

Our subject this time is the Divided Kingdom, an intensive study of the Divided Kingdom. And it is a graduate course limited to graduate students, and consequently we can take for granted the course that we have, the seminary course, although some of them may be secondary. When you think of the Divided Kingdom, there are of course a good many things that enter into it. First, naturally of course is the scriptural text, and approaching that the very first thing would be a general knowledge of the content of the scriptural teaching about the divided kingdom. Now whenever I've taught Old Testament History and I think that every one of you have had it from me, have you not? I have insisted upon the memorization of the names of the kings of Judah and the kings of Israel. I used to teach Old Testament History the first year, a few years ago, and then Prophets the second year, and the first semester I required the memorization and I reviewed it each succeeding three semesters, so that the students finishing prophets were supposed to have it well enough to last for life. Now since none of you had prophets from me, I believe, whether you had that review I don't know, but at least you all had it assigned at one time to know the names of the kings. Well, that is not tremendously important at the beginning of our course, but I think it is fair not to make it an assignment in this course, but take it that it is something that you will review and have it in mind, the names of the king, that's a sort of background. In taking up any modern period of history, we start with chronology and we have certain definite dates, which are pegs on which we tie things. We can't do that quite so well with most periods of ancient history, at least of the pre Greek history, because we don't have as definite a knowledge of the ancient chronology, as we do of the modern. Ever since about 450 A.D. when the monk Dionysius, tried to figure out when Christ was born, and how many years there were since, began to number events by the number of years since that time, that system has been used even by utter unbelievers, and the result is that in a date since 500 A.D. you are quite apt to have records that contain a precise date in them some where, and having records of this type you may have difficulty fixing a date within a year or two but as a rule you can get that close. Previous to 500 A.D. do you have any record of which gives the dates in comprehensible system; that is, a system that says - calls a/syst one year 234 and the next year #k 235, and the next one 236. What would you say about that? Mr. Vannoy. (Student).

What I mean is, records that were numbered, like the numbers today. Today there are probably - I wouldn't be surprised if there are 100,000,000 pieces of paper today not counting printed newspapers that have the year 1960. It is our custom today, even in your class work you are apt to put 1960. It is a wide spread custom, and consequently, everything here was destroyed, and people had very little to go by, but quite a bit of the written material was preserved. Somebody 2000 years from now, trying to figure out the chronology of this period would find records that have the number 1960 on it. Now if you are looking at records from the ancient Egyptians you are apt to find that this happens in the year of the earthquake. We have that in ~~even~~ one of the Bible (3 3/4), two years after the earthquake, or you may find it stated that something happened in the 18th year of King Raamases II, and then if you have something else which ~~else~~ is stated from the third year of Meneptha, the successor of Raamases II, you immediately say this must be at least 3 years after the other thing, but was it three years or 35, or 72? It all depends on how long Raamases reigned, and if you don't know how long he reigned, you don't know how long after ward it is. They have a system there going numerically, one, two, three four, but they stop with a definite king, and you start again, and how long was that? You have to find some record. The ancient Kassyrans would name every record - not every one, but the bulk of them, in the reign of king so and so. So you know in which reign it was, but they didn't tell the number of the reigns. They would say the Lemu of so and so, and the Assyrians had the custom of naming a man as the Lemu of that year, and that meant that an Assyrian contractor said that so and so has borrowed so much money and this money is to be paid back with interest at a certain rate after six years, and ~~it~~ it was signed in the reign of King Sennacherib, in the Lemu of King Sennacherib. Well then, you have to find out in which of the Sennacherib's years was he the Lemu. And then you may find that it will say back in the Lemu of the governor of the province of Babylon. Well then you have to know which year of his year was this man the governor. But you have to get a list of these Lemus in order to know the number of years, and this very simple system that we have today, of numbering one, two, three, four, right straight along, is something which came almost universally, at least universally in the western world, after about five hundred A.D. but before that in most cases, dating was done by some local event, unless it

was ~~done in~~ by the reign of a king. In Rome, in the Roman Empire, it was customary to name it by the consul, they had two consuls every year, and you would say, this happened when so and so was consul, or the same man might be consul ten years later. So the Roman system was not particularly good in that regards. Now the Romans did develop a system of naming, of numbering events from the year of the (6) AUC. Anno (6 1/4).
? ?
The year of the Ptolemy cities. But I don't recall when they started that system, ~~wh~~ but I don't think it was very early. At least it is not of any use in our event, because our event ~~in them~~ are before the Roman history. Yes? (Student). That's the thing that we have to find some way to figure out. And so that's our problem, in approaching ancient history. The problem of getting precise arrangement in order to get a skeletal system to the differences. Now there has been much progress in it, but the progress is made by discovering of (7) discovering the fitting together, and sometimes the wrong guess is made, so if you will take five (7) to history - if you take five standard books on it ~~se~~ written say twenty years ago, you would probably find the dates varying in the last few years, for everything they give. They may recognize this event was exactly 62 years after this event, but one may say it was 1392 BC in a certain period. The other may say it was 1462, the other may say it was 1420, and 13 whatever it would be. Our present system is a wonderfully simple system, and it is much more simple now than it used to be. If you take an event from the middle ages, and different people started a year at a different time. At Rome they very likely started at Christmas day. So if you find a Roman issuance from 1322, if it is Dec. 27, 1322, it would be what some other countries would call Dec. 27, 1321, that is, you see the different countries started (8 1/2) at different times, and that is the problem, but today we all agree on this crazy date, Jan. 1. I mean, there's no reason why Jan. 1 should be the beginning of the year, whatever. You can make an argument for Christmas as the beginning of the year. You can make a good argument for that. You can make a good argument for the winter (8 1/2). That would be an excellent date for Christmas. It seems to me it is December 21. At that date the sun stopped going south and started going north again, so we call it the (8 3/4). The date when the sun stands still. It doesn't stand still but it stops going that way and comes back.

It isn't the sun at all of course, it is the earth, that as it tilts, it tilted this way and then it tilted that way, in relation to the sun, and so December 21 would be the end of one cycle and the beginning of a new cycle in the weather. That would be a good date to start, you could start it here with the equinox period, which is March 21. The Romans started it with March, so March was the first month, because they didn't know the $(9 \frac{1}{2})$ in March 21, but they knew that spring started, and that was the start of the year, the $(9 \frac{1}{2})$ part of the year, the winter, when the year is old and about to go, it ~~is~~ certainly includes January and February. So they had a very $(9 \frac{1}{2})$ time to start. We have a nonsensical time to start, January 1. But it has a tremendous advantage over any of those other systems, in that it has been widely adopted, and that we have a pretty good agreement, so that if you get a doctrine almost anywhere in the world, with a certain year on, you will know what year it is. The only time when you would have difficulty on that would be when you get near the international date line, and there of course you can have two events taking place at the same time, ~~w~~ one of which would be December 31 of this year, and the other January 1 of next year. And if you just have the year, they would seem to be a year apart, but the dateline fortunately goes largely through water, and it is only through Alaska and Siberia, that that is apt to be much of a problem. You can leave one of those countries and arrive at the other country, at a time which is an hour separate from that one, but which is a day off, and that of course is $(10 \frac{1}{2})$, but we have today a very simple system because we all agree, January 1, the new year starts, and accept for the variation of going around the world, it is very very useful to chronology. It is like the system with the chapters in the Bible, ~~with~~ It is excellent to have all the world agree, except for the Hebrew Bible, and there we have a few cases that are different, such as the 20th verse of a certain chapter is this particular verse, and even though the chapters are very frequently started from entirely the ~~same~~ wrong place, we are extremely fortunate to have something we agree on, so that when we say the 20th verse of this, chapter on this, we know what we agree upon and we all know the verse, even though it is the wrong number for it. But they didn't have this in $(11 \frac{1}{4})$, and ~~so~~ so it is clear from the study of the history of Scotland during the 12th century, you could probably set up a chronological table and discuss it. And say the divided kingdom, it is with a course from grammar

The Divided Kingdom. 1. (1960-61.) n(10) (11 1/2). 5.

School student the right way to do might be, to set up dates (k11 1/2) but in a graduate course you want to start where our knowledge is solid, the dates which we give to it is something later of time (12). We want to find out what would be the evidence on it. In Scotland, the evidence

would be (12) perhaps it is not - perhaps a few compare with it, but ~~not~~ yet several written cases of a ~~per~~ paper, or other writing material having a date on it, and that would give us a definite chronological basis. Yes, Mr. Ruble. (Student). I mean to say, the system of numbering 221, 222, 223, 224. Now a number of years like that, after the birth of Christ, started. (Student).

The birth of Christ? Well, the what the ~~usn~~ (12 1/2) is, unto a sincere monk, there would be no ~~basis~~ dates in the world as important as the birth of Christ, unless ~~you~~ it was the death of Christ. The death of Christ is of course more important by far than (13)

but after all, it comes from the (13) the of the . When the incarnation becomes apparent, it is not the time of the incarnation, I suppose, the actual incarnation would be at the conception, rather than the birth, but it is the time when the incarnation becomes apparent

to the (13), or at least the (13), in the fifth century. This monk's name was Dionysius, and he worked it out and he made a mistake. That most people today agree that he was four years off in his time of it, but when we say it is 1960 after Christ, we mean that it is 1964 after Christ's birth, or we mean that it is 1930 after his death, but we don't mean 1960. Our year beginning is irrational, our number of years is irrational, but we all agree upon it, and that is just a (13 1/2) to take them. ~~Example~~ (Hard to hear).

Exactly like in electricity where you get a - you buy a battery, and it says on it positive. You fasten the positive this way and the negative this way, and when they say positive they mean negative, and when they say negative they mean positive, and every electrician knows that and when he says negative he means positive, and when he says positive he means negative. But what's the difference? It is just a -

It would be much more logical if we would change all our electrical ~~figures to~~ textbooks to say positive where they now say negative, and say negative where they now say positive, but the early students of electricity were mistaken, as everybody in the field knows now and we simply use the terminology that was then used, and of course for practical purposes, you've got the positive and the negative together in a certain way and that's all that you need to know, but when it comes to knowing what really happens, you just simply understand that when you say positive you mean negative, ~~and when~~ but we have a definite system and it is of tremendous use. Well, we don't have that sort of a definite system with the chronology of ^{ancient Israel} ~~English history~~ or .(1) There we must do a lot of figuring, (1) but when it comes to the ancient history - I meant to say first though that this new system that Dionysius introduced, was probably not a guess on his part. I mean, a brand new idea on his part. He was probably familiar with (1 1/4). After the founding of the city of Rome was used or not, I haven't looked into that. But he probably did have some familiarity with one system which was used before that as ~~in~~ (1 1/2). And that ~~is~~ the system, the Seleucid system of dating, Now anyone who took the course in Daniel here of course can give us a good discussion of who Seleucus was, and what he did. But there are some here who didn't take it, so we can explain that Seleucus was one of Alexander the Great's generals, he was a very active general and a trusted man under Alexander the Great, and after Alexander the Great's death, they tried to hold the empire together under an illegitimate son, who might have succeeded in doing so, if he had been old enough to do anything, he was about 4 years old, he was too young to do anything, and he was illegitimate in addition. Well, Alexander had married the daughter of the king of Persia, and there was expectation that she would have a child, and so there were those who said this illegitimate child is certainly not the successor of Alexander. It will be the new child if it is a boy, and it was a boy. Here was a little baby which was born some months after Alexander's death, and he was in no position to hold the empire. And the result is that a man named Ptolemy who was another of Alexander's generals, saw that one - one conquest was the land of Egypt, with its great fertility and its tremendous wealth. It had been subject to the Persian empire. And was very easy to defend because of the water and desert surrounding it.

practically, only one direction from which it could really be attacked, and that was from Asia, so Ptolemy very soon afterward, after Alexander's death, he decided the empire just won't be able to hold together. I might just as well grab some of this for myself, so he went to Egypt, and he grabbed Egypt and he made himself king of Egypt, and established a rule in Egypt which lasted 300 years. The Ptolemaic ruler, and Seleucas, this other general took service under Ptolemy, so Ptolemy had Seleucas as one of his generals. I think, wasn't it 320 BC when Alexander died. (Student). Yes, then there was quite a period of time there when Ptolemy - when Ptolemy seized Egypt and made ~~he~~ himself king of Egypt, and pretended to be the successor ~~to the throne~~ ~~the~~ ~~successor~~ ~~of~~ of the old Pharaoh, and Seleucas worked for Ptolemy, and the other people tried to hold the rest of the empire together. And began fighting over whether it would be Alexander's illegitimate son who would be over, or his legitimate son who was born after his death, and they divided up into factions and there were all kinds of problems there, and the time came, when Seleucas the general of Alexander, who was now a general for Ptolemy decided - he couldn't tell how the thing was going to come out anyway, and he decided that he might as well seize a part of the empire for himself, so he left Ptolemy's service, and he headed over to the East, and went to Babylon, and he seized Babylon, and made himself king in Babylon, and tried to take the territory over in that general area. Ptolemy kept Palestine, but Seleucas kept the country of Syria, and Babylonian and Mesopotamia - quite a bit of Alexander's empire over there. And the year that Seleucas seized Babylon he counted as the beginning of ~~the~~ his kingdom, and so he numbered events after 312 B.C. the year when he seized Babylon. And that came to be called the Seleucas' era. Well now, Seleucas developed a kingdom which was much harder to defend than Ptolemy because Ptolemy had all these wonderful natural defenses around him, but Seleucas managed to hold his empire and to extend it, and his successors, his descendants succeeded him for many years, Ptolemy did for about 300 years, and after a hundred years, Seleucas' descendants conquered Palestine from Ptolemy, ~~roughly~~ and took it away from him, so about 200 BC we have Palestine becoming part of the Seleucid empire. But for some reason or another, Ptolemy dated events after his events of his reign and when he died, his son succeeded - dated after events of his reign,

etc, but Seleucas for some reason, I don't know if anybody knows why, after his death, they kept to some extent dating events after the time when Seleucas came to Babylon. And so today you can find Hebrew manuscripts which will have a date on them, of say 1230, and they'll say copied in the date 1230, and you figure well, they are using the Seleucid Era which means that you ~~subtract~~ subtract 312 from 1230, and you will decide it was the year 918, when this manuscript was written. The Seleucid Empire disappeared 600 years earlier, every body had forgotten all about Seleucid, didn't even know he existed, but they just kept on ~~e~~ that system of dating. The unfortunate thing ~~is~~ is that the Jews when they made their manuscripts very often in the Middle Ages, everybody knew this was 1500, 1200, so why bother put that down. They just copied in the year 30. Now we have to figure what century it was. But they would give the last two figures, although sometimes they would give the last three figures. We have to figure which calendar it is. The Seleucid Era continued to be used for a limited extent, into the late middle ages, by the Jews, it was used by the Seleucid Empire. Well that may have given Dionysius the idea. But at any rate the idea was adopted of dating all events from the birth of Christ, and I've even got a book recently from East Germany, published under the Communist auspices, on some problems of ancient history and archaeology and it says, The History of ~~the~~ Egypt during the last Three Centuries before the (8 1/4) which is German for Before the Change of Time. The Communists don't want to mention Christ at all, so they don't want to say years before Christ, but they say, the change of time. But it would practically be the same system, so recognized now. Christ's birth now stands in the center of dating and even during the United Nations, with Krushchev there, denying the very ~~existence~~ existence of God, certainly there was no mention of Christ whatever, opposed utterly to it, yet he will date his record 1936, and this has become the established system and it is very convenient for us.

But when we take up the Divided Kingdom we don't have an established system like that, so we want to do some study in chronology here, but ~~the~~ chronology can not be made simply a basis of start, it must be something to go on to, so that is why the kings are quite important for us now, as a back ground, a definite solid thing that we can stand upon here, that the Bible tells us that Solomon died and Rehoboam succeeded him, and the Bible tells us that Zedekiah was

carried off to Babylon, and so we have a beginning and an end of our period of the Divided Kingdom given in the forms of reigns here. And it would tell you in what year it was. That in his 11th year, he was taken off to Babylon. So you have something for your background, for your period, and we want to study chronology a little this year. Well now, we don't have then chronology as a background, as we would like to. We have to figure our chronology out on the basis of the kings and the relation to other nations that we can find, and I don't simply give you dates, this is it, we would have to do that with undergraduates, it is necessary. You have to give something to make a basis on. And then I try to explain that there is still considerable uncertainty whether we can carry these dates back with quite as much definiteness on this. There is a man in England named (10 1/2) who wrote a book on the Romance of Bible Chronology and many Bible students think very highly of it, but (10 1/2) took the attitude that - well, the book of Daniel says so many years after the destruction of Jerusalem, to the coming of Christ, so many years, and he says therefore the chronology must be wrong, (11) so he ~~has~~ lopped off about 60 years, the chronology that today all scholars hold, and dates all your dates about 60 years later. Some of you have heard of Dr. Cooper in Los Angeles, who has quite a strong movement of Bible study and excellent (11) Dr. Cooper adopts (11) theory, and it is not impossible that it is right because there is a very dark period in the Persian empire, between 500 and 300 BC, our knowledge is extremely rare, and it is possible that it is (11 1/2) years off in all our chronology before that. It is not probable, because while we do not have absolute proof, we have a good many different evidences, to get the length of the period, and scholars accept it as ~~the~~ being approximately in a certain month, so that they date the fall of Jerusalem in 586 BC, and they date Alexander's death about 331, and that is accepted by all historical scholars today. (Student). 323, well that would be more logical. (Student). Y s, the end of the Persian empire. Well, of course (12 1/2) quite a bit, he wept though I think he had plenty for more lands to conquer, and he was trying to make a plan, I understand to go westward.

The Divided Kingdom we have to - for our purposes here we assume that the dates that the scholars have accepted for Alexander, and for the beginning of the Persian empire. (d (13 1/2) But that could really go under the study of the Persian empire, rather than the Divided Kingdom.

We can't start with chronology. We want to look into chronology later. We start with the basis of what we have in the Bible, and we find statements in the Bible, and we see the things that can be ironed out. Last year a meeting was held up at Princeton, at which a man from Biblical Seminary - made a very strong pronouncement there - there are certain matters in the chronology of the later divided kingdom which simply cannot possibly be explained as the correct view. It must be in error, and they are based upon - they are in the original text, and they can't be later. Therefore we can't feel that the Bible is inerrant. And -

3. (0)

shows the importance of that problem of chronology. But that's not our starting point. What is our purpose? Well, we announced the study of the Divided Kingdom? Well, how are you going to study the Divided Kingdom? Our first, and by far greater evidence about it of course is dating, so our first study is the parts of the Bible that give us information about the Divided Kingdom. Now these parts will be particularly the last part of I Kings and the book of II Kings, and the book of II Chronicles, and here of course we have a very interesting problem of the relationship of Kings to Chronicles, and so when we take up a subject, you should look at Kings and Chronicles and see, do you have two different accounts, or do you have an ~~one~~ account which is word for word the same, or do you have something that is very similar, and if so what are the differences, and how can you account for the differences? That is an interesting study, it won't be our main study, but we certainly should do that this year, look at the differences between Kings and ~~the~~ Chronicles, ~~and~~ we looked at this a little bit in Old Testament History, but we didn't go very thoroughly into it, but to see what the material is, you might say superficially that is to say, as you would gather it just from looking at material in it. That is the first step. Your next step of course is to see what it exactly is in Hebrew. Now if this was simply a course in Hebrew, we could take all the Hebrew under the Divided Kingdom, and spend a year on it, and get much of value in grammar, and problems of textual criticism, very precise problems connected with the Hebrew. That's not our purpose here. Our text is the Hebrew Bible. It is not the English Bible, but we don't have time to do it (2), so we'll want to read large

sections of the Hebrew, and to examine all pertinent, all vital questions to see if the Hebrew should go specifically with it, but our first point of approach then to the Divided Kingdom is what do our sources say? And our primary sources are the Hebrew books, with the help that we get from various translations, particularly English translation. You may want to prepare the Septuagint which is placed before us. That's our first step then in this course, is what do we learn from the Bible itself about the Divided Kingdom? Now we are interested there in the political history of the Divided Kingdom as given in the Bible. We are interested in its economic history, wherever the Bible throws light on it. We are interested in its religious history, particularly in that which relates to Kings, we could take two or three months and I believe that we could make great profit in studying Elijah and Elisha. I have given ten lectures on it sometimes in the course of ~~the~~ Old Testament History. They are extremely interesting, and there is a great deal to be learned from it, but that's more about prophets than what you would call the Divided Kingdom, so that I would think that for this course, we would confine ourselves to Elijah and Elisha as they relate to the political history, or to the kings themselves, rather than to in this particular course, the study, the prophets of Elijah and Elisha, and their relation to the religious history of Israel. I believe that would be reasonable to (4).

Well then, the Hebrew text is our first basis of study and when we deal with the first third of the material here, - the first third of the period, there is very little evidence about it, we have a little material right away connected with Egypt. Why would that be, Mr. Ruble? Why would we immediately have a relationship to Egypt as we begin the study of the Divided Kingdom? (Student). In the first third (4 1/2) of the period of the Divided Kingdom, most of our information comes from the Bible. We have very little of other sources from which we gain any knowledge of that period, but we do have near the start of the period, an immediate interest in Egypt, but - in the book of I Kings then, in the fourth year of King Rehoboam Shishak, pharaoh of Egypt came up and captured Jerusalem, and took much plunder out of Jerusalem. Well there we have a contact with Egypt, tying up with the specific name of the ruler of Egypt, and relating to a war like expedition, of the king of Egypt outside of) 5 1/2

We don't have much about this in the Bible, but we have that much which gives us a peg to hang chronology on right away. We know that if we can date Shishak we have some idea of the dating of Rehoboam. It gives us a peg and it immediately connects our interest with Egypt. Our interest with Egypt becomes quite considerably greater, at a much later period, but ~~w~~ at this time we do have ~~an~~ definite interest to Egypt. We have no mention of any relationship to Babylon~~an~~ or Assyria, during the first few Kings, and the archaeological material that has been ~~ex~~avated from the first few Kings, - there is some but it is very slight, and quite vague. There is a question of how much time we should take from this on ~~m~~ archaeological material for the first time of the period. I mean archaeological material right from Chronicles, because we don't have very much. It makes some interesting guess work. But then we come along to the time of King Ahab, and the name of King Ahab is a name of great importance to us, to the Bible student the name of King Ahab is of ~~g~~ tremendous importance. Now I'm speaking not of archaeology, but of the Bible, now from the Bible student why is Ahab is of tremendous importance? (Student). Ahab from the view point ~~is~~ of the student of Biblical religion is tremendously important because he is the king under whom Elijah prophesied, and Elijah, he is the picture of a wicked king against whom a great prophet prophesied. I believe that 95% of the Bible students ~~is~~ asked, who would you think of above all who would be a wicked king against whom a great prophet prophesied, Ahab would be more than anybody else, the one that they would select. He is the one against whom Elijah prophesied, and so he is tremendously important, from the view point of the study of religion in the Bible, the study of the work of the prophets, but in this particular course, he is of interest to us from another view. There is another reason of why he is of great importance. He is I believe the first king of the Divided Kingdom, who is specifically - whose deeds are specifically mentioned in Babylonian, Assyrian history. So with Ahab we get a definite tie up with Mesopotamia and for archaeology he is of tremendous importance. He is of tremendous importance for Bible study, but for archaeology he is of tremendous importance, because there was a tie up with Mesopotamia, and of course we know a great deal about that from ~~him~~ (8 1/2) but he is the first one whose deeds are mentioned.

Now I didn't say that he was the first king, of the divided kingdom, who is mentioned in Assyrian inscriptions. There is another who is mentioned, but he is mentioned as Ahab's father. He is mentioned as the father of him, Omri. Omri, is I believe, the first king of the Divided Kingdom who is mentioned on a Mesopotamian inscription, but he is simply referred to as the father of the land named after him, or something like that. Of his actual deeds we have no mention, but we do have ~~as~~ of Ahab. So with Ahab we begin to reach contact with Mesopotamia, and of course we have tremendous amount of archaeological material and of inscribed material from Mesopotamia. From then on we have many context there which would be interesting to study into. Now for next time I wish you would look over in the Bible the material on Rehoboam. Now there isn't much time for that, by tomorrow morning, ~~in~~ so we won't be able to spend a good bit of time. This is a graduate course, so we have about six hours of work outside, but we certainly don't expect to put that proportion between Monday and Tuesday. But take at least an hour, between now and tomorrow. Look over the material on Rehoboam in the Bible. See everything you can find on Rehoboam. And as far as you can compare the verses in Kings and Chronicles, see if there is anything told in one that isn't told in the other. Get the general comparison and then if you can get time, look at the specific verse by verse of it, see what is given in either one, everything about Rehoboam, try to do it - if you can get two hours in that's fine, but get at least one hour in before next class.

Next class.

Now for today I asked you to look into Rehoboam. We noticed last time that when it comes to the chronology, the one thing that ties it up here is Rehoboam's connection with Shishak, so we'll want to look into Egypt a little bit, and I have just this minute asked Mrs. Baker to look up two books in the library, one which ~~we~~ I don't think we have, and the other I ~~do~~ hope we do have. I'll want you to know something about the Egyptian relationship with Rehoboam, and it will be - there are important Egyptian relationships later on, but we won't come to that until some little time. One thing that of course we will want to understand fully about it, is that the Divided Kingdom comes after the period of Egyptian (11 1/2). The great history of ancient Egypt, is divided into three main high periods, of which they call the Old Kingdom, the Middle Kingdom, and the New Kingdom, and all three of them are prior to the Divided Kingdom. So that our connection

is a later less important section of Egypt history. But we have very little external connection with the history of the time of Rehoboam. We do have some connection shortly after that, with things that have been discovered in Palestine. So far as I know nothing specific has been discovered in Palestine which can be with certainly connected with Rehoboam itself, or unquestionably ~~unquestionably~~ to his time, so some that is fairly certain from a little bit later, so we'll look at that when we get to it.

But now let's for today look at the history of Rehoboam, and to look at all we find in the Bible, about him. Now what did you find about him, Mr. Ruble? (Student). I was just looking at the Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt. It was very interesting, that in it ~~it expresses~~ Breasted the great scholar of the University of Chicago, one of the greatest Egyptologist that we've ever had, tries to prove that practically every thing good in Hebrew religion or in modern social religion comes from ancient Egypt. He takes a very extreme attitude, on that. He goes through the Egyptian records on everything, all kinds of wicked stuff, but you'll find occasionally beautiful things, and he'll take that beautiful thing and then he'll build upon it a whole superstructure, so that all (13)

and you'll find one or two cases where you'll have a section of the Bible very similar to an Egyptian ~~psalm~~ or something, and that Bible taken from Egypt. And then you will go into the Bible and you will find one or two of these things that the average person impress (13 1/2) the rest of it, and he'll say (13 1/2).

But when it comes to the historical matter, Breasted is as good a historian of ancient Egypt as we'll ever have, but he does not (14). But he was an excellent historian, and he studied the records very carefully, went into Egyptian archaeology material, for ancient Egyptian history, the translation (14).

In fact, in most fields, they have something better than the other countries have. (Hard to hear.) But in History he is very excellent

History of ancient Egypt by Breasted, and it has a lengthy discussion of all the material known
 * in his day about all the things and in his day a great deal was known. We had tremendous
 number of inscriptions then, and since that time you can add a little information here and a
 little there, but not a great deal. The great main fact of Egyptian history - (student). John A.
 Wilson, was the scientific secretary of the orientalist, and he was at that particular position
 under Breasted, in which he over saw the coming in of the archaeological material, and he was
 well trained egyptologist, and a very very nice fellow, and ~~when~~ when Breasted died, there were
 three great scholars in the University who were, each of them (1 1/4). And
 (Hard to hear) ~~Wilson~~ the directors passed over all three of them, and
 appointed Wilson as director of the (1 1/2) institute. Two of them got so disgusted
 that they quit. The other one stayed and did a good work. Wilson was a very nice fellow.
 I met him over in Germany. (Hard to hear). And I used to see him at the University of the
 Oriental Institute. He was there and he was a very nice fellow. I even addited some of his
 lectures, but then they invited him to Washington to be head of the department of strategic
 studies of the near east, to oversee all that, and somebody said, made some difficulties for
 him, and he got into (2 1/2) some problems, as a result of it. Finally, he got
 mixed up and not only Washington, but came back and became
 directorship of (2 1/2). And since that time I haven't heard much about him, but
 I hope he continued his teaching. His scholarly work is good and excellent. Dr. Speiser
 succeeded him in head of that department in the government in the war, and they gave the
 department (3) was very highly recognized. (Hard to hear). But I guess in
 that particular sort of pressure, he just (3 1/4) have this particular knowledge
 and ideas, but he was a very nice fellow. I always appreciated everything that I had from him.
 I haven't had much contact with him lately. He was a very nice fellow and he was a good
 scholar. Everything that I have come across of his has been thorough. But he never had the
 world wide fame that Breasted had. Breasted as a young man took an interest in Egyptology,
 and worked extensively in it and made a great reputation for himself. He got John D.
 Rockefeller tremendously interested. It was his confidence in Breasted that led him to give

\$1200 to the (4). he had excavations all over and finally - it was a lot of good work, too. And in Chicago they built the Oriental ~~Re~~ Institute which they examined everything very very fine, only they were a little too sure about their ability of architect. I understand they forgot to put the stairways in and had to ~~h~~ tear half of it out to make room for it, so it was half built, something like that. There is a problem about that. Some of the men there said to Breasted, he seems to be a sort of lord of creation (4 1/2). (Hard to hear). But Rockefeller had confidence in Breasted, so when Breasted died, Rockefeller said, well, (5) I've given \$1200. I'd better not give anymore. So instead of saving the money and being careful, they were spending wildly and now the money is gone, they had these big buildings and these fine places, all through the Near East, and they didn't have money to carry it on, so they started to sell off their excavation centers, and selling out the materials, (5 1/2) and shut down their work. Dr. Albright used to say that he never advised a man to go who was interested in Bible study to study at the University of Chicago, because he said the Bible is a religious book, and if he had no ~~unde~~ sympathy with religion how could he understand a religious book. Of course, Breasted was an ordained pastor, a preacher, but he was anti- (6). Speaking of Shishak, I remember seeing a headline in a paper, the theory of the fundamentalists disproved. Under that, Bible shown not to be free from error. Under that, ~~th~~ a statement something like this, the Bible is not free from error, and never can be proved to be free from error. This statement was made by Dr. James Henry Breasted in connection with his giving to the press the information about the discovery by one of his archaeological expeditions, of evidence that Shishak had conquered Jerusalem and described (6 1/2). In other words, what he discovered was a corroboration of the Biblical account and he was just afraid that people would take it and prove that the Bible was true, so he made an opposite statement, and the opposite statement got the headlines. He was a very (6 1/2) but as a scholar, he was a solid careful ~~study~~ scholar, and his scholarly work like in his history is very dependable, very worth while. When he gets into, like this development of thought, in ancient Egypt, and the later books which he built upon it, which he called the Dawn of Conscience - he writes his theories, so when it comes to text in classical material, he is quite (7).

Of course that is one thing a person has to learn in scholarly work, the average person tends to think that everybody is either a saint or a ~~devil~~ devil. They are either perfect or they are no good, but we all of us are as a matter of fact, (7 1/2) we've all got our sins, so when it comes to moral goodness, Christ's was the only one who was ever free from evil and one may have a great glaring evil, and yet can have a lot of good in him, far more than someone else has in many fields, and yet he only in one. Though someone else may not have that particular evil. I think that we have to be charitable to one another if we stand by the Word. And the same is true of ability. You learn pretty soon to find that some people take a certain scholar and they attach themselves to him, and everything that he says is just perfect. And you can't do that because righteous people make mistakes, the most brilliant person will have a queer sort of a mistake in his mind, (8 1/2) is a crazy attitude. And you have to learn to judge people and see their excellent points and to see their weak points, and Breasted - there is much I dislike about him, but there is much of real scholarly work, so I'm sorry we don't have his history of Egypt here. * I ~~am~~ was going to ask you all to read his account of Shishak. Well, for the present suppose you, there is a much later book called When Egypt Ruled the East, which is very good, but I'm not sure that that comes up to Shishak. (Student). You, do? What is it called? (Student). History? I've never seen it? I'd like to see that. I know he wrote on the ancient achievements of Assyria. He wrote sections on it. (Student). Now if he has taken Breasted and brought him up to date that would be excellent. Of course a paper back would not be as big as Breasted's work but it would be a tremendous good work, of course. But it would certainly be worth while. So let me know about that. Ask Mr. Smitley. Tell him I would like to have it for the library right away. We ought to have that if it is a recent one. You see, the trouble is, Breasted's work is 30 years old now, and I don't even know if we could buy it new or not. It is still good. It is still a scholarly work. But what Wilson writes, see if it goes as far as Shishak. I'm sure it would be excellent (10). The story of Rehoboam has this important context with Egyptian archaeology and we want to look into that some. But then we have the history of - Mr. Ruble said I Chronicles now. I don't see anything about - I don't see anything in II Chronicles 9. (the last verse.) Oh, and Rehoboam his son

reigned in his stead. I see. Well, he is mentioned here, but actually, the whole chapter is about Solomon. I think it would be better to say, either to say 10, or to say 9:31 and following. Then incidentally there is a matter of historical interpretation. There is the matter of Biblical hermeneutics. Chapter 9 reads, and Rehoboam his son reigned in his stead, chapter 10 says Rehoboam went to Shechem for to Shechem were all Israel come to make him king, and there is the question, Is that statement, Rehoboam his son reigned in his stead, a summary statement of what follows, and then the next verse, precedes to tell about his beginning to reign. Or is it to be interpreted as it would be in England where - when a king dies, you would say, the king is dead, long live the king, and the other man is considered as king immediately on the death of his father. But he is not crowned until maybe a year later, and you remember, Edward (11 1/2) yes he was king, Edward VIII, but when it came to his coronation, he crowned himself, because he had abdicated before the crowning of the king. So there might be a question as to the exact minute or day when Rehoboam becomes king. But you read in the next verse that to Shechem was all Israel come to make him king. Now we have this chapter in II Chronicles X here, which describes Rehoboam, that section, and he has the same thing I believe in chapter 12 of I Kings. And part of the two is pretty closely parallel. You all, I trust were able to get at least an hour, I hoped you would (12 1/2). I'd like to ask this question. Was Rehoboam a wicked man? (Student). Yes, so Rehoboam was not a man who we would class as a wicked man, and yet, why did the people turn away from him, - did not he display his wickedness from the very beginning there, Mr. Vannoy? (Student). I don't think it was wickedness. I think it was poor judgment. He was a young, ~~an~~ inexperienced man who made a decision which was an unwise decision. And there wasn't necessarily, ~~in~~ in the beginning of the account of it, anything that was righteous or wicked about. It was a matter of lack of wisdom. It is true, that you don't find any evidence of any great guilt involved, but I don't think you find any evidence whatever of any real opposition to the (14 1/4) and his first act there was an act of real - you might say poor judgment. There are certain things under which you would have to think that it would be the wise attitude to take. I used to find that when I was teaching -

So you won't have to whistle later on, because _____, but I used to find that there are times when it is best to take a strict attitude, to save a lot of misery by doing it _____ (1/2), and I seem to find that true, _____ and his people thought that they could make the king make concessions where it would be easy going, - they might be the one that would suffer by it. And you have to consider the whole situation, but in this situation the advice of the old men was the right one. And yet we are not told that the division of the kingdom came because Rehoboam was lacking judgment, or because Rehoboam did a wicked thing or a foolish thing. We are told that God ~~saw~~ ^{caused} the division of the kingdom, and it was a punishment for Solomon's sin, not for Rehoboam's sin. It was during Solomon's reign that God had told Jeroboam that God was going to divide the kingdom, on account of Solomon's turning aside and doing a wicked thing. So it was a punishment for Solomon's sin that was visited upon his son. (Student). Yes, I think there is no question that it was much easier for the division to occur than it would have been otherwise, because of having a different group in the middle. It made it easier for the Northern and the Southern kingdom _____ (2). I think there is no question of that. But I don't think that alone was _____ (2 1/4). I don't think that alone could have brought it, and I think the Lord could have easily kept that from bringing it, if the men had followed him with their whole heart. But there is a division between the south and the north before this. ~~Q~~ Do you know Mr. Haffly of any time when the south and the north~~s~~ were divided prior to the time of Rehoboam? Divided into two kingdoms? Mr. Ruble, do you know? (Student). ~~The~~ ^A divided kingdom, the first eight years of David's reign. We don't call it the divided kingdom because it was united. And it was united for 30 years after David, the remaining 32 years he was king of the whole kingdom, and Solomon reigned over the whole kingdom, but there had been a division, just like the division later, ~~and~~ except the _____ (3 1/4). The southern kingdom is a little larger under Rehoboam than it was under David. Yes? (Student). Absalom took the whole kingdom, including Jerusalem. You see, Absalom took ~~the~~ Jerusalem and David fled over into Transjordan, and Absalom had the whole kingdom, and then after Absalom was killed in battle, then when they came back, then the northern section revolted under another man, revolted against David, but Joab went into the mountain, and put it down quite clearly, so that would be a division that lasted a very brief time. It shows that

there was an under current of division, but it didn't last long at the time. If it had it would have come into evidence a little earlier, but it didn't come until after David was brought back. Then there was a ~~an~~ brief division (4 1/4). It showed there was already a division. Then of course in the book of Judges you have a time when there was trouble between the southern and the northern kingdom, the northern section, and there was fighting between them, and the people who were trying to escape, the ones who were victorious tried to hold the force of the river~~s~~, and protect the others from escaping, and everybody who came they would ask him, pronounce the word, Shibboleth, and if they said Sibboleth, why they would kill them, because they belonged to the other kingdom. Now of course that is just a poor representation in English of the difference. ~~It~~ Probably it was more like Psibboleth, than Sibboleth. We don't know exactly. It was a sound there, which was something they couldn't pronounce. Just like today you take the average German, and if we asked him to pronounce the word the he would probably say ze book. He couldn't say the unless he had a tremendous amount of practice. And you ask the average American to pronounce a word with a German r in it, like my second week in Berlin

o ?

I asked the taxi to take me to the Friedrich Wilhelm university. You see there is an r in university and an r in Friedrich, and an l in Wilhelm, and he said where is it? I repeated it. He said, where? I repeated it. He said, oh, the (5 3/4) hotel, and it ~~is~~ just shows how difficult it is for an American to pronounce an r that a German can understand. Or an l even. The two are very very difficult for us because there are (6). And our ch is utterly different from anything that the Germans ever would think of. But here the north and the south were different enough that there would be such a difference in pronunciation ~~if~~ even in the time of the Judges, that they could by this word recognize which place a man belonged to. Yes? (Student). Well, there was the division - one reason for it is this, that the Philistines held most of the plains area, and there were these other people on most of the Plain country. The Israelites were largely up in the mountain, and a little distance north of Jerusalem, the mountains become quite narrower. So it wasn't particularly a very good place to live, so it makes the section we've had through there, going north from Jerusalem, where there is not much habitation, and also in between there was a section of the Gibeonites, and of course not having

any radio, or anything like that, there was - it was easy for the sections to grow apart north of this division and south of this division, so in the course of time, they would tend to grow apart in different ways, south of this, and different attitude towards things, and it would gradually grow apart, and a good king could have held them together, but God determined on account of Solomon's wickedness that it was better for the subsequent development of the Word of God, that they should in no case have as much power involved in this, and consequently ~~the~~ that there should be one king over each section, instead of a king over both, so the Lord caused the division. I don't think it is quite right to say he simply punished Solomon by having his successors have only small territory. That's one aspect of it, but the main aspect is, it was the Lord's will that in a world with sin, this was the best way to prepare the way for the coming of Christ, rather than have the strain that comes on a person who has too much power, so that the king with less power would be better, and God caused the division, but the human inciting and decay is not the cause. The human cause was the gradual difference that had developed between the people settled in the north and the people settled in the south. You know, I'm amazed when I see the difference between a person in Georgia, and a person from one of the northern states, and I'm particularly amazed at that when I think of the origin of Georgia. Many parts of the south were settled by the Cabaleers, the aristocrats ~~and~~ from England who looked down on (9), and many parts of the north were settled by the mercantile (9) who were oppressed by the nobility and came over here with one reason, to have a certain freedom from them, but when you get to Georgia, the history of Georgia, here, that Oglethorpe made Georgia a place of refuge for the persecuted of Europe, and the early settlers of Georgia were Protestants who were persecuted by the Roman Catholics in different sections of Europe and they came over here, for a place where they could be free from that persecution, and where they could follow the word of God. And they were poor and persecuted until they came to Georgia, but today we take the people of Georgia, and the difference between them and people of such very similar background from New England, is tremendously different in their speech and you take in the civil war, some of the greatest ~~and~~ hot heads of the southern side in the civil war were from Georgia, and it simply shows how with people separated by a long distance they can develop in this way.

I don't particularly make that about Georgia. South Carolina (10 1/4) but in Georgia it is very strange. It simply shows how people can develop, when they are separated by long distance. They can develop in different directions, particularly then, and you know in Europe today, you go to some part of Europe today and you will find in one country, in France and in Germany, you may find that there is a marked difference in the pronunciation in some one particular sound, you come up to some difference, and everybody pronounces this sound in a certain way, and beyond it the language will be the same, but this particular sound is pronounced quite differently. And you wonder why that is, and you trace back, and you find that it dates from the 12th to the 14th century, there were two different powers that helped, and there was one force here and one force here, so it was difficult (11). And maybe two centuries - 800 years from then, caused a separation between people who were perhaps of the same family, but they had little contact with each other, for a couple of centuries, and the language developed in such a difference, so today it is all the same language, there is a marked difference in pronunciation in certain sounds. It corresponds to an old (11 1/2). So here we have the division of the kingdoms which it predispose - its real cause, the Lord's determination that this is what is best for His purposes in connection with Israel, the real cause, a part of the cause, His punishment to Solomon, for turning away when he had such wonderful opportunities (12). But he had his head turned by the . And its occasion is the lack of wisdom on the part of Rehoboam. The young fellow didn't know what to do. He went to people for advice. But if he had been the fellow he should have been, he might have seen the difference between their advice. But he made this decision, and it was God's plan and so we read that when Rehoboam then thought that he was going to conquer the northern kingdom, that the Lord simply thought that (12 1/2). That it was from the Lord that the division was to start. And he did start. Now of course, maybe he couldn't help but start . The people wouldn't have backed him up if he (12 1/2). But we are not told. We can at least hope that there is, but it is not as Rehoboam and Jeroboam.

Now we have then these three chapters in Kings and in Chronicles. As you read in Chronicles you read straight along through the history of Rehoboam, don't you? And then we come

to the end of the history of Rehoboam, and you read about the history of his son. Do we do that in Kings? Mr. Grauley? (Student). We don't. Why not? (Student). You think so? Yes, in Kings' here, we start in with Rehoboam, and we have of course one to 24, telling about Rehoboam. Then we read in verse 25, about Jeroboam, and then we go on to read about Jeroboam in connection with chapter 12, all ~~of~~ of 13, we read about Jeroboam, and things connected with him, and 14 tells about Jeroboam up to verse 21. And then in 21 we return to Rehoboam, and we have Rehoboam through the rest of the chapter, and that of course brings us a vital difference between Kings and Chronicles. Kings is the history of the kings of Israel and Judah, and the purpose of Kings is to give us a survey of the history and of the working of God in these two kingdoms. Chronicles is a history of the ~~in~~ kings of Judah alone, and Chronicles omits Israel. That is, it deals with Israel as it relates to it, but not otherwise -

K-6. (0)

Now this being the case, what about Elijah, the great history of Elijah? Do we have this in both Kings and Chronicles, the story of Elijah? Mr. Ruble? Do you have anything about Elijah in Chronicles here? Does anybody think they have anything about him? (Student: No.) No, that is where you are all wrong. Kings tells about the northern kingdom. Elijah's ministry was in the northern kingdom. But, there was a time when a king of the southern kingdom went up to the northern kingdom, and had considerable connection with the northern kingdom, and so what relates to the southern kingdom relates in particular to Elisha. We have a whole chapter in Chronicles in which Elisha is prophesied. A chapter in which the northern and southern kingdom stand together. So that Elijah and Elisha are very incidental in Chronicles, - they enter into it comparatively little. Only as they relate directly to the southern kingdom, and most of what they did was in relation to the northern kingdom. I heard a sermon by Dr. Barnhouse once, in which he said, that - after the division, he says, God deals with the southern kingdom. They were God's people. The northern kingdom were the wicked people, and so he said that during the next few years, all the righteous people left the northern kingdom and came to the southern kingdom, so the wicked were moving from the south to the north, the righteous were moving from the ~~south~~ north to the south, so the southern kingdom were God's people. God's people, and the northern kingdom were the wicked

people who God had rejected. Now it is nowhere stated in the Bible that that was the case. But that doesn't prove that it wasn't. There are things that are happening that we don't have proof of, mentioned. But if that was the case, why on earth does God send His greatest - that is as far as these are concerned - His great succession of prophets, that we ever had described to the northern kingdom. You don't find Elijah and Elisha ever telling people to go to the southern kingdom. You never, you find they come to the northern kingdom and dealing with the northern kingdom, so that God was dealing with both ~~the~~ kingdoms. There is no doubt about it. Now the southern kingdom had the Levitic dynasty. It was the dynasty He was blessing specifically. But the northern kingdom was the kingdom which was also part of Israel and at the end we are told that Israel and Judah will be reunited. They are both God's people. It is very easy to make a guess like Dr. Barnhouse did, and to present it very very vividly, so that it is almost stated as fact, but there is just no evidence of it. No evidence whatever. In fact, the evidence is the other way. Yes? (Student). II Chronicles [?] ~~III~~. (Student). Yes, (Student). No, of course in many cases the Levites and the priests were ~~not~~ naturally (3 1/2) but then because Jeroboam turned away from - the golden calf, but then when it comes to the people, they came down to sacrifice, and then you read a long a little further to see what happens, that Jeroboam put up the golden calf right on the border, right at Bethel, just on the border. Now I'd better, unfortunately this class comes right before chapel. And I need a little break before chapel. Now just about our lesson for the next time. This is a graduate course, in which we have to do three hours of work a week on it for each class. Six hours of work outside this work. Now I think it wouldn't hurt if we could spend a certain amount of time reviewing general matters of Old Testament History. I would frankly be a bit shocked ~~if~~ ^{that} you didn't know about the first eight years of David's reign. There are several chapters devoted about it. It is a rather important element in the history, but - of course it is not in our present here. ISBE is good, you will find a lot of good in ISBE, but you will find more in the Bible, and you should know the main facts in the Bible. But now, let's go on with this, and take Rehoboam everything we have about Rehoboam in Kings and in Chronicles and compare them and see what the difference is. See what verses are in one that are not in the other. See if you can where there is a word that is strikingly different between the two. See how

much there is in it that is almost word for word the same. Make that the comparison between Kings and Chronicles. Then learn something about Shishak. You might see what Wilson has in his book, if you have it here, it might be very good. You could all look into the Encyclopedia Brittanica. It might have a good article on Shishak, or on Sheshonk, and try to get us some ~~inform~~ information about Shishak for next time. Then look into Rehoboam a little bit. Where was Rehoboam's capital. Find it on the map. See why he would pick this particular place for his capital. What advantages did he have? And get the main facts about Jeroboam. And then after doing those things if you get through that, for next time, I think you might say, well, you might be able to look at Rehoboam's son and tell us, was Rehoboam's son a good man, or was he a bad man? Was he a believer in the Lord, a follower of the Lord, or was he an enemy of the Lord? Compare Kings and ~~Chroni~~ Chronicles and see if you have the story of Rehoboam's son with the same person repeated, or how much is omitted, and how much is added. I think you can get me a definite answer on that. Now this is not absolutely specifically assignment but I think you can put in six hours of work. And have good material.

NEXT CLASS. (7 1/2)

It was to keep alive the knowledge of God in a sinful world, to prepare the way for the coming of His son, and so there was given a great picture of the greatness that there would be when God's true Son of David would reign. The greatness and power was illustrated by the power that Solomon had, but Solomon, a human being erred, fell into sin, largely through pride over the great things God had given him. There are very few men who can stand to have great power or great glory, and Solomon started wonderfully, and then proved he couldn't stand, and the Lord, you can't see how it is much punishment to Solomon, after his death, so far as the kingdom (8 1/2) but it is - the result of Solomon's sin in the sense that it was not the best way to prepare the way for the coming of Christ (9) in the world, that with the limitations and difficulties of man's sin, it ~~would~~ was more apt to be done with the kingdom divided. Of course God would have to supernaturally intervene to do it anyway, so that as a result of Solomon's sin the kingdom was to be divided, and Jeroboam was given the opportunity to follow the Lord, and receive the Lord's blessing, and Ahijah told him God would give him a lasting kingdom to his descendents if he would

be true to the Lord. Well then, the next fact about Jeroboam that we should know is that he fled to Egypt, and he was in Egypt for the latter years of Solomons. Then there is a problem in the interpretation of the passage we have, that when Solomon came back, from Egypt, most critics find a contradiction in the account of the kings. The way it reads it would seem to say that as soon as he heard Solomon died he came back and that he was the ring leader in the opposition. There are those who think that that must be wrong because of the word which occurs in Kings which is not in Chronicles, which says that when the people had heard that he had come back, they sent and got him and made him king. Well now, there is an interesting historical problem there, to be ironed out, and I won't discuss it until you look into it a little bit, and see what you think on it. It is not a major problem at all, but it is one which I would like you to look into a little bit. But at any rate, this we know, that soon after Solomon's death, he came back, Jeroboam came back, and whether he was the ring leader, in the opposition to Rehoboam or not, he at any rate was the - was made king by the people of the northern kingdom, many of whom must have thought that he was a very able man, and had been in opposition to Solomon, so they would take for granted that therefore he was opposed to think that they hadn't (10 1/2) about Solomon, which showed how little they knew about human nature. And then they made him king, but then number six, Mr. Vannoy.

NEXT CLASS.

It is interesting that twenty years ago, no I don't know if I would say twenty. At least 15, years ago, most scholars felt that Jeroboam went to Egypt, befriended the king of Egypt, made a relative of the king of Egypt, and that when he came back, when four years later the king of Egypt came up in order to help Jeroboam, and attacked Rehoboam. He came to help his friend Jeroboam. That was a wide spread view. Then there was discovered in Egypt, a large monument on the wall in which it showed the king, Shishaq - Sheshonq was perhaps what it was in Egyptian, he showed here the name of cities he claimed to conquer, and - there were a couple of hundred of them, and some books on Egyptian history will say that the - Shishaq went around the point, so monument put up by Thutmose III, a thousand years earlier, and named the Egyptian cities which he conquered, and the thieving scribe of Shishak just copying names of

Palestinian cities from this monument to show what cities he had conquered, and it was just a lie. Now we know that Egyptian kings often lied, and so it would not be at all inconceivable that particularly a late king like this, should have done such a thing. But since that time, some time within the present century, a hundred years back here, I would suggest that sometime between 1920-35, there was discovered at Megiddo, in northern Palestine a stela put up by the king Sheshonq, to tell of his conquest of Megiddo, which is one of the leading cities in the northern kingdom, fortifications, and consequently since that time most scholars believe that this proves that in general Sheshonq's claims are right, and of course many of the things he claimed to conquer, he made (14) tribute or something, so that they admitted submission, rather than that there was a battle or anything like that. In probably most cases they surrendered to him, let him come through, but the claims that he made to have attacked both kingdoms, in his monarch, is now accepted by scholars, and so the present tendency is to feel - now his coming had nothing to do with any friendship toward ~~Rehab~~ Jeroboam. That it was to strengthen Egyptian might in that part of the world, and (14 1/2). His claims which we knew for a long time now are backed up by this discovery in the northern kingdom.

