

rather than the history in the Old Testament, the first ~~source~~ source is, of course, the Old Testament itself. That is your first source of Old Testament history and by far your best and largest source. Number 1, the Old Testament itself. The Old Testament is not a book of history. A man said to me once, "I'm quite familiar with the Bible. I've made quite a study of it and I've found out exactly what it is. It is a very inaccurate history of Egypt." Well, I rather the accuracy of this statement that he made a thorough study of it. I heard him say that. Anyone who knows anything about the Bible knows that it ~~is~~ may not be called a history of Egypt because it tells comparatively little ~~of~~ about Egypt. Many books of the Bible have no reference to Egypt, or if they do it is merely an allusion to something that happened long before in Egypt. ~~The~~ Egypt is a comparatively small feature of the Bible, but history—the Bible is not a book of history in the sense that it was written to give us history. That is ~~not~~ its purpose. You study ^{the} a history of the world or a history of the universe. There are tremendously important events in connection with the universe never mentioned in the Bible. It is not even a history of Israel. There are very important events in the history of Israel not mentioned in the Bible. There is much about Israel which is greatly stressed that is not particularly important from the viewpoint of the history of Israel. That is to say that the Bible is a Book which tells ~~us~~ us about the Lord and His relation with mankind, which gives us a revelation of God to mankind, which shows the situations/ⁱⁿ which He did great things, and it presents that which is necessary for us to understand this situation. But ~~in~~ between them the history is often extremely sketchy. It does not attempt to give it. A full history of Israel or even a history of all ~~the~~ most important events in Israel. It contains much history. It touches on history. It has many contacts with history, but it is incorrect to speak of it as a book of history just the same as it is incorrect to speak of it as a book of science. If you want to write a book ~~on~~ on zoology you would be very foolish to think that you could get the material from