

for tomorrow were assigned so we won't have to take time with that phase. Now we were discussing at our last meeting the fall of man and we had looked at the matters of the critical theories, the alleged Babylonian derivation; we looked at the fall itself, we were looking at the curse, and we noticed the curse upon the serpent and saw that there is involved in the curse upon the serpent a curse upon Satan. Some exegetes do not hold this, hold that it entirely relates to the serpent, which I do not think makes sense. Others hold that it entirely relates to Satan, which I also do not think makes sense. Others try to interpret every part of it as referring to both, which I do not think makes sense, but I think that as you take it that he is speaking to one part of the time and to the other part of the time as anyone can do with simply a turn of the head, that it works out reasonably well. I have no doubt that the first third is addressed to the serpent and that the last third is addressed to Satan. Now as to the middle third there may be some difference of opinion, but I think we will agree that the middle third is not nearly as important as the last third in any place, and the last third surely is speaking about Satan. Now this was the curse upon the serpent--a. Now we take up small b.--the curse upon the woman, and you notice that when the woman blamed the serpent God turned to the serpent and dealt with the serpent, but then having dealt with the serpent, He then proceeded to deal with the woman. Her excuses were followed out and it looked as if she had succeeded in evading responsibility, but that was not the case at all. God dealt first with the one who had been the primary instrument in it but then He came back to the one who had shifted the responsibility to the serpent. We can never escape God's judgment by shifting responsibility to someone else and I think in the whole course of our training and experience there is a very important point. You will find that in your contacts here as students and in your contacts later in various fields of service you will be associated with various people and in any type of Christian work your associations will

T 1

change from time to time through your life. It is very unlikely that any of you will be associated with the same people the rest of your life, but oh, how easy it will be when there is some criticism of it, when there is some point at which you fall short, when there is some difficulty into which you come, to try to put the blame on to people around you, and to try to turn attention to them instead of taking that which belongs to you. As a matter of fact, if you succeed in shifting responsibility to someone else even if he is more responsible than you are in the end it is of no particular benefit to you, but if you will think of the matter as to how does it affect you and how can you improve in your system even if some one else is ten times as responsible as you are <sup>if</sup> you, yourself, can learn how to improve through the experience, there is something which can be vital, in your work and in your training for the Lord. I think that it is one of the easiest ways that Satan misleads us, is by putting us into that defensive attitude that is constantly trying to blame others for things. Before God it doesn't matter whether the other person is responsible or not. That is between him and the Lord. As far as you are concerned, the question is, "Are you doing what is right or are you doing what is wrong?" You stand and fall on your own merits before God and you cannot shift responsibility to anyone else no matter what they have done. God will judge him. Mr. Sit? (Student) Yes. Mr. Sit has stated a number of things which seem to be necessary and unavoidable conclusions, and he has stated a <sup>number</sup> of other things which are purely assumptions added to the text which are not here. The first half of what he said I would think was certainly an unavoidable conclusion, that Satan has fallen before this time. It is pretty hard, <sup>though</sup> the Bible nowhere describes to us in any explicit way the fall of Satan, it is pretty hard to imagine Satan's fall as having occurred after this time, and that he had fallen, that he fell at some time, is very clear from the Scripture, and that he is to be punished and that he is the force back of the evil of this world is undoubted. It

T 1

must have come before Adam. I see no way out of that. Now whether it came just before Adam, whether it came a few years before or whether it came thousands of years before we are not told in Scripture. We just don't know, but that it came before Adam seems absolutely unavoidable, so thus far, what Mr. Sit says seems to me to be, although not stated in the Scripture, an inference from the Scripture which is unavoidable. But then he went on to say, "And do you say that he has been all this time without any curse upon him?" and that now he is cursed for the first time? I would never say anything of that sort. This does not say this is the first time Satan has been cursed; it does not even say that it is the first time that this curse is placed upon Satan. We simply do not know, but the interest of this is primarily to the man and the woman and to us hence, and it does give us now a knowledge of the ultimate state of the one who has been an active agent in the fall of man. Now, whether Satan knew this before, whether God/<sup>had</sup>declared this before, or whether God had merely determined it in the counsels of eternity but not even revealed it to Satan as yet, is something we don't know about, but at this point here it is revealed to man and whether it is the first time it is revealed to Satan or not we just don't know. Yes? (Student) I would say that the—I do not think there is enmity between Satan and the woman any more than between Satan and the man. I think the statement of putting enmity between "thee and the woman" refers exclusively to the serpent. I don't think it has anything to do with Satan. I think Satan relates to the third part of the <sup>prophecy</sup> / , and I think the first and second relate purely to the serpent. I don't see how the first can have any relevance to Satan whatever. I've never seen any evidence of enmity between Satan and womankind except as womankind has first been redeemed through the blood of Christ, and the same refers to mankind. Man and woman are on the best of terms with Satan except when they have been redeemed by the blood of Christ, but I think it is a fact about creation that there is <sup>an</sup> enmity between the human race and the serpent, as yet. Now

T 1

as to whether the exact meaning of this phrase of it, the blessing, I would like to leave that to No. 5, , and simply here to deal up to this present thing with the matter of the curse. So then, if there is no further question right here we will go on to b, the curse upon the woman. As we noticed, the woman did not avoid her punishment by throwing the blame on Satan and no one will succeed in evading his punishment by throwing the blame on somebody else; certainly not in the sight of God, and not usually in the sight of others either. I was much impressed one day in the war, in talking with a lieutenant who told me that he had been due at a camp in Santiago at a certain hour and that he had reached there five hours late. The train had been late. He should have been there an hour ahead of time and I said, "Well, of course they excused you for that, didn't they?" "Well," I said, "I never even mentioned it to them." He said, "What's the use of making excuses. I was late and that's all there was to it." He said, "It's true the train was late, but I should have taken an earlier train that would have avoided that possibility," and it impressed me that the person--we all make mistakes--but the person/<sup>who</sup> does the best he can and avoids trying to excuse one or other particular thing in the end would be better thought of by the Lord and by people, also than the one who is always trying to shift the blame to someone else for the results which are achieved. It's the results that count and not the excuses that we make. So, the woman has made the excuse and God has followed the excuse out but He comes back to the woman and He says, "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee," and here we have stated certain things which are to express the sorrow of the woman in life and they are things which we observe, always have observed, as a matter of experience, that one who took the foremost place here, in stepping into the temptation, is placed in a secondary position and she is in that position and there is no way in which it can be avoided or changed, and many attempts have been made to change

T 1

it but they have never succeeded because the whole attitude is as much ingrained in woman's nature as it is in any desire of mankind. It is a situation which is implanted in world. In the sight of God the redeemed person is an individual and all individuals who are redeemed through Christ are equal in God's sight and there is no superiority or inferiority in God's sight of redeemed individuals because of race, of birth, or sex, or for any other reason. All redeemed individuals are equal; that is, all are equal in standing in God's sight, but among the unregenerate creation there is a definite situation in which woman has found herself all through the ages and does find herself. It is fact of observation and it is a fact which is here explained as due to God's curse upon her. Then we go on to the curse upon the man. The man tries to shift it to the woman and the man tries to say that the woman has given it to him and he even blamed it on the Lord. He said, "the woman whom thou gavest<sup>to be with</sup>/me," as if to say if only God hadn't given him this woman he wouldn't be in that situation and I think there is a mighty good for every man to think of. If you want to ruin your opportunity of serving the Lord effectively you marry a woman who is not interested in serving the Lord, and there are too many men who go into the Lord's service who think that in the selection of a wife they do not need to take any consideration of anything other than that which the man of the world would take into consideration, and such an attitude can ruin your ministry and ruin life more easily than anything else you can do. If you are called to go into the Lord's service you not only have no right to consider marrying a woman who is not a Christian; you have no right to consider marrying a woman who is not a consecrated Christian, who will not be a real helpmeet to you in your service to the Lord, but if you do, if you allow yourself to be carried away by your feelings or by your instincts or by some fascination and to marry some woman who--you have not carefully thought out the question of whether she is a real helpmeet to you in the things of the Lord, and you

T 1

find your life is ruined, you cannot turn to the Lord and say, "the woman thou gavest me, she gave me of the fruit and I did eat." Adam couldn't help himself. God gave him Eve, but any man today can help himself and has a very definite responsibility toward it and cannot evade it by saying, "the woman thou gavest me." He can say, "The woman that I was foolish enough to marry because I put my own desires first instead of putting the Lord's will first." But Adam said, "the woman thou gavest me gave me of the tree, and I did eat," and God said to Adam, "because thou hast hearkened to the voice of thy wife." She might speak but Adam didn't have to obey her. "Because thou hast hearkened to the voice of thy wife and hast eaten of the tree which I commanded thee saying, 'thou shalt not eat of it'" because of this God placed very serious difficulty in the path of the man. He said, "cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Here is a curse placed upon the vegetable and animal creation, a curse placed upon the creation for the sake of man, a curse placed upon the creation in order that man may suffer as a result of man's sin and man is not allowed to make any excuses on the ground that the woman had led him into it. The woman is put in the position where she is not supposed to lead the man astray, but she does

T 2

but the man has the misery in life all through from the situation of the vegetable creation and from the situation of his body. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground." His body is now made corruptible; it is made subject to decay. It is made subject

T 2

to disease.; it is made subject to decay. Somebody asked the noted skeptic Ingersoll, "If you were making the world, how would you do a better job of it than God did?" And Ingersoll said, "I would make health contagious instead of making disease contagious!" which is a very good answer. If anybody wants to say that there is a proof that this is God's world because everything in it is perfect, he is just shutting his eyes to facts. Things are not perfect in this world. This is a world of misery and a world of suffering and there is something wrong in this world. There is something out of mesh in this world in the character of man and also in the animal creation and also in the vegetable creation, and it is a fact that it is disease that is contagious. Health is too, so some extent, but it is primarily disease that is contagious and it is <sup>a</sup> fact that you have to work out to make good plants grow but that the weeds will just sprout up the minute you turn your back to them. It is a fact of observation and you cannot make an argument for theism from the perfection of the universe. There is a perfection of the universe, but there is also an imperfection and the imperfection is in many ways much more obvious than the perfection and you cannot explain it apart from the fall and the curse which God has placed upon the universe. I've been much impressed several times at the Grand Canyon hearing the naturalists give their talks about the nature of the canyon to hear a note which one of them brings in every now and then, and that is the balance of nature. He says, "Here in the canyon"—I've heard them tell this story several times—he says, "Here in the canyon there are a great many mountain lions and the government decided a few years ago we want to get rid of these mountain lions; there are too many of them," and so they called in a good hunter who hunter down the mountain lions and killed quite a lot of the mountain lions and he said, "What was the result?" He said the result was that the deer began to multiply so fast that we had sickly deer falling dead all over the roads to the park, and the things <sup>all</sup> got out of balance. He said

T 2

that under normal conditions the mountain lions killed off all the sickly deer and the backward deer and they keep the number of deer down and now the number of deer multiplied so much that they became a menace to the rest of the nature and a menace to humanity there and there was even talk of importing a few mountain lions to make up for the ones that had been killed. He said one time somebody pointed a little animal there that seemed to be an utterly destructive animal; they could find no good in this animal, and they said, "Let's root it out of the park. Let's kill it. Let's hunt it down" and he said, knowing of the balance of nature as he did and how it is only injured rather than helped by any way man interferes with it, he said, "Now before you do that, go slow," he said, "and investigate carefully and see what the result is if you kill this animal which seems to have no good about it," and he said that upon investigation they came to the conclusion that if they killed this animal there would no longer be any century plants in the park. Well, you know those beautiful century plants that stand there with sharp prongs on the side. They are not particularly conspicuous there--just these sharp points about so high above the ground there and they stand there for a number of years and then out of the middle there shoots up a little soft spot that comes up quite high and then the beautiful flowers, and he said, "If you kill this animal there will be no century plants, and the reason is there is another animal which is well able, has an instinct, that when this century plant has shot up a little distance and it has the little soft buds on it and no seeds as yet produced, this little animal jumps up over the short stocks on the side and gets a hold of this bud and eats it and the result is that it would never seed and in a short time there would no longer be any century plants there, but the other animal they wanted to kill kills off this animal and keeps this down to the proper balance of nature and thus you could have some of both animals and also some of the

T 2

century plants. As Tennyson said--he spoke of nature red in tooth and claw. I don't know whether I have mentioned to you the experience I had when I was at Princeton Seminary. We went out for a walk in the park one time and we had some friends down from New York who had been in the same college I had been in in the west and I remember one of them was a girl studying at some school of social work in New York and we went out there to the estate and there we saw a little pond with beautiful swans on it that looked so pretty, and peaceful, and then as we watched way over at the other side of it, perhaps twice as big a pond, two or three times as far as across this room, a goose jump into the pond, and immediately one of these <sup>big</sup> beautiful swans swam across it just as fast as it could and began fighting the neck of that other less attractive animal and fighting it and threw it out of the pond and here was this big pond big enough to get a hundred swans in and there were about ten of them in it, but they wouldn't allow the geese in the pond. I remember how when the girl saw it--she was studying social work in <sup>a</sup> New York school of social work, and she said, "Why, that's unsocial," and she was quite shocked to think that a swan should be unsocial and would want to keep this whole pond to themselves and not allow the geese to share it. Now that is a fact of nature, that the curse is upon the animal creation and nature is red in tooth and claw and so is humanity unregenerate. The curse is here. We have to face it. And where did it come from? This is not a perfect world. It is a world of sin and misery; a world that is out of joint. If this world is the way the Creator made it He did a pretty poor job of it but it is not the way the Creator made it. It is the way the Creator made it altered to the way the Creator cursed it toward the son of man and so the world is today under the curse and <sup>will</sup> remain under the curse until the Lord removes the curse from it as we are promised in the book of Romans, in Romans 8. And so here is the curse laid on nature for man's sake and man is the one who suffers for the curse upon nature. Woman suffers for the curse upon social relations and

T 2

the curse upon the body of the woman. Man also has a curse upon his body but is less aware of it; it is less inconvenient to him because he finds his principal misery from the curse upon nature, which God has placed there on account of his sin. And so this curse on nature is the fact of experience, a fact that no one can deny who observes the life of the animal or vegetable creation or the life of the races of mankind and it is a fact which 8:22 tells us exists, and all nature groans together with our bodies waiting for the redemption of our bodies, the time when God will remove this curse from nature and from the body of man. Yes? (Student) Well, the ground would to some extent include the animal but very definitely the vegetable, because it goes on--"thorns and thistles shall it bring forth unto thee" and then the animal creation is more brought in by the idea of the "dust thou art", that unto dust he is to go, and, of course, man's relation to nature has here principally mentioned the aspect of the ground and of the vegetable. The animal is not especially brought in the promise here but is doubtless included, and is stressed in other places in the Scripture, and of course over in Isaiah 11 and in Isaiah 65 and in Romans 8 you have the promises of the removal of this curse so that the lions and the ox will lie down together, and the enmity will be removed from the animal creation. Yes? (Student) That's right. (Student) This book I referred to last time of \_\_\_\_\_ describes the condition in which the animal creation does not have the enmity or hatred. It is a purely an imaginary picture but of course the picture as we have it in the world today is a situation in which there is misery and killing and destruction in a way that forms our balance and these people, these naturalists often speak of it in a very beautiful term, this wonderful balance of nature, but when you get down underneath and see what the balance is, it is a balance of killing and of destruction and misery, and a balance which is a result of the curse and it certainly was not the situation as God made the earth or intended it to be. Yes, Mr.---? (Student) A spiritual curse on the \_\_\_\_\_. There is, of course, the breaking of the fellowship with God when man went and hid himself

T 2

and God called for him, and then, of course, there is this prediction that man is to go into death. (Student) Yes, physical death, but our concept which we learn from the New Testament that the man living in sin is dead while he lives, the concept of spiritual death as the breaking of fellowship with God is something that is not exclusively mentioned here but which would seem to be very reasonably derived from it, but not certainly specifically stated. Mr.---? (Student) It's on account of Adam. "For thy sake" means "on account of thee". It is done in order to affect Adam and it affects him in two ways. It affects him because it is a punishment, it is a misery, it is a suffering, and also affects him because fallen man is far better off having to work and one good minister that I know up in Philadelphia who has built up a large church told me that this statement "in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread" was a statement of the constitution of the natural person and that it is necessary for his health and vital. Writing sermons and visiting doesn't provide the proper exercise for him so he got an electric pad that he gets into and has his wife mop his face off with cold water while he is in it for half an hour and the perspiration pours off him and he feels that that is a necessary thing for his health. Well, whether that has any definite relation to this I don't know but it is a fact the man who has the normal exercise is far healthier than one who doesn't and that the one who is idle, in our age the one who is idle is far

than the one who is and . These are the three elements then of the truth which is here given. There is, of course, a further act of God in driving man out of the garden. Perhaps--I think we'll leave that until the aftermath of the fall. In a way it is part of the fall, you might say, but let's leave it. Let's look at the evangelia now, and this, of course, is the germ of the gospel and it is a very interesting thing that in the Scripture--now, nothing in the Scripture is untrue, it is all God's Word to us and dependable. Very frequently we find that an idea is suggested several times before it is clearly explained, as if it is neces-

T

2

sary to get us used to an idea and to gradually slip the context into our consciousness before the attempt is made to explain it with any fullness, and so very often we have ideas which in the later part of the Scripture are fully explained which are just suggested in a certain way, suggested in a way that you couldn't but that you wonder just why it is stated that way and then later on you find the explanation. Some have suggested that that is the case with Genesis 1:26. God says "Let us make man in our image." Is that "us" an editorial "we", is it the "we" of majesty, is there, as a Jew suggested to me once that God is giving honor to the rest of the creation of associating them with Him in His language, "Let us make man? Or is there there a suggestion of the plurality of persons in the godhead, "Let us make man"? Now that, I think, is a very reasonable conjecture, not a proof, but conjecture. Here we have a suggestion, in this terminology by the Lord, of the fact that there is this plurality of persons in the godhead even though it is not explained for us in the book of Genesis. Now, in this case we have a very brief thing which at sight is a curse.

T

3

bruise his heel. It is at first sight a curse; it is a statement of trouble to come for the, for Satan and trouble to come for the seed of the woman but it is stated in such a way that it would suggest that the trouble which was coming to Satan is a much greater trouble than the trouble that comes to the seed of the woman. This word "bruise" is a hard word to translate. It doesn't occur very often. There are roots from which it may possibly be derived. One is " " and the other is " " " " " means "snap at" or "lie in wait for" and if you were to take it from " " as (I forget whether it is Revised Version text or margin, I think it is the margin suggests that interpretation) that would fit very well for the serpent.

T 3

"Thou shalt lie in wait for his heel". The serpent lies in wait and watches for his heel and then jumps at it, but "he shall lie in wait for thy head" doesn't fit so particularly well and the does not occur in the writing. " " seems perhaps to be the more reasonable interpretation but the word " " occurs very rarely in the Bible. It is translated "cover" in Psalm 139:1 which does not fit here at all. The idea of, in Greek and in Aramaic, in the translation, it is rendered "beat" or "strike", bites and stings, and it would seem at any rate to indicate-- I think "bruise" is probably as good a rendering as any in English--it indicates a crushing or an injury. "It will bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel." You might say if a rattlesnake bites you in the heel it can kill you just as well as in the head, but that's not quite true. I've often thought if a rattlesnake bites me in the heel I'd have a tourniquet to put on down below the knee and keep the poison away and if I lose my leg I've lost my leg, but I've often thought upon climbing up a cliff and it gets me in the head it would be rather hard to put the tourniquet around the neck so I think that the bruise in the head from any viewpoint is a much more serious thing than the bruise to the heel, and so we have the suggestion here that in the end there is to be a painful injury to the seed of the woman; that there is to be a mortal injury not to the seed of the serpent, but to Satan himself. He shall bruise thh head and thou shalt bruise his heel. Now why does it speak of the one whom Satan will thus injure and who will destroy Satan as he. It is the masculine. It is not the feminine. It is not the virgin Mary who does it. Why speak of him as the masculine and related to the previous phrase, her seed, the seed of the woman, using it in the singular, very clearly not the seed in a sense of posterity but in the sense, because of the singular pronoun used, of some individual who is to be the true seed of the woman, the promised one? Why does it say the seed of the woman, is there any descendant thereafter who was any more

T 3

the seed of the woman than the seed of man? In fact, far less, you might say, the expression, "the seed of" is a term which is over and over used of the man's part and ordinarily you speak of the seed of the king, the seed of the man; you do not ordinarily use the phrase, "of woman". It is very rare indeed, but here we have the phrase, "the seed of the woman" and it may be in a case where we have a doctrine suggested with a peculiar phrase, a phrase that is a little hard to understand, just why should this particular phrase be used, why is it the seed of--it's not the seed of Eve any more than the seed of Adam certainly. I should say in fact it is more the seed of Adam than the seed of Eve but here "the seed of the woman", one who is in some way to be described by this very unusual phrase, "the seed of the woman" and it would seem to me that as you simply read Genesis 3 you don't quite know how it can be fulfilled or what but you do feel quite sure that it is something quite out of the ordinary, something rather unusual, someone who can, very properly, be called "the seed of the woman", is the one who is going to bruise the head of Satan. Yes? (Student) It can be either collective or singular but when you take the "he" it doesn't say "they". (Student) That's right. It's taking "seed" in one case as referring to all the descendants of the woman, all the continuing posterity, and then you are singling out the one individual from this who is the "he", the one individual who can be spoken of especially as "the seed of the woman". Well, now there is good reason to think that Eve took it in this way, that Eve took this as meaning that from her body there would come one either soon, as she hoped, or eventually, but definitely some time who would be the seed of the woman, because we read in Chapter 4 at the first verse a very peculiar sentence. "And Adam knew Eve, his wife, and she conceived and bare Cain. " ", a name derived from the noun " " which is "to acquire" or "to secure possession of" and the translation in Old English "I have gotten" comes rather

T 3

close to the meaning of it. "I have acquired", "I have received". "I have gotten a man" and then we have a translation "from the Lord" and where do we get that "from"? Do you find any "from", Mr. Tow in your Hebrew Bible at that place, or haven't you looked at it? Who has? Who can tell us? Mr. Sit? (Student) Well, what is this? Yes. What does " " mean? (Student) Yes. There are two different words, those which in the independent form assume the form " ". One of them is really " " and if it is used with a suffix it becomes " ". The other one is used with a suffix as " ", " " and both of them in the independent form have the form " " so .

Now if it is the preposition, which would be " " that means "with". "I have gotten a man with, in association with the Lord." What does that mean? That doesn't seem to make any particular sense. Now it is translated, I believe, sometimes, "with the help of", inserting the words, "the help of" which are not here at all. With the help of the Lord. There's no "help of" expressed here. "With the Lord" doesn't make particular sense here, and yet the other interpretation is a very strange one, if you take the other " " which is the sign of the accusative. I have secured a man " " which is a sign of the accusative, "from the Lord" which is the object of the verb and hence in opposition with the object which we already have, and I have secured the Lord. This man whom I have acquired is the Lord. " " , the Redeemer. What a strange thing for Eve to say. I have secured a man; I have secured the Lord. Can it be that Eve thought, "Here is the promised seed." Here is the one who is to be indeed the Redeemer who will bruise the serpent's head. " Here it is--this redeeming one, can she even have had a conception of the idea that this redeemer is actually to be a manifestation of the Lord. Mr. Sit? (Student) Of the verb, undoubtedly, and then you have " " which would be sign of the accusative, used before the other " ". Mr. St. Clair, what was your question?

T 3

(Student) It's a question of having two objects, yes, one of which is in apposition with the other. Oh, you mean " " . I don't know of any case where (Student) With the " "? You take it from the idea that it is with the , but there is no expressed. That's where they get this idea. Now, this alone would perhaps not be enough to prove a great deal but we notice that Eve had another son, and then we find in v. 25 that Adam knew his wife again and she bare a son and called his name "Seth" which means "He has appointed", for, she said, God has appointed me another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew. Cain is a murderer; Cain cannot be the seed of the woman. Cain killed Abel; Abel can't be the seed of the woman. God has given another one; perhaps this is the seed that God has appointed, the one who is to be the promised seed. Well, Eve may have died before she knew whether Seth would be the seed of the woman who would bruise the serpent's head or not. Perhaps all her life she hoped that he would be and died without knowing for certain, but it may be that the prophecy was passed on to Seth and handed on to others and that they kept wishing and hoping, each one, that his child would be the promised seed, and then we get over to Chapter 5, Verse 29, and we read in v. 28 that Lamech lived an hundred eighty-two years and begat a son and called his name Noah, which means "Comfort", and he said, "This one will comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed." Was this again a hope on Lamech's part, the hope that this is indeed the promised seed of the woman, the one who will bring the deliverance from the situation/<sup>in</sup> which the ground is cursed, and therefore he called him "Comfort" in the hope that through him the comfort would come, the deliverance would come. Now these, as you notice, are all simply suggestions, but you notice how they fit together and form a pattern, and no one of them alone is enough to hang this interpretation upon but all three of them together fit in with the idea that Eve understood that there was a definite seed

T 3

coming, one individual seed who would indeed bruise the serpent's head but it remained for future ages to discover that this one was indeed the seed of the woman in a very real and remarkable sense, different from any other man who was ever born of the descendants of Adam, on account of His virgin birth.

Well, we go on now. That was No. 5, the . . . I notice that last year I think I called this C, the woman in subsequent periods. That is, it could be part of the title, the discussion of the meaning of the seed of the woman, or you could make it a definite head. It doesn't matter which in the outline so we will call it part of the same one, and call No. 6 the aftermath of the fall. The aftermath of the fall, which we are given here at the end of Chapter 3, in v. 20 Adam called his wife's name "Eve". She was th mother of all living. And unto Adam and his wife did the Lord make coats of skins, and clothed them. Man before had made his fig leaves, sewed his fig leaves together and made the aprons. Now God ~~has~~ not restored them to a condition of innocence. That is impossible now that the fall has come and the thoughts and impulses of man are corrupted, but God has provided a different sort of clothing for them, not a vegetable clothing, but an animal clothing. Now, of course, we today use mostly vegetable clothing. No, I guess silk would be animal, wouldn't it. Nylon would be mineral, but cotton--or wool, even, is animal; that's right, but cotton, of course, is vegetable. But He provided for them coats of skins and clothed them and we are given here no explanation of why the coats of skins would be preferable to the fig leaves sewed together and neither are we in the next chapter given an explanation of why it is that the animal sacrifice is acceptable and the sacrifice of mere vegetation is not.

- - - - -

T 4

but later on that God requires for His sacrifice the shedding of blood.

Mr.---? (Student) Well, I think it's the fact of observation that the animal kingdom is closer. Yes. (Student) I wouldn't think so, no. I wouldn't think that,--I don't know when else it could have started except at that time. A f t e r m a t h, aftermath of the fall. Yes, Mr.--- would (Student) It's anybody's guess. We don't have any evidence, but I think it unlikely there would be a sharp change in the weather. I would think it likely that the present warm weather would/continued. (Student) I doubt it. That is, it might eventually, but I don't think immediately. I doubt if it would immediately. We don't know; that's purely a matter of guess. But we do have this change from the vegetable clothing to the animal clothing and then we have the insistence on the animal sacrifice and you can't get the animal clothing or the animal sacrifice without the shedding of blood, which would be an introduction of a symbol, of the sacrifice of Christ. Now that is purely conjecture. It is not so stated, but it is as reasonable conjecture as anything that could be made, I think. Now then, coats of skins, then, the Lord made for them and clothed them and then we have this statement in v. 22 showing us what a primitive account this is and how very aboriginal indeed are the ideas of the man who wrote this book, because the Lord God said, "Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil, and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever; therefore the Lord sent him forth from the garden of Eden." Fits right in, doesn't it, with what Satan said. Satan said, "God knows in the day you eat thereof your eyes will be open and you will be as gods, knowing good and evil. God is just wanting to hold you back and keep you from getting ahead," and now here we find that God knows the man has taken a hold of this and He says, "All right now, man has become like one of us to know good and evil; therefore, let's drive him out of the garden, lest he put forth his hand and take of the tree of life and live forever." Those who have interpreted it

T 4

that way the words will carry that construction, but it certainly does not fit in with the thought of the passage as a whole or of the picture of God which is given before and after, and we have to conjecture, then, just what is the <sup>true</sup> meaning of this, and that which is the most obvious, natural interpretation perhaps is one which is not in line with the picture of God given elsewhere in Genesis, and so it would seem to me that one thing to note would be that, as we observed, the knowing of good and evil does not mean of knowing what is morally good and evil but is a tremendous step forward in personal efficiency. It is a step forward where man is able to produce and to destroy, where he is able to accomplish more and God wants him to accomplish more, but not yet, not until he is morally ready for it, and therefore man has become as one of us, that man has become where his power is greater than it was. It is, of course, silly to compare it with the power of God but many a man in this age thinks he is getting to where men are the true gods and they are going to step out and be able to control the universe. That is the general attitude of our civilization today, and I think there is a suggestion of that same attitude here. This is the attitude that has come into the heart of man, the attitude of stepping forward with his own power regardless of God's will and now the next thing he will logically do is to take of the tree of life which God has placed there in order that in God's own time man shall partake of it and shall receive the eternal life or the lasting life which might be secured by the effect of this particular thing; this is to be withheld from man now for a season. For the course of the time when the curse is upon the earth, man is to be removed from the proximity of the tree of life, possibly a tree of which he was eating before, and which gave him the particular type of vitamins which were necessary for the continuous life without corruption, and now he is removed from the presence of this tree of life and driven out and from the garden of Eden to till the ground from which he was taken.

We'll continue next time.

loss of the paradise which they had had just before, losses which we today don't appreciate so much because we have had no experience of them. We cannot compare it with anything in our own experience. We notice that very strange verse, No. 22. It doesn't say, "And the Lord said, Behold the man has become a sinner and therefore we must drive him out of paradise;" it doesn't say, "Behold now the man has acquired a taste for wickedness and therefore we must drive him out of ". He says, "Behold, man has become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever: Therefore the Lord sent him forth." Therefore it is quite evident from this verse that man had in some way become more like God. In some way he had taken a step forward, and this step forward was a cause of his being deprived of the advantages which he had in Paradise. Now the explanation which I offer for that is that since this word here translated "evil", good and evil throughout the Old Testament means good and evil in a physical sense instead of a moral sense, good and evil in the sense of that which is helpful or harmful, that which builds up or tears down and of course, if applied to God's plans it becomes morally evil, but the meaning is physical evil; if you put that meaning in here, that the Lord is saying, "The man has taken a step forward in knowledge and efficiency, a step forward which he would normally have received when he had passed the test of obedience and had acquired the moral stamina which would enable him to make the proper use of this step forward in efficiency and understanding, and having this it would now be dangerous for him to be in a situation where he might step forward to try to use this newly acquired ability in the further defiance of God, so he is driven out. Now there may be some other interpretation that some one can think of of this verse which would seem to make better sense; if you think of one, why hold to it, but I think for the purposes of the class we will, I will simply give you mine of the verse,

T 5

which is the only one I have as yet heard which has impressed my mind as at all satisfactory in relation to it, and of course it does apply the two Hebrew uses of these two words that are here translated "good and evil". It is not a major point to our interpretation of the fall. The major point, of course, is; man has disobeyed God. God has given him a simple test; he has disobeyed him. Having disobeyed Him, he, therefore, has fallen and therefore naturally has . Mr.---? (Student) Yes. There are various words in Hebrew that mean "wicked man", words that mean "blasphemous man", words that mean "sinners", words that mean "men who are doing that which is contrary to God's will", but this word " " is a different word. It is word which means "bad" simply in the sense of that which is unsatisfactory or which is destructive, like when you feel " " , that is good; when you feel " " , that is bad, when you feel " " , that is bad. That is bad in a physical sense rather than in a moral sense. Now if you make a plan to go out and rob a man and just as you are on your way to rob him unexpectedly a policeman comes along , that is bad. That interferes with your plans, but morally it is good. If you are going on your way to do a good work and something comes along and interferes with it , that is bad, and morally it is bad also. You see what I mean--that it is a badness which is not moral in ; there are other words for moral badness. It is that which is unsatisfactory to the person or thing involved, and of course, as applied to God it naturally is from all value, but as applied to other things it all depends on the particular purpose or the particular thing whether it is morally good or morally bad. It is exactly as if, if a man goes into a safe at a bank and takes out a thousand dollars and walks off with it, that act in itself is neither morally good nor bad. If the is doing that to pay a check for the bank it is a good act; if he is doing it as a burglary it is a bad act. The act itself is neither good nor bad but has a moral quality attached to it depending on its purpose. There

T 5

are words that describe moral qualities, but these particular two words do not. These particular words are physical words, rather than moral words, and so when we say "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil", if it were the tree of the knowledge of that which is good or bad in the eyes of God, that, of course, would be moral good and / but just the tree of the knowledge of good and bad would seem to be that which produces increased efficiency rather than that which produces increased spiritual perception. However, that is a side point and I do not want to lose our attention from the main point of the passage by it at all. The main point is that regardless of what the tree was or why the tree was there or what results could come from it, the test is a simple one of obedience to God. God has given a command. Man may see no sense to the command but that doesn't make any difference. The question is, "Does Man love his God enough to obey God's commands even if man doesn't understand the reason for them? Does man trust God's goodness enough to know that what God's command is must be for the best, even though to the man it appears the other way?" It is the test of man's willingness to be dependent upon God and trust God and to love God, altogether apart from the actually is or isn't. I really don't think that the matter of the interpretation of the words given either affects the story much one way or the other except in relation to this one verse, this 22d verse. In relation to this verse--to my mind this verse makes good sense if good and evil are correctly understood and otherwise I do not know of any very sensible interpretation of this particular verse. It is, of course, a rather incidental verse in the chapter as a whole and is not the main thing with which we are now concerned. Did you have something, Mr.---? (Student) Well, that is a question. God, when He created Adam knew that Adam would sin. He knew that death would come so that all this .

We will have to say this, that God created man in such a situation that he could have lived . We'll say that, and whether God intended to use

T 5

particular means for that, I don't think God put Adam in such a situation that Adam could have shut himself up in a room with no access to food and water and lived eternally. Yes. Well, now this tree of life, it would seem, then, would very possibly be an instrument which God intended to use in the making this eternal life which man had the opportunity of having and which consequently it was perfectly all right for man to eat from as long as man had not sinned; and there is no command here not to eat of the tree of life. It's in the garden there; every man could eat of it as much as he wanted to but now that he has sinned, God drives him out from the garden lest he put forth his hand and take of the tree of life and eat and live forever. He deprived him of this means of eternal life, a means which was perfectly all right before. (Student) Yes. It is entirely possible. I mean, I wouldn't speak dogmatically on it but it is entirely possible.

(Student) That might very well be, yes, but it is God's order that he is now to die and he carried out the order by removing from it the particular vitamins which he needed for the continuing of permanent life. Mr. Sit?

(Student) Very likely, yes. Very likely that is unrelated to the particular thing they ate but simply a fact that is to be--I would think most likely.

Now, our next part is C. Genesis 4-5, and in Genesis 4-5, the thing you will naturally notice first would be the seed of the woman, No. 1; we've already spoken of that so we need not, perhaps, say more about it now. So we can go on to No. 2; sin brings forth death. Sin leads to death, inevitably. We have that in Chapter 4, v. 8. The first death did not come about as a result of simply of the dissolution of the body by any natural means. It came about as a direct result of sin through the murder; through Cain's murdering Abel. Adam and Eve sinned and they saw what appeared like greater sin, in their children. And how often that is the case, that one turns aside from God's law and from the teaching of the Bible and, nevertheless outwardly in his life carries on the fine ethical principles which are due to the

T 5

background and training and his life outwardly is very respectable and very fine. In God's sight it is not, for he has turned away from God's teaching, but in the next generation the teachings that he is following bear fruit, in the next generation, and in the next generation you see the results in clear, outspoken sin on the part of the next generation which is without the influences which had affected the external characteristics of the previous generation. That is a thing which we see over and over, and so here Adam and Eve probably all through their lives were not subject to quite the extent of sin or the depth of sin, that is so far as its outward manifestation is concerned, into which Cain fell. We find Cain here falling into this sin, we find him jealous of his brother. It seems likely that he disobeyed the command of God in bringing a vegetable offering instead of an offering which would typify God's means of redemption. I think that is a very probable inference from what is stated here though certainly one ought not to be dogmatic about it. It is a fact that Abel brought a vegetable offering and Cain brought an animal offering--or vice versa--and that God had respect to Abel and his offering and not to Cain and his offering. That much is a fact. Why, we can infer. If you do not want to infer that it is the fact that it is against God's command then it would be Cain's attitude and if the command had been given Cain's attitude would certainly would affect his relation to the command. At any rate we find then that death came into the world. Yes? We can't be dogmatic about it. Abel had faith and Cain didn't. Does that mean simply the way they got the offering or does it mean that Abel followed out the type of offering the Lord commanded and Cain not. I think the latter is true. It is not so clear and we must not be dogmatic about it. And then Cain has slain his brother; death has come in, and in v. 14 we have the fear of death. The Lord drives Cain away; he is to be a fugitive and vagabond in the earth and Cain said, "My punishment is greater than I can possible bear". He said, "I'll be a fugitive and a vagabond and any one who finds me will

T 5

slay me. I think our English translation there is not very good. It says that every that findeth me shall slay me. Only one could find him, of course. The Hebrew word "אִישׁ" -- anyone could say, the Hebrew word "אִישׁ" is a word which may be translated "any" or "every", depending on the context. Our English word "every" is a word which is sometimes a very ambiguous word. Our Hebrew word "אִישׁ" covers both our English words, "any" and "every". It would be a better English translation to say, "Anyone finding me will kill me", and that is the way it is translated in v. 15. The Lord set a mark on Cain lest any finding him should kill him. That is quite different from the idea that a murderer is to be killed by man. In this case, God said, "this murderer is to be punished by God but is not to be killed by man. That would be that murder is a civil matter. It is not something which is done by the Lord Himself. God will punish Cain, but God puts a mark on Cain that man should not kill him. Yes? (Student)

T 6

I mean, is to be interpreted. Is there a command given to man there to shed the blood or is it a prediction given, that by and large that will be the fate which will come to those who shed other men's blood, that they themselves shall suffer from the same type of thing which they bring upon others. It is to some extent a penalty which God places on the murderous nature of man, that the ones who partake in it are very apt to be punished themselves some time. And that is a thing. You will see it worked out in life today. When you get gangsters who are brutalizing the population and who are killing people, you can be pretty sure that some of them themselves are going to be shot by other gangsters even if the law does nothing to them. Murder begets murder. It is a law of nature as God has established the universe, so I am not at all sure that that particular statement would have to be taken as a command. Now we get over into the laws of Israel and God lays it down as

T 6

civil law for Israel, the death penalty for murder and for blasphemy and for certain other very serious crimes, but that is the civil law of Israel. Then you have fear of death, which has come in, and toward the end of this chapter we have a very interesting development. We have the development of the family from Cain on and we find that they are learning to do all sorts of excellent things. They are getting the knowledge of construction and destruction developed very greatly, and we find that Lamech here had two wives, Adah and Zillah, and Adah bore Jubal, the father of such as dwell in tents, and had cattle, and Jubal was the father of all such as handle the harp and the organ and Zillah bore Tubal-cain, an instructor of every artificer in brass and iron, and now here is Lamech, and he says to his wives, Adah and Zillah, "Here my voice; ye wives of Lamach, hearken unto my speech; for I have slain a man to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt. If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold, truly Lamech seventy and sevenfold. And what does that mean? I have entitled it, "Culture without godliness." God had given the command. Cain is not to be touched. God says, "Whoever slays Cain, vengeance shall be taken upon him sevenfold. Now Cain's descendent Lamech says, "If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold, truly Lamech seventy and sevenfold." Cain had a big quarrel with his brother. He got very angry at him and killed him, but Lamech says, "Here is a man who injured me slightly and I killed him." There was a young man who stepped on my toe and I have slain him." Cain had provocation, or at least thought he had. Lamech had far less provocation. Cain committed one murder. Lamech committed two murders. God said that Cain was not to be killed by man; he said whoever would kill Cain, vengeance would be taken on him sevenfold. Lamech said, "Whoever tries to injure me; I shall be avenged seventy and sevenfold." It is a marvelous picture of the spirit of our day, which is the same as the spirit of the day of Lamech. Knowledge had increased. They learned now; they had plenty of food; they had plenty of cattle. They had good shelter, their fine tents. They had music, the harp and the organ.

T 6

and the organ. They had copper and iron instruments. They could make fine weapons, far better than anything that anybody else had anywhere else in the world, and with all this fine technical advance Lamech felt secure that he didn't need to look to any kind of an old superstition of divine protection for himself. There was Cain and it took God to avenge him. Well Lamech says, "I'm not worried about his God," he says, "If Cain would be avenged sevenfold, with all this fine equipment, all this splendid armour, this fine machinery that I've got, truly Lamech will be avenged seventy and sevenfold." He says, "You just irritate me a little and I'll run my bayonet through you," and the picture is a picture of culture with godliness and what it leads to. Adam defied God by disobeying God's commands. Lamech is defying God by thinking himself to be greater than God. He doesn't need any god. He, with his fine machinery that he has and this splendid equipment is able to take care of himself. He finds whatever God for his own counsel.

That is his attitude, and it is no wonder that very soon after God sent the flood and wiped out the whole race. Well, this is the picture then of the development of sin and title no. 2, Sin brings forth death, and we see here how the development of increased efficiency and increased knowledge without dependence on God and development of increased moral strength leads to death, to haughtiness, to misery. Mr.---? (Student) I think that that is one particular note on which Dr. Scofield made a rather poor selection of material. If the same words were used by some one of the godly line, such an interpretation might be worthy of consideration; in the context it certainly is not that.

Yes? It is altogether possible that there is simply a there, a parallelism. I have slain a man to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt; that he had only killed one man. Yes? (Student) You don't have to interpret it as two men. It may be only one, but it seems to me the wounding and the hurt is a minor point. It's not that he is claiming to have had extremely serious provocation for the course that he took. He was so strong with all these

T 6

fine things that his sons had invented, that if anybody interferes with him, he'll show them where to get off. Mr. Christopherson? (Student) Yes. He means--(Student). No, I don't think so. I think the "to" there is undoubtedly the reason why he is hurt. "To my hurt", "to my wounding" A man injured me and I have slain him. This is a modern idiom--"to my hurt"but I don't think that would be a rendering . That is a good modern idiom but I don't think it . Yes? (Student) He didn't? Well, when God chose Abel instead of Cain--(Student) Well most people think it is. That's the very time when most people get angry, is when somebody else is preferred before them because they always know, they always know that they have , they themselves are the ones who deserve the particular place. People are always having excuses. It is the very nature of sin. Some one-- who was it--told of going to the penitentiary and talking to the people there, and he said after he talked to the inmates he made the discovery that there wasn't a single person there who deserved to be there. He said every one of them had been framed. Every person there. They all had excuses. It is human nature, since the fall, that when anyone else is preferred before us we all immediately become angry. I've found this. If a person deserves an 85 and you give him a 95, he never comes around and makes a fuss about it. I've never had one yet, but I've had many a time when I wasn't sure whether someone deserved a 70 or a 65 and I have thought it over and come to the conclusion finally to give him the 70 and then they've come around to see me and insisted they should have had at least an 85 and probably a 90. I've had probably fifteen or twenty cases of that. I remember when I first began teaching Hebrew and Dr. Robert Dick Wilson was teaching the advanced Hebrew and he was taken ill so I taught it the last month, and then I gave the exams and I marked the papers and there were two fellows I did that with. I gave 70's, and I really thought they should have 65's but I gave in to a momentary weakness and gave them 70's, and in both cases they came around

T 6

and they said there is no \_\_\_\_\_ in that kind of work, in getting

. For all the work they had done they should have had, probably a 90 but at least an 85, and I mentioned it to Dr. Wilson and Dr. Wilson said, "Oh, you are just beginning to teach; you should have brought the papers and let me mark them, and then I would have borne the brunt of it

." Well, I took the papers to him and he looked them over and he decided I had been wrong. I should have given them 65 instead of 70. But it is human nature. We all feel that we deserve more than we get in everything. Once in a while we get more than we deserve and then we keep quiet, but when Abel was respected and Cain wasn't, Cain knew that was pretty mean favoritism. That was pretty low down, and he did the thing that people usually will do. Instead of blaming the one who was giving Abel the better position here, he blamed Abel and he \_\_\_\_\_ his

against Abel and they had a quarrel, and it is very easy for such a quarrel to reach the point where there \_\_\_\_\_. Now further details of Lamech we do not know. All we know is what is stated here and we have to try to interpret what is stated here. It is not a tremendously vital section here at all. It doesn't affect the main teaching. To me, it falls right under this head, "Sin brings forth death" and that in Cain which was

\_\_\_\_\_ was God's \_\_\_\_\_ to protect Cain and say that no one would be allowed to kill Cain, he should be avenged sevenfold, had now reached the point where you find Lamech without ever calling on God to help, declaring his situation. To me it is the result of culture without godliness. It is thinking that we can get along perfectly all right. We may use the Lord. We'll call for a day of prayer if it will help the morale of the forces and \_\_\_\_\_ if when it comes to forming a United Nations/there are some who don't believe in God we'll just have a minute of silence; instead of having any invocation to the Lord at all we'll just go through some sort of a form but actually we'll \_\_\_\_\_ God out of His universe. That is what Lamech has done here.

T 6

This is, of course, not Lamech, the father of Noah. This is a different of Lamech. It is Lamech, the descendant of Cain. Yes? (Student) It doesn't suggest there were many more. We are not given any chronology at this point. We don't know how it is . We don't know how many years have gone by. We don't know . We don't know how large their families were. We don't know how widespread people were, but at least there were enough people scattered through the earth by that time that Cain felt that in driven away from his place where he was known he would be put in a situation where he would be in grave danger. He thought that, and he said, "I'll be a fugitive and vagabond in the earth;" he said, "this is more/<sup>punishment</sup>than I can bear." Mr. St. Clair? (Student) Yes. V. 17--now just a minute. Where is that is v. 17? (Student) I don't see it in 17. No. (Student) Oh, I see. I thought you said in v. 17 between and I didn't see the word at all. (Student) Yes. My own opinion is it was . That's my understanding. I remember--who was it, was it John Brown? Was that his name? Or was it ? He answered questions and one question was, "Where did Cain get his wife?" and his answer to this was to show how Adam begot sons and daughters, to show the size of the family and then to show how the objection to marriage within the family is that are multiplied and that in form and that how when you have how this was not possible with pointing out that Cain had been so many years old when he had married his sister and he said that how Cain got his wife and why didn't the old fool marry sooner?

T 7

Well, now it is not a reasonable objection to the Scripture that Cain would have had to marry his sister because there was no reason under those circumstances why there should have been any harm in that, and Adam did beget sons and daughters, but I do believe that Brown was wrong in his statement that Cain had waited so very many years. I don't think we have anything in the Bible to tell how long he waited. This statement here that Cain knew his wife and she conceived and bare Enoch and he builded a city and called the name of the city after his son Enoch, I don't think necessarily comes after Cain went out from the presence of the Lord. It is entirely possible that it is telling now how Cain went out and built a city and it mentions the fact that Cain had a son after whom he named the city. It is entirely possible that his son had been born before this. I am not certain by any means but it is entirely possible; we don't know, and it is entirely possible that there were other people in the world by this time or at least there would be rather soon. Mr. Sit? (Student) Well, we are told here that the cherubim were placed at the east of the garden and a flaming sword that turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life, and so when Adam left the garden he couldn't get back to it, and he went on; how far he went we don't know, or whether he tried to get back and was driven away by the angel, the flaming sword, we don't know. All we know is that he was shut out and after this, of course, we have many events which occurred and then we have the flood which changed the whole face of the world and whether God removed the garden at the time of the flood or at some previous time, we just don't know. I mean speculations would be interesting on it but they wouldn't .

We simply don't know. The difficult question is, v. 22 of chapter 4. What happened to the brass and the iron? Archaeology shows this man using copper, which is here called brass, the Hebrew word means copper just as well, using copper for many years before he began using iron and it shows him using stone

T 2

for many years before he began using copper. We have abundant evidences of of the stone man, who used instruments of stone, and then they began using copper and then eventually using iron. We have all this comparatively late in our archaeological remains and it is pretty hard to find the place after for the flood. The iron age begins at about a thousand B. C. The copper age begins at 3000 B. C. It is pretty hard to get any flood in after that. What became of the copper and the iron here is, I think, a more difficult question. Now God may have simply taken the garden of Eden and carried it away but I hardly think he carried away these iron and copper implements that Tubal-cain and these others made, but that question we will look at a little later under the flood. Now the next thing, No. 3, here is the antediluvian patriarchs. And that is what we find in chapters 4 and 5. We have lists of patriarchs, lists of individuals. Now in 4 there is just a list of individuals and when you get to chapter 5 you have not only a list of individuals but a, some statements about them. We find that Adam lived a hundred and thirty years before Seth was born and Seth lived a hundere and five years before Enos was born and Enos lived ninety years before Cainan was born, and then you have how long they lived after these children, how long they lived before <sup>first</sup> the / child was born. Well, now these figures are given in chapter 5 and then chapter 5 ends with Lamech, not the Lamech who said, "If Cain be avenged sevenfold, truly Lamech seventy and sevenfold," but the Lamech who called his son Noah, saying, "This one will comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands because of the ground which the Lord has cursed," one who was interested in God and in God's curse and in God's prediction, a very different type of man from the ungodly Lamech, this godly Lamech here, but Lamech's son Noah is the one who is there at the time of the flood. So we have this list here, this genealogical list and numbers of years for it and some have tried to add the years together and to find out how long it was from the flood back to the time of the creation.

T 7

Is it possible to do this? Does this give us a solid basis for chronology? That is a question that has been much speculated upon. It is interesting that the Sumerians of Mesopotamia have left us a list of the kings who reigned before the flood and they are named ~~Abraham, Isaac and~~ and then ~~and then~~ and then ~~and~~ and it tells us how many years each of them reigned. Now in his book on archaeology and the Bible, Dr. Barton tries to see if these names can equal the Hebrew names and some of them he makes little changes in and some of them he translates and then translates something somewhat similar into Hebrew and thus with considerable juggling and twisting he manages to get some of them somewhat like the names of the Hebrew patriarchs. It reminds you of what Dr. Albright of

that it is very easy to get

some ~~out of Moses.~~ All you have to do is drop Moses and add ~~He was~~ ridiculing the idea of taking two things which have very slight similarity and trying to equate them. Now I think that is what is done in this case. I see no reason to think the Sumerian list of kings before the flood has any relation whatever to the Biblical list of the patriarchs who lived before the flood. The names are utterly different, but these patriarchs are given and it gives something of the years of each one and the real interest to us is perhaps not so much in how many years the total was before the flood as how many years the total is in the next list of patriarchs that we get, the list that comes over in Chapter 11 where we have the descendants of Shem. Some have figured up in chapter 11 if Shem lived after he begat Arphaxad five hundred years and begat sons and daughters and then Arphaxad lived thirty-five years and begat Salah and Salah lived thirty years and begat Eber and Eber lived thirty-four years and begat Peleg, figured it up that perhaps Shem was a guest at Abraham's wedding, according to the adding up of the figures of how old a man was when his son was born that you would have Shem still living at the time when Abraham was married. Now that seems extremely unlikely. It seems

T 7

extremely unlikely that in the time of Abraham, Shem was actually alive. It is hard to think how men could have put God completely out of their <sup>as they did</sup> consciousness/by the time of Abraham, that he was one individual coming out from a wicked city and a wicked civilization, and coming out at a time at which we have archaeological evidence of centuries before of people who had no knowledge of God whatever, and yet it would be such a short time after the flood that the men who had actually been in the ark would still be left. And so it makes us question very seriously if it is the Lord's intention that these men who are given here give us a continuous chronology so that we can tell exactly when the particular events mentioned occurred, and it would seem very unlikely that that was the case. The figures are given us to give us certain ideas; they teach us certain truths, but the particular thing of an exact chronology <sup>early</sup> back in those/days, there is no reason to think that God intended to give us. Certainly God did not give us an exact chronology anywhere in the Bible of the later years, of the time from Ezra to Christ we can only rest on the speculations of Greek historians to make our guess as to how far before the time of Christ Ezra was. They took the number of generations that lived according to certain records and they just multiplied so many years to a generation and made a guess, and there is a big period there between 1200 and 100 B. C. that are dependent upon extremely slight information for knowing the life of the period and we have no Biblical information whatever. Nowhere in the Bible does it tell us how long before Christ those things happened. As a matter of fact the Bible doesn't tell us when Paul was converted. We can't tell from any statement in the book of Acts whether Paul was converted the year after the crucifixion or five years or ten years after or twenty years after, and we have to take certain data which we get from pagan sources and get certain dates toward the end of Paul's life and then figure back and try to figure about when this was that he was converted. God has evidently not desired in the Bible to give us an exact chronology. That is not a part of

T 7

His purpose. That doesn't mean there is anything wrong in our trying to get as many facts of chronology as we can, but it does mean that we needn't, when God hasn't even given to us in the New Testament these things that are the very center of our religion, we need not expect that God will give them to us regarding the flood or the creation, a means of knowing exactly how many years ago that was. It would have no purpose except to satisfy our curiosity, and it is very good to satisfy it if we can but we needn't expect that God will do it. We have no right to go to the Bible and say, "What does the Bible teach on this? Does it teach this date or that date?" Let's go to the Bible and say, "Does the Bible give us an answer to this question? Do we have the data for answer to this <sup>particular</sup> question or not?" And in this case it seems hardly reasonable to think that we have it. Now that partly rests upon the fact that if we take all these years exactly assuming that their purpose is to give us an exact chronology it does not fit in with our recent discoveries and also rests upon the fact that later geneology in the Scripture does not attempt to give us complete statements. Now you find, for instance, that in 1 Chronocles 9:12 you have a statement there that you can compare with Nehemiah 11:12 and in 1 Chronocles 9:12 you have certain individuals named, and if you look at Nehemiah 11:12 it is quite evident that we have the same individuals. Let's look at Nehemiah first, Nehemiah 11:12--of the priests. The brethren that did the work of the house were eight hundred twenty-two and Adaiah, the son of Jeroham, the son of Pelaliah, the son of Amzi, the son of Zechariah, the son of Pashur, the son of Malchiah. That is Nehemiah 11:12 and in 1 Chronocles 9:12 we read about Adaiah the son of Jeroham, the son of Pashur, the son of Malchijah, and in each one of those it was Adaiah, the son of Jeroham, the son of Pelaliah, the son of Amzi, the son of Zechariah, the son of Pashur, and then both of them, the son of Malchiah. So it seems quite definite, then, from the fact that your beginning and end are the same, and one of them has three others in between, it would seem quite definite that

T 7

you have in one case simply a genealogy. When he says the son of he means the descendant of. Of course we have that right in the beginning of Matthew, where we read of Joseph the son of David, the son of Abraham. He means the descendant. The word "son" is translated that way in Scripture, and in Matthew 1:8 we have the list of the ancestors of Christ and we have three kings omitted, who are given in Kings 11:15. There is no question in that case, and there is no question in this case because anyone in the time of Christ that didn't know the names of the kings of Judah—certainly any Jewish child would know that, and supposing that somebody were to tell you that George Washington was the first president of the United States and that John Adams was the second and that Andrew Jackson was the third and Martin Van Buren was the fourth, I think everybody here would immediately recognize that Jefferson and a number of others had been omitted.

T 8

kings in the genealogy. It was apparent to everybody, it was no mistake, it was no accident, it was simply not the purpose to give the entire complete list. They knew how it ran, they knew the genealogy down to this point. They were just skipping forward in the genealogy. It says there that he begat—and then lists his great grandson as the one—his great, great grandson, I believe it is, as the one whom he begat, with these three names omitted. Well, now the result is that it is my opinion and that of most scientific students of the Bible that there are gaps in the chronology, that in Genesis we are given certain key figures, given an idea of the progress and given an idea of the comparative length of life by telling us the ages of these particular individuals who are mentioned when their first child was born, but then it may have the name of one who was a great grandson. There may be a jump of a few years or many years in between certain

T 8

of these steps in the geneology, and so while we know a good deal about the individuals, we do <sup>not</sup> know anything about the overall picture, the complete list. Now, Dr. Davis, in his Bible dictionary, suggests the possibility that some of these men were not men at all but tribes. I don't think that is a reasonable interpretation at all, but Dr. Davis suggests it. He thinks that there may have been tribes which had the leadership for a period of a few hundred years. I feel that the years are to be taken literally as the length of life of that time, but that there may be gaps in between; that when man came out of Paradise much of the strength of Paradise remained with him and death was slow in getting a foot-hold in work. It already had a hold but it was slow in working itself out, and then as the effect of sin increased, longevity diminished, and the length of time was cut down until in the time of Noah it came to be <sup>about</sup> one hundred and twenty years and then later on it works down to about seventy years, which it has been for the last couple of thousand years. So I think there is probably much of real value for us in these lists of the patriachs, the statements about them, but that we can add our years together and get the total length I do not think likely. Now when we say this, the result of that is that if someone wants to say there is proof man has been on the earth nine hundred thousand years, I'm not going to say, "You are absolutely wrong. The Bible says he was created in 4004 B. C." We do not know. Someone asked me this. He said, "I believe we have proof that man has been on the earth for nine hundred thousand years." He said, "Now could it be that there were human beings on the earth for all that time but that four or five thousand years ago one of these became Adam?" I said, "I don't think so at all. I am quite sure that whenever the first man was, that was Adam, but when Adam was, I don't think we know. Adam may have been a long time ago. He may have been less long ago, but any evidence you want to bring to put Adam back quite a ways, I don't think poses any serious difficulty for the believer in the statements of the Scripture." Now on the other hand, here is an interesting thing. ~~Can we~~ Can we ridicule the date 4004 B. C.? Is that perfectly absurd? We

T 8

have Egyptian records going back to 5700 and 6000 B. C. We have Chinese records of kings back to 5000 and 6000 B. C. Well, all such statements are absolutely false. There is not written record of anyone anywhere on this earth before 3000 B. C., and so as far as any written records are concerned, the date 4004 B. C. could stand. The difficulty is not with written records. It is with

T 8 (Second part)

And we mentioned the fact that the list of patriarchs, it was rather absurd to try to connect that with the Sumerian antediluvian kings. We noticed that as far as the chronology is concerned we seem to have gaps in chronology in other places in the Scripture which show that it does not seem to be the intention of the Scripture writers necessarily to give every individual in the line. They speak in Matthew of one king's begetting another, who was his great grandfather, and so it seems to be at least occasionally done in the Scripture that they name a man and beget means not his son but some descendant of his. Now, of course in the table of the patriarchs, we run into a certain difficulty in with them, that there are years given, Now in that case the, it becomes a little more complicated if you apply the same principle, that would seem to require that you say that "A" lived so many years and beget a son and then he lived so many years and beget sons and daughters, and that the name given for this son be either that this is the man who beget at this age or that he beget the ancestor of this man at that age; that is, that the important thing which is told there is how old the man was when his son was born, not necessarily how old this particular man's father was when he was born, so that it would be, "A" lived two hundred and twenty-five years and beget either "B" or an ancestor of "B" and after he beget either "B" or an ancestor of "B" he lived so many years and beget sons and daughters, and then that "B" lived so many years and beget either "C" or an ancestor of "C" and that after he beget either "C" or an ancestor of "C"

T 8

he lived so many years and begat sons and daughters. You see it is not by  
sny means a certain thing that this is the correct interpretation but it is a view  
which has commended itself to a great many interpretators of the Scripture, as  
a possible view, and in view of the gaps elsewhere and the fact that at certain  
vital points in the Scripture we are not given exact information for constructing  
a complete chronology, it seems to many interpretors today unlikely that it is  
the Lord's intention to tell us just how far back from Noah Abraham lived or just  
how far back from now Noah lived, or Adam. Now any light we can get on these  
facts is, of course, of interest and of value, but it does not seem to be the  
Lord's intention to give us this complete enumeration in the Scripture. Those  
who have taken these and, intending to give us a complete enumeration, and added  
them together have come to many different results. There are probably twenty or  
thirty different figures that have been given for the creation. That which  
came to be most generally accepted was that of Archbishop Ussher. The reason  
that his guesses were accepted at places where other people's guesses were not  
accepted was doubtless due to two things--one that he was a man of outstanding  
prominence in the church and a very fine man in every way, a man of great in-  
fluence, and secondly, that he managed to figure the dates together in such a  
way as to have the creation of Adam exactly 4000 years before the birth of Christ,  
and of course that works out very interestingly/accordance<sup>in</sup> with the statement  
in the New Testament that a day is as a thousand years to the Lord and a thous-  
and years as a day, so you have exactly 4000 years exactly from the birth of  
Christ in 4 B. C. and then two thousand years after, making 6,000 and then the  
millennium, the Sabbath, making 7000, and so Ussher's idea seems to fit in to  
a very nice scheme and that doubtless helped in this but of course  
that is no proof that it is true at all and there are--the general attitude  
of the scholars of the Bible today is to think that it does not attempt to tell  
us when Adam was created, that it is not the Lord's intention in the Biblee to  
give us information on that, and the information we can get elsewhere is certainly

T 8

worth while. If someone says, "I believe that man was created 900,000 B. C." I would say to him, "It seems to me that you are making it rather early," but I would not say, "That it contrary to the Scripture." I do not think that it is necessary to interpret the Scripture as making the creation somewhere between 5000 and 3000 B. C. as it would be if you figure it up. It is intended to give us these dates without any gaps between. There are certain gaps. We can't get away from it. There are places we have to guess, and Ussher guessed, and many others have guessed and their guess is different. The Dropsie College of Hebrew learning in Philadelphia has at the bottom of it that this was dedicated in such and such a year, the corner stone laid, and on the one side it gives it according to our numbers and on the other side it says that it was on the 23d of in the year—I forget whether it was 7254 or what it is, but it does not figure from Ussher's chronology. It is one of the many other systems. Mr.---? (Student)

If you can have it to two thousand years you can just as well have it two hundred thousand, it seems to me. (Student) I would have said, I would have said six months ago. I would have said my guess is that the flood was about 4000 B. C. and the creation of man perhaps 10,000. I believe Dr. Harris, if I recall correctly, would have said at that time that his guess was that the flood was about 10,000 and the creation of man maybe 15,000 or 20,000. I am not sure whether I remember exactly what he would have said at that time. Since that time we have both of us heard material presented by a very fine Christian man who is a very thorough student of geology in which he claims that he is absolutely convinced that the evidence shows that man was created 900,000 B. C. Now I am not at all sure that the evidence he presents is conclusive. He may be entirely wrong. It may be that the creation was only 100,000 B. C. or 200,000 or even as late as 100,000. It is possible though the evidence he presents makes any figure later than 200,00 very difficult, but I will say this, that if the 900,000 date should be fairly definitely

T 8

proven scientifically I do not believe that it would contradict Scripture. I certainly do not accept it until it is scientifically proven. I mean, here is one very fine geologist and very fine Christian who is quite convinced of it. Well, that doesn't prove it. He may be wrong. A dozen may be wrong, but I heard him discuss it for five hours and present evidence and pictures and so on and there are a number of points in it which look very, very convincing, and I also was able to pick out a few points on which it is clear that further evidence is needed and they are now seeking further evidence, but I don't think it is contradictory to the Bible. I would say just on a superficial reading of the Bible, I would not think it was that; I would think that the creation was somewhere between 5000 and 3000. I would think that it was fairly easy in view of these other to say that this may have been as early as 10,000 or 15,000. On just looking at the Bible alone it doesn't strike our minds as quite , but if it can be adapted, a thousand years I do not think we have anything to become terrifically excited about over what is the age of man. This I would insist upon, that wherever man began, that man was Adam. was Adam. Mr.---? (Student)

any accurate information apart from divine inspiration, so it seems to me that in that connection--it would strike me as most likely that those figures would come either from the old part or the middle part. That is to say, it shouldn't be difficult for people in the days before they had writing to recall the figures of the years and that might have been passed down by word of mouth and--how's that? (Student) I don't know. It's a question-- Mr.---? (Student)

T 9

It is Matthew 1:8. In Matthew 1:8 you have the statement that Solomon begat Rehoboam and Rehoboam begat Abijah and Abijah begat Asa and Asa begat Jehosaphat and Jehosaphat begat Jehoram and Jehoram begat Oziah and Oziah begat Jotham,

T 9

and everybody who had Old Testament history last semester knows that Jehoram was not the father of Uzziah, but the father of \_\_\_\_\_ who in turn was the father of Joas, who in turn was the father of Amaziah, the father of Uzziah. So that you have here these three Israelite kings and Matthew simply says that Jehoram began, and then gives the name of his great grandson. Well, now if Matthew could do that here--and it is no mistake because all the Israelites knew the names of these kings even better than those who had Old Testament history last semester, know them. They had them clearly in mind and if Matthew had come out with something that simply \_\_\_\_\_ kings by mistake, people would have said, "Why, what a crazy book! How can we believe anything in the book of Matthew when it gets the kings all mixed up!" so it is very evidently that he did it intentionally and that he simply gave the kings along in line and said "begat" and then named one who three or four individuals down the line. Now if that is all right for Matthew to do it certainly is all right for Moses. Now I don't say that Moses did do it. I certainly don't say there are gaps as long as this, but I say that there may be, but we don't know, and I think certainly that there are gaps after the flood. I feel quite convinced of that because we have archaeological evidence going back to perhaps 4000 B. C. which leaves no space for a flood, and it is pretty hard to see how you can have the tremendous flood and no change made in the world. It would seem to me that the flood occurs earlier than any other archaeological event. That is, we have evidence of floods. You go up here to the \_\_\_\_\_ you'll find a place where the flood waters have built up soil three or four feet high in one of those. You take the Johnstown flood--you'll find evidence of floods. In Mesopotamia you have evidence of floods in different parts of the country, but the floods come <sup>from</sup> /t different times, maybe a thousand years apart, but an evidence of a flood such as Noah's we do not have. Mr.---? (Student) There are flood areas in widely \_\_\_\_\_ areas in Mesopotamia which come from periods as much as five hundred years apart. You will find the same civilization underneath one that you find above the others and still another civilization between

T 9

it and the flood area, so they're pretty hard to synchronize, and being right next to the river, it would be very easy for the river in one big flood to deposit a great deal of soil and all rivers have floods/Yes? (Student) In other words, the eighth in the genealogical . He counts it the way they . That doesn't mean that there are no gaps.

Mr. Sit? (Student) device for remembering the list. There are so many in the list. (Student) Yes. He divides /<sup>them</sup> into three groups, the main into three groups of fourteen each, but if he said if he meant there are actually fourteen men with no gap, then he told a lie, because there are other three, as everybody knows, as the Old Testament clearly proves, as all his readers would know, except the Gentiles, and Matthew is the gospel to the Jews, so that very evidently he meant there are fourteen--he meant, "I am arranging these in three approximate groups and I am getting fourteen in this list." I admit it is not what you would gather from it. It is superficial interpretation, but as a superficial interpretation of it Matthew has here said something which is definitely wrong. You have to say either Matthew was wrong or that Matthew didn't intend to name them that way. One or the other. Of course, there is a third possibility that some critic might say that there was a mistake, Matthew wrote it right but he didn't say there were fourteen generations and then somebody copying made a mistake and left out three and then somebody put in that verse. All such ideas would be pure conjecture and our belief is that it is as Matthew wrote it. Yes? (Student) In the third of Luke? Yes. Well, I don't think we would benefit by taking a lot of time counting those up, but when Peter says these were seven and when Luke gives ten names, it just shows that God didn't intend us to take these figures and construct an absolute complete table of years. There are many purposes of the Bible, there are many other things which it might have done which it didn't do. It might, for instance, have given us the exact figure of five. We find in Kings that it describes a bath there, and it says that this bath was circular and it says that the bath was ten cubits across and that it was thirty cubits around and people say that that is a mistake in the description of the

temple, because they say if you make a circle which is ten across it will not be thirty around. As a matter of fact, they say, it will be thirty-one around, but of course if he had said it was ten and thirty-one they could have said, "No, that is wrong because it is not thirty-one around, it is thirty-one and four-tenths around!" while if he said it is 31.4 they could have said, "That's wrong, because it is 31.40," and then if you had said, "All right, it is 31.416," they could say, "That's wrong, because as every mathematician knows, it would be 31.4157," and you could go on and on and I think it has been figured two hundred places. Well, the Bible could have given it the whole 200 places to have given us an accurate statement. That was not God's intention. God gives it approximately. He only gives the first figures just the three, instead of giving the whole list. We cannot figure exactly what pi is from the Scripture, because that was not God's intention, to give us pi. He just refers to the approximate figures. He didn't even give us the first five figures of it, which

And He certainly didn't give the two hundred. Well, now the same thing applies to these other questions as to the length of time mankind has been here, some of these matters of chronology. The Lord could have given us something five times the size of the Encyclopedia Britannica and answered a great many questions about ancient history that we are interested in and after we read that we could think of still more questions to ask that wouldn't be answered in it. That was not His intention. He gives us the great facts of the universe, He tells us about Himself and His relation to man and how man can be saved and in so doing He touches on many points and that which He touches upon is true as far as the information goes that is given to us, but He does not attempt to give it in full, and whatever can be literally and definitely inferred from the Scripture we can stand upon without fear that it will ever be proven to be erroneous but we want to be very careful that we stand upon a statement of Scripture and not upon a gap in Scripture, not upon something that is <sup>simply</sup> not whole. When we read that Sennacherib returned to his own land and when he was warshipping in the temple of his god

T 2

his sons killed him and he died, we can stand on that, that he returned to his land and we stand on that, that as he was worshiping in his temple his sons smote him, but as to the gap between when he got back and when they killed him--was it two minutes, was it two hours, was it two days, was it two years, or was it twenty years? We cannot stand on the gap because the Bible doesn't say how long it was. We have archaeological evidence which suggests very strongly that it was twenty years but on a superficial reading of the statement you think it certain that it was within the same week. It doesn't say it was, but there is a gap there which the Lord simply didn't choose to . Well, I think that is as much time as we'd better take on this matter of chronology. I would not have said that man was created 900,000 B. C. I certainly don't know anything about it. It is altogether possible that there are some serious errors in these methods of calculation. At the same time, there has been some very convincing evidence. I do not say it was even 100,000, but it does impress me as extremely unlikely that it was any where near as late as 4000. I would guess it was at least as early as 8,000 or 10,000, and possibly 9,000. I think they show us the change in the world at the flood as we see how before they lived such long periods of time and after the periods of time of those going after the flood rapidly decreased, and it shows the effect of a changed condition in the world. (Student) I would think so, yes. I don't know of any other. Possibly, for men of the earlier day there was some particular purpose. There might even in some later time come to be some real purpose, but I know of no other purpose that is of particular value to us now. (Student) I don't know whether there is anything in popular language that is available yet because this man is doing first hand work in it and he is giving us the most recent work as he saw it. One of the big things he based it on was coral set up out of the ocean bottom, and the Government, the Navy, has placed at his disposal quite a sizeable sum of money in order to go and dig up additional coral, in order to check the results he has secured. Now, that is only one part of it, but that

T 2

was one of the number of vital segments . The material he used came from a number of different places and he drew it together particularly to look at this one point. I think that doubtless within the next few years we will either find some serious errors in it or we will find more convincing evidence for it but he is a bright fellow and a keen-minded fellow and a very earnest Christian, and he expects to find , and I told him I did not believe that it contradicted the Scripture, but that doesn't mean he is right. He may be proven wrong, but it is unfortunate that there have been up to the last two or three years in recent decades hardly any Christian geologists. We have had Christians who have done careful study in most other fields of science, particularly in the fields that don't particularly touch the Bible, like physics and chemistry and astronomy. We have had very, very fine Christian men. Till a century ago the geologists were mostly very fine Christians, but in recent years/there have been some botanists and biologists who have been convinced Christians there have been hardly any geologists who have been. There is one man, a Seventh Day Adventist, who has written extensively on geology who takes views that differ with the views of all other geologists today, and that doesn't mean that at some points he may be proven right and they wrong, but one would be very foolish to stand upon the opinion of a man who is so entirely by himself on as involved and complicated a science as geology, and of course there is a great deal of new material discovered in it and many new thoughts and this man of whom I speak before going into geology was a Ph. D. in chemistry, and he is very much interested in physical chemistry names of , which he says have been worked out particularly within the last few years and he claims they are extremely reliable. Now I am not able to speak with any first-hand knowledge in the field because we've been very short of Christian geologists and the next few years should bring further information but I just think that it would be foolish for us to put ourselves out on a limb to say the Bible teaches that man was created either in 4000 B. C. or in 10,000 B. B. I don't think it was 4000 and if it

T 2

wasn't there are gaps, and if there are gaps of a thousand years there can be gaps of a hundred thousand, but what they were I don't know. Mr.---? (Student)

T 10

of the higher critics is that this is . That is simply their attitude, that these are ancient myths. They would not even think of there being any truth in anything in the history before the time of--well the wouldn't have thought of anything before the time of the kings, at all. They thought that it was just folk lore before that, and that the critical theories were with that viewpoint. They were largely the result of the philosophy which was widely taught in Germany, philosophy of history of a hundred and fifty years ago, according to which we didn't believe any ancient document unless we had absolute proof from completely other sources, and this did away with all the history of early Rome, up until the late period of the republic. It did away with most ancient history but that has been given up and the attitude taken now is, where we have ancient sources we trust the sources unless we have evidence that they are erroneous. It has been given up in all other fields except the Bible. In the Bible the higher criticism developed in the atmosphere which had accepted those theories of the nondependability of ancient documents and now that we trust ancient documents in general much more than we did then the higher criticism has been established and widely held in relation to the Bible, while the other attitude would not be held of itself .

Well, now I think we are ready to go on to the flood. Mr.---? (Student)

The trouble there is that, especially in those days, there was so much upheaval and war that any such figuring would be altered very quickly when the war came. (Student) Oh, yes. A great deal. There has been at all periods in history, and another thing about it, also, is that even apart from wars population has never moved at an exactly stable rate. During the last century we had a time

T 10

when the population, I think of the world, doubled, <sup>whole</sup> the/world, within a very short period, quite unprecedented from anything before or since, and it was due to improvement in the sources of food and improvement in hygiene. That improvement came and the population all over Europe increased tremendously, the population in every country and every section. Well, now in ancient times we have certain great advances which are similar, which are comparable, and just when they came we don't know exactly so that we have not sufficient evidence to base any estimate of time on the basis of it. (Student) Ur has been fairly well excavated. I imagine it wouldn't be difficult to make a fairly good estimate on this. I imagine it would not be difficult to make a fairly good estimate of the population of Ur at a particular time but you'll find that Ur a few years before that was completely destroyed and you'll find a few years later it was completely destroyed and I don't think the population movement would be at all stable. Well, now, D, the flood, and 1, the ~~cause~~ cause of the flood. We find that stated in Genesis 6. We find that Genesis 6, the beginning of the chapter describes the increasing sin in the world, and we find here that the sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were fair, and took them wives of all that they chose. And what does that mean--the sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were fair. Some say the sons of God are the descendants of Seth and the sons of men are the descendants of Cain and this means a breaking down of the line of demarkation between the holy line of Seth and the unholy line of Cain. Well, that is not what it says here. Maybe that's what it means, but it doesn't say it. Certainly there is a great element of possibility in it which would account for the increased wickedness of the world because it is true that there is nothing that has been more injurious to Christian men than marriage with unChristian women, but I think you could say vice versa also, so I don't think--I am sure you can say vice versa, and I am not at all sure that you would call the sons of Seth the sons of God in a proper sense, and I don't know how Cain was any more a man

T 10

than Seth was. Christ Himself had His favorite title for Himself, the Son of man. He was the Son of God, He was also the Son of man. To say that the sons of God are the descendants of Seth and the sons of man the sons of Cain is at least highly conjectural. Now the other suggestion that is made for this is that the sons of God indicate exalted beings. It indicates demons or it indicates spiritual beings, beings which had fallen and that they saw the daughters of men who were beautiful and v. 4 would fit in with that idea because when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, the children they bore became mighty men, men of renown. Well, why should the breaking over of the line between Cain and Seth produce mighty men, but if there was anything supernatural like this in it, that could account for the unusual might of the men, for the fact that they were giants. These are the two interpretations advanced for it; we are not given sufficient material to decide as between the two interpretations, whether there was a time here of demoniac interference with mankind in some such remarkable way as this, or whether it simply indicates the confusion of intermixture of the Godly and the ungodly, we are not told, but that 4th verse would look a little bit in the direction of there being something supernatural about it.