K. 7.

where you have statements here that the rest of the deeds of so and so are they not given in the book of the days of such a king of (1/2). It would show clearly that the writer of the book of Kings, had ^{sources} ~~sources~~, he had materials that he surveyed, and he collected what was important for his purposes, and evidently he felt that these other materials were available if people wanted to look at them, whether it was available in manuscripts that were circulated, (1) whether it was available in some central place where people could go and see it, (1) but he does refer to other books, not only as sources, he could see, but as sources which people could go to if they wanted to. Now (1) is a distinction, because it doubtless was much later. And it also had sources, upon which it rested. The attitude of many scholars toward Chronicles not long ago was the author of the book of Chronicles writing long after Kings was written, wanted to glorify ancient Judah, so he took the book of Kings, and he

copied it, and the parts he was interested in, which was talking about Judah, and then he enlarged it, and makes it purely imaginary, but there has been found some evidence that the things in Chronicles is true, that were not mentioned, which led many of the secular scholars to feel that the author of Chronicles certainly must have had some other sources than Kings, so it is all not at ~~all~~ ^{un} likely that it did copy from some parts of Kings, you find so many verses that are identical, which leads to think very likely to simply utilize the word which was already available for material that he wanted to (2). But he doubtless had other accounts to choose from. And of course the place where you get most striking evidence between Kings and Chronicles that I've ever saw, is in connection with what particular king. Now I asked for you yesterday, if you got into Chronciles, to look at the reign of Abijah, and compare Kings and Chronicles. How many of you have done so? (Then we'd better leave that until later. The reign of Abijah is very late in ~~the~~ [?] Kings and Chronicles. Please be sure to do that before next time.

Now today I asked you to look at Rehoboam, and Rehoboam's reign as we noticed begins with Rehoboam reigning as king here in the northern kingdom after they broke away from Judah, and Jeroboam - I asked you just now to name the prophets during his reign, and - how many - here is one that has a correct answer and then it is ~~not~~ crossed out. We have ~~the~~ during the reign of Solomon, we have Ahijah the Shilonite, active during Solomon's reign, telling Jeroboam that Jeroboam will be king. Does he do any prophetic work during the reign of Rehoboam. In I Kings 14, we find the account of Jeroboam sending his wife down to Shiloh, and going there to Ahijah the prophet, which told me that I should be king over this people. And so she comes down to ask whether their son will be healed. Why does she disguise herself. How could he tell whether the king of Jeroboam, son of Jeroboam would recovery from his illness, if he didn't know it was the son of Jeroboam he was being asked about? (Student). Yes, but what I mean is, what was Jeroboam's idea in having her disguised? What was the point of that? (Student). The point of going to ask information on him, without him knowing who is asking information. Do you think that the wife was planning to come in and say, will you tell me about the son of Jeroboam whether he is going to get well? I'm interested in

finding out, - well, wouldn't that give away right away which he was. Or wouldn't you just say, my son. (Student). I have the feeling myself that when Jeroboam sent his wife in disguise to find out that he had an idea that this Ahijah could tell the future in some magical way, rather than that he was thinking of him as a real prophet. Jeroboam had turned against the Lord to a very large extent. Was he thinking of it as a sort of old superstition, as a guess, thinking that this man had some sort of magical power, - When my aunt was very ill in Los Angeles, her sister in law - her brother came to visit me from Montana, 1600 miles away, and his wife was dabbling somewhat in spiritism, and she went to a medium, and this spiritualist medium, when she saw her immediately put her hand on her lungs, where the cancer was, and she said oh, oh, it hurts, it hurts. In other words, this spirit medium, seeing the woman, whose husband was going through to visit his sister, 1600 miles away, immediately was impressed with pain, in the part of the body in which the husband's sister was ill. But she said, oh, pain, pain, but she said, I don't see any death. I don't see any death. So she took it as meaning, the spirit said that he was sick with an illness in the lungs, but that she would not die. Well, a month later, the woman died. And so that whatever spiritual forces this woman had, now of course there is a great deal of fakery in spiritism. But it doesn't seem to me just likely to be a fraud here. It seems to be ~~in~~ very unlikely, in any way to find out, of what this woman's husband was going to do. A sister who was in this condition, so far away. But it would seem to me that perhaps there is a supernatural force which informs ~~this woman,~~ ~~thats~~ ~~which~~ this woman of something present and past, but has no power at all to predict the future. And the spirits, if they are being - with whom these people get in contact, could know that he was going, they could know that from his ideas (7 1/2) they would actually see what was happening, but not (7 1/2). Now Jeroboam may have thought of it like that. If only you can go and - remember the woman who tried to touch Jesus without His knowing who it was. She thought if she would just touch him, she would get healed. And of course she did get healed, but ~~she~~ Jesus immediately turned around and talked to her. He felt that virtue had gone out from him. That suggests the possibility of something, do you remember the people at the pool of Shiloam, they thought that whoever would step in after the angel touched the water

would immediately be healed. So it would look as if Jeroboam thought he could get some information that will be helpful, without revealing who we are. But it was certainly a very unworthy idea. (Student). That would be upon this apparent contradiction between verse 20 and 21. My feeling would be that those that followed the house of David, would probably be the leaders of the tribe, that in the meeting, the leaders of the tribe of Judah stood up for Rehoboam, and that Benjamin maybe was divided. So that they didn't make any stand for Rehoboam, there, Some of them might have spoken for Jeroboam, and or they might have just kept quiet. But that when it came to the actual division, that Jerusalem was right on the border of Judah and Benjamin, and that some of the people of Benjamin followed one way, and one the other way. That would be my guess, and so that when he says he was going to give one tribe to him, there is only one complete tribe that (9 1/2) and at the same time that it may have - there may have varied the people of ~~Benjamin~~ Benjamin for a time, but eventually the bulk of the people - it is very interesting how Ahijah took his garments and cut it in twelve parts, and gave one part to - he kept one part, he gave ten parts and he kept one. And you wonder, how can you divide twenty into twelve, and give away ten and only keep one. Well, the one tribe that he had, the tribe of Judah. And Benjamin is sort of in between, but eventually most of them go over to Judah, (Student). So I believe that right up to the end here, the individuals kept their pedigree (10) as to what tribe they belonged to, pretty definitely, but of course, in the Southern Kingdom, you have - Judah is the overwhelming mass - and then you probably had some (10 1/2) ~~migrants~~ migrants from the northern kingdom. You had some people who kept up their idea of other tribe, and I would imagine that people, you remember, didn't Paul say he was of the tribe of Benjamin. I think that Paul in the time of the New Testament specifically speaks of himself as from the tribe of Benjamin. The identity was kept but of course it is true that the tribe of (10 1/2) got more infused or less ~~mixed~~ mixed with one nation. And actually of course, in the original giving of the tribes, Simeon was south of Judah, you remember. Simeon and Dan were south of Judah, both of them are in the Northern Kingdom, now. Their people had pretty well migrated. Before the time of Solomon, even though their actual area was given them by Joshua. Well, we have -

A man who had been head over a large part of the work under Solomon, and then he fled to Egypt. He was a practical man, a builder, a soldier, a man who was politically and secularly minded, and his interest was to build up a strong kingdom. When he becomes king over the Northern Kingdom, he wants to build a strong kingdom. You have no evidence he set out to conquer the southern kingdom, but Rehoboam was going to bring the kingdom back, and then reconquer the northern kingdom. Shemaiah told him to quit trying, because he said that this things was from the Lord, but Jeroboam ~~was~~ set out to strengthen himself. So he takes Shechem and Mount Ephraim, and he makes it stronger. He conducts considerable building, work in Shechem and he dwells there. And he was also interested in making Penuel stronger, which was over across in Trans Jordan, - it may have been that he wanted to be sure that they would hold a good bit of Trans Jordan, that E (12 1/2), so that he built a fortification over there. I don't think the statement he built Penuel would be any warrant for considering that it ever was a capital of his. He might have stayed over there while they were doing the work. I don't see any evidence here that he established it that way. Then we read in verse 26, that Jeroboam says in his heart, now will the kingdom return to the house of ~~David~~ David, if this people go to sacrifice to the Lord in Jerusalem. So ~~at~~ the king made two calves of gold and he said to the people, Jerusalem is too far away to go. Behold your gods, O Israel, which brought you up out of the land of Egypt. And he set one in Bethel and the other he set in Dan. And why did he set the one in Bethel and one in Dan? (Student). the political purpose here - the natural thing to do would be to build one headquarters in the middle of the land. That would be the natural thing, and that's what Jerusalem is supposed to be. The one center to which they came from all over the land. But his purpose is to keep them from going to Jerusalem. Now if he builds one in Dan, that would make the people go that's the best way in the world to keep them in the opposite direction,/from Jerusalem. It is way up in the north~~e~~ there, but of course, that is so far, that many would be much nearer Jerusalem, so he built one near there, so that on the way to Jerusalem they go right past - and he says these are your gods which brought you up out of Egypt, and he'd stop them before they got to Jerusalem and then he made it difficult to go across the border anyway. He made this to stop them on the way. The people

who were in the southern part would go to this, and the people in the northern section would

(14 1/2), stopped them from going to Jerusalem. So he took these two places and

he put up these two golden calves -

K-8.

evidence we have for writing on the back is at Tell ~~Heleth~~ Halaf over in Syria, where

Baron Oppenheim excavated about 1929 or 30. He excavated a city there where they had a big temple with statues of gods standing on the backs of animals, he had quite a collection of them there, a wonderful big stack. He offered to sell me the whole bunch, but since he wanted a half a million dollars for them, I didn't buy it. But he found some very beautiful statues there.

He wrote a book on them, and he said, Tell Halañ, and that I think was the main basis on which various ones have suggested that Jeroboam's idea was that - not that the calf was the god, but the calf was the foundation ~~on~~ upon which the invisible god of Israel was imagined to stand.

on Albright's part

Now that is purely a guess. But it does have a parallel in these statues which were on the backs of animals over there in Tell Haláf, of course the whole idea of idolatry is something which wasn't very clear in people's minds, anyway. Surely the Assyrians when they thought of Adad, the god of storms, didn't think that this statue here was producing storms. This statue in some way represented the god of Adad, and they were worshipping the idol, the idols represent the invisible god, or a god at least which could get around and do something. It wasn't tied to a place, and yet when their worship to the statues were carried to such an extent that people were easily come to think of it as if the statue was the god, that surely, some of them at least thought of the statue, as simply a representation. It would be like the difference where the

Roman Catholics worship an image, or worship a picture, and they say of course, that the

(2 1/2) say, these pictures just represent, they remind people of them. Nobody thinks

the picture is (2 1/2) and yet you will find that the common people around, many of them

will think of the statue as actually being the thing, or being the god, and these ideas are

conceived in people's minds. And you will find the Roman Catholics even have a pilgrimage to the Virgin Mary of this town, the Virgin Mary of that town, the Virgin Mary of the other town.

Especially in the Middle Ages. They would make a vow to the Virgin Mary of this city, or that

city or the other. They almost have them as separate gods. But certainly Jeroboam was not being (3) with two different gods, one at Bethel and one at Dan. It was the god, which had brought them out of Egypt, and as the time goes on in the Northern Kingdom, we find that while the worship of the golden calf, is constantly reviewed, yet we find that the worship of Baal is put in an entirely different category. And we don't find - we find Elijah, very very anxious to destroy the Baal worship, and evidently not paying too much attention to the golden calf worship which seems to be thought of as a much inferior - much less harmful thing, so that it would seem that both of them were definitely wrong. The Baal worship was breaking the first commandment, and to some extent the golden calf worship was the second commandment rather than the first. That to some of the people it was Jehovah they were worshipping under a different form, whether he was above the animal, or whether he was - whether the animal in some way represented him. It is interesting of course that we have golden calf built, made by Aaron coming out of Egypt, and to how great an extent this was - relates back to that, is something that we just don't know. It is interesting to think - Mr. Vannoy. (Student). Well of course God is Elohim, but I believe that it is ^{these} ~~the~~ instead of ^{this} ~~the~~. (Student). Well, is it these - is it these represent your god, or these are your gods. It is hard to tell. Since Elohim is plural in form meaning the one god it is rather hard to be sure, to say whether he meant a group of gods. Well, I'm not sure you can say it is a matter of the verb. The verb is plural too. And then the verb, the difference between singular and plural might be just a vowel letter. So it is difficult to be sure on that. Now of course, the next time we'd better get the Jeroboam's reign very well in mind, and get Abijah's and Asa's. Everything about Asa, you might have to look in the concordance to do it. Because some little things about Asa, may be under some other king. But try to compare Kings and Chronicles and be sure you know about Abijah, is he a good man, or a bad man? Was he entirely bad? Was he entirely good? What was he? Get that for sure the next time, and then of course Jeroboam - and try to get everything you can about Asa.

END OF CLASS.

If you would mark these down I would appreciate it. The first assignment I'll call the mother assignment. That's the title of it. Look at I Kings 15:2,10,13, and at II Chronicles 11:18-22, 13:2; 15:16. With these verses in front of you, write a discussion as to the - who was the mother of Abijam? Who was the mother of Asa? And how old do you think she was, when each of these men were born? Now the assignment is to be worked simply from the English and the Hebrew text. See what you can do from these texts on this, and then, if you want to look at any commentaries or discussions afterward, that's up to you, but that is not required for this assignment, but it definitely is not to be done before you have done everything you can from these texts alone. That is, you can look of course at any Bible passage you want to, but please write up your discussion on this, before looking at any commentary or other source on the matter. In fact, I'm not assigning you to look at any other, but if you do, and want to add something afterward, that's up to you, but make it separate, not included on the paper which is to be based purely on this. Now the second assignment is a similar one. This we call the year assignment. It consists of all the verses in a certain section of the Old Testament which have the word year in them, as I've copied them from Young's Concordance. They are as follows: I Kings 14:20-21; 15:1,2,9,10,25,28,33. 16:8,10,15,23,29. II Chr. 12:13; 13:1-2. 14:1,6. 15:10,19. 16:1,12,13. Now these verses I've given you are all the verses dealing with a particular period that contain the word year. However, I did look at context, to be quite certain that they are all relative to a certain discussion. Now what I want you to do is, similar to the other assignment, to make a study based upon the Biblical passage in the English and Hebrew. That is, consult the Hebrew as you wish. It is not an assignment to read these verses in Hebrew, but to consult it where you think it will throw light on it. But in most of these, the English will be quite sufficient for the present purpose. But it is to look at these verses, and ^{take} ~~base~~ the data that is contained in them, and construct it into a table. Now I don't want you to copy this from any discussion of the subject, any encyclopedia, or anything like that. I want you to take this material and to arrange it yourself. Arrange this material in tabular form so as to bring out clearly this interrelationship of these verses. Do the verses fit together? Do you find any that are

quite difficult to fit into the system. What is the situation in that regard? That is this particular assignment, and write it up as a table and a discussion. Have it ready to turn in. Then if you wish to do so, (there is no objection afterward to your looking at any discussion anywhere that you feel inclined to, and adding comments afterward based upon (12 1/2) but saying what you based about it. But that's not a part of this assignment. This assignment is a direct study from the passage.

Now in your study for Asa today, did you notice anything that impressed you as at least a strong verbal contradiction? Did any of you? (Student). Very strong language about his being such a wonderful man, but if you take these verses by themselves, you'd think that he was just about the finest man in the whole Bible. And yet you find other verses, which have a fairly strong condemnation of this aspect of his life. I think this is very valuable to bring out the fact that all men are sinful and are imperfect, and that the finest of men have their faults. And if you had only a few verses, you might stress one aspect of it, and no others. (Student). The question might be asked about the judgment of kings and chronicles regarding Abijah. There, I think if you just read the two, you'd feel that there was quite a (14). Then I had in mind, what looks like a contradiction, between II Chronicles 14:5, and 16:17. I'm disappointed none of you noticed that. I don't want to discuss that this morning, just mention it to you.

K. 9.

I don't want to discuss that this morning because I'd like to get into the prophetic situation in Jeroboam's reign, and I'm afraid we wouldn't have time. I'll ask you a few questions about Asa there, and about Jeroboam's reign. But today, let's look at I Kings 12:13. In this discussion of Jeroboam's reign, in chapters 12, and 13, we have after the beginning of Jeroboam's reign, we have a little bit material nature about his deeds in verse 25, and then verse 26 we go on to look at his religious activity. And in connection with his religious activity, the - we find that his political ideas, mixed into it, very definitely. How many calves did Jeroboam put up at Bethel? This seems to be a contradiction doesn't it? That in verse 31, no in verse 29, it says - verse 28 says he made two calves, so verse 29 says he set one in

Bethel and one in Dan. That seems to be very explicit. But then in 32, ~~it says~~ it says that in Bethel he sacrificed unto the calves that he had made. That would appear to be a contradiction, wouldn't it? There is an interesting question, how many calves did he put up? ~~And~~ Another interesting question that is much discussed is, was this calf, a god? Was it a symbol of a god? Or was it a foundation upon which the invisible god was supposed to stand? There has been much discussion over this, by a number of scholars in recent years, over various views on these problems. I think though this morning, I want to go on to the activity of the prophets. The prophets, we are not going to deal with this course much with Elijah and Elisha. But I don't think in this course, it is largely a historical course, that we will do much in the life of Elijah and Elisha. But we will deal with the other problem, that the others are less about them, can directly enter into the history at these various points. But here we have this account at the end of ~~verse~~ chapter 12, how he set up these calves, one in Dan and one in Bethel, and then we find in 32, Jeroboam ordained a feast in the eighth month, on the fifteenth day of the month, like unto the feast that is in Judah, and he offered upon the altar. And verse 33 says he offered upon the altar, he made in Bethel, the fifteenth day of the eighth month, even in the month which he had devised of his own heart; and ordained a feast unto the children of Israel; and he offered upon the altar, and burnt incense. Mr. Grauley, what does this 33rd verse, the middle ~~h~~ third of it mean? (Student). Judah, Jerusalem was on the 7th month, and he made this on the eighth month, a month later. And of course, the temple was finished building on the eighth month, but the dedication of it, occurred on the seventh month. But he put it on the eighth month, and so he abandoned the specified time, of holding the feast, but he had this feast here, and it continues that when he was holding this feast, it is really a poor place to put a chapter division, in the beginning of 13. Surely, it would be much better to put a chapter division at verse 26, because that starts a new (4 1/2). 25 may be the life of Jeroboam. This doesn't seem to be the proper place for it. Up in verse 31, he made an house of high places and made priests of the lowest of the people, which were not of the sons of Levi. What does that mean Mr. Vannoy? (Student). The custom from the people in general, is the idea that they must be Levites, or of ~~h~~ the priestly family, and having done that, then probably some one

the best that they could get perhaps, were pretty low class. That they were all of a lower class it seems to me drawing much from (5 1/2) statements. That is a way that it could be taken but I think that it is quite unnecessary. Mr. Haffly. (Student). Yes, it may very well be that some of them were. In fact, you might say all of them would be ~~if~~ if they were turning away from the proper worship at Jerusalem. And doing something that was contrary to God's command. But they might in other regards be the best citizens. At least some of them might. I wouldn't be sure of how many of that kind you could get. Now it continues, that while he was there at this feast, there came a man of God from Judah by the word of the Lord unto Bethel; and Jeroboam ~~is~~ was standing by the altar to burn incense. And Jeroboam cried against the altar in the word of the Lord, and said, O altar, altar, thus saith the Lord; was my insertion of the subject correct? Mr. Ruble doesn't think so. He thinks it is the man of God. Well, I agree with Mr. Ruble on that, and the man of God cried against the altar by the word of the Lord, and said, O altar, altar, thus saith the Lord; Behold, a child shall be born unto the house of David, Josiah by name. Montgomery says in his commentary that even such an ultra conservative as Keil admits that this is not an attempt to give the name of King Josiah, but he ~~recognizes~~ recognizes that the term is used here in a general sense, a man will stand firm - there will be a man born to the house of David, a man who will be loyal to the Lord, and then it is pure coincidence that Josiah had the same name. (7 1/2)

But while it is true that predictions of specific names are the only two cases I recall in scripture there is certainly no reason why the Lord shouldn't do it if He chose to, at all, and certainly the natural interpretation of this, ~~is~~ Josiah by name, to say that it means he is going to be called Josiah. Behold a child shall be born to 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 burned upon thee. Now here was a definite prediction of course, and the prediction should prove that this man was a man of God, but that it was fulfilled, and then we read later on, that when Josiah heard about the prediction he proceeded to do what was said here. Does that destroy the value of the prediction, this kind of a proof. After all, supposing that one of you would say, tomorrow Dr. MacRae is going to drive over ~~to~~ here in his car, and then if you told me that you had said it, I said well, I wouldn't want to prove him a false prophet, so I would get in the car, and drive over here. Then nobody could ever use that as proof that you had the power

to predict the future; that you predicted that I was going to drive over tomorrow in a car, ~~an~~ if I had heard about it, of course ^{you} ~~Y~~ could do it, couldn't ~~#~~ you? Certainly it wouldn't prove that you were a true prophet. So that here, what does this prove anyway? If ~~M~~ Josiah simply heard of this, now how soon he heard, we don't know. It is possible that he had a good bit of study before he heard about the prophecy, but suppose he heard all the (9). And then proceeded to do it. Does that prove that this is of no value whatever, as an authentication of this prophet as a man who spoke from God? Mr. Grauley, do you have an idea on that? (Student). We have liberal scholars who like to poke fun at the idea of fulfilling prophecy intentionally, and I think it was even Strauss, who suggested that Jesus saw the predictions of the Old Testament, could be so easily explained as a man crucified, and therefore he deliberately got into - aroused such opposition against himself, that would naturally lead to crucifixion, in order to make people think he was a prophet. To give that impression. ~~But~~ Now of course that is (10) But it would be much easier to believe that Josiah would simply say, well, the man of God. Predicted this. That's what I'd better do, and proceeded to do it. Any one of us might do a thing like that, on a whim like (10). If I heard that Mr. Ruble predicted that I was going to drive over, I might say, well, just for fun, I'm going to walk this time, but on the other hand, I might just take a notion to do what he says. Of course, people take notions of all kinds, and ~~if~~ Josiah took a notion to do this, then what is the good of the prediction. What does it prove? It doesn't prove anything about it. (Student). Sennacherib came against Jerusalem in Isaiah's time. Sennacherib said, the Lord has sent me to reduce you people to severe (10 3/4). To force you to become as a captive. ~~The~~ He said, the Lord has sent me for this purpose. So we don't believe it is true. And of course, it is utterly proven not to be true, by the fact that he failed there. But people have often claimed that the Lord ~~sent~~ sent them. Now here this man comes up, - our dean when I was in college, he was a good Christian man, used to often tell the story of a Christian meeting he was at, and in his church when a man there came up front, and said, everybody here who really loves the Lord Jesus Christ, walk out of this den of iniquity here and come follow me, and walked out, and started walking down the street expecting a great number of people to follow him, and nobody did. And he simply had an idea

of this, that he was appointed to be a special man of outstanding leadership, but nobody else thought so, and if anybody were to say, he was sent by the Lord for that purpose, he would be extremely skeptical. The Lord may send a person to be a voice in the wilderness and to have very little hearing, very little apparent success, those things do happen. But ~~it~~ certainly it requires (12). But here is this man who comes up from Judah and naturally the people of Judah (12 1/4) and political thing. They wanted Jerusalem. They wanted them to come to Jerusalem, and he stopped them from coming, and a man comes up, and says, hear the word of the Lord. He says, people are going to burn men's bones on this altar, and (12 1/2). The Word of the Lord. Well, this man gives him a denunciation that he feels like giving, because his patriotic motive - is he really seeking the Lord's will? (~~12 1/2~~).

he goes ahead and does it.

You might consider that's a

pretty good evidence upon it. If I were to tell you - If I were to say to you today, the Lord has revealed to me that tomorrow Senator Kennedy is going to come up to Faith Seminary, and ask for a chance to speak in our chapel and explain his views on separation of church and state to the students, if I were to tell you today that the Lord had revealed that to me, and then if tomorrow Senator Kennedy were to appear, and make such a request here, you would tend to think that the Lord had given it, because ~~it~~ it would seem so extremely unlikely other viewpoint. (13 1/2)

But if you found out that I had gotten a letter from Senator Kennedy yesterday telling me that he was going to do that, you would say that it certainly destroyed any evidence that the Lord had spoken through me on it. That would just be that he did a thing that he wanted to, but I used it to make you think that the Lord spoke through me. So what's the purpose of a prophecy like this anyway? Why have one. Well, certainly there may be various purposes. Surely one of them is to authenticate the man's message. The man's/ from Judah's message here. This is wrong. This worship is wrong. Well now, somebody says, why is this wrong? The Lord ~~came~~ - K. 10.

The Lord gave the Northern Kingdom to Jeroboam. He caused Ahijah to tell Jeroboam that the Lord was going to split up the kingdom and give it to him. It was part of the Lord's plan that they should have them, not Jeroboam's daughter. Now Jeroboam says, I won't keep it very long.

If my people are always going down to Judah to worship, and be subject to propaganda down there. It is only sensible to do something to keep them up here. It is - ~~he~~ he says it is purely a political move. There is nothing religious in it at all. It is purely political, ~~like~~ like salting a flag. Well, this man says it isn't. This man says it is a wicked thing, that he should not do it. He says that God is going to punish, and as proof for it, God is going to cause that there will be a king of Judah named Josiah, of the house of David, who will burn men's bones on this altar. Well now, if King Josiah just comes and does it, and never hears about it, you might say well, it could be a coincidence that a man happened to do what the other man predicted. These things do happen in life, but it could be a pretty good proof, if he didn't know about it. But if he did know about it, and said, that's what I'm going to do. But he said, I'm going to do it. Well does it destroy the force of the prediction? Mr. Haffly, what would you say? (Student). I'm not so sure that the point Mr. Haffly made about the incense would be so vital. My impression is that in all sacrifices there was incense used. But the one point that he named was a very vital point, that there is going to be, when a man comes ~~one~~ called Josiah, there is still going to be a house of David reigning, because, suppose he said, a man from the house of Jeroboam is going to be reigning 200 years from now. Well, 50 years from then the whole house of Jeroboam had been destroyed, and nobody in that house ever reigned again. If somebody were to make a prediction today, and say that General Franco, will do something in Spain, and General Franco were to hear it, and do it, ~~it~~ it wouldn't prove that the man spoke from God, but if somebody today were to say, there is going to be a descendent of General Franco's 200 years from now, who will be ruling in Spain. He would be saying something that nobody would possibly say without divine knowledge. Now he doesn't say when Josiah is going to come, but he does say that there is going to be a man whose name is Josiah from the house of Judah, who will be a king and will have power enough to do this. And so there is an element ~~of~~ of prediction there in the continuance of the house of David, until ~~such~~ such a time as this comes to past. But that is a pretty strong thing politically when you look at it. Here is Jeroboam who has 2/3 of the people, and the house of David only has one third, and if Rehoboam were to try to come and destroy Bethel he certainly wouldn't get very far. That's quite evident, because Jeroboam had double the portion he had.

It is very unlikely that Rehoboam would be able to do a thing like that at all. But he says there is going to be a man of the house of David who will be able to do this thing, as well as desire to, and so the fact of the continuance of the house of David, until a time when the house of David, is strong enough, then the rulership of the northern kingdom, so that a man from that house, and this man at that particular time will be called Josiah. If Rehoboam heard of this and named one of his sons Josiah, well that wouldn't make that man able to do this thing. It was a difficult thing to do. Mr. Ruble you had a suggestion. (Student). The fact that the house of David would continue until the point where somebody was able to do this. Nobody could do this when Jeroboam reigns. Nobody could when Baasha was king. Nobody could do it while Ahab was king. Nobody could do it while Jeroboam II was king. Those were powerful rulers who had double the power of the king of Judah, and the king of Judah could no more do that than Stalin could say, I don't like Faith Seminary. I'm going to blow it up. If we were in Moscow he might take a notion any night to do that and the next morning, the men would come over and blow it up. But in this country, at present he is just absolutely unable to do that. Now if somebody makes a prediction that Stalin is going to blow up Faith Seminary - that Krushchev is going to blow up Faith Seminary, the prediction involves getting power into this area, and there was no such power then, so there would be no point in giving anybody the name Josiah while the power was still in the hands of Israel. It is a prediction then of the continuance of the house of David, until such a time, as the man of the house of David, would have sufficient power to perform this thing. And it is a prediction of course, that the man who had such power would be called Josiah. And when it comes to the matter of his fulfilling, of knowing the prophecy and fulfilling it, whether he knew it or not, there is involved the point that the man, Josiah, would be a man who ~~wouldn't~~ wouldn't be interested in fulfilling the prophecy or interested ~~in~~ in destroying the altar. Neither one of these two. Simply the interest in defiling the altar, would show that the man Josiah was a man of Godly interest. There were many kings of Judah who were not. Who is going to predict that that man will be. Well, Mr. Haffly mentioned a moment ago, that the book of the law was discovered in Josiah's reign, and brought about a tremendous revival. Well now, the man of God

from Judah here, could not possibly know that the book of the law would be rediscovered in Josiah's reign. He couldn't have known that. But if it had not been discovered, humanly speaking it is extremely unlikely that Josiah would have ever thought of fulfilling this. It was the great revival that brought it about, which resulted in Josiah's having the desire to do it. And of course, his power to do it was not the result of the kingdom of Judah conquering the kingdom of Israel, which some might think was necessary, but it was the result of the Assyrian empire destroying the kingdom of Israel, and leaving a power vacuum into that area - within that area which made it very easy for Judah to go that far, into what he formerly did in the area of Judah. (Student). If the division of the kingdom had come to an end, ~~there would~~ ^{you can see} how there could have been a king named Josiah then, this doesn't say when. Conceivably 40 years from then there could have been a king named Josiah, and the people of the Northern Kingdom would say, we don't want to be separate from each other. We are going to unite, and they would get rid of their king, and Rehoboam, and then King Josiah would be called to do that. There wouldn't have to be a ~~the~~ continued divided kingdom, but there would have to be a situation in which the power of the king of Jerusalem could extend over (7 1/2)0. Whether by doing away with the Divided Kingdom or having the Southern Kingdom stronger than the Northern Kingdom, or having some outsider destroy the Northern Kingdom, it is more or less in the area that is quite easy to make an incursion into (7 3/4). Any one of these things could conceivably happen? But I think this is ~~the~~ ^{one of the} most interesting prophecies for that reason, that - the idea that if a person fulfills prophecy intentionally, it disproves the prophecy as far as any evidence then is concerned, is a gross overstatement. It may be a true statement. It depends upon the ~~the~~ situation, but there are many situations, in which the very fact that one desires to ~~do~~ do it, can be partly a fulfillment of the prophecy. Of course, that is true of Christ. Strauss ~~(8/1/2)~~ was right after all. Christ did intend to go to the cross. He brought it upon himself, but he did not ~~bring~~ bring it upon himself as a man trying to fool people. He brought it upon himself as God who made the plan. So the fact that Strauss says it is right, but the interpretation is a hundred per cent wrong. Well, this is a tremendous prediction here given by this man of God, which is something that was fulfilled 300 years later, and the fulfillment of

it is described in II Kings. But then we have of course the next sign, ~~is~~ that he gave the same day where he gave an ~~immedi~~ immediate sign as an authentication of the later prediction. And the immediate sign was something which could have taken place accidentally. There is not necessarily ^{in this} a divine production of a miracle in the sense that something happens without any natural causation. It could be that God simply reached down from heaven, and took this altar and ~~poured~~ and tore it, broke it apart. God could do that if He chose to, but the sort of thing could happen without God choosing to do so. Could the altar be rent and the ashes be poured out, without God's reaching down and introducing a new unnatural force, Mr. Vannoy? (Student).

It could be an earthquake. - I have myself had the uncomfortable experience of making a fire as I was camping as cook, and having a big rock there - I had two big rocks and I ~~took~~ ^{put} my kettle across from one to the other, and the fire was in between, and all of a sudden, a sound like a shot, and that stone just broke in two, as one end got heated, and the other end wasn't heated. There was a difference in temperature - there was a stress which produced a break, and anything that is heated like that, such a break can occur. There are accidents of that sort. I would imagine that upon altars which have a heavy fire on, there would occasionally be times when there is a sudden break in it, and the ashes are poured out, as is described here, apart from any inter-divine intervention, but in this case we are told, that the man predicted it, and also immediately thereafter it happened. And of course it would be possible if you had come up and made a careful measurement of the heat, of the stone, tested it here and tested it there, etc, the (11 1/2) is something that rarely happened, but it might have happened. That could be, but certainly extremely unlikely.

how the king was moving in that way, and the fact that it happened right immediately after. Whether it was a supernatural act, or whether God simply used providential circumstances to bring it to focus, the thing would be in this situation, at the time when God led them out to make the prediction. In any event, we have an immediate authentication of it, following upon the ~~previous~~ long

(12) prediction, which was a denunciation of the altar, which would lead many people to see God's wrath upon those, to look forward to the time when it would be ended in the way described, but then there was an immediate authentication of it, by this particular sign that he

gave, and then of course he gave another sign. Jeroboam heard his saying. He reached out his hand, and immediately was paralyzed. He couldn't pull his hand in again. And he - and just at that instance, the altar was rent and the ashes poured out. And the king then immediately ~~after~~ asked him to pray for him. And the man prayed, and the king's hand was ~~de~~ restored, so it was like it was before, and that of course makes a complete conversion of the king. He is now going to change his kingdom into a Godly kingdom, do the will of God throughout, and so he asks the man of God to come home with him, and tell him what to do. Of course, if that has been the case, I think the Lord would have commanded him to go home, but the fact that God had forbidden the man in advance to come, was pretty good evidence that God was thoroughly familiar with the heart of Jeroboam, and knew that Jeroboam would not - Jeroboam would be anxious to utilize the power of this man seems to have, and anxious to keep him with (13 1/2) the people who were moved to think he was a true man of God, but that there was no evidence of a real change in the heart of Jeroboam. And so God had commanded the man not to compromise with Jeroboam, not to get ~~up~~ tied up with him, but he did pray the Lord to restore the king's hand, and the Lord did restore it, and then the king said, I'll give you a reward, come home with me, and refresh yourself, - and many a man when he said, come home with me - would say, well now, I couldn't go with a wicked man like that, but then when he said, I'll give you a reward, many a man would then realize that there was a rare opportunity to influence the king for good, by going with him.

;;/ 11. (0)

In the first place, God had given this man explicit direction in advance, and the man explained these directions here in verse 9 of 10, and then refused to compromise with the king, and went back. And there is many a man who does exactly that. Refuses to compromise with great forces and then is led into compromise with that which seems to be inbetween in someways, and to going back on the promises that he made, and sometimes after standing up boldly and refusing to compromise for the sake of a great reward, as this man did, one compromises for a little small thing, as this man did, and then he suffers more for it, then he would have if he would have given in on a big compromise. Yes, Mr. Ruble. (Student).

No, I don't think the word of the Lord is necessarily a written word. If it did, I wouldn't know where it would be, but this was just - Montgomery makes quite a bit of this, frequent use of this phrase in this chapter, the word of the Lord which is not used much elsewhere, and is a rather unusual way in which it is spoken, and people suggested that it is a later insertion, but it would seem to me that he has here, a == simply a personal peculiarity of this man, as he uses this phrase, and it is a little different from the ordinary usage. People have their individual personalities, and this man - you'll find everywhere you go, you will find that a certain phrase will be used in a certain way, - sometimes they are very good, too, and this is quite good. The man is stressing the fact that this is God's command, - he came by the word of the Lord, and he said, it was spoken by the Word of the Lord, etc. This is the Word that God had given him. But it is rather isolated. It is a particular usage. I don't recall coming across elsewhere, as it occurs a number of times here, and I would think it is simply the personality in this particular situation, using a rather good means of expressing a thought that ~~is~~ is found many times, in scripture, but ordinarily not expressed that way. It came to me by the word of the Lord, he was convinced this was the Lord 's command. That is an interesting thing. So he went another way, and he went not by the way that he came to Bethel, and the chapter could have finished at verse 10, as far as the great political events are concerned, and then skipped over to verse ~~is~~ 32. It could very well have done that, but then we have these 22 verses which tell us about the old prophet. They don't add any political understanding of the situation. After all, the purpose of the Bible isn't to give us a political understanding. We are particularly interested in this course, of getting the political background, that happened in each various way, - we are much interested in that in this particular course, but the purpose of the Bible is to give a spiritual concept, and so here is a case where the relationship of this man to other men is a thing that is very interesting and valuable for us to come familiar with.

Was the other man a true prophet? Mr. Grauley? (Student). No, the man of God that went and brought him back. Was he a true prophet? (Student).

NEXT CLASS.

I gave you some assignments which I did not have in mind to have ready before next week, and I want them written out, and so if possible ahead of time, so I can look them over, and right there I think of a problem. (Problem over ~~where~~ when to meet the following week.) Not later than Monday morning. There is the possibility that someone might have looked into those ahead and had some questions about it right now. It may be unlikely but if you should, you could raise them now. Mr. Ruble. (Student). I don't know of any proof that the word mother could be translated as ~~ancestor~~ ancestor, the same way that father can, but it would seem to me that if it is true of father it could very likely be - it would certainly be a worthwhile suggestion. Of course, there is another thing, there is an even harder problem than that, which I hope that none of you will overlook. I'm most interested in your first noting the problem, and second the suggestions you have as to what the answer is. I don't think you know what the answer is, but I think it is good to have in mind the possibilities. Of course, in connection with the scriptures, there is always these possibilities. First, we find something in the scripture, which we know is true. If we knew it already from some other source, what does the scripture do for us? Well, it may drive it home to our hearts. It may be a blessing to us. It may be a worthwhile thing if we already knew it. But if we don't know it, from any other source, how can we say whether it is true or not. It could be true. But many things that appear to be unlikely, in such a case we try to make an explanation. Now your liberal says, look here, here is an utter contradiction. This simply doesn't make sense. Well now in such a case, as far as our dealing with the liberal is concerned, we don't have to know what the truth is, all we have to know is, that there is a reasonable interpretation which may be true, and which if it true, then there is no contradiction. Now of course we have sufficient reason ~~to face the word~~ for faith in the word, if we find something that is just a plain contradiction, and there is no way to get out of it, we still can say, ~~it~~ well, we don't know anyway, but we know it is God's word. He doubtless has a way. We can rest the thing on faith. But for the matter of dealing with the unbeliever, it is good for us to be able as far as possible to give some sort of a reasonable answer, not to have to retreat, simply through a matter of faith. And - but to give such an answer, it is not necessary, that we know

what the true answer is. It is only necessary that we know of an answer which may be true, and which solves the difficulty. I think that is very important to have in mind. We are interested in getting all the truth we can, and consequently if we can find what the true answer is, that is very useful for us. But here are two distinct purposes, the purpose of understanding and of knowledge, we want to find what the truth is, if at all possible. But we know there are many things we can't possibly know ~~about~~ the truth about, because they simply are not revealed to us. Did Asa have a mole on the left side of his face? Nobody on earth knows. We can't say he didn't. We can't say he did. Did he have digestive trouble when he was a boy? Nobody on earth knows. There are all kinds of questions that can be asked, that nobody knows. But when we find the same woman given as the mother of two successive kings, one of whom is said to be the father, there is an apparent contradiction. Now if you have a way of solving the contradiction which is entirely reasonable, which may be the case, and which if it were the case, there is no contradiction, then we have an adequate answer to the unbeliever. But I don't think that we should be satisfied with that, because our interest is not just in answer the opponents, but in knowing what the truth is, and therefore if there are other answers we could think of, which also are not improper, which might be true, it is good to think of them first. And then to see ~~which~~ where we think the balance of probability lies among them, but perhaps ~~still~~ ~~we know~~ feeling we don't know as to be certain on it. Now this matter of one woman being the mother of a father and a son, is of course, a thing which imposes an immediate difficulty. In fact, so great a difficulty, that it would be hard well, not impossible to take the position, the Bible as we have it today, is the inerrant word of God, exactly as we have it today. Now we don't ~~say that~~ take that position. We take the position that there is the possibility of error ~~ex~~ that has crept in. We take that position, and I don't know how we can state that position, in the Bible, that the Bible in the original was inerrant. Not the Bible as we have it, and of course that leaves the possibility of error, but it may be that you can show how we can interpret the Bible exactly as we have it, is the inerrant word of God, then it is also possible to show what kind of errors, might have come in, and if it is

exactly as we have it here, then how do you explain apparent contradictions. Well, if you can think of two or three explanations, all equally valied, we are in a much better position, because you don't know when something may be discovered, that proves utterly unreasonable, one suggestion is - , and if we have others already established, then nobody can say, oh well, they say it means this, and then we prove it doesn't. They may say something else, they are just anything to hold the position. That's not the same. The same is, we believe it is right, but we also believe it is reasonable to say that - but when we have an answer to a problem, which we cannot prove, but which impresses us as likely, it is very good to see what (12 3/4). And then have our eyes open, (13). And now of course, this matter of the same woman being the mother of different ones - is not the whole (13) as it is of (13). Yes? (Student). Personally I don't like the word, presupposition, because as used by certain people, it impresses me as meaning, you just take a leap in the dark. You say, well now, I'm going to assume that the Koran is the Word of God. That's my presupposition. Well, ~~the~~ all right. You find difficulties in the Koran. Yes, but I have faith it is the word of God, so I won't worry about the difficulty. I don't like that attitude. I think that is a resignation of intelligence. I don't think the Lord wants us to do it. I don't believe in presuppositions in the sense in which they are used. I won't say that is. Maybe that is. (But certainly by many of his followers, use it in a sense which I think is very definitely wrong. But -

12. (0)

- on the other hand, it is absolutely impossible in life, whatever your viewpoint on this, to take every thing up from an absolutely ~~a~~ isolated view point. That is absolutely impossible. You come over here to school in the morning, Mr. Ruble comes here to a certain meal, and he says to Marie to have the food cooked and ready. Well, how do you know she is going to get it ready? How do you know? She ~~is~~ may forget ~~and~~ or maybe she won't. Maybe she'll just take an ocean she doesn't feel like it today. Maybe there won't be anything ready. Hadn't you better check every time, an hour a head of time or after, if she is going to do it, to make sure she is. No. You have experienced in the past, that leads you to believe that she is a woman of dependability, and that when she has agreed to do a thing over a period of time, she will do it, and you take for granted

that she will. You don't presuppose it, on some basis of grabbing ahold of something. It is a result of your previous experience. You feel she is dependable. And you feel you can trust her, and if someday, you got there and it wasn't there at all, and it wasn't done, you would say, oh well, you can't tell. You wouldn't say, there was some unusual circumstance, that accidents occur. Something has happened which has made it impossible to do what you would otherwise count on her to do. Now that doesn't require (2), to reach certain conclusions, sometimes on absolute proof, but more often on a general preponderance of evidence of some kind. You have to do that in the (2) of our lives, and in our scholarship altogether. We don't take up a book of history and check every single statement in it from original sources to see if they are dependable. We have people who tell us that this man is a reliable writer. He has a general reputation. He is connected with an institution that would not have a man on the staff who was not considered to be a man of some ability and of some dependability. We think the particular book is a dependable one. Well, in spite of all that, when we come across three or four statements that we know are utterly fallacious, and we can easily prove are fallacious, we lose confidence in the book, and the next day when somebody comes to say this book says so and so, we say well, I wouldn't trust that book. We are not simply presupposing that statement. We are acting upon a (3) of previous experience or previous evidence. And for somebody to simply say, well, the Bible says that so and so was the mother of so and so. What difference does it make? It may be true or it may not be true. Nobody knows. That is not a scientific approach to anything. If somebody can come along and say, well, the Bible is full of errors, it is just a lot of hodgepodge of erroneous statements. Therefore I don't trust anything in it. He is making a statement that ~~can~~ be questioned, and we can challenge him to present his written number of errors, as evidence that the Bible is undependable. And we immediately have against that the fact that the Bible has a tremendous world wide ~~interest~~ influence on (3 1/2) and thousands of people consider it as a very very dependable book. Of course, you don't just cast aside (3 3/4) something that idea about it. Those people may all be wrong, but it gives you a basis upon which you have to have evidence to the contrary, before

you simply cast it aside. And so for the ~~quasi~~ Christian there is an approach, now Ramm has just gotten out a book on the Testimony of the Spirit which impresses me that he goes much too far in the direction of mysticism, though I haven't read the book, I've only skimmed through it, but it is my impression that he criticizes fundamentalists tremendously, for putting too much attention to the Bible, and not enough to the testimony of the Spirit. And I would say the Testimony of the Spirit is to say Jesus is the Lord, and the Bible is perfect. We have ~~to take~~ ~~the Spirit~~ the testimony of the Spirit upon it, and we know that the Lord has saved us, and we know what a change He has made in our lives, and we know what a change He's made in other people's lives, and we have reason to consider this is His word, and therefore we do not expect to find mistakes on it. At least, mistakes, I mean, in the original, and we expect to find that the present Bible has been preserved with remarkable (5). Even though there are people on small matters. And so that is our approach to it. It is not a mystical approach, because we presuppose this and there is nothing that you can say that will affect it, but it is where we have a great preponderance of evidence, and therefore we expect other evidence to fit in with that. And we look to find what explanation we can find on this. So on these matters, if somebody who is always saying crazy statements today, - today he says he was born in Ireland, and tomorrow he says he was born in Thailand, and the next day he says he was born in South America, and we've heard him talk this way so much that we can't put any trust in him at all. If he makes two contradictory statements we pay no attention to him. But when a man in whom we have confidence as a dependable man, who has proven reliable, when he makes a statement one day that he was born in Paris, and the next day he makes the statement that he was born in Kentucky, we don't immediately say, well now, this man is a liar, we can't believe anything he says. We say, we have reason to consider him as a dependable man. Let's look in the atlas and see if there is a place called Paris in Kentucky which will solve the apparent contradiction, and we assume that there is an explanation involved in it, and we are apt to with a person we have confidence in, even ~~the~~ when all the evidence is against him to give him the benefit of the doubt. And we have reason to give the Bible the benefit of the doubt. We as Christians, even if we should have extremely strong evidence of

an , but and we don't expect the unbeliever, to accept our argument on a case like that.

But most of the cases are certainly not like that. ~~W~~ They are simply cases as Mr. Ruble says

can ~~man~~ mother be ancestor? Well, if father is, it would seem quite reasonable to think that

mother might be, but then of course immediately, then the person is justified in saying, yes,

but look here, we have a case that there may be twenty kings whose mother is given, and in 18

of these cases, it appears very reasonable to think that this is the immediate female ancestor

~~whomism~~ as we mentioned. Why, then in this case, should it mean something other than the

immediate female ancestor. Is there any reason to think that? ~~≠~~ Well, in such a case we

are justified to say, perhaps there is a reason. Let's see if we can find one. But if you have

eighteen cases, where it is used in connection with a king's accession, - then you can't just

arbitrarily say, oh well, it could mean that. You have to present some reasons why, the usage

might be different. So there are some interesting problems there, and yes? (Student). I would

say that it would impress me as quite unlikely that the conqueror changed a heathen name

arbitrarily into a name that would include the worship of God. Now I do think that there are

certain changes that there is pretty good reason to think there are certain changes taking place

somewhat similar to that. We have, I believe, a man named, I believe he is called Methadaal.

I'm quite sure we have a man named Ishbaal. At any rate we have later on, references to

Ishbosheth, and Mephibosheth. You know who they both are, I trust, well now, bosheth means

(8 1/2). It should be very likely that a man would be called Ishbosheth at the time of

, or that he would be called Mephibosheth - the one who loveth (8 3/4).

And so that the suggestion is made especially since I'm not sure whether in both of these, but it

certainly is at least, we have a name in which Baal occurs, in some (9) and also in bosheth

And the suggestion is made that here were names, compounded with the word ~~Ba~~ Baal. And Baal

was of course, the god who - the god of Jezebel, who was the terrible danger to the people of the

land, and the god whose name was compiled with Baal, who was so terrible that they didn't want

to say Baal, so they said Bosheth, which means the abomination. And so they simply said Bosheth

Instead of taking the name of Baal on their lips. Well of course, you have a parallel to that, in

the way that you have the name of God, now whether the critics are right that it is pronounced

Yahweh, or Yakweh, or whether it is pronounced something entirely different would almost certainly pronounce some way, and it is not pronounced in the vocalization, if they put in the vowel of Adonai, Lord, instead of with the consonants of the name of God, and they felt they didn't want to take any new God on profane lips. It is not a feeling we share, but a feeling which we certainly can sympathize with. This change taking place, this direction, it is not at all strange for a thing like that to take place in the other direction. You or I are apt to repeat a story which impressed as the kind of story which we think is a good sane reasonable ~~formula~~ point, and that it is worth repeating, and yet as we heard the story, it had a swear word in it that we won't repeat, and we will put in blank or something like that. With such a viewpoint, so that the listener will know what we are really (10 1/2) but we don't want to take the filthy thing on our lips, because that is very good for us to avoid, taking ~~a~~ such ~~a~~ expressions on our lips. But it is necessary sometimes to point out that others have used it. The substitution of Bosheth in this case, is (11) extremely probable. But right there again, now this is getting ahead, because we are going to take up the Baal worship, at the time of Ahab, and that is a tremendous part of our course here, but we are getting ahead. But the principle we deal with now, so I don't think there is any harm in getting ahead, - the matter has to be noted a bit however, that the word Baal is not the name of the god that Jezebel brought down. That god was Melqart, the god ~~as~~ of Tyre. And even the name Melqart means the king of the city, they didn't dare to take the name of the god on their lips. So they called him Melqart in Tyre, the king of the city, and in Israel they called him the name Baal which is just the word for man, and the word Baal does not necessarily mean this wicked heathen worship of Tyre, except that the word seems to be used for that, when Jezebel introduced it, and then when the word came to be used so commonly, the word master to be restricted to the one god, this one heathen god, , people quit using it for any other one reason, and the word Baal which would be a perfectly proper word to use of the Lord, the master, perfectly proper ~~as~~ to use of him. It could have been used in names before referring to him. The people later not realizing that, of course, at any rate, not likely to use the name in that way. because it is used in another way now, would simply instead of repeating the ~~wrong~~ word,

man's name, especially in Bosheth, (12 1/2). ¶ In other words, they were not actually substituting something for one who had the name of a heathen god. Now Rehoboam is the son of Solomon, who had built the great (13), even though he had let his wife live with him and he died. Rehoboam we are told, Shemaiah told not to fight with Jeroboam. This thing was of the Lord. Rehoboam was a man with his weaknesses, but definitely a Rehoboam was a follower of the Canaanite (13). (Hard to hear). The ending am, now on certain names, and it is a question just what the ending am is, even Baalim, and there are certain names that have an am ending, of course Rehoboam (14) to the people. There it is simply an answer to the people. But -

13.

