as if it had happened without his knowing. The

sneer is quite unwarranted, in that connection. That there would be a king who would be (14¼) to fulfill Elijah's prophecy is the complete chain in Israel. And so Jehu threw him into the pit there and there is the fulfillment of the prophecy which was made about Ahab but it is said that Ahab humbled himself and God said this evil will come in the days of his son instead of Ahab, and so thy blood, even thine, here it is his blood is flowing in the person of his son rather than of Ahab. Some try to get around that by saying that when the dogs licked up the chariot in which he had been some hours before that that was the fulfillment, but that wasn't near Naboth's vineyard anyway. . .

O.T. History 303. (½)

...well, this Jehu then proceeded to go into Jezreel and Jezebel heard him, she was a brave woman, she painted her face and attired her hair to look out of the window. And when Jehu entered in she said, Had Zimri peace, who slew his master? And she was right, Zimri rose up for his own ambition and killed his master and made himself king, and within 7 days people killed him, but this is a different situation. This was not Jehu an individual, trying to make himself king, this was Jehu leading a movement, a large movement of dissatisfaction with the house of Israel. And it was an altogether different situation, Jehu looked up at the window and said who is on my side, and two or three eunuchs looked down and he said throw her down, and they threw her down and some other blood was sprinkled on the wall and on the horses and he trod her under foot and he went in and ate and when he got through he said go, see now this cursed woman and bury her, for she is a king's daughter. And they went to bury her and they saw no more of her than the skull and the feet and the palms of her hands. And this fulfilled Elijah's prediction also that in the portion of Jezreel shall dogs eat the flesh of Jezebel. ¶ And so this was a tremendous revolution in the northern kingdom, the revolution of Jehu and we notice it also changed conditions in the southern kingdom, because King Ahaziah of the southern kingdom was up there with Jehoram, and he was killed at the same time. But his death had the exact opposite effect from that of Jehoram. The death of Jehoram meant a complete and final and irrevocable end to the Baal worship in Israel. The death of Ahaziah meant that his mother could

take the throne in Judah with no one of the royal blood to oppose her, and could introduce the Baal worship with force in Judah. And so the revolution which worked for the cause of God in Israel as its immediate effect, had the direct opposite effect in Judah, and for the next few years the Baal worship was dominant in the land of Judah and if it hadn't been for the work of Elijah and Elisha, despite the good work of Jehoshaphat, his compromise opened the way where it would not merely have turned over for a few years to the Baal worship but would have gone over completely and would have been the end of the true religion in Judah. But God did not allow things to take their natural course there because he was going to keep this nation in this nation a true witness to have it be the place where Christ would come to this earth and where the gospel would begin from which it would spread out, and therefore he introduced the⁸⁶ unusual methods of overcoming human sin enough to hold it true, but not enough to establish the kingdom of God there, because that was not his purpose for this age.

Well, the revolution of Jehu brought in a new king and here it is interesting that we have this new king referred to in the Assyrian records. One of the first important Assyrian references that was found to an Israelite king, one of the earliest come to light, is plate 100a and 100b in the book THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST. Plate 100a and 100b show two sides of the so-called black obelisk, a small black obelisk from the floor here it would stand about this high, not a large column, but its size may be this wide, it is square and on the four sides it has pictures engraved on it, pictures and inscriptions, and it says here that Jehu son of Omri presents his tribute to the king of Assyria. Jehu son of Omri presents his tribute to the king of Assyria. And it describes the tribute and shows the fine things that he brings, and it is a corroboration of Jehu's name as ruler at this time, the obelisk has been dated, it is by one of the Assyrian kings, found way over across the desert in Mesopotamia, but it shows also the ignorance of the Assyrians that they call him son of Omri, he was successor of Omri, he was not immediate successor, but he had destroyed the house of Omri, and yet Omri's name was well enough established that the Assyrians referred to Israel as the land of Omri, and referred to Jehu as his son. They It shows, from a political viewpoint, how important Omri was, though from a religious viewpoint his son

Ahab was far more important. But from, we who know the facts from the Bible know that Jehu represented a complete change from the house of Omri, he represented the introduction of an entirely ^{different} line. That was 1, The Revolution of Jehu.

2. Jehu's Failure. Jehu was the general, the leader in the army, who became disaffected and who was ready to take the place at the head of the popular dissatisfaction with the house of Omri, with the popular feeling against the Baal-worship he set an end to it, but he was not a man like ^{David} ~~God~~ who was really seeking God and seeking to do the will of God. And the result was that he did a good thing to root out the palace of the house of Omri, but he proceeded way beyond any reason in the bloodiness of the way he did it, and in the number of little children, descendants of Ahab, and so on, that he killed in order to establish himself as firmly on the throne as possible and in Hosea, the book of ^{Hosea} ~~Hosea~~ ^{begins} ~~here;~~ ^{with} the statement that God is going to avenge the bloody ~~day~~ of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu. And that is nearly a century later. It was a long time before it was done, but God held it against him, the bloodiness of what he did, and the unnecessary cruelty involved in the way he did it.

But Jehu rooted out the Baal worship completely, he invited all the Baal-worshippers to a big meeting and said if Ahab served Baal a little, Jehu is going to serve him much, called all the prophets of Baal, all his servants, and all his ~~people~~ priests, let none be wanting, for I have a great sacrifice to do to Baal. And the Baal worshippers said say this fellow Jehu isn't so bad after all, is he? Very clever, he talked as if he's in favor of the Baal, as if he's against the Baal worship, he gets these people to stand with him, to make himself king, but really he's going to stand with it, he realizes how much superior and more cultivated and more sophisticated our religion is than ~~the~~ the old-fashioned ~~of~~ religion of Israel, and now we'll gather round him and become his associates, and he got them all together there and then he massacred them, and there's no evidence that that was God's command or God's will, that was Jehu's plan to do away with these whom he would either have to stand with or they would be an undermining influence in the kingdom, and he got them together and he killed them, that brought the complete end to the Baal worship in Israel, but if he hadn't done that it would've come soon anyway, because it was not he but

Elijah and Elisha who did the work.

It's like King Henry VIII that wicked English King whom many people call the father of the Church of England. He was not at all the father of the Church of England, he saw a chance for his own political advance to take advantage of conditions, but it was William Tyndale and men like that, the English readers of Luther ^{'s works} who brought the Reformation in England. Luther was the head, the founder of the Reformation, not Henry VIII. Henry VIII took advantage of it for political purposes, therefore gave it a chance to go ahead faster than it might have otherwise, and then towards of his life he tried to slow it up, but he died before he finished that task, and it went on, and he had helped it but not intentionally. Nor did he deserve any credit.

So Jehu proved to be a political-minded fellow who was using the times and the days for his own benefit. And the Lord said to Jehu, because thou hast done well in executing that which is right in mine eyes and hast done unto the house of Ahab according to all that was in mine heart, thy children of the fourth generation shall sit on the throne of Israel. But Jehu took no heed to walk in the law of the Lord God of Israel with all his heart, for he departed not from the sins of Jeroboam which made Israel to sin. He left the Baal worship but he stuck to the Golden Calf. And he had four generations of descendants who reigned, the last one a very brief time, the other three for long periods. You have nearly a century in which the house of Jehu reigned, a house greatly inferior in leadership and ability to the house of Omri, and a house which did not make up for that with a real loyalty to the Lord, but which kept an outward apparent loyalty to the Lord, and at least gave Elisha and men like that an unhampered opportunity to express their message.

Well, then we find that in those days the Lord began to cut Israel short and Hazael smote them in all the coasts of Israel, all the borders of Israel, the Old English coasts is the same as borders today. Jehu reigned over Israel 28 years, quite different from the length of time that Zimri reigned. Well, so much for Jehu's failure.

3. Jehu's Successor. And now we come into a period in which we do not have a great deal of importance in what happened, a period of nearly a century, in which you have his son, the son of Jehu, who was called Jehoahaz, and he reigned for 17 years, and then his

son Joash, or Jehoash, reigned 16 years and it was he who came and wept over Elisha. What was that reference? Does somebody remember? Where Elisha died, I'll find it in a second. Yes, chapter 13. Well, there is an incident we should know about. Jehu's son Jehoahaz, his son Jehoash, or Joash, both forms are used, and Joash came to Elisha and said my father, my father, the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof, I hope most of you can follow, either in your English or in your Hebrew Bible, 2 Kings 13:16, verse 15, and Elisha said to him, take bow and arrow. Joash is interested in the defense of the land, and he recognized that Elisha is the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof. Today we would say the tanks of Israel and the jet planes thereof. He is using the height of defense as a figure for this godly man and how much he means to the land. Just how sincere Joash was, at least he's expressing what the people believe and what was true. But Joash says this, and the old man there lying on his bed, probably 88, 90 years of age, he lies there and he says to Joash take bow and arrow, and he said to the king of Israel put your hand on the bow, and he put his hand on it and Elisha put his hand on the king's hands, and he said, open the window eastward, and he opened it, then Elisha said, shoot, and he shot. And he said, The arrow of the Lord's deliverance, and the arrow of deliverance from Syria, for thou shalt smite the Syrians in Aphek till thou have consumed them. And he said, take the arrows, and he took them, and he said to the king of Israel, smite upon the ground, and he smote thrice and stayed. And the man of God was wroth with him, and said, thou shouldest have smitten 5 or 6 times, then had thou smitten Syria till thou hadst consumed it, whereas now thou shalt smite Syria but thrice. Wasn't that unfair of Elisha? He says to Joash take the arrow, now smite on the ground. And why doesn't he explain that just as many times as you hit the ground with those arrows, you're going to defeat the Syrians? Well, Joash could have hit the ground a hundred times and then he could beat the Syrians a hundred times in battle. But instead of that he just said smite, How was he to know that every time he smote meant a defeat for Syria? But you notice what he said, the king of Israel smote three times and the man of God was wroth with him and said, thou shouldest have smitten five or six times, then hadst thou smitten Syria till thou hadst consumed it, whereas now thou shalt smite Syria but thrice.

Any work you do, any situation you find different rules of the game. You'll find there

are all sorts of things that you go at in ignorance and that you'll have a tough time getting done, go at it the right way and you'll get it done.

I tried in 1947 to go to Germany to buy books for Faith Seminary Library and I wrote to Washington in April and said I'd like to go to Germany in July and...

O.T.History 304. (1 1/2)

...and a month later I had no word, I wrote the head of the Passport Division, and they said still pending before officers in military government. And then they said let us know to which consulate^{te} in Europe to send word to see, I said send it to England. I went to England and a month later it hadn't come. Next October a letter came saying that there was no military reason why there should be any objections to my going the preceding July to Germany to get my books. Well, I wrote the letter and it went through channels, went through forms, that's what happened. The last day in London I went into the Consulate and I asked for, whether they had received word from Washington that I had been given permission to go to Germany. No, no permission, no word at all. Well, the woman said, suppose I call the office of Military government, so she called, and I won't take time now to tell what happened, but there was a certain thing developed in an unexpected way, and the result of that was that I had to go upstairs and sit for an hour and wait, and then that afternoon I had to go out to the outskirts, go in to the office of military government where there were people who had been sitting there for days waiting for consideration, and when they'd get through one office they'd have to wait for hours to get through the next one, and so on, and they took me and sent a fellow to go to this office and that, and get this signature and that signature, and within half an hour I had everything in shape and went right into Germany and bought all the books that I could afford to for the Seminary Library (1 3/4)

In the one case I stumbled onto somebody who knew the right ropes, knew the way to do it. In the other case I didn't know how to do it and sent the letter to Washington and found out next October I could have gone in July. Anywhere you go, there are rules of the game, there are ways, there are things to find out. But ordinarily you expect somebody

to tell you what they are, to explain how to do it.

Here we find that all Elisha said was smite on the ground. He spoke (2 $\frac{1}{4}$) 3 times. Why didn't he say, every time you smite you are winning a battle, and then he'd know. You can't blame Jehoash for it. Well, that's the result you get when you take the magical sort of approach so many people take to the Bible. These times, the number three means this, and so on. You have to read a little bit beneath the surface and see what really is involved, very often, in interpreting Scriptures. What was Elisha doing? Elisha was showing, ~~was~~ not working a magical thing that one smiting means one battle, Elisha was revealing the character of Joash. Joash wants to win the victory, he comes and he says my father, my father, the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof. Elisha says, all right, here's what God wants you to do, you smite on the ground. Joash says oh I don't know what this foolishness means and he stopped, and if he was really interested in knowing what Elisha had in mind and trying to find out what God's will was for him, then when God's prophet said you smite on the ground, you go at it with force and with vigor, and five or six times he probably would hardly have stopped with that length of time. He would enter in with his whole soul to doing the thing that Elisha commanded. When he did it three times and stopped, it wasn't the number three that mattered, it was the lack of energy displayed, ~~they~~ ^{lack of} ~~stopped~~ interest, the stopping sooner, and God said you are not one who is really interested in obeying the Lord. You are in a half-hearted way of doing what the father says. And God is going to deliver Israel, he has promised, because he is going to keep alive his testimony here in the land until the time comes when Jesus Christ comes, among the people of Israel, at this time he is going to ~~be~~ (4 $\frac{1}{4}$) defend them, but he is not going to give his blessing to Joash as he would like to give it, because of Joash's indifference and lack of whole-hearted enthusiasm about endeavoring to carry out the will of the Lord. I think we can trace that in all of our relations with the Lord. We know what the Lord wants us to do, and we go ahead in lackadaisical fashion to fulfil it. The Lord wants you to read the Scripture a certain amount of time, ~~you~~ put a certain amount of time in prayer. God isn't so much interested in how much time you put in these things, whether you do them at regular intervals, whether you go through certain forms, as in the

Spirit in back of it, the interest, the enthusiasm, the zeal to really accomplish and do for him and do what he wants. And so in this case I think on the surface you don't see what it really means, and it's very easy to draw a magical conclusion from this and many other passages and to miss the heart of it, the real thing that God wants us to get.

Well, Joash reigned for a good many years in the land of Israel and then he was succeeded by his son Jeroboam II, and by this time the Assyrians were beginning to weaken the power of Syria tremendously. And the result was that Jeroboam II was able to extend the power of Israel very greatly. Jeroboam II we are told extended the power of Israel to its earlier frontiers, to its earlier lengths, the kingdom of Israel was at its largest extent since its beginning in the time of Jeroboam II. He was a king who reigned for many years, 27 years I believe it was, 41 (I was looking at the figure here that speaks about Ahaziah) 41 years. 41 years was a very long reign as you see, and we know very little about him. We know that Amos came ^{up} and gave the messages of God up there, against the practices ~~that~~ ^{of} Jeroboam II. It's good to get Amos in mind. Amos came from the southern kingdom up to the northern kingdom to give the messages in the book of Amos. Many people think that Amos was the earliest of the writing prophets. Some people call him the founder of Monotheism. They recognize that he was a monotheist, they try to do away with the earlier ones. But by that time all had to recognize their clear monotheism in Amos' writing. He came up from Judah, into Israel, he prophesied at the court, at Bethel, where Jeroboam II was for a time. This ties it up with Jeroboam II, with the second of the writing prophets. And the first just before him, Hosea, also refers to Jehu, as I mentioned. So it's good to get Amos and Hosea tied in with this rule of Jeroboam II. And we can tie in Jonah also because it says in Kings that he restored the boundaries of Israel, as God had prophesied by the hand of Jonah. Some take that as meaning Jonah helped him, well we don't have any proof that Jonah helped him. But we have proof that Jonah predicted, did he predict during his reign? We don't know. This we do know, he didn't predict after his reign. So we can say that Jonah was either in the reign of Jeroboam II or before. Although in the minor prophets he comes much later than Hosea and Amos. It's ~~proof~~ ^{proof} they are not arranged chronologically. Well, Jeroboam II must have been a very powerful ruler. He ruled for 41 years. We do not know a great deal about him. The Scripture tells us

comparatively little. And then his son reigned a very brief period, Zachariah hisson reigned a very brief period, and then he was killed, and that was the end of this long dynasty of Jehu. And that finishes A, The Dynasty of Jehu.

B, Judah during the century after 841. We'll look at that tomorrow morning at 8 o'clock

(9 $\frac{1}{2}$) We are looking at XII, The Divided Kingdom from Jehu to Hoshea. We saw A, The ^Uynasty of Jehu, and under that 1, The Revolution of Jehu (more review to 10 $\frac{1}{4}$). It is not from the Biblical viewpoint a particularly time. The Baal worship has been destroyed, the worship of the Golden Calf is continued. There is a general downward progression, though nowhere near like it was at the coming in of the Baal worship, and toward the end of the period you have the coming of Hosea and Amos with their great prophecies and of course we have Jonah's prophecy somewhat earlier than this. We don't know whether Jonah was in Jeroboam II's reign or somewhat earlier. Then we take B, Judah during the century after 841. 841 is a sharp important point in the history of both kingdoms because, as we noticed in the northern kingdom there was a revolution, a change of dynasty, there was the end of the political power of the Baal worship, it's the turning point in the northern kingdom. In the southern kingdom it's also the turning point but a turning point in the opposite direction. The revolution in the north not only kills king Jehoram or the northern kingdom, but it also killed his nephew who was visiting, Ahaziah the king of Judah. And so when young Ahaziah was killed the southern kingdom was left without a king. But it had a queen mother. And she was a resolute determined ^{abb} woman. She was a foreigner, but not so extremely foreign, not so foreign as Jezebel, because Jezebel was from Tyre, she was a Phoenician woman. This woman was the daughter of Jezebel but her father was Ahab. So she was an Israelite, brought up in the kingdom of Israel, and therefore would have far more in common with the people of Judah than Jezebel had with the people of Israel. She had seen her father-in-law die and her husband reign for a time. She had seen her husband die, and now her son had reigned for just a year. And she was probably, ~~she~~ might be compared to Catherine deMedici in France, who was related to the family of (12 3/4) to the Pope, who married the second son of one of the French kings, and consequently nobody ever thought she'd have any powers in France. Then when her husband's older brother died,

her husband became heir to the throne, and then when her father-in-law died her husband became king, but he had a mistress who was very prominent and for whom he did everything and you might say, he in a public way he treated Catherine deMedici as if she were dirt under his feet and his reign was the most miserable time in the world for her, she was an Italian and the French people looked on her as a foreigner and had not much use for her, most of them. And then when suddenly, in a joust, Henry II was killed, it left the throne with his little son, and Catherine deMedici became the Queen Mother and in absolute power and for the next 30 years she ruled France, in absolute power, and one after another of her three sons was nominally king but too young to have much power, or too weak. And she was one of the great forces in modern French history and she did more to wreck the Reformation in France than perhaps any other one person. And though she was hated by the French who considered her as an Italian and a foreigner, but she happened to be the one who was in position to seize and hold the power, and she had the brains and the ability to know how to do it. Now Catherine deMedici prevented France from becoming a Protestant nation, not because she wanted to but because she was looking for her own power, that's what she was interested in and was looking for, she (14 3/4)

and gave the Jesuits a chance eventually to give
it a death blow...

O.T.History 305. (1 $\frac{1}{3}$)

...would have been an equally great force in Judah if God had not intervened. And the, what she succeeded in accomplishing simply shows us what would have happened to them, if God had not interfered with the great miracles of Elijah and Elisha and the tremendous activities of those two men of God. The Baal worship would never have stopped with Israel. It would have taken Israel and Judah and turned them both into utterly pagan nations, and the knowledge of God would have been forgotten then as it has been forgotten, as it was forgotten in all the other nations of antiquity. But it was rooted out of Israel by the activity of Elijah and Elisha, but the revolution that destroyed it in Israel destroyed

the king, the legitimate king of Judah, and left his mother in a position where she could seize power and she resolutely did so. She had all of her children and grandchildren seized and killed immediately. That meant there was no one ^{of} whom people could say this is the legitimate king. There was nobody of whom they could say that. Therefore, she being the Queen mother naturally would have the right to the throne under this silly idea of rule by birth which has been so powerful in so many nations for centuries, until very recently. And so Athaliah immediately proceeded to do everything she could to advance the Baal worship and for about 8 years she was dominant in the land. But unknown to her from among the children who were killed, there was one little baby who had been rescued, and was carefully hidden because if he was found he would of course immediately have been killed. And then the priests of God made a careful plan and suddenly one day they brought out the little boy, declared who he was, the grandson of Athaliah, the son of the last king, declared who he was, declared he should be the king. They had men with arms right at hand ready to seize Athaliah and they made a sudden turnover of the power and it was not a turnover to an outsider, a usurper, it was the one whom most of the people would recognize was the legitimate ruler. Athaliah after all was only related by marriage to the royal line of Judah, and so it was possible to make the revolution and put an end to Athaliah's activities. Had it not been for that, probably she would have reigned as long as she lived, and Judah would have been completely wrecked as far as worship of God is concerned. So Athaliah, 1, Athaliah, under B, Athaliah did not reign long, but she shows what the revolution in Israel actually accomplished in Judah, and shows what a terrible danger there was if it were not for this intervention of the priests.

And then 2, Joash. Yes? (student. 3 3/4. In this case, do we consider that the throne of David has moved over into the house of God temporarily?) Yes, there's an interesting question. God said that David would never lack a man to sit on the throne. And yet when the last king Zedekiah was blinded, first his children killed in front of him, then he was blinded, carried off to Babylon, to captivity and died there, there was no successor. And for a period of nearly 600 years there was no one who was recognized by anyone on earth as a descendant of David actually exerting any authority, any political authority, there was that long period. In most countries people would say the dynasty came to an end.

It was finished. The king of France was beheaded a century and a half ago, but his descendants call themselves kings of France to this day, there's a small royalist party which claims that a man descended from the king of France should be reigning on the throne today, but it is a small group, most people pay no attention to it, the French people as a whole have forgotten it, and we all consider that the line of the Bourbons as far as ruling is concerned has come to an end. Everybody except those who believe the Old Testament prophecy about the house of David, after the death of Zedekiah, at least a century after it. But God knew differently, because God sent his son Jesus Christ, the heir of David, one in the line and sent him and he came and was there in the land and we believe he's coming back to set up the throne of David eventually. Now he is the legitimate king but not reigning in any physical way today, and he did not in any physical way when he was here. There is a gap between Zedekiah and the birth of Christ, and if it would come to actual reigning, the gap is from Zedekiah to the return of Christ, actual reigning on this earth but we say that David never lacked a man to sit on his throne because, though there was a gap the line did not come to an end. Now the line was continuous from David up to Zedekiah as far as I recall, except for this one gap. And at this time, of course, there was a legitimate heir unknown to the people, unknown to Athaliah, in the priests' home. So that the people might think that the house of David had come to an end. Actually of course, the only Athaliah had on the throne ^{was} ~~of~~ her relation to the house of David, so that if she had any right to reign it was as a member, though a member by marriage, of the house of David. Of course, if Joash hadn't been there, ~~had~~ Athaliah's death what would have happened we don't know. It probably would have been (7) but I think it's a very interesting point that Mr. Shellabarger brought out, that God had promised David would not lack a man to sit on his throne and he has for all these centuries since the death of Zedekiah, but we consider the prophecy still in effect because we consider this as a gap rather than an end. And previous to that there was only this one brief gap, which in effect was not a gap, because Athaliah was actually, got this far by the marriage relationship to another. I suppose you might say in God's sight the seed (7 3/4)

But mighty few people knew anything about it. And as far

as the priest was concerned, he was hoping they could get the power back to Joash but I doubt if he had any certainty. It was a potential place there, it was like in England when Cromwell was the leader. You might say the seat of power of England in a sense, you might say, was over in France where Charles II was engaged in his licentious life at the court of the king of France and sort of hoping that the English people would be foolish enough to invite him back to England. Well, that's number 1, Athaliah.

2, Joash, and Joash had a long reign, a reign of 40 years, I think it was. He started off very well, a young boy who owed his authority to the fact that the priests had brought him up, had saved his life, had brought him into his power, having led the revolution, had destroyed Athaliah. Toward the end of his life he turned against those who had befriended him, and in many respects a good king, yet he cannot be considered as one who stood true to the Lord through the end and was really outstanding in his loyalty to God. Now he was succeeded by his son Amaziah. And Amaziah who reigned for 29 years was a very proud sort of a boy who got an idea that he was going to reestablish the old glories of David. And that would be number 3.

3, Amaziah. Amaziah thought he would establish the old glories of David and he challenged the northern kingdom to fight. Now God could have established the old glories of David if He chose, but it would be only God's power that could do it, because Judah was only one tribe as against ten tribes of the northern kingdom, and Judah, though this one tribe was wealthier than any tribe of the northern kingdom, was actually only about a third of the power of the northern kingdom. From a human viewpoint it was utterly absurd for them to challenge the power of the northern kingdom. But Amaziah did. He challenged the power of the northern kingdom, the king of the north had his hands full defending himself from the powers north of him, he didn't want to go war with him, he tried to put it off, but when Amaziah insisted, then he marched down there and attacked Jerusalem, made a breach in the wall and gave them a pretty good (10 3/4) And so Amaziah, if he had been facing a strong aggressor from the north, he would have brought terrible disaster on Judah, but his desire to show his power this way, but as it was it didn't do much harm.

And then Amaziah, after 29 years of reigning, the people got so disgusted with him

that they put an end to him, and he was succeeded by his son, whom we usually call Uzziah. And Uzziah is also called in the Bible Azariah. We usually call him Uzziah but we find both names in the Bible. Azariah and Uzziah. Perhaps the man who wrote the name Uzziah was a southerner, I don't know, but anyway we have the two forms. And Uzziah reigned for 52 years, a very, very long reign. How much of it he actually reigned we are not actually able to say, because the Bible does not give us details. That is to say he was nominally king for 52 years. But we know he wasn't actually king for 52 years. We know that because of something that happened. Uzziah was in many ways a good king, he gave wonderful promise of being a fine ruler, a great godly man, but he had something of his father's conceit, feeling of his own greatness, he was like many a young man who goes into a church and immediately does good things, stands for what is right, but immediately if people accept what he suggests, then immediately he is going to suggest everything to make this church his church, and he tries to move practically everything into his own hands and he loses the support that he has. Well, Uzziah isn't exactly like that because he didn't merely try to change things, he went against the definite command of God. He was a ruler, he said I'm going to perform the priest's function too, and he went into the temple and began to offer the incense in the Temple like the priest. Now he was in this not defying God in the sense of trying to destroy the worship of God, he was observing the worship of God, trying to forward it, but in doing it he was breaking the regulation God had given as to how it was to be done and taking unto himself more power than God had willed he should have. And we read in Chronicles that when he was in there the priests came in and they told him he had no right to be doing this, and he began to remonstrate with them and tell them he was king and one of them said look at your arm there. He looked at his arm and he was all white for God had smitten him with leprosy. And so the rest of his life he lived as an outcast, as a leper in his upper room of the palace, shut in there, seeing nobody. Naturally he couldn't rule if he was shut in and saw nobody. So that his son must have been reigning during this time but how long it was we have to try to fit in to make the chronology as a whole fit, because we're not told. So the story of Uzziah is the story of a man who started out very, very hopefully and then proved an utter dis-

appointment because of his too great conceit as to his own ability to do things the right way, the best way, instead of seeing how God had ordained that they should be done. It was not in opposition to God but it was refusal to work out details as God had prescribed...

O.T.History 306. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...5. Uzziah's son, Jotham. And we know very little about Jotham. Dr. Davis in his Bible Dictionary, in the chronology, so arranged that all of Jotham's reign of 20 years came inside of the reign of Uzziah. (3/4) prefers to arrange it so that 16 years of it comes inside and then he has four years of his own, but that's a pure guess, we don't know. Yes? (student.1) No, I was going to speak of that when we come to that time ($1\frac{1}{2}$) in connection with ~~of~~ Isaiah, but it won't hurt to mention it now. Isaiah says in the year that King Uzziah died, (this is chapter 6, verse 1 of Isaiah) I saw the Lord. And it's very interesting, ⁱⁿ starting the ministry of Isaiah to realize that God's vision that he gave Isaiah came at the year when Uzziah died, and Isaiah thinks that's worth mentioning in starting. I don't think he mentions it merely as chronology to show the date, I think he mentions it to show the impression made on his mind by that fact. We have ~~a habit~~ ^{it happen} nowadays once in a while, that someone has been a great character. Perhaps someone has been a great person and then has made a failure and has disappeared from sight or perhaps he simply has become old and weak and disappeared and for years nobody thinks of him, practically never mentions him. Then the person dies and all the newspapers have big spreads about this person's career and we are all reminded of it then. It is most likely that Isaiah in hearing of Uzziah's death and realizing that this man was in the upper room for years and nobody saw him, maybe once in a while you'd get a glimpse of his face in the window there, as he went by, but they knew that he was there as a leper, no longer able to rule, they knew he'd made a wonderful start, had given every promise of being a great and good king, and then had dismally failed in this way. It made an impression on Isaiah's mind, and in that situation thinking of how this great one of the earth simply laid on the shelf by the Lord because of his failure to follow the Lord fully, in that situation, Isaiah went into the temple and there had his wonderful

vision of God. And it was the impression of Isaiah's wonderful start and Uzziah's ^{terrible} failure and his years of simply waiting there ^{for} with the leprosy to entirely consume him, that impressed Isaiah's mind with the importance of eternal things, and put him in the frame of mind God wanted him to be in when he was ready to give him this great vision. Well, this is as good a place as any to mention that. It slides over into the next period, but in the very beginning, so this is just as good for that. Now that is 5, Jotham. We won't go on to his son Ahab, we'll leave that for the next period. But instead we will take as capital C, The Assyrian Empire. Because during all of this previous century, the Assyrian Empire has been an important power though it has not entered much into the Biblical account. But from here on it becomes a vital power in the Biblical account, a tremendous force which was in everybody's mind every day. They didn't know what was going to come. You couldn't understand the 2nd World War if you'd never heard of Hitler. You couldn't possibly understand it. And you cannot understand the next half century, one of the most important half centuries in the history of Israel and Judah, you cannot understand it at all if you are ^{not} familiar with the Assyrian Emperor.

And so at this point we note something about the Assyrian Empire. First I want to be sure you all know what it is. We have mentioned it before briefly. It is the empire which worships the god Ashur/~~and~~ ^{they probably called him} Assur. You'll find it written both ways. The god Assur, or Ashur, because the pronunciation probably changed at one period from an earlier pronunciation. This god Assur was the god of the Assyrian Empire and the whole region is named after the god, so in Cuneiform ~~reference~~ you will find references to (5 $\frac{1}{2}$) which means goddess, to (5 $\frac{1}{2}$) which means land of Ashur, and to (5 $\frac{1}{2}$) which means city of Ashur. You see you have three of the same name. You have a god after the god the city is named, and also after the god the whole region is named. Now this region of Assyria/ is the northern section of Mesopotamia. Mesopotamia, ancient Mesopotamia, can be divided more or less into two main sections. The southern part we might call Babylonia, that southern part (6 $\frac{1}{2}$) divided into two parts, the northern half of it was called (6 $\frac{1}{2}$) and the southern half of it was called (6 $\frac{1}{2}$) but the two of them together of the earlier period now make up what we call Babylonia,

and then north of it is this section which we call Assyria. The Assyrian land is very different from the Babylonian land. Babylonia to the south is very, very flat. And in this very, very flat area you have the two great rivers coming down from the mountain ~~to~~ through a long distance reaching this area and making it possible to irrigate for some distance on both sides of the river and in this flat country of Babylonia great cities were able to exist as a result of the fertility of the land, from these rivers. Now further north the land is not quite so fertile as it is down south, but pretty fertile still, but the land isn't quite so flat. There are mountains near it, and in these mountains there are wild animals. And the early settlers who probably came up from the south, some think this is described in Genesis where it says that Nimrod went forth from the south and built Asshur. Some feel that that is the reference to the very beginning of this land. But this land was undoubtedly settled by people who came from the south, settled at a very early time, perhaps as early as 2600 B.C. But these settlers in the north there who brought something of the Acadian civilization, something of the attitude of the people in the southern area which we call Babylonia now, they had a tough struggle up there because they had wild animals to fight that constantly you had to protect yourself from these wild animals and in addition to that, the mountains near harbored groups of people who got a precarious existence living up in those little mountain valleys and looking down from the mountain cliffs into the land, they would see the irrigation that was being established by these settlers from the south and the towns they were building and the fertile farms and they would be tempted to make incursions or attacks and try to seize and plunder what was being grown and the result was that in order to exist the Assyrian people had to develop a warlike character, beyond that which the people of the south usually displayed. And so Assyria became the center of a very warlike people. And these people had a struggle through a period of 1500 years or more, to maintain themselves but managed to send out colonies, up into Asia Minor, managed to develop quite a civilization there and became quite a force but not a dominant force in the ancient world, until about 900 B.C. And then beginning about 900 B.C. they had a group of rulers who seeing the power they had built up determined to use this power to establish a large

empire from which they could get tribute and they ~~seeked~~^{set to work} to conquer neighboring regions and it became quite a thing for a king to show what an able conqueror he was so nearly every year, at least as long as the king was young, he would take an army and go out in one direction or another and try to conquer some cities. And about 900 you got some kings who gave serious thought to the matter of how to build and hold an empire. They organized their people very carefully, they had an excellent system of supply, of preparation of armor, of having things in stock to keep well supplied, and they conquered around and tried to build a strong empire and they saw that as long as their forces were there people might be subject to them but once they went away the people would revolt. And they set to work to think of a way to prevent that. And so they, about 900 or a little later a clever thought was arrived at. It was this. When ~~we~~ attack a city and ask it to surrender to us we may be very kindly with it, we may say you give tribute to us and we will treat you very well and we'll not be very hard on you, you can make all kinds of promises but once they're under you then you can treat, oppress them, as you may wish. But they would ~~be very nice in~~^{be very nice in} their promises if a nation would voluntarily submit, if a nation did not voluntarily submit they would fight with the nation, but after conquering them they might treat them fairly kindly so that other nations wouldn't get desperate and fight very, very strongly to resist being conquered. They might treat them fairly kindly after they conquered them. But after they conquered the city they would make them take the oath of loyalty to their god Assur and to their king, and they would say now remember you are subject to us, if you ever desert us, then you may expect very terrible treatment. And so when the nations would revolt from them, then they would use the harshest measures imaginable, and they would publish accounts of these and spread these all over so that other people would see how they treated them. One king tells for instance, about a town which had been subject to them and revolted, he says I surrounded this city with my army, I besieged it, I made a hole through the wall, I went in, I siezed all the people, I took them out and I impaled thousands of the man on stocks around the city. Others I flayed alive, others I cut off their heads and piled them up in great piles like cabbages at different places where passers by could see them,

and others he says I pulled out their tongues and he describes the tortures that he made in order to make a most terrible example of this city, in order that other cities that were subject to them would see what fate must be theirs if they revolted from the Assyrian empire. One writer has headed his chapter about (13) the calculated frightfulness of (13 $\frac{1}{2}$) but I don't think you need to remember his name in that connection particularly, because this policy which we find the most clearly expressed by this particular king was followed by the subsequent kings. And the impression which is made on all the region for miles around was tremendous. From this time on the Israelites lived under the knowledge of what the Assyrians had done to other nations, and what they may do to them. Now just when the Israelites started giving tribute to the Assyrians we don't know. We do have a record though that Jehu paid tribute to them. Just what the tribute amounted to, how much he was supposed to be subject to them it's hard to say, but we have no record of his having been conquered by them, it may have seemed to him that the safest thing was to put himself under their protection rather than to risk an attack by them. We don't have any record of interference during the next century on their part. But it so happens that during this next period of a century there was quite a decline in Assyrian power. There was a decline from which they came back again with great force later on. But there was this great (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) to the west which came in the 9th century, when two or three kings made campaign after campaign to the west, and it is generally thought that at the battle of Karkar in 854 the coalition of the kings in the west were able to fight them to such a standstill that they decided that for the time being they better give up...

O.T.History 307. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...after that for nearly a century. Now sometime during that century Jonah made his visit to the capital of the Assyrian Empire. The early capital of the Assyrian Empire had been the town of (3/4) but later another of their towns became superior to (3/4) that was the town of Nineveh. And Nineveh became the capital of the Assyrian Empire, and as the Assyrian kings brought back their booty and brought back their prisoners they enlarged it till it became one of the largest

and strongest cities in the ancient world. And this city of Nineveh became so much recognized as the capital of the Assyrian Empire that they would often speak of the Assyrian Empire simply as Nineveh, though Asshur was always a very important city too. But Nineveh became more important. It was a very early city but less important in the earlier days, than Asshur. Now these later kings of the Assyrian Empire followed another idea to hold their territory. They thought of the idea, this is really getting to the beginning of the next period-- they thought of the idea, when they would conquer a nation of taking its leading people and turning them away from their homes, and that was a very clever idea because they figure this way: if we take say the fourth of the people who are the brilliant people, the administrators, the teachers, the best part of them, the people who work with their heads, if we take these people away and carry them to another section of our empire they will no longer be there to serve as agitators and leaders to induce the people there to revolt against us. Very clever idea, it reminds us of what the Police Lieutenant told us when he was here, Police Inspector rather, how they de-activated gangs in Philadelphia, that if they get the leading three fellows out of a large gang the gang is generally deactivated until eventually probably someone else of the same family comes forward to reestablish the gang. But he figured that if he was to take the leading people from a nation that he conquered and take them away and there would then no longer be leaders there to organize the people to revolt against him. But these people he would take to some other section of his empire, the people in that section, seeing these people come in whose language they couldn't understand, whose customs were foreign to them, would think of them as people the Assyrian king brought in, and therefore they would look to them as representatives of the Assyrian king rather than as fellow prisoners. And they would be apt to be a sharp line of division between the local people and the new people brought in, with them fighting one another and the bright people brought in, the leaders, would have to look to the Assyrian arms to protect them because they would be inferior in number and power, to the people of the area. So he would become to them their protector instead of their enemy, and he would take the leaders from one area to another, the leaders from that area to another, the leaders from that area, take them back to the first one.

Very clever idea, very ruthless, very inhumane, but very clever. Yes? (student.4)
 No, they had a great amount of liberty. You see there would be tremendous numbers of them, they would not be, it would not be possible to hold them as prisoners, he didn't them as that, he wanted them to build up the area, to make it a prosperous area that would support his income. But they would not have any large number of people of their own language, and their own culture, whom they could influence against the king of Assyria. They'd have to work there and be subject to him, and that was his scheme, that was his idea, a very clever idea. But it was a very cruel idea as far as the peoples were concerned, and it resulted in the tearing away of thousands of people from their homelands and taking them to live among people who had no understanding of them, who had a hostile attitude toward them, and it resulted in very great cruelty and very great misery. But this was toward the end of the period we're talking of now, that the Assyrians introduced this idea. In fact, that gets over into the next period. I think we can start the next.

XIII. The Final Days of the Northern Kingdom and the Ensuing Half Century. And on this part, we will make A, the Assyrian Empire. Because if you notice, in the period before, Assyria is sort of in the background, becoming an increasingly important force in the background, often mentioned on account of the tribute which had to be paid and that of course gives us many references to Israel in our archeological records, but not actually a present vital force until this last period. But during this last period the Assyrian Empire has a new birth of power. Its kings become very able men, very great conquerors, men who have a thoroughly organized empire subject to them, but who make one fatal mistake that while they bring the people from these different areas where they think they will be reduced in power and have to be subject to Assyria, they do not find means of making friends of them, and of getting their force as a real support to the Assyrian Empire. They put their trust only in their own people and their own people bear the brunt of their wars and more and more the actual Assyrian people are cut down by the wars and by the great efforts of these years, until in the end they have a great tremendous empire but inside it's very, very weak, because their nation has become so weak and there are so few who can be trusted to be loyal to the king that actually when it ends, it ends very

suddenly and in a way that just could hardly have been expected. But you find these Assyrian kings then in this later period, carrying on the same tradition of the earlier period, that is of making attacks in all directions, trying to conquer cities, trying to establish their power, showing the calculated frightfulness against those who revolt against them, but you get a series of conquerors who carry their conquests to a point that had never been reached by the previous rulers at all. And we should become familiar with the names of a few of these most important of the Assyrian kings. The first one who becomes important in this period, I'll call him number 1 here then is Tiglath Pileser.

1, Tiglath Pileser. I believe he is now usually called the Third. These kings did not use numbers. They simply had a name. It is a device of our own era to give kings numbers. And they simply used the name and we as we have gathered the material we have given them numbers to distinguish them and sometimes we have been in confusion as to what number to give them, and so some books of history will call him Tiglath Pileser III and some will call him Tiglath Pileser IV. I believe that now it is pretty well established that there were only three up to this time. At least in this what we call the later Assyrian Empire, there were some kings (9 $\frac{1}{4}$)

we do not include in the numbers. So Tiglath Pileser the Third was probably the man who introduced this system of colonization. He is mentioned specifically in the Bible as having made an attack on the northern kingdom and an attack on the excuse that he had been invited to do so by the king of the southern kingdom. He was a very able general and he succeeded in conquering Babylon to the south and so Babylon which had been a great capital while Assyria was just a minor area, now was subject to Assyria but the Babylonians did not like being subject to the Assyrians and it was so difficult to hold them in subjection that the Assyrians ^{thought} ~~started~~ it simpler to pretend to be king of Babylon. The Babylonians knew it was only by force he was king, but he went through the form and the Babylonians said we won't take any Assyrian for our king, Tiglath Pileser. Well, Tiglath Pileser said before I became king my name was Pul. Will you take me under that name? Well, that was better than being killed so they took him. So they made him king of Babylon and he had to go through the great ceremonies of being crowned king of Babylon, and the

Babylonians pretended they had their ~~own~~ king though actually he was the king of Assyria who was holding them by force. But in the Babylonian record Tiglath Pileser is simply called Pul. And in the Bible sometimes it speaks of him as Tiglath Pileser and sometimes it speaks of him under the name of Pul. Now he became king in 743 B.C. and he reigned until 723. And you see here in the reign of 20 years, a reign of constant conquest, constant terrorism, a reign of constant difficulty with the people of Babylon who called him Pul, ~~some~~ thing the Babylonians insisted was, they said our king has to take the hands of our god New Year's Day. Every New Year's our god establishes him a king and he can't reign unless he has gone through this ceremony. Well the king wanted to be off fighting in Persia or in Palestine or ~~somewhere~~ else, half the time, and how could he be down there ~~in~~ in Babylon New Year's Day every year? Well, if he wasn't they would pretend he wasn't king any more until he went through that ceremony. And it made an awful lot of nuisance for him. But he was Pul as far as the Babylonians were concerned, he was Tiglath Pileser as far as the Assyrians were concerned, and he is very important ⁱⁿ with the relationship with King Ahab of Judah and with the kings of the northern kingdom. Then Tiglath Pileser is succeeded, number 2, in 723 by Shalmaneser, I believe this is Shalmaneser V.

2, Shalmaneser. And Shalmaneser only was king for about 4 years, from 723 to 719. He continued as ^Tiglath Pileser had been doing, and he was succeeded in 719 by Sardon. Sardon had a much longer reign. He reigned until 687, 719 till 687. Sardon was a very able general and he also went through the form of taking the hands of the god of Babylonia, and was ~~nominally~~ king of Babylon, by the Babylonian choice but actually by his own power, all through the years of his kingship. Yes? (student. 13 3/4. Where are you getting the chronology? The chronology in TANE is different.) Give me what you have there. (14. Well, for Tiglath Pileser it has 744 to 727, and for Sardon II it has 721-705.) Yes, the dates which I have been giving you are the dates that Thiele gives us in his list, and the fact that this other book, both published in the last 5 years, by competent scholars and they differ by four or five years, shows how you cannot be exactly sure on these dates. But we can be approximately sure. We notice the difference is only two or

three years in both cases. We can be approximately sure of the dates of the, and of course that's the thing that matters. And it is interesting to know approximately how long they reigned. Tiglath Pileser had a long reign, Shalmaneser a comparatively brief one, and Sargon a long réégg. Now these were the kings who were important during this period. The next period the kings are even more important...