Mr. Tow? (Student) There are the angels of God, and these are fallen angels.

Wheth<sup>er</sup> there might be a change in some way, it is hard to say. Mr. ---? (Student)

That's , if I recall correctly. You mean as to whether a study of the precise word would throw further light upon it? It has been historically understood to mean giants, great beings; whether--it sounds like the verb "to fall".

Whether it means there were fallen beings in the earth in those days or--(student)

Well, it isn't the right sort of a form for that " " you'd expect to

be past " " would be more active You'd expect " "---

something like that. Not " ", so that as far as form is concerned

it doesn't suggest so much as .

Mr.---? (Student) In v. 2? The verb "to be" there? It is--how's that? " "

Yes. Sons of " ". Now these are the two interpretations of this. I

T 10

think either of them is a possible interpretation. I don't think we know for a certainty which of the two it is. My inclination is to guess that there is some supernatural element involved but I am not at all certain that's correct. The other seems to me less likely, but not impossible. At any rate we have increasing wickedness here and I wouldn't be at all surprised if in that increasing wickedness we have the spiritual influence of the one who had led man into his fall increasing the wickedness. I do not think we can account for this world apart from the activities of Satan. There are too many things that simply are unaccountable otherwise. The curse accounts for many but there are ~~many~~ <sup>others</sup> which the curse alone does not account for. There is certainly a definite activity of Satan in the world and that is surely definitely taught by our Lord in his statements, and <sup>demon</sup> said that the one that has the ~~spirit~~ driven out of him and the house is left empty, the demon goes and gets seven others worse than himself and brings them back. It seems to me that there is a very real truth to that. It's a very good thing to get people cleaned up and to get them away from the evil in which they have been but if you merely get them away from the evil to which they have been addicted you prepare them for something which may be more respectable but may be even worse in God's sight. There is a need of something positive. It is not enough to turn away from sin; we must actively turn to God and serve Him. Mr.---?

(Student) That is, if they were sons of God, they were beings of supernatural character, of character superior to that of man, but they were beings which had fallen and which were under God's displeasure but permitted for the present to still be active. I think that we find the sons of God, the phrase used in the Scripture in various places in a way to indicate that it is used of supernatural beings and I would think it could still be used of the fallen. Mr.---?

(Student) I don't think so, no. I think they were all ready fallen before. I don't think that was the fall, but I think you could--they were not in a true

T 10

sense, sons of God any more, but they derived their strength from that power which He had originally given them. They were the sons of God in the sense of being superior to men and so if (student). " " is translated "judges" but whether it is correctly translated "judges" I am very skeptical about it. Mr. Sanderson has put his finger on a good point, that the word " " is used in the Scripture in a sense other than that of " the true God ". It is used in various other connections and other senses and there are some very interesting problems connected with it. One case, our English version translates it "judges" but it is " " in the New Testament. I believe it is that passage where Christ says, "He calls them gods unto whom the Lord came." I think he is quoting that very passage, so that would look as if the translation "judges" was not really a correct translation. "Bring them to the gods" is a phrase used occasionally in Scripture. The word is used, like all words in the Scripture are used, in senses which some times have to be gathered from the context. We rarely find a word in the Scripture any more than we do in modern speech which always has exactly the same meaning. They vary somewhat in different people's mouths and in different situations. Human language is a very fallible instrument and when we say that the Bible is verbally inspired we do not mean that God created an infallible language for it. We mean that He gave us something in which the fallible words are used, words which express the idea as well as can be done in fallible words and words which correctly interpreted do not mean bring in incorrect implication of fact or doctrine or of judgment, but it is very, very vital that we get the correct interpretation of what verbal inspiration is. It is easy to build up an idea of verbal inspiration which is not taught in the Scripture and does not conform to the nature of language and then have people knock it to pieces and simply destroy our whole religion and that is a very grave danger. I am all the more convinced that it is vital that we study sanely and exactly and accurately rather than simply take an extreme position and stand on it. The extreme position--a few people can go

T 10

out and proclaim and win followers but you will always find there are those who react against the extreme position and then they usually go to the opposite extreme and it much wiser to try to find just what the Scripture does teach. Now in this matter whether the sons of God are fallen beings or whether they are the sons of Seth the Bible doesn't say and as far as I can see we can take either of the two interpretations as far as our present knowledge goes. We say it is one of the two. I don't know of any other suggestion, and of the two I am inclined to think it is the supernatural being. I am inclined to that but I don't feel at all dogmatic about it.

Now we find that this, v. 5 God saw ~~that~~ the wickedness of man was great in the earth and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And God repented that he had made man on the earth and it grieved him at his heart and He decided to destroy them from the face of the earth. But there was one man who found grace in the eyes of the Lord, Noah. So very evidently we do not have here ~~that~~ the descendants of Seth, all of whom are good, and the women that descended from Cain, all of whom were bad, and some of the sons of Seth have gone over and joined the bad but there still are a lot of them left, but we find that sin has been on both parts of the human race. The line of Cain has gone much worse than the line of Seth but both of them have fallen into sin and out of all of both lines we have only Noah left who has found grace in the eyes of the Lord, and then we find that, verses 11 and 12 describe

T 11

very corrupt and so God gives Noah a message and the New Testament refers to the days of Noah. In Matthew 24:37 and in Luke 17:26 it tells us that as it was in the days of Noah so shall it be in the days of the Son of God. Yes? (Student) Yes. It is a very interesting word, this word " ", and Mr. Sit asked us a few minutes ago and we had a little discussion about it. Well, everybody's mind wanders / occasionally and probably some others missed it also. I don't

T 11

mind the mind of any of you wandering occasionally but bring it back as quickly as you can. Mr.---? (Student) Yes. And if you have a question that you want to ask, even if it has been asked, don't hesitate to ask it again. If I haven't made it clear, if it is something vital I certainly want to take the time to do it. This is a rather incidental point so I'd rather not take the time for this particular thing. Mr.—? (Student) Repentance means Godly sorrow for sin and turning away from it, and so the Lord saw, He'd made men on the earth, He had a Godly sorrow for their sin and He turned away from it. I don't think that is what it means at all and when you look at the Hebrew word there which is translated "repent", the Hebrew word is the word " " and this Hebrew word " " is used in--it is quite generally translated "repent" in the but it is also sometimes translated "to be comforted" and in the it is the positive and you find in Isaiah 40, "Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people, saith the Lord", and that is the positive of this same verb. It is not "Cause my people to repent. Cause my people to repent". It is, "Cause my people to be comforted. Cause my people to be comforted." "Comfort my people, comfort my people," saith the Lord. Those two translations occur for the verb and they are quite different in their ideas to us, but actually the word has one meaning, but it is a quite difficult meaning. I traced it through once--went right through the Old Testament looking at the usage of this word and I came to this conclusion, that this word " " has the meaning of a changed emotional feeling from an unhappy state to a less unhappy state which is brought about in view of something which has occurs or which one plans to do. Now you see we have no exact English word that gives that meaning but that, I came to the conclusion, is what is meant by this word " ". We read in Genesis 24, for instance, that when Rebekah came to Isaac, we read that Isaac " " her after the death of his mother. It doesn't mean she repented, turned away from sin. It means that his state of misery on account of the loss of his mother

T 11

was considerably lessened with the joy that came from the presence of Rebekah and we find many other instances. We find it used in Samuel where the Lord said to Samuel, "It has repented me that I have made Saul king. I'm going to anoint another," and ~~Saul~~ <sup>Samuel</sup> went in the very same chapter and said to Saul, "You have sinned against God and God is going to take the kingship away from you and God is not a man that He should repent." The very same words here. God told Samuel He had repented; Samuel said to Saul, "God is not a man that He should repent." Well, you see it is the meaning of the word. God said to Samuel, "I am in misery because of the wickedness of this man Saul. I comfort myself with the decision to appoint another king. I find relief from the unpleasant emotional state by the decision that another one will be appointed king." Samuel said to Saul, "God is going to take the kingship away from you and, "he said, "don't you think you can make some sacrifices or some kind of a present to God and that God is a man who will turn away from His sadness, of His determination to remove you from being king and allow Himself to be made happier over it and forget it because of some present you give Him." You see how--there's a very definite meaning in it. Well now, of all the passages in the Scripture this one here is perhaps the hardest to begin the law of first interpretation, the principle of first occurrence you see. It is the hardest one of all but I do think that the meaning does fit here very well that God, in view of His determination to destroy man from the face of the earth is comforted over the misery which the creation of man has brought Him. You see it fits in with the others. It certainly is not turning away from sin, a Godly sorrow for sin and turning away from it and in the Old Testament it is mostly used for God, this particular word. It is altogether different from the Greek word we use in the New Testament. I think it is rather unfortunate translation. Mr.—? (Student). It is used in the \_\_\_\_\_ to be comforted or to repent and then the \_\_\_\_\_ of it, the positive of it, to cause to repent, to cause to be comforted.

T 11

Yes? (Student) He was grieved on account of the situation of man and His grief was lessened by this decision to do away with him. So, of course, you cannot interpret the simply in the light of the one verse alone. You take the following verse—And God said "I will destroy man", and you take its many uses elsewhere and, I tried this meaning, "He was grieved" but it doesn't fit, and I know too many cases where isn't "grieved", it's a lessening of grief, often a lessening of grief through contemplation of a decision which has been made. Very often—it is used a good many times in the Scripture. You will find it interesting to look it through and see how it is used. Well, we have to stop here. I have assigned your lesson for Monday and for Tuesday and if you will look on the board about noon you will see a definite statement that we will or not meet on Monday. If we don't you can

T 11 (second part)

our further discussion. We were looking at the flood--No. 1, its cause, and we noticed that the cause of this flood was increasing wickedness on the earth, increasing wickedness from the fact that sin is here, and Satan is here in power, and consequently everything which is not constantly vitalized and strengthened by continuous contact with the Spirit of the living God inevitably degenerates and goes down. You cannot form an organization, a denomination, an institution or a movement that will automatically keep on a high plain. You can do nothing that will insure that any movement will remain Christian. The only thing that will insure that any denomination, movement, institution or anything whatever will remain Christian is constant communion between its leaders and God, constant looking to Him day by day. The wonderful Christian spirit of the founders of no institution is sufficient to keep it good ten years later, or to keep it Christian ten years later, and so we find that the human race has degenerated

T 11

until there is only one man left who is righteous and yet, as Christ tells us, they were marrying and giving in marriage, they were going through the ordinary processes of life without people realizing that a terrific crisis was upon them. The descent into sin and wickedness is something which was not fully realized. Conditions were moving along smoothly and they looked on this man Noah who preached righteousness to them and declared the judgment of God as some sort of a crazy freak, and then suddenly the crisis came, and before looking at the nature of the crisis or that which followed it any further we might take up No. 2, the Babylonian flood story. Now for a very good statement of the similarity between the Babylonian flood story and the Biblical story I have a note in my notes here that you may see Skinner, p. 177 for an excellent statement of this, but I cannot read it to you from Skinner because I did not bring my copy over from home thinking that I would use the one in the library, and the one in the library seems not to be there, and so that makes a good point right here to call your attention to the fact that some of you may not be cognizant of, that commentaries are not supposed to circulate. They are supposed to remain in the library either on the table there or in their proper place on the shelf. Other books which are used for a class and a good many people have to use are placed on a reserve shelf, meaning they are not to be taken out of that room. This is not necessary in the case of a commentary, because it is a regular rule of the library that no commentaries are to be withdrawn from the room. It is only after considerable search that I found one copy of Driver's Genesis and no copy of Skinner's seems to be there. It is my impression that we have at least two of both of them, and so I would like to make this request to you that you would abide by that rule which is necessary in order that all may have the use of these books, but no commentary whatever be taken out of the library except it be done by a member of the faculty, and he signs a card for it. We would prefer no student ever to take one out of the library.

Now, the Babylonian flood story. I asked you, as your assignment a couple

T 11

of days ago to note the similarities between it and the Biblical story. Barton gives a statement of them in his ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE BIBLE which I do not think is anywhere near as good a statement but he mentions certain features. He says that the account so closely resembles that in the Bible that nearly all scholars recognize <sup>that are</sup> there two versions of the same narrative, and then he has footnote as two accounts of the same event. I don't know whether he put the footnote in or whether some editor put it in in order to make it look a little more conservative than it would otherwise, because two versions of the same narrative and two accounts of the same event are quite different things, and for one who believes as Barton did that there is no special truth in any of it, it is easy enough to say that there are two different versions of the same narrative but there would be quite a difference when you say two accounts of the same event. He continues, "In each case there is a divine revelation to the whole of the deluge that a catastrophe is coming <sup>which</sup> of everyone else is ignorant. He then relates the building of the vessel, the pitching it within and without with pitch, the embarkation, the flood in which other men are destroyed, the resting of the ship on the mountain and the sending out of the dove, the disembarkation, the sacrifice and the information that in future a deluge will not be." I asked you all to look up the similarities and to read the account as you would find it given either in Barton's ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE BIBLE or in Finegan's LIGHT FROM THE ANCIENT EAST or in some other book which would give you a translation of it. I think it was four years ago in this class that I did not give that assignment but instead I read the story of the deluge here and I remember that as I started like it is now outside, point here that the it was about / and when I got to the/floods began to come down, it began to pour rain, and when I got to the end where there was a rainbow, the bright sun was shining in the room, so we had effects which were very appropriate in our description. Now, I have noticed--those of you who have read it, and I hope all of you have read it, for it is within the two hours of the assignment, in fact, you could read it in half an hour easily

T 11

within the two hours of that assignment; it certainly would not be fulfilling that assignment simply to copy what one of these various writers said, but I meant you specifically to read the account, and if you read it you noticed the very dramatic manner of presentation. You noticed that a vivid picture was given here of the flood, a vivid picture of the attitude of the god who was so sure the flood was going to come and who got the word secretly to without the other gods knowing about it, that a flood was coming and all that might be saved through the flood, and then we remember the description here, the vivid description of the terror of the flood, were frightened at the deluge; they fled; they climbed to the highest heavens; the gods crouched like dogs, were laid down by the walls--a very vivid picture which he gives. One little

T 12

sight of the people who were there like logs floating about and wept to think that all mankind had died. Professor Fredrich Delitzsch, the one who gave the lectures on Babylon and the Bible said, "You find no compassion in the Biblical Noah," which, to him, was one of the signs of the great superiority of the Babylonian account. The picture is a very vivid picture here which you have, and there are certainly many points which at first sight look very similar to the Biblical account but, we ask, are these points similar to those which we have in the story of creation. We notice that there you have the sun, moon and stars created in both accounts. Well, what kind of a creation story would it be if you didn't have. You notice that there man is created. Well, how would you have a creation story without <sup>humanity</sup> ~~man-being~~ created. We noticed that most of the points of alleged similarity between the Babylonian story of the creation and the Biblical story of the creation were simply such as would exist in any two creation stories and therefore when you say there is a story of creation you have practically named all the similarities. The Babylonian creation story does have

T 12

a certain chaos with dampness and wetness which is somewhat similar to the dampness of the Scriptural account but that is just about as far as any similarity goes of a life which would not necessarily inhere in any creation story. There is really no reason to consider the Babylonian creation story related to the Biblical story any more than any other creation story anywhere in the world. In this case, I think that we have a difference. We have in both a flood. Well, there have been thousands of floods in the world. A very dramatic story of the Johnstown flood here in Pennsylvania would make a thrilling account, certainly just as thrilling as the Babylonian story here, but it surely would be entirely different. There you have a flood which occurred from the coming down of a big river when the dams were broken and the flood swept down through the river bed--entirely different from the picture of the windows of heaven being opened here. Here you have an account of a divine revelation to Noah that a flood was coming. There is a divine revelation to that a flood is coming. Now of course that is something which you might have in several flood stories but you wouldn't have to have. It is, you might say, something which is incidental to the fact that there is a flood. It might or it might not be. Then you have in both of them the account of the building of a vessel. Out in the Grand Canyon there were two boys who were up the Bright Angel creek, a stream bed which is quite a stream, a little stream maybe as far as from here to there; maybe a little wider, sometimes from one to three feet in depth which flows down, bright, cold water, flows down from the north into the Colorado river, and I remember a few years ago these two boys who were up the stream bed a couple of miles and just at that time there was a cloud burst five or six miles away from them up in the mountains there which hit right in the upper end of one of the little tributories of the Bright Angel Creek and that water came flooding down there and this stream which was ordinarily two or three feet in depth came up to twenty feet in depth. The trail th<sup>ere</sup> which had been built at a cost of many thousands of dollars was completely washed out.

T 12

I went up a month later and I tried to walk up it--you'd have a lovely trail along the side and as you would be walking along and all of a sudden you /would come to a place that was completely washed out and there was a drop of twenty feet. and you would have to retrace your steps and you would go down and eventually I decided I might as well just walk up through the body of the stream. It would be easier than trying to follow the trail. It did terrific havoc to the trail and to the place inland. Well, after it was over the parents of these boys went up the stream to see if they could find any trace of the bodies of these two boys who had been up there when the flood suddenly came down and they went up and hunted and hunted and finally they saw that way up on the side of a steep hill the boys had heard the waters coming with a terrific roar and they had managed to dash up the side there and to get up high enough that the stream didn't get them and they had gotten up there and were safe up there on the hillside. Now in a story of a flood somebody might go up a high mountain and that way he might be saved from the flood and thus not injured. Occasionally you have stories of floods in which someone manages to hang on to a piece of wreckage and though he may be hurled about by the waters, manages to escape with his life. There are various ways in which an individual might save his life in the course of a flood, but in both these stories a boat is built and built in advance in preparation for the coming of this tremendous flood. Then we have a building a vessel--both of them mention this little incidental fact, it was pitched within and without with pitch. Now that, you might say, would be rather incidental to the description of the building of a boat. It would be watertight to resist a tremendous thing like this, and you notice an interesting little touch that both of them had that. Then in both of them it tells how they went into the boat when there was no sign of rain and got in there in readiness for the coming of the storm. In both accounts, as it is being swept about, they're in the flood, the master of the vessel sends out a bird. Now that is not a thing that would necessarily occur to people in a flood like

T 12

this. Surely there would be many people who would be wondering whether they any where near a time when they could get out of the boat who wouldn't think of sending out a bird. You wouldn't always have a bird you could send out, but in each case you have three birds sent out. They are different birds. The order of them is different, but you have three birds sent out one after the other to see if from the actions of these birds you can get any idea as to whether the flood is abating enough that you will soon be able to get out on dry land again. Both of them describe the disembarkation. Well, if you have an account of a boat you would rather expect to have a disembarkation but then both of them tell how a sacrifice is made, and in the Babylonian account it says that when they disembarked and made a sacrifice the gods smelled the sweet savor. The gods above the sacrifice had collected like flies. Well now the Bible has nothing exactly parallel to that but the Bible does tell how Noah made a sacrifice immediately after they came out of the ark and then in both of them you have an intimation that there would not be a deluge again, that if God is going to destroy mankind He will use some other means but that the deluge will not be an instrument again. Now these are a large number of similarities between the two accounts which are not simply natural and necessary to the fact of having two stories of the flood. You have many stories of floods in other countries, because everywhere you have a big river you have a flood some time or other. Floods are rather common, but that doesn't mean you have a flood every year by any means but if you would take the Mississippi, certainly once in every ten or fifteen years you have a rather devastating flood, and the same is true of many of the big rivers out in Pennsylvania, and so flood stories are rather common, but very few of them have anything like this number of little incidental details in common, and consequently it seems to me that in the story of the flood you are in quite a different situation than you were in the story of creation. My own inclination is to think that the Babylonian flood story and the Biblical flood story are indeed two accounts of the same event. Mr.

T 12

Jester, did you have a suggestion or a question? (Student) I believe there was just a slight rain, yes; but I don't think the main rains had started, if I recall correctly, but I notice he does say, "When the centers of rain shall rain upon you in mighty rain storm at evening, embark upon the ship and close thy door. The time approached, the centers of rain sent at evening a heavy rainstorm. I observed the appearance today. I embarked upon the ship." So there was a little more evidence in this case than in the Biblical case that the rain was coming. Perhaps that wouldn't really be a similarity between the two. They did enter in ample time in both cases. They didn't wait until they were really in--it was obvious it was difficult, and then rushed to the boat. In both they into it first, but in this case probably a little more information of it had been given. (Student) The expression of--? (Student) Yes. (Student) There would be more faith in the case of Noah. That would be definite. Well, there are many similarities then between these which are slight incidental things such as would not necessarily occur in the story of a flood and we have--probably every nation on the face of the earth has a story of a flood. Probably every people who ever lived in a river valley has had a <sup>great</sup> flood which has left an impression on the imagination of the people and so how many of these stories go back in any sense to the Biblical flood would be hard to say, but it certainly would look as if the Babylonian story and the Biblical story went back either to the same event or to a common source. Mr. Buswell? (Student) Well, now that is a separate question, the nature of the flood, but--you mean the Babylonian or the Biblical? (Student) Yes. Well, that is a separate question. Let's take that up later, but as to the <sup>two</sup> stories I think we must say that there are striking similarities between them and my inclination is to say the Babylonian story of the creation or of the fall has no similarity whatever to the Biblical story. The Babylonian story of the flood is strikingly similar to the Biblical story. Now is that unnatural or is it natural? The creation had taken place at least 3,000 years before the time of the Babylonian story, the Biblical story perhaps a few hundred

thousand years. No one had seen the creation. It was only by revelation of God that it could be known to anybody. Man intentionally put God out of his mind. How, then, could he be expected to have remembered much about the creation of the world, and the same applies to the fall. These would be only things at the time of the flood which were remembered as something from long before, but the flood would be something which had not been so/far prior to the story of the Babylonians or to the story, or to the time of Abraham. It might be a few hundred years; it might be a few thousand years, but at least it was far nearer than the fall was or than the creation was and there is nothing per se in it that would make sinful man want to blot it out of his mind. that all of the theological implications of the flood story are completely lacking in the Babylonian flood story. The Biblical flood story comes because man had sinned against God. The Babylonian flood story comes because one of the gods has a and he decides that he wants to get rid of mankind. In the Biblical story Noah alone is righteous on the earth and God preserves Noah. In the Babylonian story one of the gods secretly tells his friend that he can save himself from this and the other gods are angry with him when they discover that somebody's life has been saved. There is nothing theological in the sense of Christian teaching in the Babylonian story. It is a polytheistic story of gods who blame each other, who fight and dispute, who crouch with fear like dogs, who swarming come to the sacrifice like hungry flies. It is utterly different from the picture of God in the Bible and of the purpose of the flood, as the purpose of the preservation of Noah. All of this is what we would naturally expect sinful/man to put out of his mind if he turned away from God and turned into , but the great tremendous event of this flood and the outstanding facts about it are something that would make a tremendous effect on the imagination of mankind and it would be quite natural that for a long time after the main features of them would be recalled and passed on from generation to generation, and so to my mind it is absolutely natural that the Babylonians would retain much of the detail of the story of the flood, much more so than it would be if they remembered the

T 12

creation story or the story of the fall, and it fits quite together with the fact that the Bible should have it Abraham, and the Babylonians should have it at this early time, and written down at least as early as 3000 B. C. and perhaps a good deal earlier and passed on to subsequent generations, and I think we can agree with the critics that the Babylonian flood story is similar to the Biblical flood story, though you can say that it is altogether natural that there should be a recollection of the event; in fact it becomes a further evidence of the fact that the event occurred, that it should be recalled as long as this after the time. Now there is no other race in the world anywhere that has literature as ancient as the Babylonian literature and it is altogether natural that the main details of it should have been forgotten also, but quite natural that they should have been preserved this long in Mesopotamia.

T 13

Now in past years I have taken them in the opposite order, but I thought today it might be more logical to do them in this order for a special reason which I have in mind. The critical story of the flood as you know takes it that there are two documents in the story of the flood which have been interwoven together, and you have, not like Genesis 1 and 2 where you have the whole of the story of creation and the whole of the story of creation, according to the critical idea. Here you have a few words from the P and a few words from J, a few verses from P and a few verses from J, and so on, and so on, a little of this and a little of that, a little of this and a little of that, intertwined together to make up your whole flood story. I happened one evening to drop in at a Presbyterian church in Charlottesville, Virginia, and I remember that the pastor there in that Southern Presbyterian Church was preaching a sermon on the flood and he said in beginning, he said, "I am preaching my sermon tonight on the J story of the flood and I will read to you the J story of the flood." He said, "I am sure that as you read it in the Bible many of you have been confused by

T 13

the repetitions and contradictions between the J and P stories of the flood which are so intertwined in your Bibles just as you have been confused by the mixture together of            and            in the gospels of Matthew and Luke!" He said, "I am sure you have found in, both in the gospels and in Genesis this very confusing, so tonight we will simply read the J story!" and he simply read those verses which they put into the J story and then he proceeded to preach quite a good sermon on the J story of the flood. Now, that is their theory then, that you have these two stories, the J story and the P story of the flood combined together, and while the main treatment of this question is something which will be taken up in the introduction to the Pentateuch where the whole matter of the critical theory of the Pentateuch will be considered at one time, still it is worth while that we take a few minutes to note this question, "Is it something that is necessarily true that the J story and the P story are two distinct stories which have been intertwined together and interwoven together?" And as you look at it--I asked you to look up the evidences which are given for it and one of the evidences which is most stressed is the fact that you have a continuous and complete story of the flood in either the J story or the P. story, and that consequently you do not--it is repetition when you put the two together; you have the same thing told twice and this is quite evident in the early part of the story. For instance, you find that the P story says that in v. 10, the P story says that the fountains of the great deep were broken up and the windows of heaven were opened, and then v. 12, the J story says, "And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights," and thus you have one of them saying that water came on the earth and the other says water came upon the earth. You have the thing repeated and so you give one of them to the J story and you give one of them to the P. story. Then you find that in vs. 13-16a you have the P story--from 13 to 16a, the P. story, telling about all the people and all the animals going into the ark, and then at 16b you have the J story, "The Lord shut them in." And then, 17a you have the P story, "And the flood was forty days upon the earth". Then

T      13

you have the J story, "And the waters increased and bore up the ark, and it was lifted up above the earth," and then the P story again, "And the waters prevailed and were increased greatly upon the earth." And so you notice just as an example of it, here is v. 17, "The waters increased and bare up the ark and it was lift up above the earth,"—that's the J. story, and then the P story said, "And the waters prevailed and were increased greatly upon the earth; and the ark went upon the face of the waters." And you notice how it is repeated. And so it is easy enough to divide up the story and to take half the verses and make a fairly continuous story and to take the other half and make a fairly continuous story, and it looks like a very strong argument that you have two different stories which are combined here, but an interesting feature of it is that you can carry that argument still further. You take in v. 17, "The waters increased and bare up the ark, and it was lifted up above the earth," and then the P story, "And the waters prevailed and increased greatly upon the earth and the ark went upon the face of the waters, and the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth." You notice how they both say the same thing, but if you take what the J story had in 17 b, "The wathers increased. They bare up the ark and it was lifted up above the earth," Well, there you have twice told that the ark was lifted up—twice right in the one story, and then you go into the P story in v. 18, "The waters prevailed and they were increased greatly upon the earth," and then in v. 19, "And the waters prevailed esceedingly upon the earth", and then the end of 19 tells you that all the high hills under the whole heaven were covered, the end of 20, which is also P. says the mountains were covered. In other words, if you have repetition which warrants dividing it up into two stories, because the same thing is told you twice, so you can say one of them is J and the other is P, then you will notice that very often the same thing that is told you twice is told you five or six times, so you could in turn divide J into five or six stories and you

T 13

could divide P into five or six stories because a great many of the things which are told twice and thus give us warrant to say you have two or three different stories are told two or three different times within each of the two documents. I think that is a very interesting fact, and that you can easily follow through in the earlier part of the story of the flood, of the coming of the flood and of the waters upon the earth, you find that a thing is told and told and told and told and told again, and they give two or three of them to J and two or three to P, but why say you have two documents? Why not say you have six or seven documents? And then an interesting thing is that when you get to the end of the story of the flood you find that practically everything is only told once, and the result is that at the end of the story of the flood you have one telling a certain thing and the other telling a certain thing. Only one of the two documents tells how they came out of the ark. Only one of the two documents tells how the sacrifice was made. Only one of the two documents tells about the promise that there will not be another flood, so the details of the end of the flood are only told once, and the critics say, "Well, the other story must have had it also, but the redact<sup>or</sup> when he put them together only took from one account there." Well, if you are going to have the redactor free to take as literal as much as he chooses you cut down very greatly the validity of that sort of argument as evidence there was a redactor at all, but the interesting thing is that in the beginning of the flood story if you have evidence for two documents you have evidence for six documents, in the first half, and in the latter part of it you do not have evidence for more than one document, and what does it mean? It seems to me it means that a very natural and effective literary device has been used. The waters increased and they multiplied and they prevailed upon the earth and the waters mounted up and they covered the heavens and just one thing after another, after another, to pile up adjectives and statements to impress upon you the tremendous nature of the flood, and then when the flood is over, they don't have to say, "And the waters went down and they stopped, and they discontinued and they were gone." It

T 13

is not necessary. The flood's over; the waters are gone. The people come out. God speaks to them. There is no need of repetition. It is a dramatic device in telling the story and you do not have two accounts straight through. You have five or six accounts of the early phases of the flood, which is simply the piling up of statements in order to effectively make the impression of the tremendous nature of the flood which God brought upon the earth, and then at the end there is no need of that particular rhetorical , and it just comes to an end and then stops. I repeat . You could say it comes to an end at the J document; it stops at the P document, but that isn't done. It merely says it comes to an end, so you have to assume that the other that it stops has just been left off, but that is one thing that I think is very noticeable about this argument. It is so easy to divide the flood story up because you have everything told twice, but it is only true of the first half or two-thirds of the story and there there is very little that is told twice. Most of it is told five or six times, and at the end of that story, there is hardly anything that is told more than once. It simply is a literary device of way of telling it and I think that that is true of that argument, that on examination it disappears. Now, of course, one of the big arguments is the argument that one document always says God and one of them says Lord, and it is true that in Genesis 1 God is always said, but in Genesis 2 we have the Lord God and there are a few times where we just have God. In Genesis 3:1, Satan says--there you have "God said"--it does not say, "Hath the Lord said?" So that it is not consistent throughout, there; and here both names are used., Lord and God, but you will find that sometimes you have long series of verses where only once is God referred to, and I remember Driver the Lord points out in one case: he says, "You compare this from J where ~~God~~ is always used, and this from P, where God is always used," and you look at the fifteen verses he is pointing out from P, and you'll find that the word God only occurs once and there is no other reference to God in the portion. The fact of the matter is that the argument for the divine names is greatly overdrawn in this story

T 13

of the flood and it doesn't work out consistently there. There are a few cases where the critics say that the redactor had changed the name and actually that you have God or Lord used in the wrong sense. As I say, we are not trying to go into the arguments for the, the arguments as a whole, but we are simply looking now at one of those cases which is most widely given as a clear proof of the fact that you have two documents brought together of the story of the flood, and the reason that is given of clear proof is because it is so easy to take the first part of the story of the flood and to divide it into two parts without losing any of it, but you can't do that in the last half of the story and in the first part you could just as well divide it into five or six, because your reiterations are not combined . . . Now the reason today that I gave the Babylonian flood story first instead of dealing with the critical first is because the Babylonian flood story has a very interesting relationship to the Biblical story and that is the fact that if you are going to make a comparison between the Biblical story and the Babylonian/story you will find that it takes the entire Babylonian story to get the similarity. That is to say, the Babylonian story has some similarity to J and some to P and some few statements that are both in J and in P, and you do not get a fair parallel to the Babylonian story unless you take the flood story as it stands in the Bible, but you find that in the Babylonian story there is a great flood, divinely sent, which destroyed all men and animals except those saved in a single vessel with one man to whom the coming of the catastrophe had been disclosed and who had gathered into this vessel species of tame and wild beasts and members of his own family. That is in both the J document and the P document and the Babylonian story, but/the P document—the Bible tells you that the patriarch was divinely directed to build the vessel and that he was given particularly the dimensions and told to pitch it within and without with bitumen and to stock it with provisions and that he ended it on the day that the flood came or the day before, that the great deep as well as the heavens supplied the waters of the flood and that the ark eventually

T 13

rested on a mountain. All these things are in the P story and not in the J story and all these things are in the Babylonian story. On the other hand the J story has it, but the P story does not, that there was a covering to the ark, and that the door is shut is specifically mentioned in the J story and it is mentioned in the Babylonian story. They were both of them--the J. story and the Babylonian story mention how long this storm was, though they give it different lengths. They each mention that a window was opened and that birds were sent out. That is mentioned in the J story but not in the P story, and it is mentioned in the Babylonian story. There is mentioned in the J story the erection of an altar, an altar of sacrifice, in the J story--it is not in the P story--and it is in the Babylonian story, and so we see that we have indicated that we have a number of things which are in the J story and in the Babylonian

T 14

and when you divide it up into two stories, as the critics do, you have something which is nearer, is nearly as parallel to the Babylonian story as the whole thing put together. Now, I think that is an extremely interesting evidence of the fact that the Biblical story should not be divided up and if you want to take a reiteration of the reason for dividing the story up, the Babylonian story, you could certainly divide into two documents or into six documents, because that is a very common device there, to be repeating interest, but to think that you have two different stories, the J and the P story which became united together by some redactor of about 400 B. C. and that in Babylon you have two different stories, one like the J story and one like the P story and these stories were united together before 2000 B. C. in Babylon, it could push accident beyond any reasonable ground whatever. The Babylonian story is there as a unit by 2000 B. C., long before the time at which the critics say the J and the P stories were written.

Mr. St. Clair? (Student) That is an interesting suggestion. Yes. (Student)

Not that I have ever heard of. I have never heard of any such thing. Yes? (Student)

T 14

That the Biblical story and the J and P documents were bound together about 400 B. C. make the whole, which has about ten different elements similar to the Babylonian story, all of which are an integrated whole in the Babylonian story at 2000 B. C. and therefore the idea that in the Biblical the whole is produced by combining two distinct stories seems quite unreasonable. If it would be, why would it be so similar to the Babylonian story? Well, now I think that is as long as we will take at this time on the <sup>comparison of the</sup> arguments for the critical view. There are other arguments which are raised and which might be examined to see if they carry through consistently and it is remarkable how often, according to the critics, you have evidence of the distinction because here is a flat contradiction, and you have the one and the other and they flatly contradict each other right next to each other—they must be different stories! Well, you ask why on earth didn't the redactor have sense enough to see that and to straighten it out and then you will find where the part that the critics/<sup>say</sup> belongs to one uses the phrases that are distinctive of the other, and they say, "Well the redactor modified them," and the redactor modified so many points to make them count, and at the same time overlooked so many points that it cuts down tremendously the value of it as evidence toward such a statement as that it once came from two distinct documents. Well, now let's look at certain features about the flood, as to the nature of the flood, No. 4. And under it there are certain questions which we might ask about the flood. First, was it a universal flood?" Was the flood a universal flood? Well, you read in your English Bible and what does it say? It says that the whole earth was covered with the waters of the flood. Well, now if the whole earth was covered with the flood, certainly it was universal. The trouble is, of course, that the Hebrew word/<sup>which</sup> was here translated "earth" also means "land"; it's used of the land of Egypt, it is used of the land of Canaan, it is used often of one particular land, the same word which is used of the whole earth, and so that particular word does not prove whether it was a universal flood or whether it was a flood which existed only in

T 14

one place. But this we can certainly say, "God was determined to wipe man out from the face of the earth." That is a clear picture, and so it is undeniable that the picture in the Bible is a picture of an event which eradicated human beings from the face of the earth. We can say this, the Bible clearly teaches that wherever man was, there the flood was. Now, would that mean that man had only spread over a certain portion of the earth and the flood doesn't cover the whole earth? It might be, but when you look at the statements about it, the tremendous nature of it, the fountains of the great deep broken up, and all this, why you soon come to the impression that it is much too great thing to think of as just the description of a local flood, and so I think we can say this, that there is no specific statement in the Bible which clearly proves that it is the whole world rather than a portion of the world, but that the picture given is one that is pretty hard to interpret as otherwise than a flood which covered the whole earth. Now, of course, there are--I didn't mention there are little contradictions the critics say, between the two stories but most of them dissolve on examination. They say that one represents the waters as prevailing a hundred and twenty days and the other says forty days, but when you compare them, one seems to be the length of time it rained and the other the length of time the water was there after it rained, and then they say that one of them has rain and the other has a tidal wave, that v. 11, which is the P document says, "In the same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up and the windows of heaven were opened." One of the two accounts says rain and a raising of the level of the earth. The other one only mentions rain; well, that is not a contradiction. If you said it was a tremendous rain, that doesn't prove there was a great increase in the water of the ocean. If it said there was rain but no increase in the ocean and two verses later said there was a rise in the ocean, that would be a contradiction. If you say one moment there was tremendous rain and then two minutes later you say there was a great tidal wave, you are not contradicting; you are merely supplementing, and particularly when in mentioning the tidal wave

T 14

it also mentioned the rain in the same statement. So these contradictions mostly disappear on careful examination. It was then not necessarily a universal flood but certainly a flood covering a tremendous area and the picture of it is such as to make the most reasonable interpretation be that it was a universal flood.

Now, how early was this flood? When did it take place? We do not know. You find in your many Bibles the statement made that 2500 B. C. was the year of the flood. Well, in Mesopotamia we have records and we have levels of civilization which seem to go from 3000 B. C. right up to 2000 B. C. It is pretty hard to find any place for a flood in the middle of that, and if you assume that there are gaps in the account of the patriarchs after the flood, then it must have been before 3000 B. C. Personally, I think it is extremely unlikely that it was later than 4000 B. C. I would think it nearer 5000 B. C. but we don't know. We don't know when it was, but it certainly would be very hard to reconcile with the evidence that we have of ancient civilizations a date as late as 2500 for the time of the flood. Now, there is a widespread tradition all over the earth of the great flood. I think the Babylonian story of the flood is to quite an extent a corroboration of the fact of the flood. Whether the other stories elsewhere in the world are to be taken as corroboration, whether the tradition of the great flood was passed on all over the world or not, it is hard to say. It would at first sight certainly be a remarkable corroboration that there are floods occurring just about everywhere in the world, but then, again, as I said, in every place you have a river valley, you have terrific floods once in a while, and so a great many flood stories could very naturally come into existence from the rising of the waters in particular areas, and so how many of them are actually recollections of the great flood is hard to say. The Babylonian flood strata we have already mentioned, and we have noticed that it is highly questionable whether we have actual strata in Mesopotamia which indicates the flood. Personally, it is my opinion that we do not know where man lived before

T 14

the flood. We have a picture here in the Bible of man before the flood perfecting metal, the use of the copper and the use of iron, carrying civilization way beyond the point at which we find it immediately after the flood. Shem, Ham and Japheth were probably not versed in the making of iron and copper. Let us suppose that a great flood were to occur here and that everyone was killed here except me and I was left. Do you imagine that we would soon have a big power plant built and electric lights all around? I wouldn't have the least idea how to go about it. In something like that a tremendous amount of the technical knowledge of our age would be lost if the individuals who survived did not have that particular knowledge. We have this knowledge before the flood and largely gained by the people of the race of Cain. We have no evidence that Noah's family were specially skilled in the founding of copper and iron and these other things, and then we can trace in different places in Mesopotamia and elsewhere people using stone and using it very cleverly. I am sure that the instruments they made out of stone were far superior to anything I could make or that you could make. They show a very high level of artistic achievement and of artistic achievement in making these things out of stone but they did not know how to smelt copper and to make things out of copper by smelting it in the heat and pouring it into moulds. That is something which was learned about 3000 B. C. and once that was learned civilization was completely overturned. The people who knew it could make new weapons far quicker than any others; they had a tremendous advantage and most of the cities of Mesopotamia were burned or destroyed between 3000 B. C. and the next hundred years after that. The people who had the new weapons used them but the knowledge of it spread. You have turmoil and confusion and then the world was in pretty much the same state as before, except that everything was on a much lower level of culture, because while they had better technical devices and better weapons, they didn't have the time and leisure to make as fine artistic things as they made before when they had only the stone

T 14

articles to make it, and so culturally they all took a step backward, though technically they took a good step forward. It was one particular scientific idea which became known and made a great step forward at about 3000 B. C. Well, now this idea would seem to have been known before the flood but forgotten afterward, and it is my personal opinion that we have no idea where the ark was when Noah went into it; we have no idea where the people lived before the flood. There probably were not a great many people on the earth. They may have been in South America; they may have been in the heart of Africa; they may have been up near the North pole. We don't know, but wherever they were if we should happen to stumble on that place and dig deep enough we find remains, I think, of the life of the people prior to the flood, and it would show an advancement in scientific devices which was not reached after the flood for at least a thousand years. They had to retrace a good many of their steps. Of course, back in the middle ages we had to retrace many things that had been known in ancient times and had been completely forgotten with the coming of the middle ages, and so I don't think we know where civilization was before the flood. I don't think we know when the flood was. I think that everything that has yet been found of ancient times comes from a period after the flood. I mean everything of which we have any great amount. When we find a single tooth somewhere, or a single skull, we don't know whether that was before the flood or after, but the actual civilization, extensive civilization before the flood I think must be somewhere on the earth, but nobody knows where. Mr.---? (Student) Yes. I was going to say that under another topic. Perhaps we'd better leave it until tomorrow, since it is five now. So we will take up No. 5, I call the consequences of the flood, and under b of that I have a brief discussion of that thought.

T 15

For next Friday I wish you would spend your two hours making a map, an outline map showing the main features of Palestine. I wish you would show on this map the general outline of the sea coast, also the line of the Jordan valley, including all lakes of any importance which are along its course and six principal cities in Palestine. Pick out six important places and include them on it. Now make this map and turn it in but also remember how to make it so you can do it on request at any time. That is the lesson. Now, this is not an artistic map. I am not asking you to do something beautiful. I certainly could never do that myself, but I am asking you to get the main outline in mind. (Students) Six cities or places in Palestine. Six cities of importance in Palestine. If you want you may include Jerusalem among the six.

Now we were discussing last time No. 4, the nature of the flood. At the end of that we spoke of the Babylonian flood strata, and we were going on to No. 5, the consequences of the flood. Now, of course, we don't need to mention the outstanding consequence of the flood, that all the wicked were removed. There was a complete end brought as far as this earth was concerned to the great body of the wicked. We are interested now in the consequences upon this earth, and so I will put them under two heads. Small a--blessing on the righteous. At the end of the great judgment of the flood God declared His blessing to the few who had been true to Him. God blessed Noah and his sons. He promised them that there would no longer be, would never again be a similar flood, that the earth would not be wiped out with a flood, and then He told them that they were to be fruitful and multiply and fill up the earth and He gave them a dominion over all the creatures of the earth. Into their hands they were all delivered, and He said, in v. 3, Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you. This Old English word "meat", of course, is "food" in modern English. Every moving thing that lives shall be food for you. Had a similar statement been made to Adam at any time?

We have no record of any giving of human beings before the flood the right to eat meat. We have no record of any such thing. They were to eat the herbs, they were to eat vegetables, but there is no statement before the flood of any right to eat creatures. There is no evidence of such a thing until this, and here/<sup>it</sup> is explicit. If a person adopts a vegetarian attitude of eating they may do that on some dietetic theory or some idea that it is better for themselves, but they cannot do it on a Biblical basis because it is here explicitly stated to Noah by the Lord that every moving thing that lives shall be food for you. Even like the vegetables I have given you the animals for food, He says. But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat. And then He goes on and speaks of the danger of human life being taken. He says, "At the hand of every beast will I require the blood of your lives, and at the hand of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed. This does not, is not here a command for capital punishment, as you see. It is a prediction by the Lord. It is the Lord's declaration that in general murder is to result in death, that when murder and assassination is introduced into an area the ones who introduce it are quite likely to suffer for it. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God mad he man. Mr. Cater? (Student) The first verse speaks of the blood in the flesh as not to be eaten. That was mentioned herein the fourth verse. I heard a paper once given at the American Oriental Society by a Jewish doctor who told of having examined the various animals killed in /normal fashion which is observed by Gentiles, and then animals which were killed in the fashion according to Jewish ceremonial law in which all of the blood is allowed to drip out before the body is used, and he claimed that it was much less toxic, that which did not have the blood in it. That was the statement which he made, and that would seem to fit with this command given to Noah here. Of course, in the Jewish law it is a ceremonial matter rather than necessarily a hygienic matter. Now this promise to mankind assures them of a supremacy upon the earth. These little creatures,

T 15

smaller and weaker than many of the animals, are assured of the Lord that they are to have dominion upon the earth and that the fear of them is to be upon all the creatures of the earth. They are told to be fruitful and multiply upon the earth, and then we have God making His covenant with Noah and promising these wonderful blessings to him and assuring him that when he sees the rainbow in the clouds he knows that God is going to keep His covenant and not to send the universal flood again. Then we have these promises of blessing on the righteous but we have no removal of the curse. In fact you might say that in one way the curse is intensified because there is more of a recognition in these statements of the fact that there will be killing upon the earth. Whoso sheds man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed. Murder has become enough of a fact that it needs to be regulated. It is recognized as something that is going to occur. He will require your blood at the hand of every beast and at the hand of man. It is then to be expected that there will be murder, that there will be suffering, that there will be misery upon the earth. The curse has not been removed. As far as the curse is concerned, it is still here and it has worked itself out to a greater extent upon the earth than before. The sinful individuals have been wiped off from the earth completely but the curse is still here and showed itself before many generations had taken place after this time, but there are specific blessings from it to those who would be in the covenant relationship with God and God gives the assurance that He is going to maintain His covenant relationship with those who are in the covenant with Him. The covenant, He says, which I have established between me and all flesh that is upon the earth, all individuals have a relation to God which they cannot escape, but there are special blessings which are available to those who maintain the covenant relationship with God. Now, it would be interesting to go further into the details of these relationships but I think that we will move on to small b--changed conditions. There is not a specific statement given here that conditions upon the earth have been

T 15

changed but it is pretty hard to read the first nine chapters of Genesis without having the feeling as you come into chapter 9 that you are in a new situation, that you are in quite a different atmosphere from that in which you were in the earlier chapters of the book. Very often as a person travels from one area to another you have a different feeling. You don't just realize what it is or why it is but there may be something different in the people in the certain place, something in their customs, something in the general surroundings. You don't immediately recognize what it is, but you recognize that there is a different atmosphere. There is a different climate there, and upon examination you can, if you examine far enough, you can always find out what are the factors that enter into it and make it different, and so in this case we notice certain changed conditions. We have noticed that there is definite provision here that man may eat animals which he has killed, that the moving things are to be food for him. There was no such provision before. It was not stated before that not to eat animals but it is exclusively stated that they may eat fruit, that they may eat plants. Now there is an explicit statement that they may eat animals. Then we notice a very strange thing. Here is Noah, a Godly man, a preacher of righteousness for many years, a man who has been blessed of God and selected out of all the earth to be saved from the flood, and Noah has come out of the ark and we read that he became a husbandman and planted a vineyard and drank of the wine and was drunken, and you wonder--was Noah so excited after all the tense life that he had been through with all these hundred years of preaching and all this experience of the flood and all that, that he simply relaxed and fell into this drunkenness. That is a thing which everyone must guard against. The man who has done the greatest service in the Lord's kingdom, the man who has called a great evangelistic meeting or has performed a great missionary work and has just pulled himself up will often reach a point where he just seems to collapse completely, an act which he must watch carefully that

T 15

he do not fall into the deepest and grossest of sin. It has happened. It has happened that men who have been most used of God have fallen into such a condition that their usefulness has been brought to an end or they have fallen into such a condition that it has been years before they have come back and been restored to usefulness in God's kingdom. But is that what we have here? It doesn't sound like it? For one thing, it didn't happen as soon as the flood was over. Noah became a husbandman and planted a vineyard and drank of the wine. Now when you plant a vineyard one day do you usually drink of the wine the next day? Here is a statement where if you take the verses in the order in which they occur and assume there is no gap in between a miracle must have occurred. Noah planted the vineyard and he drank of the wine. Well, what a miracle, if he could drink of the wine the next day after he planted the vineyard. It is quite evident here that a space of time has elapsed, that this vineyard which Noah planted has had time to grow up and the grapes have had time to come out upon it and Noah has taken the juice of these grapes and he drinks of it and he is drunken. It is not then a reaction immediately after the terrific flood of the situation of the flood. There is quite an interval in between, an interval in which Noah has been working in the garden and cultivating the crops and having the sort of a change in his strenuous life which he has been in in the past. There is no reason to think of this as a relapse of Noah into known sin. There is nothing actually to suggest that. There is simply a fact given. Noah plants a vineyard and then we assume there is a gap between that and the next verse. The vineyard must have grown up and reached the point where there were a good many grapes and he took these grapes and he pressed them out into a dish and he drank some and it tasted good and it stood there and maybe two weeks or a month later he drank some more of it and this time it had a different effect on him from which it had had the first time and he took it and he was drunken and here was Noah who had fallen into this drunken

T 15

There is not a suggestion in this chapter that, or any where else, that Noah had fallen into sin in the matter. In fact, we are told that Noah cursed others and it is told in such a way as to suggest that Noah was right in cursing them. There is no suggestion of any wrong on Noah's part in the transaction, and so it seems very natural to wonder why on earth would this creature of righteousness not know that if you drink wine from the grapes you are apt to get drunk. That he had been preaching over the radio all these years so that he never saw the people he talked to and never knew what kind of lives they lived and never knew the danger into which they were falling. Was he the sort of a preacher who was absolutely apart from the people and has no knowledge of their situation and the needs of their lives?

T 16

When Noah was a preacher of righteousness during those many years before the flood it would be strange indeed if Noah did not come in contact with it and know about it, and strange indeed that he would fall into drunkenness in this way, and so while we cannot say it does not say anywhere there was no drunkenness before the flood, neither does it say that there was drunkenness before the flood, and the whole tone of this story is to suggest that this was a surprise to Noah. There is something that he did not expect to occur and a think which occurred which he did not expect would ~~then~~ be the fermentation. It would look as if fermentation, which is so common a phenomenon today, was something which did not exist in the same way or to the same extent prior to the flood, and so the suggestion has been made by some that you have a marked change of condition after the flood, that you have animals used for food, that you have fermentation occurring in a way in which it did not occur before and the question is asked, "What would be apt to make such a change after the flood like this from the situation that existed before?" And someone,

T 16

observing these facts, then, has noticed that one of our planets--I believe it is the planet Saturn--has a number of rings around it which would seem to be great rings of vapor around it, and that would fit in with the statement in Genesis 1 that God made a firmament or an expanse between the waters above the firmament and the waters below, and consequently the theory has been advanced that this earth prior to the flood was like the planet Saturn, that there were these great rings of vapor, the waters above the firmament, around the earth, and that the sun's rays came to this earth mediated through those great bodies of water up there, and consequently there was not the sharp heat or the sharp brightness of the sun which we have today, and that the way in which the Lord accomplished the flood was to cause this canopy of waters from above to fall down onto the earth opening up a more direct way to the earth from the sun so that the sun would be seen, not so much as it is getting light and getting dark, but as, but a good deal more clearly, as we see it now, and that this would have an effect upon the constitution of men and of animals of an increase of thirstiness, perhaps, would cause a greater amount of killing and of slaughter upon the earth, would make it perhaps more feasible to eat meat than before, and also would more greatly increase fermentation, upon the earth. Now, whether there is anything to this theory or not, I am not in a position to say, but I do think that there are a number of Scriptural phenomena which seem to fit in with it rather neatly, and consequently it seems to me that it is something with which we should at least be familiar. Mr. St. Clair? (Student) Yes. is used for anything unfermented. That is, I don't think that Christ is referring to drunkenness in that passage; He is simply saying they were carrying on the ordinary affairs of life, eating and drinking and making merry, etc. I don't believe that--certainly there is nothing wrong with the eating as pictured and I don't think he means that the drinking was wrong. (Student) Well, of course, it is my impression that under natural conditions that grape juice

T 16

will only ferment up to about 12% which would be enough, I believe to produce drunkenness if quite a bit of it were used, but it is their artificial process of distillation of which are used, that produce stronger drinks. Now, under other conditions it might be that fermentation would only go up to two or three or four per cent, something which would not have the effect unless gallons and gallons were taken. I don't know, but at least I wouldn't say that there wouldn't be any fermentation but it might be tremendously decreased in amount. Mr.---? (Student) Yes. Thank you. That is another very definite point. As soon as the curse came upon the world, death came, but death was very slow in working itself out, and the early patriarchs lived very long periods. We find that there is comparatively little shortening in the length of human life prior to the flood, while after the flood the span of life rapidly decreases and the very long periods of life which exist before the flood and immediately thereafter have practically disappeared by the time of Abraham. By that time life is longer than it is now, but not a great deal longer. Yes? Well, we have no proof of it. It seems the most reasonable way to interpret the words that it refers to the same type of years, but it would be not impossible that there was a different type of year used before the flood. However, we note the individuals immediately after the flood living length of years that are comparable to those before, and then it decreases rapidly but it is pretty hard after the flood to see a particular place where the length of years might have become noticeably changed. Our year today is definitely shorter, of course, than the year was four thousand years ago. It believe it is about half a minute shorter, or something like that, of course, not enough to make much difference in a figuring of the span of life. It would be a possible consideration that they might have used a different type of year before the flood and after, but I don't know just when since the flood you would think of a change taking place, and since the longevity continues pretty much the same for the first part after the flood/I doubt very much.

(Student) Oh, no. Noah had it back there. (Student) grape juice is still .

T     16

In the time of Christ they used grape juice, a great deal of it. In fact, in the Old Testament, they used the words "wine" and "new wine" and "new wine" is grapejuice, and that is referred to a great deal in the Old Testament. Grape juice was very commonly used--(Student) Well, that would be truly imaginative. There is absolutely no evidence of any such state, while there is abundant evidence in the Old Testament of the use of what they call "new wine", abundant use of it. These changes, then, we have noticed, suggest a change in conditions of life after the flood. The canopy theory is one which has been advanced to account for it. It might be true--it may not. It is one of those many matters on which we do not know. All we can do is arrange our data to see how they look. They look, a certain amount in a certain direction, but it is not complete. No one living today was there then. Anyone living today who tells you anything that happened 5000 years ago is using his imagination to quite an extent. He may have a certain number of definite facts. Beyond that, he is using his imagination. Now it is interesting--I referred you the other day to a book                    called                    , a book which describes a re-enactment of something similar to the flood on this earth, with a man from this earth being used instead of the serpent by Satan as his spokesman. Now it is quite interesting that in this book called                    , which is about the planet Venus, the author of this book describes conditions on that planet as if there were a canopy of water over it, and describes differences in conditions very much as it would be if this canopy story were true. He never refers to it but that would seem to be his theory about the condition of Paradise there. Now, he never mentions it. If you are familiar with the theory it is interesting as you read the book to see that he is at least familiar with the same theory.

Now, we go on to E.     Capital E is Genesis 10-11. And Genesis 10-11 has

T 16

in it three elements which we wish to look at rather briefly. The first of these is the table of the nations, Genesis 10, and there is a table of which we must say that there is a great deal in it that we do not fully understand. There are lists there of people who are not all individual persons. They certainly, many of them, are peoples, and the peoples are described in their relationship to one another and the relationship, from what we know of ancient history, would seem in some cases to be a descent of one nation coming out of another; in other cases, possibly a political relation of one group controlling another, then. There are different types of relationship represented here. It would seem that the descendants of Noah spread over the near East and somewhat further quite quickly and we are told here simply of this people in that general area. There would doubtless be many other of the descendants of Noah who would <sup>have</sup> been spread much further in different directions and separated from this group of them which is described here. This is a table then which is not a genealogical table in the usual sense of the word. <sup>indeed</sup> It is a table of the nations. Now I do not have--I notice that in my outline here I did not make mention of this thing of the curse upon Canaan, and perhaps we ought to say just a word about that. There are just a few things of interest to know them. What did Ham do that produced this curse. We are not told. There are certain suggestions made but it is a little hard to know just what Ham did and why it was that he was cursed. Noah awoke from his wine and knew what his younger son had done unto him and then Noah proceeded, not to curse Ham, but to curse Canaan, and there are doubtless elements back of that which, knowing the family history of the case there at the time and the customs of the time would be perfectly clear to us, but there are elements in it which are now forgotten and we do not really altogether understand what happened there. We do not know just what happened. Something happened that Noah could see when he awoke from his wine, could see had happened and knew what his younger son had done to him and for some reason it was Canaan

T 16

particularly who was implicated rather than simply Ham, and so Canaan is now cursed. There are people today who quote this as if there was a curse upon Ham. There is absolutely no suggestion of any curse upon Ham. The curse is upon Canaan and when anybody talks of a curse upon Ham they must be talking from some other basis than the Bible because the Bible places no curse upon Ham. The curse is upon Canaan. Mr. Buswell? (Student) and idea which developed with absolutely no basis whatever. It is much easier to let your imagination run wild and think up new ideas than it is to go to the Bible and say, "What does the Bible say? What does it teach?" There is no mention here in chapter 10 of the people outside of the area of the near East. The people beyond that area are simply not mentioned here. They would, of course, all have to be descendants of Noah, but as to the exact relationship we do not know, that is the exact descent, through what lines they came. It is not here stated and consequently we know it's from Noah but we do not know the exact relationship. These are given here in order to show the relation to the succeeding history and God's bringing of Abraham into the world. We cannot equate Shem, Ham and Japheth with any particular division of the earth's people which we have today. I have heard this statement made. I don't know whether it is true or not, but I have heard the statement made that on a basis of physical science that it was fairly easy to see how from the yellow race you might have a sharp change which would produce the white race, the red race and the black race, but rather hard to see how from one of the others it might have come, and so it seems to me altogether possible that Noah and his sons were what we would today call the yellow race and that their skins have changed in the people in the near East so that all of those people belong to what we call the Caucasian or the white race, before the time of Abram. Now that is a possibility.

- - - - -

what the physiognomy of Noah was. There is absolutely no way to know. We know what that was of Abraham and his successors. They belong to the Caucasian race and the people of the near East, with whom this chapter particularly deals because it is among those people that God revealed it, but we simply do not know about the others. Well, now, it is a good point, though. I am glad you called attention to it, that there is, you cannot divide the peoples of the earth up into the descendants of Ham, Shem and Japheth according to any knowledge that we have today. I wrote a chapter on archaeology in a book which was recently published and before the book was published a number of chapters were submitted for other sections in it and then all of us looked them all over, and one was presented for anthropology about three years ago by a man, five years ago, I guess, by a man who claimed to know a good bit about anthropology, I am quite sure no one here has ever heard of him, but he presented article on anthropology for inclusion in the book and it was rejected and not included in the book but of course it was distributed to the various members of the affiliation, and in this he worked up a scheme whereby according to his idea Shem was the ancestor <sup>to</sup> /the Semitic peoples and Japheth was the ancestor of certain tribes up in the Caucasus mountains, and then everybody else was from Ham, and then he took the statement here, a servant of servants shall he be and he said, "That means he will be the best of all servants, and that means that all the great inventions of the earth have been made by the descendants of Ham and he made it that all the inventions of the earth were made by someone other than the Jews or the tribesmen up in the Caucasian mountains whom he calls the descendants of Japheth. Now, this, of course, is pure fantasy and it would really have been absurd to have printed such a thing in book with the purpose which this one had, but it interested me to see how he interpreted Ham as being the ancestor of the doers of everything practically that is good in any field except the field of religion. I never heard

† 17

of anyone else taking that particular view, but the curse here is not upon Ham, the curse is upon Canaan, and Canaan is the ancestor of the Canaanites, the people of Palestine when the Jews went into it and they were white people. This curse upon Canaan is a curse upon certain white people. It is not a curse upon Ham, and there is no reason to equate Ham with any particular race according to our present divisions. It would seem to be that whatever equation we can make today is that we use these terms for linguistic groups, of languages rather than races, and today we speak of Semitic peoples, by which we mean people speaking the Semitic languages. Racially they differ a great deal with one another, and the same with the Hamitic. The Hamitic languages of today are the languages used in certain areas of North Africa and all the speakers, the native speakers of Hamitic languages today are white people. Some of the Hamitic languages have spread down into central Africa, but the languages which the negroes speak, none of them are Hamitic languages, and if you look in Chapter 10 in the table of nations here at the sons of Ham, they are Cush, which is Ethiopia, and Mizraim, which is Egypt, and Phut and Canaan. You have no reason to think that any one of those four was anything other than white. From which of the three sons the negro races came we simply do not know but there is absolutely no ground whatever for equating negroes with Ham and there is absolutely no curse upon Ham in the Scripture. The only curse of this fashion, is a curse upon Canaan which were the white people who lived in Palestine when the Jews came in and dispossessed them and they became hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Jews and the curse which is here given upon Canaan was then and there fulfilled at the time of the Jewish conquest of Canaan. The governor of Texas a few years ago made the statement that the Bible predicted conditions of the second world war and for his prediction he turned in the Bible to the third chapter of the book of Isaiah, the 18th verse and he read it in one of his speeches. In that day the

Lord will take away the bravery of their tinkling ornaments about their feet and their cauls and their round tires like the moon, and he said that predicted the tire shortage of this war. Now of course the tires which are referred to here in the old English have absolutely nothing to do with rubber tires in the war. They are some element of feminine attire and the quotation which the governor of Texas made had absolutely nothing to do with the second world war but it had just as much to do with it as the curse upon Canaan had to do with the negro race there. It has absolutely no connection with them or anything about them. Now the of the nations then has many details dealing with ancient groups and tribes in the area that spread through the near east, and does not go into detail on the descendants who spread from them and we do not know from which of these three sons they came or whether some came from each one of them, but we go on to No. 2, the tower of Babel, and the tower of Babel is described in the beginning of chapter 11. The whole land was of one language and one speech, and it came to pass as they journeyed from the east--as who journeyed from the east? All the sons of Noah or the sons of Shem? Some interpreters take it that these are the Semites and some take it that it is all the descendants of Noah in one group. We do not know, and where we do not know we should not be dogmatic. There is no harm in making guesses if we label them as guesses and say, "This is a guess that I make but it may not be right." It is good to make guesses but be sure you always label them. We don't know whether these are all the sons of Noah or whether they are the Semites. But these here, we read were joined together from the east and they found a plain in the land of Shinar, which would seem to be Mesopotamia, and they said to one another, "Let's make brick and burn them thoroughly, and here there was brick and slime which describes Mesopotamia--it might fit some other area but it fits perfectly with that area--and in v. 4 they said, "Let's build us a city and a tower whose top will reach way up into the sky, and let's make us a name lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth, They're going

T 17

to put up a great big, tremendous monument there so that they can see it from all directions and use it as their center. It's going to be a great center in which their power will center and from which their power will go out into all the world. It is a godless, human power, trying to control this world in forgetfulness of God. You might say it is somewhat similar, then, to the United Nations of today, an organization which in forgetfulness of God and bowing Him out of His universe seeks to build up a manmade control which is to extend over the whole earth, and so they build up this city and tower whose top would reach way up into the skies. And let us make a name lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth. Now, of course, "whose top will reach up unto heaven," -- somebody may say it means the top will reach up into heaven where God is, but, of course, that is pure conjecture from the statement and is not at all borne out by the rest of the statement. It would not fit in the context that there was any such idea in mind. It seems to be simply a great center which they were building, a great center of human government and human organization, to control the world in one great unified, one organization in defiance of and forgetfulness of God. And then read, "the Lord came down to see the city and the tower which the children of men builded." Anthropomorphic language—"the Lord came down". Of course, the Lord is everywhere. It means, of course, that the Lord manifested Himself there particularly, that the Lord paid special attention to what was happening. It is exactly like the statement that the Holy Ghost descended on the day of Pentecost, or that the Holy Ghost came into believers on the day of Pentecost, the Holy Ghost was on this earth always. Everything here happens through His operation, and the Holy Ghost was in the believers. He is in all people and He controls all people to a large extent, but He was in the believers from the time that they became disciples for their regeneration was His work. The descent of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost or the coming of the Holy Spirit

T 17

into a person is not like putting water into a pitcher. It is not a movement of something physical from one place to another, for the Holy Spirit is God and God is everywhere, but it is a special manifestation of the Spirit of God in a particular way and so as the Holy Spirit manifests Himself in a particular way at Pentecost and as He manifests Himself in a particular way in those who are yielded to the Lord and whom the Lord uses particularly for His purposes, similarly here God manifested His presence. He took a special interest in what was happening. In anthropomorphic language, He came down to see the city and the tower which the children of men built and the Lord said, "Behold the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be restrained from them, which they have imagined to do." No harm in the people being one language; no harm in the people being one people if it is one people devoted to God, one people seeking to follow out the will of God, but when people are acting in defiance of God, when people are opposed to God, when people refuse to even recognize Him in their assemblies and have at their beginning of their first meeting and a minute simply of silence and don't even try to

a silent prayer in which they can pray to all the heathen deities they want; they simply call it a minute of silence, because if they said silent prayer that might offend one of the three greatest powers who are

. When you have any sort of an attempt at unity of that type you can be sure that the Lord will say, "The people is one and they have one language; <sup>there</sup> go to, let us go down and confound their language." The phrase, this old English phrase "go to" which is used in v. 3 and v. 7, the Hebrew is simply "Come". "Come!" let us go down and confound their language." It simply means " ". It is not, it is a very strange old English translation. And so He said, "Let us confound their language that they may not understand one another's speech," and so the Lord scatters

T 17

them abroad upon the face of all the earth and they left off to build the city. How did He scatter them? Did He pick them up and put one over here and one over here and one over a little way. It would seem more reasonable to consider that when it says, "The Lord scattered them," in this instance it means that the Lord caused that a process occur<sup>red</sup> which resulted in their being scattered. Now what was the process? If all of a sudden you and I were talking together and all of a sudden we found we were talking different languages. Now I don't think the sensible thing to do would be to turn and you'd run over this way and I'd run over that way ten miles, the sensible thing to do would be to point at you and indicate: "I want to know what you call that. And I'd tell you what I call it, and pretty soon we'd get together and learn each other's language, and we'd get on as well as we got on before. It may be that what the Lord did here was to cause a change in the constitution of the mind of the people, to make a change in the brain so that all of a sudden they started talking different languages. That is a possible interpretation of the statement, but it does not seem to me to be the most probable interpretation, of this statement. It seems to me much more probable that what he did was, he went down and confounded their language so they couldn't understand one another's speech. He caused that these over here who were standing for dictatorship would start talking about democracy and calling the others over here who claimed to be, who really stood for democracy, calling them , and simply twisting the meaning of words around so that you have people who are supposed to be working together, who were using words in an entirely different way, and choosing their usages thereof because they were coming to oppose one another, each of them trying to advance his own interests. That is what the Lord does, then, there is a great united movement in their of trying to accomplish some great thing in their antagonism to God. God

T 17

simply intensifies a little bit the attitude of hatred and of selfishness and of greed that are in the heart of every natural man. He simply intensifies them a very slight bit and you have them soon at each other's throats, and you have them very soon talking so each of them doesn't understand what the other was talking about. They are going in different directions and are soon split up into a dozen tongues. It happens

T 18

what is meant here, that God caused that this great unified effort for an ungodly purpose would be broken up by the members of it ceasing to have an understanding, by them beginning, not to understand one another because each of them was looking out for his own selfish purposes and his own interests instead of merging all those selfish purposes together into one great selfish purpose which would be contrary to God, and the result would be that soon they would not understand one another's speech. I have known many instances where I have had two people tell me of a talk they have had together and as they describe it one of them tells me what he said and what the fellow said and isn't that terrible what he said? and then the other one says, "Now I said this and he said that," and you know they will tell you word for word just exactly the same thing, but if you hear one of them say it you think what awful things the other fellow said to him and then as you hear the other one say, you think what awful things they were this man said and it is in the tone of voice, but you <sup>can</sup> interpret the tone of voice in such a way as to get an entirely different idea. Human words are extremely fallible, a very, very poor method of conveying thought. The tone makes a big difference and the thought back of the words makes a tremendous difference. Mr. ---? (Student) That's right. Yes. (Student) The Lord scattered them abroad, simply means He picked them up and He put this one over this way, this one over this way, and this one this way. He

T 18

simply scattered them, maybe He just blew on them and caused them to shoot off in all directions, but it seems to me that when it says the Lord scattered them it means that the Lord did this, not by one miraculous act but through a process and it seems to me that also it maybe--I don't wish to be dogmatic about this--it may be that in v. 7 where the Lord said, "Let us confound their language" and v. 9 where He confounded their language, that it is similar to the process like the scattering of the people, that He caused the sinful selfishness that was in their hearts--and it is not only in the hearts of people who live miles apart but it is in the hearts of people who live right in the same family sometimes--that He caused the sinful, selfish greed of their hearts to cause a disagreement and an unwillingness to work together which broke up the whole concern and split them in all directions. That is one interpretation; another interpretation is that God worked some kind of a miracle in the mind of each of them and took away the language which he had and put another language in place of it. I do not say that is impossible at all but it may be what the Scripture means. But there are these two interpretations. Personally the other one impresses me as being more likely to be the meaning of the particular passage. I wouldn't be dogmatic about it at all, which of the two it was. We must note, though, in v. 9, therefore the name of it is called " " , because the Lord did there " " the language of all the earth; and from thence did the Lord scatter them abroad upon the face of the earth. Now if the Lord " " the languages there, why did they call it " " ? You see the difference? If what He did was " " why do you call the place " " ? Now that is hardly a logical development from " " to " " , and so I think that upon this one particular point I would be dogmatic, that is I would not be upon what happened, which of these two. There might even be a third theory, different from either of these which



T 18

before Babylon existed. Babylon was comparatively late in becoming an important city and when it became an important city it was founded by people who came there from the west and people have called it the gate of God, " ", so that it is simply an interesting note here; that is, not to say that Babel means confound, which it does not. Well, that I think, is rather important, not for itself, in v. 9, but for the light it throws on many subsequent cases where we have a meaning of a Hebrew word which is somewhat similar to the name of some place. Mr. ---?

(Student) No. The first letter wouldn't be that. The second would be that but not the first. (Student) Yes. Yes, but it is not a Hebrew word. It is a Babylonian word. (Student) Well, we continue there Friday morning.

T 18 (second part)

For today you have made a sketch map of Palestine ~~showing~~ the coast line and the Jordan River and the various bodies of water along the Jordan River and showing six places in Palestine. I want to collect these at the end of the hour but for next Tuesday--no, Monday in this class--for next Monday please bring me another sketch map of Palestine which will cover the same coast line and the river Jordan and the places along it, I mean the bodies of water along it, and will indicate the same cities as you have this time and will indicate in addition ten more places, and then at the bottom on another sheet or the same sheet in connection with your sketch map just mention the sixteen places that you give and name one or more important events that occurred there. You can easily do this within two hours--probably less, but I am not asking you for an artistic map, just something that will show the main coast line and the Jordan, and so on.

T 18

Now we finished up last time our study of Genesis 1-11 and I think that at the very end of the hour perhaps it wasn't 100% clear what I said about Babylon in relation to " ", and so it may be well just a minute to repeat that. When Moses wrote there was a place in the plain of Shinar called Babylon. This place, so far as we know, was only a few hundred years old when Moses wrote. It was a place of very widespread fame. It had for a brief period been the capital of a widespread empire and it was a place whose religious and literary influence and commercial influence were felt all through the Near East, and Moses refers to this general area where this city of Babylon was, and he says it is quite appropriate that that city should be called Babel. In Babylonian language it is " "; in the Hebrew it is " ". It is very appropriate it should be called " " or " " because it was there that God " " the speech of the nations. Now as you can very easily see that is a play upon words. " " is not quite so stupid as to think that " " was derived from " ". There is no possible derivation by which this word would come from the other one. One is two d's and an l; one is a d and two l's. " " in its regular method of writing has two l's. " ", the gate of God, and they also write it in the Sumerian, " ", which is the Sumerian translation of gate of God. There is no possible way in which " " could be derived from " " and Moses trained in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and the wisdom of the Egyptians included a good deal of knowledge of Babylonian so that a good Egyptian scribe was able to write, read and write Babylonian writing, would certainly not have made such a mistake as that. The critics will tell you that the Bible has many cases in it where ignorant men have given etymologies in which they derived one word from another in a way in which/could not possibly be derived. We utterly reject that interpretation. We say that they were not of deriving one of these from the other. They were simply making a play upon words. They were saying, "It's quite appropriate

T 18

to call it, that there is not only a place called " "; he says, "That's where God " " the nation. There is a similarity of sounds and that is all there is to it. Now we have a good many other instances that are somewhat similar to this which we will look at later but this is one of the clearest ones in the Scripture and I just wanted to be sure that you fully understood exactly what the situation was in this case. Yes? (Student) Well, now, I am not sure. We will see what it is. I mean, I am not sure whether or not we want to take time to go into details of this matter, but we'll see—oh, yes. Genesis 10:25. And unto Eber were born two sons; the name of one was Peleg; (division) for in his days the earth was divided; and his brother's name was Joktan. Somebody said to me once, "If you will take the coast line of South America the way it projects out there and in, and if you will take the coast line of Africa, the way it projects in and out, and you will fit the two together you will see how they fit right closely together and he says, "Once they were one land and then the time came in the days of Peleg when a division was made and Africa split from South America," and I suppose by his death they were three inches apart and by the death of his son they were six inches apart and then eventually they got further and further apart and we have them that way today. Now there have been reputable scientists, quite apart from any relation to the Bible, who have advanced a view very similar to this, the view that Africa and South America <sup>that</sup> once were together and/they split apart and there have been scientists in Germany who have advanced the theory that there was a land which was in the middle, between the two, which connected up with the two of them. So far as I know there is no evidence for any of these theories. They are interesting speculations. I would not say they are impossible. It might be there's some truth in it, but I think we certainly would be very foolish to get ourselves out on a limb expanding theories like this for which there is no specific evidence. What this means--the earth was divided-- is very hard to say. It could mean so many different things. It might be something very, very important to the people at the time and yet completely forgotten at a later period. It might be from

T 19

indicates something of considerable importance that happened at this time.