I was intending the last two or three days to look into the Westminster Dictionary, and see what he says about this Abijah (1/2) but I haven't laid my hands on my copy, and I haven't ~~got up~~ gone up to the library to look at the copy there. The Westminster Dictionary of the Bible, as you know, is Davis' Bible Dictionary, completely revised and brought up to date by Professor GETHMAN (1/2) of Princeton. The preface says he's brought all new archaeological evidence there, and I went through it carefully and did not find any such evidence. The story of Jerusalem, Davis brought the archaeology up to 19 (1), has left out the archaeology altogether. Some of the most important discoveries (1) My impression is that he (hard to hear) changed the references ~~to~~/^{from} a logical order to a Biblical order. And my impression is that it is very little change, except for the insertion of higher critical ideas in a few places like Isaiah - it has several pages proving that Isaiah wrote it, but he almost throws it out at the end however, (1 1/2) that one man wrote it. It is more likely that (1 1/2). He introduced liberalism but not at many points, so I prefer the use of Davis' Bible Dictionary, the 4th edition, published 1927, reprinted recently by Baker, instead of using the revisions which were made by (2) of Princeton, which he called the Westminster Bible Dictionary. I prefer the use of (2) except for one thing, and that is that in the matter of ^{ETYMOLOGY} ~~eschatology~~, (2) did a particular good amount of work, and he had good intentions, and the matter of etymology is one in which

considerable advance has been made, and therefore I would ~~3x~~ expect that you might have new ideas on etymology that would be worth while, in the later times, no beginning, and (2 1/2) has added many etymologies in the case of many words where Davis didn't give any, so to my mind, that is the most valuable use of the Westminster Bible Dictionary, the etymology. And I've been intending to look and see what he says about Abijah. So I would appreciate if you fellows would do that. See what the book says on this. The Israelites were a land lost (3 1/4) They had very little to do with this (3 1/2). The Philistines held most of the sea. (Hard to hear). And of course Rehoboam's mother was Naamah of the Ammonites, and Ammon is often (3 1/2). She is not a woman who would expected to (4) (Student). Dr. Montgomery in writing his volume on Kings, spent years. It is one of the most valuable books in the International Critical Commentary by far. Some one say it was one of the four of them that had any respectable (4 1/2). A strong statement, but many of them are rather shoddy. But there is nothing ~~about~~ shoddy about Montgomery, for though he was a liberal, he was active, and he was careful, and he worked for years, and I attended his courses (4 1/2) quite a number of . He always had a kings, and he would discuss the material. He did a tremendous amount of work, and then he told me one day, I've gotten my work all ready (4 3/4). It's too long, you will have to take out one/fourth. (5). Oh, I felt bad about that, because he did so much research. He had to drop these little fine points. There was a fourth of them he had to drop out. You can't leave out the things that are general. He had to leave out the things that would be of most interest to the specialists, and so I was very much disturbed, So he had to get busy and work on it, and worked for a long time. Then when he got that finished, the war came. And so the war came in and by the end of the war, when Scribners would be able to print it, they didn't - there was a certain amount of new developments, and new material. He had to put that in his bibliography. He asked one of his students (6). had put his own chronology in. My impression is that has done very little of the book, but judging by the amount of work that he did not do, in revising the data of the Bible Dictionary, where his name is in big letters, here his name does not appear on the cover. My impression is

that he kept it pretty much as it was. But you never know. You never know at what point he may have made a change. And then of course, it has got a tremendous amount of detail in it, and somebody must have done quite an amount of work in the chronology. It is one of the best commentaries I believe that we have. I don't mean a devotional commentary. It strictly is not. It is definitely liberal. But for solid factual material, carefully given, and well presented, by Montgomery, and he was a real careful scholar. But I found nothing in that about Abijah, and I tried to (7), but I didn't lay my hand on it yet. When I was working on the Nuzi names, I found a number of Nuzi names, names at Nuzi. (Student). Uzziah who is also called Azariah, and that is quite a difference, and of course we have to recognize that when it comes to names, very often there are things, Hiram Ulysses Grant, I believe when Hiram Ulysses Grant, if I recall correctly, went to West Point, and was told that he would have to put his initials on everything, and he thought of how all the other fellows would all rib him if he put H.U.G. on all his belongings, why he simply took his grandmother's name, Simpson, and put it in and dropped the Hiram, and called himself Ulysses Simpson, and ever since he has been known as U.S. Grant. But, he made the change for a definite purpose. Clarence Edward McCartney was born in western Pennsylvania and had three brothers, and they all went into the ministry, and two of the brothers went over to Scotland and took graduate work at the same seminary. Getting over there they found that most people in Scotland spelled their name McCartny, the two who didn't go to Scotland kept spelling their names the way their father had spelled it, ~~MacCart~~ Macartny, without any (8 1/2) so ~~pre~~ 30 years ago, ~~he~~ I knew 4 ministers, 2 of whom were Macartny, and two of whom McCartney ~~w~~ and the 4 of them were brothers. Now if you didn't know that about their going to Scotland, you'd think there was a problem (9), but there are all kinds of queer things that happen with names. And if you are convinced that there was lots of heathenism among the Israelite kings, and actually named their sons after heathen gods, and as the chronicler would change it and put in the word instead, why this can fit with that hypothesis, but before you put too much attention to it, thoughts like that about this particular name, you ~~need~~ need to have a few more statements which a similar hypothesis seems reasonable. When you advance an isolated thing you don't

have much ground to stand on. And there are so many things that could happen with names, but it is always a thing that you can think upon which is ~~im~~possible (9 1/2) that it might have occurred. And in this particular case I (10). There are quite a few names that seem to have an am ending, and it is possible that the am might represent some usage, that seems to be used, that they simply thought of him by the shorter form, Abijah. Yes? (Student) ~~h~~- name and simply ending in ~~ah~~, ah, and you can have a vowel letter. But there are a great many names, in the Bible in which the word Jehovah, however is a part of the name. There is Adonijah, which is certainly, Jehovah is my Lord. There is Hezekiah, the Lord has taken hold... ..or has strengthened. There are - There is Micaiah, who is ~~e~~ like the Lord. There are some names that have this element in them, and consequently, whenever you have a yah, at the beginning or at the end of a name, Jehoshaphat, the Lord has judged, there is always the possibility that it is the Divine name. And of course sometimes we have it ~~h~~ I believe in somewhat a stronger form. Yes, we have ~~h~~ Jehovah, the Lord is just, which is shortened into ?
Jonah, we often have this shortening of the form. We have a ~~e~~ longer form also. So we have a great many of these, in which this occurs, when you have Abijah there is the possibility of it being my father is the Lord, which is quite a common type of thing. My father is the Lord, but there is also the possibility that in Babylonian, there are a great many names which end in

(12), which is a substitute for a long name. Just like we take William and shorten it to Billy, there are many names - which shortened, and they just take the first part and leave off the last, and many such fit on ia, so that it would not be at all impossible that Abijam was a shortened form was a long name, and that Abijah was another shortened form. That might be. If you had a mappiq in there you would know that the Massoretes thought it was possible, they felt it meant the Lord. That would only show you what the Massoretes thought, and I don't

(13). (Student). Zerah, the Ethiopian, yes. So an ending in h would not be god. It would have be an ending in ih. Just h would never be Jehovah, but yah would be Jehovah. It has to have the yuh sound, as well as the h, Jehoiakim, Jehoiakin, Zedekiah, you see, the Lord is like - Zedekiah. There are many cases like that, but it is yah, it isn't just

h. And this Abijam has the yuh in it.

14.

Nothing on first part of record. (4).

This then apparent contradictories of certain irregularities, in the book, irregularities of this type, are - do not fit with its being simply an artificial book. There was an article here in the Journal of Biblical Literature a few years ago by Professor Enslin, then professor at Crozer Seminary, called the Artistry of Mark. In this, Enslin took up the theories so commonly held by New Testament scholars, that Mark is simply the facts about the life of Jesus, just as they would have occurred, and that Luke and Matthew took them, and embellished them, and developed them into a literary work to give their theological ideas, but Mark gives us the real gospel background. But Enslin took it up the supernaturalistic ideas of Matthew and Luke were already in Mark. That Mark had not a simple teacher, but he had a man who he thought he was divine in the sense of being the saviour of the world, and so Enslin's conclusion was that Mark actually is a literary production, ~~not~~ it is an artistic work by somebody who had a theological idea and wanted to get this idea across, and that it is an artificial production. Well, that was his idea about it, about Mark. But it was an idea that would be very difficult to hold, about the king unless you were to think that the book had gone through a great deal of changing. To introduce these irregularities. Now another possible view of Kings is of course that there were a lot of ~~letters~~ records, contradictory records written by different people from different viewpoints, presenting them in situations and some of them written years later, mostly confused, and somebody just put them all together, without bothering to see whether they contradict it or not. Well, there is too much (6 1/2) for that involved. It is very evident that it had been arranged in order, to give a consecutive picture, dealing with one people, and then going to the other, and coming back, and trying to give it in such a way as to give it a continuous picture, and it is certainly not just a skelter helter mass of contradictory material. It is very far from being that. Does it have - it is hardly conceivable that a person in such a case would put in things that in his mind would sharply contradict it. Now of course, we believe the Lord set His seal upon the Old Testament - God's word. We believe that it is entirely true in the original

manuscripts - that means that we can admit a certain amount of error in transcript. We have no doctrine that God has preserved it, absolutely without error. Some may think that but I don't think that most Christian scholars believe that. We believe a certain amount of it, a very minor of ~~area~~ error had come in. We are not ready to cast aside whole sections or to make large changes, but we are ready to admit the possibility of a small amount of error that has come in, in the course of transmission. Wherever possible we prefer to interpret the words as they are, rather than to assume that there is an error. And so when it says that Shemaiah told the king to stop, that God did not want him to try to reconquer Jeroboam, and King Rehoboam stopped. We believe that that is true. That Shemaiah said that, and Rehoboam did that. Then when we read at the end, that there was war all their days, between Rehoboam and Jeroboam, we don't have to say it is a contradiction. We don't have to say that that verse has come in through error, and it wasn't there originally. It doesn't belong there. We can easily think of possible explanations, all their days certainly doesn't mean every day. But it means through the general course of their history. Well, it is very easy to see that a great attempt of Rehoboam to reconquer, - Shemaiah tells them to stop. They give up that attempt. There might be a period without war, but then there might be minor skirmishes from time to time, as there were border difficulties, and there might have been particular occasions, sufficient to make it altogether correct to say there was war all their days, while the other statement would still be true. You can fit the two together. We don't have to consider them historically as a contradiction. We can believe that Rehoboam desisted from an all out effort to reconquer the Northern Kingdom, but we can consider that there were border skirmishes, sufficient to call it a state of war, off and on through the whole reign. Now these matters that I asked you to look at for today, have in them some statements that appear to be contradictory. We have the specific verses about the mother, certainly. And we have the statement about Rehoboam, that - ^kAbijah of course, that his mother was Maacah the daughter of Abishalom. It would almost certainly be Absalom. And then we have the same about Asa, that his mother was Maacah the daughter of Abishalom, and then we have an additional statement that Asa removed Maacah, his mother from being queen. Now these statements in Kings would seem to have a flat contradiction in them, as they stand.

We look at Chronicles and we find that Chronicles says that Rehoboam took Maacah the daughter of Absalom for a wife, who bore him Abijam. And this fits with the idea of her being Abijah's mother. And Rehoboam loved Maacah the daughter of Absalom above all his wives and concubines, and he made Abijah the son of Maacah the ruler over his brethren, for he thought to make him king. Well, he did make him king. Then in chapter 13, we have the statement that his mother's name was Micaiah the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah. The mother of Abijah. We have thus a second contradiction, don't we? We have two contradictions. We have the idea that Abijah's mother was the daughter of Absalom, and we have the idea that Abijah's mother was the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah, and then we find in Chronicles it says that Maacah was the mother of Asa the king. - follows Chronicles and say that Kings has an error. That in Kings the mother of - the name of the mother of Asa has been erroneously inserted as the mother of Abijah. Does that solve the problem? (Student). Chronicles while it does not specifically say - while it does not say that the mother of Abijah was Maacah, it does say that Rehoboam's wife Maacah was (12 1/2) and he had a son, Abijam, (12 3/4). So actually you have the contradiction between Kings and Chronicles in the statement that the same woman was the mother of Asa as of Abijah. And then in Chronicles you have the additional contradiction, where you make Abijah have a different mother. Micaiah instead of Maacah, who is thought of as Uriel of Gibeah, instead of the daughter of Absalom. Of course, you can resolve the contradiction, by saying there is a verse the (13 1/2) inserted, it is one or the other. We have to avoid that method if possible. But that is a possibility. (Student). Matthew clearly holds that Abia and Asa were father and son, not two brothers, Matthew 1:7.

15. (0)

So that that way of solving it doesn't get us around it. What suggestions would you have to make, Mr. Haffly? (Student). I don't think we have any evidence of mother as simply being female ancestor. Now of course you have the analysis of father, that it certainly would not be at all impossible. I don't know of any evidence but in this case, the queen mother must fit perfectly, if the queen mother might continue to have influence

even after the grand . That would not be impossible. Yes? (Student). Grandmother of Asa. And when it says he removed his mother from being queen, I think that could mean the queen mother. It might conceivably be grand mother. That the standing of a queen mother might say well,

(1 1/2). So I would think that that might be a possibility, though it is

I Kings

rather strange to take a case and say in ~~verse~~ 15:10 , his mother's name was Maacah, under Asa.

(Student). And therefore the problem is that Chronicles says ~~Maa~~ Micaiah is the daughter of

Uriel of Gibeah. Now could Micaiah be the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah, and also be the daughter

of Absalom? Could that be possible? How? (Student). I would think that would be possible.

The name, the father, might mean the grand father. That would seem not at all impossible, and

of course, it would not be at all impossible that the grand daughter of Absalom would be the wife

of Rehoboam. I know a fellow who is teaching at Wheaton College, told me that his son and his

brother, are room mates in college. His mother's son, his brother, is a student at the college,

one year

and his own son is one who is younger than his brother. And in those years with the polygamy

that they had -

(4). It happens today but it happened even more then. Yes? (Student)

There is quite an interesting thing about it. If you look at all the kings of Judah in I Kings, it is

my impression that we find that all but the last one, had their mother given, and some of the

first ones. That is to say, it would look as if, here is a possibility that could have occurred,

it could have become customary in the later days, simply to always name the mother. And then

the compiler of Kings, drawing up his list, would have the records of the mothers' names, all of

the later kings, which are all given. But I don't think they are all given among the earlier kings.

It might have developed later, and he might find evidence as to the mother of ¹Rehoboam, and

he might find evidence as to the mother of Abijah, but he might ~~find~~ not find evidence as to the

mother of Asa, but then we ~~w~~ see the statement that Asa removed his mother, from being the

queen mother, and that would

(5 1/2) and so the statement could have come

in as a gloss. That would be a textual error, that could have come in. People didn't just

arbitrarily make textual error. But a scribe could write in the margin of his manuscript, having

~~th~~ all the other mothers that are given,

(6). So that would be a possibility.

And the Micaiah and the Maacah - I don't think there is any great difficulty there, because the difference in Micaiah and Maacah would be the of yodh, which you certainly have - we have many cases where the appears in shortened form, after a woman's name like this. It could be that the name is in a longer form in this book, but we have a real problem in Chronicles because she is called the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah, and I don't see any way out of that, without considering it an error, and I don't see how such an error, could enter in. I don't see anyway out of it, except possibly the grand daughter, and it doesn't seem to be at all difficult, that she was called after the grand mother. (Student). It would be entirely possible that it would be a woman's name. But all the other (7) as far as I know are named after the father. And It would not be usual to name a person after his mother. Now ~~we~~ I don't think there would be any difficulty of it occurring, if the woman indeed was a well known woman. Some outstanding woman, might be. But as to one thing we know that Uriel is a man's name. But also we have no evidence of any outstanding (7 1/2) like you have after ward. (Hard to hear). So that we have here a very interesting little problem, about the mother of Abijah, and the mother of Micaiah, but I don't think that it is a problem which needs to raise any great difficulty in the acceptance of the dependability of the book of Kings and Chronicles. It can be either a minor textual error. On this assumption the only place that we need to assume any textual insertion, would be in the verse 15:10, where it says his mother was Maacah the daughter of Abishalom. On the assumption that this was an erroneous insertion - in Chronicles we are not given a specific statement of it, though we are told concerning Maacah the mother, but I think the difficulty of contradictions between the two there would (9 1/2) be explained quite reasonably on that assumption. That this was an error. I doubt ~~it~~ very much if it would name Asa, it would name his grand mother. So the assumption of a minor textual error, just an assertion, would seem rather difficult to escape from, and then of course the other, the matter of the Uriel, the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah, there is a case where the assumption of the grand mother, the assumption of Absalom being the grand father, would clear that up, and certainly may be reasonable to think. It would certainly seem quite unlikely that

the author of II Chronicles would say in chapter 11, that Rehoboam made Abijah the son of Maacah, her brother king, and Rehoboam loved Maacah the daughter of Absalom above all his wives and concubines, and then that two chapters later he would name this Abijah becoming king, and (10 1/2) mother was a different woman. It would seem much more likely that he was simply giving a mother designation.

That was an interesting problem about the mother. Then there was another problem I asked you to look at, about the years, - you have given me a table of that, - (student), I think you'd have to say not merely the way the Jews counted the years, but that the way most anybody counts when they say a man reigns 3 years. A man reigns a few years - in ~~Antiquities~~ 99 cases out a hundred you would read now a part of a year as a whole year wouldn't you. Whenever you say that something happened in so many years, it would be comparatively seldom that they would use the exactly, - an American president, who was inaugurated on a certain date and who left his office at a certain date, and on a certain date later you could say he was president 4 years, and be absolutely accurate, but there are very few times that (12) You could say that a certain war lasted 10 years or 8 years, or 4 years. You wouldn't ordinarily say (12) And so for a man to start reigning in the eighteenth year, and for another man to start in the twentieth year, and for the one who reigns three years, you certainly have no problem. Now it could even be possible let us say that Rehoboam reigned 17 years, and that he died at the end of the 17th year, so he reigned 17 full years, and that Abijah became king, on the 2nd day of Jeroboam's 18th year, and that he reigned 2 years 11 months and a half, and that he died in December, and that Asa became king in the last week of December, so he still could become king in Jeroboam's 20th year. Consequently to have three years, running from the 18th to the 20th this way, even if they were 3 absolutely full years, there is no problem whatever because when you say he began to reign in the 20th year, you aren't saying whether it was the first week of the year, or the last week, or the middle week, or where it is. So there is no problem there. Then, we have Asa reigning, 16:1 says that Baasha came up against Asa, in the ~~4th~~ 36th year of Asa's reign, and if you add 22 years of Jeroboam, and 2 of Nadab, and

- well, if you take ^LAsa's reign, and add it to Rehoboam's and Abijah's, and add Jeroboam Nadab and Baasha, you get Elah beginning to reign in the 25th year I believe of Asa, and how could Baasha ~~be~~ fight Asa 10 years after he died? Did you notice that Mr. Ruble?

16.

asked where numbers ~~fit~~ in. It is of course complicated, - about this, that there is a possibility that numbers may have been represented in some sort of a figure to us instead of spelling, which is unknown. Now we cannot say they were, so I'm not sure, whether there is a good possibility, but it is at least a possibility, that we know that the Babylonians represented w (1)

spell out figures, and take it and indicate it with particular marks, and the Egyptians couldn't and of course the Romans (1). Well now, we have no evidence of a Hebrew method of

giving numbers, spelling them out, we have no evidence of such, therefore we can't say there wasn't it, but with other nations having one, there may have been one, and if there was, there might be a possibility of confusion in figures, which is much easier to confuse than when you spell it out. But that is pretty much an matter of (1 1/2) to build on that. Now if it

was like the Babylonian system, - kScofield Bible. I think that you will find in the new edition that that note is a little bit weakened, that is, that it holds up the possibility of error coming in in the writing of numbers more easily than in writing the (2). 1 But that it doesn't make

it quite as , because we have so many numbers that are , that it would be very unlikely that (2 1/4) you just can't depend upon it. You take in Kings and Chronicles, you've got dozens of numbers, and you don't have one case in ten (2 1/2), so on the whole they are the same, there is not that much difficulty, but there is difficulty. (Student).

The theory has been held that the book of Chronicles represents the late writings, of ~~the~~ trying to glorify the ancient history, and therefore they exaggerate all the (3) but the

fact of the matter is, that we don't have a great many different In the numbers of kings a d chronicles and when we do, they are just as apt to be smaller in Chronicles as larger. So that that does not (3). But there may be cases where there is an error in the figure, and there may be cases where figures are used to represent different thing, like in the case of David. How

long was David king of Israel? Well, David was king of Judah 40 years, he was king of Israel 33 years. He reigned in Hebron for 8 years, then he was made king over all Israel. Those facts are very clearly brought out in Kings. In Chronicles it is passed over a good bit. It just doesn't go into the details. But it speaks of him as reigning 40 years. But it begins his reign with the elder officials coming to Hebron. And of course that didn't happen until he reigned in Hebron for 8 years. So that, how long was he king? Well, he was king of all Israel 32 years, of Judah for 40 years, and Judah is an important part of Israel, so they say he was king of Israel for 40 years.

NEXT CLASS.

I think it is very important that we understand that it is true that in dealing with the practical Christian work people want a certain sound, they want a definite answer, and the bulk of people like somebody who knows everything, and can give an absolute answer for everything. Well, if a preacher preaches his doubts all the time, even if they are doubts about minor matters, preaches with uncertainty, he is not going to build a church of Christ. His function is to preach the word of Christ, not to preach his doubts, even if they are doubts that there is nothing wrong with, but ~~the~~ at the same time, I think it is very vital that we understand, that it is the whole word of God and not just a few main teachings of our Bible, and if we understand that we then get into this problem that there are many things not given in the word of God, they couldn't be otherwise, and that is true in history, it is true in doctrine, it is true in theology, it is true in all the ~~sciences~~ sciences and it is good for us to understand, now as I say a series of sermons stressing that would be unfortunate, but I do think that a person can make a concept ^{clear} ~~here~~ to the people, and I think the people are in a stronger position if they have it clear. If a student = if a young person has got an idea of a whole system of theology, or a whole system of history, with every little detail worked out, and they are told this is it, this is it, they can accept that, and believe it, and have a (6 1/2), but then let him go to a college, let him go to any place, let them get with other educated people, and they find on some of these points, they have different ideas, and if they find, and finding they have different ideas on this thing, the next tendency is to think oh well, I've been sold a bill of goods, I've been given the whole thing as true, it is not true, it is all false. It is like the man I knew, who had gone to a very very fine seminary, a

seminary that stands for the word of God, but a seminary in which there is a system of doctrine, which I've been told is worked out to the smallest detail, and he lived in the home of the president of that seminary, and was very very close to him, and when he graduated he thought that doctor so and so was just the last word on everything. Whatever he said was the final truth on everything. Well, he got out into the work, and he got to meeting with some other educated people, and he found on a few minor points that doctor so and so was wrong, and having found that, he decided that he'd been sold a bill of goods. Everything he ever taught was wrong. Now he took the attitude = he made this statement to a friend of mine, he said, I'm just as much against the pre-tribulation rapture, which he had been taught in the seminary, I'm just as much against the pre-tribulation rapture, as I am against the higher criticism. And in other words he turned against - having been taught everything the man had been taught, he turned against that. Well, I shouldn't say quite everything. He hasn't given up all the fundamentals. I think he is a real Christian, and I think he is leading some people to the Lord, but between the two attitudes, his attitude of blind following of a great and good man who I think was in error on certain minor points, and his attitude of complete rejection, when the great bulk of his teaching was excellent, I think the second attitude is far worse than the first, but the second attitude is the reaction which can easily come from the first attitude. And when we look at the scripture, I mentioned yesterday at the beginning of the class, that there is the possibility of saying, this book of Kings, like someone has said, the book of Kings was written, he said the whole Old Testament was written just to glorify the Hebrew nation, and it was written by people who made up all these stories, and there is no truth to them on it. Well, if somebody made up the thing, it would not have irregularities, and inconsistencies and contradictions. He would not put anything like that in. It would be a, b, c, 1, 2, 3, just so. When we look at it, it isn't that way. We have difficulties in it and problems. When we find these problems like who was Asa's mother, we find that it is very very difficult, to know for sure the answer, because one place says - because it explicitly gives the same mother for him, Maacah the daughter of Absalom, as it gives for Abijah, and it explicitly says he is Abijah's son. Now that is explicit. And we don't say that she was married in both cases,

married to her son, but she was the mother we don't believe that. That would solve all the difficulty, but that would be so contrary to the teaching of the Old Testament, and we definitely don't teach that at all. I don't know of anybody who accepts that. So that in order to avoid that difficulty, it is pretty hard to avoid thinking that there is a minor textual error has crept in. It is pretty hard to avoid that. But we can't be sure just where the error is, and we have the added contradiction that in Chronicles he gives a different father, but the same woman is given the same father, two chapters earlier than the father, and that being the case, you have a clear contradiction in Chronicles unless there has been a textual error, which would be very difficult to explain, how this happened, or unless there has been - she is called the daughter of Absalom, being her great ancestor, even though he was a grand father, and also is called the daughter of Uriel, of Gibeah, being a direct father, and thus the ~~w~~ two names are given, and so it is no contradiction, but the word daughter was used as son, ~~was~~ used in those days. I'm almost certain of that.

Now the other textual error, which the assumption in Kings, the statement about ~~the~~ Asa's mother, is given, erroneously, being a copy of Abijah's mother, is easy to explain as a textual error, very easy to explain. It is easy to explain how ~~ee~~ it could have come into there because we find that in Kings, all the late kings are given the mothers' names. And not all the early kings, and so it is a natural assumption, that when ~~H~~ the book of Kings was drawn up, this was a systematic plan, that was suggested to the (11 1/2) and they found their data insufficient for the early kings, and then that a scribe later studying this, going through it, found the first one or two have (11 1/2) and then there are a few that don't, and then all the latter ones have mother's given. Well, he finds that Asa put away ~~the~~ Maacah from being the great queen mother, and so naturally he assumes she is her mother, and put a little note at the place in ~~the~~ line with the same (11 3/4) and that could have crept into the text. And in other words we can't be sure which seems to be the more probable thing, the important thing is not that we know exactly what the truth is on ~~the~~ all these matters. The important things is that we know the truth on many things, which we ~~are~~ can be sure of in

scripture and that we have an answer to those who say the scripture is in error, not in showing how it is, but in showing how it may have been, because if you have an answer to how it may have been, you have a sufficient answer. That is to say, if somebody says I saw Dr. McIntire in Sweden on Wednesday of a certain week, and somebody else says why, you are a liar I saw him in Philadelphia on Monday, and if these two statements were made 50 years ago, or even 20 years ago, if these two statements were made, one of those men would be a liar. There would be no way to get around it, ~~unless~~ he might not be a liar, he might be mistaken, but ~~of course~~ at least the statement would be incorrect. They could not both be true. It is absolutely impossible. Now today if somebody said, I saw him in Philadelphia this Monday, and another said I saw him in Sweden this Tuesday that afternoon, or this Wednesday, well, - the answer is if these men are both dependable, honest men, we don't say either of them is a liar, we say maybe he took a plane. But we don't know whether he took a F.A.S, whether he took K.L.M. or whether he took Pan American whether he took (13 1/2) we don't know, we don't know what line he took. We can't say. But we can say that it is possible and we have two things in our relation to the scriptures. We want to get all the truth we can. Then we want to get evidence to answer those who say that the scripture is in error, by ~~show~~ showing that the statement on which we are not sure what the truth is, can be interpreted in a way that is not impossible. (44) Of course nothing is impossible in God's sight, but in dealing with mankind it is very reasonable to argue from our viewpoint, when you take up the apocryphal books for instance = K.17.

the apocryphal books and the Roman Catholics say this is part of God's inspired word. If you don't accept Judith and Tophit, let him be anathema. Well, William Henry Green has a chapter in his Introduction to the Old Testament, where he takes up these books, and shows that they have historical inaccuracies, and shows that they have geographical absurdities. He shows that there are statements in them which are utterly unreasonable, and you read that, I would say that that was not proof that these books are not part of God's inspired word.

If the Bible says something which seems to me utterly unreasonable, why I say let's get some more knowledge and see what we can see in it. But when I find that the numbers of problems of this type in the apocryphal books are far more than those in the canonical books, I say it is a good added evidence of the fact that these are not part of God's word. Yet it is not the ground on which I establish this. The ground on which I decide the attitude of Christ towards it, and that alone, but this is the supporting evidence which is $(1\ 1/2)$ and which shows that the God could make any statement, and He could make it true. But God has given His word to human beings, He has given it in such a way, that we should be able to answer reasonably most of these $(1\ 3/4)$. And I think it is very important in the course of my teaching, not for you to know who Asa's mother is, if we can know about it, but if we can't be sure, well, that's not too clearly stated, but it is clearly stated that we know there is a reasonable, a resolving of the contradiction. And so I think we have two possibilities here of which one of those two is much more probable. There might be another one... But I do think we find our correct answer in making great changes in the text as it stands to day, but I believe we are justified in assuming minor errors. I don't think we are justified in assuming great changes. I was shocked when I was teaching about in the fourth year I was teaching, I guess I had a student in the class who is now professor of Old Testament in the seminary in which I was then teaching, and I assigned him some - an article - it was two articles by some modernist, on a certain passage in the scripture and their suggestion was to throw aside a whole chapter of the prophets, and it is an erroneous thing, it just doesn't belong there, and I assigned him that to read, and give a report on it. He was convinced by it. And I think he has a more - better attitude than that now. As far as I know he does, but I was shocked that a man with as much $(3\ 1/2)$ I was shocked that a man $(3\ 1/2)$ the devotion to the scripture that he had, would be changed $(3\ 1/2)$. A little change yes, little errors have crept in, but a whole chapter $(3\ 1/2)$.

Now the next thing we looked at was the matter of the chronology. There are two points in that we wanted to mention, which Mr. Vannoy brought out yesterday. Mr. Vannoy would you

just mention them again. What are the two points in the chronology between the time of Rehoboam and the death of Asa, which seem to you to constitute a real problem. Maybe it wouldn't take more than a couple of minutes for you to copy your chart on the board, Mr. Vannoy.

The school where I was teaching, the head of the department was Oswald T. Allis, and Dr. Allis was very much steamed up about the chronology in the Davis Bible Dictionary, because according to Davis' attempt to fit these ~~p~~ figures together he made Uzziah's associate Jotham as king, while he was still reigning, and he made Jotham associated with his son Ahaz while he was still reigning, so that one time according to Davis' figures you had three kings reigning at once, Uzziah, Jotham and Ahaz, and Jotham's reign ends before Uzziah's reign, so Dr. Allis says Jotham has no reign at all. Oh ~~we~~ he thought that was worth making a great fight about, the fact that poor Jotham was left with no reign. Actually it says Ahaz, Uzziah continued afterwards. Well, I think we have more important things to fight for actually, than whether Jotham had an independent reign or not. The question is, what are the facts. The answer is, we simply don't know. We certainly know that Jotham reigned ~~ed~~ while Uzziah was still king. How do we know that Mr. Ruble? We know that Jotham was reigning king while Uzziah was still king. How do we know that? We have the story of how Uzziah went into the temple and burned incense, and the Lord smote him with leprosy, and for the rest of his life, he lived in his own upper room, with no contact with the outside world. Well, somebody else had to do the reigning, so that I wouldn't say it would be a hundred per cent certain on that, but I would say 80% certain that Jotham began to reign, long before the old man died of his illness. And when Isaiah passed the place and saw his face at the window once in awhile, and then when he heard that Uzziah had died, Ahaz had doubtless already (7), and some people think that is crazy, that such a thing could happen, why, you usually can convince people things are reasonable if you resort to analogy. We have one of the most interesting analogies in the United States, that Henry Ford built up a great Ford empire, and he was the president, and absolute dictator of the Ford empire. He would pick a man up off the streets, and make him general manager for a hundred thousand a year, and then one day he would take a notion he didn't like him and come in and say you are fired. And the fellow was out just like that with nothing - Ford was just an absolute dictator. He wasn't perhaps as extreme as

that but pretty near. And then as Ford got old, he retired, and his son, Etzel became president of the Ford company, and Ford retired and Etzel was president, of the company, and then Etzel Ford died, and Henry Ford again became president as an old man, who had retired. He was president until he got so senile he was extremely old and weak, that he just had to turn things over and he turned things over to his grandson, (8). So you have a president of the Ford company and then his son, and then the father again, and then the grandson, and that has happened in recent history in the United States, and it is altogether reasonable, and not the least ~~un~~ bit unreasonable that such a thing would happen to Uzziah, Jotham and Ahaz.

But now here we are looking at the earlier chronology which I asked you all to study for yesterday, and in that chronology, we have the first problem that strikes us is the 18th and 20th year there, and that does not strike us as a serious problem, but then we come down and Asa reigned 41 years, and we have Asa reigning 41 years, and we have during Asa's reign, we have Baasha becoming king in the 3rd year, we have Elah son of Baasha becoming king in the 26th year, and we have Zimri killing Elah and killing every single descendent of Baasha who was living in the 27th year of Asa, we have Omri becoming king in the 31st year of Asa, and we have in the 36th year of Asa, king Baasha of Israel coming up against Judah according to a statement in Chronicles, and so there is a statement which is absolutely impossible to fit in, and the only possibility is that there is an error in transcription or some other understanding, some misunderstanding, I don't see how a misunderstanding or a different interpretation would solve this, and the suggestion is made that instead of it being the 36th year it is the 26th year, of Asa, in which Baasha came up against Israel. What do you think of that suggestion Mr. Grauley? It is hardly likely that Baasha made this big attack against Asa, within the last few months before Baasha's death. Especially since there is a good deal told after this, that hardly seems at all likely. It is possible - that it is 26, that is an interpretation that could solve the problem. It is altogether possibility, but it seems to me quite unlikely. Now the suggestion might be that instead of

just - of the 36 being erroneously taken - copied as 30 when it was 20, that instead of that, it was 16, and that of course would make it perfectly simple, that in the 16th year of Asa, which would have been the 13th year of Baasha, Baasha came against Asa. Now that would fit perfectly well, but prefably it doesn't seem at all quite satisfactory, because it is easy to see how 36 could be an error for 26, but it is pretty hard to see how 36 could be an error for 16. So that doesn't seem to me to be at all satisfactory, now suppose it was the 6th year. That would be, from the viewpoint of the history very excellent, because that would mean that just about three years after Baasha became king, he proceeded to strengthen his kingdom by building this fortification against Asa. That would seem very reasonable, 6 would seem to me extremely reasonable, and if it was the sixth year, it would seem to me not particularly very difficult, to think that the 30 got in by error, that it was the sixth year, and that in some way the word 30 got slipped in, in copying, and it got to be the 36th year. Now whether there is another word 30 in the context, that could have been miscopied in this case, I haven't looked into. But this appears to me as not extremely unlikely, but much more likely than that 36 is an error for 16. So that would seem to me to be a possibility. Now Thiele in his book, on the numbers of the Hebrew kings, has a different suggestion altogether, instead of thinking that 36 is an error for 6, which seems to me would be much more likely than that it is an error for 26, or 16, Thiele suggests that instead of being the 36th year of Asa, it could be just the 36th year. And should mean the 36th year of the Divided Kingdom. And that would include the whole reign of Jeroboam, and it would make it the 12th year of Baasha, or the 14th year of Asa. Now each of these, as you see, assumes a textual error. I'm inclined at the moment to think that the suggestion I've made is better than the one Thiele made, there is a textual error, instead of being 30 it is just 6. But Thiele is doing his best to keep all the numbers as they are, to prove that there are no errors in the numbers, and so instead of having an error in the numbers he just has it in the case of a few other words. Instead of being the 36th year of Asa's reign, it is just the 36th year of the divided kingdom. My hesitation about that, is I don't know of any other case where dates are dated from the beginning of the divided kingdom. So it does not impress me as an altogether satisfactory interpretation. Now what are the other problems, Mr. Vannoy?

(Student).

We have no evidence that Tibni ever reigned over the whole land. You see all we had about him in here is that the people were divided, half followed Tibni to make him king and half followed Omri, but the people that followed Omri prevailed against the people that followed Tibni, so that Omri, became king over the whole land, and Tibni certainly never did, but there may have been a four year period in which he held part of the land and Omri ~~o~~ the other part. In fact, I don't think we have to say there may have been. I think we can say there definitely was, because Zimri's 7 days were in the 27th year of Asa's reign, and Omri began to reign in the 31st year. There is definitely a four year period, but during that four year period, you can't say that Tibni was the king, because Omri's people never recognized Tibni at all. So that Tibni was a man who tried to become king, but he probably held enough of the territory - it is like Ishbosheth, - in the list of the kings we never give Ishbosheth, but for 8 years Ishbosheth reigned over 2/3 of the land of Israel. So that there would be a good argument to be made that Ishbosheth belongs in the list of Israelite kings. He reigned over 2/3rds of Israel, for 8 years, and then he was assassinated and his followers came up to David and he reigned as king over the whole country, when he was previously reigning over about a third of it, so we have these two problems in the chronology here, and this ~~e~~ last one, Omri, we don't need to make any change in the text. We have no right to make changes in the text. I'd better not say it that way. We have no necessity of considering that any error has come into the text. That what we have is not the original. When it says Omri began to reign in the 31st year, 12 years he reigned over Israel, we can simply not consider it as an error in this case, but that there is an interpretation of that which makes this 12 years of reigning begin earlier than the 31st year, when it says he began to reign. Consider that as being over the whole country, and consider the 12 years as beginning when Zimri died. We have something quite similar to this in English history, where we have Charles I beheaded, and Charles II fled for his life in disguise and escaped, and lived in France for I think it was 11 years. And then Charles II came back and was made king of England, and in between Cromwell had ruled most of the time, and Charles' followers would not recognize Cromwell as the ruler in any sense of the word. They considered him strictly as a ~~ruler~~ usurper. They considered

Charles II became king after his father's death, so they said this is the 12th year of Charles II's reign, so actually he had been in exile for 11 of the years, and had absolutely no control over the English government, but that is the figure which they used for it. And of course, we have the problem today about ~~who is~~ Queen Elizabeth. In English they call her Elizabeth II and some of the Scotch get mighty angry that they call her Elizabeth II, because Elizabeth I had no power over Scotland whatever. She was the queen of England, and she was not a queen of Scotland, but Elizabeth is actually Elizabeth I in Scotland, and II in England, but they don't bother with that. They just call her (4). So that these problems are not so bad.

Now Mr. Vannoy brought out another problem here, and that is that to add up the years of - he got 60 on one side, and 65 on the other. You get a difference of five years, which is quite a bit of difference, but when we recognize of course that the totals are not exact years anyway, it doesn't seem with this many kings, that there is too much of a problem so far. It could include portions of years, of different amounts in the two sides, so up to here, as we go on further in the Divided Kingdom it becomes an acute problem, but up to here, (4 1/2).

This attack of Baasha on Asa is a very interesting thing, from a number of reasons, and I ~~didn't~~ asked you to look

~~go~~ into that in particular for today. Mr. Haffly could you just give us the main events -

I guess I didn't word it right to say the attack of Baasha on Asa, ~~he~~ Baasha probably wouldn't say he made an attack at all, what did he do? (Student). They might say that he had taken certain territory like Nehru says of the Chinese communists, ~~that~~ have seized territory belonging to India, but the Chinese communists say that territory belongs to China, so that the Chinese will not admit they had made an attack on India. They simply seized territory, that they say belongs to them. Nehru says it doesn't belong to them, so there might be argument whether the Chinese communists attacked India or not. There might be argument over whether Baasha attacked Asa, but Baasha at any rate made a fortification on the border, a fortification which would protect his land against Asa, and would also give him a strong base to make an attack on Asa, if he should desire to do it, and ~~at~~ what does Asa do? Did he like Rehoboam say well, I'll just take my army and I'll attack and I'll destroy them. He had more sense than that, didn't he? It is very nice for somebody to say, that we don't like what

the University of Pennsylvania is doing. We are just going to go down and tell them they've got no right to do it. We're here, and they've got to quiet down and do what we tell them. They are so much larger than we are, if we get something from them we'll get it by a courteous request, rather than by a strong attack, and the difference between our size and the University of Pennsylvania is not comparable to that of Israel and Judah, and yet the difference was sufficient that Judah was very silly to ever think they could force Israel (6 1/2). Israel was nearly 3 times as large an area, and perhaps twice as large in wealth and power, and so they were by no means equal to them, so what did Asa do, Mr. Vannoy? (Student). Yes, our English Bible says king of Syria, why didn't he say King of Syria? You read it in the Hebrew instead of the English of course, and Syria doesn't occur. What does occur? (Student). Aram, is the name for the Aramaean people, who spoke Aramaic, and who had a kingdom with the capital at Damascus, they had other kingdoms, but this was their largest one, the capital at Damascus. Now why does our English Bible say Syria? Instead of Aram? (Student). Well, it is a later name. At that time it is called Aram because they were Aramaic people, but then that the ~~Assy~~ Assyrian empire later conquered this whole area, and then when the Greeks would come from Greece, to enter this area, they would say they were going to Assyria, though Assyria is hundreds of miles further east, because this was territory held by Assyria, just like back in 1776, you'd say the United States was three little colonies upon the sea board, and yet 60 years later, President (8 1/2) say that the Mexicans had entered the United States territory, had shed American blood on American soil, because of their (8 1/2) account of Texas, which ~~Mr~~ Polk ~~was~~ claimed was part of the United States. Well, in 1776 it would be absurd to call Texas a part of the United States. It was part of Mexico, but by this time, it was acclaimed that Texas was part of the United States. Well, Assyria is way off to the east, but from Assyria the armies came in the time of the kings, and conquered all of this land right to the Mediterranean sea, so when the Greeks came they say what country is this? Why Assyria of course? Just like when they come to San Francisco today, they say the United States. Well, a hundred years ago, 150 at least, they would have said this is Mexico. Now they say it is the United States. Well, they said this is Assyria, and the Greeks shortened the Assyria

to Syria. It comes from the god, Asshur, so the (9 1/2) is just as much a part of the rest, as the Greek (9 1/2) is Assyria, they meant Asshur, they called the area nearest to them that, so we call Assyria, the one further east, and the nearer we call Syria, and thus we carry them into an earlier period, and call Aram, Syria. It is a misnomer, but any name is something you apply to anything that you know what you mean by it. How you apply it. (Student). No, Benhadad had no connection whatever with the Assyrians. He was an Aramaean, which later came to be called Assyrian. Well, next time look over this Asa more thoroughly, and try to get in mind the details about Asa, and particularly the geographical details about Asa, and then look into Omri's reign. Try to get well in mind, there isn't much told you about Omri. You might glance a little ahead into Ahab, but with this in mind, what did Omri do to strengthen his kingdom? How many things can you find that Omri did to strengthen his kingdom? And we will look into it next week, and try to get in the full six hours of study.

K. 19.

- NEXT CLASS.

You could say that in the third year of the king of France, Charles II began to reign, and then you might say he reigned 50 years, and yet the reign of this king of France, might have only been 30 years, 25 years, - but his followers counted him as king all the time that he was in exile. Of course, Omri doubtless was reigning over a sizable part of Israel. So it is not an interpretation that is absolutely certain, but it surely does resolve the problem. I'd like to look at the chart on the board for a few minutes now, and you have a total there, of - on the chart we have no difficulty of the fact that Abijah's three year reign began the 18th year of Jeroboam and ended the 20th. That is no problem for us because we don't know ~~more~~ what month it would begin or end, so that it would be simple enough to get three years, of one, inside of two years of the other. (1 3/4) there is no problem. Now we still have a problem on this matter of Omri, 12 years, but that we noticed - suggestion which seems to be quite satisfactory, but when we add the figures on it, we have 51 on one side, and 66 on the other. Now that is a very sizable difference. Of course, you might say

that all the kings in the kingdom of Israel reigned for - began their reign and ended their reign in such a way that a month or two is counted as a year, and that none of the kings of Judah reigned, and ~~you~~ ^{if} could do that - 1, 2, 3, 4 - you can hardly count, 4, 5, 6. You have 6 reigns on the one side, and you say every one of those reigns, has a couple of months that it counts as a full year, while on the other hand, every man on this kingdom of Rehoboam's kingdom, began his reign on January 1, and ended it on December 31, so that there was no case there where there was less than a full year included, and that would give you exactly 61 with the one, with the other one 66 portions of years, but actually totalling only to 61. Now that is a suggestion, which could solve the problem. Is there anything wrong with that suggestion, Mr. Grauley? (Student). It is no problem at all in thinking that six kings - if you count the last - if you count every part of year in which they reign as a year, would certainly not be at all impossible, that this fits in together to call the reign 66 years, with actually the reign only 61 years. There is no difficulty in that is there? None whatever? What is difficult with that? (Student). Yes, there is a problem Abijah, Rehoboam, Abijah and Asa, is all the kings we have of Judah at this time, but these three kings, - if each of them, of course we don't care when Rehoboam started to reign, because Rehoboam and Jeroboam started at the same time, so they each get part of that year, which they could count, but if Rehoboam ended his reign on September 31 of this year, and his successor began it on January 1, you could get exactly 61 years. ^(4 1/2) But it certainly ~~isn't~~ unlikely that all of these would begin the same way. It would seem - if you are going to have in such a way that they end exactly on December 31, you might concede we have one on both sides, and if you are going to have any it would be more likely to have some on the (5) and some on the (5). You had six chances to hit ^{at} December 31, as the day of death. Of course it wouldn't be December 31 to them, but the end of the year. You have six chances to hit the day of death as the end of the year, in the one case, and three in the other. Now that doesn't mean but what you could get it, in one or even two of the three, but I would say it would be possible that one or two of the six, - it would be possible that one of the 3 (5 1/2). It would be rather impossible - rather improbable that two of them (5 1/2)

i would say that you are stretching probability to the point of extreme unlikeliness. It is not impossible, but it is - seems unlikely. We had ~~the 4th~~ isn't it 48 presidents in the United States? We have 365 days in the year, and 3 of our presidents died on the 4th of July. Now there is a very very small chance that that would happen, 3 presidents would die on the 4th of July, on the same day, and that day, the day of our national independence. You see, that is extremely unlikely that three would, but if somebody would tell me that all American presidents would die on the 4th of July, I'd simply tell him that he is talking through his hat. It is extremely unlikely three would. To say that 6 would, so unlikely you would hardly dream of such a thing, and when somebody would say, they all would why it certainly is impossible. Now to say that all the kings of Judah died on the last day of the year, and none of the kings of Israel which is necessary in order to reconcile it, - 5 years difference, if that is the explanation. It is pretty unlikely. It is much more likely there might be one on each side, - there might be none, it is about 1 chance out of 365 of getting it. But there might be conceivably, it is more likely that there would be one out of six, rather than one out of three, and so to say that all three on one side did, and none on the other side, is just extremely unlikely. Mr. Grauley? (Student). - at all probable that six kings would count their years as enough ^{(1} years, to make a 10 year difference. That doesn't seem to me possible. Let's look at it. - I can't see any way how you can add more years this way, than the number of kings, so that on the one side, it would be highly possible that 66 years ~~w~~ could represent 61. Or 60 1/2 perhaps. But not less. So that it would seem to me that this system of figuring would be entirely ~~sat~~ satisfactory if all the three kings of Judah, reigned exactly to the end of the year. But that is so improbable that it hardly seems worth mentioning as a possibility that each of them reigned to the end of the year. Now ~~as~~ you know ^{do} of any other possibility Mr. Ruble? (Student). I don't know how these figure, but a man would reign a year and two days, and they would say he reigned two years. Well, it would depend if he reigned ~~July~~ from July of one year to ~~July~~ of the next, ~~a~~ year, even if he reigned from October of one year to February of the next, you might conceivably call it one year, but I don't see how you would call less than a month one year. (Student). We've made this addition. They haven't made it.

(Student). Well, if you added the 7 days in you'd get more than (8 1/2) instead of less. Suppose we count the 7 days as a year, you'd get 67 instead of 66. and then you've got six years difference instead of five, so you've got a difference ~~in~~ ^{between} this and the other, and your problem isn't in Israel. Your problem is in Judah. And the answer to that problem which is suggested by Thiele, which impresses me as a very excellent answer is this, - in view of this situation here, to assume that in Judah it was customary to ~~some~~ count a man's first year of reign as if ~~he~~ it was still the reign of his father. That is, it was done in certain other countries. We have records that so and so was king, not in the first year of so and so, this contract was made not in the first year of this king, but in his accession year. In other words that was a very natural idea, to occur to him in making a list, lets not get all things mixed up, so that the same year is called the first year of this man, and the last year of the other, and the total gets mixed. Let's say, you have your new year. You have again the 25th year of the king. Now the king dies. Why, it is still his year. Whether he dies in January or in December, and we start the next year the first year, the following year, so we call this the accession year, and we know that in certain kingdoms did that, so Thiele says, if in the kingdom of Judah, you count the first year as the accession year of the king, and then the next year as the first year, that is to say, you might not do that the very first case, well yes, you count the first year as Solomon's last year, so that Rehoboam's accession year would be the first year. And then Rehoboam's first year would be - start a new year, and if you did that, in each of the three kings, then you would get the exact number of years, regardless of when the king died, and if you accept Thiele's suggestion for this, you have an exact solution to this particular problem. You have in one case, each king getting an extra year here because of the fact that two kings would get credit for the one year, in between. The last king you wouldn't expect to get an extra year. But each of these - of this would be, because his last one and his next one would overlap. Well, the last (11 1/2), and the ~~last~~ first - in Judah, the (11 1/2) would represent the exact total. (Student). No, he thinks they were (11 3/4) but he thinks at this time, that was the custom, and if you assume, you see we wanted to look at problems in this ~~set~~ class, I don't want to give you solutions. I want to look at the problems which this

is a graduate class, and many ~~etc~~ graduate classes, the professor pours it in, and you swallow it, but that is not my idea of what a graduate class ought to be, and certainly not what I want this one to be. We want to look at the problem, and see what we find, and ~~at least~~ of course we are interested in what we can get, but we don't want to take some body's guess, and then apply it. We want to see the problem, and then see if it fits in. In this case, this suggestion would seem to fit except for one problem, and that problem is that on this assumption, Asa's three years, might actually be 4, but could not be two. α And so on this assumption, Asa beginning on the 18th year of Jeroboam and ending on the 20th, would be difficult. Because ~~Asa~~ on this assumption might be the 19th of Rehoboam. So there is a problem, but Thiele has an answer to that, too, which would seem rather questionable, and yet it is worthy of consideration.

My objection to that is that the new year began at a different time in the (13).

And he presents evidence which he thinks shows that they had an ecclesiastical year in Judah and also a political year, and that the ecclesiastical, instead, none of them - these two systems that ~~Saul used~~, Solomon used, one of them was taken by the Northern Kingdom, and one by the Southern Kingdom. Now that certainly would not be impossible at all, even during the Middle Ages, a Vatican document, dated around ~~January~~ December 25, as the beginning of the year, and I think (13 1/2) did too in the Middle Ages. I'm not sure. The countries varied.