O.T.History 308. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...we've already, we've just recently mentioned how Isaiah had his inaugural vision in the year when King Uzziah died. We noticed Uzziah and Jotham. We will start here with number 1, Jotham's son Ahab. And Ahaz the son of Jotham is a king who was from a human viewpoint a very clever fellow. He was very worldly wise. But from God's viewpoint he was very stupid. He considered religion as a very useful thing to keep the people under control, under discipline, and to maintain their loyalties but he thought that, after all, what matters is this life and we want to have our power strong here. And early in Ahaz' reign the Assyrian power of Tiglath Pileser appeared as a tremendous threat to Damascus and to Samaria. That is to Syria, of which Damascus is the capital, and to Israel of which Samaria is the capital. Now we assume, but it's a pretty safe assumption that it's on account of this threat that these two powers made an alliance in order to try to fight back the Assyrians as Ahab had done. But they said we've got Ahaz behind us down there to the south, we can't risk an attack from the south when we're trying to defend ourselves from ~~Assyria~~. So they said let's attack the kingdom of Judah first ~~the~~ and put our own puppet in there, And so they made an attack on Ahaz and Ahaz then very cleverly sent a large amount of tribute across the desert to Tiglath Pileser, and Ahaz said to Tiglath Pileser, I will be your subject, I will be tributary to you if you will deliver me from the attack from these two powers to the north. Now that is the big event of the early book of Isaiah. You cannot understand ~~Isaiah~~, the early chapters, without having this in mind. This was a great situation which Isaiah faced. Ahaz was telling the people in the beginning of chapter 7, we are being attacked from the north, let's build our defence, let's make ourselves strong, we've got Syria and Israel attack-

ing us. But of course Judah couldn't hold out against Israel alone, to say nothing of Syria, which was Aram, and Israel together. And Tigleth Pileser knows that he has, I mean Ahaz knows that he has secretly sent to Tiglath Pileser to come and protect him, and Isaiah is told by the Lord about this underhanded scheme, and told that it will put them in a position where they will face the other directly. It's exactly what we were in 20 years ago.

When we faced the tremendous power of Hitler, and instead of saying let's reduce Germany to where it will still be a powerful nation but not a menace to us, we said we've got to wipe them out on any account, let's make friends with anybody we can to get rid of them. We join in with Soviet Russia, a far worse dictatorship than Hitler and the end was that Hitler was wiped out and we're face to face with Soviet Russia and in a far worse position than we were before. That's exactly what Ahaz did.

Tiglath Pileser wiped out Syria and Israel, he faced Assyria. It was a far worse situation than they had been in before, and it was against that situation that Isaiah devotes a great part of his prophecy. When I used to ~~go over~~ deal with this in prophets class, during the beginning days of our relation with Russia and the early days of the world war II, it was interesting to point out the precise parallel and it has worked out exactly as I predicted at that time, in view of the clear statements of Isaiah. Well, we'll have to continue that next week. In this book, TANE, there is a section which contains the Assyrian historical records, a selection of the, p. 188 to 204. I would like you to read those 16 pages very carefully. Read those, make it 14, to 202--188-202--in that note every reference to anyone mentioned in the Bible, and make a brief statement of what it says about them, what these Assyrian records say...turn that in by this Friday.

(assignment to 5 3/4)

(6 3/4) At the end of class last time we were speaking about XIII, the final days of the northern kingdom and the ensuing half century. Under that we looked at A, the Assyrian Empire. And we noticed there 1, Tiglath Pileser III, and in looking at Thiele which I was giving you his dates on the kings of Israel, I misread his statement about the dates of the Assyrian kings, and so I want to ask you to correct the dates that I gave you there.

I was quite surprised to find that there was a difference that I misread from him and the date in Fritchard, because those dates are pretty well agreed on. We have from the Assyrians the Limu list, year by year the kings, and for dating of contracts and we have thousands of contracts, and therefore it would be very strange if there would be much disagreement about the relative dates of these king. Now it is possible that a darker period later on might later be illuminated by new discoveries, and the Assyrian dates might all be moved forward or backward. That is possible but very improbably. But there are (8)

I know about Biblical chronology that assume that to be the case, and I'm certain that it will be so found, to build everything on it, I think that that is going pretty far in view of the fact that all secular scholars in the field and most Christian scholars in the field agree upon these dates of the Assyrian kings. Later on there is a period there in which I haven't (8 $\frac{1}{4}$) I won't say that these dates may not later have to be adjusted one way or the other, but it seems very unlikely. And so, the dates, it would be good for you to get them down correct for these Assyrian kings: Tiglath Pileser III 744-727. He is also called Pul, we mentioned. It may have been his personal name, but it's the name that the Babylonians called him as king of Babylon. While as king of Assyria he was Tiglath Pileser III, very cruel man, a very able man, a great conqueror, a successful aggressor, one who conquered many nations and who probably introduced the idea of the transfer of population to strengthen the cohesiveness of his empire. And then his successor Shalmaneser V, 727-722, a reign of only 5 years. And his successor Sardon II, 721-705. Sardon II, it is quite generally agreed, is the man who conquered Samaria. The Bible says Shalmaneser V came against Samaria, then it goes on to tell how the king of Assyria fought against it, and it does not mention that it was a different king who takes it but Sardon in the beginning of his reign mentions his conquest of Samaria. He may have been the general who was directing the conquest, the fighting of the three-year siege there, at any rate he reigned from 721-705, a very successful rule, re-conquered Babylon which had revolted, held it in subjection and built a new capital for himself 12 miles northeast of Nineveh, a city which has been excavated which he called Sardon's fortress, and in which we have found some very inter-

esting and important bas-reliefs and so forth, and he was succeeded by his son Sennacherib, who reigned from 704-681. Sennacherib, not as able as Sargon, but an active king, thus he succeeded in carrying out the conquest, who fought in many different regions, one who became so disgusted with the Babylonians that finally the time came when he destroyed the city. He said he knocked down the great temples, overwhelmed the city, he reduced it to just wasteland so that it could never again be inhabited. I think he must have greatly exaggerated, because very soon after we find it a very powerful city. But at least he brought terrible damage to it and in 681 he was assassinated by his son. And it is described in Isaiah but the details of it are unknown today. It is a point of real mystery, the details of the murder of Sennacherib. Well, these Assyrian kings are important for us to have in mind because they were just as important to the whole world in their day as Adolph Hitler was to the world in the period between 1935 and 1945. They were a force constantly aggressive.

Capital B, Judah at this time. The last king we looked at was Jotham, spoken of as a fairly good king. Some of Uzziah and his reign probably overlapped a great deal with that of Uzziah. But Jotham may have died as a rather young man because he was succeeded, when he was succeeded by his son, his son Ahaz was only 20 when he became 1. Ahaz, Jotham's son. king. Ahaz was a young man and a man who did not inherit much of the good qualities of his father and of his grandfather. He inherited all their bad qualities and evidently little of their good qualities. And Ahaz soon found himself facing a very disagreeable problem. It is described rather fully in 2 Kings 16 which a couple of weeks ago you had assigned to study carefully the events in this last part of Kings. And this chapter about King Ahaz is very important. It might be less, it might be intrinsically, from the historical viewpoint, no more important than the events in the reigns of some other kings, to which we pay a good deal less attention. But from our viewpoint of Biblical study, it is of tremendous importance because it is the background of a very substantial portion of the prophetic books. Therefore it is extremely vital that we have well in mind the principal aspects of this outstanding problem of the reign of king Ahaz. We're told in chapter 16 here of Kings that Ahaz was 20 years old when he began to reign and he reigned

16 years in Jerusalem and did not that which was right in the sight of the Lord his God like David his father. But he walked in the way of the kings of Israel, yea, and made his son pass through the fire, according to the abominations of the heathen, whom the Lord cast out from before the children of Israel. He sacrificed and burned incense in the high places and on the hills and under every green tree. Then we read here in 2 Kings 16 that Rezin king of Syria--doubtless in this assignment last week in TANE you noticed the name Rezin also mentioned there, not in materials from Syria because we have very little from Syria, but in material from Assyria, telling about king Rezin from Syria. Syria you remember is probably Aram, but in later times after the Assyrians conquered Syria, the nations (14 3/4) called the whole area Assyria and then it was shortened to Syria and then the name Syria got tied on to Aram, which actually wasn't Syria at all, it was the region the Assyrians had conquered.

O.T.History 309. (1/4)

...modern times we pretty well stick to the name of Syria for that area. Our Bible constantly says Syria, where the Hebrew says Aram, one of the lands of the Arameans, the region centering in Damascus. And Rezin, King of Aram, king of Syria the English translation says following the Greek, recovered Elath to Syria and drove the Jews from Elath and the Syrians came to Elath and dwelt there to this day. It said in verse 5 that Rezin king of Syria and Pekah son of Remaliah king of Israel came up to Jerusalem to war, and they besieged Ahaz but could not overcome him. Then we read in verse 7 that Ahaz sent messengers to Tiglath Pileser king of Assyria. Now visualize the situation, you have Judah here, Judah here in southern Palestine, north of this you have a region three times as large as Judah, the region of Israel, the Transjordan territory is either in the hands of foreigners like Moab or Edom, or in the hands of Israel, and north of that is Syria a region twice as large as the region of Israel, though a great part of it is desert, a large and prosperous kingdom, and then Assyria is way beyond the desert across from that. And from the viewpoint of the people of Judah Assyria probably seems very, very far away. They have little contact with it, they probably didn't think much about Assyria. And

from the viewpoint of Syria, Assyria is right next to it and is a constant menace, one with which they have fought in the last two or three centuries a number of times, and one which is a constant menace and a very, very dangerous one which has conquered much territory north of them. Now Israel is in-between Judah and Syria, and Assyria does not seem as great a danger to Israel, but yet it is far more present to their minds than it is to Judah. To Judah it seems far away. People aren't worried about Assyria way up there, they're worried about Israel right next to them, and about Syria a little bit, beyond Israel. And so here we have Israel and Syria coming to Jerusalem to war, and besieging Ahaz but unable to overcome him. Now in Isaiah 7 this particular point is elaborated a little more fully. We find there in Isaiah 7, it says, that it came to pass in the days of Ahaz that Rezin king of Syria and Pekah the son of Remaliah, king of Israel, went up toward Jerusalem to war against it, but could not prevail against it. Isaiah 7:1. And it was told the house of David, saying, Syria is confederate with Ephraim. And his heart was moved, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind. And we read a reference to that a little further, in verses 5 and 6, where Isaiah says, because Syria, Ephraim, and the son of Remaliah, have taken evil counsel against thee, saying, Let us go up against Judah, and vex it, and let us make a breach therein for us, and set a king in the midst of it, even the son of Babel.

Now that shows in Isaiah there that they actually were threatening Ahaz's kingship, threatening the destruction of the house of David, threatening taking over Judah and putting a puppet king in power there. Modern historians make a guess that Pekah and Rezin, fearing the coming of the Assyrians wanted to be safe-ⁱⁿ ~~from~~ their rear from an attack in their rear ~~from~~ they're defending against the Assyrians, if they come, wanted to be sure Judah was friendly with them and therefore ^{was} attacking to do away with the house of David and putting in a new king. As far as I know, that's purely conjecture. Maybe they didn't even have the Assyrians particularly in mind in this, simply felt (5) for others, they'd like to extend their domain and take in Judah under a puppet king. Whatever the situation is, it was a very great danger for the house of Judah. And in that situation, Kings tells us that Ahaz thought of a clever scheme to protect himself

from them, a scheme which has often been used before and since. Verse 7 says, (2 Kings) so Ahaz sent messengers to Tiglath-pileser king of Assyria, saying I am thy servant and thy son, come up and save me out of the hand of the king of Syria, and out of the hand of the king of Israel which rise up against me. And Ahaz took the silver and gold that was found in the house of the Lord and in the treasures of the king's house, and sent it for a present to the king of Assyria. And the king of Assyria hearkened to him, for the king of Assyria went up against Damascus, and took it, and carried the people of it captive to Kir, and slew Rezin.

Now that we are told, in Kings here, that that is what Ahaz did, sent messengers this way. We are not told that he told the people that that's what he was doing. And statements in the book of Isaiah make a pretty good reason for believing that he did not confide this plan to his people. That he dealt with his people on the basis of urging them to be preparing to fight valiantly against Israel and Syria in order to protect their lands from them, when they came. And that this scheme to have Tiglath-pileser come and exploiting them was something which he knew meant eventually (6 3/4) but that in the meantime he wanted to keep the people fighting hard so they wouldn't be conquered before the Assyrians got there. There is pretty good evidence for that, because without it much of Isaiah is unintelligible. With it, it's very easy to understand what Isaiah means in chapter 7 and chapter 28. Now if you could look in your Bibles at Isaiah 7 here, and follow as we look at what Ahaz did here.

We notice that when this happened that God spoke to Isaiah, chapter 7:3. He said Go forth to meet Ahaz, thou, and Shearjashub thy son, at the end of the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field. That is to say, Isaiah did not go in to Ahaz's palace, and talk to him. Probably Ahaz was too busy to talk in his palace with Isaiah. He reserved his time for more important matters than what this preacher would have to say. Ahaz was, as we've noticed, an evil king, a king who was not a believer, a king who was not interested in doing the Lord's will. And therefore, in order to get to Ahaz, it was necessary to meet him outside. But another thing about it is, that it shows evidently how Ahaz was rushing the work forward. This was outside the wall, where they

were working in preparing the arrangement for the water supply, to resist the seige and strengthen the defenses for Jerusalem. In other words, Ahaz was on an inspection tour of the defenses. He was out there seeing how the work was coming/ forward, urging it on. He was interested in raising the morale of the people and having them ready to fight strongly and to resist Israel and Syria if they should attack.

I remember in 1940 when a man told me that conditions in this country, that the war situation was so serious and the danger of war with Germany was so great that President Roosevelt found it necessary to go personally to inspect the munitions plants, in order to be sure that everything was done exactly right. Well, I thought that was wonderful propaganda, political propaganda. Because actually of course to send experts to see how the factories were working would be far more than for him to come in with his retinue and hold up the work while they recognized him in every conceivable way, but it raised morale, it showed the importance of this thing, it showed how important he thought it that everything be done just right. It would not contribute much to the work, it might contribute greatly to the morale, and for many reasons it was, from his viewpoint, a very wise thing to do.

Well, now Ahaz was doing doubtless the same sort of thing. And so here are two reasons why the Lord said go to meet Ahaz at the end of the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field. Now there's a third reason why he said it which we will not notice until during the next reign. But during the next reign we have another reference to the same place which fits right in, but we won't look at that now till we come to that. So keep the third reason open. But the Lord said, go to this place and say to him, take heed, and be quiet, fear not, neither be fainthearted for the two tails of these smoking forebrands, for the fierce anger of Rezin with Syria, and of the son of Remaliah. Because Syria, Ephraim and the son of Remaliah, have taken evil counsel against you. Verse 7, thus says the Lord God, it shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass. For the head of Syria is Damascus, and the head of Damascus is Rezin, and within 65 years shall Ephraim be broken that it be not a people. And the head of Ephraim is Samaria, and the head of Samaria is Remaliah's son. If ye will not believe, surely

ye shall not be established. The Lord ^{says} to Ahaz out here, Isaiah steps up in front of the people where Ahaz is carrying on his inspection tour, out there with all the multitudes of pious people around, Isaiah steps up ^{to} the king and the king is saying we must fight and we must hold ~~off~~ ^{off} Israel and Syria, we must build ^{these} defenses strongly, we read here that the house of David, his heart was moved, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind. And Isaiah says don't be panicky, don't lose heart, don't lose confidence, take heed and be quiet, don't be fainthearted, for these two smoking firebrands. They've made their plans but the Lord says it shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass, why, within 65 years Ephraim won't even be a nation. Well, Ahaz could not order the guards to push Isaiah out of the way and go on. He could not do that because the pious people considered Isaiah to be a prophet of the Lord, and they were interested in these words of comfort from God, and any act of disrespect towards the prophet would hurt the king's standing with the people and interfere with the defense efforts rather than help them. In fact, Ahaz thought that this was a good thing for the people, that to strengthen them in their faith would make them fight better and make them, it was a good thing for the nation, the religious basis of the nation. But he didn't want to take time away from important defense work, for the words of this prophet. And so as Isaiah finished he said, thus says the Lord, it shall not stand, but, he says, if you will not believe surely you shall not be established. That must have been a reference to Ahaz's facial expression. Ahaz was showing by his manner he didn't want to interfere with Isaiah but he wished he'd get out of the way and let him go on with the work, he wasn't interested in what he had to say. So, we read in verse 10, moreover the Lord spoke again to Ahaz, saying, ask ^{thee} me a sign of the Lord thy God, ask it either in the depth, or in the height above. Ahaz, you don't look interested, you don't look as if you really think that God can order that their plans won't succeed (13¹)

Ask for a sign. Well, this is just the opposite of what Ahaz wants. Ahaz wants Isaiah to get out of the way and let him go on with the defense inspection. Carrying on the preparation to defend the land. Isaiah has already wasted a bit of time, delayed the people. Well, maybe he has helped the morale enough to be worth a little intervening,

a little bit of a delay, but we don't want it to go on any longer, and Isaiah, he's showing his impatience, his desire for Isaiah to stop and get out of the way. Isaiah says, well, ask for a sign. Well, this is inviting him to take a longer period, to give him a longer time to show that this is real, that they can trust the Lord because in 65 years Ephraim won't be a people. And of course, Ahaz is thinking also, I don't care what happens to Ephraim 65 years from now, I'll probably be dead by that time, but I'm interested in what's going to happen in the next 65 days. Are they going to succeed in destroying Israel before Tiglath-pileser gets here? With his help. I want them to hold them back now. As far as the future is concerned, I don't need to worry about the Lord, I put my trust in Tiglath-pileser. ~~How~~^{He'll} come...

O.T. 310. (1)

...I would take it this way, that in verse 3 the Lord says to Isaiah go and meet Ahaz and say so-and-so, so that from verse, verse 3 is the command to Isaiah where to go and what he is to say and the command goes up to verse 9. But that between 9 and 10, Isaiah goes and does it and then, that at the end of 9 we have the words given which relate specifically to Ahaz's attitude and then the Lord spoke again to Ahaz, and that means that God gave Isaiah now a further message which he hadn't given him before he came. But I would think it very unlikely that it came in any other way than through the mouth of Isaiah. So that (1 1/2) his attitude, Isaiah says to him, well, you look incredulous, you look as if you don't think that this settles the matter, that Ephraim is going to be destroyed within 65 years. God says their plan won't stand, why not ask for a sign of the Lord? Ask for a sign. Well, we could wait three weeks to see if this sign (1 3/4) We could lose a lot of time over that, that's not what Ahaz wanted. Ahaz wanted to get away from this and get on with the inspection, and so he thinks of a very clever idea. It says in verse 12, Ahaz said, I will not ask, neither will I tempt the Lord. A beautiful statement. A very, very beautiful statement, a clever statement, just exactly the thought we ought to have, we'll trust the Lord, we'll take his word, we won't ask him for a sign,

It's just exactly what a believing man ought to say, in the situation. I don't need it, I believe the Lord. But As Ahaz says it, it is not an answer but an evasion. It is, as we were told in chapel this morning, it is (2 3/4) . It is an attempt to make himself out to be one thing, when actually he has an entirely different purpose and attitude in mind. Now we can infer that from what we know of the character of Ahaz and more particularly from the way that Isaiah answers. If a godly man said that and Isaiah answered him as in verse 13, we would say he was utterly lacking in tact, and certainly not a man to represent the Lord. But if Ahaz was a hypocrite and said this, then the answer was the right thing to answer. Many a Christian worker says something that is a good thing to say but says it to the wrong person, where it is a bad thing to say. He assumes people are (3 $\frac{1}{2}$) hypocrites who aren't hypocrites, and he assumes people are true believers who are hypocrites. Well, in this case, God is speaking through Isaiah so we know that Isaiah makes no mistake in it. And I would think, in addition to that, that it must have been that Ahaz's facial expression and his manner of speaking made it rather evident, both to Isaiah and to the people, what his true attitude was. Because Isaiah answered in such a strong, such a condemnatory way, which the words in plain print do not warrant. But the words with the facial expression, or a tone of voice, would show him were utterly insincere. Certainly warrant the response that Isaiah give. $\frac{1}{2}$

Isaiah says hear ye now, O house of David, he doesn't address Ahaz personally, he looks to Ahaz as one who is representing the house of David. He is the son of David, he's the man who is carrying on the promises to David, he is sitting on David's throne, he should be a man who is pious, who is following the Lord, who is trusting Him, who is looking to the Lord to give protection in this, but instead of that Ahaz is giving nothing but evading, and so he says, hear ye now, O house of David, is it a small thing for you to weary men, but will ye weary my God also?

When they asked Jesus for a sign, Jesus said no sign will be given you, an adulterous and wicked generation ask for a sign and it won't be given a sign except the sign of Jonah, but here we find that an adulterous and wicked generation refuses to ask for a

sign, and is rebuked for it. It is because, ~~if~~ of the attitude involved. Will you weary my God also, therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign. The house of David won't always have a man the type of Ahaz was representing, sitting on the throne of David and not being interested in God's promises, not being ready to take God at his word or to look for a sign to show that he should take God at his word. The Lord will not always leave the house of David in such a situation. He's giving a sign to the whole house of David that the house of David is to have a supernaturally-conceived head to replace Ahaz in God's own time, who will actually be God-With-Us, who will actually be the representative of God on the earth and of course, as we find later, more than that, he actually be God on earth. He will, A virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. And then he goes on to assume, this son, we are not told when he is coming, the true son of David. We're not told when he's going to come, suppose he were to come right now. Well, if he were to come right now he would eat curds and honey. Curds and honey he would eat. In his, this that he may know is a very poor translation. The $(6\frac{1}{2})^*$

may be for the purpose of but it doesn't have to be, except $(6\frac{3}{4})$

in relation to $(6\frac{3}{4})$

as for the purpose of

this $(6\frac{3}{4})$

Certainly it's not a way to get wise to eat butter and honey.

I guess fish is supposed to be brain food but not butter and honey. Nowhere in the scripture does it say if you want to get wise eat butter and honey. Butter and honey shall he eat ~~that~~ he may know, no. Butter and honey shall he eat--things that you get from the animals--the things that come from a pastoral community, the things that can come from an area where there are not many to till the ground and there are many plants growing that have to be laboriously planted and tilled and cultivated. But what you get from the animals for a comparatively few people, with lots of empty land, can take care of these animals and can get the products of the pastoral life. These things will be available when he know to refuse the evil and choose the good. When this little baby, supposing he were born now, before he would be old enough to know enough to reach for the warm milk instead of for the hot stove, before he would be old enough to know enough to make simple choices of refusing the thing that is harmful and choosing the thing that is

good, before that, verse 15 says, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings. We've been talking about what's going to happen in 65 years but now we're getting a lot closer, now we say, before a little child, if it were born now, would reach the age when he could make simple choices, before that Rezin of Damascus and Pekah of ~~Syria~~ Israel will both have disappeared from the scene of Israel. Now, that's bringing your promise right close where it means a lot. And so he makes this promise to us, and then he continues, the Lord will bring upon thee, and upon thy people, and upon thy father's house, days that have not ~~come~~ from the day that Ephraim departed from Judah, even the king of Assyria. And

And Molten, in his Modern Reader's Bible says, in verse 17, he must turn his attention away from the king of ~~Abaz~~ and turn it to the king of Israel to the north, because it was the northern kingdom that was attacked by Syria, not the southern kingdom but I don't think it's necessary to interpret it that way. I think he is saying that the king of Assyria is going to come and going to become a factor in your life, not merely in the lives of the people who know him. And Ahaz, as he hears ~~these~~ things, well, what on earth is Isaiah referring to the people of Assyria for. Isaiah is not in the privy council, he hasn't heard the private discussions of the plans to relieve the pressure from Israel and Syria by getting Assyria to come attack them. He is not aware of this, has somebody given this out, are people beginning to realize it? But he hadn't said he'll come against Syria and Ephraim, he said he'll come against thee.

And Isaiah now had gotten bold enough where it's pretty hard to interrupt him, and he is able to give a somewhat longer discourse, and he continues here, and if somebody things that the interpretation that I gave to verse 15 is very poor, making butter and honey a sort of pastoral situation of semi-exile, look down to verse 22 and see as Isaiah continues, how he says in verse 20, In the same day shall the Lord shave with a razor that is hired, What is a razor that is hired? That is a very indirect reference, it wouldn't be clear to the people, but it would be clear to Ahaz, and to his nobles. A razor that is hired, namely, by them beyond the river, by the king of Assyria, a razor that is hired. Ahaz has sent a lot of tribute across to Tiglath-pileser, to get him to

come, a razor that is hired. And the Lord will shave with a razor that is hired, the head and the hair of the feet, and it shall also consume the beard. And it shall come to pass in that day that a man will nourish a young cow and two sheep, and from the abundance of milk they give he shall eat butter, for butter and honey shall every one eat that is left in the land. And it will come to pass in that day, that every place shall be, where there were a thousand vines, now it will just be for briars and thorns, with arrows and bows shall men come thither, because all the land shall become briars and thorns. And on all hills that are ordinarily digged with the mattock, they/ won't be able to come there because of the fear of briars and thorns, but they'll send out oxen and ~~sheep~~ and goats. It is a picture of the situation where a few people are left with lots of land, a proportionately small number of people and not enough people to till it, and to grow things that require active cultivation. Now of course this is what will take place very soon in the land to the north of them as the Assyrians took a great many people off with them into captivity. And we read that when, after the northern kingdom was taken into captivity that the lions began to come into the town and injure people because the land was so depopulated, there was not the population to keep down the wild beasts. Mr. Deshpande? (student.12 $\frac{1}{2}$) Yes, it would seem that the name here is a description rather than a name as a designation. He shall be called Immanuel, could be that that's the name he's going to be given, Immanuel. But it could be that that is a designation of his character, he represents God with Us. And we find it often, that people--remember Naomi said don't call me Naomi call me Marah, because life has turned bitter, and Naomi means sweet. In those days there was a great stress on the meaning of names, which we don't give today. Of course another thing about it would be that everyone in royal families nearly everywhere has several names. We call him Immanuel, but Jesus was the direct deputation that was given, to put the stress on Saviour, but he also does fill the Immanuel prophecy, he was the Immanuel. Now that's in the realm of prophecy and we want to keep to the realm of history. So I think it's good to touch on these/ a little, but we don't want to spend much time on it. We want to spend our time principally on the historical aspect of this thing, relation to the background. That's what we're dealing

with in this particular course. But this is important to have in mind as background for the prophets when you get to them. Yes? (student.14 $\frac{1}{4}$) Yes, this is the whole house of David, not just Ahaz. (student.14 $\frac{1}{2}$) A sign, you might say (14 3/4)

There is a sign as a means of evidence that God really is speaking. And ~~then~~ ^{then} there is a sign as a bringing to them of the understanding of God (15)

Now the latter is particularly involved in this (15) A sign for the house of David, we don't have to put up with a man like Ahaz permanently. God is going to provide one who will be a proper son of David, that's a sign to the whole house of David...

O.T.History 311. (1 $\frac{1}{4}$)

...sign to Ahaz and to the people living then. If this child should be born right now, we're not told when he is going to be born, why within this brief length of time that a child would be able to make simple choices, your immediate pressing difficulty will be gone because both kings will be out of the way.

Well, this situation here facing Ahaz is a very important situation. It is a situation in which this wonderful Immanuel prophecy is given, but in it we have Ahaz representing human plans and human ideas of how to meet a great crisis and Isaiah saying the way to meet is to trust in God and look to God. Your human expedients which seem to be meeting the crisis, Isaiah says, are actually not going to meet it but to make it worse. They may seem to meet it temporarily but they're going to make it worse in the end. So he stresses the theme of exile which they can take as meaning the exile of the northern kingdom but he speaks of it in such a way as to suggest the southern kingdom also is in danger of such a thing.

And then in chapter 8, sometime later, the Lord gave another sign to Isaiah dealing with this same situation. A little later, he said to Isaiah take a great roll and write in it with a man's pen, concerning Mahershalalhashbaz. That means hasten the booty, hurry the spoil. Sounds like war, sounds like difficulty. And so he says, I took to me faithful witnesses and I went to the prophetess and she conceived and bare a son. And the Lord said to me call his name Mahershalalhashbaz. Be glad you're not a prophet that you have to give your sons names like that. But the name was given, of course, so that

the son would be a living witness to the message God was giving Ahaz. For before the child will have knowledge to cry (2 $\frac{1}{2}$) * before he can say the two simplest sounds a child can make, the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be taken away before the king of Assyria. You notice he doesn't say the land of Israel is going to be completely despoiled by that time. Israel was not yet destroyed. The king was removed from it, the land was overrun but it was not yet despoiled. But Syria was. And so he says before this time, a shorter time than the previous time designated, the riches of Damascus and the spoils of Samaria will be taken away before the king of Assyria. And the Lord said, forasmuch as this people refuses the waters of Shiloah that go softly and rejoice in Rezin and Remaliah's son, therefore, the Lord brings on them the waters of the river, strong and many, the ~~river~~ rivers, the River Euphrates which gives life to the greater part of Mesopotamia, this is often a figure for the land as a whole, so he says the Lord brings on them the waters of this great river, which is a figure of speech which he explains immediately, even the king of Assyria, and all his glory, and he shall come up over his channels and go over his banks, and he shall pass through Judah, he will overflow and go over, he shall reach even to the neck and to the stretching out of his wings he shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel. Here Immanuel in the previous chapter predicted, Immanuel is here thought of as one who is the real ruler of the land. Ahaz is an unworthy son of the house of David. This land belongs to Ahaz only temporarily. But in actuality it is Immanuel's land, and so he says Immanuel's land, thy land, O Immanuel, is going to be overrun by the king of Assyria. And he continues, Associate yourselves O you people, he addresses the great foreign aggressor, Associate yourselves and you'll be broken in pieces. Give ear, all you of far countries, gird yourselves and you'll be broken in pieces. Take counsel together and it shall come to nought, speak the word and it shall not stand, for Immanuel. Now this Immanuel is exactly the same as the Immanuel at the end of verse 8. But the King James at the end of 8 puts Immanuel here in translation, for God is with us.

Now of course you could make it God is with us in both cases, or you could take it as Immanuel in both cases. I incline to think it's better to take it as Immanuel

in both cases. Of course it means God is with us. But he says Immanuel, your land is going to be overrun by the king of Assyria. But he says, after all, it is Immanuel's land, and though all these great wicked forces come and attack us, God is going to cause that they be annihilated, that they cannot completely conquer, because it is Immanuel's land. God is with us. And so he goes on, in ~~verse~~ chapters 8 and 9 and 10, stressing the fact that this clever scheme of Ahaz, this clever scheme of getting the king of Assyria and destroy Syria and Israel so that Judah will be safe from them, actually brings Judah face to face with a far greater and more dangerous aggressor than Israel or Syria ever were.

And the removal of the buffer state, though temporarily helpful is in the end terribly harmful to Judah. It's exactly what we did 15 years when the whole attitude was unconditional surrender, utter unconditional surrender of Germany, (6 $\frac{1}{3}$)

annihilate them, reduce them to an agricultural folk that have no power whatever. A great many of the factories as soon as Germany was taken were torn down and shipped off to Russia, and Germany was just to be annihilated, no longer a force in the world. Now of course within a few years that ~~had-to-be~~ ^{attitude} changed completely, because they began then to realize that in removing Germany from being a force in the world, they were bringing us right face to face with Russia, which was very nice to have on the other side of Germany as a help to us against Hitler's aggression, but which face to face, was a far greater danger than Hitler ever was. And that is exactly the situation that Ahaz is facing here and Isaiah is bringing it out. He should trust the Lord and know that the Lord can deliver them if they put their faith in him but if they put themselves, if they look to their clever human schemes to get Assyria to come and help them, in the end they'll be face to face with Assyria with no buffer state in between, in a far greater danger than they ever were before.

And Isaiah goes on and develops that thought in the next chapters, but at the end of chapter 10, he tells how the Assyrian is after all only God's instrument. He says in verse 5 of chapter 10, Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, I'll send him against an hypocritical nation, but he doesn't think so. He thinks that he is powerful, that he is

doing this on his own, and so the verse says in verse 12, wherefore it shall come to pass, that when the Lord hath performed his whole work on mount Zion and on Jerusalem, I will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria and the glory of his high looks. He, the Lord, is going to overcome the power of the Assyrian, even though he uses him temporarily.

So you see the message given in these chapters, as dealing with that immediate century, leaving out of attention for the moment, the very wonderful prophecy of Christ that are in several of these chapters, the message for the immediate situation is a rather complex message. Ahaz is doing wrong in using these human expedients and making alliance with a wicked power, in order to protect himself against the neighboring nations. God is going to punish him for it, he will see that his scheme backfires, he will see that Assyria will be fought next to them and they'll be in far greater danger than they ever were before.

But the Lord says, I'm not going to let the Assyrian conquer you. He says, though Ahaz brings this great danger on the land he says I'm going to protect them from it. You don't think I can protect you from Israel and Syria, you have to look to Assyria for help. He says when you're faced with Assyria, I will protect you from Assyria. And I will destroy the power of Assyria, and make it impossible for Assyria to destroy Judah, the Lord says. So you see it's a rather complex message.

Well, the same message is given again, in two more places. It is given in chapter 17 where it calls the chapter, the burden of Damascus, but most of it is talking about Ephraim rather than Damascus. He is talking about this land and Ahaz's attempt to protect and how the Lord is going to protect them in the end in his own way. But you get it more clearly and more fully in chapter 28. In Isaiah 28 you have a situation where undoubtedly, chapter 28 begins with a great banquet at which the Nobles of Judah are holding a banquet to celebrate the fact that they, that Tiglath-pileser will come and deliver them from Israel and Syria, and they're going to be protected by this plan. The people at large don't know of it, just a few Nobles who are close to Ahaz. Ahaz, of course, is not at the banquet. It's a banquet of these Nobles are making this plan,

but these Nobles are making this plan, with Ahaz, and they are now celebrating because they know that it's going to work out. They feel confident of it. But ^{Isaiah} ~~Ahaz~~ comes into the banquet. So we have in ~~chapter~~ 28:1, Isaiah enters into this banquet, and these people say ~~well~~ what's this fellow coming in here for, he wasn't invited. But they're giving ~~out~~ things rather lavishly, they're having a very fine banquet, they're giving a certain amount of things free to the people around, and Isaiah enters in, it's pretty hard to clear him out immediately, so he starts in, and when they've heard a few words they think this man adds to the pleasure of the banquet and are glad to listen to him for a little, because he attacks the people of Ephraim, that they are anxious to be delivered from. Isaiah says,

Woe to the crown of pride, to the drunkards of Ephraim, whose glorious beauty is a fading flower, which are on the head of the fat valleys of them that are overcome with wine. Well, these Judean Nobles, reeling in their wine and their luxury of their banquet are glad that here it is pointed out what terrible drunkards the Ephraimites are, the people of the northern kingdom. And he goes on, ^{Behold} ~~the word~~ of the Lord, ~~hath~~ ~~the~~ mighty and strong one, which as a tempest of hail and a destroying storm, as a flood of mighty waters overflowing, shall cast down to the earth with the hand. The crown of pride, the drunkards of Ephraim, shall be trodden under foot.

They think well this is good stuff, we're glad this fellow came in. This helps our celebration and it improves the morale of the people. They're glad to hear Isaiah talk through verse 4, where he's talking about the downfall of Ephraim. But then in verse 5 he begins bringing in a little religion into it, well, it's all right to listen to that, but we hope you get back to the patriotic theme soon. Verse 5, In that day shall the Lord of hosts be for a crown of glory and for a diadem of beauty, to the residue of his people. And for a spirit of judgment to him that sits in judgment,

But then in verse 7 Isaiah turns to them and they don't like that so much. If he had given verse 7 first, they'd have called the bouncer and thrown him out immediately. But starting with verse 1 about the drunkards of Ephraim, they congratulate him, he keeps going and now they couldn't stop him quite that quickly. So now he keeps on.

So in verse 7 he says, But they also ~~have-erred~~ ^{-- a better} translation would be, but these also-- he has been talking about Ephraim, now he says, but these, the people right in front of him, the banqueters--these also have erred through wine, and through strong drink, are out of the way: the priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink, verse 8, all tables are full of vomit and filthiness so there is no place clean. Now the Nobles are beginning to get restless. How much, he's attacking them directly, and they don't like that. It's all right to talk about the drunkards of Ephraim but we don't a temperance message here, at our banquet.

So in verse 9, they say, who is he going to teach knowledge to, who is he going to make to understand doctrine? them that are weaned from the milk and drawn from the breasts? Does he think that we are little children, does he think we're infants. He's giving us a temperance lecture here? Precept upon precept, line on line, here a little, there a little, that is the sort of thing he's giving, for children, that's all right for the kids but that's not what we want at our banquet. They're beginning to wonder whether they hadn't better call the wouncer. Then in verse 11, Isaiah turns directly to them and he says, but with stammering lips and another tongue will he speak to this people. With another tongue, with stammering lips, what's that mean? That means foreign ^{conqueror,} ~~tongue,~~ that means those who can't understand. To whom he said, this is the rest wherewith ye may cause the weary to rest, and this is the refreshing, yet they wouldn't hear. But the word of God was to them precept on precept, simple language was given, they wouldn't take it. Verse 14, Wherefore hear the word of the Lord, ye scornful men, that rule this people which is in Jerusalem. Because ye have said, we have made a covenant with death, and with hell are we at agreement, after getting Tiglath-pileser to come and help. When...

O.T.History 312. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...this clever scheme, this alliance with one you can't trust anyway. You've got to stall him, he'll come in and give you promises and you know you can't trust anything he says in the first place. Therefore, thus says the Lord, verse 18, your covenant with death shall be disannulled and your agreement with hell shall not stand, when the overflowing

scourge shall pass through, you'll be trodden down by it. Your plan is no good, verse 20, for the bed is shorter than a man can stretch himself on it, and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it. Well, we continue there in an hour.

(1 3/4) We were looking at Isaiah 28 and 29 the last time we met, and we noticed there how Isaiah pointed out to the Nobles that the plan that they'd had was not capable of solving the problems they were facing. That their covenant with death was going to be disannulled and their agreement with hell would not stand. That this plan they made, this clever plan to call in a wicked force to overcome the neighboring dangers, was actually removing the buffer state and putting themselves in a worse situation, than they were before. And so in the beginning of chapter 29 he goes right on to see what the result of it if going to be. He says Woe to Ariel, means the hearth of God, woe to the hearth of God, the city where David was, makes it perfectly clear it's Jerusalem, city where David was. Verse 2, I will distress Ariel and there will be heaviness and sorrow, it will be to me like a wrath, a hearth of God, a place where there's a burning, where there is a destruction. I will camp against thee round about, and will lay siege against thee with a mount, I will raise fortw against thee. Thou shalt be brought down, shalt speak out of the ground, thy speech shall be low out of the dust, and thy voice shall be as of one that hath a familiar spirit, out of the ground and thy speech shall whisper out of the dust. Here is the situation that is to be produced through Ahaz's scheme.

They are to be brought into danger, worse than what they have now, far worse, because the Assyrian force will be round about them, and they will be in imminent danger of being besieged and destroyed. Now it's very unfortunate that the King James Version, they translate the (3 3/4)* at the beginning of verse 5, moreover. A much better translation here would be but, because the context of verse 5 shows a sharp antithesis to verse 4. Verses 1-4 show what the result of the scheme of Ahaz and the Nobles is. Great danger, great difficulty, worse trouble by far than they're in now. But what's going to happen. But the multitude of thy strangers, that is the people from a distance who come to attack them, will be like small dust. Well that could just be how many there were, as many as the dust. And yet you think of small dust as, you think

of something that has not much power. They'll be like small dust and the multitude of the terrible ones shall-be like chaff that passes away, it shall be at an instant suddenly. Thou shalt be visited of the Lord of hosts with thunder, and with earthquake, and great noise, with storm and tempest, flame of devouring fire. And the multitude of all the nations that fight against Ariel, even all that fight against her and her munition, and that distress her, shall be the dream of a night vision. It shall even be as when a hungry man dreams, and, behold, he eats. Here is the Assyrian king in a dream, he's eating, he's just going to take Jerusalem, but he wakes, his soul is empty. He wakes and he's got nothing. And then he goes ahead in the rest of the chapter and denounces the wickedness of the people in general and their indifference to God, but chapters 30 and 31 deal, the two of them with this situation, Here are the people who have brought in the Assyrians to deliver them from Syria and Israel, now they say well, we're in danger from the Assyrians, then we'll turn to the Egyptians. So he says in chapter 30, Woe to the rebellious children, that take counsel, but not of me, and that cover with a covering but not of my spirit, that walk to go down to Egypt but have not asked at my mouth, to strengthen themselves in the strength of Pharaoh. Therefore shall the strength of Pharaoh be your shame, and the trust in the shadow of Egypt your confusion. Verse 7, For the Egyptians shall help in vain to no purpose. They think, we're going to get the Assyrian Empire to free us from the danger of Israel and Syria, and if we have trouble with them we'll call on Egypt, we'll ride the tightrope between the different forces, we'll play our cards very skillfully, we'll be safe through it all. He says you won't be at all. He says the Egyptians will help to no purpose, in vain. It will not deliver you. But he says, verse 15, thus says the Lord God, the Holy One of Israel, in returning and rest shall ye be saved, in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength, ye would not, ye said, no, we'll flee on horses, therefore shall ye flee, and so on, But he tells how the Lord is going to deliver them by his strength, not by anything they do, verse 31, for through the voice of the Lord shall the Assyrian be beaten down, which smote with a rod. And chapter 31 is the same two ideas, we won't take time to go into detail how they fit together and how they deal with spiritual needs of the people, and so on,

But just this historical matter that he predicts. He says, woe to them that go down to ~~Eg~~ Egypt for help. You think Egypt will help you from Assyria, like Assyria helped you from the other, it won't work. The Egyptians are men, not God, their horses flesh, not spirit. When the Lord stretches out his hand, both he ~~that~~ helps shall fall, and he that is helped shall fall. The Lord says you won't be able to deliver yourselves from Egypt, but the Lord says, I'm going to deliver you from Assyria. Verse 5, As birds fly, so will the Lord of hosts defend Jerusalem. That doesn't mean he's going to send airplanes to deliver them, it means like the bird just seeming to hover overhead, that ~~is~~ if you can't reach, you can't get at, but that simply is beyond your power. God is going, by his might and power, to deliver Jerusalem. He'll defend it, he'll deliver it, like birds fly, he will protect you in a way that you could never imagine. Verse 8, Then shall the Assyrian fall, how's he going to fall? Are the Israelites going to overcome him? He's going to fall with the sword, not of a mighty man, and the sword, not of a mean man is going to destroy him. Well who's going to kill him? It won't be the sword of a strong man, it won't be the sword of a weak man. It's going to be the power of God. People in the days of Ahab must have thought well now, isn't this--the ungodly must have thought what ridiculous nonsense this man Isaiah is telling us. He says that we're foolish to look to Assyria for help against Israel and Syria, he says he could protect us from them, he says that the result of this is going to put us in a worse plight and we begin to see he's right in that. We'll get ~~next~~ next to the buffer state but then when we have no buffer state we'll be right next to Assyria but then when we say well we'll turn to Egypt the other side will defend us then, he says that won't be any help, but he says just like birds flying the Assyrian is going to be overcome, and he says it won't be the sword of a strong man or a weak man, but it's the Lord's power that is going to defeat the Assyrians. Who ever heard of such a thing? A mighty army, a tremendous aggressor like the Assyrians and simply the Lord's power in a way that doesn't use anybody's sword defeating them. Why they probably said,--look what ^{Stalin} ~~Selemea~~ said, when the, Roosevelt said to him that in their conference for settling up affairs in Europe, why not have the Pope be in the (9¹/₂) and Stalin said, how many divisions does

he have? How many divisions, in other it's the force, it's the power that's going to settle things. Well, I don't think the Pope is a proper representative of the spiritual forces that enter in, but the fact is that there are spiritual forces that enter in, even though the materialistic philosophy of Stalin may not admit even the possibility.