Now, it is interesting, too, to notice the name of the one Peleg (division) for in his days was the earth divided. Does that mean that his father, Eber, said, "We'll call this boy Peleg because before he is grown the division of the world will take place"? How would his father know it? Does it mean that it happened before he was born and that the father said in view of this situation that would be a good name to give his son? Or does it mean that this boy's name was Peleg and during the life of this boy, Peleg, who had this name "Division" a striking event took place. Whether it be a geographical division or a national or political division, and people noticed it and they said, "Isn't that interesting, that during the life of this man whose name was 'Division', this great division should have taken place?" Now you might say that is a coincidence, and it would be, but coincidences like that are extremely common. It is remarkable how very, very frequently we find that coincidence. There is an ancient town in Northern Syria called " ", which means "little mountain", " ", or " " the town from which our Bible comes, the name of Bible. It means "Little Mountain". The town has been excavated in modern times. The excavator was a Frenchman named " ", "little mountain", in French. I don't think they selected him to be excavator because of the fact that he had that name. There is out in the Colorado River as it goes down through many canyons out there, about eighty years ago Colonel Powell, a great geologist and explorer, took a party of surveyors and explorers and they made the first trip with a boat down through the Grand Canyon, through the Colorado River, and as they went day after day down through terrific rapids and great places with tremendous cliffs on the sides, you'd hear the falling rock around you and where the boat would occasionally be turned over and they would have considerable difficulty and they never knew when just ahead there might be a steep water fall which would kill them

T 19

all--there proved to be none but they wouldn't know when there might be, their first trip down--the men got, some of them, more and more frightened, and finally the time came when one day two of the men said, "We're not going a bit further. What is the use of risking our lives this way. There may be a tremendous waterfall just ahead, the next rapid we may not get through safely. We'll not go any further." So they left the rest. They had reached a little creek there for the night. They camped there over night. These two men left the rest and they said, "We're going to make our way out of here some way on foot." So they left, and the others, when they went on, on their map -- they were mapping all the little creeks, and this one, where the others had left, they marked "separation creek", because it was where the other men had separated from them. Now the other men went up the creek a way, managed to make their way up the side of the mountain. With tremendous effort they got up to the top, out on to the flat country and came to a band of Indians who took them for a couple of cattle thieves and immediately cut their scalps off, and killed them, while the rest that were in the party got in their boats and the very next day they came out into calm waters down below and their dangers were all over. The maps have borne that name, "Separation Creek" ever since, but thirty years ago it was decided to make a dam below that in the Colorado River, the Boulder Dam, or as it is now called, the Hoover Dam and this dam was made which in a narrow canyon walled up the waters of that Colorado River and as a result caused it to rise higher and higher and make a big lake where previously there was just a river flowing down and this lake is now about 100 miles in length and reaches way back up the river a way and is called Lake Mede, and as you fly over it in a plane you can see the Colorado River coming down utterly brown with the tremendous amount of sediment in it and then you see a spot where the brown ends and it becomes clear crystal blue, because the waters enter Lake Mede and the water stops going and it drops its sediment there and that side you have absolute

T 19

brown and this side you have beautiful blue, and as you look down, you see that spot, you see a creek that comes in right at that spot and it is called "Separation Creek". It is where the blue waters and the brown waters separate, and anybody would say the name was given when the dam was built twenty years ago, and the waters separate right at that point, but you can look at a map fifty years old and you will find it still called "Separation Creek", for the other reason. Now those are two illustrations of the fact that life is filled with remarkable coincidences and these coincidences don't prove anything. They just occur. They do not certainly prove a definite plan in it when you have a coincidence in your life it is as a rule apt to be something that is rather interesting, and that is all. Well, now, it is interesting that in the course of history people have noticed coincidences and have remarked on them--have been impressed by them. This may be such a coincidence, that when this man, whose name was Peleg, was in his prime a great event occurred and they said, "It is very appropriate that his name should be Peleg because it was in his day that the earth was divided. Now, of course, the other possibility is--I mean there are two other possibilities. One is that it happened before his birth and therefore he was given this name. That would seem rather unlikely because it says here that "in his day" it doesn't say "just before his day"; and the third possibility is, of course, that the Lord revealed to Eber, "I want you to call your son's name 'Peleg' because in his life there is going to be a peleg. That's possible, too, but there is no evidence for such a thing here. It would be a pure guess absolutely, without any foundation. So I think that sums up the various possibilities in the interpretation of this matter of Peleg. It is a matter on which it is easy to see how any one of these possibilities may be the fact. It is something which may have been tremendously interesting to people in the day of Moses when they probably remembered the precise events which are here referred to. The precise events have been forgotten. To us it is now just interesting statement. We may get some further light sometime that will make it again

T 19

to us of tremendous importance, but unless we do and until we do it will be very foolish for us to be dogmatic about just what this name means. Of course, you can make a much better impression on people if you can say, "This is what it means". People will say, "Oh, that is a learned man. He knows." Someone else will say, "What does he know about it? He says, 'Maybe this; maybe that.' What does he know about it. Let's go and listen to this fellow." And you can draw much bigger crowds when you speak positively in your conviction than if you say, "Maybe it is this and maybe it is that." Well, what is the answer to it? If your sole interest is in drawing crowds, don't come to seminary. Gather about fifteen facts and go out and just yell them out as loud as you can. Wave your arms and stamp your foot and say, "This is it," and you can gather a big crowd. There is no question that anybody that will take any fifteen statements, I don't care what they are-- sensible or can go out and he can draw a crowd and can build up a movement with them, and if you take fifteen good statements which are true Scriptural teaching and you just go out and declare them and you may build up something that will really be very helpful in the work of the Lord. Some people say, "What is the use of studying all the Bible. We've got John 3:16. Let's go out and give that." Well, it is a thousand times better to just go out and give John 3:16 than it is not to go out and give the truth of God. There is nothing more important in the Bible than John 3:16 and I praise the Lord for anybody's work who is just going out and giving John 3:16, but let a person who does that recognize his limitation. Let him gather people in and then leave their leadership to somebody who has knowledge, not only of one or two verses of what God has given, but of the whole counsel of God and who is ready to interpret the Word. I would say, as you go out and preach, take the things you are absolutely sure of and don't speak them as if there was doubt of them. Speak them with conviction; speak them positively; speak them in a way to gather people about you; but

T 19

the things that you are not sure of, do not speak positively on. Keep quiet about those things under the circumstances where it is simply drawing people in, but then as you come to lead people, give them a sane, sensible approach to the Scripture of seeing what there is they understand thoroughly, what there is they partly understand, and what there is that we don't know what it means, and you may not produce quite as enthusiastic a group as you would with the other but you will produce a group which is going in a sane, sensible direction and in the end it is far better to march forward steadily and persistently in the right direction than it is to run with tremendous force and energy in the wrong direction. Get a place you can keep up in the right direction and keep it up, and the Lord will bless you. There are two things that are vital in any of our work. One is deciding what the truth is, the other is making the truth effective, and if you skip the first you may be very effective but effective in the wrong way; if you skip the second, you will be just somebody that is saying, "Maybe this" and "Maybe that" and people aren't going to be interested. You've got to be both. Well, now, I think perhaps. Mr.---? (Student) I don't think so, no. V. 32 says, "These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations, and among these people the nations were divided in the earth after the flood." I think that this says that the people, with that the area of the near East there, the area which this narrative is particularly dealing, is divided up among the particular descendants of Noah who are here named but it would not seem to me reasonable to conjecture that all these divisions were placed at one precise time, at the time of Peleg. There may have been some of the most important sections that took place at that time. That may have been the outstanding instance of a division of the nations, but that they all were together until that time and then they all split up into many nations within that . I don't think it is impossible but it seems unlikely and since we have no evidence in favor of

T 19

it, I would not think it reasonable to suppose it.

Some

times tremendous things all happen together at just one particular point,

but usually a thing like this, a division takes place and

we

Well, now let's go on to Roman numeral II. Roman numeral I was

Genesis 1-11 and Roman numeral II is New Light on Old Testament History

from Palestine. Last semester we spent a few days getting a brief introduction to what we properly would have taken this first

get an introduction into the cuneiform material, into that which throws

light upon the Bible which comes from Mesopotamia. I am not sure this

year that we will get time to look at the material that comes from Egypt.

This material from Egypt is tremendously interesting but does not have

anything like as many contacts with the Bible as the material from Pales-

tine and the material from Mesopotamia. Now let us look at the new light

from Palestine and first we will take as "a" the geographic background.

It is very helpful in knowing, understanding the Old Testament, to know

something of the places with which it is dealing. I know that when I was

in Berlin I was dictating a letter to a young English girl who typed some

letters for me and in this letter to my folks who were in Los Angeles,

California, I mentioned the fact that I didn't know yet whether Princeton's

Dr. Robert Dick Wilson was going to stay at Princeton Seminary the next year

and would want me to be his assistant there or whether a new seminary might

be started and he would want me to be his assistant there, or whether he

would feel that neither of these things would happen for another full year

and I might spend another year studying there in Berlin and I mentioned to

the folks in Los Angeles my uncertainty about it and how I wished I knew

in order to make definite plans whether to have the additional year that

I wanted right then in the University of Berlin. Dr. Wilson was in Prince-

ton, N. J.; my parents were in Los Angeles, and this English girl to whom

T 19

I was dictating the letter, she took down the words of my uncertainty and how I wished I knew right now a little about my plans for my next year, she looked up and made a very bright suggestion. "Say," she said, "Why over to Dr. Wilson's house and ask him about it." Then they can write and tell you what he says." It just never happened to occur to her that Los Angeles and Princeton were too far apart to just run over to the other house. One day over there I went into a store and the man recognized I had a peculiar way of talking and he said to me, "Say, where do you come from?" "Oh", I said, "I'm from America." "Oh, are you?" he said. "Say," he said, "There was a man just in here from America. Probably you know him." And I said, "Well", I said, "I don't know

- - - - -

T 20

"What city was that from? What part of America?" "Let's see," he said. "He told me. "Oh, yes. It was Rio de Janeiro," he said. Without even hearing his name I knew immediately that I had not met the gentleman. Well now this seems silly to us when we think about the ignorance of people in Europe about America and our ignorance of Europe, of course, is just as extreme. I remember--this is another illustration--when I got over there for my second year I put an American flag up in the room and the maid came in the room and she looked at the flag and she said, "My, that's a pretty flag." I said, "Yes". She said, "Is that the flag of America?" I said, "Yes". She said, "North or South America?" Well, that's just about how much they know over there about American geography and how much most Americans know about the geography of any other part of the world, but if you read an account of something that happens in another country or another area and you don't know any more about its geography than that, it is pretty

T 20

hard to get much idea from it of the real situation. We need to know something of the geography. I remember a student there, an American student, who was taking an examination, an oral examination for a degree and as one of his subjects he was allowed to take American history, and the instructor there asked him, in examination; he said, "Tell me what important thing happened in the middle of the last century between North and South America," and he puzzled; he couldn't think what important thing happened between North and South America in the middle of the last century and then the learned man said to him--he tried to give him a little hint. He said, "Oh, don't you remember about the civil war?" And this friend said, "Oh, that was all in North America. That was between the northern part of the United States--". "Oh," he said, "it's all the same, it's all the same." He just didn't understand the geography here. He probably knew a great deal about history, but he didn't understand the geography. Now, there are people who know a great deal about the Bible and yet don't have a real understanding of it because they do not have the geographical background, and that is why I have had this map open, so that you would absorb something of the geographical background of Palestine. Now as you look at the land of Palestine on this map you notice, you can't get any idea from a glance at that map of the size of it, but for someone in America here you get a better idea when you are told that it is about the size of Maryland. I think to most of you that is a fairly definite idea. Well, now you say right away. "About the size of Maryland. Well, we take the train to Virginia and we go right across Maryland in no time, across one corner of it. If we go to the East coast to the West coast we cross Maryland in no time, it seems like. It is only a few hours. What of importance would happen in a little country like that?" Well, there is this to notice about it. It is a little country. You cannot tell by size how important places may be. A girl said to me a year ago out--two years ago now--out in Nevada, she said, "Isn't it silly?" she said, "in the East, <sup>what</sup> ~~the~~ little counties they have," she said,

T 20

"Here in Nevada we have eight counties"--I think she said eight; eight or ten, I forget which--", she said, we have eight counties here in Nevada," and she said, "In the East," she said, I think she said, "They have about thirty counties in New Jersey." Why", she said, "the whole state isn't a third as big as one of our counties. She said, "It ought to be just one county, New Jersey." Well, I pointed out to her that one New Jersey county would have more people in it than the whole state of Nevada, and I said, "After all, what does a county government do? Perhaps if they figure up taxes, if they deal with keeping , "

I said, "Whatever they deal with," I said, "if they have ten people to deal with who are spread over an area of land as big as New Jersey or if they have ten people in one town, their work may be pretty near the same amount," and she said, "Maybe the number of people does have something to do with it," but she had been thinking how silly it was to have counties in the East here that were smaller than the counties in the West. Actually , it isn't the number of square miles but the number of people that matters. Actually, it is the nature of the territory. You can find areas in the west in the United States a hundred miles square where there won't be over ten people in it--just desert. There's nothing you can do there. Personally, I love them, but for most people, they prefer an area like New York city where you have more of interest that happens in one block than you would have in a thousand square miles of that sort. Size doesn't tell you such a great deal, but in addition to that there is this to notice about Palestine. We say it is the size of Maryland. Well, that is the flat area, but there isn't much flat area in Palestine. Actually there is two or three times as much ground there as you might think because it goes up and down, up and down. There are hills and there are valleys. That means that, of course, there is more territory, but more than that it means there are divisions of territory. It means that people are separated into groups. It means that there is the opportunity for differences to develop in areas which in miles are quite near each other. Out at the Grand Canyon again, if you stand at the southern side of the Grand

Canyon you look twenty miles across and you see the hotel on the northern side, but if you want to go there, you pass through four states on the way and you travel several hundreds of miles. You write a post card from here to there, it goes way over into California and back around. It goes through several states to get there, For most people there is no other way to go unless you take an air plane. It is only twenty miles, but it is difficulty to get there. Now, there are no Grand Canyons in Palestine but there are mountain ridges, there are hills, steep hills, which separate the area into groups, and through the ages different groups have settled in these different areas and divergencies of type have developed, and a great deal of history has been built around the variety of the terrain in that land, and so it becomes important for us to know a little about the terrain of Palestine. Now, one thing that would not be obvious to you in looking at a map like this, though more obvious in this than in most maps, is that the land of Palestine is a land which naturally divides into sections that run from north to south rather than from east to west. That is the natural division. If you start at the north here you can get an idea from this map that there is an area along the sea coast here that's very flat, before these little marks begin that indicate sort of mountain ridges. It is an area that is fairly flat, along here. In some places it is rather narrow. Here it practically disappears, but in general you have another flat area from Sidon on the north and still further, all the way down here; except for that place you find them clear down to the south. And so we have what we call the coastal plain, and this coastal plain is the first geographic of Palestine. It extends from north to south, all the way, with very few divisions. It is an area that is quite low, it is an area that has little creeks coming down from the mountains, so there is a little water. It is an area where there is plenty of sunlight. They have some of the best orange groves in the world down here in the now. It is quite a productive area, an area which is not particularly large, but an

T 20

area in which it is fairly easy to develop a rather successful life. Now that area there, around the coast, is an area which is often referred to in the Old Testament but an area in which very few of the Old Testament events occurred, because the Israelites were never, to any great extent, in that area along the coast. That area was usually held by people stronger than the Israelites. In the days of the Judges and before, these stronger people have settled there, and while it was divided up among the tribes and made part of the tribes, it was never conquered by the tribes prior to the time of David, and then this conquest was only a temporary thing. Before many years after his death they seemed to have won their freedom again and this coastal area was not an area held by the Israelites during any substantial period of Israel's history. It was an area that was held by other peoples and so it is not the most important area by any means in Palestine, from our viewpoint of Old Testament history, but it is one that it is vital that we should be familiar with. In this area, to look at it a little more in detail, you will find its northern section is <sup>Phoenicia, here,</sup> which we discussed to some extent last year, mentioning its three greatest cities, Tyre, Sidon and , mentioning the roving character of the people of Phoenicia, noticing that many little bays and indentations up here and practically none down here, and those people being a seafaring people and those people being a landloving people, down here. Only Joppa and Haifa , the two seaports down here, and neither of them very good ports. We noticed those matters in connection with Phoenicia last year. Now, there is in this area the plain of Sharon up here which was quite important before the time of Moses, but which in the Biblical history does not play any great part. It would seem to have been occupied by a people who were strong enough to maintain their independence against the Israelites but not strong enough to be a menace to the Israelites, but south of that we have what we call the Philistina plain. This area down here is the area in which the Philistines settled possibly at just about the same time that the Israelites were coming into Palestine from here some time in the same

T 20

century perhaps, the Philistines arrived by sea over here. They would seem to have been a rather small people. I don't mean in size--they were giants, some of them--but in numbers, a rather small people but a people possessing arts and sciences superior to those of the people round about them. They knew how to smelt iron and make good iron weapons, and a small group of Philistines was able for a time in the period of the Judges to hold supremacy over all of Palestine. We read in 1 Samuel that there was no smith found among the Israelites, that when the Israelites wanted to sharpen their mattocks and their hoes they had to go down to the Philistines to get it done, that if Saul, the king and Jonathan his son each had a good suit of <sup>armour</sup> / ~~iron~~, or a sufficient promise whereby they were able to get them from the Philistines, but the rest of the people did not have this armour and so it came about that the Philistines, with their fine armour and their good weapons, a small group of them, could easily hold the Israelites in subjection

he, after he became king of Israel, was able to put down the power of these Philistines to such an extent that they never again were any great menace to the Israelites, although during most of the time of the divided kingdom they had been independent of them. They were not subject to the Israelites but rarely were they a menace to the Israelites, because the Israelites were so far more numer<sup>-ous</sup> than the Philistines. Mr.---? (Student) Quite a good bit of sand down there, and then there is not nearly so good a water supply here in this area. It depends partly upon on where the creeks are, because there is not a great deal of rain. (Student) There's more here, yes. There's much more here. How's that? (Student) Yes. Well, that is the impression that you have from them. Now had no smiths. That is a matter of interpretation. Gradually it went through the land and took away the <sup>smiths</sup> / out of the Israelites or was it that they hadn't had any in the past, but we notice that iron only begins to come into use at this time. We didn't find evidence of iron before, and iron implements occur first

T 20

in the Philistine area before they are found in the Israelite area, so that the suggestion which is accepted by most archaeologists today is that the smelting was brought in by the Philistines and eventually learned from them by the Israelites, but you are quite right. It is matter of interpretation and which, simply taking the Biblical statement alone and without the evidence from other sources, one would be free to take either of the two interpretations, but in view of this other evidence I think the other interpretation fits better.

Mr.---? (Student) Yes. Yes, it seems as if--if you and I were put in an ark and everybody else in this room were destroyed and we came back and everything had been destroyed on the earth, I doubt if the two of us together could build a \_\_\_\_\_ from it.

T 21

(March 28, 1949)

And we noticed in 1890 that Sir Flinders Petrie at that time laid the foundation of all subsequent work in Palestinian archaeology. We noticed that Palestine has been at a disadvantage as compared to Babylonia and Egypt in that in those countries we have great numbers of inscriptions which have been preserved. In Egypt we have the great monuments which were put up by the pharaohs to tell of their great accomplishments, and on these monuments we have the statements by the Pharaohs of the great deeds which they did. There also are a large number of papyri which have been preserved in graves in Egypt which give us a good deal of information.

This information, of course, is very one-sided and very incomplete. If all the written material which you have from a nation is that which is preserved in graves you can well imagine that it will be quite scanty. Out of the whole ancient literature of Egypt probably not a tenth of one per cent was preserved in the graves, and so our papyri material from Egypt is extremely scanty. Nevertheless, it is very considerable in amount and tells us a great deal about ancient Egypt. Now in Palestine we do not have any papyri to speak of preserved in this way. Now, Palestine is a much damper climate than Egypt. Papyri is not preserved above ground in Palestine

T 21

any more than in Egypt, and in graves practically none has been preserved in Palestine. On the other hand, in Mesopotamia you have the writing mostly done on clay tablets and these clay tablets are almost indestructible, particularly at , and so from Mesopotamia practically all the ancient literature has been preserved. Only a small fraction of it has been excavated; it is mostly buried, but that small fraction includes hundreds of thousands of clay tablets, in every sort of material you can imagine. Now in Palestine we have found a few clay tablets, quite a few, but altogether probably not over a hundred, that is, it is practically nothing in comparison with the clay tablets from Mesopotamia, or even from Egypt, and the reason we don't find more clay tablets in Palestine is because they were so near Egypt and they had access to good sources of papyri. The result is that as far as Palestine is concerned our archaeological material is very, very poor in written matter and if it were not for the contacts with Egypt and with Mesopotamia we would hardly know where to begin in archaeological work in Palestine. As it is, these contacts give us very good foundation for many interpretations in Palestine and then the two discoveries that we noticed last time. The importance of the tell and the importance of pottery have put us in a position where we can learn a tremendous amount about Palestinian archaeology. Fortunate it is that Palestinian archaeology was late in beginning. We had the foundation of work that was done in Egypt and the work done in Mesopotamia, and the result is that a tremendous amount of light has been shed upon the Bible by Palestinian archaeology and it has been corroborated at many points by the discoveries which have been made in Palestine but this would not be true if it were not for the contacts with Egypt and Mesopotamia and also for these few very specific discoveries, the discovery of the tell and the discovery of pottery. Now if we had time we could spend the rest of the semester looking at the discoveries that have been made in Palestine since the time of Flanders Petrie. It would be very interesting and very much worth while, but since our subject is Old Testament History and we have a good deal of the history

T 21

yet to go through, I think it is better that for most of our specific material that we will look at from Palestinian excavation, we leave it and consider it in relation to particular points in the Bible, rather than taking it up now, in relation to specific discoveries in Palestine, and that we content ourselves as far as our present study is concerned in just a very rapid survey of the archaeological work that was done in Palestine from 1890 up to the present day. This survey will be extremely rapid and will of necessity be quite superficial because of the speed at which we will go through it. We will have to omit a great deal that is important and some of this material we will touch upon as we come to the places in the Bible upon which these particular discoveries shed light. I want, however, to mention just a few of the most important excavations. Now, one of the most important excavations after Flanders Petrie's work was the excavation of the ancient city of Gezer. From the viewpoint of our knowledge of Palestine Gezer has given us far less information than have various other excavations. This is partly due to its being one of the first great excavations made in Palestine. However, the fact that it was made so early tremendously increases its interest and its importance in the history of the development of Palestinian archaeology. At Gezer the excavation was mostly done by Professor McAllister, an Irish professor of Celtic archaeology whose primary field was not the study of Palestinian archaeology but who was very well versed in general archaeology and who went to Gezer under the direction of the Palestine archaeological society of Great Britain, went there and carried on the work almost single handed. It is a marvelous industry, the work which he did at Gezer over a series of years, but he was insufficiently helped. He was in a position where it was necessary either to pay too little attention to the actual direction of the excavation or too little attention to the actual reporting of what was discovered, and so, being alone his work is nothing like what it would have been if he could have had more competent assistance. Also, of course, it was greatly hampered by the fact that he did not, that you have learn on various tells

T 21

before you can learn how to do it, you have to try different places and learn by experience, and this was one of the places where they learned by experience. Now this city of Gezer is one of considerable importance in the Old Testament, mentioned also in Egyptian records. At Gezer McAllister found some most remarkable things. He found a great high place with eight high columns, ranging from 5ft. to 10 ft. in height. He found a great rock cut tunnel going down in the center of the city with eighty steps going down  $94\frac{1}{2}$  ft., a tunnel 23 ft. high and 13 ft. wide made about 2000 B. C., and abandoned and forgotten at about 1400 B. C. He found an open cistern from the, two centuries before the time of Christ which would contain two million gallons of water. Now these two things are mentioned to give an idea of the high development of this city of Gezer. He found practically nothing in writing. That is partly due to the fact that, of course, the papyri which would have been used would have left would have largely disintegrated but also due to the fact that at this great hill of Gezer there is a shrine to a Mohammed<sup>an</sup> saint right on the very summit of the hill so, of course, you couldn't come to that spot and it is most probable that the citadel of Gezer would be right under that spot and that is where you would be most apt to find a real treasury of clay tablets. Some time it may be possible to excavate there, but there is no immediate evidence that it will be possible. Now this place of Gezer then is one which any book on Palestinian archaeology of twenty years ago will give extensive space and almost any general book on the subject will have some pictures from Gezer, so it is important to know a little about it, but it has thrown far less light on the history of Palestine naturally, than the later excavations which were made with the benefit of the knowledge of method that was acquired at Gezer. Now, there were a number of places at which excavation was done between 1890 and 1914, most of which had further excavation made after the war, after 1920, and carried<sup>on</sup> the work considerably further than the point that had been reached prior to that time. We mentioned

last fall in connection with the story of Solomon the excavation of Megiddo in 1904 and the discovery there of one column, square column, with a hole across obliquely from one side to the other, a problem the explanation of which was not known until further excavation from 1927 on. The city of Jericho was excavated at about the same time. The information, the material throwing light on the situation of the walls at Jericho was not gained until the late 1920's. At this particular time the main cities, sections of Jericho were mapped out and then, it was discovered that Jericho had a big gap in its history, that from the period of Joshua up to the time of Ahab there was no fortified city at Jericho, and that, of course, fits into the Biblical account that Joshua made a curse upon the city of Jericho and cursed any man who would rise up and rebuild the city of Jericho, and then that in the time of Ahab, we are told in 1 Kings 15, that he and the Bethelites rebuilt Jericho and that when he rebuilt it the curse of Joshua was fulfilled upon the city, showing that there had been no walled city at Jericho during all those centuries in between. Well, thus far did excavation go at Jericho prior to the war.

In 1907 excavation was carried out at Samaria and very important things were discovered there at Samaria. The palace of king Omri and the palace of Ahab and what is most likely the palace of Jeroboam II were unearthed there. The street called Straight, which was built through Samaria by the Romans, when it became a Roman city was observed, and this gives, of course, an interesting analogy to the similar street which the Romans constructed through Damascus when they took that city, the street called Straight which is mentioned in the Book of Acts. ~~It is~~ before the time of the Romans you would not find a street in any city that you could call a street called Straight. The streets all went around, all crooked in every conceivable direction, but it was part <sup>the</sup> of efficiency of the Romans and when they captured a big city they just cut a street right through the middle of it and it made it easy to find your way from one section to another of the city. I think even today there are some cities that could profit by having <sup>straight</sup> a street go through them. I am sure London would. It seemed to me over there in London

T 21

as if just about every street went only about a mile. It would go a mile in this direction and then you would have another street that would go that way for a mile and another street would go this way for a mile and they would just twist all around as they were built up through the ages. When I was in Leyden, Holland--they have a straight street there that comes right up from the city hall right down to the canal, and I was over at the other side at the University about half a mile across from this street and when they told me at the University how to get back to the center of town, they said, "Walk around the canal down here to this straight street and then go straight up." "Well," I said, "That's a mile and a half and it's only half a mile across, why not go straight across?" He's said, "You'd never come to it." The streets all twist and turn so in those medieval cities. It is only very recently that we have reached to some extent in city planning the idea which the Romans already have established in most of the cities that they conquered before the time of Christ. So that phrase in Acts, "the street called Straight" recalls the efficiency of the Romans, an efficiency unparalled in other countries in ancient times and in most countries until within the last century.

Now an interesting and important excavation was begun in 1913, the excavation of Shechem, but unfortunately the war interrupted it and the results of that excavation by the Germans from 1913-14 have not even yet been published in any decent fashion. We just mention that just before the war in Jerusalem there was a certain amount of excavation carried on by a sea captain, Captain Parker, who seems to have been actually looking for treasure. He had a finished  
 who used a crystal glass to gaze into it and determine  
 where the excavations should be carried on and they managed to bribe the  
 Mohammedans, to permit them to go into the , the  
 most sacred Mohammedan site in Palestine, and there right in the center of  
 the temple area in Jerusalem, to go in in the dead of night and to dig on

on that ancient, famous sacred rock., and today you can see the holes in it where these men dug, at night. Word got out of what was happening and all sorts of wild rumors spread around and it is a wonder every white person in Palestine wasn't massacred by the Arabs. Parker and the men escaped to the city and got away safely and the whole thing would have been an utter

- - - - -  
T 22

has asked advice from , the famous archaeologist of the French Dominican school at Jerusalem, and he permitted to be present at the very excavations which he carried on and to study them, and so later on which he called UNDERGROUND JERUSALEM, which was under ground in more than one sense, but it told of the discoveries by this work of Parker and gave valuable insights into the earlier history of Jerusalem. Now from 1914 practically to 1920 you have naturally a complete gap in Palestinian archaeology. Now, however, after the first world war archaeology opened up again in Palestine and might be said really only to have begun then. Before that time Palestine had been under the control of the Turks and if one wanted to excavate in Palestine he had to get permission from the Turks and that usually meant bribery, and it always meant the whim of the particular Turkish official. It might be given with no particular reason; it might be suddenly taken away with no particular reason. Conditions were extremely unsatisfactory prior to 1914 in Palestine for excavation. After the war, Palestine was under the British mandate and conditions were so greatly improved that Palestinian archaeology can almost be said only to have begun in 1920, after the war. One thing, of course, which made it so much superior to past times was the greatly increased number of expeditions. From 1920 on there was far greater interest in archaeology and there were far more different places being excavated at any one time than at any time prior to 1920. A second factor, however, which was perhaps equally important, was that after 1920 there was

cooperation between the different expeditions, that is most of them. Before that time each excavation in Palestine had been pretty much carried on in ignorance of what was happening elsewhere and the attitude of the different excavators was, "I am here to make a great discovery and I don't want this other excavator to know anything about what I am doing for fear he might get the credit for some of what I am doing or it might help him make a great name for himself where he is excavating. Now after 1920 there was a remarkable amount of cooperation secured in Palestine with all the excavators except Sir Flinders Petrie. Sir Flinders Petrie returned to Palestine in about 1926 when conditions became very difficult for excavation in Egypt, he moved his work up to Palestine and carried on work there, but he felt he could do better work by not letting his thinking be disturbed by the theories of others and the result was that Petrie's theories after that time are quite different from those of any one else, and anyone else using his books has to revise and change around his statements, studying his facts and reaching their own conclusions. He was separate from the rest and very noncooperative in general interpretation. He used his own phraseology and he refused to try to work in cooperation with the others. This was a real handicap, yet his work was well done, he was one of the greatest excavators in history, and so the facts which he has published have been of real value, to us. All excavators recognize that Sir Flinders Petrie laid the foundation of Palestinian excavation but subsequently they felt they had gone on on the foundation he laid but he had gone on in a different direction and this, of course, means that his excavations stand more or less in a unit by themselves after that time. One thing that greatly increased cooperation between the others was the fine work done by the leaders in the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem at this time and one of the things that they did which was best was to use their influence in getting the Palestine Oriental Society organized in 1921. Various men from the various nations in Jerusalem were induced to come together and become members of the Palestine Oriental Society and in this society they met every month through the winter and gave papers

T 22

and discussed their work and each profited by the work of the other. It was an interesting experience to attend a meeting of the Palestine Oriental Society. I had only been in Jerusalem three or four days when one was held. They had representatives there of all the different religions that you would find in Palestine and of most of the different languages that you would find there. You would have a paper given in English by a leader in the British School or in the American school, then a German would get up and discuss it in German, an Arab would get up and give his opinion in Arabic, a modern Jew would get up and tell in modern Hebrew what he thought of it and they would argue back and forth, and then the next paper might be in French and the next one after that might be in Hebrew and the next one, perhaps, in German. Thus you had these representatives of different nationalities working together there harmoniously in order to promote the understanding of Palestine, and the Palestinian Oriental Society was the great instrument in backing this cooperation. Another instrument was Dr. Albright who was for nine years during the twenties the director of the School of Oriental Research. Dr. Albright did not come to Palestine till after the Palestinian Oriental Society had been organized but he took an active part in it from a time very soon after its foundation, and they all came to recognize that Albright's advice and interpretation of what they discovered was very helpful and at the same time to recognize his attitude, that whatever they discovered was theirs and no matter how much he knew about it, he would say absolutely nothing about it until they had published it. That is recognized in archaeology, the right of the discoverer to make a first publication and of course that is something that makes people more willing to tell what they have found when they know that others won't say anything about it until they have published it first, and yet it has its very great handicaps, as when the University of Chicago discovered in Mesopotamia in the twenties an Assyrian king list and they announced in one of their publications that they had discovered an actual complete list of the ancient Assyrian kings in Mesopotamia

T 22

and it was being brought back to Chicago for study, and all over the world <sup>who</sup> everyone/was interested in ancient history began to think that his whole idea of chronology would have to be revised as soon as this was published, and then Professor \_\_\_\_\_ in Chicago who received this for study already had three or four other things he was studying so it remained on the shelf for nearly ten years before he got around to study it and to write it. In the meantime the rest of the world wondered and questioned and asked what was in it and nobody was allowed to even have a look at it until Professor \_\_\_\_\_ was ready with his publication. That's the disadvantage of it, but the advantage, of course, is that people are now ready to say a little about what they have found if they realize that they are going to be given the credit for it and that they will be allowed to publish it. I was told in Chicago just this week of a man who had been very anxious in a popular magazine to publish something about the new manuscript of Isaiah which was found last year in Palestine and he went and asked/<sup>for</sup> permission to publish material about it and was told by the man who happened to be present at the American School when the Arabs got it around and sold it and who, therefore, had part of his rights on it, that after April 1 they could publish anything they wanted to about it, if they paid a proper royalty for so doing, but that before April 1 they must not publish anything about it, because his own publication was to come out about that time. Consequently that meant that they had to leave it out from all present plans. Of course, though, there are just <sup>different</sup> some of the problems that enter into cooperation with/leaders in the field like this. In a field of science where there is money to be made out of discoveries, there is great jealousy, but in a way it can be forgotten, a good bit of it, because after all the one who makes the success secures a monetary reward from it, but in any ~~field~~ of scholarship you find that it is very easy for a terrific jealousy to come in among individuals who are anxious that they get credit for being the first one to make a discovery, and sometimes it makes cooperation extremely difficult, as I found myself on certain projects which I

T 22

have worked upon with nonchristian scholars. So in Palestine it was a real triumph that so large a measure of cooperation was accomplished. I remember Dr. Albright's telling me a little experience that throws a little light on this. There was a great excavation in Palestine conducted by a great American university which I don't want to name because of the thing I am going to tell about it but Dr. Albright went there to visit the excavation and the man who was the second in charge took him all around and showed him everything and discussed it with him. A new man who was in actual direction of it had just arrived from America a month or two before and he had his own ideas of what was profitable for the honor of his university and for the honor of the work they were doing and so as the second man, who had been there for a long time, took Dr. Albright around, the first man came around behind different monuments and took pictures of it to show how this man was actually showing Dr. Albright everything that they had discovered. He snapped these pictures in order to send them back for evidence and then that raised the point where he saw that Dr. Albright was actually being shown their most private discoveries there, he came up to the man and told him that he thought it would be much better if these things weren't mentioned to him as yet. In fact, he said that Albright had seen enough of the mound and he suggested that it would be just as well if he go on to other places now. Well, the second in command, it happened-while he wasn't recognized as a director and the leader-was a great specialist in a certain area and he immediately sent a wire back to the United States to the university saying that he was resigning immediately if Dr. Albright wasn't permitted access to their work and the thing was patched over then and the other director was moved on to a different country and a different place a short time after that, but it just shows the spirit that was so common before and that would have become dominant there if it were not for the fact that this spirit of cooperation had begun to make its way and succeeded to a very large extent during the period between the two wars.

T 22

Now a third factor which made for great improvement in Palestinian excavation after 1920 was the fact that there was so much better a relationship with the government. We noticed that the Turkish government, before the war, had been so arbitrary in whom it would permit to excavate and whom it wouldn't, and it depended in a very large extent on who paid the biggest bribe to the Turkish official. Now, the British government put the matter on a solid scientific basis. They established in the government in Palestine a department of antiquity and this department of antiquity was given the authority and the responsibility to encourage excavation and exploration in Palestine but also to oversee it and guard it that it should be done wisely, and so it was made a rule that anyone could be given permission to excavate in Palestine if he had proper qualifications but that no one should do it without proper qualifications, and proper qualification involved two things. In the first place it involved experience in excavation and knowledge of the field of archaeology proper to take hold of the matter and to do a decent job, and just because a man raised some money and went over to make a name for himself in excavation was no reason why he should be allowed to excavate, no reason he should take material that has been preserved from ancient times and destroy it as you inevitably do when you dig up a mound if he is not qualified to interpret what he's found enough to preserve for posterity the knowledge that has been buried there all through these centuries. But the second qualification which was required was a sufficient amount of money to carry the work through properly. There was no sense in allowing a man, no matter how well qualified he might be, to start in the work and just get the ground nicely opened up and have to stop for lack of funds, or work for one year perhaps and get the problem nicely entered into and then not be able to come back the next season because he wouldn't have funds enough to carry the work through to a proper end, and so if you took a great ancient city in Palestine which it would take twenty years to excavate properly, if a man had only funds enough to excavate for one year, naturally he would not be given permission to do

T 22

it, but if you took a small city there which would be comparatively small and much simpler to handle and if a man had funds to work one or two years, he might be allowed to start, and thus the Department of Antiquity tried to put the whole business on to a workmanlike basis and it was a tremendous improvement over the previous situation. For a number of years John was the Director of Antiquity in Palestine, Professor in the University of Liverpool, a man widely experienced in excavation with his own particular pet ideas and sometimes rather alone in his interpretation but yet one thoroughly qualified to handle this sort of work. Now a fourth feature which was greatly productive of advance in the mounds of Palestine after this time was the presence in the twenties and the thirties of certain great expeditions in Palestine. That is to say, it was very useful in Palestine, to have a mound there of a small city and excavate it and learn of its accomplishment, but all the usefulness of the excavation of small cities was tremendously enhanced by these few great expeditions which took very large cities and examined them on an extensive scale. Often as you look at the results of these great expeditions you feel of them as if the work was disappointing

T 23

and often you get half or two-thirds as much knowledge, it seems, from a small city as you do from a great city of which the excavation costs, perhaps, ten times as much, and so you feel in a way as if it wasn't worth the extra expense, but the fact of the matter is that the excavation of the great cities laid the foundation upon which the excavation of the small cities could be successfully carried out. Just to give an illustration of what I mean, the city of Megiddo which we mentioned <sup>connection with</sup> in the study of Saul, Megiddo is one of the largest cities in ancient Palestine. Since the time of Christ it remains simply a ruin, simply a large hill there. There has been no settlement of any account there since that time. Now this is such a large city that there are over twenty cities

**THIS PAGE BLANK**

T 23

there, one above the other, and it rises to a very great height, and it takes a large force of several hundred men working a whole season to open up and examine the whole of any one of these cities, one mound, and of course your levels are one on top of the other and it isn't straight at the top of any one, it varies up and down and there is a certain amount of overlapping as it was done, of course, in a very haphazard fashion when the city was destroyed or left deserted and then a new one built on top of it, and so it is a very complicated matter but the way that a big city like this is excavated, the attempt is made to examine everything you find there. Now you have a certain layer there. You are absolutely sure. This is the layer, say, from the period of about 800 B. C. You have material coming from 700 just above it, you have material say from 850 just below it, you are sure that this is just about 800 B. C., the city. Well now in the remains of that city you may find thousands of pieces of pottery, and some of them fairly complete. You may find there a few things in writing, but you'll find a great many things throwing light on the exact customs and habits of the people of that day. Well, this makes it in some ways a tedious study because you have these thousands of objects to examine as they are discovered, to photograph, to classify, to draw, to write up. It makes a very extensive and often tedious study and you wonder at point after point of the thousands of facts just what this has to do in increasing our knowledge of ancient history, but when you get through with it you have a picture of life in many, many details at each one of these particular periods, and then you take a small city and you excavate there and you find and you find one percent as much stuff as here but you can interpret your material from the small city in relation to this great extensive volume of material from the large cities, and the result is that you are able to learn facts about the history of the small city which that would be absolutely impossible for you if you didn't have this great, extensive amount of material from the large city here with which to compare the results from many / , and some

important city in the Philistine domination of Palestine and also in the previous Egyptian domination and so Bethshan, which was excavated by the University Museum of Philadelphia right along with Megiddo, which the University of Chicago

T 23

of our actual increase and understanding of Palestinian history naturally comes to a far greater extent from the small cities than from the few big expeditions.

It would not be nearly as successful or effective if it were not for these few great expeditions that have been carried out. Now I want to mention to you now just three great expeditions. The first of these, of course, is Megiddo, which we've already mentioned. Megiddo, which the University of Chicago excavated. They began at the top and they went on down and they gathered material from Megiddo from way back in prehistoric days. It must have thrown light on later Israelite history, it must have thrown light on the period of David and Solomon, it must have thrown light on the early history, going back into prehistoric days. It was one of the greatest expeditions that has been carried on in Palestine. A second, that ranks in the same rank with Megiddo is Bethshan. Megiddo is the fortress which guards the passage across the mountains, across Mount Carmel from the highway by the sea, the way of the Philistines, as it is called in the Pentateuch, over into central Palestine, and so it has a strategic and tremendously important situation. Now Bethshan guards the passage from the center of western Palestine down to the Jordan valley. It is about on a level with Megiddo only quite a bit further east, and Bethshan is a city of which we read in Samuel that Saul's body was fastened to the wall of Bethshan and the men of Jabesh-Gilead came over and took down the body of Saul and and of his sons and gave them a decent burial. It was not a city which was especially prominent in the Bible. We do not have much there after the tenth century B. C. until comparative<sup>ly</sup> late. During the period of the divided monarchy the city seems not to have been active, but later on it was quite an important place. It was one of the ten cities which was a capital in the time of Christ and before the time of David it was a very important city in the Philistine domination of Palestine and also in the previous Egyptian domination and so Bethshan, which was excavated by the University Museum of Philadelphia right along with Megiddo, which the University of Chicago

T 23

excavated. There were two of the three great excavations in Palestine. Both of these excavations were begun during the twenties, carried on to quite an extent during the twenties and then on into the thirties. Now the third great excavation--there have been a great many smaller ones--but the third great excavation in Palestine is the excavation at the real Lachish.

We mentioned that which Petrie excavated in 1909 was thought then to be Lachish, and even in books as late as 1925 we find Petrie's works called the excavations of Lachish. Dr. Albright decided early in the twenties that was not Lachish. It did not fit the requirements in the Bible for Lachish, and he picked out which he thought was probably Lachish. Now in the beginning of the thirties the British School of Archaeology began excavation of Tel and the excavation proved that this was indeed the site of ancient Lachish, the second most important city in Palestine, and Lachish has proven to give a great body of material, as did Megiddo and Bethshan, for the comparing of material from other sites all over Palestine. In addition to that it has given especially outstanding specific discoveries. Sir Charles Marston, the English commercial magnate who became greatly interested in archaeology, contributed extensively to the excavation of Lachish and he has written a series of books on archaeology and the Bible, many of which contain very fanciful theories. In his desire to prove the accuracy of the Scripture he often resorts to theories which may or may not be true but which cannot be proven. In his book THE BIBLE COMES ALIVE which

NEW BIBLE EVIDENCE SUMMARIZED summarized his previous book NEW BIBLE EVIDENCE in the first third of it and that contained some good material and some quite fanciful, but the last half or two-thirds of this book THE BIBLE COMES ALIVE is devoted to the study of the material of the discoveries made in ancient Lachish and he has spent quite a bit of time on the ground talking with the excavators, studying what was found and gives a very interesting and dependable account of the discoveries there and points out the relationship of many of them to Biblical statements. That last

T 23

half of that book THE BIBLE COMES ALIVE I can wholeheartedly recommend as a very excellent presentation of the result of one of the most important discoveries that were made of the most important excavations that have been conducted in Palestine. Now at Lachish the work was under the direction of James \_\_\_\_\_, one of the most expert excavators whom modern Palestinian study has seen and it was very unfortunate that one evening as he was driving in from Lachish to Jerusalem some Arabs stopped his car, made him get out and then fired several shots into his head and left him there dead. It was thought later they had taken him for somebody else. Whatever the real cause of it, the fact is that this, in this fight between the Arabs and the Jews in which \_\_\_\_\_ had taken no part, he was the victim and it put an end to the life of one who was as promising an excavator in Palestine as anyone ever was in that land. I think Dr. Albright perhaps was a little bit \_\_\_\_\_ in his statement when he wrote his memorial to him, when he said, "As long as the Bible shall be honored the name of James \_\_\_\_\_ shall also be honored." I think that is a little bit extreme but I think nevertheless that we should give him honor for the fine work he did and regret greatly that he did not live to continue another five years, and his death brought a pause to the work in Lachish and much that would be of tremendous importance in the light it would throw on the conquest of Palestine at Lachish has never yet been discovered because of the death of \_\_\_\_\_. Let us hope that the work at Lachish can be continued again some time in the not too distant future. Now those are four matters I have mentioned of great change after 1920 from the situation. There is a fifth to be mentioned, a fifth factor which contributed to the improvement of Palestinian excavation after that time, and that is the presence of specialists. By that time there were a number of individuals who had gone to Palestine and worked there or who went to the twenties who came to be specialists in particular fields of study. Some were specialists in details of excavation. One of those was Clarence Fisher, of Norristown, Pennsylvania.

T 23

who went to Palestine--went to Egypt first, and worked in excavation in Egypt. learning much of solid method of excavation, care in distinguishing the different languages and reporting what was found, and then in Palestine was the first Director of the work at Megiddo and at Bethshan. Fisher does not seem to have had the ability to be a director. He was not continued at either place as director very long. The particular knack of administration of directing a large excavation like this does not seem to have been his, but he is recognized as being as fine a master of the specialized details of proper conduct of an excavation as has ever been produced, and fortunately Dr. Fisher remained in Palestine taking a great interest in excavation and almost every excavation which he carried on in Palestine for a number of years, for a period of ten or fifteen years, benefited by his knowledge. He was constantly called in as an expert, called in for advice, hired for a period of time to give suggestions, to carry on a certain part of the work, and Fisher and others that were in Palestine over a period of time took an interest in various excavations and gave a unity to the method of work done through the discoveries which could not possibly be attempted when you have simply a little group coming from America and working and then leaving and another group coming from another country and working and leaving. These specialists give a unit to it. I think you might perhaps call Dr. Albright who was there for nine years as Director of the American School of Oriental Research in the twenties a specialist in human relations as he took an interest in all these different mounds. I remember one--the excavation of Shiloh which was begun by the Danes and there were two Danes there who were working both of them very excellent in their own field but they just couldn't get along together. I think about every week one or the other would get thoroughly grieved at the other and he would come down to Jerusalem looking for sympathy and they had come to, both of them, know that they could get sympathy from Dr. Albright and so every week, about, Dr. Albright took a little time out

T 23

from his other duties to smooth the ruffled feelings of the particular one of these two D<sub>2</sub>nes who came in and to fill them with renewed enthusiasm for the work and to get him to go back and to get along with that other disagreeable fellow for the sake of the good work that had to be done, and he was a great help as a specialist in this line in keeping the work moving, and of course as he circulated around among the different excavators it was very helpful to the general collaboration and cooperation among them. He also carried on a number of excavations to at different times, fairly small excavations, but they had results of considerable importance. Now there's one type of excavator that is rather unfortunate to have that they have in other countries and you have in Palestine. I just mention, when I was there with Dr. Albright we went on a horseback trip through the country and we came before long to a great mound where we stopped and visited. There was a great modernistic professor from California who had been worsted in a debate on the accuracy of the Bible and had taken a very radical stand and been rather worsted by some of the students with whom he had been rash enough to debate on the subject and desirous of recouping his professional standing he had announced that he was organizing a great expedition to go to Palestine and make great discoveries and then he went there and instead of doing as most excavators would like to do, finding a place way back in the back country as far as possible where you can carry on your work without being interrupted, he found a very splendid mound which was just about fifteen miles from Jerusalem and right on the main road, so there as you go on the main road you see that great hill rising up and on top of it you see men rushing around carrying baskets and you see work going on and I said when I was over in Jerusalem

T 24

car after car would come / through with these visitors from all over America and they could stop and go up the mound and here was the very noted excavator standing there at the entrance to the building welcoming all the visitors and he would welcome a visitor and have you write your name in his guest book and show you some of the things that had been discovered and you'd come back to America and tell how you had met the greatest authority on Palestinian excavation himself there and at work. Now with all the time he spent in greeting visitors, the work could very well have been another failure, but fortunately he was able to get ahold of some specialists in Palestine who really knew what they were doing and he had sense enough to let them really conduct the work and only to be the figurehead himself and so they carried on the work and they were competent and there was some very good work done. The only thing he insisted on was "This is Mizpah we are excavating, because he announced before he went he was over there to discover Mizpah and when Dr. Albright said, "It may be Mizpah, but I think it is more likely Ataroth," it didn't appeal to him much that it would be Ataroth expedition so he called it the Mizpah exposition, and made a good deal of that, but whether it was Ataroth or Mizpah there were some very valuable things found there and there was real advance made in Palestinian archaeology even though many hundreds of American tourists were given an utterly distorted idea as to who the real leaders in archaeology are as a result of the way this particular work was carried on. Now this professor died after the work had been carried on for some years and before much of it had been published and some others had been studying, examining the great amount of material which he brought home and the volumes are just beginning to appear on it now and it should be really very much worth while. Of course many another who will go with the same sort of ideals which this gentleman had are apt to neglect the work or would rather do it themselves instead of having sense enough to leave it in the hands of those who are competent, so it simply points out/ the dangers of this sort of thing. The publicity

T 24

that may be connected with it is apt to be a danger and to hinder the real accomplishment which should come from this type of work. Now of the many excavations which have been made in Palestine I don't think we'll take time in this class to go into any of them particularly in length but rather to look at the results which have been attained at various points in our study of the history upon which they throw light and thus to note different ones and we will constantly be referring to these principles of Palestinian study which we have observed in this hasty way, and so that I believe was Roman Numeral II, wasn't it? New light from Palestine? One was the patriarchal age. I mean one was Genesis 1-11 and then we would make in that case Roman numeral III, the patriarchal period. The patriarchal period, which would run from Genesis 12-50, and under this, A is the historical background, and it is a question how much time we should take on this historical background. We could take a semester on it and we want to touch on the most important phases of it because you can't properly understand Abraham and his successors without knowing something of the historical background, most of which has become known to us, what we know of it, through archaeology, and so A, under the patriarchal period, is the historical background, and under that we will mention very briefly No. 1, Mesopotamia. Last semester we looked quite a bit at the material from Mesopotamia. We will try now simply to put the patriarchal period in its proper place in relation to Mesopotamia. We have no date given in the Book of Genesis, that is, unless you look in the margin, of course. It doesn't tell you whether it was B. C. 1920 or B. C. 1620 that Abraham performed a certain act, nor do any of the records that Abraham left have precise B. C. dates, and so there has been a good deal of discussion. People have tried to add up dates subsequently in their history but there are a good many places where we are not given precise dates that can be added up and so any date from that period is extremely conjectural. I remember seeing the statement made by Dr. Albright about fifteen years ago. He said that some people try to make out that Amraphel of Genesis 14 is Hammurabi, but he said this is utterly impossible because he says that Abraham--he says Hammurabi is about 2000 B. C. and Abraham is the seventeenth

T 24

century B. C. It is three hundred years later. Then a little later in the bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research of which Dr. Albright was editor, he put in a headline "Revolutionary Change in the Chronology of the Near East. New Discoveries made at \_\_\_\_\_ on the Euphrates Prove that Hammurabi comes from the Seventeenth Century B. C. instead of the Twentieth, as previously thought." And so you move Abraham up then you move Hammurabi up and again you have them near each other, but just how near we can't be sure. Dr. Albright was one of the first to suggest this moving up of Hammurabi; others thought he was rather crazy in such a wild idea and now they practically all accept it, and so Hammurabi is now pretty well recognized to be at that later period, and it is most likely Abraham was king and it is a period which was quite a little later than your Ussher date would say in the margin of your Bible. It was a time when the city of Babylon was a city of great importance, during the time of Hammurabi or a little later, and the code of Hammurabi which we mentioned last semester, while its relationship to the code of Moses is not very close, the laws of Hammurabi are a commercial law, a law for secular life; the laws of Moses, of religious life, a law for a sanctified people. The emphasis is on religion here, the emphasis is on commerce there; the overlapping is comparatively slight between these two sets of laws but the code of Hammurabi was the type of law which was in use in Babylonia, from which Abraham came out and in Genesis at point after point we find in the life and activity of Abraham and his family that there are practices and there were things done which are hard for us to understand just why they would do them this way until we read the laws of Hammurabi and see that he was simply carrying out the established custom and established law of Babylonia of his day. Now in northern Mesopotamia at this time Assyria was developing into a power of some importance, though still quite small. There was another power of much greater importance, the so-called Mitanni. Mitanni is the name of the kingdom, Mitanni.

T 24

It was a kingdom in northern Mesopotamia for a long period at this time. The people of it are called Hurrians. The Bible speaks of them as the and we have many contacts between them and the history of the patriarchs. We will look at them a little bit tomorrow afternoon.

T 24 (second part)

I began Section III, The Patriarchal Period, A. The Historical Background, and we spoke of 1, Mesopotamia. We mentioned the Babylonians, the code of Hammurabi, the importance of the city of Babylon and went on to northern Mesopotamia and mentioned the rise of Assyria there, and the Mitanni kingdom there in the north, composed of a people whom we call the Hurrians, spoken of in the Bible as Huran, but not recognized until the last few years as being a people whom we otherwise call Hurrians.

Now we move on to Number 2, Egypt, and we want to know a little bit about Egypt in the time of Abraham. Abraham, as you know, is a good bit before the time of Moses and people sometimes think that the Israelites in the time of Moses in the oppression built the pyramids of Egypt. Actually the pyramids of Egypt were at that time just about as old as would be something which Charlemagne, the emperor of the Franks in 800 A. D. had built would be in our day. Now, it was at least eleven hundred years before the time of Moses when the pyramids were built, so you see the pyramids in their building have absolutely nothing whatever to do with the oppression of the Israelites. Of course, they are interesting in showing the great slave power of Egypt, the great big number of people who were gathered together to perform a tremendous, utterly useless task, to build these mighty monuments that have no value on earth except to contain the decaying body of a dead pharaoh and yet millions of people were compelled to work on the tremendous, absolutely useless undertaking. They show us, then, something of the power of the Egyptian monarchy but they have nothing in the world

to do with the Israelites. Now we will not take a special heading in this course for the study of new light from ancient Egypt for we have too much ground to go over, but at this point as we begin the study of the patriarchal age, the first place where Egypt enters into the Biblical history, it is desirable that we say a little about Egypt just to have the background of Egypt in mind. You all know of course, that Egypt is the land which is southwest of Palestine, the part of Africa which is nearest to Asia. I don't know whether all of you are familiar with the fact that Egypt is a land which is different from most countries of the world. It may be spoken of as a land with one dimension, a land with length without width. That sounds strange but the explanation of it is that, except for the northern portion of Egypt, Egypt is along the narrow area that winds next to the Nile river. The Nile river flows through a great desert area and here the river brings water and the possibility of growth and this little narrow area there is the area of, really of light in Egypt. It is desert, absolutely barren on the sides. This was greatly impressed upon my mind when I climbed the great pyramid, and there as I stood on top of that pyramid, I looked on this side and it was the Sahara desert, brown, dry territory--nothing there, nobody there, and I looked on this side and there it was green and fertile and great crops growing and thousands of people packed in to the small area. It is a land where you have absolute desert except as that Nile river flows down from central Africa and as it flows down--in altitude, of course--but up as we think of south and north, it flows up from central Africa there through that great desert/<sup>region</sup> and it fertilizes the land for a short distance both sides of the river. So it is a land with length without breadth. It is a land which had a unique opportunity to develop civilization. It had this wonderful fertilization from the river which would bring water and also would bring soil down from the heart of Africa and it would overflow its banks and it would fertilize the land there. Not only was there water but also other necessary materials which it spread all over them and it made it one of the most fertile sections of the world, but another great advantage of Egypt in addition to this unexampled prosperity which it enjoyed through this <sup>great</sup> river was its isolation. Great deserts

T 24

on both sides with practically nobody living in them. What is the result? The people are fairly safe from attack. Egypt has always been a difficult country to conquer. Rommel found that out in this last war. <sup>With</sup> that great army he made his way along north Africa to attack Egypt and when he got there he found himself shut in to a very small area by those great salt wastes to the south and the sea to the north and it was right at the strategic point there. General Montgomery succeeded in driving him back and utterly disrupting his attack on Egypt and that has occurred in history time and again. The one who controls Egypt has something that is not difficult, as a rule, to defend against attackers. And so Egyptian history is at first sight far more interesting than Babylonian history because it has more unity to it. It is a continuous, unified thing, and easy to understand and to see how things develop and progress, because you don't have so many different influences coming in from different directions and conquests and overturnings and changes. You have much influence from other countries but it comes in in a more systematic way with a dominant power in most ancient periods held right there in Egypt. And so Egypt is a land which is very interesting historically and extremely interesting archaeologically and many think it is much more interesting than Palestine or Mesopotamia archaeologically but we don't spend much time on it in this course. The reason for that is not because it does not have very many contacts with the Scripture because it has a great many contacts with the Scripture.

T 25

The land of Egypt is near Palestine. The land of Egypt has very important contacts with Israel; and yet our archaeological relations with Egypt, important as they are, are not one-tenth as important as those in Mesopotamia. Now, why is that? The reason for that is in the nature of those contacts. The Israelites in their relation to Egypt had a relationship which was something of which the Israelites could boast in the rest of their history. They could glory in the fact that their God had overcome the tremendous power of Egypt and delivered them.

T 25

That was a great reason for prominence of Egypt in Israelite history and thought, prominence in the Psalms, prominence in the prophets, prominence all through the Bible, but it is not a reason for prominence of Israel in Egyptian monuments. Now you go to Paris today--you can visit the tomb of Napoleon in the great Hotel des Invalides where they have that great, large room devoted to the tomb of Napoleon and the monuments round about and you find monuments to and the other great battles which Napoleon conducted, and as you look around the room you see no monument to the battle of Waterloo. The French did not put up a monument to the battle of Waterloo. That was something which they would just as soon forget about. We would not know about it if we had to depend on the French to tell us about it, and we need not expect to know about the delivery of the Israelites from Egypt if we have to depend on the Egyptians to tell us about it. At the one time the Egyptians were conquered by a great foreign power known as the . These people came in from Asia. They overran Egypt. They held it in subjection for perhaps one hundred and fifty years, and then the Egyptians drove them out of the land, and you will find in ancient Egypt not a single monument put up to celebrate the driving out of the . The Egyptians were simply ashamed the had been there. Most any other nation would have put up a monument to liberation, but they didn't even do that. They just forgot they had been there. The very existence of the control over Egypt was forgotten, except for the fact that a few of the nobles of Egypt in their tombs telling how great men they had been on earth said, "I took part in the driving out of the hated invaders. I fought at such a battle, and so on, and from their tombs we get something about the driving out of the , but nothing from the monuments that pharaoh put up for the public to see. They would rather just forget the had been there, and so it is not at all unnatural that the tremendous thing of the exodus from Egypt is not even mentioned in Egyptian inscriptions. But the Israelite relationship with Egypt is such that we need not expect to find a great deal in Egypt about it. Many say, "Yes, but the Israelites lived in

T 25

Egypt for a long time. Surely they left some traits. Well, the Israelites lived in northern Egypt. Egypt is divided into two parts. Northern Egypt is a wider area, that great fertile desert area of Egypt, north of Cairo. Southern Egypt is a narrow stretch along the river Nile with the wilderness on both sides. The Israelites were in northern Egypt. The greater part of the events important in Egyptian history have taken place in northern Egypt, or lower Egypt, as we call it, but nine-tenths of our historical remains from Egypt come from upper Egypt, where the Israelites never were. The reason for this is that lower Egypt is a region where the river is always overflowing, it's building up a larger and larger delta area there, it's fertilizing the land, it's extremely fertile land, the land rises higher and higher as the water deposits more soil there and all is used for crops. You go in there and try to excavate there. You'd have a terrifically expensive bill to pay to rent this fine farm land to excavate in and you wouldn't get very far down into it before you'd strike the water level underneath, and everything underneath there is apt to be pretty well decayed from being sunken under the water there,, and so it is not a good place for excavation, lower Egypt, even though it is the main center of Egyptian history. We have some things from lower Egypt but not a great many, but upper Egypt is a region where you have that long, narrow stretch of fertile land beside the Nile and then on both sides of it you have the wilderness and it is very easy to go on into that wilderness where there is nothing and put up a monument there, and so the kings, even though they were active in lower Egypt, most of them came from families in upper Egypt, they went up to upper Egypt every year or two and they put up a monument there to tell the people in the old home town what great people they had become. So you have thousands of great monuments from upper Egypt in which the pharaohs tell of their great deeds but they don't mention their defeats and we have a great deal of knowledge of the actual life of upper Egypt in past times, but the Israelites were not in that region. So under these circumstances it is not strange that/though we have some very important archaeological material from Egypt

bearing on the Bible, it is comparatively small in relation to the amount that we have from Mesopotamia, even though our total amount of actual Egyptian archaeological material is very great indeed.

Now we should know a little bit about the background of Egyptian history and it might be said of it that in studying ancient Egyptian history it is customary not to divide the history up as we divide the history of most lands-- this period reaching this long and then a break and this period--but it is customary to think of the high points of Egyptian history, because there were three periods to greater or less extent in which the Egyptian empire was at its height, and we call those the old kingdom, the middle kingdom and the new kingdom, and the new kingdom we often speak of as the empire period. Now these three periods are not periods that come one right after the other. There are periods of disintegration, of decay in between each of them and the next one, and during the periods of greatness, the old kingdom, the middle kingdom, the new kingdom, you have tremendous numbers of records and monuments put up to celebrate the greatness of the pharaohs and during the days of decay and decline you have very little, and the result is that we know events year by year in the great periods of the pharaohs but when you get to the periods in between, the periods of decline, sometimes scholars have differed by as much as three thousand years as to the length of a period in between. One would say: "This period is two hundred years in length;" the other would say, "This is thirty-two hundred years in length. Now why should there be such a great difference as a difference of nearly three thousand years in the ideas of scholars as to the length of these periods. The reason for that is what is called the Sophic cycle. Now I don't want to take much time on the Sophic cycle because we are not going <sup>into</sup> / Egypt to any great length in this course and so if you find it complicated, don't worry too much about it, but it is a very interesting thing and I think worth taking a minute or two to point out just what it is. The Egyptians had a far better idea of the calendar than any other ancient people and consequently their calendar is worse than that of any other people. The

T 25

reason for that is this: the Babylonians, the Hebrews, they make them up, following the moon. The moon goes around the earth and there's a month, and maybe it's twenty-nine days, maybe it's thirty days. They watch and see when <sup>the</sup> the moon starts a period again or not. And so a month goes by the moon. Well, now you take the number of times the moon goes around and divide it into the number of times the earth goes around the sun and it doesn't fit in exactly. They just don't fit together, and the result is that their moon calendars were way off, and so they would have so many moons and then they would see summer come again so they start another year, and that way they made their years rather arbitrarily and in time developed a system that came rather close to being an exact number of years. But the Egyptians had a far better system and so it worked out in a way far worse. That is, their system was so good that it didn't need <sup>be</sup> to/corrected and so the imperfections in it remained instead of being taken out the way they were in the Babylonian calendar. The Egyptians in very early times knew that the year had 365 days in it and that is remarkable. You take any people and you figure how long the world is and to figure that a year is three hundred and sixty-five days is a marvelous feat. Well, to figure that it is 365 days and 11 hours and six minutes and twenty seconds--is that right, Mr. Alling?-- to figure the exact length there the way we do with our modern astronomical instruments is something that we can't expect the ancient Egyptians to do. They got it down to 365 days and that was mighty fine but it was a quarter of a day off. Now, of course Julius Caesar knew about the extra quarter of a day and he introduced a leap year every four years and then--it isn't exactly six hours, it's about half an hour off from that and consequently in the course of sixteen hundred years we got eleven days off, and now we've corrected that and every century we omit the leap year except on the fourth century when we keep the leap year, so we have this complicated system we use now to try to get it nearer the exact length of the time, but the ancient Egyptians had a calendar which was

T 25

very excellent- 365 days. Now, with a calendar like the Babylonian's you'd go three years and you'd see that you were seeing summers beginning when it was half over and you'd say, "All right, we'll leave out an extra month so as to make it put in a whole change of a month this year," and that would straighten it out, but with the Egyptians when you only got one day off every four years, why eighty years would go before you would be <sup>ty</sup> twenty years off, and so you wouldn't notice it. Most of the people who had noticed eighty years before were all dead now, or if they were living people thought they were getting into their dotage and didn't pay much attention to them, and so the Egyptian calendar was established in very early days as 365 days a year and they kept it up and the result was that in the course of 1460 years the calendar went clear off, and the first of January stopped being in the middle of the winter and in the course of seven hundred years it was right in mid-summer. In another seven hundred years it had gotten back to mid-winter again, and so it went clear around. And that we call a sothic cycle. Now we have certainly astronomical records which tell us that on a certain date a certain star arose and we can figure when those stars rose and we can figure it out astronomically, and so we know that the Egyptians called it January 1st in a certain year, when it was actually July 1st, and knowing that we know their calendar was six months off and so we know it was seven hundred years from the time, when January 1 hit <sup>does</sup> January. Now/that make this clear? It's the general idea of the thing. That is what we call the sothic cycle. And so we have a few of these records and we are able to say of certain events, we know when a sothic cycle ended, shortly after the time of Christ. We have a record of that. This was the beginning of the sothic cycle. Well, we can figure back 1460 years to get another one, so much another one. Then you have a record from a king which proves to you that this event this king did was in year 700 of a sothic cycle. Well, was it the first, the second or the third, or the fourth sothic cycle. And so if you take a book on *Egyptology* published thirty years ago he will tell you a certain thing happened in the year 7300 B. C. Well, then you take a book written a

T 25

few years later and they make it 1460 years later than that, and they say it was 5900 B. C. and then you take a book written still later and you move it up and make it about 4300 B. C., and you take a recent book and you'll move it up to 2700 B. C., which is probably correct. So the old statements you find in some old books which show how Ussher's chronology can't possibly be right because a great Egyptian event thousands of years before the time of Christ are absolutely out of date today.

ANCIENT TIME, a book used, I don't know whether it is today but I know fifteen years ago it was used in high schools all over this country as a standard text book of ancient history and that great scholar of Egyptian history says, 4241 B. C. is the earliest fixed date in history because that is the date the Egyptians got their calendar. Now scholar of any standing, so far as I know, today thinks the Egyptians had their calendar before 2700 B. C., but you see fixes the time the sothic cycle would have begun; he says, "That is when the calendar started," and he said, "Of course, it couldn't be as late as 2700 because the Egyptians were too intelligent to go that long without a calendar so it must have been 4241. That is when the calendar began." Now, nobody follows that now. Mr. Wilson?

(Student) Sothic. It comes from Sothis, which is Sirius, the dog star, the big dog star. If you happen to go outdoors in the evening lately you'll see it very prominently up in the sky. It is the brightest star in the northern heaven, or in any heaven, for that matter--Sirius, the dog star, and it is based on the time when Sirius arises in the morning just before the sun rises. But those details aren't so important. I think the general system, of it, though, is quite important and very interesting, and shows how so many stars have differed by 1460 years or 2900 years in their dates and these differences are not regarded in the length of the middle kingdom, the old kingdom or the new kingdom but the length of a period between the middle kingdom and the new kingdom or the middle and the old, because those periods we have very little information about. The is extremely scanty regarding those periods.

T 26

B. C. and that's the time the pyramids were built. We divide ancient Egyptian history into a number of what we call dynasties. They're rather rough divisions. They're not very scientifically made. They are the divisions we find in the writings of the Egyptian priests about 300 B. C. who told us about the history of his country and he and we have taken his enumeration of his power, and it is a rough arrangement but it does put terminology, and so we think of Egyptian history as divided into about thirty dynasties. Some of these dynasties had two kings in them and some just one. They varied greatly, but of these dynasties, some are extremely important, some aren't very important. The old kingdom, so-called, is the fourth, fifth and sixth dynasties, and that was a time of, very high point in Egyptian history, when Pharaoh reigned supreme and his word was law, and he could order millions of people to come and devote year to most every/working for nothing with any more sense to it than the building of this big monument to him where his body could decay after his death, and where he thought nobody would get at it to desecrate it, but his thoughts were wrong in that regard because so far as I know every one of the pyramids--well, we'll say, there were several hundred pyramids, and practically every one at least was dug into by grave robbers in ancient times and the pharaohs' bodies taken out and all the all the jewelry and everything that was put with him was taken out, so all these millions of men working for decades did not save the body of the pharaoh from corruption or even from desecration by human beings later on. But it was a tremendous amount of power in the land. When the<sup>t</sup> pharaoh who was the king of the northern kingdom and the king of the southern kingdom of Egypt, that is, they always thought of them as two separate kingdoms and yet united by the pharaoh, even though they never again were two kingdoms after the first dynasty. The king of these two kingdoms built these large<sup>tremendous</sup> pyramids largely near Cairo where the northern, the upper and lower Egypt come together. There they were built simply as graves for himself. Now if you take a line and measure out the entrance to any one of these pyramids, you take a pyramid, you have his

T 26

body in here somewhere and you have a way in here to get to his body. There is a passage way, which is closed up outside. If you will take that passage way and take this distance from here to here you can divide that exactly into the number of divisions that there are years in the history of the world from the creation up to the end of the world. You can divide it exactly into that many divisions and you could do that with every one of these pyramids. In some cases the division may be half an inch in length, in some cases three quarters and in some cases it may be a foot in length but in every case you can divide in into exactly the number of divisions that there are years in the history of the world from the creation up to the end of the world, and so you see these pyramids throw a great deal of light upon the history of the world and there are long books written on prophecy contained in the pyramids. I hope you all see the principle of the pyramids. Well, the pyramids, as far as any relation to the Bible is concerned, I don't think we can say has any, but they are tremendous works of man and show the great power of ancient Egypt. Then there is a break up in Egypt and we call this the first period of disintegration, great break-up after the old kingdom, and then we have what we call the middle kingdom and the middle kingdom is the eleventh and twelfth dynasties, and they reign from 2160 to 1788 and this period from 2160 to 1788, the scholars call it '88, I think all scholars agree on that even though it is only a guess--there is absolutely no way in which we could tell whether it would be '88, '89 or '90, or '87 or '86. You cannot tell the exact year, but it is approximately this and '88 is the number that has been picked and is accepted by most scholars--that this period, then, is a period of the eleventh and twelfth dynasties which, according to their records, were great kings and mighty conquerors, but as compared as despots, they are not mentioned in a class with the rulers of the old kingdom. That is to say, this is more of a feudal period. It is a period in which pharaoh has great glory and quite a bit of power but in which the individual has far more freedom than he has either under the old kingdom or under the

T 26

new kingdom, and in which the nobles had far more individual power than they had either under the old kingdom or under the new kingdom, and so the middle kingdom in Egypt is not the time of great military glory, though there is considerable; it's not the time of the great dictatorship of the pharaoh, but it is the time when the Egyptian spirit was able to exercise itself and the classics of Egyptian literature and the foundation of Egyptian culture in many fields is laid in the middle kingdom and for centuries after they look back to this period as a time of great classics and of great writings written about this time and as you read them they are like many of our great classics of modern days. They didn't say very much but they said it beautifully, so beautifully that they just loved to read it over and over and over, and so we have our great ancient Egyptian classics from this period. Just an illustration of one of them which is a story of an event just before the middle kingdom during the period of disintegration, but was one of the great classics of the middle kingdom period. It was a time when the pharaoh was rather weak, before the beginning of the middle kingdom period, a man lived over in the delta, lived over—not in the delta, he lived in an oasis a little distance over from central Egypt, and, according to the story, he left his wife there one day and left provisions, supplies for her, and made a trip into the main part of Egypt, and he came in with his donkey, and as he came in he came to the estate of one of the Egyptian nobles and this man saw him coming and he looked down and he said, "That's a beautiful donkey. I'd like to have that donkey," and so he ran out to where the laundry was hanging up to dry and he took a beautiful sheet and he spread it out on the grass so that it spread across the path a way, so that as the man came along with his donkey he came to that place and he couldn't go straight across without treading on this beautiful piece of cloth there and so he led the donkey a little bit to the side and the result was it got up into the field and it took a bite of some of the that was growing on this nobleman's property and so the nobleman ran out and confiscated the

T 26

donkey for the loss that he had suffered through it, and so, he having taken the donkey, the peasant appeared before him and **pled** with him to give it back and he refused to do so, so the peasant went to the town a few miles away which was the headquarters of the pharaoh and appeared before the \_\_\_\_\_, the leader of the minister of justice of the pharaoh and he pled with him to give him back his donkey and he addressed him, "The one who is outstanding in nobility and grandeur, character, the one who always gives justice--oh," he says, "give me back my donkey." And he said, "if you give me back my donkey all future ages will regard you as paragon, they will consider you as the greatest example of justice and righteousness Egypt has ever seen and if you don't give me back my donkey," he said, "even though through misunderstanding, future ages will curse your memory and think of you as one who has caused Egypt to suffer and to be in misery," and so on, and when the \_\_\_\_\_ heard him talk for an hour this way, he says, "Well, go on and I'll hear you some more tomorrow," very gruffly, and then he went over to the pharaoh, and he said to the pharaoh, "I saw a peasant who really can talk," he said, "you ought to hear that fellow," and told him about it and the pharaoh said, "well, keep him talking," so the next day he came back and they had a secretary hidden behind a screen and she took down every word he said, and the peasant made his very beautiful, eloquent *plea for an hour* and he gruffly dismissed him again, and he did that seven successive days, and at the end of the seventh day they then brought the peasant in and gave him back his donkey, brought him before the pharaoh who honored him and gave him a beautifully written copy of all the speeches which he had made. One copy was kept by the pharaoh and that is one of the great classics of Egyptian literature, the story of the eloquent peasant. Now there are others. They are very interesting, the type of these different stories which come from this period of the middle kingdom but you see there is not an awful lot to them, there is one which is a conversation of a man with his soul and he talks to his soul and he says, "Soul, what do think of living any more. Don't you think we ought to die? What's the point of continuing to live?" and then the soul

T 26

answered and said, "Well, I don't know. It might be worth living a little longer," and they talked back and forth and people find all kinds of philosophy in it. It's got quite a number of verses in it and if you look/you can find all the philosophies that you want buried in this beautiful conversation of a man with his soul. However, if you are not particularly good at digging out imaginary meanings from recondite statements you may think that it is just rather awkward words, but it is a great, one of the great pieces of classical literature in ancient Egypt, and these which were written in the middle kingdom were read and copied on through the next period and even in the time of the new kingdom when Egypt commercially was way ahead of what it was in the middle kingdom, and when the pharaoh was far stronger, people tried to ape the language of the middle kingdom and this was a beautiful written language and their spoken language in ordinary use, language for ordinary business, was quite different, as the languages moved on, but they imitated the language of the earlier period, the great, classical period, from 2160 to 1788. And then after the middle kingdom comes the period of disintegration between that and the new kingdom and in this period we have a group coming from Asia and conquering the land, a group which we call the . Now we don't know a great deal about this period. We have very few monuments left to tell us about the period. We know that during this period the people came in and it used to be thought-- some thought they reigned three thousand years, some fifteen hundred<sup>en</sup> and some only one hundred. Now it is down to about a hundred to a hundred and fifty years. It is pretty well agreed, the period the . We also know now that the were not numerous. They were a comparatively small group which came from Asia and succeeded in conquering Egypt and we know how they managed to conquer Egypt. We know that they had a new weapon, a weapon which the Egyptians didn't have, and that with this weapon they had means of overcoming far greater forces, and this weapon which they had was the use of the horse. The horse was unknown in Egypt before this time. The Egyptians had the donkey, but a donkey doesn't move particularly fast, he is not particularly

Y 26

strong and when these very vigorous men came down from Asia with little chariots fastened behind horses, they would dash in with these horses and they would disrupt the body of the Egyptian troops and, Egypt was probably already disintegrating after the end of the middle kingdom and they dashed in and overcame section after section and all of lower Egypt, the northern part of Egypt, was held by the , probably not upper Egypt at all, but lower Egypt was held to a hundred by them for a hundred/and fifty years and they pretended to be Pharaoh, and took over the titles and all the forms of the pharaohs during the time that they were there in Egypt. It was the use of the horse which enabled them to conquer Egypt, and we have found in the last twenty years interesting evidence about this, we have found that while the had their great headquarters they built an unusual type of establishment. They had a center for the dwelling of their leaders and of their people, their headquarters where the horses were kept, and then they would have a large area which would be closed in with a rampart which was beaten earth, which wasn't built of stone, it was just beaten earth. They would pile up the earth and beat it in fairly hard and they would have this around a large area perhaps a mile square and the result was they had this large area in which they would practice with their horses, maneuver with their horses and all that, and it was protected by this rampart, and as an enemy came from outside they were protected from attack by the enemy and it would take quite an attack to break a way through this rampart. It could be done in time, but they would have plenty/<sup>of</sup>time to get well ready for answering the attack and then all of a sudden they would burst out through their gate with the horses and attack the enemy and destroy them and drive them away. So they had their special type of establishment which they built, which was never built before or since. These large areas walled in with these high ramparts of beaten earth, and we find these up through Asia Minor, we find some of these down through Palestine and down into Egypt, these particular types of remains from the time of the showing the course of the in coming down there and then eventually being driven back out of Egypt. Now the were

T 26

there in Egypt, conquerors of Egypt and they established themselves and brought in new customs, some of which remained there after they themselves were driven out and eventually the Egyptians in upper Egypt developed developed to such a power that they drove down into lower Egypt and drove the out, and then you have the new kingdom, and it is rather hard to say when the new kingdom ended, and it's rather hard to say exactly when it begins, because the seventeenth dynasty introduced the new kingdom, but it didn't last long. The seventeenth dynasty is a dynasty of men from upper Egypt who succeeded in overcoming the and driving them out and was almost immediately replaced by the eighteenth dynasty, which is the first great dynasty of the new kingdom, and so we might

-

-

-

-

T 27

Now that final date is a little hard to set because the 18th dynasty certainly belongs to the middle kingdom and the nineteenth dynasty unquestionably belongs to it and the beginning of the 20th dynasty does, certainly, but then as the 20th dynasty sort of peters out and the 21st, it is not a sudden end of the new kingdom, it is a sort of dying down of it, and so 1107 is a date which a good many set for the end of it but it is rather hard to say just when it ends, but in this new kingdom, or empire period, are two main sections, and they are the 18th dynasty and the 19th dynasty. There is a brief period of disintegration between the two dynasties, the 18th dynasty and the 19th dynasty. There is a brief period of disintegration between the two dynasties. Now these two periods, the 18th dynasty and the 19th dynasty, which come in the earlier portion of this empire period. We call them the first empire and the second empire, the 18th dynasty and the 19th dynasty. They represent a time when the power of pharaoh was perhaps not quite so absolute in Egypt as in the old kingdom but when it was far greater internationally than even during the old kingdom. During this period the pharaohs conquered the regions round about them. They carried

T 27

their troops far south. They came in contact with negroes as they penetrated into Africa, into central Africa. The troops went westward into Lybia and they went eastward into Asia and in the 18th dynasty we have certain Egyptian kings who were outstanding in their power. We have, the first one which perhaps I might take time to mention here was a first king of particular interest to us then, was a woman, Hefhetsut is probably as good a way as any to put/into English. <sup>it</sup> Now this woman, Hefhetsut, seems to have been a legitimate daughter of one of the pharaohs and she was married to a young man who was probably the illegitimate son of the same pharaoh and he was probably much younger than she was and as long as she was in power he was a sort of a flunky around. He didn't have any particular standing. She was the king, and Egyptian pictures in the Egyptian monuments and in the tombs where they have beautiful colored pictures of them, they always show the Egyptians with shaven faces. An ordinary man had to shave his face. Now, of course, the king had a beard as a sign of kingship, and a god had a longer beard. That's a sign of deity, the real long beard, but a king would wear a good sized beard, and in Hefhetsut's pictures she always wears the beard, because she was the king, and she wasn't such a good conqueror, it would seem. She would send out the troops on commercial expeditions and she increased the standing and wealth of Egypt and she built two great monuments in southern Egypt showing her greatness, telling of how the gods blessed the time when she was born and decreed she would be the great ruler of Egypt and then telling of her great expedition down into the land of Put, <sup>which</sup> is Ethiopia and South Arabia, and how they brought back ebony and gold and incense, and it shows her husband. The young man he is third off in a corner weighing out the gold, doing a side issue during her reign. She put up great, beautiful obelisks celebrating the great events of her reign. She was indeed a powerful ruler, and then suddenly she appears, and what happened to her we don't know--whether she was driven out, whether she was killed, whether she fled--but at any rate, Tothmes III begins to reign, and he took her monuments and he knocked them over and he went into these beautiful great temples she built in southern Egypt and he went through all these beautiful pictures and he simply had her face just covered

T 27

over, just scratched out of the picture. We have the beautiful pictures but where the queen is you may see a little of the beard showing but the face has just been rubbed off. I found one place on one of them where they had overlooked an actual picture of her, but all the rest, you see the pictures and then her face is just rubbed off, / because he felt rather bad about the way she had treated him during these years and now he established himself as the king of Egypt. Now how to spell his name into English has been done different ways , three different ways it's been done. It doesn't matter so much which spelling you use. The old Greek way which was used before the recent discoveries is probably, after all, as good as any. That was Tothnes, and he built great obelisks, more than anyone before him, and of the obelisks which Tothnes III built we have today, one standing in Constantinople, one in Rome, one in London and one in New York, four great obelisks which have been brought from Egypt and stood up in these of the four/greatest cities in the world and stood up there, all coming from this same , from Tothnes III. Now Tothnes III-- you can see the one in New York any time if you are up there and go into Central Park. It's right out there in back of the Metropolitan Museum there. Now Tothnes III, this young man who had been held down by his wife while she was queen, now immediately after he was brought into power asserted himself and he started in making war-like expeditions, and he is very interesting to us because he led expeditions up through Palestine and he started out to conquer that whole territory and his armies came up through Palestine and one of his great events was the conquest of Megiddo and in his account he tells us how he conquered Megiddo. He tells us about the plan of the battle, about what he found there; he described place after place in Palestine which is conquered: his accounts are tremendously interesting to us for the light they throw on events in Palestine at this time. Now Tothnes III was a very great conqueror and best of all he left us pretty full records of what he did and it gives us much light on ancient Palestine at his time.

