

Old Testament History, Literature and Theology

BCM 101

By Dr. Ted Hildebrandt

**Full text of the Youtube Videos and
biblicalelearning.org course development**

<http://biblicalelearning.org/old-testament/ot-literature-dr-ted-hildebrandt/> |

Table of Contents

Hold down the Ctrl key and click on link to jump there

1. Course Introduction + Theistic Proofs	3
2. Theistic Proofs, From God to Us	32
3. Antilegomena, Transmission--Scribal Copying	61
4. Translation, 9 OT Turning Points, Opening of Genesis 1	92
5. Genesis 1:1 and 1:2, Days of Genesis	123
6. Image of God, 2 trees in the Garden of Eden	154
7. Genesis 3-Fall, Cain and Abel	188
8. Sons of God (Gen. 6), Abraham's 3 children, Mesopotamia	212
9. Binding of Isaac (Akedah), Isaac, Jacob	247
10. Jacob and Joseph narratives	276
11. Intro. to Exodus	310
12. Plagues and Tabernacle in Exodus	340
13. Leviticus: holiness, purity laws, problems	375
14. Leviticus: sacrifices and feasts, Intro. to Numbers	408
15. Numbers: Wilderness Wanderings	444
16. Numbers: Balaam and Deuteronomy as Covenant Renewal	471
17. Deuteronomy: Institutions and Concept of Law	504
18. Deuteronomy: Difficult Laws, Intro. To Joshua	534
19. Joshua: Jericho, Ai, Gibeonites, War	568
20. Joshua: War, Intro. to Judges	601
21. Judges: Samson, 2 Levites, Ruth	637
22. 1 Samuel: Eli, Samuel, Saul	668
23. 1 Samuel: Demise of Saul, Early Stories of David	701
24. 2 Samuel: David's Compassion, Passion and Hatred of Evil	735
25. David's Sin, Solomon	767
26. Kings, Messianic Prophecies--Joy	797

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 1[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)**A. Course Introduction [0:0-3:29]**

Class, let's get started. The clock in here is about five minutes slow so we'll have to remember that at quitting time. But right now, we'll get started. This is Old Testament History, Literature and Theology class, and welcome all of you to this classroom. The other class has previously heated and warmed it up for you. Let's get these folks some syllabi. As we said, this is Old Testament History, Literature and Theology course and so you're in the right class. We will be, in this class, believe it or not, after the first day you're going to say this is crazy, but we'll be video-taping this whole course. What I hope to do is to make the tapes available online. You'll have to give me the weekend to work on rendering and editing the video. I'm going to try to get them up every Monday. Kyle Lincoln will be our TA for the class and he's going to be our video-tape expert back there. He will also be running review sessions for this class. When we get toward the exams, there'll be review sessions. Kyle will be running those. So he's the guy you need to know.

Let's open with a word of prayer and then we'll jump into an introduction to the course. All right, let's begin. *"Father, we thank you so much for your word. We thank you that you've expressed your love, your anger, and your expectations of humankind over the thousands of years that are represented in the Old Testament. Thank you that you allow us, in this course, to see your different relationships with people for so many centuries, and with so many different types of people. Father, we are very different types of people, we seek to know you, we seek to love you, and we seek to worship you. We pray that this course might lead to those ends; that we might honor and glorify you, which is the chief end of man. We thank you for your presence here with us. In Christ's name, Amen."*

This is Old Testament. I think I'd like to begin by just going over the syllabus. We'll try to get the lay of the land, and by the way, it's alright not to catch everything in this first class hour, it'll come over time. We're just beginning the semester. So let's just go through this. You see my name: I'm Dr. Ted Hildebrandt. I go by Hildebrandt, or by Ted, just don't call me Teddy.

Speaking to student: Yes, ma'am? You need a syllabus? Okay.

My contact information is there, I do a lot of emailing. I'm sorry I do old emailing, I don't do the Facebook. There's an old system they call email; do you know how to use that system? If you don't we can work with CET and they can get you going with that. I realize it's an outdated system but that's what I still use. Sorry, I'm mocking myself out at this point. I'm over in Frost 304, third floor Frost; there's a bunch of Profs up there. My phone number extension is 4412, and my email is there. My hours: I'm in there most mornings, I usually come in about 8:30 or 9:00, so I'm usually in from 8:30 or 9:00, till noon. So if you have any questions or want to drop in and talk about something, feel free to drop in. I'm generally in 8:30-noon type of thing. I'm usually there for most of that time.

B. Syllabus Read Through [3:30-3:58]

So, let's do the course description: "This is a course in Old Testament History, Literature and Theology. It examines the Old Testament in terms of its history." History is going to be really important in the Old Testament because God is going to do these incredible things in history. In other words, this book is not just myth and legends, these events actually happened in history. So it records for us the mighty acts of God in history.