And Isaiah says here when earthly things seem absolutely beyond your reach, nothing you can do about in and he's going to deliver Judah by his own power, Jerusalem by his own power, from Assyria. This is the prediction he makes in connection with the rebuke against Ahaz and the Nobles for their wicked scheme of using wicked human forces as allies instead of trusting in the Lord and going forward in His strength.

And so these are the statements given in connection with Ahaz reign, there's one more we'll briefly call your attention to, not in Isaiah but the Prophet Micah. I imagine that after what we've said now, that everyone here is aware of the fact that Isaiah prophesied during the reign of Ahaz. I hope none of you will forget that fact, it's very important, but you may not be so familiar with the fact that Micah also did. But Micah, a much shorter prophecy than that of Isaiah, but the one that is more similar to Isaiah than any other book in the Old Testament. You take anybody that has never read anything in the Bible and you read to him six or seven chapters from Isaiah, and then you read to him from other parts of the Bible, then you pick a chapter at random and read it, and he'll be able to tell you right away whether it's from Isaiah or not, because Isaiah has a different style from other books of the Bible. It is very different from any other book, much larger vocabulary, much more poetic language, there's a different approach in Isaiah's style of the whole book than any other book of the Old Testament. But the person would, in both cases, immediately say that is Isaiah, but the only book that you find some might have a little difficulty in being quite so sure about being distinct from Isaiah is Micah. Micah is more like Isaiah than any any other book of the Old Testament, though it is quite different, but more like it than any other.

And Micah begins, The word of the Lord that came to Micah the Morasthite in the days of Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah. Isaiah begins in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah, kings of Judah. Which he saw concerning Samaria and Jerusalem. And Micah

begins with a prediction of the destruction of Samaria. I will make Samaria as an heap of the field, as plantings of a vineyard. And then after telling of God's punishment against Samaria, then all the rest of Micah deals with the southern kingdom. It is similar to the approach in Isaiah where in 28 he deals with the northern kingdom and then from there on it's all about the southern kingdom. It was during the ministry of both of these prophets that the northern kingdom was destroyed.

Now I'm going to speak separately about Judah and Israel and now there's a little question in my mind which to speak of first. So at this point we've been speaking about Judah prior to the destruction of the northern kingdom, and that finished the reign of Ahaz but he is succeeded by number 2, Hezekiah. And Hezekiah gets a fair amount of space in the Old Testament because he was a man of very great importance in relation of the people with God. He is as fine a king as Judah ever had. He is at least as fine as Asa and Jehoshaphat and perhaps he was finer. And he is very prominent in the early portion, in the first two-thirds of the book of Isaiah. He is described also in 2 Kings 18+20, and in 2 Chronicles 29/31 to 32. Thus you see Chronicles has more about him than Kings does. Hezekiah reigned 29 years in Jerusalem. He began to reign when he was 25 years of age, and he did what was right in the sight of the Lord, according to all that David his father had done. He removed the high places, broke the images, cut down the groves, broke in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made, for in those days the children of Israel burnt incense to it, and called it Nehushtan. He trusted in the Lord God of Israel, so that after him was none like him among all the kings of Judah nor any that were before him. The Lord was with him and he prospered whithersoever he went forth, and he rebelled against the king of Assyria and served him not. That is told in the beginning of 2 Kings 18.

O.T.History 313. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...trusted the Lord, a very marked contrast from his father Ahaz. But in the fourth year, we read in verse 2 of 2 Kings 18, in the fourth year of Hezekiah, which was the 7th year of Hoshea king of Israel, Shalmaneser king of Assyria came up against Samaria

and besieged it. And at the end of 3 years they took it, even in the 6th year of Hezekiah, that is the 9th year of Hoshea king of Israel, Samaria was taken.

Now in the 14th year of king Hezekiah did Sennacherib king of Assyria come up against all the fenced cities of Judah and took them. And Hezekiah king of Judah sent to the king of Assyria to Lachish saying I have offended, return from me, that which thou puttest on me will I bear. And the king of Assyria appointed unto Hezekiah king of Judah 300 talents of silver and 30 talents of gold. And Hezekiah gave him these things and he wasn't satisfied. We read in verse 17, the king of Assyria sent Tartan and Rabsaris and Rabshakeh from Lachish to king Hezekiah with a great host against Jerusalem. And they went up and came to Jerusalem, and when they were come up, they came and stood by the conduit of the upper pool, which is in the highway of the fuller's field. Have you ever of that before? The very place to which the Lord sent Isaiah to stand and face king Ahaz and tell him that instead of his wicked schemes he should trust the Lord and follow him, and that his wicked scheme would result in bringing the, a far greater danger than the danger that he was trying to deliver himself from, by that scheme, in that very spot we find here, the representatives of the king of Assyria stood to call on Ahaz's son to surrender everything to him, and here we find them giving the most blasphemous words as they call on Hezekiah's people to turn to the king of Assyria, and surrender to him and turn over Hezekiah to him and he will have mercy on the people if they will immediately surrender to him. But otherwise how terribly he is going to treat them, if they resist him. And this story now here is told in Isaiah 36-39, in 2 Kings, and in 2 Chronicles. It's one of the outstanding events of the whole Old Testament. This account of how these, the Assyrians were going to destroy Jerusalem, he sent his message and you read here in 2 Kings that (and it's also in Isaiah almost word for word) how that Isaiah came to Hezekiah with the answer to Sennacherib's threat, terrible threats, threats which had been overcome, which had been fulfilled in his terrible treatment of other cities all around, which he and his father had taken, and he had taken, we read, all the fenced cities of Judah, and he had overcome them, he had taken thousands of people into captivity, now he is threatening Jerusalem. And God gives a message to

Isaiah to give to him. Verse 28^(chapt. 29) because ^{thy} rage against ~~me~~ and thy tumult has come into mine ears, therefore I will put my hook in thy nose and my bridle in thy lips and I will turn thee back by the way by which thou camest. And this shall be a sign unto thee. Ye shall eat this year such things as grow of themselves, and in the 2nd year that which wpringeth of the same, and in the 3rd year sow ye and reap and plant vineyards and eat the fruits thereof. See what the sign is? The sign is this, the Assyrian king is down in the Philistine plain with his army. Up here in Jerusalem, the people are able to get out into the surrounding country, to pick, to harvest a certain amount of material, but not able to get out enough to do systematic agricultural activity. Therefore, he says, you will eat this year such things as grow of themselves. They had been unable to get out to plant and to properly cultivate but a certain amount grew of itself. The Assyrian is not going to close in on us to the extent that they cannot get food from the country near Jerusalem, but will be a danger, a menace to such an extent that they cannot, they haven't been able to get out this year to plant and to prepare the ground and to cultivate, all they will be able to do is, when the Assyrians, no Assyrian band is in clear evidence, to go out quickly and to gather up everything they can of what's growing and bring it in as fast as possible, lest one of the Assyrian bands going through the land shall see them and carry them away. They are able to get what grows itself this year but not to really cultivate and plant. And he says next year will be just the same way. But he says in the 3rd year you'll be able to sow and reap and plant vineyards and eat the fruit thereof. In other words by the 2nd year (6 $\frac{1}{2}$) they've already been in this situation for some months but by the 3rd year, the 2nd year away from this, the Assyrian danger will no longer be there. Not only will they not be in danger of its conquering Jerusalem, but they will be in a position where they can go out into the country and they can run their farms and they can sow and cultivate and reap and normal orderly fashion. The sign in other words here is not a miracle in itself, but it is the time element so that as it happens over this period of three years, they will know that God was in it, predicted just when it would come. He has not yet told them how it will come. He says I am going to put my hook in your nose and my bridle in your

lips and turn you back the way you come. Verse 32, he says, thus says the Lord concerning the king of Assyria, He shall not come into this city, not shoot an arrow there, nor come before it with shield, not cast a bank against it. By the way that he came, by the same shall he return, and shall not come into the city, says the Lord. For I will defend this city to save it for my own sake and for my servant David's sake. And it came to pass that night that the angel of the Lord went out and smote in the camp of the Assyrians one hundred and eighty-five thousand, and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses. Much better translation would be, and when men arose early in the morning, behold, these were all dead corpses. It doesn't mean the dead corpses arose but it means that when Sennacherib got up in the morning, his people came to the door and said something terrible has happened in the night, they said our army has just melted away. People have just been dropping right and left, like flies, there are just thousands and thousands of them that have died. And the power left was too little to think of going up and conquering Jerusalem, in fact too little to stay there safely, they had to get out, and get back to their own land before the little force left should even prove too small to protect the king of Assyria. Well, now that is the tremendous thing that is described here in Kings, the angel of the Lord went out and smote in the camp of the Assyrians 185,000 people, and we find the same thing told in Isaiah and the same thing told in 2 Chronicles.

Well that is of course one of the great tremendous events in the whole of the Old Testament history. You notice how it was predicted by Isaiah in , so clearly predicted, in the time of Ahaz, that this the Lord was going to do. Ahaz brought the tremendous menace on them, but God of his own grace and his undeserved mercy was going to enter in and deliver them by his own power, apart from anything whatever that they did. Well, it's a tremendous thing the Bible claims here and naturally one/who wants to approach the Bible with an extremely skeptical attitude, can say well it is fairy stories made up. But now we have discovered in these last two decades the inscriptions of the Assyrian kings and it has thrilled the archeologists to read the prism of Sennacherib, the account which he gave of the great events of his reign which he put around through the land of

Assyria telling what a great king he was and how many cities he had utterly destroyed, broke in pieces, and how many of the people he had flayed alive and taken into captivity and so on, and here we have a quotation from it in *The Ancient Near East*, p. 199. "In the continuation of my campaign I besieged Beth-Dagon, Joppa, Banai-Barqa, Azuru, cities belonging to Sidqia who did not bow to my feet quickly enough: I conquered them and carried their spoils away. The officials, the patricians and the common people of Ekron," you remember one of the Philistine cities, "who had thrown Padi their king into fetters because he was loyal to his solemn oath sworn by the god Ashur, and had handed him over to Hezekiah the Jew" and Pritchard has put in here the exact writing in the Assyrian writing (Hazaqiau, the man of (10 3/4)* you see how

it is written in syllabic writing but it's a representation of what you get from the Hebrew (11)

"And he Hezekiah held him in prison, unlawfully, as if he Padi be an enemy--had become afraid and had called for help upon the kings of Egypt." You remember how we find in Isaiah 28-32 how this is what they said we'll do, and they had done it, call for help on the kings of Egypt. "and the bowmen, the chariot-corps and the cavalry of the king of Ethiopia, an army beyond counting--and they actually had come to their assistance. In the plain of Eltekeh their battle lines were drawn up against me and they sharpened their weapons. Upon a trust-inspiring oracle given by Ashur, my lord, I fought with them and inflicted a defeat upon them. In the melee of the battle, I personally captured alive the Egyptians' charioteers. With Isaiah had predicted some years before. He said Egypt will help you in vain, it will accomplish nothing, by (12)

"I captured alive the Egyptian charioteers with their princes and also the charioteers of the king of Ethiopia. I assaulted Ekron and killed the officials and patricians who had committed the crime and hung their bodies on poles surrounding the city. The common citizens who were guilty of minor crimes, I considered prisoners of war. The rest of them, those who were not accused of crimes and misbehavior, I released. I made Padi, their king, come from Jerusalem and set him as their lord on the throne, imposing upon him the tribute due to me as overlord." Now after telling these terrible things he does to the other city, now you expect Sennacherib to go on and tell what he

did to Jerusalem. Hezekiah is the ringleader of the opposition here, surely he'll utterly destroy it. He has destroyed the Egyptian force that came to its assistance and surely he'll destroy it. You read here then, "As to Hezekiah, the Jew, he did not submit to my yoke, I laid siege to 46 of his strong cities, walled forts and to the countless small villages in their vicinity, and conquered them by means of well-stamped earth-ramps and battering-rams brought near to the walls, combined with the attack by foot soldiers, using mines, breeches as well as sapper work." Undermining. "I drove out of them 200,150 people, young and old, male and female, horses, mules, donkeys, camels, big and small cattle beyond counting, and considered them booty." This is what he did to the fenced cities of Judah. After doing that you can imagine what he's going to do to Jerusalem and Hezekiah. (Himself I made a prisoner in Jerusalem, his royal residence, like a bird in a cage. I surrounded him with earthwork in order to molest those who were leaving his city's gate. His towns which I had plundered, I took away from his country and gave them to Mitinti, king of Ashdod, Padi, king of Ekron, and Sillibel, king of Gaza. Thus I reduced his country, but I still increased the tribute" and so on. And then he goes on, "Hezekiah himself, whom the terror-inspiring splendor of my lordship had overwhelmed and whose irregular and elite troops which he had brought into Jerusalem, his royal residence, in order to strengthen it, had deserted him, did send me, later, to Nineveh, my lordly city, together with 30 talents of gold, 800 talents of silver, precious stones," and so on. You notice how he destroyed Jerusalem, how he conquered it, he shut it off like a bird in a nest. That's all he said about (14¹/₂) And he can't say he conquered Jerusalem like he conquered all these others. He naturally isn't going to tell people that he was defeated, he's not going to tell he had difficulty and lost a lot of his army, he's going to boast about anything he can, but I don't remember any other case where an Assyrian king boasts of shutting a man up in a city like a bird in a cage. They always tore down the wall of the city and took the man out and killed him and wrecked the city. But here he shut him in like a bird in a cage. It's a very clear evidence of the fact that the Bible is true, that Sennacherib was stopped, not by human force, not by an army, the Egyptians, the Egyptians helped to no purpose...

...but God interfered and delivered the city and made it necessary that Sennacherib give up and go back home. And now there's another very interesting thing in connection with that. At the bottom, on page 201 here, you will find the words, Epigraph from a relief showing the conquest of Lachish. "Sennacherib, king of the world, king of Assyria, sat upon a ninedu-throne and passed/in review the booty taken from Lachish." Now it says in the margin Figure 121, but that must be a typographical error, because it's figure 101-2. If you turn in the back I hope you will all look at this figures 101-2 in the back of The Ancient Near East, you will find there three pages, two of them together, one great big page, 101 and then 102, Sennacherib seated on his throne, receiving the booty taken from Lachish, and ~~the~~^{inhabitants} of the town kneeling before him, and the attack on Lachish by siege (1 3/4) engines, ~~pushed~~^{pushed} up an incline and accompanied by archers who shoot from behind shields; archers, spearmen, and sling-throwers support the siege-engines; three nude figures impaled: relief of Sennacherib found at Nineveh." There in Nineveh in his great palace Sennacherib lived for the next 20 years. And there in the palace he had this great beautiful bas-relief put up showing his great forces attacking Lachish and conquering Lachish and destroying it and showing the booty from Lachish brought before him as he sits on his throne (2 1/4) And it's interesting that he doesn't take one of the big capital cities of one of the (2 1/4) to show his conquest and his great power. But he takes the 2nd most important city of Judah, the city of Lachish. And I call this picture, Sennacherib's Consolation Prize. He tried to forget that the Lord had prevented from conquering Jerusalem by taking ~~the~~^{the} second most important city in Judah and putting up this great beautiful bas-relief to show the great conquest that he had of the 2nd most important in Judah. He never would have bothered to mention the 2nd if he had the first. And ordinarily you wouldn't bother to mention the second anyway, but I guess it hurt him pretty badly to think he hadn't been able to take Jerusalem. He tried to comfort himself with this great beautiful large picture there in his palace of Lachish, one of our finest pictures of the Assyrian methods of attack and the conquest which they made, one of their great monuments of that day. So it is an extremely

interesting instance where archeological evidence has marvelously proven the accuracy of one of the most wonderful stories in the Bible. Some of you perhaps are familiar with Byron's poem about it, a very beautiful poem in which Byron describes the downfall of Sennacherib, the Lord destroying the hosts there in the night, it's a very beautiful poem. In this course, in the past sometimes, I've brought it and read it to the class, but I don't think we have time for that this year. But I do call attention to it. But this is one of the great events in Old Testament History and you see how it was predicted so clearly, you see what a place it played in God's revelation. His power, his power, and of the folly of trusting in human methods and human schemes and especially in alliances with ungodly forces. Well, after this we find described, we find in all three of them described Hezekiah's sickness, and how the Lord added 15 years to his life, and we have described also how the king of Babylon sent letters and a present to Hezekiah. This is the last thing described in the account of Hezekiah, in all three accounts. But it seems to most interpreters highly possible that actually it took place earlier than any of the other events described in the life of Hezekiah. It says at that time Berodach-baladan, the son of Baladan, king of Babylon, sent letters and a present to Hezekiah for he had heard that Hezekiah had been sick. Most interpreters think that what it really means is that this king of Babylon which had revolted against Assyria and had gained its independence for a brief time under this king, Marduke (5 $\frac{1}{2}$) which contracts, as the Hebrews say it, into Merodach-baladan, but in 2 Kings it gives as Berodach, you see a mistake, a B for the M, clear technical error, it is Merodach-baladan in the others, but Berodach-baladan here. But and we well know that the name of the god was Marduke, the god of Babylon. But this man had led the Babylonians in insurrection against the Assyrians, for a number of years they maintained their independence. And when this king came, his representative came to Hezekiah, they came nominally to congratulate him on recovery from his illness, but they didn't in those days go over 2,000 miles across the desert and down there, simply to congratulate a man on his illness. That was the excuse but the real reason was to get Hezekiah to stand with them against the Assyrian conqueror. And so it probably precedes Hezekiah's rebellion against Assyria,

and the situation that he went through there. But in it, we read that Hezekiah welcomed them and entered into the finest of relationships with these men, and after they left Isaiah came to king Hezekiah and said where are these men from? He said they're from a far country; from Babylon, and Isaiah said hear the word of --said what have they seen in your house? Hezekiah said everything in my house they've seen, there is nothing among my treasures I've not showed them. In other words Hezekiah had perfect confidence in these men. They were enemies of the king of Assyria as he was. He had utter confidence in them. And it's as if, you might say, as if when the Dutch were feating Hitler that they would enter into an alliance with another force of about equal power from some other part of the world, say that men came from Paraguay to Holland and they entered into a friendly relationship with them, and in order to work together against Hitler, and then say that a prophet came to the people of Holland and say an army is going to come from Paraguay and is going to conquer and destroy you. They say, how ridiculous. What utter nonsense. Well, that's exactly the way this sounded to Hezekiah. Here was Assyria, great world power, Babylon had been a world power but now for years it had been subject to Assyria, it had gained its independence and was independent a brief time. And they were glad to do what they could to help Babylon gain its independence from the great power of Assyria. But to tell him, as Isaiah said, but behold the days come that all that is in thy house, and that which thy fathers have laid up in store unto this day, shall be carried unto Babylon. Nothing shall be left, saith the Lord. And of thy sons that shall issue from thee, which thou shalt beget shall they take away and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon. Then said Hezekiah unto Isaiah, Good is the word of the Lord which thou hast spoken. And he said, Is it not good, if peace and truth be in my days? I like the translation here of it in Kings much better than the one in Isaiah which seems to give rather poor picture of Hezekiah's attitude, has practically the same words but the way it's translated he says, good is the word of the Lord, for there shall be peace and truth in my days. I think that the word (9 $\frac{1}{7}$) * could just as well be translated but instead, but there shall be peace and truth in my days. Hezekiah doesn't mean this is good that Babylon is going to do this,

but he means that whatever the Lord says, I am glad to accept it as God's word and consequently it's good, but praise the Lord there's going to be peace in my day. The Assyrian is the great world power. He says the Assyrian is not going to conquer Jerusalem, and nearly another century (9 $\frac{1}{4}$) the great world

They had taken Samaria, carried it off captive, carried away the ten tribes into exile, but for nearly a century after this Jerusalem remains there unattacked by the Assyrian king, and then it is not Assyria at all that conquers Jerusalem but another power, which in the day of Hezekiah appears to be such a minor power. And this, though it probably occurs in the very beginning of Hezekiah's reign, is placed at the end in all these accounts, not that they're changing the chronological order but that they are putting the prediction of the Babylonian conquest at the end. They're giving the great deliverance at the beginning and they're putting the prediction of the conquest at the end. In Isaiah that's a very logical place for it because then it introduces this wonderful prediction of deliverance (10 3/4) in chapters 40 and following.

Well, Chronicles also tells about the great passover that Hezekiah proclaims. The greatest passover that the land has had for many, many years, and the wonderful loyalty of Hezekiah to the Lord, the way in which he established and observed it exactly as the Lord wanted it and did away with all the high places where the people worshipped aside from the central place where they were supposed to, the critics of course say all this was a later invention, because the idea of the destruction of the high places, they say, was never heard of till Josiah's time. But the Bible says that Hezekiah did it. And (11 $\frac{1}{4}$) statement here in Kings and in Chronicles that that is what Hezekiah did. Well, we had better stop our survey of the history of Judah at this point with Hezekiah, to go back and look at what has happened to the northern kingdom. We've gone past the downfall of the northern kingdom under Judah, but we go back and we don't need to look at much detail in the downfall of the northern kingdom because the great prophets of this period were in the southern kingdom. We have looked at the northern kingdom in more detail than the southern, at the time of Elijah and

Elisha, because God sent his great prophets up to the northern kingdom at that time. Then later on under Jeroboam II he sent Hosea and Amos to the northern kingdom and so the northern kingdom is very important there, from our viewpoint of the account of God's relations with the people, and of his keeping alive his testimony, until the time of Christ when he would send Christ into the world.

But at this time Isaiah and Micah were in the southern kingdom and it's there they were giving great messages, and so we can look more rapidly at the events which from the historical viewpoint are just as important as these that happened in the northern kingdom.

So C, The Downfall of the Northern Kingdom.

Number 14 End of the House of Jehu. Now the northern kingdom as you know is not spoken of in Chronicles as the southern kingdom is. It is simply in Kings. But we find that in the northern kingdom God has told Jehu that his descendants to the 4th generation will sit on his throne, and we read in 2 Kings 15, in the 38th year of Azariah king of Judah, that's the same man otherwise called Uzziah, Zachariah the son of Jeroboam reigned over Israel in Samaria six months, and ~~Shallum~~ ^{Shallum} ~~challenged~~ the son of Jabesh conspired against him and smote him before the people and slew him and reigned in his stead. And here again it happened as it had when Zimri killed Eli that the conspirator the man who slew the king, himself was (13 3/4) He reigned for 6 months but Menahem the son of Gadi came up from Tirzah and came to Samaria and smote Shallum the son of Jabesh and slew him and reigned in his stead.

So, number 2, The Dynasty of Menahem. The Dynasty of Jehu was followed by this usurper, this assassin who only reigned for one month, and then, that is Zachariah reigned six months but Shallum was killed in only month, and Menahem conquered him and set up a dynasty of his own. But this dynasty did not last as long as had those of Jeroboam or of David. There are two kings in it, as in David's but the two kings lived a much less time than those did. Menahem reigned for ten years and he was an evil king we are told but we don't have much detail about him. But we read in 2 Kings 15:19 And Pul the king of Assyria came against the land, and Menahem gave Pul a thousand talents

of silver that his hand might be with him to confirm the kingdom in his hand. And we find in Pritchard's volume, we find that there is in the inscriptions of King Tiglath-pileser, he is also Pul as you remember, we find that among those from he took tribute, we find on page 193...

O.T.History 315. (1/3)

...he said I receive tribute from Rezin of Damascus and from Menahem of Samaria. Here we have this Biblical name here thus found on an inscription of King Tiglath-pileser. He reigned for ten years and was succeeded by his son Pekahiah who reigned for two years.

Number 3, Pekah. It's interesting that the name Pekah is so much like the name Pekahiah. But the two are unrelated. It very often happens that way in history. It is strange how often when you get one name you'll get another one right away that is very, very similar to it. Happens more than once (1 1/4) You'll have two fellows together with unusual names, from different parts of the country, no relation, come in the same year. You run on them. Life is full of them.

But here we have Pekahiah reigned two years and then we read that Pekah the son of Remaliah, a captain of his conspired against him and smote him in Samaria, in the palace of the king's house, with Argob and Arieh and with him fifty men of the Gileadites, he killed him and reigned in his place. You remember that Gilead is over across the Jordan. Now why did he have 50 men of the Gileadites with him? It says that Pekah reigned for 20 years and for many, many years, students have agreed that ~~it~~ ^{it} fitted in with the Assyrian chronology there is only room for a ten-year reign of Pekah here.

So as Davis stated in his 4th revised edition of his dictionary of the Bible, an edition which was published in 1924 and reprinted in 1954, in this Dr. Davis pointed out that the present Hebrew text assigns 20 years to the reign of Pekah. It is impossible that he occupied the throne of Samaria during all these years. But Menahem a predecessor of his was on the throne about 738 B.C. in the ~~reign~~ of Tiglath-pileser. Critics of all schools accordingly admit that 20 years are much too long, and then Davis goes on and gives his theory about it. He says there's a fair possibility however, that the Hebrew writer when he summarizes the reign of Pekah (3) that in the 52nd

year of Uzziah king Pekah reigned over Israel and Samaria 20 years does not mean that Pekah reigned all of the 20 year period in Samaria. Pekah was associated with the Gileadites, we've just noticed. It is just possible that he set up his authority in northern Gilead in Galilee in 749 B.C., during the confusion which accompanied the death of Jeroboam II. And maintained his power during the greater part of Menahem's reign, being the cause of Menahem's feeling of insecurity, until Tiglath-pileser invaded the north and established Menahem's sway over the whole country. Then Pekah, like Abner before him, abandoned opposition, professed loyalty and was given a high military position in the service of the king whom he had hitherto refused obedience. After Menahem's death, in the absence of Tiglath-pileser and perhaps backed by Rezin, he seized the throne in the 52nd year of Uzziah (4) reigned. Now that's purely a theory but it is a theory which would account for the fact that we have little indication which seem to fit in with it. And the tendency on the part of most students is to think that probably the situation is something like that. In other words, that Pekah reigned 20 years, but actually he reigned about ten years in Samaria, but that he may have reigned in Transjordan for the other ten years. (4½)

we just don't have enough to prove it (4½)

But it's pretty hard to fit in with the Assyrian chronology if he actually reigned for a whole 20 years. Well, so much for Pekah. Oh, no, we need to say a word more about him, don't we? Pekah was a bad man but an able ruler, an able man, an effective man, a man who tries to deliver the country from the Assyrians by making an alliance with Syria, and it was Pekah and the king of Assyria whom Ahaz so feared that he made his alliance with Tiglath-pileser. Pekah also is mentioned in the Assyrian records. And then, number 4, Hoshea. Tiglath-pileser says in his account that the people, he says, he speaks of Israel which he calls the land of Omri, this is 200 years of Omri, but he calls this the Land of Omri, very interesting, he says the Land of Omri, he says the people there overthrew their king Pekah and I placed Hoshea as king over them. So Hoshea was a man who was made king with the help of Tiglath-pileser. 2 Kings 15 says Hoshea the son of Elah made a conspiracy against Pekah the son of Remaliah, smote him

and slew him and reigned in his stead. And Hoshea, we read later on, that he was a wicked king but not as wicked as the kings before him. He reigns 9 years and he rebels against the king of Assyria, and the king of Assyria came and attacked him and destroyed him. And that was the end of Samaria as it was then. When they came that time, after that rebellion, Hoshea having been put in by Tiglath-pileser, reigned for 9 years, and ^{rebelled} ~~turned~~ against him and turned to the Egyptians to help and refused to pay the tribute, then there was no mercy. These people of Samaria knew now that if the Assyrians conquered them they would treat them with absolute cruelty and without mercy, and the result was that it was many times as hard to conquer these people before Tiglath-pileser came, and his force was overwhelming, they couldn't resist it, he took Samaria, and he made Hoshea king subject to himself. But now Hoshea has revolted and they knew that if the Assyrians take them, Samaria will be destroyed and they will be treated without mercy and so they make a strong stand against them, and it takes ^a ~~them~~-three years ^{seige} to destroy them. That's pretty long. But Samaria was well situated, up on a hill there, good hills on three sides, easy to defend, plenty of water for the city, and it took the Assyrian force three years before it was destroyed, and before the three years was over, Shalmaneser V died, and Sargon became king. (7 $\frac{1}{2}$) Who may have been the general of the army that besieged it there. One of the first things Sargon tells us in his annals is how he conquered Samaria and destroyed it and led the people away into captivity. And so number 4, Hoshea. Oh, the date--722 is the 9th year of Hoshea. Now the conquest ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~in~~ ~~722~~ ~~or~~ ~~721~~ was in 722 or 721, that is, it's right there at that period, 722-721. We know it's not 720, it's not 723, but which of these two years it falls into, it may be difficult to say. But that is a fixed date. That is one of the--we notice the Battle of Karkar is a fixed date, 854. Of course we don't know exactly where that came in Ahab's ¹ ~~reign~~, but we know it's in Ahab's reign. Now this is a fixed date. 722-721, the date of the conquest of Samaria, because it is explicitly stated in Sargon's annals that it happened this first year, and we know that that was when he became king. So that that is established, as established as any date in this whole period. (9)

And it is one of our solid things in chronology.

Well, then, 5, The Coming of the Samaritans. 2 Kings 17. After Sargon took the city, he took thousands of people into captivity and we read in 2 Kings 17:24 following, that he brought them from Babylon and Sennacherib had overwhelmed, Sargon had overwhelmed a part of Babylon, he brought them from there, from Cuthah, from Ava and from Hamath and from Sepharvaim/^{and other cities he conquered} and placed them in the cities of Samaria, but they were very small numbers compared to those before and the lions began to come into the city, and they wrote to the king of Assyria and they said the nations you have removed and placed in the cities of Samaria, don't know the manner of the God of the land, therefore he has sent lions among them and they're slaying them because they don't know the manner of the God of the land. So the king of Assyria commanded, take one of the priests that you've brought here and let him go and dwell there and let him teach them the manner of the God of the land. See, the king of Assyria favors religion. So he sent a priest to teach them the manner of the God of the land. One of the priests they had taken to Samaria came and dwelt in Bethel and taught others to fear the Lord. Howbeit every nation made gods of their own and put them in the houses of the high places which the Samaritans had made, and they worshipped their own gods and they also put the Lord up with their gods as another one along up with them. This is the beginning of the Samaritan religion in the northern kingdom, one which the Jews always felt was entirely apart of from them, they felt that it was a mixture, it was very false to the teaching of the work.

And Roman Numeral XIV, The Last Century of Judah, we'll reach at 8 tomorrow morning.

O.T.History 316. (1)

...yes, chapter 19, we read in verse 35, and it came to pass that night, that the angel of the Lord went out and smote in the camp of the Assyrians 185,000 and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses. So Sennacherib king of Assyria departed and went and returned and dwelt at Nineveh. And it came to pass that he was sorshipping in the house of Nisroch his god, that Adrammelech and Sharezer his sons smote him with the sword, and they escaped to the land of Armenia and Esarhaddon his son reigned in his stead.

Now after reading that in Kings, and it's practically identical with the wording of what is said in Chronicles, I believe, definitely in Isaiah, how many of you would be able to give us an idea how long it was after he got back to Nineveh before he was assassinated? How many would gather from this that it happened in the month that he went back? Raise your hand. How many would think it happened not within the month but within the year? How many would think it happened not within the year but within two years? Within three years? Within five years? Would anybody think it was more than five? In other words three-fourths of you don't think at all. Which is probably the reasonable attitude to take, because the scriptures state that he ~~went~~ and returned and dwelt at Nineveh and it came to pass as he was worshipping in the house of his god, his sons smote him with the sword. Well, when did this come to pass? It does not say after he went back but we know it wasn't before because if it had been he couldn't have gone back, so it was after, but how long after it just does not say. Well, Nineveh and he died there in Nineveh. And the evidence would seem to show that it was before 700, that he had this disaster (2 3/4) in Palestine and it was 680 when he died. So that it's pretty good evidence that it's at least 20 years after he got back before this happened. Well, that you would never gather from the scripture. But I think it is an excellent warning against reading into the scripture what is not there. The scripture does not say that it was 20 years later but it doesn't say it wasn't. It just says he went back and he dwelt in Nineveh and it came to pass that he was worshipping in the temple of his god, he was assassinated. Doesn't say when. And when the scripture doesn't say we have no right to say that the scripture does say. I think that's a tremendous part of the unbelief in the world today has been fostered by people reading into the scripture what is not there. The scripture does not say that man was created in 4000 B.C. It doesn't say but it has been spread all over the world that 4000 B.C. was when he was created and then when you find geological evidence which it's very, very difficult to explain on any other basis than that this world has been for millions of years and man for at least tens of thousands, then people immediately say well that evidence is entirely wrong, you're unChristian if you take what that evidence seems to present. Now if the scripture plainly said that

man was created in 4004 B.C. I would say there will be some way found to interpret this evidence other than to take it as showing a much longer period. But there's so much evidence of a long period that it is silly to take an inference based on a very superficial interpretation of scripture and fight it on that basis. ^{If} the scripture clearly stated something we can stand it, ^{if} ~~but~~ the scripture says that it came to pass a month after he got back that his sons ~~was~~ ^{him} assassinated ^{him} I would say there was something more to be found ~~by~~ ^{of} archeological evidence in the light of which we will understand it and see (5)

But the scripture just says he went back and he was killed. It doesn't say how long the interval was. In my opinion, one of the most helpful things can learn for being a worth-while student of the Lord, serving the Lord, carrying on his work, is not to read into scripture, take what's there and stand on it, but when the scripture doesn't speak, let's (5 $\frac{1}{2}$) say we don't know. Here, we just wouldn't know at all if we didn't find the archeological, and when we find it, ~~is~~ ^{is} different from what a superficial examination of scripture would tell us, on careful examination, it's (5 $\frac{3}{4}$)

Just says he went back and then it says he ~~dwelt~~ there, well that suggests, ~~dwelt~~ there, that he didn't just get home and be killed. You don't ordinarily say he dwelt a day or two, ordinarily it implies something of a period, in this case of 20 years, and when you look closely at scripture the statement he dwelt there fits a lot better with his being there 20 years before he was killed, than it fits with the idea that he just got there and was killed immediately. Mr. Welch? (student. 5 $\frac{1}{4}$) No, this death, it is a good question, because it is one of the unsolved mysteries of history, the details of Sennacherib's death. Now it is entirely possible that there is some special significance to the worship of Nisroch here in this connection, but we don't know what it is. ^Uhey did not have newspapers in those days, they did not have reporters who were ready to print all sorts of scandals and imaginary stuff, ~~that there-w~~ if there were and we had a dozen copies we could study them through and compare them and make a guess what the truth was. But the fact is that most of our material from those days comes from what the kings put up to remember themselves by. To have people remember them by, and from the annals which the Assyrian kings made and distributed widely. Now here you have a

and nobody with authority to issue annals or to put up inscriptions had the time at this point to sit down and try to give a full statement. Sennacherib was killed. What's going to happen. Well, there was a turmoil for a time until his successor became established on the throne. There was turmoil, a certain amount of upheaval and when it was over things had to be settled in regular fashion to go on, and actually we perhaps learn more from the Bible about it than we do from any other source. But the Biblical commentaries (8) does not explain. But we know from other sources would seem to show that there was a strong Pro-Babylonian party in Assyria. A party which looked to the great literary, religious, and commercial traditions of Babylon, wanted Babylon to continue to be a great city and then there was the party which was represented by king Sennacherib who thought Babylon should be just absolutely under the thumb of the king of Assyria and this business of going down to Babylon every year to take the hands of the god Bel interfered with a lot of other things that he didn't feel like bothering with it, and he didn't, and he said Babylon is under us, we've conquered it, it should be subject to us, and Sennacherib sent a son of his to rule in Babylon for him and the kings of Elam doubtless arranged with the Babylonians to counterattack and take his son off to prison, and he never did get back. And then, under Merodach-baladin the Babylonians revolted and for many years they had their independence and then Sennacherib siezed the place and Merodach-baladin fled and he just put in another viceroy, as representing him, and then they killed him, and then he went down and he says he utterly destroyed Babylon, but we know he didn't utterly destroy it because it came back fairly rapidly. But he at least did an awful lot of damage there. And historians generally think that there were two parties now in this empire, the pro-Babylonian party and the anti-Babylonian party. And that Sennacherib's wife, favorite wife had prevailed on him to designate a son, a younger son, her son, as heir to the throne rather than one of the older sons, and her son had the name Essarhad^{son}don, which is Ashur-ach-idenoch, which means Ashur has given a brother. Now that's pretty good proof it's not the older son (10) his name means the ^{god} Ashur had given a brother, and so it seemed that he was designated, he wasn't the first son in line and Essarhad^{son}don was one who liked Babylon and who admired

the Babylonians' culture and had very high regard for anything Babylonian, and if Essar-haddon came into power Babylon would have a resurgence of influence in the empire, and the present view of most Assyriologists is that two older sons killed him and tried to seize the power but that Essar-haddon was too strong for them and (10 $\frac{1}{4}$)

to the one who had been designated. And thus that Essar-haddon became king and these two sons Adramelech and Shadrezer (10 $\frac{3}{4}$) escaped into the land of the Armenians.

Now in the time of Sennacherib's grandson, we have a time when he conquered Babylon, a good many years later, and he tells us in his accounts, he says, I tortured and killed the men who were responsible for the death of my grandfather Sennacherib. But that's all he says, and we don't know what his proof is (11 $\frac{1}{4}$) or what the connection was (11 $\frac{1}{4}$)

Now the fact that the Bible mentions he was worshipping in the house of Nisroch, his god, may be that Marduke the god of Babylon, he was trying to have recognized as an ^{inf}superior being, that he was worshipping Nisroch, his deity, when this was done, we just don't know enough (11 $\frac{1}{4}$)

My feeling would be that the fact that the Bible would speak of this verse in all three places, or at least in two of them, would be pretty good evidence that there is a real importance to this which may become clear to us sometime as we get further evidence on the part, perhaps somebody's memoirs that he wrote for his children, that were put in his tomb and rediscovered, or something like that, that throws further light. But up to the present we're pretty much in the dark. All we know is there is no evidence that it wasn't exactly as described here in the Bible, but what the full details (12 $\frac{1}{4}$)

But under the ^{A.} Assyrian Empire for this period now, the last century of Judah, we are mentioning as number 1, Essar-haddon. And Essar-haddon reigned from 680 to 669. You see it was not a long reign. But during this reign he proved to be quite a successful king. 680 to 669 is the date which Pritchard gives here, and which I imagine is quite definite, barring a typographical error (13)

His reign, I know it's not in 680, that's when Sennacherib was killed. But as to the precise date it began, I think probably 669 is correct. Anyway, Essar-haddon is a king who was well-known for his inscriptions and monuments. He was an able ruler and an able conqueror and he lived in his annals kings from many cities in the east, in the west, that is in the Palestine area, who were subject to him, and he even followed up the conquest with a march into Egypt. And he was able to seize, though not to hold, Egypt. Essar-haddon was very devoted to the city of Babylon, he rebuilt the great temples of Babylon, he strengthened Babylon, he gave ^{it} a new importance and helped the Babylonian party very much during his reign. Essar-haddon who reigned from 680 probably to 669, was succeeded by Ashurbanipal, and ^{2.} Ashurbanipal then would have begun his reign in 669. I don't seem to have a statement here as to exactly when he ended it. My recollection is that it was 626. I know that he reigned for a long period. Ashurbanipal, you notice the difference between Essar-haddon and Ashurbanipal. One king, both of them started as Ashur but it's a queer thing that we usually say Essar-haddon and Ashurbanipal. Actually they should both be the same, either Essar-haddon and Escarbanipal, or Ashur-haddon and Ashur-banipal...