T 27

After him came **Tothnes IV** and a number of other kings, leading up to **Anemophis** the III and his son <sup>Anemophis</sup> / IV, the one with whom we should be familiar. **Anemophis IV** is also called you will sometimes find him given as . They spell it all these ways and you never know whether to look under **A** or **I** or **E** in any book if you want to see what it says about him, but the latest is to spell it **Akhnaton**, and he is one of the most interesting characters in ancient history, this man **Akhnaton**, **Anemophis IV**, because he is different from all the pharaohs before him. Some have called him the first individual in history. Some have called him the first monotheist in history. There was a period about thirty years ago when it was customary to exalt him and think him to be the greatest of all the ancients, and then there came a reaction from it and then scholars began running him down and saying he never amounted to anything, and everything good we find from his reign was done by some of his men and not by him at all, and it is pretty hard to prove it one way or the other, but the fact is, whether he did it or whether he was somebody else's puppet in doing it is an interesting thing to work out, and there have been those who have said that Moses couldn't have been a monotheist, monotheism must have developed by an evolutionary process and come out first in the time of the great seventh century prophets, **Amos** and the others. They invented monotheism. It was unknown before that time. It came by this evolutionary process and now we find ancient **Egypt** and we find that **Akhnaton** was a monotheist, and there is no question about that. He was a monotheist, and no one can say that it would be impossible to have monotheism prior to the seventh century B. C. because here seven centuries earlier we have true monotheism, as I believe all scholars recognize today that **Akhnaton** was a monotheist. And so, naturally, if you want to attack the Bible for sure and you find this approach in the Bible, you say there was no monotheism that early, you jump from the opposite side and attack from that side, and that's what **Freud** does in his book **MOSES AND MONOTHEISM**. He says that **Akhnaton** was the monotheist that **Moses** got it from him and that this **Egyptian** pharaoh was the first monotheist and **Moses** just got

T 27

it from him. Well, of course, that is a very good way; if you can't attack the Bible from this side satisfactorily, just jump over to the opposite side and ~~at-~~ tack it there. Don't say monotheism must be with the great discovery of the great prophet, say it is very early but the Hebrews didn't start it. They just took it over from the Egyptians. But the trouble with that is that the monotheism of Akhnaton and the monotheism of the Bible are definitely different. There is nothing spiritual about the monotheism of Akhnaton. His god is the material disc of the sun. It is a materialistic religion; it is not a spiritual religion, and it is a religion in which there is no trace of anything ethical. It is utterly different from the ethical monotheism of the Old Testament despite Freud and his book MOSES AND MONOTHEISM. He just ignores that <sup>but</sup> statement/~~that~~ is true that in the writings of Akhnaton we have beautiful observations of nature, we have wonderful hymns to the material disc of the sun, but we have no recognition of anything ethical in the relation of the worshiper to his monotheistic god. It is purely a matter of being obedient to this one powerful god, drawing your strength from Him. There is nothing of ethics as the Bible , and so Akhnaton was a man who proved that monotheism is not a late development as the critics claim. It was known in that early time, and his is not the monotheism from which Biblical monotheism comes because the two are utterly different. They agree in being monotheism, but they are utterly different. Now, of course, personally I think that the explanation for it is the other way round. I think that Akhnaton was influenced by the Israelites and I think that he secured his ideas of monotheism from them without having gotten a very full or complete idea of it and that it is a perversion and a corruption of the teaching of the Israelites. Now, that, of course, is something you can't prove. It is conjecture, and it may be entirely false. He may have dreamed it or imagined it or something, we don't know, but it certainly is just as reasonable a guess as the other and I think far more reasonable because it is an isolated occurrence in ancient Egypt. It is not something that is characteristic of ancient Egypt. It is an isolated occurrence that one king here turned

T 27

## Egyptian

against all previous/viewpoints and all subsequent Egyptian viewpoints and adopted true monotheism and broke with the previous Egyptian religion and subsequent Egyptians called him "that criminal of \_\_\_\_\_". They looked down on him, they destroyed his name from the monuments because of the religion which he tried to enforce in Egypt for the brief period of his reign, and so to say that this separate, unusual thing that occurred in Egypt then is the origin that all that we have in the Old Testament is much less reasonable than to say that from the Hebrews this young man got this idea but didn't get the full idea from the Hebrews and thus his monotheism came to pass there in Egypt. Now just a word about this queen Ehefetsut. She was a very interesting woman and a very powerful ruler and you will find some good books--or, I shouldn't say "good"--you'll find some books on archaeology today which will tell you that she is the daughter of Pharaoh who pulled Moses out of the bulrushes and brought him home, and you will even find one or two books that say that is absolutely proven. Well, as far as any proof of it is concerned it is just entirely in the imagination of the writer. There's absolutely nothing to show with any evidence whatever that she was the daughter of Pharaoh who did that. We will say, out of, say, three hundred daughters of different pharaohs at different times any one of them might have been one of them. So there's one chance in three hundred that she is the one. We can't say she wasn't, but I think it is perfectly absurd to say she was, even though I don't deny the possibility and I think that it is a way to hinder true Bible teaching and faith in the Scripture to make a guess like that and then be dogmatic about it, rather than anything that is in any helpful to faith. There is absolutely no evidence to connect her up with Moses in any way, but she is the most outstanding woman in Egyptian history at that time. She may have been the woman who drew Moses out of the bulrushes but there is no reason to think she was. Well, now, this man Akhnaton came quite a little time after Queen E. He didn't reign so many years but his years were years of great because he moved away from Thebes, the ancient capital of Egypt, because worship the god \_\_\_\_\_, misspelled in English Amen, but amoon is the correct

T 27

pronunciation of it. Of course, it used to be they didn't know how to pronounce it and they wrote it \_\_\_\_\_ and you still find it \_\_\_\_\_ but the god Amon was the great god of ancient Egypt and he completely disbelieved in Amon. He believed in Acom, so his name akhnaton means the living image of \_\_\_\_\_ the deity of the sun and he moved away from Thebes and he built a new city, the city of \_\_\_\_\_ which in modern times is called \_\_\_\_\_ and consequently we speak of it as the \_\_\_\_\_ age, because it is the age when the headquarters of the king was at that place which today is called Tel \_\_\_\_\_, and that was to be a city where many gods had been made and worshipped, only the one god \_\_\_\_\_ of the sun would ever have been worshipped in that place and \_\_\_\_\_ to that place and lived there a few years and then he died, and he left no male heirs. His wife wrote up to the king of the Hittites and she said, "Send me a son to marry me and carry on as ruler of Egypt," and the king said, "I haven't got any son I can spare. They're all busy here," and she wrote back and said, "Well, then send me anybody who says he is your son. The Egyptians won't know the difference and that way I'll continue as \_\_\_\_\_ and they sent somebody but he was killed on the way, queen and he will be king, /but her son-in-law succeeded her as ruler and then he died and another son-in-law succeeded him as ruler and this second son-in-law was the one who moved the capital back to Thebes. He had his grave hidden a little better than most of the others and the result is that

T 28

his grave there in Egypt. The grave of King Tut has been discovered there in modern times. He was one of the least of the pharaohs, but comes toward the end of a period of greatness, one of the least of this period of greatness, and the \_\_\_\_\_ gems and the precious things and the wonderful productions that were in his tomb are almost unbelievable until you see them. When I went into the room in the Cairo Museum where they had the gold works and the jewels and the mirrors and all the fine things brought out of his tomb, I went there with a

T 28

young man who had just been at the Tower of London, and he said to me, he said, "The crown jewels of England don't compare in expensiveness or in excellence of workmanship with the material that was taken from this one tomb of this one pharaoh here which is in this room in Cairo and he was one of the lesser of the pharaohs," and that gives you an idea of the wealth of the pharaohs in this period. This man was the first in history

-

-

-

T 28 (second part)

historical background of the patriarchal period. We'll continue with the patriarchal period this hour and the hour from eleven to twelve this morning, in accordance with the notice which I had posted yesterday morning. Now, we were looking yesterday at the 18th dynasty and we very briefly sketched a little bit of the events of the life of Ehefetsut, of Tothnes III and of Akhnaton. The book MOSES AND MONOTHEISM is a very interesting one, with its description of the wonderful monotheism of Akhnaton, of the fact that Moses was an Egyptian noble who was tremendously impressed by the teaching of the great sage, King Akhnaton, and who, after the of Amon, succeeded in destroying it in Egypt, went to a group of Hebrew slaves and taught them the teachings of his master, Akhnaton and then, according to Freud, he led them out of Egypt, this Egyptian nobleman was the guide and helper and leader of these poor Hebrew slaves and helped them to improve and advance in many ways and all the time he taught them his wonderful teachings that he had got from Akhnaton, and then finally the people got so infuriated at him one time that they rose up and killed him so nobody knows where he is buried, but when they had killed Moses it made a trauma in their consciousness, it affected the sub-consciousness of the people and consequently, although they tried to put him out of their minds, it remained in their subconsciousness and this was passed along from generation to generation for a number of centuries until it reached the time of the great eighth century prophets, Amos and

T 28

the others, who invented monotheism, according to the critics; but he says they didn't really invent it, it was taught by Moses and it remained in the subconsciousness all this time and it had been caused to remain there by the great shock to the consciousness caused by their having killed Moses and now it came out in full bloom. It is a beautiful psychological theory. The only trouble with it is there are no facts to support it. I saw a discussion lately of--somebody had advanced the theory that, had written a book to prove that, the seven-days of creation are not actual days of creation but they are days in which the story of creation was revealed. This is based upon a statement over in Exodus where it says that in seven days, or in six days, the Lord made heaven and earth, and he said the word " " which is translated "make" there can just as well mean "show", so in seven days the Lord showed heaven and earth and that means that it was like a picture, the seven days God took in revealing a picture to the writer, and therefore he puts it up to seven days and it really doesn't mean that the seven days have anything to do with the creation of it. Now that is a very interesting book and very well-written by a man who is anxious to maintain the truth of the Scripture, and an organization recently put out a discussion of this book and the discussion rather amused me because it was written by a man who went into the material and he said, "In the first place, if we accept this theory, it doesn't solve the problem of the relation of geology to the Bible and he discussed that and then he discussed the fact that it doesn't solve the problems of relation of anthropology to the Bible and he discussed that and then he discussed the relation to the various points, and so on, / and showed that we wouldn't find what we really need by accepting this theory and then after he had discussed that a long time, down in the course of the discussion he incidentally remarked that after all the theory had no exegetical foundation because the word " " never means "show" except ten times and those are always in the phrase "show mercy" and it doesn't mean to reveal something but to perform something and it seemed to me that if there is no exegetical

T 28

foundation for it that is all that there is to it and what's the use of spending a lot of time discussing whether the theory is satisfactory from other viewpoints. Is it in accordance with the facts? And there is absolutely no factual evidence for such a theory because the Hebrew word does not mean that. That is enough to settle the matter. That should be all that is needed at all in that connection, yet it was put incidentally down as a minor point towards the end of the paper. Well, now in this particular case, Freud has very beautiful theories but the trouble with them is that they do not rest on a foundation of fact. He has, it is true, built a good bit of it on statements made by well-known scholars who have accepted these as facts. Thus Professor Lee, professor at the University of Berlin when I studied there, professor of Old Testament there, had written a book to prove that the Israelites killed Moses and authority was authority." He took it on word but when you read the book, although was a great scholar, his evidence was pretty slight that the Israelites killed Moses. Now, of course, that is getting a good bit ahead of our point in the history. We are only noticing the importance of Akhnaton in theorizing about the origin of monotheism. The fact is that Akhnaton was a monotheist. The fact is that any argument that monotheism could not have begun before the 8th century B. C. is contrary to fact, because here was a monotheist several centuries before. The fact is that the monotheism of Akhnaton is very different from that of the Bible. It does not provide a sufficient starting point for the monotheism of the Bible. These are the definite facts. Yes? (Student) No. Well, that of course, rests on your exact definition of theism. Theism is usually considered as belief in a personal God who controls and directs--I don't know. He believed in the material disc of the sun as the god which had created all things, controlled all things and in the light of which we should all live. The principal difference between it and the Biblical religion is that there is no ethical element. Our God is a God of justice and righteousness. His

T 28

god was a god of absolute power just as much as ours and a god of personal planning but was not a god of ethical righteousness as far as evidence goes. That is the teaching on that vital point of monotheism, that God is a just God and a righteous God is something which we find no trace of in .

I think you would

. Yes, Mr.—? (Student) Akhnaton

is the way that is coming to be adopted now. It has been spelled many ways in the past because, after all, it is an Egyptian word and not an English word and in the Egyptian writing the vowels are not written so we'll find it sometimes beginning with an E, sometimes with an I and sometimes with an A, but the A is coming to be the regular method now. Now, another thing about Akhnaton's reign that should be noticed is that that Akhnaton was so interested in his theorizing and his attempt to get the people to worship only the one god instead of the many gods of Egypt that he didn't pay much attention it would seem to the administration of the empire and so the Egyptian empire fell to pieces during his reign. His grandfather had been a powerful conqueror, his father had to some extent maintained the tradition of his grandfather. He, himself, paid no attention to these matters, and the reputation of the Egyptian power sufficed for a time to hold Palestine and Syria in subjection but as the years went by people began to forget the reputation of Egypt and look for realities. They began to look for some power and no power was forthcoming and in his archives there is letter after letter from his representatives in Palestine saying, "Pharaoh, if you will just send us a few Egyptian troops, with just the sight of a few troops we'll be able to impress people with the power of the Egyptian arms and the, to maintain the power of Egypt in this area, but if you don't send us any power we will very soon reach the point where Egypt will lose everything in this area." These letters constantly plead with him for help, for financial help as well as for sending of soldiers. Many of the letters are from the kings of the various Canaanite cities, and these kings of these Canaanite cities say to him constantly, "All the other kings are

T 28

turning against you. They are plotting behind your back, and making schemes to gain absolute independence of Egypt. They are joining with your enemies. I am the only one in the area that is loyal to Egypt, and then another king will say the same thing, and each of them accuses the other one of being false to Egypt, and the fact of the matter of course was that each one of them was looking out for himself and was ready to stand by Egypt if Egypt would give them protection and the best guarantee of safety but was ready to go against Egypt if Egypt did not do so, just like most leaders in most countries in the world. They are looking first to their own interests and they would be loyal to Egypt if that was what was best for themselves but we find these various letters conflicting with one another and contradicting one another in this way and yet out of it we learn a great deal about the history of Palestine at this time. We learn to know dozens of individuals in Palestine and Syria and one interesting thing in these letters in Palestine and Syria is that occasionally they speak of a people called the \_\_\_\_\_ and this people called the \_\_\_\_\_ they mention in these letters is a people which seems to be in eastern Palestine and which seems to be conquering various cities and sometimes they say if the king doesn't send help \_\_\_\_\_ the \_\_\_\_\_ will conquer the whole land. Now the term \_\_\_\_\_ is only used two or three times but they used an idiogram, and idiogram which we write \_\_\_\_\_. Now just a word about this matter of idiogram. In the Babylonian there is a custom which we use in English, only they use it much more than we do, that is the writing of idiograms. In English, very often as you read you will come to— I got a letter the other day asking me to go and speak to ten people at a place where I was and they didn't say to ten. I arrived at the place and they handed me a letter and the man asked me to phone him and he said, "Friday night I wish you could come and address a meeting of teachers, pastors, laymen, etc.," and when I saw them all together I wondered what the etc. was. In fact, anyway, there being teachers, pastors and laymen I wondered the etc. was, but as you

T 28

read that letter in English you come to etc. you may say etc. You might say et cetera, but you're not apt to. You are not apt to pronounce it in Latin. You are more apt to say, "and so forth" when you come to it, and yet the words "and so forth" and etc. have only one letter in common; that's the t, between those two different phrases, and yet you'll say "etc." and you'll say "and so forth" and sometimes when you see i. e. you'll say, "that is" and i isn't "that" and "e" isn't "is" but there is no/letter in common between "that is" and "i. e".  
 other

We have a number of these marks in English where we write Latin and yet we don't pronounce the Latin, we pronounce the English, as a rule. A few decades ago they would probably have pronounced the Latin. Now this is a habit which we might as an idiogram. That is, we wrote letters and we don't read what the letters say but the idea that is in them, so we pronounce something entirely different from what the letters actually stand for, the writing that we put down. Now, the ancient Babylonians did the same thing as we. They had taken over their writings from the Sumerians, just as we took ours over from the Latin and so they would often put Sumerian words in and they would usually pronounce them in their own language, but often we're not just sure how to pronounce them and here is a case of it. In this writing, in the Babylonian language written by the kings of Canaan who spoke Hebrew, to a pharaoh who spoke Egyptian but

T 29

In these writings they often write this " " for a people who are  
 and sometimes they write " ", they don't often  
 write this but it is pretty well recognized that " " and " "  
 are the same thing. At least they are--if they're not identical they are close to being the same thing. Now I mean by that, is there any difference between a Hebrew and an Israelite? Was Abraham an Israelite? I hardly think you would call him an Israelite, when Israel was one of his grandchildren.

T 29

He had Isaac and Ishmael, his children, and then there was Esau and Jacob, his two grandchildren, and Israel is just one of the many grandchildren of Abraham and you could hardly call Abraham an Israelite. Well, if we call any descendant of Abraham we are apt to call it Hebrew and the Bible speaks of him as Abraham, the Hebrew, in, early in the discussion of Abraham, in such a way as to suggest that there were other Hebrews and he was only one of them. Well, the term Hebrew is a wider term than Israelite and yet the two correspond nowadays to such an extent that we are apt to think of them as almost identical and, of course, Jew is a smaller term, which means one of the twelve sons of Jacob but which we use commonly now to refer to all the sons, all the descendants of Jacob. Now, this then, whether these terms are identical or not, they cover much the same ground at least, and when we read that the or the are coming from the east of the Jordan and are conquering many sections of Palestine, it is pretty hard to keep from saying right away, "There you've got the Hebrews," and the Hebrews are conquering sections of Palestine. There is an account in these letters which fits with the account of the conquest of Canaan. Immediately one is apt to come to that suggestion. Mr. —? (Student) Well, I don't say it is quite . " " is the word in the Babylonian language. " " is an idiom. That's , and the way they are used suggests that they are interchangeable, but whether exactly interchangeable or not we don't know. " " may cover a slightly different area than " " but at least they overlap and they're quite generally the same. All we know about these words is their usage. That is, we read about it and then we have to infer what they are. We can't find a and ask him what he is and what they did. We have to take it from a few usages, put them together and try to reach a conclusion, and the conclusion we reach is that at this time the were a people who were invading Palestine. We reach that definite conclusion, but, of course, then we find that word in other Babylonian texts much earlier than this and some somewhat later.

T 29

We find them being slaves up in Mesopotamia. We find them attacking in various other regions. We find the attacking not simply in Palestine but way up north in Syria, where Joshua and his men never went, so the term is used in a much larger way than anything that the Bible describes and whether it is these Hebrews or the Hebrews of is a question on which we need more information. I remember picking up two articles by two learned Biblical scholars in 1928 and one of them said, in view of a certain particular piece of evidence which has come to light we know, can see that there is no longer any reason whatever for doubt that the who are described in these letters and who are now attacking Palestine are the Israelites under Joshua, and then I picked up another article by an equally learned Biblical scholar who said, "In view of this particular evidence there is now no longer any excuse for thinking that there is any connection between the mentioned in the letters of Akhnaton and the Hebrews under Joshua. Now there were absolutely antithetical views, conclusions taken. The fact is that the evidence is not sufficient yet to reach a conclusion and of course if we knew when the Israelites came into Palestine then we would be in a position to make a much better decision, that is, if this is a hundred years or two hundred years before the Israelites came in it naturally can't be the Israelites, but of/course there are things in this which are very similar to the Israelites' coming and there are things which are very different. They attack Syria as well as Palestine, and we find other things about them earlier that are not known of the Israelites and consequently there are reasons to question it and yet reasons to say it is so and it is a matter on which we have a certain number of vital facts but we have as yet insufficient facts to reach a positive conclusion. Mr. Jester? (Student) Yes, he was just about fourteen hundred, just a little before fourteen hundred. (Student) N<sup>o</sup>, it is Sumerian. It actually means, it seems to mean "fighters with a net" and it is hard to get much connection, but that is what the actual signs seem to mean. Oh, yes. Anybody . Almost any English is going

T 29

to have etc. or i. e. somewhere in it if you have much more than that. There is practically no Babylonian anywhere that doesn't have some Sumerian/words scattered through it but you read them in Babylonian. Yes, that is extremely common, and then when you get to Hittite, when you read Hittite, the Hittite uses Babylonian idiograms and also Sumerian and sometimes the two in combination, and you get the same thing carried one step further there, but in any Babylonian reading you will find idiograms, which are Sumerian words written but pronounced as Babylonian. It is a very common thing but of course it may— often you know exactly what a word means but you don't know how to pronounce it, unless you know how the Sumerian does. Well, now I merely mention this to show how interesting Akh— is to us from so many different viewpoints. We have these tablets from his reign which tell us more about conditions in Palestine and Syria at that time than we know at almost any other time in ancient history about exact details of events in Palestine and Syria, and yet they are not a connected historical account of the land but a lot of letters, the carbons of the letters that pharaoh sent to them and the actual letters that they sent to him. We have many letters both ways. While the bulk of them go to Palestine many go to Syria and there are also some letters to Babylon and to the Hittites included in them. Now these letters were discovered at the place where Akh— had made and placed his headquarters, his new capital at \_\_\_\_\_, the modern name of which is Tel-\_\_\_\_\_, so we call them the Tel-\_\_\_\_\_ letters. They were discovered there about sixty years ago. Some of them are in the British Museum, some are in the Berlin Museum and there are a few in other places, but these letters have been preserved to us because of Akh— monotheism. You see how that is. If A----- had stayed at Thebes, the ancient capital, these letters would have had the fate of the other archives which came to the pharaohs in Thebes before and since. They've been lost. We might find some of them some time but we have not found them, the archives of the Egyptian kings before or after this time but he moved his capital over to \_\_\_\_\_ the modern place

T 29

and then his son-in-law moved it back again and when it was moved back again all these old letters from the reign of A 's father and himself seem to have been missed in the moving and were left there <sup>were</sup> and they/discovered some other time. We have no such a trove of letters from any other and if A-- hadn't moved his capital that way we just wouldn't have them . Well, now I mentioned that he died at quite an early age and so scholars today are divided between those who call him the first individual in history, the first monotheist in history, praise him as one of the great leaders. People who like to run down Moses and like to talk of what a wonderful man was and what wonderful ideals he held, but there are other Egyptologists who have reacted against this and they have examined his money and tried to show that he lived like a man who didn't have much sense and that he, after all, died pretty young, and how could he have done all this before that, and they say it was worthless and he was just a puppet and he didn't amount to and so you find heated arguments on both sides on both sides of this, but when you get down to it the big argument as to whether A was a great man or a weak man doesn't matter much. The important thing is that the activity of the king, whether from his own ideas or from somebody else's ideas, the activity of the king at this time was devoted to advancing monotheism of that particular type in Egypt. That is the fact. That fact we know, whether we are able to say who gets the blame or the credit for it is after all of minor importance. The fact is that he moved the capital and then later it was moved back and these tablets were left there. The Germans excavated . They brought the material back to Berlin and they fixed it up in Berlin in such <sup>as</sup> a way/to be much more interesting than the material in most other museums in the world. Instead of putting up a lot of little things in a show case and you look and "Here's something from A and here's something from his great, great grandfather, a lot of little things in a show case and you ~~at one thing after another~~ look/and read a little writing under it, they arranged a room to be one of

T 29

the rooms of his palace and they put the things they found in the palace in just the right place as they had found them and tried to reconstruct it in such a way that you could see the way the things looked at his time, and you get more of a vivid realization, or you did before this last war, of the actual situation there in ancient Egypt from the way in which the Germans in the Berlin Museum display the things which they have excavated at El .

No after A's death the priests of succeeded in overcoming those who were the followers of . They succeeded in getting his daughters pretty well under their control. He left no sons. We noticed how his wife tried to get the king of the Hittites to send a son to marry her and failed so the power passed to his sons-in-law and they were rather weak and incompetent and one of them held the power and lived two or three years and died and then another took over and he was a young man and he died before such a long time but he lived long enough to have the capital transferred back to Thebes and to have the priests of the Egyptian god Amon get complete power in the land again. Yes, Mr.---? (Student) Yes. The Canaanite, which is very close to Hebrew, the Hebrew language, was the language spoken by the king in Canaan. The kings in Egypt spoke Egyptian but on these tablets they used a language that was a foreign language to both of them, the Babylonian, to write on the tablets, just as if you today were in Italy and wanted to send a telegram to somebody in Germany, you'd probably write it in French, because English would not be an acceptable language in the country, but French is acceptable all over the world, or at least was before the war. Well, at that time Babylonian was similarly the lingua franca, the language of diplomacy, and so he wrote in it but every once in a while there was a word they wanted to express that they didn't know just how to express in Babylonian, because after all the customs were quite different, and so in those cases they did the word in Babylonian as they understand it, and then they'd put in parentheses the Hebrew word so as to say, "Well, now, if you don't know what we mean by the Babylonian, here's the Hebrew word. Maybe you'll understand that." and so we

T 29

call these , in the . They were put in by the original writers but they're not part of the sentence. They're an explanation of the word for it in the other language, in the Hebrew language. (Student) Yes. The fact is that the Canaanite language and the Hebrew language are the same substantially. but we have discovered in the last few years quite a bit of material from ancient Canaan, in Palestine quite a few brief inscriptions which were nevertheless <sup>long</sup> enough to tell us quite a little about the language although they don't tell us a great deal of it, and then in northern Palestine we've discovered a large number of clay tablets with actual Canaanite written on it and this being from quite a distance from <sup>where</sup> the land of Israel was and quite a bit earlier, the language differed a good bit but yet it is close enough to see it is the same language. It differs about as much as the English of England and the English of American would, perhaps a little bit more, but it is quite definitely

T 30

before any of the other allies came in and they went through pretty well and picked up anything they felt like and took it off and in the Berlin Museum two days after the conquest the Russian officers walked in and they just scooped up everything they saw that looked good to them and took it off, and so they took--for instance, they had the best collection of silver seals in the world and of those ninety percent were taken but there were a few off in a corner they didn't see. Well, now as to these particular tablets, whether they took them or not I do not know, but they took a good deal from this . In that particular case the men/<sup>who came in were men</sup> who knew something about the field and knew what they were worth and so they seized just about everything of value. In many a house in Berlin a Russian truck would just back up to the house and they'd go in and they'd line the people up and take away any rings they had

T 30

or anything like that and they they'd take up the bath tub and take the door knobs off the doors and the radiators and anything metal and carry off, and that was often done by people who didn't have much idea of what they were doing and just took anything that looked valuable and they say that a lot of that stuff was just dumped about a hundred miles from Berlin and left there, but the museum seems to have been visited by men who really knew what they wanted and so they probably took most of what was of value and left quite a little that wasn't of much value, but these tablets--there was no great loss to the world, all these El tablets were now destroyed, because they have been copied with as much care as any set of Babylonian tablets ever have been. Their great importance was recognized. There are many important tablets right here in Pennsylvania in the Museum that may be of tremendous importance but their importance has not yet been recognized. They have never been copied and, of course, there are far more like that in the British museum. A German scholar once said it was more possible to excavate in the British museum than in Babylon because there is so much there that has not been studied or copied, but these El-Amarna<sup>na</sup> tablets, the importance was universally recognized and they have been copied so carefully and photographed and everything so much that if any of them were lost there wouldn't be any tremendous loss. We have definite records of just exactly what they contain, even though there are many, many points about the El-Amarna tablets which are not yet fully understood, like any letters. A letter doesn't explain everything. It takes a good deal for granted. When I was in Palestine I'd get a letter from my mother in Los Angeles and she'd say, "Last night Sam came over and we had a very nice visit with him," and I would write back and I'd say, "Do you mean Sam Watson or Sam Sullivan?" and she'd get the letter six weeks after she wrote it and she couldn't figure which and she'd take a week thinking and inquiring about it and she'd write me the answer and I'd get the answer six weeks after I wrote the question, and by that time I'd

T 30

forgotten about the question. Well, in many letters you get there are statements like that. People don't explain. They just name the person and in those cases you know from the context what they mean. It wasn't quite that way in diplomatic letters, but nearly as bad, if read by people who don't know the background or the situation, and that's the situation we are in. There are letters and there is much taken for granted yet we have a good many of them, there are a great many parallels, and we are in a position to explain a great deal about them and there is a great deal more that we can explain with further study and also with bringing them in relation into relation to more material as it comes, so they could be a great source of knowledge of Palestine for many years to come, even though they have been carefully studied and very excellently taught. The El-Amarna letters, then, are one thing for which we have Akhnaton to thank for his monotheism is the cause of their having been preserved. Now Akhnaton's son-in-law, his second son-in-law who became king, Tutankamen or Tutankaton, the living image of Aton, the one true god, the material disc of the sun, the god in whom Akhnaton believed, and you can be sure that Tutankaton always called himself Tutankaton, or he wouldn't have married the daughter of this very fanatical advocate of the religion of Aton, but he was a weakling and in his reign, his kingdom, the capital was moved back to Thebes, and there at Thebes, the old capital of Egypt, when the capital was moved back the priest of Amon reestablished their power in Egypt. Amon was the chief of a dozen, in fact hundreds, of gods. He had come to be the chief one because king after king had given such great gifts to the temple of Amon, even though theoretically he had not been, he had risen from a small deity in a small village of upper Egypt, but he had come to be the leading deity of Egypt, and now this man took up whom the priests took up Amon, the living image of the god Amon, died and was buried, and they hid his tomb better than any other ancient tomb in that

T 30

off his name everywhere they found it and they never referred to him by the name Akhnaton; they called him that criminal of . but this son-in-law, Tutankamon or Tutankaton, in his grave there, in the tomb, left dozens of fine wooden chairs and beds, all sorts of things made of wood, and, of course, very elaborate jewelry, very splendid works of fine jewelry, almost inconceivable, the amount of treasure that was found in this tomb of one of the less of the pharaohs, but the interesting thing is that almost every chair, every statue, every bed, almost everything, you have on one side the name Tutankaton and on the other side, Tutankamon, so he literally carried water on both shoulders. He was the great representative of Aton, the one and only true god and also he was the true supporter of Amon, the great enemy of Aton, so I call him the first modernist in history. He was the one who used the terminology of both gods and carried water on both shoulders, and consequently he made a good transition figure from the monotheistic religion to the polytheistic religion that followed and took complete possession so that Aton was completely forgotten. The modernist is after all a transition . He does not have anything that will last but he is a half-way that makes it easier to pass from belief to unbelief. Now, just one incidental word which I don't think I have mentioned in this class before though I've mentioned it in many places because it is important in this connection. That is the curse of the pharaoh. Everybody, nearly, who was reading the newspapers in 1924 was aware of it. There are probably many who have not heard of it but many will come across it in different things, the fact that when they opened up the grave here of Tutankamon or-aton, they found over the door the curse of the pharaoh, that anyone who shall enter this tomb or shall take anything out of it, the curse of death is laid upon him by the great gods of Egypt and a similar thing was found above the entrance to the tomb of every pharaoh, but the newspaper man who entered this tomb hadn't entered any of the other tombs, or if they had they hadn't been able to read the Egyptian and hadn't asked anyone what they meant and didn't know, but they noticed that on this and they thought that was

T 30

quite a striking thing to write up in the newspaper articles, so the articles came back and told how these men had gone in and had braved the curse of the pharaoh and had braved the fact that the curse was laid upon them, and it was only about six months later that the third cousin of one of the men who went in died, so the papers got a headline, the curse of the pharaoh has been fulfilled, and the fact of the matter is that within the next twenty years every single man who went into that tomb that, within the next twenty years every single one of them had either an uncle, a cousin, a grandfather or some other relative who died, every single one of them, and so you will hear people telling you that the curse of the pharaohs was fulfilled and it was but that is how it was, and the same thing is probably true of every other tomb that has ever been entered and of everybody who either has or hasn't entered any one of these tombs. Now this ended the 18th dynasty, of Egypt. The 18th dynasty which had been so glorious ended with chaos and disaster to the land. The Egyptian empire was lost and within the land of Egypt there was very little power in the hands of the pharaoh and the line died out and a high priest of the god Amon became the king of Egypt, and this man who became the king of Egypt, some lists record as the last king of the 18th dynasty and some record him as the first king of the 19th dynasty, and it doesn't matter which you call it. He is the transition figure between. He took over the power and he reestablished things in Egypt and he traveled all through the land and established the government on a firm basis again after a period of anarchy between and he got things well established again and he was succeeded by a king named Rameses/ because he lived such a short time. He lived a year or two, and I wouldn't mention him except that other kings of the name were of tremendous importance. He was Remeses the 1st, but his son Rameses II was a young man when he became king, because his father died so soon, and this man Rameses II is the pharaoh who has left as great a mark as any pharaoh in all history. Rameses II, you we had , the god has established, or given birth, and this

We were looking last time at the end of the hour at the experience of the Israelites in Egypt when Pharaoh tried to punish them for their effort to leave the country for a time by saying that they were lazy and must work harder and therefore they wouldn't be given any straw, and when they were given no straw they went through all the land hunting for stubble, and then they complained and he said they must make just as many bricks as before and would not be given any straw at all. Now some have interpreted this to mean that in the end they had to make them with no straw whatever and others interpret it to mean they have to go and look for their own straw but that which is mentioned in the second stage of it is stubble which many feel would hardly act as a binding material, that little stubble, bits of stubble they could pick up. How could that really bind the bricks together? And anyway, if it was a matter of binding the bricks together you might have good bricks or you might have bad bricks, but the lack of straw he doesn't think would make it any harder to make bricks, and so it was Atchinson's discovery that the presence of the extract of straw in the clay makes a difference between the clay being easy to manipulate and easy to work, or hard to work. That discovery which he made which was so helpful to him in his own scientific inventions and which also seemed to him, and has seemed to others to be the true explanation of the matter of pharaoh making their task more difficult by not giving them any straw, that the straw was not a binding material but produced a change in the size of the particles. Atchison discovered that that was what it did. It made the particles smaller, made them so small that they floated easily in the water and he called these very small particles, he called it defloculate. Later on the term co was

T 30

one is Ramoses, the god Ra, the sun god, has given birth. That is, he was the son of the sun god, the sun god Ra brought him into being. So Ramose, you'll sometimes find it written Ramose, but in the ordinary English we say Rameses. Rameses II reigned for many years. His reign was over fifty years in length. He had fifty sons and a hundred daughters. When he died his oldest twelve sons were all dead so he was succeeded by his thirteenth son and he was already at the time, so you see Rameses reign was a very long reign. He was a great builder. You find all over Egypt the great monuments which he put up, temples and palaces everywhere. He loved to put up his statue. We find statues of Rameses that would reach twice as high as this room. They stand, dozens of them, many places in Egypt. I don't know whether that was too high. They were just piles by hitting them back and the whole thing would fall, and he put up dozens of these statues of himself all over, and he loved to himself out as a great, powerful conqueror. He would and a dozen of them or he would show himself shooting his arrow into a great mass of his enemy, to win fame for himself and he led his army up through Palestine and won back again the empire, reconquered most of Palestine and Syria.

T 31

was foolhardy and got himself into a condition which might have proven serious but this, he was fortunate enough that reinforcements came just in the nick of time and saved his life and snatched victory out of defeat, and when this happened as he had a poet to put it into beautiful poetry describing how they were about to be destroyed and Rameses himself single handed overcame the enemy and established the victory. He had good press agents, and so we find copies of this poem all over Egypt describing the great victory

of Rameses. Yes? (Student) Yes. Rameses was about 1300, a little after 1300, and so Rameses II was a great conqueror and especially a man who loved to boast and had good press agents and so he did do a definite thing. He got credit far beyond what he had actually done and then he conquered a great deal and had a great deal of plunder and he used it for building these great things all through Egypt and he doubtless used a great many slaves in doing it and it has been quite generally thought that he was the pharaoh of the oppression of Egypt, though we have no proof of it. That has been quite generally thought that Rameses II was. Now we don't need to go into the details of the reign of Rameses in this class, but to mention that at his death he was succeeded by his thirteenth son, Merneptah, and Merneptah was an old man already when he became king, so he only reigned a very few years and Merneptah probably wasn't much of a conqueror. He was too old. But he did have some good press agents so he took some of his father's poems and just put his name in them in place of his father's and the school children had to learn the poems with the name of a new pharaoh in the place of the old one, and we have some of those poems which are not but which are word for word like the ones written for Rameses II. And so we are at a little difficulty in knowing the historical events of his reign because of this tendency to claim credit for things he didn't deserve. I even know of one statue which is the statue of Tothnes III and on the back, down between the shoulders and back it says Tothnes III, in very small writing and one of the scribes seems to have overlooked that because on the front they chiseled off the name of Tothnes III and had put in the name of Merneptah, and so this beautiful wooden statue which is in the Berlin Museum has the name of Merneptah on the front but written in little small letters on the back, if you look close you can see the name of Tothnes III, of whom it was originally a statue. So he took over poems and statues, etc. and tried to make people think he was as great a man as his father Rameses II had been. Well, it has been thought by many that he was the Pharaoh of the exodus. There's no proof of it, but if Rameses II was the pharaoh of the oppression, Merneptah would be the pharaoh of the exodus.

T 31

and an interesting thing is that a monument has been found describing, claiming to describe a great expedition of Merneptah into Palestine and it names various places in Palestine which have been destroyed or which are in misery as a result of the conquest and it says in it Israel. It says, "Israel has no seed. Israel has no seed," mentioned among the others. Well, now, some take that as the earliest place we find the name Israel and some take that as proof that Merneptah was the pharaoh of the exodus and that he was killing the Israelite children and so he said, "Israel has no seed." Now others take it as proof the Israelites must have gone earlier than this, they must have been in Palestine and that this would mean that all their harvest was taken away from them and they had no seed, with which to start a new harvest. The word "seed" has both meanings in Egyptian just as it does in English. And so the Israel we call it, the Israel monument, because the word Israel occurs in it, though to him it is only one of various words in it, has been a cause of much discussion and we need further light to be sure exactly what it means and it is a very interesting monument connected with this man Merneptah, and an interesting thing in it is that the other places in Palestine named have the Egyptian mark before them which means the name of a place but when it mentions Israel it only has the mark for the name of a people, not a place, and that would fit with the idea that the Israelites who were recognized as belonging in Palestine might have been still actually in Egypt in subjection to him and mentioned in connection with his account of the people in Palestine whom he conquered here, this Palestinian people who are slaves in Egypt. Now that's a possibility so there/arguments which can be made both ways but the fact <sup>are</sup> that there is the connecting them up with the name of Israel one way or the other. Now I see we'll have to continue an hour some

T 31 (second part)

leaders of the 18th and 19th dynasties in the last two hours and it would probably be a good thing to give you the principal dates of two or three of them. These dates are fairly definite and so I think that it would be a good thing for you

T 31

to have them at least in your notes and have a pretty good general idea of them in your head. Tothnes III may be placed from 1482 to 1450. Of course, that is after the reign of . That is his actual reign himself, 1482-1450. Yes? (Student) Yes, I have spelled them all already as we have gone through the lecture but I'll spell them again as I give this now. Tothnes--there are several ways to spell it. I think Tothnes is the old fashioned way. Thutnose is the new fashioned way, and either one of them--people will know what you are talking about. Thobhes or Thutnose III, 1482-1450. Then Akhnaton, A k h n a t o n, 1387-1366, and then Rameses II, 1299-1232 and Merneptah, 1232-1200. Those are four of the outstanding pharaohs and that gives us dates which are accepted by most scholars today. Some might vary a little bit one way or the other but they're pretty definite. Now, I think that we will at this time content ourselves with the amount of introduction to the background that I have given you. The further history of Egypt we'll glance at later on, but I am just giving you these main things in order to have it as background to note the relation of the patriarchs to it.

No. 3, then, will be Palestine. The history of Palestine at this time. We have noticed something of the archaeological situation as regards the study of ancient Palestine and the fact that our understanding is based more upon objects than upon original records, so far as actual archaeological material is concerned. The archaeological history of Palestine has been divided by archaeologists according to the type of metal which was in use and the metal which was in use in Palestine previous to the time of about 3000 B. C., of course there wouldn't be any, and so we call it the stone age. There are different phases of the stone age but that doesn't relate much to the Bible. The bronze age begins about 3000 B. C. and the bronze age runs from about 3000 up to about 1200. That is the age in which bronze is the leading metal, the leading material for making important things, just as stone was before. Yes? (Student) Oh, well now--maybe just a word on that right here would be in order. Genesis tells us of the knowledge and understanding before the flood of both bronze and iron. This would evidently

T 31

This would evidently be in the settlement previous to the flood of which, so far as I know, no one has ever yet been found in any remains. Naturally the ark may have been lifted up and carried, one knows not how far in the course of the long time it was upon the earth. Possibly if we were to dig out in our back yard here deep enough we would find remains of the civilization prior to the flood. I think that unlikely, but it probably is as likely as almost any other place. We don't know where it may be. It may be buried under the snows of Alaska; it may be in the sands of the center of Africa. Doubtless there would be tremendous climatic changes after the flood, and so where the antediluvian light was we don't know but before the flood people would have used copper and used iron and used stone, according to the description in the Bible. After the flood, however, you have Noah, who had been a preacher of righteousness but who did not know as much about growing in grace as he, perhaps, ought to have known, and how much he knew about smelting of copper I think is extremely questionable. That his sons knew anything about these things I would think very unlikely. It would seem likely that the knowledge of these technical matters was lost. That's the thought, and that it was many centuries before humanity discovered again how to use copper; that is to say, during the stone age, copper is used, but it is used little and when it is used it is used as stone. That is, you take a nugget of copper out of the earth and you beat it into a shape, and you use it, or you cut off a piece of it--you use it as you would use stone. The stone age is not a backward age. In fact the artifice of the late stone age is extremely advanced and things were made with great care and very excellent things were made out of stone. It took a long time to develop the fine use of stone but the knowledge of how to take copper and to smelt it under tremendous heat, to mold it into the shape that you desire/ to be is something which I am sure I could work for many years and I would never hit upon a way to do it if I didn't have the help of technical experts, and if a person had even forgotten there was such a thing, had no knowledge of the use of it, naturally they would be

T 31

in a position where it would be a long time before somebody would ,  
 and so we have the stone age up to about 3000 B. C. in the near east. Now in  
 other parts of the world the stone age would be much longer than that although  
 the bronze age pretty well began over most of the world of man within a com-  
 paratively short time because once you have the use of bronze you have such a  
 tremendous advantage over others that naturally those who had it proceeded to  
 conquer those who didn't have it and then those who were conquering split up  
 in little groups and taught one another and it did not establish a world unity  
 but it did cause a tremendous overturning and change within the world. It  
 wasn't that the bronze weapons were such a great deal better than the stone  
 weapons. They were doubtless better, but they could be made much more quickly,  
 and so you/have many more of them. That was the great advantage which it gives,  
 and you got the strenuous age immediately after the beginning of the use of  
 bronze. People no longer had time to make artistic things. They were too  
 busy making things rapidly for utility. It was the age of utilitarianism.  
 It was the strenuous age, which began in 3000 B. C. However, it wasn't long  
 before things settled down fairly well and you have a period of about 1000  
 years in which, after the first general upset at the introduction of bronze,  
 the use of it became pretty well known all over the world of man and after  
 that people settled down to a pretty settled life. And so you have a period  
 of about a thousand years in Egypt, in Palestine and in Mesopotamia in which  
 there are upheavals but in general it is a rather, fairly settled period, at  
 least in comparison with many other periods, and we call this period the early  
 bronze. We found in it, well made, often very artistic, and not changing  
 rapidly. It is a long period of fairly steady life.

T 32

We distinguish that from the early bronze because it is a period in which we find  
 a sharp change that has come to pass. The first great crisis in history had  
 been about 3000 B. C. with the introduction of bronze. Now, we have another

T 32

great change crisis, between 2000 and 1600 B. C. and this crisis is represented in Egypt by the Hyksos conquerors. It is a crisis of migrations. It is a time when groups are coming down from the mountains, are moving about and conquering other areas and you have upheaval and turmoil and much destruction all over the near east, all over Palestine, and so many during this period of the middle bronze, and you have distinctive potteries, but many more types of pottery during these four hundred years than during the previous thousand because as the new groups came in and conquests were made there was more change in style. Then the middle bronze ends about 1600 B. C. and then we have what we call the late bronze, which runs from about 1600 until about 1200 B. C. and the late bronze age in Palestine is a time of, in general, of degeneration. During this time in Palestine civilization is going down hill, which is partly due to the fact that no longer are the races that are in Palestine so strong as they were before but Egypt and the Hittites are overrunning it from both sides, there is considerable confusion from that score and the general attitude of the people morally is doubtless declining. Yes? (Student) About 1600 to about 1200. During the late bronze there is a decline in culture and civilization in Palestine. You remember that Jacob was told, or was it Abraham? Abraham was told that the iniquity of the Amorites was not yet full. There was a declension in culture and in morals in Palestine between 1600 and 1200 and by 1200 the iniquity of the Amorites was full and it was time for the Lord to cause to wipe out the whole iniquitous Canaanite civilization. You'll find that artistically and culturally there is an increase in the stress of the lower, less moral aspects of the picture. You can take a picture, you can take a little statuette in Babylonia, glorifying motherhood, a statuette which may be very frank regarding physical characteristics but yet which would not be considered as particularly sensual. It merely is a frank expression, and you can take that and find something similar at about 1600 in Palestine and then at about 1200 you can find that the same thing exactly is done differently, with little changes here and there, just enough to convert

T 32

what was merely frank and not particularly sensuous into something that was quite sensuous. This was a change which gradually occurred during this late bronze age. The morality of the Canaanites declined during this period and it is very evident from the material that we find just before the Israelite conquest that the statements in the Scripture of the iniquity and wickedness of the Canaanites at the time of the Israelite conquest are not the least bit overdrawn, and it represents the end of a long period of degeneration. So this is the late bronze age, and then comes the iron age, early iron age, which begins at about 1200 B. C. and runs to about 300 B. C. when we have what we call the Hellenistic period. You see, we give up our metal terminology now because the Greek influence becomes so dominant in this section of the world that it affects everything from about 300 B. C. on, after Alexander's time. I believe in giving those Egyptian dates I spelled the names of the first two kings and did not spell the names of the last two. In case some of you don't have them I might mention here that Rameses II was spelled R a m e s e s, which is as good as any, though some put another s in. Some make it R a m e s s e s but I don't see any need of that many s's, because Rameses himself never spelled in Latin letters. He wrote it in Egyptian marks which were an entirely different sort of thing, and do not correspond letter by letter with ours. There are no vowels in it and even there are not usually definite marks for consonants. They would have one sign which would stand for mss and be followed by one for s. It would hardly be . That is, Egyptian writing is a very peculiar type of writing so naturally there is variety in deciding what is the best way in English to write it, but Ramases is the usual way, though some spell it the other way. And then Merneptah is spelled various ways but I think it is perfectly all right to spell it Merneptah, a method which has been used quite largely in English literature. Merneptah. That is the spelling I gave at the first hour. Sometimes the first r is omitted and an r is inserted later, but I think this is as good/<sup>a</sup> way as any and it is the way which is most commonly used in writing this word. Now, I've mentioned these principal periods

T 32

of Palestine on a basis of archaeology, that is, on the basis of changes in the and the general changes in the types of civilization, of culture, which we have found. The middle bronze period interests us particularly in connection with the patriarchs. We are not particularly interested as Bible students in the early bronze age, because we have nothing in the Bible telling us about Palestine in the early bronze age unless it would be at the very end of it--certainly nothing during any other time, except perhaps toward the end, and probably not. Probably it was well into the middle bronze before the patriarchs. But the middle bronze, this period of upheaval and turmoil, is a period which interests us greatly and so it is worth our noticing here that there is a foreign group which has come into northern Mesopotamia and spread into Palestine and which exerts an important influence in this period known as the Hurrians. I have mentioned them to you in previous classes. We spell it H u r r i a n, Hurrian, the Hurrians. We put that ian ending on as purely an English ending. We get their name from Babylonian sources and the sign there is, maybe you have har, here, here or more. Some have called them harrians, some herians, some have called them horians, some morians and some have called them Suberians. These different names have been used, but now scholars are coming to accept the term Hurrian as the most probably correct designation of them. There are a number of reasons for it which we don't need to go into now. Some have adopted other spellings and have tenaciously held to them. For instance, Harian was held by some who wanted to tie them up with the Arians but such reasons have often dropped by the side and there are various indications which point in the direction of one or the other and the term Hurrian is now pretty well accepted the as/correct term for these people. There is a people mentioned in the Bible called the Horites and it is quite probable that the Horites and the Hurrians are the same people, though we do not have a great deal told us about the Horites in the Old Testament. They are mentioned occasionally in the early part of the Old Testament. Then, in connection with Palestine for this period we should know

T 32

about, of course, the migrations of the Hyksos, which we noticed under Egypt. The migrations of the Hyksos with their horses and their great enclosures for maneuvering with the horses. Also in connection with the general period of the patriarchs it is important that we know, that we are familiar with the fact of the discoveries at Ras Shamra in northern Palestine. Yes? (Student) Yes. Both migrations. Their migrating down and their being driven out would be just at the end of it. The migration down the middle of it. They are one of the various groups migrating in the middle bronze age. Now Ras Shamra is the name of a place in Syria. It is a modern name. Ras Shamra. It is a modern town in Syria quite near, quite near the Mediterranean sea fairly well north in Syria. It was in 1929 that natives in Syria near this place began digging up some things which they thought showed that there had been an ancient civilization there and some one on the spot sent word down to the French Director of Antiquities for at that time Syria was under the control of the French government, and he sent word down to the Director of Antiquities and asked him to send a man up there and look it over and see if there was anything there worth excavating and the Director of Antiquities said, "Oh, you get stories like this from all over Syria. The natives are always finding something and they think they will go in there and do some excavating and there'll be money for the work and so on and we we've got plenty of other places more important and probably there is nothing anyway," and he just kept putting them off and putting them off and paid no attention, but he kept hearing from this place until finally when one of the leading archaeologists who was making a trip to another place further north he would be going right near Ras Shamra, and the Director said to this man, he said, "When you come to this place, I wish you'd go there and just take a look and see if there is anything worth looking into," so he went over and took a look and what he found thrilled him so much that he stayed there for several years, off and on, excavating, and they found there the remains of a very interesting ancient town and there's considerable of buildings that were found there, some interesting frescoes on the wall and different things, the archaeological materials that they

T 32

found there were of considerable interest but the most interesting thing they found was a large group of clay tablets, the largest group of clay tablets that has been found anywhere in Palestine or Syria, and when they found these clay tablets they found that they had a writing in them which looked very much like the cuneiform writing of Mesopotamia, the same writing as on the El Armarna letters, but the signs were different. The signs were not like the writings. It was the same kind of signs, the cuneiform writing, as I explained to you last semester, was made with wedge-shaped marks, made by pushing the stylus into the clay and these are typical signs in the cuneiform writing, and once you have seen a few clay tablets or inscriptions on the walls with writing of that type on them, you immediately recognize them as different from anything else you'll find anywhere else in the world. Now, these clay tablets at Ras Shamra had the same kind of wedge marks on them but the signs were different from the Babylonian signs and one strange thing about them was that there were comparatively few kinds of signs on them. There were only about thirty signs which occurred and recurred. If you look at these Babylonian tablets you will find that there actually are about a thousand signs which may be found occasionally. There are about a hundred that are extremely common, about two hundred more than occur every now and then, and perhaps another five hundred that every once in a long time you'll find, but here there were only about thirty signs and that would look as if it was not a complicated system like the Babylonian system but as if it might be an alphabetical type of system, and then they found a remarkable thing in this writing. They found that the Babylonian signs are all derived from pictures and so there is not much definite system to them. They all come from original pictures which have been made into the type of figures you could draw with these definite impressions this while these marks were systematically arranged. Thus, you'd have a sign like this and you'd have one like that and you'd have one with three . You'd have one like this and one with two and one with three. It looked like an artificial system that someone had made up in lieu of the cuneiform writing. The cuneiform will have this

T 32

I don't believe it occurs in that form ever but if you put this to it, that is a fairly common cuneiform sign, or if you put a mark at the end of it you have another common cuneiform sign, but these seem to be arranged as if somebody had just taken the idea of wedge-shaped marks and worked out a system and so the conclusion was reached that somebody from Palestine and Syria was familiar with the alphabetic system which developed into our Hebrew alphabet and from which our English and all other alphabetical systems in the world have come, somebody was familiar with that that knew that it was for writing on Papyrus, not much good for clay tablets. You couldn't hardly write that type of letters on clay tablets, and got the idea of an alphabet from it and then just artificially to make up an alphabet, and that's pretty well accepted now, that this is an alphabet which did not grow like natural alphabets have but was invented and, of course, to some extent that represents a step forward. If somebody would invent a decent alphabet for us to use with our English language and persuade us to start using it, we'd be far better off than with the very crazy system that has gradually grown up through the ages into the monstrosity that we call our English system .

of writing today. Well, the systems that were in use in much of the ancient world were nearly as bad as the system we use for English today, but this is an artificial system which has been invented and consequently has much in its favor. Now they took these tablets and the French excavator who first found these tablets did something- which very few excavators have ever done.

T 33

March 28, 1949

"I'm going to study it and then when I know all about it I am going to publish it and let the world know what a great thinker I am and the result is that the rest of the world will be studying over problems for twenty years maybe which would be solved if you only had this material available to you. Instead of that he immediately published the material. He copied it right off and published it at once so that it would be available for study and when the material came out the result was that a few people were able to begin studying it and there was a German in Hamburg who had been in the intelligence service in the war from 1914 to 1918 and had been busy with deciphering enemy cryptograms and so he had good training in practising working out what things mean in an unknown type of writing

T 33

and he set to work on this and he was, on the guess that this might be some kind of a Semitic type of language, trying different plausible words. He worked out a system, sort of an alphabetic system whereby he had about three-fourths of the signs figured out. He wrote it up in a German paper and a copy of it reached the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem. Dr. Albright, receiving the copy, went over to the French School at Jerusalem and visited

who was then a great scholar of Babylonian material and Palestinian material, who was then a monk in the Dominican Monastery in Jerusalem, a man who has subsequently married and left the church and is now professor in the University of Paris. At that time he was a monk in the Dominican school in Jerusalem, and during the same war had been busy with the French army in trying to work out German cryptograms, so he had been doing the same kind of work that had been doing with the German army but he had been doing it on the opposite side, and he had already been working on this, and he had worked out about three quarters of the signs and when Dr. Albright took in the statement of what

had worked out and they compared the two they found that each of them had worked out different signs and so about a third of them they had both worked out and about a quarter of one they had worked out correctly and a quarter of the other they had and then the hints and suggestions gave them enabled them to work out the rest of them, so you thus have the two men working together then.

Probably it is<sup>about</sup> the best thing that was accomplished by the 1914-18 war, the training of these two men to interpret the writing of the ancient people of Ras Shamra, and so the two men, using that thing which they had secured in that war, they went to work this out and to get the key to the reading of it, and when this key was thus secured, people set to work reading the tablets they found in them evidence that this city had been a city which is named in Babylonian material. We already knew about the city but we didn't know just where it was. We knew it was somewhere in Syria, and they found evidence that it was indeed that city, a city which was called Ugarit, and so the first ten years after discovery was

made most everything written about it referred to it as the Ras Shamra inscriptions and the Ras Shamra material. You look at any book written up to about 1940 about this material and it will be under R and you look under Ras Shamra. Most everything since 1940 calls it Ugaritic, after the ancient town, so you look under U for any subsequent works. Well this material was found to be in a language very close to Hebrew, written with all of the consonants given, vowels not written, an alphabet somewhat similar to Hebrew though looking entirely differently, and the remarkable thing about it was that many of the tablets proved to contain religious and mythological material, and in this religious and mythological material there was found the myths and the legends and the religious beliefs of the ancient Canaanites. Now this was very important because some scholars before that time had written long books to show how the Israelites got all their ideas from the ancient Canaanites. It was easy to write books to prove that because we didn't know anything about what the ancient Canaanites believed, except a few hints from the very late writers, but now we know a great deal about what they believed and there is evidence now that the Israelites did not get their ideas from the ancient Canaanites, and so it is a pretty good instrument to do away with that feeling which is widely taught that the Israelites were desert dwellers who simply came into Palestine and took over the religion of the Canaanites. However, it does help greatly in understanding the Bible, these tablets, because the Bible is constantly warning the people against the Canaanite religion and occasionally makes references to it and here we have more detail on this religion, and the contact is not so much between this material and early Genesis as a beginning of Biblical religion, as it is with the prophets because in the prophets we have the people warned against the Canaanite religion and we have references to it and these references are easier to understand in the light of this material. Also, of course, this material contains a language which is quite similar to the Hebrew Bible and sometimes we have a word used only once in the Bible and used several times in this material and from the context we can learn something about the word, and just what it really means, and so it is quite useful in closer interpretation of Hebrew words provided you don't go to an extreme on it. After all,

T 33

it is a different dialect and a word might be similar and yet might have a different meaning than it has in the Bible, but it will throw considerable light. It has destroyed some of the critical viewpoints regarding the Bible. On the other hand it is the foundation on which some new ones have been built up. There is a character mentioned in some of these texts, for instance, called Danel, and this Danel is a sort of a semi-god, half god and half man who does peculiar things in some of these stories. Now, Dr. Albright said, "This explains the statement in the Book of Ezekiel where it says that even though Job, Noah and Daniel were in the company that God would not spare them for their sakes. This statement, Job, Noah and Daniel, of course, had always been a tough one for the critics because they say the Book of Daniel was written in the time of the Maccabees about 168 B. C. and here is Ezekiel written several centuries before and refers to Daniel. Well, now, of course, it is a peculiar thing that Ezekiel giving the example of great righteousness along with the ancient Noah and the ancient Job would give the contemporary Daniel, because according to our belief Daniel lived at the same time as Ezekiel, and yet it is a confirmation of Ezekiel's belief in the great righteousness of Daniel and in his being wellknown among his countrymen. It is mentioned, I believe, three times in the one chapter. Well, now, Dr. Albright says this book doesn't refer to Daniel, because those stories were written long after the time of Ezekiel. It proves that when Ezekiel says, "Job, Noah and Daniel," he didn't mean Daniel, he meant Danel, the ancient demi-god of the Canaanites, and that's who he was referring to. And so you see, from this material some theories have come which are destructive of the Bible, but also a great many facts have come from it which are destructive of anti-Christian theories at many points, and it is material which is of much value for Bible study. Now this material comes from our general period of the patriarchs, and many scholars who have studied it have written on it and some of them have gone to great extremes in what they have derived from it but there are many others who have been very careful and cautious in trying to see just what are the facts and what can be legitimately deduced from it. It is an

T 33

entirely new area of study, absolutely unknown prior to 1929. Now, the--yes!

(Student) Well, the--for general information on this it is rather hard to tell just what to suggest. Any book on archaeology written lately will give the general facts of it. I think Finnegan's *LIGHT FROM THE ANCIENT EAST* probably would give a good general introduction to it. There have been some grammars and lexicons and that sort of thing written lately and there have been perhaps two hundred different articles written by different scholars interpreting these texts and some of them very sensible and some of them very extreme. They are mostly quite technical. I think as yet there is no dependable book that is devoted entirely to it that is usable for the average reader, that doesn't take a detailed, technical study, but any book on archaeology written in recent, within the last ten years, will have something about it and will give the main facts at least. The other thing that should be mentioned about Palestine here is what we referred to in our first hour, the El-Armana tablets. We discussed them at some length the last hour but they, of course, relate to this general period, to the late bronze rather than to the middle bronze. Then during this period one thing that we should mention is this, that the Jordan valley was the great cultivated area. Up in the hill country there were towns in Palestine but the Jordan valley was in its prime in this period, a prime which it lost and became largely a desolate region. We know that--we've already mentioned the Hittites, the great empire of Asia Minor which was occasionally trying to hold Palestine and Syria, and Hittite armies came down through that area every now and then during this period.

Now we go on to b: a was our historical background of the patriarchal period; b. is Abraham, and under Abraham, No. 1 is a general outline of the material aspects of his life. No. 1, a general outline of the material aspects of his life. The Bible tells us that Abraham was, came out of Ur of the Chaldees. Most modern scholars think that that is a late insertion in the Bible and undependable. That comes from the P documents and they say that you can put no confidence in it, and I have often heard men speak of northern Mesopotamia, Haran, as a place from which Abraham came, and they based it largely on the fact that when Abraham sends his servant

T 33

to get a wife for his son up to E<sup>aran</sup>, he says, "Go to the land of \_\_\_\_\_, and our English version translates " \_\_\_\_\_ " kindred, the land of my kindred. Many scholars today say a word that begins with a "N" like that must indicate a place, and so it doesn't mean kindred, but it means birthplace. Go to the land of my nativity, and this proves Abraham was born up there. That is an argument based purely on philological matters upon the formation of the word. I took the word once and traced it through Genesis and found a number of cases where "kindred" fits excellently and "birthplace" doesn't make a great deal of sense, for the translation of the word and I think that the old translation which the versions have always had, "the land of my kindred" is one for which a mighty good argument can be made. The Bible, as we have it, says he came from Ur of the Chaldees, and the only argument against it is that it is in what is said to be the P document and therefore \_\_\_\_\_ . As a matter of fact, we found in excavations in Babylonia that Ur was a very ancient city. It is one of the earliest cities of Babylonia. Now if they said Abraham was born in, and named a city which wasn't even founded till a thousand years later, why it, of course, would be a glaring inaccuracy in the Scripture, but there is no such inaccuracy as that anywhere in the Scripture. It says he came from Ur of the Chaldees. Ur of the Chaldees may be a late term to describe the place. That is one of the arguments expressed against<sup>it</sup> that the people whom we call the Chaldeans probably didn't come in there till hundreds of years after the time of Abraham, but that is no objection to Abraham's being born in Ur if the Bible describes Ur by a term for it which was not used until a later time. We might say that the Norsemen came to America about 1000 A. D. Leif Ericson came to America. Well, you say Americus Vesputius wasn't even born till 400 years later and how could he come to America? I don't think anybody would quibble over that. You say America and you mean this land here and he came to this land and we use the term used today for this land. Yes?

(Student) We know this, that at about 1000 B. C. or a little later there were a people there called the Chaldeans. It is usually thought that they didn't come<sup>in</sup> until about this time. Now if that is the case we have no evidence

T 33

so when Abraham lived there it would be Ur but it wouldn't be Ur of the Chaldees, town  
 It would be this /r which was later called Ur of the Chaldees but it wouldn't be called Ur in Abraham's time. Then, in Laban's time it may be that the Chaldees weren't yet there; the phrase "of the Chaldees" might have been inserted later on, not written there by Moses but inserted there later on simply as an indication of the location of the place which Moses described as Ur, to point out where it is in that area which we now call the Chaldean area. Now, as to whether it was so-called in Moses' time, there is no present evidence it was, but there is no proof that it wasn't in Moses' time, but it seems highly unlikely that it was called Ur of the Chaldees as early as Abraham, and it may not have been as early as Moses, but it was called Ur, and it was in the region which later was called/Chaldeans. the region of the  
 Yes? (Student) Well, it might have come in as people were studying the Bible, studying the text--they might have come to this place Ur and some of them might have written in the margin "Ur of the Chaldees" simply to make it a little easier for people to understand where this Ur was.

T 34

but if it was it is nothing whatever against the inspiration of the Scripture or against the Mosaic authorship, and if it was written by Moses, if it was called that as early as the time of Moses, that would certainly be no objection to the statement if it wasn't so-called in the time of Abraham. That is, it may have been so-called in the time of Abraham, but we have no evidence that it was. It is less likely to be so-called in the time of Abraham than in the time of Moses. We have no evidence as yet that it wasn't in the time of Moses, but not so many . At any rate, there is a city of Ur in that region--oh, by the way, I should mention that as to evidence of the possibility of the Chaldeans having come in later, it is my impression that the Greek translation just has Ur, doesn't have Ur of the Chaldees. Now, I am not quite sure of this and I haven't checked it for a long time. I hadn't expected to go into

T 34

that particular detail this morning, but that is my impression, that the Greek translation doesn't bring it in, and that, of course, doesn't prove that it wasn't in the Hebrew because they often omit phrases in the Greek translation, and yet it suggests the possibility of it. At any rate, however, the city of Ur we have known since 19--the early 20's, was in existence at the time of Abraham and was already then an old city. It was a city which is one of the earliest cities in Mesopotamia. It was one of the great cities in Mesopotamia. It was a city which we know, from excavation, had a standard of living, had a splendor of--the luxury of the houses in Ur at the time of Abraham was as great as that of Babylon a thousand years later. Babylon in the time of Nebuchadnezzar was a great city in the ancient world, had no further advanced house/<sup>building</sup> and general comfort in the houses than Ur had in the time of Abraham, so this city was a sophisticated, cultured, advanced city in the time of Abraham. It was already there and it had all these and when God said, "Come out of Ur and go out into a land that I will show thee," he was calling him to go out from a highly developed, cultured, comfortable place--go out into what seemed the back woods into the distant wilderness. Well, now, we read in the Scripture that Abraham and his family, including his father, left Ur to go into the land of Canaan and they traveled from the city of Ur northward a long distance up the, along the rivers, and when they got about half way there, to Canaan, perhaps a little less than half way to Canaan, they came to the city of Haran, and there they stopped, and they stayed in this city of Haran until Abraham's father died, and then <sup>Abraham</sup> went on from there further on into Palestine. Well, now why did they stop at Haran? Why did they leave Ur and go off there and why would they stop in this particular place rather than any other city along the way before or after Haran? That is a question which you might ask and the Bible doesn't tell us, and so we are not in a position to give an answer, but if we can find something which seems to suggest a probable reason why Terah stopped in Haran, a reason which would make it the natural thing for them to stop there rather than any other place, and the Bible says he was at Ur and then went to Haran, that would be, in turn, an added

T 34

weight to our confidence to the accuracy and dependability of the source, and here we strike a most interesting thing. The city of Ur had its great central temple, the devoted to Lumna, the moon god. The moon god of the ancient Sumerians, Lumna, at the great temple there in the city of Ur. That was the central deity of the place, it was distinctive of Ur, and when you go up through the land of Mesopotamia you occasionally find small temples of Lumna, but it always is quite subordinate, subsidiary. Other gods are the main gods of every city until you come to Haran, and when you come to Haran you find that Haran was the other one of the great cities of ancient Babylonia which worshipped the moon god as its principal deity. Now, you know in the book of Acts how, when Paul was in Ephesus and they found he was interfering with the worship of Diana, the goddess of Ephesus, they had the great uproar, and they called, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians," and the worship of Diana was a simple feature in the life of Ephesus and the making of, the coppersmith, you remember, was one of the leaders against Paul. There was a great industry that centered around the worship of a particular deity would give a simple similarity to the two different cities in which it was central, much as the same industry would make one city like another. I remember years ago when I lived up in Calumet, Michigan. It was, at that time--well, I'll say a little before that time, it had been the leading copper mining district in the United States and then they used up a great deal of the copper in Calumet, and other copper districts began to develop in the United States, and the next one which came into prominence was around Butte, Montana, and that became the second great copper mining district in the United States, and then the third was found down in Arizona, and there have been a few ever since. I remember up in Butte talking to a man who told me that he went to a district just a hundred miles away from Butte and got a very good job mining coal and he said he went into the mines and worked one day and then when he finished he didn't even stop to ask for his pay. He just started out walking and he didn't stop until he got back to Butte. He said he had heard it said that the copper miner never does coal mining, but he hadn't realized what it meant until he tried a day of coal mining. There is a difference in the industry, a difference in the type of life, a difference in the

T 34

type of people in a coal mining center and in a copper mining center. Well, now, my father and I left Calumet and made a trip out west and on the course of the trip we changed trains at Butte and we were there about an hour and a half, I guess, and there in Butte I went for a little walk for a few minutes and I must say as I walked along the streets and saw the houses and saw the people, everything struck me as--I felt more at home than I had felt anywhere since I left Calumet. There was a similarity to the general type of life in the place which centered around copper mining different from that found any other place in the country which did not center around copper mining, and I remember we were in the station and a man came in and my father looked up and he had known the man twenty years before. I think he ran into two or three in the hour and a half he was there, and my father said to me, he said, "You know I could pick up the phone book here and run right down and I could probably pick out a hundred people that I have known in Calumet, and they have moved away and they have gone to another copper mining settlement. There is that similarity between places which center around the same industry. Well, now it would seem very reasonable that there was the same similarity between Ur and Haran and old Terah as he traveled along was probably disliking the discomforts of travel and thinking of their home back in Ur and saying to Abraham, "Why on earth do we have to pick up and leave and we had a good place to live like that, what's this crazy idea of yours going way off in a far country there to Canaan," and as they went along Terah became more and more homesick and wished they hadn't started but at other times he's be quite happy about the traveling and he'd see the people in different places and he'd say, "Oh, my, I wouldn't stay here if they'd give me the town. Let's go on further," and then they came to Haran and immediately he felt at home. There was a similarity between the places, and very likely he ran on to people that he knew in Haran, just as we did in Butte, run on to people we had known in Calumet, even though that was fifteen hundred miles. I remember my father telling of being down in Arizona, a third great copper mining district and he was driving along in his car and a man hailed him and asked for a ride and he picked him up, and he started talking to the man and he said, "The first place mentioned was Calumet, Michigan,

T 34

and there he was two thousand miles away down there in Arizona, but he was in a copper mining area and people naturally go back and forth among the same places with the same interests, and so here we have archaeological evidence which makes it seem quite natural that an old man leaving Ur would think of Haran as a reasonable place to stop, and a place where he would feel--"Well, I feel at home here. Let's not go any further. This is good enough for me right here," and the Bible simply tells us the fact that they left Ur, they came to Haran, they stopped at Haran, they stayed at Haran until Terah died and then they came on out. Yes?

