

that Israel did evil and followed abominations and turned away from God. Jeroboam put up those golden calves to lead the people astray. Judah here is ~~xxxx~~ pictured as going astray just as much as Israel, only the official religion was true.

They were officially following God's commands, even though they actually ignored them. It was easier then to snap back to a following of them when they had drifted away but had not made any change in the official declarations as to

what they stood for. However, the picture given here is one of Judah in a pretty bad situation here during the reign of Rehoboam. In the course of this reign there is one specific event described, only one. General statements about the wickedness of Rehoboam, but one specific described in Kings as occurring in his reign. What was that specific event? (Asks students) The invasion of Shishak

is the only specific event during the reign of Rehoboam that is described in the book of Kings aside from the events in connection with his accession which we took up with the desruption. This invasion of Shishak, however, we will leave for a minute. We will take it as a separate small heading here. Dealing for the moment

in general with the reign of Rehoboam, we note that in Chronicles we have a full account of the reign of Rehoboam. Chronicles has a much more <sup>lengthy</sup> ~~full~~ account

You have gone through it in your study. You note that in Kings it says that Rehoboam was an easy ruler, while in Chronicles it tells you that for three years Rehoboam followed the Lord. Now is this a contradiction between Kings and

Chronicles? Very clearly it is not. Out of seventeen years he followed the Lord for three years. So a brief general picture of his reign says he was a

wicked king and Israel did evil during his reign. A more detailed picture describes the fact that for three years he followed the Lord in general and then turned very radically away from the Lord. So you have a fuller statement in which some

of the remarks seem to contradict the big general statement, but they do not actually. The general statement is giving the detailed picture and this is giving a fuller account and consequently certain smaller features would not have

occurred to you simply from the one big statement. They do not contradict it ~~but~~ but they are not largely enough to be brought in under it. That is a very