...become customary to give one with the *sh* ——— and the other without. The fact is that the Babylonian pronunciation is *sh* and the Assyrian pronunciation is just *s*, just like in certain parts of Germany today. The *s* before certain letters is always pronounced like *sh* in most of Germany but around Hanover it is pronounced with^{out} the *s*. Well, here, Assyrian is a dialect of Babylonian and the *s* is omitted, it's a small letter, and consequently you take the ordinary Babylonian pronunciation, and it's *Assurbanipal* (1) but the Assyrians are dominant at this time and therefore there is a great deal of importance attached to the way the king himself pronounced it. And we sort of make a compromise by calling one of the kings the one and the other the other, but it's the same name (1 1/2) *Esarhaddon* and *Ashurbanipal*. But the more striking contrast between the two is that the name *Esarhaddon* (?) is *achidonoch* (?), *Asshur* has given a brother, but his name (1 1/2) *Ashurbanipal*. *Asshur* has built up an heir. In other words, (1 1/2) *Ashurbanipal* is the oldest son, he is the one who is designated as the heir to the throne while *Esarhaddon* was a younger (1 3/4) So *Ashurbanipal* was brought up as the heir to the throne, trained for it and was given a training that most kings didn't have, he was trained as a scribe also. And (2) *Ashurbanipal* in his inscriptions usually shows himself with what (2 1/2) at first seems is a little short sword at his left side. But afterward it became established that this on his pictures was not a sword at all, it was a stylus, it was the instrument that the scribe uses to press into the clay tablet, to write the cuneiform writing. And (2 1/2) *Ashurbanipal* in many of his inscriptions tells us how he was trained in all the wisdom of Babylon, and of Assyria, and how he knew, he was an able scribe and he was very proud of his literary ability. I have stressed (2 3/4) *Ashurbanipal*'s interesting culture and writing and literature, naturally, because it was true, he sent his representatives to get copies of all the literature of Mesopotamia, what they couldn't secure they copied them, so he had thousands of copies made for the great library at Nineveh. I stressed this in a class in the monuments in relation to the Old Testament that I gave twenty years ago, and I remember a woman who was in the class, in her final exam said (3 1/2) *Ashurbanipal* was not cruel in this position, and ruthless and aggressive like the other Assyrian kings but that he was mild and peace-

ful disposition. Well, unfortunately, mildness and peacableness don't always go with interest in literature and ability to write. And so ever since that happened I call attention in the class always, in addition to that in speaking of (3 3/4) Ashurbanipal to picture 122 in the back of Pritchard's THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST. There you have a beautiful idyllic scene where King (4) Ashurbanipal is banqueting in a garden with his queen, attended by his servants and musicians. This is a bas-relief taken from one of the palaces, 122 in the back of the book, it shows (4) Ashurbanipal reclining on a couch, drinking wine and in front of him on a chair sits his favorite wife, behind her are people with fans and with instruments of music, there are trees around with all sorts of fruit on them, it's a very idyllic scene and you would say a peaceful scene, till you notice that Ashurbanipal is not pictured as looking at his wife but looking over her head at one of the trees, and you follow his eye to the place in the tree at which he is looking, and you find there that there is something there, hanging on the tree, and it's explained in the writing in connection with the bas-relief, that this is the head of the king of one of the lands he had just conquered which he hung in the tree there for his amusement while he was having his banquet. And it shows that Ashurbanipal, though he was a literary man, was just as bloodthirsty and cruel as any of his predecessors on the throne of Assyria. Ashurbanipal carried on his campaigns, and he describes ^{in great detail} the campaigns he carried on, I was surprised to notice that Pritchard does not include any inscriptions from Ashurbanipal, and therefore there is no mention of him or date given, in the text although in the back there are ^{various} pictures from his reign. But Ashurbanipal, the reason he did not include him in the front doubtless was that there was ^{very} limited space and he stuck to those historical records that make specific mention of Palestine, and Ashurbanipal doesn't make specific mention of Palestine but he tells about a re-conquest of Egypt which he made, and he describes that in great length, so he must have come down through Palestine. Ashurbanipal founded ^{it} a ^{nuisance} nucleus to go down to Babylon every year to take the hands of the gods in the New Year Festival. He had too many other things he wanted to do and down to Babylon would be a trip of maybe a week or two, with the poor transportation arrangements in those days, and so he fixed on an arrangement, or rather his father fixed on an

arrangement, for him. Esarhaddon in his will left Ashurbanipal as emperor but he left a younger son, Shamashshamukin as the king of Babylon, and the king of Babylon was supposed to be subject to the emperor of the Assyrian empire, but in Babylon^g he was supreme, subject only to his ^{brother.} ~~god~~. He was the ruler of this area, subject to his brother the emperor, Shamashshamukin, the name means the Sun-God has established a name, he was the king of Babylon, he could take the hands of the god Baal, go through the New Year ceremony, the Babylonians would receive him as their king, unfortunately they received him all too well. They received him so well that before long they convinced him that he should not pay any homage to his brother Ashurbanipal, that he should be entirely independent of his brother, and so as Ashurbanipal tells us, the Babylonians made arrangements with the neighboring kingdom for a concerted attack on Ashurbanipal. He says they closed the gates of the city to prevent his going, they broke the bonds of brotherhood, they declared themselves independent, and all these neighboring countries^{down}/there joined with them in a revolt against Ashurbanipal. Ashurbanipal said the thing became so great, the power against him, it looked hopeless and then he had a vision one night and Ishtar the goddess appeared to him in flaming fire in the heavens and assured him that he was her darling and he would be established (8)

Well, it worked out ~~in~~-his annals^{are}/very beautifully, they have all sorts of picturesque symbols and are very carefully worked out, and very picturesque but evidently it was a real fight he went through in this, but in the end his army conquered the area around Babylon and they got into the city itself and they broke into the city, overcame the Babylonian forces and as his forces came into the city, his brother Shmashshamukin shut himself up in the palace and set fire to it and perished in the flames. And after that Ashurbanipal said Grandfather was right, he said, these Babylonians, there's no use trying to keep them as an equal power in the empire or even an subordinate power, we've just got to wipe them out. So there is in Pritchard here, though he doesn't give a heading here Ashurbanipal, earlier in the account, where he is speaking of Sennacherib he quotes this little bit from Ashurbanipal's annals, in connection with--maybe it was in the larger book, at any rate Ashurbanipal tells how when he conquered Babylon he killed the conspirators who were connected with the death of his grandfather but gives us no details. And then Ashurbanipal says that he destroys Babylon, he knocks down its walls, he

destroys the city, with the power of his army he reduces it to just agricultural fields, there was no city; but again he must have exaggerated to Sennacherib. (9 $\frac{1}{2}$) because we find that before long again a great city. The people of Babylon had very great tenacity and a great deal of vigor and although they had not been the mistress of the world now for some centuries, they still retained tremendous stability and eventually they made a wonderful comeback, but Ashurbanipal was now established, he conquered ^{Elam} ~~Elam~~, the region in southern Persia, which had been an enemy, a thorn in the flesh, to the kings of Assyria for centuries, he conquered ~~of~~ Elam, he says he went to the treasure house of the Elamite king where no conqueror had ever gone before and took out of their treasuries, carried them off to ^{Assyria,} ~~Babylon~~ and you would think from reading the annals of Ashurbanipal that the power of Assyria was just about at its pinnacle where it would endure, as Hitler said his power would, for a thousand years. But heading number 3 is:

3. The Fall of Nineveh and its Aftermath. And Ashurbanipal when he died at 626 he had reigned as you see for a long time, and probably his great warlike exploits had mostly been done during the early years of his reign, and as he grew older he probably did not hold as tight a hold on the reins of government as he had, gave more of his time to literary activities or banqueting and finally (11 $\frac{1}{2}$) the Assyrian blood had been tremendously cut down and as long as you had a strong Assyrian force and a strong administrative power you had plenty of men to draw on, from all the different nations that had been conquered, but when your Assyrian central nucleus got pretty well cut to pieces and when your central organizing power weakened, all of these various peoples were ready to throw off the power of Assyria as soon as they could. And so after after Ashurbanipal's death, almost immediately Babylon revolted again and established its independence and Babylon, having established its independence, there was no successor of Ashurbanipal but two or three weak successors in the next three years, but no one of them was strong enough to re-conquer Babylon. And then there was a force over in the northern part of what is now Persia, the Medes, a people who began attacking the empire and the Medes and the Babylonians were together and in 612 B.C. there was an attack made by the forces of the Medes and the Babylonians together on the city of Nineveh which was successful in

conquering the city and destroying it, and they turned the waters of the Tigris River over the city and they left it a ruin and it was never rebuilt. It's one of the few cities in the world's history which have been destroyed and never rebuilt. Nineveh which had been the mistress of the world, Nineveh which a very few years before its destruction it seemed to be so powerful that nobody could ever dislodge it, was completely destroyed, utterly ruined, the people driven away from it, and it was about 300 years later when the Greeks in their(13¹/₂) came near the place where Nineveh had been and there's no trace of anyone having even suggested what the name of the great city was, which was left an utter ruin there. There just was a complete end to it, and here we should mention one of the prophets, one of the lesser-known prophets.

A very interesting book, the book of Nahum. The Burden of Nineveh. The book of the vision of Nahum the Elkoshite. 3 chapters in the book of Nahum, a book which is the burden of Nineveh, woe to the bloody city! it is all full of lies and robbery, the prey departeth not. It is a book which predicts the destruction of Nineveh, unfortunately, we don't know when Nahum was written. It sounds like a prediction and therefore it would seem...

O.T.History 318. (1¹/₂)

...verse 11, chapter 2, says, where is the dwelling of the lions, and the feedingplace of the young lions, where the lion, even the old lion, walked, and the lion's whelp, and none made them afraid? The lion did tear in pieces enough for his whelps, and strangled for his lionesses, and filled his holes with prey, and his dens with ravin. Behold, I am against thee, saith the Lord of hosts, and I will burn her chariots in the smoke, and the sword shall devour thy young lions. The Assyrians took the lion as the symbol of their power and in addition to that, there always are references to lions! Ashur-banipal loved to put up pictures around his palaces showing himself fighting lions. One shows him taking a lion by its mane with his left hand and holding it by the mane and smiting his dagger into it with his right hand. Another one shows him in the back of his chariot shooting his arrows into the lion and it gives a very vivid picture of the lions falling over dead, as Ashurbanipal killed them. He liked to picture himself as a great lion-hunter, a great lion-man, he's not the first one to do it. And you get much

of the flavor of the Ninevite Empire here in this book of Nahum, which declared God's determination to destroy Nineveh. And the last verse of it says, There is no healing of thy bruise; thy wound is grievous: all that hear the bruit of thee shall clap the hands over thee: for upon whom hath not thy wickedness passed continually?

Now Nahum has a vivid picture of how the attack is going to come, and we read in chapter 2, verse 4, the chariots shall rage in the streets, they shall jostle one against another in the broad ways: they shall seem like torches, they shall run like the lightnings. That verse has been quoted in each of the last two wars, I believe, as being a prediction of tank warfare. But of course it has nothing to do with modern times, it is the prediction of the upheaval and turmoil in connection with the destruction of Nineveh. The book is a vivid one to read in this connection, with this downfall of Nineveh and here was Jerusalem still standing. Sennacherib was going to destroy Jerusalem, over 100 years have passed, or about 100 years, Nineveh is utterly destroyed and Jerusalem is still standing there.

Now it's interesting in this book of ^{Nineveh} Nahum to look in the, at the 12th verse in the King James' Version. It says thus says the Lord, though they be quiet, and likewise many, yet thus shall they be cut down. Now what does that mean? Though they be quiet and likewise many, yet thus shall they be cut down. (3 $\frac{1}{4}$)

And we perceive the exact Hebrew words of it in the Hebrew. We will excuse those of you have just started ^{Hebrew} this semester or haven't yet started from doing this, but ~~the~~ rest of you look at Nahum 1:12, thus has said the Lord, though (3 3/4) *

Now this word * suggests the word shalom, peace. The ² archives version, it can mean peace or it can mean wholeness or completeness. And the King James Version translates it, though they be quiet and likewise many, --now what does the likewise have to do with it? How do you say likewise, quiet and likewise? ^{many} The American Standard Version in 1901 made it, though they be of full strength and likewise many. Now that's a pretty good guess, it makes a lot better sense than quiet. ^{Peaceful} People would be a more accurate rendering, peaceful and perfect, perhaps. But they don't fit the con-

text any of them. The Revised Standard Version solves the difficulty very nicely. We find that in the Revised Standard Version, at Nahum 1:12, it renders it, thus says the Lord, though they be strong and many, it leaves out the likewise altogether you notice. They leave out the likewise and they take the word that means peaceful ~~and~~ Hebrew and they make it strong. But they have a footnote, the footnote says ^{Hebrew} ~~peaceful~~ uncertain. They have hundreds of footnotes like that, Hebrew uncertain, wherever they don't understand it, they just put in what they think will sound good and put a little footnote, Hebrew uncertain. Well, it is pretty hard to make sense out of it. Though they be peaceful and likewise many, though they be complete and likewise many--why the likewise? Well, in the Assyrian records which we now have, we find that thousands, we have thousands of contracts. The Assyrians were a great commercial people and we have these thousands of contracts, we have many from Babylon too, we have them from different countries in the Near East. They are written on clay tablets, it was very, very important to have them, according to the law if you could be proved to have something in your possession that didn't belong to you, somebody ^{else} proved it belonged to him, you were a thief and were killed, and at the very most if they were merciful to you and didn't kill you, they'd at least cut off your hands. And so it was mighty important to have your witnesses to any purchase you made. And your witnesses might die, they might go off on a trip, so it was a wise thing to get a (6 $\frac{1}{4}$) of their seal. So these, everybody when they bought anything of any value at all, got a clay tablet, with a certification on it, and (6 $\frac{1}{2}$) contract with every store, and being on clay instead of on papyrus they last, and so we have hundreds of thousands of these contracts. And the Assyrian contract have various forms in them different from the Babylonian contracts. But one thing you notice that occurs over and over and over in the Assyrian contracts, I've read maybe a couple of hundred of them in the original, and in these couple of hundred, I'd say that perhaps sixty out of the two or three hundred, have got in them this phrase--they will be a contract in which say three or four people unite in (7 $\frac{1}{4}$) and they will say, that we guarantee repayment (7 $\frac{1}{4}$) *

and this is an Assyrian technical legal phrase (7 $\frac{1}{4}$) *

and what it means is, in English to translate it, the best legal phrase today to represent the idea would be collectively and severally. We guarantee this as a group and each of us individually. Therefore you can be absolutely sure of getting your money back, in this money you have lent, you can be absolutely sure it will be carried out because we are altogether guaranteeing it, but if all of the others fall short, every one of us individually guarantees it and puts everything he has back of the contract. Now that evidently became established as a usage in Assyria, in some way, we do not find it in the other countries, but it is a very common phrase. If you want to be sure that your contract is safe you ask people to give a guarantee (8 $\frac{1}{2}$) *

and that's exactly the word that we have here in the book of Nahum. (8 $\frac{1}{2}$) * Though you may be (8 $\frac{1}{2}$) *

Though you Assyrians who use this phrase so much in your contracts, of a group of you holding responsibility severally and jointly, though you as a nation stand against the Lord altogether and each one of you with all his force, yet, he says, thus shall they be cut down when he shall pass through. All you can possibly do will not enable Nineveh to survive. God has determined its destruction and it will be destroyed. Now we find, you take a, any post in Britain in the last war, you find German phrases quoted, and they get, in wartime, these phrases get quoted from another nation, sometimes they pass into our language and keep on being used, other times they disappear until after the war is over. Well, here is a case where in the book of Nahum we have this common Assyrian phrase used against the Assyrians, and of course Nineveh was destroyed, Assyria became a ruin, the contract tablets were buried, and remained there for 2500 years, and nobody knew the place anymore and when the scribes copied in Nahum they didn't know what it meant and when they tried to make sense out of it they didn't know what it meant, and so we have the Archives Version saying though they be quiet, and likewise many, which is a much more literal translation of the Hebrew than either the American Standard or the Revised Standard. The Revised Standard is correct in its footnote, the Hebrew is uncertain if you look at it only from the viewpoint of Hebrew. But if you look at it as a quotation of an Assyrian

phrase, and this is about Assyria, the whole book of Nahum is about Assyria, it makes perfect sense, and it is, in my opinion a very interesting instance of the accuracy of the Bible here in giving the background and the accuracy of the scribes in copying and recopying through many centuries, keeping the context absolutely accurate, a phrase which just didn't make sense to them. So this book of Nineveh then shows Nineveh's reaction to the destruction of the Assyrian Empire or this prediction of it rather, but it combines the Lord's reaction to what the Lord said was going to happen, and Olmstead, Professor Olmstead of the University of Chicago 20 years ago, wrote a book HISTORY OF ASSYRIA, a book with beautiful pictures and very good presentation, he knew the (11)

very well, but he waxes poetic in his last chapter. He quotes from Nahum and then he quotes from a French writer who goes beyond Nahum in his description of the destructiveness of the Assyrian Empire, and its bloodiness and then he himself said, all of this is completely wrong. He says the Assyrian Empire was the guardian of civilization, was spreading civilization and culture. He says Assyria was a shepherd dog which died at its post. He goes from one extreme to the other. But the fact of the matter is, that among the heathen nations Assyria showed her good points that others had not developed, they showed an organization, an organizing power, they had a knowledge of the Babylonian culture which they took over from the Babylonians and passed on, they had many points which were superior to the other heathen nations around, but they shared in their bloodthirstiness, their cruelty, and God used the Assyrians, as he tells us in Isaiah 10, he used them as his instrument to punish his people for their sins, but having used them, he then in turn punished them, because as it says in Isaiah 10, you did not think you were serving me, you were doing it for your own advantage, for your own glory, and shall the axe boast itself against him that uses it? He says, when I've done my work, then I'm going to punish you. And the downfall of the Assyrian^{Empire} is one of the great destructions of history. Yes? (student.12 $\frac{1}{2}$) A hundred years before, Jonah, we mentioned Jonah in the proper place, but we didn't go into it there, perhaps I should have gone into it a little more than I did. Jonah, God called to go to Nineveh and preach to it. And we read Jonah immediately took a boat to go in the opposite

direction. And of course the reason wasn't that Jonah was afraid, the reason was that Jonah knew that Assyria was this great bloodthirsty oppressor and he was taking the law into his own hands. He was going to protect his people from Assyria by not being an instrument to save the Assyrians. I would have a--the spirit of Jonah we may think of as a terrible spirit, but I tell you, it is a terrible spirit but it's not an uncommon one. I was at a Bible Conference in the fall of 1918, of fine Christian people where they were giving some of the finest Christian presentations you ever heard, and, but there was a man there who gave a paper on If Germany--it was just after the first world war--he said If Germany Should Come and Say we have sinned, we've done wrong, we want to be forgiven, we should forgive them. And those people around me were so angry, some of them were almost ready to lynch that man, their ~~was~~ bitterness and hatred toward Germany there was so intense, a result of the propaganda during that war that whipped up that feeling, and I tell you, as I saw that feeling on their part I could understand Jonah's feeling. Jonah was a man of like passions with outselves, Elijah wrote. He was a man who had a sense of (14 $\frac{1}{4}$) but he was a man who was a real servant of the Lord. And when the Lord, Jonah was ready to risk his life to preach repentance among the people of Israel, but when the Lord said to him, you go to Nineveh, Jonah said oh those wicked people of Nineveh, if I preach among them and they turn away from their sin, then their nation will become strong and it will mean terrible danger to mine. So he fled, took a boat to Spain, and of course in his mercy intervened and caused him to be thrown out of the boat, and God provided transportation ^{for him} from there back through the Mediterranean, back through ...

O.T. History 319. (1)

...to Nineveh and then we read in the book of Jonah that Jonah preached and that the people of Nineveh turned, confessed their sin and turned to the Lord and then they ~~the~~ said thing ^{is} that Jonah after (3/4)

for the people repented and the Lord postponed it, so (3/4) it was a century later instead of three days later. Jonah went outside the city and watched to see the city destroyed, and said isn't this just what I said when I was in my home-

land, that God will have mercy on the city and won't destroy it. And then if Jonah, instead of that, after doing the great work of Elijah and going through the city and preaching ruin to the point where the people turned to God, if then instead of running off he had then proceeded to teach those people and to educate them and to give them the word of God so that it wouldn't be merely a few that sincerely turned to the Lord and a lot that turned in fear but not in reality, to their God, and taken advantage of it and taught them and taught their children, history might conceivably have been different. But (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

I used to hear, people used to say somebody like Moody or Torrey comes to a city and preaches and have people all excited and stirred to come forward and shake the evangelist's hand and then they all settle back into their same ways and there's no change made in their lives, and then it's twice as hard to ever reach them again. Well, that's often true, if there's no follow-up. It isn't always true, even a campaign like that may reach individuals who turn to the Lord and do a wonderful work in days to come, but they're comparatively few out of many. But the follow-up is just as important as the campaign itself, and in Jonah's case the follow-up was definitely lacking. Well now, the Ninevites didn't put up any monument to tell about their revival under Jonah, but doubtless it meant that some people were saved, and it meant that many others had improved moral character, and it meant that there was a strength and stamina in the nation which when the nation turned to wickedness again made it (2 $\frac{3}{4}$)

than it would have been otherwise. So in the end Nineveh, the wicked Nineveh, at the end of its history, was a stronger nation than it would have been if there hadn't been this turning to God. That I should have mentioned at that previous point. I did mention Jonah's place. I want you to know when he comes (3)

but the

details of it we didn't go into that. Yes? (student.3) It's not mentioned in the Bible, consequently, after the great Ninevite campaigns that were stopped at the Battle of Karkar, after that serious campaign (3 $\frac{1}{2}$)

and Shalmaneser II, after that there is a decline in their lifetime. And (3 $\frac{1}{2}$)

come to Tiglath-pileser III, and we have the list of all these, but we don't know a great deal about any of them, and we could make a guess which of the two or three it was but we just don't know. (Yes? (student. 3 3/4) Well, I don't know, it couldn't be Tiglath-pileser III because he's much later. Tiglath-pileser III is one of the cruellest oppressors of all, and he was at the height of his power then, and I'm quite sure it wasn't Tiglath-pileser III, but also I would say that (4 $\frac{1}{4}$)

that there is such a thing as the late manuscript, somebody's imagination. There's no reason that you would have such an inscription but when they turned away from it, they didn't put up monuments (4 $\frac{1}{2}$) They weren't like we are today when we have paper and so much can be written on paper, and we have libraries to keep the paper and we have tremendous things in the libraries that nobody ever looks at now, and our histories today are quite distorted because they are ungodly who are writing our history books today and they are distorting the history and leaving out the place Christianity has played in it, but the original books are in our libraries and a person can go there and find the facts. But in those times they did not have paper, they didn't have the original writing. What we have is contracts and the statements of the kings' (5 $\frac{1}{4}$) and so it is probably what he had read about, or something written at a much later date. (5 $\frac{1}{2}$) Many such things have occurred $\frac{3}{4}$ but we have to check very carefully which one before we (5 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Now the fall of Nineveh then is a very important thing in world history. And $\frac{1}{4}$ whole book of the Bible is devoted to it. I called number 3, the fall of Nineveh and its aftermath, because the Assyrian Empire was not ended when Nineveh was destroyed. It had received its death blow, but there was still force enough to gather a new capital at (5 3/4) Haran the city on the Upper Euphrates where Abraham had lived for a time, and at that city the Assyrian Empire made a new stand which lasted for about 8 years. And there was still considerable force in it but the Babylonians and the Medes had destroyed the city and they were attacking. The Babylonian force was under the command of the son of the king of Babylon. It was the Assyrian Viceroy, a Babylonian who had made himself king, right after the death of Ashurbanipal, and his

son Nebuchadnezzar was the general of their army, and they were attacking what remained of the Assyrian Empire, it took about 8 years to make a complete end to the Assyrian Empire, and Pharaoh-necho was the ruler of Egypt who had been put in power by Ashurbanipal. Or he was the son of the one Ashurbanipal had put in power. There were two. His power had come from Ashurbanipal. And he, knowing of the tremendous partisan feeling, thought the side on which we can find safety is the side of the Assyrians. They've won out against these great Babylonian revolts in the past, they still were (7 $\frac{1}{4}$) and so he came with an army from Egypt in order to stand with the Assyrians, and he came up to stand with the Assyrian, up through Palestine and he came up to Haran, and there they had a great decisive battle between him and the forces of Nebuchadnezzar and the result of this battle was that Pharaoh-necho was utterly defeated and his forces turned and went pell-mell back^{down} the plain (8) the Mediterranean Sea, through Palestine. And as the forces of Pharaoh-necho defeated by Nebuchadnezzar, fled down there, Jeremiah the prophet stood up on the hill country in Judah there and looked down on the plain and saw the Egyptians fleeing pell-mell leaving their instruments of war and rushing as fast as they could, the Babylonians following them, and in chapter 46 of Jeremiah he describes it, the word of the Lord which came to Jeremiah the prophet against the nations. Against Egypt, against the army of Pharaoh-necho king of Egypt, which was by the river Euphrates in Carchemish which Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon smote in the fourth year of Jehoiakim son of Josiah king of Judah. And he goes on and there's a whole chapter here, Egypt rising like a flood. Come ye horses, and rage, ye chariots, and let the mighty men come forth, for this is the day of the Lord God of hosts, a day of vengeance, that he may avenge him of his adversaries. And there is a whole chapter here describing the defeat of Pharaoh-Necho by the forces of Nebuchadnezzar in connection with the death stroke of the Assyrian Empire. Now elsewhere we have other references to this and I want to mention in connection with the kings of Judah. But this, in the account of the death of Josiah in connection with Pharaoh-Necho's coming up there, Pharaoh-Necho says in our King James Version I have not come against you Josiah but against the king of Assyria, and the cuneiform inscriptions show that he came up there to

help the king of Assyria. So it was alleged that there was a mistake in the scriptural account. But the fact of the matter is that the preposition used is the preposition (9 3/4) * which can mean against but can also mean concerning. And what the Hebrew says is actually, I ~~am~~ ^{haven't} come up on account of you, I have come up on account of the king of Assyria. You're not my affair here, you get out of the way and let me by, and Josiah wouldn't get out of the way so Josiah was killed. But it's not for you I've come up it's for the king of Assyria, and he actually had come up to help the king. But in the English translation of the preposition which could have either of the two meanings they picked the wrong one in that place. So in the English translation it seems to contradict the fact. That preposition (10 $\frac{1}{2}$) * is in a way like our English preposition with. In the last war we fought with the Germans, didn't we? But America fought with England against the Germans, didn't we? So we fought with England in the last war and we fought with Germany in the last war and they're both with. But the word with has opposite meanings. In one case it means against, in the other case it means (10 3/4) Now the Hebrew word (11) * means against or it means on account of (11)

O.T.History 320. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...Romans 14, the last century of Judah, this morning we looked at A, The Assyrian Empire. 1, Essarhaddon; 2, Ashurbanipal; 3, the fall of Nineveh and its aftermath, and under that, we had looked at the end of hour ~~at~~ Pharaoh-Necho's Expedition to help the king of Assyria and how it was driven back and utterly wrecked by the Babylonian power. And that very naturally leads us to B, The Neo-Babylonian Empire. And under that number 1:

1, Nebuchadnezzar. That's all we're going to discuss about that at the moment, is Nebuchadnezzar. We have noticed that about 2,000 B. C., or somewhat later, Babylon established an Empire; it was practically unknown before. But it became an important city, established an Empire which lasted for a couple of hundred years, more important, established itself in the imagination of people by its literary standing, but its commercial standing, by the exploits of its leaders in that time, so that it remained

a nation of tremendous reputation during the succeeding 1500 years. But during most of that time it was not a great powerful empire. It was a city of great importance, commercially, politically, literarily but the imperial power largely passed to Assyria. Particularly after 1,000 B.C. Now the downfall of Assyria has been brought about by a coalition of the Babylonians and the Medes. And just at the time of the battle of Karkar where the remainder of the Assyrian imperial power was broken and it lost its headquarters at Haran, it disappeared completely after that, just at that time the general of the army received news that his father had died. And the death of his father put him in line to be the king of Babylon. He rushed back to Babylon, got himself established as king, with little difficulty about the succession in this case, and immediately came back and carried on the fight to establish control over the remnant of the Assyrian power. And this man Nebuchadnezzar is probably the best-known Mesopotamian ruler today. For the reason that he is ^{prominent} ~~common~~ in incidents in the Bible that have been stressed in Sunday School. He deserved the prominence though in addition to that because he was one of the great rulers of Mesopotamia. He ruled for many years and during these years he was very powerful, had a very strong control over Babylon and over the region round about. He was king from 605 to 562, you see a long reign with a very strong power. Now at the very beginning of his power you can see that in a way it was not quite the same as the old Assyrian power because the overthrow of Assyria had been brought about with the help of the Medes. And so the Medes remain an independent power to the northeast, particularly east, of Babylonia. But a great part of the old Assyrian Empire was in the hands of Nebuchadnezzar and he succeeds in conquering Egypt ^{which} ~~with~~ the Assyrians ~~had~~ had conquered only towards the very end of their days of empire. And so he holds Egypt and most of Palestine, Assyria, and all the region over through Mesopotamia. Now this man's name Nebuchadnezzar, in the Babylonian, is Nabu-kuduru-utsur, ^o Nabu, protect the boundary, it means, a very appropriate name for one who is a great general and leader of a great Empire as he came to be. But that Nabu-kururu-utsur became contracted to Nebuchadnezzar the form in which we find it in the book of Jeremiah. In Daniel we find it in the form Nebuchadnezzar, and naturally there are those who would think that this Nebuchadnezzar

was an incorrect name. But in this particular case I had never heard that charge made because we have so much evidence from other sources of this form having become a well-established term. It would seem to be a shortened way of saying Nebuchadnezzar. It's easier to say nezzar than drezzar, and it's a phonetic process that establishes this as a simpler way of saying the name and it was written Nebuchadnezzar but in Hebrew we're writing in a different language anyway. And so Jeremiah who knows Nebuchadnezzar mostly through records and documents, at a distance, uses the formal name the way it is written, but Daniel who was at the court uses it the way that it probably was pronounced right there by the people at the court. So either name is correct, the one the more formal spelling, the other the actual representation of the pronunciation. Nebuchadnezzar is very different from the Assyrian king who has held the empire before him. These Assyrian kings had been very proud of their warlike exploits, and they made out careful accounts of what they did year by year which they distributed through their realm in order to show what great generals, what successful soldiers they were, describing place by place and point by point, their excursions, their conquests, their overthrows of enemies, of cities they conquered, and so on. That was what appealed to these Assyrian kings. Nebuchadnezzar seems to have been a different sort of man, he was a very able general, a very successful one, but to him the generalship, the fighting, the conquest, rather than the things delighted in. And he has left us no inscriptions giving full details of his conquests or telling where he went year by year. We thus are in a much poorer position to check his relationship with Judah than we are his relationship with the Assyrian king, because he does not give us the information that they gave. He begins his inscriptions with a statement something like this, I Nebuchadnezzar the great king of Babylon the Lord of the world, I Nebuchadnezzar have conquered great cities, ~~and~~ have crossed mighty mountains, have led my armies through difficult countries, have overcome powerful enemies, just a general summary which sounds like boasting but we have ample reason to believe that it is actually what he did. But it's a general summary of his military exploits, and then after that he goes on to tell how I took the great temple of such and such temple which was somewhat run down, and I ~~put~~ **put** down sections of it and

rebuilt them and added two large sections and then his inscriptions give great detail of his building, and so he was a great builder, rather than a great soldier. He was a great soldier and an effective and successful soldier but this was secondary in his mind, the building was far more primary to him than the conquest. And it is what he stresses in his inscriptions. Now we have a tremendous amount of detail in his inscriptions of the building that he did, and we know that he did because we have the evidence of it. We have excavated in many of these cities and we can see there how he took the great temples and palaces and he rebuilt them or he remodeled them, he changed them around according to a new and better plan. His wife came from a mountainous country, Babylon was a very flat area, and they say that she longed for the hills and native mountains. So he built a very high brick building, on top of that he put earth and planted trees, and all sorts of flowering plants, and it became known throughout the world as the Hanging Gardens of Babylon, which he built for to please his wife. But it shows in general something of his building. In Babylon the German excavation went in there and excavated a great part of Babylon, ^{studying} ~~exploring~~ very carefully what they found and they found bricks which had a stamp put on them. We think of printing as something modern. Well, actually it isn't. What is modern is printing with movable type. If by printing you mean taking something and stamping, writing on it, stamping a meaning on the thing, Nebuchadnezzar was perhaps one of the greatest printers in history. Because he had a stamp made, probably many of them, which said, Nebuchadnezzar the great king, the king of Babylon, the king of the four great sections of the world, the restorer of the crown (10 3/4) and so on, they had about ten lines describing the greatness of King Nebuchadnezzar, and this was on a stamp the size that would fit on a brick and so every brick was stamped with it, and over a million bricks have been examined in Babylon that have the name and titles and exploits of Nebuchadnezzar stamped upon them. You see, it was very similar to what we do when we print a book. We put a lot of writing on a stamp and stamp it on successive pages and thus we reproduce, but of course the thing is ^{that} these letters were just put on the one stamp, and it wasn't re-arrangeable, anything like our newspapers are. But it's the same principle, a finished principle.

But when you see all these things that Nebuchadnezzar marked with his name to show what a great builder he was and when you see the tremendous building that he actually did in Babylon, it makes the book of Daniel live for us, when we read how Nebuchadnezzar looked out and said, is not this great Babylon which I have built. We don't read of any Assyrian making statements like that. They built palaces and temples but that was to glorify their great military conquests whereas he did the military exploits in order to get the wherewithal to build the great buildings.

Well, Nebuchadnezzar then, as you see, ruled for ^{97^{er}}40 years and ~~was~~ was doubtless a very effective general before that. He was an able ruler and one who held a very large territory under his sway. And when you see the beginning of this, you note already that there is a very strange situation. You have in the west along the Mediterranean Sea all of those kingdoms practically have been conquered except one of the few that remain is up on the hill country there, above the plains of Palestine, there is Jerusalem and the section near it which the kings of Judah ruled. And had ~~re~~ ruled for a century before. And Essar-haddon conquered Egypt so his armies had to go back and forth within sight of Jerusalem, that is if you were on ~~the~~ ^a high place in Jerusalem, or out on the edge of the hill country, you could look down to the plains and see his army going back and forth. And they had taken Egypt, Nebuchadnezzar held Egypt, this is a little island, you might say, surrounded on three sides and practically on the fourth side by the power of the Assyrian Empire and of Nebuchadnezzar. Well, a condition like that we wouldn't expect to last indefinitely. Well, so much then for (13 $\frac{1}{2}$) Empire
during the last century of Judah. We'll have more to say about it naturally, after the destruction of Judah.

But we will go on to C. The Last Kings of Judah. And the last king of Judah at whom we have looked is Hezekiah. So we will call 14. Manasseh. And Manasseh, the son of Hezekiah reigned, if I recall correctly, 52 years. It was a very long time that Manasseh reigned. He had this extremely long reign, 55 years, he must have been a ~~very~~ very young man when he became king, to reign as long as this, but the Bible tells us that Manasseh was a very different sort of king from his father, Hezekiah. He probably more took

after his grandfather, Ahaz. Ahaz the very ungodly king, succeeded by Hezekiah one of the godliest kings in all Israelite history, now he is succeeded by his son, one of the most~~u~~ ungodly. He was a wicked king, he turned away from following the Lord completely and completely neglected everything that his father had stood for.

O.T.History 321. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...and so this was a long time of moral declension, a time of going down hill as far as his religious life was concerned. But we notice how long a period there is, there is 150 years, almost as long as the United States has existed, that Judah existed after Israel came to an end. We're apt not to realize the length of this period. But of this long period, 55 of the years are years when Manasseh is ruling and the picture that we are given of ~~Manasseh~~ Manasseh in 2 Kings is entirely a dark picture. Now in 2 Chronicles, as you note, we have more detail on the king of Judah than we have in Kings. And in Chronicles we have an important incident given which was not given in Kings. After telling in 2 Chronicles 33 what a wicked king Manasseh was, how much evil he did, how he built again the high places Hezekiah had broken down, made groves, worshipped the host of heaven, and then all the wickedness that he did, then we read, the, verse 10, the Lord spake to Manasseh and to his people, but they would not hearken. Wherefore the Lord brought upon them the captains of the host of the king of Assyria, which took Manasseh among the thorns and bound him with fetters and carried him to Babylon. And when he was in affliction, he besought the Lord his God and humbled himself greatly before the God of his fathers, and prayed unto him, and he was intreated of him, and heard his supplication, and brought him again to Jerusalem into his kingdom. Then Manasseh knew that the Lord he was God. And then you read how Manasseh then turned to the Lord, took away the strange gods; nevertheless the people did sacrifice still in the high places, yet unto the Lord their God only. Now the rest of the acts of Manasseh, his prayer unto his God, and the words of the seers that spake to him in the name of the Lord God of Israel, behold, they are written in the book of the kings of Israel. His prayer also, how God was intreated of him, and all his sins, and his trespass, and the places wherein he built high places, and so on. So Manasseh slept with his fathers, and they buried him in his

own house: and Amon his son reigned in his stead.

Now when in the course of Manasseh's 55 years did this incident occur? Kings doesn't mention the incident, Chronicles doesn't say when it happened. And so we have no clear evidence of when it happened, but it would be suggested by the way it's given at the very end of Manasseh's reign, that perhaps it was very near the end of his reign. Now that is purely an inference and not at all a dependable inference. It could be early in the reign, Chronicles does not say when it was. But it was at the end of the reign it was understandable how it might have been omitted. If he had a reign of 52 years of wickedness and then in the end he repented and turned to the Lord and tried to make amends it would be such a small thing in its effects proportionate to the reign as a whole, and leave so little effect, particularly if he was succeeded by a wicked and ungodly son, that it would be understandable how it would come about that it would not have gotten into the accounts of Kings at all. So that I think that is a pretty good ground for suggesting that it probably was near the end of the reign. Now the critics have raised another serious question about this. Of course, the general critical attitude is Kings is on the whole good history but Chronicles is late and untrustworthy, written by somebody who took what was in Kings and copied a lot of it and added a lot of stuff from his imagination. That's the general critical attitude of a few years back towards Chronicles. Nowadays they are not nearly as skeptical of Chronicles as they were because some of the statements in Chronicles have been receiving a certain amount of confirmation from historical examination in a way to lead them to be not quite so skeptical of it as they were. Another thing, the general attitude of the critics has been, well, the Chronicle is simply magnifying the greatness of Judah and when you find that the in Kings it tells of a battle in which there were a hundred people killed, Chronicles will say there were a hundred thousand killed, so as to magnify the importance of it all. That's what they say. The fact of the matter is that in the cases where we have differences of numbers between Kings and Chronicles, they are just as apt to be the other way. They are just as apt to be a smaller number in Chronicles as a larger number if there's a difference. You cannot say it's a defin-

its tendency to magnify. And that of course has led some very intelligent critical students to take the conclusion that some of the aspersions against Chronicles are not warranted. Now this particular incident is one which they attack. The statement was made: right on the face of it you can see that this is an imaginary addition of the Chronicler because you notice what he says. He says that the Lord brought upon them the captain of the hosts of the king of Assyria which took Manasseh and bound him with fetters and carried him to Babylon. Well, the critics said, why would they take him to Babylon? Would it not be much more sensible to take him to Nineveh than to Babylon? Now in Kings when they speak of the kings of Assyria, they tell about his coming to the capital of Nineveh or they refer to Ninus. But Nineveh was destroyed about 600 B.C. and if Chronicles was written 200 years later, when they remember Babylon as the great powerful place and Nineveh had become hardly more than a memory, why it seems to be a mistake to mention the king of Assyria and say he took him to Babylon. So, they say, here is on the face of it, the evidence of an error in the book of Chronicles.

But now it is an apparent error but one which is not difficult to answer when we know the actual situation. We don't know when this occurred, and therefore we don't know who was the king of Assyria that did this. Was it ^{Essar-haddon} Manasseh or was it Ashurbanipal? ~~Yes-it-^{is}~~ It would have to be one of the two. Well, Essar-haddon, as you know, was one who loved Babylon, one who spent much time there, one who rebuilt many of the great temples of Babylon. Under the circumstances it would be quite a natural thing if Essar-haddon would choose to bring some of his captives to Babylon, instead of to Nineveh. And to show off his greatness there to the people he wants to impress, the people of Babylon. Now if it was later, if it was in the time of Ashur-banipal, Ashurbahāpal, you remember, has his great difficulty in Babylon, he was trying to coerce the people, and so in his case there is a possible reason also why he might have chosen to take a captive king and carry him to Babylon. The fact of the matter of course, is that when we have ^{brief} ~~these~~ accounts like this, there can easily be other factors entering in that we don't know anything about. If it was to say that one of the Neo-Babylonian kings took a prisoner to Nineveh that would be clearly an error because Nineveh was not rebuilt

it wasn't even in existence. But Babylon was an important city, and particularly in the reign of these two kings there are reasons that are easy to see why he might have done exactly what is described in Chronicles. And so this, which has been suggested as an error, actually ~~though~~ it is not what we perhaps would expect, but it is something which might easily have happened. Now in the Apocryphal writings there is a prayer of Manasseh. You notice it refers here to the prayers he wrote, his prayer unto his God. It must be that when Chronicles was written there was a book the Chronicler had which contained a prayer of Manasseh. Do we have that prayer? I think it very unlikely. It is my guess that some later writer, reading this here, that book having disappeared which contained that prayer, he made up a prayer, and said probably Manasseh's prayer was something like this. Now that wouldn't be anything dishonest for him to do. When Josephus writes his story of the Israelite kings he tells about Saul and how Saul saw the Philistines coming and he gives us the thoughts in Saul's mind. He said to be or not to be, that is the question. He didn't use those words probably, but he shows the same sort of reasoning, shall I kill myself, shall I try to flee from the Philistines, what shall I do in this situation? And he gives us about a page of the thoughts of Saul. Well it is quite frequently done in writing accounts of history, to imagine something that is in line with the facts as we know, not contrary to them, and to try, to enlarge that way, particularly if it's labelled as what he may have said, or what he probably said, but when that's done it's very easy for people later to get the impression that it's an actual ^{true} story and to repeat it as such. There are all sorts of stories that come into history which are imaginary, never fact, and very often they didn't come in because somebody tried to palm something off, but because somebody made a definite expression of his judgment, a (10 3/4) picturing what probably happened. At any rate, this prayer of Manasseh in the Apocrypha has nothing in it which would apply to Manasseh. It's just a very nice prayer (11) but it's called the prayer of Manasseh, and it's contained in the Apocryphal writings. Very unlikely it actually had any connection with Manasseh. But it doubtless is the result of this statement having been made there in Chronicles.

Well, I believe that this in Manasseh's life was very late, because it would not seem that there is much effect of it in what follows. And yet, when we find his grandson very anxious to serve the Lord, it might just be that Manasseh did influence the grandson after his own conversion. We will give number 2 to Amon, but he hardly deserves it. 2, Amon. Because Amon who succeeded Manasseh was, it says here that Amon was 22 years old when he began to reign and he reigned 2 years in Jerusalem and he did what was evil in the sight of the Lord, as did Manasseh his father. For Amon sacrificed to all the carved images which Manasseh his father had made and served them. And humbled not himself before the Lord as Manasseh his father had humbled himself; but Amon trespassed more and more. And his servants conspired against him, and slew him in his own house. But the people of the land slew all them that had conspired against king Amon. You notice the difference from what happened in Israel. Repeatedly in Israel the people conspired against a king and killed him and killed all of his family and a new dynasty started. But here in Judah the king has been killed but the people of the land slew all them that had conspired against king Amon, and the people of the land made Josiah his son king in his stead.

Now I just wonder if this figure has been correctly preserved, where it says Amon was 22 years old when he began to reign. Manasseh had reigned 55 years when he died so that his son, his older son, you would normally expect would^{not} be only 23 at his death, you would normally expect he might be older. Now of course it's possible that one not the oldest had been designated as king. But the greater problem with that is, that Amon's son Josiah is made king and Josiah is 8 years old, we read here in 2 Chronicles 34, when he began to reign. And if he was 8 years old, if his father reigned 2 years and was killed when he was 24, and at that time the son was 8 years old, it's not impossible but it's extremely unusual. And it's entirely possible that the figures have been correctly preserved, but it would seem to me at least possible that there's been an error in transmission here and Amon was actually older than 23 when he became king. I can't help wondering could it be that his young boy Josiah had been influenced by his grandfather after his conversion. That the leaders that he

had put into power in Judah were men who were wicked men, that you would expect of a wicked king that he was, he had wicked men all around men, he's old and decrepit, he comes back from his exile and the captivity, and he comes back and he tells how he turned to the Lord and begins to improve things. And these men didn't pay much attention to him, they thought he was an old doddering idiot and they have the power pretty much in their own hands and he didn't have much energy left to really accomplish a great deal with them, but he might have been able to have a very considerable influence on his young grandson. Now whether that's true, we don't know, it's entirely possible, but the fact is that Manasseh who was generally wicked, but Chronicles says there was this conversion in his life, he was succeeded by his son Amon who was a very wicked king...

