

when I mentioned to someone that I was going to Washington. He immediately said, NC or DC. Well to me Washington was Washiggtton, DcC. I'm not sure I even knew there was a W<sup>h</sup>ashington, NC. at the time, but to him living in North Carolina, Washington, N. C. was just as important as Washington, D. C. And as a matter of fact you find that you have a State of WASHINGTON, a city of WASHngton, you have places called Washington in many of our different states. It's very common. You ~~need~~ need a further distinction. One man ~~said~~ <sup>says</sup> I'm going to WASHINGTON; another ~~may~~ man says, I'm going to the District of Columbia We don't find any contradiction ~~between~~ because they refer to the same place. But a man could be going to a different Washington; and in such a case he ought to specify which. In this case we have Kadesh and we have the wilderness of Paran. Is Kadesh simply a place in this large desert area which they called the Wilderness of Paran? And actually such wildernesses rarely can be exactly delimited because usually they run one into another <sup>have</sup> We ~~have~~ in Calif. and in the neighbouring states, the great Mohajvi desert, and we have also the Colorado desert. And the two run into one another. You cannot always be sure exactly what area is a part of one and part of the ~~other~~ <sup>now</sup>. Well ~~not~~ if one says, They went from Kadesh and ~~came~~ <sup>to</sup> back from Kadesh, and the other says they went from the wilderness of Paran and came back <sup>to</sup> from the wilderness of Paran; you have then a situation where you have not necessarily a real contradiction. But as a matter of fact when you look at it, you find that it doesn't say that they went from Kadesh or that they went from the wilderness of Paran. It says they came to the wilderness of Paran. And then a little later it says that God said Send spies and they sent spies. So it's a good assumption/<sup>that</sup> it means that they went from the wilderness of Paran, but there is no mention of Kadesh whatever in the account of their going. And when they came to come back, you find that it says, They came back to the wilderness of Paran, to Kadesh and they showed them what they had brought with them and told about it. And the critics divide the verse right in the middle. It says, They came to the wilderness of Paran -- they say that's in one document, and ~~they~~ then it goes on to Kadesh and they told about their trip and what they had seen -- they put that in the <sup>other</sup> ~~other~~ document, and then they say there is a contradiction between them. And so you ~~have~~ <sup>the</sup> the wilderness of Paran and Kadesh mentioned together as if they are simply specifying a part