

in the middle and going on is that the archeology evidence of this type is clear and easier to follow with the last half than with the first half. I thought that would introduce it more gradual; then we would take the first half where it is somewhat more involved and we would have the background of that material last. That's the reason I arranged it this way for the two semesters.

Now ~~what~~ Shishak is mentioned here in the Bible as the king of Egypt. The Egyptian records tell us that he was actually a mercenary soldier from some neighboring group in the employ of the king of Egypt, either he or his father was and he received the throne and became king of Egypt and was recognized as king of Egypt but was of foreign extraction not likely an Egyptian himself. He was a mercenary soldier becoming king of Egypt, trying to restore something of the old glory of Egypt which was now to quite an extent gone. Now as you take the Bible simply alone on this matter, it is easy to reconstruct with a little imagination what you would think the history might have been. You read in Kings before this that Jeroboam fled from Solomon; fled into Egypt and that the king of Egypt treated him well and that he stayed there until the death of King Solomon and then that he came back. You read in fact the name of Shishak in Chapter 11, verse 40, which I trust you all have in your chart of the names of all kings, not this recent chart but the earlier one we made. Jeroboam arose and fled to Egypt and to Shishak, king of Egypt. He is specifically mentioned as the man who protected Jeroboam from Solomon. Now Jeroboam has left Egypt and come back up to Palestine and become king. He is in the northern kingdom and there is war between the northern and the southern. What a natural explanation that Shishak, the ~~friend~~ friend of Jeroboam, the man who had sheltered him in Egypt comes up to take Jeroboam ^{point} and attacks the southern kingdom and conquers it in order to help his friend Jeroboam--a very good guess as to the historical events which has only trouble with it that it is not true, but it is an example of how easy it is on the basis of the evidence to form a good hypothesis and then become very dogmatic about it when you don't have evidence to prove the point. Here are