O.T. History 322. ($\frac{1}{3}$)

...his own servants killed him after two years, but then the people did away with the whole crowd of those around Manasseh and put the little boy in as king. And so Josiah becomes king as Chronicles says that he was only 8 years old when he began to reign. And Kings says the same thing. He was 8 years old and he reigned 31 years. Now that will take us then to number 3, Josiah. And Josiah reigned 31 years and those years were very important in the history of Judah. Because this young man Josiah was very godly man, he did what was right in the sight of the Lord and walked in the ways of David his father, and declined neither to the right hand, nor to the left. For in the 8th year of his reign, while he was yet young, he began to seek after the God of David his father and in the 12th year he began to purge Judah and Jerusalem from the high places and the groves and the carved images and the molten images. And so we read about all the good things that Josiah did, and after Josiah had made a great reform and we read that he went up into the country to the north which the Assyrians had conquered, up there to Bethel and there at Bethel he destroyed the altar which the man of God had prophesied against in 1 Kings 13. And he fulfilled that prophecy made 300 years before, ^{which} he gave his name and told what he would do, and here was a dynasty still going at that time, when there had been 4 dynasties in Israel, and the land had been taken captive and the people taken into exile. But Josiah is still king of the line of

David and fulfills that prophecy, and he follows the Lord and he does away with the high places, and he sets up in Jerusalem, sets up the establishment as the word of God said it should be. And one important event in Josiah's doing this was the discovery in the temple of the book of the Law. And this is one of the central features in the whole critical story, their whole attitude toward the Old Testament. We read in Kings and in Chronicles about the discovery of the book of the Law in the temple, and we find in 2 Chronicles 34:15 here that Hilkiah the priest found the book of the law of the Lord given by Moses and Hilkiah said to Shaphan the scribe, I have found the book of the law in the house of the Lord. And Hilkiah delivered the book to Shaphan. And they read it to the king and the king determined to carry out the commands of this law. And then you read of the reforms that Josiah brought about and many of them fit exactly with the commands in the book of Deuteronomy. And particularly his doing away with the high places where they worshipped God in many parts of the land, and putting in place of them all of the worship, of the sacrifice, to be centralized in Jerusalem at the Temple, the critics say this was never known in the land before; it was introduced by Josiah because of this book of the law of God. So they say that book of the law of God must have been Deuteronomy which commands that they worship at the one place. Well, they certainly are right, the book of the law of God must have included Deuteronomy. But to say it's only Deuteronomy is entirely unwarranted. It could be Deuteronomy, it could be the whole Pentateuch. Personally I think it was the whole Pentateuch. Well, how could the book of the law be lost? How could he find it in this way? Didn't the people know about the book of the law of ~~Moses-till-he-found~~ ^{the Lord, wasn't it to be} found everywhere? Well you've had a 55-year reign of Manasseh, a reign of wickedness. According to Jewish tradition the followers of Manasseh decided to kill Isaiah the prophet, and Isaiah fled and hid in the ~~woods~~. And he hid there, according to this tradition, in a hollow tree and the wicked men who were pursuing him having seen where he went but not letting on that they had seen him, they said let's chop down this tree, let's cut it, and they took a saw and they cut it in two and cut him in two. And where we read they were sawn asunder in Hebrews 11, some thing that that is a reference to that Jewish tradition about the

death of Isaiah. Well, certainly Hebrews says they were sawn asunder so we know some of the followers of God were sawn asunder. But that it means Isaiah we don't know. This Jewish tradition is late, it may be entirely false. And yet it may be true, we don't know. But it was after the godly Hezekiah, there was the ungodly king Manasseh, the tradition at least shows the nature of his kingship, the wickedness of his rule, it would be very easy for the law of God to be lost under those circumstances, and a copy of it was found up there in the temple. Now that doesn't mean that nobody had copies of it. There may not have been and yet there may have been many godly people who had copies in their homes, copies which they were reading. But copies which they kept rather carefully hidden. And when Josiah became king somebody would come up and say, king, I've got a copy of the book of the law I want you to read, Well, probably most of them, after hiding it for 50 years and reading it secretly would hesitate for fear of having it taken away from them. They would hesitate to believe the stories about how good this man was and how would he be sure that what they had was genuine but here they found this actually in the temple and it was certified that this was found there in the temple and when he heard it he recognized it as the Words of the Lord and gave deference to it. Now this is generally dated as 621 B.C., the date of the discovery of the law and of Josiah's revival. We have noticed that Hezekiah had a similar revival 80 years earlier. But 621 B.C. is generally given as the date of Josiah's great revival. And it was a great event in Judah's history, unquestionably. But (7 $\frac{1}{4}$) that it is what the critics^{hold}, the beginning of the book of Deuteronomy is something there is no need in the world to believe. It was a time when it came into prominence again, but that's not to say that it hadn't been in prominence before. Now of course that's a long study, the study of the arguments for and against the genuineness of Deuteronomy. We're interested now in the historical situation in the revival to which Deuteronomy undoubtedly contributed greatly. Yes? (student. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$) Well, the high priest and the scribe who saw it declared their conviction that it was the book of the law of God. And I believe over in Kings we have another one, witness, that I don't see reference to in Chronicles, as having certified to it to the king, that it was in their opinion definitely the book of

the law of the Lord. We read, yes, in Kings we read, that Hilkiah the priest, and Ahikam the son of Shaphan, and Achbor ~~the son~~ and Shaphan and Asahiah, went to Huldah the prophetess, and communed with her. And she said to them, thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Tell the man that sent you to me, thus saith the Lord, behold, I will bring evil upon this place, and on the inhabitants thereof, even all the words of the book which the king of Judah hath read. Because they have forsaken me and have burned incense unto other god, but to the king of Judah which sent you to enquire of the Lord, thus shall ye say to him, thus saith the Lord God, as touching the words which thou hast heard: behold I will gather thee to thy fathers and thou shalt be gathered to thy grave in peace and thine eyes shall not see all the evil which I will bring upon this place.

Now there is the certification of this woman who is recognized as a prophetess, that it is the book of the law of God. Now we can know of course that they felt they had sufficient warrant, and they felt that one whom they recognized as a spokesman for God certified it, that that was the situation. Yes? (student.9 $\frac{1}{2}$) No, but that would show that there were official records in it, and the compiler of Kings and Chronicles had access to those official records. And when they wrote the official records were available so people could go to them and get further information. But those official records are (9 $\frac{3}{4}$)

But they are evidence there were other books available when they were written, but they're not nowadays. Yes? (student.10) There's no doubt, as I say, that Deuteronomy was either the book found or a part of it. I don't think there's any question of that. But to say it was only Deuteronomy is unnecessary, now it may have been only Deuteronomy, but I don't think likely. I don't think likely they had the other four books and just added Deuteronomy to it. I think likely what they found was the whole five. My personal opinion on it. But that it included the book of Deuteronomy, there's no question of that. I think all conservatives and liberals are agreed on that because the reforms so definitely carried out the commands of Deuteronomy. Yes? (student.10 $\frac{3}{4}$) No. Well, the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Samaritans claim the original copy made by Moses, and the critics claim that it was something that was written at the time of Nehemiah, but we have no proof. At this time they weren't having any (11 $\frac{1}{2}$). It is altogether possible, but I wouldn't

think it ~~certain~~^{likely}.

Well, the book of Deuteronomy then, they accepted, but the question was asked, how did he know this was the book of ~~the~~ law? I say the whole Pentateuch, at least (11 $\frac{1}{2}$) including the Deuteronomy, how do we know? Well, he thought he was sure. Well, I'd say this. It wasn't that had just been written that year. He'd be a pretty stupid fellow if they could bring something just written that year and palm it off on him. The critical theory as it was advanced a hundred years ago about this was that the priests in Jerusalem at this time saw this chance to get a bigger revenue and therefore they wrote the book of Deuteronomy and put it in the Temple where they could find it/~~and~~^{again} they called it a pious fraud. It was a fraud because actually they wrote it and not Moses, it was written in order to get more income for the priests!//~~They~~ there, to make all the sacrifices there. But also as it urges good ethics and all that, it was a pious fraud. Of course to do something to get money for yourself and then actually urge good ethics doesn't sound very pious. But that was the claim of the critics, that was the original position on Deuteronomy. But today very few hold it. Because most recognize that it would be mighty difficult to take something just written and bring it and have the king and other people accept it as a genuine thing that came from the day of Moses. And most today believe that it had been in the Temple there at least 50 years. Most believe that today, very few think today that it was written at that time. Most think it was written earlier. And if so, their position is much weaker from a purely human position, it is not impossible to think of a grasping priesthood making up a book in order to try to increase their (13 $\frac{1}{4}$) But to think that somebody did that 50 years before when Hezekiah was against all (13 $\frac{1}{4}$) worship and put it in there in the hope that 50 years later there'd come a reaction in favor of the worship of God and it then would be found, is rather fantastic. And so if it wasn't (13 $\frac{3}{4}$) how did it get there?

The general view of the critics today is that it is a book written in the northern kingdom. A book which represents the views of the northern kingdom rather than the southern kingdom, and that this part about worship in Jerusalem is a later addition stuck in. Well, it's pretty hard to figure how it ever got into the Temple

under those circumstances. Yes? (student.14) Well, just how much was in this book of the law

My guess would be that having found this book, which I would think was the whole Pentateuch, but that they read in particular in Deuteronomy, and that (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

and then probably they would find in the Temple library (14 $\frac{1}{2}$)

that would be my guess, but we know very little about it. All we know is what is here quoted. But of course the critics in making it out that this is the first time this came into existence, have to do away with Hezekiah's revival which (17...)

C.T.History 323. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...was a God who was actually working in it and we don't find that in such a visible form in our ordinary history. And therefore it takes a man with faith in God to accept the Biblical account. But if you have faith in God you find that the historical differences are much less, the historical differences, in most of the critics views. Well we continue there...

(1 3/4) We were speaking about 3, Josiah, and we noticed that he reigned 31 years. The great reforms which took place in the 10th year of his reign is described and then the next thing is his death, so that the last years of his reign are passed over with hardly any mention. There are those who claim that where in the book of Jeremiah we read the words, How hath the pen of the scribe dealt falsely? that this is proof that Jeremiah considered that Deuteronomy was a forgery. Of course I think it's extremely far-fetched. But there are those who claim that. On the other hand, the book of Jeremiah is filled with the spirit of the book of Deuteronomy, ^{much of} and the phraseology of Deuteronomy, and doubtless it was in Jeremiah's mind, the book of Deuteronomy which Josiah had paid so much heed to.

Now the death of Josiah is described in 2 Kings 23:29. And there we find it very briefly given. In 2 Kings 23:29 we read about Josiah that in his days Pharaoh-necho king of Egypt went up against the king of Assyria to the river Euphrates. And king Josiah went against him and he slew him at Megiddo when he had seen him. And this day

when he went up against the king of Assyria, has always led people to think that Pharaoh-nechoh went up to fight against Assyria, but we now have the records of the times showing how Nebuchadnezzar as general of the Babylonian forces was fighting against the king of Assyria, and Pharaoh-nechoh came up to help the king of Assyria and he was driven back by Pharaoh-nechoh, and some have thought that there was here a contradiction between the clear full statement of the ~~book~~ of the archeological discoveries and this preposition here, this statement in 2 Kings 23:29. I do not believe that that is the correct interpretation. I think we should note that the preposition there Ψ "against" is like our preposition "with" in connection with something. That the preposition (4 $\frac{1}{2}$)* Ψ translated against in many cases, but is translated concerning almost as often. And ordinarily if we fight with somebody it means we fight against, but it doesn't have to be, a man might very well in speaking of another man, say, why say, it's nice to see that fellow, I fought with him at Guadalcanal. And anybody who knew that they were both in the U.S. Marines would understand that they fought side by side. And while our ordinary use of fighting with someone is to fight against, we do use it in the other sense. And the preposition (5 $\frac{1}{2}$)* Ψ here, ~~in~~ 2 Kings has a very, very brief statement here, and it seems to me that knowledge of the Hebrew preposition saves us from any misconception or any idea of a contradiction. But when you come to translate, when you don't know anything about the situation you have to do the best you can to translate it into English, and ordinarily you get an idea of the whole situation and then you try to give a translation that gives the situation as you understand, but in interpretation if you can, in translation, get a word which preserves the ambiguity of the original, you are making a better translation than if you give what your interpretation is. Because especially if it's a situation where you don't know a great deal about it. The later evidence may show ^{whether} ~~them~~ one or other of two possible interpretations is the right one. If, for instance, if somebody says over in Europe, he say a person who came from America. Well if you're translating that into English and you say he came from the United States chances are 3 out of 4 that when they say American they mean the United States, just as we do. Canadians

~~talk about the Americans.~~ But America is also used in the sense for the whole continent. And it's good to preserve the, as near as you can, the extent of the original. Of course there are times when to preserve it would give nonsense because you don't have that particular form in the language. In that case, you have to take a stand on it. But if only you could indicate in some way that you have done so, then your readers aren't going to be confused, and say look ahere this translation says this, that's what it means. Well that means what the translator thinks it means but the translator may know perfectly well that another interpretation is equally valid of the original. It isn't fair to blame the translator for it if it's the best he can do but we cannot stand on a translation, we cannot do it.

I got a letter a couple of days ago from a man who says he's going to write to the Directors of the Seminary and suggest that I be replaced, that some other one be secured for President of the Seminary. He says we should have a man who will stand by the King James Version which is the final version and the version which should stand permanently and in my little pamphlet criticizing the RSV in the last paragraph I expressed my hope that some time godly men will make a translation which would be as good for the English of our day as the King James was for its day. And this man feels that that's a most terrible thing to suggest, that the King James Version could in any way be improved upon. Well, he's sending a copy of his letter, not only to ^{some of} the directors but to other friends of the Seminary so that they will see the terrible unbelief there is here in the Seminary. Of course, you'll find godly people who think the KJV is the last word, it is the true translation, and I will agree that the KJV is ~~the finest~~ ^a translation that has ever been made. But we've learned a lot since it was made and, like in this particular realm, we've learned a lot, and the KJV is in the language of 300 years ago, and when ~~they~~ say, O, Lord, keep me from leasing, nobody today unless they've gone to look the word up particularly in Old English dictionary, has any idea what you're talking about. Unless they think we're in the real estate business. But there are many, many expressions in the KJV which just don't make sense today. Well, I don't think that's bad, when a

word doesn't make sense. It's easy enough for us to say, well, we don't know what this means. It ~~was~~ probably in Old English meant something clear but we don't know what it is. But ^{what} is difficult is when a word has changed meaning and you may not even realize it, and that's what throws us off. That's where we can be very, very (9 $\frac{1}{2}$)

And I don't think there's any translation available yet that's anywhere near as good as the King James, but I hope there will be sometime, because I think we're in a terribly crippled situation having to use a translation in a language that nobody today understands. Yes? (student. 9 3/4) Yes, very, very good. And he slew him at Megiddo, when he had seen him. That's about as ambiguous a statement as you can possibly make, isn't it? King Josiah went against him; and he slew him at Megiddo when he had seen him. Well, we would say, whoever wrote that certainly didn't ~~hatter~~ ^{hatter} to make himself clear. But, you can say, it wasn't necessary to make himself clear, because he ~~would assume~~ ^{assume} that the reader would go on and read the next verse. The next verse makes it clear and it is perfectly all right to use abbreviated language in expressing things if we've already in what ^{precedes} ~~we've seen~~ or will in what follows make clear what we're saying. But unfortunately most of us don't do that. I get letters ~~and~~ it's impossible to tell what they're talking about. Because they assume that you know who the he is / ^{or} ~~the~~ him they're talking about. Now in this case we read on and it says that his servants carried him in a chariot dead from Megiddo and brought him to Jerusalem and buried him in his own sepulchre. We know that they didn't do that to Pharaoh-necho because he wouldn't have a sepulchre of his own in Jerusalem. So then we realize that it's Josiah that is meant. But you have to go on to get it, it was not clear (11) Yes?

(student. 11) Yes. Well, fortunately we have a fuller account. Yes? (student. 11 $\frac{1}{4}$)

Pharaoh-necho came to fight against the king of Assyria, to the river Euphrates and King Josiah went against him. It doesn't say whether Josiah went against the king of Assyria or against Pharaoh-necho but if we have the, we gather the situation from the contents and then we can understand it. And it may very well be that when the book of Chronicles was written the writer of Chronicles who in so many, many many

God, and came to fight in the valley of Megiddo. Now these it's probably all right to have the g capital, it was ~~Pharaoh~~ ^{when} Necho says he represents god he certainly doesn't mean the true God but when the writer says the words of Necho were from the mouth of God, he was saying that God in his mercy was causing Necho to give Josiah a chance to escape. That is, Josiah probably had a misplaced sense of loyalty to God.

O. T. History 324. (1½)

...and actually Josiah was just a little portion, a tiny portion in relation to the great empires and all he did was to hurt himself, by meddling in things that were too great for him to have any effect upon them. If he was going to do it he should first have long communication with other powers and have the full situation and know where he ought to stand and do it not alone but with others. So it says he hearkened to the words of Necho and came to fight in the valley of Megiddo. Megiddo you know is way north of Jerusalem but it's the place where, coming up from Egypt, up that coastal plain, the mountain gets narrower and narrower and it's a pass--the valley is 15 miles wide at the bottom--gets narrower and narrower as you go up until up at the top it edges right out till the mountain comes right up to the Mediterranean Sea. And there in order to get across, to get up to Asia Minor or to Mesopotamia you have to cross over the (1½) to the Central Plain. And so there in the Valley of Megiddo, a valley next to the fortress of Megiddo, where there would be the nicest place, the easy place, to cross over. And it's a very good place to stop them, because a small group of well-armed people there could stop a group many times as large, by holding the narrow pass. And so Josiah tried to hold him there and he didn't succeed. And the archers shot at King Josiah, the king said to his servants, have me away, for I am sore wounded. His servants therefore took him out of that chariot and put him in the second chariot he had and they brought it to Jerusalem and he died, and was buried in one of the sepulchres of his fathers. And Jeremiah lamented for Josiah. It's interesting to have this mention of the prophet Jeremiah in the book of Chronicles.

So Chronicles has a much fuller account of it and doubtless they had records which gave the fuller account, but for Kings they had not thought it necessary and had condensed it and had condensed it too much. Chronicles gives it more fully. This battle here by the way is the battle of Megiddo which attracts the most attention of any battle in the Old Testament. There were far greater battles of Megiddo earlier between the Egyptians and other people, but this is the one which killed the great godly king Josiah and which gets naturally a big attention in the O.T. And which causes Megiddo as a battle place to become a prominent place in Bible history though in world history there are other far more important (3) Yes? (student.3. I don't quite understand what you mean, they had condensed it and condensed it too much.) Yes, that "too much" was a bad ^{phrase} break, they had condensed it to the point where it just gave the bare essentials and the Lord desires that we should have somewhat more information than that, and so the Chronicles ~~gives~~ gives it in more detail. Now ordinarily, you expect the earlier writers to let you have the detail and the later writers give it in briefer form, and that (3 3/4)

a brief statement seems sufficient. And that's why I said too much, I meant that in order to get the full impression the Lord wants us, more detail is desired than Kings gave. For Kings purpose it is perfectly all right, but the Lord wanted that we should have more information. So what I meant was, that I don't think the writer of Chronicles had firsthand information, he got it from writings. Now the writer of Kings may have firsthand information, because Kings doesn't go much longer than this, another 25 years. He may have seen all this, on the other hand, he may not if he was 25 years later, he could easily have not been around when this happened, and in such case we have the Chronicles. Yes? (student.4½) No, I didn't mean to say that, I said a minute ago that God wanted us to have more information. But there are two factors in the writing of every Bible book. There is a human factor, that human beings write what they think is important for us to have. There is also the factor that God has inspired the book, which doesn't mean that he is dictating to these human beings. Now he has dictated certain portions.

Thus saith the Lord, that's the Lord dictating. But the great bulk of the Bible books have not been dictated by the Lord. But the Lord has inspired them, which means that he has seen to it that what is there as it came from the hands of the original writer is exactly what God wants there, and he has done that in the first place by selecting the writer, selecting them before their birth, by seeing to their education and their training and their preparation, seeing to what they'll see and what they'll know and what special revelations he may give them. And then by overseeing them, as they use words from their own vocabulary, and their own style of writing, to keep out of what they write any erroneous ideas that are in their mind. And so inspiration is a complex process, it is not simply dictation, but the result of it is just as definitely the mind of God as if it were dictation. The Lord sees to it that what they write is exactly what he wants. Now it may very well be that for the people between the time when Kings was written and when Chronicles was written this brief statement was amply sufficient. It may be that the longer that the people were passing on by word of mouth all this about him and a great deal more. He was a very well-known figure to them, and the accounts, many accounts about Josiah were doubtless well-known and passed on to the people, there was no need of having any more than was in Kings. But by the time of the writing of Chronicles much of that tradition had disappeared and some had become twisted and the Lord desired to have us have a fuller account ^{than what} ~~because~~ Kings gave. Although probably not as full an account as the people knew at the time Kings was written. And so he led the Chronicler to give us more details here. Mr. Welch? (student) 6 3/4. Mentioning this as being an important battle in the O. T., does it mean then that this has come to be symbolical in the N. T., rather than being (7))

Well I would say we would have to examine the evidence. It would be entirely possible for it to be used symbolically. Like we say a man has crossed the Rubicon when he hasn't gone anywhere near where the Rubicon River is. It's entirely possible to refer to the king of Assyria when you don't mean Assyria at all, or to refer to Babylon when you don't mean Babylon at all. Because after they have become established and well-known they can then easily be used as figures for something similar. On

the other hand, they, though they may be used as figures they may be used as specific mention, specific places. You have to study the particular context to make your decision on it. We cannot say that a person, for a person to take a word, to say that Assyria is used symbolically of a great aggressor in a part of the Bible written long before the kingdom of Assyria became that, would be ridiculous. It cannot be used as such until it has become well-known in this category. But after it has become ^{the Bible} then no one can be accused of misinterpreting/if you interpret something like that as a figure of expression. He can be accused of misinterpreting if he does ~~it~~ it through carelessness without careful enough attention to context (8 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Well, the death of Josiah ^{it} was not an important battle, but it was important because it meant the death of this great and good man whom the people loved, but it was actually a very small skirmish with Pharaoh-necho. Yes? (student.8 3/4) We are not told. My guess is that it was an misplaced sense of loyalty, to the king of Assyria. My guess is that he had heard of the downfall of Assyria, of Nineveh, he knew how the captain was being held at Haran. The kings of Judah had been paying tribute to the kings of Assyria, he felt ~~he~~ had an obligation to him, he felt ~~well~~ now if I can hold the pass and stop the Egyptians from coming up, it may make all the difference in the battle. And ~~he~~ may not have realized that Pharaoh necho was ~~going to help~~ ^{coming up to help} (9 $\frac{1}{4}$)

Or it might have been the other way around. It might have been that he thought Pharaoh-necho was going ~~up~~ to hurt the king of Assyria and that he thought if he could interfere with it, whichever ^{way} it was in his mind, he actually ~~did~~ not have the power to carry out a thing like that and it was a matter of worldly politics rather than a matter where ~~he could be~~ ^{there was any} right or wrong engaged. There were two wicked nations fighting against each other. God had not given a revelation that he wanted his people to be on the side of one or the other of these wicked nations, neither of which was holding principles which were ~~not so~~ ^{and so} more wicked than those of the other, ~~though~~ I would say that Josiah made a mistake in what he did. But I think that it came from a misplaced loyalty. I think that he thought he was performing a worldly obligation. Now that's ~~purely~~ a guess, we don't know. It may be something

entirely different, in his mind, the Bible just hasn't told us. Yes? (student.10 $\frac{1}{4}$)
 Yes. No, he was going to fight with the king of Assyria against Necho. That we know
 because we find that when he got up there Nebuchadnezzar defeated him and drove him
 back. And Nebuchadnezzar defeated the king of Assyria. Yes? (student.10 $\frac{1}{2}$) Well,
 I would say that it could have been perhaps that if Josiah had gathered as great an
 army as possible and gone and made a determined fight against him, even if he were
 defeated, it might perhaps have been sufficient for us to have the (11)

But the account doesn't sound like that, it sounds to me as if
 he just heard the king of Egypt was coming with a force and rapidly gathered the very
 small group and it sounds as if just a little group went up there, thinking that a
 little group could do something, they suddenly come to this situation, the king of Egypt
 is more than sufficient for that, and told them to get out of the way, nothing you can
 do, (11 $\frac{1}{2}$) you just get out of the way, and when
 they didn't he thrust them through. So the account doesn't sound as if he had--if he'd
 had a big army he'd have been standing on one of the hills near, directing the forces
 instead of out in front on his horse so that they could kill him and do away with (11 $\frac{3}{4}$)

Yes? (student.11 $\frac{3}{4}$) Well, I would say it was either a misplaced
 sense of loyalty to the king of Assyria or a misplaced feeling that he could benefit
 the world by injuring the king of Assyria, and which of the two it is we don't know.
 He tried to stop Pharaoh-necho. Necho says to him I'm not come up against you but
 against wherewith I make war. Necho didn't come against him. Now whether he really
 knew we don't know. Josiah's ^{dead} ~~said~~ then we go on to number 4, Jehoahaz. Kings and
 Chronicles ^{both} /tell us that the people of the land took Jehoahaz the son of Josiah
 and made him king in his father's stead. This man Jehoahaz is elsewhere in the Bible
 called (12 $\frac{1}{2}$)

the same name as one of the kings in the northern
 kingdom. But usually he is called Jehoahaz. Not the oldest son of Josiah, evidently
 the people thought he'd made a better king than the older brother. So they picked
 Jehoahaz, made him king in his father's place, he was 23 years old when he began
 to reign. He was an evil king, People decided in less than three months that they had

made a mistake in choosing him, but Pharaoh-necho came into Jerusalem within three months after this. So that would sound as if Pharaoh-necho, having defeated Josiah, had come down with his troops against Jerusalem and the people said what can we do against the forces of the Egyptian king and they didn't make any very great resistance and so he came into Jerusalem, he made them pay him a hundred talents of silver and a talent of gold, he seized Jehoahaz and carried him off to Egypt as a prisoner, and he took his older brother, Eliakim and made him king over Judah and Israel. It was Eliakim ~~wh~~ means God has established--but Pharaoh-necho changed his name to Jehoikim which means the Lord has established. And what does Pharaoh-Necho care whether his name means God has established or the Lord has established. It didn't make the slightest difference to Pharaoh-Necho which of the two names he had, but for him to change the name was a sign of his power. He didn't change it to an Egyptian name or to a heathen name, but he simply made a change in it so that they would have to admit that he was (14 $\frac{1}{4}$)

So he changed his name to Jehoikim

and Jehoikim was 25 years when he began to reign, two years older than his brother who was taken away to Egypt. And so that brings us to 5, Jehoikim, another son of Josiah. And Jehoikim, we are told about in about 4 verses in Chronicles, very, very brief...

O.T. History 325. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...in Kings, the account of Jehoikim is also quite brief. In Kings Jehoikim has seven verses, seven in one and four in the other, so you see that neither Kings nor Chronicles considers Jehoikim as very important. We learn much more about him from Jeremiah than we do from the original. He is an extremely important figure in the book of Jeremiah. Kings says he did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord according to all that his father~~s~~ had done. No that's Jehoikim^{chin}. Jehoikim it says, just a few verses higher, it says that he did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord according to all that his fathers had done. Now why should they say of Jehoikim according to all that his fathers had done. And of Jehoiachin the son of Jehoikim, according to all that his father~~s~~ had done[?]. You notice the difference

the singular and the plural. Well I trust you all know why it is, we won't
 take time on it. But Jehoiakim was--I may ask you some other time--but
 was a very wicked king according to the book of Kings, it says, speaks of
 innocent blood that's shed, that he filled Jerusalem with innocent blood, which
 would not pardon. And the book of Jeremiah tells us something about this
 Jehoiakim, he reigned for 11 years, he was a very wicked king, we learn from
 that after he had reigned 3 years King Nebuchadnezzar came to Jerusalem.
 After he had reigned for 3 years the Pharaoh-necho had been defeated by Nebuchadnezzar,
 after Pharaoh-necho's forces go hurling pell-mell down toward Egypt, with
 Chaldeans after them. Well, that's when Nebuchadnezzar becomes king of Babylon,
 after the battle of Charchemish, 3 years after the death of Josiah. And Nebu-
 chadnezzar then comes down to Jerusalem and again the people don't resist him much,
 why? Tremendous army of the king of Babylon, a nation many, many times as
 powerful as the power of Judah.

Remember in the beginning of the World War, somebody said the Germans could
 conquer Denmark by long distance telephone. And it practically amounted to that.
 German forces just came in and took Denmark. Well, later on there was a very
 Danish underground, there was considerable resistance, but when they came in
 they got just practically no resistance. Well, why should there be? What could they
 do? The power of Germany was at least ten times, perhaps thirty times, as great as
 the power of Denmark. To resist simply meant to be mowed down, there was, they saw
 no chance in resisting. Well, the situation was even more so here, when Pharaoh-
 necho came in, took away the king, made ^{an} his older brother king. Now, after
 there three years, Nebuchadnezzar comes, and so he just comes in to Jerusalem.
 Even sure he came, he may have sent a representative. But at any rate, he
 said to Jehoiakim, he said I have defeated this man, I have utterly
 defeated Pharaoh-necho, now you were put in by Pharaoh-necho but I know you have no
 special loyalty to him, you promise to be loyal to me, I'll let you stay

king. So Jehoiakim became tributary to Nebuchadnezzar, and Nebuchadnezzar took some of the royal family with him to Babylon, as hostages, for the good behavior of Jehoiakim, took some young men from the land off to Babylon, said now you be subject to me, and left Jehoiakim to reign in Jerusalem. And Jehoiakim reigned another 8 years. The very next year, the 4th year, the year after Nebuchadnezzar had been there, a prophet Jeremiah read, wrote a scroll of the Lord's denunciation against Jerusalem for its wickedness, and when --Jeremiah then went and hid and his friends read the scroll in the public square. And somebody heard it and told king Jerholakim what was happening and king Jehoiakim said let me hear the scroll, so they got ahold of the scroll and they brought it into Jehoiakim and he sat in his summer palace where he had a little fire in the grate and he sat there, they read to him the scroll Jeremiah had written, and as they finished a section of it, Jehoiakim would take it and take his penknife and cut it in pieces and throw it in the fire. And he showed what he thought of the word of God as given by Jeremiah, by his treatment of it in the 4th year of his reign. Now there's nothing told about that in either Kings or Chronicles. But Jeremiah 36 has the account of this occurrence. And in Jeremiah 26 we have an account of Jehoiakim's attitude toward Jeremiah and a little earlier time.

In the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim, we read in Jeremiah 26--those two numbers are worth having in mind, Jeremiah 26 and 36--the Lord had commanded Jeremiah to stand in the court of the king's house and to rebuke the sin of the nation. And Jeremiah had done it, and when he had done it the priests and the prophets and all the people took him saying, thou shalt surely die. Why has thou prophesied in the name of the Lord saying this house shall be like Shiloh and this city shall be desolate without an inhabitant. We're not told earlier in the Old Testament that the temple at Shiloh was destroyed. But here he says this temple will be like Shiloh, and there's no point in the comparison unless everybody knew Shiloh had been destroyed. And this city shall be desolate without inhabitants. Then, we read in verse 10, when the princes of Judah heard these things, they came up to the king's house to the house of the Lord, and sat down in the entry of the new gate of the Lord's house. Then

spoke the priests and the prophets to the princes and to all the people, saying, This man is worthy to die, for he hath prophesied against this city, as ye have heard with your ears. Then said Jeremiah to all of them, The Lord sent me to prophesy against this house and against this city all these words, and called on them to repent, and then the princes and all the people said to the priests and to the prophets, verse 16 tells us, this man is not worthy to die for he has spoken to us in the name of the Lord our God. And so the elders in the land and the princes protected Jeremiah. But it's interesting when we read down in verse 20 that there was also another man who prophesied in the name of the Lord, Urijah the son of Shemaiah of Kirjathjearim, who prophesied against this city and against this land according to all the words of Jeremiah: And when Jehoiakim the king, with all his mighty men, and all the princes, heard his words, the king sought to put him to death: but when Urijah heard it, he was afraid, and fled and went into Egypt: And Jehoiakim the king sent men into Egypt, namely, Elnathan the son of Achbor, and certain men with him into Egypt, and they fetched forth Urijah out of Egypt, and brought him unto Jehoiakim the king, who slew him with the sword, and cast his dead body into the graves of the common people. Nevertheless the hand of Ahikam the son of Shaphan was with Jeremiah, that they should not give him into the hand of the people to put him to death. You see here how Jehoiakim at the beginning of his reign was unable to injure Jeremiah because the good princes whom his father Josiah had put into power protected Jeremiah, but he did kill this other prophet, and what a picture that put before Jeremiah's mind for the rest of his reign. All during the next 30 years Jeremiah had vividly before him this other prophet who did exactly the same prophecies he had given, spoke according the same words Jeremiah had, who the king had chased clear down into Egypt and brought back and killed, and Jeremiah knew that would have happened to him too, humanly speaking, if it hadn't been for these princes who had protected him. And during the next 11 years, little by little, Jehoiakim manages to replace these princes. One of them dies, Jehoiakim puts an evil man in his place. Another one of them perhaps is caught in some slight indiscretion which normally wouldn't matter, but with the king hostile

to him he uses it as an excuse to get rid of him, and puts in an evil man. And thus little by little, in those 11 years, Jehoiakim changed the princes until the princes were men who were evil men instead of good men. But at the beginning of his reign, God had seen to it, through Josiah, that good men were there as princes, to protect Jeremiah.

Well, it comes to the end of the reign of Jehoiakim and some say that the book of Jeremiah contains a false prophecy, because Jeremiah made a prediction against Jehoiakim. I don't remember the exact quotation, the exact reference given, but in two places Jeremiah said, Jehoiakim will be buried with the burial of an ass, his body will be cast out of the city unburied. That's what it says. And Kings and Chronicles say that Jehoiakim died and he slept with his forefathers, and how could he sleep with his forefathers if he was cast out of the city and buried, his dead body, and buried with the burial of an ass? They say there's a contradiction. Well, of course it's the sort of a contradiction which is on the face of it cannot be a contradiction because that is what they say, Jehoiakim must have had a normal death and been buried properly or else, because the others say he slept with his forefathers. Well does he slept with his forefathers mean he was put in the same grave with them? I don't think it has to at all. It doesn't mean they put five of them in the same grave, that the man slept with his forefathers, it doesn't mean that at all. It means that he went into the realm of the unseen as his forefathers had done. Yes? Jer. 22:19-- Thank you -- gives this prediction. Kings and Chronicles simply say that Jehoiakim died, but Jeremiah said he shall be buried with the burial of an ass, his dead body cast out of the city. We have no evidence he ever was, but we have two possible attitudes toward Jeremiah. One of them we know is written right at the time when these events happened. Jeremiah was active for another 25 years afterwards. Now there are two possible attitudes, one is the book of Jeremiah is a true book which is God's word and God gave the prediction and then of course, the prediction is (12 3/4) fulfilled, in that case there's no problem about Jeremiah having given a false prediction. Now there's another view, that it's a human book, that Jeremiah is simply,

that he simply made some guesses and tried to make people think he was a great prophet. Now if that is (13) would a book which came out at the end of his life, contains material written to the end of his life, anywhere from ten to twenty years later, contain a prediction of something that everybody knew didn't happen. It would be perfectly ridiculous. It would be absurd, that he would get out a book saying I predict that Jehoiakim would be buried with the burial of an ass, cast outside of the city, his body unburied, when everybody knew he'd had a good state funeral and died a normal death (13 3/4) and been buried

It's the sort of alleged contradiction ~~at this point in~~ ^{--this one is--} which a little examination of the situation shows to be utterly ridiculous. If the book of Jeremiah contains this statement and was written within, distributed within a very few years after the events --when everybody knew that (14) Like suppose somebody would get out a book today to show what a wonderful prophet he was, that he had predicted that Adolph Hitler was to be killed in the battle of Stalingrad, why if somebody did make a prediction like that, he wouldn't get out a book today to show he had. If he was getting out a book today showing his wonderful predictions, he'd certainly leave that out.

O.T.History 326. (13)

...So it's perfectly obvious that from any viewpoint this is an absurd charge to bring against Jeremiah. What it means is that from Jeremiah's prediction which is given we learn something about the history which we're not told. We're not given the full details of history; we're given comparatively little, we know that it must be, that there was an insurrection against Jehoiakim, there was something, probably Jehoiakim was so wicked and he tried to make alliances with Egypt, to turn against Babylon and refuse to give the tribute, and the situation got so bad that the people revolted against him and he was killed in the revolt, and they took his young son, whom they thought would be, the son of Jehoiakim, would have all his good points, without any of his bad points, and made him king, and 3 months later Nebuchadnezzar's army came, and took Jehoiakim's son and carried him off to Babylon.

Well, that's getting on to the next point in the outline, number 6. Jehoiachin. Yes? (student. 1½) No, it means that you take a king and he dies and you wrap him up in good linen, put fine things around him, and jewels, and bury him in a wonderful tomb, to lift his body up on a shelf in that beautiful tomb ~~where~~, put the rock up against it, like the rich man did with the body of Christ. But in the case of an ass, when it dies you just throw it over the wall and let it rot. And the burial of an ass, that's what it meant, you just threw it out into the refuse. And it means that probably there was such hard feeling against Jehoiakim that there was an uprising and he was cast out like that, probably they didn't leave him, he probably was brought in and buried but it may have been that the Babylonian forces had come by that time and were around the city and it may have been some time before there was opportunity, maybe they couldn't find him after the battles were over, and so forth.

But Jehoiachin, his young son, Kings says, was an evil king. But he didn't have much time to prove it because Jehoiachin was only ruler for 3 months. Now there's a very nice thing in the English. The names Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin in the Hebrew are spelled exactly alike, except that the father ends in m and the son ends in n. That's the only difference. But in English, for some reason, we always Jehoiakim ending kim, and Jehoiachin ending chin. It's a different spelling of two things that are absolutely alike except the last letter. But it does make it very nice for us because at a glance we know which of the two it is much more easily than if the only difference was the m or n. So I think it's a very nice thing. But it's not grounded on any solid basis. If the Hebrew should be k (3½)

But I think it's a nice thing, it's a helpful thing. I don't suggest you change it, but I call your attention to it.

This Jehoiachin then is also called Jeconiah. In 2 Kings, in Jer. 27:20, he is called Jeconiah. He is also called Coniah. He is called by all three names: Jehoiachin, Jeconiah, and Coniah. All three forms are used for him. He was a young lad when he became king. I believe in Kings and Chronicles, one says he was 8 years old, and one says he was 18 years old. At any rate he was a young lad. And he

reigned for 3 months. Kings says he did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord according to all that his father had done. At that time the sergants of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came up against Jerusalem and the city was besidged. And Nebuchadnezza king of Babylon came against the city and his servants did besiege it. And Jehoiachin the king of Judah went out to the king of Babylon, he, and his mother, and his servants and his princes, and his officers: and the king of Babylon took him in the 8th year of his reign, that's not of his reign but of the king of Babylon's reign. And he carried out thence all the treasures of the house of the Lord and the treasures of the king's house and he carried away all Jerusalem, and all the princes, and all the mighty men of valour, even ten thousand captives, all the craftsmen and smiths, none remained, save the poorest sort of people of the land. He carried away Jehoiachin to Babylon and the king's mother and the king's wives and his officers and the mighty of the land, these he carried into captivity from Jerusalem to Babylon. All the men of mi ht, even seven thousand, craftsmen and smiths a thousand--see why the name smith is so common--a thousand smiths here. All that were strong and apt for war, even them the king of Babylon brought captive to Babylon. And the king of Babylon made Mataniah his father's brother king in his stead and changed his name to Zedekiah. So we call him Zedekiah, but his previous name had been Mataniah. And so Zedekiah is number 7.

Now Jehoiachin, you might think was very unimportant, because he only reigned for three months, but actually the people gave Jehoiachin a tremendous importance because they considered him the rightful king. He was the son of Jehoiakim, he was the man who should be king, he was taken off captive, they said one of these days he will return. He is our rightful king, we want to get our freedom from Babylon and have Jehoiachin come back. And so he was 38 years in captivity in Babylon, he was 38 years in prison when they fainally let him out of prison. But he was --the people of Judah all though he is our king, and they thought of his uncle Zedekiah as just a sort of a regent, ruling until he should get back. So Jehoiachin was very important in the minds and hearts and affection of the people. He was too young a man to have show his wickedness much, and they put all the glory and kingship onto him, and actually

Kings says he was a bad man. So he wasn't worthy of it. But he was ~~defeated~~ ^{succeeded} by his uncle Zedekiah. And Zedekiah was only 21 years old when he began to reign, so ~~he~~ was thus only ten years old when his father Josiah died. And Zedekiah was a young fellow, a well-meaning young fellow. Kings did not say that he was a bad man, it says he did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord. It speaks of what he did, not of what he was. If you just read Kings and Chronicles you would say Zedekiah was an evil king, because they point out that he did evil. But Jeremiah tells us much more detail on it and we find that Zedekiah, though he did evil, was a man who wanted to do good. He was a man who desired to be a good king, but he was a man who did not have the strength of character to resist the bad princes who were in power. And consequently he went along as the princes led him and he gets the blame and deserves it for what he did as king. But it wasn't what he would have done if he'd been left to himself, if he'd had the power to do it. Yes? (student: 8) Well, they're used many places. I mean you can look in any concordance and you can easily find Jehoiachin is the commonest, but Coniah is used at least five or six times. And Jecniah is used at least four times. (student: yes, Jecniah is given in 27:20 the verse you gave.) I just happened to notice that, I didn't bring any references on it, because they both occur quite a number of times. And of course it's good for us to keep the one name so it's easier to know whom we're talking about but the other two names are used for him.

Now Zedekiah then is mentioned in Jeremiah and he is not mentioned much in Ezekiel though he is referred to there but he is prominent in Ezekiel. So it's good to know that Jeremiah is very important in connection with all the kings but that Ezekiel is important more particularly in connection with ^{the} reign of Zedekiah. The book of Ezekiel starts: It came to pass in the 30th year, in the 4th month, in the 5th day of the month as I was among the captives by the river Chebar, in the 5th day of the month, which was the 5th year of king Jehoiachin's captivity. And so here we have this great number of captives which Jeremiah had taken away, and among them is Ezekiel. And Ezekiel is over in the land of the captivity, in Mesopotamia, while Jeremiah is in Jerusalem. And they're both prophesying during the reign of king Zedekiah. We'll continue there next Monday.

(10 1/2) We were speaking last time on Zedekiah. Zedekiah was number 7 under C, the last kings of Judah. I mentioned this morning that we do not have a section meeting today, just the lecture today. Now we mentioned Zedekiah last time, the last king of Judah, actually he was king, he reigned as king, ^{but} ~~while~~ of course he had ~~made~~ king by the king of Babylon and the people of the land felt that Jehoiachin was their real king. In the book of Jeremiah we have many references to king Zedekiah. And the picture that emerges of him from the book is much clearer than the picture you would get of Zedekiah if you were simply reading Kings. Kings simply says he was an evil king, and that's about all it says about him. But it is, Kings and Chronicles have very little to say about his reign anyway. But in Jeremiah you have maybe 20 chapters, well I haven't counted them but at least 13 or 14, maybe as many as 20, which are dealing with the events of Zedekiah's reign. And in that book it is easy to get the picture of Zedekiah of his real character, a man who perhaps, under normal circumstances, might have been a good king. If he had had as his nobles the men who Josiah left in power, he would probably ^{have} just gone along, and been considered as a good king. He certainly does not give any evidence of being the sort of man who would have ~~been~~ initiated ^{the} ~~in~~ evil which the nobles wanted that were there now. He was rather holding back on them, holding back, and yet realizing that his power was far inferior to theirs and he hated discussion and dissension anyway, and he tried to get along with them as well as he could and he did what they wanted but the (12 1/2)

and when they wanted to kill Jeremiah he was able to prevent it and when they put Jeremiah down in the dungeon, he was able to send a man to pull him out. But when he called Jeremiah in and talked with him he said to Jeremiah, now don't you tell these nobles what I've talked with you about. You just tell them that we've had just a nice discussion and you were asking me if you couldn't have your conditions made better. Well, Jeremiah doubtless had asked that so it was no lie to tell them that, but Zedekiah was afraid that they would know that he had asked Jeremiah what shall I do in this crisis. Because they weren't interested in Jeremiah's ^{opinion} ~~opinion~~ but evidently he was. He was like the bulk of people that go along with

the tide, and they ~~will~~^{may} resist the tide a little bit but they don't resist it a great deal. They go along with it and if they happen to be in a good tide, they're pretty good people, if they happen to be in a bad tide they're pretty bad people. But comparatively few will really exert themselves on their (13 3/4) trying to be made an influence. And Zedekiah was not one of these. Now Zedekiah is quite prominent in the book of Jeremiah. In the book of Ezekiel, Zedekiah is very little mentioned. But the book of Ezekiel is almost more important for the reign of Zedekiah than the book of Jeremiah is. Because the book of Ezekiel, about half of the book is written during the reign of king Zedekiah. And Ezekiel was, he was called a colonial in his day. He was a man who was devoted to Judah but was not in Judah. In his case he was not a willing colonial. In his case he had been taken into exile. But there in exile they were the most patriotic of all. We often find that today. The people in exile or the people who are away from their native land often are the ones who are the most conscious, the most outspokenly patriotic...