Whenever you find a date between December 25, and January 1, you have a problem to know what the dates mean, because some people said the year begins from the birth of Christ, so naturally that is our new year, while others said, no, the new year begins from January 1.

There is no reason in the world why it would begin at January 1, but that it is the custom, and whatever ~~is~~ established ~~is~~ the custom, I don't know, ~~the basis~~ it is a crazy sort of a custom. Though we have the difference, now it could just be as well a difference in two kingdoms, of two or three months. And Thiele suggests that in order to explain such a (14 1/2).

Now whether that is justified or not, we may hold in abeyance. But I certainly think that on the basis of this (14 1/2) we have mighty certainly proven that there is a difference.

Yes, Mr. Ruble? (Student.)

That is asking a question that suggests going ahead and taking results from other sources, and trying to apply them here. ~~As~~ On the basis of our knowledge, that is our knowledge from the study of this portion of the Bible, we have no statement in this portion which would connect it up with foreign dates which might be fixed by other methods. We have no such evidence in this section. And consequently all that we can do at present, is to say that the 4th year of Ahab, was the 61st year after the Division of the Kingdom. We have no other basis. Now a basis might be suggested in that Shishak came up, but it wasn't a certain year of Shishak's reign, it is a certain year of Rehoboam's reign, he came in the 5th year of Rehoboam reign. So that doesn't give us any exact data. Now there have been various scholars have given very good statements for $(1 \frac{1}{2})$ but we are not in any position to intelligently discuss the statements in this, until we get further along in our inquiry. So for the present I want you simply to use the data that we have here. Now if there is any earlier data in the Bible, that you think would throw light on it, don't hesitate to point it out. I don't know of any. But if it is a matter of later dates, well lets' wait until we come to it to see its bearing. So for the present, I would simply say 61st year after the beginning of the distuption would seem to be a fair date for the fourth year of Ahab, on the assumption that the king of Israel counted their years as two years, and the king of Judah differed.

Now I must rush on because we bothered to put this on the board. I don't want to erase it and have to write it on the next time. I'm afraid we'll have to though anyway. The material on the board here is absolutely meaningless to you, probably. But we will state that this is a ~~translit~~ transliteration of Semitic letters. A transliteration of Semitic letters into Latin letters, And consequently when you see an n you say right away, the n represents a nun, and when you see an s with a dot under it, you know it represents a tsadi. When you have a square bracket that means this is a guess, anything in square brackets is inserted by the interpreter as a guess. Anything that is in half square brackets like this is inserted by the interpreter but there is in the material, something which seems to make it not merely to a very great extent, that is, it might be that he had this, you see, and you have a break there. $\text{\textcircled{e}}$ (Explanation on board between whether a letter could be an a or an n when only part of the

letter is there.) So you can't determine this, unless you look at the exact tablets and see if the portions there are sufficient to make you quite sure that it isn't (4) but at least there is a portion so that it is not just a guess out of the air, but when you find something in square brackets like this, the interpreters says there is nothing there to suggest this, but he says, I say that I can make a guess that this is very reasonable. I must go now, but I would ~~app~~ appreciate it if you would copy this, and then try ~~to~~ between now ~~and~~ and tomorrow to make some sense out of it. ~~B~~ Like for instance when you see a word mlk what does that suggest? King, yes. And when you see aleph, r n, what does it mean? Aram. ~~Surely~~ Syria, in the later form. Take it and see if you can make anything out of it.

NEXT CLASS.

He made one or two very slight changes in Dunan's interpretation of what particular letters they were. In the whole he followed Dunan. But the second line of the inscriptions Dunan made nothing of, every thing that is in square brackets or half square brackets in Albright, Dunan just threw up his hands, ~~with~~ ^{he} ~~not~~ it did nothing to the second line. Now Dunan called his article, in French, "An Aramaic stela dedicated to Melqart. If he couldn't do anything with the second line, how could he figure that it was an Aramaic stela, dedicated to Melqart? Well, he could figure ~~a~~ that it was an Aramaic stela, easily from where it was found. It was found north of Aleppo, which is near the Syrian coast in - quite a distance north of Palestine near to the coast of Syria. And there is no trace at this place where it was found of anything from earlier than the Roman times, so that Albright says evidently the stela had been brought to that ~~site~~ ^{where} ~~is~~ cite in Roman times, perhaps in the immediate vicinity of Aleppo, ~~or they may~~ there may have been a shrine to Melqart. It is quite far north as you see. And a stela from this early time, written in old Hebrew characters, would be pretty sure to be in Aramaic. Now the Aramaic language, I don't know how much any of you know about the Aramaic language, but the Aramaic language is one of the five most prominent Semitic languages. These languages I'm sure you all know are Accadian, which is a term we give to designate a number of dialects including Assyrian, Babylonian. Accadian, Arabic,

Aramaic, and Hebrew, and Ethiopian. Ethiopic, we have quite a bit of material in Ethiopic too, but perhaps the other four out of the five, the other four, are perhaps the most important for Old Testament study of the five, though Ethiopic has a fair amount of material. Arabic is of great importance to us, because of the very extensive vocabulary and the great amount of written material. It is of less importance than the others, from another view point, because practically all of our Arabic material comes later than 700 A.D. Consequently there is practically nothing in Arabic contemporary with Old Testament times. But it is such an extensive language, for linguistics and comparative languages, Arabic is considered as the most vital of all. For historical purposes of course, Accadian is most important, because we have the great royal inscriptions in Babylonian and Assyrian. But the Aramaic is much more important historically than is the Arabic, perhaps less though than the Accadian. But in many ways it is very important historically because it is so near to the Jews. It was the language of Aram, the Aramaic people who at the time of the first millennium B.C. occupied the area around Damascus. We call it Syria. And the Aramaic language is ~~spe~~ closer to Hebrew than any other of the Semitic languages. It is very close to Syriac. There are certain differences in vowels. Certain words have different meanings, and there are some very definite differences, in verb forms. But it is close enough that when you write Aramaic, without any vocalization, you can recognize a good deal of it just ~~as~~ studying ordinary Hebrew. Well now, this inscription then, though it is in Aramaic, and none of you have had Aramaic, I believe, yet, putting in just the consonants which were all that were written down, you can recognize quite a few words from their similar similarity to Hebrew. If you look at the third line of it, you find the first word there. What is that word Mr. Ruble? (Student.) Nowadays, we try as a rule when we mention any place, give all its names the way the people there used them. But in some ways it is more consistent to Anglosize ~~it~~ everything. After all, you are talking in English. At least, that is what they used to do. You take a map of - a present day map of the world, and when they ~~have~~ have a gulf down in South America, they are apt to put a Spanish word for gulf, and if it is over in Arabic, they'd have to put the Arabic word. And the average American has no idea what the words mean, but they used to anglo-size everything. We say Rome, but no Italian ever said Rome. They say Roma. We say Florence they say

(11). Florinze. We say Cologne, in Germany. The German says G Koln.

We anglosize it, in most of our words. Well, before linguistic study at advance as it has lately, and people are trying to do them in the original way, the effort was not made - they made everything into their own language, and if you saw bar-hadad, they would say ben-hadad. They would say son of Hadad, and they would know what you are talking about. For Ben-hadad. So why bother to try to say Bar-hadad? We over here, we didn't call Hitler the leader, we tried to take the German word, the Feuder. ; But how many Americans ever called him der feurer. They called him - words mispronounced. They didn't get it right. Hardly anybody did? I don't know if it is just a result of translation, and then you know what you are talking about, - as it is to make a very foolish stab at something which gives a different idea. The words and sounds are all different. Many English (12)

and a fifth of these say - Don^u Quihote. Well, that's correct. That's the way the Spanish called him. But if we do that we ought to say Meck-iko. Instead of giving it an anglo-sized sound, Mexico. I don't know if we'd be better off to say, meck iko. We wouldn't get it the way the Mexicans do anyway. Well, in this case then, they take Ben=hadad, the Hebrew usage, Ben-hadad, but the way he says it is Bar-hadad. That's not to say they translate everything, but something that is so common, that is easily understood to them, they (12 3/4) translate it. Now you have then as Mr. Grauley suggests, you have Ben-hadad, and I ~~kan~~ don't know whether the (13) was correctly understood or not, by Denon, but certainly the next line, Denon didn't make anything out of. But you can see from this, what letters we have here that were~~t~~ perfectly clear in the original. There wasn't much. ~~e~~ Ben-had was always ~~nd~~ (13 1/2) the h, the h was somewhat obscure, but we take the next name, well, what is the next word~~s~~ after Ben-hadad, Mr. Vannoy? Yes, Benhadad the son of, and you'd take that next word there and - (Student). Categorize, filling this in on the basis of this verse, in I Kings, about the three names exactly the same, as we have there in I Kings ~~ke~~ 15:18. If Albright 's filling in is correct, we have here a very interesting ~~eeh~~ ~~com~~ ~~er~~ ~~ation~~, of the Biblical reference to Ben-hadad, as the son of Tabrimon, the son of Hazion. This is very interesting indeed.

the second line is so broken, because it makes a restoration to so quite an extent suggestive, but yet you can see how it does fit. Albright says there is exactly enough room ~~the~~ for the right number of letters. Exactly the right number of letters and traces of a few letters, ~~not~~ enough to make it very likely that this is the correct filling out. Well, if so then, it is a very interesting corroboration of the Biblical ~~re~~ferences, and as a matter of fact, from this 9th century B.C. we have only three inscriptions which have been discovered in Palestine and ~~Ass~~ Syria, only three stelas, inscriptions. This one and two others. One of these two others is the famous Mesha stone, which ~~we~~ haven't yet looked at, it comes slightly later in our history, so we will want to look at the Mesha stone directly by detail, Mesha of Moab, we've mentioned in II Kings 3:4. And then there is a stela in northern Syria, most of these are inscribed toward the end of the 9th century. That is ~~w~~ shortly before 800, which Albright thinks is the time when this (1 1/2) stela was set up, but this stela is not anywhere near Damascus, that's an interesting thing isn't it? It is way over near Aleppo, (student). We have only the three from that century, but - yes? (Student). In Palestine and Syria, we have only three royal stelas, that have been found. How many stelas have been found from the 9th century B.C. put up by kings of Judah? Mr. Ruble? ~~€~~ You don't believe, any. In other words you have confidence in what I just said. I said that there are only three royal stelas from the Palestine and Syria, which have been prominent in the 9th century. One of them being in way in North Syria. One of them being over in Moab, and one of them being this one, which is (2 1/2). So that leaves none for the kingdom of Judah, or of Israel., ~~€~~ We have found no stela put up by them, telling about their great (2 1/2) at all. But we have three, and so we are very grateful for them, and it is very interesting if this one is actually a corroboration of those three names, given in the Bible, given in that reference in Kings. Now the trouble is that this stela seems to be near 800, and the time of Asa is given to be 0 would be about 800, and that would make it a little earlier than that, and this makes this Ben-hadad must have reigned 50 years, if this is actually the date of it. - based on the type of writing they probably had. So if that is the case, why he would have

had to reign about 50 years, and Albright gets around that by saying that the book of - he has a very interesting suggestion which he makes here, which I would be rather skeptical of, at the moment. - (Student). The 36th year of Asa which King - which Thiele made, - gets around by saying it is the 36th year of the kingdom, which seems to me certainly to be a very ~~very~~ good suggestion, though certainly not proven. Albright gets around in saying that all these figures are off in Kings and Chronicles, correctly preserved by a very (4). That's quite a cry from the attitude of 50 years ago, when Chronicles was just the writings of somebody, who took Kings and tried to enlarge it, and added to it to glorify the angels, That everything in Chronicles that wasn't in Chronicles was imaginary, utterly unreliable, Albright is quite convinced with his great deal of Elijah's material in kChronicles, which is a step for the good, but when ^{he} we come to the basis of it, ~~it~~ throws quite a bit of the Hebrew, he is getting into a dangerous direction. But there is something in this, that is still even more interesting. This inscription here shows the king - Benhadad the king of Damascus, putting up a stela, for Melqart, and Melqart is the god of Tyre. Now if Melqart is the god of Tyre, why should the king of Damascus put up a stela in honor of Melqart? Well, it shows that the religion of Melqart was reaching out, and trying to reach other places, so that this god of Tyre, and this god Melqart, a king of Damascus, ~~it~~ was put up the (5), that's very interesting, because we have in the next period we are just coming to, we have the god of Tyre, who in the Bible is called Baal, but was brought in by Jezebel, from Tyre, we have here trying to get people in Palestine to follow this god Baal, and we have the great threat to the religion of Israel in its whole history, brought about ~~the~~ by the coming in of Baal worship. Now Baal is the god of Tyre. Well, you say, right away, but if Baal is a god, and this is Melqart, why put two of them together? Well, the fact is, that Baal is not a god's name, it just means master. It is a title which it seems in early time to be sometimes applied to the Lord, and that was applied to every Canaanite deity, but the Baal in the story of Elijah and Elisha, was the Baal of Tyre, who came with the daughter of the king of Tyre, ~~is~~ Jezebel who married the king k- the son of King Omri. Ahab did. And here we find Damascus, with its king,

putting up an inscription to the god of Tyre, and so we would suggest the name of the god of Tyre, which is not actually Baal but is Melqart, but unfortunately the word Melqart, is actually Melek (The king of the city. And so that is a ~~probability~~ ^{title, too}, so we have another title given to the god of Tyre, the king of the city, and this title is preserved, in Hebrew-Roman sources, for the god of Tyre. That's the same god ~~of~~ doubtless, and what the actual name means was perhaps we don't know. Perhaps they didn't like to take it on profaned lips, the name of the

(6 1/2) god, so they called him the god of the city. Albright says it is not the city of ~~Tyre~~ Tyre, but the underworld that is referred to. But the god of the city of Damascus,

(7). Olmsted, says this is Palestine and Syria, waxes very eloquent about how Jezebel came down from this great advanced civilization/merchant city of Tyre, ~~at~~ which its fleets going all through the Mediterranean, and contact with the great civilization of other countries, and she is coming down to this backwards, hill country of Israel, was anxious to bring her - ~~to find~~ refined cultured god with her, and to get people to worship him, instead of the backward god of Ethiopia. Olmsted ~~she~~ said she must have been very much like a Christian lady in the early days of the Christian development, married to a heathen prince, trying to teach her religion, well, what we read in the Bible about Jezebel leads me to question very seriously of Olmsted's evaluation of her, but I do think that it may be that while Olmsted's evaluation I think undoubtedly is very wrong, it could give us an idea of what her own evaluation of herself would be. She may very well have thought of it exactly the way that Olmsted would (8), and she would ~~find~~ try to bring to these rude backwards people the more cultured civilization (8 1/4). Well, you say, yes, but the Baal worship had all these crude immoral things connected with it. How could you think that was advanced? Well unfortunately today we have all sorts of heathen who think they are very cultured. So there is an exact parallel. But this inscription then, one of the three inscriptions that we have from - three royal inscriptions from this particular century, and I think that Albright says it is our second oldest Aramaic inscription altogether. It is very interesting, and (9)

The Divided Kingdom. 21. (9) 1960-61.

just discovered, just published, - in 1942. Of course, scholars have mostly thought that Ben-Hadad who is mentioned in the time of Ahab, was the son of the Ben-Hadad at the time of Baasha, and so the Ben-Hadad who is later on the son of Hazael, they called Ben-Hadad the third, and now Albright says that this proves that there was only one Ben-Hadad, and that is the first, - (9 1/2) the other Ben-Hadad the second, and Montgomery follows that view in the I.C.C. volume, but I don't think that we need to be sure they are right on it at all. In order to do it he has to throw away these figures in Kings, of course, after all he could reign 50 years couldn't he? It is not impossible, but to have him coming and fighting against Ahab, ~~and~~ so vigorously and getting up into Ahab's chariot, and Ahab sparing him and all that when he'd reigned 50 years seems a little bit unnatural, but still the old king might still be able to put up a stela even if his son was reigning, and actually running an army in that respect, - there's a lot we just don't know. But it is not a complete ~~corroberation~~ [?] corroboration of the Biblical record because of the fact that it is so broken, and yet it fits so well, that it certainly is to quite an extent a corroboration, of the Biblical record, and the parallel that it gives to our story of Baal in the Bible is a very interesting one, and expends our (10 1/2) Of that, I would say very definitely. And I think it is very interesting that Albright would want to stand for the 36 figure in Chronicles and ~~says~~ stand on that, and throw aside the figures in Kings. Now there may be errors in the copying of these figures, but my own guess is that they are comparative few, and that most of them can be explained on the basis of ~~an~~ understanding of it, a better understanding, but the attitude of throwing aside (11) so completely ~~and~~ instead of reversing the matter, * to take context now and one on the basis of it, through out kings, it is sort of like the attitude of Olmsted again, in relation to the New Testament, you know Olmsted came to a conclusion that John is correct. The gospel of John is thoroughly reliable. He wrote a book on the life of Jesus, he said Jesus had never been studied by a real historian before, but now I've studied him, so now at long last Jesus stands forth in the full light of history. That is what he says in his book, but most others (11 1/2) ridicule highly . But in his book, which made something sensational when it first came out, Olmsted's argument was, the synoptics may be mistaken but where

John made a statement stick to John. John is reliable. And of course the criticism in the New Testament holds that John was late and unreliable and the synoptics are early and contain more of the truth, so some of the professors in the divinity school were quite aroused that he ~~would~~ was injuring the churches' faith, by putting John ahead of the synoptics. And they of ~~could~~ would throw out John.

Maybe you can run over this article sometime during the semester. This is an article which appeared in the Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research. Oct. 1942, pages 23-29. You will have to read it critically, and see what there is in it that you can take ~~(13)~~ and what there is in that is questionable. One of the reasons you see that the critical scholars feel perfectly home at with Albright, is that Albright doesn't hesitate to throw aside anything in the scripture that he thinks is something else that is more dependable, and so he constantly, he is ready to throw this out, this is wrong, this is wrong, - but yet he is always driving home things that proves they are right, and often drives home things that all scholars are agreed are wrong, so he is in quite a confusion (13 1/2) and he has said a tremendous lot which is very very helpful and very essential to scripture, but when conservatives try to make Albright out as that he (14) he is afraid of the critical , but his conclusions are in favour of a far greater amount of historicity than any other liberal scholar, so that his material is very very helpful to us, but not developed slavishly by any means.

K. 22.

A fact we find constantly in this, that when a nation faces another nation next to it, they are apt to appeal to the one that is on the other side of it, to help. Just like we did with Russia in the last war. Russia and we fought against Germany, especially around the east side of it. Not because we had anything in common with Russia, but because we both were next to Germany, and we figured they were so far away there was nothing for us to fear from them, and in the time of the reformation we find the French king, in order to get help against the emperor, he will line up with the Turks, but the Turks were so far away that he had nothing

to fear from them, but they are on the other side of the empire, and they can attack the Empire from the other side, and take the pressure off him from this side, so that Baasha ~~g~~this built (1) at Ramah, and then Asa took all his treasure, so that he had to take out all his treasure from the house of the Lord, ~~s~~ in other words it was a real serious heavy thing for him to meet, to get enough for (1 1/2) but he did it and sent it to Ben-Hadad, and then Ben-hadad, attacked Israel on the other side, and the result of that was that Baasha had to take a force to defend himself there, and so he quit~~e~~d the building of Ramah, and Judah withdrew the troops sufficiently from it, that so much would happen (1 1/2) (Student). Asa was able to go and to do away with this fortification that Baasha made against him and make one of his own, that makes two (2). It doesn't mean that he built these two cities to be fortified. But you notice it said he made a proclamation throughout Judah that none was exempt, in other words, it was ~~p~~ a pretty big undertakeng. It was a very big job of fortification in order to protect his land against the Northern Kingdom. And you notice all the time there has been constnat~~t~~, opposition between the south and the north. There is not fighting all the time, but there is fighting a great part of the time on a number of these southern kings, and there was war between Jeroboam and Rehoboam all their days. There was war between Abijam and Jeroboam, all their days. There was war between Baasha and Asa. You read that constnatly. There was a constant attitude of opposition between the southern and the northern kingdom, with this attitude this constant attitude of opposition between the southern and northern kingdom continued all through their history. Now on the cause of the northern kingdom there is considerable opposition between the northern and the southern kingdom. At the beginning of it there was constantl fighting between the two, but does it mean all through its ~~high~~ history. Can anybody here give us ~~the~~ proof to the contrary? (Student). In I Kings 22, you have the account of Ahab planning an attack against Ramath-Gilead and Jehoshaphat is up there with him, and Jehoshaphat says isn't there another prophet of the Lord we can ask of, and Ahab says to Jehoshaphat, I'm going against Ramoth-gilead, will you go with me? And

Jehoshaphat said, ~~in~~ my army is like your army. My men like your men. In other words, my men are right with you. We are a hundred per cent together. Now Rehoboam never said anything like that (4) but there is Jehoshaphat taking a position to some extent like a vessel, to the northern kingdom. Working in full fellowship with the northern kingdom. And do you have any further proof of it? Do you remember the case where the northern kingdom attacked Moab, and the king of the southern kingdom goes with him like a (4) with Jehoshaphat. He went with the king of the northern kingdom on this attack against Moab, where they went down through the southern kingdom, and around the Dead Sea and came up below. And then we find that in addition to that that king Ahaziah - no King Jehoram of the southern kingdom who was Jehoshaphat's son, actually married the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel. So we have a period in the history of the Divided Kingdom, where the northern and southern kingdoms, not only were they at peace, they were on friendly terms, they were working together, and the southern kingdom, being smaller, taking a position almost like a vessel to the northern kingdom, and when the house of Ahab was all killed by Jehu up in the north, they killed also the king of the southern kingdom who was up there with the cousin of the northern kingdom. Now those are facts which anybody who had Old Testament History should know, but I see that they are easy to forget. But they are basis facts, in the history of the Divided Kingdom. I didn't bring them up here to remind you of them. They are a little bit ahead of our present place, but I was rather foolishly assumed that everybody was familiar with them, but what I wanted to bring out now was how those facts came about? In the northern kingdom as you know we had 2 dynasties. We had the dynasty of Jeroboam and his son only reigned two years. We had the dynasty of Baasha which his son only reigned 2 years. And then we have after Zimri killed Elah, then we have Zimri killed within 7 days, but then we have ~~Tibni Tibni~~ Tibni and Omri fighting, for four years, and Omri becomes king, and the whole period of Omri's reign including the time when he was fighting with Tibni, is only twelve years. The closest they could get. Well Omri only reigned 12 years, and the Bible has very little to say about Omri. Do you think that Omri was any great importance?

Well, the Bible says little about it. The Bible says far more about Ahab, than it does about Omri, but the relationship of Ahab to Omri could be compared I believe, the relationship of Solomon to David. That is to say, David built a great empire, Solomon just carried it on. Now it is not quite like that. Omri did not build a great empire, but Omri did some things, that stabilized the northern kingdom very tremendously. He was - most scholars believe that Omri was one of the most important kings ~~of~~ in the whole history of the northern kingdom. There is a very vital reason for thinking that he may have been ~~most~~ one of the most important kings, aside from the results that we find in the history of what he did, and that is the fact that in Assyrian inscription the name of Omri is the earliest name of any Israelite king that can occur and the Assyrian inscription, there is no Assyrian inscription that we have from the time of Omri. But inscriptions from a later time refer to Omri in such a way as to show that the name runs very high in their idea, that when Jehu killed all the house of Omri, paid tribute to Assyria, the Assyrian inscription that tells about it, calls ~~he~~ him Jehu, son of Omri, and he had killed all the sons of Omri, killed all his descendents, it is quite clear that the word son is here used to mean successor, but after Omri - three descendents of his reign were before Jehu, so to call Jehu son of Omri shows how important Omri seemed to be ~~to~~ in contemporary history. Then in addition to that we find that later on - even a hundred years later, the word Omri is used in connection with the Northern Kingdom, in the Assyrian inscription, and once the land is referred to as the land of Omri, so that we ~~can~~ see that the Assyrian scribe thought of Omri as having been a tremendously important king of Israel. Now in the Bible you wouldn't be apt to get that because the Bible tells us very little about it. It just says he was a bad king, and that the man is, and that he built Samaria. That's all it says. But now when you read that he built Samaria, you ask, why is that important? Well, the building of Samaria is important because it is a very important thing for any king to have a good capital. One of David's first acts when he became king of all Israel was to capture Jerusalem, and make it the capital. To have a strong headquarters for the land. It is a very important thing. In the northern kingdom, Jeroboam reigned at first in Shechem. Then he moved to Tirzah, and the location of Tirzah is not yet certain. Probably

it is a little north of Shechem. But he moved to Tirzah, and then the succeeding kings reigned in Tirzah, but we find that King Omri lived in Tirzah for six years, but then he moved to Samaria, and Samaria becomes so important that the northern kingdom comes to be called Samaria, and Samaria becomes the most important city in Palestine. It is probably a city two or three times as big as Jerusalem, it was a city which occupied a very large area. It was a city which had a very fine location on a high plateau overlooking the country side, for a long distance around, so well situated for protection with steep drops on the side of the hill, that it resisted the Assyrians for three years and then finally was seized. A wonderful location for a city. Well now, why wasn't there a city there before. Before Ahab, there might have been a very tiny town, a little headquarters there, but nothing to speak of. But he built here his great city, it would seem that Omri introduced, or at least took advantage of something that had been produced very shortly before, the use of cisterns. Cisterns are mentioned quite frequently in later Israelite history, hardly at all in earlier history. The cistern is still important in Jerusalem ~~days~~ today. Every house of Jerusalem has its cistern. It is a large reservoir of water under the house, so ~~(#)~~ arranged that all ~~wate~~ rain that lands on the roof, is directed to go into the cistern. So that you have your water as it rises from the rain, that comes in the rainy season, into your cistern. (11) Well, before the time of Omri it was necessary that every city have a good spring, or an enemy could simply surround the city and starve the people out. They'd have to have a good spring in the city. And that limited the number of places that could have cities. But Samaria has its small spring there, hardly enough for a big cistern, but Omri was familiar by this time with the idea of a cistern, and Samaria built a cistern, and thus is able to get along, even though it had no big spring of water. And Samaria which he built there was a great capital, so that shows the greatness of Omri a big thing like that, setting to work to build a better capital and more centrally located capital, a fine headquarters for the nation, but another thing that Omri did was to say what's the use of all this little fighting constantly, constant bickering and fighting with other small groups. Let's make peace with them. Let's make friends with them and we have good reasons to think that this was the policy Omri introduced, because from this time on we find

the southern kingdom and the northern kingdom at peace until the destruction of the house of Omri~~X~~, until this dynasty which includes four kings comes to an end. And so he set about to make peace in corroboration with neighboring nations, instead of constant war and fighting, and in doing this, he made use of a means that kings have made since time immorial up to and including the present. And that means was marriage alliances. And so he looked to the north of him where there was the area of Phoenicia, and this area in which Sidon, had been the great city, now Tyre was the great center, but the people still went largely by the name of the former great city, Sidon, but now Tyre is the capital, but the people are largely called Sidonians. And so Ethbaal, king of Tyre, ~~A~~ we call him in one place in the Bible, king of the Sidonians, gave his daughter in marriage to Omri's son and this introduces the more commerce, the more interrelating, the more possibility of (13 1/2) this year, by the friendly relation to Tyre in the north. This policy which Omri introduced is carried further by the daughter of Jezebel, Athaliah, being married to the son of ~~the~~ Jehoshaphat, the king of Judah, so we see all these evidences that Omri introduced a new policy which from a view point of practical political strategy is very excellent (14) if it had been joined with an out and out allegiance to the world, but instead of that it was joined with the carrying on with the attitude of Jeroboam and no division, no strong division to the God of Israel, and the result was that it actually led to (14 1/2) but from a political view point ? features these were effective teachers that Omri introduced. Well now, study the life of Omri and of Ahab, and try to give all the political events, in the life of Ahab. All his work, all his political events, everything of a material nature in the life of Ahab, and study that for next time. And of course, maybe you'd better do the same for Jehoshaphat. We are interested in all the prophetic developments. We are interested in the religious development. But we are at the moment putting our basis on the economic material background. Take everything you can find about him -

END OF CLASS.

- You take a person who works down town somewhere, works with his business and talks with his friends, he phones to his wife, he does all kinds of things and you write down for four days every word he says, and the ordinary person not particularly interested in religion, how many times would he use the word eternity? Chances are, not at all. It is a philosophical term. And it is not necessarily ~~clear~~ true that there is a word to express an idea which people will not commonly use, unless it is taught them as a philosophical or religious term. So you can't say, there must be a word for it. Therefore עוֹלָם must be the word for it. If you ask what is עוֹלָם ? What does it mean? And you find that עוֹלָם means a long time. How long a time does it mean? It means a very long time. But does it mean a time of which you can say that there is absolutely no end to that time? Well, if it did, why did they say the עוֹלָם of the עוֹלָמוֹת . That is translated forever and ever. It is the 'olam of the 'olams. And I think the best parallel I know of to what the word probably means is that you look down the railroad track on a flat surface, and you see those tracks going, and ~~far~~ they get nearer and nearer and nearer and at the end they seem to come together, but they don't actually. But they keep on getting smaller and smaller, and way off in the distance, that's 'olam. So the עוֹלָם of the עוֹלָמוֹת would be, you think of way off as far as you can see, and then you think of multiplying that by itself, just as many times as possible, that that is . That was way way way off, but it does not express the idea that there is no end to it. Now it may be there is no end to it, but you have to gather that from other teaching, not from this word. As proof of that, the word is used in the past. It is not merely used for a long distance in the future, but also for a long distance in the past. These are the men of 'olam. That's used in Genesis 6. These are the men of 'olam. That doesn't mean these men who came into existence when the sons of God ~~w~~ came unto the daughters of men were eternal. It doesn't mean that at all. The Bible translates they were the men of old. They were men way way back, as far back as you can think. And 'olam is way way back, and way way ahead. So he says here, he certainly is not saying Israel will never never never exist again, but he says Israel was so wick that it will be a long time if ever before we will have to worry about them. They have kperished, forever is all right, but forever to us conveys the idea of endlessness. And ☹ I'm quite convinced that is not in the

word 'olam. I looked up all the usages of it in the Bible. This man sent me this manuscript' wanting me to give a good word for it, of what a wonderful book he had written. He just sent it to me and just asked me to look it over, and see if I had any suggestions. And I looked it over and found it beautifully written, but philologically it was utterly incorrect, and I looked at every use of 'olam, and I gave him the evidence. He thanked me for it and I don't know if he ever published his book, but - the book might have done good if it were published for it was presenting good ideas definitely taught in scripture, but it was building upon a word which does not prove it, therefore it was building upon a false argument, and I gave him the evidence. But here our word 'olam, Mesha may have wished they perished forever, he hoped it would last forever, but it certainly didn't. But it is interesting to have the infinitive absolute construction which is a very peculiar Hebrew usage, that we don't find much in other languages. Here we have it in the Moabite stone. $\text{טִּלְחָ} \quad \text{טִּלְחָ}$. And Israel had perished for as far as you can see. We won't have to worry about Israel anymore. That's what the people said after the first world war. Russia & is completely out. We will never worry about Russia anymore, and both world wars were taken up with Germany. But some nations have good powers of recuperation. Well then, continuing a little further Mr. Haffly. (Student). שָׁרַת does not mean perish, it is often translated that way. But inherit in modern English, means to receive a legacy. That as the result of someone's death, kproperty comes to your hands. Now in the cases where שָׁרַת is used in the Old Testament, comparatively few of them, means that. I would think that you could safely say that - that that is a minor thought as far as שָׁרַת is concerned, but what שָׁרַת means is, to get possession of. It is to get possession of, or to take possession of. So you'll see it in the dictionary as to possess or dispossess. Well that sounds like just the opposite, possess or dispossess, but actually it is the same thing. To have possession of, or to get possession. To take possession of. That is שָׁרַת . More to take than to get. And so here it is שָׁרַת , he has taken possession, who has? (Student).

NEXT CLASS.

King Jehoshaphat said, is there not a prophet here ~~w~~of the Lord that we may enquire of the Lord, and one of the king of Israel's servants answered. It is interesting. The king of Israel who we think of as an apostate, they are the ones who had the prophet. ~~We~~ Of course, they hadn't brought him but he was there. So one of them said, here is Elisha the son of Shaphat, ~~which~~ poured water on the hands of ~~Elisha~~ Elijah. Now this, he followed water, simply means he followed him, it means he was with him. And of course, Jehoshaphat said the word of the Lord is with him. That is a guess that Jehoshaphat knew something about Elijah. And we are told in Chronicles that Elijah had sent a message to Jehoram (II Chr. 21) ~~e~~ but whether that was before or after this we don't know. Jehoshaphat said the word of the Lord is with him. So the king of Israel, and Jehoshaphat and the king of Edom went down 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. How utterly inconsistent isn't it? Elijah said, is it because there is ~~no~~ king in Israel that Ahaziah sends to Baalzebub for help. Now Elisha says, why do you pretend to come to the Lord for help? Why don't you go to the prophets of your father and mother? But of course, ~~a~~actually, anything that the king of Israel did was wrong, because he was basically wrong. He needed to get right with God first, and then (10 1/2). He was putting second things first and consequently he was wrong. And so Elisha refused - Elisha said, - no, the king of Israel said, oh no, ~~the~~ for the Lord has called these three kings together, to deliver them into the hand of Moab. In other words, let's forget these minor ~~min~~ matters, let's all stand together for the big things. Let's stand and ~~stay~~ save our lives. Like the Russians, we don't believe in God. We are just trying to destroy the - (11) was not of Russia, but when the war came, they gave special permission to the churches to hold prayer meetings, (11) to get patriotic Russians, and went to the churches and held their services. The Russians not believing in God tried to utilize Him and here he says well now, look, here we are in a desperate situation. Forget your little theological squabble, and let's do the big thing - winning this war. Elijah said, as the Lord of Host lives, before whom I ~~stand~~, surely if it were not that I regard the presence of Jehoshaphat, the king of Judah I would not look toward thee, or

see thee, but now bring me a minstrel. What does he want a minstrel for? And it came to pass that as the minstrel played the hand of the Lord came upon him. Is this some sort of a magical superstitious idea (12) that you call a minstrel, ~~man~~ when you get influences of music, then you go in to sort of a trance, and you get an estatic message, and you say it must be from the Lord. Why did Elisha want a minstrel? (Student). Of course, there's one peculiar point about Saul. We read, that Samuel, (12 1/2) Saul's going into the prophets and prophesying. He takes off his clothes, (12 1/2) is naked there. (12 1/2) to have an estatic feeling is not prophesying in any ordinary sense of the word, (12 3/4) it is a little hard to understand. anything like that, (13). If it was common, you might say it is evidence that the modernists are right, that we have all these superstitions here, that they just gradually gathered together. (13 1/4). But when it stands alone, it seems to be interpreted in the light of the other things about the prophets, which represent him, ~~man~~ as men who really knew the Lord and spoke from him and gave his message (13 1/2) worked these things out by natural methods. But why then does he want to get a minstrel? Does the hand of the Lord come on him by a minstrel? What is the point of the minstrel? And my interpretation of it is that the minstrel was not to bring the message of God unto Elisha. That it wasn't that at all. But that the Elisha was so disturbed by the sight of the wicked king of Israel, that was trying to get help from God, that (14) contrary to God's will, was so disturbed and upset by that, Elisha was, that he needed a sedative. He needed something to calm his mind, so that he could forget the king of Israel, and listen to the Word of the Lord. He needed something to calm himself, and listen to the minstrel, not to learn the Word of God, but it helped to calm his mind, and get himself in a position to listen for the message that the Lord would give him as a sedative so that he would not be disturbed from the presence of the wicked king, Jehoram. That seems to me a satisfactory explanation which solves this particular problem here, and which -

END OF CLASS

assignments - let's look at the passage first that we were looking at. We were not quite finished with our considerations of the third chapter of II Kings. In that chapter ~~w~~ you remember we found the king of Israel, and the king of Judah and the king of Edom, going against Moab, and they may have gone through Judah, that is the king of Israel went through Judah, and then Ahaziah king of Judah, went south from Judah and crossed over through the wilderness and joined with the king of Edom, in his (1). And then they headed north through the wilderness up toward Edom, and then in that wilderness, which they didn't know very well probably, we read that they found themselves absolutely without water. In the present day, or for one who knows nothing about war, from first hand experience, it may seem rather strange that a whole army like this would get into a place where they didn't know where there was water, but they tell us that as recently as 100 years ago, in the Civil War, a great army from the south coming up to the battle of Gettysburg and the army from the north, trying to meet them were in two opposite valleys, and had no idea where each other were. They didn't have the means of observation or the means of communication that we have today, and so a whole army could get lost, even a hundred years ago. In those days when they were far less adequately equipped, ~~in a~~ ~~and then~~ material way, even a hundred years ago, a thing like this could happen that - and then of course, these were not great armies. They were small armies, but they were the armies of these three kings, and they went in this situation there. It appeared that the force could die out for lack of water. That doesn't mean of course that the people didn't have any water to drink, but they had their animals to take care of, and without the animals, the people would be absolutely (2 1/4) and so in that situation, Jehoshaphat asked if there wasn't a prophet of the Lord there. He should have inquired of a prophet of the Lord in the first place whether he ought to go on this trip or not. He should have sought the Lord's will as to (2 1/2) whether to join with the king of Israel ~~in~~ in such an undertaking, but he hadn't done that, and he is rebuked for that, elsewhere. Not in this particular case, but in similar cases. But here he finds himself in difficulty and now he looks to the Lord. And the Lord wants us to look to Him in all situations, not just after we get into difficulty like this. And so Jehoshaphat asked, where is there somebody and it had to be somebody who had come with this king from the northern

kingdom. That must have been terribly embarrassing to Jehoshaphat, that he who had established the teaching of the word of God all through the land of Judah, who had done so much to revive the people and in general stood so staunchly for the Lord, got into a crisis and he had to look to the wicked king of Israel to find a prophet to give him help in a situation. It must have been terribly embarrassing to him, but it was a man who was connected with the forces of Israel, but the king of Israel had no desire to have him there. He was connected with him. And when Jehoshaphat heard that Elisha was there; he had heard of Elisha. He said, the word of God was with him. And then we noticed last time how Elisha answered the king of Israel and his refusal at first to do anything to him, and then how Elisha asked for a minstrel. He said, that if it were not that I regard the presence of Jehoshaphat the king of Judah I would not look toward you, now see you. And here we come into one of the basic problems of life. The difference between the mechanistic in life and the spiritual. There are those to whom everything is mechanistic, and there are those to whom everything is spiritual. And neither one of them - (4 1/4). I was at a Christian conference in Canada one time where there was a doctor, who was the doctor for the camp who had been active as a travelling representative for the Christian medical society. He was a wonderful young man, very ardent Christian, a very earnest Christian. A very fine man. But I found that his mind was just full of doubts and difficulties. And I ~~found~~ had some long talks with him, and the central problem was this, here he was as a doctor, he takes care of the patient, and he does the thing right and the patient gets well. And he makes a mistake and the patient dies. In other words, how well he does it, what medicine he uses, what material means he uses determines life and death for that person. Now he found it very difficult to reconcile that with the Biblical idea that God was the creator of the world, and that God controls all things, and that God punishes people or blesses people or does things in accordance with His own will. He found it very difficult to reconcile. He found this pressure of mechanism that what I do has results, and that the person regarding whom whether they are good or bad, or regardless of whether the doctor is good or bad lives or dies in proportion to the skill of the doctor. And that he found pushing him into a position of where it was very difficult to hold unto the Christian faith. Now of course the majority of people would not think that far. But if

a person does think of this, it is a - one of the tough problems of life, is this relation between mechanism and spiritualism. I had a professor of botany once in college who was a - he didn't have time for (6). He was mixed up with that sort of work. And that sort of effort. But he said to me one day, he said, you see - three birds on a tree, and they start out and they start out toward the other tree, and two of them fly to it, and the other one gets way and turns around and flies back. He said, now do you mean to say that bird gets a notion he wants to fly back to that tree as a matter of individual persuasion. No, he said, it is all mechanistic. He said, it is the forces in the hereditary of those birds, and the forces in the universe, in the air about them, the situations and what they mean. All this enters in and produces what they do. And of course, he reached the conclusion that can excuse a man from any moral judgment whatever, if everything we do is simply the result of our upbringing, our background, of the forces that control us, and we can't help ourselves. Well, that's carrying mechanism to the extreme, but mechanism is a fact that we have to recognize in life. You can't get away from it. Mechanism is here. You go and you eat something that you know is bad for you and you are going to be sick, no matter how good a person you are, and you drive carelessly and you are going to have an accident, no matter how pious a person you are, and the mechanism is here, and we have to face it. So how do you fit the two together, mechanism and voluntarism? Personal choice? Personal attitude? And particularly when you get into the spiritual realm, the activity throughout. Well, we can't exactly fully understand it. But the vital thing, for us is to recognize that both are true, and that we have a power of choice, that we have an individual - while we are conditioned by our background, by our environment, yet we have a power of choosing to go along with it, or turn against it. We have a voluntary power, and that God has a voluntary power, and that God has created all things in such a way that there are forces and there are mechanisms operating and there are things which act in accordance with mechanism, and yet that God is ruling and overruling and interfering as He chooses. I had a friend who was a quite a good singer, he had a fine voice. And he practiced a great deal and he learned his singing quite well. And occasionally he would sing solos and they were well rehearsed, and well practiced,

they were well given, but he had a church which he was pastoring, and he was just afraid that the spirit of God wouldn't have full reign in his service, afraid that he would think of some human way of trying to make it effective so that he would get up and he would read his sermon off, ~~and~~ from his paper in the most monotonous way you could dream of. No expression, no variety, no effort to use human means to get it across, because he was afraid he would be like an actor, and trying to produce an effect by a mechanistic means, instead of ~~by~~ like the messenger of God. I think God wants us to be His messengers, but He wants us to use the mechanistic means to get to the place where He wants us to be, and not only that, but to give our message in a way that will be effective. Now there are evangelists who lose the spirit entirely, who become hypocrites, who become just mechanism, they've used music, they've used manners, just as everything in order to make an effect on people, when they don't believe a word of it. I don't think of many like that, but there are some - there have been some hypocrites who were like that, and there have been some backsliders who became like this, but the thing was, ~~there~~ their service was entirely mechanistic. And you'll find some people who have been converted by methods that were entirely mechanistic, and had their lives turned around, after perhaps listening to people who paid no attention to mechanism, had no effect upon them whatever. The Lord wants us to use the mechanism we have. ~~Th~~ Now here we have Elisha, what is the Lord's will? And ~~the~~ Elisha says, bring me a minstrel. And they bring a minstrel, the musician plays, and as he plays the hand of the Lord comes on Elisha, and I don't think we can get the hand of the Lord by mechanistic means. I think we can use mechanistic means to understand the Word of the Lord. We can study language. We can study grammar. We can study vocabulary. We can compare usages in other places. We can use mechanistic means to learn what words mean. But for a true and deep understanding of them we have to have something more. We have to have a ~~pr~~ ~~ap~~ spiritual relationship with God, or we cannot understand the full meaning of His revelation, but living close to the Lord will not make us by itself, interpret the word. We have to have the mechanistic if we are going to get beyond the great vital teachings that are more important than anything else, for us to get beyond that, to under~~st~~ stand the fuller teachings of the ~~Word~~ ~~de~~ Word of God, we

have to use the mechanistic, learning the languages, ~~and~~ studying the grammar, comparing scripture with scripture, and so forth. In understanding the Word, the mechanistic is necessary. But as to God's giving His revelation, and as to our relationship to God, we can't force God by anything we do, by any magical activity, or by any mechanistic activity, we can't force God. Our relationship with God must be spiritual, and Elisha's was spiritual, and so I feel that we are right in interpreting this verse here, as meaning that the purpose of the musicians were not to bring the word of the Lord to Elisha, or to get the message from God to Elisha, but it was to quite Elisha's spirit, it was to put into - to help him to shut out the noises that were beating upon him of the wickedness of this king of Israel ~~before~~ in front of him, and made him so upset, so excited that he couldn't listen to the still small voice of God. He had to get a human means to help him get the shutting out of the distractions, that he might hear the Word of God. And I think in our own ministry, we need to learn to use the mechanistic means to enable us to make our Work effective. The means of speaking, ways of getting it across, ways of studying that will be effective. Way of relaxing to take care of ourselves. I used to find when I'd give a message, I'd be all full of energy, of enthusiasm of what I'd just given, and I'd finish the message and I'd stand up, and I'd sing, (12 1/2) final hymn, and then I'd go down and I'd shake hands with everybody, and I'd begin to relax, and ten minutes later, I was absolutely (12 3/4). And then during the last hymn I'd just sit down and relax, and try to make my muscles relax, my legs, my arms, my eyes, my voice, everything, and try for those few minutes to relax, then I could go down and talk to people and an hour later, I wouldn't be half as tired, as I would (13). If I would not get some little relaxation. (13) mechanistic that enables the mechanical forces God has given to work more effectively. If it takes the place of the spiritual it is useless, it is worthless, but it is necessary as a (13 1/2) to help to (13 1/2) to learn the mechanistic things that are useful, and here Elisha was in this situation, and he found amusement ~~in~~ the end, he knew that was what he needed, with that he was able to ~~of~~ shut out the thing that kept him from being able to listen for the voice of God.

We go on in the story here, and we find that when the minstrel played the hand of the Lord came on him. Incidentally on this matter of his getting himself relaxed, it is amazing how much it does (1/2). You would think that sincerity would produce the most effective results, and it does over the long run, the person who is insincere and hypocritical is bound in the end to lose out, but along the way, there are points where the insincere person can have a tremendous advantage over the sincere person, if the sincere person allows his emotions to control him, instead of his controlling his emotions. In other words if he lets the feeling of the moment take possession of him, instead of the feeling of his adventual goal toward which he is going to work, and for which he must bring all thoughts into captivity, in order that that shall be accomplished. Did you ever see two men facing each other, one of whom was so angry, he just couldn't think, and the other one, is calm and collective, and he just makes a fool of the one who gets carried away by his emotions. If you know the one who is carried away by his emotions, might be very sincere, very earnest and very (1 1/2) in his views. But if you can combine rightness and sincerity with a calmness and a relaxing that enables you to think of what to do to accomplish the adventual goal, you get much further then you would if you let your emotions carry you away. There is a point in there of getting (2) that is necessary for us. And so ~~Elisha~~ got the message and Elisha gave it and here is a message which is very strange in this part of the world, in the Eastern United States. He says, make this valley full of ditches, for thus says the Lord, ~~ther~~ ye shall not see wind, neither shall ye see rain; yet that valley shall be filled with water, that ye may drink, both ye, and your cattle, and your beasts. And this is something that is very difficult to understand, but that in the southwest part of the United States, it is very easy to understand because out there, this sort of thing does happen. I was in New Mexico one time, in a town where it hadn't rained in three years, and just on the edge of this little town there was a huge gully which was as wide as the length of this room, and perhaps nearly as deep as the room. And that gully, people who had been there, the town had only been built about two years before, and the people had never seen a drop of water in the gullies, and the

children had been playing in there, and one day all of a sudden somebody hollered, get out of there, get away quick. The water is coming. And there was no sign of rain there, but looking way off up in the mountain, if you happened to look in that direction, you find way up there where it was raining. And the rain was maybe 20 miles away, but there was a cloud burst up there 20 miles away, and the water came pouring down, and this thing which had absolutely no water one minute, ten minutes later the water must have been 15 feet deep. It was all of a sudden water came pouring down. Now that hadn't happened for three years, and it doesn't happen very often, but it happens often enough that everybody who lives in a country district, has seen it some time or other. Now these people from Israel and from Judah were probably never had that experience. They were not aware of that sort of thing. And of course, if it happened once in three years, why, it is a thing that you can't (4) it happen any particular day but the Lord say, make the valley full of ditches, be ready for it, because it is the sort of thing that will just flow away and be gone. I was out in the Grand Canyon area. I had a rain that just poured down on me so that if you didn't put water proof stuff over you, you'd just get soaked through, and 15 minutes later it would be dry, and you'd be hunting for a drop of water. It just rushes off and is gone. So the Lord told them to get ready for it. Make the valley full of ditches quickly, so that you have these ditches here to stop the water, when it comes. For the Lord said, you shall not see wind, neither shall you see rain, yet the valley shall be filled with water, ~~and~~ that ye may drink, both ye, and your cattle, and your beasts. And this is only a light thing in the sight of the Lord; he will deliver the Moabites also into your hand, and ye shall smite every fenced city, and every choice city, and shall fell every good tree, and stop all wells of water, and mar every good ~~part~~ piece of land with stones. He does not say that the king of Israel is going to again have possession of Moab. He doesn't say that. He promises that they will be able to prevent the efforts of the Moabites to hurt them, that they will be able to ^{reap} ~~reap~~ a great amount of destruction there in the land. And that is as far as he goes. And the next day, suddenly there came water by the way of Edom, and the country was filled with water, and the water came by the way of Edom, that means

that the water was flowing north toward Moab. And so the people here had plenty of water now, but the Moabites heard that the kings were coming to fight against them, they gathered all that were able to put on armour, and upward. What does that mean, upward, Mr. Ruble? (Student). Does that mean armour on the upper part of the body as well as on their legs? What do you think it does mean? (Student). You mean they would gather the crippled and the maimed and the little children? (Student). Like you say, from 10 to 80, they gathered together. They gathered the people who were just barely able to handle an armour, all they that could put on armour, that's all they could do, and upward. The people who were far more skilled than that. The people who were accustomed to armour. They were good fighters. They gathered from the least to the greatest, from the least on up. And then they stood in the border, and they rose up early in the morning, expecting the attack of the kings, and the Moabites saw the water on the other side as red as blood? Now why would the water be as red as blood? Well, they reached the natural conclusion. They say, this is blood, the kings are surely slain. They have smitten one another. Now therefore, Moab, to the spoil. And that would be a natural conclusion, to see there is water coming, and yet it would take an awful lot of fighting, to make the water as bloody as that. The - I've seen in the Grand Canyon one time, a cloud burst up in the hills, though there was none down in the lower parts. But the cloud burst fell on two parts, one of which was red soil, very red soil, and the other part was black soil. And the result was that as the water came pouring down, through these two streams, down in two different gorges in the Grand Canyon, one of them was a stream carrying lots of black mud, but it didn't particularly cover the water, the other part was full of this red soil, and it looked absolutely red, it looked like blood. And you saw these two streams, each of which was maybe as wide as this room, and they were coming down with force, and one was absolutely red, and the two merged, and for maybe, as far as from here to the back gate, they ~~was~~ half the water was red, and half was black, and then they merged, and from there on, all the water was red. And so the stream, double the size, went for another mile and a half, and it was all red, and I followed it down, and I saw there where it went into

the Colorado River, and as it entered the Colorado river, we saw this stream of absolutely red water going into the Colorado, and in the river you could see the red, and you could see it for maybe a quarter of a mile, and then it disappeared. The main river was so much larger that it disappeared. It was swallowed up. But that water looked absolutely like blood, it was absolutely red, from that red soil, and the very name Edom means red, and it may be that, well, at least the land of Edom, does include Petra, which was famous for its redish rock, and for those beautiful colored area in there, and it must be that this part of the stream was flowing down through a section which would have the red soil, that was swept off with it and make it look red, there. But these Moabites misinterpreted it. They said, this is blood. The kings are surely slain and they have smitten one another. Now therefore, Moab, to the spoil. And so they came rushing out, not to fight, but to take spoik, and it is a very easy mistake for anybody to make when they are engaged in a great conflict, is to think the others are utterly annihilated and you just go out ~~an~~ to mop up and get what you can from them, well, you might say that it is like what Dewey did when he ran for president. He thought there was no question in the world but that he was going to be elected, what he wanted to do was to keep from offending any of these other people, so that they would all stand ~~before~~ behind him after he was president. He went around the country, giving beautiful talks about what wonderful nice unity he was going to have as president, while Truman went around tearing Dewey to pieces, and knocking the Republicans. Truman completely defeated him, but Dewey was just completely over confident, and here these people rushed out, not looking for a battle, but for ~~p~~ spoil. And so they gave a tremendous advantage to these three kings, and they beat down the cities, and on every good piece of land cast every man his stone, and filled it; and they stopped all the wells of water, and felled all the good trees. And so they - the prophecy of Elisha was completely carried out. They won a ~~ee~~ great victory, and did a tremendous amount of damage. But it was not a lasting picture, because verse 26, And when the king of Moab saw that the battle was too sore, for him, he took with him seven hundred men that drew swords, to break through even unto the king of Edom: but they could not. And

then he took his eldest son that could be his successor, and offered him for a burnt offering upon the wall. And when that happened, there was great indignation against Israel; and they departed from him, and returned to their own land. It is quite a cryptic statement, and it is not at all sure that we know exactly what it means. Except that this is clear from it, that Edom was not conquered. They ~~then~~ returned without conquering Edom. Whether the superstition of the Edomite soldiers, and many of the followers of the kings of Israel were such that seeing this thing they thought that Chemosh would utterly annihilate him, they'd better get out of the way, or whether it stirred up the Moabites, to fight as they hadn't fought before, or what it means, we don't know, but there was great indignation against Israel. It is quite clear, the last phrase, they departed from him, and returned to their own land. ~~It~~ The ones that were to depart, they were the people who were the attackers, that is Israel and Judah. We wish we knew. We wish we knew more about it. The Moabite stone says - tells about the Moabites gaining their freedom, but does not speak, it sounds as if they gained it a good long time. So it is quite evident that they were not reconquered. But of course the purpose of the Bible is not to explain ~~the~~ all the historical events, but it is to tell of God's relation to His people, and what He did, and probably this event, this whole chapter was told, not in order to tell us about the historical relationship between the Moabites and the Israelites. There may have been many other events of great political ~~importance~~ importance, which aren't even mentioned in the Bible. Perhaps one of the most important political events in all the history of the Divided Kingdom, is not even mentioned in the Bible. What was that? (Student). One of the most important political events in the whole history, of the Divided Kingdom, was not even mentioned. The battle of Karkar. Surely that was the battle which decided that Judah and Israel could last another hundred years, if the king of Assyria had won that battle, he would have gone on and taken Israel, and (13 1/2) to his kingdom, and Judah was in great danger, and it might not have lasted much longer. It was a decisive battle which affected their history for a hundred years. And the Bible doesn't even mention it. Which was a very good

- ~~generalization~~ ~~in the story~~ ~~we are~~ ~~drawn~~ ~~to~~ ~~find~~ ~~that~~ ~~we~~ ~~have~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~main~~ ~~story~~ ~~from~~

proof of the fact that the Bible is not a book of history in the sense that it is a book to tell us what are the important events in history. It is a book of God's relationship to man. And it tells us what history, what geography, what physics, what chemistry (14) what biology is necessary for an understanding of God's relation with man, and whether His helping him (14 1/4) is in correct, and ~~dependable~~ dependable but is not complete because that is not his (14 1/2) so it leaves out something as important as the battle of Karkar, and here it does not tell us more about the relation to his (14 1/2). The purpose of the chapter is not to say they were not able to reconquer Moab, but the purpose of it is to tell us about Elisha and about his relationship to the kings of Israel and to show God's (14 3/4).