(Student) That there was this one deity -that was the distinctive god of the two places though of course both places worshipped many other gods and many other places worshipped the moon god but the moon god would just be an incidental deity in most places--in this place it was the leading deity of the place. (Student)--- Well, they didn't fit in; at least Abraham certainly did not fit in. Just how much spiritual nature Terah had we do not know. There is an old Jewish tradition that he was an idol maker but we just don't know. We don't know anything about him. And I think, even aside altogether from that, I think that a person ~~with~~ that knows the Lord will certainly not or at least should not feel at home anywhere in this world, because the usages of this world and the whole attitude of the world is very very different and America certainly is pagan land, and why should you feel more at home here in America than you would feel in some other country. However, I remember that after I had been a year in Germany I was wont to come back to America for the summer and I went into a bank and asked for some money and I gave them some German money and I asked for \$100 in American money and they handed me 10 American 10-dollar bills. To me it was merely a commercial transaction. I went in to get that money, but as I received that money from him cold shivers went up and down my spine and I had a thrill such as I have hardly had in my life before or since. It just reminded me of the background and the situation to which I was accustomed. And even though the Christian is one whose home is in heaven and should be a stranger as much in one part of the world as another

with its worldliness and its wickedness yet the fact is that the particular sort of background with which you are accustomed gives you a great thrill when you come back to it and when you come on to something quite similar it is going to give you the same effect, because even though our citizenship is in heaven we always are pretty well tied in with this earth. I wouldn't build a great argument on it at all but I do say that it is an interesting little incidental point which looks in the direction of the accuracy. It is not a lonely little fact devoid of all others but when you get a lot of little incidental points which look in the same direction cumulatively it makes quite a strong argument and this is just of them--that is all. T---35.

Now we come to a question which perhaps is more striking than this. That is that we find Abraham coming over into the land of Palestine and there in the land of Palestine we find him traveling up and down and through the center of that land and there we find him described as one who with flocks and herds camped at one point and moved north and south from a point along the hill country in Palestine. He does this when he first reaches Palestine, When he returns from Egypt with far greater property, He does it again. He has his flocks and his herds encamped at Beersheba in the far south; at Hebron further north or up near Bethel or even further north up in the region of Dothan or in regions of the north of Palestine but always on that hill country area. As we read this of his traveling up and down in that hill country area, we might wonder how it is that a man with flocks and herds would travel up and down in that hill country area <sup>in this way.</sup> ~~with his wife~~. You would think of the area as taken up with cities and with people while here and there it would be densely enough populated that a man ~~would~~ <sup>would not</sup> be able to camp in just one place with all his property and then to move to another and camp and wander back and forth up through that hill country. This particularly <sup>is</sup> the case when we notice in later history and we find that in the time of that later Israel kingdom we find great cities right in this very hill country and today it is up in

that country that the great bulk of the population lives, except of course those down in the Philistian plain. The Jordan valley in the time of the Israelite kingdom was rather a desolate region with very few people living there., and same was the situation in the Jordan valley in ~~the~~ recent years. Well, under those circumstances it is amazing and an interesting thing that Abraham ~~must~~ should have wandered back and forth encamping in different places in this hill country region here. We find this perhaps brought more particularly to our attention when we turn to Gen. 13 after Abram had been down in Egypt and we find what happened when he came back up into the land. And we find that there again he was traveling back and forth with his flocks and herds in this hill country. And then when Lot went down into the Jordan valley we find that Lot set his tent towards Sodom and eventually went right into the city of Sodom. That is when Lot went down into the Jordan valley gave up the itinerating habits of Abraham --of camping here and there and he settled down in one definite area, and he remained in that city of Sodom doubtless having steady and permanent pastures for his flocks and herds right in the neighborhood. That 13th chapter is a very interesting one. As you read that 13th chapter of how Abram and Lot were so rich after they had been down in Egypt, how they came up into the land then--you find that they had a certain amount of difficulty in this hill country. We read in the 3rd verse how they camped there between Bethel and Ai and we read there that the land was not able to bear them that they could dwell together for their substance was great so that they could not dwell together. And there was strife between the herdsman of Abram's cattle and the herdsmen of Lot's cattle. And it is easy of course to reconstruct the scene of what must have taken place. They were settle there on that hill country and camped there between Bethel and Ai and we'll say one morning Lot's men went out 5:30 a.m. to take their flocks and herds out to pasture and they found that all the places where there were good springs near where they were encamped were taken up with Abram's flocks who had gone out at 5:00 am so Lot's men had to travel

quite a long distance to get past them. get to good springs, good pasturage and it made quite a disagreeable long trip for them getting past Abram's flocks and the same thing coming back at night; doubtless the next morning they went out at 4:30 a.m. to get ahead of Abram's men and they would find themselves in the same plight that Lot's men had found themselves in the day before and they would have to go further and so the next day they would doubtless come out at four o'clock and pretty soon they wouldn't be getting any sleep at all if they used purely peaceful means to see who would get there first and get the good pasture land of which the amount near was quite limited. And so there was naturally was a strife between the herdsmen of Abram's cattle and herdsmen of Lot's cattle and they began to say we have had this side and the others would say, No! we were here first you; you have to go further up and so there was strife. And Abram said, We must put a stop to this for it is dangerous for the Canaanite and Perezite dwell then in the land, we read. And so Abram, we imagine, came to Lot's tent and they walked out together and after a while Abram said to him "Let there be no strife between me and thee, and between thy herdsmen and my herdsmen for we are brethren and is not the whole land before thee. Separate thyself I pray thee from me I pray thee. If thou wilt take the left hand then I will go to the right. But if thou wilt depart to the right hand then I will go to the left; We read that Lot ~~then~~ ~~upon~~ lifted up his eyes and beheld all the plain of Jordan, that it was well watered everywhere before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, even as the garden of the Lord like the land of Egypt as thou comest unto Zoar, Which phrase incidentally here "as thou comest into Zoar" ~~refers~~ go, in the statement here? As the Scripture stand in the English it seems ambiguous but when we check it with the facts we find that one way is right and the other way is wrong. He fled to another place in the Jordan valley so that would suggest that when it ~~suggests~~ "When thou comest into Zoar" it means that he beheld the plain of Jordan that it was well watered

everywhere and especially as you come to Zoar, that is that he saw the Jordan valley stretching down there clear to Zoar and it was all well watered in all that area towards Zoar and up where he was. He had the Jordan valley as you come down toward Zoar you look at that whole valley and he saw that it was well watered everywhere Before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah even like the garden of the Lord , like the land of Egypt. And so we have here this place Zoar down at the end of the Jordan valley way to the south ~~and~~<sup>but</sup> we have the rest of the area and all that above which Lot looked at and Lot saw this well-watered land everywhere and so Lot says, "That is a wonderful place to be", and Lot chose the plain of Jordan and journeyed east and separated one from the other. A wonderful story to show the selfishness of Lot and the unselfishness of Abraham and how Abram was rewarded for his generosity and unselfishness later on --a very fine story to bring out if you are telling the story in America but it is not a good story to tell in Palestine, simply to read from the Scripture there , because if you stand between Bethel and Ai in Palestine. I remember when I stood there and looked, here came along a ~~man~~ man with little pipes in his hand playing long holding them in his mouth and playing on the pipes and behind him came his ~~wife~~ flocks and his herds following along behind him as he went along there, heading off towards the nice springs and pastures up there near Bethel and Ai. And then we look down there in the Jordan valley--down there three-quarters of mile in altitude we saw that barren arid--a little muddy stream flowing weaving back and forth in a depression in the middle of that valley and <sup>on</sup> both sides of it there is quite a rise up from the river and then ~~is~~ a very flat area with hardly a thing growing in that part of the valley--further down you see alot of weeds growing. And that is the way it loos today and that is the way it looked a hundred years ago, the way it looked a 1000 years ago --it looked that way in the later Israelite kingdom when the critics say the story was written. It looked probably almost like that in the time of Moses and Joshua. You wonder why on earth anyone could ~~make~~ make up a story like this; why did Lot choose a land like that as the well-

T 35

watered region. In the days when Abram was unselfish--it doesn't say that he was unselfish but it certainly suggests it when it tells of God's rewarding him later it certainly suggests it--why was Abraham unselfish in staying up here in this kind of section in this part of the land . And so it looks that way to us -- that part of the land and the story just doesn't seem to fit the situation, and you wonder why on earth why anybody when the P document was written made up a story like this or even when the J document was written why did he make a story up like this but the trouble is that the story was doubtless written at the time the story occurred and when a story is written at the time when the events occur you don't bother to explain the things that are really obvious to everybody at the time. If you say that you went from N.Y. to San Francisco you probably would not bother to say, N.Y. at the extreme eastern end of U.S. and San Francisco is at the extreme western end. Everyone knows that and if they didn't they could look on the map and find it out very easily. You just wouldn't bother to explain that but 1000 years from now if both of them were ruins and forgotten and people no longer knew even where they had been <sup>your</sup> ~~the~~ story might be rather obscure of what you meant. And if you were writing a story like that about some place along the same line that happened long ago, you no doubt would qualify it and say something about it. It says that it was well-watered everywhere so it does have a qualifying statement here for it says "it was well-watered before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah". (Begin T-----36 here)

T 36

just even a little later, the events described. Circumstances might change a little with the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, down there. Well, the story seems to the critics to be a story which did not fit the background, to those of them who knew anything about Palestinian geography. Even Edward Meyer, the great German historian, probably the greatest authority on ancient history who ever lived, writing in 1928 pointed out the essential inaccuracy

T 36

of the story. He said in 1928 the Jordan river flowed down through a desolate, barren valley, he said never was the attempt made to harness the river and use it, to draw water from the river for irrigation purposes, and thus to make a garden out of the desert, as was done in Egypt under almost identical circumstances. That's the statement Edward Meyer made in 1928. Of course, here is comparison to the land of Egypt, which is very similar. The land of Egypt would be largely a desert if it were not for the irrigation, for which the Nile water is used for the area around it. Well now, when Edward Meyer made that statement in 1928 he showed that he was getting old; he was about seventy, when he died a year or two afterwards, and he wasn't as up-to-date as he would have been ten years before. He certainly would have known then any discoveries that had been made because he kept right up to date during most of his life.--when he wrote that great series of histories of ancient peoples and the history of the Mormons,/<sup>for</sup>which he made a trip to the United States to gather material, first-hand; but in 1924 and '25 there had been made discoveries here which, if Meyer had known about them, he would not have made this statement. In those years the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem made investigation of the Jordan valley and examined the large number of small hills down there in that desert area. In 1929 I was with a party which examined a few more of them, and we brought further evidence of the fact that the Jordan valley was not always a desolate region, but there was a time when the Jordan valley was filled with little towns, and the way we tell that is that we noticed that many of these little hills looked like tells and we went close to them and examined them carefully and we found pottery strewed over their sides which would not be there if they had not been actually settled places, and/<sup>as</sup>we'd look at the pottery we'd learn something of the great numbers of people who lived in these different towns at one time and that shows us that the irrigation must have been extensively developed, because otherwise you couldn't survive in towns down in that area, but with using the Jordan the way the Nile has been used to irrigate the soil there, you could make a very fertile region out of it, and with irrigation thus you could <sup>these</sup> keep many towns in prosperity which existed there in the Jordan valley at that time.

T 36

Now we ask, "At what time were these towns there?" I remember when we rode on horseback down along the Sea of Galilee and into the southern end of the Sea of Galilee, we saw there at its southern end a town, Beth  , the city of the moon, a town which ran for nearly a mile along the southern edge of the Sea of Galilee, which rose quite high there, and on examination you find that most of the pottery, practically every bit of pottery there, comes from a time previous to about 2000 B. C. That year the City of the Moon was an important city there in the early bronze age, but the middle bronze hadn't much more than started before the town was deserted and the town of Beth   was thereafter never settled again except for a very small Roman fortress on the top of it in Roman days, and the same thing is found in city after city down through the Jordan Valley. In dozens of instances it is found that the cities were deserted before the time of Moses, and so it becomes evident that in this region, that in the time of Abraham the situation was that the Jordan valley was built up. Many towns in it, lands doubtless fenced off into pasture lands, which was owned and settled and used, and a person could not travel north and south in the Jordan valley. They couldn't be here for a few weeks or a month/<sup>and</sup> there for a few weeks or a month; he would run on to too many fences, too much area cut up into pasture, too many towns. The hill country was way behind the Jordan valley at that period, quite contrary to the situation in later years. And then the Jordan valley underwent a change, and we find that after the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, there was a great change which took place, and we find that at the time when Joshua came into the land there was Jericho, that strong fortress down in the Jordan valley, but very few other towns, and you remember He destroyed Jericho and laid a curse upon anyone who would rebuild the city and it was not rebuilt until the time of Ahab, and so we have a long period there with very few towns in the Jordan valley, practically none, and that condition has existed more or less up to the present day. There was a situation and a complete change. Now why did this change take place? It think it is fairly easy to see why it took place. First Sodom and Gomorrah are destroyed. That

T 36

means that quite a lot of the people are gone. Well, the rest of the people, seeing what's happened to them, might begin to think, "This begins to look like an unhealthy place to stay in. Maybe it would be good to look for another place." Perhaps some of them act on that; perhaps they don't, but an effect soon comes from the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. There are a great many irrigation ditches in that area which are no longer kept up, no longer maintained, and the result is that little ponds of water settle in these ditches, instead of it being kept for running water. soon you have perfect breeding places for malaria, soon you have malaria spreading in the area, and the whole valley does indeed become, as it did and the area around Megiddo did too, later, when there was great depopulation. The two areas became great breeding places for malaria. People died off or fled the area, and the area came to be almost devoid of people. And so this story is one which no one living in Palestine today could ever have invented and it is extremely unlikely that anyone in the time of the later Israelite kingdom would ever have invented it, a story like this, but we now know from evidences discovered beginning in 1924, we now know that this fits with the situation prior to, quite a bit prior to the time of Moses. In fact, the depopulation might even have begun to take place in the time of Abraham, but it evidently had not gone very far at that time. Mr.—? (Student) They are small tells. Of course, the one at \_\_\_\_\_ is very definitely and clearly a tell, but \_\_\_\_\_ . It isn't so distinct a tell, and these are, some of them are fairly wide but rather squatty. You don't recognize them quite as quickly as you do some of the tells out in the hill country somewhere in the more isolated situations, but after you become used to looking at the tells you begin to suspect them, and that, of course, requires quite a bit of following out. So far as I know no one of these has been investigated. There has been a little excavation down near Jericho, in that general area. A Jesuit has excavated somewhere in a town which he wanted to prove was Sodom and Gomorrah, and all other scholars are convinced that it is not, that it is a situation over a thousand years older. As far as I know there has been no other excavation in that area, but there has been quite a little examination of pottery and the pottery compared with that from mounds that have been excavated

T 36

up above shows you pretty definitely just when the people were there. Mr.---?

(Student) When was this? (Student) When did he--? (Student) In the land of Palestine there is this hill country which goes from .

there is this hill country up here which goes from Beer-sheba in the south up through Hebron, Jerusalem, Gideon, Shechem. , this area here, this hill country is where Abraham traveled back and forth, and in that area, that is where the great towns were in the time of the Israelite kingdom but in Abraham's time about half these cities had not yet been founded. It was an area which was comparatively little settled. It was an area which had good springs here and there on it and which with comparatively small settlement made a fine situation with large flocks and herds to go back and forth--stay down here until the pasture land is pretty well used up and move up to some other place and stay there a few weeks and move up to another, and then he moves up and then he comes back and then he goes up again and so that was good in that day for that. It would not have been good in the time of the Israelite kingdom because there were too many towns there. On the other hand, this area down here is an area which is fine if you irrigate, but if you don't irrigate, it is empty, and nothing grows unless you take the water out of the Jordan and irrigate, and it had not been irrigated in times of which we have any record. The only refer<sup>ence</sup> that I know of in any literature is this reference here. In the later times it was pretty much a barren area. Yes? (Student) Now, it is equally interesting that the place up in the north here from which our word Bible comes, the name G means "little mountain" and Pierre Mont , a Frenchman whose name means "Little Mountain" was the excavator of the place about ten years ago. Those coincidences happen and it is interesting to draw interesting lessons from them. In themselves, they don't prove anything but it is interesting as pegs to hang a lesson on, and of course it is true that the term has quite a different meaning from . but of most of course/these terms weren't originally Hebrew terms. Many of them were originally

T 36

terms from some other language before the Hebrew or Canaanite speaking people came into the land, and then often they just twist a little into/ the language of the people who were there later. Now this, then the background of Palestine at the time of the patriarchs fits in with the life as described in Genesis, which is a very interesting point about it. Mr.---? (Student) Well, there are perhaps two hundred tells in Palestine; maybe fifteen or twenty of them have been excavated and it is a question where you are going to excavate. You have to have the money to excavate. It takes quite a little money. You have to have a qualified staff and there aren't many men who are qualified to serve on such a staff, and then there have been so many periods of war or internal turmoil in the land in the last twenty years during which you couldn't excavate that when it boils down to it, not a tenth of the excavation that could be profitably done in Palestine has been done, and so it is a matter that many factors enter into, where a particular excavator decides to excavate. Now, another thing, of course, would be this, that most excavators who go to Palestine are interested in finding something which bears light on the Bible, and all these towns in the Jordan valley which were destroyed before the Israelite occupation have little contact with the Bible, so that most men would be much more interested in excavating up in the hill country where they'd have a city that plays an important part in Bible life than to excavate down there where you have a city which might throw tremendous light on ancient civilization but which wouldn't have much to do with the Bible. Now, of course, in Jericho. Jericho had a great many contacts with the Bible down in the Jordan valley, and those contacts were very interesting, and Sir Charles Martin gave a good bit of money for Professor John Garstner to be excavating in Jericho and then when he got down below the Biblical period and he had another find to be buried there in Jericho, down into prehistoric times, Garstner was very anxious to go on excavating down to that point, but Martin was interested in something which would throw light on the Bible

and after they got down two or three layers below what had any connection with the Bible whatever, Martin preferred to give his money for an excavation up the other side of the hill country of Lachish, where they had many definite contacts with the Bible, and so it is rather easy to see why it would be

. Of course, the region that everyone would like most of all to see well excavated is the Philistian region, because we know very little about the Philistian region, but the trouble is that in the Philistian region you have a high civilization all through the Hellenistic age and reaching on into the Roman period and for a long period afterwards, and the result is you have to excavate through hundreds and hundreds of years before you get to this and very few people are willing to give money for all that excavation of later history and no government with any self-respect would allow a man to go in there with a steam shovel and just throw away the remains of later periods, so the Philistine period is a period which the Philistines themselves are comparatively unknown to us, and we would be much more interested in them than we would in the early civilization of the Jordan valley. Mr.---

- - - - -

T 41

that which was done by Abraham, and so there was simply a carrying out of the customs to which, with which he was familiar from the bringing up in Ur of the Chaldees. It would not mean, of course, that this was the law which he was trying to carry out. It was not the law of Palestine. He was pretty much a law unto himself at this time. He did not have to do this, but it simply showed how easy it is when you are brought up with certain customs, certain habits, certain background of law, how easy it is when you are in a situation where that is no longer binding upon you simply to go ahead and follow those same customs or those same laws and assume that that is right, and how very hard it is to break people away from the customs to which they are accustomed, unless you can definitely bring them evidence it is wrong and even then it is often very hard to get them to change their customs. Now, evidently God had made no revelation to Abram of a requirement of a change in this regard and when he got into this situation he and Sarai simply carried out the customary law to which they had, and of course we know nothing about that law till 1901 when the code of Hammurabi was discovered but we've had Genesis all through the ages with this description of what Abram did, and it is very interesting that it throws light on the background of the story and fits in with the Biblical statement that he came out of Mesopotamia, he and Sarai.

Now, number 2, the spiritual history of Abraham. No. 1 was the general outline of the material aspects of his life. As to the spiritual history of Abraham, we will not be able to take <sup>as</sup> much time as we would like to on it. Most of you are quite familiar with most of the details. We will just mention a, his call., God calling him out to leave his family, to leave his kindred and separate from that which was evil, to go out into Palestine to a land which God would show him, and yet we notice how much he took with him of the life from which he came as he went there, how much of custom, of habit, of background he took with him as one inevitably does, as he was led out into a place

T 41

to  
 where through him there could be raised up a group of people/whom God would give His revelation, through the people through whom the revelation would be brought into the world, through whom it would be preserved, through whom the preparation would be made for the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ into the world. So there is a call to Abram to come out and a wonderful record of how Abram obeyed the call.

Now, b., the altars. Abram built altars down here through the land of Palestine at Shechem, between Bethel and Ai at the oaks of Mamre, at Hebron, at Mt. Moriah in connection with the offering of Isaac—we have these altars up and down, everywhere he went and stayed for any length of time he established the altars. He knew that God was there and he established there a place where he would particularly remember God and render his service to God.

Then c. God's covenant with Abraham. We find the covenant of God with Abraham brought out in three places. We find it brought out in Genesis 12, in Genesis 15 and in Genesis 17. Now, we might look at those briefly. Genesis 12, the covenant made in connection with his original call. What do we find promised to Abram in his original call, in verses 1-3? The Lord had said to Abram, "Get thee out of thy country and from thy kindred and from thy father's house, to a land that I will show thee, and I will make of thee a great nation. God is to prepare a people through whom to give His revelation and to bring His Son into the world, and Abram is leaving his kin, is leaving his background. Christ said anyone who leaves family or houses or lands for my sake, he said, he shall receive them a hundredfold in this life, and of course that doesn't mean everyone is going to receive back whatever they give up for the sake of the Lord but very frequently we receive them in this life, and always in eternity we find that we haven't really given anything up for God because He always repays with abundant interest, and so Abram is leaving all his old associations, his many friends and kindred there. God is going to make of him a great nation. "And I will bless thee and make thy name great," and how literally that has been fulfilled. Is there any other name in the world as great as the name of Abraham?

T 41

Certainly among all Jews the name Abraham is one of the greatest names there is. Among all Christians it is one of the the great names, and among all the Moham-medans. Is there another name, is there any other human being whose name has been quite as wide spread among different groups as the name of Abraham? "I will make thy name great and thou shalt be a blessing, and I will bless him that blesseth thee and curse him that curseth thee, and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Now these are the things promised. God is going to watch over him, care for him, bless those that bless him, curse those that curse him and then the great thing, that through him will come blessing to all the family of the earth. There have been those in recent days who try to make it, "In thy name will all the families of the earth wish themselves good fortune." They give him as an example of a successful man. Well, that is certainly a modernist interpretation. The traditional interpretation, "In thee shall they all be blessed," and the is certainly used in that sense enough times in Scripture to date-- it is a passive very frequently even though originally, of course, it is a reflexive. And that is all that we find in the original covenant, but you might say we find a post script to the covenant, a few verses later, where he has left Mesopotamia and come clear across to Palestine. He is now down in Palestine here, and we have the post script. The Lord appeared to Abraham and said, "To thy seed will I give this land, not to Abram." Abram will own nothing in the lands until he bought the burial place for his wife. He owned nothing in the land. He wandered back and forth; he was a sojourner in a strange land, but God told him that his descendants would receive the land in which he was now traveling. That is a sort of a postscript there and some people talk as if that were the main thing of the covenant with Abraham, the getting of the land of Palestine. He was in a much better land from all the viewpoint of the standards of that day over there in Mesopotamia, and he gave it up and went to Palestine. The giving of the land is in a way a postscript to the covenant. It is certainly not the outstanding feature of the covenant given to Abraham. Some people try to make a system out of it that whenever his people were in the land there is blessing, when they left the land and went somewhere else, they were out of God's favor. There is no

T 41

such suggestion in the Bible anywhere. This was the land to which God prepared to raise up His people in it. It was His will ordinarily that they should be there, but certainly when they went down into Egypt it was through God's/<sup>direct</sup> leading and was in no sense forsaking the covenant. Now we have the next presentation of the covenant in Chapter 15. After Abram had given back to the king of Sodom all the booty that had been taken, he said, "I will not take from a thread even to a shoelatchet. I won't take anything that is thine, save only that which the young men have eaten and the portion of the men who went with me. Abram was giving up his claim to any share of the booty but the men who had gone with him and helped, they were entitled to their share, and they got their share, of course.

Let them take their portion. But Abram received nothing from it. He had done it to help Lot. He had not done it to enrich himself. He refused to take anything from it and it is often very to make these wonderful renunciations in the midst of a big meeting or a big occasion and then when everybody departs and you are alone there is apt to come the depression and the gloom afterwards, and you wonder whether you were right, and probably that is the reason that God immediately came and comforted Abram, and Abram had given up his chance for these worldly goods, and all this booty he had taken and could have kept half of it. The king of Sodom said, "Keep all of it. Give me the people and keep all the stuff that you've . Abraham could have had it but he refused to accept any of it and the word of the Lord came to Abraham in a vision saying, "Fear not, Abram; I am thy shield, and thy reward is very great." Now you can render it that way or , "Fear not Abram; I am thy shield and thh exceeding great reward." Both are true. If God is his reward, surely his reward is very great, and yet God was going to bless Abram and his family in material ways as well as spiritual ways, and Abraham immediately, when God said, "Thy reward is great"--I think it is better than "thy exceeding great reward" in view of the next verse, because Abraham immediately asks a question. He's not showing skepticism, he simply is asking for details. He says: "Lord, you say I am going to have a great reward. Well,

T 41

what good will that do me? What will you give me seeing I go childless and the steward of my house is this Eliezer of Damascus. I haven't got any progeny. There is no posterity. What's the good of heaping up goods if you did give them to me? There is no place for them to go except this stranger here and who would be the heir because there is no one of the family?" and the word of the Lord came to him saying: "This shall not be thine heir, but he that cometh forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir." And he brought him forth abroad, and said, "Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them," and He said unto him, "So shall thy seed be." And so again He promised him as before a great posterity, a great continuation of Abram's seed. That is the first great element of the covenant promised to him. We find that brought out here in verses 4 and 5. He said, "I am the Lord that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees to give thee this land to inherit." He is to have a seed and the place to live, a place where they can develop to fulfill that which God wishes them to do. And then in verse 18 again, He speaks about the land. The Lord made a covenant saying, "Unto thy seed have I given this land," and then he names the other people in the land from which it is to be taken to be given to Abram's seed. Then in chapter 17 we have a repetition of the covenant again, and in Chapter 17 we have the sign of the covenant. In 17 the Lord is making His covenant with Abram and He says, "I am El Shaddai: walk thou before me and be thou perfect," and then the first element of the covenant in verse 4, "My covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations." And now He changes his name from Abram to Abraham, for the father of many nations have I made you. And I will make thee exceeding fruitful and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee. I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generation for an everlasting covenant. Again the seed. And then in verse 8, the seed is to have a place to live, "And I will give unto thy seed after thee the land wherein thou art a stranger. All the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession: and I will be their God.

T 41

And then in the succeeding verses He gives him the sign of the covenant, that God is giving Abraham His blessing and it is a blessing which is to continue through many generations and to continue from father to son and He orders him that every son at eight days of age should be circumcised, and then we read, at the same day Abraham was circumcised when he was ninety-nine; Ismael was circumcised when he was thirteen, and thereafter all the children were to be circumcised as a sign of God's greatness and of God's mercy given to Abraham for his faith and to his continuing prosperity. And then this matter of circumcision here is interesting—the discussion of it which we find by Paul in Galatians 3:13-16 where he points out that Abraham was blessed of God in uncircumcision. His blessing did not come through circumcision but after he believed he was circumcised as a sign of his faith, as a sign of his cleansing and of his ingrafting into the family of God and of God's blessing which continued upon his posterity.

T 42

the covenant with Abraham, and right at this point it would be best to look at the statement which Paul made about this covenant with Abraham which we find in Galatians 3. Galatians 3:14—we read that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, the blessing of Abraham, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith. "Brethren I speak after the manner of men. Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. And He saith not, 'And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.'" And here, as you see, we build a whole argument upon the fact that the singular and not the plural is used of the Hebrew word. That is what you will find in many books on verbal inspiration. Here is the proof of verbal inspiration. Paul built a whole argument upon the fact that the promise to Abraham was "to thy seed", not "to thy seeds". Yes,

Mr.—? (Student)

T 42

It is just the same. The Septuagint is exactly the same as the Hebrew in this regard. The Hebrew, the English and the Greek, all three, have a word "seed" which means grain, or posterity, and it is taken like as you speak of . It refers to the totality of it, whether there be much in it or little in it, and so that as you speak of "seed", you say the farmer's going out and planting seeds. You wouldn't say that. You'd say he is planting seed. He went to buy seed, and you speak of a man's seed. The word is used in a collective sense, which may include one or may include many. The only time the word "seeds" is ever used is when we speak of individual, separate bits of grain, in English, in Hebrew or in Greek. Now of course you cannot depend upon it ordinarily that there will be such a parallel usage in two languages even at that, but here we do have this in English, in Greek and in Hebrew, this exact usage, and so when Paul says not to--he says, "Not unto seeds, as of many," he is, as you might say, inventing a word. He is using a word which doesn't refer to posterity at all. It would refer only to individual seeds of grain. He is putting in this plural form simply to indicate what is not meant there, not to indicate what isn't said, because such a thing never could be said. It never, in any book, in Hebrew, Greek or English, speaks of a man's seeds as indicating his posterity. It is always his seed. And so Paul in this case is not building an argument upon the exact Hebrew word. He is interpreting the Hebrew word. He is saying the promise that in Abraham's seed shall all the earth be blessed, this promise is given, not to the whole posterity of Abraham, but is given to the one individual who is the promised seed. Yes---? (Student) Because he is not stating that the Old Testament doesn't have this word, but he is stating that the Old Testament doesn't mean plural, and consequently he uses a plural which doesn't exist simply as a means of showing, not plural, but singular. Does everybody understand that? I think that is rather important and if some one of you doesn't understand it, please ask about it. Mr.---? (Student) Yes. Paul here is interpreting, rather than building an argument on a word. And so Paul says that these promises are to Abraham and his seed and that when he says his seed

T 42

he means one posterity, one descendant, not the group of descendants, and so he says, he doesn't mean "seeds" as many, but he means "seed" as one, and the word "seeds" is never used to mean the many descendants of a man. You would call that seed, but he uses the word in a way in which it is never used simply to bring out the idea, that the idea of this is not a plural idea but a singular idea. Yes? (Student) If any instances, there are not over two or three, and those would mean a few grains of flour. (Student) Because the plural would never be used for people. The plural, as in Greek, would only be used for a few seeds of grain, never used of individuals. The posterity is always the singular of collective seed. (Student) I don't think it does in the least, because it is never used of people. It couldn't be. If you said Abraham had four seeds and planted them in the earth you might use the plural then. If you said, "Abraham has a great seed, thousands of individuals belong to Abraham's seed," you'd always use the singular. It's never a plural in such a case, never a plural, and if it is used of individual seed, that the Greek is, it is not more than two or three times in the Bible. It is never used of people. Yes? (Student) Promise. The great promise of salvation. The blessing of Abraham. The promise that in him shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, that that promise is a promise which is given to Abraham and to his seed, meaning one particular one of his descendants, rather than to his seed as meaning the whole of posterity. He is not meaning all the promises, certainly, because you read in Genesis 13 there, you read, "I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth." And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered. Now, very evidently, that doesn't mean Christ. That means all his posterity. Like the dust of the earth, like the stars of the heaven. That means the great number of--but the promise, the specific promise of the blessing is to come to his seed, and the blessings of God's promise to the seed of Abraham; these great salvation promises are not to a great mass of descendants, but promised to Christ. That is an

T 42

explanation for it, not an argument based on a word, and so Paul ties up the promises to Abraham very definitely with this one individual seed which is coming, which is Christ.

Now c., the seal of the covenant. Yes? (Student) I don't think so, no. No, I think, though, that it isn't one passage but there will be verses dealing with the great mass of descendants and verses dealing with the individual descendants to whom the prophecies were made, but the verses will come one right after the other. It is not that one chapter is one and one the other. Well, now as we move on to d, the seal of the covenant. That is given in Genesis 17: 7-14. Paul has made a great deal of the fact that the blessing of Abraham comes upon the Gentiles because the covenant is with Abraham and his seed, the covenant of salvation, the covenant of blessing. It is Abraham and his seed, and the seed to whom it is given is Christ, and now we find that in Chapter 17, verses 10-14 a seal of this covenant, a seal of this promise of blessing was given, and there God told Abraham, "Thou shalt keep the covenant there for thou and thy seed after thee in their generations. This is my covenant which ye shall keep between me and you and thy seed after thee," and then it goes on and gives the order. He circumcised Abraham, he circumcised the other male members of his family, and then thereafter every child that is eight days old is to be circumcised and this is to be carried on continually as the seal and sign of the covenant. Now what did this circumcision mean? What was the point of it? Was it just to mutilate the body in some peculiar way so as to indicate that the person was a special one set out, like when you take cattle you brand them and put these marks on them so that anyone can see that this cattle belongs to this individual? Is that all there is to circumcision? Is it just some sort of a boundary mark that sets these individuals apart as belonging into one group? Well, surely that enters in to it a little bit; surely that is true of all the sacraments, that the sacrament is a seal and the sign of our ingrafting into Christ, that it is a sign set apart that indicates that we belong to Him. That

T 42

is certainly not the whole meaning, but it certainly is a portion of the meaning, but there is surely much more meaning than that to it, and we find considerable discussion of it in the New Testament, and while we don't want to go into that much at length here, I just want to indicate a few of the passages and briefly to note what the New Testament says that this circumcision means. Now in Philippians 3, we find that Paul speaks in Philippians 3 about circumcision. In verses 4 and 5 he says, "Though I might also have confidence in the flesh. If any man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more; circumcised the eighth day." Paul had this circumcision, so he was one of the Jews who had this which the Jews might depend upon, that through a performance of rites and ceremonies he had been circumcised at the proper time, on the eighth day, but in the verses before he declares this, he says in Verse 3, "For we are the circumcision which worship God in the spirit and rejoice in Christ Jesus and have no confidence in the flesh," and therefore we see from that that we cannot say, "Here is the Spiritual religion, the Christian religion that Paul is now advocating; there is the circumcision, the Jewish religion, and what we want is not circumcision but the Spiritual religion." That is very evidently not Paul's idea at all because he says, "For we are the circumcision which worship God in the Spirit and rejoice in Christ Jesus and have no confidence in the flesh," and so he shows there that circumcision, like any other rightful ceremony, is a thing which can indicate a Spiritual blessing or which can become a merely external, formalistic thing that gives no value in itself. So he says, "I can't trust in the flesh, in the fact I was circumcised the eighth day," but he says, "we are the circumcision which worship God in the Spirit," so that circumcision is just a Spiritual matter. It is a thing which has a Spiritual significance and you cannot trust in a mere physical thing, but the Spiritual thing which it denotes, which it indicates, is very important. Now in Philippians here he doesn't go further into the meaning of this Spiritual thing which circumcision denotes, but in Romans he does. In Romans 4 he has quite a discussion

T 42

in verses 7-13. of what did circumcision mean as far as Abraham was concerned, and he said, David describes the blessings of the man to whom the Lord imputes righteousness without works, saying, "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven and whose sins are covered." Then in verse 9 he says, "Does this blessedness come upon the circumcision only or on the uncircumcision also?" For we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. How was it reckoned? When he was in circumcision or in uncircumcision--not in circumcision but in uncircumcision and he received the seal of the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of a faith which he had yet being uncircumcised, so Abraham was not saved because he was circumcised, but his circumcision was a sign that he was saved. It was a sign and a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed to them also and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham which he had yet being uncircumcised, for the promise that he should be the father of the world was not to Abraham or to his seed through the law but the righteousness of faith, so the circumcision was the sign and the seal that Abraham was a believer in Christ. It was the sign and the seal that Abraham was saved, was saved by faith, was saved by the grace of God and this was the sign and the seal of it which God gave to him. We've had it back in Romans 2 also, from 28 to 33--n.o. 25-29. He says, "For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law; but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision. Therefore if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision?"

T 43

-- and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God! So that circumcision, then,

T 43

is a physical thing, which like any physical thing profits nothing in itself but it is a sign of the spiritual blessing, and it is the sign which God gave to Abraham, the sign and the seal of relationship which Abraham had to God because righteousness was imputed to him as a result of his faith, and so the circumcision indicates the cleansing, the setting apart, all of which comes through faith in Christ, and through the grace of God which is shown through what Christ did later on, and that is the meaning of circumcision and that is the sign and the seal of the covenant which God commanded Abraham to take upon himself and to extend to all those who should come to believe in God and be brought into the family of Abraham by being adopted into it because of their belief in God and also which he should perform on every child on the eighth day after he is born, the sign of the blessing of God. Many of these things seem to us strange when we first examine them and we have to try to figure out just why did God do them this way and what did He mean by them, but the fact is that is the way God did it. God gave Abraham circumcision, which is the sign and the seal of his faith and of his being saved through belief in Christ. He gave him that sign and that seal, and then He told him that he was to give that seal to his children upon the eighth day, and as to the exact details of of this there has been much discussion and much disagreement as to/some of the details. That, of course, is a matter properly for theology, rather than for Old Testament history, but the thing that we are stressing here is the point that God did give circumcision as the seal of salvation through faith, and then He ordered that it should be given to the children, and we certainly can infer from that God put a difference upon like Abraham the children of believing parents, a difference upon them from the situation of other children and my own personal belief regarding it is that God indicates that if those who are in the covenant with God, who have believed in Christ, are born again and members of God's family, if they fulfill their part in the upbringing of their children, if they pray with them and for them and teach them, that they do not need to be worried and anxious. — "Is this child going to believe?"

T 43

Isn't this child going to believe? Is this child that I am bringing up to be a son of perdition who is to be lost? Is this child one who is to be saved?" -- that they can have faith that God who has given them salvation is going to bring this child to the outward signs of conversion and to a definite visible salvation in His own time, but that already He permits them to give the seal and sign to the child as the evidence of their claiming the promise of Abraham for the child. Now that is the way I interpret this thing and other people may have different details in their interpretation of it, but the vital thing is <sup>the fact</sup> that God did give it, that God gave circumcision as the seal and sign of salvation and then that God ordered Abraham to give it to his children, and that's the fact. <sup>as to the interpretation</sup> Now/the details of it, theologians differ, and that is a matter for theology rather than Old Testament, but the fact is that which we must recognize, that it had the meaning of the seal and sign of salvation and that it is commanded to be given to the children.

Now there is one other New Testament passage that we will just glance at, and that is Colossians 2:10-12, and ye are complete in Him which is the Head of all principality and power, in whom also ye are circumcised, with the circumcision made without hands in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ. That doesn't mean, of course, by the fact that Christ was circumcised, but it means by the circumcision which Christ provides; that is, by the Spiritual death of which circumcision is a physical sign. Buried with Him in baptism wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath He quickened together with Him, having forgiven you all trespasses. You who were as those who are uncircumcised have become as those who are circumcised through the putting off of the body of the sins of the flesh through the circumcision of Christ, buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him. And so here we have the same application that we had in the other verses, that the circumcision is the sign of the cleansing of the ingrafting into Christ of the turning away from ~~darkness~~ to light

T 43

which God gave to Abraham and which belongs to Abraham's seed, hereafter, but of which the particular detail of the sign God might change in a particular period, but the meaning of the sign was the same. So circumcision, then, indicates that we are Christ's. It is the sign of the ingrafting of Christ. It is the sign of cleansing. It is the sign of true faith in God's unmerited grace. It is a sign that children can be saved only by God's grace; The fact that one was a child of Abraham was not enough to save him. It was necessary that something more be done. It was necessary that the seal and sign be given that child as an indication that something must be done to the child more than that he just have a natural birth, that there be a cleansing, that there be an ingrafting into Christ, and so the circumcision of the child is the indication that the child is not a member of God's family simply because he is a child of Abraham but that God has promised His covenant to continue to Abraham's posterity if Abraham will fulfill his part, and that the continuing posterity as they are given a sign of the , that they have a blessing but that the blessing can come upon them only as God by His marvelous grace performs a mighty miracle upon them and ingrafts them into His kingdom. So it is a sign that race is not enough but also/<sup>a sign</sup> that there is special blessing for the children of Abraham; there is a special mercy that God gives to the children of those who are God's. Now so much for d, then, the sign and seal of the covenant.

Now e, Abraham's meaning for us. No, I think I'll skip that because it is pretty well covered under another head. Let's call e the high point of Abraham's faith. We have, of course, many high points in Abraham's faith but there is one which seems surely higher than any other, and that, of course, is just one thing. That is the time when Abraham, who had been promised blessings to come to all the earth through his seed find that he is commanded to kill his son, and he is to give up the one who is not only dearer to him than any other one on earth but the one who is, as far as he can see, the one through whom the blessing of God must come. In fact he has been told, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called."

T 43

The blessings must come through Isaac, and yet God commands that Isaac be and that Abraham here having absolute certainty that this was God's word to him, there was no question that it was God's command. "Take thou thy son, thine only son Isaac whom thou lovest and get thee to the land of Moriah and offer him there," that Abraham didn't stop to argue with God or to say, "Well now this can't be. I'm sure this can't be. This is the seed through whom the blessings are to come. How can it be that God wants him offered as a burnt-offering? But as Hebrews 11 says he accounted that if it were God's will the blessing should come through Isaac God was able to raise him from the dead, if that should be necessary, and so, as Hebrews 11:8-19 shows, this was the great high point of Abraham's faith in which he took not only that which was dearest to him of anything on earth and laid it upon the altar, but he took that which, as far as he could see, was the only means whereby ~~he could carry out the~~ there could come to pass the promises that God had given and was ready to lay it aside and sacrifice it at God's command. Yes? does mean Is your verb or your noun? It is used in both senses. You mean "accuse" in both? To cause him to go up, is a term which might be used of simply lifting something up in the ordinary sense, but when used in connection with an a burnt offering which you lift up from the altar and you consume with fire, to lift up a burnt offering, would seem quite definitely to mean to burn, to kill him and to burn him. That would seem quite definitely to be the command, and so there is a very interesting point there, that God told him to take Isaac and go to the land of Moriah and offer him as a burnt offering and that later God showed him that the whole command was not to be carried out, but Abraham followed God's command as far as it was made known to him, as far as he understood it, and then God showed him in the end that there was another aspect of it which Abraham had not known in the beginning. I think that probably the Hebrew could be translated altogether properly, "Take Isaac whom thou lovest and go to the land of Moriah in order to offer him"—that is, it is literally "and"

T 43

but go there for the purpose of offering him. That is, I don't think there is a contradiction in God's command, that he says, "Now offer him" and then says, "Don't offer him," but he says, "You take him and go there to offer him," and then when he gets there and he is ready to do it, he is ready to carry out God's command, then God interposes and shows him that the command is not to be carried to the full extent. Of course here there is a great example of faith and at the same time we must be very, very careful to recognize that in this case God spoke to Abraham in absolutely unmistakable language and that today we have God's Word here and when we get a revelation of these things from God which contradicts anything in His Word we must say . . . The Word of God here is our revelation today and we must be very careful that we do not today do something that contradicts God's revelation thinking that it is God's command to us. God does not give us commands that contradict His revelation, but in Abraham's day the full revelation had not been given and consequently God spoke more clearly and directly to people than He ever does in our age and we must consider that there was absolutely no doubt God had given this command to Abraham. You'll find many a person today who claims that God has given them a command that definitely are contrary to His revelation and we know in such cases that the devil and not God has given the command. Yet? (Student) It means simply " . . . " and of course in the Old English the word " . . . " would be . . . (Student) Yes. God never tempts any man in the sense of inciting to evil. Of course, God tempts . . . in the sense of putting them in a situation where they . . . . That is--we find it in Jeremiah, that our English translation speaks of God as having--Jeremiah says, "God, you've tempted me." He says, "You've deceived me." He uses various terms there which are given a most specific . . . . The Hebrew means to tempt, or to lead in a direction contrary to that which Jeremiah . . . . It doesn't mean to deceive or to tempt in our modern English sense. Of course this is a translation

T 44

Mr.---? (Student) a string of ands, very frequently they indicate the purpose of the first one or of a previous one in the string. "Go and get such a thing" we often say in English. We mean, "Go in order to get it,"—"Go to get it--go and get it." The command is to go and the purpose of going is to get it. (Student) No. They may . They wouldn't .

The might use the infinitive with for the sake of, or in order to, but ordinarily they simply use the string of ands with . That is the most usual construction of it. When you have two commands--like when Joseph said to the men, he'd tell them what they could do, he'd say, "Now you go and don't ever come back," it's perfectly all right, but if you want to see my face again you do so and so. This do and live. Now he is not ordering them to live. He is ordering them to do this in order to live. This is the means through which they live. It is a very common Hebrew expression. The word "and" in Hebrew has a broader meaning than it has in our English. Now, then, this is the case where Abraham showed his faith in action most positively and most definitely, and of course it is an illustration to us of the fact you will find so many people today who will do something that is contrary to God's will and will argue that they are doing this in order to spread God's Word. They will compromise in most inexcusable ways and they will say that they are doing it in order that they may get a bigger hearing to God's Word. They could have a larger church. They can reach more people if they will do such and such a thing and therefore they should do it. Well, now Abraham here was told of the promises God was giving and all of these promises were conditioned upon the continuing life of Isaac and yet when God's command came, "Go and sacrifice Isaac", Abraham was ready to do it. There was no secondary objective which stood to him before the objective of doing God's will, of carrying out that which was definitely revealed to him as the thing God wanted him to do. Yes? (Student) I would say who was commanded to sacrifice his child, to kill his child today a person/would know that that was contrary to God's revelation. It is contrary to the will of God. We certainly would not do it. In Abraham's day the revelation had not been given as fully or as clearly as it has today, and

T 44

in addition to that all around him there were people who were observing these practices and therefore it seemed to him a more natural thing to do than it does to us today. Just like when Abraham took Hagar, in taking Hagar he was doing something which would be contrary to God's more fully known nature but probably not contrary to any revelation that had been very clearly made known to Abraham up to that time but it was acting in accordance with the customs of the people with whom he had been in contact and to which he had been accustomed, and God certainly never praises Abraham for having taken Hagar but He doesn't condemn him specifically for it. He was following the customs which were customary around and it had not yet been made clear that those customs were definitely contrary to God, and in this case, if Abraham had understood that killing of a child like this was contrary to God's will it certainly would have been wrong for him even to have started , but the fact that people all around him were doing that sort of thing made it easier for him not to know that that would be a thing in itself contrary to God's will, and that we ourselves, I doubt if we could prove from anything in the Bible previous to this time. We would have to go into matters brought up later on in order to prove that that is definitely contrary to God's will for human beings. Yes, Mr.---? (Student) In case there are two aspects of that. There is the question of actual leading and the question of the providential action of God. I would think it altogether possible that God might in His providence have a certain individual here might figure a specific ministry for God and might be planning on that, might even think God had led them to that ministry specifically. Now I don't think ordinarily in our day God does take an individual or and say, "I want you to to work at this place. I want you to do this thing." He wants us to study the Scripture, see what the things are that He wants done in general and then figure out where we would best fit into that plan, but in His providence He would permit a person to either feel they had a definite sign that was the thing they should do or to feel that after studying the Word and studying themselves, that was where they

T 44

best fit in the needs of God's kingdom and to go ahead and work for a definite objective and work for it and plan for it and everything and then the time comes and when they come right up ready to enter it and they find providentially that circumstances are such that they can't go into that, but that they have been prepared by their training and by their Spiritual experience and all that and by this one Spiritual experience of being stopped at that point they have been prepared by it all for another work, by which they might do a far greater work for God than the particular work they had aimed for. It might even be a ministry <sup>simply</sup> of prayer. ~~There/invalids~~ <sup>have been</sup> laid aside on beds of pain for thirty years who have wrought as much in prayer as any other three or four people put together almost have wrought in hard direct work for God. Moody attributed the great success of his tremendous campaigns in England to a bedridden invalid in London who had been praying for ten years that God would bring great revival and we cannot tell just what may be God's particular will for us but God providentially might prepare you for this work over here by having you go in this direction. I remember hearing one of our graduates testify as to how when he had been in college he had taken work in drafting. He had taken a lot of work in the study of mechanical drawing and planning buildings and that sort of thing intending to become an architect and then that the Lord had touched him and had led him to devote his life to the ministry and he had turned his whole course in preparation for seminary and had taken work that would be more adapted for the preparation for seminary work and he said in those days he looked back on the couple of years that he put doing all this study of mechanical drawing and drafting and that sort of thing and thought, "What a awful waste of time. If only two years earlier I had set my face toward the ministry, think of how much time I would have saved and how much further along I would be." and then after he was out of seminary three or four years the Lord put him in a place where the church was terribly cramped and crowded and they needed a new building and the war was just coming on and it was getting hard to get materials and so on and he jumped into the thing and worked

T 44

his head off for about six months along with his regular church work in making, and making the plans working with the architects and/gathering the materials and here, there and the otherplace, and he said that the Lord used all that preparation and training that he had there that seemed to him absolutely wasted to make it possible that the building should be put up before the war made it absolutely impossible to get material and to save a tremendous amount of money in saying how this particular thing and that particular thing could be done in just this way. Now, it would be very foolish for a man, thinking, "I may sometime build a church," to go ahead and say, "Well, now, I'd better spend two or three years studying architecture." That certainly is not God's will, that we think of all the possible contingencies in our life and prepare for them, but here was a case where God had providentially caused that that man should have that particular training that that particular man would need in this special crucial situation and so God providentially very often leads us in places we don't understand and we look back and see how He was leading and how everything was directing us toward the place that we eventually reach. Mr.—? Yes. I would say that in our age, that in our day God leads almost entirely through His Word, that the direct individual leading which He gives is very small in amount and comes, I would say, only at particular vital turning points which God can see but which we can't tell which they are, and therefore I would say be very suspicious of a particular, specific leading to you or to someone else that is aside from or in addition to the specific teaching—I don't mean just a verse here and there, but the specific teaching of the Word. Test all things by the Word. If that message was one which would edify the Church in the building up and would help in the progress of the knowledge of Christ it might be something that is very definitely God's will. If it wasn't, it was very definitely not God's will and a person would have to judge it on that basis and no one could say—it is like the preacher who went to the man and said, "The Lord has shown me that you are to give a thousand dollars to the church," and the man said, "Well,

T 44

now, if the Lord meant that I think he would have shown me that He wanted it too. I know one minister whose wife died and one of the women of the church came to him and she said, "The Lord has shown me that I should be your next wife," and he said to her, "Well, I think the Lord would show me also." Certainly, one man has no right to say, "The Lord has shown me this, and all the people differ with him and they are wrong. The question is, "What does the Scripture show?" Well, that is the principle involved and it is a matter of application in each case. Well, now, in this case, then we have this high point of Abraham's faith and Paul says that Abraham was saved by faith and not by works and James says that Abraham was saved by works and not by faith alone and James says that faith without works is dead, and they both are true and there is absolutely no contradiction between them, because you could do all the works in the world and it would profit absolutely nothing. You could do anything in the way of definite service to Christ and there would be nothing gained for you if you don't have the faith which is the vital thing, but if you do have the faith you are going to have the works. Faith without works is dead, not in the sense that there is any reward for works, per se, but that if the faith is real it is a faith that works and a faith, as James says that the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also. It is a better way to say, perhaps--that is, a clearer way for us today, perhaps, to say that it isn't faith at all. I think that is what Paul would say. Faith without works isn't faith at all, because the faith that is true faith will/show itself in works, and of course that is the thing that people can't understand. You take Preserved Smith in his HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION and he tells about Calvin and these crazy doctrines that Calvin taught that people were predestined from the foundation of the world to be saved and that God had done it all, it was all of God's grace and there was absolutely nothing that you could do about it. God had saved you and he points out the terrible, awful doctrine Calvin taught and then he goes on to say, "And yet the strange thing is that these doctrines which you would think would

make a man just lie down and do nothing actually resulted in producing a race of people who worked as no other group of people in the world did." He says, "They worked and they toiled and they struggled and they just did everything possible to accomplish the thing that they believed, and he said, "How can you understand? it is strange, but these doctrines have produced these results," and of course the fact of the matter is that the faith is of God and the faith is all of God and it is only of God's grace that we are anything, and yet if we have the true faith enough we will work and we will work harder and more effectively and more intelligently than anyone can work who is merely doing work to win God's favor and is not showing

as a means of showing forth the outwork-

ing of the faith which God has implanted in him. So this is a high point of Abraham's faith and we would have to take two or three hours on it instead of a few minutes if it were not for the fact it is such a familiar passage and everyone of course, is fairly familiar with this 22d chapter.

And then we move on, then, to Abraham's . Yes? (Student) Well, I haven't looked at it just lately with that specific question in mind.

particular verse .

(Student) Yes. All right. We'll look at 17. (Student)

unto thy seed after thee. There is a promise to the seed but it seems to be a promise dealing rather specifically with the land . In 17--how's that? 17:7--And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. That seems to refer there to the continuing seed in their generation. It may be that Paul isn't referring so much to one specific occurrence as to Abraham's

Yes--in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed. That certainly would seem to refer to Christ alone. Yes, that is a confirmation of the other.

T 45

By myself I have sworn, saith the Lord, for

because thou hast done this thing and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, that in blessing I will bless thee and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven and as of the sand which is upon the sea shore. Now up to this point that is certainly telling that there is going to be a great posterity, a numerous posterity, and then He said, "And thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies and in thh seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed. That might be referring to Christ, that that is fulfilled in Christ. How's that?"

(Student) Thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed. Those would be two great promises, looking forward to a complete victory of Abraham's seed and looking forward to blessing for all the earth in Abraham's seed, and those two promises certainly take place in Christ and then through Christ and upon all those who are Christ's.

(Student) Well, of course, this is true, that all those who are Christ's are inheritors of the promise through Christ. (Student) Yes. Not by through Christ. Christ is the one when it comes to the others. When it comes to that. (Student) That's right. That's it, yes. I don't

like that word double because people often use doubles to indicate two unrelated things. Any two related things can be parts of one whole thing and the term "double" as people often use it means two unrelated things that don't naturally belong together at all. Well, now I see our hour is up and we'll continue at eleven o'clock.

T 45 (second part)

Now before we take up Abraham's , I've been asked a question about chapter 15. I think we might take just a minute on it. We find in chapter 15 here that we read that the Lord spoke to Abraham and Abraham believed in the Lord and he counted it to him for righteousness and then the Lord said that He was going to give him this land to inherit it, and he said, "Lord, God, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?" and then we read, in verse 9, that the Lord said

T 45

to him. "Take me an heifer of three years old, and a she ~~goat~~ of three years old, and a ram of three years old, and a turtledove, and a young pigeon." And he took unto him all these, and divided them in the midst, and laid each piece one against another: but the birds divided he not, and when the fowls came down upon the carcasses, Abram drove them away. And then we read--no, further down, in verse 17--Would you read us 17, Mr.---? (Student) What did it pass between? (Student) In verse 10. How many disagree with that? How many agree with it? There are a few neutral but most people seem to agree with it. I think that is undoubtedly what it means. It is very nice that they didn't put a chapter division in between anywhere there because I have seen articles by even fine scholars who will take a statement like that and say, "What on earth does it mean" when there is a chapter division in between, and here, even though there are a few verses in between I think there is no question that the Lord ordered Abraham to divide up these animals and put the two pieces on the two sides but the birds he simply laid there without dividing them, they being quite small, and then the fowls came down upon the carcasses and Abram drove them away and he sat there and then as it got toward the evening and he'd probably been working ever since three that morning and he was getting pretty tired and a deep sleep fell over him and a horror of great darkness fell upon him. He fell into sort of a trance--very sleepy and when things seem sort of unreal and in this condition he received a message from God and God now gave him some specific information about the nearer future, and how often you find in the prophecies that there is a trend somewhat similar to what we have here. Early in the chapter God gave him predictions about the distant future and now He gives him more information about the nearer future. Very often God gives us His great promises and then He gives us an earnest of their fulfillment with something that is near--not arranging it in chronological order, you see--in the reverse of chronological order but in a rather logical order that way and so when Abraham went in this sort of a trance the Lord gave him this specific information that "Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs." It is a plural pronoun here in connection

T 45

with the seed and referring to the posterity. "And they shall afflict them four hundred years and also that nation, which they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance. And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age. But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again: for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full." And that was quite a bit of specific information for the near future given Abraham in order to encourage him and his descendants that these things which God had promised were to come to pass and as they saw the earlier things coming to pass they would realize the later. And the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full. The Amorites down in Sodom and Gomorrah, their iniquity was full and God judged them, but the rest of the land was moving rapidly in that direction and it took a period yet before it reached that point where God rooted them out entirely. Yes? (Student) In the fourth generation they would come back again. That is, the fourth generation, not after Abraham but after they went to Egypt. Yes? (Student) Yes, the sun went down and it was dark, behold a smoking furnace, and a burning lamp that passed between those pieces. Here were these pieces of the sacrifice which were there and as it was getting dark Abraham saw this thing like a saucer, I suppose, sort of bright and shining that came up between these pieces there and it was a sort of a peculiar vision which he had which drove home to his mind the fact that God was really speaking to him through this very unusual situation. (Student) passing between pieces symbol of a covenant. (Student) Yes. Well now, that would be perhaps a rather reasonable conjecture from this passage, or there may be some other evidence that would suggest that--not in the Scripture that I know of but there might be evidence elsewhere of the custom among some tribe or some group that would suggest that. I don't happen to be familiar with it but I would be very interested to know any evidence like that that would throw further light on the general meaning, but I don't know of any. Mr.--? (Student) Something to impress on Abram's mind the fact of this very unusual revelation to them of information of what was to come to pass in the fairly near future. That

T 45

would be my impression. That would be just my off-hand guess about it, but at the same time this particular form going through this passing between those pieces, it would seem like that the Lord would have used something that corresponded to something in Abram's experience in order to make the meaning clear and so I think it would not be inferring too much from it to say that possibly there was a custom in Abram's time of sanctioning the covenant with going through some form somewhat similar to this but I don't know of any such evidence that that was so. I think that would be quite a valid and reasonable conjecture to be given as a very likely guess, but unless there was some specific evidence of which I do not know I would feel like labeling it a probable conjecture rather than as in any sense certain. Yes? (Student) Christ said, "Abraham saw my day and was glad." Now just how explicit would it have to be to fulfill the words of Christ I don't know. Whether that means that God gave him a rather definite revelation, whether it means that Abraham took the promises given to Eve of the seed of the woman that would bruise the serpent's head and took these things and combined it with what God told him, that in him should all the nations of the earth be blessed and came to a reasonable inference that there was to be a specific seed in which the promises to Eve and himself would be fulfilled, or just exactly how much is involved in it I don't know, but Christ did say, "Abraham saw my day." (Student) Well I think it means--that is included in it, yes, but I think it means more than that. Mr.--? Altogether right that there was a growth in Abraham's faith and an increase in it and he would know much more specifically later on than earlier, but just how early in the process this chapter is I don't know. It might be that the growth had begun some time before. Now I just couldn't say how much would be involved in this particular verse here. But I think Mr. Sit's point is a very good one, that certainly by the end of Abraham's experience with God he knew far more than he did at the beginning but all through it he took the trusting attitude toward the Lord, that whatever he

T 45

promises the Lord gave He definitely accepted as God's definite promise. It was God's free grace to him and was certain to be fulfilled. He trusted in God, and it is a matter of salvation but salvation is not a matter of how much theology you know. A person can know a great deal of theology and can have a very thorough understanding of the plan of salvation, may even think it is all true, and yet may definitely be lost. A person can have a very small knowledge of theology, can know very, very little, but can know that God has provided a substitute for them and that they are trusting to the finished work of God and can be saved but the person who is saved will want to know more. The person who is truly saved will go on to know the Lord better and to understand more detail about it. A person--at the instant at which they are saved their knowledge may be very, very slight, but if it is a true faith it is going to grow and their understanding is going to develop but just how much specific intellectual knowledge is necessary for salvation is a thing we can't say. We can say that a definite heart attitude toward Christ is necessary, and Abraham had that heart attitude all through, from beginning to end and he increased in his intellectual knowledge doubtless through his life, though certainly didn't reach the point that one reaches who has the gospel which he can read. I think that it is a great mistake to think that a person is not saved because their knowledge is slight but on the other hand I think it is highly unlikely that one is saved who keeps on in the Christian life a long time and still has an extremely slight knowledge. Mr. Hoogstrate? (Student) passed between them and--it depends how close they were. If they were quite close it would set fire to them. If they were some distance apart it wouldn't, but it doesn't say anything here about their having burned. That is not mentioned, and so I would say that you have a perfect right to guess but you should label it as a guess, whichever one you . (Student)

T 46

Well now, the next point I want to take up, f, is Abram's lapses, and the Lord has given us this wonderful man Abram, this man who was the friend of God, this

T 46

man who had the name greater than that of any other individual probably, who has ever lived on this earth; that is more wide-spread, this man who is the great example of faith in God and of salvation by faith in what God has done. This man had two very regrettable lapses, one described in Genesis 12, one described in Genesis 20, and of these two lapses we can notice this, that in both of them he failed at his strong point. There is many a man who fails at his weak point. In fact, the ordinary person will fail at his weakest point. He is always falling down where he is weak, but for the one who is to be a Christian leader, for the one who is really outstanding and unusual and different from the general run of people I think there is a special warning that you may fall at your strongest point, at a point where you feel most secure, a point for which you are most praised, the thing of which you are most certain that right in that you win your great victory, that is the very point where Satan may catch you off guard and make you

and Abram's great point was his faith and he

failed at this very point. He went down to Egypt, he went over to the land of the Philistines and in each case he said, "There is no knowledge of God here and therefore I had better resort to underhanded strategies in order to make myself safe, and he did that which was not God's will for him in order to make himself safe in these places, and he failed at his strongest point and his failing showed itself in his telling a white lie. What is the difference between a white lie and a black lie? Well, both of them are lies, and the difference is that the white lie is a lie which you think you can consider to be excusable. That doesn't say God excuses it, but you think you can consider it to be excusable, and so in this case Abraham went down into Egypt and he entered the land and he turned to Sarah and he said, "Now I know you are a fair woman to look on. The Egyptians will see you and they will decide to kill your husband in order to get possession of you and so", he said, "if you will just tell them you are my sister--after all you are (Sarah was Abraham's sister; they were half brother and sister and it certainly is not a lie to call our half sister a sister so

T 46

that the statement made was a true statement, but the statement made was a statement which covered up a more important fact and a fact which people had a right to know-- that though she was his sister she occupied a relation to him much closer and much more important than the relationship of a half sister. She was his wife). And so he told a half lie in Egypt and the same half lie in the land of the Philistines and in both places the half lie which he told brought harm to others and put him into a situation from which it was necessary that God extricate him and God extricated him because of <sup>Abraham's</sup> ~~his~~ importance in the work of God. It was necessary and desirable that Abraham be enabled to carry on the work and God extricated him, but it brought definite harm to others, the others were injured on account of Abram's white lie and perhaps the greatest harm that it brought was that when his trusting son Isaac who idolized his father and copied his father and imitated his father in every possible way found himself in a similar situation, Isaac told, not a white lie but a black lie. That is, Isaac said that Rebecca was his sister and she was not his half sister at all. She was only a second cousin, and so the influence upon others was perhaps one of the worst features of Abraham's act, that which he did which was within the technical bounds of truth led to an act on the part of his son which was definitely outside of those technical bounds, and so these are Abraham's definite lapses--Genesis 12 and Genesis 20, and then Isaac followed in the footsteps of Abraham. One of them, of course, is the J document and one is the E document, so you have simply the two documents telling the same story with variations, but the trouble is you get a third instance and that also in one of the same two documents; not in the P document, so that you have one of the documents telling it twice, and if one of the documents could tell it twice why couldn't the original story tell it three times? Mr.---? (Student) Yes. The answer is that every man whom God has ever blessed has been a sinner and every sin that anyone has ever done has brought harm and injury to others, has brought the curse upon others as well a

T 46

upon ourselves, and God does not bless us because we are righteous and not sinners, but he blesses us because we are saved, because He sees us in the person of His Son, not in what we are, and because as a result of our salvation and of our justification we are moving on a road of sanctification and even though Pharaoh might be a far better man as the world sees than Abram (I don't say he was, but he might be) and even though Pharaoh might have wonderful virtues which Abram didn't have, yet Pharaoh was moving in this direction and Abram was moving in that direction, and there is many a man living today who as the world sees is not a specially fine character who is a true Christian and is struggling against the terrific background and terrific handicaps and making real progress, who is a far better man in God's sight than many a man with the finest of backgrounds and most respectable of character who is moving in the opposite direction. I think it is a very good thing, a question like this with the unbeliever, just to bring up the fact that it isn't because we keep the Golden Rule that God blesses us but it is because we are saved through Christ and that means that eventually we will keep the Golden Rule far more than the one who is not saved, but it isn't our present condition but it is the, our relation to Christ which means our eventual condition and is not based upon our present condition. (Student) Abram had doubtless had severe chastening from God but we are not in position to measure the chastening in comparison to the particular deserts of each individual. We can't do that. I was talking to a dentist who told me he had a Spiritualist girl who came to him to work on her teeth and "Oh," he said, "I'd prefer her to any patient I've got" he said, "because when I take that girl and dig into her tooth and it hurts I say, 'Oh, is that hurting you?' she says, 'Don't bother, don't bother,' she says, 'I'm just being punished for my sins. That's something I did yesterday that I am getting punished for now'" and he didn't have to worry about hurting her. Well, that is not what the Bible teaches, that we suffer or are happy in this life in proportion to the sins we do in this life. If we suffered in proportion to our sins, every one of us has an eternity of suffering ahead and it is only through

T 46

the grace of God that any of us escapes from it and God's dealing with us in this life is calculated to bring lessons to us and to improve us and to give us that amount of chastening which will have the desired result in our case. Just how much chastening Abram got we don't know but it is true that as far as chastening is concerned a great deal depends on the individual. There is one individual to whom a harsh word upsets them so much, particularly on children.

One harsh word upsets them so much that they can't sleep for nights. They are just terrifically upset, and there are others upon whom a real hard beating has little effect, and you have to decide on the particular type of chastening that will bring about the desired result upon the particular individual, and God's wisdom is far beyond ours. We cannot judge of the righteousness of His acts, but we know they are righteous. Yes? (Student) No. Pharaoh was plagued because of Sarai. As far as Pharaoh's life was concerned in this world, Pharaoh might have a very happy life or a very unhappy life in this world. It doesn't make much difference really, because his misery through millions of years hereafter is so great a part of his experience that the little more misery or little more happiness in this life doesn't affect it one way or the other. He wasn't plagued in this life on account of his sins. He might go to the dentist and his teeth might not hurt him hardly at all. He wasn't plagued for his sins, but he was plagued in this case in order to bring to his attention the fact that there was something wrong in this matter of sin. God did it in order to free Sarai from the situation, not in order to punish Pharaoh for what he had done. These are interesting questions. They are questions upon which we cannot draw accurate conclusions but we can gather certain ideas about them that are worth our knowing. (Student) No, I don't either. He did the same thing over again. (Student) That's right, and the sins into which David fell, on the other hand, were far grosser than any of which we have evidence that Abraham fell into. The two men were men of quite different character. There might be a real repentance on Abram's part that wouldn't show itself in the same way as David's did. Yes? (Student)

T 46

He was just a young kid of seventy-five, in chapter 12. (Student) Yes. Well, now whether these chapters are arranged in exact chronological order I don't know. It is possible that you have the whole incident given of Lot here continuously and, chapters 18 and 19, and just where 20 might come chronologically I don't think we are told. There is a problem there, but I don't know what the answer is, but that might be along that line. At least we are told that Abimelech was attracted to her. On the other hand, you take King Henry II of France and he was, it seems to me that he was ~~twenty~~ five and his mistress was forty-seven. He already had been married for some years. She had been his father's mistress for years before but he was so desperately in love with her that he absolutely ignored his own wife and was absolutely true to Diana until he was killed in the . Now there is a case which is not isolated. You have a good many such cases. It is not, certainly, the normal thing. It is unusual, but it is by no means unique. And so it would be possible--we just don't know, but at least there is this about it that it wasn't necessarily just the queerness of Abimelech because as soon as they came into the land Abraham said to Sarah, he made this statement. He knew they were apt to get into trouble. You know some women's age is not measured in years and Abraham certainly suspected that in the case of Sarah because he made preparations in both cases. It is a thing on which we have no further evidence but I don't think we can say that it is so strange, so very unusual we have to give up our faith in the Bible on account of it. I think we can say that it is something which we don't fully understand on which there must be some factors we don't fully understand, because the Scripture gives us . Mr.---? (Student) Well, yes. The picture you get of Abimelech here is a very nice picture, and Abimelech, like Pharaoh, had trouble fall upon his household on account of the act which he had done, as he said, in his innocence and his ignorance of the facts, and so the harm came upon innocent bystanders through Abraham's white lie, and I think surely Abraham must have felt very badly about it even though we are not told of specific repentance.