O.T.History 327. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...people who were very, very patriotic. He had been taken into exile at the beginning of Jehoiachin's reign and there in the exile over in northern Mesopotamia, the people were saying it won't be long now before God will take us back. This is God's land, that is Palestine, it's God's land, it's God's people, it's God's temple, God can't let his people be destroyed, God can't let the heathen take over. Look at what happened in the days of Isaiah, against the mighty Assyrian aggressor, God protected Jerusalem like birds hovering. Now he certainly will protect Jerusalem now. They were ^{these men were studying to be} saying, ~~the prophets~~ were saying, just a few years, 2 or 3 years God is going to cause that we be taken back to our home land. Here was Ezekiel facing that sort of an attitude on the part of the very, very patriotic people and he was having to say to them no, you're not going back to Jerusalem, Jerusalem is going to be destroyed and the temple is going to be completely burned. Well it didn't make him popular at all. He was, Jeremiah and Ezekiel had two of the most unpopular ministries in all

history. And Ezekiel there in the exile had to go to these people and bring them God's message and yet do it in such a way that he wouldn't get killed while he was doing it. And so the Lord first, in the beginning of Ezekiel, appeared to the prophet and gave him a vision of himself in order to strengthen him, to be aware of the unseen God as so much more important, to be true to him, than to think of the (2 $\frac{1}{4}$)

And then, in chapter 3 the Lord told Ezekiel to go to the people and to warn them of their sin, to warn them of their iniquity. He told ~~him~~ to tell them that he was a watchman and he says if you warn the righteous and nevertheless ~~let~~ the righteous turns ~~to~~ into sin in spite of your warning, you've delivered your soul he said. But he said, the righteous man who turns into sin will suffer for it but it's not your fault. But you are responsible to warn the wicked and to warn the righteous. Now, if you'll turn in your Bible to Ezekiel 3, you'll notice that between verses 10 and 21 this command is given to Ezekiel to go and to warn the people and to speak directly to them, warning them about God's will for them, and then you find right in verse 22, that the Lord says, the hand of the Lord was on me and he said to me, arise, go forth into the plain, I want to talk with you. He got out there on the plain, and fell on his face before the glory of the Lord, and the Lord said to him go, shut yourself in your house, he said. He said, verse 26, I'm going to make your tongue cleave to the roof of your mouth. You're going to be dumb, you won't be to them a reprover. For they are a rebellious house. Now how do you fit this together? That in verses 10 to 21, the Lord says to him, you go and reprove them for their sin, reprove them for their iniquity, you're responsible to God for every one of them. And then in verse 26, he says to him you are to be quiet, you're to be dumb, you're not to be a reproof, the two come almost one right after the other, and they're sharply contradictory. Who says there are no contradictions in the Bible? Here are two sections, just five verses apart, that absolutely contradict each other. It's just as if one of you were to say, why, Saturday morning around 11 o'clock I saw Dr. MacRae walking down toward Cheltenham. Somebody else 'd say why that must be wrong, at 11 o'clock I saw him walking up from Cheltenham. And one of you might have seen me walking down and

one might have seen me walking up, and you might both be absolutely right, but I might have gone down and then ten minutes later come up. One of you saw me one time, one saw me the other. And the only way you can make any sense out of this apparent contradiction is to consider that the element of time is involved in it, though not clearly stated, it is doubtless there. God gave him the command to reprove the people, to speak to them directly and Ezekiel started out to do it, and after a little while the Lord said, now you be quiet, you be dumb. Don't (5 1/4) reprove them any more. Why did he do that? Because doubtless it was because Ezekiel had gone to the people and had talked to them and had told them of their sin and pointed out their wrong and now they wouldn't listen to him. And Ezekiel might have said, oh, those people, they just won't listen to me, they're just going on in their wickedness, there's no use to try to talk to them, any more. And that will be the Lord's will. The Lord can use another method. The Lord used one method, he sent Ezekiel to reprove them, to talk to them directly, to give the message and then it reached a point where everything Ezekiel just made them angry and made them not interested in going on, the Lord said there's no use in going forward, since it is accomplishing nothing, we'll use a different method. ~~And~~ If he went on they might pay no attention to him or they might just get so angry they'd kill him. They'd throw him out of their connection there altogether. He would have no chance to have any influence with them further, the Lord didn't want that, the Lord wanted Ezekiel to have a great influence upon them and wanted him to use means that would get the interest. And so here in chapter 3, the Lord now said to Ezekiel you're are not to be a re-prover any more, but in verse 27, but when I speak with thee I will open thy mouth, and thou shalt say to them, thus saith the Lord. He's going to give him a message at the time he wanted him to have it. ~~but~~ he's not to go on using his own judgment any longer now, in giving messages, simply because another method is necessary in order to get the message across. ~~I/td~~

I talked to a missionary in South America who told me of going into a town and seeing a missionary who was there, had a little place off in the corner of the town

there where he'd been preaching the Word of God faithfully for 25 years, and he had about 5 people that came and heard him and no one else was the least bit interested. He couldn't get them to come, they just had no use for him. This man told me how he thought about the problem, how could he reach more people. And he said that he had set to work, he knew Spanish very well, and had gotten about a dozen of Spanish proverbs, very prominent, well-known Spanish proverbs and he said, and he hired a hall and announced that he was going to speak for 12 nights on the following subjects, and he mentioned these proverbs. And each of these little proverbs, people saw this and said what's that, that sounds interesting, and he had that place crowded and he spoke for 12 nights and he started in with this little proverb and he went ahead and talked about things of daily life, things that interested the people, gave them a few little interesting suggestions about their lives, and then led it on to show sin in their lives and to show the place of the Gospel and the need of the Gospel and in the end the missionary there who'd been 25 years and had about 5 people coming to his meeting now, the next week he had a couple of hundred out, the result of this man having used a different approach, to try to get the people where they lived, and get them to show an interest, and get them to come out. Well, now Ezekiel here used an approach which was a good thing to use if it gets results. But if it doesn't some other method is necessary at that time. And then he can return to this method later.

So the Lord said to Ezekiel, he said in chapter 4, Son of man, take a tile and lay it before thee and portray upon it the city, even Jerusalem, and lay siege against it and build a fort against it and cast a mount against it, set the camp also against it and set battering rams round about. Moreover take to thee an iron pan and set it for a wall of iron between thee and the city: and set thy face against it and it shall be besieged and thou shalt lay siege against it. This shall be a sign to the house of Israel. Lie thou also upon thy left side, and lay the iniquity of the house of Israel upon it: according to the number of days thou shalt lie upon it thou shalt bear their iniquity. I have laid upon thee the years of their iniquity,

according to the number of the days, 390 days, (9 $\frac{1}{4}$)

to say this is utterly impossible, how could he lie there 390 days, he wouldn't have any food, he wouldn't have any sleep, that would be impossible, ^{possibly} just a dream that Ezekiel had or something that he told about as if it had happened, when it never actually happened. Well they miss the point of the whole story. The point of the story is that he make an object lesson, that he go through something without doing anything to upset or disturb people, he takes (9 $\frac{3}{4}$) something that will arouse their curiosity. He lies out there in the public square, here's Ezekiel lying there and he has this tile, he has drawn on it a picture, that anybody can see is a picture of Jerusalem if they look closely. And there he lies, and he holds an iron pan up between him and it, and he lies and holds this pan up there and he puts up a sign (10 $\frac{1}{4}$): ^{Day One.} ~~and they watch~~. How long he stays there, whether an hour, two hours, three hours, we don't know, but he might come back the next afternoon, he might come back the next morning, and put up a sign: Day Two. The people would see these signs, Day One, Day Two, Day Three. And the man lies there and holds up this pan and there's the tile out in front. The little children would say, Mummy, what's that fellow doing there? What's that mean anyway? What's that thing in front of him? And the mother would look closely and, why, she'd say, that's Jerusalem. Why look that looks exactly like Jerusalem. Look, son, I've been telling you about the different parts and you can see it on that tile, as he's drawn it there. You see that's where the King's palace is, and over this side that's where this gate is and so on. I've been telling you about it and here's a nice picture of it. Bring the other kids and have them look at it. The kid would be interested but he'd say but what's the man doing there. Look at the way he's lying and the way he's holding up that pan, looks as if he's hiding, protecting himself with it, or something. Well, she'd say, I guess he's representing a siege of it; well, she'd say, the city was besieged a few years ago, but that isn't going to come again. God's going to protect us, we're going back to Jerusalem one of these days.

But day after day they'd see him and they'd ^{be} asking questions. And after he'd

done that a few days, then we read that the Lord said to him that he was to take food and he was to measure out, take a little scale and measure out about two ounces of food ^{very carefully} and eat it. And then a certain time later he'd measure out two ounces again and he'd eat it. And they'd say look how carefully he weighs his food. And then he would take water and he'd measure it out. And the Lord said, ~~And thou shalt~~ eat it as barley cakes, and thou shalt bake it with dung that comes out of man, in their sight. When the Lord gave Ezekiel this command, ~~P~~poor Ezekiel was stopped. And he said, in verse 14, then said I, Ah Lord God! behold, my soul hath not been polluted, for from my youth up even till now have I not eaten of that which dieth of itself, or is torn in pieces, neither came there abominable flesh into my mouth. He says, don't ask me to do this. Then the Lord said to him, verse 15, then he said to me, Lo, I have given thee cow's dung for man's dung, and thou shalt prepare thy food with it. And Ezekiel found it a lot easier to do this, using the cow's dung to cook with, instead of human dung, but either one of them would make clear to the people the terrible situation to which the city would be reduced, when they wouldn't have fuel, they would have to use even such ingredients as that to have fuel, and they'd have to measure out their water and have to measure out their food. And Ezekiel, it just dawned on him gradually what he was doing, and what it meant. Instead of his coming up with a big declaration that would make them angry and they'd all storm out of there and they'd go and ask if he had a permit to hold a meeting at that place, and ask it be revoked, or something. Why they just gradually saw, it just gradually sunk into them what it meant. And so the Lord gave him, through the next few chapters here, gave him the object lessons to perform in order to get the ~~prophet~~ (13 $\frac{1}{4}$) across to the people in a way that did not arouse their antagonism. And didn't ^{arouse} like it too much so that they wouldn't listen any further (13 $\frac{1}{2}$) And so he got them to watch it, and then the Lord gave him some messages to give there, after interest was aroused to a certain point, but the Lord became a little frightened about this. He said, Ezekiel is not a particularly good speaker, he said (13 3/4)

get these points across,

so in Ezekiel 6:11, Then saith the Lord God; Smite with thine hand, and stamp with thy foot, and say, Alas for all the evil abominations of the house of Israel! He said it's not going to do you any good to just stand up there and give your message quietly, you ought to stamp with your foot and bring your fist down, get the point across. So here we have a good public speaking lesson right in the Bible, in the book of Ezekiel here (14¹/_a)

Now some might prefer to take it that either this is a sign, has a certain particular meaning, prophetic meaning for us

but in the context it's very clear that that's what it is, it is a public speaking lesson that the Lord gives Ezekiel in order to get the point across to the people. And so that these early chapters of Ezekiel here, we have the Lord showing himself Ezekiel how to use various ways to get the truth across...

O.T.History 328. (1¹/₂)

...and fails in this, but that they will gradually be led along, in order that the truth will come into their minds and into their hearts. And then after he had used the method of object lessons, we find that the irritation against him which his constant rebuke had aroused had subsided to quite an extent. And so in chapter 8, it came to pass in the sixth year, that he was in his house, and the elders of Judah were sitting before him, The people by this time had come to think that maybe he does know something that's worth our hearing, let's go and see what he has to say.--Some of the leaders at least-- and let's talk to him. So there they are in his house and he said, verse 2, Then I beheld, and lo a likeness as the appearance of fire: from the appearance of his loins even downward, fire; and from his loins even upward, as the appearance of brightness, as the colour of amber. And he put forth the form of a hand, and took me by a lock of my head, and the spirit lifted me up between the earth and the heaven and brought me in the visions of God to Jerusalem, to the door of the inner gate that looks toward the north. And now we have Zedekiah's reign described to us here, but it's Ezekiel who is far away across

the desert, but the Lord in a vision, carries him across the desert, over there into Jerusalem. And now we have a number of chapters in which Ezekiel sees what the children^{of Israel} do in the (2) and it describes the abominations and the worship of false gods and the heathenism that is coming in, and it shows the destruction that is going to come. Ezekiel sees that, all in a vision, evidently while the elders of Israel are there in his room. There in his home, and then doubtless tells them what he saw. And this way, this is a very unusual way of getting a message across to them, and he if he had just said why in Jerusalem there is all this wickedness they probably would not have believed it or paid any attention to it, but here they see him having a vision, they hear what he says he's seeing in the vision, and as he mentions some of these things they remember little bits they have heard in letters that have come, or from visitors, a little thing that fits in here and fits in there and fits in there, and certifies to them the fact that Ezekiel really has a vision there that the Lord has given him. And so poor Ezekiel has a task there of being among the most patriotic of all the people, the people who are already in exile, and telling them, no, God's not going to protect Jerusalem, he's going to destroy it! And so Ezekiel then in chapter 12, the Lord gives him another object lesson. He says in chapter 12, ~~the~~ prepare stuff for removing and remove by day in their sight, bring forth your stuff by day in their sight, as stuff for removing, and go forth at even in their sight, as they ~~ghat~~ go forth into captivity. Dig through the wall in their sight and carry out thereby.

And so he tells how he did it, he dug a hole from his cellar up outside of the house, so instead of coming out of the door, the obvious way, he was coming up through this. People saw the dirt begin to come out, and begin to emerge--what's happening here? What's going on anyway? (4) And then they see Ezekiel begin to carry his stuff out (4 1/2)

and they say what does he mean by that. And they're all aroused and they're all interested, and Ezekiel turns to them and says this is what's going to happen in Jerusalem, People are going to have to dig under the wall and try to get out of the

way before they're captured. "They're going to have to get what they can carry and run with it because it is all going to be destroyed. And so he gave them, the Lord gave them these object lessons and these visions of the conditions in Jerusalem in order that the people in exile who were so patriotic could be shown that the important thing was not for them to be patriotic for a nation or for an institution or for an organization but to be loyal to the Lord. And to see what is the message the Lord wants given. In Isaiah's day, the Lord wanted to show despite the wickedness of the people that he could protect his city. He wanted to demonstrate that, he was not yet ready to destroy Jerusalem. Now the Lord wanted to destroy Jerusalem and show the people that no physical city, no physical temple was necessary to represent the Lord, that the Lord was the unseen One who holds all (5 $\frac{1}{2}$) in the hollow of His hand, and that even though the people of Jerusalem were far better than any of the nations round about them, morally they were high and lifted up above the nations round about them. Yet they came far short of God's standard and it was necessary that God should punish them, that he should send them into exile, that he should purge out their sin from them.

And so, he continued giving messages ~~and showing~~ ^{and showing} ~~and showing~~ to these object lessons to get the idea across to them, until the Lord sent him one of the most difficult object lessons, in chapter 24. In chapter 24 here, we find in verse 15 and following, of chapter 24, we find that the Lord said to ~~Jeremiah~~ ^{Ezekiel}, Son of man, behold, I take away from thee the desire of thine eyes with a stroke, yet neither shalt thou mourn nor weep, neither shall thy tears run down. Forbear to cry, make no mourning for the dead, bind the tire of thine head upon thee, and put on thy shoes upon thy feet, and cover not thy lips and eat not the bread of man. So I spake unto the people in the morning; and at even my wife died; and I did in the morning as I was commanded. And the people came and they couldn't understand it, they said, Ezekiel, we've seen you all these years, how close you were to your wife, and always thought of you as just an ideal couple, so utterly devoted to one another, here she has died and you are not going into mourning ceremonies, you are not showing any of your feel-

ings and Ezekiel says to them, the reason is because the Lord has told me that the terrible things that are coming on the nation are so great that the suffering of one individual, even though terrible, is small in comparison. And some used this as an object lesson and then the Lord said to him, in verse 25, he said, also thou son of man, it'll come to pass that ~~that~~ one that escapes from the city, from the destruction, will come to you and in that day your mouth will be opened to him that is escaped and thou shalt speak and be no more dumb. In other words, chapter 24 here, is right at the time when the siege of Jerusalem began. That's brought out in the beginning of the chapter, in verse 1 he gives a date, in verse 2, he says son of man, write thee the name of the day, even of ~~that~~ same day: the king of Babylon set himself against Jerusalem this same day. And so there's the beginning of the siege of Jerusalem, in the Ninth year of Zedekiah, as described in chapter 24 here.

Now, that is in chapter 24, just back in chapter 21, the Lord has been showing the coming of that calamity, the attack against Jerusalem. In chapter 21, the Lord said, verse 18, the word of the Lord came to me again saying, also thou son of man, appoint thee two ways, that the sword of the king of Babylon may come: both twain shall come out of one land, and choose thou a place, choose it at the head of the way to the city. Appoint a way that the sword may come to Rabbath of the Ammonites and to Judah in Jerusalem the defenced. For the king of Babylon stood at the parting of the ways, at the head of the two ways, to use divination: he made his arrows bright, he consulted with images, he looked in the liver.

Now somebody says, nowadays reading this, they'd surely wonder what it's talking about. The king of Babylon stood at the head of two ways, this way goes to the Ammonites' capital, that's the capital of Jordan today. The other one goes to Judah, to Jerusalem (9 $\frac{1}{2}$) city. He stands at the parting of the ways, to use divination: he made his arrows bright, he consulted with images, he looked in the liver. Well, I'm sure that a hundred years people would be very, very puzzled by that statement. What does it mean? That the king of Babylon looked in the liver. How do you look in a liver? Well, we now have excavated at Babylon

and at Assyria and we have found hundreds of pictures of livers, hundreds of them. We have found that pictures, hundreds of the, which show the liver of an animal and one lobe of the liver will be enlarged and they will say this is the way the liver was when king so-and-so asked for it and the next day he was assassinated. So if you find a liver of an animal like this, watch out. Then they'll show another liver with the lobe in the different part of the liver and they'll say this is that way the liver was before there was a great victory and the country was greatly extended, so if you find a liver that looks like this, that's fine. And it was a great science among the Babylonians, the science of liver-watching. They had special experts appointed to slay an animal, not for sacrifice, but to get the liver so they could examine the liver and see what the future would be, and what procedure the king ought to use. You might think how could such a cultivated, advanced, intelligent people as the Babylonians do such a thing. Well, we think of the Romans as very cultivated, but the Romans had a similar thing, they would look up and look at birds. And the Romans had a rule, even right at the time of Christ, that if an army crossed a stream, they had to get the omen, and to look up and look for the bird, see what bird they'd see and what king and decide whether it was a good omen or a bad omen and if it was a bad omen they couldn't go on, they had to stop the battle, they just couldn't go on, couldn't continue the thing they were planning. And they couldn't cross a stream without taking a new omen. Cicero was very, very anxious to be elected head of the watchers of the omens. He had no faith in them, he'd no belief in them but he thought it was a very important position in the Roman power and he wanted to have it. But the Romans had this meaning much like the Babylonians did and if you think that it all died with the Romans--

I was sitting in the street car one day and happened to glance at the fellow next to me and he had a little book in his hand that said, What Astrology tells us About What's Going to Happen Next Month. And it told which stocks were going to go up and which stocks were going to go down, what the star had to say about it. Now I never saw the man again so I don't know whether he became wealthy as the result of following the stars in his speculations or not. But there are plenty of people

today who use just as silly methods.

But among the Babylonians it wasn't just a silly idea, it was something that was scientifically worked out. They had hundreds of pictures of livers, and they had them arranged according to what ~~would follow the different signs~~ ^{was found at different times}, they made a definite science of it. And when you get away from the Christian ~~people~~ teaching that God is controlling the world, and that God deals in accordance with His plans and He reveals them only as he may choose, the secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him, not with the average (12 3/4) and the Lord sends things into our lives for His own purpose, sometimes He chooses to let us know and sometimes He doesn't. When you get that you have the complete answer to all this sort of interpretation, but when you don't have that, you can get scientists that are absolutely materialistic and they don't believe in any of this supernatural business at all, it's just fact, it's just what science proves, and you follow those men along for a few years and you'll find that most of them fall into some kind of superstitious nonsense of some kind or other. Because the human mind knows there's something more to life than just materialism. And if we don't find the answer ~~any~~ God has given it we're going to find it somewhere else. It's amazing that the people that seem to be so intelligent fall into the most crazy things.

But among the Babylonians this was almost done as a science and then all that stuff was buried and forgotten and about all we knew about it was this reference here in Ezekiel, which preserved the recollection of the habits of the Babylonians and describes the king here, making his arrows bright, they fired an arrow and saw where it landed, that gave them information. They consulted images and he looked in the liver. (14)

But now in chapter 24 we notice the Lord said to Ezekiel, Now, he said, this is the day that the king of Babylon set himself against Jerusalem, this same day. Well, Ezekiel told the people, the king of Babylon has today begun the siege of Jerusalem. Well, that's way across the desert, they couldn't know whether he was talking truth or not, not until they hear later on. But when they do and find it is right, it is a divine arrangement to increase people's confidence in the fact that Ezekiel is

God's messenger, that he knows the facts in advance...

O.T. History 329. (1 1/2)

...chapter 24 he says this day began the siege and in chapter 32 he says, verse 21, it came to pass in the twelfth year of our captivity, in the tenth month, in the fifth day of the month, that one that had escaped out of Jerusalem came to me, saying, the city is smitten. And then he goes on and gives messages of comfort to the people through most of the rest of the book after that. But in between, and Ezekiel is arranged in chronological fashion, there are very few places (1 1/4) in chronological order. Jeremiah is not, Jeremiah is a different (1 1/2) But Ezekiel is arranged according to a chronological fashion of arrangement. Every message is dated, and nine-tenths of the messages in the book are given in the order in which he received them. And the date is nearly always there, and in between chapter 24 and chapter 33, there are no more messages against Jerusalem, against Judah, against the Israelites, no more condemnation (1 3/4) in those chapters. During ^{these} the 38 years the Lord gave Ezekiel no message of rebuke for the people of Israel. The reason for that is perfectly simple. (2) Before that God is warning the people, telling them what is coming, preparing them for it. When it comes they are too shocked, they are too stirred, their emotions are too stirred by it, for him to give a message (2 1/4) probably would be stoned they just wouldn't be able to stand it. And God has him refrain during that period. But he gives messages but they are messages, there are many messages in here, but they are messages against the foreign nations round about. They are messages of God's wrath against the sin of the Ammonites, of the Edomites, of the Philistines, of the people of Tyre and Sidon and Egypt, and so on, those very interesting messages, many of which have been so wonderfully literally fulfilled, were given to them during this period. When to the people knowing their city was under siege and probably would be taken and destroyed, it was a comfort rather than a re(3) buke and it strengthened, instead of

turning their enmity against Ezekiel they'd look at the terrible things they were hearing from Jerusalem, they'd say well (3 $\frac{1}{4}$) Ezekiel warned us, he told us this was going to happen, but Ezekiel wasn't saying that. Ezekiel was giving messages which gave them the pleasure that misery has in company of knowing that these other things which were worse things were going to get their punishment too. God was against Jerusalem for its sin, but that didn't mean that he was condoning the sin of these other nations which were worse than Jerusalem. And so the book of Ezekiel is a wonderful picture of those times, it's a wonderful picture of the sin of Israel, the reason why God had to send them into exile, it's a wonderful picture with its prophecy of the future, of what's going to happen, but it's more than that, it's a picture of the way God directs his prophets in bringing his message and presenting it in such a way as to reach the hearts and minds of the people and to get a hearing for the message. Well, Ezekiel, then after the fall of the city, he then gives messages of comfort and ~~victory~~ ^{pictures} a great future and how God is going to bless, which do not particularly concern us in this particular course. But this part of it is extremely important and interesting in connection with the stories of the reign of Zedekiah. ¶ Now one interesting thing that has come to light in connection with the reign of Zedekiah, I've mentioned to you a number of times the city of Lachish. It's the second most important of the cities of Judah. The city of Lachish was destroyed by Sennacherib, conquered but was rebuilt later, a very important city. In 1890 (4 3/4) sent Petrie to excavate Lachish, he went to Tel el Hesi in Palestine which everybody agreed was Lachish and he there laid the foundation of modern excavation principles in Palestine, learned there the principle of the tel and the principles of the pottery. And any book up until at least 1925, at least the next 35 years after that, that tells about archeology of Palestine, refers to Petrie's excavation as the excavation of Lachish. About 1921 or 22 Professor Albright said that is not Lachish at all, Lachish is tel(5 $\frac{1}{2}$) and very few people paid attention to him for a while, eventually the British exploration fund was interested in a place to excavate, they picked Tel

they excavated there, and there they found true that that was Lachish, as Dr. Albright had in this case ^{had} correctly figured out ~~from~~ the arrangements (5 3/4) in relation to other cities in the Bible. And so from then on, Petrie's work is called the excavation of Tel el Hesi, not the excavation of Lachish. And the excavation of Tel _____ is called the Lachish excavation.

Well, I forget the year, was it about 1934 or 35 sometime along there, when the British were excavating at Tel (6 1/4) that the word came over the Associated Press that the, that a group of Israelite letters from the time of the destruction of Jerusalem had been found at Lachish. The most important discovery of written material ever made in Palestine. And the newspaper reporters immediately went to prominent archeologists and people like that all over these areas. And the paper came out and this one said, oh that's wonderful, and this one said, that's marvelous, and none of them knew anything about it except what they'd been told and they couldn't say much, until they got to Dr. (6 3/4) And he was very clever. The papers--they went to Dr. S _____ of the Univ. of Penna. and told him that they had discovered this marvelous group of material in Palestine. Dr. S (?) said, if that is true that would be something as great as the discovery of the Tel el marna letters. And he went on for a whole column to tell about the Tel el marna letters which were discovered back in 1883, and on the front page of the Inquirer they had a whole column of Speither about the Tel el marna letters, which the average person would know just as little about as they would the Lachish letters, and which are really much more important than the Lachish letters, because they're so much more extensive and they've been studied so many years and we know so much about them. Well, there's a great deal about them we haven't yet figured out. Now these Lachish letters are the largest group of written material in ancient Hebrew that we have. But they are very fragmentary. There are 21 of them, they're on potsherds, pieces of pottery, written on it with ink. We--of ancient Hebrew writing, just about all we have is the (8) _____ inscription, a few

occasional words in the El Amarna letters, the Moabite Stone and these Lachish letters. So they're very important but unfortunately very (8) damaged. But in these letters, on these pieces of pottery, we have evidence that this was when Lachish was besieged, in the last days before the conquest of Jerusalem. And you have in them, one place says that the lights, the signal lights of Ezekia we are unable to see any more. But names the cities they can see them--shows that they had a system of signalling with lights, especially with the enemy there, signalling from one town to another. And here the lights have ceased to come from one of the towns, which may mean that the Babylonians had now taken that town. We have evidence in them that some man was accused of treason there and he was under trial for it but it's very fragmentary, we cannot figure a great deal out about it. The word prophet occurs a number of times in them, some have thought it refers to Jeremiah, but we're not sure, and there was one name which is the name that occurs in Jeremiah, but unfortunately it's turned around, Jeremiah speaks of a certain man the son of a certain one, this has it reversed. And so whether it's the same one and one or the other is mistaken, or whether it is his grandson, we just don't know. So the But Lachish letters do not tell us a great deal, but they may one of these days, when we find a little more (9 $\frac{1}{4}$)

we can explain some of the other. But they are one of the very few actual ancient writings that we have found. And they do give that vivid picture, of the people in Lachish, looking for the signal lights of the other cities. And (9 $\frac{1}{2}$) noticing that there are no longer signal lights coming from ~~but they were getting them from the~~ ~~no-longer-signal-lights~~ others.

Yes? (student.9 3/4) Oh, yes, on the basis of stratification they have been definitely attributed to this time, I don't think any archeologist questions this. Now, of course, that's not to say they don't specifically mention Zedekiah, they don't specifically mention the Babylonians by name, so that there's one chance in ten thousand that there might proof come up (10)

but it's very, very unlikely, the evidence is such as to (10 $\frac{1}{4}$)

Yes? (student.10 $\frac{1}{4}$) No, thank you for that. That word letter unfortunately in English is very ambiguous, letter can be one individual letter of the alphabet, or it can be

the book of Romans, one letter. And these are letters in the sense, not of the book of Romans, if I send a letter to you of communication, if I put it in your post box, it might have three sentences in it or it might have 50. Well, the longest of these would have maybe 12. But most of them are rather short. They are actually either letters or memorandums. They usually call them the Lachish letters, but I think ~~memorandums~~ would be much better. Yes? (student.11) Yes, the Siloam inscriptions, didn't I mention that? Well, that's good to know a little bit about. It's in the museum in Constantinople, because it was found when Palestine was part of the Turkish Empire. So they took it there. It was found a long time ago before the turn of the century. But this is, in Jerusalem, there is a ^{tunnel} ~~exit~~ which carries water from a spring, to bring it into the city and Hezekiah tells us how he stopped up the water course and he closed this up and covered over this spring outside, in order to bring the water into the city. Well, it goes maybe as far as from here over to where I live. It goes that distance underground, it's so large that you maybe have to stoop your head, in some places you have to bend over pretty far. But this tunnel goes that distance there and it's quite a stunt in Jerusalem to walk through this, but it's a little bit dangerous because once every hour or so, there's a time when the water seems to spurt and to ~~come~~ ^{and} ~~of-course~~ it would be rather difficult to survive in there in such an atmosphere. And the other reason is that where the water comes out the Arabs there like to gather there at that pool and ~~wash~~ their clothes. And occasionally a young archeologist has walked through it and ~~muddied~~ up the water and made it difficult to wash their clothes, and when he stepped out and they've seen him, they've all picked up mud and rocks and thrown them at him. This is not very pleasant either. But somebody was looking around inside of this, I think it was about 1890, I forget just when now, and he noticed some queer marks on the side there and he told someone about (13) and they went and they investigated and made a light in there and they found there was a writing in old Hebrew letters, which is attributed to the date of Hezekiah. And in this writing, and if any of you have a copy of Gesenius' (13 $\frac{1}{2}$)

it is still our best

and in the front of it is a picture of the inscription with a translation. It's something like this, and this was the manner of the digging. The diggers started and they came together, they heard each other on the two sides of the rock and they cut right through together and they came together, and it shows what for those days was quite an engineering feat. To dig from both sides and to come through and to meet there in the middle and make a tunnel through.

And that is in old Hebrew letters, not the kind of letters we use now, they used to call them Phoenician^{letters,} they're rounded instead of square. They're the same characters we have but they're a little different in form. (14)

So that and the Moabite Stone, of course is in the Moabite language but that (14 $\frac{1}{4}$)

because it's just the same as our Hebrew except that it does not contain any vowel letters, it is usually considered that they didn't have vowel letters in those days (14 $\frac{1}{4}$) Yes?

Now those are our three principal things in ancient Hebrew, we have quite a lot more than that in Phoeniciah...

O.T.History 330. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...we have a few Aramaic inscriptions and then we have hundreds of thousands of Babylonian, and we have thousands of Egyptian, but in Hebrew we have really very little. (3/4) assume an importance beyond what they're worth.

Well now, number 7 was Zedekiah, and still under this heading of the Last Kings of Judah, I thought I would put number 8, Judah immediately after the destruction. Because after Jerusalem was taken by the Babylonian king, all the people were rounded up, that is the bulk of the people were rounded up and carried off into captivity. And when they got the people a certain distance away, they found that Jeremiah was one of the prisoners who was siezed and was being taken. And Jeremiah said to the man who was the official there, he said get word to king Nebuchadnezzar that I'm here, among

these people, and they got word to Nebuchadnezzar, and Nebuchadnezzar said to Jeremiah, if you want to go into exile with these people, you may, if you want to stay in Jerusalem you may. It's up to you. And evidently he'd been hearing about Jeremiah's good work in telling the people they couldn't win out anyway; they might as well give up their arms and surrender to Nebuchadnezzar, so Nebuchadnezzar thought of Jeremiah as an ally. Of course he was very unpatriotic, but he wasn't (1 3/4)

but he put loyalty to God ahead of loyalty to people of the nation, the group. And so the people (2)

but it was loyalty to God which led him to do what they considered unpatriotic. But Nebuchadnezzar of course didn't understand that. Nebuchadnezzar recognized him as an ally and told him ^{he could} which he wanted (2 1/2) and Jeremiah said I will stay. So after this we have an account in 2 Kings and in Jeremiah of the people who stayed in the land, there weren't many, but these people who were left in the land, we find that the king appointed a prisoner, a man who should be in authority over these people, except subject to the king of Assyria. And this account in 2 Kings, ~~chapt.~~ 25, verse 22 following, he picked out a good man and he said to him, Gedaliah, the son of Ahikam, the son of Shaphan, he said you are to be ruler under me. And Gedaliah said to the people, fear not to be servants of the Chaldees: dwell in the land and serve the king of Babylon and it shall be well with you. But it came to pass in the seventh month that Ishmael the son of Nethaniah, the son of Elishama, of the seed royal, came and ten men with him, and smote Gedaliah, that he died, and the Jews and Chaldees that were with him at Mizpah. And all the people, both small and great, and the captains of the armies, arose, and came to Egypt for they were afraid of the Chaldees.

Well, now that's the brief account in Kings, but one is told more at length in Jeremiah because these people came to Jeremiah and they said this man is a quisling (I don't think they used the word Quisling) but they said this man is a Jew who is disloyal, he's taken service with the --they probably called them collaborationists, he'd collaborating with the king of Babylon, he is ruling for him here, and they said we're

going to kill him, and Jeremiah said (3 3/4) Jeremiah said God has given the land over to Nebuchadnezzar and Nebuchadnezzar has ^{his} authority now ^{from} God, you are to submit, this is the time the Lord wants to purge out ^{the} sins of the people. ^{this} it is his will, ~~it~~ it is not his will that ^{you} we should kill this man. But they didn't listen to Jeremiah, they went and they killed (4 1/2) and then after they killed them they were afraid of the ^{power of} ~~senselessness~~ Nebuchadnezzar, who was way across the desert but when he heard of it he could send a strong force if he chose, and so they fled to Egypt, but they grabbed Jeremiah and carried him off. So poor Jeremiah was taken to Egypt and carried down there with these people and then the book of Jeremiah gives some of the prophecies that he gave in Egypt, and he died in Egypt. So his life was truly a sad life, standing for the Word of God and not being listened to much (4 3/4) even at this point. But in future (4 3/4) people had read Jeremiah's books and ^{it} they had a tremendous influence in the (5) world since that time.

But this (5) what happened in Judah immediately after the destruction. Jeremiah really was very patriotic. He was declaring the Lord's will but he hated to think of what was going to happen. And so Jeremiah wrote a book, five chapters long, which we call the Lamentations of Jeremiah; How doth the city sit solitary, that was full of people! How is she become a widow! She that was great among the nations, and princess among the provinces, how is she become tributary. The book of Lamentations, is Jeremiah's weeping over the destruction of Jerusalem. And he has been known ever since as the weeping prophet. Well we continue tomorrow morning.

6 3/4. That was 8, under C, under XIV. So now we go on to Romans 15.

XV, The Exile. A, The Beginning of the Exile. When did the exile begin? Well the answer to that question is similar to the answer to most historical questions. There is not a precise point at which it is necessary to say that the change between two historical periods occurred. I think that is very important for us to have in mind. I've seen little booklets with the title, "Are there two returns of Christ?"

Christ returns once. He's coming back, a second coming, there's not a third and a fourth. Therefore his coming is one instant, it all happens at once, there's not a series of events. Well, that argument is simply contrary to history. Every important change in history has had various points in it. It is not just one individual event. And we are told in the Bible that Christ's return comes suddenly, unexpectedly, nobody knows the day or the hour, and it seems to me that makes absolutely clear that the first recognizable event of it, is unexpected. There is no sign which we must then say this must come before it can occur. Now in the case of the exile, when did the exile begin? Well, it is natural to say the beginning of it is the end of the kingdom of Judah. That's the natural thing to say but I'm not saying that's the right thing. That, you might say, is the complete thing to say. When Judah was no more then the exile was there. Well, even that might, you might question, because you remember that after Jerusalem was destroyed and Judah was taken there was almost a year in which there were a large number--not a tremendous number but a sizeable number of people left in the land--and then they killed the King and they fled to Egypt. Well that was (9)

For them the exile really began when they left to go to Egypt. But that was a comparatively minor thing. But when did the exile begin? Well, the exile for a very substantial portion of the people, the exile began as described in 2 Kings 15:29. In 2 Kings 15:29 we read in the days of Pekah king of Israel came Tiglath-pileser king of Assyria and took various things and people and carried them captives to Assyria. So here we have Tiglath-pileser coming and overcoming Pekah in the northern kingdom and taking large numbers of people off to Assyria. Now whether he took half of the people in the northern kingdom, or a third or a fourth, we don't know. But he took a very sizeable number at that time. And that would be about 730 B.C. So if you want to know when the exile began, it began for a very substantial number of people, perhaps nearly as many people as the whole population of Judah, it began about 730. That's number 1, 2 Kings 15:29, about 730 B.C. Well then we read in 2 Kings 18:11, we read about the larger exile of the northern kingdom. This is 721 or 722 B.C., you can't tell just the year, but

you read the king of Assyria did carry away Israel into Assyria, and put them in Halah and in Habor by the river of Gozan and in the cities of the Medes. And this is the an exile which probably took 50% more people than the whole population of Judah, because this I would say was at least half of the people of Israel, the northern kingdom, and maybe two-thirds, included in this second phase of the exile. And Israel was always two or three times as numerous as Judah. So that this, might be called the beginning of the exile, or it might be called the exile of the northern kingdom, it's the second stage of the exile of the northern kingdom, the larger stage, and the northern kingdom is by far the larger portion of the two. People say where are the twelve tribes, and someone said not so long ago, they said in Hebrew vowels don't count, therefore they said Isaac's sons, if you don't count the vowels, you could have Saxons and so the British people are the ten tribes of Judah, of Israel, because they are Isaac's sons. Well, there are 50 other arguments just as silly as that which are advanced for the so-called British Israel, and it sounds so silly that you wouldn't think any sensible person would pay any attention to it but if you go through 20 years of ministry and don't strike at least one or two people who are very, very ardently devoted to this foolishness, why you're probably on a desert island somewhere. And Dr. Robert Fitzweilson told me of one time when he was invited to speak to a great gathering in England, to defend the scripture against the attack of the higher critics and he got up there and they had two or three noted lords there sitting on the platform, someone connected with the Royal family, I think, introduced them and there was a very outstanding audience that was there, and then he realized that from the words they said, that they were British Israelites, they were people who felt that the British people were the ten lost tribes. Well, of course, that was no great effect on them, his speaking there, because he was defending the Bible and they wanted the Bible defended, and I hope nobody ever thought (13 1/4) that he held with that foolishness. But it's the silliest arguments they advance, but it's important for us to realize that the exile isn't just Judah, it is the whole people and the whole people include Israel, and Israel is the larger portion of the

people but when they came back from exile it was ^{not} just Judah that came back, it included a substantial number of people from other tribes. And the twelve tribes are mixed together and what we call the Jews of today are not simply from the tribe of Judah, they represent the twelve tribes. There is absolutely no--some have said the American Indians ~~represent~~ ^{are the lost} ten tribes. But there are many different theories. But there are no lost ten tribes. The ten tribes went into exile first, the other tribe went into exile later, they mixed together and became known by the name of the largest tribe and the one which had lasted longest, ~~practically~~ ^{consequently} the whole group is called Judah, but many were not from the tribe of Judah but from other tribes. Yes? (student. 14 $\frac{1}{4}$) Oh, that we'll come to later, but just one brief word about that is in point, just a word of clarification now. Assyria controlled the whole area east of the desert. And then it is through Palestine and Syria and all this region, in fact Syria is really Aram but it's called Syria, abbreviation of Assyria. Then Babylon took over the whole empire, which included all that had been Assyria...

O.T. History 331. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...but others would be ⁱⁿ different portion of the empire, and then when they came back they came from different sections, although ostensibly from Babylon, so when they came from Babylon we don't simply ~~mean~~ ^{mean} from the city, we mean from the area which was held under their power, which is represented by Babylon. But it was a good question and good to clarify, though I don't want to take time on it because (3/4)

⁵ But the exile then of the northern kingdom, then, was to Assyria, and the southern kingdom to Babylon, that's important to have in mind. But they both were in the same area, except the capital would be different, when each of them held this whole large region. Now that is the second ~~stage~~ ^{stage} of the beginning of the exile. And the largest of all. Then number 3, the third stage is in 2 Kings 24:1 and this is more than a hundred years later than the second. In 2 Kings 24:1, we read that Nebuchadnezzar came up into the land of Israel and Jehoiakim became his servant 3 years, and then he turned and rebelled against him. Now this would be approximately 602 or 603, just before 600 B.C. Just a little bit

later than that. Let's see, 586 was when Zedekiah was ~~when~~ taken, then
 597 was when Jehoiakim was taken, so 608 is when Jehoiachin became
 king and reigned 11 years. And this is about 3 or 4 years after, yes,
 just about somewhere between 604 and 603. (student. $2\frac{1}{2}$. What is the
 year 606 noted for? That's a year that's usually mentioned.) 606,
 I believe, would be when the king of Egypt, Pharaoh-necho, the king
 of Egypt came into the land and he held them. I doubt if Nebuchad-
 nezzar got there quite (3)

I'm not sure whether we have evidence to establish ~~it~~ exactly in that
 period. But 606 is used often ($3\frac{1}{4}$)

(student. $3\frac{1}{4}$. I thought it was for this. I'm not exactly sure but ~~it~~
 is a prominent number.) Well, it's somewhere between 606 and 603.
 My ~~information~~ ^{inclination would be toward} is a little bit later than 606. But this was a small
 stage of the exile. It would hardly ~~be~~ be worth mentioning if it were
 not for its being the beginning of ~~the~~ movements which came ~~later~~ on.
 This ~~was~~ was a time when the people were made subject to Babylon, they'd
 been made subject to Pharaoh in Egypt just before that, and the Baby-
 lonian king did not take many people into captivity at this time.
 But we find a further explanation of this ~~perbd~~ period in Daniel 1 where it
 says in the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim king of Judah. Yes,
 the third year would be pretty close to ($4\frac{1}{4}$)

It wouldn't be much after, so perhaps 606 is a fair date to give for
 that. 606, in the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim ~~king~~ king of
 Judah came Nebuchadnezzar from Babylon and besieged it. And the Lord
 gave Jehoiakim king of Judah into his hand, with part of the vessels
 of the house of God, which he carried into the land of Shinar to
 the house of his god, ~~and~~ Well, now that doesn't sound like any ($4\frac{3}{4}$)

does it? It sounds like a tribute, many a king did that
 before. ~~Many~~ But in verse 3 and 4 it says, And the king spoke to
 Ashpenaz the master of his eunuchs, that he should bring certain of

the seed of Israel and of the king's seed, and of the princes; children in whom was no blemish, but well favoured, and skilful in all wisdom, and cunning in knowledge, and understanding science, and such as had ability in them to stand in the king's palace, and whom they might teach the learning and the tongue of the Chaldeans.

So we see that here, probably 606 is a good number to use for it, it would be very close to that anyway, that in 606 Nebuchadnezzar took certain of the princes away. Mostly young men to be trained to be in his palace. That you would not call an exile if it were not for the later stages, because the so few were involved. But there were a few involved, perhaps a hundred, I don't think we have evidence of any more. But there's many a time when two nations have fought and at the end of the war one of them has taken hostages from the other. Many a time that's happened. If the exile didn't follow after, we wouldn't call this the beginning of the exile. But since the exile did follow after, as far as Daniel was concerned, this was the beginning of the ^{ex} exile, about 606 B.C., because that's when he was taken into exile, and, now, when the Romans came into Palestine about 60 B.C., they took hostages, they took a young man to Rome, he was brought up there, he was there for 20 or 30 years, educated a Roman, then he came back and became king of Judea, his name was Herod. He had lived for 20 many years in Rome as a hostage, but that didn't make an exile. That was not an exile. Most of the people were in their land. ~~But~~ This I wouldn't call an exile except that the other stages followed it, and for those who went and didn't come back, they stayed, so for them it wasn't an exile. And so we can call 606 the third point in the exile and it would be the beginning of the second main stage of the exile of Judah, not mentioned really in 2 Kings 24:1, merely alluded to there, but mentioned very definitely in Daniel 1:1-4.