26. (0)

- prophecies about Ahab's death here, quite justified in starting with chapter 21. But if one is to make it absolutely complete, I think they should start with 19. Now I said, prophecies Elijah gave to Ahab, and 19 was not given to Ahab. So it shouldn't be (1/2). You were right. But yet I would like to glance at it anyway. In I Kings 19, does anybody notice there, any prediction relevant to Ahab? (Student). If I were to say to you go down to Washington and swear in Nixon as the president of the United States, what would you say? You would say, how can I swear in Nixon? Even if Nixon was willing to go through a ceremony, (1 1/2) why, that wouldn't make him president, and for Elijah, a man who had fled and was hiding in the desert ~~from~~ far from the land, and in fear of his life in the desert, for God to say to him, you go and anoint Jehu king over Israel, why unless it is a prediction, it is ridiculous. He has no power to anoint the man, unless God gives it to him. And so when God gives him a command, ~~and~~ to anoint somebody, to be king over Israel, the implication is that God is telling him what God is going to do. And his anointing doesn't make Jehu king of Israel at all, but his anointing is an indication of what he thinks God is going to do. If the chief justice of the United States swears in Kennedy as the president of the United States, that makes him president, but the reason the chief justice has power to do that is because the constitution gives him the right, and because the people have elected him, and so he has an authority to

do it, and no body else will have any such authority, and if somebody could come up and pour some oil on a man's head, and say I'm going to anoint you king, but it never makes him king unless the Lord gave him the authority and designated what the Lord intended as his right, and the Lord's intention was. So when God gives a command like this, to Elijah, though it is given in the form of a command, rather than of a prediction, the implication is very clear that it is a prediction. He is predicting that Jehu, a man of an entirely different dynasty, is going to become king of Israel. So that is a prediction of the end of the dynasty of Ahab. Well that is certainly not under the terms of what I asked you to define, so I wouldn't have expected any of you to have it, but I would be glad if you happened to notice it as germane, though not included in the actual assignment. Then there is another here which is not by Elijah, and consequently would not be included in the direct assignment, and yet again I would be rather happy if somebody had taken a notion to include it, though I wouldn't deduct from anybody who does not take such a notion. But in I Kings 20: 42, we have an unknown prophet who, verse 41, hasted and took the ashes away from his face; and the king of Israel discerned him that he was of the prophets. And this king of Israel of course is Ahab. And he said unto him, Thus saith the Lord, Because thou has let go out of thy hand a man whom I appointed to utter destruction, therefore thy life shall be for his life, and thy people for his people. And this is a prediction which certainly was fulfilled when Ahab, in fighting against the people of Syria, was killed. It is a definite prediction, there is no question to that, but it is - and this is fulfilled, in chapter 22. The previous one we looked at was not fulfilled until Ahab's dynasty was fulfilled. But as far as Elijah knew, it might be fulfilled right away. It doesn't say when. It is nearly fulfilled, there is going to be a complete change of dynasty. Then the next one, is as Mr. Ruble pointed out, in chapter 21, and in chapter 21 there we have Elijah coming and giving a prophecy which the Lord has told him to give. And we read in verse 19, the Lord said, Thus shalt thou speak unto him, saying, Thus saith the Lord, Hast thou killed, and also taken possession? Thus saith the Lord, In the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth shall dogs lick thy blood, even thine. Where did dogs

lick the blood of Naboth, Mr. Grauley? (Student). In Jezreel, in the city of Jezreel. Is that the same as the city of Samaria? (Student). Yes, it is quite a distance from the town, the city of Samaria. In verse 1, verse 1 could be confusing to somebody who didn't know that. After these things, Naboth the Jezreelite had a vineyard, which was in Jezreel, hard by the palace of Ahab king of Samaria. But that doesn't say it was in Samaria, but simply that Ahab was king of Samaria. But this was by a ~~summer~~ his summer palace in Jezreel, and in order that Naboth should be killed, Jezebel wrote letters, she sent the letters through the nobles that were in his city, verse 8, ~~for~~ though it was some distance away from Samaria. And of course, there was this judicial murder, which Ahab would not stoop to, but would gladly take advantage of when it was stooped to. And I remember a professor when I was in Seminary, who said, he was also pastor of the first presbyterian church in the town, he said that in the divorced case of ~~the divorce~~ people, you never know who is the guilty party, so he simply made a rule not to marry divorced people at all. He couldn't be sure who was the guilty party, and one of the students who was sitting next to me, bent over and said, yes, he said, he turns marriages of divorced people to Bob Bryan, and let's him do it, his assistant. And he himself would not take the responsibility of making a decision on it, so he turned it over to his assistant to make the decision, which was certainly not a very wholesome way of dodging the responsibility, and in this case, Ahab was indensed to this wickedness, but he took advantage of it, when Jezebel stooped to it. And there are many people like that, today. But, the prediction, in the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth, shall dogs lick thy blood, and then in verse 21, he says that his whole posterity was going to be wiped out, verse 22, and I will make thine house like the house of Jeroboam and like the house of Baasha. And verse 23, and of Jezebel also, he says, The dogs shall eat Jezebel by the wall of Jezreel. Him that dieth of Ahab in the city the dogs shall eat; and him that dieth in the field shall the fowls of the air eat. In other words, all of his posterity will be wiped out. Now when was verse 24 fulfilled? Mr. Haffly? (Student). This took place at Jehu's rebellion, didn't it? I'm sure that until Jehu made his insurrection, there was no (8 1/2) where a member of the royal family who died in the city, had his body eaten by dogs. That certainly would never

happen, with a member of the royal family. It would simply be unthinkable. Unless of course that member of the royal family had become an utter bum, ~~but~~ and was completely unknown. And this doesn't mean one well, it ~~is~~ says ~~is~~ all. Him that dieth, it means everyone shall, everyone of Ahab's posterity, at a certain time, who dies in the city, that dogs ~~will~~ shall eat, and if he dies in the field, the fowl of the air shall eat. In other words, Ahab is going to sink so low that they won't even bother to bury him. And this never happened in the life of Ahab. But it happened at the time of Jehu's revolt, which was quite a long time later. Then, that's the prediction in 24. How about the prediction in verse, 23, Mr. Grauley, when was that fulfilled? (Student). So this was not fulfilled in Ahab's life time. It was fulfilled quite a few years after this. After his death. When ~~is~~ at the time of Jehu's rebellion. Well now, if you read these, you would think that they were going to happen right in Ahab's life wouldn't you? It doesn't say they are, but you would certainly get that implication, you would get that affect. Well, then you read in verse 29, where God says, Seest thou how Ahab humbleth himself ~~in~~ before me? Because he humbleth himself before me, I will not bring the evil in his days; but in his son's day will I bring the evil upon his house. And all that we have noticed predicted in verse 24, and in verse 23, and also what is predicted in verse 21 and 22, all of that was fulfilled not in Ahab's life time, but in the end of the reign of the second of his sons, to become king, at that time were these things fulfilled, as verse 29 says, I will not bring the evil in his day, but in his son's days will I bring the evil upon his house. So that is absolutely clear regarding these verses, but of course verse 19, is one of which there might be a question, is verse 19 included in the evil which is to be brought in his son's days, or is verse 19 excluded from what God says in verse 29? Well now, we have some more prophecies, about Ahab's death, in chapter 22, not given by Elijah, but given by Micaiah. Therefore not intended to be given on any of your papers on this, but I think it is very good if you have noticed it. In chapter 22, in verse 20 we read that Micaiah said, The Lord said, who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramothgilead? And verse 22, he said, I will go forth, and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. Thou shalt persuade him, and prevail. And in verse 27, the king said, Put this fellow in the prison, and feed ~~will~~ him with bread of

affliction and water of affliction, until I come in peace. And Micaiah said, If thou return at all in peace, the Lord hath not spoken by me. Here is a specific prediction about Ahab, made by Micaiah that he would fall in the battle of Ramoth-gilead, that he would not return in peace, and when was this fulfilled? Do you know, Mr. Vannoy? (Student). We read in verse 34, And a certain man drew a bow at a venture, and smote the king of Israel between the joints of the harness. And verse ~~36~~ 35, the battle increased that day, and the king was stayed up in his chariot against the Syrians, and died at even; and the blood ran out of the wound into the midst of the chariot. And then we read, in verse 37, So the king died, and was brought to Samaria, and they buried the king in Samaria, and one washed the chariot in the pool of Samaria; and the dogs licked up his blood; and they washed his armour; according unto the word of the Lord which he spoke. This is a fulfillment of Micaiah's prediction.

~~What number is fulfillment~~ But is this the fulfillment of the prediction that Elijah made? What would you say Mr. Ruble? (Student). It definitely fulfills the prophecy that Micaiah made about Ahab, but does it have anything to do with any prophecy that Elijah made about Ahab?

END OF CLASS.

27 (0)

In our last meeting we were looking at the fulfillment of Elisha's prophecy, about Ahab. You remember that those prophecies were given in I Kings 21, and there in I Kings 21, you remember that Elijah said three things about Ahab, four things. First three, and then a fourth, and now the three that he said were number one, verse 19, thus saith the Lord, in the place where dogs licked the ~~dog~~ blood of Naboth, shall dogs lick thy blood, even thine. The second thing he said, was that the posterity of Ahab would be completely destroyed, and the third thing he said was the dogs shall eat Jezebel by the wall of Jezreel. I think that is a fair summary of what we have, because verse 24, is actually simply a continuation of what we find in 21, and 22. That the entire posterity is brought to an end. Now these are the three things then that Elijah predicted about Ahab, and then in verse 29, the Lord said to Elijah, Seest thou how Ahab humbleth himself before me? Because he humbleth himself before me, I will not bring the evil in his days; but in his son's days will I bring the evil upon his

house. Now there we have no statement that the predicted evil is to removed, none whatever, but we have a statement that the time of it is postponed, on account of Ahab's humbling himself. It is not to be in his day, but in his son's days. Well, of the three things that are given, the third one about Jezebel, takes place literally, specifically, the dogs eat Jezebel by the wall of Jezreel. Every detail of it, literally fulfilled, but not in the time of Ahab, but in the time of his sons. As described over in II Kings 9. And then the second thing that, the destruction of his posterity, the complete destruction of his posterity, is also described in II Kings 9. In the time of his sons, not in his own time. Then that leaves the first thing, which is said, that in the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth shall dogs lick thy blood, even thine. And we found two things fulfilled in the time of his sons, the third and the second, ~~and~~ how about the first? Well we find that Jehu in verse 24, of chapter 9, 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. 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. Well Jehu then, who I don't think we can take as necessarily an inspired interpreter, of scripture, Jehu did interpret the scripture as meaning that the first of the three parts of the evil, as well as the second and the third, was fulfilled in the day of Ahabs son, rather than in his own days, and that the dogs licked the blood of Naboth in the spot where they - in the spot where that happened, they would lick thy blood, even thine, was fulfilled in his requiting him in that very place, through the death there in the open field, of his son. Now that is Jehu's interpretation, and as I say, Jehu is not an inspired interpreter. It is possible that Jehu was mistaken, and yet it would impress me as not altogether likely, that the Lord would cause a mistaken interpretation of Jehu to be included in the inspired text without any word of correction. That would impress me. We have three things predicted. Two of them ~~and~~ we have no question.

Jehu fulfilled, in his son's days rather than in his. The other one, Jehu thought he fulfilled, if he did not, is it not a bit strange that the Lord did not explain it. I just throw the problem out. Now of course, the problem is a little more acute, because we say, thy blood, even thine. How can that be the blood of his son? Well, the Lord says, I will bring the evil, not in his days, but in his son's days. Would that mean then that the son would have his blood licked by the dogs, in the place where the blood of Naboth was licked? (5 1/2)

Well, that did happen to the son. Was Ahab's blood licked by dogs in the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth? Well, we have noticed that Ahab's death is described in chapter 22, and in that description which fulfilled the prediction of Micaiah, that he will not return in peace. In that statement it says the king was brought not to Jezreel, but to Samaria. And they buried the king in Samaria. His body was not thrown out in any way like Naboth's had been, where the dogs would injure the body, or like the son Jehoram's was. But he was buried in Samaria. But then we have ~~this~~ this 38th verse, this very strange 38th verse, one washed the chariot. Did they take the chariot away from Samaria, and carry it down to Jezreel and wash it? No, it was Samaria. That has nothing to do with Naboth. Naboth is in Jezreel. And they washed his blood in the pool of Samaria. And the dogs licked up his blood. Though ordinarily when you lick up blood, you think of flowing blood, or liquid blood. You don't think of blood that has been on the chariot for hours and days, and they washed the chariot. ~~when~~ When did the dogs lick up the blood? Was it before they washed it? I hardly can see how it could be after. I wouldn't think there would be enough of his blood dried on the chariot, that when they washed it in the pool, the blood would flow off, and the dogs could lick it. It is a very strange statement and it is not the sort of statement that would be an evil thing as shame to Ahab, as fulfillment of Elijah's prediction, to say nothing of it nothing being in the place at all. They washed his armour according to the word of the Lord, (7 1/2).

It is a very very strange verse. And the Septuagint has the verse a little bit different from this. Not though, it says, and they washed the chariot in the pool of Samaria, and the swine and the dogs licked up his blood. And they washed his armour and the harlots bathed themselves, according to the Word of the Lord which He spake. Now how does that all fit in?

The only interpretation some have given is that the dogs would be taken as a ~~type~~ representation for male prostitutes. ~~§~~ But it certainly wouldn't have any relationship to the washing of chariots. It is a very queer verse. And if this verse is the fulfillment of Elijah's prediction, it is a mighty queer fulfillment, certainly far from being a literal fulfillment. And we have a fulfillment later on, the exact place, the indignity that happened to Naboth, his body lying unburied, happened to Ahab's son in the exact place where it happened to Naboth. And the only thing different is that he was a son rather than a father. But ~~like~~ the Lord said to Elijah, I will bring the evil in his son's time, instead of in his own. Yes, Mr. Grauley. (Student). Now this would be that whatever you can say about Ahab's chariot here, would be equally true about Josiah's chariot, he was killed you remember near Megiddo. And anything ~~w~~ that would be killed in battle. I wouldn't see any particular to single out Ahab. But in this particular (9 1/4) here, I don't know. It is a very queer verse. And my off hand inclination is to think that perhaps it represents a gloss. That is to say that the fulfillment is exact, precise and literal. Except that it is the son rather than the father, and that is predicted, for the evil will come in the days of his son, rather than of the father. My guess is that this verse was not in the original, but there is a very early time, somebody wrote in the margin, a suggestion of how this prophecy would have been fulfilled about Ahab, and that got into the text. (10) and it is a very off hand suggestion. I wouldn't want to stand on it at all, but I do feel quite convinced that the fulfillment is in that exact (10) with Jehoram. I do feel quite convinced of that, and I don't see any reason in the world (10 1/2). And I don't see how this ~~a~~ is a fulfillment anyway. And if it isn't a fulfillment, it is not in the place of Naboth at all, and if it isn't a fulfillment well, what does the verse mean? Mr. Ruble? (Student). Do you have any specific statement, the dogs licked the blood - but I would think that when you get to the point of it, the point of the thing is an unburied body, subject to indignity, that is what happened to Naboth. He was stoned as (11)

a blasphemer when it was all a lie, and so his body (11) lay there unburied, and the dogs had free access to it. That was not true of Ahab. Ahab was buried. There was a little blood on his chariot perhaps that maybe some dogs got to, but that wouldn't sound like a fulfillment of this thing, this prediction to me, but in the case of Jezebel, when they threw Jezebel out ~~o~~ the window, the dogs ate her~~e~~ up rapidly, there must have been lots of scavenger dogs around, and to throw the body out unburied into the field, would seem to be subjected to the same source of humiliation as occurs in the case of Naboth, and with almost certainty results in [?] being there (12). If scavenger dogs were enough around to eat up Jezebel, I would think that there would be enough to eat up (12). (Student). That's a very good suggestion. I wonder just how literal that statement is. I would incline to think that when he says that those who die in the city the dogs will eat, and those who die in the country the fowls of the air eat, that probably what he means there, that those who - that his posterity is going to be reduced to humiliation and scattered, and he certainly doesn't mean everyone. No one of them is going to be (12 3/4). Some of them will be subject to being eaten up by dogs, ~~by~~ and some by birds, but the birds would probably have greater access outside than they would inside. That would be more of the spirit of (13) rather than (13) though there evidently were scavenger dogs around, but does that mean by the fact that dogs would be inside there wouldn't be dogs outside the city? (Student). And the pool of Samaria, I don't know whether that would be inside or outside. I don't know. I certainly wouldn't think that (13 3/4) to get there. There might be a (14) there. (Student). No, I would say two things, I would say in the first place,

28. (0)

that I think it would be very strange if there were two fulfillments. It is one or the other. I would think. And then I would say in the second place, that it is said that the evil will come in the day of his sons, rather than of himself. So that if there is something that sounds like a fulfillment, in the days of his son, that would seem to ~~be~~ to be the more likely thing. And it seems to me that the one in the days of his son fits. Now as to this, in Ahab's death,

whether this fits, it seems to me that it is true that occasionally a prediction just turns upon an accidental feature, but that normally a prediction is a matter of the inherent idea - the essential principle rather than just you might say an accidental allied feature to it. I don't think that many of the predictions of the Bible are like the predictions of MacBeth, where they say that until Bern's woods shall come to Dunsamane, MacBeth is safe, and then, the enemies cut sticks and hold them up in the air, to hide how many there are, and so they say Bern's woods has come to Dunsamane. And also, MacBeth says I'm not a bit afraid because he says no man born of woman can injure me, and MacDuff says I wasn't born of woman. I had a ciscerian birth, and so you are not as safe as you thought you were, because you were given the prophecy that no man born of woman could injure you. Those are things that turn on a twist of a word, or a pun, or something like that, and a Biblical prophecy, it doesn't impress me as being that way, the Biblical prophecy is not a matter of a word, as in an essential idea. And the idea in the prediction here given about Ahab, seems to me to have two - to have three elements in them. One element is, that it is to be in the place that it happened to Naboth. Of how broadly or narrowly you are going to measure that place, there might be a question, but just somewhere else in the same country, would hardly seem to me to fulfill that part of the (2 1/2). Then the second thing about this is that it represents a humiliation which you would not expect to come to the king, and as a matter of fact it was terrible humiliation for Jehoram to have his dying body cast off, thrown out like that. But for Ahab he died in battle which everybody considered an honorable death. His body was brought back with honour to Samaria, and he was buried in Samaria. There is no humiliation in that at all. Many a king has been very proud that they died in battle. And then the third thing about it is, that the dogs licking the blood, that the real meaning of that would seem to be, the body cast out unburied, like Naboth's was, so the dogs could get access to the body. Now in this case, no dogs got anywhere near Naboth's body as far as we have evidence or any reason to suspect. The only way that any dog would have gotten anywhere near Ahab would be that there was some dried up blood on the chariot, that the dogs got ahold of. Well, there is no humiliation in that. There's no

lack of being buried in that. It is not in the place where the others occurred. It is like, suppose somebody were to say to me, you are going to shed your blood for your country. And then suppose that ~~£~~ after this accident that I had last spring, they found my shirt here which (3 3/4) something had gathered in here, and they had to take three stitches in the arm (4). Well, I certainly shed some blood, but it wouldn't fit at all. It is a different relation altogether, than if some blood from me then that came out of this arm (4) was on the car, and if later on after I was gone from it, a pig came up and licked a little of that blood off the car, there would be no humiliation to me in that. There may be some deep meaning in this verse that is unknown to me. I can't say there isn't. I don't see how the meaning of it can be that Elijah's prophecy given about - he makes with Naboth is that which is represented. I don't see how that ~~reminiscent~~ (4 1/2) ~~is~~ can be represented. Now it is true that in this very chapter, 23 here, you have the statement made by Micaiah that Ahab will not return in peace. He said, if thou return in peace, the Lord has not spoken with me, by me. Well this says, and they licked the blood and they washed his armour according to the word of the Lord which he spake. Now the word of the Lord which Micaiah spoke, was that Ahab would not return in peace. And Ahab ~~e~~ returned as a corpse and was buried, and his chariot, they have to wash the blood off of, and it is a fulfillment of Micaiah's prophecy, that he will not return in peace. It is a definite fulfillment of that. But that it has any relation to Elijah's prophecy, of the chapter earlier, that in the place where the dogs licked the blood of Naboth, they shall lick thy blood, ~~as~~ except for the recurrence of the phrase, dogs licked the blood, I fail to see any inherent principles of similarity in there, or any reason to think this is a fulfillment of that, when I find in II Kings, something which is an exact fulfillment of that, with the one exception, that it comes in his son's days, instead of in his. And God told Elijah that the evil will come in his son's days. But it is a queer verse. And I don't mean to give you a final answer on it, for I am certainly not in a position to do that. But I do feel that the fulfillment of Elijah's prophecy, in the later chapter, and that this is a fulfillment of Micaiah's prophecy, in this chapter. And then the relation to the dogs licking the blood, and when you get the septuagint they've also got the prostitutes bathing in the blood, why, I can't get away from the feeling that something has

happened to the text here. That the (6 1/2) began in the Hebrew manuscript and was carried on. They got swine in too as well as dogs. And I don't think that such prophecies are numerous. I think they are very few, these people who will take a whole chapter and throw it out. I think that is utterly wrong. But that occasionally an error has crept in, it is my conclusion that (6 1/2), that there are a few such cases. If there are any such, I would be inclined to think that perhaps (6 3/4). Well, let's go on to the second point.

The second assignment was - let's take the third first, instead of the second. Let's look at the third and then come back to the second. The third was, how old was Ahaziah of Judah when he began to reign? Mr. Grauley? (Student). which I heard at the University of Pennsylvania last night, the man who was introducing him said, Dr. so and so has given this lecture last year, he said, it is very similar to what he is going to give tonight. In fact, he said, it might be identical. But he gave it last year in Paris and in Munich and in Berlin and in Hamburg. He said, did you get it in Vienna too? And the other man said, no, I didn't give it in Vienna. Well, it sounded as if we were getting sort of second hand stuff, that had been given all over Europe last year, so then when the other man got up he said, this was all in German, he said, I'm very sorry to give you a warmed over lecture instead of something that is newly cooked. But he said I would like to make this clear, that when I gave it in ~~the~~ Europe and those places was just two months ago. And I only returned last month. And so he said I had just given it very recently. And then when he got through, he lectured an hour, then the chairman got up and he said, when I said last year, he said, I meant last school year. You see, he thought - let's see, last school year he finished a year and then went over to Europe and gave some lectures. So now he said, he gave these lectures last year and actually it was two months ago. Well, we speak of last year meaning the ~~the~~ school year, we speak of last year meaning the calendar year, and if I would say to the class, now this is our first lecture in church history this year on January 3rd next year, they will laugh. It would be a kind of a joke, the first lecture this year. Because they are oriented to the school year. So there are so many different ways in ~~e~~ this connection of speaking of years that when you have just a difference of one year like that, I don't think it is a problem to worry about. You may not be

sure what the explanation is, but you know that there are enough possible explanations that it doesn't need to be a problem. If it is a difference of more than it may very well be a real problem. (Student). This is one case that we can be sure that Chronicles is wrong in the statement. Now ~~w~~ how do the difference come? Did the word $\text{כ}^{\prime}\text{ל}^{\prime}\text{ל}^{\prime}\text{ל}^{\prime}$ get changed into $\text{כ}^{\prime}\text{ל}^{\prime}\text{ל}^{\prime}\text{ל}^{\prime}$? That doesn't seem to me very likely because after all the two words are quite different. Now however just looking at it I notice this, just off hand this second I noticed this, imagine you are a scribe, and you are copying. Let's turn to II Chronicles 22. (Student). to copy things just exactly. It is very very difficult to ~~get them~~ keep the eyes, and sometimes getting on the wrong lines. Particularly when you have something almost identical. And if he was copying an early copy of Chronicles being copied, it would be to my mind, much easier to think that the word $\text{כ}^{\prime}\text{ל}^{\prime}\text{ל}^{\prime}\text{ל}^{\prime}$ with an ל in it, and the כ and the ל sound almost the same to the Jews as they do to us, it wouldn't make that much difference, that it was copied as $\text{כ}^{\prime}\text{ל}^{\prime}\text{ל}^{\prime}\text{ל}^{\prime}$ with the aleph, by just a little twist of the mind, when instead of getting the number which was on the next line you notice, he is looking back to the number, he looks to the number 20, he sees the number 40, but he sees it with one letter difference. And that it was a mistake in copying which can be explained in that way. That would seem to me to be the most likely reason of how it got in. If you've ever done much copying you've made mistakes which are just about identical to this. I'm amazed sometimes with the mistakes I make in writing. I write a thing down and I think it. I write it, I look back at what I've written, and there is a (11) or something a little bit different, what I intended it to be. There is another word ~~in~~ my mind, (11 1/4) when I wrote that. And copying, page after page by hand is the most laborious thing in the world, and it is impossible the way some have (11 1/2) and that is the sort of a thing of your eyes looking to something very similar in another line. It is the sort of mistake that does occur in cases. At any rate I think we have proof from the ~~film~~ ages that Chronicles is wrong in this case, and my guess is that this copying in the (11 3/4) is ~~my~~ mistake, it seems that in this way he got 42 ~~and~~ instead of 22. That is to say, he was going to write 22. And he had the problem, probably he had a whole line in mind, and he was just going to write down and gets two ~~the~~ thirds of the line written, and

he comes to the place and he thinks, how old was that, and glances back at the page, and he sees the letters of 40, instead of the letters of 20, looking at the line above. And he says 42 and he writes it down. And if that happened in the very early copy of Chronicles when there were perhaps only one or two copies in existence it could account for the mistakes. One of course is

(12 1/2). They tried to find the mistake and root them out, and of course after there were a thousand copies of Chronicles made - then if a (12 1/2) a copyist had ~~could~~ make an error like that, that would be easily ~~be~~ caught. But in a case like this they might (12 3/4).

It is very easy in copying to miss it. You do a thing over and you don't see it. You do a thing over and over and over and don't see it. And of course as you do more and more you get a good many more of the mistakes, but it is just about impossible to (13). I've always figured that in ~~reading~~ any proof, you need to read it twice, with different purposes, read it once for content, thinking of ideas, and read it once for spelling. Because you can read a thing for spelling and preciseness, and you ~~garden~~ can let utter nonsense get in that you don't realize.

And you read for content (13 1/2). So that actually people talk about so many mistakes in Numbers and Chronicles, actually (13 1/2). There are dozens of numbers there and most of them are identical, but there is an occasional error and sometimes you just can't be sure which is wrong. Now in this case I think that the fact that a similar word being in a line down, it is a pretty good proof that a possible way that it could occur, and therefore to make a mistaken assumption that (14) unless you look at Kings and find a similar thing, now that is what occurred, then you as to years, that I think you can say that with almost absolute certainty, that the man 40 is not apt to be younger than the man who is 22. I think that you can be sure that in this case we have an error in the text in Chronicles. I don't know of any way to (14 1/2).

- to say that the fact that Chronicles has 40 and Kings has 20 in this case, instead of being evidence of undependability of the Bible it is the very opposite. It is evidence of the remarkable dependability of the Bible, because the mistake is perfectly obvious ~~in the interpretation~~ when you compare the dates, when you compare the age of the prophet. The verse is only 2 verses before that makes it absolutely clear, it would be strange indeed if many a Jew, many a copyist did not notice the error in (1) and yet it was continued as it was. The greatest difficulty as many think in our New Testament text, that there was a serious rescension made about 300 A.D. in an attempt to correct the text, and that the attempt to correct it was not made scientifically and that consequently the attempt to correct the text, much evidence as to what the text actually was was lost. Now in the case of the copying of the Old Testament here that the sharp contradiction - something that is impossible that a man should be 42 and be the son of a man of 40, we find it preserved, and continued through hundreds of copyists, without interference, and it shows the great effort of the scribes to retain exactly what they found, so that if an error crept in very early they perpetuated the error, rather than to make a change in the text even where there was absolutely no question, but what the error had been there. It is an evidence of the remarkable care that ^{the copiest made} (2). To copy what was there even when it did not ~~involve the~~ (2). Now the same thing certainly can be said of this matter of the death of Ahaziah, the text agrees that Ahaziah was killed at the time of the revolution. And they agree that Ahaziah was in the Northern Kingdom at the time with his (2 1/2). They agree on that, and that he was killed as a part of the revolution of Jehu. But where was he killed? Just what was the circumstances of it? Well, you have one story in Chronicles and you have one story in Kings, and at first sight the two stories flatly contradict each other, and it shows that the scribes did not say, well now, Chronicles is late and must be wrong. Kings has got the true story. Let's leave it out and let's here and here, and they copied what they saw. So we are led to a true story. And as we compare the true story which of them is true? Well, it is not a matter here of a letter or of a word but there is a matter of two or three verses, and Mr. Haffly, in comparing the verses what would your conclusion be on it? (Student)

Get the main events of the dynasty of Jehu. Get that well in mind. But we won't spend a lot of time on it, because we must get into the period of Ahaz and Hezekiah, and so let's get an idea of the main events in the dynasty of Jehu, and see if you can find when Jonah lived. And then in the southern kingdom, the kings in between now we won't spend much time on, after these, until we get to Ahaz. Let's try to get Ahaz in mind.

~~And~~ NEXT CLASS.

M Between the form and the meaning. Because the purpose of words is to convey meaning. I was once in a debate in the presbytery of Philadelphia in the old U.S.A. Presbyterian Church and I wanted to bring out the fact that the men on the committee, that had whitewashed Pearl Buck's book, and ~~some~~ the Presbyterian Foreign Board of Missions, that that committee was a committee composed of people either of modernists or modernist sympathisers, so I stood in front of the presbytery and I said we've had reference made to the action of the committee of the general assembly, and I said, who was this committee? Who were the members of this committee? And immediately one of the modernists back in the middle jumped up and said, You want to know who they are? Here they are, one, two, three, and he started naming them off. He took my words, probably intentionally as a matter of fact, in order to heckle me, he took my words, as what the form of them was, the question, but the question was a rhetorical question. I was meaning to say, that the important thing isn't what a committee is, but who is on the committee, and I'm going to tell you now. So I gave it in the form of a rhetorical question. The nature of this committee is the important factor here, and I'm going to point out that factor. But he jumped in thinking I would pick two or three modernists in the committee and talk about them. He started in to read the whole list, he started with two or three men known as conservatives, in order to change the impression. And here, when the Lord says to Elijah, anoint Jehu, king of Israel, you might say, here is Elijah, what is he like? He is God's servant. He doesn't, his is not to reason why, his is but to do or die. God says. Listen, he does it, and that's what it is. He doesn't even think what it means. Well, anybody who reads much about Elijah knows that Elijah wasn't that kind of a servant. Elijah was a man

who was intensely filled with desire, to accomplish the work (7). And to raise up the armour of the Lord. And he was after a tremendous accomplishment, of making the Word of God known, and of exposing the Baal priests, then in his reaction of over tiredness after it, he had let himself be bluffed by the empty threat of a powerless woman, and had fled. Jezebel couldn't even kill Naboth, without getting Ahaz's signet ring and going through the form of a trial, and of pretense with a lot of lies. How ~~can~~ could she send word to Elijah who had just convinced all Israel that he was God's representative that had been able to kill all these dozens of Baal priests. How could she send to kill him? She couldn't possibly do it, but she sent word. She said, if you are out here at this time tomorrow, you will be like these Baal priests you've killed. And Elijah was so strikingly picked up and he walked for 40 days to get away from here. He just blindly went, because he was just overtired. And Elijah now gets down in chapter 19 to Sinai, and there at Sinai Elijah is scared of his life, and he is hiding in a cave, and there the Lord said to Elijah, go forth and stand on the mountain, and first he said in verse 9, what are you doing here Elijah? Elijah said, I've been very jealous for the Lord God of hosts, and the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thy altars, even I only I am left and they seek my life to take it away from me, and the Lord said, go forth and stand on the mountain, and the Lord passed by and a great strong wind rent the mountain and break in pieces the rocks before the Lord, but the Lord was not in the wind. The Lord sends this tremendous storm. He sent a great earthquake. He sent a tremendous fire. After every one of these it says, the Lord was not in it. In other words he led Elijah to see that God was far greater than anyone of his works, and that God's works were such tremendous things, that in the face of these great cataclysms that God could produce, how silly it was for him to running in terror of his life, of one (9 1/4) woman up there in Israel, that was giving him empty threats. That if she ever could carry out, she could not at this particular time. Probably never. And so God is trying to comfort and encourage Elijah, and then he proceeds to say to Elijah, Elijah, you are afraid of your life, and of this king of Israel. Well now, go return on the way to the wilderness of Damascus and when you come anoint Hazael to be king over Syria. Well, Elijah is running in terror from the wife of the king of Israel. Here is

a king nearly twice as strong as Israel, and God says , a son of a nobody is going to be by God's power to be made the king over that land. And he said, you go ahead and anoint. In other words, if you are God's representative, why should you be afraid of the wife of the king of Israel, when God announces to you the change he is going to make, in the great power of Damascus. And then as far as Israel is concerned, he says, Jehu, the son of Nimshi shall thou anoint to be king over Israel. And then he gives the bad word, and Elisha the son of Shaphat, shalt thou anoint to be prophet in thy room. In other words, Elijah, you've fallen down on the job. You've done a wonderful job. And you've made a mighty stand for God, and then right at the time when the back of the Baal worshippers was broken, the people were filled with excitement and enthusiasm, crying, the Lord is the God, the Lord is the God, and they let Elijah take the Baal priests and kill them, right at that time, instead of staying and organizing the people and reestablishing the ~~work of~~ worship of God and carrying out that which he had won by his great (11) on Carmel, he ~~is~~ fled in terror because of the bluff of Jezebel. So God said, we are going to appoint someone else to carry on the work. And so the three seeming commands to Elijah, are not commands actually but are predictions/ (11) - the forms that of command, the form of that of a command, but the actuality is a prediction. They are predictions given in the first place to encourage Elijah by giving him a renewed sense of God's greatness, and God's power. And also to enable Elijah in passing this word on, to give people an evidence that will serve when these great changes take place, to prove that Elijah ~~w~~ really was a spokesman for God and God has spoken through Elijah, and God has predicted things that no body could predict twenty years ahead of time. The change of the dynasty of Israel, who the successor would be, when the new dynasty had changed, and the dynasty of Syria, which no body in Israel even could have made a guess about. Probably Elijah hadn't even heard of Hazael, the son of a nobody. No father even named, The king of Assyria calls him son of a nobody. And so there are these two great purposes in the prediction. Now if the prediction, if these were understood by Elijah, as a command, rather than a prediction, all we can say of Elijah is that he grossly failed in his duty, because God said. God, return on the way to the wilderness of Damascus, and when thou

comest, anoint Hazael to be king over Syria. Where in the scripture does it tell us, that Elijah anointed Hazael to be king over Syria? (Student). - Elijah anoints Elisha to be prophet in his place - (student). In this chapter you find even just two verses later, verse 19, So he departed thence and found Elisha the son of Shaphat. Now that is passing over a lot in a few words, for he probably had to walk for a few weeks to get from Sinai up to him. It said it took him 40 days going down. It would take him at least that to come back. So he departed then and found Elisha the son of Shaphat, who was plowing with twelve yoke of oxen. And did Elijah say now, Elisha, I'm going to anoint you now to be my successor? What he did was, he - Elijah passed by and cast his mantle over him. This, Mr. Graul~~é~~y has in mind, ~~his~~ he cast his mantle over him. But I think he retrieved it later. I don't think he let him keep it. Now I don't know. Maybe he did. (Student).

K. 30.

how in this verse carried out for obedience? Thou shalt anoint Elisha, son of Shaphat, to be prophet in thy room. So what happened? Elijah went up there and he goes by and here is Elisha with ~~the~~ twelve yoke of oxen before him. He is a pretty rich man possibly. He had a big establishment, 12 y~~o~~ke of oxen. But they are working in the field, and here is the ~~twelve~~ yoke of oxen, I suppose 11 of them came ahead and then the last one - and each of them had a man guiding them, and at the last one was this son of this wealthy man, Elisha. And as he comes by Elijah cast his mantle over him. And anybody knows a farmer driving along, when somebody comes walking by, when a fellow out of the desert comes walking by and takes his coat and throws it over top. What are you trying to do? Look out here. I'll fall into the threshing machine, or something. (1 1/4) of blinding me, throwing something over my head. What is this guy? Some kind of a hobo or something. What's he doing? Elisha was a man who was already ready. God had prepared him. He knew who Elijah was. He knew about Elijah. He knew about Elijah's work, and he probably had for months been thinking, oh, I wish I could have been on Mount Carmel, and seen what Elijah did. And seen his wonderful stand against the prophets of Baal. How I would have liked to have stood right before him, or ~~if~~ if I could have done little menial service for him. If I could have taken the place this servant

that just went up to the top of the hill to tell him he saw the rain coming, and sent him up seven times, before he came back and said, yes, I see a cloud like a man's hand. If I could just do menial services, just to help a great man of God. When the ordinary person would think he was just some kind of a hobo, this fellow, Elisha was one who was interested and looking for him, and here he was busy at his work, and all of a sudden he sees this coat come over his head, and instead of getting angry, he looked around and sees who it is, and immediately he says, he leaves the oxen, and runs after Elijah in verse 20, and he says, Let me, I pray thee, kiss my father and my mother, and then I will follow thee. And Elijah says, Why, isn't this wonderful. God has prepared this man to - this rich man to leave his home and come and become my successor. He says, Elisha, this is wonderful. You I'm going to train so intensively, so that when I'm gone you can be my successor. No, what did he say? He says, ~~Elisha~~ Elisha says, Let me, I pray thee, kiss my father and my mother, and then I will follow thee. He says, ~~God~~ back again. ^{In other words} What have I got to do with you? God told him to anoint him and so he throws his coat over him, but when the fellow comes (3). What have I got to do with you? In other words, poor Elijah, he the great man of God is being put out of his position that he's made a ~~v~~ failure of. He runs away from his duty and now God says, go appoint this man in your place and he'd do what God said, but he is doing it with rather poor judgment, and Elijah says, what have I got to do with you? ^{But} But, Elisha says, now, he says, please wait he says, I'll be with you. Just as soon as I say goodbye to my family. So Elisha went back and took a yoke of oxen, and killed them, and the average farmer would only have one yoke of oxen. It would be a terrible wasteful thing for an ordinary person to kill a whole yoke of oxen. But this was a wealthy family and Elisha then killed the yoke of oxen and boiled their flesh, he takes the wagon and he uses it to fire to it, so there is more expense involved, and it is a pretty clear sign that he is not going to do anymore farm work. He is destroying the things he did use. And he boils their flesh with the instruments of the oxen, and he gives this to the people. He has a feast. It must have taken him 6 or 7 hours, and he finished this, and he started out, and says, oh, I hope Elijah didn't go too far. I hope I catch up to him. He goes around the corner, and sees Elijah just sitting down there. He comes

and Elijah says, ah, You've come as I suggested. And Elijah says, welk, you can take my cloak along. He ministers to him. In other words, he does menial tasks. And later on they said, Elisha, that's the man who used to pour water on the hands of Elijah. He did the menial tasks and Elisha was content to follow him and do menial tasks for him for a number of years, and we don't know just how long, but little time after that, in II Kings 2, the Lord was going to take Elijah into heaven with a whirlwind, and Elijah went with Elisha from Gilgal, and Elijah says to Elisha, stay here. I pray thee, for the Lord hath sent me to Bethel. Now you see what an obedient servant Elisha was, Elisha said, As the Lord liveth, and as thy soul liveth, I will not leave thee. So they went down to Bethel. In other words, though he was just ministering to him and doing menial tasks, he was not just a servant under his thumb, and he knew that Elijah was trying to shake him, and he says, as the Lord lives, and as thy soul lives, I won't leave thee. And the sons of the prophets said, do you know that the Lord will take away you master from your head to day? And he said, yes, I know it. ~~Hold~~ You folks be quiet. So Elijah said in verse 4, Elisha, stay here, for the Lord has sent me to Jericho. They'd already gone from Gilgal up to Bethel which was a walk of maybe 4 or 5 hours, and they climbed a couple of thousand feet, now they are up at Bethel, and Jericho is down right next to ~~the~~ Gilgal. It is as if you walk from here to Trenton, you get up to Trenton, and you say, now you stay here. I've got to go to Philadelphia, and Elisha says, as the Lord lives, and as thy soul lives, I will not leave thee. So they came back down to Jericho. And they get down to Jericho, and there the sons of God say, do you know the Lord is going to take your master away from you, and he says, yes, I know it, but don't say anything to disturb Elijah. He is in a kind of a raging mood anyway, and we don't want to get him upset. And then Elijah said to him, tarry I pray thee, here, the Lord has sent me to Jordan. He said, as the Lord lives, and as thy soul lives, I will not leave thee. When did he anoint him as his successor? Or when did he anoint him? He was very surly about it. And they two went on, and Elijah took his mantle and wrapped it together, and smote the waters, and they were divided. Now as this was a hot day, Elijah probably wasn't wearing the mantle. Elisha was probably carrying it, but he

takes it from him, and he smites the water, and it divides ~~ke~~ so that the two went over on dry ~~ge~~ ground. And then they go over, and then ~~Elisha says to Elijah~~ Elijah says to Elisha, ask what I shall do for thee, before I be taken away from thee. He doesn't say, remember how I anointed you to be my successor. You are going to take over now. I'm going away and you are going to do the work. No, he says, ask what I shall do for thee, before I be taken away. And Elisha just says, ~~let~~ a double portion of thy spirit be upon me. In other words, he says, give me the share of an eldest son, because it was customary then in all through the ancient near east, that if a man died and he had ~~six~~ six sons, his property was divided into seven parts, and the oldest sons took two parts, and the rest gets one. If he had three sons, it was ~~divided~~ divided into four parts. So in other words, the oldest son gets double what any other son gets. He is the recognized heir, and this here of course is a figurative expression. You ~~d~~ can't divide a spirit into parts. And some people take it that Elisha wanted to be twice as great a man as Elijah. I'm sure that if he had, which I doubt very much, I'd think he was a humble man. I don't think he was that much of an heir to probably think, well Elijah did this great work, but I'm going to be twice as great. Give me a double portion. Make me twice as great as you were. Even if he had thought that he'd have sense enough not to say it. And if he had said it, Elijah probably would have struck out at him with pretty strong language, because Elijah wouldn't take that sort of treatment from anybody, but what he meant was, let me be your heir, your successor. A double portion ~~of~~ of your spirit. There will be many ~~we~~ ^{which} ~~hope~~ ^{will} who will ~~try~~ ⁱ to carry on ~~the~~ ^{in it} work like Elijah did, but let me be the one who will be most effective, the one who will be recognized as the true successor. Not that he is ~~even~~ necessarily a fifth as great as Elijah, but that he more than any one else is the one who carries on the work of Elijah (9) That is his request. It is a very humble request, not a (9 1/2) request, as a misunderstanding of the phrase, to take it as (9 1/2) as Elijah had, as much as anyone else had, (9 1/2). It means I want to be the one who can carry on his work, your real successor, and did Elijah say, that's grand, Elisha. I've been training you. I've been preparing you for this day, and now I'm so happy you're going to

succeed me. Let me pour some oil on you, because God commanded me to anoint you. He said, you've asked a hard thing. Nevertheless, if you see me when I'm taken, from you it shall be so, but if not, it shall not be so. Even now, Elijah does not tell Elisha he is to be his successor. Even now. If you don't see me, you won't be, and so as they still went on and talked, a chariot of fire and horses of fire appeared and separated them, and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven, and Elisha saw it. He cried, and he saw him no more. He took hold of his own clothes, and rent them in two pieces. And he took up the mantle of Elijah that fell from him, and went back. And he said, I wonder if it is really so. Elijah would never ~~get~~ give me a hint that really I could be his successor, but he said, if I see him go up, I would. Now, if it is really so, or is it ~~a~~ just a dream? Am I back on my father's farm dreaming of the great things I'd like to do for God? Is it really true? And so he took the mantle of Elijah and he said, Where is the Lord God of Elijah, and he smote the water, and they parted. And there was the proof that God (11) that God had given the prophet of succeeding Elijah. So as far as this being a command to Elijah back here to anoint Elisha as the prophet in Elijah's place, if it was Elijah was a very very disobedient servant, but I don't think Elijah was. I think Elijah understood, not as the literal statement of the words, but the command, but as the meaning of the words which were a prediction, that Elijah you have made a failure. You've done a ~~tremene~~ tremendous thing. You deserve tremendous praise for that. You have mentioned that here, but it is mentioned elsewhere. But now you have reached the point, where a different type of personality from yours has to take part, and carry on the work of the Lord and complete it. And Elisha is the one who succeeds him. And Elijah never quite ~~recognized~~ reconciled the two. Why can't I

(12). Well, I want the work carried on. I'm glad to do what I can, to help

it, but why can't I (?) And there is no evidence he ever said a word to give Elisha the understanding that Elijah was acquainting him or anointing him or in any way (12).

He treats him in this rough way, which was perhaps all the better for Elisha. But he certainly was not anointing him as a prophet to take his place. God anointed him by giving him the mantle, of Elijah. But as to a specific literal (12 1/2) he never had. And Elijah never

anointed him in any way, shape or form. But these are then three predictions which God gave to Elijah, and the predictions were not fulfilled in the order in which they were given here. They were not literally fulfilled in the commands, because Elijah never anointed any one of the three, and I don't think ^{Elijah ?} (13) think Elisha was the least bit ~~disobedient~~ disobedient to God in that. Elijah represented this, but what it meant was that God was going to make certain changes. That God was supreme over his work, and even over the nation of Israel, of which Elijah was so frightened of this heathen woman, which was wife of the king ~~of~~ that he fled in terror for 40 days in the wilderness, that God considered (13 1/2) and do what he chose with it. Not when he controlled Israel, but when he controlled far greater nations than Israel, and the great nations of the land, perhaps 50% more powerful than any . God controlled things and would make a change with predictions 20 years ahead the change of dynasty, so that a man who was the son of a nobody would be king. And of ~~n(13 1/2)~~ course it is very interesting that in the Assyrian records, the reference to Hadad (14) who is undoubtedly the same man called Benhadad in the Bible. Perhaps it was a longer name. And Hazael son of a nobody. Hazael who has no right of blood to succeed him, and here this son of a nobody in the Assyrian records fits right in here with this Biblical record, when they ~~give~~ mention Benhadad, remember they give the ~~amen~~ name (14 1/2) and when they mention Elisha they tell of his father's name, and when they mention Jehu they tell his father's name, but Hazael no father is given, anoint Hazael, which either means one of two things. He is either a great man and you don't need to tell it, or he is so inconsequential a man that you don't bother to tell. In this case it is the last one.