T 46

Now the matter of--yet? (Student) Well, I wouldn't think He spoke to Pharaoh  
 Neccho. (Student) Yes. Well, Abimelech--of course at this time we have no  
 who was a true servant of God. It shows the knowledge of God was  
 not at this time. Of course, we find that Peter said, in Acts--  
 Peter said, "I see that God is not a respecter of persons but that he has in  
 every nation those who are received of him." That is what Peter said when  
 he met Cornelius

T 47

He was recognized as a true servant of the Lord. Now, whether there was a  
 definite relationship between Abimelech and the Lord we simply are not told  
 and I don't think we have any right to assume there was when we are not told  
 there was but it is a fact that the picture we get of Abimelech here is not  
 quite the ordinary picture you would expect. (Student) It certainly sounds  
 like it, yes. It certainly definitely sounds so. God said to him in a dream.  
 Well, of course, God might bring a dream to anyone, an unbeliever, for a specific  
 purpose. That might be, too. It is altogether reasonable to think that God  
 has moved very specially upon the hearts and/minds of unbelievers to accomplish  
 specific purposes. Well, now, perhaps that's--oh, yes and the last is one  
 more point just to notice. The question about Hagar. Was it a lapse on  
 Abram's part to follow the custom of his day as described in the law of  
 Hammurabi? And when Sarai gave him Hagar for a concubine to take her in order  
 to try to have a son in that way? Well, we must say this, that regardless of  
 what the attitude was toward his following the customs of the time rather than  
 the higher standards which certainly are taught in the Scripture explicitly in  
 other parts of the Scripture and certainly implicitly in earlier parts of the  
 Scripture, regardless of that--this we must say; that it was at least, to some  
 extent, a lapse of faith, his looking to Hagar to raise up one to be his seed  
 when Sarai had no son. It was to some extent a lapse of faith, not a striking

T 47

lapse of faith as these other cases because Sarai was, had gone so long a time with no child that it certainly seemed to everyone as very, very unlikely that she ever would have a child. In fact, Sarai didn't believe it when God gave her the promise about it. It seemed to her absolutely impossible, and so there is not as great a lapse of faith as the other two but it was at the point of his faith. God promised that he would have a seed. He entered into a particular scheme, you might say, in order to bring God's promise to pass and there is one place where I think David gave a very wonderful example. David thought and worked through his life to accomplish what he felt to be right, but God had promised David that he would be king and it was God's definite promise, and that definite promise and this particular special blessing to come to David which God had made was one which David never lifted up his hand to fulfill. When Saul was right before him and he could have killed Saul so easily and Saul had been trying to kill him, he said, "I will not lift up my hand against the Lord's anointed," and he refused to take advantage of the opportunity which he had, and then after Saul was dead he waited until the people came to him, and they came to him and made him king of the kingdom of Judah and that was only about a quarter of the whole land at that time and he took that position and then never raised his hand to try to take control of the rest of the land and instead of that he was very careful to abstain from anything that looked as if he was trying to take a hold of it. God had promised him and he knew that God would fulfill it and he trusted God completely in the matter of the particular blessings that God had promised him. I think that at that point David was a wonderful example of faith in God's promises, in not lifting his hand to fulfill the promise of what God was going to do with him. We have the opposite extreme in the case of Jacob who, though Jacob was to receive the Birthright, nevertheless Jacob was so anxious to get it that he resorted to the trickery of getting Esau when he was awfully hungry and getting him to give him the birthright for Esau said, "What's the good of a birthright to me if I am going to die anyway

T 47,

of hunger, and so he gave him some food and got the birthright from him and then later on he disguised himself to get Esau to give him the blessing. Both of these belonged to him. God had declared they would come to him. They were his in God's sight and it was not necessary that he resort to any of these things in order to get them. He would have had them just as much without it. Yes? (Student) Yes. In the case of Jehu, God had selected Jehu to do away with the Baal worship and to root out the house of Ahab. That was a different case because God didn't tell David to root out the house of Saul to overcome him. David was simply promised he would be king. Jehu was specifically appointed to root out this but then Jehu, once he got started, was seeking his own advantage rather than to do God's will and therefore he received condemnation, not for the thing in general which he did but for the way he did it and the extent to which he carried it. Well, now I think that is sufficient on the lapses, perhaps. I don't think we need a special heading for relation to Melchizedek. I have already just referred to it. If you think we do why we will give it one. We'll call it g, then, Melchizedek. I think that is worth knowing. Yes? (Student) God blessed Ishmael. God blessed all the seed of Abraham. There would be one seed through which the promise was to come but all the seed had blessings. There were blessings for Ishmael, there were blessings for Esau, there were blessings to all of them, and opportunities for all of them to maintain the relationship to God and to receive God's blessing, but the line of Jacob was the line specifically selected for the bringing of the promise to the world. (Student) Esau? Well, simply that in that case the promise went through Jacob. Esau was the progenitor of the people of Edom but the blessing given Esau had very specific promises of blessing in it the same way Ishmael did. (Student) I don't know how much, but I know they would consider themselves descendants of Abraham. They all do, regard him as the father of the patriarchs and they look to Abraham as one of the very greatest of the fathers and there are blessings promised to Ishmael. God

T 47

does not confine his blessings to one group or to one race or to one section, but He worked out the great blessing of bringing Christ into the world through one line. Yes, Mr.---? The seal of circumcision did not represent the fact that Christ was going to come in the line. It represented the fact that God would bring blessing to the individual. The seal of circumcision represented the individual's relation to God rather than the promise that Christ was going to be born of that line. That's the birthright. Mr.---? There is a tradition, that they do; certainly part of them do. After all, when you figure the way the way that the lines go out it would seem most likely that most of the earth would have some of Ishmael's blood in them and also some of Isaac's blood, but probably more of Ishmael's. I figured my genealogy up once and I traced it back to about 700 A. D. and on three different lines I came to Charlemagne, in 700 A. D. and I thought that was very interesting to be able to trace back on three lines to Charlemagne, and I wonder how many people today are descended from Charlemagne, and so I figure that you have two parents, four grandparents, eight great grandparents and so on back. When you get to Charlemagne there would be, I think about five hundred million ancestors, if none of them overlapped, and of course there were not probably at most fifty million people in Europe at the time of Charlemagne, so I think you can say that every person who has any ancestors from Europe is a descendant from Charlemagne, whether they can trace it or not. It goes out that way. Well now, whether Ismael--I would think it likely that if Ishmael had descendants in Arabia who lived as much as five hundred years the relationship would have gone out to the extent that everybody today would have been as one of their ancestors. Yes? (Student) Well, circumcision was practiced by the Egyptians before the time of Abraham. God did not introduce circumcision as a new thing at this time, but God caused that this rite which was already known in certain sections should be adopted by Abraham and his people, not merely for hygienic reasons but more particular as a symbol and

T 447

seal of the covenant, and it received a meaning among them. Now you can have circumcision without it's having any such meaning. I imagine that three-fourths of the babies born in our hospitals today are circumcised but in most cases it has absolutely no meaning. It simply is a hygienic thing, as it was in <sup>Egypt.</sup> (Student) I don't believe so. I don't know about that, whether they did or not. The Philistines did not, definitely, but about the others I don't know. Yes? (Student)

Separation from others but relationship to . Well, now, the matter then of Melchizedek, which we call g, then. We've already mentioned the statement of Peter that those in every land who, there may be those in any land who are accepted of God, that it is not-the knowledge of God, particularly in that early day, was not restricted entirely to the chosen people. Originally of course, all our ancestors knew about God but people shut God out of their hearts and they turned away from God. As Paul said, they willingly forgot God and God gave them over to believe a lie and it may very well be that there were more--aside from the direct line of God's revelation--there were more who retained something of the primitive revelation at that time than there had been at later times. At any rate, we have Melchizedek, and one thing that has been a problem to some people about Melchizedek is what Hebrews says about him. What is the chapter in Hebrews? Hebrews 7, and there in Hebrews 7 we read about Melchizedek, the one to whom Abram gave a tenth part of all, first being by interpretation king of righteousness, Melchizedek, and also king of Salem, which is king of peace. Now, of course, his name is Melchizedek, king of righteousness, and Salem means peace, so he was king of Salem, he was king of peace and he was without father and without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but made like the Son of God, abideth a priest continually./ Genesis doesn't tell us anything about any ancestors or any descendants of his. It doesn't tell us when he began his life, when he ended it. From Genesis, he is simply a figure who comes into the camp, appears briefly and disappears, but of whom none of these specific details are stressed as they are in the case of Levi. Levi

T 47

received his priesthood because of his descent from Abram, because he is the one selected from Abram and his descendants receive it because they are descended from him but as he says,--that is, the Levitical priesthood is a matter of specific regulation in accordance with a physical relationship for the purpose of good order but Melchizedek is one/whom we have none of these things told to us. He simply appears as one who is indeed a priest of the Most High God, and so he is in that way a symbol, a type of the situation of the Lord Jesus Christ, who appears from outside the line of direct descent of the promises of God though he is also within us. He is the son of Mary but he is also the Son of God. He appears from outside. He is the great seed by virtue, not of his place in descent but of his relationship to God, and so Melchizedek here is simply given as an example because of the fact that he did not have his position because of any of these particular things but he appears in Genesis without any stress laid on any of these particular things. I don't think that he would mean to say that Melchizedek, the king of Jerusalem, was one who had always been there from the time of Adam and who is there today still and one who was simply a separate creation of God, unrelated. He certainly had a beginning of his time there; he certainly had an end of his time there, but these things are not told us in Genesis and his relationship was not based upon them. Yes? (Student)

T 48

(Student) Yes, I would think so, because the way the record stands it begins with stressing the fact that he brought forth bread and wine and was priest of El Elyon. That is stressed immediately. Then after that is stressed, he blessed him. He said, "Blessed be Abram of El Elyon", the purchaser of heaven and earth and Blessed by El Elyon who hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand." It is very definitely a religious context and in the middle of that religious context Abraham gives the tithes, so I don't see how you can get away from it that it wasn't

T 48

that Melchidezek was a powerful noble who held the road and you had to pay him toll to get past but it was a religious arrangement. (Student) You mean in the Bible? No. I don't know any. Mr.---?(Student) Yes. I would say that it is a possible guess but very unlikely. (Student) Well it doesn't particularly fit into any of the documents. Of course, now in Ugaritic you have the god El--- which some say is related to this but that is highly questionable. (Student) Well, of course, nobody could say that before recent years because we had no evidence anywhere bearing on any such name until the discovery of the Ugaritic text and in the Ugaritic text they are grabbing everything they can to seem to have any relationship to the Bible and using it to explain the Bible but there are so many explaining it from different viewpoints that they contradict each other and it will be some time before that material is, before a consensus of opinion is arrived at and so we do not have it as a definite position as yet. There is great divergence as people are making new theories and giving them up and making others. It is such a recent stuff, this Ugaritic. It is pretty hard to say what the                      will be after a few years. Well, now, just a word about h.

h. is Abraham's meaning for us. I've scheduled it under two heads.  
through

1. He is the one/whom God gave the promises and prepared the way for Christ.

That is his most vital place in it in God's economy. He is the one through  
for Christ.  
whom God gave us these promises, the one through whom He prepared the way. Abram was an instrument of God in order to set apart this people through whom he would bring His Son into the world and through whom He would He would give the Scripture, give us the revelation and second, however, Abram is of vital importance and an example of faith and faithfulness. This, of course, Hebrews 11 stresses greatly in verses 8 to 19. Abram has a specific place of importance in God's economy. Abram is an example in himself for us and both are important; both are vital but we must not simply stress one and overlook the other. One could be one without being the other. There are many who are wonderful examples of faith who have no

T 48

particular place in the general structure of the progress of His kingdom; there are many who have important places in the Kingdom who are not the great examples that Abraham is, but he combines both. So much for B, Abraham. I don't want to take much time on C, Isaac, because there isn't a great deal that is important. Isaac is a lesser figure between two great figures. He is a weak figure between two strong figures. He is a link—a necessary connecting link, but a connecting link between two vital characters. I remember when I was in seminary hearing Dr. Eerdman say that people always wanted the Episcopal marriage service because they thought that it was such a beautiful service and the Presbyterians were always saying, "Oh, let's use the Episcopal service." Well, he said, "It is a beautiful service but is it quite so true?" He said, "It says in it. May they be blessed/as Isaac and Rebecca were, and after all, when you think of how Rebecca cheated Isaac and deceived him and so on, are they the best sort of example for conjugal happiness?" Well, it is true that Isaac here is a secondary figure, in between the two great figures, and yet his position in between the two makes him a vital connecting link so we can indeed speak of the three great patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Isaac seems to have been a pale copy of his father Abraham. Whatever Abraham had done, Isaac did. He copied his good points; he copied his bad points. He copied his bad points. He deserves credit for copying his good points. He deserves great credit, but he also deserves criticism for the bad points he copied. Fortunately there weren't so many bad points to copy. But Isaac did have an attitude of trust in his father. He had an attitude of submission. He made no objections when his father took him up to sacrifice him. He went off, walking up the mountain. He absolutely trusted his father—put him on the table and began to tie him up. He doesn't seem to have offered any objection. He was very loyal to his father and if you have a father like Abraham to be thus loyal to, it is wonderful, but the trouble is there are very few fathers who deserve to rank with Abraham, and whether they be physical fathers or spiritual fathers, there is a real danger when ~~one~~ takes the attitude toward any human being of putting that human being up as an example and an idol between him and God.

T 48

There is a great danger because any human being can fail and can fall and can have lapses. Abraham had few of them but Isaac imitated those few which he had. It is remarkable how many things there are which Abraham did which Isaac did. He camped at the same places. He went up and down there camping at the same places that Abraham had and he carried forward in his detail after detail even to calling his wife his sister, just what Abraham had done right through his life. I think the danger is one that is vital for us all to guard against, the danger of taking any lesser ideal. I remember my mother saying when she was a young woman there were two preachers who were having evangelistic meetings and oh, how they poured out their souls to lead people into the kingdom, to get people to believe in Christ and to be saved. These men were just giving themselves unstintingly for the Gospel, and my mother said as long as these two men have the faith that they have, she would never waiver in her faith in the truth of the Scripture and the truth of salvation through Christ, never, as long as these two men stood so true, and then thirty years later I saw both of the men. One of them had gone, gradually had lost his belief in the Scripture and had become a strong modernist. They visited in our home and he talked about the gospel of the shambles--had absolutely no belief in the teaching of calvary and of salvation through the blood. The other one became a great social leader, a great leader of social service and a professor of social work in the University of Chicago. Both of them turned absolutely against the thing they had been teaching as young men and which had impressed her so much, and that happens repeatedly, it happens so often, and I think one reason the Lord allows it to happen is because He wants us to put our faith and our trust in Him and in Him alone.

T 48

second part

position in  
and we noticed a little bit about the character of Isaac and his relation to  
Abraham and Jacob. If you take all the section of Genesis that is simply talk-  
ing about Isaac you will find that it is a comparatively small section. As I

T 48

recall, the chapter that tells about Abraham's death tells about Jacob's birth, and Abraham and Jacob really practically cover the book of Genesis between--that is, between the beginning of Abraham and the end of Jacob and Isaac is a rather incidental figure in between. He is important because he is one of the three, but he is by far the least important of the three. He is the connecting link between two important figures.

Now, D, Jacob, and under this I, general outline of the material aspects of his life. Now, of course, under that a. would be his youth in Canaan. Jacob was brought up in the home of Isaac and there of course he learned a good bit about conditions in Canaan and he was one who was quick to take advantage of everything which he learned there. He was able to adapt himself to different types of work, to take a hold of them and to learn to be quite good at them. He was always looking out for that which would accomplish something and which would advance the objectives which he had in mind. As to the general background of his youth in Canaan, I think we have covered that fairly well in connection with this story of Abraham in Canaan, so we will move on to b, Mesopotamia, and you know it was very early in the life of Jacob that he left home and made that long trip up into Mesopotamia. His mother with her clever scheming had tried to get for her favorite son everything that she wanted him to have. It so happened the things she wanted to get for him God had promised him and they would have been his anyway. Isaac was trying to keep him from having them because he wanted them to go to his favorite son, Esau, but the Lord had already declared who would receive them, and so Rebecca's schemes resulted actually in nothing but what would have come anyway but did result in her losing her son, her favorite son Jacob. He went off into Mesopotamia and she never saw him again. Now when he went up to Mesopotamia there it brings him into contact with a civilization and culture very different from that in Palestine at this time. He was up in northern Mesopotamia in the land there where Abraham had worked for quite a time with his father Terah, where and Terah had died, the region in which a good many of the relatives were still

T 48

living, Mesopotamia. He came in contact with a different type of civilization, a civilization of which not much was known until comparatively recently. We have a good deal of information about Palestine from the Bible and we have learned some new material about Palestine. We've learned within the last century and a half a good deal about southern Mesopotamia and central Mesopotamia, but northern Mesopotamia is on the outskirts and in addition to that, this was in the second millennium B. C. and the greater part of our material from ancient Mesopotamia comes from the first millennium B. C. and the second largest amount from the third millennium B. C. This is in between the two in the period of which less is known and the section of which less is known until comparatively recently. Now, recently there have been some discoveries made in that general area, discoveries made up in the, further east than where Jacob was but in that general area up there at a town whose ancient name was Nuzi. It is near the modern sea of Kerkuk, a great oil center in modern Irak, and not very far from this town of Kerkuk there was discovered in 1926 there some clay tablets which show that there had been a small town there in the second millennium B. C., a town which bore the name of Nuzi. Now there are some who try to say it is Nuzu and some who say it is Nuza and the fact of the matter is we are not sure which it is--Nuzi, Nuzu and Nuza but the early publications with it all called it Nuzi and we have it often referred to in the tablets as Nuzi, perhaps far more often than either Nuzu or Nuza.

T 49

a form that has become pretty well established, Nuzi, although there are a few books which now call it Nuzu. Now here at Nuzi these tablets which were found were very interesting because they were different from any previous tablets known to us. They were clay tablets written in the Babylonian language and yet written in the Babylonian language about the way that English would be written by some Frenchmen who didn't know a great deal of English. That is to say, they have--it is the Babylonian language which is used, very definitely, and

T 49

the words and the construction in general have the same meaning as the Babylonian writings but there are certain things they get all mixed up. They get their case-endings constantly mixed up and in their spelling there are certain sounds that they can't distinguish. They can't tell a "t" from a "d" and they may write one or the other. They can't tell a "k" from a "g" and they write whichever one is easiest to write in any particular word. There are certain sounds that way which these people evidently found absolutely unfamiliar with them which are very regular in the Babylonian writing and they confuse them constantly in the writings, and then there are some expressions which they get mixed around. After you have looked at a few of these you get used to the main peculiarities of them. It is Babylonian written by a people who did not speak Babylonian, and so, in these tablets, in the Babylonian language we learn something about culture which is quite different from the Babylonian culture. Now there is one great advantage over the great bulk of tablets that are familiar to us from the Babylonian. Most of our tablets are the inscriptions of kings telling of what they have done or are various important pronouncements by the state dealing with particular matters considered to be of general importance but these tablets from Nuzi are not that sort at all. These are the private archives of certain families. The great bulk of them come from one particular family and in that family they give us the business transactions of that family through four generations and thus you find the wills of the members of the family, their marriage contracts; you have their business contracts with hundreds of other people of the community, and you learn a great deal about the ordinary life of the ordinary middle class people of this community. Perhaps, for instance, a great many of them are legal texts in which this family, which was a very industrious, clever family, had legal-- had litigation with other families in Nuzi and this family practically always wins out in the litigation. Now in Nuzi there was a law, much like the law of ancient Israel, the law that land must remain in a family. You couldn't sell land. In these texts we find that this family from which most of these texts come got around that law. who was the head of the family,

T 49

makes his arrangements whereby evidently a man would come to him and say, "I'm up against it. I need some money. I'm broke. / <sup>Will</sup> You lend me some money?" and would say, "Well, how can I lend you money? What have you got for security?" and the man would say, "I have nothing left except my land and I can't sell that," and would say, "I'll tell you what I'll do. I'll lend you this money and then we'll work out some arrangement." So the man would borrow the money. Then two years later the man had spent the money and had not made it all back that he expected to and he comes to and says, "Well, what shall we do about it?" "Well", said, I can sue you as a slave for the money. I could make you one of my slaves, but, after all, you are not worth it. I don't want to do that. I'd rather have your land." "Well," the man says, "how can I give you the land?" "Well," would say, "all you have to do is adopt me," so they would make out an adoption, and so the adoption paper is made out, and in this paper it tells how this man of his own free will--it nearly always says, "Of his own free will", he adopted as his son and has given his adopted father a present, and that is the amount of money given him and it tells of this present has given and then it names just exactly where the property is and describes it quite fully and quite exactly and it says if any litigation comes about this the adopted father is to pay the cost of the litigation and then the contract is made, is his adopted son and this particular land is designated as the share that this adopted son is to receive of the man's property. was adopted by over four hundred different citizens of Nuzi. And thus from these tablets we see how in those days as in our present day people found ways of getting around the law and even though the law tried to keep the land cut up into little holdings with each family holding its own land, holding it theoretically from the king and paying the king a certain amount of work each year for this land that been assigned to him, yet this great amount of land came into the family of , and then we have some law suits in which, after two or three generations, we find that the grandson of the man who had adopted takes the land and seizes and says,

T 49

"This is my land, inherited from my grandfather," and then goes to law about it, the thing is looked into, the tablets are brought, the judges give their decision and they decide that the land properly belongs to and that the other man is to pay the costs. And so we have hundreds of these--there are some thousands of tablets altogether,--hundreds of these adoption tablets, hundreds of legal tablets, many other types, from these families, and we see the life of these individual families. We know a great deal about all the different features of the way in which they lived in this area at that time. The town of Nuzi was destroyed when it was conquered by the Assyrians in about 1500 B. C. so we have here a town which was destroyed before 1400 B. C. and so through a period of between one hundred and one hundred and fifty years we have all this material on the events in that town at that time. There is a book published by the University of Chicago, Volume 57 of the Oriental Institute Publications of which I am one of the three authors which contains within it--I won't say the telephone directory of ancient Nuzi, but perhaps we'll say the directory of the people because it lists the individuals mentioned in this town. It tells their relationship with one another, tells which tablets they are mentioned in, the nature of their names, what we are told of their racial background, etc. from the names found in this town of Nuzi. Now for the student of ancient culture, these tablets are among the most interesting tablets which have ever been found anywhere because they show the contact between two cultures, the Babylonian and the culture of the people here, the Hurrian people of this community. They show the contacts between them, the effect of one upon the other. They show us the life of this community of that ancient time. It throws a great deal of light upon the details of ancient history. For the Biblical scholar these tablets are extremely interesting because they give us so much information about the life of this area in which Jacob lived during a number of the formative years of his life, and so it is very interesting for the light it throws upon the background of the Bible and it is interesting for the fact that at a number of places it, in very interesting ways, confirms the accuracy of events in the

T 49

Scripture, or I should say, perhaps, it makes us see how naturally they fit into their background, rather than that it so much proves any one particular event there. Now, one interesting thing in these tablets which we find is the matter of land tenure. I mentioned how the land there theoretically belongs to the king and he parcels it out among the different families and they have their tax to pay for the land to the king. You do not have, strictly speaking, a private ownership of the land, even though in the degenerate <sup>ate</sup> days with which our tablets deal this law becomes to quite an extent a dead letter and following the schemes which his clever mother worked out has devised a way of getting around this law. But we see a system of land tenure there, very different from anything that was known in Palestine at that time. Now it is interesting that when we find in chapter 47 that Joseph was down in Egypt, we find that Joseph there in Egypt when he was in charge of the land for Pharaoh changed the land holding system of Egypt. Previous to this time, in Egypt the land was held by individuals, regular private property in land, but we read here, in verse 20, that Joseph bought all the land in Egypt for Pharaoh, so the Egyptians sold, every man his field, because the famine prevailed over them; so the land became Pharaoh's and thus we have it shown here that Joseph got the land for Pharaoh and verse 26 tells that Joseph made it a law over the land of Egypt unto this day; that Pharaoh should have the fifth part; except the land of the priests only, which became not Pharaoh's. And so you have previous to Joseph private property and land in Egypt. After Joseph, you have the land in Egypt belonging to the Pharaoh and the people paying a fifth part of the property to Pharaoh as their rent for the land. Early Egyptian documents show that before the time of Joseph the land was privately owned. Late Egyptian documents show that the Pharaoh owned all the land and the people paid one fifth the property to Pharaoh, except the land of the priests, which was not touched. That remained in their hands. And so the Bible says Joseph made a change in Egypt. Egyptian traditions show that some time before Joseph the one situation and some time after the other situation.

T 49

And now these tablets from Mesopotamia give us a clew as to where Joseph got the idea. As a boy he heard his father Jacob tell about his experiences in Mesopotamia and describe how different was the landholding position in Mesopotamia and in Palestine and now when Joseph goes down into Egypt and is working for Pharaoh he sees an opportunity to change the land system of Egypt from the previous system to the system with which his father had been familiar up there in Mesopotamia. It is just one other little piece that fits in to the whole situation and shows how it all fits together. That would be naturally how the idea of the landholding system way up there came down into Egypt when Joseph introduced it there. Now another interesting place here where these tablets from Mesopotamia throw light upon the condition in, upon the statements of the Bible relate more particularly to the situation when he returned to Canaan. I think, however, since the light on it comes from Mesopotamia we might well discuss it under this head. This relates to the attempt of Laban, Jacob's uncle, to recover the terraphim, or household gods, which had been stolen. You remember that we are told in Genesis here that, in Genesis, chapter 31, that Jacob left the land of Mesopotamia rather suddenly and he started back toward Palestine and we read here in Chapter 31 how Jacob rose up and set his sons and his wives on camels and carried away all his cattle and all his goods which he had gotten, the cattle of his getting, which he had gotten in Padanaram, to go to Isaac his father in the land of Canaan, and Laban went to shear his sheep, and Rachel had stolen the images (the Hebrew word there is terraphim), the terraphim or household gods, the images that were her father's, and Jacob stole away unawares to Laban the Syrian, in that he told him not that he fled.. So he fled with all that he had; and he rose up, and passed over the river, and set his face toward the mount Gilead. And it was told Laban on the third day that Jacob was fled. Jacob had a three-day start, and Laban took his brethren with him and pursued after him seven days' journey; and they overtook him in Mt. Gilead. Now here is Jacob, down here in Mt. Gilead, and Jacob had with him all the flocks and the herds which he had earned up there in Mesopotamia, earned partly by his

T 49

hard work, his hard unsparring work, and partly by his cleverness in securing the utmost possible result for his work, and so he had a large number of flocks and herds and naturally a large number of men to take care of the flocks and herds and here is Jacob with all of this number of servants with him going over into Palestine, with all these flocks and herds, and Laban pursues after him for seven days, and overtakes him and when he overtakes him he is quite upset because Jacob had left suddenly without saying Good-bye, without giving him a chance to say good-bye to his daughters and to his grandchildren, but the thing that Laban is most excited about is the fact that Jacob has stolen his household gods, and he wants those household gods back. That's the big thing that interests Laban, and though he feels badly that Jacob has left suddenly and has taken with him all these flocks and herds that Jacob has earned from him, taken Jacob's wives and daughters, taken his grandchildren, Jacob's children, the thing that he is most upset about is his household gods.

T 50

Jacob is quite upset. Jacob said, "I wouldn't think of doing such a thing. What an awful thing to accuse me of!" He said, "With whoever thou findest thy gods, let him not live," he says. "Before our brethren discern thou what is thine with me, and take it to thee." For Jacob knew not that Rachel had stolen them. So Jacob just opened everything up and said, "Come in and hunt through everything and see if I have done such a despicable thing as steal your household gods." And so Laban simply started out and went right through and hunted for them, and Jacob, we read, was quite terrified of what Laban was apt to do in the situation. We read that God had said to Laban in a dream at night, saying, "Take heed that thou speak not to Jacob either good or bad," so evidently Laban had brought with him a large enough expedition that, despite the number of flocks and herds and consequent men to take care of them that Jacob had, Laban had a large enough expedition with him that he could have overcome Jacob. That would be an expensive

T 50

thing for Laban to do. A seven-days' trip. You would have to provide for expenses of travel, of the people there, and back again; you'd have to provide for all their living expenses on the way; you'd have to give them reasonable compensation for it. What was there that made it worth Laban's while to go/this expense and this trouble to pursue Jacob in order to try to get back those household gods. Well, that is a problem that has puzzled commentators on the Bible through the ages and some medieval commentators suggested that those household gods probably were made of gold and that was why Laban was so anxious to get them, but if the

household gods were made of gold it would take quite a bit of gold to pay the expense of such an expedition as that. He knew that Jacob had a three days start over him. It took seven days to catch up with him. It would be--they would have to be pretty good sized--now how big were the household gods? Well, we read that Latham went into Jacob's tent and into Leah's tent, into the two maid-servants' tents, but he found them not. And then he went out of Leah's tent and entered into Rachel's tent and Rachel had taken the images and put them in the camel's furniture and sat upon them and Laban searched all the tents but found them not, and Rachel said to her father "Let it not displease my father that I cannot rise up before thee, for the custom of women is upon me." And he searched, but found not the images. And so Rachell was sitting on these images, and as she sat there she said, "Please excuse me, father, I don't feel well today. Excuse me that I don't get up. You can search everywhere in the tent all right and see that nothing here is stolen from you without my getting up, so he peered all around; he looked on all sides of her and everything, and you can be quite sure that after this/<sup>if</sup> he was convinced that the household images weren't in the tent, that they were not in the tent that they were not particularly big. Anything that she could sit on and hide so well that he wouldn't even suspect that they were there and wouldn't say, "Well, now I hate to trouble you daughter, but here is a chair over here, if you will just move over here, it's just three steps over, and if you will just move over here I'll look there where you were sitting there. Evidently they were small enough that

T 50

she could hide them that way and she would not suspect it. And so we find that the theory that they were made of gold does not account for their being worth all this trip and expedition and the excitement on Laban's part, or the excitement, on the other hand, on Jacob's part, because now Laban has looked everywhere and hasn't found them and we read in verse 36, Jacob was wroth, and chode with Laban, and Jacob answered and said to Laban, "What is my trespass?" That's the first time I ever noticed that word chode there--c h o d e. I don't think I have ever used it in a sermon in my life. He chode with Laban, and Jacob answered and said to Laban, "What is my trespass? and what is my sin, that thou hast so hotly pursued after me?" And he went on here--we have nearly a column in which Jacob told Laban what he thought of him for accusing him of such a terrible thing and pursuing him this way. "Why, of course I haven't stolen them. I've been absolutely honest all the way through. Except the God of my father, the God of Abraham, and the fear of Isaac, had been with me, surely thou hadst sent me away now empty." And so he tells him just what he thinks. And so it leaves us with this question. Why on earth was it worth all this expense and bother on Laban's part to try to get these household gods, and why was Rachel anxious to steal them in the first place, to take them along, and why was Jacob so upset that Laban would suspect him of such a thing? Well, it is a thing which we couldn't understand until/within the last fifteen years, until the discoveries were made at Nuzi. There is no explanation for it in the text. It doesn't state why they were important, and that is natural enough. If, in the day when this was written, everybody understood, if all Jacob's family knew perfectly well the importance of these household gods, there would be no need of writing it down, and then later on when it is forgotten there simply is no explanation included here as to the reason for it. And so there was no satisfactory explanation for the reason. It was a mystery to us through the middle ages. It was doubtless a mystery in the time of the later Israelite kingdom when the critics say this story was written. The reason for it had doubtless been forgotten. But now these Nuzi tablets have been excavated and read and from them we learn that ~~on the~~ there in Mesopotamis, the region in which Laban lived,

50

that up there it was customary that when a man died if a son-in-law could go into the court and could bring with him the household gods of his father-in-law and say, "Here, my father-in-law gave me his household gods to take care of, instead of one of his sons having them, which would be the natural thing, that was acceptable in the court as proof that this father-in-law had passed over his own sons and had designated this son-in-law as his proper heir and successor to all of his property, and so it is clear enough why Rachel stole the household gods. Jacob already had a large part of the property of Laban. She figured he might as well get all the rest of it, so she took the household gods and after Laban's death Jacob could go into court with them and could present them and receive all the property that was left to be divided among Laban's sons, and it is easy enough to see, then, why Laban was so excited about it. He wanted to save as much as he could for his sons to have after his death, and why so Jacob was so disgusted that his uncle Laban would think that he would condescend to such a miserable, dirty trick as to do that. Mr.---? (Student) I'm sure she would. (Student) Oh, no. She wouldn't do it until after Laban's death. It's after Laban's death. She would get all of Laban's property after his death, so that doubtless that was what was in the mind of Rachel when she took them, and that explains why Laban was so excited about them. It explains why it was important to him to get them back. It explains why Jacob was so disgusted that he would be accused of such a thing and it shows, makes it seem extremely unlikely that this story was written, as the higher critics say, in the days of the later Israelite kingdom, because if it had been and they had imagined an antiquated custom like this no longer known in their day, they surely would have explained just what their importance was. As it is, probably by that time the explanation of the importance of the terraphim had been completely forgotten. And so this is a case where we have light thrown on the Biblical narrative. We can understand it better by this material that has been discovered within the last fifteen years and in addition to that it makes the critical theory seem extremely unlikely, and it fits in with the book

T 50

having been written at the time, with this account having been written at the very time of the events described. Now another thing that is interesting about the background of this trip to Mesopotamia is that these people in Mesopotamia among whom Laban lived, that is Laban and his family, were not Hebrew speaking but Aramaic speaking and we find that brought out in this very same chapter at which we have just been looking. We find it here in chapter 31, that after Jacob had accused Laban of falsely suspecting him, then Laban wanted to play safe, and so Laban said, "Now, look here," he said, "I don't want you coming over and making me trouble with these things after I'm dead." He didn't say it in so many words but that doubtless is the idea. He said, in verse 44, "Now therefore come thou, let us make a covenant, I and thou; and let it be for a witness between me and thee." And Jacob took a stone and set it up for a pillar, and Jacob said to his brethren, "Gather stones," and they took stones and made an heap, and they ate there on the heap. They sealed the covenant with a meal together there, and Laban called it Jegarsahadutha, but Jacob called it Galeed. In other words, they both called it, Stone of Witness. Stone of Witness--only Laban calls it Jegarsahadutha, which is Stone of Witness in Aramaic, and Jacob calls it Galeed, which is Hebrew for Stone of Witness, so you have the same--this stone is put up between us and they give it the name in Aramaic, which is Laban's language, and in Hebrew, which is the language that Jacob and his family had learned in Palestine and that they now talk as very natural, as their home language, and they give these two names to this stone, and then Laban says, "This heap is a witness between me and thee this day." In verse 52 he says, "This heap be witness, and this be witness and this pillar be witness, that I will not pass over this heap to thee, and that thou shalt not pass over this heap and this pillar unto me, for harm." In other words, Laban said, "If you have got those terraphim somewhere and in some queer way I haven't been able to find them in all the search I've made, we make this covenant. You won't pass this spot and come back here to injure me with them, to use them against me." And so they put

T 50

up this stone of witness and they say, "Here is a witness between us. You are to stay on that side and not to come over here and injure me by producing these things in court if you have them. I won't pass over there to injure you with my stronger force of men. We'll make this dividing line between us." And therefore they call it Galed and Mizpah, a watching place, for he said, "The Lord watch between me and thee, when we are absent one from another, that you don't cross over here to hurt me and I don't cross over there to hurt you, but each of us stay on our own side, and stay separate." So there we have the origin of that beautiful/benediction, "Don't you injure me and I won't injure you. We'll each keep on our own side." Mr. Gustafson---? (Student) Well, it is a fact that most people have the idea of in some way something that is binding upon them. You will find that among most peoples there has been the attitude if you take this particular type of a promise, why you know I wouldn't go back on that promise. (Student) Yes. You remember the story they tell about William the Conqueror and Harold, who was the last king of the Saxons? They say that Harold was visiting in Normandy and he wasn't yet king, Edward the Confessor was king of the Saxons, and William the Conqueror said to Harold--he had entertained him pretty well at his home there; he said to Harold, "I want you to leave on good friendly terms with me; otherwise you might not leave", but he said, "I want you to leave on good friendly terms with me," and he said, "It is understood between us that I'll have a right to the throne of England, and after Edward the Confessor dies, you promise to support my claim to the throne," and "Oh", Harold said, "Sure, I'll support your claims to the throne. I've got to run along now," and William said, "Well, now let's make a vow on it," and Harold said, "Well, now what kind of a vow do you want?" and so they say William the Conqueror placed on the table there a couple of old relics, relics of St. Dennis and St. Anthony, and he put a couple of relics on and he said, "Now you put your hand on these relics and you say, 'By all that's sacred under my hands here I vow that I will maintain the cause of William of Normandy to be king of England,'" and they say that Harold looked at him

T 50

and he said, "Oh, what are these relics of St. Anthony and St. Dennis? I can swear on them and it won't matter at all," so he put his hand out and he made his great oath and then, after he finished the oath, William said, "Well, now let's look under the tablecloth," and so he lifted it up and there were these on the tablecloth, and under the tablecloth he had a hole cut in the table and in there he had a couple of relics from \_\_\_\_\_ and it was recognized that anything that was sworn to by \_\_\_\_\_ you must stand on, and so they thought that he was absolutely right when he conquered England to kill Harold in the battle because Harold had gone back on an oath made over these great relics which were underneath the tablecloth. That is the story by which they justify William the Conqueror's conquest of England. Well, Harold had made this promise on these great relics, and it is a fact that I think you will find that most people, no matter how lying or how untruthful they are recognize that you have to have some standard by which you can stand, and that there is something which, if they say it by that, then they expect you to believe it. and in this case these people were not nearly as reprobate as--Laban was considered a pretty decent man in

T 51

and call God for a witness and eat there together on a heap, establishing a covenant, they felt, "Well, if you can't trust them on that, you can't trust them on anything. That is just about something that you ought to be able to go by." Mr.---? (Student) N u z i. They're named after the ancient/town of which <sup>name of the</sup> they were found and they explain thus the whole situation here which otherwise was rather obscure in the region. Now I think it is very fine to realize that Jacob never did try to use these household gods in that way. We get over to chapter 35 and we find that Jacob buried them. He didn't quite destroy them. They were still kept, but they were buried. We read there in Chapter 35 that when he came to Bethel there Jacob called upon the people who were with him, in verse 2, chapter 35. He said to his household, "Put away the strange gods

T 51

that are among you and be clean and change your garments." And verse 4, "They gave unto Jacob all the strange gods which were in their hand, and all their garrings which were in their ears; and Jacob hid them under the oak which was by Shechem!" And they journeyed on, and he left them, and he never made any attempt to use these in the way Laban feared he would. Yes? (Student) Of the earrings? I should think it likely that they were probably devoted to some heathen deity or something like that. We don't have light on it but there may be something in the Nuzi tablets that would throw light on that if one looked for it specifically, but it hasn't occurred to people as a problem and so they haven't been looking for it. (Student) Yes. Well, we do find that at this time he was trying to bring his whole <sup>company</sup> more in line with his own ideas. Now, for instance, he says here, "Put away all the strange gods among thee," and he knew they had some, but he hadn't done it before, but at this time he is determined to bring his whole company in a line with the idea which he himself had. Well, now, this light then from Mesopotamia here helps us to understand the passage and also shows us that it fits in exactly with the customs as they were at the time.

Now, c. the return to Canaan. This is so bound up with the life in Mesopotamia that as we look at the material background there isn't much more to say of it than what we have already said. We will look later under the Spiritual history of Jacob a little bit at the events at this time when he came to meet Esau, expecting Esau to try to kill him for the wicked deeds which Jacob had done to Esau before he came away, <sup>but we find</sup> the easy-going, happy-go-lucky attitude which Esau had. Jacob was a man who schemed and planned and worked; Esau was one who ~~would become very angry~~ and then would get over his anger and be the best of friends. Yes? (Student) There isn't much we know about it. There is an obscure section there. We don't fully understand just what it is. There is a question, of course, on the ground of eugenics as to whether there is anything that Jacob could do which would affect the cattle there, and the account sounds as if he did something in such a way that there would be an effect upon the offspring.

T 51

Now it isn't very clear just exactly what it was so I think we must say that there remains something of a problem there, but it probably is--well, there is this about it. At least, it wasn't such a simple thing that anybody could do it at any time or it would have been done at all times. It would have been perfectly obvious to Laban that it was a perfectly simple thing, that it was foolish to enter into an arrangement like that. It was something a bit out of the ordinary, but just what it was we don't really understand. There's a problem there that is something we just don't fully understand. Of course, that's often the case when you speak of these customs. There are things which were fully clear to the people of the times which are not fully explained. You can't tell about everything in life or you would fill an encyclopedia instead of a book. You assume a great deal and then as customs change often much of the background is forgotten. In this case of the terraphim it was completely forgotten but now we have light on it that explains it. Something may come to light that explains that, but as yet we don't fully understand it.

Well, now, d is his life in Canaan and there again Jacob spent the rest of his years in Canaan. He lived there a good many years. He who <sup>had</sup> brought such sorrow to his father in his youth found sorrow brought to himself with the loss of his own son, Joseph, and then, eventually, joy coming in the going to Egypt to be reunited with the son Joseph. That we will look at under Joseph instead of looking at it here.

And so we go on to No. 2. Spiritual history of Jacob. Jacob is a strange character. Abraham, as you read about him, everything seems in general noble. He had his lapses, he had his weaknesses, but he was a noble character. He was one whom anyone would have loved. As you read of Jacob, it is brought home to you as you contrast the grasping, clever maneuvers of this rather shady character in many ways, with the open-hearted, hail and hearty good-naturedness of Esau, a man who would get terrifically angry and then get over it and be ready to do anything in the world for the one with whom he had just previously been so

T 51

angry, Esau, the rather simple, easy-going type of man that has more of an appeal for most of us than Jacob has, it shows the sovereignty of God. It shows that it is not our goodness that determines our acceptance before God. It is not what we are but what we may become. We are all lost in sin and we are all deserving of nothing good of God and God chooses whom He shall save and whom He shall make leaders in His kingdom and often His choice is very different from the choice which we think we would make if we were in His place. It shows the sovereignty of God, the fact that Esau is the one who was laid aside. I don't say the one who was lost, because Esau has blessings. God gave him blessings and he had on the whole a happy life, and we have no reason to think that Esau was lost. We don't know a great deal about him, but the great blessing of being the leader in the kingdom, of being the one to whom the promise was given of being the ancestor of the chosen people was that which God had planned to give to Jacob before he was even born, because at his birth the prophecy was made that the older should serve the younger, and God had predetermined before the birth of the two that Jacob was the one through whom the blessing would come and the one who would receive the greater blessing on this earth. Now we find Jacob as a young man grasping, trying to get for himself but at the same time having a vision, having an understanding of values which Esau did not have. Jacob wanted things which he considered worth-while which to Esau were just nothing. Jacob got Esau when he was hungry and he said to him, he said, "If I give you this pottage to eat, will you give me your birthright?" and Esau said, "Oh, if I am going to die what good is a birthright to me anyway? You take it," and I don't think that made any difference. God had given it to Jacob before he was born. They were both in error in the transaction, for we read in Hebrews 12:16-17, "looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God, lest there be any fornicator or profane person of Esau who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright; for ye know how that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected; for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears." Here was Esau who simply

T 51

didn't see the value of it. For one morsel of food he sold his birthright. It is too bad the Old English here says "meat" for of course it was not meat which he gave. Meat is a modern word which means "flesh" in the Old English. Meat in Old English means food. And so Jacob deserves credit for the fact that he could see values and could see that worth having even though he went at it in the wrong way. Jacob is characterized by determination and hard work even though through a great part of his life he was seeking for himself rather than for the glory of God. Then we have that incident at Bethel where Jacob tried to make a bargain with God, where, as Jacob was going off into Mesopotamia he had that dream in which he saw the ladder with God at the center of the ladder and the angels ascending and descending upon the ladder and where Jacob made that promise that if God would bring him back to his own land that he would be his God and he said, "This stone which I have set for a pillar shall be God's house, and of all that thou shalt give me I will surely give the tenth unto thee." We read stories in the magazines every now and then about <sup>some great oil man or</sup> some leader in some line of business who had made an oath in his early days that he will give a tenth of everything he makes to God and then how very rich the man has become and then they will go on in the magazine and tell how the psychologist has explained it, and he says that the fact that the man takes God as a partner gives the man a feeling that he is going to succeed, a feeling that he can't fail and therefore the man succeeds and goes ahead but I don't think the psychologist necessarily has the whole idea of it. There may be an aspect of truth in what he says, but there certainly is nothing in the Scripture to suggest that we have a right to give something to God and then to demand that God will pay us in a material way in this earth. Christ has said, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you," and he says that the one who gives up houses or lands or relatives for the sake of God shall receive them back many fold in this life, but I don't think He means that in every individual case God is going to repay specifically or that we can make a bargain with God. I think what He means is that God is

T 51

certainly not going to be <sup>in</sup> any man's debt and what we give out of a heart of love to God he certainly will repay many times over, whether in this life or in the next life, but if a person tries to make a bargain and says, "I am going to do this for God and now God has got to do this for me in most cases it won't work. In most cases the result will be very different from what we desire, but in Jacob's case God stooped to Jacob's weakness and God put this man with all of his bad qualities <sup>blessed</sup> and all his--God ~~lost~~ the good that was in him, much of which was so buried that the ordinary person wouldn't even have seen it, and God transformed Jacob the supplanter into Israel, the prince with God. Now you find Jacob's attitude toward Laban. Laban misused him; mistreated him. Laban tricked him, giving him Leah when he thought he was doing work for Rachel, but we find that Jacob continued persevering submitting to the terms which Laban gave him and making out as best he could under the terms, the mean, ~~low~~ terms which Laban had made for him, that he persevered and continued and he secured that which he was after. And then we have that which many people think of as Jacob's conversion. Whether this is his actual conversion or whether it is a great Spiritual experience in the life of one who actually was converted before this time but who was to quite an extent in a backslidden state we cannot determine, but at least we do have this strange experience at Peniel, or Peniel. Both of these terms are used in the Scripture, in fact, used in succeeding verses: And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel: for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved. And as he passed over Peniel the sun rose upon him, and he halted upon his thigh. This is strange where after he had left Laban and went on and now he hears that Esau is coming with large forc<sup>es</sup> and he expected an attack and he worked out a clever scheme to try to lessen the force of the attack and then a man wrestled with him at night there and we read that they wrestled until the break of the day and he said, "Let me go. The day breaketh." And he said, "I will not let thee go, except thou bless me," and it is not very fully explained exactly what it was that happened. Jacob was alone. He had this experience at night. Was it entirely a Spiritual experience or was it specifically in some regards

T 51

a physical experience. Whatever it was, we find that it resulted in the change of his name: "Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel: for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and has prevailed." And He blessed him there. We find a reference to this in Hosea 12: 4-5. There we find a little more explanation of it

T 52

Yea, he had power over the angel and prevailed: he wept, and made supplication unto him: he found him in Bethel and there he spake with us; even the Lord God of hosts; the Lord is his memorial. And so Jacob had power with God and Jacob God transformed into Israel. With all his faults, with all his wrong qualities, he had that in him which the ordinary person could not see but which God had put there, and God made him a successor in the line from Abraham, the line through which the chosen people came and through which the oracles of God were given. Now we'll continue with him next time.

T 52 (Second part)

history of Jacob, and we had mentioned Penueel just at the end of the hour. We noticed that at Shechem he buried <sup>all</sup> the false gods that any of his party had. There is no reason, of course, to think that he had ever shown any ownership or adoration of any false gods but up to this time he had not insisted on bringing his whole company in conformity as he did now. Then, of course, in the character of <sup>Jacob</sup> Joseph there is quite a picture of his terrific grief over Joseph. One must tremendously sympathize with him in his feeling of the death of Joseph and at the same time one must recognize this great partiality shown to Joseph and to Benjamin that while his love of Joseph was a fine characteristic, yet here was perhaps a flaw in it, his partiality as over against his other children. The latter part of his life it would seem as if he did a good bit of meditating upon the Word and upon God's will for him, because we find him having this definite revelation from God that he

T 52

is to go down to Egypt, not to fear, and then when he is down there we find in Genesis 48:15 that he looks back over his life and he finds all these experiences through which he has passed and he makes the statement, "The Lord has shepherded me." He says: "God, before whom my father Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long." The word used for "feed" there is the word " " the Hebrew "shepherd". The Lord is my shepherd. "Feed" is not an exact rendering, of course, of it. Shepherding has as a large element of it feeding but it means much more than that. It is caring for him, directing him, watching over him all his life, and then at the end of his life the Lord permitted him to give those prophecies in Chapter 49 and that is a very interesting chapter. If you want to take the book of Genesis for first year Hebrew and read it straight through you will find very few parts of it that are particularly difficult for the last semester of first year Hebrew, but when you come to another portion of the Bible it is much harder reading because there is less context. It jumps around and it has a larger vocabulary and this poetic language. It is quite difficult to interpret as he takes up each of the sons and then these very poetic ways describes the various things which are to happen to them in the future. Now the chapter is one which is one of the hardest things in the book of Genesis fully to understand and one of the reasons for difficulty in understanding chapter 49 is that here, as very frequently elsewhere in the Scripture we find that a prophecy is given without our being told about the fulfillment of it. There are various places in Jeremiah and Isaiah where some critical scholars say the prophet made a false prophecy. He declared that this is going to happen and it didn't happen and their knowledge that it didn't happen rests upon the fact we have no statement of its happening, but even if the Bible were strictly a human book it is hardly likely that Jeremiah would predict something that was to take place five years later or ten years later and then that after that time his book would be widely distributed and that they would include in the book passages which predicted things as certain to happen and then those things didn't happen at all. It would be too simple a thing just in selecting it or editing it simply to have left out those sections

T 52

if it were a purely human book. Now, of course, we do not believe it is a human book. We believe it is a divine book, but whether you take it as human or divine, in either case, it would not contain predictions by the prophet of something going to happen in his lifetime. ~~that happened~~, if it happened, before the book was actually distributed much and it would simply be included as a prediction and nothing more said. That is simply unthinkable in it as a human production and as a divine production we know, of course, the prophecy is given to the prophet for truth, and so from either viewpoint you would have to say that when Jeremiah or Isaiah declared that something is going to happen within the next few years, before his book was entirely written, or before it was distributed much, you can be quite sure that that event did happen, and so it is certainly sufficient evidence that the Lord does not always tell us about the fulfillment of predictions. When He tells us of a prophet's word, sometimes--in fact quite a number of times, the prophet declares that something is going to happen in the near future or in the distant future and it is not necessary for God's purpose in the Bible to give us the full explanation or the details on how that particular prediction was fulfilled. Now, we take up this prediction, this prophecy here, Genesis 41. You will find that there are a number of the predictions which it is very easy for us to see how they were fulfilled. We don't want to go into detail on this now, but rather belongs in the prophets course than in this course, but I just want to bring out just a few main principles of interpretation of it. There are quite a few of them, or several of them at least. It is very clear how they were fulfilled. Take verse 5. Simeon and Levi are brethren: instruments of cruelty are in their habitations. Why was that? He said that, of course, because of the way in which Simeon and Levi had treated the people of Shechem, had made this alliance with them and then had killed them, and Jacob was very incensed at them when they did it and said, "You arouse the enmity and hatred of all the land against us," and so here he gives his curse upon Simeon and Levi for that. He says, "O my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united: for in their anger they slew a man, and in their selfwill they digged down a wall. Cursed by their

T 52

anger, for it was fierce, and their wrath, for it was cruel:" Now up to this it is all general rebuke to Simeon and Levi. Then he says, "I will divide them in Jacob and scatter them in Israel," and it sounds like a punishment upon Simeon and Levi for the wicked deeds which have been done and the prophecy/fulfilled about both of them. How is it fulfilled about Simeon? The tribe of Simeon--  
 that  
 if you look on any map /: shows the tribal boundaries (I don't think any one of these has the tribal boundaries on it) but in the back of most Bibles you will find a map that shows the tribal boundaries as the tribes were distributed under Joshua and you will find that Simeon is way in the south. As you look through the history you don't find anything about events in the tribe of Simeon in the south and when the kingdom is divided Rehoboam has only the tribes of Judah and part of Benjamin in the south and Simeon is not mentioned there, while you are told that ten tribes are in the hands of Jeroboam, and so it is quite clear that the tribe of Simeon, though they had this territory, this borderland territory on the edge of the desert where there were Nomad tribes and danger from the Egyptians and the Persians, they did not stay there. The people drifted away from it and were scattered in Israel. I don't think there is any doubt historically whatever that that is what happened to Simeon. There was thus fulfilled in Palestine, in the time of the Israelites in Palestine, the prediction which he made here about Simeon, a prediction which was a punishment upon the nation for the actions of its ancestor upon the tribe. Well now, here is Levi, and you would expect the same thing to happen to Levi and it undoubtedly would have happened if it were not for the fact that in the wilderness when the people turned away from God and made the golden calf, the tribe of Levi stood with Moses and the tribe of Levi stood when Moses called, "Who is on the Lord's side?" they came to him and they stood with him and he used them as his representatives in carrying out the Lord's will in relation to the rest of them and then the tribe of Levi was given a special blessing and so on account of the fidelity and loyalty of the people to God they were given a blessing and thus no one

T 52

has any right to say that I am cursed for the wickedness of my ancestors. We are placed in difficult situations on account of their wickedness, yes, but if we are truly loyal to God the curse can be turned into a blessing, and that is what happened in the case of Levi, and so the tribe of Levi were told that God would set them apart for His own glory, would give them a special place with Himself, and instead of their being scattered as Simeon was by simply finding the place they were unsatisfactory to live in and drifting through the rest of the land, instead of that they were deliberately placed all through the land and they were given specific cities, and the Levites are given cities of their own all through the land and they are appointed God's representatives in the different sections of the land, and so the Levites are the people who got the message of God to the others all over the land and had a very special place in connection with the worship of God, but they were scattered and that which was a curse originally is thus literally fulfilled upon Simeon and upon Levi but in the case of Levi it is changed into a blessing instead of being a curse. Well, now after going through the tribes in order like that, the order of birth, after Simeon and Levi they come to Judah, and when they come to Judah here the statements given about Judah here certainly refer to two things. They refer to David, the son of Judah, who becomes a great king, and that, of course, does not come until long after this time, but it is here definitely predicted; and then, of course, the prophecy of Judah also, the prophecy of David, naturally includes the prophecy of David's greater son, and so it is purely a Messianic prophecy, a Messianic prophecy which includes David and the promise is to David as David's greater son. The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until He to whom it belongs shall come, and unto Him shall the gathering of the people be, until Christ Himself should come. The scepter came to Judah when David took it and the control, the leadership belonged in the House of David until the One came who truly possess<sup>es</sup> the leadership <sup>from it</sup> and/who shall never depart, and so here is a wonderful prediction of Judah and then he departs from the normal

T 52

order and Zebulun who you would think would be placed much later in the list is placed right next out of his normal order, and some think that that is done because of the fact that Christ, though born in the tribe of Judah and of the tribe of Judah, was brought up in the land of Zebulun. Now that may be rather of a jump. I don't think we should be dogmatic about it but it is interesting to note that they go through in normal order except for this one who is out of order in this way. At any rate we have here this definite predictions about Simeon, which we know how it was fulfilled, the definite predictions as to Levi, the definite predictions about Judah. I one time was Assistant Professor of Old Testament and the Professor of Old Testament had a man writing a thesis for him on the study of Genesis 49 and it happened that the Professor was out of town for a week and so the student came to me and asked if I would look it over and see if I could make any suggestions so it would be ready when the Professor returned to town. In other words, to satisfy the professor

T 53

get a general idea of it and help on minor points it is all right that you should do, but I was interested to see the direction in which the professor had led him in his interpretation of this chapter and the method which he had used for it. He went through these predictions, one after another, and he took the predictions and he tried to show that you couldn't find anything in history with most of them that showed how it has actually been fulfilled, and that the people who think they are still future have disagreements as to what these predictions about the different tribes mean; just how they are to be fulfilled we can't be sure, and therefore his conclusion was that prophecy, after all, is not a literal matter but a matter of presentation of great Spiritual truths and the purpose of the chapter simply is to show that God's blessing is to be upon the Church and that there is nothing specifically literal which we are to seek for in the interpretation of the chapter. Now, of course, that is a method which is found in certain circles of interpreting

T 53

prophecy, which tries to reduce practically all prophecy simply to a general matter of saying, God is a great God and gives great blessings and there are many enemies but God will deliver His Church from them and you can express the meaning of all prophecy in about six sentences that way, and it does away in most cases with any specific/<sup>literal</sup> meaning of prophecy. I think that is an utterly wrong approach toward interpretation of prophecy. If you are going to use that with prophecy you ought to use it with theology, too, as the modernists do, and if you are going to use it with theology ~~and~~ with prophecy, or with doctrine, you might as well give up the Bible and get your ideas themselves from observation and then do as so many, many preachers do, ~~ilook~~ look for a text upon which you can hang the idea you have in mind. I remember some years ago--maybe I have mentioned it to you--going to a great church where a great Christian preacher was preaching, a man who was a real gospel man but one who, at least in that instance, instead of studying the Word and saying, "What does the Word teach? Let's get my ideas from the Word and then go out and present them," went to the Word saying, "Here's something I want to get across. Where can I find a text to hang it on?" And so he gave a sermon on the power of saying "No" and it was a wonderful sermon and it really, really after hearing that sermon you would feel that it is mighty important when temptations come to you, if there is any difficulty or anything that would lead you astray, that it is very important for you, instead of going after it to stay on what you think is right and saying, "No, I will not follow it." I thought the sermon was very good but would have been much better if he had said, "I am going to give you a sermon on the power of saying "No" and left the Bible out of it. It was a good ethical sermon. I think if Fosdick had preached the sermon it would have been very helpful to his congregation, as I am sure <sup>was a</sup> many of his sermons on good ethical sermons have been, but this/sermon by a man who was a true believer in the gospel and ordinarily preached the gospel, and even so I don't think there was anything wrong with the sermon, I think it was a good sermon, but I think that actually the sermon would do more harm than good

T 53

because of the fact that he tied it up with a text that had no connection with it and that is doing despite to the Word of God. Here is the text which he used on it. It is in Judges 4, and in Judges 4 we read about--Sisera fled when Deborah and Barak defeated his forces and his army was annihilated and he fled and he fled down to the valley there and he came to the house of Jael, the wife of Heber and he came in there and she was afraid of him and so she pretended whatever he wanted and he said to her, "Stand in the door of the tent," (verse 20 tells us, of chapter 4)"and it shall be that when any man doth come and enquire of thee and say, 'Is there any man here?' thou shalt say, 'No.'"/ and then he gives this wonderful sermon on the power of saying "No." Well, the text is certainly a wicked man fleeing from the righteous/of God's people telling a woman to tell a lie in order to protect him from his just deserts, and to take a verse like that and upon those words, "Thou shalt say unto him, 'No', to beautiful exhortation to the power to say "No," --. The sermon was good, it would do good, but that sermon tied to this text would create in people's minds the inevitable impression if they read the context at all that the Bible is just a collection of words which you can take a few words out of anywhere and hang an idea upon them without any relation to context, and to my mind the spreading of faith in God's Word, that it isn't what we think that matters but what does God say is far more important than any ethical exhortation we may give, no matter how strongly we may give it, or even, I must say, the presentation of some great doctrinal matter that is clearly taught in the Word of God. If you present a doctrine that is as clearly taught in the Word of God, use for your starting point a text that teaches that doctrine. Don't take a text that teaches some other doctrine or that has no connection with that doctrine and then hang that doctrine on to it. You are destroying people's faith in the Word, and I think the same thing applies to prophecy. To take prophecies and to insist that the literal terms don't matter, that it is just <sup>great</sup> the Spiritual truths that you could know just as well if you didn't have any of these prophecies is a method according to which these prophecies might just

T 53

as well not be in the Bible at all. It is doing despite to the Word of God. There is much in the prophecies that we do not understand just as there is much in the doctrines that we do not fully understand. The Bible is an infinite book and it contains a great deal that we do not have the full facts or material to understand entirely. It contains many teachings that will be tremendously helpful in one period or another of the earth's history and when you get to that particular situation and you read that Scripture in the light of the situation you just see how it fits and applies to the situation and God gives you direction and leading and understanding from that passage which perhaps is hard for you to understand when you are/in a situation somewhat comparable to it. It is all of it valuable. It is all valuable for all Christians but sections of it are more helpful at one time than at another time, but every bit of it has a meaning and whatever meaning we can get we should stand on and when we can't understand what the particular meaning of a thing is we should say, "Well, here is a thing that I only <sup>not</sup> see this far into. I do not see further down into it. Perhaps I will later. Perhaps with further study of it. Perhaps it will be particularly helpful in some situation which I may come to later in life or which the Church may come into in some other generation, but it has a truth there, it has a meaning or it wouldn't be in the Bible. It isn't just a presentation of great spiritual truths that you can already get from somewhere else and don't need that portion. Every portion of the Scripture is there for a real purpose and has a definite meaning and in connection with this chapter here I personally am quite convinced that this chapter, 49 here, is dealing mostly with the history of the tribe in Palestine. My own impression is that while there may be some things in the chapter that deal with events today, while there may be some things in the chapter that deal with events that are still future, it is my personal belief that very little of chapter of the chapter falls into such categories as that. It is my personal opinion that Jacob here is telling his sons what is going to be the future of the tribes during the period between

the conquest of Palestine and the exile, that is, that most of it falls into that period, and when you get into the books of Kings and Samuel and Chronicles, and Judges, most of what you have there deals with the kingdom as a whole, or it deals particularly with God's relationship with the kings and with the kingdom and doesn't give us a great deal of specific history of the tribes in their particular local situation, though there must have been a great deal of that that occurred. There must have been all sorts of events there in which God was active and which were important in the history of the nation, which God did not include in the history that is given here, and it is my personal opinion that if we had lived, had been present there, during those years, those generations when the tribes were there in Palestine it would have been easy for us at point after point to say, "Just look how literally this particular prediction about Reuben or about Gad or Naphtali or Asher or some one of these is fulfilled. Just see how exactly we see here the fulfillment of that which was given." I think it had a great value for the people in that day, to see these situations and say, "Look here, what God predicted to our father Jacob we see now has come to pass. Should we not then trust this God who could predict the future in this way. Should we not study His Word then to gain other truth from it that is vital for us. Should we not know that what the prophets today are telling us as they speak in the Word of God is just as certain to be fulfilled as we see these things that are fulfilled around us which were predicted by the Lord through Jacob in those times long ago. I think it had a great value and a great purpose for the people during that period, and while there are parts of it which are specially interesting and especially valuable to us today, it is my opinion the main purpose in most of the chapter was for that period and that it had a very real purpose during those centuries, and personally I think that just as much as when Jeremiah said, "the king Jehoiakim is going to be cast out with the burial of an ass," and when we read that, Jeremiah said that and Jeremiah predicts during the reign of Jehoiakim and during the reign of his brother Zedekiah eleven years

T 53

later and after the death of Zedekiah, some time after that, the Book of Jeremiah is completed and as a whole is distributed, and in that book, to think that Jeremiah would have included in that book the prediction as that Jehoiakim would not be buried but would be cast outside the wall with the burial of an ass when it wasn't true and he received a beautiful state burial and was absolutely buried in the tombs of the kings is/unthinkable. We are nowhere told that anything bad happened at the death of Jehoiakim. We are just not told. We are simply told he died. That is all we are told. We are not told the details of it, but we do have Jeremiah's prediction four years before and then we have many other predictions made a few years later about Zedekiah, contained in the Book of Jeremiah, and either Jeremiah was a false prophet, and not only a false prophet but a pretty stupid man to include in his book definite predictions which everybody knew hadn't come to pass, either that is true, or else those specific predictions about Jehoikim were fulfilled, and if we have in that and other cases specific predictions made and we can be sure they were fulfilled even though the Bible doesn't tell us the details of this fulfillment, I think that certainly we are justified in taking the same attitude toward these various statements about the different tribes. They are given in poetic language. Doubtless you couldn't reconstruct the full situation in advance/<sup>from it</sup> but I feel that is the place you would see, there is Asher, there in Naphtali, there in Gad, there in Reuben, and the different tribes you have just exactly what our father Jacob said would come to pass. What a wonderful book this Bible is! And what a wonderful God who made these predictions and had them come to pass in that way. But certainly the great purpose of prediction is not to satisfy curiosity and to enable us to know just what is going to happen in different events, but a great purpose of it is to enable us/<sup>as the things happen</sup> to see added proof that God is indeed the God of the universe and that God has spoken in the past and that we should take heed to the words which God speaks now and which we find anywhere in His Word.

T 53

Now, let's go on to E. D was Jacob; E would be Joseph, and then we want a general outline of the material aspects of his life. Joseph was a boy in Palestine and the life as he moved up and down that hill country was substantially the same as that of his father and of his grandfather, Isaac, and then we all know how he was taken by his brothers and sold as a slave and he is carried down into Egypt and then there in Egypt you have him in Potipher's house as a slave, Potipher had purchased him, and then Potipher put him into the position of master over his house, steward of the house, and when Potipher is given a false idea of Joseph he casts him into prison and then Pharaoh takes him out of prison and exalts him to be the ruler of Egypt. That, of course, gives us a general outline of the material aspects of his life, a life with many changes in it, a life with all sorts of unusual circumstances in it. It must have seemed like a change as he looked back on it and thought of it. It very likely seemed like a dream. It is so different from anything in Egypt. When he was in prison, how strange it would seem to think that once he had been a ruler at Potipher's house, but it is interesting from the viewpoint of the material aspects of it, it is interesting that it brings us in contact with these various types of his situation. Doubtless in youth he had heard from his father stories about he had undoubtedly learned that way about Mesopotamia, ~~stories of~~ the system of land tenure there and then when the time came to put this into effect in Egypt he did so.

T 54

for a slave to be put in a position like this. Well, in our Egyptian records we have evidence that it was customary in the homes of the great nobles to do that very thing, to take a slave who seemed bright and intelligent and reliable leader and and make him/overseer over the rest. This was an actual position; head over the house was a regular position in the homes of the Egyptian nobles. We have evidence of that in their tombs and pictures of their lives and their dealings

T 54

with their people, and so we know that that is quite in line with the general Egyptian background of them, and then there are many details of his life in Egypt which are very different from the general situation in Palestine. Naturally there would be in the life of a settled community of the type of Egypt and a community which depended on the river rather than on rainfall and a community that has such great material prosperity, far beyond anything that Palestine ever had had, and so there, it is interesting to note many little details of the background and the source, as if some of them such comparatively small things as the fact that the men in the prison, when they had a dream, they were tremendously interested, wondering what the dreams meant. Well, you might say you find that often in any land, people wondering what dreams mean. That is true, but it is interesting that in Egypt you do have many records of instances where people had dreams and wondered what they meant. It was quite a common attitude in Egypt. Now in many other lands the attitude is to laugh at it. It sounds silly, to draw something from your dreams, but in Egypt they rather expected a dream to have a meaning, and so we find that the chief of the bakers and the chief of the butlers were troubled about their dreams and they wonder what they mean and doubtless the Egyptian, like all other people, had all sorts of dreams that came to them on account of what they had eaten the night before, or they hadn't had enough exercise, or something. But in this particular case we know the Lord had given them a dream for the purpose, in order to give an opportunity to set Joseph apart by enabling him to give the correct statement as to what would happen in the future to these two men. Now, as when the Pharaoh made Joseph head over the nation, we might say, "That's very strange. The Egyptians hated foreigners so. How very strange that they would take one and make him head over the whole nation, who was a foreigner like this." Well, it so happens this was not the only time this was done. We have some records of other pharaohs who did the very same thing, who took a foreigner whom they thought they could trust and who, of course, being a foreigner, was dependent on them. He couldn't in Egypt against them, if

T 54

he should want to do so, and so there various instances where a foreigner has thus been the Prime Minister of Egypt, and in fact that position of Prime Minister is one which you find quite commonly in Egypt with the as we generally call it, but it is more apt to be in later periods after this, which would perhaps be rather natural. Now, in Egypt there is a story, the story of the two brothers which is quite an interesting story and you will find in many books the statement that the Egyptian story of the two brothers is the origin of the Biblical story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife, and in books on archaeology, many books on archaeology or books on the relation of the Bible to archaeology, they will give you the first third or half of the story quoted and translated, and then as you read that quotation from this story you see how very similar to the story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife, and they say, "There's where the story of Joseph comes from, there is the origin of it," and of course you see the implication of that, that that never happened. It is just an Egyptian story which some Hebrew got hold of and he made up the story of Joseph out of it. Well, I think it would be much more helpful if they would print the story as a whole instead of just the first part of it. You'd get a truer idea of the story. Sometimes I have read the story to the class. The Egyptian flavoring is interesting even in translation, but I don't have a copy of it here this morning. I will just give you a brief summary of it. In the story there are two brothers and these two brothers lived in Egypt and one of them had a wife, there, and the younger brother works for the older brother, and the two of them go out and they work in the field and the older brother tells the younger brother what to do and the younger brother does it and the cattle talk to the younger brother and they tell him where the best pasture land is and he can understand the cattle so he is able to do many things for them, and he is very strong. He takes great big loads of grain and carries them on his shoulder. He is of wonderful service to his older brother, and then the story tells how one day they are out in the field and they need some more grain and, or there is something they need that is

T 54

in the house and the older brother says to the younger brother, "Go back to the house and get me this and bring it up," so he goes to the house, and when he gets there, the story tells how he finds his brother's wife there in the house and she sees him, and says to him, "Say!" she says, "you are very beautiful," and she says, "don't rush right out to the field," she says, "come here and lie with me and I will do all sorts of things for you. I'll make you pretty clothes to wear and everything if you will just do this," and he turns to her and he becomes as angry as a leopard and he says, "Why, you are like a mother to me and your husband is like a father to me, and should we do this wicked thing?" and he gives her quite a sound rebuke, and then he gets the thing and he goes out, and then she feels so disgusted about it that she takes and she tears her clothes, and she takes and she dirties up her face, and then she lies there weeping and the older brother comes home and he comes to the house and the lamps aren't lit and the dishes aren't washed and everything is confusion and he comes in and he wonders what is the matter and he finds his wife there weeping, and she has made herself sick, and he sees her there put her in this situation, and he says, "What is the matter?" and she says, "Your younger brother came in from the field and he saw me here and he wanted to lie with me," and she says, "I told him that it was awful to think of such a thing--wasn't I like a mother to him and you like a father," and she says, "He struck me" and she showed the blow on her face where she had hit herself, and she said, "He tore my garment, but I fought against him, and so he went off," and so the older brother becomes angry as the leopard and he immediately goes and he takes his sword and he stands behind the door and he is going to kill the younger brother as soon as he comes in and then the younger brother comes in and the cattle are ahead and he is leading the cattle and when the cattle get inside ahead of him, they see the brother standing behind the door so the cattle speak to the younger brother and they say, "Watch out. Don't come in here. Your brother is behind the door with a sword and he is going to kill you," and so he sees through

T. 54

the crack between the door there, he sees his brother's leg as he stands there and he turns around and he runs and the brother runs after him, and the story usually stops there; I mean the quotation stops there. Then they say: "What an exact similarity to the story of Joseph and Potipher's wife. How clear it is that this is the origin of the Biblical story." Now I think it is too bad that they don't tell the rest of the story because the rest of the story is so different in general tone from this. There are some strange, grotesque things in the story thus far but not one fiftieth as much as from this point on. The brother flees and the older brother comes up behind him and he is catching up with him and so the younger brother cries out to <sup>the</sup> God to protect him and immediately a great river springs up between them and there was this great river, and it is full of crocodiles, and so the older brother can't possibly swim across the river to get to the younger brother because of all the crocodiles in it, so he stays there until morning, and in the morning he makes out a way to get across and his younger brother has fled further and finally, eventually, the younger brother is killed and his heart is buried and a tree grows up from it and somebody eats the fruit of the tree and all sorts of <sup>and strange</sup> grotesque things happen and it finally ends up in the palace of the pharaoh with somebody eating some of the fruit, and as you read the rest of the story it seems like such a sharp, sudden change from this first part, which is after all in general a natural, human story similar to the events which have happened in every country all over the world at many times but with a few elements of the unusual and the grotesque in it, and then you get all this tremendous amount of the grotesque added to it afterwards. It is a story which is found in Egypt from a period quite a little after the time of Joseph. It is a folk story which was told among the people of Egypt. Now to think that out of this folk story in Egypt there, some Israelite coming in contact with that story, seeing the situation between the younger brother and the wife of the older brother, should take that

T 54

idea and then should make the story of Joseph in Egypt out of it, and thus you get the story of Joseph, and just take that out of the whole story, is--we won't say impossible, but I should say that it seems much more likely to think that what actually happened is that Joseph was there in Egypt, as the Bible tells us, and had exactly the experience that the Bible describes, and then that when Joseph became prime minister of Egypt, naturally people were interested in all the details they could get about his history and the commentators would tell about the little events that occurred during his life and the stories of events in his life would be spread by word of mouth through Egypt, and then, after this great prime minister of Egypt had died and had largely been forgotten, easily enough, because the Hyksos were driven out and there was a noble , but even without that, great men like that are forgotten in all lands, in a period of time, and yet stories about them often linger on, and this story, being spread about through Egypt, could easily become the center of a folk story into which these grotesque elements would be added and accretion given as it passed from mouth to mouth and eventually when all connection with Joseph was forgotten you would have this folk story circulated which had its start in this historical event. Now, it is altogether possible, of course, that the story of the two brothers had absolutely no connection with Joseph at all, but if it does it seems to me that this is a much more natural and reasonable explanation of it, that it is a folk story built upon an actual fact, than that this grotesque folk story gives the source from which this story of Joseph is build, for the story of Joseph is such an utterly different type of story than most of that story, even in this first section, with these elements of cattle talking to the younger brother. The Bible has the supernatural in it. God speaks to people . God performs great things, but the supernatural is always very economical-ly presented in the Bible. It has a definite purpose. It is connected with definite events in the plan of God. The Bible is not a story like Aesop's fables in which we find men who can talk to animals regularly and all that sort of fantastic

T 54

thing that weasily gets into folk stories. You have only two places in the Bible at all where animals speak, and in one of those it is very definitely stated that God opens dumb animal's mouth, and in the other case, of course, we know that Satan spoke through the serpent. The Bible is not that sort of a book. The Bible is a natural, safe history of events. That actually happened, including the occasional, wonderful, supernatural interventions of God in human life, very different from this folk story in Egypt. And so it is simply told as a fact in many books--here is the origin of the story of Joseph, this story in Egypt. To my mind it is much more reasonable to say, "Here is the probable explanation of the origin of this particular folk story in Egypt."

Now I just referred to the Hyksos a minute ago. We have already noticed that the Hyksos reigned in Egypt during the period between the middle kingdom and the new kingdom, that the Hyksos conquered Egypt on account of their new weapon of war, their secret weapon which gave them a tremendous advantage over the people that they fought against, their use of horse, and with that the small group of Hyksos was able to conquer <sup>the</sup> a far greater number of Egyptians. Then, as time went on and the Egyptians also got possession of horses and learned how to use them, the time came when they were able to drive the Hyksos out of the land, but they differ from the people of most other lands in that they did not put up monuments to celebrate the fact that they were driven out. They preferred to forget the fact they had ever been there. They were so ashamed of having ever been under foreign domination. And so <sup>in</sup> Egypt we do not have monuments to the expulsion of the Hyksos though we have a few places in which the pharaoh boasts of the fine things which he had done in reestablishing order after the Asiatics had been driven out, but the actual expulsion is not referred to in the great monuments, though in some of the tombs we have the nobles telling us the great events of their lives and describing how they took a valiant part in some of the battles driving the Hyksos out of the land, and so the facts about the Hyksos have come to light little by little as these

T 54

details have been gathered and while I wouldn't say we could be absolutely certain that it was the Hyksos kings that were in Egypt when Joseph came in, it seems very likely that it was. The Hyksos kings called themselves pharaohs, took over the Egyptian customs, pretended to be the great leaders of Egypt, but actually they were, of course, foreigners and they had little foreign groups supporting them, in those leading positions, and that, of course, would make it still more natural that Pharaoh would be happy to have Joseph and other Asiatics as the leaders of his kingdom and it would also explain why he caused the Israelites to go into the land of Goshen rather than to mix with the Egyptians, for he said every shepherd is an abomination.

T 55

Asia, and then naturally later on when the Hyksos were driven out, this great body of Israelites who had been the pests when the Hyksos came were now looked upon as a potential menace to the kingdom and the new king "who knew not Joseph", probably because he was a native Egyptian king and unrelated to the previous Hyksos kings who had so favored Joseph, he would look with suspicion upon the Hebrew people and desire to put them into a situation where they could not be a menace to this land. Now Professor Peake of the University of Liverpool, who was for about a month professor at Oxford before his death, in his book, EGYPT AND THE OLD TESTAMENT, went through the Old Testament and tried at every possible point to make out there was a mistake in the Bible, and he is particularly good at doing this in connection with Assyria because he is an Egyptologist and doesn't know so much about Assyria, so when he deals with Assyria and its relation to Egypt he waxes dogmatic and strong in pointing out how these statements are simply/wrong in the Bible, but when he comes to Egypt he knows Egyptology excellently, he is very well versed in the material and he always puts the "if", "and" and "buts" in every time he claims that there is some sort of a mistake in the Biblical account, and he will say, for instance,

T 55

in this story of Joseph, "Oh, it is easy to show how much of the background fits with Egypt. It is easy to show, for instance, that the house of, the position of head over the house was one which was actually found in the homes of the great nobles. It is easy to show that when Joseph<sup>went</sup> to Pharaoh before going he immediately said he shaved, and that that was the custom in Egypt, before going before Pharaoh, he would shave and bathe and do as Joseph did, on leaving the prison, even though Pharaoh was in haste to get him, he had to do this first, and that the ring that Pharaoh gave him and the special things were just what a pharaoh would give to one that he delighted to honor. He goes on and spends about ~~ea~~ pages noticing all these different things in background which just fit and he says, "Oh, it is easy to show all this from that, and this from that," and then he ends up, "but the fact we notice at the end is that after all there is nothing to prove it was in the Hyksos time. It might have been in some other period, and after all, it may have just been made up on Palestine. It might never have been in Egypt. And so he takes this very hostile attitude toward the Scripture, but it is interesting to note the admissions that are made by a man like that, and he makes many admissions of the possibility of the events, and, however, we do find a few places where he raises very serious difficulties. One of these I have mentioned to you before in connection with the earlier period of the history about the camels, where he insisted that there were no camels in Egypt till the later Persian empire and therefore that the Scriptural statement about Abraham having camels in Egypt simply show it was written by someone who didn't know much about Egypt, and of course that was a perfectly true statement when he wrote that in 1928, because science had not yet caught up with the Bible in that regard. An Encyclopedia Brittanica, 1930 edition, says that camels were never in Egypt until the later Persian period, 400 B. C. but we notice that we have proof now that camels were in Egypt at this time even though we didn't know it before and the Bible is accurate on that point. Now there are a number of points like that, on which

T 55

Peake makes statements that represent the knowledge that was available to him, the knowledge of Egyptology at this time. He would say, "Such a thing is unknown in Egypt, in the Bible suggested; therefore, the Bible is wrong," and in some of these cases we have since found the Bible was right. There are a few in which we do not yet have the evidence, and that is particularly true in connection with this time of Joseph. One thing that Peake makes a great deal of is the names of the people that Joseph was connected with in Egypt, the name that was given to Joseph and the name of his wife and of the priest whose daughter she was. He says these are types of names which are very common in Egypt several centuries later but which were unknown at this period, and therefore that shows that the story is not genuine. Well, of course, the difficulty is that from this particular period we don't have much information. If it is the Hyksos period we have very little in the way of monuments from it. We don't know what the type of names was in general, except the names of the two pharaohs, and therefore it is pretty hard to be sure that these types of names were in use there. He makes a great deal of his argument but I don't think it is really a very strong argument. It is an argument from a place where we don't have much evidence, and I feel sure that we will get evidence to show that such names were used at that early period. He makes much of the fact that Pharaoh married Joseph to the daughter of the priest of the sun god, and he says the later pharaohs, when they tell about the Hyksos they say that they were men who ruled in ignorance of Ra, the sun god. Well, now, he says if the Hyksos were opposed to the sun god, why on earth would a Hyksos king marry his favorite, Joseph, to a daughter of the priest of the sun god. Well, after he says all that it sounds like a pretty sound argument, but then he goes on to make another admission, "Oh, of course it is true that several of the names of the Hyksos kings which they took as kings of Egypt include the name of the sun god as one of their own, the pharaoh to whom the sun god has given,"

T 55

or something like that, but then after all they were just aping old Egyptian custom on that so it doesn't prove anything, but it seems to me the confession which he makes there destroys the whole force of that argument. The fact that the later pharaohs said that these kings, the Hyksos kings ruled in ignorance of Ra doesn't mean that the Hyksos kings didn't try to conciliate the followers of Ra when they were there, and might very well have taken the high priest as the high priest of Ra there and to have married his daughter, the daughter of one of the great old Egyptian families from before the time when the Hyksos came to his favorite, in order to take this young upstart who came from Asia and married him into one of the old Egyptian families, and at the same time to show a measure of favor to the old Egyptian family and thus win its loyalties to the new king instead of having him conspire against him. It is just the sort of thing you 'd expect him to do and so we have much of historical background in the time of Joseph, much knowledge that fits in to the account as contained in the Bible even though Peake tries to push it aside with a wave of the hand. There's a little bit more that we ought perhaps to look at eleven o'clock, and then there are some difficulties he points out but I don't feel that they are very strong difficulties.