Then number 4, 2 Kings 24:14-16. Now this sounds more like an exile, 2 Kings 24:14-16. It says there ~~that~~ the king of Babylon took Jehoiachin and it says he carried away all Jerusalem, and all the princes and all the mighty men of valour, even ten thousand captains, and all the craftsmen and smiths: none remained, save the poorest sort of the people of the land. And he carried away Jehoiachin to Babylon, and the king's mother and the king's wives and his officers, and the mighty of the land, those he carried into captivity from Jerusalem to Babylon. And all the men of might, even 7,000, and craftsmen and smiths a thousand, all that were strong and apt for war, even them the king of Babylon brought captive to Babylon. Now there is a tremendous exile. There is very, very large movement, but not as large as (8) because Israel was much larger, but that is a very, very large movement, and that is 597 B.C. From this description here you'd almost think that was the greatest movement as far as the southern kingdom was concerned. Certainly ^{it} was a movement that took the outstanding people, because it says it took all the trained people and left only the poorest of the land there. And then the final stage of it is in 25:11,12. 2 Kings 25:11,12. Now the rest of the people that were left in the city, and the fugitives that fell away to the king of Babylon, with the remnant of the multitude, ~~the~~ did Nebuzaradan the captain of the guard carry away. That is right after the capture of the city. They have taken king Zedekiah, carried him out captive, this was the final end of Jerusalem, as far as that century was concerned, 586 B.C. So that in the fullest sense the exile begins in 586, with this fifth phase. The outstanding people of the land, the bulk of the trained, skilled people were taken away in 597. A few of the princes, particularly young men, sort of as hostages for good behaviour of the people here, and to be trained to be helpers in Nebuchadnezzar's court, were taken in 606. And then of course we have the two stages of the early beginnings of the exile.

Well, now, the land was to lie fallow for 70 years, Jeremiah said. There would be 70 years of exile, when do you start the 70 years? Well, the best way to ~~know~~ is to find out when it ends and then count back 70, that's the easiest way to work it out. Because if you take the beginning and figure ahead, there would be nobody on earth who could say which of these five would be the proper time to build upon. Naturally, Jeremiah said it's after the first two stages so it wouldn't be till then. But some might say it would be 586, that's the final end. Some would say 597 because that's when the outstanding people went. I doubt if anybody would've said it was 606 when the little group of people went, Daniel and a few princes went, something that had happened over and over again in every country, when one country was victorious in a war. 606 would be of no importance if it weren't that the other two follow, and the other two having followed, it becomes the beginning of this whole thing. And at the beginning it is possible to consider it the beginning of the exile. But it is another example of the fact that the Lord does not usually give us his prophecies in order that we can know exactly what is going to happen. Prophecy is not history written in advance, in the sense that we know just what's going to happen. The Lord doesn't want us to know just what is going to happen. But the Lord gives ^{us certain} ~~the first~~ indications of what's going to happen, and certain specific points in it in order that when they occur our faith is strengthened and in order that we may properly prepare for certain places in his future plans. ~~The~~ prophecy is history in advance if you mean it contains true things that are going to happen. It is not history in advance if it means that it contains a detailed picture so that we really know in detail what's going to happen. And can exactly work it out. Yes? (student.12.)

No. After the 2nd stage, 1st stage. He gave it a hundred years after the whole of the first stage. Well, then, the nature of the captivity.

B, The Nature of the Captivity. We won't take a great deal of time on the nature of the captivity, but I don't think that most Christians have a real understanding of the nature of the captivity. And I think it's good that we should have an idea just what the captivity really was. Now we think of captivity, we think of a man being in a dungeon, we think of a man being in prison. He's a captive. Well, it doesn't have to mean that, you're a captive if you're subject to another nation. You're a captive if you're under the control of others that you don't want to be under the control of. In the extreme sense ^{a prisoner, being} ~~end~~ of it, being/in a dungeon, something like that, it was a captivity in that sense for Jehoiachin, who was taken and kept in prison for many years. It was only after the death of Nebuchadnezzar that he was released from prison. He was in prison and doubtless there were people ~~that the Babylonians would~~ ^{about him whom they considered} war prisoners, whom they kept in prison, though most of those they killed, but there were probably some they kept in prison. But the bulk of the people were not in prison, the bulk of the people were captive in the sense in which the people of Poland and Czechoslovakia and the other nations behind the Iron Curtain are today subject to Russia. Now it was furthered in that sense because they were removed from their homeland. But they were removed, most of them, to other sections of the Empire and the people from those sections had largely been removed, many of them, to their sections to which they had gone, and the people in these other sections were carrying on their lives with comparatively little hindrance. Instead of being an independent country they were part of the Assyrian Empire. And instead of being a united part of the Assyrian Empire, since their country was simply subject to it, they were scattered through various sections of the empire, though in large groups, scattered in

large groups in various sections, but in the captivity they had very substantial individual freedom, they built their own houses, they carried on their business, many of them became well-to-do, many of them entered government service and secured important positions, they became an integrated part of the empire. It was a place which was not bad for, it was an awful lot better for many of the nations that had been conquered than they had been under their own people.

O.T.History 332. (½)

...if it were not for God's promises ^{to them} and God's interest ^{in them} and the plan ~~which~~ he had for them to use them as his means for bringing Christ into the world, you could say that for the bulk of the people they would be better off scattered and integrated into a large empire with power of becoming great in that empire and getting along well in that empire than as a little small nation, cut off from all th the rest. So that for the individual the bulk of them found ~~themselves~~ quite contented and quite prosperous in the regions ^{to} which they were taken in exile, well not necessarily immediately, but within a comparatively short time they found themselves as well off as most of the other (1½) but the thing ~~that~~ kept alive their patriotism and their dissatisfaction ~~with~~ this was the promises of God. We read in the Psalms they say sing us a song of Zion. How could we sing a song of Zion in ~~the~~ a strange land, how could we do our task, singing a song of Zion. There was a longing for their own land and a longing which was more and more stressed as a longing for the land which was the land of promise, the land where the Lord had plans for them, the land where the Lord wanted them to be, the land which was the place where God had promised to give His blessing to them. And so the interest in their returning to their land and the desire to return was kept alive by the Bible and by the stress on God's

promises. It was not simply a patriotic desire but to a very large part a religious desire to return. And when the exile came to an end there were great numbers of people who felt much better satisfied to stay in the countries of the exile than to go back to Palestine. So the nature of the exile, the captivity, is something that we should have well in mind. It is brought out very clearly in the book of Daniel, you'll find that Daniel and his friends very soon become prominent in the empire. Now here is Daniel who cannot eat the king's meat. Daniel does not want to defile himself. This meat has been offered to idols, he has nothing against meat, he's not a vegetarian, but he does not want to eat meat offered to idols, and he cannot make that clear to the men who have charge of the training in the service of the king of Babylon. He simply requests that he may follow his own particular practices, and avoid eating this meat, and the king says, the eunuch says well if you come before the king and you don't look as well off as these others, you're all peaked and thin, he says I will lose my position, I may even be killed for not taking proper care of the fellows I'm supposed to fatten up, ^{strengthen,} ~~make ready for service~~ the king properly. And Daniel and his friends, three friends, said give us a test, let us just take pulp, let us take vegetables and just drink water, and they start off to drink water, no vitamins in it, none of the amino acids they need, and this vegetable, how are these people going to be strong and well, and the Lord worked miracles, the Lord caused that the vegetables that these fellows got were vegetables that grew in the section of the land where there was more fertility in the soil, more vitamins in the soil, they got their protein and their vitamins and everything that they ordinarily would get, the Lord directed in the bringing of the food, the particular food they got, so that without touching the meat, which ordinarily they would need for

their greater strength, these fellows were able to show themselves better and stronger than the rest, but you notice that as far as the Prince of the Eunuchs was concerned, he didn't care what their practices were, he wasn't greatly interested in that, but he was interested that they be able to do their part in the king's palace, that's what he was interested in, And then in chapter 2, so Daniel and these men get prominent positions, they're not mistreated, they get prominent positions, now in chapter 2, we find that the, well, of course he explains the dream in chapter 2, but in chapter 3 you find that Nebuchadnezzar puts up a great image and says everybody has got to bow down and worship the image. Now did Daniel bow down and worship the image? Did Daniel refuse to worship the image? Where does it say Daniel refused to worship the image? There's no mention of it. Chapter 3 does not mention Daniel at all. And it's all about the three friends, Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego. (5 3/4) They're called like the three Babylonians, Abednego means the servant of Nego, they are heathen names which these three men were given by the king of Babylon. They go by these names. And they were well-liked and successful in his court, but now he puts up this image, and everybody has to bow to it and he is very angry when they don't bow. Well, it's quite evident that he hadn't been doing that right along or their face would have become obviously (6½)

Wooley the excavator of Ur of the Chaldees has a theory which is a very interesting theory. There's not sufficient food to establish but it's a possibility. He gives it in his book on Ur of the Chaldees. He says that he found in the great temple of the moon god in Ur, he found the evidence of the great temple, the way it had been before the time of Nebuchadnezzar and then he found evidence of how Nebuchadnezzar had made changes in the Temple and you can tell because as we mentioned already Nebuchadnezzar always had his name stamped on the bricks that

went in to the great buildings that he had built. And so this great Temple of the moon god, one of the great temples of the world at the time, this great temple at Ur, before Nebuchadnezzar's time, had in the very inside a small room in which there was the statue of the god, and then in front of that it has a small corridor coming into it, a very small corridor by which you can get into that room, then it has large store rooms round it, so that you could not see into it at all. It was like the temple in Jerusalem. In the temple at Jerusalem, only the high priest went into the Holy of Holies. The ark of the covenant was not seen by the people, while Wooley says that in most of the temples of Babylonia previous to the time of Nebuchadnezzar there was an inner shrine in which the statue of the god was, and the priest came in there and offered incense, and then the priest might carry the statue out and carry it in procession through the streets, but the people did not see the statue in there because it was in the room which was not open. But he says that Nebuchadnezzar tore out the store rooms in front of the shrine and established a great wide open way so that the people could look into the front of the Temple and could see the statue of the god standing there in all its splendor. And Wooley suggests that this means that Nebuchadnezzar introduced a new custom of having the statue in prominent view so that the people as a whole could bow down and worship it instead of doing it through the instrumentality of the priest as was generally done before. And that would mean that ordinarily an individual wouldn't go to those services at all, but here Nebuchadnezzar perhaps in introducing the custom, he says, I've built this big statue (9¹) and everybody in the neighborhood is to be there, and when the time comes they're to bow down. Well, maybe Daniel was off on a trip for the king, perhaps he'd sent Daniel to represent him to go to the court of Persia or somewhere else, perhaps Daniel was away on business of some sort or other, perhaps he was sick and home in bed, we're just not

told anything about this, but we are told that Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego refused to bow down and there's not a single mention of Daniel in the chapter. But these three friends of Daniel's refused to bow to the statue and the Lord miraculously intervened to keep these three men from being killed. Now maybe in other parts of the empire there were a few hundred others that didn't bow that God did not intervene and save and that were burned in the furnace, or were beheaded for their stand. We don't know. But there was no great amount of persecution during the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. During the reign of Nebuchadnezzar such incidents were rare, and we find that when the people, after this, at the beginning of the Persian period, when they wanted to injure Daniel, they had to get a special edict that for 30 days nobody will pray or make any request of anybody except the king. Crazy thing, the king, I suppose they flattered him up to the point where he was ready to sign something without really thinking about it and he signed the thing, and they did it in order to catch Daniel. It shows that under ordinary circumstances, that sort of religious persecution was not there. The exile as a whole was not a time of persecution. There were individual instances of it, and individual points like this, when the king put up this great statue. Are we to think that these three men are the only men who wouldn't bow to it, that all the other kings bowed to it. I don't think that that is what happened, I think that probably there weren't many of them in this particular area, because these three are so conspicuous by their failure to bow to it. They were in the service of the king, they were in important positions, they were supposed to do it and they refused, and God honored their faith. And the exile was a time of great testing for the people, a time when it would have been easy for their faith in God to have been completely wrecked but it was a time when God intervened with this outpouring of miracles, one of the four great periods (11½)

but just all the evidence we have of that particular one is in the book of Daniel, it ~~was to be~~ ~~the~~ these which happened in connection with Daniel's life to show God's power and protection so that the people throughout the empire would hear of it and would have their faith strengthened in God (12)

(student.12) It's entirely possible that God caused that the particular vegetables that they got would have in them what they needed, it's possible that he placed certain unusual elements in the air, that they breathed in, and got it that way, it's possible that even that he injected it directly into their system by some unseen method, it's possible even that he had fortified them in advance with a good many of these elements, so that they didn't particularly need it at that particular period, we just don't know. I would say that there's this about it, that it was God's hand in it definitely, that it wasn't just that anybody that would just confine themselves to pulse and water would be just as well off as somebody that eats the good food that was provided for these people. These were good foods, they were the best foods in the land, provided for the king's people, and they should make them strong, but God made up for it in another way, but whether it was a supernatural thing or whether it was a providential thing, it was a miracle in either event, a definite action of the Lord. And an action that we cannot demand of the Lord. To me one of the most important statements of this 3rd chapter is where Nebuchadnezzar said to Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, if you will not worship my god, ye shall be cast the same hour into the midst of a burning fiery furnace, and who is that God that shall deliver you out of my hands? And verse 17 says, if it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver ~~you~~ out of thine hand, O king. Verse 18, says, but if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up. They don't mean if God is unable to deliver them, they knew that he was able to deliver them.

They mean if he does not choose, to deliver us, because God chooses in many cases that people shall suffer and die for his cause, that they shall lose out as far as earthly advantage is concerned, and it is His will that **We** set an example and we show our loyalty to God by actually **losing** out, not **having** (14 3/4)

God might have chosen that Daniel in the furnace there should be martyred, that they should come before the king looking peaked and pale and thin, and that he would say what's the matter **with** you fellows, if they won't eat the good food **we're** given, throw them out, put them in prison. (15)

But in that case He
did use (15) to glorify
by giving them his wonderful blessing...

...
 ...but these men didn't know. For all they knew he might in their case do as he had in many many others prefer to have us glorify him through suffering rather than glorify him through his marvelous deliverance. Well, the nature of the captivity then was as a whole not a time of persecution, not a time of suffering, not as a whole, but there were individuals who suffered persecution, and it was a time when it would have been easy to settle back and enjoy the general prosperity of the Empire and forget all about God. God intervened to keep that from happening. Yes? (student. 1) Yes, they did, but they had many, many captive men, and there is no evidence that he made a great number of them slaves. Now, if this was the first nation he'd conquered he probably would have made all of them slaves. But he had conquered a dozen nations, other nations, perhaps bigger than they before this, and he probably had all the slaves he needed then. He probably took some. But if he had taken a great number I think it would have said. We do have many of them living in very (1 3/4) in different parts of the empire. Then capital C.

C, The Fall of the Neo-Babylonian Empire. The Neo-Babylonian Empire did not last a long time. Nebuchadnezzar had a fairly long reign, from about 606 till 562. During this period of 40 years he established his power and made many great conquests and he devoted the latter years of it almost entirely to great building. That took tremendous resources. He used up a great deal of the resources of the Empire with all this building that he did and as he grew older he didn't have the energy to go and do a lot of fighting and the general strength of the empire was lessened very considerably. He was succeeded by his son, Amo-marduke. Now his Amo-marduke who reigned from 562 to 559, only about two years, his son was not well-liked and was finally assassinated. It was not a successful reign, we probably would not even mention it if it were not for the fact that he ^{is} mentioned in the Bible. 2 Kings ends with Amo-marduke, or as it's spoken of here Evil-~~merodach~~^{merodach}. It came to pass in the 37th year of the captivity of Jehoiachin king of Judah in the 12th month; on the 27th day of the month, that Evil-merodach king of Babylon in the year that he began to reign did lift up the head of Jehoiachin king of Judah out of prison. And he spoke kindly to him and set his throne

of the kings that were with him in Babylon: and changed his prison garments, and he did eat bread continually before him all the days of his life. And his allowance was a continual allowance given him of the king, a daily rate for every day, all the days of his life. Well this was after 37 years in prison. That's a long, long time, 37 years in prison, and then Nebuchadnezzar died, and all the rest of the king Nebuchadnezzar's life he left this young king of Judah who had only reigned three months in prison. And then, when Nebuchadnezzar died and his son became king, for some reason or other he thought it was a nice thing to do to release him from prison, and so he released him from prison and gave him an allowance for himself and his family and within the last ten years there has been discovered in Babylon, tablets listing the allowance, saying that for Jehoiachin who had been king of Judah and his family, his children who are named, there is a certain amount set aside that is to be provided for them, for their care, in this first year of Amel-mardake. A very interesting corroboration of this account in 2 Kings. Now was 2 Kings written at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem? Well, if it was, these last few chapters were added 25 years later. Maybe 2 Kings was written as a whole was written at this time, 25 years later, we don't know. But 2 Kings runs through a time 25 years, 25 years after the beginning of the exile. That's the last event described in it. Then, when he was killed, he was succeeded by a man who was mentioned in the Bible though that fact was not recognized until the present century. History has told us about (5 3/4) Nerigisser, the old doubting general of Nebuchadnezzar.

Nerigisser, but he was rather old by this time. We have the Greek form of his name--Nerigissar. He reigned from 559 to 556. He was a strong capable man but he was pretty old by this time. In the Babylonian form, his name was Nergal-sharezzer. Nergal, protect the king, Nergal is the god of protection. But in the Greek form it's Nerigisser. (student.6¹. spelling of name) Well, now, up to a few years ago nobody knew that he was mentioned in the Bible. But there's an interesting verse in the book of Jeremiah. Jeremiah 39:3. In Jeremiah 39 we have the account of the conquest of Jerusalem and the destruction of Jerusalem which is repeated in chapter 52. And in chapter 39 it tells how Nebuchadnezzar besieged Jerusalem, took it and verse 3 says,

And all the princes of the king of Bab lon came in, and sat in the middle gate, even Nergal-sharezer, Samgarnebo, Sarsechim, Rabsaris, Nergal-sharezer, Rab-mag, with all the residue of the princes of the king of Bab lon. How many princes are named here? How many? As it is vocalized in our English text, it would sound like six wouldn't it? Sound like six princes, but two have exactly the same name, Nergal-sharezer, and that's a queer way to name six princes and name two of them exactly the same, isn't it? But of course our English was translated from the Hebrew and the Hebrew was copied and re-copied and re-copied and re-copied. But the Babylonian was not known because all the tablets were buried. And now we know that in the Hebrew as it stands today there is only one mistake and that mistake is the insertion of a hyphen. Samgar-nebo, there should be no hyphen, or perhaps better, move the hyphen to the end of nebo instead of the beginning. So what you really have is this, all the princes of the king of Babylon came and sat in the middle gate. Nergal-sharezer of Samgar, Nebo-sarsechim was Rabsaris, and then, as if it was an afterthought, having told us that Nebo-sarsechim ~~the~~ Rabsaris was there, he says Nergal-sharezer was ^{the} ~~of~~ Rabmag. You see, Rabsaris and Rabmag, we now know are two names of officials of the king of Babylon. And so Nergal-sharezer was the Rabmag and Nebo-sarsechim was the Rabsaris which is literally the Chief of the Eunuchs. And the first one named is Nergal-sharezer and it says Nergal-sharezer, Samgar. Well, we have a Babylonian tablet listing officers, chief officers of Nebuchadnezzar, which mentions Nergal-sharezer of Sinmaguer. Well, now if you take Sinmaguer and you say it in Hebrew, how would you say it? Anyone who has had as much as a month of Hebrew doubtless knows that a (9 3/4) * nun before another consonant is assimilated, and consequently Sinmaguer would become Simaguer and so the nun would not be written but the mem would be doubled and in the Hebrew manuscripts they don't indicate the double, that's a comparatively recent thing, the indication of it. And so it was just written samech, (10 $\frac{3}{4}$)* and the name Shagar was well-known and so it easily got pronounced Samgar. It's very, very difficult to preserve the pronunciation of foreign names, very difficult. In fact you just can't.

I went into a barber shop in Berlin once, ~~Y~~ man turned to me he said to me in

German, why, here's an American, he can solve our argument. We're having a big argument. In German Felle is Falls, and what is the correct pronunciation Niagara Felle, or Niagara Felle. Well I told him it was neither one but Niagara, they just threw up their hands, couldn't figure it. When one man told me once that he had relatives in the United States and I asked him where they lived and he said in Iowa, and I asked him where, and he said Iowa, Fort Doge, Iowa. Well the Fort gave me the clue it was Fort Dodge Iowa, but it seemed to him a sensible way of pronouncing it. And it's that between any two languages. Proper names we just cannot pronounce because the pronunciation is different and people won't even get your name if you pronounce it the way you say it in your own language. So that here it is a marvelous evidence of the accuracy of the scribes that they took these names and after the end of the Babylonian realm sounded just like nonsense to them, they were strange foreign names and they copied them so accurately, though they had no idea what they meant, that as you look at it here, in the Hebrew and English it looks like six names, and yet the only thing that's wrong in the letters is a hyphen between Samgar and Nebo where it shouldn't be, because Samgar is the end of the name of Nergal-sharezer. Nergal-shareze of Simaguere. And the Nebo is the beginning of the name Nebo-sarsechim. So it is a marvelous evidence of the fact that God has not written the Bible on metal (12¹/₄) where the weather cannot touch it, and nothing can happen to it, and every letter remains exactly as it was, there are slight changes that have come in in copying but they are very slight, and the original was absolutely free from error, the copies have an occasional error of copying which has come in, but the number of errors of copying is tiny compared to that of any other ancient work from ancient times. We have most any other work and you will find many, many times the errors in copying that you have in the Bible. Yes? (student. 1?) There are just two, in this particular verse there are two great princes, Nergal-sharezer and Nebo-sarsechim. Two individuals named there, then we have another one named in a few verses further, Nabuzaradan the captain of the guard, whom we also have evidence was Nebuchadnezzar's assistant. Yes? (student. 3¹/₄. What are the officers Rabsaris, and Rahmag?) It's pretty hard to say for this reason. That the literal

meaning has been lost, they've become titles of honor. "Rabsaris would be the prince of the Eunuchs, and Rabmag, there's some discussion whether it means the great chief of the chief of the bakers. There's some discussion. But it's actually like in England, various princes will have names referring to services around the palace which they never do at all. These are probably names of services that are honorary titles given to men who are leaders in the army or leaders (14¹)

So the precise literal interpretation of the word doesn't mean much, but it is a name of an office the functions of which probably vary. We have a great deal of evidence on Assyrian offices of state. On Nebuchadnezzar's officials we have very little evidence. This particular tablet that names these officials here is the only tablet that I know of that names Nebuchadnezzar's officials. And for the Assyrian kings we have many such tablets. But Nebuchadnezzar, in all his inscriptions, talks as if he did everything himself. And so when people say well if Daniel was such a great man in Nebuchadnezzar's household in his government, why don't we have tablets of names? Until this inscription was found we could say he didn't have tablets for any of his officials, he simply claimed credit for everything.

C.T.History 334. (14)

...princes of the king of Babylon came in and sat in the middle gate. There was Nergal-sharezer of Simaguere, there was Nebo-sarsechim who was the Rabsaris. Now Nergal-sharezer was the Rabmag. You see, they are identified by the place, ^{he comes from,} you give the second one as identified by his position, then you go back and tell the position of the first one. Well, we'll continue there at 2:35.

- (2) We were speaking this morning about the fall of the Neo-Babylonian Empire, C, and under that we mentioned Nerigissar who reigned from 559 to 556. He was rather elderly when he took the throne, he died after three years and was succeeded by his son (2¹) Now this son's name does not occur anywhere in the Scripture. He only reigned 9 months, he's not particularly important from our Biblical viewpoint, not nearly as important as the two previous kings because both of them are mentioned

in the Bible. He only reigned nine months and he was killed and there was a conspiracy which sat upon the throne a man named Nabonidus. He reigned from 556 to 539, 17 years reign. The reign of Nabonidus was ended by the conquest by the Persians. Cyrus the Persian conquered Babylon and sent Nabonidus into exile. Babylon became now a part of the Persian Empire. That was the fall of the Babylonian Empire, an empire which lasted for about 65 years, but which was very powerful and very great while it lasted. In connection with Nabonidus, he is not mentioned in the Bible but he is referred to in the Bible, or maybe not referred to, maybe implied would be a better word. How many of you can tell me how he is implied in the Bible? How many? Quite a number. Mr. Mitchell, how?

(student.3 3/4) I guess everybody recalls that, doubtless, from our introduction to archeological material here, we notice how Babylonian material corroborates the Bible in some places and in others at first sight seems to contradict it, but on examination, as we get fuller data, we find it fits perfectly. Hope everyone has that in mind. Now in Daniel 5 we have Belshazzar mentioned and only a few years ~~it~~ it was thought there was no such man. Belshazzar is mentioned as king and the lists of kings we have do not contain any such name and now we know that when Belshazzar said I'll make you the third ruler of the kingdom it implied that Nabonidus was indeed the first ruler, and Belshazzar the second. Now there is one other thing there that I'll very briefly mention, we read that the, in verse 10 of chapter 5, that the queen, by reason of the words of the king and his lords came into the banquet house: and the queen said to him there's a man in thy kingdom (last part of verse 11) whom the king Nebuchadnezzar thy father, the king thy father, made master of the magicians, astrologers, Chaldeans, and soothsayers. Now twice she calls Nebuchadnezzar the father of Belshazzar, and yet we now say Nabonidus was his father. Which is correct here, the Bible or the archeologists? Was Nabonidus his father, or was Nebuchadnezzar his father? How can the one man have two fathers? Was he the adopted son

of one of them? (student. 5 3/4. Was he a grandson?) That is one possibility, very good possibility. The fact that in the Bible the word father is used for ancestor just as son is used for descendant. He could be an ancestor, now in such a case, that has been guessed by some people, that the queen here mentioned is not his wife but his mother. And that she is the daughter of Nebuchadnezzar. Now of course (6 1/4)

that the queen was his wife it would be quite natural here that the one who tells him about one from an earlier reign would be his mother, who would know kings before he was familiar with them. And the queen came in and she says thy father, meaning her father who was his grandfather. That is entirely possible. But it does not prove that Nabonidus' wife was the daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, it does not prove it, because in ancient times th the word son and father are also used of successors and predecessors in the

6 3/4. throne. The Assyrian writers speak of Jehu son of Omri, and Jehu had actually killed all the descendants of Omri but he was his successor. The word son is often used for a successor. So the Bible when it says thy father doesn't necessarily mean that he was the blood father, it might mean a predecessor, the fact that it's repeated twice, thy father Nebuchadnezzar, the king thy father, would seem to me to suggest that it means more than a predecessor, and it is entirely possible that his mother was Nebuchadnezzar's daughter, we just don't know. At least there's proof of any contradiction from the fact that his real father, his immediate father in the English sense, was undoubtedly Nabonidus. Well, there was a tablet found twenty years ago which says that ~~the~~ in that night the king's son was (7 3/4) slain, — which fits exactly with the statement here, in that night Belshazzar was slain.

Now there is here in Daniel another immediate problem but that may relate more to the next period but still I think it would be worth taking on it right here, that we have our Bible open to chapter 5 here. In that night was Belshazzar the king of the Chaldeans slain. And Darius the Median took the kingdom, being about threescore and two years old, sixty-two

years old, it pleased Darius to set over the kingdom a hundred and twenty princes. Now any history book will tell you that Cyrus the king of Persia conquered Babylon, and incorporated Babylon in the Persian Empire. But the end of chapter 5 here says that in that night was Belshazzar king of the Chaldeans slain and Darius the Median received the kingdom. Well, now what about them? If the history books say Cyrus the king of Persia conquered, and if the book of Daniel says that Darius the Mede took the kingdom, and the next chapter tells about Darius' relation to him, is that a contradiction between our historical evidence and the Biblical statement. The higher critics all say that it is. But if you will look closely at chapter 5, you will find that chapter 5 says in verse 28, my kingdom is divided and given to the Medes and Persians. It doesn't say given to the Medes. The critics all believe that Daniel teaches that after the Babylonian Empire there was a Median Empire, and then after the Empire of the Medes there was a Persian Empire, a fact which has no evidence in history, in fact all the evidence is against it, but they say that's what Daniel teaches and therefore the Book of Daniel is completely wrong, as you would expect if it was written 400 years later, ^{as they think it was,} three to four hundred years later by somebody who didn't know anything about it, made up some stories. But you notice here that in verse 28 it says the kingdom, it doesn't say given to the Medes, it says given to the Medes and Persians, and the (10) of Persians is not a new addition because the word he's interpreting is (10 $\frac{1}{4}$) which has nothing to do with Medes but does with Persians. The chapter itself says that the Medes and the Persians are one Empire, not two. And then we go on to the next chapter and you'll find that Darius who was the king here, who has Daniel put in the Lions' Den, that the men come to Daniel in verse 15 and they say to the king know, O king, what the law of the Medes and the Persians is. Pretty good proof and also verse 8, according to the law of the Medes and Persians. Pretty good proof that the writer of Daniel

considered the Medes and the Persians to be one Empire rather than two. And in addition to that you can notice that it says Darius the Mede took the kingdom, the Aramaic word there which is translated took is better translated received. Now you receive might be that he received it because he took it by force, but it's not the usual way you say it. But if he received it from Cyrus and made him sub-king under himself, that would fit perfectly. And that is in the opinion of most conservative Bible students the probably interpretation, that this Darius the king who set 120 princes over the kingdom and over these three presidents of whom Daniel was third, that he was the king over the Babylonian area, but put there by Cyrus the Persian. There's one other statement that fits with that too, that over in chapter 9 we read, the beginning of chapter 9, in the first year of Darius the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, which was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans. Well when a conqueror (12)

we don't usually say he was made king. Now you could, but it's not the usual way, but to say he received the kingdom and he was made king over it fits exactly with the idea of Cyrus putting him in as a subordinate ruler under Cyrus. Now that's not proven but that is certainly a possibility and the critics' idea that Darius the Mede and a Median empire that's otherwise unknown to us, that (12½) doesn't exist but the book of Daniel tells about it, certainly is contrary to the statements in the book of Daniel because it speaks of the law of the Medes and the Persians (12 3/4)

Yes? (student. 12 3/4)

yes, because

the editors of it believe that Daniel is false ^{to history} and there is a Median empire in there and so they give a translation which is not there an inaccurate translation but which is, of various possible translations, selecting the one that contradicts history instead of an equally correct one which would not contradict history, a somewhat better but not--I don't say the other is absolutely necessary but the other is at least slightly the more natural

interpretation

But if it was for their argument I don't think they

Yes? (student.13 $\frac{1}{2}$) Daniel 6:28 says, so this Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian. Well, we have considerable information from Cyrus about how he conquered Babylon and what he did thereafter. In this information there is a (14 $\frac{1}{4}$) who was made his representative in ruling Babylon. It is most probably that this man whom he called (14 $\frac{1}{4}$) is the man whom the book of Daniel speaks of as Darius. Now we don't know much about the situation, we know of the great conquest by Cyrus and we know of the great events in Cyrus' life but the details of his administration of (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) we don't know. It is altogether...

O.T.History 335. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...and Darius reigned a couple of years and then he decided that he did not care to have a man with the title of king under his rule of Babylon, there's too much danger of insurrection so he would rather have just somebody with the name of governor and call himself king, the one king, supreme (1) and so in Daniel here it's speaking of the reign of Darius and then of the time when Cyrus did away with (1) that's entirely possible. Now it is also not impossible, when he speaks of the reign of Darius and the reign of Cyrus the Persian that he is speaking (1 $\frac{1}{4}$) of the same time, one the immediate king and (1 $\frac{1}{4}$) Like you could say during the time when so-and-so was governor of Pennsylvania and so-and-so was president of the United States. I think that's less likely but I think that's also highly possible. Well, this is a very important problem in connection with the criticism of Daniel. For our history whose purpose is not so much to determine the authenticity of Daniel as it is to know what the facts are, as to what occurs, and the

fact is that there is no historical evidence of a Median empire in between the empire of the Neo-Babylonian Empire and the Persian Empire. But now--Yes? (student.2) Yes, that goes right on to our next subject. Thank you, that was a very good transition to our next subject. Because we were just speaking of C, the Fall of the Neo-Babylonian Empire, now we speak of D.

D, The Rise of the Persian Empire, and under that number 1.

1, The Medes. Yes? (student.2½) I'll take a second on that, though that is prophets rather than history. The book of Daniel is divided in two parts. Chapters 1 to 6 are the account of the events of Daniel's life. Chapters 7 to 12 are ^{the} ~~divisions~~visions that God gave Daniel. The events of his life in 1-6 go through in chronological order, then the visions he has go through in chronological order, so that chapter 7 is the first year of Belshazzar, which you see is earlier than chapter 6 or 7. Chapter 8 is the third year of the reign of Belshazzar. Chapter 9 is the first year of Darius the Mede, chapter 10 is the third year of Cyrus king of Persia, and chapter 11 is not the first year of Darius the Mede. I said it's not, not is.

And then we go on to D, The Rise of the Persian Empire, number 1, the Medes. And the Medes are a wild people, that is in the viewpoint of the settled Babylonians, the more settled Babylonians, they are a wild people living in the northern part of what is today Persia. And these Medes had had their battles with the Assyrian Empire, never been conquered by the Assyrian Empire, they had had their battles with the Elamites these people of Elam who were to the east of Babylonia, they were a factor in history for a long, long time. And now the Medes become a very important factor in connection with the downfall of the Assyrian Empire because it was the army of the Medes and the army of the Babylonians which together had over-

whelmed Neneveh. But the Babylon took over the Assyrian Empire, most of the Assyrian empire but the Medes who had been friends with the Babylonians who had been cooperating with them in this, it was only a rather unstable alliance, and the Medes continued as a separate nation, not particularly friendly with the Babylonians, but just south of the Medes there was a group which called themselves the Persians, just how subject to the Medes they may have been we don't have a great deal of evidence. But there was a king among the Persians who had ancestors who'd been kings of a section called Anshan, a rather small section. Call that number 2.

2, Cyrus, king of Anshan. Now this king of Anshan threw off all obedience to the Medes and began conquering nations near him and the king of the Medes decided that he'd better put an end to this danger of this aggressor Cyrus king of Anshan, and so he led an army against him in 553 B.C. And this army which came against Cyrus, and everybody thought would make short work of him, when they faced Cyrus, his own soldiers rebelled against him, and delivered him into the hands of Cyrus, and in an hour Cyrus leaped from the position of king of Anshan, a rank hardly better than petty prince, to the proud position of king of the Medes. And so he called himself king of the Medes and Persians, but he was from the Persian group rather than from the Medeian group. So they speak of the laws of the Medes and Persians, but eventually they call him just the king of the Persians. He had the Median soldiers joining with him, not conquered and destroyed but turning to him, and so he became king not so much of a force that had overwhelmed the Medes as of a force which had been welcomed by the Medes as supreme power, but his people soon became the supreme leaders in the empire, so the Persian empire was combined of the two groups, the Medes and the Persians, of which the Medes had been by far greater until 550 B.C. And after that, Cryus has the whole empire in

his hands, that is the whole region of the Medes and the Persians. And in 553 Cyrus starts to conquer territory north of Babylonia, territories which were not in the Babylonian empire, and in the next ten years, Cyrus' armies went north of the Babylonian region, conquering section after section, they got ~~the~~ the wealthy cities of Asia Minor and they conquered one after another till they came to the River Haleh which was the border of Lydia the territory of (8 $\frac{1}{2}$) Croesus. Croesus is known proverbially as the richest man who ever lived. King Croesus. We say rich as Croesus. Well, Croesus was king of Lybia, had been king there for many years, in Asia Minor, and Cryus faced Croesus in 546, Croesus went to the Delphic Oracle in Gree in Greece to ask whether he should attack him, the Delphic Oracle said if you attack Cyrus, a mighty empire will be destroyed. Croesus thought that meant ~~Cyrus~~ Cyrus' empire but the battle proved it meant Croesus' empire. So that Cryus conquered most of Asia Minor, and Cyrus is, the Persian empire is pictured with its rapid conquests in the book of Daniel in the visions that Daniel saw. This rapid conquest went along north of the Babylonian empire and then way along to the west of it, into Asia Minor, and the people were down there in Babylonia in the reign of Nabonidus seeing how ~~this~~ Persian had become head of the whole Median group which had joined with them ^{fifty} ~~six~~ years before to overcome the Assyrian empire and now was swinging through all this country and soon had an empire just about as big as Nabonidus' empire and naturally the next thing ~~that~~ happen~~d~~ ~~ed~~ would be for Nabonidus' empire to come in conflict with it. Well, this progress of Cyrus, this tremendous progress (9 3/4) which eventually resulted in conquering the Babylonians is something which th the Lord permitted Isaiah 200 years before to have a wonderful picture of in a vision. We look at the book of Isaiah, chapter 39, and we find that the ~~chapter~~ ends with a declaration of God, through Isaiah, to Hezekiah, that his descendants will be taken to Babylon, not to mighty Assyria, but off to Babylon. And that there in Babylon they will be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon. Now that was a startling prophecy that

Isaiah gave because Assyria at that time of Isaiah was the great tremendous nation, and Babylon was a comparatively weak force then, Nineveh usually held in subjection, he said his descendants will be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon. And immediately after that, the end of Isaiah 39 there is a sharp change in the book of Isaiah. It is the belief of most conservative interpreters that chapter 39 ends the portion of Isaiah which was given in the reign of Hezekiah. So that after the death of Hezekiah when he was defeated by his son Manasseh and there was such terrible wickedness in the land, and eventually, according to Jewish tradition, Manasseh killed Isaiah, but during that time the Godly realized that Isaiah's predictions of exile were bound to be fulfilled, they realized that, they imagined themselves already in that situation, and Isaiah wrote a book to comfort them, to comfort them that the exile was not forever, God would deliver them, and to assure the exiles when the time came that he was going to deliver them. And so ~~th~~ Isaiah ~~wrote~~ looked forward 200 years into the future, and in chapter 40, he says, comfort ye, comfort ye, my people. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem and cry to her that her warfare is accomplished. ~~S~~He had received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins. Those people away over there in Babylon in exile but God said, verse 4, every valley shall be exalted, every mountain and hill ~~shall-be-made-low,-the-difficulties-will~~ shall be made low, the difficulties will be removed from their way, for them to come back home again, to Palestine, and at the end of the chapter we find them fainting at the long journey, which took four months of travel to get from Babylon over to Jerusalem. He says, he gives power to the faint and to them that have no might he increaseth strength. Even the youths shall faint and be weary, and the young men shall utterly fall, but they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength, they shall mount up with wings as eagles, they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint. This long journey across will not be too much for them, they will

the end of the exile. Well, the next chapter, 41, depicts the people in Babylon there, in the Babylonian empire, seeing Cyrus coming in this great progress that we have just described, and Cyrus crosses the mountains of Persia and rapidly spreads across the territory north of Babylon and on through Asia Minor, and they hear the reports of what is happening, and all the nations are filled with terror as Cyrus comes. And chapter 41 starts, Keep silence before me, O islands, let the people renew their strength, let them come near, let them come to judgment. Who raised up the righteous one from the east. Who is the righteous one from the east? Well, that's Cyrus of course. Who brought this man Cyrus, an instrument of God's righteousness, from the east? Called him to his foot, gave the nations before him, made him rule over kings, gave them as the dust to his sword, as driven stubble to his bow. He pursued them and passed safely, even by the way that he had not gone with his feet. All the Persians had never been here before, Cyrus is going, place after place after place conquered in this rapid conquest, shortly before the end of the ^{Neo-}Babylonian empire. God said, I did this. Who did this? He says, I am the one who did it. He (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) then goes on, a picture, verse 5, the isles saw it and feared, the ends of the earth were afraid, the people (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) were filled with terror. The people of the Greek islands there are wondering what to do, as the great Persian army comes. They (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) but God says that thou, Israel, art my chosen, Jacob whom I have chosen, you should not fear because I have raised up Cyrus. Well, somebody might say...

O.T.History 336. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...1.the righteous one of the east that Isaiah speaks of as ($\frac{1}{2}$)

200 years later. Well ($\frac{1}{2}$)

let's go on and see how it all fits together. We go on then to chapter 43, and in chapter 43 we find in verse 3, that the Lord says to Israel,

For I am the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour, I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee. Since thou wast precious in my sight, thou hast been honourable, and I have loved thee, therefore I will men for thee, and people for thy life. And after Cyrus conquered Babylon, he let the Israelites go back but then he went on, he and his son, and they conquered Egypt, & Ethiopia, here mentioned. They conquered them, it is pictured as a ransom that God gives them for letting Israel go. Verses 5 and 6 tell the people of Israel they're going to go home. Fear not, I am with thee, I will bring thy seed from the east, and gather thee from the west. I will say to the north, Give up; and to the south, Keep not back. Then we move over to chapter 44, and there in 44 God tells what he's going to do. 44:24, thus says the Lord, thy redeemer, ~~At~~ I am the Lord that makes all things, verse 25, that frustrates the tokens of the liars, makes diviners mad, turns wise men backward; verse 26 that confirms the word of his servant, and performs the counsel of his messengers; that says to Jerusalem, thou shalt be inhabited, and to the cities of Judah, ye shall be built, I will raise up the decayed places thereof, Jerusalem is going to be rebuilt. Now when Isaiah writes this Jerusalem hasn't been destroyed and won't be for another hundred years. But this is nearly a hundred years after that, says it's going to be rebuilt. That says to the deep, Be dry, and I will dry up thy rivers. That's usually considered to be a figure of speech for Mesopotamia, the two great rivers of Mesopotamia. I will dry up the rivers, not meaning a physical drying up of the rivers, but a bringing to an end of the power of the great empires of Mesopotamia, and that came through Cyrus's conquest of the Babylonian Empire. That says to the deep, Be dry, and I will dry up thy rivers; That says of Cyrus, He is my shepherd and shall perform all my pleasure, even saying to Jerusalem, thou shalt be built and to the temple, thy foundation shall be laid. And of course all the critics say it actually mentions Cyrus by name here so that proves that Isaiah didn't write this

at all, that this is written at the time of Cyrus, that is what they say, but we say if God could give the name of Josiah 300 years ahead, why couldn't he give the name of Cyrus too? But the fact that he actually uses the name Cyrus here at the end of chapter 44 is proof that when before he told him the the righteous one from the east ~~what~~ ^{that} comes and conquers ~~his kingdom~~, it's Cyrus of which he is talking. So that we have Cyrus mentioned here at the end of chapter 44 and it continues speaking of Cyrus. Thus saith the Lord to his anointed to Cyrus whose right hand I have holden to subdue nations before him, I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the gates of Babylon, the two-leaved gates, and the gates shall not be shut. I will go before thee and make the crooked places straight, I will break in pieces the gates of brass and cut in sunder the bars of iron. And so he is picturing here so wonderfully the coming of Cyrus and his establishing his power over the nations, and he says that it is God that is giving him the power to do this, that it is God who is establishing. /~~over~~

Chapter 46 tells us what's going to happen to gods of Babylon. Bel boweth down, Nebo stoops, their idols were on the beasts, and on the cattle. They stoop, they bow down together, they could not deliver the burden, but themselves are gone into captivity. Babylon is going into captivity, verse 2. And then in verses 10 and 11 of chapter 46 he says, Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure: Calling a ravenous bird from the east, the man that executes my counsel from a far country, yea, I have spoken it, I will also bring it to pass. So he calle Cyrus the righteous one in one verse, in another one he calls him the ravenous bird, depends on how you look at it, If he's God's instrument to do ~~God's work~~ ^G he's the instrument of God's righteousness, he's the righteous one. If you look him as the great aggressor, gobbling all the land, he's a ravenous bird that is conquering everything

in his way. And the result of it is told in 47, what happens to Babylon. Come and sit in the dust, O virgin daughter of Babylon, sit on the ground, there is no throne, O daughter of the Chaldeans. Verse 5, Sit thou silent, and get thee into darkness, O daughter of the Chaldeans for thou shalt no more be called the lady of kingdoms. And then in chapter 48, verse 20, the Israelites definitely found they are going to be delivered. Go ye forth of Babylon, flee ye from the Chaldeans; verse 21, they thirsted not when he led them through the deserts, he caused the waters to flow out of the rock for them, he clave the rock also, and it gushed out. Now of course we are not examining this great section of Isaiah, the book of Comfort, we are just glancing at its relation to the Old Testament history, and seeing the vivid picture it gives of Cyrus' rapid conquest and the assurance as the people see them they need not fear as the heathen do, but rejoice because he's God's instrument to deliver them from Babylon, and so Cyrus then conquered Babylon, killed Belshazzar, established himself in power over this great region, and reigned until his death in 529.