C. Importance of culture in the revelatory and interpretive process [3:59-7:38]

We'll be teaching this against a cultural background. In other words, this book,

the Bible, comes to us from a very different culture than what you folks are used to in the 21st century. Moses wrote in 1400 BC, Abraham lived in 2000 BC – that’s 3000-4000 years ago. So the culture was very, very different. Does culture make a difference when you try to understand somebody? Does culture make a big difference? Yes. So we’ve got to realize the cultural impact of that. The Bible will be written in the Hebrew language. I dare say there are very few people, although I had one Jewish fellow in the last class, who can do some Hebrew. It’s written in the Hebrew language, and does language affect how things get communicated? Sometimes different kinds of things can get communicated by the language, and so the language itself is really important. By the way, the Hebrew people, read backwards. They read, from right to left; we read the other way. Now, did you notice I said “backwards,” do you see what I just did? Is that a cultural thing? Would they say we read backwards? What I’m saying is the language is different.

When God comes in the Old Testament and gives us poetry, is the poetry that he gives us “good American poetry?” No. Do you realize, Hebrew poetry does not use rhyme and meter? Rhyme and meter are so embedded in the English language, yet they are not even used by the Hebrews; they don’t do poetry like that. They rhyme thoughts using parallelism. So it’s a whole different way of doing poetry.

By the way, did God adapt himself to that culture? Does God adapt himself to culture? That’s a bigger question. Or does God come down and say, “Hey, this is who I am. You guys do it my way or it’s the highway!” Does God adapt himself; when God comes down to write poetry, does he write Hebrew poetry? Yes, he does. So he adapts to their language and culture and that affects a lot of things in how he’s going to communicate.

Have you ever tried communicating in another culture? I’m not talking about, “I was down in New York City and we went cross-cultural” No. I’m talking, have you ever lived in a different culture where everyone around you is of that other culture? Does that affect how you communicate? Everything’s different. It is an interesting experience. Hopefully, you’ll have a chance to do that at Gordon College. In some senses you’ll do

that here because we'll be going through the Old Testament, and the Old Testament is going to take us back 3000 years. So culture is an important influence, in terms of how God expresses himself and how people understand, what they hear.

By the way, does your culture affect how you hear this book? Are you locked into your 21st century culture? Have your schools prepared you, trained you, and actually PC-ized you? You're Americans and you're trained in a certain way. When you read the content of the Old Testament, are you going to be shocked? You're going to be shocked because the stuff is so different from what you're used to hearing. We have our perspectives in America that we're so used to hearing. We pride ourselves in diversity, right? I just laugh because I don't think so. We're diverse within the narrow scope of that little PC [Politically Correct] circle. But what happens here when you get into the Bible, there's no PC consensus. It's just raw life as it happens with all its ups and downs. You've got to wrestle with that. So I'll be jamming that in your face and watching you squirm; and some of that content is going to be shocking. It still kind of shocks me at times. So culture's a big thing.

D. Significance of Geography in Reading Texts [7:39-10:51]

Geography is another thing that's really important. I lived in Israel back after the Civil War for a year. My wife and I lived in Israel and so I got to know the places, why? I walked those places. When it talks about going from the Mount of Olives and back into the temple area and Jesus riding a donkey—I've walked that road. I don't want to tell you how many times, but probably hundreds of times. I've climbed the Mount of Olives. I even climbed it in eight inches of snow one time just to get a picture. What I'm saying, when you know a place, it'd be like saying Jesus went to Danvers and went to the mall. Now question: Do you where Danvers is? Do you know where the mall is? When it says that, you know exactly where it is and you understand what's going on.

By the way, does geography affect things? Let me just put it this way, how many of you are from Massachusetts? Does geography affect things? How many of you are

from New Hampshire? Question, you people from New Hampshire, does geography affect things? Is New Hampshire different from Massachusetts? You say, “Thank the Lord.” Massachusetts is different than New Hampshire. If you go to New Hampshire, they will tell you that. By the way, does anybody come from Maine? Is Maine different than the other two? I’m from, actually the honest truth is I don’t know where I’m from anymore. I was originally from the Niagara Falls, New York area, and I lived in Israel and Tennessee. I lived in Tennessee for a while. My wife said, “I ain’t raising my kids to talk like that.” I kind of liked it myself; but she didn’t. She’s an English major, so she’s taught me how to speak proper –“ly.”

But what I’m asking is, is geography significant? Let me just give an example. If you’re from Tennessee, do you grow up in a different world in Tennessee than it is in Massachusetts, seriously. Is there a difference between the hills of Tennessee; are they very different than what you’d get in Massachusetts? Yes. Does that geography affect a person’s worldview. If they’re from the Midwest, for example, or if they’re from Texas, or if they’re from Alabama? Does geography affects things?