T 55 second part

at the time of Joseph in Egypt there are only two or three more points that we ought briefly to mention. One is we find that in the story of Joseph the famine was bad in the land of Palestine and they sent people down into Egypt to get supplies, and that is just what we would expect. Egypt would be far less apt to have famine than Palestine. Egypt was the land with the Nile river bringing a constant supply of water and constant provision of fertilization for the land and so famine in Egypt would be very unusual. It would be more or less common, every now and then in Palestine, and they might naturally go down

T 55

to Egypt to get supplies. However, some<sup>one</sup> would say, the story of Joseph doesn't merely say they went from Palestine to Egypt for supplies but it says there were seven years of famine in Egypt. Isn't that rather strange? That you would have a terrific famine like that in Egypt. Well it is strange. It's unusual, but it is not unique. We have an inscription which was found far south in Egypt which was published and copied as early as 1891, and inscription in hieroglyphic characters which tells about a famine there and describes a terrific famine which he says lasted for seven years. Now of course immediately it was suggested this was a reference to the famine in the Bible but this is dated about 2800 B. C. and consequently this is not the famine under Joseph. It does show, however, that there was occasionally such an event in Egypt. It is not something which is absolutely unique and without parallel in that land. Then we have an inscription at the time of \_\_\_\_\_ in which a man named \_\_\_\_\_ tells how he made provision there for a famine and he saved up material so that when the famine came he was able to care for the people of the city. This sounds as if he did for his city what Joseph did for Egypt. This is dated about 1500 B. C. or a little before. It is getting nearer Joseph's time. It is hardly, however, the famine to which Joseph relates. Yet there is nothing in this account to suggest that it is quite as bad a famine as that in Joseph's time, and in addition, coming after Joseph's time, after the terrific famine which they had undergone, it would be rather natural that they would watch out for the possibility of future famines and they would make provision for them. Mr. Shedd? (Student) He merely said that he collected corn and was watchful in time of sowing and when a famine arose lasting many years he distributed corn to the city each year of famine. Ordinarily one would think of a famine as something that would not be apt to come in as prosperous a land as Egypt. They would never expect it, but after having the terrific famine under Joseph it would be rather natural that for a short time afterwards, for perhaps a couple of centuries afterward, people would be more saving and would be preparing so that if a famine did come

T 55

they were ready, and in this case there was a famine of considerable extent for which this man was ready, so it is again not a proof of the story of the Bible and what Joseph did but an illustration of a similar, somewhat similar thing which happened somewhat later there in this town of El . I remember crossing the ocean in 1912, I believe it was, and we crossed the ocean and half the people on the boat used to walk the boat at night, night after night with their life preservers on all ready to be protected in case they should be plunged into the icy water. The reason for that was because three days before the Titanic had sunk and thousands of people on board had been drowned, and the result was all these people were terrified that their boat would sink and they were in readiness for it, when actually our boat went several miles south of its usual course to avoid icebergs. I went to bed and slept soundly each night because I felt the time to be nervous was just before a great disaster, not just after one, because after one you could be sure that not only would the people be extra careful but the ship men were extra careful, and they sailed south of the iceberg area and every precaution was taken. But you will find that special attention taken in order to keep from a repetition of it. So it seems to me that this is not a fifth of the story of Joseph but it is just what we might expect would happen after the time of Joseph. If this came from just before the time of Joseph, then it would seem rather strange that Pharaoh would have had/warning of the dream to do the same thing again. Mr.---? (Student) The first one, the one which is over a thousand years before the time of Joseph. He says that for seven years the Nile does not overflow. (Student) Well, you see the Nile comes from/far south of central Africa. It flows thousands of miles and there is very little rain ever in Egypt, but in that region in Africa the rainfall would vary to some extent. Usually, in the equatorial regions there, there would be a great deal of rain, but there might be a period of a year or a few years in which the rains would so decrease that the Nile would not overflow its bank and fertilize the country round about, so that that would be an

T 55

unusual event, but certainly not an impossible one. In other words, that would be a normal cause of a famine in the land. Of course, there might be famines from a plague of insects that would destroy the crops, or something like that. Now, in connection, then, with Joseph in Egypt, it seems very likely that it was during the time of the Hyksos that he was there. It fits about the general period of the Hyksos. The Bible doesn't give the date. Ussher's dates are strictly in the margins and not part of the text. The Bible does not tell you when it happened but as we fit it in with general events, it comes at approximately the time of the Hyksos. It is very probably that that is just when it was, and if that is when it was it is very natural that we do not have any inscription or monument put up to celebrate this man Joseph that we have discovered in Egypt. Now, of course, there might have been one put up and we just not have discovered it yet, or it might have been destroyed in some way. That is no proof that there was not a great ruler like Joseph in Egypt, but we know that the Egyptians destroyed most of the places left by the Hyksos, most of their monuments tried to forget the fact that they had been there, and so it is very natural that the precise details of this direction of Egypt under the Hyksos should have disappeared, even though stories of the events then could very easily have been passed on among the people and become folk stories, as I believe in the case of the story of the two brothers.

T 56

Scholars of the critical school regard this as the original of the story in Genesis. While they recognize that it is a theme which is not confined to Egyptians and Hebrews, the fact that the theme of the Biblical story is laid in Egypt leads them to think it extremely possible that there is a connection between the two. Conservative scholars, on the other hand, hold that in all probability there was more than one such scandal in Egypt, and account for the likeness by the similarity which would naturally present itself in such cases, holding that the Egyptian tale has no bearing on the credibility of that in Egypt, which is all right as far as

T 56

it goes, but Barton, when he wrote this, hadn't heard my lecture and so hadn't heard the explanation that I gave in the last hour and which I personally feel is extremely reasonable in the whole situation, that there is a connection between the two as the liberals say, but the connection is that the incident in the life of Joseph was caused this story to get started, and that that led to the story that got all these mythological accretions to it and developed into the folk story that was brought out among the people there. Now, we notice that we don't know the date of Joseph, but we think that it was in the Hyksos period. That is a very reasonable time to think that it was. In the time of Joseph there is mention of horses and horsemen, and later on in Exodus, much mention of it. In the time of Abraham we have no mention of horses in Egypt, and this fits with it being either in the time of the Hyksos or afterward, and then when we have the king of the oppression who knew not Joseph, you might have a king who knew not Joseph right in the same dynasty. Such things happen. I was amazed a few years ago when I was up in the mountains just after I graduated from college with a group of young college fellows and we got to talking and it happened that I had just taken an M. A. in American history so I had read quite a bit of American history of recent years before that, and talking with these fellows I happened to refer to E. H. Harriman who was president of the Union Pacific Railroad and of about a dozen other railroads and two or three steamship lines and who had such tremendous power in the United States that cartoons used to show a meeting of the Board of Directors of one of our great railroads, and then the cartoon would show ten people sitting around the table and every one of them would have E. H. Harriman's face on them, and President Theodore Roosevelt once called him an undesirable citizen and refused to receive him at the White House because of the great power which he had. He was one of the most powerful men in American history. His son, Averill Harriman, has been rather prominent in diplomatic circles recently but nothing like the prominence that his father had, but here it was only about ten or fifteen years after the death of this man

T 56

and these fellows, college men, men of intelligence, had never even heard the man's name, and when a man can have such tremendous power, one of the five or six most powerful men that ever lived in the United States, and within ten or fifteen years most people don't even know his name or anything about him, you can easily see how a king could arise who knew not Joseph, a man who was not interested in the events of his predecessor or who even disliked the people of the predecessor. We have it in Roman catholic history; we've noticed it in church history, when in the time of the later counter-reformation one of the popes, as soon as he became pope, had the nephews of his predecessor executed, men on whom the previous pope had lavished all sorts of honors and wealth. Such things occur, but it is not necessary to suppose such a thing occurred here. The most likely explanation is simply that the pharaoh of Joseph's time was indeed one of the Hyksos kings.

Now, one other matter we should mention here again very briefly. We have mentioned it before in the discussion of Jacob in Mesopotamia, was the change in the system of land ownership in Egypt, and Peake mentions that in his book and brushes it aside very nicely. He says, "It is true that in Egyptian inscriptions before the time of the Hyksos we find the statement that the land was owned by individuals, and we find definite evidence of that. Now it is true that in the time after the Hyksos we find evidence that Pharaoh owned all the land and distributed <sup>it</sup> and distributed/among the nobles and collected a fifth of the produce as rent for it. That is true," he says, and he says, "it was very ingenious of the Hebrew writer to attribute this to the cleverness of Joseph in buying up the land for Pharaoh, but," he says, "actually, of course, it had nothing to do with the change. The reason for the change is perfectly obvious. When the Egyptians drove the Hyksos out of Egypt, naturally, all land titles had been lost because the Hyksos had held everything, and so naturally everything fell into the hands of the Pharaohs, and he distributed them as he wanted to. Well that is--when a great scholar and a man with the name of Peake says a thing

T 56

like that, why naturally it was so, why you are tempted to say, "Well, that is the explanation." It reminds me, however, of what Robert Dick Wilson used to tell of the years when he studied the higher criticism in Germany, and in those years they weren't quite so sure of it as they have been in more recent years, and he mentioned how in those days when the professors would come to a point on which there was grave doubt, they would say, "Why, undoubtedly, this is the case. Undoubtedly it must have been this way," and when they would come to a conservative theory which they had no evidence to answer, they would just say, "Why, that's impossible. It couldn't possibly be that way," and just such dogmatic statements as that often carried more weight than the piling up of a great deal of real evidence. Now, in this case, he occasionally resorts to that method, and I think when a man uses strong, dogmatic language about anything it is a good thing to ask, "just what is your evidence?" Let's examine the facts and see what they are." Now he says, "It is perfectly obvious that this would have taken place." Well, is it perfectly obvious? When the Egyptians drove the Hyksos out of the land the desire of the Egyptians was to reestablish things as they had been before. Now, if it was a century or a century and a half that the Hyksos had been there, they might have forgotten how things were done before. They certainly did. Certainly in any such case many things are taken over from the conquerors after they are driven out without people realizing that they are taken over from them, but for their simply having driven the Hyksos out, to say, "Now we don't know whom the land belongs to so Pharaoh will keep it all," is certainly not natural. The people who had stood with Pharaoh in driving out the Hyksos would certainly have certainly have risen up in wrath against that, and they certainly would have said, "No, we want our private property. We want something as reward for what we have done. We want definite land." I don't think Pharaoh could have succeeded in putting across a scheme like that simply on the ground that he was the leader of the forces that had driven out the Hyksos who had taken everything away. Here was this system which had been established for many years in the land. People

T 56.

would have been accustomed to it, and Pharaoh could very easily slide into the position which the Hyksos pharaohs had had. But the Pharaoh simply said, "Well, now, we don't know who the land belongs to so I'll take it," it is conceivable some pharaohs would have thought of that scheme and tried to put it across, but very few rulers are quite able to carry that sort of thing through. If Peake could give us one or two instances of countries which have been conquered by an invader and when the invader was driven out the land was all simply held by the new ruler of the country instead of being distributed among the people again on some system of private property ownership, he would, if this was introduced in that connection he would have some evidence but I don't know of any such instances, and so when he says it is perfectly obvious, he is simply talking without evidence at all. He should say, "We have evidence of such events occurring elsewhere and therefore that may be the explanation," but as far as I know he has no such evidence, so I think we must be careful that in our presentation of the background of the Scripture we do not say things are perfectly obvious, for which we have no evidence. I don't think we advance the cause of the Scripture in that way. I think that we should give our evidence and be careful of our statements, but when we look at what somebody else has done, don't be surprised if he doesn't follow that plan, and if he is someone who is attacking the Scripture, the more positive he is about his statements the more reason there is to check up on them and make mighty sure that his statements are correct. Mr.---? (Student) Well, now I think perhaps that will do for the background of the general outline of the material aspects of the life of Joseph. Suppose we go on now to No. 2, the Spiritual history of Joseph, and I will not in this course take much time on this. We can draw many very valuable Spiritual lessons from Joseph's life, but most of them are regularly drawn in Sunday School classes and those which are not you can easily draw from your own study of these stories. It is very important, it is very worth doing, but there is no special need of our taking time in class here to go into it at much length. We will take it and try to confine ourselves to those matters which may be less clear

T 56

or on which there may be questions.

Certainly there is no doubt that Joseph is the most perfect character presented in the Old Testament. There is no record of anything in connection with him which we feel much reason to criticize. The only thing that one might criticize, perhaps, is his attitude as a child when he would dream that all his brothers and his parents would bow down to him and serve him and some think that that shows a rather conceited attitude on the part of the young man. Well, with the acts of favoritism his father showed for him it wouldn't be at all strange if he set into something of such an attitude but it certainly, if he ever had such an attitude, it didn't show itself in his treatment of his brothers when they came down to Egypt. He dealt with them very wisely, there. He didn't reveal himself to them until he had tested them to see whether their attitude had changed. He was careful in order not to do what would be dangerous for Egypt and dangerous for his family and for himself, and at the same time he was filled with love for them and forgiveness and with desire to breach the gap once he was sure that it could be safely bridged, and so he gave them these various tests just to see what their attitude would be when the other brother was taken, the other favorite son of his father, when Benjamin was held, was going to be held. What would they do? Would they take an attitude somewhat as they had taken in his case or would they show a change of mind, and he felt it safe to reveal himself to them after he had given them this reasonable test. Now Joseph is one of the greatest instances of trust in God we can find anywhere. Even in the terrific miseries that he came into through no fault of his own he trusted God and did not complain, and felt that God had a purpose in it and God would work good out of it. If one is truly the Lord's, things may go utterly different from that which we expect or plan, and the idea of prayer or faith that we can command God to do what we want Him to is an utterly false idea of faith, but the idea of faith that God knows and what is best/He wants us to work as His instruments to secure what is best and if things come utterly different from what we had expected and planned, nevertheless we can be sure that God's hand is in it and trust Him fully, is the attitude of

T 56

true faith, and that is the attitude which Joseph showed at point after point in his experience. Yes? (Student) It was part of God's revelation to show us that His goodness is not a result of works of righteousness that we have done but of His own choice, and of His own sovereign will. On the basis of the goodness of the two men Joseph was certainly a far finer character than Judah, but God chose Judah by His sovereign will to be the one through whom Messiah would come. Yes? (Student) a very good answer.

David was certainly the man after God's own heart and certainly God made great promises to David and God carried out the promises. That is entirely true, but it wasn't a matter of goodness of David; it was a matter that David was the one that God had chosen and then that David showed a repentant heart, an attitude of desire to serve God, but certainly when it comes to goodness, the real, downright, wholesome goodness, the evidence we have would make Joseph a far finer character than David, a far more wholesome character, and a far less selfish character, but God chose David as the one who would be the king and the one through whom the work would come. David, of course, was not a reprobate, he was one who turned back to the Lord when he sinned, he repented with his whole heart; he was a man after God's own heart, but it wasn't for works of righteousness David did that God blessed him. God selected David for His purpose and then David did show a proper attitude, though he turned from it many times in the course of his existence. Yes, Mr.---? (Student) the Scripture in such a way that the common gives either interpretation, and you should decide for yourself which of the interpretations you think is the true one before you read it. If we had nothing given except that first part of the story of Joseph we would indeed be at a loss to know which way to interpret. Was this a conceited young boy whose father put him ahead of all the rest and who therefore took it for granted that he was better than all of them and would probably rule over all of them and was so sure of it that he proceeded to have dreams which showed the attitude which was in his mind, or was he a very fine young man with a splendid attitude who

T 56

was not injured by the fact that his father had made such a favorite of him, out to whom God gave dreams, as He did in Egypt later on in his life, and God revealed certain things in his dreams and then Joseph told the dreams that the Lord had revealed to him and his father when he heard the dream wondered about it, that is, on the first interpretation you say, the father said, "Are your mother and I and your brothers going to bow down to you? What kind of a conceited idea are you getting?" On the other he said, "M, what a

T 57

You have to reach your conclusion on it through what you learn of Joseph's character from the rest of the Scripture, and I think what we find of the way he took it when he was sent down to Egypt can justify him taking the . Yes? (Student) No. Jacob is merely asking a question. He is not giving a dogmatic . Jacob says, when he sees the dream, he says, "Will thy mother and I and thy brothers bow down before thee?" Well, the grain was the son of the moon. You would think the moon would stand for the mother, wouldn't you? Well, what do most children do when their mother is dead and there is another wife living with the father? Don't they usually call her "Mother"? Under the situation when Leah was the wife of Jacob, the one who was buried with him in Hebron, wouldn't all the children refer to her as "Mother" and wouldn't he use it? He would certainly have the position of mother and the authority of mother so that I think that we could take it perfectly as referring to Leah, and yet we have no evidence that Leah was living, we have no evidence that she would bow down, and I think that it is a warning to us against feeling that every element in a parallel or a picture must have a full meaning. God didn't say, "Your father and your mother will bow down to you." God gave him a dream and in the dream he saw the heavenly bodies bowing down to him. Jacob guessed from it that this means that your father and your mother and your brothers will bow down. Well, if the Lord doesn't say that is what it means,

T 57

maybe it meant that the leaders of Egypt were going to bow down to him. The other leaders of Egypt and the lesser of Egypt. We are not told, but Jacob interpreted it that way and I think right, that the family was going to/put in a position where Joseph would have a great position of supremacy, and they did. The brothers bowed to him and had no idea who he was, but certainly Joseph never put himself in a place later on where his father would bow humbly before him. Some men would have done that sort of thing, but Joseph would never do such a thing. So it was not an instance of our being given exact full details but it is an instance of a revelation in advance of the fact that this one is to have a remarkable position in which people whom you would not ordinarily expect to bow to him will bow to him. Well, I think perhaps we will run on from Joseph—we could spend a long time studying this, as I say, with great profit, but it is one of the more obvious sections of the Scripture, one of the most—oh, one other thing I think I should stop just for a second on. Some people will say, "Joseph was a type of Christ in that he married a Gentile wife." Well, personally, I think that is rather absurd. I think that it is interesting that we find many striking parallels between the life of Joseph and the life of Christ. I think that is very interesting. I think that—but I am very skeptical as to how much right we would have to predict anything about the life of Christ because of events that occurred in the life of Joseph. We have—in the tabernacle we have types given us which God gave in advance in order to represent great truths and great matters, and thus we have types given and we have allegories. We have stories in the Old Testament taken as illustrations, as when Paul said that Hagar corresponds to Mt. Sinai which genders to bondage as Sarai corresponds to Jerusalem, the heavenly Jerusalem. It was taking and Old Testament story simply as an illustration, but the idea that the Old Testament stories are given us to teach us things about Christ because of superficial or accidental similarities, I think can get us into a rather unwholesome method of interpreting Scripture. I do not think that it is a dangerous enough method that anybody should go forth and feel that it is his duty to become an

T 57

opponent of that sort of thing and to fight those who do it. I think that most of those who use this sort of method are glorifying the Lord and trying to advance His cause and I think it is very wrong to think that you have a great duty in life to tear into and expose that sort of thing, but I do think that it is the sort of thing for us to avoid. I think it is a dangerous method of interpretation. I think that we should recognize there are types and symbols in the Scripture given for that purpose but when there is no statement ~~that~~ something is a type or a symbol, when Pharaoh the wicked king, the heathen king, told Joseph to marry the daughter of the priest of the worship of the sun, to say that that is a figure of Christ marrying a Gentile bride, that is going a little far, I think. Yes? (Student) written.

Why Genesis was/ Yes. A very good question. The Book of Genesis was written in order to show us the beginning of the important things with which we have to deal in the world. It shows how the world came into being, <sup>more particularly</sup> how sin came into the world and how God made His first promise of redemption, and then, of course, it shows us the preparation for the coming of Christ to the setting aside this family and dealing with them, and then it gives us illustrations of God's dealing with individuals, from which we can learn lessons as to how He may deal with us in a lesser way, illustrations of right and wrong in these people's lives. I think all of it is valuable as illustrations of that type and I think we can take stories from it to bring out definite truths, but to say that Joseph's marrying the daughter of the priest of Ra illustrates that Christ would have a Gentile bride is rather extreme. Yes? (Student) Joseph was an obedient servant of Pharaoh and he did what Pharaoh ordered him to do, and there is no statement in Scripture as to whether he brought her to the knowledge of the true God or not. I think most likely he did. (Student) That's right, and maybe if Joseph had done the same thing his descendants would have been like the descendants of Judah, instead of becoming the secondary group that Ephraim and Manasseh became--people of power and strength, but not the great center through which the knowledge went down. Maybe Joseph, wonderful man that he was, was so busy with handling the country that the bringing up of the children was largely in the hands of his wife,

T 57

who, even though she may have tried to bring them up as Joseph wanted her to, didn't have the background or the training for it. I think that Abraham's course was very wise and I think that any man today who marries a woman who is not a true Christian is doing very wickedly and very wrongly, but in that early time and under the circumstances/<sup>in</sup> which Joseph was placed, to say that it was a blot on his character that he carried out Pharaoh's command I think would be highly questionable—to say that it might have been a very fine thing if he had said "No. I bet your permission to send and get me a wife from Palestine" might have been a good thing. I think that it would have been very difficult under the circumstances. I think that we cannot draw lessons for us from everything these men did but I don't think it is a blot on Joseph at all. Mr.—? (Student)

About all we know about them is that they were a group which is not one race. They included people of various races. It was probably a small group, probably gathered together in Asia through some men who were very excellent in handling horses and perhaps somewhat on the outlaw type of men in Asia, a group that gradually gathered together and gathered considerable strength and then others came together with them and we note from the names of the Hyksos kings and and—the few names that we have of the Hyksos—that included some who were Semites, some who were Hurrians, some of different races. There was quite a mixture among them. They are not a race but a group which gathered together, probably a small group but which gained a great amount of power and proceeded to conquer quite a section along and then to conquer the whole of Egypt and to hold quite a bit of Asia as part of the empire. (Student) The Israelites were , and Pharaoh is dealing with the Israelites and suggesting to them that instead of showing them the special honor which you might expect of having them live at his court, that it would be better for them to give them a very splendid section of Egypt which would be away from the court, and to have them make visits to the court but not be right there all the time because the Egyptians had a hatred for shepherds and

T 57

the Israelites would find it easier to get along with the Egyptians if they weren't rubbing too closely with them all the time. (Student) The general attitude corresponds with the Asiatics. That was all. The Egyptians had more--they were more raising crops and that sort of thing, while in the more pastoral area they would be--of course, shepherds here doesn't mean just people who keep sheep. It means herdsmen, sheep and cattle. Mr.---? (Student) I wouldn't say it would prove that but it would look in that direction. Yes. It would fit in with the idea that they were Hyksos kings, although it is not impossible that a native Egyptian king having this favoritism to Joseph who did so much for him and in whom he had so much confidence, might do things for Joseph that would be displeasing to others of his own people. Such things happen. In many an empire we find--well, take Queen Mary, Queen of Scots--she was doing so much for that Italian secretary of hers and she would probably have done for his family if they had come over then, and of course that was one of the things that roused the people against her, and we find right today when President Truman takes one of his old cronies and puts him in a position that people don't think he is fitted for, we have considerable opposition roused by it. (Student) I think the attitude was mainly a matter of their being foreigners, rather than their being--this entered into it. They may have considered people of that type as rather inferior, while in the area from which the Israelites came they wouldn't be considered inferior. They

. Yes? (Student) water sheep were drinking from or not, but I know I hate to myself. I find it extremely disagreeable, but I wouldn't be surprised at all. I remember one time in Colorado I spent four hours in trying to find some decent water that wasn't all fowled up by sheep and finally I ran on to a man on horseback and I said to him, how miserable this water was that the sheep had fowled up and how I'd like to find some decent water and he said, "the horses don't like it either," so maybe the cattle don't. I don't know. I traced the stream for a mile and a half up the side of a hill till I got up to the place where it came right out of the ground and I thought

T 57

I would drink there and the sheep had been right up to within half an inch of it. (Student) In our own country, in the west, in the early days, there were wars between cattle men and sheep men, bitter fights, but there is a lot of background here we don't have to go into detail on and it is the sort of thing the Egyptian kings didn't put up on their monuments and explain about so we don't know yet about that. Well, let's go on to our next Roman numeral. I think this was III wasn't it? And so the next one is IV.

No. IV is deliverance from Egypt. We have a gap between Genesis and Exodus. We have a period there in which the history is not told us and that is quite in line with Egyptian history. In Egypt we have these big gaps between the high points in which we know comparatively little. The deliverance from Egypt. Perhaps we might call it the background of deliverance and speak a little bit of the general situation as it has come down to us from archaeological discovery. Exodus begins with a king who knew not Joseph and most likely this points to the fact that the Hyksos had been driven out in the meantime, perhaps some time before, perhaps fairly recently before. Exodus begins with a people who were oppressing the Israelites and the cruelty of Egypt is depicted on the monuments at point after point. We have already mentioned that in previous connections. The Israelites, we are told, built storehouses for Pharaoh and we find in the 18th and 19th dynasties great building operations carried on, storehouses, temples, palaces, all sorts of buildings built and a great deal of--so much was done they would have to have great numbers of people at it and it fits right in with the general situation of the 18th and 19th dynasties. Now, at Pithom--we find, I believe, in Exodus 1 that they built store cities for Pharaoh at Pithom and Raamses. Well, now there was a group of Egyptian kings called Rameses, and Rameses I reigned only a brief time so this more likely would seem to be at least in the time of Rameses II, which wasn't very long after Rameses I. It is in chapter 1, verse 11. "They built for Pharaoh treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses." (Student) Well, that looks to many as if it was 19th dynasty, when Rameses was king. I don't think it is conclusive proof because

T 57

the name of the city might have been changed later. We might say that Stuyvesant was the governor of New York. Actually, he was the governor of New Amsterdam, but the name was changed and yet we today should refer to it by the name by which we know it now. So this city of Raamses could have been a city built before. We have from the time of Raamses II a \_\_\_\_\_ on the building of the city of Raamses, a city which is on the border of Asia \_\_\_\_\_, a city which gets supplies and everything ready for raising an attack against Asia, which / \_\_\_\_\_ praises the king for his great exploits in building this city of Raamses.

T 58

So that this fits in with the idea that it might have been 19th dynasty even though a great many Bible scholars are quite convinced it must have been a century earlier--18th dynasty. We don't know which. We don't know when the Exodus was, but the general background of the new kingdom is certainly the time, and whether it was 18th or 19th we have no conclusive proof as yet. Now the general history of the 18th and 19th dynasties I have already given you. We mentioned Tothnes, Akhnaton, Tutankhamen, Rameses I, Rameses II and Merneptah. I don't think we will go into the 20th dynasty right here. I have it in my notes here but I think we will leave it and mention it later, the 20th dynasty. Perhaps one more thing, then, in connection with the background here, the matter of the story which we have in chapter 5 about the building of bricks without straw, to make the bricks without straw. Now you are all familiar with that story, surely, what was the reason why Pharaoh didn't give straw? Was it because he thought they could make better bricks without straw. Was it because he was running short of straw? Was it because he preferred, he thought they would be better bricks if they didn't have straw? What was the purpose? Mr.--, what do you think? (Student) No, they didn't fire bricks usually. Perhaps the lowest level, not much above that. They baked so well in the sun they didn't do that. Mr.--? (Student) Well, then why would Pharaoh not give them straw? (Student) Well,

T 58

that certainly seems to be the impression of the story here, that the reason Pharaoh didn't give them straw was because he wanted to make it harder for them, isn't it? Yes, Mr.—? (Student) Could make more without straw. (Student) But it would be easier to make more. Yes. And so then we find over in verse 18 we find that Pharaoh said, "Go, therefore, thou and work for there shall be no straw given you, yet shall ye deliver the tale (old English for the complete number) of bricks. Well, now, what does that verse mean? Doesn't that verse—yes—doesn't that verse say, "Despite the fact you haven't any straw, you have got to deliver just as many bricks as before"? Well now, if it was easier to make them without straw so that they could make more, that verse wouldn't hardly fit with that hypotheses, would it? I think that verse looks against that suggestion. Mr. Sheed? (Student) Well, now, it says—it just says, "Go, therefore, and work for there shall no straw be given you, yet ye shall deliver the tale of bricks." He doesn't say, "Yet you have to get the straw yourselves." Earlier, we find them going and getting straw. Here we don't have it told whether they did or not. Mr.—? (Student) Yes. That would seem, perhaps, to be a second stage of it. You have the first stage where he is giving them straw, and then you find in verse 7 he says, "You shall no more give the people straw to make bricks. Let them go and gather straw for themselves, and the number of bricks they make before you shall lay upon them. You shall not diminish anything thereof: for they are idle." Therefore they cried, saying, "Let us go and sacrifice to our God." And then the taskmaster said, "Thus says Pharaoh, 'I will not give you straw. Go get straw where you can find it; yet not ought of your work shall be diminished.'" So the people were scattered abroad gathering stubble instead of straw and then, in verse 16, the people complain, "There is no straw given thy servants and they say to us, 'Make bricks'. Behold your servants are beaten but the fault is in your own people." And he said, "You are idle. You are idle. Go therefore now, and work, for no straw shall be given you." Now it is possible that the <sup>third</sup> /stage they still had to go getting straw for themselves. That is possible. On the otherhand, it doesn't say so, and so whether the third stage

T 58

was continuing to get straw for themselves or whether the third stage was they had to make bricks without any straw, at any rate Pharaoh's purpose seems to have been to make it hard for them, because they were complaining and wanting it easier and they wanted to go off and sacrifice to God in the wilderness. He said, "It is because you are idle and discontented. I'm not going to make your work easier. I'm going to make it harder. Therefore, first he says, "No straw given you; go get your own straw." Now, in the last, he just says, "No straw given you, yet deliver the tale of bricks." Dr. \_\_\_\_\_, in one of his books

told of having visited a place which was thought to be this Pithom and he thought that he saw a place where you could see the bricks down at the bottom, that they were made with well-chopped straw and he could see the marks, the long pieces of straw in it. Then up in the middle layers he said you could see that stubble had been used and you could see the marks of the stubble in the clay and it was almost as if it had been engraved with engravers tools. And then he said, the top bricks, he said, were not as good bricks and had no straw in them at all. That he describes as having seen that. I have not found any other account in which anyone else speaks of having seen that same thing. The original statement about

it was made by \_\_\_\_\_ an English traveler in his book on Egypt after the war, by which he means the war of 1880, and in that book he says that he goes to the excavation where Navile, the Swiss archaeologist was excavating the city and he says that \_\_\_\_\_ was quite sure it was Pithom and he says that he was much impressed to notice that in the city of Pithom that some of the bricks were made without straw and he says that, especially in the corners of the building, and he says, "I do not remember to have seen bricks like that anywhere else in Egypt and Navile thought well enough of Stewart's statement that in the second edition of his own book on the excavation he quoted it in a footnote.

Miss---, you had a question? (Student) Oh, which name? Navile. Yes, Navile, the French-Swiss archaeologist who excavated a town he thought was Pithom. (Student) Kyle? Kyle. That was the Kyle who was president of Xenia Theological Seminary in St. Louis, which later was combined with Pittsburgh Seminary of the United

T 58

Presbyterian church and became Pittsburgh-Jenia Seminary in Pittsburgh. Carlisle makes this particular statement but I haven't seen it from anybody else, and Peet in his book is not familiar with the statements of Carlisle, but he is familiar with Navile's book and with the quotation from Stewart in the footnote of Navile's book and Peake says that the statement impresses him as most fantastic. Now anybody who is familiar with Egyptian customs could make such a statement he couldn't understand because he said that while the statement Peake made was that while straw had been used in the making of bricks in Egypt and elsewhere both in ancient and modern times, yet he says in Egypt its use is somewhat rarer. He says as a matter of fact the ~~must~~ must go here so well that it doesn't need straw to bank it. It doesn't need/banking. That is ~~Peet's~~ Peet's statement, and so Peet says, "Anyway," he says, "taking straw away from them wouldn't make the work any harder. It would make it easier." He agrees with Mr. Dickerson. He says it would make it easier, because he says that actually he says the Nile/ <sup>mud</sup> coheres perfectly and if you didn't have to put straw in it it would be that much easier, to make the brick. So, he says, as a piece of local color he says this is an utter failure, in the Bible, to make out that Pharaoh made it harder than it was by taking straw away from them. He said "That would just make it easier." So that is the statement Peake made. Now there are some who try to answer Peake's statement by saying, "Well, Peet is certainly talking very dogmatically without evidence when he says this because we do find straw used abundantly in Egypt. There are many places where we have evidence of the straw in the books and it was very frequently used." But that doesn't get at the basic problem here. If he thought that he was making it harder for them to make bricks, to not have the straw, here so well that you don't need it to bind it together, how would it make it any harder ?

And so we have to reject the suggestion that Mr. Dickerson has made and maybe we could consider one that Mr. Christopherson has made, and he suggested that perhaps there was a chemical reaction there and that suggestion was made by Dr. Atchison, Charles G. Atchison. I don't know whether he was a doctor or not; Mr., at least, Charles G. Atchison about 1904 and Atchison was a man whose name should be familiar

T 58

to a student of history of science but I am afraid many scientists today have never heard of him but he is one of the greatest scientists in American history. He is the man who invented carborundum. He was the first man that produced graphite artificially. He was the founder of <sup>the</sup> of chemistry, and his founding of <sup>the</sup> of chemistry came from this very matter of the bricks and the straw, because Atchison, having made the graphite artificidally the first time, desired to have strong clay vessels, pots to hold the material in his basement and he looked around and found that all the best vessels of this type in America were made of clay imported from Germany and when he examined the German clay to see what was different in the chemistry of it from American clay he found that it was exactly the same in its chemical constituency, and therefore he couldn't see why the German clay should be better, but it was better, and you could make much better vessels out of it and it was/easier to make and so Atchison tried to compare the two clays and he came to the conclusion that there was a difference between them which was produced by some other element being in them, and he tried many different elements and finally found a gallotannic acid and then, remembering this story in the Bible he took rye straw, and he said he had never been satisfied with the ordinary interpretation, that the straw was used for binding and he didn't see how the stubble would bind them together and they used stubble, and so he took rye straw and simply put it into water and made an extract of it and he mixed that with clay and got as good results as he had got with the gallotannic acid and consequently he called his new product, Egyptianized clay, after this account here in the Scripture. Now Egyptianized clay did not prove to be a great commercial success. They found other means of doing the same thing, but the principle which Atchison discovered in this Egyptianized clay, he went on to use later in further study and it was taken over from him by the General Electric Company and used by them to give us the electric lights which we have. We will say a word about that next time.

T 59

We were looking at the end of the hour at the experience of the Israelites in Egypt when Pharaoh tried to punish them for their effort to leave the country for a time by saying that they were lazy and must work harder, and therefore they would not be given any straw, and when they were given no straw they went through all the land of Egypt hunting for stubble and then they complained and he said they must make just as many bricks as before and would not be given any straw at all. Now some have interpreted this as meaning that in the end they had to make them with no straw whatever; others interpret it as meaning they had to go and look for their own straw, but that which is mentioned in the second stage of it is stubble, which many feel would hardly act as a binding material, that little stubble, bits of stubble they could pick up. How could that bind the bricks together? And anyway, if it was a matter of binding the bricks together you might have good bricks and you might have bad bricks, but the lack of straw, he doesn't think would make it any harder to make bricks, and so it was Atehison's discovery that the presence of the extract of straw in the clay would make the difference in the clay being easy to manipulate and easy to work, or hard to work. It was—that discovery which he made which was so helpful to him in his <sup>own</sup> scientific inventions and which also seemed to him and has seemed to others to be the true explanation of the matter of Pharaoh making their task more difficult by not giving them any straw, that the straw was not a binding material but produced a change in the size of the particles. Atehison discovered that that was what it did—it made the particles smaller, made them so small that they floated easily on the water, and he called these very small particles—he called it ~~deflocculate~~; later on the term ~~co~~ was substituted by others and is today used, but the term that Atehison used, of course, was ~~deflocculate~~, and then he tried to use the same process that he had used with the clay. he tried to use with graphite, and thus he made, he took the graphite and he mixed it with gallotannic acid or with straw in oil, and thus made the graphite soluble in oil, and thus he made a specially fine lubricant which he called Oildag. dag standing for deflocculated

T 59

Atchison graphite, and then he tried to do the same thing in water and he made that which he called aquadag, because it would dissolve in water, and oildag and aquadag are today very commonly used in many industrial uses and I believe also in connection with automobiles. I read an article about the life of Atchison by one of the, by the Vice President of the Atchison Industries Company in a chemical magazine which appeared about five years ago and in this article the writer told of a very interesting thing that happened a few years after Atchison had invented aquadag. He said that at that time all the electric lights were made of carbon, carbon filaments, and the carbon wore out rather quickly and also was quite expensive. There was quite a wastage of current in proportion to the amount of light, and at the General Electric laboratories they decided to try to use tungsten filaments, and in order to do this they had to take the tungsten metal and try to make very thin filaments out of it and so they annealed the tungsten, beating the rods of tungsten to make it smaller and smaller, to make a fairly small wire, but that wasn't small enough for the purpose. They wanted to make it a very thin wire so they tried to run it through a dye, through a diamond dye. There was a very small hole through this dye and they would pull this wire through, thus making the wire thinner and spreading it out more, in order to get Tungsten filaments that would be small enough to use for electric light purposes, and the trouble was that the wire would break a great deal of the time--either the wire would break or the diamonds would wear out. The diamonds wore out very quickly, and so it was not very practical, and they were trying to work out a way in which they could make electric lights with tungsten filaments, and then one of the engineers at the General Electric plant, who is now one of the leaders in that branch of the General Electric Company, heard of the letter of the Vice President of Atchison's industry about what happened. He was visiting his father in New York and his father took him to a meeting of the chemical society in New York and there at the meeting Mr. Atchison described his discovery in relation to aquadag and told, as this engineer describes it--Atchison told about the bricks and the straw in Egypt and

T 59

his discovery of deflocculated Acheson graphite and the various uses it had, and the General Electric man said that as soon as he finished the lecture he rushed up to see Mr. Acheson and asked him if he could see some of this unusually fine lubricant and he got a hold of a little of it from him and took it with him up to Schenectady and they found that it solved the problem of making tungsten filaments, that it was the lubricant that made it possible to run it through the diamond dies and to make the filament and consequently they were able to make electric lights with tungsten filaments, and I believe all electric lights used today, except perhaps for very specialized purposes, that all electric lights anywhere in the world now use tungsten filaments at a tremendous increase in efficiency of light and saving of cost and this worked out into this then, the result of Acheson's knowledge of the bricks and the straw in ancient Egypt, and so what Peake presented as a case where the Scripture was very clearly the imagination of somebody and didn't fit with Egyptian circumstances, really seems to have worked out very well, to have been helpful in American science and actually to have made the work more difficult by taking the straw away from them, just as the account said. Now I have given the details on this with a good bit of the direct quotations in the article in this book MODERN SCIENCE AND CHRISTIAN FAITH, in which I have a chapter on archaeology that gives the greater part of the relation of archaeology and the Bible that we deal with in this particular course, and I won't go further into this particular matter at length because further detail you can easily get from that if you desire.

Now we have been discussing then the background of the deliverance and we didn't go any further now into the history of the Egyptian kings. I have given you the high spots of the kings of this period. I didn't mention the 20th dynasty now. It is really past our present period, but just where the Exodus comes in this period is something that cannot be said. There are evidences pointing in various directions. There is not sufficient information to be certain, and therefore I think it extremely unwise to try to be dogmatic on the matter. I think we can say that whatever the Scripture says about it is true. There is no archaeological evidence which has been discovered to prove any Scriptural statement about the

T 59

exodus to be impossible or contrary to the actual evidence that we have found, but as to just where it fits into the archaeological material, just what part of what dynasty was the time of the exodus, there are various considerations pro and con about different suggested dates and since the pharaoh isn't named in the Bible we can't be sure exactly which one it was at present. I don't want to go into this problem at length right here because we cannot deal with the problem of the exodus without dealing with the problem of the conquest. Naturally, if we knew when the exodus was we would know when the conquest of Palestine was, and if we knew when the conquest was we would know approximately when the exodus was, and both of them are in this same position at present, that we do not—we know within a couple of centuries, of course—but we don't know exactly when either one of them took place and there are a number of people who have a very definite idea on it and twist all the evidence they can get a hold of to try to force it in with their particular idea of an exact date. Well, either one of these suggested dates may prove to be right but I think it best that we do not be dogmatic on that at present.

Now, B is the course of the oppression, and we will not linger more than a couple of minutes over this but just mention that the oppression in Egypt lasted over a period of a good many years, at least forty, because Moses was forty years old when he led the people out of Egypt, or when he began to lead them, to work with them in order to deliver them from Egypt, and the oppression was already on the way when Moses was born, so although Pharaoh made the attempt to kill all the Israelite boys, it is quite clear that he did not succeed, that there were many of them who grew to manhood during that period and it is also clear that the oppression lasted for a long time. The oppression was very severe and very disagreeable but in spite of it the people grew in number. It did not wipe them out or reduce them to weakness. Perhaps in this fifth chapter it reaches sort of a climax in Pharaoh's taking the straw away from them to make their lot as difficult as possible.

Now let's go on to C, Moses. Moses is the great figure, of course, of the last four books of the Pentateuch and one of the greatest figures of the Bible.

T 59

We find the story of his birth told in the second chapter of Exodus and his name is, Pharaoh's daughter calls his name Moses and she says, "because I drew him out of the water." It is another of the various cases which we find in the Scripture in which a person is given a name and the name is connected with a statement of something relevant to him and yet the name does not mean what the statement of the cause of the name says. That is to say, it isn't as if you wanted to say, "I will call this--here is a certain reason, therefore I take this reason and make a word of it and make a name." It seems to be rather that one takes a known name and then one uses that name because there is some reason why that name seems appropriate, either in the meaning of the name or in the sound of the word of the name. That is, there is often a pronoun word in the selection of the name. The name seems generally to have been selected from a store of usable names, rather than that they were invented for the purpose. Now in this particular case, the name Moses is a good Egyptian name. We have Egyptians named Moses and we have many Egyptians who have a name of which Moses is the last part of the name. We have the king Ramesses which many archaeologists today pronounce Ramoses. It is exactly the same as, the last part, as the name Moses. Then we have . . . . . Of course, our English word Moses, the ending es is a Greek ending. The Hebrew is simply " " and in the Egyptian kings it is the same way. The end is just " " and the Greek ending. Moses means, "given birth". The sun god has given birth, has brought forth a child, "Ramoses; Amen has brought forth a child, " moses". There are these common names in Egypt, and the princess gave the boy a name which was a name which you strike every now and then in Egypt but the name was quite appropriate because it was similar to the Hebrew word which would describe the contact which she had had with him. It may be the mother of the boy who suggests, who was brought to be his nursemaid who suggested to Pharaoh's daughter that this name would be a good name for him, a common/Egyptian name, a good name to give the boy, and it would tie up with the Hebrew word which described the way in which she had come in contact with the boy. Now, this boy was brought up then in the land of Egypt and we are

T 59

not told anything about his education, in Exodus, but over in Acts 7:20-22. Stephen tells us that Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, which, to a Bible believer is sufficient evidence that Moses was thoroughly trained, claiming to be a member of the royal family, trained for a high position in Egypt, trained in the knowledge of the Egyptians in how to do things, and so this man who was raised up to be the leader of the Egyptians was not a man without education.

T 60

of little education and no training, but that is extremely rare, and the people who have founded movements and established great organizations in the history of the church, the great majority of them have been men who have been thoroughly trained and prepared for the work which they have done, and the Methodist church is known for the fact that a great number of its workers have been men who think they were called to the work with comparatively little training, but the men who founded Methodism, the Wesleys, the organizers of it, the planners of it, the directors and leaders in it, were men with the highest training available in England at the time. The very name Methodist was given to these men at Oxford University where these men were recognized for their careful, hard, methodical study and ~~trades~~ ~~as~~ over against the many students who took things rather easy and were very light in their attitude toward the training they were getting. These men were methodical in their study, methodical in their devotions, methodical in their service to the Lord and the other students in derision called them "Methodists" and the word came to be applied to the organization for Christian work which the Wesley's founded which later developed into the denomination. Moses, here, then-- God, in His providence, brought it about that he should be trained and fitted for his work. There is, I think, an interesting parallel between Moses and Wesley that both of them were thoroughly trained and prepared and then when they had plenty of training they went out and used their training and tried to do a great

T 60

work for God and failed, and then each of them had to unite with the great tree which he had received, something which he learned in, under very humble circumstances or in humble connections. Somebody has said that Moses took forty years to learn to be somebody and forty years to learn to be nobody, in the wilderness. Well, that is only a half truth, and yet there is a very real truth in it, that the one whom God is going to use must be one who is well trained and qualified but one who realizes his own limitations, who realizes that apart from God he can accomplish nothing. Well, Moses, then, was thoroughly trained and we have anticipated a bit his attempted individual deliverance of the people. He was brought up in Pharaoh's household but feeling himself to be one of the Israelites he looked at his brethren bearing their burdens and he wanted to help them and when he saw an Egyptian smiting a Hebrew he looked this way and that and didn't see anybody interfering so he slew the Egyptian and then the next day he saw two Hebrews fighting together and he stepped up to them and he was going to solve it. Here was this man connected with the royal family who was protecting the Hebrews and now he was going to have them take a right attitude towards one another and tell them what they should do and how they should do it, but they refused to accept him as a deliverer and they said, "Who made you a prince and a judge over us? Do you intend to kill me as you killed the Egyptian?" And then Moses realized that he might be able to do what he wanted in relation to common people fairly securely but he was apt to come into collision with the royal authority ~~if~~ if this thing went out that he was using his authority this way and interfering and even taking human life and when Pharaoh heard of it and sought to punish Moses and Moses fled and went to the land of Midian, and so we have here the Hebrews refusing to accept the deliverance and it is a thing you will find. As you go out and try to help people, very often they won't want your help and you need God's instruction and God's leadership, not only to tell you what to do to help people but to tell you how to get the people to accept the help they need. Now if you are going to just wash your hands of them because they don't just immediately welcome you with open arms and thank you for what you are trying to do for them, you'd better not

T 60

have much anticipation of doing much in Christian work, because as a matter of fact the persons who have been most used of the Lord have very frequently had to make their way for a long time without very much recognition from those whom they were trying to help, but they were there to serve the Lord, not to serve the people, except as they served the Lord by serving the people. I am very much interested in what I heard Mr. Leland Wang say the first time I heard him speak. He was speaking one night at Dr. Laird's church and he told about the number of times in his early ministry when he, in his early ministry, had become discouraged and disheartened and he wanted to quit his ministry but he said he had taken over the ministry as a servant of the Lord and he said there was nobody he could resign to except the Lord because it was the Lord who put him into it and so he said he couldn't resign. He was doing it for the Lord and not for the people. I was very much impressed with the way that he expressed that and I think that Moses at this particular point didn't, wasn't working for the Lord. He was working for the people, trying to help them, and he found it pretty discouraging work, and he quit and left. You have to know you are working for the Lord so definitely that no matter what attitude people take you are going to keep right on, making sure, however, that you are doing it the way the Lord wants you to. Well, now Moses fled into Midian and Moses had forty years there in Midian and the statement that he had to learn to be nothing in forty years as he had learned to be something in forty years is only a half truth because it is true that in his attitude he had learned to be something in the wrong way in the first forty years. He had learned to feel himself superior to others, to think of himself as one connected with the royal family who could simply go out and tell people what to do and they would have to do it and that was wrong and he had to get over it, and he had to get that experience of forty years of humility and isolation in the desert which brought him down to the point where he really was skeptical of his ability to accomplish anything, where he developed a great humility, where he could say in all truthfulness that he was the meekest of all living men in his and it is the

T 60

attitude which was characteristic of him. He became meek and humble as one needs this attitude of learning to be nothing if one is to be successful in the Lord's service. If one can be satisfied with knowing that he really is nothing, no matter what people say about him, it saves him an awful lot of worry, because as long as you think that—if you put Moses up here and somebody who is <sup>absolutely useless</sup> / down here, as long as you think you are a very great man and belong up here, why if somebody puts you down here, you feel pretty terrible, and if somebody puts you up here you feel pretty elated and you are so much concerned between the people who put you down here and the people who put you up here that it detracts from your effectiveness and <sup>your</sup> attention you can give to your work, but once you realize you are really down here and that you are nothing except as God uses you, then you don't care what people think because you know whatever value they give you is more than you really deserve. It is only the grace of God that makes you anything and so Moses had to learn this lesson but it was a lesson of attitude. As far as training and ability is concerned it is not true that the first forty years were learning to be something and the last forty years learning to be nothing. From that viewpoint, the whole eighty years was learning to be something, because God was training Moses during the entire eighty years for the work which He wanted him to do. If the first forty years Moses was learning the wisdom of the Egyptians, the principles of leadership and the understanding of writing, of literature, all sorts of very vital matters which he learned from the Egyptians, but a large part of the important work which Moses did; in fact, of the years of service which Moses put in actually in the great work which he accomplished for the Lord, nine tenths of them, I believe—at least a very large proportion of them, were spent, not in Egypt but in the wilderness, and Moses didn't go out into the wilderness as a city dweller who knew how to turn on the electric lights and ring for the elevator but didn't have much idea how to get along out on the . He went out there as a man who had lived there for forty years, as man who knew a great deal about how to get on in the wilderness, where would be the decent places

T 60

to camp, what would be the decent way to set up the camp, where you would look ordinarily for water, what you might expect there; there were a great many things about the wilderness that Moses learned during this forty years that were tremendously useful in his leadership of the people. God had given him few extremely different and diverse types of training and both of them were vital and essential in the work that Moses had to do for God thereafter, so in his attitude he learned to be something wrongly and had to correct it in the latter forty years, but in his actual training he was all the time securing training that was worth something in the Lord's service. Now we could easily think how Moses must have felt when he first got out there. At the end of the forty years there we know he had given up all thought of accomplishing anything for the Lord. He had settled down into being satisfied simply to live/his life and God had to take him by the scuff of the neck and bring him out and force him into the work that God wanted him to do and God doesn't ordinarily do that. Ordinarily if you are not ready to look for the job God wants you to have, ordinarily you are not worth enough to His Kingdom that He is going to go and take you like He did Moses. It is comparatively seldom that He does that, but in places of key men, absolutely necessary men, He does do that, as He did in the case of Moses, but I don't think Moses got to that attitude of mind immediately when he went out to the desert. He fled from Egypt but possibly he thought, "Oh, my. I ought to be helping my people.

Probably his very feeling of the wrong in giving the task that he had started was one of the things that was possibly stifling and forcing back in his mind, and that had put him in the position where at the end of the time he just didn't want to have anything to do with it, and he said to the Lord, "Send thou whom you will send, only let me stay here. It is probably one of the things that contributed to letting him get that way, was his forcing down the impulse within him, his first few years there, to step out and to serve the Lord and to try to do something when he couldn't see how to do it. Under those circumstances he knew that he couldn't accomplish anything to go back to Egypt. He figured that he would be killed immediately; there was nothing that he could accomplish,

T 60

and here he was out in the desert there confined in this humble life away from Egypt and how he must have felt. What a waste. All these years of training and preparation and now he can't do anything with it, and yet all the time he was being prepared and fitted for one of the greatest works that any man ever did. It isn't where you are or what degree you have that counts in the Lord's service, but it is what are you doing with the talents and abilities that the Lord has given you? It doesn't do you any good to sit back and look at someone else and say, "If I had his ability, think what I could accomplish. Some people have far more ability than others have, but the thing that is most needed is a thing that, unfortunately, is very rare. Most of us are thinking, "Now, if I get this degree, I am ready to do that kind of work. If I get this recognition, I am ready to do that. If I go through this particular thing, people will recommend me to this particular kind of work, and actually the thing that counts so much is not/ the degree that you have as the use you make of the opportunities for training, and if a person will think of his own needs and what he ought to have and what he can do to remedy it, there is no limit to what can be accomplished by any one of us in life, no matter where we are. I feel that probably every--well, perhaps we shouldn't say every, we'll say at least ninety-five per cent of the students in any school, including this one, could get twice as much value out of their work if instead of their objective being simply to get a good mark in the course or to get a degree, it was to fit themselves for the Lord's service effectively. I mean, not that you fit yourself by getting a degree but that you fit yourself by what you are doing today. What do you need today? What way is there in which you can improve yourself? Not, this other fellow has ability that I don't have, but what can I do to develop that particular ability? Not--I'm pretty good in this line and the other fellow isn't very good there, so I don't need to worry about this. I may be pretty good in comparison to him but am I much good in comparison to the needs of the work? You may be two steps ahead of him, but you need to go ahead more steps, if you are going to have something

T 60

that is worth while. Now, personally, I have always opposed as far as possible students taking on full time pastorates in Seminary because I have felt that it isn't enough to take the work and get it in your mind and then, like a sponge, and then put it on exam papers. The most important thing isn't memorizing a few things. It is thinking them through, meditating on them, making them a part of yourself, seeing their relevance to your life and to your work, and as you think through these various courses in relation to one another and in relation to your life's plans, and study through the problems that are raised in connection with them, then there is no limit to the value which you can get from your Seminary training. A person with a quick mind can absorb a great deal of the material, long enough to write it on an exam paper pretty well, and forget about it, and it is mighty hard for someone else to check on, whether he <sup>has</sup> really thought it through and gotten much good out of it or not, and as a matter of fact I am not sure that there is so much value in someone else checking on it, because after all, one trouble with our whole American educational system is that we have these temporary, immediate motives before us so much that when those temporary, immediate motives

T 61

the bulk of people simply stop and don't go any further, and the average minister thinks, "What shall I give for my sermon Sunday morning? What shall I give Sunday evening? What shall I give in the prayer meeting talk Wednesday? Now, that's finished, let's read the newspaper or let's go out in the garden," instead of thinking that he is still in training just as much as when he was in seminary and the important thing isn't what you are going to give in your sermon this week but what are you doing to improve yourself so that all your sermons five years from now will be many times better than your sermons now, and you will be far more effective. Moses, out in the wilderness there, was forced under the pressure of the circumstances to take ahold of the situation and to learn how to

T 61

handle it decently, and we noticed that when Moses went out there he was a man of initiative and energy and interest in trying to do something worth while, even though he was out there in the desert where there seemed to be no future for him, when he came to the land of Midian and came to this well, he saw these women who were trying to water their father's flock and having difficulty because the shepherds would drive them away and water their own sheep, and Moses was stirred with the injustice of the thing and he stepped up, and fortunately he didn't kill the shepherd as he had killed the Egyptian and start another feud, but he drove the Egyptians away and made it possible for them to have their fair turn at the use of the water and this of course, introduced him to the priest of Midian in a favorable way and so he called him to his home and Moses stayed there and he gave Moses Zipporah, his daughter, in marriage, and so Moses stayed there and then forty years go by, and then we have the call of Moses in chapter 3, and here we have that experience which God gives to a few key men at vital, crucial points in the progress of His Kingdom, but which He does not ordinarily give, because God expects most men, particularly in these days when we have His Word, to take the Word and study it and see what the need is and what there is that you can do to fulfill the need, and it is only in particular key instances that He grabs a man by the scuff of the neck as He did Moses and puts him into the place of necessity. Mr. Casner--?

(Student) Oh, you mean you want further information about Jethro? I do not see that in the particular context here we are given anything more about him, just called the priest of Midian, which would evidently mean not of any broad Midian, but a priest in the land of Midian, and later on, of course, we have Jethro coming to the people of Israel and being received by them in a way that suggests that he was considered pretty much as one with them, and so at that time they certainly considered him as a true believer and it would certainly as if, from that, you could say that at this time also he was a true believer in God. I think that that is something of ~~inferent~~ but I think a justifiable

T 61

inference. Of course you know the critical view, which is that these Midianites here believed in a queer sort of a desert god they called who would just go on a tear through the wilderness, a great volcanic god, and Moses got his god from him and that is the way the whole worship of Jehovah, from worship of him, but it does seem likely that he was a worshiper of the same God whom Moses served. Even though we don't believe that Moses got from him, we believe that he believed in God before he went there. Mr.—? (Student) Well, I don't know how old he was. He had grown daughters, and he was in the desert all right and shiek is the Arabic word for chieftan and he probably had some followers, so it is not as bad as it sounds, but—yes? (Student) Yes. I think that the Lord is interested in forcing us into a situation where we are ready to utilize every potentiality we can find to serving Him but as to whether we serve in this particular type of work or that particular type of work, or this particular place or that particular place, there are particular instances where it is very vital that a certain man be in this place, but in most instances a man who is truly consecrated to the Lord can do a wonderful work in any one of fifty places, and I think the Lord is more interested in developing us into a consecrated servant of His than He is in fitting us into the one particular niche. That is, in general, and I am speaking that more from observation. The Bible gives us, of course, mostly—the individual<sup>of</sup> whom it tells us a great deal are mostly key individuals who were vital for a particular forward step in the great work of the Lord. Of course, we recognize the Lord's providence is in everything and if we are truly anxious to serve the Lord and do our best to serve Him we can be sure that in the end we will be able to look back on it and see that every step was for the best, in accordance with His purposes. We can definitely do that, but the sort of a call that God gave Moses, where Moses absolutely didn't want to do this and God just forced him into it by a divine supernatural intervention, is something which is rare in our day. Now, we don't have Scripture saying that everyone can expect any such call. There is nothing

T 61

of that kind in it. There isn't any statement, it is true, they can't expect it but when you don't find it either way you have to gain something from your observation on that.

Now this call that God gave to Moses here, the Lord spent a lot of time arguing with Moses and Moses was worth arguing with. Most of us aren't, and we need not expect the Lord to take that much time . I don't think that He does it ordinarily. I talked with--a few years ago I knew of a man and a woman who went as missionaries to a section which had a rather bad climate, and they had--I knew of a second couple that went to that area, and then the second couple, the woman had trouble with her health in that area and they came back, and left the work, and then the first couple came back on furlough and I talked to the wife in the first couple and referred to the second couple, and she said, "Oh, she said, they didn't have a call to that particular country. That's the trouble. They went there without having been called to that particular country. If they had been called there they would have gotten along all right." I had the idea that before people went to that particular country in which it was so difficult for white people to survive, they ought to try to have certain tests made to see whether their health condition would fit in with that particular place, rather than spend a few thousand dollars going and then find they weren't fitted for it and come back, but she said, "No", she said, "the thing is, if they really have a call for that they will be all right and if they haven't they shouldn't go." Well, that was her attitude, and I was interested in the fact that she, herself the next time she went after a few years there found that her health failed and she came back and her husband was exceptionally well trained for the work in that particular place and anxious to continue there but he had to give it up altogether to stay in this country because her health absolutely shattered under the strain of a place to which she was not at all physically fitted. Now, I do not think that in our day God ordinarily leads a certain person to say, "This is the place." You hear a missionary speak about a certain place and "This is the place I should

T 61

serve. If you are going to decide on that sort of a basis, you should be sure you hear people from every place before you make your decision and then you should be mighty sure that you don't make it where the best speaker speaks, because that is not a fair method of making a decision, certainly, but I think that in our day that sort of a call is very unusual. The Lord has given us His Word and He has given us a world that needs the gospel and He wants us to see where we can serve Him and how we can serve Him most effectively. I heard someone say of business that if, that anybody who will do every day the things he knows he ought to do and do it just a little bit better than he was doing, by doing the things he knows perfectly well he ought to do but isn't doing, he will soon be head and shoulders above everybody around him, and I think the same thing is certainly true in Christian work, and many a person wishing the Lord would reach and pick him up and lead him out into some great thing, when just by taking hold of the situations and opportunities they have they they would very soon get into some great thing for the Lord. Now, in this case, Moses has shut up the call within him, the feeling of the need to serve his people and to serve the Lord; he's settled down into a satisfied life there, living off there quietly in the desert taking care of the sheep and the Lord reaches out and takes him by the scuff of the neck, and He does it by first appealing to his curiosity. He gives him a wonderful thing to see, that Moses can't understand. The angel of the Lord appears to him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush. Moses sees the bush burning with fire but the bush isn't consumed, and he says, "I'm going to turn aside and see what on earth is happening here, and God called to him out of the midst of the bush and said, "Moses, Moses," and he said, "Here am I." I don't think we can expect that God is going to call to us in a means like this but I do think that it is altogether right for us to see the means which God used to take a reluctant man to turn him around until he would become a servant of the Lord, and perhaps we can learn something from it that will be helpful to us in arguing with people. God didn't simply meet Moses and say, "What is the matter with you? You wicked man, you've turned your back on the Lord's service; you are way out here away from the people of God. You ought to be back here doing something. He did come pretty near to talking that way in the end of the

T 61

conversation, but in the beginning of the conversation He gave Moses something to interest him. He roused his curiosity. He roused his interest. He put him in a position where Moses, of his own volition, stepped out in that direction where he would be ready for witnessing, and certainly the man who uses sound common sense salesmanship principles in reaching people and getting their interest and attention will succeed far better in any type of Christian work than the one who comes into a head-on collision with everyone that he tries to reach for the Lord, and certainly that is what the Lord even did here--attracted Moses' curiosity, attracted his interest, and then He said, "Do not come here. Put off your shoes from your feet for the place whereon you are standing is holy ground," and so he impressed on Moses the importance of the situation. He gave Moses an idea with whom He had to deal here, that he was in this situation face to face with the Lord and Moses was now ready to hear the message, and then the Lord told him that he was going to bring the people out of Egypt and to give them blessings, and before He told Moses the part he was to have in the work, He told him of the great work that was going to be done and He impresses him with it and Moses doubtless was thinking, "My, isn't that wonderful and won't that be grand for the Lord to go in there to Egypt and bless the people and bring them out, and then He ended up, "Come. now, for I will send thee to Pharaoh," and the part that shocked Moses was at the end of the first part of the message, and Moses said, "Who am I that I should go to Pharaoh? I couldn't do this thing. It is just impossible. Just forget it. Get somebody else because I couldn't possibly do it." Dr. Douglas Johnson, who is the General Secretary of the British Inter-Varsity was telling about the work that he did in introducing it to many different British schools of all classes and types and I was greatly interested in his account of how just one or two individuals in a school, those people would become interested and some times it would take a long time before anything was developed but in case after case really vital work for the Lord was built up with one or two people and sometimes they seemingly very ineffective people, sometimes seemingly people

T 61

who you would think would never accomplish anything for the Lord, but he saw that these people who did something for the Lord took his statement, "It all depends on me," and realized that meek and worthless and futile as they might seem, yet they were the only apparent means there of doing something for the Lord in that godless place and then, though, is the second part of the sentence that made it worthwhile, "It all depends on me and I depend on God." And here is Moses. He says, "It depends on me. What can I do? Who am I, that I should go to Pharaoh and bring the children of Israel out?" and the Lord said, "Certainly I shall be with you," and so Moses, it would depend on, but Moses could depend on God and God can use the poorest servant if he is really surrendered to the Lord."

T 62

fully consecrated to the Lord, and so here Moses began raising all kinds of questions and Moses asked--first he said, "Who am I? What could I do?" And the Lord said, "I will be with you, and here is a sign, here is a token to you. When you have brought forth the people out of Egypt you shall serve God on this mountain." What kind of a sign was that to Moses? How would that encourage him to go down there? That was the sort of sign that would be useful later. It wasn't much help right now, it just put the idea in his head. Now you see; here's a prediction. When it is fulfilled you can be encouraged. You will come out with the people and you will serve God right here where you are now. Right here you will be able to say, "This is the place the Lord called me and here He has brought me out here with these people," but then Moses said, "I'll come to the people and say, 'the God of your fathers,' and they'll say, 'What's His name?'" and what shall I say to them?" And God said to Moses, and He said, "Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, has sent me, and I heard a wonderful sermon at a Y. M. C. A. conference in , California, when I was in college by a pastor of a great Congregational church in Berkeley in which he told how this really means, "I will be what I will be," and it shows the constant change--there is nothing fixed or static in the Christian religion, everything is moving and changing and consequently you don't need to stand by old forms and traditions but

T 62

go forward and ventuously into the future. " " . Well, now the English translation makes it a present and the Hebrew is an imperfect, but I don't think that the imperfect has to denote a change here. It can certainly denote a continuance, and it is not a static continuance, it is an active continuance. The name of God be, possibly the correct pronunciation may be " " , as the critics tend to pronounce it; we don't know what the pronunciation is, but-- what the true pronunciation is, because we do not have the vowels preserved, but that seems quite a reasonable guess as to what it might be, and I was interested in Prof. Montgomery who died last month, of the University of Pennsylvania, in hearing him give a theory as to the meaning of this divine name of the Lord, the one who causes things to happen. " " you knows to mean to become or to happen, and, of course, that is the one that is often thought to be the correct original form. The name of God is in the , the one who causes things to happen. In other words, He is the great God in back of all the great events of the universe. Well, now in this case he is the self-existent One, he is the One who is accomplishing things , the One who is bringing to pass His purposes, and so He says to him, "Just shalt thou say to the children of Israel, 'I AM hath sent me'" and we find that over in the New Testament Jesus Christ said to the people, "Before Abraham was I AM," and they immediately took up stones to stone Him, because they recognized that Jesus was there equating Himself with the One Who revealed Himself to Moses and was claiming to be the great God of the universe, and then God said to Moses, "You shall say that the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, Jehovah, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob hath sent me to you." " He names them, the fathers, to show the continuity. in despair in Egypt but the God Who brought them down there is going to bring them back, the God Who was with their fathers in Canaan is going to bring them back to Him, the God Who called Abraham out of Ur of the Chaldees is going to come to them and is going to bring them out into a land flowing with milk and honey, and so He gives Moses this command and this promise of empowering but after Moses' previous failure he is now pretty much afraid to go and

T 62

so he starts in making more and more excuses and how ready we are. We fail once and then we won't step any more in that direction. We say, "Let someone else do it. I just don't have that knack. I'm just not good for this," and the question is not "Do you have the knack?" The question is, "Can God give you the ability to do the thing that needs to be done?" and He can if you put yourself in His hands and then do your best to train yourself along the line that is needed.

T 62 (second part)

the call of Moses, which begins in chapter 3. At the time when God called Moses to the work which Moses had previously tried to take up in his own strength and made an utter failure. Now Moses was ready. The time was come. He was to be a great key figure in God's Kingdom and God was calling him for the specific work, but we find that now that Moses is ready and prepared he is now not anxious to do it. Previously when he wasn't ready he was anxious to do it. Now that he is prepared he is not anxious to do it. I think that corresponds to something in the experience of many of us. With no training and no special aptitude for a work, how many of us are ready to jump into it and think that we can do it better than the veterans who have been working in it for years and who know more about it than we could learn without taking many years of learning, but we are just ready to jump in and feel/that we could do it far better than they can. However, the same people who take this attitude of feeling they can do anything when they are not even prepared for it at all, after they have had some preparation and they are fifty times better equipped to do it than they were before, they begin to realize what it calls for, what is needed, for it, how many different things it requires to do it perfectly that they don't have, and then they go back and you have two problems in any kind of work. One is to keep the people that don't know anything about it from jumping in and wrecking everything with their hasty, illconsidered measures, and the other is to persuade the people who have the training to do it fairly decently to go ahead and do the thing they are capable of doing that they are trained to do. You have those two problems, and of course the difficulty is that in speaking to people, if you give a message adapted for one of

T 62

these two groups, the other one takes it as an excuse for them and goes further in the direction in which they are going. The person who is not ready needs to be told to prepare and get ready. The person who is fairly well ready needs to be told to get busy and use what he's got. You'll find so many people that don't want to go to school; they want to get right into their work—after all, why is the training needed? And many of them jump into the work and do good work for a little while and then soon just peter out and fizzle out and accomplish little with their life. An occasional one makes up the lack, while the ones who can/ be <sup>finally</sup> persuaded to get busy/and prepare themselves, when they have enough preparation to do the work as well as most are doing it, or better than most, are apt to feel their inadequacy so much that they want to go on and on and on, learning more and more and more instead of getting busy and using the thing they've got. It is one of the weaknesses of human nature. And here we find Moses holding back, and declining, and God gives him one argument after another. God in His great mercy doesn't turn Moses over to do what he wants and give him leanness of soul with it, as happens to so many. He insists and He keeps after him because here is a key point in God's work which God is determined to carry through. God, of course, could carry through all His work. He could make it all automatic. He could press a button and make <sup>whole</sup> the/world Christian. He could do it that way if He chose but that is not the way He chooses, and the way He has chosen to do it, the work suffers tremendously through the weakness and inefficiency and unwillingness of mankind, and yet if it was left to us it would just go all to pieces and God would not do that. At key points He intervenes with power, as He did with Moses here and He picked Moses up and against his will He made him become a great key worker in God's Kingdom. And so God has spoken to Moses and Moses has declined on one argument after another and God has insisted and God has told him what He is going to do. He is going to free the people from Egypt and enable Moses to lead them out against Pharaoh's will, and then in the beginning of verse 4, Moses says, "But they won't listen to me. They won't hearken to my voice. They'll say,

T 62

'The Lord hasn't appeared to you.' In order to do this great work I have to have some credentials. How could I do it? I have no credentials. Nobody will recognize me." Well, the Lord says, "I'll give you some credentials," and the first credential that He gave Moses is the power to perform a striking act, the power to do something that will make the people see that here is one who has power beyond any power that they have, will make them see that surely this power has proved that God is behind this man, and so He says to Moses, "What's in your hand?" and Moses says, "a rod", and he cast it on the ground, and he cast it on the ground and it became a serpent and Moses fled from before it. He fled from his own rod, when his rod became alive and a serpent, and then the Lord said to him, "Put forth thy hand and take it by the tail," and he put forth his hand and he caught it in the way that God showed him to do and immediately it became a rod in his hand. I think it is very interesting the way, the way verse 5 connects with verse 4. The Lord said, "Put forth thy hand and take it by the tail and he put forth his hand and caught it and it became a rod in his hand, that they may believe that the Lord God of their fathers, the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob hath appeared unto thee. Now that doesn't, as we read it in English, make good sense, does it? He put forth his hand and caught it and it became a rod in his hand that they may believe that the Lord hath appeared unto thee. It just doesn't make sense as it stands, and so it is another of those many cases where we have to interpret the scene from the words that are here and understand. The Lord says, "Put forth thy hand and take it by the tail", and Moses does what He says and the Lord continues speaking, "that they may believe that the Lord has appeared unto thee." If you interpret it that way, that the Lord was going right on and talking and in between it tells you what Moses has done, it makes good sense. It is just another instance of the fact that the Bible is not simply a combination of sounds out of which we can pick any few words and--here's something that makes perfect sense and is the Word of God to us. It is not that at all. The Bible is a Book of ideas. It is not the ideas that are inspired, it is the Words that are inspired, but by

T 62

that we mean that the words are adapted to convey the ideas, but it takes interpretation and study to learn what the ideas are which are conveyed by the words and we do not always get it at the first glance. In fact, often a brief summary glance may give you the wrong idea altogether of what it means and in this case simply to examine it closely and see what actually happened makes it perfectly clear. It is just at first sight that it isn't clear. And then the Lord gave him another sign. He put his hand in his bosom and when he took it out it was leprous, and he put it in again and he took it out and it was like the other, and the Lord said, "Now why should you worry? He said, "If they don't listen to the one sign they will believe the other sign, and if they won't listen to these two signs I am going to give you a third sign, so now surely you have sufficient evidence. They will accept you as the Lord's representative." So Moses thinks of another, and when you are deciding what to do it is mighty good to think of all the excuses you can think of. It is a lot better to think of them in advance than to wish you had thought of them later on, but when God is definitely speaking to you and showing you what He wants/<sup>you</sup>to do, you should know that He has an answer for your difficulty and for your problem, and you should trust Him, and if you are absolutely sure it is God who is speaking, then of course you can know that God will give you the answer later on, but if you are making a plan dealing with earthly people or earthly situations, you <sup>all</sup> to think of/the difficulties and all the excuses and all the problems you can ahead of time and get an answer to them as far as possible, rather than to wait until you get into the middle of a situation. Mr.—

(Student)

T 63

Why, no, I would say this, that God gave him these signs to convince the people and doubtless he could use them on those times when they would serve the purpose required. Undoubtedly God enabled him to use them whenever the people needed this particular sign. As to whether Moses could have used them, at another time when

T 63

they were not needed for that purpose, on that we have no evidence. That is a theoretic question which the Scripture doesn't answer one way or another. Now my guess would be that he could not, that God enabled him to do it at such times as it was needful. I wouldn't think this was saying that God was saying to Moses, "I am giving you supernatural power. You can turn a rod into a serpent. You can make your hand leprous and make it weel at will." I don't think He is saying that, but this is a matter of interpretation. If you differ from me, that is your purpose, but my interpretation of this is that God said to Moses, "Do these things here. Now see what I have enabled you to do. I will give you similar power at such times as it is needed for the work for which I have sent you." That's my interpretation of it. Now/<sup>that</sup> is purely interpretation. It is not so stated in the Word. If someone wants to build an argument that God gave Moses a supernatural power which he could use at any time he wanted to, well we'd have to investigate that and see whether there is evidence for it, but my expectation would be that the evidence would be insufficient to prove that, but certainly this doesn't mean that these things happened just at one time. It does mean that at the time when Moses spoke to the people and they wouldn't listen to him because they he thought he wasn't God's representative, at both times God enabled him to work these miracles because--the purpose of them is given, "that they may believe the Lord God of their fathers hath appeared unto thee." Now, of course, if Moses went before them and he said, "God has appeared to me and as proof of it I threw down my rod and it became a serpent and I put my hand in my bosom and it became leprous, and God did all that and thus He proved to me that he was speaking to me, there are some people who would say, "Well, if God did that/<sup>for</sup> you, then we know you are God's representative," but most people would say, "Let's see you do it now," and I think they ought to say it. If he gave that kind of a sign, he should be asked to do it now. Well, now, Moses now has another objection.