Now just a very brief survey of Persian history during the remaining years of Old Testament history. That will be number 3.

3, Succeeding Kings. We are not going into the end of the Persian Empire because that brings us beyond the limits of the Old Testament. But we want to look at the Persian Empire during the rest of what has any direct relation to any Old Testament book. And so number 3, Succeeding Kings, Cyrus's son, Cambyses reigned from 529 until he committed suicide in 522. When he killed himself in 522, after conquering Egypt and thus receiving the ransom that God gave for Israel, the ransom of Egypt and Ethiopia, on his way back in 522 he committed suicide. He heard a false rumor which terrified him, committed suicide and another man, not a direct relative but perhaps related distantly, named Darius became king, and Darius reigned from 521 to 486. During his reign the temple in Jerusalem was rebuilt.

Cyrus let the people go back, but in Darius's reign the temple was rebuilt. Darius had a very difficult time getting established as king, after Cambyses killed himself, there were a number of fights for the throne, Darius had to fight in many provinces, which was fortunate for our knowledge of archeology. He fought in many provinces but he established himself as supreme, and then he put a great monument up at (8½) in Persia, celebrating his victory and naming all the provinces he had defeated, and he put it up in three languages and that gave us our, the first proof of the reading of the Babylonian language, the reading of that monument that he put up there. But Darius reigned then from 521 to 486. You see, he had a long reign, he held all of the old Babylonian Empire, plus the old Persian region which extended even into India and he held Asia Minor and he held Egypt. And he was succeeded by Xerxes his son. And Xerxes whom many think to be the Ahasuerus of the book of Esther, though others think that was (9½) , Xerxes who reigned from 486 to 465, decided to go still further and conquer Greece, and it was a great epic of Greek history, how the Greeks in their little city states, fighting for their freedom, were able to keep from being conquered by the mighty Persian empire which, of course, had to send its army tremendous long distances, and the armies were made up of perhaps thirty different languages, and they weren't well organized but there were tremendous numbers, and the Greeks--the Battle of Thermoplae, the Battle of Salamis, the Battle of Marathon, these battles famous in Greek history, represent their succeeding in keeping their freedom from Xerxes. But (10¼) was succeeded by his son Artaxerxes, who reigned from 465 to 425, and after the reign of Artaxerxes, conservatives do not believe that anything more was written in the Old Testament. And consequently from the viewpoint of Old Testament History there is no need of our going further in the history of the Persian empire. But I want them to show its relation-

ship to the Biblical history, to give a very brief summary, I'm not going into many details because they are not, there's not much about them in the Bible, there's comparatively little. But we will take Roman Number XVI, which is, Return and Rebuilding.

XVI, Return and Rebuilding. You see, ~~XV~~ was The Exile, and under the Exile the Rise of the Persian Empire was what ^{brought} the Exile to (11½) and to an end. Now I might have just given, begun the Persian Empire and then taken up XVI and gone on with it, but I thought it would be just as simple dealing with it, to give this picture (11½) the end of Artaxerxes. And then XVI, Return and Rebuilding. And under that:

A, Return Under Zerubbabel. Now this is, this return under Zerubbabel was brought about because of Cyrus's conquest of Babylon. And the Bible tells us, we have no record of it in archeological sources that have yet come to light, but the book, we've already noted that 2 Kings ends with Jehoiachin being ~~let~~ out of prison 25 years after the Babylonian conquest. 2 Chronicles tells about the conquest of Zedekiah, and then its last two verses jump ahead: Now in the first year of Cyrus king of Persia, that the word of the Lord spoken by the mouth of Jeremiah might be accomplished, the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus king of Persia, that he made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom, and put it in writing, saying, Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, All the kingdoms of the earth hath the Lord God of heaven given me; and he has charged me to build ~~him~~ an house in Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Who is there among ~~you~~ you of all his people? The Lord his God be with him, and let him go. And that's the end of 2 Chronicles. But those two verses which end 2 Chronicles, begin the book of Ezra. They are repeated on the very next page of our English Bible, almost word for word. Cyrus said that God had given him the victory, now the people of Judah may return to Jerusalem (13½)

it says the Lord God of Israel, the people who worship him may go back to Jerusalem which is in Judah and build his house.

Then the beginning of Ezra, which continues the history right after 2 Chronicles, goes on to tell how some of the people now went back. Well, this (14) of Cyrus naturally strikes us as very interesting. Did Cyrus the king of Persia recognize the God of Israel as the one who had given him all these powers? We have no record of it in the records we have from Cyrus. We have no record in his records of his letting the Jews go back. Well, what is it then? Is it an imaginary thing, did it never happen? Did some Jew make up this story and put it in here? Well, we have an interesting (14½) on it in the book entitled THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST which some of you now own and I wish all of you will some day own. In THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST...

O.T.History 337. (½)

...Cyrus on page 206 to 208 and here is an inscription by Cyrus telling about his conquest of Babylon, and after he tells about his conquest of Babylon here, he thanks the gods of Babylon for having given him the control of Babylon. He says on page 206 of this book that the Nabonidus had not worshipped Marduk properly. He says the worship of Marduk the king of gods he had changed into abomination, daily he used to do evil against Marduk's city. Upon their complaints the lord of the gods became terribly angry and he departed from their region, also the other gods living among them left their mansions, wroth that he had brought them into Babylon. But Marduk on account of the fact that the sanctuaries/ of Sumer and Akkad had become like dead, turned back his countenance, his anger abated and he had mercy on them. He scanned and looked through all the countries, searching for a righteous ruler willing to lead him in the annual procession. Then he pronounced the name of Cyrus, king of Anshan, declared him to become the ruler of all the world. He made the Gutti country and all the Medes bow in submission to his feet (Cyrus' feet). And Cryus always endeavoured to treat according to justice the Babylonian people, they call them the black-headed whom he (Marduk) had made him conquer. Marduk the great lord, a protector

of his people/worshippers, beheld with pleasure Cyrus' good deeds and his upright mind and ordered him to march against his city ~~κ~~Babylon. He made him set out on the road to Babylon going at his side like a real friend. His widespread troops strolled along, their weapons packed away. Without any battle, he made him enter his town Babylon, sparing Babylon any calamity. He delivered into Cyrus' hands Nabonidus, the king who did not worship him. All the inhabitants of Babylon, as well as the entire country of Sumer and Akkad, princes and governors, bowed to Cyrus and kissed his feet, jubilant that he had received the kingship. Happily they greeted him as a master through whose help they had come to life from death. ~~And~~ And so he says that he took over Babylon at the direction of Marduk the god of Babylon, And then over on page 208, he says, I return to the sacred cities on the other side of the Tigris the sanctuaries which have been ruins for a long time, the images which used to live therein and established for them permanent sanctuaries. I gathered their former inhabitants, I returned them to their habitations. Furthermore, I resettled upon the command of Marduk, the great lord, all the gods of Sumer and Akkad whom Nabonidus has brought into Babylon, the anger of the lord of the gods, unharmed, in their former chapels, the places which make them happy. May all the gods whom I have resettled in their sacred cities ask daily Bel and Nebo for a long life for me and may they recommend me to Marduk, my lord, they may say this: "Cyrus, the king who worships you ~~κ~~ and Cambyses his son..." Well you see the claim he makes here. It is the god of Babylon who has given Babylon over to Cyrus. The god of Babylon has turned against Babylon and given it to ~~Cyrus~~ Cyrus, and the various gods of Babylon, of the different cities, he has sent back, which had been brought into the city of Babylon.

Well, you see from here Cyrus' strategy. The Assyrians and the Babylonians took all of the gods from the different countries and they brought them to Babylon, and they took the people and they removed them

and resettled them in various areas to force them to be subject to Assyria and to Babylonia. Now Cyrus sees a chance to make friends with these people by reversing the process. He says to these people you've been taken into exile, you've been carried away by these wicked Assyrians and Babylonians, your gods are angry about it, they have brought me to deliver you. I'm letting you go back to your own land, I'm letting your gods go back to their own temple, I am brought by your gods to deliver you, that's the attitude that Cyrus took toward these various gods in Babylon. Now the Bible pictures that as the attitude that Cyrus took toward the God of Israel, and it would seem that Cyrus, that was his political method. The armies had overwhelmed these nations before, now he's going to make friends with them, he's going to live with them; of course, they're still be under, they're still right under his thumb, but instead of their being under the thumb of the wicked Babylonians and Assyrians, they're under the thumb of the righteous, good, friendly Cyrus. They will charge them the same taxation, treat them about the same, but he delivered them from the others and that makes them subject to him. That's his strategy, that's his policy. And the Bible represents Cyrus in exactly the way that he represents himself to these other gods. The only thing is we have no reason to think, no proof at least, that Cyrus actually personally recognized the God of Israel. We have none of his writings which show his recognition of him, but we do have exactly the same relationship represented as his claim, and of course the Bible says that God brought Cyrus, raised him up, gave him power to deliver his people. Cyrus says Marduk raised me up to deliver his people, and he says that of all the other gods. Well, Cyrus was ready to admit all the gods raised him up, and he helped their people, then the people should be subject to him of course. But we of course believe that what the Bible says about him is true. It was God who raised up Cyrus. God brought him for this purpose, God did it to deliver His people and take them back.

The other gods, they took their statues which were in Babylon as proof of the conquest, they carried them back with them, but probably not many people went back, the people were well established where they were, they were contented there, not many of them went back to their own land. But the Jew and the other Israelites, having kept alive through the exile, the belief in their one God the true God, and having Isaiah's promise that Cyrus would come and deliver them and let them go back, a substantial number of them, though probably a small proportion to the whole, were willing and ready to risk the miseries of a long journey across the wilderness and the life in a territory which had just been torn to ruins by the conquerors and left in ruins a hundred years before and just growing up in weeds and ashes, to go back there and to undertake to rebuild a place where they would have the true worship of God. Now since the other gods, they gave the statues to them to take back, in ^{this} case there are no statues, there is no statue of the God of Israel, but there are the vessels from the sanctuary, the various things from the Temple, which had been carried away by the conquerors and which Belshazzar had, was using there when he saw this handwriting on the wall, and he gives these to them and tells them they may take them back, and so the facts about Cyrus, letting the exiles go back, as described in the Bible, are not corroborated by specific archeological evidence but fit exactly with the evidence of that archeology gives of the general attitude of Cyrus toward the various people whom the Babylonians and the Assyrians have conquered. Yes?

(student.9) That was along the crescent, yes, but along the crescent, there were long wilderness areas. There were fine cities and well-established sections and then there were sections where there wasn't...

(student.9½) The easiest route was to go up around it. (3/4)

That is undoubtedly the way they went.

Though across the wilderness is very difficult, though not impossible, because it's a very rough country there and a very dry country and the Arabs once found themselves in a situation where across that wilderness they had a revolt, and they couldn't take time to go around, they had to get there as fast as they could, and they had no way to carry enough water to get across, so they took their camels and they made the camels drink all the water they could possibly get into them and then they started out and as they went along they killed camels along the way to get the water out of them, and that way they were able to get enough water to get across, but that is such a very unusual way that in the Arab Chronicles much is made of it, the very unusual situation showing the ingenuity of the tremendous power of that particular Arab conqueror. Ordinarily it certainly would not be. Of course, now an airplane can go straight across without any difficulty. In fact I believe they drive across, but in those days ($10\frac{1}{2}$)

Cyrus, then, gave the command that they could go and we have it described in Ezra 1, and we read that he gave them, the last verse says, All the vessels of gold and of silver were 5,400, and these did Sheshbazzar bring with them of the captivity that were brought up from Babylon unto Jerusalem. And then we have the list of some of the people who came with Zerubbabel and made this trip back, and there was a substantial number of people, but a comparatively small part of the whole people, who undertook to make this long journey back and it took them four months on the way to get across, and if Cyrus conquered Babylon in 539 B.C., then it would be within the next couple of years that they made their way back. So that it would be between 539 and 536 that the beginning of the Return took place, and it's interesting that if you go back from that time 49 years, if you go back from that time 49 years you come to this time of the destruction of Jerusalem. Jerusalem was destroyed in 587, in 539, 49 years later, Cyrus conquered Babylon and let the people go back. And there are

those who think that ~~that~~ 49 years fits exactly with the statement that you have in the book of Daniel where you read in Daniel 9, that he says in Daniel 9:25, Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks. If we take that as seven weeks of years, that could be 49, just the time that passed. And there are some who believe that is the 49 years, though most people do not. But it's interesting that it exactly fits if it is.

Now in the same chapter of Daniel it refers to Jeremiah's statement that the land is going to be (13½) for 70 years. He says, chapter 9:2, he understood from Jeremiah the prophet that he would accomplish 70 years in the desolations of Jerusalem, and he set his face before the Lord to pray. Well if we go back 70 years from 538 we get 608 and assuming they didn't get started for a couple of years, it would be maybe 536 they went back, that would be about 606, about when Daniel and the few princes were taken, which we could think of in a way as the beginning of the Exile, though actually it was ^{twenty} ~~ten~~ years later before the real (14) occurred. Well, we have to stop there...

O.T.History 338. (½)

...XVI, Return and Rebuilding, under that A, The ~~Return~~ under Zerubbabel. This is described in the beginning of the book of Ezra. It came, as you notice, a little less than 70 years after the first small group was taken from Judah, and a little less than 50 years after the great bulk of the land of Judah was left desolate. This return we notice was by the permission of King ~~Cyrus~~ and while we have no (1¼) evidence regarding it, we have evidence that it was in line with the attitude which Cyrus took. So the proclamation was given and Cyrus made available to them materials to take back. We read that ~~he~~ made these materials, means, available to Sheshbazar the prince of Judah. And then

in chapter 2 we read about the people who came with Zerubbabel, Chapter 1 these were made available to Sheshbazzar. And there is considerable disagreement as to whether Sheshbazzar is the first prince and Zerubbabel his assistant who succeeded him, or as to whether Zerubbabel and Sheshbazzar are two names for the same man. The answer to that problem is something^{on} which conjectures can be made and arguments can be based on inferences from a word or two of Scripture, personally I always feel in a case like this when there is no clear proof, that it is much the wiser policy to say we just do not know and evidence may come for one or the other. Which of the two the Scripture has not made clear. But Zerubbabel led a comparatively small group of people back. After this period which can be by round numbers called 70 years. The comparatively small number were allowed to go back to live in communities of their own, and to take the sacred vessels for the Temple. They were supposed to be allowed to build the house of the Lord. Well, with Zerubbabel there was the High Priest who is called Joshua, in chapter 3 of Ezra, is called Jeshua. Elsewhere he is called Joshua. They got back there and they proceeded to establish homes for themselves and they settled in a very desolate land which had been run down terribly and it was very difficult to get re-established. This was about 538 when they returned. Well, after the return they intended to build the Temple right away, but the building of the Temple is a difficult task, it is a large task and a difficult task, they made a very nice beginning on it, and then in chapter 5, we read of the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin heard they were going to build the temple and they tried to interfere with it. In chapter 4, we read how they interfered. First they came to Zerubbabel and the leaders, and they said let us build with you for we seek your God as you do, and we sacrifice to Him since the days of Essarhaddon king of Assyria who brought us up higher. Now that was a very fine thing to have assistance. The little group of them would have a very difficult job to get this great temple

built. As a matter of fact it was many, many years before it was completed. And here were these people who had been established there north of them, established for some time, they say we worship the same God that you do, we want to help in building this temple. But under the circumstances Zerubbabel and Jeshua and the leaders of the people were very wise to examine the situation carefully. If these people were indeed of one mind with them, if they worshipped God as they did, it would be very, very foolish to fail to take advantage of their help in building the temple. There is many a group which has split over very, very minor points, and which each part has tried to build something, and neither part has succeeded because neither part had the energy to do it. I know of one church up in north Jersey which nearly split over the question of whether the crucifixion was on Wednesday or on Friday. Some thought it was one, some thought it was the other, and they got so angry at each other, they didn't see how they could work together. And I heard of a group yesterday out in central Pennsylvania, a church which some years ago split because when we first began getting cars with bumpers, one group thought that they should have the bumpers black, it was (6 $\frac{1}{2}$)

white bumpers, and so today I was told that half of the group has ordinary automobiles, the other half has automobiles with fine chrome on them and are just like the others except that their bumpers are painted black, so they're called the Black Bumper Church. And are distinct from all denominations in central Pennsylvania. There are all sorts of divisions and refusals to work together over very, very minor points.

But in this case there was not a minor point involved. These people who wanted to help them in building the temple were people who had the Samaritan religion which was a mixed religion. They claimed to worship the Lord but actually they had various teachings in their worship which

were definitely contrary to the teaching of the Scriptures. And under these circumstances, to bring them in to the building of the temple, would result not in building a temple to the Lord at all, There was a man once when I went to Bible Institute of Los Angeles who was the pastor of a big Presbyterian Church who came and spoke to us, and he said he was going to speak on doctrinal preaching. He said that he had, some of his people came to him and said we'd like you to give us some doctrinal sermons, we'd like to know what we believe. Well, he said, you think I want to empty my church? Why should I do that? The people said, well, give us one and try it. He gave one, and instead of cutting the crowd down, the crowd increased, so he thought it was a good thing to give doctrinal sermons. Well, what was his purpose in running a church, it was to get people there. Well, to get people there he gave just one joke after another, amused them, and made them leave feeling that wasn't a tough job to go to church. We've been good people, we've gone to church and we enjoyed ~~joined~~ the church when we were there, but they got nothing. But he knew the Scriptures, he had graduated from a sound theological seminary, he understood the Gospel, and when they asked for it he gave it to them. When it comes to believing in the sense of considering to be a fact certain beliefs, but when it comes to believing in the sense of putting your trust in it and believing that this is what God wants us to have, I would say he was a rank unbeliever. He was interested in getting people instead of interested in getting the message of Christ to them. Well, in this case Zerubbabel and Jeshua very sensibly said these people are not true believers . If we let them help us in building the house to our God, it will be not a house for the worship of God, it will be a pagan temple.

When I first got to Berlin I went to the American Church in Berlin and I was a graduate of Princeton Seminary and there was a fellow graduated from McCormick there, a very fine chap, and we became acquainted and we

were together a good bit of the time in Berlin. And then we both ran on to a fellow who was a very, very fine chap from American studying medicine. And he was over there, a very nice fellow and we had lots of associations with him, but he was a very outspoken atheist. A very, very strong atheist and a vegetarian. And he was very pronounced in his attitude but, as I say, a very cultured fellow, and I was interested ^{to hear} ~~in him and~~ this fellow from McCormack ~~said~~, oh how I wish we could get him into the church, the church needs his culture, if we could only get him into the church. Well, I'd like to get him converted, to know the Lord, to get him into the church. He needed the grace of God, it wasn't that the church needed him. These Samaritans needed the grace of God, but they didn't have it. And here was this little group trying to build the temple and better never to get the temple built than have it built and then prove not to be a temple of the Lord. So Zerubbabel and Jeshua and the rest of the people said to them, you have nothing to do with us to build a home for our God, but we ourselves together will build under the Lord God of Israel, as king ~~Cyrus the~~ Cyrus the king Perisa has commanded us. And then the people that weren't ~~allowed~~ ^{to help} them, then they proceeded to weaken their hands and hire counselors against them and interfere with their purpose, and it was ~~many~~ many years before they were able to carry on the work of building the temple, they had constant opposition and constant difficulty. But the book of Ezra is a wonderful book telling how they overcame the opposition, how they persevered, ^p how they pressed on to build the temple, ~~and~~ and eventually they were able to build, nothing like the great ~~the~~ beautiful temple of Solomon, but nevertheless a very substantial temple to the Lord, one that was entirely adequate for their purpose.

Now in chapter 5 we have an interesting statement at the beginning of the chapter. Then the prophet, Haggai the prophet and Zechariah the son of Iddo prophesied unto the Jews that were in Judah and Jerusalem in ~~the~~

the name of the God of Israel. Then rose up Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel and Jeshua the son of Jozadak, and began to build the house of God which is at Jerusalem, and with them were the prophets of God helping them.

I asked you in this course to learn the names of the historical books of the Bible. They are the books from Genesis through Esther, to know them in order. We had that last semester, I certainly expect everyone in class, even if they are just taking it this semester, to know them. That is a definite part of the work of this course, to know them definitely in order. And I would mark off very, very seriously for any one of them that is out of order in the final exam at this time. I have not asked you in this course to learn the names of the poetical books, the five poetical books: Job, Psalm, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon. Nor to learn the names of the 17 prophetic books, the five books we call the Major Prophets, four of them being long books and one of them being a short book written by the author of one of the long books, nor the names of the 12 Minor Prophets which are minor in size but in no other regard. They are major as far as value and importance is concerned. I did not ask you to learn their names for this course. But on both of them, we have touched upon them as they fit into the history. There are some of them which it's not very clear to us where they come in history, but which are messages which don't have a close relation to the history and those we have not touched on in this course at all. But those that do, and this is the great bulk of them, have a definite relation to history, we found that out quite clearly. So if I were to ask you to name such books of prophecy as we have touched upon in this course, to name them and tell

(13½)
a little about them, that would of course be an altogether fair question. And if I should ask that next Monday, I expect you would all be thoroughly ready. But among those two are named in this book, Haggai and Zechariah. And it is important that we are familiar with the basic message of Haggai and Zechariah.

Haggai is a short book, Zechariah is a long one. Zechariah has much of future prediction of great interest, some of it rather difficult to understand, particularly in the last half of the book. But the first part, the first third of Zechariah, and the whole of Haggai, have one big theme and that is this. It is time to build the house of the Lord, you've built your own house, you've got nice homes and you're neglecting the building of the house of the Lord. And it was after the initial interest had rather died down in the face of difficulties and people had become lax and careless that Haggai and Zechariah came...

O.T.History 339. ($\frac{1}{2}$)

...but here in Ezra it is brought out also that these two prophets were tremendously helpful in exhorting the people that it is time to build the house of the Lord. And their message was a very vital message for that day but it is a message for every day. It is always time for us, especially when the temple of the Lord has been broken down, modernists have come in, have taken over, have changed the temple of God into a synagogue of Satan, that is a day for denunciation of them, it is a day for pointing out their errors, and even more a day for building a true temple, for building up groups of people who will stand for the word of God, and receive His truth and be assemblies from which the Word will go forth. Well, Haggai and Zechariah then have a message which is very closely related in our history to this specific time, but also a message which is of great interest for all time, and it's just too bad that they've had that word minor tagged on to them, leading people to think that they are minor prophets. They are short but they are just as important as anything anywhere in the Bible. Well, under the impetus of the activity of these prophets they proceeded to build the house of the Lord and the temple there was finished,

And so we have this new group of Jews, mostly in the area around

Jerusalem, the bulk of them not in the city. There wasn't enough country around to make a center for the city. You couldn't build a big textile factory in the city, there'd be nobody around to buy your goods. Most of them had to be on farms, down south, they had to produce what they used, and comparatively few could live in Jerusalem. Jerusalem was largely (2 3/4)

But in Jerusalem they built a fairly substantial temple and they came to the temple for their services and they lived around there and this situation continued for many, many years. But the return was in 538, the actual building of the temple would not have been completed until around 520. But then we have a continuation of life with little evidence told about it, in the first six chapters of Ezra, Ezra himself is never mentioned. He is given the history of previous times. Ezra was in, I mean Zerubbabel's return was in the reign of Cyrus, the rebuilding of the temple ran into the beginning of the reign of Darius. But Darius we've already noticed reigned 521-486, Xerxes 486 to 465, Artaxerxes began to reign in 465 and our next development comes in the 7th year of the reign of Artaxerxes. So you see that it would come in about 458, in other words it is about 80 years after the group had gone back. About 80 years has passed, the people who went back were probably practically every one of them dead. The people who had built the temple were probably every one of them dead. And the people who had been children when the temple was built were now the elder leaders of the people. When in 458 the next important step occurs in the history of the return.

That is when a man who was in exile, his parents had not gone back in the first return, he was in Babylon a student of the Word of God, and he asked the king to permit him to take another group back to the land of Palestine. Some critics deny there was a first group at all, but they have no satisfactory grounds for the denial, though we have little positive evidence to prove the fact, just a clear statement in the first part of Ezra.

But no one could, so far as I know, question that Ezra began the long four months trip across from Babylon over here to Jerusalem and have a permit from Artaxerxes to go and to see how the temple was coming, how things were going, and to help in the development of Israel. And so Ezra came and Ezra took general charge of the religious life of the people, and took a great interest in getting things established in better fashion. 80 years after the first return. I think it's important to realize. As the book is called Ezra, but Ezra doesn't come in till 80 years after the beginning of the return, but this was a large group of people who went with Ezra and it is the 2nd stage of the return. I should have called it B, Return under Ezra. But we do not have to wait as long for the next stage as we did for this one. Because it is only 13 years later that we will call C, Nehemiah. Here we have evidence of how the Jews were getting on in captivity. There were many Jews in captivity who were forgetful entirely of God, who were simply proceeding to be as prosperous as they could and to get along. There were other Jews who remembered God, and of these a good many prospered also. And here we have pretty good evidence that here is a man named Nehemiah who is right in the palace of the Persian Emperor. He is ^{Cup-bearer} ~~put there~~ to the king. He has access right into the presence of the king and he has opportunity to make himself liked by the king. That certainly is far different from being in prison. It shows how the Jews were coming forward and the security of a position at court and becoming prosperous in the Persian Empire.

But Nehemiah tells us, in Nehemiah 2:1 that in the 20th year of Artaxerxes, in other words that would be 445 B.C., 13 years after Ezra's return, that in that year Nehemiah dared to hope that he might be able to do something to help his people, they had been 80 years back in Palestine, but Jerusalem was still largely in ruins and it had no wall around it. The wall had been broken down in 587, the wall had not been 140 years in

utter ruin. The people had been living there, you might say why do they need a wall? They're in the Persian Empire, and the Persians are guaranteeing peace, I don't know how effective they were in making real safety but probably they were tolerably safe, probably a lot safer than they were 70 years ago in Palestine. The general conditions were fairly well organized under the Persian Empire, but it was a terrible affront to the pride of the Jews at least to see this wall lying there in ruins, to know that they themselves were unable to protect themselves in case of attack, and Nehemiah felt very, very badly about this, and there in the Emperor's Palace he had the opportunity of winning the emperor's favor, but it's one thing to win an emperor's favor and it is another thing to actually get his help and his support.

Now it's interesting how these people refused to let the Samaritans help them in building. They opposed it, Ezra did~~x~~, Nehemiah does now, as he comes back, they absolutely are unwilling to have the Samaritans have any share in their work and yet they rejoice in getting letters from the heathen kings of Persia that they will give them assistance, that they give them support of the Empire and protection of the Empire in (10 $\frac{1}{4}$)

There is a difference between the two. One is people entering in as religious cooperators in the ^{doing} ~~building~~ of a religious work, the other is the working with the world as it is, with worldly leaders in matters which while important to the advance of religion are nevertheless primarily secular, such as getting permission from governments and getting equal privileges **Before** governments. We have today a denomination in this country, the Covenanter denomination, at least one portion of the Covenanter denomination, which makes a great article of faith, that until the United States shall in its Constitution adopt an amendment saying that Jesus Christ is the king and ruler of this land, we cannot conscientiously hope for (11 $\frac{1}{4}$) will have any part in what is then a heathen government.

Well, you admire the (11 $\frac{1}{4}$) and loyalty which these people have shown many times, we admire what they have lost through their unwillingness to participate in government, or even to vote, in this way, but there's no Scriptural warrant for that attitude. Because the Scripture teaches that Satan is the prince of this world today, it teaches that these are the times of the Gentiles, not the times of the Jews, the times of the Gentiles, times, in other words, when the government of the world is primarily in the hands of heathen. And under those circumstances Nehemiah did not hesitate about being Cup-bearer to the king, Daniel did not hesitate to be one of the primary governors in the kingdom under Nebuchadnezzar. They did not hesitate to give advice and help to these kings, gave them a testimony in a tactful way whenever they could, and if they were put in a position where they had to deny their Saviour, faith, standing for it without fear. And dying for it if need be. But they did not hesitate to cooperate in secular affairs in a world which is, until our Lord Jesus Christ returns, (12 3/4)

I feel the Covenanters are a credit to the zeal, but I think their interpretation of Scripture is definitely wrong at this point. And so Nehemiah ~~praised~~ praised the Lord that he was given favor in the eyes of this wicked heathen king, in order that he could get his help to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem. After the people were back for 80 ~~years~~ years and living there (13 $\frac{1}{4}$) Yes? (student.13 $\frac{1}{4}$)

Yes, and that is, I think, a very definite mistake. There's very grave danger involved. But as you say, building up a protective device is a different thing. I think that's important for us to recognize. I think we should go very slow about taking specific help from government for building (14)

(student.14. The Baptists are now yielding right on this point in the southern states. They're saying that it would be proper to receive, they're modifying their views, they're lecturing them regarding parochial

support right at this present moment.). I'm afraid I'm rather heretical on this matter of parochial support. Personally, I don't feel that the state should specifically help the church. And I don't think it's the duty of the church to educate children, I think it's the duty of the parents. But I ~~think~~ can't get away from this feeling, that if the state is going to draw taxes from people in order to educate their children, and if those people don't want their children to have a secular education but want them to have an education which has something of a religious touch in the direction of what the parents believe...

-O.T.

O.T.History 340. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

...I can't quite see why the parents should have to pay for two schools, for a public school and also for a school of their own religion, that is provided of course that the school they are going to has definite standards as far as education goes. I don't think our government should help the Roman Catholics, I don't think so at all, that it should, but when it comes to a school, I don't see why we should make them pay for a public school, and then pay again for the building of Protestant schools. (student 1. Can we afford it in this economy, when we can't even keep our schools up as it is. How can we afford to add these extra schools to the economy, now overburdened apparently?) I think that if we're going to force our children to go to schools with teaching directed by the state, we have the most wonderful machinery for enforcing materialism upon our children, and making atheists of them. And we don't force our children to go to public schools, we force them to go to public schools or the other schools which have high educational standards. Well, if we do that, it seems only fair that a proportionate part of our taxes should go to those other schools(1 $\frac{1}{2}$)

But now that's a thing on which I differ with a great many people and would not want to put my opinion (1 3/4)

but not a great deal. Yes? (student.1 3/4) Yes, I would feel so definitely. Now, I don't quite see why I should have to pay to support a public school and then pay again to support a Christian School where I send my children. It seems to me that it would be reasonable that if the state taxes me to support a school, that that proportion of the taxes should go to the kind of school that I want my children to attend.

(2 1/2)

I think the general principle

But in this case, the king, he prayed that God would give him favor before the king. He did not go and demand this of the king because he knew if he did he wouldn't last very long. He went in and just prayed that God would lead the king to give him a chance (3)

and the king noticed that there was something wrong and asked him, what's the matter, you don't look happy today. And he said, he had always looked happy before, now he didn't happy before, now he didn't look happy, the king said why do you sigh, what's wrong? And he said, let the king live forever, why should not my countenance be sad when the city the place of my fathers' sepulchres, ~~lies~~ waste and the gates thereof are consumed with fire? The king might have said well now you always looked happy before, but this happened 170 years ago, strange that it would make you so sad right now, it never bothered you all the time before when you were here. But the Lord led that the king should not think of things too logically but should be moved by the emotion of his personal liking for this young man who though a period of time had given him faithful service and had won a good reputation in his eyes. And so the king said well now what is it you'd like. What would you like? And he prayed then and said, raised his heart to the Lord, and then he said to the king, if it please the king, if thy servant have found favor in thy sight, that thou wouldst send me to Judah, to the city of my fathers' sepulchres, that I may build it.

And the king said to me, the queen also sitting by him, doubtless the Lord worked it that way, that the ^{queen}king would be there on this particular time and the king and queen had had a little bit of a spat just before, and she'd been criticising him for a few people who had failed to bow their heads quite deep enough when they went by on the street and he'd had to make~~e~~ them do it on the spot, and she said it was a little bit cruel to do that and he was feeling he'd rather like to make a good impression on her now and here's this nice young man who asks a rather preposterous request, to be allowed to go a four-months' trip away and have a group to help him and have help from the state in it, but the Lor Lord just worked the circumstance, and the Lord does work circumstance. We haven't time to tell you how I got into Germany in '47 to get books for the Seminary, but the circumstances worked together, one could never imagine, but the Lord just worked it together as he worked this for Nehemiah. I don't think we should say if a door opens we should step in in, the Devil may have opened the door. Don't think circumstances should lead us, but we decide by the word where we should go, and if we're really following God's will, then God may open doors that weren't open. God may cause things to work together as he did here for Nehemiah. And so he says the queen was there and the king glanded over at the queen and he thought now she'll like this if I show real kindness to this you young fellow and she, I heard her say she liked the young fellow too, and so he says well how long will this journey take, when will you return? And he made a tremendous request, letters to governors over there, they were to go with him, an escort to take him, and timber to make beams for the palaces pertaining to the house and for the wall of the city, and for the house that ^{he, himself} I shall enter. And the king gave him everything he asked. Then he made the four-months' trip over there, back to Jerusalem, and as he went out and looked over the city and found the walls all broken down, he found the place just, outside, just an utter ruin, and then we

Have a very stirring account of how Nehemiah proceeded to build the wall and these people in the neighborhood, the children and grandchildren of those who had interfered before in the building of the temple and managed to keep that from being done for a good many years, ~~know~~ they really are concerned about walls being built, because you might say, with the Persian peace in the land they don't need a wall around the city for protection, but if you have a wall around the city it certainly means that these people outside can be shut out anytime they want and it gives the Jews a tremendous advantage against them, and they really were concerned about it. And so they proceed to interfere with the building of the wall, and it's a stirring account of how Nehemiah proceeded against the difficulties to get the people together, and get them to build the wall, and to do it by constantly watching lest the Samaritans interfere with them. And so he had the men build with a trowel in one hand and a sword in the other. Chapter 4:18, the builders, every one had his sword girded by his side and so built it and he that sounded the trumpet was by me. And I said to the nobles and to the rulers and to the rest of the people, the work is great and large, and we are separated on the wall, one far from another. In what place therefore ye hear the sound of the trumpet, resort ye thither to us, our God shall fight for us.

I know of people today who have a certain view of apologetics which in my mind is exactly as if Nehemiah had gone up into a high tower in the middle of Jerusalem somewhere with a strong wall around it and had gotten up in there and said now here we are protected, these Samaritans and others can't possibly get at us. We've got a system that's absolutely watertight, they can't get at us, they can't injure us in any way. He went up there and stayed there. They might have been perfectly safe but the walls would never have been built. Nehemiah didn't stay up in his high tower, where it was safe, he went out there where there was danger, he went out there and he worked and he built but he had his sword ready.

He had his sword at his side, he had the trumpeter all ready to blow, he had the people alert to watch, so that they did not let the building stop for the sake of defense. But they did not let the defense be neglected for the sake of the building, they carried on both activities at the same time, constantly watching but constantly building, and we have today too many people who are doing one or the other, we have people who are only watching, only defending, and never building, and getting nothing done, and we have people who are building great wonderful things which --th --the United States~~/~~ is filled with marvelous schools, fine churches, great organizations, ~~whihh~~ godly Christian people ~~have~~ build~~d~~ up and Satan's men have taken over after wards, and either activity without the other is apt to accomplish very little,

But Nehemiah gives us an example here, he carried on both activities, he built and he watched. He had his sword by his side, he had his trumpet there, but he had his trowel in his hand and he built. And ~~they~~ built the wall around the city, they got~~/~~ the work completed. And then when he got the work completed, he found there were hardly any people there to live in it. He found that Jerusalem had a few people in it and most of the people were living out on their fields and all together there were very few people and so it was necessary to ask other people to live in Jerusalem in order (11) the city. And they had to make the trip every day, they had to spend maybe an hour's walk ~~every~~ in the morning to go out to their fields, an hour's at night to come back, instead of living ~~where~~ it's more comfortable. Extra work, extra time, but~~/~~ they were willing to do it for the sake of the work. Willing to do it in~~/~~ order that the city could be a real city and not just a beautiful wall with a half a dozen people in it, of course there wasn't half a dozen compared to a big beautiful city, it seemed like a half a dozen. They were willing to do double duty to make up for the fact~~/~~ that they were so few in number. Yes?

Well, then in chapter 8 we find that Nehemiah, different from most people, did not feel so proud of his building that he made a separation from Ezra who was giving out the word of God. Many a person would have said well ~~now~~ look ~~at~~ this fellow Ezra, he's been here 13 years and they ~~ha~~ haven't done a thing towards building the wall. He's been here 13 years and he's done a few nice things but what does it amount to. Now I've built this wonderful wall here and everybody should listen to me. But Nehemiah knew that he had his task, building the wall, and Ezra had his task of instructing the people. And that it was the Lord's will that each of them should fulfill his task. And consequently we find that the book of Nehemiah ~~has~~ has a substantial portion of it telling about the activities of Ezra. Now these are not told in the ~~book~~ book of Ezra, because the activities in the first part of the book of Nehemiah come before these activities. So to give us a proper ~~idea~~ idea of the progress of it, it is sensible to give the activities of Ezra later. But here we find in chapter 8 all the people gathered themselves as one man in the street that was before the water gate, and they spoke to Ezra the scribe to bring the book of the law of Moses, which the Lord had commanded to Israel. And Ezra brought the law before the congregation and he read therein, the people were attentive to the book of the law. Ezra stood on a pulpit of wood made for the purpose and opened the book in the sight of the people and he blessed the Lord, the great God. Chapter 8 is a wonderful chapter about how Ezra read the whole Pentateuch and presented the Word of God to them. And there are several things to notice about it, one is that Ezra had been there 13 years and he'd been talking to the people about reading the Word of God, and trying to bring it to them and probably most of them thought it's mighty nice to have Ezra to give our children ~~lessons~~ some good instruction but didn't pay so much attention to him and Nehemiah built the wall and interest is roused and people ~~ple~~ come and ask Ezra to read them the Word of God. He hasn't become ~~sour~~ sour in the 13 years,

disgusted that people weren't paying attention, he was ready to jump in and do the service at the time when there was great need. And in any kind of work that we're doing, you will hit your head against a stone wall and work and struggle and get very little result...

O.T.History 341. (½)

...at certain periods of time and at other times everything will just seem to be wide open and people are just interested and ready and anxious to hear. It's mighty important that we don't become soured in the period of little results, and that we don't feel jealous of the other person that comes along and opens the door as Nehemiah does, but that we step in and take advantage of the door which he opens, and in the time of little results it's rather foolish to hit your head against a stone wall so hard that your numb and unable to take advantage of the real opportunity ~~when~~ when it comes. we shouldn't sit back and wait for the opportunity but we should (1½) and push ahead and look for, try to

find means of bringing (1½) but know that if we don't succeed that God has in the past poured out his mercy in periods of times of great blessing. Jonathan Edwards in his early ministry had hundreds of people coming to the church and he gave his great revival sermons and as he preached on sinners in the hands of an angry God, they said you could just about feel (1 3/4)

as if the floor was going to open up and the people were going to drop into hell, they were filled with fear and with (1 3/4)

he had tremendous response, did a great work there, and then the work kind of quieted down and settled down and Jonathan Edwards went on working, preaching, instead of having 50 converts on a Sunday it got to where he was only getting 10 and then to where he was only getting 3, then he went two or three years with none at all, but preaching just as faithfully, working just as faithfully, The people got together and said this fellow

Jonathan Edwards is just giving us the same old sermons he gave us 20 years ago, and we're tired of them, and they voted him out of the church. So he went out and he studied metaphysics and he wrote a book on metaphysics that was one of the great contributions, one of the greatest contributions to Christian ^{philosophy} ~~thought~~, that has ever been made in America. And then they called him to Princeton University, he was one of their first presidents. And he had another great opportunity of service towards the end of his life, but after that great opportunity in the beginning of his life when God so wonderfully blessed him, and then the blessing died out, he was helping, doing a great deal, but it was small compared to what he had done before, he could go off and sulked and said oh, this people has all turned bad, nothing good ahead, but instead of that he worked faithfully till that door was shut and then he found other doors of service, made a tremendous contribution to Christianity in America. ~~Ezra~~

Ezra had his great time of blessing when he first got there, Ezra had his time of very little accomplishment, and now the people gather together as one man, they come and Ezra reads the word of God and they're all interested and anxious to hear it. I've known of a number of periods ^{like that in my own life} ~~like that~~ when in different countries and different areas, there's just a hunger for the word of God, and ~~the last~~ alas, too often, there's nobody there who is ready, able and trained, and able to take advantage of that hunger and to give them the true word of God. Well, Ezra was there. Now another thing, though, to notice about this is that here where Ezra read the word of God to these people the critics interpret it that the Word of God has never been read to anybody before. ~~They~~ take it that this is not giving them the word of God that they'd all believed for a long time before, but they take that Ezra was here presenting the Pentateuch for the first time, and they are just reading into it, there's absolutely no warrant for that. We believe Moses wrote it, and this was reading it to them anew, rather than giving it as something they had ~~not~~ had before. Well, the

book of Nehemiah ends with the Samaritans trying to push in, trying to get in, Nehemiah and Ezra holding them out. We have the Elephantine papyri from a little after this period in Egypt, the word elephant plus ine. Papyri in Aramaic which show a Jewish colony in Egypt at this time, and it mentions, some of the same people mentioned in Nehemiah. It's a wonderful corroboration of this (4) of the fact.

But the Old Testament ends in sort of an unsatisfactory way as far as history is concerned. Probably just about the end of the Old Testament, just about 420 the book, the last book of the Old Testament was written. And it's a rather plaintive book, the book of Malachi. You have not been, you have been working for yourselves not for the Lord, therefore what you have goes into a pocket with holes, Malachi says. He says God is going to send Elijah the prophet before that great and terrible day of the Lord. The Old Testament ends, it doesn't finish, it just stops. It ends with a little group that has come back, there's a return, but it's not satisfactory, it ends with a waiting and expectation, what is the Lord going to do? When the Lord left a period of 400 years so nobody could say the Old Testament was written after the New. Before the things would be fulfilled which are promised in the Old, ^{and} as Jesus Christ was ^{coming, and} ~~promised,~~ would fulfill all the wonderful promises of the Old Testament.

So here we have the return and the rebuilding, then of course the period between the Testaments occurs, and then the coming of Christ, which cannot be properly understood without the Old Testament, and the history which leads up to it. Now we have one more meeting of this class, that will be next Monday morning, that will cover everything for the whole year.

C. H.