K. 31.

that there is a symbolical significance in it. I mean, you think of the picture. Here's a wealthy farmer plowing. Here is a wealthy farmer plowing, and he is going ahead driving the plow, and all of a sudden, a hobo comes by and throws a coat over him, and what on earth would that mean? It doesn't mean that the hobo is trying to warm up the man, who is vigorously working there, and probably on a hot day. It doesn't mean to show that he is

trying to give him some help. What does it mean? It would - to the average person it would mean an utter nuisance, that he would want to get rid of. For this person to come by, and do this fool thing, would be just disgusting. Now if it was the king who came, if a poor man were working in the field, and the king came by and the king threw this mantle over the poor man, you might say the poor man says he wants me to be his servant. He is ~~then~~ throwing this over me as a sign that he is taking me to belong to him, that I would assist or do as he tells me. Now in this case, the significance of it as far as Elijah is concerned, is not told. If Elijah thought it meant, I am by throwing this coat, I am anointing him to be my successor, certainly anything that Elijah said (1 1/2) doesn't fit with that. He says, what do I have to do with you? And later on, he says, you stay here, and he says, you've asked a very hard thing. But he says, if God gives you this predictive sign then you have it, and if not you don't. There was not the slightest indication between them, that Elijah understood, or meant Elisha to understand, that he had indicated him as his successor. But Elisha understood. What did he understand? Well, all we have evidence of that he understood was that he was to have his chance to follow Elijah. That Elijah is saying to him, boy, you can come with me. And he followed him as one that ministered to him. In other words, as a servant, doing menial tasks for him. So it is just as if a king had said, here, I'm going to take this one. You come along and you do what I want you to. He was a menial servant for Elijah, but it was Elisha's great spiritual perception and his understanding, perhaps even a revelation, that God had given him before that led him to take a meaning out of it, that probably very few people would have taken, and he immediately said to Elijah, he said, wait just a moment till I kiss my father and my mother, but we read on here - to kiss his father and mother meant to give a farewell dinner, which doubtless took quite a long time. This farewell dinner, he gave it to the people there. He called all the people together of the farm. Maybe they had a hundred servants. Elisha says, I'm leaving you. The father says, my son is going into religious work. He is leaving home. And he gives him a farewell dinner, and they all wept. His servants thought, well he was a good boss to work for. We hope that the boss that the father gets

to take the place of this man will be as good worker as (3 1/2). They did eat together, and then he arose. Elijah was waiting around the corner, just half a mile down the road. Mr. Haffly. (Student). But when Elisha says, by humbling him, what have I got to do with you, that certainly - you wouldn't say, follow me, and then you'd say, well, I will, just let me run and get my coat, and I'll be with you. He says, what ~~a~~ have I got to do with you? It seems to me that that pretty clearly shows that Elijah has says nothing. He has just thrown his coat over him. (Student). Elisha recognizes because Elisha was Elisha. I don't think anybody else could recognize (4 1/2). I doubt very much, that anybody else could (4 1/2). And as far as Elijah being the well known man, when I was at the general assembly in 1924, in Baltimore, Dr. Clarence MacCartney was the great leader of the fundamentalists. Time and again he ~~was~~ on the floor~~d~~ answering some attack of the modernists and he gave the great memorial day address, the special service of memorial day, and he gave long speeches on two or three occasions. When the assembly was over and the people were going away, I ran unto a man from Oregon, whom I had met out on the Pacific Coast, and he had a daughter who went to Occidental College, from wh~~i~~ch I had graduated the year before and he (5 1/2) and I met him there, and he met the day before at the assembly, and Mr. Angel, ran into me down the street, and he stopped and we started to chat, after we were talking along and the people were coming out of the assembly, along came Dr. MacCartney, and MacCartney stepped up to me and he said, well, it is all over. It is all over. It's over until next year, and he went on. MacCartney talked a little bit. It happened that the year before that - two years before MacCartney was in California and I had~~y~~ taken him up into the mountain, taken him different places, and I knew him fairly well, but (6) there was no reason Mr. Angel would ever dream of such a thing. Well, MacCartney talked to me and I said, Dr. MacCartney, Mr. Angel, Mr. Angel from Orlin, and I slurred over it a little, because I felt everybody knew him. He had been up before the assembly time and again. Angel was one of the members of the assembly, and he heard him speak 5 or 6 times. After I introduced him he said, Angel said, what was his name (6 1/2). I felt surprised because I was certain he had the name clear and I felt everybody would know

his name, who was in the assembly. Well, he did. But he never dreamed of a great big leader in the assembly stepping up to this young student that he'd met in Los Angeles, such a big leader from Philadelphia, stepping up to this young student, and speaking to him in a formal way, (7), and he'd seen him before in the assembly a dozen times, and heard him ~~given~~ at least two times give talks which were ~~at~~ an hour in length, but it just never entered his head. Well, in those days, they had no photographs, they had no newspapers, they had no = everybody had heard about Elijah, yes, certainly. But where was Elijah now. This was a couple of months after (7 1/2). There were lots of ~~forbesprand~~ hobos, and Elijah looked like a hobo. He was a hairy man from the wilderness. He ate locusts, and wild honey. He dressed just like one, an ordinary rough fellow from the wild lands, and there were lots (8). And it was two months since this happened on Mount Carmel which is fifty miles away from where they are. We have no reason in the world to think that Elijah is anywhere in the neighborhood. And Elisha is driving, is busy in the farm work, or working along and all of a sudden this wild looking fellow steps up and throws his coat over him, and Elisha immediately says, (8 1/2) Let me say goodbye to my father and my mother, and I'll be right with you. Elisha was ready. The rest of Elijah's life we don't know much of. He suddenly appears before Ahab, and rebukes Ahab for killing Naboth. And when he brings fire on these people of Ahaziah in the first chapter II ¹ Kings, they never suspect who he is, until they go back and tell the king about him. And the king who had heard all about his relation to his father, perhaps he had even been there when it happened, the father can't think of anybody ~~was~~ who would be apt to do anything like this, except ~~Elisha~~ Elijah, and he gives a description of Elijah, and he says that's him, but that the ordinary person would recognize Elijah, is rather unlikely. And especially a person who has had no connection as far as (9 1/2) and the account here, I don't think can be reasonably taken any other way, than that Elijah did what God said, but he didn't actually do anything that Elisha could interpret as a designation of his successor. Elisha I imagine heard about what happened at Carmel. He heard these things and he knew

the ~~story~~ stories of God's dealings with Israel, and he was greatly interested. He was ~~an~~ ~~man~~ ~~and~~ ~~a~~ ~~young~~ ~~and~~ ~~plowing~~ ~~and~~ ~~preparing~~ ~~food~~ ~~for~~ ~~people's~~ ~~bodies~~, when their souls are in danger, and if I could have been beside Elijah, if I could just have carried the stones for Elijah to put up, if I could just do anything to help that man, I'd be happy, and that was what was in his mind. And whether God simply worked providentially with Elijah and prepared him for his task, whether God had actually given him a revelation, we don't know, but Elisha immediately recognized what probably few other people would. And God speaking to (10 1/2) - you go to a man who is not even interested in and you pick him out, you anoint him. Here is the ambassador to the United Nations. * He was defeated for senator from Massachusetts, and he thought his brilliant career was over. And then the president appointed him ambassador to the United Nations. Well, he was just off in a corner there, up there in a job that ordinarily people would think was a third as important. He is there, how many ~~people~~ of the ambassadors to the United Nations do you think the people would even remember, but he's been up there, (11), he ~~was~~ just was called to be vice presidential nominee - he is selected, because they think he has qualities that will fulfill that work well, but Elisha is in a different situation. Elisha is willing to do any menial task to help, and he doesn't think that he will ever get a chance. Oh, if he could just see Elisha, what a thrill it would be. And all a sudden, this crazy looking fellow comes along and throws his cloak at him, and other people would say, get that fellow out of the way. (11 1/2) but Elisha says, just a minute and I'll come after you. I'll come with you in a minute. He's got his chance he's been looking for. There are other people who (11 3/4). And Elijah's surly (12) right out to the very end, I think Elijah never does anything contrary. There is nothing wrong with what he (12) but there is an indication in his attitude, he is ready to do what he can with Elisha, but he feels pretty bad about it. And God here is giving a very real rebuke to Elijah. We are going to displace you. Well, we have these three predictions here, and a prediction of Elisha is of tremendous

interest from a viewpoint of the history of the prophets, but we have not been spending a great deal of attention to the prophets, because it has been a course more in the political sphere of the divided kingdom. We can't do that without referring (12 1/2) in the political viewpoint. Remember when Elisha went with the sling around, after Elisha had done very great things, and was very well known. Elisha went with the priests clear down to Edom, and they didn't even know he was there. Neither did Jehoshaphat know him, nor the king of Israel know that he was there. When they got into a fix they asked, is there somebody here who is a spokesman for God. Well, they said, Elisha who used to pour water on the hands of Elijah, he is one of the mixed multitude that follows around. They didn't even know he was there. The king hadn't said we want you to come along. He just went along.

But then the other two commands - the command about Hazael, ~~about~~ and the command about Jehu were both of them fulfilled, very literally, but - not literally, but God fulfilled the literal predictions, but the command was not fulfilled (14). Hazael was never anointed. And - but he was told by Elisha that he was going to be king. Jehu was anointed. The man came and poured oil over his head, but the man who did it was not Elijah, nor Elijah's successor, but a man who Elisha had sent. Elijah you go and anoint Jehu. Well, Elijah just a few more years didd, Elisha sent (14 1/2) but the command was, you do it. It is not what is stated here, but that was ~~what~~ the way God carried it out. END OF RECORD. & End of Class.

K. 32.

Yesterday, we noticed that God had given three predictions to Elijah. You notice the reason why he gave the predictions to Elijah. You noticed how they were fulfilled. The commands were not carried out literally, but the implied predictions, were specifically and exactly fulfilled, all three of them. When Elijah came to die, Elijah the great stormy figure, which made such havock with the Baal worshippers, when he came to die, how many men were there to see him reach the end of his life? One man, Elisha. And what did Elisha say when Elijah ended his earthly career, Mr. Grauley? (Student). Don't you think when

Elisha died, King Jehoash came to his bed side, and Jehoash said, My father my father, the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof. There is no mention of any chariot of fire there at all. And so it would seem that what Joash must have meant was my, what a terrible thing to think of our losing you. You are the protection, the bulwark of the nation. What is going to happen to Israel, with Elisha's influence gone. Elisha is worth more than a battalion of tanks, and a thousand air planes. They didn't have tanks and air planes and so he said chariots and horses. Which was of course the (1 1/2) in their days. Now if that was what Joash meant when he said this to Elisha, does it not seem reasonable that that was what Elisha meant when he said it to Elijah. That Elisha was not referring to the chariot of fire, that carried him up to heaven, but that he was referring to the loss which the land suffered by his going, that he would be the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof. Well, now, where do we have that account of the death of Elisha? II Kings 13. And Mr. Ruble would you read us please, starting with verse 14. (Student). Not exactly. I don't think that the fact that he is going to smite ~~Elisha~~ Syria, but thrice, the fact that he struck the table - the ground three times, I don't think there is a one for one correlation for the number of strokes, with the number of defeats. There is no reason to think that - he is not told the rules of the game, you strike the ground, and then, if only he had known he would have hit it seven times, but I think that Mr. Ruble is right, what it indicates is Joash that ~~Elisha~~ came to show respect to Elisha. Great number of the people felt that Elisha was the great prophet, and Joash wanted to show respect. He wanted the people to think that the godly king was done. Look how he goes to the prophet's house and shows respect to the prophet. There is a really godly king. He was interested in what the people thought of him rather than sincerely interested in doing the will of God whatever it might be. And so when the prophet says to him, smite on the ground, why, he lackadaisically does it three times. He is going to do what the prophet says, but he is not much interested, but if he was on his toes, to do whatever the prophet of God says, why, when he says smite on the ground, he would have gone at it with force, and it would have revealed the character

of loyalty to the Lord, to his prophet, and so Elisha was wroth at him not because of the silly matter of whether he happened to do it two times or three times or five times, but of whether he put his heart in it, and it indicated the fact that his heart was not really in the service of the Lord. Now this comes near the end of the longest dynasty of the northern kingdom. A dynasty that reigned for nearly a hundred years. And that's a long time for a dynasty. I don't think there is any dynasty in the world today, unless of course you count that Queen Victoria didn't start a new dynasty but continued one. But that would be the only one that any dynasty in the world today would be that (5). Somebody pointed out I remember that ten years after the war, that the government of Stalin was the oldest government in the world. That every other government of any importance had changed hands in those times. And here we have a succession from father to son, who went through how many generations, Mr. Grauley? (Student). 5 kings of this generation, of this dynasty who reigned. Now in a way you shouldn't count the last one. But there were four who reigned for a long period of time. What were the names of these four Mr. Haffly? (Student). It is a rather natural assumption that if Jonah was earlier than Hosea and Amos he would (6) be put earlier in the Minor Prophets. Now that's purely an assumption. We have no evidence that the Minor Prophets are arranged strictly chronologically. But we do have evidence that they are in general arranged chronologically. What evidence would that be, Mr. Ruble? (Student). Well, I think you could say it more specifically than that. You could say that the last two of the Minor Prophets, Zechariah and Malachi are after the exile. So they are the latest of the minor prophets. 3, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi. They are the latest of the minor prophets, of which we can say with almost certainty. At least you can say, that practically all of them are much earlier than those three. And then you find of the first three you find two of them specifically dated, Jeroboam II. So that you have certainly a general chronological arrangement in the Minor Prophets. Now whether you have it specifically might be questioned but at least you have it in general. Then among the minor prophets we find that Jonah just near the beginning

of it, but it is after Hosea and Amos. Well that doesn't prove that it wasn't written before but it does suggest the possibility ~~is~~ at least that it was written after that, and then of course we find nothing in Jonah to tie up specifically with any exact (8) but ~~we~~ we do find this tying up with this verse in Kings, to Jeroboam. That something Jeroboam did fulfilled a prophecy of Jonah, and where do we find this prophecy of Jonah, Mr. Grauley? Mr. Vannoy? (Student). No, the prophecy was quoted in Kings. It says that he quoted something that was done by Jeroboam II. Where do we find that prophecy of Jonah? We have no evidence of such a thing. Therefore we can say that we know that Jonah made prophecies, did prophesyings which is not contained in the book of Jonah. We know that. Jonah's book does not tell us all about Jonah, because here we have reference to another prophecy. But this other prophecy came before the end of Jeroboam's reign, but the implication is that it came some little time before the thing was done, that was prophesied and so whether ~~was~~ he was in the reign of Jeroboam, or whether he was earlier, we just don't know. But at least he wasn't later. And it may be that he prophesied earlier in the reign of Jeroboam, and Je (9 1/4) fulfilled this later in his reign, or it may be that he did the prophesying earlier in that time. We just have no way to tell. But this verse fits in with the basic problem of the book of Jonah. Why did Jonah flee? And of course the evidence is very clear, he didn't flee because he was afraid. He fled because he was a patriotic Jew who didn't want to give the Ninevites a chance to repent. That's perfectly clear in the book, and that fits in exactly with the prophecy from him that was quoted from Kings, being the prophet of a great reestablishment of the land. And so we do not know when Jonah prophesied, except that we know that it wasn't later than Jeroboam II. It may have been slightly earlier. We know that. And we know that Jeroboam II of whom so little is told in the Bible would seem to be one of the most powerful kings in the land of Israel. And the - he reigned as long as any other member of the house of Jehu, and he succeeded in holding an area bigger than anybody has held, ~~at~~ at least since the time of Ahab.

Well then, after him, then we have Zechariah with his brief reign, ~~who~~ who was killed by

Shallum a usurper, who after a month is himself killed, and then Menahem becomes king and he reigns 10 years before his son reigns in his stead, but after two years he is killed by a usurper. And this usurper the chronologies all say he reigned 8 years, but the Bible says he reigned 20 years, so we have a problem there about Pekah. But Pekah was evidently an able ruler of the northern kingdom. And do you know of any case where we have Pekah mentioned in the prophetic books? In the 7th chapter of Isaiah he is specifically mentioned. Then we have - we summarized the northern kingdom under Jehu. Now in the southern kingdom at this time, we have Athaliah reigning, and then we have Athaliah killed, and her grand son, a little boy of seven, becomes king. And was he a good man or a bad man Mr. Ruble? (Student). If I said he was a good king or a bad king, I think we could safely say he was a good king. He was a king who did much that was good. If you take the greater part of his reign, you will find that what he did was good. But you will find that he was mighty wicked at the end of his reign, as described in Chronicles. He was very wicked at the end of his reign. And he did something that was very very wicked, and which our Lord refers to in the book of Matthew, and of Luke. And this which he did, was pretty ^{hard} ~~good~~ to figure him as a good man when he did a wicked thing like ~~that~~ that, so that we are left not knowing whether he got a tumor on the brain which changed his character at the end of his life, or whether actually he was a bad man all the time, but as a young fellow he was subject to those who had made him king and went along with him, and gave him support in every thing, but once Jehoiada was dead, then he showed his true nature. Now it is hard to say. Maybe he showed his true nature and (13) as a bad man, or maybe after Jehoiada was dead, he always leaned on Jehoiada. Now Jehoiada was gone, he looks to someone to lean on and picks the wrong person, and he chooses a wicked man instead of a ~~we~~ good man. We don't know. But we know the fact that Joash, though he was a wicked king who did so much good and put an end to the Baal worship, Joash at the end of his life did a deed which the Lord Jesus Christ refers to as a very wicked thing. * Well now, that I'm going to make (14) now, because you can write it out for next

time. Now I don't know of anyone who thinks that Obadiah the prophet was the same as Obadiah the son of (14). It is a specific prophecy against Edom. And we don't have any particular reason at the time of Ahab to expect particularly about Edom. So that anyway his character does not - he was the king's steward. He was a good man, and (14 1/2) he was doing all the good he could to put himself into the position of danger.

I don't think that anybody thinks that he is the same as Obadiah, the prophet.

NEXT CLASS ?

33. (0)

These questions I gave you, the first one refers to Amaziah, and who was Amaziah, Mr. Ruble? (Student.) From Kings you might get one answer why, but that would be purely in English, but probably a correct one, but if you read Chronicles you will get a different answer. Now that doesn't mean that the answer you get in Kings is even correct. But there may have been two reasons that entered into the statement. And one of them is I think - you might say that the one you get from Kings is the underlying one, but the one you get from Chronicles is undoubtedly the actual occasion ~~to do it~~ = the real cause of this procedure. (Student). And then number two refers to Joash, and that you can look into, and I don't think you will find many passages - I hope you can see the factor, I think it is a vital factor that is rarely mentioned. That's number two. Then number three is to arrange in definite chronological order all the important events in the reign of Hezekiah, and explain the reason for the order that you have got. Give specific references and discussion and reason for all extra-Biblical material bearing on the reign of Hezekiah.

I asked you to look over the chronology through the reign of Ahab, and I don't know if that would be considered to include all of Pekah's reign or not. I think it ought to. If it did you would get into that vital question about Pekah that we want to look into some more before we get through, but I don't think we will this morning. The other question that I asked you to look into was extra-biblical material bearing on Ahaz and Hezekiah. No, I limited it to Cuneiform didn't I? What did you find, on that, bearing on the reign of Ahaz? Mr. Ruble, what did you find? (Student). It is important, because Tiglath-Pileser is specifically named in the Bible. We have Tiglath-Pileser named in the Bible, and

referred to as Tiglath-Pileser in two or three cases, and we have two or three other cases, where we find him referred to under a different name. Do you know that name, Mr. Grauley? (Student). Pul. And we know that these are told of Tiglath-Pileser because of Assyrian and Babylonian inscriptions, in Assyrian he is known as Tiglath-Pileser, in Babylonian he is known as Pul. And the evidence is clear that it is the same man. Many think that Pul may have been his actual personal name, and Tiglath-Pileser, the accession name which he took when he became king, just as - there was an English prince named David, everybody called him David. But when he became king he was King Edward VIII. And that was his ~~accession~~ accession name, which I think actually that was his official name before. Edward, Duke of Wales. But his family was David, and it is possible that Tiglath-Pileser took the accession name when he became king, and his actual name was Pul, as a general name, because he seems to have seized the throne, not to have been the next one in line to get it. The - another factor that enters in there is Assyria had conquered Babylonia, and was holding Babylonia as subject to them, but the Babylonians who were very proud and patriotic people refused to admit that they were in anyway subject to Assyria, and so the way the Assyrian king was able to handle it, was like the way of the British empire trying to hold it together now by having the queen, the queen of all the different sections, and Nehru of India, and the premier of Pakistan, had been pretty hot between each other, until quite recently, but they go to London and appear before their liege lord, Elizabeth. Both recognize her as queen of their land, though actually they are independent countries. Perhaps it would be a better illustration, the fact that before the first world war, there was Austria, the country they held, and Hungary was a country subject to them, and Francis Joseph was emperor of Austria, and king of Hungary, and the union between the two was theoretically nearly a personal union, ~~between~~ ⁱⁿ the individual (5 1/2). That's what you had in England before the actual union, when King James VI of Scotland, became King James I of England. Now this is not quite that way because the Assyrian armies had conquered Babylon, but the only way they could hold Babylon without a tremendous loss and difficulty, was to go through the fiction of pretending that the Babylonians were

voluntarily accepting the Assyrian king as king, and the Babylonians under compulsion - under great compulsion, it was a lot easier to get them to pretend they voluntarily took the king, then it would have been if they forced them into subjection against their pretense. And so the Babylonians had a habit, a custom, that every year the king of Babylonian would take the hands of the god Marduke, and be made king by the god for another year, so the Babylonians let the Assyrian king take the hands of Marduke, and the trouble was a ~~year~~ year later when he was supposed to do it again, he might be off on a campaign in Palestine or in Persia. * And he didn't want to make a trip way back from ~~Babylon~~ Mesopotamia and (6 1/2) then down south to Babylon in order to go through the ceremony again, and you are apt to have a revolt. But the Assyrian king, Tiglath-Pileser is known in the Babylonian records as Pul. He is king Pul of Babylon, but he was emperor Tiglath-Pileser of Assyria. And the Bible has this name Tiglath-Pileser and it even has one place where he is called Tilgath-Pilneser. But of course Tilgath-Pilneser has no similarity ~~to~~ to - is not used in the Assyrian records. There he is Tiglath-Pileser. It is not exactly that pronunciation, but it is in that order. And so we have in the Bible references to King Pul and to Tiglath-Pileser, and we have in Assyrian records, and that fits with the Bible. It is right at this time that we have a king by this name, so that's a corroboration.

What else do you find in Cuneiform literature that has relation to king Ahaz, Mr. Ruble? distinguish from (Student). Jehoahaz of Israel, Jehoahaz of Judah. How would you distinguish Jehoram of Israel from Jehoram of Judah, or Joash, in fact most of these names can appear with a shorter or longer form. Only you would expect that Jehoahaz it would be Jehaz. As far as I recall in the Bible he is always called Ahaz. It is never in the longer form, but the fact that the Assyrian inscription mentions at this time with the longer name, it is pretty good evidence that Jehoahaz was actually his full name. The Lord has taken hold. Just taken hold doesn't mean anything. It would be a natural abbreviation for it. Well now, king Ahaz, we don't find much about in the Assyrian records, but we have a good deal about it in the Bible. Yes, Mr. Grauley? (Student). A good point, the inscription describing the fall of Samaria, according to most datings would come 4 years before the

accession of Hezekiah. Consequently it would come under Ahaz time. (Student). Yes, well that is of course the actual fall of Samaria. You do have though, in the inscriptions, I think you have the account of the conquest of Damascus, and that ~~s~~ took place very definitely in Ahaz' reign, but the actual fall of Samaria took place 11 years after the fall of Damascus. You know, those things are predicted in kings, in Chronicles I believe, but definitely in Isaiah 7. In Isaiah 7 here we have the account of Ahaz, - Isaiah not go into the palace. I think there were two reasons. One is that it is quite evident that Ahaz was not interested in talking to Isaiah. That is, he wanted to get into the palace, it might be like you or I if we'd go down to Washington, and say I want to see president Eisenhower. Chances are that we would hang around for three days, and never get anywhere near him. They say that Kennedy is going to be more accessible. But I personally have my doubts, with 150,000,000 people, there are a lot of them who could take an ocean they would like to see the president about any time, and if he were to see everybody that wanted to see him, he'd never have any time to do anything. So they've got to do some selectigg. And it is absolutely necessary. I went through the White House a month ago, and they let us come in at one end and out the other, and we went through all the downstairs rooms, and they told us they are open in the morning. In the afternoon they are closed to the public, because the president holds meetings there. Throngs of people went through these room, and came in one end and out the other. ~~✱~~ And you saw those rooms. If you were told that if you'd like to talk to the president, I'm sure that half of those people would stop and pass the time of day with him. And he could never get anything done. It is absolutely necessary to be selective in a position like that. And Ahaz' desire to select them does not include Isaiah. Hezekiah was different. Any time ~~Hezekiah wanted to see~~ Isaiah wanted to see Hezekiah all he had to do was to come in and visit him. (12 1/2).

So there are two reasons for him to go and see him there. One was probably he couldn't see him anywhere else. And the second is that he had a message to give, that was not simply for Ahaz but was for the people of the land. And if he did get in - for a private audience with the king there might be very few people who would know what they talked about. So ~~✱~~ if he went out here

where the king was having an inspection tour, and was observing the preparation and fortification to protect Jerusalem from the attack of Rezin and Pekah, he will have a chance to speak ~~to~~ in such a way that a lot of people would hear, unless they stopped him before he (13). And so we have Isaiah utilizing that situation in order to get a hearing, and so the Lord gives him a message to give, because (13 1/2) the son of Remaliah takes saying let's 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 Tabael. Well, why did they want to put a king in there, even the son of Tabael. The theory that scholars make about this is ~~is~~ that Ahaz was taking a policy of general friendship toward the Assyrians, and that these people felt rightly that their only hope (14) was to resist the king. And they didn't want to fight Assyria and run the risk of making an attack from the back ~~is~~ and so (14) they thought they would clear out, and Ahaz out of the way, they would put up a ~~is~~ puppet king who would stand up for them. And it is exactly as the Germans in 1914. They were to make war with Russia, and it would take a few weeks before Russia could be mobilized, and in the meantime with France attacking in the back, it would be ruined, so they decided to take (14 1/2) France first. And they asked France, are ~~is~~ you going to promise to stay neutral while they attacked Russia, and France wouldn't make any such promise, and so they said we'll (14 1/2) you out first, and so they attacked France first. And that's what these kings were going to do. And so they were going to put in a puppet king, in Judah, and of course, King Joash 50 years before could have easily done that. He conquered Amaziah. He made a breach in the wall, and 50 years later, there you find not the king of Israel who did this 60 years before, as king of Israel. He doesn't find the king of Israel going to do this, but he finds a ~~is~~ coalition of -

34.

We find then that in verse 17, Isaiah speaks about Assyria. And you notice in 20, he calls Assyria, a razor that is hired. Do you have any idea what he would mean by that? Mr. Grauley? (Student). to get the king of Assyria ~~is~~ to come and deliver them from these two forces to the north, and of course, it was a very wise strategy, just exactly

like Roosevelt's strategy to get - to join in with Russia to attack Germany from both sides, in that way we could wreck Germany, and then there would be no buffer state between, and we are face to face with Russia, and that is exactly what Ahaz did. Ahaz was afraid of the lesser kings, and so he got the greater enemy beyond to join with him against them, and that brought him face to face with the enemy, and that's what Isaiah is doing now. That Isaiah says that there would come greater danger than there has ever been before, because the king of Assyria would be right next to him. And he calls Assyria a razor that is hired. In other words, you got him into this, now you've got to get him out. And that's the same prophecy he makes in chapter 8 here, where he says in verse 7, now therefore, behold, the Lord brings up upon them the waters of the river, strong and many, even the king of Assyria, and all his glory; and he shall come up over all his channels, and go over all his banks; and he shall pass through Judah; He won't stop. He'll keep going. That's why the Poles in 1939 refused to ask the Russians to help them against Italy, because they say that once the Russians got in they'd never get out. They were entirely wise. We've gotten into Ahaz how. You've got a very involved political situation with Ahaz and Hezekiah, and there's some very interesting points of chronological order of Hezekiah's events in the Bible, and I'll be interested to see what you make of it.

~~K=~~ NEXT CLASS.

Our time was cut down by not meeting yesterday and we're getting toward the end of the term. We've moved straight along during the term it seems to ~~be~~ me, but we have quite a bit of ground yet to cover and there are only 6 hours left. No, there are only five left. Today there are only four left. We have some of the most interesting portions of the Divided Kingdom that we haven't discussed in class yet at all. The - So I had better not take much time discussing with you the papers now. Why did Amaziah make war against Israel? A good answer to that is ~~pretty~~ perfectly clear in Chronicles though not in Kings, though I trust that everybody got it. Number two, the precise relationship of the man whom Joash martyred - I think the answer is quite clear on that. There is one chronological point which is not conclusive but it is interesting, which I've wondered if any of you mentioned. Then number three, arrange in a definite chronological order all the important events in Hezekiah's reign.

Arrange all the important events in the reign of Hezekiah and give the specific references and discussion of extra-Biblical material bearing on the reign of Hezekiah. With this in mind you would have a pretty good idea now of events in Hezekiah's reign, and it is very good to have those events in Hezekiah's reign in mind, before we look at Ahaz' reign, because the Lord when he talked with people in Ahaz' reign, certainly had Hezekiah's reign very much in mind.

The reign of Ahaz as you know is described ~~in~~ in Kings and in Chronicles. However, the description in these two places is not all that we have about Ahaz' reign. We have a chapter in each of these two books about it, but in addition to that, we have very valuable information about Ahaz' reign in Isaiah. In Isaiah 7. However, this information in Isaiah 7 and elsewhere would not be nearly so easy ~~to~~ for us to understand if we did not have the material in Kings and Chronicles. From the beginning of Isaiah 7:1 we are told that in the days of Ahaz Rezin the king of Assyria, and Pekah the son of Remaliah, king of Israel, came up against Jerusalem to war against it, but could not prevail against it. We are given more detail on this in Kings and Chronicles to tell us how there was a great attack, and a great victory by the king of Israel, but he was repulsed from the siege of Jerusalem, and then having been repulsed, it seemed quite definite that they would come again. There is no mention made in the Bible as to why they made this attack, but most scholars believe that the reason why, they made the attack was because they were intending to form a coalition to resist the Assyrians, and that they did not want any danger of being attacked from the rear, and so that their idea was to get - overcome Ahaz and to get a puppet king put in. We don't find anything about this puppet king, in Kings or Chronicles, but in Isaiah 7 - 7:6 it says that Syria and Ekphraim said let's 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 Tabeal. That they were going to put this man in ~~the~~ as the puppet king in Judah evidently because Ahaz refused to join with them in their coalition to resist the king of Assyria. That is purely conjecture. No one can say it is certain by any means, but it certainly seems to be a very good possibility in view of the historical situation. At any rate, it is certain from Isaiah that they were actually going to remove Ahaz and to (7 1/2)

put in a puppet king. We read in Isaiah 7:2 it was told the house of David saying, not just Ahaz. The whole question of the continuance of the Davidic dynasty is at stake here. God has promised that David will always have a son to sit upon the throne. God has told through the prophet who spoke ~~through~~ to Rehoboam, that there will be a son of David named Josiah who will destroy the places where they worshipped the golden calf. He has made those promises but now Israel and Syria together are determined to put an end to the Davidic dynasty. Israel is much larger than Judah; perhaps twice as much in power as Judah, and Syria is quite a bit stronger than Israel, and you get the two of them together. What chance does Judah have? So we learn from Kings and Chronicles that Ahaz decided that the only safe way to do in this situation was to look to the king of Assyria for aid. I'm not sure we can be certain the reason they were against him was because he didn't want to join against the king of Assyria. Maybe they had some other reason. Maybe there was some particular cause of it other than this. Whatever the cause was they didn't want to have the danger of an attack when they resisted Assyria. And they were determined to put an end to the house of David. I think that is quite important in connection with Isaiah 7, which deals with God's promise for the continuance of the house of David. That these men were trying to destroy the house of David, but then of course we have the situation complicated still further by the fact that the present representative is an unworthy man. We have Ahaz' who seems to have been a scoffer, who was not interested in the cause of the Lord. Who was interested only in political maneuvers, and we are told in Kings and Chronicles the wicked things that he has done in the land. We gain a pretty good picture of his character here in Isaiah. And now in this situation we do not find Isaiah going into the palace of King Ahaz, and giving him God's message as he would have done with Hezekiah. Hezekiah's palace was ~~always~~ always open to Isaiah. Isaiah was his trusted counselor. But with Ahaz, the only way that Isaiah could get to Ahaz was to go out side where he could grab Ahaz in a situation where it would be pretty hard for Ahaz not to pay attention. And this situation is out side of the city where Ahaz is getting the people to work industriously for preparation to resist another attack by Israel and Judah. He is trying to get the defenses of the city greatly strengthened, and

strengthened so that it will be easier to resist the attack of these people. And there he is out there trying to encourage the people to work hard and vigorously on the strengthening of the defenses and out there it was very difficult for him to simply shrug aside the thought and say we haven't got time to bother with now. He could at least get in a few words. So in that situation the Lord said to Isaiah, in Isaiah 7:3 go to meet Ahaz and Shearjashub thy son. His very name was a symbol of the fact that God's mercy was going to continue even though hard times would come first. And he says to meet him at the end of the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field. And after your study for today of the events in the reign of Ahaz' son, Hezekiah, would you have any suggestion Mr. Grauley, as to why God would have commanded Isaiah to go and meet him ~~at~~ at this particular place. Of course you might say that was where he was conducting the defense inspection but surely there were other places he was also conducting this inspection. Why would he pick this particular place? (Student). If he - he could have said, you go out where he is inspecting, but why does Isaiah give us the precise detail as to where he went and talked? Why did he give it in such detail here? Why is that important? The exact place, at the end of the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field. (Student). Turn over in the book of Isaiah many chapters and naturally it was many years later. We turn over to the time in the reign of Ahaz' son, when we read in chapter 36 that Sennacherib, king of Assyria came up against all the defended cities of Judah, and took them. And the king of Assyria sent Rabshakeh from Lachish to Jerusalem unto king Hezekiah with a great army. And he stood by the conduit of the upper ~~pool~~ pool ~~in~~ in the highway of the fuller's field. And it was there that he called on the people to surrender because it was absolutely nothing they could do. The Assyrians were so strong, and had so much power that they might just as well surrender. There's nothing left and not only does he talk to them, but he talks loud so that those on the wall could hear him. He calls on them to surrender and God caused that Isaiah should speak to Ahaz at the very spot where the result of Ahaz plan would be worked out. It isn't quite clear with a comparison of Chronicles Kings and of Isaiah that Ahaz had a clever plan. His clever plan not simply to arouse the people to defend Jerusalem to the very utmost, but the plan was to get them to

defend it long enough that they could hold out until help came from another quarter. And the third to which Ahaz was looking for help was not to the Lord but was to a human force very different from that which would be in any way parallel to the looking to the Lord for help. He was to look for the wicked, ~~a~~ eager, aggressive Assyrians as his helpers in this emergency.

K. 35.

Now this looking to the Assyrian aggressor for help of course has many parallels in modern times. ~~W~~ It is very common when a nation is in danger to look for any kind of help is better than none. I've heard people say - I would make the devil himself my ally if in that way I could succeed. I've heard that expressed. ~~We~~ don't care what the situation is. I've talked to a man down in Washington in the early part of the war, before the United States was in it, that he was working there on lend lease, and he said to me, the United States has promised lend lease to England and to France in their struggle against Germany. ~~S~~ Though the United States was not in the war, we were giving them the lend lease, and he said my purpose or function is to work out arrangements to get a great amount of lend lease for another country which we are not naming, because the government thinks that the bulk of the American people would not favor giving lend lease to that country, so we are not naming it, though we are giving more to it than to England and France. They were giving help and support to the force that would even more than Hitler, opposed to every thing that the West stands for, and of course it reduced ~~the~~ all the beautiful statements of Roosevelt's meeting with Churchill in the high seas to utter nonsense. One day Roosevelt and Churchill meet on the high seas and make the Atlantic charter. ~~We~~ are going to stand for freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, freedom from fear, freedom from want. ~~We~~ are going to stand for these things. A little later they make alliance with Russia which is the greatest enemy of all the United ~~S~~ates, in order to gain the victory over Hitler, and of course once they did that, the claim for any principal they were standing for was to lead to utter nonsense ~~because~~ the power of politics because they were claiming for principles they were allied to the greatest enemy in the world to those principles. Well, Ahaz wasn't

quite as much a hypocrite as these men were, because Ahaz didn't declare that he stood for anything. He however was (2 1/2) to protect his land by getting the help of Assyria. Well, Assyria was on the other side. Judah never had to fear from Assyria. Before Assyria would get near Judah there were buffer states. There was Israel, much bigger than Judah and there was Assyria, bigger than Israel. And they were in the way between Assyria and Judah, so Judah had a ~~very~~ fairly safe position as a buffer state. But when these buffer states turn against Judah, instead of looking to the Lord for protection, they look to the Assyrians and then with the help of the Assyrians - then the Assyrians destroyed the buffer states, and the result was going to be that Assyria will be right next to Judah. And that means there is no buffer state in the Assyrian attack, and that means that Judah itself was faced directly with it, and that's exactly what did happen as the result of Roosevelt's alliance with Godless communistic Russia. Instead of Russia having as the people next to them as a great German force that they were trying to propagandize against, they now have the Western powers against (3 1/2). The great and powerful Western power against them is the United States, and so instead of having a buffer state between we now are facing them directly. Well that's what Ahaz said - that's what Isaiah said to Ahaz. He says, you are getting temporary security at the cost of permanent later. You are getting help from the immediate danger by bringing them into this situation that will be a permanent injury. I think that we can safely ~~then~~ say that Ahaz had not told them what his plan was, that he had only revealed it to a few of his nobilities. A few of the leaders were with him in the plan, and they secretly sent to Tiglath-Pileser, sending him a great amount of tribute, as a bribe to ~~come and~~ ~~cover~~ ~~an~~ ~~attack~~ ~~of~~ Syria and Israel, which he probably would have done anyway, but he might not have done it right away. It would be too late to help them. But he sends this big bribe in order to get the help of Assyria against Israel, and the people don't know about this. The people are to fight and Syria violently to hold back Israel and to - and they don't know that Ahaz would think that if they would just hold them back for awhile we are perfectly safe, because Assyria will attack on the other side. So we find here that God gave Isaiah the message, he said, you go to this place

where Ahaz can't refuse to listen to you. At least for a little while, because if he did he would hurt the morale of the people. You will get a chance at least for a few words anyway. You go there and you say because Syria and Ephraim have said we are going to destroy Judah and put up a puppet king in there and that would be an attack on God's plan which had promised the continuance of the house of David, therefore verse 7, Thus saith 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 sixty-five years shall Ephraim be broken, that it be not a people. If you will not believe, surely you shall not be established. In other words, God says, 65 years from now, Ephraim will no longer be a nation. So don't worry about them, put your trust in the Lord and if you will not believe, you will not be established. And Ahaz said to himself, what a lot of junk. What do we care what happens to Israel 65 years from now. We are interested in what happens to us in the next three years. Is Israel going to conquer and destroy us in the next three years, and put an end to the house of David, and put a puppet king, the son of Tabeal in as king of Jerusalem. If they do that, well even if Ephraim does get wrecked in 65 years that's no help to us. And so he says, I've got to be polite to this enthusiast here, who claims to be a prophet of God. I've got to be polite to him. As long as he is in front of the people like this, but I want to get rid of him as quick as I can, and get on with my defende inspection. And so - anybody could see how from the looks of the king's face he wants to get through. Well, you let him talk. Now you've talked. Now get out of the way and now we'll go on. But Isaiah doesn't stop. Verse 10 the Lord gives him a new message right on the spot. The previous message the Lord may have spoken to Isaiah with a voice that anybody could hear who was in the room. We don't know. But this one, he spoke to his inner ear, because God gives him the message like this, and Isaiah proceeds to give it. The Lord spoke to Isaiah as saying, ask a sign of the Lord. Ask it in the depth, or in the height above. It is very plain that Isaiah wants to move on, and he wants to get on with the inspection. He wants to be polite though not to hurt the people, but get rid of Isaiah as soon as possible. Now Isaiah says, well, you are not putting trust in God. Well, let's investigate the matter. Ask a sign of the Lord. Ask anything, in the heights, in the depth. Let's take 3

or 4 days off like Ahab did, on Mount Carmel. Let's have a big conference. Let's prove the Lord means what he says. That he really is God. Well, Ahab says, if we lose 3 or 4 days out of our work now, we may not be able to resist the Israelites. So he says, how can I get rid of Ahaz nicely, and he comes out with this beautiful pious statement, I will not ask, neither will I tempt the Lord. A beautiful statement. Anybody is most deserving of commendation for making that statement when asked for a sign. I don't need a sign. I believe God without it. I'm not going to tempt the Lord. But in Ahaz' case, it is perfectly obvious from his face, from his attitude, and to what they know of him that it is utter hypocrisy. And so Isaiah instead of saying that's a beautiful spirit Ahaz. I'm glad you don't need a sign, as Jesus will say 700 years from now, you've seen and believe. Blessed are those who believe without seeing. You are ready to believe without seeing. That's a wonderful spirit. But instead of saying that, 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? Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign. Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and call his name Immanuel. These men are not going to bring an end to the house of David. They are not going to put an end to the dynasty. This dynasty is going to continue until the point where God sends his own son. His virgin born son. The miraculous child who is the greatest one of the house of David, it is going to continue. They can't stop it. The virgin will conceive, and bear the son, who will be called God with us, because he is going to be actually God in human form. But he says, if this son were to be born right now, nobody knows when he will be born, but if he were to be born right now, that he may know is purely a guess, it is simply to his knowing, which might be purpose but can just as well be time, when he knows. Butter and honey shall he eat when he knows to refuse the evil, and choose the good. He won't be eating regular food. That is eaten when the commercial ways are all open, to get regular food, he'll have plenty of food that comes from animals. Butter from cows, honey from bees, but he won't have much to get from agriculture, because before the child will be born now, he would reach the age when he is old enough to make simple choices, and reach for

the warm milk instead of the hot stove, before he knows enough to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings. It is not a promise of 65 years from now. It is a promise for ~~within~~ right within the next two or three years. If the child was to be born right now, before he reached that age to make simple choices, he - the two kings would be gone. Now of course the nation of Israel continued longer, but the king of Israel, Pekah was removed by Tiglath-Pileser, until within a couple of years, and of course Ahaz says, well, I know that. He says, people don't know it. How does Ahaz ever know it? Isaiah says we don't need to worry. Well, we don't. Tiglath-Pileser is going to rescue us. There is no question of that, of course. But he says, we've kept the thing a secret. How does Isaiah know about it? But Isaiah goes right on and says, the Lord will bring on thee, and thy father's house, days that have not come from the day that Ephraim departed from Judah; even the king of Assyria. And Moulton in his Modern Reader's bible says, it is very clear that Isaiah here in verse 17 turns his attention away from Ahaz and looks to the king of Israel, because he is now saying that the king of Israel is going to have a terrible time ahead, but I don't think there is any warrant in that. He is not talking here to the king of Israel. He is talking to Ahaz, and he is saying to Ahaz, you think that your act is going to get peace and security because you are going to get rid of the attack from Ephraim by the help of the Assyrians. He says, actually the result of it is, that the Lord will bring on you and your people and on the house of David a worse situation than you've had since that one which you had when the Northern Kingdom left the Southern Kingdom. That was a bad blow to the house of David, when Ephraim departed from Judah when they lost two-thirds of their land. But now there is a worse time coming for Judah, because the Lord will bring on you the king of Assyria. And the king of Assyria is not going to be content with Israel and Syria and eventually he will attack Judah also. And in verse ~~20~~²⁰, Isaiah makes very clear the way God is going to cause Ahaz' plan to back fire, in the same day shall the Lord shave with a razor that is hired. In other words, Ahaz is paying the tribute to get the king of Assyria to come. You've got a razor that is hired, but it is going to actually do damage to you. Mainly by them

beyond the river, by the king of Assyria. He actually mentions him and then he describes

(13) in the next few verses of the chapter the time when the abundance of milk he shall eat butter; for butter and honey shall every one eat that is left in the land. The de-coming of conditions where there will be ~~few~~ population. There aren't enough people to perform agriculture service, so as verse ~~22~~²³ says, in every place where there were a thousand vines, they'll now be only briars and thorns. You can't get to it because of the ~~in~~ briars and thorns, but the end of 25 says, they'll be lots of cattle in it. You have the ground for the cattle and the sheep and the oxen, but you don't have the men to raise crops. And so the end of the chapter makes it perfectly clear what is meant in verse 15 about the butter and honey. Some commentators say verse 15 shows the simple life of our Lord. He shall eat butter and honey. While from the context the succeeding verses makes it perfectly clear, that in that verse he is not talking about Christ at all, but he is talking about what is going to happen. And then of course Isaiah goes on in chapter 8 still looking forward to the back firing of the plan of Ahaz, but also pictures the immediate success. He says in chapter 8, a few months after this, the Lord tells him to take a great ~~roll~~ roll, and write in it with a man's pen about Isaiah's son, hasten the booty, hurry the spoil, because verse 4 says, before the child shall have knowledge to cry,

K. 36.

- cry of course in the modern English has a different meaning than in the old English. I think it would be much better if we would say call. To call, my father and my mother, before he is able to talk. A sooner period than in the previous chapter. Before that time the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be taken away before the king of Assyria. But it goes right on and says, that the king of Assyria is going to actually come into Judah. Now therefore, behold, the Lord brings up upon them the waters of the river, strong and many, even the king of Assyria, he shall come up and go over his *channels*, and over his banks, and pass through Judah. Not just Israel, but Judah is involved, and so he goes on in the succeeding chapter showing the coming of the Assyrians right into Judah, but even that isn't going to destroy the house of David, because God in His own

time will send His own one, who is described in verse 6, of chapter 9, unto us a ~~new~~ child is born; unto us a son is given; He is the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, and His preaching is described in chapter 9:2, where the people that walked in darkness, in the land where the Assyrians first attacked, will see a great light, when Jesus begins to preach there, as is fulfilled in Matthew. Now if we had time to take an hour or two on chapter 10, it is the first great statement of God's control of the nations. It has a tremendous statement of how God uses the Assyrians for His own purposes, but then when He gets through with the Assyrians, He destroys them, and so He shows - suppose at the end of chapter 10, suppose the Assyrians were to come and attack Jerusalem from the north. He isn't but suppose he was. Let's think what would happen. Well, verse 27 says, that he wouldn't succeed. His burden shall be taken from your shoulder, and his yoke from off your neck. But now let's just imagine him coming, verse 28, He is come to Aiath, he is passed to Migron. At Michmash he hath laid up his carriages. In these towns a few miles north of Jerusalem. They are gone over the passage. They have taken up their lodging at Geba. Ramah is afraid. Gibeah of Saul is fled. Lift up thy voice, O daughter of Gallim. Cause it to be heard unto Laish, O poor Anathoth. Did anybody here, hear of Anathoth before? Who lived at Anathoth? Jeremiah. A hundred years later. O poor Anathoth. Madmenah is removed. The inhabitants of Gebim gather themselves to flee. He comes right toward Jerusalem. Down in that hill country, from the north. He shakes his hand against the mount of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerusalem. Now actually the king of Babylon came by that route, a hundred years later. The king of Assyria never came by that route. It is not a prediction of how the king of Assyria will come, but it is a prediction that he will come, and suppose he came the most natural route, he'd get right up to Jerusalem, right up to this point, and what would happen? Verse ~~29~~ 33, the Lord, the Lord of hosts, shall lpp the bough with terror. And the high ones of stature shall be hewn down, and he shall cut down the thickets of the forest with iron, and Lebanon shall fall by a mighty one. The Assyrian king shall be destroyed. The Assyrian empire will be wrecked. The great force of Lebanon which rrepresented Assyria will fall with a mighty crash, but it goes right on in chapter 11, (3 $\frac{1}{2}$)

the stem

the stem of Jesse, there is going to be a rod that comes out of that. Jesse, the house of David is cut down so that it looks as if it's disappeared, but out of his root shall grow up a branch, the one who is the prince of peace, who is described in chapter 9. Well of course to look through these chapters in a full way would take hours, but we are looking now at the historical background to see how it fits in. Mr. Haffly? (Student).

Now I want us to turn over for a second to chapter 28. And over in chapters 24 through 27, you have the Isaiah apocalypse, a section by itself, in which Isaiah gets ~~us~~ a glimpse clear off into the distant future, and chapter 28 from any view point starts a new situation. Now here is the new situation in 28. We are not told when it was given, where it was given, how it was given, but as we read the chapter we can see what the situation is, and it is very interesting as we get into the chapter here, to find that this fits exactly in the very time that chapter 7 is. Here is - here it is the time of Ahaz and Isaiah is giving his prediction at this very time of which he spoke in Isaiah 7. But he is giving it to a different group of people. As we go through the chapter we find it quite evident that ~~God~~ Isaiah in this chapter is coming to a banquet held by the nobles of Israel, of Judah that is. And these nobles of Judah who are in on Ahaz' plan which will deliver the land and give them safety from Israel and Syria, and get rid of Israel and Syria by bringing in the Assyrians, they are having a big banquet to celebrate it, but not telling the common people why the banquet is being held, so the people at large don't know. All they know is that in this time of difficulty and trouble the nobles are having a great banquet, and they rather don't like it, but they don't understand why, - after all, they've got lots of money. Let them have a banquet, we'll - maybe tomorrow they'll be in a mood to work hard on the defence preparations. But here comes the banquet, and into the banquet hall walks ~~Isaiah~~ Isaiah. And the nobles, they want to be happy and have everybody rejoicing and all that, they don't want to cause any disruption or anything, but now if this sour old prophet, and this sour fellow who is always talking fanatically about the Lord, how they should be looking to the Lord for their conclusions and ~~on~~ everything. If he is going to come in and

cast a gloom on the occasion, well, let's tell the bouncers to get rid of him, so immediately they say to the bouncers, I think you'd better knock this fellow out of here, but wait ~~n~~ just a minute, we don't want to cause any disruption. Perhaps he'll be decent and won't cause any trouble. So Isaiah starts to talk, and Isaiah says, woe to the crown of pride, to the drunkards of Ephraim. And these nobles of Judah say, well that's pretty good so far. After all, he's a sort of a fanatic but he's a pretty good speaker and has got pretty good literary power, and he speaks very nicely, and if he is going to attack the northern kingdom, attack Ephraim, why that will strengthen the people in their determination to fight and to hold them off for the time being until the Assyrians come and gives us the deliverance that we know is coming, but that people don't know about it, and so let him say a few words, and if he gets off on some ~~g~~ crazy fanatical business, then we can have the bouncers throw him out, but let's let him talk a few minutes. So Isaiah talks in a way not to arouse their enmity but to win their approval. He 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. And of course, some of the people say, this is a bit ironical. Isaiah criticizing the people of the northern kingdom for getting overcome with wine. Look at some of these nobles here at the table who are already drunk. They look as if some of this fits them, too. Their minds are a little befuddled and they don't realize that he is in sort of a pious way knocking them when he slams the drunkenness of the Israelites, and they are not noticing it though, and we won't say anything about it, but we'd like to hear what the fellow says, and we'd just as soon the bouncers not get on the job yet.