Moses says, "Oh, but God," he says, "I can't speak. I'm no speaker." I was talking to a man out in the Grand Canyon who is a naturalist there and every day

T 63

he'd have to speak to the people, telling them the story of the canyon and showing how all the evolutionary history of the earth is demonstrated in this great canyon in front of them, and giving them little tit-bits about the natural history of the canyon. He was a very interesting speaker and a very excellent speaker, and he would speak once or twice a day for half an hour to an hour in front of a different audience every day, and it is quite strenuous work and of course he varied his message a good bit, and then I was talking to him and he said to me, he said, "These other men here who are busy for the Government fixing up trails or supervising traffic or giving information or general seeing that law and orderliness are observed," he said, "They are always saying to me, 'Oh, you don't have anything to do. All you have to do is get up and talk. You have nothing at all to do. Your life is easy.'" He said, "I get so tired of them sometimes I think if one of them would just take it over for a day and give me a little bit of a rest it would do me so much good and I'd be so much better the next day, but," he said, "they say, 'Oh, you just have an easy life. You just get up and talk, but,'" he says, "once in a while I am laid up so I just can't do it and then I ask one of them, 'Will you speak for me?' and they say, 'Oh, I can't speak. I can't talk. I don't have the gift of speaking,'" and it just struck me that people that do not speak have no realization of what it takes out of one. There are people who can get up and talk all day and it takes nothing out of them but as a rule I don't think it does anything for any one else, either, but to speak effectively requires a concentration of all your being upon the job you are doing and I think in most cases it takes a tremendous lot out of the person who is doing it, but those who do not do it have no realization that it takes anything from one, on the one hand, and on the other hand the attitude of Moses, "Oh, I'm just not a speaker, that's all there is to it. But actually, speaking, of course, is something which some have a greater ability than others have for it, but everyone can triple or quadruple their effectiveness by proper training and proper effort. And so Moses here is simply giving the answer which so many a person gives. You ask somebody in your church. You

T 63

say, "I wish you would get up and give your testimony. I wish you would come with me to this meeting and say a few words." "Oh, I can't speak". Most of them will just simply refuse absolutely to speak, but if you keep after them and you urge them and finally you cajole them into doing it and they come and do it once or twice and find it isn't so bad, then after that they'll want to take the whole time. People get bored to death listening to them because they can't speak decently and they won't take the time to learn to try. They've gotten over their first fright. Now they feel that they can do it all right. So I got think Moses got over his first fright, because God stooped to his weakness here and provided him a spokesman, but in later times the evidence seems to be that Moses spoke right out himself and didn't wait very often for Aaron to come and be his spokesman, but in this particular situation now it is an objection which is raised and the Lord's first answer to it is, "You learn how to do it." Moses says, "I can't speak. I'm slow of speech and have a slow tongue." Well, the Lord says, "Who made man's mouth?" He says, "Haven't I made the mouth?" he says. "If I ask you to speak then can't I give you the power to speak? Can't I teach you how to speak? You go and train and learn and do what I want you to." "Now, therefore, go, and I will be with thy mouth and teach thee what thou shalt say," and Moses says, "Oh, Lord, send by the hand of him whom thou wilt send." In other words, "You send anybody you want to, but just don't bother with me. I just won't go." And now after all these objections have been given and God has answered every one of them, the Lord is angry. And the anger of the Lord is kindled against Moses--and praise God that His anger was kindled against Moses. I think most of us would simply have said, "Oh, well, if that is the way you feel, go ahead, I'll get somebody else," or "We'll let this job go. We've got plenty of other things to do. Why worry about this, if you feel that way?" That's what most of us would say. Most of us do say it repeatedly in our lives, but God, having a key situation here and a key man for it, didn't take that attitude. He kept on, and that is what we should do when we have a key situation, even if people don't want to do what we know they ought to do, and if they won't

T 63

give us the help and cooperation they should, we shouldn't simply fold our hands and close up our mouth and turn away and say, "All right, you go your own way." We should say, we are not serving them or trying to please them, we are serving the Lord and trying to please Him and if He wants the work done then we should go ahead and get the help we need even if people give all kinds of silly objections to it and even if we see if their sinful heart is opposed to doing that which they ought to do. So the Lord, instead of sullenly turning away as I fear most of us would do or angrily making an outburst against him which would make him angry and close the door on further cooperation, when His anger was kindled He did something practical. He said, "Isn't Aaron the Levite your brother? I know that he can speak well and he is coming to meet you and you speak to him and tell him what to say and I will be with your mouth and with his mouth, and I'll cut the work in half. You have the leading position. You have the responsibility. You have the leadership and the wisdom to use, but you have an instrument to help you do this thing you don't think you can do yourself. Aaron can come and be your spokesman, and he is your own brother and you have confidence in him and know he is a good speaker," so this thing is completely answered. And right here, perhaps, God didn't give this answer first, God gave this at the end, and that's often a very good thing to do with people. If you know somebody has a strong objection and if you know you have the perfect answer to your objection, it is often a very good thing to present things in such a way that they will bring up the objection and let them present it in the strongest possible way, let everything be based upon this, and then you give your answer. If you give the answer right away, then they'll immediately, well that's answered, here is another argument and here's another, but if you can bring into the position of real importance the thing that you know you have the answer to, then there is actually no way in which they can decently decline to go ahead and do the thing they should, and so God Moses in the position where Moses' final objection had been answered in an absolutely conclusive way and Moses went and returned to Jethro, his father-in-law and said, "Let me go<sup>and</sup> return to my brothers

T 63

in Egypt, and see if they are alive!" and Jethro said to Moses, "Go in peace", and so now he starts out, and the Lord has given Moses this definite message. "Go and return, for all the men are dead which sought thy life!" And so Moses takes his wife and his sons. Do you think Moses was just married that day? I was reading one commentary on this, <sup>few</sup> the/verses after this where it spoke of how Moses was getting married without having been circumcized, so the Lord made trouble for him, but it seems to me that that commentator was taking, as so many commentators do, a verse at a time and not looking at the situation at all, because here he takes his wife and his sons. Now, of course, maybe he had quadruplets, or <sup>at</sup> least twins, and they were all just one, but even then I don't think he was just getting married. The Lord-- then he took his wife and his sons and put them on an ass, and he returned to the land of Egypt. And here is another instance where we see that the chronology of the Scripture doesn't usually go right straight forward to say all of one thing and all of another and all together. He returns to Egypt, and then the next we know we find him on the way to Egypt, which, of course, is evidence that he returned to Egypt is a general statement of what he did, and then He goes ahead and tells details on the way. He returned to the land of Egypt and he took the rod of God in his hand. That of course is before he returned, he took it with him as he returned, and the Lord told him what to do and what to say to Pharaoh, and the Lord said, "You show all your wonders to Pharaoh, but I will harden his heart that he shall not let the people go." He said, "Don't you be worried if when you show these things to Pharaoh, Pharaoh turns you down, because," he says, "that is part of the plan. You are not to go down to Egypt and say, "Pharaoh, let the people go," and Pharaoh says, "All right, go ahead." That is not the plan. God is going to bring the people out of Egypt with a stretched out arm and they can't do this if Pharaoh just lets them go, so He says, "I will harden his heart that he shall not let the people go," and so when, he gives him the message that he shall let them go and sefve Him and if Pharaoh refuses, I will slay thy son, even thy first born. Did you have a question, Mr.---? (Student) Well, it is in the

T 63

It is in Asia, not so awfully far from Africa. It's near the wilderness country there, some comparatively small distance to the east of Egypt. And so he starts back towards Egypt, and then we have a very interesting incident, verse 24-28, one of those precious little bits of primitive tradition, that record for us early material that might otherwise have been lost, and that has been incorporated by the redactor into the story without their altogether realizing its significance, and consequently it preserves for us something of an understanding of the situation in those times, such as the compiler of the narrative didn't realize at all. We find here that it came to pass by the way in the inn, that God had met him and sought to kill him. Now why is this? Here is God, the God who is mentioned so repeatedly in the Bible and we get the impression elsewhere in the Bible that He is a great, powerful creator of the universe, but here we find that He isn't that at all. He is a deity of this local region who goes on a tear, evidently, and kills anyone who gets in his way, because here, it came to pass by the way in the inn that God met him and sought to kill him, and so Moses runs into this situation and from it we learn something of what sort of a God was actually, in the beginning, and so Moses took this primitive deity and transformed him into an exalted being that could form a foundation for the lofty religion that was found in the Old Testament, and of course no such passages were by the redactors and not included in the compilation but here is one that got into it and it just gives us an idea as to what they really thought of before the Hebrew prophets with their marvelous Spiritual creativeness developed the idea of one God who controlled the universe and who had high ethical ideals. We find of course no ethical ideals in this narrative here at all. He just meets a man on the way and tries to kill him and then Zipporah, his wife, takes a sharp stone and cuts off the foreskin of their son and casts it at his feet and says, "Surely a bloody husband art thou to me," so she—here is her husband and is about to kill him and she has to do something/and so she makes a sacrifice of the first thing she can lay her hands on and when sees the sacrifice he is appeased, so we read in verse 26, so he let him go

T 64

much light on the origin of " " or the origin of the idea of the early teaching about " " which before the idea was changed and transmuted and developed by those prophetic writers who invented a god who would be creator of all the universe and who would have high ethical principles instead of just trying to kill anybody he met by the way. Yes? (Student)

. You know, I suppose everybody here is familiar with the fact that in the Bible we have the word Eloi, which simply means God, and then we have the word which means , that is, it is in the plural; my Lord, literally, but it is used in the plural, as is used in the plural, but used for the one great God, and we simply translate it The Lord. Then, the name of God used most commonly--those are both titles, and that is a very deceptive thing about our English version, that it uses God in such a way that most people think of God as a name when it is a title, and it uses The Lord in a way that makes most people think it is a title when it is really the name. The name is , those four letters, and when the Jews came to those four letters in their reading they did not pronounce the sacred name of God lest they should take the name upon unclean lips. They did not pronounce the sacred name of God but they simply said The Lord or they said , and usually when they would come to that they would say, The Lord, and in our authorized version when it they put Lord in capitals. When it is the real word , they put it in small letters, capital L and small letters, in our English version, unless it says The Lord , and if it is that way, the Jews didn't say The Lord Lord, they would say God, the Lord God, and in that case our English version has GOD in capitals, so whenever in the Authorized Version you see either GOD or LORD in capitals you know that that means the name of God which is not pronounced by the Hebrews at all. The Septuagint, when it quotes these verses, uses , uses the Greek word which means The Lord, if it is translating this word , and so the New Testament simply quotes it the way the Jews pronounced it there. The Revised Version translates it as Jehovah, which

T 64

is taking the consonant \_\_\_\_\_ and the vowels of Adoni and putting it together, a very queer combination, taking the vowels of one word and the consonants of another and some have said, "We don't know how \_\_\_\_\_ was pronounced; all we know is that it wasn't pronounced Jehovah, and yet, after all, what's the difference? Jehovah is a combination of sounds representing this specifically and indicating a name. We don't know how they pronounced it. If we did, we couldn't pronounce it the way the ancient Hebrews did. Our mouths aren't formed the way theirs were. We couldn't possibly pronounce it exactly like they pronounced it. In fact, it is very difficult to pronounce the words from any other language exactly as the people of that language would pronounce them. And so if you use Jehovah and indicate this, you know what you are indicating, it is a name for God, it's purely a representation of it. It is not the real name, but it represents it and you know what it is, so I think there is much to be said for using Jehovah. However, it is customary to call it Lord this way and as long as you can see the version and see it capped \_\_\_\_\_ you know where you are. Now the reason I mention this is because Mr. St. Clair asked if it was Adoni, and of course we do call this Adoni and yet this is what Adoni really means, so it is hard to determine which it really means. That's why I \_\_\_\_\_ . It is the \_\_\_\_\_ . Now the critics call it " \_\_\_\_\_ " which may by the way it was pronounced. There is probably better evidence that it was pronounced that way than any other way. About twenty years ago they all decided it hadn't been \_\_\_\_\_ . It was \_\_\_\_\_ and for a period of about seven or eight years most every book would call it \_\_\_\_\_ and then they decided \_\_\_\_\_ wasn't right and they went back to \_\_\_\_\_ , which was used before, and so that is the way the critics refer to it and that may be the way it was pronounced. There is good reason to think it was. At the same time the word is used by the critics so much with all these associations of thinking of it as an early primitive deity or a thunder god of Mt. Sinai and all that sort of thing that to me the word suggests all that and I hate to use it, while Jehovah doesn't suggest any such

T 64

thing. Now I use the word advisedly here because I was presenting the idea of the origin of which the higher critics would hold. Here is this book by Addis, THE DOCUMENTS OF THE HEXATEUCH, Volume I, the oldest book of Hebrew history, in which he takes the J and E documents and separated them from the P documents, and puts them to run right along smoothly here, and here we have this in the J documents and here is a footnote. Here we have one of the oldest paragraphs in the hexateuch--Yawe tries to kill Moses. The reason for this does not lie in the fact that Moses had neglected to circumcize his son. Circumcision had not even been mentioned hitherto. Is that true--it has not even been mentioned hitherto? (Student) Not in the J document, that's right. Not even mentioned hitherto. He doesn't say the J document, but of course that is what he means. It has been in the P document, because we know if it is dealing with ceremony it must belong to the P document and therefore it couldn't be part of the J, so now you have found that it has never been mentioned before, in the J document, but he says, "Circumcision has not even been mentioned hitherto. Much less had the law of circumcision been imposed. The explanation seems to be that the Yahwe of the early Hebrews devours like the element of fire, not for moral reasons but by necessity of nature." Now think what that means. The Yahwe of the early Hebrews devours like the element of fire not for moral reasons but by necessity of nature. Now to say that in simply language you would say that he just goes on a tear and kills anybody that gets in his way. He is appeased by the blood of circumcision, and Zipporah calls Moses a bridegroom of blood; that is, a husband whose life she has saved by sacrificing the blood of her son. Thus, circumcision is regarded here as an offering of blood for the propitiation of Yahwe. Now that is an interpretation which Addis gives in his book here on the documents of the Hexateuch, of it, but I imagine there may be some of you who do not like this particular interpretation and if you don't there are two things you can do. One is, you can put it up on a shelf saying, "I don't know what the passage means. I am quite sure it doesn't mean that. I don't know what it means. I'm going to keep watching for light to

T 64

explain what the passage means." Now that is a possible thing to do, but you shouldn't just leave it on the shelf indefinitely. You should keep watching for it and trying to find an explanation, and don't keep too many passages on the shelf, but it is far better to do that than to jump to some interpretation and say, "This must be what it means. I am going to grab this and stand on that and interpret other things by it." But now we want to know, what does it mean? If it doesn't mean that. It came to pass by the way in the inn that Yahwe met him and sought to kill him. Now the word Yahwe, of course, is the critics representation of this .

If you say Jehovah met him, you have the way the Revised Version has, the important thing is that we realize it is the name of God which is used here, <sup>being, this</sup> that this/god-- call him Jehovah or Yahwe, that this god met him by the way and met him in the inn and sought to kill him. Well, what kind of a god is that? What does it mean, he seeks to kill him? Well, of course, in the most obvious sense of it it does sound like the one who just kills anybody in his way but I think we certainly are justified in saying that when it says he sought to kill him, it means that the Lord caused something to happen which was clear to Moses and to Zipporah that it was a threat to Moses' life and it came from God. Now was that some unusual, miraculous intervention? Was it some illness that came to Moses suddenly, which seemed to be the end of Moses? Exactly what form it took we don't know, but I don't think we have any difficulty in reaching the conclusion that this first verse must be interpreted in that way, that the Lord caused something to happen which was immediately and correctly interpreted by Moses and Zipporah as an indication that Moses' life was in serious danger. Well, if we take that then, as verse 24, we get away then from / <sup>the idea of</sup> the thunder god going on a tear and killing everybody in the way. We have a great marvelous good god of the universe who, for a great purpose of His own, causes Moses and Zipporah to feel that Moses' life is in tremendous danger at the hand of the Lord and naturally you would say right away, "If that is the case, there must be a reason." Well, maybe Moses' life is simply over. Moses had lived long enough. Everyone must go some time. ~~It is time~~ for Moses to go. The difficulty with that is, God has given

T 64

Moses a work to do. God has told Moses specifically this work is ahead, this work is for him to do. Therefore, we know that God is not simply taking his life because he now has ended his days. It is not Satan here who is causing trouble because the definitely Scripture/tells us the Lord sought to kill him. It is God's divine act for God's purpose. Well now there is no explanation given to us as to why it happened, but we find two things. We find that Zipporah seems to know why it happened because immediately she did something. Well, that doesn't say she knew why it happened, but she knew this. She either knew why it happened or she knew what the remedy was. If you see a person who has just been eating some stuff and you, and the person gets all white and upset and you decide they have food poisoning, you may immediately take soapy water and make them swallow it as quick as you can. You do that because you know that is the remedy for it. You cause them to get rid of the stuff that they have taken into their system before it poisons them. You know the remedy by the signs, but you are pretty apt to know the cause of it, that the cause of it is they have taken something in that needs to be put out. Now in this case, Zipporah knew what would cure this, because she immediately proceeded to do something, and it is a pretty good indication that Zipporah also knew why it had come. She knew what was wrong; she knew what to do to cure it. And furthermore, we find in verse 26, "so He let him go." God brought an end to this which appeared to mean that Moses' life was in danger of immediate extinction. God brought an end to it as soon as Zipporah did this, and so either, as the critics say, this appeased God and satisfied Him, or else this fulfilled the thing that God wanted, and so we have there the definite evidence, I think, that the reason for Moses' life being in danger is connected with circumcision and that the circumcising of the child was a thing that was desired and brought an end to it. Yes? (Student) It was something right on the spot, undoubtedly, but might it not be a sickness, might it not be a terrific seizure or something that ? Such things happen very rapidly. (Student) Of course that is a reasonable statement, that the woman never and the woman immediately performs that which is needed and she casts it at her husband's

T 64

feet and says, "Surely a bloody husband art thou to me," and so God lets him go and now the difficulty is over, perhaps the next minute, perhaps an hour later, but when it is over, then she says, "A bloody husband thou art," because of circumcision. She repeats it, what she has said right at the moment's time. She is repeatedly blaming Moses for the situation. Well now I looked—yes, Mr.—? (Student) I doubt it. I think if you will leave out the first phrase, the last one I think is undoubtedly correct. She objects to the circumcision. Else why did she say it? I think very evidently she objects to the circumcision. She didn't want it. She said, "No, we'll wait until the child is grown up and he can decide for himself. We're not going to do this now." And Moses gave in to her and they didn't do it, and now the Lord seeks to kill him, and Zipporah is in the situation—she's got to choose. Is she is going to keep Moses and keep her previous ideas, or is she going to give in to what Moses has been saying all along but not insisting on and is she going to give in, and immediately she doesn't wait for Moses to do it now, that it is, the Jewish interpretation says that circumcision must be performed by man. Now this says that she took a sharp stone and cut off the foreskin of her son. Now that couldn't do because that was against the law of circumcision. It is done by a man. Therefore, the Jewish interpretation says, when it says that she did it it means that she had Moses do it.

T 65

you do it. I give up my objection," but I don't think that was necessary. I don't think that there was question here of observing an exact, precise law there. She knows what the situation is. She is going to lose Moses because of her insistence upon her own ideas on this thing—or is she going to give in? And she takes the foreskin and she does this thing immediately, but she is not very happy about it. She says, "You are a bloody husband and we have to perform this bloody rite. We have to go into this gospel of the shambles in order to keep you alive," she says. She says, "All right, we'll do it, rather do that than lose you." Yes!

T 65

Well, the Lord is dealing here with Moses. Zipporah is involved, but she is not the primary individual. It doesn't say the Lord was pleased with Zipporah, <sup>attitude</sup> but it does say that the thing that the Lord was displeased with was now removed. The child has been circumcized. (Student) Yes. Well, we have these facts, and we want to try to construct an interpretation out of it that will give us the satisfactory interpretation. I think we agree that the critical interpretation is not satisfactory, but here it is not the question of what is satisfactory. I don't think we can question this, that the reason he sought to kill him was connected with the circumcision and that Zipporah knew what was needed and that when Zipporah circumcized the child, then the Lord removed this imminent danger of the moment. That much is certain, but the fact that Zipporah circumcized the child put an end to this present difficulty which Moses was in, and also I think we can go, taking not the first part but the second part of what Mr.--- said, I think we can definitely say, not that Zipporah was a godless woman---I don't think we can say that at all, but I think we can say that Zipporah didn't approved of having the child circumcized. She said, "This is a bloody rite. I don't like it, and especially on a poor little child like this," and she objected to it and she refused to do it and now Moses is in a situation, and Zipporah removed the thing that had been hazarding the success of Moses' work and even threatening Moses' life by herself plunging into the situation and cutting off the foreskin of her son, but when she does it, she gives in but not with very good grace. She throws it at Moses' feet and says, "You're a bloody husband." Yes? That's Aaron. That's right. He's brought along with Moses for awhile and now it goes back to Aaron. The thing would be that you could go along with Moses for awhile, then you could turn to Aaron, and you could come back to Moses, or you can go along with Moses right up to a <sup>thing</sup> /and then you can go back and tell how Aaron starts. I could say that I ~~started~~ to drive to California and you could describe all the events on the course of my trip until you got to Denver and then when you describe my leaving Denver to go further west, you could say, "Now, about the time that I left the east a cousin of mine started in to come by horseback from Los Angeles, to come eastward, and he was

T 65

hoping he would meet me somewhere on the way. Now that day after I left Denver, the two of us met on the road." He could do it that way, or he could say that I as I left—describe my leaving Philadelphia, then you could say that on the same day that I left for the west this cousin started from Los Angeles and he went as far as San Berdino that day. / "Now the next day I reached Pittsburgh," and tell about me in Pittsburgh and then go back and tell about him in in and some of those places and then go back and describe me going through Ohio. Either of the two ways. You couldn't go strictly chronologically or you would have to tell what I did at ten in the morning and what he did at 10:30 and what I did at eleven and what he did at 11:30 but you could take a day with him and a day with me and a day with him and a day with me or you could take me right straight through and then go back and take him. Now, of course, as it stands here you've carried Moses right up to the end of his trip. He's on the way approaching the end, and then you take Aaron and you go back to where Aaron started and have him come out to meet him. Now, of course, Gaddis simply says that the E story has Aaron in it and Aaron isn't mentioned in the J story--or in the E story. In fact he takes the name of Aaron out of the E story, but he combines / up with the section before it. Mr. Sit? (Student) It would seem so. These are our first references to Aaron. He says in verse 14, "Is not Aaron the Levite thy brother? I know that he can speak well." And then over here he mentions that the Lord said to Aaron, "Go into the wilderness to meet Moses," but we are not told anything about Aaron before this time. Of course, we know this. When Moses was / through the bulrushes all the other Hebrew children were not killed. If all the Hebrew children at that time were killed except Moses and that kept on the next four years, when Moses got to Egypt there would have been nobody under forty years of age, so very evidently the plan didn't work out to kill all of them, but he killed a good many of them. (Student) Oh, verse 27, yes. The mount of God seems to refer to the whole mountain<sup>ous</sup> area in Sinai. (Student) Probably five or six days, and Moses, of course, would go more slowly, with his wife and family. He may have been gone about the same length of time. (Student)

T 65

I don't know as we have anything. Later on it comes to be used a good bit of the area at Sinai where God appears to the people, but, of course, that usage couldn't go back to this time. Just what it would mean to Aaron then is hard to say. It's even possible that using it to Aaron here it might be a term for some mountain just outside of Egypt. It might not be that same area, which is called later mount of God. We don't know. That's another thought, but our present thought, and I'd like to deal with it, is this matter of what does this story mean about Moses and Zipporah? Does it mean that—is it a queer sort of tribal deity that just kills people in the way or is there a great teaching for it? Is there something that is part of the great plan of God. Now I picked up one commentary last night which made this statement; it said, "Moses had been married without being circumcized." Now, that was wrong, it said. According to the Jewish law a man should be circumcized before he was married. Now, here Zipporah knows that is what is wrong and therefore she circumcizes his son and that appeases the deity. Now that doesn't seem very reasonable. If the objection was in regard to Moses it would have to be he that was circumcized, surely, but if the thought is that, the objection is that Zipporah had declined to let Moses carry out what he wanted to do and circumcize the child, if Moses had said, "We want to circumcize this child," and Zipporah said, "No, I don't like that. I don't approve of it. I don't want it," and so Zipporah refused to circumcize the child and Moses gave in to his wife on this point and the child was not circumcized, and they lived in the wilderness and everything went along happily, but then the time came when God called Moses to do a great work for Him and He called him to Egypt to do this great work and it was vital that the one who was called to perform the great work of God should be one who was carrying out God's commands fully in his life and in his family, and consequently if Moses was going to be God's great leader to carry out His work, then the command

T 65

of circumcision as applied to his child must be performed and so here as they are on the way to do the great work for which God had called him, God intervenes in a way to make Zipporah feel that Moses' life is in serious danger and she immediately knows the reason why. The reason is because Moses has given in to her on this matter and has allowed the child to remain uncircumcized, and therefore Zipporah immediately, seeing the thing and she must decide between hanging on to her previous idea against circumcizing the child and doing the thing that Moses wanted and keeping Moses instead of losing him, she immediately circumcizes the child and He lets him go. The thing is done. Mr.—? (Student) She cut off the boy's foreskin and just threw it at Moses' feet, so she did it all very rapidly. She was trying to save Moses' life. (Student) to be the case, unless one of two things were true, unless as Addis suggests, she knew that this deity could be appeased by blood and this was the quickest way to get blood, or unless it was a matter that they had discussed before. It had been a bone of contention between them. She knew that Moses against his better judgment had given in to her on the matter and she realized immediately that Moses was doing a very dangerous thing in undertaking to carry on the Lord's work without fulfilling the Lord's commands, and it either Addis is right and she just does the quick thing to appease the god, or they had discussed it before sufficiently that she was fully informed of the situation but she simply held back from it and wouldn't do it, and now she did it, and God would not use Moses to the utmost until his commands had been fulfilled. Well, now I think we maybe will have to wait until eleven. I see there are several of you who have further questions and discussions. We'd better wait until eleven.

T 65 second part

Exodus 18, we read that as the Israelites were going through the wilderness some time after they had left Egypt, when Jethro, the priest of Midian, Moses' father-in-law

T 65

heard of all that God had done for Moses and for Israel, His people, and that the Lord had brought Israel out of Egypt, then Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, took Zipporah, Moses' wife, after he had sent her back, and her two sons, of which the name of the one was Gershom; for he said, "I have been an alien in a strange land," and the name of the other was Eliezer; for the God of my father, said he, was mine help, and delivered me from the sword of Pharaoh. And Jethro, Moses father in law, came with his sons and his wife unto Moses into the wilderness, where he encamped at the mount of God. Now, this says that Jethro came and brought with him Zipporah and Moses' sons after Moses had sent them back, and it mentions the two sons, Gershom and Eliezer. Which was the older of these two sons, Gershom or Eliezer? Mr.—? (Student) Is the oldest always mentioned first? Mr. Camburn is right, that there is a certain presumption, that since Gershom is mentioned first, he may be the oldest, but there is actually no proof of it. It might be the other way around. There is no proof. But there is a suggestion that maybe he is the oldest. Now let us assume, then, that Gershom is the oldest one. How many years older was Gershom than Eliezer, Mr. Oldham? (Student) Yes. They may have been twins for all we know, for we do not know whether they were twins or whether Gershom was twenty years older than Eliezer or whether he was one year older. We don't know anything about them. We just don't know, but we have the proof here that there were two sons, and these two sons and Zipporah had been sent back by Moses. Now, when had Moses set them back? We don't know anything about it. Therefore--the Lord has not told us whether Moses sent them back immediately after the circumcision, or whether it was later on in Egypt when things began to get rather hot and he thought it was better for them to get out of the country as things developed, or when it was. We do not know. There are many conjectures, since this is the first mention afterwards

T 65

of them. There is no mention in between and refers here to his having sent them back, that after the time when Zipporah <sup>had</sup> saved Moses' life. in this connection, as we saw before, they immediately had sent her and the children back, but that is only a conjecture. It is probably a very reasonable conjecture, but certainly not at all sure that it was right. Now in the passage we've been looking at, before they went back, we find that <sup>there in the inn</sup> the Lord met him and sought to kill him, and unless we take the critical idea that this means that God was just a

T 66

we must say that is the great God of love and goodness who there for a special purpose puts Moses in a situation where it appears that his death is imminent. Mr. Hoogstrate: (Student) What does it say about it? (Student) Well, that's different. I do not think we can properly interpret this, "sought to kill him" in the context. If you take, of course, the critical view, yes. This wild deity there that kills anybody that gets in his way would have killed Moses, too, if Zipporah hadn't thought of a way to appease, but if you take God as the great God of the universe who has called Moses and told him that he must go to Egypt and promised to do great works for him, then it becomes very evident that His seeking to kill him means that he put him in a situation where it was apparent to Zipporah and Moses that something must be done or he will be killed. Of course, that doesn't mean God intended ever to kill him. Everything that happens is part of God's will, part of God's plan. Mr. Wolfe? (Student) In the case of Isaac if the animal hadn't happened to get caught in the thicket, why poor Isaac would have been killed, but God knew, of course, before He told Abraham to go there that he would provide the animal. There is a close similarity between them. So I see no way to escape from the conclusion that if Moses is going

T 66

to fulfill God's work for which God has called him it is necessary that Moses fulfill God's commands, and not even his love to his wife must be sufficient to allow him to step aside from carrying out the commands that God has given and from showing in his life that righteousness which God desires by bestowing upon his child the sign of the covenant. Moses could be a true child of God without having done this. Moses could be a true child of God without having done this, he could be truly saved, but if he is going to be a real leader in God's Kingdom, if he is going to accomplish God's work, God wants him to carry out the commands which have been given to Abraham, that not only shall he himself receive the seal of the imputation of righteousness to him by faith but he shall also give it to his infant as a sign of his belief in God's promise that he shows His mercy unto thousands of generations of those that love him. And so here Moses evidently had given in to Zipporah's urging and had allowed her to bring up the children in accordance with her idea, but if

Moses is going to be a real leader for God he must carry out God's commands and he must circumcize the child as God has commanded. I do not see any other possible interpretation of this/<sup>incident</sup> here unless you take the critics interpretation. Now, if there is no further question on this--Mr. Casner? I don't quite . (Student) We are not told absolutely definitely but we are not told he didn't take a second wife and there is no reason why she could not be/<sup>one who could be</sup> spoken of that way, as an Ethiopian. We, of course, are again in a case where our information is not altogether full but I don't see any reason why we have to assume anything else. Mr. Cater? (Student) Other women? What do you mean, other women? (Student) Why, certainly, yes.

(Student) Well, that's not told us here. All that is told is that the circumcision had to be performed in order that Moses would be in a relationship to God in which he could properly carry out the Lord's will. It is not stated that Moses then sent Zipporah away. There are many who think that after this experience in which Moses' ministry was hazarded by the attitude which Zipporah took in this case, and the fact that even after she gave in she did it so reluctantly and so sullenly and said the statement that showed that she was giving in, she'd rather have Moses and ~~she~~ in

T 66

on this thing than lose Moses and stand by her belief on this matter, but she didn't like to do it. There are many who think that afterwards Moses sent her away, but there is no proof of it. It is entirely possible that she went on to Egypt with him and that in Egypt he decided to send her back. That is possible--I think less likely, but possible, but if the vital thing here was that Moses sent her away, we would have been told about it and we are not told about it, so that is not the vital thing. The vital thing is the circumcision. Mr. Sit? (Student) About the deliverance of the Israelites. That is referring to Moses' deliverance when Pharaoh sought to kill him after he killed the Egyptian, before he went into Midian. He delivered me from the sword of Pharaoh. That refers to--(student) We don't know. I don't see that it matters. The important thing is that she was resisting on this matter of circumcision and until she gave in Moses couldn't be fully used of God. In fact, he must be thrown on the scrap heap if the victory wasn't won on this point. Now, as to whether the fact was that one child had already been circumcized and she had said, "Well, you can have your way with one child but I am going to have mine with the other," and now she had to give in on the other child, or whether she circumcized both at this time, or whether she circumcized one and that the other would be circumcized later, I don't see that the Scripture has to go in to all those little details. The vital thing we are told is that on account of her refusal to carry out the rite of circumcision upon the child as God had commanded to Abraham, she was in danger of losing Moses and she gives in on the matter, and she circumcizes the child and she throws the foreskin at her husband's feet and she says, "A bloody husband art thou," but even though she does it unwillingly and with this attitude, nevertheless the thing has been done and God has accepted it as sufficient and then he lets him go. Now whether there were two children or one child involved in it doesn't affect the principal. It is just like the question regarding the New Testament where people try to find an error in the New Testament as to how many times did the cock crow before, after, before Peter had denied the Lord. He said, "Before the cock crows, thou shalt deny me," and in another one, "Before the cock crows twice thou shalt deny me thrice. Well now, the question is, did the cock crow once, twice or three

T 66

times. One gospel mentions one cock crowing, another mentions two cocks crowing, and as a matter of fact if somebody had been there in Jerusalem with a microphone he probably would have found hundreds of cocks crowing all over Jerusalem, and it didn't matter whether there was one cock crowing, or two cocks crew or ten cocks crew. The vital thing is that it isn't an individual cock crowing some time in the night from some disturbance that is important, what the Lord is saying is, "Before the time in the morning at which the cock crowing occurs, before that time, right tomorrow morning, the very earliest start of morning, when most people are still sleeping, before that time Peter will have denied him, and there would be hundreds of cocks crowing in different parts of Jerusalem and whether they would happen to hear one or two or three or, which would penetrate to that distance, it all depended how sharp the ears were of the people who were listening, and many people tried to prove that the Scripture is not verbally inspired because they find a contradiction between the gospels as to how many cocks crew. It is not the important thing how many cocks crew, it is a general method of stating an approximate period in the morning before which Peter will have done this, and in this connection the important thing is, is the matter of circumcision to be carried out as far as the children are concerned. Now whether it had been carried out <sup>on one</sup> before and now is completed, or whether it had been carried out on one before and now is carried out on both, whether it had been carried out on one before and the carrying out of it on one immediately was a giving in on the principle and then there would be no difficulty as far as going further is concerned, is a thing that the Scripture doesn't bother to go into. It reminds me of the time I was up in the Canadian rockies and I was traveling somewhere with a man I got acquainted with there who was a banker from Minneapolis and I happened to meet him in the hotel there one morning and he told me that he was trying to get them in the hotel up there, in the Canadian rockies, to cash a check for him and he was having some difficulty that they didn't think there was any proof he was a banker and they didn't know how they could trust his check and he wanted quite a sizable check cashed and they didn't know whether they would or not. It

T 66

looked as if they wouldn't, and then I happened to meet him a little later in the morning and he says, "My, I feel much better now. The lady agreed to cash my check." I said, "Well, you know, I am getting a little short of cash. I've got a notion to ask her to cash one for me," and he said, "Well," he said, "if it will do you any good you can tell them you know me but I don't think that would make any difference." Well the check I wanted cashed was probably about a twentieth the size of the one he got cashed, but I went down and I saw them and I asked them if they would cash it and, no, no, they didn't know me. There was no reason for cashing a check for me, and so on, and you could see they were very unwilling to do it, and then I did mention, I said, "I know a banker here from Minneapolis," I said, "Mr. So-and-so," "Oh," they said, "if he will sign your check we will cash it," right like that, so I went to see him and he was amazed, so he signed the check and then he said to me, "Well," he said, "I guess—he went with me, and he said, "Well, I guess you figured you had taken a chance on me for this much, one little more wouldn't matter," and they nodded, but they had ignored the principle. Once they had ignored the principle, what fell under the principle, it doesn't matter the precise amount, whether they trusted him for eleven hundred dollars or eleven hundred and fifty dollars wouldn't make much difference to them. The principle was , and I think in the Scripture if we have all the details told in all these matters we'd have two or three big encyclopedias, but the Lord is giving us the vital principles and often we have to decide what the principles are and we have to decide it not only by what are all the facts but what are the facts stressed, what are the facts given? What are the facts the Lord thinks are important enough to mention? Now the fact that Zipporah was sent away at some time or other, whether, as seems likely, right at this time, or whether later on, is not particularly important, and it isn't even mentioned here in the story, just incidentally mentioned when she is brought back that she had been sent away, but the vital thing here is that she has given in on this matter of circumcision and there may have been dozens of episodes that happened on the way to Egypt but the Holy Spirit this

T 66

one worth putting in the Book for the knowledge of all future ages, and why did He think this was important enough to put in for the knowledge of future ages unless it was that He wished people of all ages and all generations to realize that the man who is going to be greatly used of the Lord and to enter upon a big work for the Lord in any way comparable to the work which Moses entered upon should be one who carries out all the commands of the Lord and who doesn't let his own interpretation or his willingness to please his wife allow him to step aside from the carrying out of the full commands of God. If that isn't a reason for putting it in, I can't think of any other possible reason for putting the story in here on the part of the Holy Spirit. The only other reason I can think of why it should be here would be the reason that the critics say, that it just crept in and gives us an idea of what they really thought about Yahwe in these early days. Now, if there is no further matter on this—yes, Mr.—? (Student) Yes, that's right. The matter of acts and motives doesn't enter into this particular story. In God's final judgment of us, He will judge us by our motives, not by our motives, not by our overt acts. It is the motives that matter in God's final judgment, but in the preparation of a man to serve the Lord to the full it is not enough for him to have right motives in his heart. He must have the push and energy to carry out those motives, else he can't expect to be greatly used of the Lord. That certainly enters in to the man's life. Who was it I heard telling that a man came to Mr. Springer and—Mr. Springer of Colorado who was here not so long ago—and this man said, "Mr. Springer," he said, "I'm a Fundamentalist. If you question it, ask me what I think on some doctrines. Ask me a few questions." Well, Mr. Springer said, "Nobody has to ask me questions to find out whether I am a Fundamentalist." That is to say, "It isn't what creed you are willing to sign but it is what you proclaim and what you are standing for that determines whether you really believe in the gospel. A man may be a quiet believer out somewhere in the corner rarely witnessing for Christ and such a person may be saved and may be going to Heaven but a person that you should trust as a Christian leader isn't one who silently signs some creeds and then goes off and

T 66

preaches on the brotherhood of man and ways of bringing universal peace, but he is a man who believes in this enough to get up and stand for it and fight for it and try to win people, and even if Moses in his heart wanted to carry out the command of God, if he was going to be used of God as a great leader he must give his children the sign and seal of the covenant which he has himself as showing the imputation of the righteousness of God to him.

T 67

on the way to Egypt, and why put it in here unless it has a lesson for us? There may be things in the Scripture that we don't know what the lesson is, there may be matters that we can't see the practical importance of, well, let's put them on the shelf and let's keep thinking about them and let us recognize this, that God puts everything in the Scripture for a purpose. He means it convey a lesson, and perhaps we can see the lesson in it, perhaps it has been of particular importance for people of some other period, some other time, but if we can see what the lesson should be in a particular thing in the Scripture we should adopt it and stand on it, because that is why He puts it in the Scripture. It is not just to satisfy our curiosity.

Well, now he goes on after this, and tells about the experiences down there in Egypt, and instead of going through those now, our subject C being Moses here, and we'll say a few more words about Moses' character, / about Moses' life in general. We note the great steadfastness of Moses before Pharaoh. This man who hesitated about going into the work, who was so backward about allowing himself to become a leader for God, once he went into the work was absolutely steadfast and solid and stood without fear before the greatest monarch in the world at the time. His leadership of the people--he met with the people with all kinds of difficulties and troubles and questionings and complainings against him but he showed firmness and, at the same time, tactfulness. He shows clear thinking, he shows loyalty to God, he was used of the Lord to lead them as one of the greatest leaders in all

T 67

the history of the world. Now of course that was true of instance after instance. Then there is the meekness of Moses and we read in one place in the Scripture that Moses was the most meek of all men living and this is just a simple direct statement as to the character of Moses, the great humility which he had, the humility which he had learned during this period in the wilderness. A professor in McCormick Seminary, I believe it was, gave a paper at a meeting of the American Oriental Society in Chicago not so long ago which was written up in Time magazine in which he said that with a slight change in the Hebrew text you could change the word "meek" to--I forget how he translated it--the German " ", one of the ancient versions has it. He was the most--"pestered" is a way to get the idea of it--he was the most pestered of all human beings. Now, Moses certainly had his difficulties and his troubles and he said that was what it meant, not he was the most meek. He was the one who had the most difficulties and troubles. Well, you have to change the Hebrew text for it and it doesn't fit the context which is telling how God intervened to deliver Moses from the attacks of Miriam and of Aaron and the criticism of them, but he was not standing up for himself. He would stand up for God, but ordinarily he did not stand up for himself in these matters, and so I believe that it was pretty well established<sup>at</sup> that meeting that the new view which Professor advanced was purely conjecture. Yes, Mr. Sanderson? (Student) Yes. Meekness is very difficult to measure and I would certainly think to say that he was an exceedingly meek man would be a very reasonable way to take it. I don't think it means that you can't measure meekness except as you measure it against the circumstances in which people find themselves and it would be very difficult to make a fair measurement. To say that God made such a measurement and came out with Moses at the top of the list, I think is hardly necessary. I think what we can say from it is that Moses was a very extremely meek man, so meek that it is very unlikely if the Lord set aside a few angels to take all the different people and make all the definite calculations we would find anybody coming anywhere near Moses in the calculations. (Student) Paul had committed more murders than any other man living.

T 67

It doesn't mean anything of that kind, but it certainly means that he feels himself to be exceedingly sinful in God's sight. Yes? (Student) Yes, we'll touch on that under the next heading, the struggle with Pharaoh, but I want to say just a few more words about Moses here pertaining to his character in general. We have Moses' great meekness and yet it was at the point, at the strongest point that he failed. Strong men are apt to fail at their strongest point, weak men at their weakest point. The strong man is the man who has, who towers so high above others and is so outstanding that he, if he fails, is apt to fail at the point where you would never suspect it, the one that he doesn't think worth watching, the one where he is absolutely sure of himself, there of all things he doesn't need to worry, and that is the point where Satan gets ahold of him and where he fails, if he fails, and Moses made his great failure at this very point, when he equalled himself with God and said, "Shall we give you water out of the rock?" That was the failure in his life which God used to show that even this perfect man Moses, this outstanding man, had a great weakness and could not be the permanent leader of the people. He was not the Lord Jesus Christ. He did his work, his great work, in bringing them out and in carrying them through the wilderness--Moses could not be granted his desire to also lead them into the promised land, he could not be granted that desire--to do that would be to put Moses into a category/<sup>in</sup> which no mortal man could belong, one who would be a permanent leader, going on far beyond what any human being could accomplish, and the fact that Moses came to death as all human beings do, and his work came to an end is tied up with this one instance in which he showed the fact that he was still a sinner like other people, in which he failed at his strongest point. Mr.--? (Student) Well, I think it is Numbers 20, isn't it? (Student) Yes. I had it down 2-13. The 10th verse is the one, then, in which it comes out specially. Numbers 20. That is where the Lord said to Moses, "Take the rod, gather the assembly together, and speak unto the rock before their eyes and it shall give forth water!" and Moses took the rod, and he gathered the congregation before them, and he said, "Hear now, ye rebels; must we fetch you water out of this rock?" Very unlike Moses' ordinary attitude. He was irritated and he was tired;

T 67

he had just about reached the end of his endurance and he gave way to his feelings in a way he ordinarily didn't, and he gave way to them in equating himself this way with God and instead of representing the majesty of almighty God who was able to care for his people and who could open up the rock and let the water come out, and flow freely for them, Moses here put himself in the place of God and acted as a human being would in God's place. He says, "Hear now, ye rebels; must we fetch you water out of the the rock?" and in irritation struck the rock a couple of times and the water came out and the people ate, but the Lord said, "You have not believed me to sanctify me in the eyes of the children of Israel; therefore you shall not bring this congregation into the land which I have given them," and it was this—not that if only Moses had just watched a little more closely and been just a little better than he was he would have been the great leader for another forty years after the forty in which he did lead the people through the wilderness and the years before it in Egypt. It was not that, but it was that Moses here showed that he was a human being, a fallible human being, that he was not God and could not be the permanent leader of the people. God punished him for his sin as He punishes all for their sins but he certainly gave him a name and a place above almost any character in the whole Bible, or in the whole history of the world. Yes? It just was an evidence of his irritation and instead of acting with the majestic movement typical of the full strength of the almighty God it was giving way to his irritation and striking vigorously—"Hear, now, you rebels." That was all. (Student) Yes, I just said so. (Student) False pride? (Student) No, that's the rest of the people. That's not Moses. We come to the spies later, but this was Moses' sin at his weakest point, and then there is Moses' intercession, Moses' intercession before God in Exodus 32, where the Lord tested Moses, where the Lord said to Moses, "I am going to wipe this people off from the face of the earth and I am going to make a great nation out of you, and Moses said, "This people have sinned a great sin; yet, now, if thou wilt forgive their sin, and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written," and so Moses was the great intercessor before

T 67

God for the people in their sin. Moses was God's instrument in punishing the people. He upheld the majesty of God before the people, but he pled with God for the people and made intercession for them and now, of course, Moses' death at the end of his time in the wilderness, as in the case of John Calvin, no one knows where he was buried. He was buried and his body--where it was, no one knows, and of course, the reason is the same in both cases. Moses was such a great leader, was such a great Christian that if he had died and been buried by the people they would have put a great monument, they would have had pilgrimages to the place. It would have been--he was the founder of their national life and they would have been tempted to worship the memory of Moses instead of worshipping God, and God prevented that by having him go out and be buried so that no one knew the place where he was buried. Now Professor \_\_\_\_\_ of the University of Berlin twenty years ago wrote a book to prove that what really happened was that the Israelites turned against Moses and killed him and that was the way he really was killed, but that is pure conjecture, pure theorizing, absolutely no foundation for it, even though Freud built another book on \_\_\_\_\_ book and went ahead to show the psychological results of it upon the Hebrew race, but what the Scripture tells us is that God caused that Moses should go out and leave the people and die apart from them so that no one would know where he died and of course Calvin provided the same thing for himself / he knew the leadership he had all through the Christian world was such that there would be tremendous danger of people taking a wrong attitude toward his grave after his death and so he commanded that only a few friends would bury him quietly in the middle of the night and not let people know where he was buried in order that there should be no veneration of his tombstone<sup>OR</sup> the place where he was buried. Well, then, we have Moses, then, not entering the promised land. He is leading the people toward it, he is looking toward it but he does not enter it himself. He goes up to Mount Pisgah and the Lord lets him look it all over and see it there before him but he does not enter it for over a thousand years, and then we find him in Matthew 17:3-4 standing in the promised land and there he stands, Moses and Elijah,

T 67

with the Lord Jesus Christ, Himself.

Well, now D, the struggle with Pharaoh. No. 1, the attitude of the Israelites. Moses had come to save the Israelites, and the Israelites are very, very disgusted and their oppression with their suffering/and they want to be saved, but as soon as it begins to look as if they are going to be in misery in the course of it and there is a danger they won't be saved at all, they decide they'd better stay as they are. They would rather put up with something they know, with the present oppression than to risk the misery of getting Pharaoh really disgusted at them and when anything goes wrong they blame Moses for it and then they turn against Moses and Aaron and their attitude is exactly the attitude of people everywhere in the world when God sends a great leader to do a work for them. You have to do your work for God and not for the people. You do it for the people but for the people secondarily and primarily for God. You try not to do what will please the people now but what you know will please them in the end, and that is the attitude that has to be taken because human beings are all sinful and they don't see very far ahead and they look at the immediate situation, and the few people to whom God gives a vision of the distance and to see what is really needed are very, very few and there are many who think they have that vision and don't have it at all, and as for which really have it and which don't have it, you can't decide by counting noses among fallible human beings. You have to decide by studying God's Word and seeing what His truth really is. Someone has well said that one with God is a majority, but God without anyone is a majority. The majority of the people is not necessarily right; they are more apt to be wrong, than right. Democracy doesn't mean that you just take a count of noses and see what people think now and that is true. Democracy means that in a world of fallible human beings, you don't give any one fallible being the right to dictate to others but you give him the opportunity to win others to his view and that's very different from saying that the majority is necessarily right at all.

No. 2, the character of Pharaoh.

T 68

included all of Egypt and doubtless much of Asia. We don't know who the Pharaoh was so we can't be sure how much but most of the pharaohs of this time include large sections of Asia in their empire. He had absolute power over his people. His subordinates treated him as a god and showed an attitude of worship before him. He was one who was accustomed to think of himself as a god and after his death was called "that good god" in the Egyptian inscriptions, and it was considered that he became one of the gods. Even in one of the pyramids there are pictures which show the pharaoh going up to heaven and eating up the gods when he gets there and we call it, "The cannibal" inscription, this particular one. Pharaoh is so much one of the greatest of the gods that he actually can eat up the other gods. There is only one tomb that actually goes this far, but many of them show the pharaoh going to heaven and being received among the gods and taking his place as one of the foremost of the gods. Now this attitude toward a man would naturally give that man an idea that he himself could do whatever he wanted to do and that everyone should simply accept it, and so we have this man who represents deification of humanity, who represents the establishment of human power as supreme, who represents the denial of any superior power. We have the tremendous power and authority of Pharaoh and with this power, this greatest power in the world God has begun a contest, and it is not merely a matter of bringing the Israelites out of Egypt. It would be very, very easy for God to bring the Israelites out of Egypt. All that would be necessary to do would be to put pharaoh in a mellow, genial frame of mind, to put him in such a frame of mind that he would invite Moses to dinner and they would sit and chat and probably drink a good bit of wine and ask Moses about the country up there and everything and he would get in a friendly attitude toward Moses, and then he'd say, "What are a couple of a million slaves to me? If you want them, take them." It would have been very, very simple for God to have worked on the mind of Pharaoh in such a way as to have Pharaoh sign away the Israelites and turn them over to Moses. That would have been very simple but that is not God's purpose in this situation. His purpose is not to bring the Israelites

T 68

out of Egypt. His purpose is to bring the Israelites out of Egypt in such a way that an impression will be made upon their minds of the fact that God is able to overcome the greatest human forces that might attempt to hold them against the will of God, to bring them out in such a way that they will have visible proof that God's power is supreme, and that there is no earthly power or heavenly power that is worthy to rank on a level with God. It is to bring the Israelites out of Egypt in such a way that they will have in it a picture of salvation from the great Spiritual forces of the universe that would drag them down, a picture of what it means to be saved from sin and death and from the great forces of wickedness which are greater than any force upon this earth, and for that reason God did not wish to soften Pharaoh's heart so that Pharaoh would be in a good jovial mood and would just say, "All right, take them along." That, of course, is what Satan did with Roosevelt. He got him over to Yalta and softened his heart and made him feel happy and made him think, "Well, anything that Stalin wants, if I just give it to him, then that will put him in a good mood and he will introduce democracy into Russia and the whole world will be one, and so when Stalin said to Roosevelt, he said, "I'd like the northern half of Korea," why Roosevelt said, "Certainly, you can have it," and Stalin said, "I'd like to have Berlin, all the country around Berlin, and part of Berlin," Roosevelt said, "Oh, certainly, you can have it," and Roosevelt just turned over everything to him that he asked for. Roosevelt's heart was softened, and he gave all those things which he had absolutely no right to give, because he was not, like Pharaoh, an absolute monarch. He had no right to make any agreement whatever about anything, without getting the United States Senate to ratify it. According to the Constitution all things have to be approved by the United States Senate, but his heart was softened to the point where he wanted to be genial and agreeable and he simply gave Stalin everything he wanted and the world is suffering the results of it and will suffer them for the rest of the age to some extent--to a great extent in the next few years if our Lord tarries. Now, in this case Pharaoh's heart might have been softened so that he would let

T 68

the Israelites go without much --but that wasn't God's desire. God's desire was to harden Pharaoh's heart so that Pharaoh would be stiff and obstinate and would insist on the attitude which was the true underlying attitude of his heart, instead of just being easy-going and letting him do something that was contrary to his underlying, definite, real attitude, and so instead of Pharaoh being-- oh, what difference does it make? Go ahead--instead of that being Pharaoh's attitude, Pharaoh's heart was hardened so that he would refuse to let any subordinate considerations turn him aside from the underlying, fixed attitude of his heart. That is, of course, what hardening his heart means. It means making him stubborn, it means making him set in his ways, it means making him carry out in practice that which was his real, underlying, fundamental attitude. And so this greatest power of the day refused to submit to the thing that Moses desired but stood adamant and little by little became more adamant, instead of little by little giving in, in order that it might be made clear to all the world that the greatest force of the world at the time standing determinedly against the counsel and desire of God was unable to accomplish his purpose. that God could force through that which He desires to do. Mr.---? (Student) There is in Romans 11--no, it is Romans 9--there is a definite reference to his raising up Pharaoh <sup>oh</sup> in order that he might show/through him His great works, but in Romans 1 he refers to the people who have turned away from God, how God gave them up to believe a lie and to worship all sorts of wickedness and all that. I don't think that is Pharaoh. It's not speaking here of Pharaoh's salvation or of Pharaoh's beliefs. It is speaking of his tenacity in standing by that which is already his definite character. Pharaoh's refusing to let the lesser considerations lead him to do that which is contrary to his fundamental, underlying purpose. You see, that is exactly what Roosevelt did, because Roosevelt had declared that the Russians in their on Finland were carrying on utterly unprovoked aggression, he had declared in the Atlantic charter that freedom of religion and freedom speech and the other two freedoms must be made universal; he had taken a

T 68

stand which was contrary to everything that Stalin wanted, and yet he got in a situation and he got filled up with good liquor and he was feeling in a jovial mood and here was Stalin who was begin very pleasant and using his personality and Roosevelt thought, "Well, I'll be friendly to him and he will be friendly to us, and against all the evidence and against his own previous statements, his heart was softened and he gave in to that which was against the true attitude that he had been expressing right along. Well, now Pharaoh could very easily have done the same thing. Pharaoh could have done that very, very easily, but it was not God's will that he should. It was God's will that the tremendous contest should go through that involved those ten great plagues, in order that the Israelites shouldn't say thereafter, "Wasn't it good Pharaoh happened to be in light mood that day and he let us go!" They shouldn't say that; they should say, "Wasn't it wonderful how against all the resistance which Pharaoh has put up, God with a stretched out arm brought us forth and showed His superiority to the great power of Pharaoh and to the great gods of Egypt, and that is what the hardening of the heart of Pharaoh means. There are three different words <sup>used</sup> here in connection with the hardening of Pharaoh's heart. One of them is " " which means "to make heavy," one is " " which means "to make sharp", and one is " " which means "to make fit" and you see there is a little difference of idea in those three, but it means to make him stiff, hard, determined. (Student) Well, the word is used in two ways. In Exodus 4 and 7, before they go down to Egypt, God says that He is going to harden Pharaoh's heart. He tells Moses what is going to happen. Then when they get into Egypt we have a number of instances, about twenty times altogether, we have a number of instances in which we are told that when it was quite evident that trouble was coming to Egypt on account of the presence of the Israelites there and then it says, "Pharaoh hardened his heart and would not let them go." or "Pharaoh's heart was fixed without them and he wouldn't let them go." We have the simple statement that Pharaoh hardened his heart about ten times, and then things get stiffer and stiffer and the plagues get worse and worse and get to

T 68

the place where the Egyptians are saying, "Why should the whole land be wrecked on account of these people. Let them go and get rid of them," and then we read that God hardened Pharaoh's heart and we have that expression a number of times toward the end there, and so Pharaoh faced the situation in which the easy way out of it was, just let the people go, and he got off and he said, "No, I said I wasn't going to do it and I'm not going to do it." Just like what the commentators claim (I don't know whether it is true or not) but they claim that six months ago, they claim that four to six months ago Secretary of Defense Forrestal said, "I'm getting awfully tired. I've been working eighteen hours a day here for several years in the Defense office and I am getting tired out and I want to resign," and that Truman was rather tired of having him around--<sup>were other old cronies he'd prefer there--</sup>and he was just ready to let him go, and then a lot of commentators, Walter Winchell and others, began to attack him and criticize him, Forrestal, because he used to be in Wall Street, and call him all kinds of names and things and saying that Truman ought to fire him, and Truman got obstinate. Truman hardened his heart, and Truman said, "If these folks think they are going to force me to fire him they've got another thought coming," and so, according to the commentators, Truman wanted to let him go and Forrestal wanted to go, but Truman insisted he stay because he would not give in to the commentators who were trying to force him to let him go. I think Drew Pearson wrote an article in which he said, "It isn't right for the President of the United States to let commentators run him," in the sense that he will do a thing he doesn't want to do simply because they don't want him to do it. Well there is--I don't know whether all that is true or not, but it is a good illustration of the hardening of your heart and making yourself stubborn and determined that you are going to go on this way and not let someone force you the other way, and that is what Pharaoh did for quite a while, and then when the pressure got so severe that it would be strange indeed for a man to keep on standing against it when everything looked as if it would be so much better for Egypt just to let the people go and Pharaoh would be so much stronger without them than he would with them, then we read, "The Lord hardened his heart," and the Lord strengthened

T 68

that stubbornness of Pharaoh's and he said, "I don't care if the whole country goes to pieces. I'm not going to let them go," and he stuck to this until his first-born child was killed, and then he said, "Get out of this country--the quicker, the better," and then even after they'd gone his heart was hardened again and he changed his mind and pursued after them, but it is said about half the time that Pharaoh hardened his heart and about half the time that the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart and it wasn't a matter of making Pharaoh a wicked man. Pharaoh was already a wicked man. It wasn't a matter of making Pharaoh a sinner. It was a matter of making Pharaoh in his actions stand by that which was the true attitude of his heart, instead of allowing him for lesser considerations to turn against his true attitude. You might say it was as if Zipporah hardened her heart and said, "I don't care if Moses dies and I don't care if his whole work goes to ruin. I'm not going to give in on it," but she didn't do that. Her heart was not hardened, but it's not, it doesn't at all mean that God caused Pharaoh to become a sinner or to be lost. That has nothing to do with God's hardening Pharaoh's heart whatever. It is . Now we find this term rarely used of others, but it is used in

this particular connection about twenty times, although there are references here with the verb used in each case and the forms but I don't think we'll take the time to quote them all because there is a good deal more we want to get to. Mr.---

(Student) Yes, a very good question. How much is Satan's agency and how much is God's definite plan, and they mix in varying proportions. Everything is a part of God's plan. / There are some things that God definitely wills should be this way; there are other things that He wills to permit Satan to do. Now, in that connection, with David, God permitted Satan to tempt David. In this particular connection, whether Satan in involved in it or not we just are not told and we don't know. I think we have a few minutes yet. I think that is all we need to say on this hardening of the heart. It is a test case of stiffening against influence or easy surrender. Paul refers to it in Romans 9:17.

Now, No. 3. Two was the character of Pharaoh.

No. 3 is the plagues

T 68

themselves. Now, what do we read? That God wanted the Egyptians to let the Israelites go so He caused that

T 69

We find nothing of that sort. The plagues of Egypt Egypt  
 at other times. These things which I mentioned could have taken place. He could  
 very easily have caused any one of them to take place, but that is not the way ordinarily  
 God works. I think we must insist that God has the power to do anything He wants to  
 but some people think they are glorifying God if they make everything He does do just  
 and bizarre as possible and insist always  
 as queer and strange/and that He doesn't use the means of that which He has created.  
 I don't think this is honoring to God but I think that it is confusing to people  
 and so think a little bit about that. When I express that in a little more abrupt  
 language people are usually shocked. We'll think about it a little and we'll dis-  
 cuss it further next time, and under that, we've finished discussing No. 2, the  
 character of Pharaoh in which we dealt with the meaning of the hardening of Pharaoh's  
 heart, a phrase which occurs about thirty times. Now we took up at the end of the  
 hour No. 3, the plagues themselves. We noticed that the plagues are not bizarre  
 or utterly unnatural. They are not something that is entirely different from the  
 sort of thing that might naturally be associated with Egypt. Similar, but lesser  
 plagues occur occasionally in that region. The first nine plagues all correspond  
 to something that is rather natural in Egypt. There is a statement from Robinson's  
 HISTORY OF ISRAEL in 1932 in which he says, none of these plagues except the last  
 contain anything strange or abnormal. All are events which may naturally take  
 place at the end of the inundation of the Nile. The stagnant water left as the  
 river goes down often reddens with and becomes undrinkable, while  
 fish which have been caught in the pools will, of course, die as the ground dries.  
 Frogs naturally find their way from the waters on to dry land and may easily be so  
 numerous as to be a nuisance. The pools breed quantities of mosquitoes and these  
 in turn produce distressing forms of skin disease. Thunderstorms accompanied by  
 heavy hail are rare in Egypt but they do occur and are naturally alarming. Sand

T 69

and dust storms which produce deep gloom may well take place to the east of the delta, while locusts are only too frequent a scourge. In all this there is nothing to awaken incredulity. The miracle will consist in nothing more than the coincidence of all these events and their exceptional severity and we notice that none of the plagues are things which are altogether strange or bizarre or unnatural in Egypt. There are five characteristics which the plagues have and the first three of those are those characteristics which mark them out as signs or as supernatural interventions of God. The first of these is intensification. They are all things which occur in Egypt but they occurred at this time in greatly intensified form. They occurred far more severely than was usual or at all frequent. No. 2 is prediction. Very often most startling and strange things occur and prove absolutely nothing, but when someone speaks as God's messenger and declares that something will happen and then it happens, that is a sign which accredits the message or the messenger. Prediction is a very vital element in most signs and in this case that is one of the outstanding features of the account. Moses predicted that these things would come to pass and then they came to pass. Yes? (Student) Definitions of miracle. It is to be noticed that the word "miracle" is not a translation of any Hebrew or Greek word. I shouldn't say it exactly that way. What I mean to say is there is no Hebrew or Greek word which has as its meaning that which we call a miracle. You will find that the Hebrew word " " is often translated "miracle", but you will find that more frequently it is translated "a sign" and it is used of—for instance, if I say, "Here will be the sign that you will know that I'll come to your place and speak and you are to meet me at the station. You've never seen me—here's the sign. You'll find that I will be holding a Bible in my right hand. That is the sign." That would be the Hebrew word " " and the Hebrew word " " is at times translated "sign", is sometimes translated "miracle". Then there is the Hebrew word " " which occurs much less frequently and is also translated in other ways and which doesn't necessarily mean something that is supernatural. The same is true in the New Testament. The Greek words which are translated "miracle"

T 69

are more frequently translated either a sign or a wonder or some other word, so that there is no Hebrew or Greek word of which we can say, "This word, in the original of the Bible, is a word which denotes a supernatural act which is performed in order to give a sign or attestation of a message or a messenger." The idea of a miracle is an idea which has been attached to the Bible by students of the Bible. It is not any specific Biblical word. It is an idea which we gather from the study of different passages but the Bible nowhere says, "This is a miracle, in the sense in which we use our English word "miracle", because there is no Hebrew word which means only what we mean by "miracle," and consequently we have no right to ask what the Biblical meaning of the miracle is for there is no such word. We ask, "What is the meaning of the English word "miracle"? Well, the English word "miracle" means whatever English people use it to mean but that doesn't prove anything about what God teaches in the Bible. Consequently, all interpretations of miracle which consist of saying, "A miracle must be such-and-such a thing, then when you find in the Bible the word 'miracle' it must be this thing which I've defined the word 'Miracle' as being," are purely human guesses. The only way to tell what it is is to see what the Bible says, and the Bible says he gave the sign. He says, "The man that you see wearing such-and-such a kind of a coat will be the one;" or he says, "He gave a sign He caused that the rock should be smitten and the water should flow out." He gave a sign. He caused that the first born of every family in Egypt would die. The word "sign" then may indicate something which is a perfectly natural thing done simply as an indication of something, or it might indicate something which is a supernatural event done to give an indication of that which only the supernatural could indicate. Now we in recent centuries have come to believe in a natural order as a result of the fact that in scientific study we find--you take two of hydrogen and one of oxygen and you put them together and you get water, and it always happens. You hold something up and you let go and it always drops. We have certain things that we observe and we say, "These are natural law; this is the natural order," and from

that we have made the jump to the idea that there is such a thing as a natural order and there is such a thing as that which is beyond the natural order and that there is a sharp line separating these two and that from that the jump is easily made to say a miracle must be something which is outside of this line, which is outside of the natural order, but the Bible nowhere teaches such a natural order. The Bible nowhere teaches such a line. The Bible has no word to indicate something which is outside of that line which you put around that which you call the natural order. Here is the law of gravitation. If you take this book and put it here and it is this far from the ground, it will naturally fall, inevitably, but I can reach out my hand and hold it there and stop it. Do I destroy the law of gravitation? I do nothing of the kind. I simply exert a personal influence in such a way as to cause that the law of gravitation does not apply in that situation. Well, if I can do a thing like that, why cannot God, the creator of the universe, do exactly the same thing if He chooses by whatever means He chooses to utilize? Now, somebody says, "If God causes that there shall be something that we can't see, an invisible thing, invisible to us but just as real as my hand that holds up the Bible that shall come there and hold it up and He uses a natural phenomenon which He causes to do that," they say, "That's not a miracle. That doesn't prove anything. That's in the natural order," but they say, "if God will suspend the law of gravitation and say at this particular place the law of gravitation is suspended and so the natural order is destroyed, that is a miracle," and that proves something about God. Well, that's purely human guessing. There is absolutely nothing in the Bible to prove that there is any such line of demarkation and that a miracle is that which is that side of it and that which is not a miracle is that which is this side of it. Now if you say that God's will is divine you must have something outside the natural order and above and beyond it imply that the human being is assuming there is such a natural order. It implies that the human is capable of knowing what the of that natural order. It implies that if this thing happens and it seems to be outside the natural order and we say there it is divine and it proves God did it and then

T 69

we learn a little more and we find it is possible inside the natural order, well then it is not a miracle any more. Once you adopt an attitude like that then every miracle of the Bible becomes a matter of guess work because we don't know enough to know, assume there is such a line between natural and supernatural, we don't know where it is, and therefore all we can say is that these look like miracles to us today but that for all we know when knowledge goes a little further we'll see how they could have been done naturally and therefor we'll see they weren't miracles at all, and therefore it makes--I think this idea of a word as something that must be supernatural to be a miracle reduces you to absolute uncertainty as to whether anything at all is a miracle or not, since we don't have enough knowledge to know what the limits of the natural order are if there are such limits. So to me it seems far more satisfactory to think that common sense interpretation leads us not to say that God, in order to prove He is God, says, "Well, now here, I'm going to give you absolute perfect, infallible knowledge so that you know all the limits to natural order and then I am going to show you I can get outside of it, and that proves I am God." Instead of His doing that we will say that God does some things which you can't see how a human being could do, you can't see how in the natural course of events this could take place and therefore it seems to you to be an evidence of something that is beyond your experience and beyond your knowledge and when the Lord does a certain number of things of that type, accumulated evidence is such as to be mighty strongly convincing that there is indeed a power transcending human force at stake. It is just exactly as if I were to hold up the book, and hold up something here that weighed fifty pounds and I hold up something else that weighs seventy-five pounds and all you could lift would be something that weighs twenty pounds, you would say, "Oh, there is proof that I am much stronger than you are. It's proof of that, definitely." Now there is definite proof that God is far superior in knowledge and power to us, but you require proof that God can go outside the natural realm. Well, man's mind is infallible and he can't prove what the limits of the natural ord<sup>er</sup> are

T 69

if there are such limits. It is absolutely impossible as evidence that there are, and I do not think the Scripture gives us to understand that there is any such type of evidence that God has chosen to present, because we don't have the mind to appreciate it if there were. Now I think that it is a very common attitude among Christians that here is the Bible, the more peculiar, the more strange, the more

the events you find here, the more definitely it is a supernatural book. If anything in it sounds natural, that must be wrong, because that is not honoring God. Let's assume that God does everything . Well, that's not what you find in the New Testament. Christ could easily have come to this earth in such a way He'd never been sleepy, He'd never been tired, He'd never been hungry, but

T 70

He was weak. He had the limitations of a human being and yet He wrought such works as no other human being ever has done and in this we see the proof that while He was a true human being he was far beyond any human being, he was the transcendent One, the Son of God Himself, and so, while there are those who define a miracle as an act in the external work wrought by the immediate power of God without any intermediate circumstances means, wrought without means by God. To my mind it is an utterly unsatisfactory definition because I don't know how any human being can tell whether God does a thing with means or without means. This we know, that He does something which we know of no way to do and which it seems to us very unlikely that any person we know would be able to do. That we know, but to say that we know that He does this without means--to me it is just a matter of the way you use words. It's like the--I don't know whether I ever mentioned in this class the story of the Arab and the magician. Do you know whether I did--the box? Well, this story--according to this story an American magician--not a real magician, not a man who had supernatural power at all, but a man who was a trickster, a man who would go on the stage and do things to make people marvel had a trick whereby he would have

T 70

a magnet, an electro-magnet concealed under the floor and he would come to America here and he would say, "Now I'll show you a wonderful trick. I can make that box heavy or light," and a person would come up to the platform and they'd pick it up like nothing, and he's say, "Now I'll make it heavy," and they'd pull and they couldn't pull it up," and it was wonderful trick. He could make the box heavy or light, but when he got over to Arabia and showed it there, people saw it and they said, "Oh, that's nothing. We know you have some kind of queer, scientific mechanism that can make a thing heavy or light. That doesn't prove anything. We are not interested, and it was a total flop, so he thought of a new way of saying, and the next place he went he said, "I will show you that I can make a man, a strong man weak so he has no power, and he called on the strongest man in the audience to come up and this man came with his great big muscle and when he got up there the magician said, "Now you see that little box there. Lift it. Nothing to it- is there?" Nothing at all. The man could lift it right up. "Now," he said, "I can make you so weak you can't even lift that little box," and the man said, "I don't believe you can. It's impossible," and he said, "Now, look. I'll make you so weak you can't even lift the little box," and he went on and said, "Presto", and the man took hold and he couldn't even lift that little/<sup>tiny</sup> box, and he took hold and he jerked, and the magician was afraid he would break the floor, he put so much terrific strength on it, but he couldn't lift the box and in absolute humiliation the man left the platform, and he said the man was just ashamed to look anybody in the face, to think that that magician could make him so weak. Well, now, there's exactly the same thing done, but the people in the audience weren't able to tell whether he made the box heavy or whether he made the man weak. They couldn't tell, and you say it one way it seems like nothing, to them. "We know it is easy to have a scientific apparatus to make a box heavy or light. We don't know how you do it, but we have no doubt you can do it," "but to make a man weak or strong, well, of course, that you couldn't do. That's impossible." Well, now it is just that way, it seems to me, with this matter of saying, "Is this done without means or with means? How do you know? We can't see everything and we don't know one-

T 70

thousandth of the law of dimensions, and we don't know any but the smallest part of  
 the condi<sup>tions</sup>/ of the world that God has created and therefore to say, "This is a proof  
 of God. Is it a supernatural proof, is it done with means?" is a perfectly silly  
 line of demarkation to make, because it is one that nobody can possibly judge, and  
 to say a miracle is one done without means and that if it is done with means it isn't  
 a miracle, what right have we to bind God by a rule that God gives us no indication  
 of anywhere in the Scripture? What we find in the Scripture is that God has caused  
 things to happen in such a way that when people saw these definite events occurring  
 they said, "There is something very extraordinary here. There must be a force, a  
 knowledge that surpasses our understanding here, because they don't happen this way  
 in ordinary life, and especially if a man would come and say, "Here is proof that  
 God is speaking to me. This thing is going to happen." Now with most things you  
 can predict that way the chances are one in a thousand that it will happen the way  
 you said it. Now of course if I tell you that tomorrow morning the sun is going  
 to rise, then that proves nothing, because it happens so commonly! If I say, "To-  
 morrow it is going to pour rain here," they'll say there is one chance of four that  
 I am correct. That doesn't prove very much. If I say, "Tomorrow, we are going to  
 have a snow storm here," you'll say there is one chance in fifty, this time of year.  
 That would prove a good bit more, but it is a matter of seeing whether the predic-  
 tion made is one which a person naturally couldn't know and whether the chances of  
 its happening by accident are quite small, and if that occurs that is a pretty good  
 proof that there is something supernatural there at work. Now it is very, very  
 difficult to predict the future. If any of you have got some money you'd like to  
 waste, to throw away, you will find it very, very easy to pick any one of perhaps  
 fifty different organizations in New York which will be willing for only a couple  
 of hundred dollars to tell you for the whole of the next year every week what  
 stocks you ought to buy and what stocks you ought not, and they will go back over  
 the last three years and prove to you that they said, "Buy this stock" two and a  
 half years ago and you could have gotten that then for \$30.00 and today it is sold  
 for \$60.00 and you'd be doubling your money, and they will prove to you that they

T /0

said at such a date, "Sell General Motors at such a price" and they will show you that three weeks later it was down ten points and you would have saved some money if you had sold at the time they said, and they will give you wonderful examples of the way they have predicted the way the stock market will go, /successful predictions and as you take any one of these systems and pay them the two hundred dollars and then do everything they tell you the chances are that within six months you'll lose all the money you've got. You might do it in three if you are unlucky, if they hit it unusually well you/might last nine months. An organization made an investigation of this a few years ago. They brought the recommendations of some of these companies over a period of about five years before and they took every one of these recommendations these companies had made and they figured out if you bought every time they said to buy and sold every time they said to sell, would you have made money in the five years and with every single one of them you would have lost a great deal of money, and then they took dice, and they said, "Now, let's say, shall we say buy or sell General Motors? We'll flip the dice, if it comes this way we say sell, if it comes this way we say buy, and just by pure chance that way they made up a set of recommendations and they found that/ those recommendations they made by chance that way were followed through a person would have lost only half as much money as they would by using any one of the methods that you could buy for your two hundred dollars from one of these analysts in New York which studies the market and tells you just what is going to happen. Now I think that is a very excellent evidence of the fact that to predict the future correctly in any sizable number of cases is a very, very difficult thing to do. It is very rare that a human being has the knowledge sufficient to make many predictions of the future. Most things we simply can't tell, and if somebody comes to me and says, "Say, you struck it lucky once. Let's see what you'll do the next time," and they may strike it lucky twice. They might strike it lucky ten times, but when you find that Moses ten different times predicted the coming of a plague and predicted a plague which was similar to plagues they had had before, but far

T 70

more extreme than the ones they usually had and he predicted them in a certain order and they came in the order that he said they would come in and the one he said would come now came now and you'll find a course of his doing that for ten different ones, one right after the other, you'll have a tremendous mathematical argument for the fact that there was at least a knowledge of the course of events on the part of Moses transcending that which an ordinary human being would be expected to have, and so it is not a miracle prediction in the sense of something wrought by the immediate power of God because we cannot prove what is the immediate power of God and what is mediate power of God; but it is something which shows you a knowledge that you wouldn't expect a human being to have and when Moses says, "God said, 'Let the people go' if you don't let the people go, God will send this plague," and then the plague takes place and the Pharaoh comes to Moses and he says, "This is terrible," he says, "pray God that He will do away with this plague, and I'll let the people go," and Moses prays and the plague stops, and then Pharaoh's heart is hardened and he is freed from the difficulty and he doesn't bother with it any more just like most people do when in suffering and sorrow they promise to be a good person ever after if they'll only get through it and then when the thing passes by they forget all about their promise and Pharaoh did the same thing exactly. He said, "Now," he said, "I will let you go," and Moses said, "If you don't, this thing will happen and this thing will happen," you have there what is certainly justified in being called a miracle in what I would consider a Scriptural sense of the term, that is, an evidence, a sign which points in the direction of showing that a knowledge and power transcending that of a human being, but the making up of a doctrinal definition which says it must be something outside of a line which encompasses a natural orbit when that line is absolutely unknown to us and we haven't even any proof there is such a line, is not anything, I think, which contributes to the glory of God or to the understanding of the Bible. Mr.---? (Student) I read that in manuscript before the book went to press but that was some years ago and my recollection of it is rather hazy, but I do not feel that I am in position to pass any judgment on the chapter, but I would

T 70

say this, that the idea, if I recall correctly, is the idea that if you make a prediction and there is one chance in five of the prediction coming true and it does come true that that is looking pretty far in the direction of a supernatural agency and if that happens a number of times the chances of it happening are so very, very slight that it makes it . Now I think that that principle is supreme. Now how he worked it out in the chapter I don't recall because it is a long time since I read that in proof, but I would say this, that the mathematical argument from the viewpoint of chance of predictions of something coming true is an argument which must be used with great care because I think it is a valid and true argument rightly used but one which can be wrongly used. Now whether it was rightly or wrongly used in that chapter I don't recall and I read it rather hastily and whether it would have changed since then I don't know, but it certainly is a true argument rightly used . Now, here, just to give you a personal example. The time came some years ago when I didn't know which of two things to do. I felt it was very important for my future, and I did a thing which I do not recommend doing. I asked the Lord to give me an indication by chance of it. Well, now that is a thing which I do not think we can expect the Lord to do. I think that ordinarily the Lord expects us to study the Word and to study the circumstances and find His answer, but I think there may be cases when the Lord stoops to stoops to our weakness and gives us that sort of an indication and I feel that if you are going to do that sort of a thing you should make your decision in such a way that you know that it is not pure chance. Now that is what I did then. For instance, I would say, "If you say, "Now, shall I go to New York or to Baltimore next Saturday? What is the Lord's will on it? And you flip a coin and you say, "If it comes out heads, it's New York; tails, it's Baltimore." Well, there's one chance in--fifty-fifty. It's got to go one way or the other. It is so much just a pure matter of chance that to be sure that the Lord chose to guide you in that way would be making a pretty strong guess, but here's what I did. I said, "Now here are two coins. Now if these two coins come down heads up then that I take as an indication that I should do this and if these two coins come down any other way

T 70

that doesn't mean anything. You see. There was one chance in four that it would mean anything and it came down that way. Then I said, "Now if the nickle comes down with the date up and the dime with the date down, then it means—but if it comes any other way it doesn't mean anything," and I did that five times in a row and every time it came the particular way. Well, now I figured that there was one chance in four of its happening once, one chance in sixteen of its happening twice, one chance in sixty-four of its happening three times

- - -