So he says, the Lord has a 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 ~~and~~ the drunkards of Ephraim, shall be trodden under feet. But why do you call them the drunkards. Ordinarily you have other terms to use, you don't call them the drunkards. Some of the people on the side lines say, ah, Isaiah, he's a clever one. Look at the way he's quietly pointing out the drunkenness of these people, but they don't

catch on to it. They are strongly against the drunkards of Ephraim. Anyway the nobles think this is pretty good. We'll let him talk a little longer. So he says, the crown of pride, the drunkards of Ephraim, shall be trodden under feet, and the glorious beauty, which is on the head of the fat valley, shall be a fading flower, and as the hasty fruit before the summer, which when he that looks upon it sees. When it is in his hand he eats it up. The nobles think, well, that's what is going to happen when the king of Assyria comes, but anyway, it is encouraging the people. What we are rejoicing in is that, if the people are encouraged, and the secret isn't given away though, that's all right. This fellow isn't so bad. Let him talk a little longer. But then he says, In that day shall the Lord of hosts be for a crown of glory, and for a diadem of beauty, unto the residue of his people, and for a spirit of judgment to him that sits in judgment, and for strength to them that turn the battle to the gate. Well, he's getting unto religion now, but maybe a little religion won't hurt them. But then in verse 7, the translation is rather unfortunate, but they also. Who is the they also? The Hebrew I believe, is it *לְהַיְיָ*, which is the plural of *לְהַיְיָ* this one. These, the ones I am looking at. But these also, these nobles here, they've erred through wine and strong drink are out of the way. The priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink. They are swallowed up in wine. They are out of the way through strong drink. They err in vision. They stumble in judgment. Look at all these tables full of vomit and filthiness, so that there is no place clean. And the people who sat on the side line caught onto what he was driving at already, they say, that's getting pretty pointed. They'll probably throw him out soon. I don't know whether that was wise. But after all, he's really gotten going well now, and they didn't stop him. It would be pretty hard to interrupt him now. But verse ~~8~~ 9. The nobles are pretty disgusted now. They don't call the bouncer now. They've sort of settled back but they begin to murmur among themselves. They say, who is he going to teach knowledge? And who is he going to make understand doctrine? Does he think we are those who are weaned from the milk, and drawn from the breasts. That he gives us precept on precept, precept on precept, line upon line, here a little, there a little. Is that the way he thinks he is going to teach us, as if we were

little children, coming in here with his temperance talk, when we are having our big festivities, but Isaiah answers, verse 11, no, but with stammering lips and another tongue will he speak to this people. God is going to speak to them in different ways. The stammering and another tongue. What does that mean? Well, eventually when they think about it, they realize that what it means, is that the Assyrian army isn't going to just stop with its attack upon Israel, ~~an~~ but that they are going to come down here, and we'll hear what will sound just like stuttering, a lot of gibberish they can't understand, with another language, and it is like the man told me in Holland. He said, they didn't like to hear Germans, because he said, during the war, he said, if anybody would turn on the light in an evening, in the city of Holland, they'd hear somebody yell. Lights out. Lights out. And of course the German is enough like dutch, that they could understand what they meant, but it sounded like stammering to them, and they hated it intensively. The German troops marching in there and yelling their commands in German and all that. Well, that's what he says is going to come here. With stammering lips and another tongue will he speak to this people. This people to whom he said, This is the rest whereas ye may cause the weary to rest; and this is the refreshing; yet they would not hear. They've had their chance. They've turned over it now. God is going to speak to them forcibly with the coming of the Assyrian army. The word of the Lord was unto them precept upon precept; precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little; but they wouldn't listen. Though they may go, and fall backward, and be broken, and snared, and taken. Wherefore hear the word of the Lord, ye scornful men, that rule this people which is in Jerusalem. By this time Isaiah had gotten, gone so long, he couldn't call the bouncer without causing a major disturbance. If he had started this way he would have been thrown out immediately. Because you have said, we've made a covenant with death, and with hell are we at agreement. Who is the covenant with death? What does he mean, with hell are we at agreement? The wicked Assyrians, they've made a covenant with him, all the Assyrians.

did, the destruction, the calamity, the chaos, the confusion, yes, but we are going to fight fire with fire. We are going to make our alliance with Russia. We are not afraid of these Bolsheviks because after all they are against Germany. We are too, so we can stand together and we will benefit by it, so we've made a covenant with death, and with hell we are in agreement. Then when the overflowing scourge comes, and passes through, it won't come near us. We've made lies our refuge, and under falsehood have we hid ourselves. Now of course they don't say it. But these are what were in their minds when Isaiah tells it out, just what the situation really is. But what's the answer. Therefore thus saith the Lord, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation; he that believeth shall not make haste. If he puts his trust in God and in the foundation stone God provides, he doesn't need to be in a rush, but judgment I will lay to the line, the Lord says, righteousness to the plummet. The hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies, and the waters shall overflow the hiding place, and your covenant with death shall be ~~disannulled~~ covered. Its a word that many people say mean covered. It doesn't at all. It is disannulled. It is only translated that way this one time, but in my opinion the word means washed, it refers to the water overflowing . (14) Your covenant with death will be washed out. As they say, it is covering sin, but I don't think it -

lym K. 37.

But anyway the meaning of it is perfectly clear, the translation disannulled gives the idea. Your agreement with hell will not stand. Now the Assyrians won't destroy the people of Israel, and Syria, and make you his friend. Maybe for a little while, but in the end, you will be trodden down. Verse 27, 20 says, because the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it; and the covering is narrower than that he can wrap himself in it. Your clever scheme is not sufficient to accomplish its purpose, and exactly the same thing might have been said 18 years ago, when we thought we would use the Communists for our own advantage, and - by means of them we would destroy Hitler. Well, it resulted in the doing away with the power in between, leaving us face to face with the greatest menace that the world has ever seen. (1)

And the Lord says here that He has determined what He is going to do, and then very interesting section, verses 23 to 29, where he compares himself to an agricultural worker, shows that an agricultural worker deals gently with some things, verse 27, the fitches are not threshed with a threshing instrument, neither is a cart wheel turned about upon the cummin. You use gentle things for certain kinds of grain. You have your special ways of doing this. God is going to use His forceful measures against Judah, but with Judah He is going to deal in accordance with His own plans, so that exactly what is His purpose will be accomplished. As He will work His purpose so that the house of David will continue, His work will be done, and yet that His chastisement will also be given. And so ~~verse~~ ^{chapter} 29 starts right in ~~showe~~ showing what is going to happen as a result of Ahaz' (2). Woe to Ariel, the city where David dwelt! What city is that? David lived in Jerusalem. Of course he lived in other cities, too, but - add ye year to year; let them kill sacrifices. In Jerusalem was the place where sacrifices were killed. Yet I will distress Ariel, and there shall be heaviness and sorrow. I will camp against thee round about, and will lay siege against thee with a mount. I will raise forts against thee. Thou shalt be brought down, and shall speak out of the ground, and 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. What a picture of the people under Hezekiah's reign, as there the Assyrian army has taken all the great fenced cities, and having taken all the other great fenced cities in Judah, they are left there with Jerusalem in this terrible danger, expecting at any minute that they are going to be taken. Rabshekah came right up there to the very edge to tell the people that they'd better surrender. There is no hope for them whatever, and he certainly was speaking out of the ground, with a voice as low as the dust. ≠ Unfortunately in verse 5, the waw is translated moreover. The waw could be moreover, but it is much better translated as however, because it shows the transition there, and you can't possibly make sense out of verse 4 and 5 with a moreover. Not moreover, it is however. It is the transition in verses 1 to 4, the result of Ahaz' plan has been accomplished, and Israel is under siege, and it looks as if it is going to be destroyed. However, verse 5, God is going to give them rest, so that the multitude of these

strangers who seem like they are about to destroy Jerusalem, will become like small dust. And the multitude of the terrible ones around would be like chaff. It will be at an instance. God will in the night kill thousands of Sennacherib's troops. He'll be left unable to attack Jerusalem. He'll have to go back to (4). He says, yes, it will be at an instant suddenly. In one night, thou shalt be visited of the Lord of hosts with thunder, and with earthquake, and great noise, with storm and tempest, and the flame of devouring ~~fire~~ 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 as a dream of a night vision. It shall even be as when an hungry man dreams, and behold, he eats, but he awakes, and his soul is empty. Sennacherib dreams, tomorrow we will attack Jerusalem, and destroy it. He dreams and he dreams. But he awakes, and behold, he is faint, and his soul has appetite. And then he woke in the morning, as the Bible tells us, all these thousands were dead because of the attack of the angel of the Lord, probably by means of a plague or of that sort. So shall the multitude of all the nations be, that fight against mount Zion. And so here he predicts the result of Ahaz' clever plan, which is actually going to be misery for the land, and he predicts that, and yet he says, even this wickedness, this error on the part of the very degenerate ~~scion~~ scion of the house of David, hasn't brought the house of David to an end, because God has promised it will continue. God will give deliverance. God will deliver Jerusalem suddenly, and in chapters 30 and - 30 and 31, a large part of these two chapters is devoted to the deliverance from Sennacherib at the time of King Hezekiah, and ~~in~~ chapter 31, verse 5, he says, As birds flying, so will the Lord of hosts defend Jerusalem. It doesn't mean that He is going to send airplanes, but it means that He is going to provide a deliverance so high up nobody could get at them. It is God acting in a way that man could not possibly ever accomplish. And in 30:31 it says, Through the voice of the Lord shall the Assyrian be beaten down. It is God who does it. It is His action. And in 31: 8, Then shall the Assyrian fall with the sword, not of a mighty man; and the sword, not of a mean man. It is not a great man or a weak man. It is no man at all. It is God's power that will conquer the Assyrians, and he'll have to flee because His princes shall be afraid of the

~~and then~~ ensign, saith the Lord, whose fire is in Zion, and his furnace in Jerusalem.

I asked you to list the - what you found in the Ancient Near East, related to the time of Hezekiah. I wonder how many of you listed what it shows in there - it's a picture ~~of~~ about the conquest of the Assyrian king of Lachish, and how did that fit in to the ~~city~~ ^{story} of Hezekiah?

~~Maybe you~~ You will find it in there, and since our hour is at ~~the~~ an end, maybe you will have it in mind for our next meeting.

K. 37.

The last time we were together we made a study of King Ahaz, and we saw the plan of the king of Israel and the king of Syria to displace him. And the fear that it caused in the land of Judah, the determination to resist them, and the clever plan - Ahaz thought it was, of getting the king of Assyria to come in and to overcome the kings of Israel and of Syria who were attacking him, and thus to give him safety from them. And we noticed how Isaiah spoke about this in Isaiah 7, and also in Isaiah 28. In both of these cases, Isaiah 7 was the promise that Syria was not going to be an enemy that could cause difficulty to them. That neither Syria nor Israel would continue so to be, particularly with the emphasis on Israel. We noticed that in Isaiah 28, the first few verses were on the drunkards of Ephraim, and how the crown of pride - the drunkards of Ephraim shall be trodden under foot. The Lord is going to bring an end to Ephraim as a force against Judah. The history in the books of Kings and Chronicles particularly Kings here, shows us clearly how the house of Israel did come to an end as a force against them. Before this time of Ahaz we have had the end of the great dynasty of ~~Ephraim~~ Jehu. We haven't ~~see~~ spent much time on the dynasty of Jehu in this class. We noticed how it began. We noticed God's promise that it would continue through four generations, We noticed that it is not as strong a dynasty as the dynasty of Omri, though a longer lasting one. We saw who its most powerful king was and what he did and how he did it as had been prophesied by the ~~an~~ hand of Jonah, and it is often taken that this means that Jonah was then prophesying in the reign of Jeroboam II, but certainly one is not bound to that. For if one knows that Jonah did not prophesy after the reign of Jeroboam II, but whether he prophesied before the reign of Jeroboam

or whether it was during that reign, we are just not told, but he prophesied about the fact that Jeroboam wouldn't be able to reestablish the wide boundary of the (11). And Jeroboam established wider boundaries than Israel had before. So the name of Jonah connects up with the time of Jeroboam II. Hosea of course is like (11) of his reign. * Hoshea if I recall correctly is dated specifically to the date of Jeroboam II, where he says in Hosea 1:1, he prophesied in the days of Jeroboam, the son of Joash, king of Israel, and he predicted in Hosea 1:4, that God would avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu, and will cause to cease the kingdom of the house of Israel. This was a prophecy similar to Isaiah, of perhaps the same time or a little bit earlier that the house of Israel was going to come to an end. Then we have one other prophet who was going to reign with Jeroboam II and that of course is the third of the so called Minor Prophets. The first of them is definitely dated, the third is definitely dated. The second we are given no date for, and so there has been much of opinion as to when the book of Joel was written. Some would put it quite early and some would put it quite late. We have no definite calendar to tell us exactly when it was, but the fact that it occurs early in the Minor Prophets which seem to show that the comparison of the Minor Prophets, some where in the area of the time of writing of Hosea and Amos, it is in between there, and since the first half of the Minor Prophets have an earlier date than the last half. Now Amos particular says that he prophesied in the days of Jeroboam the son of Joash king of Israel, two years before the earth quake. Now the earth quake doesn't help us any. The reign of Uzziah king of Judah and Jeroboam the son of Joash the king of Israel specifically dates Amos. Now Amos though has very little of specifically political predictions. Amos renders forth the ecclesiastical situation, and he finds himself finding great disagreement with the leading ecclesiastics, particularly with Jeroboam II, but you don't have much of a political type in his prediction. Jonah we've already noticed about his date with the reign of Jeroboam II. He goes before. And Micah is a contemporary of Isaiah.

Some people speak of Micah as Isaiah's younger contemporary, I don't know what they

base that on. The introduction that he gives is exactly the same as the introduction given by Isaiah -

K. 38.

- The introduction is exactly the same as to the introduction of Isaiah, and the matters that Micah deals with are largely matters that the first part of Isaiah deals with. And then in addition to that, there is that great discussion about the fact that Micah 4:1-5 is very close to Isaiah 2:1-5, and there being that great similarity between these two passages, most people think that one took it from the other. I don't think we need to worry about that. If God revealed it and the prophet says that he gave it, when another prophet gave it, why that certainly would be unworthy of a true prophet, but if God revealed it to both of them as a picture, as an idea, and then one of them used the language that the other one had used, that would be merely taking over a language, not taking over an idea, and it doesn't seem to me that it would be at all contrary to our idea of prophecy, of a prophet being the direct spokesman for God, if the language in which the treatment he had, was described, was almost identical to that which another prophet had used, for a very similar vision. It impresses me as extremely likely, if one of them took it from the other, that Isaiah took it from Micah rather than that Micah took it from Isaiah. The reason for that is that Micah 4:1 fits so exactly with Micah 3:12, that it is just a part of a long continuous passage, in Micah, and it seems to me much more likely that out of a long continuous passage, they certainly - a certain section was removed, to describe the vision that Isaiah also had, then that a part of the isolated vision that Isaiah had, would fit into a contrast to describe the longer vision that Micah had. To my mind the evidence is much more strong for Isaiah's taking the language from Micah, ~~and~~ than for Micah taking the language from Isaiah. And there is another little point that fits in with that interpretation. If you look at the book of Isaiah, at the beginning of the book, you will find that Isaiah 1:1 like Hosea 1:1 and Amos 1:1 and Micah 1:1 is a verse which introduces a whole book. The vision of Isaiah, the son of Amos, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem, in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah, kings of Judah. A natural introduction ~~from~~ for the book, and we have

a similar introduction at the beginning of Hosea, at the beginning of Amos, and at the beginning of Micah, and some other books. But then when you turn over to chapter 2, you find another introduction. The word which Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem. Did Isaiah introduce his book, and a chapter later, give another introduction to it. He does not in every chapter say that this was a message that Isaiah had. We don't find headings like this much, but we do find it at the beginning of the first chapter and at the beginning of the second. And to my mind, the correct explanation of that is that Isaiah 1:1 is an introduction to the book, and that Isaiah 2:1 is an introduction simply to verses 1-5, and that verses 1-5 here are the vision that Micah described in Micah 4 and 5, and that Isaiah is introducing them with the statement, here is the vision that Isaiah saw ~~about~~ about Jerusalem. In other words, you find these words in Micah, and Micah had this vision and he described it, ~~and~~ but Isaiah also had the same vision. He is not just copying (4 1/2) Micah, but he is ~~not~~ using Micah's words to describe the vision, and so he introduces it with the words, the vision that Isaiah, the son of Amoz saw. And that would be much more natural for Isaiah to put down, using Micah's word to describe a vision that he had, which was the same vision that Micah had. After Micah has already given it, then it would be for him to put out something before Micah. There wouldn't be much use to that. So that while I do not wish to be dogmatic on it and say it is one's duty to accept the conclusions ~~on~~ as Isaiah took this from Micah, but it was the other way around. I would say that it appears to me rather definitely that if that is continued then Micah would not be as far as we know, Isaiah's younger contemporary. I would think it more likely that Micah if anything would be Isaiah's older contemporary. That Micah as far as this particular section is concerned wrote first, and this is along in Micah 4 of the 7 chapters, it would impress me that probably all of Micah was written before very much of Isaiah was written, and the two of them are very different from any other books that we use of the Old Testament, in having a larger vocabulary. The general style of the two is very similar, although there are definite differences in the book, but Micah is more like Isaiah than any other book of the Old Testament. Now that could simply mean that the style of that period - uses rather flowery language. That could

account for the similarities. But the two are similar but Micah is of Isaiah is slightly later in the beginning of Isaiah and Micah. And why anybody should call Micah Isaiah's younger contemporary when we've got a whole last half of Isaiah, which still would have ended later than Micah, and which Micah has no parallel to. I just don't know of any. I would think that they are either about the same age, or Micah was older, or if Micah was younger, he still wrote first. And that he didn't write much after Isaiah began to write. But Isaiah and Micah of course are later than Hosea and Amos, and definitely later than Jonah. Because Jonah is before ~~Rehoboam~~ Jeroboam II, and Micah is after Jeroboam II, I would think. At least he is either after or at the time, the latter part of his reign maybe (7). Then we've noticed Isaiah's predicting the down fall of the northern kingdom in these promises to Ahaz, in chapter 7, and the promises to Ahaz's nobles in chapter 28. N

in Chronicles

Now the down fall of the Northern Kingdom is not given to any extent ~~at all~~ part. Chronicles of course, only deals with the Southern Kingdom, and very little of the Northern Kingdom, but it is given in a fair amount of detail in the book of Kings, but - a fair amount is given. Not a great deal. We have this long dynasty of Jehu which comes up to Jeroboam II and then Jeroboam II dies, and he is succeeded by his son who doesn't last very long. Where do we find that now? Chapter 14 yes. Yes, Jeroboam dies and Zechariah his son reigns in his stead, at the end of Jeroboam's reign. Then in chapter 15, we have in verse 8, Zechariah the son of Jeroboam who reigned over Israel six months, and Shallum the son of Jabesh conspired against him, and smote him and slew him, and reigned in his stead. And verse 13, Shallum reigned a full month. Because Menahem the son of Gadi went up from Tirzah, and came to Samaria, and smote him and slew him, and reigned in his stead. And then verse 16, Mehaahem smote Tiphshah, and all that were therein, and the coasts thereof from Tirzah, and then he reigned ten years in Samaria. And Menahem reigned these ten years, and then in verse 22, Menahem slept with his fathers after a ten year reign, and Pekahiah his son reigned in his stead, and Pekahiah reigned two years, and Pekah the son of Remaliah, a captain of his, conspired against him, and smote him in Samaria. And Pekah we read in verse 27 reigned 20 years. And that is one of our

biggest problems in Chronology, is the fact that Pekah is said to have reigned 20 years. And when you try to fit it into the Assyrian chronology which places the fall of Samaria in \approx 721, you find yourself in a situation where most scholars agree that Pekah reigned 8 years instead of 20. As long ago as the Davis Bible Dictionary, Dr. Davis said that Pekah must have reigned in Trans-Jordan for 12 years. And that these 12 years that he reigned in ~~12m~~ ~~Transjordan~~ Transjordan were counted when it says he reigned 20 years. A more recent suggestion that has been made has been that Pekah claimed to be king after the death of Zechariah, ~~son~~ ~~of~~ or of Shallum. And Pekah counted the years of Menahem and his son as part of his own reign, just as we have Charles II of England, claiming to be king from the death of his father, and count that [?] as part of his reign, even though actually he was an aggressive man. Well, this is a bit involved. We don't have a lot of information on it, and then when Thiele deals with it in his Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings, he points out that there are four verses which contain four synchronisms, which don't fit, and - but these fit together, and Thiele believed that these represent the erroneous idea of the later scribes, who considered that - knowing that Pekah reigned 20 years, and not realizing that for \approx 12 years of his reign, he only claimed to rule, and only counted it as ruling, and ~~actual~~ wasn't actually - that a later scribe took the events of his reign and made them run 20 years after Pekah's death, and this of course, throws everything off 12 years. And so he thinks - it actually rests only on 2 passages, \approx in all there are only 3 or 4 verses involved, but Thiele I understand thinks that these must be part of the original book of Kings, and therefore the Bible cannot be inerrant, and therefore he left the Evangelical Theological Society ~~last~~ last year because it requires all of its members to say that they believe the Bible is inerrant in the original manuscripts, and he thinks this was part of the original, this error. I don't see why he should come up to that decision. I'm not sure he is right in saying that this is the explanation, but if it is, could not these 3 or 4 verses represent a later insertion. I don't think there are lengthy insertions in the Bible, but 3 or 4 verses dealing simply with - chronology, it seems to me it could have been inserted by a later writer, without destroying our belief in the (

inerrancy of the Bible. Mr. Vannoy. (Student). No, the thing is that (13 1/2) when something happened. according to Thiele, these two passages, one of them is one verse, and one of them about two verses, these two passages give inferences, which take it as if he had reigned 20 full years, after Pekahiah, and runs his reign too late. And that way confuses. Well, if you take the kingdom of Judah and Israel, and most of the chronology fits in like these. ~~You~~ Of course these two passages (14) like this, and make (14). He has a whole chapter on it. He calls it the Twelve-Thirteen Passage, and he first tries to show - to take all these and mix them all in, what a jumble you've got, and so it is a terrible thing (14) he takes these four, the two contradict each other, and make them fit with the definite system, but the definite system may be one man's misunderstanding of it. But if that man who had the misunderstanding was the original writer, you see what it does with our idea of inspiration. And so he accepts this conclusions on it, and I understand there is a man who teaches Old Testament now up in Biblical [Seminary] come out very strongly on this ground, on account of Pekah's reign we can no longer hold to the Biblical inspiration of Scripture. Well, there is so much there that is involved. Thiele thinks that he straightened it out very nicely, but he has straightened it out to the point where he has one definite conception. One definite mistake and takes four verses. And so he says, there is an error in the original. Therefore the original can't be correct. but (15). -

K. 39.

With this situation. It requires . Not a tremendous but a couple but this I think we can definitely say, I do not think that the position of (1/2) to make it necessary to say that if Thiele's interpretation is correct, the original autographs ~~anamen~~ aren't inerrant. I don't think that is necessary. That for two brief ~~per~~ passages, one of them one verse, one of them three verses, all of them simply matters of chronological data, to have inserted by a later interpreter, who thought he was putting some little chronological notes in the margin, and based upon a misunderstanding which is apprent in understanding. That is, that would not be to my mind usable as a proof that the original

autographs weren't inerrant. Now of course if any body holds that the Bible as we have it today is absolutely identical with (1 1/2), he's got a tough problem. I'm not saying that Thiele's interpretation is necessarily correct. It may be that with two or three weeks of study just on this point, I would come to the conclusion that his explanation is so good and I can't say there is any other, that I must feel that ~~he~~ his is the right one, but I'm not sure ~~when~~ one will come to that conclusion. I feel that it is altogether possible there is some explanation for it, but whether there is or not, if it is correct, it - to my viewpoint does not ~~not~~ contribute a serious problem for the inerrancy of the original language. Now if a person thinks that the present Hebrew Bible represents the original autographs, exactly, and there is no possibility of the ~~book~~ ^{verse} anywhere having been ~~inserted~~ inserted, why, to him, it is a very serious problem. But I don't think that's the position of (2 1/2). To me, that would be a very difficult position to make, because there a few, there are not many, but there are just a few, where it appears so very (2 1/2) that an error has come in. Like Ben-Hadad, and Ben-Hazor. I ^{A minor error ?} would feel that there is no ~~reason to that~~ think (2 1/2) that Ben- is correct. Nebuchadnezzar and Nebuchadrezzar I don't think it is a problem. I think it is a matter of two pronunciations. The writing was a different type of writing, and in one case you transliterate the way they write it in Babylonia. In the other case you write it the way you hear it. Benhadad, certainly nobody called Benhadad (3) the e and the r sound enough different that people would say (3 1/4). But when it came to copying a foreign name, which meant nothing to the people of the time, it was very very easy to make a mistake, the d and the r look almost alike, in the way they wrote it, and we have Ben-hadad, and Ben-hazor enough times, it is not just one or two cases, there are enough cases to show that the error did occur. And it is an understandable error, but it is an error of copying. It is not an error in the original. And we have a few cases like that which seems to me makes it quite clear that while the transmission has been very very excellent, it is not been absolutely perfect, and I take it from that that it is not the Lord's will, to be absolutely definite. I've heard the analogy given, which I think has its weaknesses but I

- has an advantage ~~of~~ up to a certain point, that the dependability of the Bible is like a bridge, a solid bridge, which you know is there, you can't see it, because there is a flood, and this solid concrete bridge, which was thought absolutely (4 1/2) but you can't see the floor,, but you know the solid floor is there, and everywhere you step it (5), but there is this tiny bit of error that it did leave a little bit of uncertainty, and my own personal feeling is that the Lord has intentionally done it, as a warning to us, not to take a verse, and build a great doctrine upon a verse, but compare scripture with scripture. Human language, human words, perhaps we can go into terrible error when we take just one verse and try to build on it, and He wants us to realize that the originals were in errant, but that what we have today, is so near to it that we can trust it, but yet is just far enough from it that we want to compare scripture with scripture, and not to take one isolated verse and build a system on it. That's my own conclusion which I think is a valid one. But in this case of Pekah, Thiele reaches this conclusion and others have taken it as an argument or a starting point for (6) serious unbelief and it comes into prominence in the last year or two. I wouldn't be surprised if it were to come into far greater prominence in the next ten year. So it is good to know about it and if our class, our course ran longer, we would want to take more time in it. It might be good for your own stability sometime in the - not this semester, to take Thiele's book, take these chapters, study it very carefully, study the Assyrian records, and work in here a bit, and see if you can develop further understanding. ~~But~~

But now we in this course are speaking primarily from the view point of history and we noticed the end of this northern kingdom, with the long dynasty coming to an end. Shallum's ^{brief reign.} ~~reign~~ Menahem's ten years, and then his son two years, and then Pekah kills him. Now one objection to the theory of Davis that Pekah ruled for 12 years in Transjordan, (70) and to the - also I think to Thiele's interpretation that he dated himself right in the reign of Shallum or Zechariah. That he should have been reigning instead of Menahem, is that it says in II Kings 15, here, that, verse 25, Pekah, the son of Remaliah, a captain of his, conspired against him and smote him in Samaria. Now that doesn't ~~it~~ sound to me as if Pekah claimed to be -as if Pekah

claimed to have been the king before. I just call your attention to it. Pekah was evidently a man of real force, and Pekah united himself with the king of Syria against the king of Judah, although this isn't mentioned here in King's at all. It isn't mentioned here about Israel. It is mentioned about Judah in the next chapter, and Pekah was evidently a strong ~~and~~ ruler, but he ~~meant~~ met a far stronger force, because we read in verse 29, in the days of Pekah king of Israel, Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria, and took Ijon, and Abelbethmaachah, and Janoah, and Kadesh, and Hazor, and Gilead, and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali, and carried them captive to Assyria. And so the greater part of the land of Israel has been made captive to Assyria, but Pekah still reigns, king of Assyria, actually did not kill him, and then verse ~~29~~ 30 says, Hosh~~aa~~ the son of Elah made a conspiracy against Pekah the son of Remaliah and smote him, and slew him, and reigned in his stead, in the ~~se~~ twentieth year of Jotham the son of Uzziah. And over in Isaiah, he tells him that - Isaiah said to Ahaz, before the child is able to choose the good and turn down the evil, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings. So it was dated right exactly there, that this was given, this prophecy to Ahaz, we noticed that he dates it here as the 20th year of Jotham, the son of Uzziah. And that would certainly fit with the interpretation that many have that Jotham and Ahaz over lapped. That Jotham made Ahaz full king. So that Ahaz would be acting king, and yet it happened in the 20th year of Jotham, that the land was forsaken of both her kings. Well, then we have the last king of the northern kingdom, this king Hoshea. And Hoshea became king when he overcame Jotham, and then in chapter 17 it tells us how he reigned 9 years. And Hoshea sent messengers to the king of Egypt, to try to make alliance with him, and ceased paying tribute to the king of Assyria, and so the king of Assyria came and went up to Samaria, and he besieged it three years. That's a long, long siege, which doesn't mean the king of Assyria put all his forces there. Yet even if he put a sizable force there it is a long siege, three years, and it showed the strength of Samaria, and also it showed the despair of the people. They realized that now there was no hope for them. The city would now be destroyed. And here we come to a problem in the history that

the Assyrian records, King Shalmaneser tells us how he came against Samaria, and the Bible here tells us that in verse 3, of II Kings 17 says that Shalmaneser king of Assyria had come against them. And he gave presents to him. Shalmaneser attacked him, and the next king of Assyria, Sargon, several times referred to his having conquered the Northern Kingdom, his having conquered Samaria. And I'd think that any book that you would read up to ten years ago, would tell you that Shalmaneser died while the siege was in process, and his able general, Sargon, succeeded him, and finished the conquest of Samaria, but just recently, the idea was beginning to gain increasingly that actually, Shalmaneser captured Samaria, but that right after he captured it he died, and that Sargon lied when he says he did. And that is the ~~the~~ attitude that came to be emphasized later. Well, I don't think it makes a tremendous lot of difference, whether it was Sargon or Shalmaneser that conquered it, but it was just at the end of Shalmaneser's reign, or just at the beginning of Sargon's reign, that it did. And that was the end of the Northern Kingdom, and it was the end of Samaria for quite a while, because the city of Samaria then was pretty badly devastated. It held out for a very long siege, and didn't want to have another center there of ^{?inscriptions} Egyptians, in the near future. Later it became a very important city ~~again~~ again. In connection with an expedition from Harvard University in 1917~~8~~. (13 1/2). And some very interesting things were discovered in Samaria. Extensive walls, fine gate ways, beautiful palace they think was built by Omri, and another one which they think was built by Ahab, because a very beautiful wall (13 3/4) an ivory house. Of Ahab. And then there was a third one (14). But no names on it - no to fit in with the history. Well, the downfall of the Northern Kingdom then took place exactly as had been predicted by Isaiah. We looked at it in Isaiah 7, and we looked at it again in Isaiah 8, and in Isaiah 28.

- those passages have not stopped with telling me that God was going to deliver them. He tells them that Syria is going to destroy Israel, but he says, ~~then~~ it is going to go on into Judah, and so you have in Isaiah 7, you have the promise of deliverance, but you also have the declaration that Ahaz' clever scheme is going to bring injury to Judah as well as to Israel, that there is exile, there is depopulation ahead for Judah, and in chapter 8, he describes the coming of the Assyrians in verse 7, the king of Assyria in all his glory shall come over his channels and go over all his banks, and shall pass through Judah. He shall overflow and go over. He shall reach even to the neck, and the stretching out of his wings shall fill the breast of thy land, oh Immanuel. And this O immanuel there in Isaiah 8: [?] - is harking back to 7 where the coming of Messiah was promised and he was called Immanuel, and verses 9 and 10 ~~a~~ go on and say, here we have the king of Assyria coming into the land. He is going to fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel. And then verse 7, says, Associate yourselves O ye people, and ye shall be broken in pieces. Give ear O ye of far country. Purge yourself and ye shall be broken in pieces. Take counsel together and it shall come to nough. Speak the word and it shall not stand, for Immanuel. And of course, the English just says, God is with us, and it is a tough problem for a translator, what are you going to do with a verse like this. Actually, for Immanuel, but what does that mean? Well, if you know that Immanuel means God is with us, but it is not simply God is with us, it is - this is Immanuel's land. God is with us. God has given His Immanuel. God has promised the coming (2 1/2) and now the Assyrians can not destroy Immanuel's land unless the Lord chooses to permit it for His own purpose, and He has not yet reached the time when He is going to do that. Consequently Isaiah's message here - you see how involved his messages are - three parts, first - this present attack by Syria and ~~against~~ Israel, God is going to deliver them from and is going to destroy Israel and Syria. He destroyed Syria immediately, Israel 10 years later. Second - This clever scheme of Ahaz is going to result in misery and trouble for Judah. The king of Assyria is going to overflow his banks, and bring exile and devastation for Judah. Third - attempts of these bodies of people to destroy Judah can succeed only so far as the Lord permits, and will not succeed in the immediate

future, because this is Immanuel's land. You can't get that out of the English. You just can't. They fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel, in verse 8, they don't say fill the (3 1/2) of thy land, God is with us. It wouldn't make any sense. It is clearly a proper name there, but in verse ten they translate it as (3 1/2) and of course if you just say for Immanuel it isn't clear, but if you explain what it means, for it is Immanuel's land, it is clear and distinct. But it isn't in clear in any case unless you have the meaning of Immanuel in mind, that God's son, is coming the Messiah, ☩ is an assurance of God's presence and is carrying out of His desires. And then of course in chapters 9 and 10, it goes on telling how God is going to deliver from Assyria, but eventually Assyria will fall and Judah will fall. Eventually in chapter 11 it tells, God will set up His own kingdom of righteousness, with Immanuel reigning in peace and glory. And we have the parallel to it in chapter 28 29 and 30. Where we start in with the destruction of Ephraim, which is attempted to destroy Judah, in chapter 28. Then we go on to look at the clever scheme of Ahaz and his nobles. They've made lies their refuge, verse 15, under a false hood have we hid ourselves. Isaiah says God will not allow this to last. He says the hail will sweep away the refuge of lies, and your covenant with death will be disannuled, your agreement with hell will not stand, when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, ye shall be trodden down by it, the second stage of his prediction and then the third stage of his prediction comes in the succeeding chapter, starting right in chapter 29, as we noticed last time. It describes the siege that is to come to Jerusalem, the terrible situation they are in, and then suddenly in verse 5, the deliverance, - Certainly the paragraph division as marked in verse 7 of my Bible should be in verse 5. The destruction of the enemy by the Lord. That ☩ he promises in verse 29, of chapter 29. He promises it again in chapter 30p. He looks at that, and consequently, and we've noticed it again, ☩ just briefly again how he promises it in verse 31. - chapter 31, verse 8, then shall the Assyrian fall by a sword, not of a mighty man, and the sword not of a mean man shall devour. It is not a strong man, it is not a weak man. It is no man. It is God's deliverance, when the angel of the Lord slays these great multitudes in Sennacherib's camp, and that of course comes quite a few years after this time, when this prediction is given. And so we have Ahaz having made this covenant (6) with the king of

Assyria, not paying any great attention to Isaiah's utterances, but Tiglath-Pileser comes and delivers the land from - delivers Judah, Judah has to pay tribute to him. Israel is (6 1/2) and Syria is conquered and made part of the Assyrian empire. Then, when Tiglath-Pileser did that, in II Kings 16, very naturally we find that - in verse 7, Ahaz sent messages to Tiglath-Pileser, well, this was before he did that, but in verse 10, after the conquest, when verse 9, the king of Assyria went up against Damascus, and took it, and carried the people of it captive to Kir ~~(7)~~ and slew Rezin, and then in verse 10, and king Ahaz went to Damascus, ~~an~~ to meet Tiglath-Pileser king of Assyria, and saw an altar which was at Damascus, and King Ahaz, sent to Urijah the priest the fashion of the altar, and the pattern of it, according to all the workman ship thereof. And Urijah the priest built an altar according to all that king Ahaz had sent from Damascus: so Urijah the priest made it against king Ahaz came from Damascus. And when the king was come from Damascus, the king saw the altar: and the king approached to the altar, and offered thereon. And he made his sacrifices, and verse 14, he brought out the brasen altar, which was before the Lord, from the forefront of the house, and put it on the northside of the altar, and he says in the end of verse 15, they offer their sacrifices on this new altar, but the brasen altar shall be for me to enquire by. And that's an interesting passage here. A peculiar passage. Did Ahaz just take a notion to like a different kind of an altar. So he changes the altar. The interpretation that most interpreters give to it, is that Ahaz when he went to Damascus, ~~to~~ to see Tiglath-Pileser, made the promise to Tiglath-Pileser, that Tiglath-Pileser had taken Damascus, and that there at Damascus, Tiglath-Pileser set up his Assyrian worship, and made this altar in Damascus, and that the altar that Ahaz saw in Damascus was not a Syrian altar, but an Assyrian altar. That when he went up; there to do homage to King Tiglath-Pileser, he as part of his homage to him agreed to introduce the Assyrian worship into Jerusalem. And that this altar that he sent the specification to Jerusalem to be built, so that by the time he got there, it would be all ready, was a sign of Judaeen subjection to the king of Assyria. By worshipping the Assyrian god, not as a substitute for their religion, but along side of

their religion, and he kept the brasen altar to enquire (of. (Student)). Yes, very parallel to that, and so also with this habit of the Romans, when the Romans, everywhere they went, they allowed the people to continue their own worship, but they tried to introduce the worship of the emperor along with this, and the Jews, got a special permission of the Romans, not to bring idolatry into the temple, but when Caligula became ~~king~~ emperor, he decided to remove that freedom of the Jews, from having idolatry brought into their temple, and a great statue of Caligula was brought to Palestine to be put up in the temple, and faced with the Roman army going to put up this statue of Caligula in the temple where they were worshipping the emperor, along with the worship of their own god, the Jewish people just threw themselves on the road, just lay there, thousands of them, where they would just have to kill thousands of them in order to get the statue thereof. They didn't fight the Romans, but they just pacifly resisted, they just lay there in front of the great statue. And fortunately Caligula died before the ^{? king was brought} (10 3/4) before - the Romans' officials didn't want to simply kill thousands of Jews, they didn't feel that this called for that. And if he did, he'd probably have a big rebellion, and then he would have to kill most of them anyhow. And so they sent to Rome to know what to do. (11) before they got the word, and they gave up there. And so it wasn't done, but it is a picture of the effort of the Romans to produce unity throughout the empire, by permitting the people every where to worship their national gods, yet having them put up a statue of the emperor, too, and worshipping. And so the Romans would be recognized as, not exclusively, but (11 1/2) and of course the Jews wouldn't do this, and the Jews were given a special exemption. The Christians not claiming to be Jews, couldn't have the Jewish exemption, and the Christians wouldn't do it, and the Christians were persecuted. But that is a thing that - now it doesn't say there in the Bible that that is why Ahaz took this altar, but it seems to be a very ~~likely~~ ~~He~~ likely interpretation, and it fits with the facts given, and seems to be much more reasonably to think that Ahaz just took a notion ~~to~~ that he liked the looks of this altar, and we read specifically that the reason he went to Damascusto do homage to Tiglath-Pileser. So it seems to be likely that it

It would be part of his general purpose to fit. And so I think it may be a good interpretation. Anything the Bible doesn't state I don't dogmatically say it is true, but it certainly seems to me to be quite reasonable. I think it is very important in our attitude towards the scripture, to get that - I know a good many people who - it is this way or it is that way. There is no middle ground, but it seems to me that there are many things which must be this way or that way. Inerrancy is different. The deity of Christ, the great doctrines, they are (13) and there is no question about it, but there are many points on which our knowledge is not definite. And - I think the (13) are testimony to the great things, when we leave their judgments upon them. But we pass judgments in varying degrees. Well, it is like we say - somebody says that Philadelphia is ten miles from here. And somebody else says no, it is exactly 8. Some people say it is exactly 9. Some say it is 8 1/2. We say it is about 10. If it was important, you'd think I'd go down, and run down in my chevrolet. But if it isn't you couldn't say I didn't say 8 miles.

(14) I make a decision, but it is (14) decision.

(14) And a great many of these things we can't make precise measures about, and so in a case like this - it makes sense in the situation, and helps us to understand it, I think it is reasonable to say that the root trouble of this was the standing of his subjection to him. Well then of course, Ahaz is succeeded by Hezekiah, and then we have Hezekiah introducing a great revival into the land. And it is described at length in Chronicles. It is described much more briefly than in Kings, but we have this great revival introduced -

41. (0)

fruit ?

as a proof of what Ahaz did came to meet him, just as we today are meeting the fruit of what Roosevelt did, when he had the chance to let Germany and Russia fight it ~~ought to~~ out between themselves, and control enough support to whoever was losing, that in the end both dictators would be destroyed, and attempts could be made to introduce democracy to both, but instead of that, he took what seemed to be the weaker of the two, and made absolute alliance with them, and the destroying of one dictator, but putting the other into a

position where he - where many people think that the records are way ahead of him. I don't think that they are, because if they were they would attack, but we have a situation here which certainly is the result of very very bad planning of the part of our leaders 20 years ago, and Hezekiah was just in that position, he hadn't brought it, but he was in it, and Sennacherib comes with his armies, and faces Hezekiah, and ~~we~~ then we have that which is stressed in the Bible three times, in Kings and Chronicles and in Isaiah, how God would deliver Jerusalem from Sennacherib. Now there you have a great many details which would be in there, which would be - there are many things we don't know, but we have the main facts, given there, and we have Sennacherib, shutting Hezekiah up like a bird, and I don't know of any case where they speak of another man in quite that way. He certainly admits that he did not conquer Hezekiah. It seems to me a pretty remarkable (2). Now we have to go and look just a little bit more at Hezekiah, and then glance briefly at Manasseh, and then we've got the events of Josiah, and his ~~is~~ three sons and one grandson. So get the main facts in mind. And we'll do what we can in that brief time.

in NEXT CLASS.

We have been talking about Ahaz' union with - his calling Assyria to deliver him from Syria and from Israel, from the attack, and Isaiah predicted that they would be delivered from it, but that the means that Ahaz has used to deliver them would actually result in great harm to the land, and how it would mean that in the end the buffer states, ~~and then Am~~ would be gone and how Assyria would come right into the land of Judah. These predictions which Isaiah made were strikingly fulfilled a few years later after - we noticed that the Northern Kingdom came to - well, that in 630 wasn't it that Pekah was slain and then that Hoshea became king, but much of his territory had been taken over by the Assyrians. And then a few years later, Hoshea rebelled against Assyria, and the result was that they attacked and they had had enough difficulty with Samaria, now that the Samaritans knew that this was the last. If they were overcome now, it was destruction for them, so that they held out more desperately than ever before, and it took three years to reduce Samaria, and this siege the Bible tells us was done by

Shalmaneser - he began this siege of Samaria, the Bible says, but Sargon says that he took Samaria. And so the - just who took it, whether it is Shalmaneser or Sargon is just something that we cannot tell. It used to be thought by everybody that Sargon took it. Today the feeling is between, to think that Shalmaneser took it, but Sargon became king just very shortly after, and he takes the credit for it, and it is ~~w~~ one of the thousands of matters in history that evidence is insufficient to be certain on it. This we know, that in 721 the Samaria after a great siege was taken, but who was the actual commander at that moment, we just have no way to know. But at any rate, then the Northern Kingdom was incorporated with the Southern Kingdom, and this brings Assyria now directly against the - Judah. Ahaz has promised allegiance ~~with~~ to Assyria, he has put up an altar in the temple which is just like the Assyrian altar. The Bible simply says an altar he saw in Damascus, but ~~he~~ it says he went to Damascus in order to give homage to the Assyrian king, and it is doubtless a correct interpretation. The altar which he saw at Damascus was the altar which the king of Assyria put up in Damascus as a sign of his control there. Else it would be hardly reasonable that Ahaz ever would have brought in something that was representative of a defeated nation that was put up, and it ~~interfered~~ with the old established custom in his land in order to do it. It is a sign of his submission to the king of Assyria. Well, the injury that Ahaz has produced brought its results in Hezekiah's time, and Isaiah had predicted a great injury to come as the result of this thing, but he had predicted that God would give a marvelous deliverance.

We find that very interesting description of this in Isaiah 29, where after in Isaiah 28, predicting the way in which the Assyrians would bring injury to the land, and the plan they had made would not be sufficient to protect them, he went on to say woe to Ariel, to Ariel, the city where David dwelt. Add ye year to year. Let them kill sacrifices. Of course, Ariel there is not a name for Jerusalem. It is used here evidently as a symbol for Jerusalem, but why do they call it Ariel? Well, the word, Ari is a lion, the lion of God, and that is a very appropriate name for a capital city, where David dwelt, but it doesn't seem to have any particular relation in the context. It might be, if you think of Jerusalem as a lion, and verse 4, - brought down, and shall speak out of the ground, and - low out of the dust. You can think of a lion crushed, but it seems more likely

instead of a lion
 that the figure is of Ari-el, hearth, ~~and that means the hearth~~. And that it means the hearth of God, the place where God's fire is. The place where his furnace is active. Now that would seem to be a more fitting interpretation ~~is~~ of it in light of the context. Also in the light of the fact that verse 9 of chapter 31 refers - it says, the Lord, whose fire is in lion, and his furnace in Jerusalem, and that exactly fits with the idea of calling Jerusalem, the hearth of God. But the ~~more~~ important thing here in chapter 29 is that - at the beginning of 29 to the end of it is extremely interesting for entirely a different reason, but the important thing in the beginning of it is that it says that Ariel is going to have distress and trouble. I'll encamp against him and lay siege against him, and raise forts against thee. Thou shalt be brought down, and shall speak out of the ground, and thy speech shall be low - as of one that has a familiar spirit, out of the ground, and thy speech shall whisper out of the dust. Moreover the multitude of thy strangers shall be like small dust, and the multitude of the terrible ones shall be as chaff that passes away. Yes, it shall be as an instant suddenly. Thou shalt be visited of the Lord of hosts with thunder, and with earthquake, and great noise, with storm and tempest, and the lame of devouring fire. Now my Bible has a paragraph mark at the beginning of verse 7. How about yours? And whoever put that paragraph in ~~was~~ certainly fast asleep. And now maybe you should not blame him. Maybe you should blame the translators of the King James version. Probably they were fast asleep, when they made this translation. It says, the word moreover, at the beginning of verse 5, makes no sense at all here. What is the Hebrew of moreover? Do any of you recall? The Hebrew word in this case, the Hebrew word that is translated moreover? (Student). It's a waw. Well now, that is not out of place, to translate a waw as moreover, but if you translate waw and, it is the most general kind of a connection, and the and can carry out all sorts of ~~ideas~~ ideas. And can be there, an additional thought, it can be something followed, or it can be there is a contrast. The contrast idea can sometimes be expressed by and, but frequently by the waw, so that when you specialize the waw into moreover, you are saying here is an additional fact about the situation, but if you specialize it into but, you are saying now here is a contrast. Here is a change. And the waw can represent ~~either~~ either one. And in this

case the context makes it very clear that the waw should be however, instead of moreover. It is a sharp change from verse 4 to verse 12. Verse 4 shows Jerusalem in anguish and in misery in the distress situation, but verse 5 says, however, the multitude of thy strangers shall become like small dust. The multitude of the terrible ones shall be as chaff that passes away. You don't describe how terrible is the great number of your enemies, by saying they are going to be like chaff that are going to pass away, in an instant suddenly. But you show your deliverance from them by saying they will be like chaff that passes away, in an instant suddenly. And verse 6 is a figurative expression, of this idea of a sharp change between verse 4 and verse 5. Thou shalt be visited of the Lord of hosts with thunder, and with earthquake, and great noise, with storm and tempest, and the flame of devouring fire. As far as I know, no one of ~~us can literally picture~~ these literally occurred. It was a pestilence that occurred, but it was a terrible over throw, of the Assyrian army, which brought deliverance to Jerusalem, and the result of it is - is described in verse 7, which is certainly part of the same paragraph as 5 and 6. 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 as a dream of a night vision. It doesn't say it is going to be like a night mare. It is going to be such an awful situation you won't believe it is true. What it says, it is going to be just like a dream that just passes away. And that is brought out in verse 8, it shall even be as when an hungry man dreams, and he eats, but he wakes up and he is hungry. It was just a vision. Just a dream. Nothing to it. That's the situation of Sennacherib. He goes to bed one night, with a great army there. He says, tomorrow we are going to start out and go up in the hill country, and lay waste its city, Jerusalem. And in the morning he wakes up and his army is dead, thousands of them are gone, and he is like the man who dreams and he is drinking, but he wakes, and he is faint. And his soul has appetite. So shall the multitude of all the nations be, that fight against mount Zion. So here Isaiah in the time of Ahaz, predicts the deliverance from the Assyrian. It is also found in chapters 7 through 12 that have that same emphasis, and here continuing in chapters 30 to 31, we have great stress on the fact that God is going to

deliver Jerusalem, like birds hovering, but - that without Jerusalem, that Assyria is going to fall not by a strong man, or a weak man, or any kind of a man, but simply by the Lord's actions, independent of human efforts. There is at this time a story ~~(12/14)~~ from Egypt about an Egyptian army having come up and met the Assyrians and that when the two great armies faced each other, that the Egyptians prayed to their gods, and that a lot of rats came, and a lot of field mice and they came into the ~~Egypt~~ Assyrian army and ate up all their bow strings so they couldn't shoot and they were helpless. And some have suggested that this is a reflection in Egyptian folklore, of the fact that the Assyrians had a great reverse at this time. A reverse that was not occasioned by a defeat in a battle. And some, just from the mention of mice in it, reflects the fact that there was an attack of bubonic plague which is ~~can~~ carried by mice. Now that is quite a bit subjective. As to the opposite extreme to that we have Martin Noth ~~in his 1959 edition~~ whose History of Israel was translated into the English, and the second [?] ~~edition~~ edition of it appeared in 1959, and Martin Noth, said (Professor of O.T. at Bonn)(13 1/4 Germany says that actually what happened was King Sennacherib heard of some difficulties elsewhere and therefore he decided to give up the attack on Jerusalem and went home, and he having done that, it seemed so unbelievable that Jerusalem which was in line ~~wa~~ for destruction, should have escaped, that - the great story of the angel of the Lord ^U_O was made up. And I don't think there are many scholars today who would ~~can~~ follow Noth's position. That it is much more historical than that would suggest.

We have in the Assyrian inscriptions Sennacherib's own account of his attack to the west. K. 42.

In this ~~N~~ Ancient Near Eastern Texts, we find it on pages ~~278~~ 277-278 in here we have in here the Oriental Institute's prism of Sennacherib. Contains the final addition of the annals of Sennacherib, and in this Sennacherib tells of the great cities he conquered and the destruction that he's meted out and the terrible devastations that were performed in many cities in the west. Like he says on page 287 here, in the continuation of my ~~campaign~~ campaign here, I besieged Beth-Dagon, Joppa, Banai-Barqa, Azuru, - I conquered them and carried their spoils away, and he describes the various cities which he's devastated, I ~~against Hezekiah, and turn Hezekiah over to him, and then he said he wouldn't treat the people~~

besieged Eltekeh and Timnah, conquered them and carried their spils away. I assaulted Ekron and killed the officials and patricians who had committed the crime and hung their bodies on ~~poles~~ 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 ~~in~~ 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~~d~~ to me as overlord.

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. 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. And that fits with what we find about this attack in scriptural accounts. We read in II Kings 18, about the attack by Sennacherib, and we read in II Kings 18:13, 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, I have offended thee. Return from me. That which thou puttest on me, I will bear. And the king of Assyria appointed unto Hezekiah, king of Judah 300 talents of silver, and thirty talents of gold.(3) How many talents of silver, Mr. Haffly? (Student) . And Hezekiah gave them all this silver which was found in the house of the Lord and in the treasure of the king's house. He gave all this to the king of Assyria, but then we read in verse 17, the king of Assyria, Tartan, Rabsaris, and Rabshekah, three titles of high officers, from Lachish to King Hezekiah, with a great host against Jerusalem, and they went up and came to Jerusalem, and ~~whan~~ 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. And did you ever hear of that place before Mr. Grauley? (Student). Yes, to Ahaz, two years before. So he went to the very spot ~~where~~ where the Assyrian King's representatives came now. And they came there and ~~at~~ they called on the people to turn against Hezekiah, and turn Hezekiah over to him, and then he said he wouldn't treat the people

too badly if they would turn over Hezekiah to him, and we have this blasphemous attack upon the Lord and upon Hezekiah, that (4 1/2) Assyrian kings, the words that Sennacherib's representatives gave.

Well, here in Sennacherib's inscriptions we found him saying - telling of this great conquest of 46 of his strong cities, and all how these he conquered but then he goes on, himself I made a prisoner in Jerusalem, his royal residence like a bird in the cage. I surrounded him with earthwork in order to molest those who were leaving his city's gate. His towns which I plundered, I took away from his country and gave them over to Mitinti, king of Ashdod, and these other kings. Then I reduced his country, but I still increased the tribute and the presents due to me as his overlord which I imposed upon him beyond the former tribute, to be delivered annually. Hezekiah himself, whom the terror-
 inspiring splendor of my lordship had overwhelmed and whose irregular and elite troops which he had brought to Jerusalem, his royal residence, in order to strengthen it, had deserted him, did send me, later, (I think this word later is inserted by the translator. I don't think it is in the original.) sent me, to Nineveh, my lordly city, together with 30 talents of gold, 800 talents of silver, precious stones, antimony, large cuts of red stone, couches inlaid with ivory, ~~n~~ nemedu chairs, elephant hides, ebony-wood, box-wood, all kinds of valuable treasures, his own daughters, concubines, male and female musicians. In order to deliver the tribute and to do obeisance as a slave he sent his messenger.

Well, that's what Sennacherib says, and it doesn't fit with what he says about other places, where it tells of his great conquests, and how he hung the people on stakes, impaled them on stakes around the city, and how he put out the eyes of the king, and made him march in his procession. Here Hezekiah, the ring leader of it all, he shut him up like a bird in the cage. And it certainly fits with what the Bible says that Sennacherib, after all his other great conquests, proved unable to conquer Jerusalem. Now he does ~~not~~ claim that Hezekiah sent him a tribute. The Bible says he did, but the Bible presents it as first, an attempt to buy him off, which he refused to accept and then the Lord delivered him, rather than something sent later. It is interesting that the number of talents of gold is the same in both

cases. 30 talents of gold, but the silver the Bible says 300 and Sennacherib's record says 800. I read this in the cuneiform in the University of Berlin, and I was very interested to hear the professor say, well, here it says 3, here it says 800 talents of silver, and the Bible says 300. What's the explanation for the discrepancy? Well, it's just that Sennacherib lied. To make it sound bigger. That's what the professor said. Well, it struck me as interesting that instead of saying, look, the Bible is wrong. There's a difference, to say Sennacherib lied. Actually you can't prove it, and it is a situation, we have a statement by Sennacherib and this statement by the Bible. But the similarities are interesting. It is very interesting. And it would seem to be much more reasonable to think that Sennacherib, the great king, writing a record, in order to encourage the zeal of his people, about an event which happened hundreds of miles away, in which none of them would know much about, would have misrepresented facts, than to think that the Biblical account written for people to read right there in Jerusalem, a story would be made up of a great deliverance which ~~never~~ actually near occurred, and it would not only be found there, but it is found in King's and Chronicles and in Isaiah. It made a tremendous impression on the Israelite people, and it certainly fits with the truth of that, that he boasts of shutting him up like a bird in a cage. And then another very interesting thing in that connection, is that in the palace of Sennacherib, there was found a great picture showing the city of Lachish, and in this picture - here's a portion of it, on this plate 101 here in this book of Pritchard's ^{The} Ancient Near East, and then on the next plate he's got another part of it here showing the people from Lachish bowing before King Sennacherib. It is a tremendous big bar relief upon the wall of the palace, showing this great city being attacked with the siege begun, they threw stones to enable people to get up close to it and shoot arrows in it, etc. It was an attack upon the city opening it up, and he's marching in, and he's taking the people prisoners, and all that. This tremendous thing on one of the great walls of his palace. So tremendous a picture of a conquest that in all the books that have pictures of Sennacherib's claims to greatness this is the one that is painted. ⁴⁴This picture of Lachish. Well now, he conquered capitals of great cities, far greater than Jerusalem, but it wasn't any one of them

that he put up. It was Lachish. Lachish was the most important of the cities of Judah next to Jerusalem, but it was a long way short of Jerusalem in its importance, and for the king of Assyria, way over there in Nineveh, to pick Lachish for the one that he would pick up all about his conquest, to me is - the meaning of that must be, that he wanted to forget the fact that he hadn't been able to conquer Jerusalem, so he put up the next greatest city of ~~Jerusalem~~ Judah, to celebrate his greatness. I call it, Sennacherib's Consolation Prize. I've never heard of anyone else speak of it that way, most of them simply just show the picture of Lachish. Here a king ~~ca~~ claimed a great conquest. And it is very interesting for the light that it throws on contemporary Palestine and on the war methods of the Assyrians etc. It is a tremendous important relief from many view points, but why would he pick Lachish, rather than many other cities ~~e~~ to conquer? So much greater, stronger than Jerusalem? I can think of no explanation except that. That it does fit with his boasting here that he shut Hezekiah up like a bird in a cage. I don't recall any case where he boasted of shutting anybody else up like a bird in a cage. He tore down the walls of their cities and took them prisoners. He killed them or carried them off. He shut them up like a bird in a cage. So that it is a very interesting corroboration ~~aff~~ it seems to me from a - a hostile corroboration of a man who doesn't want a corroboration but does nevertheless, of the great deliverance which is described in the Bible. So this attack of Sennacherib on Jerusalem has many important relations to archaeology, you see. There's the inscriptions of Sennacherib, which annals he put out various copies. Well, we have more than one copy of it. This is taken directly from the Assyrian - from the Oriental Institute prism (II) which is in Chicago, but there was a (II) of which, in Germany, which was copied long before on the continent. And there were other copies made and found of Sennacherib's annals. They were writings put out to glorify himself among his people. And various copies of them were made. You have that one, and then you have his great bar relief of Lachish, is a second, and then we have a very interesting additional relationship, which is this, that the Bible tells us that Hezekiah said, why should the

king of Assyria come and find water? And so he stopped up the pool around Jerusalem, and tried to make it difficult for the besiegers to have a good water supply, and there was an important pool of water which was just outside the wall a short ~~diff~~ distance. And so Hezekiah cut a tunnel under the wall, to bring this water into Jerusalem, from this pool of Siloam, or into the pool of Siloam, which they called it in Jerusalem from this spring outside. And it tells us in the Bible how he very hastily cut this to bring water into the city to be ready for an attack. And that tunnel under the city there is still there in present times. The water is in your midst. It comes occasionally and then it left. I've never gone through it, but you can walk through it. And in doing so you have to watch to see when the water is just gone with a big rush, and then go through. Because you wouldn't want to have it rise to its height when you are under there. And the people say it is a bit dangerous going through because when you get to the outer end, there is a place where the Arab women wash their clothes, and if the water gets muddy from people walking through they don't like it, and they are apt to pick up rocks and dirt and throw it at you. But I guess 70 years ago, some body who was going through this place and they noticed in there some queer marks on the side of the wall. And so that part of the wall had these marks on them was cut off, in Genesis grammar it is pictured here in the front. This was cut off, and was sent to Constantinople by the Turks who then controlled Jerusalem. It is called the Siloam inscription. And it is in the Phoenician writing, that is to say the Old Hebrew type of writing, which is earlier than our present type, and of course Pritchard includes it in his (14) text in here.

K. 43.

On page 321 here, in his lists of - on his book of Ancient Near Eastern Texts, there are Palestinian Inscriptions translated by W.F. Albright, and on page 321 here is the Siloam Inscription which Albright says, accidentally discovered in 1880 in the rock wall of the lower entrance to the tunnel of Hezekiah south of the temple area in Jerusalem, the inscription is now in the Museum of the Ancient Orient at Istanbul. Its six lines occupy the lower half of a prepared surface, the upper part of which was found bare of inscription. It is, accordingly,

almost certain that the first half of the original document is missing. Its contents and script point to the reign of Hezekiah (about 715-687 B.C.), a dating confirmed by II Kings 20:20 and especially II Chron. 32:30. The language is perfect classical Hebrew prose, but the spelling is not entirely consistent; translation can easily be judged by the quality of Hebrew which they presuppose. Then here is this translation of it. He thinks that the first six lines had disappeared but here is what is there - and when the tunnel was driven through. And this was the way in which it was cut through: - When they were still (something) each man toward his fellow, and while ~~they~~ there were still three cubits to be cut through, there was heard the voice of a man calling to his fellow, for there was an overlap in the rock on the right and on the left. And when the tunnel was driven through, the quarrymen hewed the rock, each man toward his fellow, axe against axe; and the water flowed from the spring toward the reservoir for 1,200 cubits, and the height of the rock above the heads of the quarrymen was 100 cubits. So it seems a hundred and 50 feet of rock across where they were going through and they cut from the two sides and they came together axe against axe, which is a great desire of engineers, in making a tunnel. In modern tunnels of course they start from both ends, and they work and they come together within a few inches or a few feet, and felt they were very successful to have done it, and they didn't have our modern tools, so there was much smaller process in it than in modern times, but they felt so happy about it they put up the inscription to describe how they met together. If only we had the first six lines they would probably give Hezekiah's name, and a little bit more specific about the situation in general in addition to what this tells about the inscription.

Well now this city of Lachish is the most important city of Judah next to Jerusalem, and back in 1890, Flinders Petrie came up from Egypt for 6 weeks in Palestine and the British society that hired him to come up called his work the Lachish excavation, and they sent him to a place called Tell El Hesse, to excavate and all the books up until about 30 years ago, referred to it as the Lachish excavation. Petrie worked there about 6 weeks and then his successor continued for a while afterward. They found very little of importance but they laid there the foundation of all modern Palestinian archaeology, by their general discoveries, perhaps not by particular discoveries about Lachish. And up until about 30 years ago every book on Palestinian archaeology

would call this the Lachish expedition. It was about 30 years ago, I guess it was 35 now, that Dr. Albright wrote an article in which he said Tell El Hesse is too small a mound for such a small city as the city of Lachish. I think Tell Ed Duwair is Lachish, and Albright is the only person who made any suggestion at that time. Then in the early 30's, the British school of archaeology began excavating at Tell Ed Duwair, and they made some very important discoveries there and they confirmed Albright's suggestion that this was the great ancient city of Lachish. Sir Charles Marston, the English motor cycle magnate, gave quite a sum of money for the excavation and he wrote a book called "The Bible Comes Alive", half of which is devoted to the results of the excavations at Tell Ed Duwair. Unfortunately about 1936 I believe it was, the leader of the excavation, James Starkey was on his way into Jerusalem after a days work on the excavation when some Arabs stopped the car. They put a big barrier on the road so the car had to stop and they stepped up with guns and they ordered Starkey and his chauffeur to get out of the car, and then to walk away from it, and then when Starkey got a short distance from it, they shot him in the back and killed him. Albright wrote an article about it in the Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research. He said that as long as Palestine is still a place of importance in the world, as long as the Bible is read, the name of James Starkey will always be remembered. I think that was carrying the eulogy a little bit further than (5 3/4) was necessary. My guess is that very few people today have any recollection of the name of James Starkey. But he was an able excavator and the worst of it is he was a good friend of the Arabs and he was killed because they had mistakened him for someone else. It was doubtless a political murder with no justification. They had someone else in mind altogether. But this excavation of Lachish was one of the big excavations of modern Palestine. And it was about 1938 that the papers said that there had been discovered some great - a great collection of writings in Lachish, which probably were the most important discovery of materials ever ~~dis~~ made in Palestine. And the Inquirer or Bulletin, I forget which, reported - went to about a dozen archaeologists and Bible students and asked their opinion on this. And most of them would say, well, if this is as wonderful as they say, it certainly is grand and marvelous to have this thing discovered relating to the Bible and all that. One that they went to was Dr.

Speiser, and Dr. Speiser knew that we didn't know anything about it yet except the stories that something wonderful was found, so he said, well, if that is so, he says, that discovery must be as important as the discovery of the El Amarna tablets, and then went on to talk for two columns about the El Amarna tablets. It got into the papers and had an account of real information, even if it was 30 years old. It would be material that most people wouldn't know about. I thought it was a very nice way to handle it. Well we will speak about these Lachish documents which are of very great interest, and of very considerable importance but first we want to go on a little further in our history. There's a little more we want to note about Hezekiah.

One thing is that in II Kings 20:12 we read that after the account of God's deliverance of him from the Assyrians, we read here in 20:12, that in those days was Hezekiah sick unto death. It tells about his recovery. The same story is told in Isaiah 38 and then we read that in verse 12 at that time Berodach Baladan the son of Baladan king of Babylon sent letters and a present to Hezekiah where he heard that Hezekiah had been sick and then Isaiah the prophet came to Hezekiah and said, where are these men from? Hezekiah said, they come from a far country, even Babylon. And Isaiah said, what did they see in thy house? And Hezekiah answered, all the things in my house have they seen. There is nothing in my treasure I have not shown them. Isaiah said to Hezekiah, hear the word of the Lord. Behold the days will come that all that is in thine house, and that which thy fathers have laid up in store until this day shall be carried unto Babylon. Nothing shall be left, saith the Lord, and thy sons which shall issue from thee, thou shalt beget, they shall take away and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon. Then said Hezekiah to 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 day. And this is at the end of the life of Hezekiah in II Kings and also in Isaiah. In Isaiah you have 2 chapters on Sennacherib's attack and the deliverance, and one chapter on the recovery, the recovery from illness, and one chapter on the mission of Merodach Baladan. Most scholars today think that the order of these chapters is not chronological. Verse 20 here does not say, after this Hezekiah was sick unto death. It said, in those days, Hezekiah was sick unto death. And what was those days? We can't be sure just when it was. Some time around there but there is a fellow who is mentioned in II Kings.

It is referred to in Isaiah and elsewhere as Merodach Baladan. And it certainly would seem to be a case of writing down a form as ~~æ~~ it sounded to the Jew, but actually that the correct spelling would be Merodach Baladan because it is doubtless the Babylonian leading god, Marduke, whose name is Marduke Upla[?]. Marduke has given a son, given an heir, and this Marduke Upla who could be called Merodach Baladan, would hardly be Berodach Baladan. He was a king of the Chaldaeans, a group of which little has been heard before in history, who were at the northern end of the Persian gulf, and who got hold of Babylon, and revolted against Tiglath-Pileser. Now in the time of Sennacherib, Sennacherib was after Berodach-Baladan had ruled for ~~2~~ 12 years, Sennacherib attacked Merodach Baladan and drives him away. Merodach Baladan escapes into (11) at the northern end of the Persian gulf where he would be very hard to get at, and the city of Babylon is conquered by Sennacherib and it seems to most scholars here is the name in the Bible - we find the same name in the writings. Kings has the first letter of it wrong. The other books of the Old Testament have the first letter correct. It means to most scholars that actually, Hezekiah's (11 1/2) comes before Sennacherib's attack and that Merodach Baladan doesn't send the ambassey clear across hundreds of miles of desert to Hezekiah simply to congratulate him on becoming cured of his sickness, but that he sends them with the real motive of getting Hezekiah to join with him in throwing off the Assyrian yoke, and to make an alliance of a lot of different states to throw off the Assyrian yoke, and then when this attack came, or before it came, Sennacherib (12) attacked the members of the second . He attacked Merodach Baladan, drove him away from battle, he reduces Babylon into subjection and then attacks the other places that were in the alliance one of which was Hezekiah the Jew. Now from the viewpoint of Isaiah - his purpose is not to tell us of the whole historical development but to show God's dealings with Hezekiah and his people, and the big dealing is the rescue from Sennacherib, so he tells that story first. Then he tells about the deliverance of Hezekiah from sickness and he took the mission of Merodach Baladan last because it introduces the prophecy that is not so great Assyrian, but relates to Babylon which for some centuries had been an inferior place, that they had to be sent into exile. And so it is

a logical arrangement, but not a chronological arrangement. Now that can't be proven but it seems likely that that is true. Yes? (Student). This would certainly seem to fit with this. I wouldn't quite say that it has to be that way. But it would seem strange (13 1/2).

(Hard to hear).

This chapter 21

Chapter 21 of Kings tells how Manasseh reigned, and Manasseh reigned 55 years, it was one of the longest reigns of any king, and he did what was evil in the sight of the Lord. He filled Jerusalem with much blood. It seems most likely that Isaiah died from persecution in the time of Sennacherib, and (14 1/2) is told about Manasseh in the book of Kings.

In this brief account of him in chapter 21 -

K. 44.

When you turn to the parallel in II Chronicles you have an account there of Manasseh's reign, telling of the wickedness, and you have in it a statement that - verse 10 in chapter 33, the Lord spake to Manasseh, and to his people, but he they would not hearken. Whereupon 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 there he prayed to the Lord, and his supplication was heard, and the Lord brought him again to Jerusalem, to his kingdom. Then Manasseh knew that the Lord was God. And there is in the apocryphal additions of the Old Testament, a small work which is called the Prayer of Manasseh, and that is a prayer which of course is a heading was given by Manasseh when he was in prison. There is nothing in the prayer to tie it specifically with Manasseh. It may be a title that got attached to it in some way. But the interesting thing about this account, which does not appear in Kings, Manasseh was taken prisoner by the Assyrians, and while in prison, he turned to the Lord, and the Lord brought him back. The interesting thing about that is that it said the Assyrian king took him to Babylon. That seems very strange and of course, in the early days the critics used to say, well, Babylon is a great famous city and Assyria was destroyed in 612 B.C. and they were forgotten and the ~~account~~ writer of the account who made up this story simply got it mixed and said he was taken to Babylon. But now that we know the history of the Assyrian kings, it

is far from necessary to take it in that way, because we know that Sennacherib's son, Esarhaddon, was a great lover of battle. Esarhaddon was not the next son in line. In fact, we are told in Kings how Sennacherib was murdered by two of his sons. It is a mystery just who did the murdering. Kings gives us the names of two of his sons. The Assyrian records don't tell us who killed him. It tells quite a bit later of his grandson, Ashurbanipal claimed to have captured people implicated in the murder of his grand father, and killed them. But the Bible specifically states that certain sons of his killed him and fled into the land of Armenia. But this we do know that his successor was Esarhaddon, and the word Esarhaddon is not a word which would normally be given to a first son of a king, because it means Ashur has given a brother. And the brother can't be the older son. Because you don't give a brother, because you've already given a son, and so Ashurhaddon was not the next son in line, and Ashurhaddon, belonged to the party that was very favorable to Babylon, and Esarhaddon did everything he could to rebuild and beautify the city of Babylon. And so it would be quite natural that Esarhaddon if he took Manasseh prisoner would take - might take him to Babylon, the city on which he lavished so much expense to build into a great and fine city, in order to increase his own reputation there in Babylon, and it fits exactly with the background of the situation. Now we don't know just when it happened. It seems very possible that that had happened. In fact, that whole period whenever it happened, in that general period, Babylon would have been a very natural place for him to have been taken rather than Assyria. Though the normal thing would be Assyria, yet it is not abnormal to go to Babylon under certain conditions. That's an interesting side light on the Biblical account here. Now we have 55 years in it that we pass over without a great deal of knowledge and then Manasseh's son dies, and in 2 years Amon is succeeded by a son, Josiah.

NEXT CLASS.

We are a bit rushed today but we have only one more hour together and we have the whole period from Hezekiah's time, up until the downfall of Jerusalem, a hundred years, but we did glance yesterday at the reign of Manasseh, which lasted something over 50

years, and we looked at the incident which Chronicles tells us he has been taken to Babylon, and I mentioned the possibility that he may have been taken to Babylon, by Esarhaddon who was very fond of Babylon and did much to beautify the city. I don't think most scholars would consider that possibility to be at all a likely one. It so happens that the successor of Esarhaddon, Ashurbanipal, had a great conflict with - it so happens that Ashurbanipal was king during a large part of a substantial portion of Manasseh's reign. He was the successor of Esarhaddon. You see Esarhaddon only reigned from 680-668, while Ashurbanipal reigned from 668=626. And so this would mean that if Manasseh's reign ended in 641, there was a period of 27 years, half of his reign in which Ashurbanipal was king. Now it would seem more likely that this incident of Manasseh's reign, which King's did not even think important enough to mention, would have occurred near the end of his reign, rather than near the beginning. If it occurred near the beginning, it is repentance and the Lord bringing him back, surely it would have made a big change in his attitude and King's speaks only ill of him. It speaks of him as a very wicked king. If it happened at the very end of his reign it might have very little affect on the land. And so that it happened before the last 27 years of his reign is quite unlikely. In view of that, it would seem more likely that it happened under Ashur-banipal than under Esar-haddon, and if it happened under Ashur-banipal, it would seem likely that it happened towards the end of Manasseh's reign, at a time when there was a special reason evident why Ashurbanipal might have taken him to Babylon, and that is this, you know, some people could think that this case in Chronicles where it says that Manasseh was taken prisoner, the king of Assyria taking him to Babylon, shows the ignorance of a later period, because Nineveh was the ~~capture~~ capital of Assyria, but Nineveh was destroyed and forgotten, and that Babylon was the great city after that, and it might be a mistake on the part of the Chronicler copying this out of a late book, but Ashurbanipal's father, Esarhaddon, he was so fond of Babylon, he made a crazy arrangement at his death. He divided up his empire into two parts, with Ashur-banipal, king of Nineveh, emperor of the empire, supreme over the whole thing. but with a younger son, Shalmashamuchen. king of Babylon. and supreme in

Babylon, but subject to his brother, and naturally Babylon having always thought of itself as the great city of Nineveh, as just an upstart in it, the ~~B~~ people of Babylon very soon encouraged Shalmashamuchen to believe that he ought to be supreme, at least ~~with~~ in Babylon, and so as Ashurbanipal tells us, he closed the gates of brotherhood to cut off my messengers from coming. He declared himself independent, and he had made arrangements with other kingdoms of this land, to the east and to the west, going as far as to the Mediterranean even to join in this fight against Ashur-banipal, and Ashur-banipal tells how very close the battle was, and of the fighting, and how very narrow he won out. Eventually he won out and conquered everything except Babylon, then he got Babylon, and Shamashamuchen shut himself up in the palace, and set fire to it. And under those circumstances if Manasseh was tremendously interested in this revolt, it would not at all be unreasonable that Ashurbanipal would take him to Babylon in order to ~~show~~ what happens to those who fight against Ashurbanipal. So that the statement in Chronicles which might be thought of as simply of applying of ignorance to the author of chronicles is not necessarily so. It could easily have happened that way. Whether it was Esarhaddon, or Ashurbanipal. But it would seem more likely that it was Ashurbanipal, because I hardly believe that it happened early in Manasseh's reign. Now I hate to pass over 50 years of history with so little said about Manasseh, but we have the very involved event of the last days of Judah - I wish we had a month for it. Mr. Haffly? (Student). Yes, he says because of that which Manasseh did. If Manasseh for 45 years carried on a wicked reign, very ~~very~~ wicked and harmful to everybody, and (10) for 45 years and then if after 45 years he was converted he was an old man without a great deal of force and power probably, and the officers he had in just about every position were antagonistic to him, to think the old man is in dotage, and his influence would not necessarily be very great. Unless he exerted himself tremendously to get rid of these people and make a complete change his influence would not be especially great. ^{There have been} ~~It would have to be~~ an old man ^{who} have been converted and had very little effect and my guess would be, that it must have been that way here because Kings never even mentions a conversion, and Jeremiah speaks of the great wickedness done in Jerusalem, by

Manasseh. Now 45 years of wickedness would be pretty hard to improve by a few years of righteousness, to offset it, particularly now when he was an old man and had very little assistance in it because all of his associates now were that way. They were the men that he had put into power. That would be my guess on this. It is an interesting thing that we have not a word to say about Manasseh, but that in Chronicles we have this story of this conversion. So that's another thing pointing toward it, being near the end of his reign.

Now we have then, I've mentioned Ashurbanipal and Essarhaddon. It is a very peculiar thing about our English spelling, we spell Esarhaddon, E-s-a-r-h-a-d-d-o-n. We spell Ashurbanipal, A-s-h-u-r-b-a-n-i-p-a-l, and Esarhaddon means Ashur has given a brother, and Ashurbanipal means Ashur has provided an heir. In other words, it is the god Ashur in both of them, but we spell Esarhaddon, E-s-a-r, and Ashurbanipal, A-s-h-u-r, and that seems like an inconsistency in our English, but it is not necessarily, because the God Ashur, the proper pronunciation is Eshur, but at this time, in Assyria the s-h sound had become an s sound, and consequently the way they said it probably was ~~Ashur~~ Esarhaddon, and Ashur-banipal, but the way they wrote it, was probably the way we write so much in English, we use old fashioned spelling to represent something in a way in which we no longer pronounce it the way we spell it, as we spell would, w-o-u-l-d, we don't pronounce the l there, but the l is there. So they wrote it with a shin, but they pronounced it with an s. And so we are using one case the way they talked, and the other way the way they wrote it. And so it is not necessarily inconsistent to use it in two different ways. Both are all right. But Ashurbanipal had a long long reign, from 668-626, so that Josiah was king 13 years, before Ashurbanipal's death. Josiah, the grandson of Manasseh, but Ashurbanipal was a very powerful ruler, and an able man, in the early part of his reign, but toward the end of his ~~w~~ reign, he would seem to have declined considerably (13) previous years of and great of the years of Ashurbanipal (13 1/2) probably a great part of the Assyrian blood was gone and men were in all kinds of positions to not have so much loyalty to Assyria, and at his death a rapid decline set in, we have two or three

succeeding rulers of the period that were hardly worth mentioning. And in 612, the Medes and the Babylonians attacked Nineveh, and destroyed the city. And this destruction of Nineveh was the destruction of a great power which had conquered so many nations around, and made a tremendous impression upon the world at that time. And the whole book of Nahum is devoted to it. -

K. 45. (0)

- of the destruction of Nineveh, the burden of Nineveh, and it tells about the overthrowing of this place, and there are many allusions to the book of Nahum, which suggest very strongly the Assyrian background. Thus we find the reference to the lion in Nahum 2:11 Where is the dwelling of the lions, and the feedingplace of the young lion, and the Assyrians always used the lion as their symbol, and their kings were often pictured fighting with lions. And the reference to the chariots of the ~~Ninevites~~ Ninevites, chapter 2, verse 4, The chariots shall rage in the streets, they shall jostle one another in the broad ways; they shall seem like torches, they shall run like lightnings. 30 years ago it was used as a prediction of tanks and automobiles. In the last war some people said it was a prediction of airplanes. Actually of course it is simply a description of the situation in Nineveh. And verse 12 in chapter 1 is very interesting of course, Thus saith the Lord; Though they be quiet, and likewise many, yet thus shall they be cut down, when he shall pass through. Now what is the reason for saying, though the Ninevites be quiet and likewise many yet they will be cut down. It doesn't make any sense. The American Standard Version has something like this, though they be perfect and likewise many, it makes more sense, but it is still a rather peculiar statement. The word would look more like peace. Shalom shalomim. It is not exactly peace, but its main letters are peace. Though they be peaceful, and likewise many, yet shall they be cut down. Still it wouldn't make much sense. The Ninevites, the great aggressors. Dr. Speiser had a very interesting suggestion which he made, which seemed to me to have much sense, and that is that these Hebrew letters here in this word, make up the same consonants as in the phrase, ~~h~~ shamuhanu. What does that mean? Though they be quiet and likewise many, - but though they, many, be shalmuhanu, taking those letters as

~~m~~ being a transliteration of the Assyrian phrase, and we have hundreds of Assyrian
~~contracts~~ contracts, Bible contracts, and a great many of them and in a great many of
 them. this phrase, shalmuhanu and what it means is collective responsibility, so that if
 my people borrow some money from another person, they say we agree to take responsibility
 for this debt, shalmuhanu, by ~~that~~ they simply mean that they will take it as a group and
 as individuals, so that 4 of the 5, died, the other one is responsible for the whole sum.
 They all take the responsibility, each one for the whole (3 1/2). And this is a phrase
 which I've never struck in a legal document anywhere except in the Assyrian ~~business~~ business
 documents and there it occurs dozens of times. And so it is quite an appealing suggestion
 that instead of this it means though they be quiet ~~like~~ and likewise many, and peaceful
 and likewise many, or something else like that, if the people are quiet, doesn't seem to
 be have anything to do with it, and the likewise doesn't seem to have anything to do with it,
 that it, though they the many of the shalmukanu, meaning though the Assyrians stand
 together as a unit, everyone of them putting his shoulder to the load, and determined to
 defend his nation, yet though they take this responsibility upon themselves, the whole
 nation, backing up its defenses, yet God says they will be cut down. It will be using a
 common phrase of theirs, in the prophecy against (4 1/2) that it makes sense
 out of a passage here, and it also shows the (4 1/2). I wouldn't say it is a
 hundred per cent certain, but it appears to be extremely probable. Well anyway, this book
 of Nahum is entirely made up of the declarations of God's wrath upon the Assyrian aggressors
 whom he was going to destroy. But the destruction of the Assyrian empire came - did not
 come with the defeat at which Nineveh was (5). That was the great beginning of it,
 but Nineveh was wrecked, in 7=612, and the Assyrian empire lingered on. Many of the
 people escaped from Nineveh. They made a new capital at Haran, the place where
 Abraham dwelt, at Haran on the Euphrates. They made a new capital of the Assyrian
 empire, but the Babylonians, there had been the Assyrian viceroy of Babylon, Nabopolassar,
 who had become the ruler of Babylon, in 625. He was a Chaldaean but the Assyrians
 thought he would stand with them. When he saw the weakness of the Assyrian empire

he soon~~e~~ established his own independence and it was the Babylonians who joined with the Medes, from the Persian area in the attack on Nineveh, and now they continued their attack against the Assyrian empire, but the empire lasted another 8 year. And finally at the battle of Carchemish, in 604, the Assyrians were defeated by the Babylonians, and the Assyrian empire came to an end. The Assyrians had previously to this time conquered (6 1/4) Egypt, Ashurbanipal had an account of an expedition (6 1/2) and reestablishing Egypt as subject to Assyria. And a man had ~~put~~ been put on the throne in Egypt who was supposed to be loyal to the Assyrians, named Necho, so we call him Pharaoh Necho, and the Assyrian records tell of how - the ¹Babylonians rather tell us how Pharaoh Necho came up from Egypt and joined with the Assyrians against the Babylonians, and evidently he tries to be ~~7~~ loyal to the Assyrians, but did not realize how weak the Assyrians (7) and how these other powers had become stronger, and so in 604, at the battle of Carchemish the Assyrians and the Egyptians were terribly defeated by the Medes and the Babylonians. And the people of Judah up on their hill country could look down toward the Philistine plain, and could see the Egyptians retreating in terror before the attack of the Babylonians, and the Babylonians were led now by the son of Nabopolassar, who had died two years before, and his son had succeeded him. His name was Nebuchadrezzar. And so Jeremiah wrote his 46th chapter about this. As you read the chapter, it sounds like a prediction of the Egyptian defeat, but a prediction given very shortly before. The word of the Lord which came to Jeremiah the prophet against the nations, against Egypt, against the armies of Pharaoh Necho king of Egypt, who was by the river Euphrates in Carchemish, which Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon smote in the fourth year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah king of Judah. And then he goes on and tells how Egypt has come like a flood, they have made this great attack, and how they are going to be defeated and driven back, and the Egyptians fled pell-mell down to Egypt and they could be seen from Judah as they looked down across into the Philistine plain. The - this meant then the end of the Assyrian empire, and the beginning of the Neo-Babylonian empire. We call it the Neo-Babylonian empire, ~~but~~ because Babylon

had been a great empire, before the rise of the Assyrian, but the Neo-Babylonian empire, the son of Nabopolassar, Nebuchadnezzar, established the empire, and he was the greatest ruler by far in the Neo-Babylonian empire, a long reign, a very successful rule. Very able in his conquests, but he did not leave much in the way of descriptive accounts of his war. The Assyrians were very proud of their wars. They left us great stone accounts of the events in their wars, but Nebuchadnezzar in the beginning of his inscriptions will say, I Nebuchadnezzar the great king, the king of the world, the ruler of Babylon, I attacked three countries. I crossed powerful big rivers. I led my armies through high mountains. I met powerful forces and annihilated them. He'll sum it all up, and then he'll go on, and say, I ~~h~~ rebuilt the temple of such and such a god, in Babylon. I built this like this, and then he'll go on and give you the full details, of all this wonderful building, the whole stress is on the building, now on his wars. So when you read in the book of Daniel, where Nebuchadnezzar says, is not this great Babylon which I have built - it exactly fits his character, and shows (10 1/2). But it isn't so helpful to us for getting corroboration of scriptural data of the fact that Nebuchadnezzar does not give as much details about exactness. Well so much for this general background of the history of the ending of the Divided Kingdom. Now we come back to Jerusalem, and we find there that 2 years after the death of Manasseh, his grandson Josiah became king. He ruled from 639 to 608, and Josiah introduced a great reform.

The critics say that the book of Deuteronomy was written at this time, and the fact that it was (11) in the temple and then found there, brought to Josiah, and it was the book of Deuteronomy that produced these great reforms. The critics have studied Deuteronomy further and they have come to think that it is pretty impossible to think that Deuteronomy was written at this time, so many of them think that it was written a century before in the Northern Kingdom, and some way got down here, and was actually found and not hidden. We believe that it was written by Moses, and it doesn't mean that it wasn't known before, but in the days of Manasseh it may have been well that (11 1/2) sight. And when Josiah was having the temple repaired, they came across the book, and it was undoubtedly the book of Deuteronomy that produced the reform, (12) because it is exactly what Deuteronomy says.

However, there is much in Deuteronomy which doesn't (12). Now I personally think a very great argument can be made that Deuteronomy (12 1/4) not written at the time but written by Moses (12 1/2) and a good argument can be made for it, there is much that (12 1/2) but the book did have the and we see statement after statement in Deuteronomy (12 1/2) the good actions of Josiah. And I couldn't pass ~~up~~ by finishing up the great revival that Josiah had without going back to mention the revival under Hezekiah (12 3/4), but the Bible describes a tremendous revival under Hezekiah and the great reforms which Josiah (13) had been done 75 years by (13) brand new things.

(13). But it was the wicked reign of Manasseh, that things were largely forgotten. Then there was the great revival under Josiah. Then Josiah we find in Kings and Chronicles, Josiah heard that Pharaoh Necho was coming up and Josiah went to Megiddo, to meet him. Megiddo was a good ways north of Jerusalem. A hundred ~~h~~ years before he couldn't have gotten anywhere near Megiddo, but now after the Northern Kingdom had been destroyed, the K. - 46.

- The Northern Kingdom had been destroyed. It was easy to get into that area. It was weakly held by the Assyrians. It was largely devastated, and consequently Josiah had a good time of revival fulfilled the prediction made in I Kings 13. Those predictions of the destruction of the altar of Jeroboam. We see how Josiah literally fulfilled the bulk of that. Of course, the big part of the prediction is that he was able to, because the Northern Kingdom had fallen by this time. ~~And~~ Another part was that he desired to do it as a result of the finding of the book of Deuteronomy. Probably finding the whole Pentateuch but it was a section of Deuteronomy which had this special influence. But now he rushes up through that country there, which had formerly been the kingdom of Israel to Megiddo. The army coming from Egypt would have to go through the pass at Megiddo, and it is a very easy place to stop a large force. A small force can stop a much larger force in a narrow pass. And so Josiah rushed up there with ~~the~~ his army and he stopped the forces, and he told them that they must stop. They must not go up and Necho said to Josiah, get out of the way. We are not coming against you.

We are coming against the king of Assyria. And Josiah wouldn't get out of the way, and tried to stop them, and so the Egyptians killed him. He was wounded and was taken back in a ~~very~~ dying condition to Jerusalem. He is mentioned in Kings and in Chronicles, but 30 years ago we found the Babylonian Chronicler which tells how Pharaoh Necho came up there to help the Assyrians. And the King James version sounds as if he came up to fight against the Assyrians. ^{k^u} And one good Bible believing scholar wrote an article trying to prove that the ~~is wrong.~~
 Babylonian chronicler ~~thought~~ Pharaoh Necho went up there to fight against the ~~Israelites,~~ Assyrians not to help them, but you read Jeremiah 46 and it fits right in with the history of the ~~Babylonian Chronicler,~~ where in Jeremiah 46 they were up there and the Babylonians destroyed them. It certainly fits with their being (2 1/2) of the Assyrians at the Babylonian conquest. And I personally do not think it is necessary for us to try to prove that the archaeological evidence is wrong, that Pharaoh Necho came up against the Assyrians rather than for them. The only reason to take it that he came up against the Assyrians is the statement that he came up ~~?~~ the Assyrians, and the word ~~?~~ is something like the ~~wind~~ word with, because in the last war we fought with England and France, against ^eGermany. So in the last war, England, France and the United States fought with Germany, so the word with can mean either on the same side of or on the opposite side of. It was used in both senses. And the word ~~?~~ can mean against, but it also can mean concerning. And Pharaoh Necho could say, I haven't come up on your account, it is because of you that I am coming up here to deal with. I'm coming up here on account of the king of Assyria. He wasn't going into the details of diplomacy and his particular scheme, with Josiah. All he was trying to say was Josiah in mixing up in these big world empires, you are a small fry. I'm not worried about you. You get out of the way and let me go on. You are not going to be hurt by me. Just keep out of the way, but if you get in my way here you are in a bad position. And so it seems to me that by noting the Hebrew there we find that the Hebrew is not complete in the sense that it does not tell us the ~~the~~ full details of the diplomatic situation, but the Hebrew can be interpreted in a way which fits exactly with the situation as it deals with it by archaeological evidence. And

of course that is the great difficulty with interpreting the Bible on any subject on which we only know a part of the facts. We have to look at it and say does this specifically teach this, or does it say something which can fit with this interpretation, but could fit with another interpretation. It is like where it speaks of sitting upon the circle of the earth. Does that mean simply that you stand up and see the earth round like this when you look off, or does it imply the sphericity of the earth. Well, I don't think it explains it, but it doesn't say, a contradictory act of (5). So that Josiah died there at the battle of Megiddo and that was a little skirmish. It wasn't much of a war, but it made a great impression on people because Josiah was a great peaceful loving king, and it is the great battle of Megiddo in the Old Testament. There were many other greater battles at Megiddo at other times, but this was the one that took the imagination of the Bible writers.

Then when Josiah died, we read in Chronicles and Kings, and in this period now, Chronicles doesn't give us as much as Kings. In the early part Chronicles gives much more, but now it gives a section of less than Kings. But when Josiah died in 608, the people made his son, Jehoahaz king, and Jehoahaz was king, but three months later, Pharaoh Necho came to Jerusalem. Now why did it take three years of siege by Nebuchadnezzar to conquer Jerusalem and here Pharaoh Necho comes and comes right in. One reason is of course that the people were expecting the siege and preparing for it for a long time. This was not particularly expected but another reason more important than that is that when they revolted against Nebuchadnezzar at the end, just like the Northern Kingdom when they revolted against the Assyrians, they knew that now that this was it. That if they were conquered, they were going to be terribly treated, and they'd do anything to resist. There was resistance there, but now Pharaoh Necho comes now. Pharaoh Necho has killed Josiah, Egypt is many times as powerful as Assyria. Pharaoh Necho is mixed in these great world affairs. Why go out and be killed trying to resist him, and you can't resist him anyway. Your force is nothing compared to his, and he isn't particularly interested in you, so they put up only a token resistance against them, and they even surrendered. Why we are sorry Josiah misunderstood your purposes, but we have no reason to war against you. Anyway, whatever the case was, Josiah

and Jeremiah made a prediction he'll be buried with the burial of an ass, why to keep that as part of the book, would be ridiculous. It would be absurd. A man could predict something that is going to happen 300 years later, and put it in his book, and the thing doesn't happen, but it is in the book, but for 3/4 of the book to be compiled and put together and published after the thing has happened, which proves him to be a false prophet would be absurd. If people thought he was that bad a prophet they wouldn't even bother to keep his books. So that we are thoroughly safe in saying, Jeremiah's prediction here was fulfilled and we know something from it of the history which otherwise we don't have (11) at all. But anyway, Jehoiakim died, and the people made his son, Jehoiachin king in his place, and if you are going to understand the books of Ezekiel and Jeremiah during this time it is necessary to remember that Coniah, and Jechoniah, and Jehoiachin are all three the same ~~man~~ man. The three different terms are used for this man. The son of Jehoiakim and evidently a very popular man. But he only reigned three months, and then Nebuchadnezzar came into Jerusalem, and ~~Necho~~ Nebuchadnezzar who had not - this is right after the battle o== no, this is 680 (?)
 Nebuchadnezzar came to - 608 (?) 608 was when ^{Jehoiakim} ~~Jehoiachin~~ became king and Pharaoh Necho made him king, but at his death in 590, Pharaoh Necho had been completely defeated by Nebuchadnezzar, and Nebuchadnezzar's army comes to Jerusalem, and again there is not much opposition. At least not ~~m~~ sufficient to make a big ~~fight~~ ^{delay} about it, or he comes in or his representatives and they take Jehoiachin and carry him ~~off~~ [?] to Babylon. (Question.)

598, Jehoiakim, and his son, Jehoiachin, (or Coniah or Jechoniah) reigned 15 months, and after these three months, [?] Jeremiah comes. That doesn't sound as if Jehoiachin died in connection with the invasion, but there may be a connection. We just don't know about it. But the Babylonians took away his son, Jehoiachin, (or Coniah, or Jechoniah) they took him away to Babylon, as a hostage, and the Bible tells us that after the death of Nebuchadnezzar, years later, his son Evil-Merodach, took Jehoiachin out of prison, released him from prison, and gave him a pension, and within the last ten years, there has been discovered Babylonian inscriptions telling about the provisions for the support of Jehoiachin and his family. It is a very interesting corroboration. But the people of the land of -

Judah evidently considered ~~Jehoiakim as~~ Jehoiachin as their true king, and he was carried off into exile and a lot of the leading leaders were taken into exile. But his uncle, Zedekiah and the people considered Zedekiah was only a regent and that Jehoiachin was king. Zedekiah the uncle is only acting as king. He was regent until Jehoiachin comes back, and there is much said in Jeremiah like that, where the people are expecting Jehoiachin to come back, and ~~Jeremiah~~ Jeremiah says, no, he will not come back. God is going to never bring him back, ~~and~~ but he lived there in Babylon for another 40 years. But to the people's minds, Zedekiah was only a regent. It is my impression that there has been found, ~~£~~ (1) sheets in Palestine which - at this time which refer to the reign of Jehoiachin, rather than Zedekiah, showing the attitude of the people, Jehoiachin was the real king and this older man, Zedekiah, was not his (1 1/2). Now Zedekiah reigned 11 years, and there is - and Zedekiah was in a situation to that which ~~Jehoiakim was~~ Jehoiakim was, only the other way around. It would seem likely as you read Jeremiah, Kings says Zedekiah was an evil ruler, but if you read Jeremiah, you can't get away from the feeling that Zedekiah wanted to do what Jeremiah said. He wanted to follow Jeremiah. He was very different from Jehoiakim, who took Jeremiah's book and cut it to pieces in the temple. And who took another prophet, Urijah who prophesied like Jeremiah did, and who had him pursued to Egypt and brought back and killed. Zedekiah showed every kindness to Jeremiah, and it would seem that ~~Zedekiah~~ Zedekiah was a man who was a wicked king, against his will. In other words, he wanted to be a ~~not~~ good king. He wanted to do the Lord's will. He wanted to follow Jeremiah, but the nobles that he had, were the men that Jehoiakim had put into positions. So just as Jehoiakim was hampered by the good nobles, ~~of~~ of Josiah, Zedekiah was hampered by the evil nobles that had been put into power by his brother, Jehoiakim. And that, I don't think you can understand the book of Jeremiah (3).

Now we said a fair amount about Lachish yesterday, and Lachish was a place where we mentioned yesterday there was found those Lachish Ostraca, which Starkey found in 1935. And these Lachish Ostraca, a few of them have been translated by Professor Albright, in this book the Ancient Near East. More of them are in the big volume. The Near Eastern Texts. But in these, Lachish Ostraca 3, was at first interpreted as having the same name in it as those

who are mentioned in Jeremiah 26, where there was a prophet Urijah the son of Shemaiah who prophesied against the same things that Jeremiah had, and he fled to Egypt, and Jehoiakim sent down his captain the son of Achbor down there to Egypt, and brought him back there and killed him. Now it is thought that this dealt with the same situation. You notice that Albright has translated the names a little different, so he probably has given up those interpretations, though he deals with the same situation. Anyway it was about 10 years later, but it does use similar name, the name of Shemiah, the son of Elnathan, names which are common in Jeremiah 26, are also found in these Ostraca, very similar. But these Ostraca were evidently, you know what Ostraca are, they are ~~pe~~ pieces of pottery with writing on them, writing in ink, and they lasted because the paper would be destroyed, but ostraca lasted, and these come from the Israelitish gate house in the Lachish (4 1/2) Lebanon, probably from 589, or about 588 B.C. Lachish of course is the great conquest, or the consolation prize of Sennacherib, but it was rebuilt again, and it was again the great city and when Zedekiah revolted against Babylon, doubtless pushed on to it by his evil nobles, when Zedekiah did that then Nebuchadnezzar came with an army and this was the end. Jerusalem now had to fight for his life, because Nebuchadnezzar wouldn't stand for no. They had to either now win their freedom, or be destroyed, and we learn ~~th~~ from these Ostraca, which fits with the situation in - described there in Jeremiah 34, - Jeremiah as you know is not arranged strictly chronologically. But in Jeremiah 34, we have the account of this time, and we read here in Jeremiah 34:7, When the king of Babylon's army fought against Jerusalem, and against all the ~~th~~ cities of Judah that were left, against Lachish, and against Azekah, for these defenced cities remained of the cities of Judah. All the rest of Judah had been taken except for the three cities, Jerusalem, Azekah and Lachish, and then one of these Lachish Ostraca, Ostraca 4 says, that - let my Lord know that we are watching for the signals of Lachish, according to all the indications that my Lord has given, for we cannot see Azek^{ah}. So Jeremiah says how only Lachish and Azekah were left of the cities of Judah that had been taken by the Babylonians, and Lachish Ostraca 4 here on page 213 of this book, tells us how the people there referred to these same ~~th~~ cities that hadn't been taken, and

they are watching for the fires in the siege of the Babylonian armies there. So these various Ostraca here, they are very interesting, and were actually written in the midst of this final attack by the Babylonians, on Jerusalem. The number of them are quite interesting in connection with this. It is very interesting that Lachish Ostraca 6 says, my lord Yahweh, may Yahweh cause my lord (7 1/2) and in good health. Who is thy servant, for a dog that my lord has sent the letters of the princes, saying (7 1/2) and behold the words of the princes are not good, but ~~to weaken~~ ^{to weaken} our hands, and to slacken the hands of the men who are informed about them. And now my lord wilt thou (8) them saying, why do you thus in Jerusalem? You hold unto the king and to his house. Are you doing this thing. And as Yahweh thy god liveth truly since thy servant read the letter there - it is a note (8) for thy servant. Well, it is interesting that Jeremiah 38:4 the charge was brought against Jeremiah, that he was weakening the hands of the men of war, and here we find the very same phrase in this Lachish letter, criticizing events in Jerusalem. It may refer to the very same man, Jeremiah. It is interesting to find the same phrase, in the same (8 1/2) in the same situation at the same time, in these letters that were dug up. Buried in the ruins of Lachish. Well, the Babylonians of course succeeded in their conquest of Jerusalem, and destroyed the city. And they took the king Zedekiah up to Syria where Nebuchadnezzar was. They brought him before Nebuchadnezzar, and there before Nebuchadnezzar his two sons were killed before his face, and then his eyes were put out. So that would be the last things that he would ever see, and then he was taken off to Babylon to march in his procession, in the time of Nebuchadnezzar. So that was the end of a man who was probably a man who wanted to be a good man, but he was weak. And he was in a ~~se~~ difficult situation, because the men around him, were the men of ~~the~~ his evil brother. And then of course, the Bible tells us of the great exile of the king immediately then, and that's the end of the Divided Kingdom, though I think we ought to glance at what happened after that, that is told in II kings 25, how ~~the~~ one of the princes of Judah was picked out for a quizling by the Babylonians. That is to say, the Babylonians said, here is Judah, here is this territory. We've taken most of the people into captivity. There are a few left. Now he said, Gedaliah

YO,,

you rule, and ~~keep things in~~ maintain peace and order there, and of course, the situation was that Jerusalem was destroyed. The thing was absolutely hopeless, and the people could have some semblance of a decent life, ~~if~~ if there was law and order, and this ~~was~~ one of their numbers was asked by the Babylonian king to maintain law and order, and Jeremiah says, God has given over this territory to Nebuchadnezzar. You must now be subject to him and serve him. But there were plenty of die hards among the people who said, death to the collaborators. Death to the quizzlings, so they came and killed Gedaliah. The result of that was that the Assyrians came and reduced them so it was just a province of Samaria, and these people had to flee to Egypt and Jeremiah said to them, if you stay here, you will be able to escape with your lives, but if you flee to Egypt, ~~you~~ the death you fear ^{pursue} will even (11) you even to Egypt. And there after (11) to take him with them. And they went down into Egypt, and then Nebuchadnezzar came with an army, and conquered Egypt as Jeremiah had predicted in his book.

And so that is today a very rapid summary of just the main facts of the last part of the history of the Divided Kingdom with a mention of the principal archaeological evidence during the time. We haven't in this course been able to go fully into the divided kingdom, but we touched upon enough important factors, ~~is~~ that I think it was useful for methods, and for background for you to go on and do further work. Now we will stop here.