We’re going to learn to read geography almost like a language. You learn to read geography like a language, in terms of what types of things are reflected. Is New York City different than Virginia? In a city context are you going to get one kind of worldview and are you going to get a very different way of being in West Virginia? Tell me about Galilee versus Jerusalem. Galilee is where a bunch of hicks lived. So Jesus is from there. So when he comes down into the city of Jerusalem things change. You need to learn how to read geography and how that affects things.

E. Literary Background [10:52-13:55]

Literary backgrounds: the Bible uses literary forms; God uses the literary forms of that day. So we’re going to get into things like the book of Deuteronomy. All of a sudden you’re going to be reading the book of Deuteronomy and you’re going to be saying, “Holy cow, look at that!” It’s almost exactly like a Hittite treaty form. The Hittites had

their treaties and the book of Deuteronomy fits that literary form almost to a “T”. Did God use the Hittite treaty to structure the whole book of Deuteronomy? Very likely. So, in other words, are there literary factors? God writes Hebrew poetry as he does in Psalms. We’ll be learning Psalms like, “The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want.” But you’ll notice, they don’t use rhyme and meter like we do in English; they do parallelism and parallelism of thought. It’s a whole different way of doing poetry. I love it; that’s actually my area of expertise--Hebrew poetry. It’s beautiful. So there are literary conventions that even God will observe.

One of those will be the Hebrew language. He’ll come down and speak in Hebrew. Actually, let me just harass you guys up front: Was Adam’s name really “Adam”? *[student response]* Well, “Adam” means “man” in Hebrew. Question: did Adam and Eve speak Hebrew? I want you to think about that for just a second. Did Adam and Eve speak Hebrew? Adam’s name is “man”; Eve’s name is *Havah*. You know *havah* because you say, “*la-heim*.” Does anyone say that? Alright, *La-heim* is a Jewish toast that means “to life.” *Havah*’s her name, you call her Eve. *Havah*’s name is built off “to life.” Adam and Eve’s names mean something in Hebrew. Question: could Adam speak Hebrew? The answer is, I’ll tell you flat out, he couldn’t have spoken Hebrew, nor was his name really “Adam” because, frankly the Hebrew language did not exist before 1800 BC. If the Hebrew language did not exist, how could the guy be given a Hebrew name?

Then you say “uh-oh, the whole Bible’s off, Adam and Eve just disappeared.” But what I’m saying is, are “Adam” and “Eve” translations of their original names probably? Did they translate names between cultures? Excuse me, some of you in this class, is your name a translation from your culture into our culture? Yes. So is that anything threatening? The answer is “no”. They’ve got names, and his name was - who knows what it was, but when they translated it into Hebrew, God says they’ve got to understand, his name originally meant “man” and so they just called him “Adam”. By the way, do we translate it from Hebrew into English? When it comes into English are there any

problems when going between the Hebrew and English? Yes, there are. So all I'm saying is, you've got to deal with the Hebrew language, and we'll look at. Language is important. So we're going to look at literary backgrounds.

F. Historical Background [13:56-14:09]

Ancient Near Eastern historical background: they've dug up all these archeological artifacts and we'll be noticing the archeology and what that's done to help us understand the Bible. Archeology, comparative history, literature, theological themes, and various things will help us understand the Old Testament better.

G. Introduction to the Old Testament [14:10-15:58]

Western culture: I'll explore that as well for the application of these texts as the foundation for spirituality. I will, in this course, and it will bother some people, but I will teach you the heavy stuff to try to get you to understand the Old Testament. You will learn the content of much of the Old Testament. Is the Old Testament too big for you guys to do in a semester? Seriously, the New Testament is one third the size of the Old Testament. The Old Testament's huge. So we'll cover some of it; I'd rather do some of it well then to shotgun through it. We'll do basically the history section. The thing with the history is this: if I can get you interested in the history, and I will try my best to get you interested in the history, if the history of the Old Testament is interesting, tell me about the prophets. Are they really interesting? And is the poetry really beautiful? So we'll spend a lot of time on the history and the history will lay the background for the poetry and the prophets.

Next is personal spirituality. My goal for this course is to have you love the Old Testament. When you're done, basically I hope you'll love God and you'll love his Word. In order to do this personal spirituality approach, what I do is I tell a lot of personal stories. Some of the students like the personal stories because it makes the class

more fun and they get to see how schizophrenic I am. I do that on purpose, though; the reason is that I want you to see modeled someone who is taking the word of God, the Old Testament, and showing the connection with 21st century life. I will attempt to make the connection with something that's three-thousand years old and the 21st century. I want you to see how that works out in one individual's life. I want you to see stories that will illustrate it from a very personal perspective. So I want you to think about that and how we think about God on a personal level.

H. Knowing the God of the Old Testament [15:59-20:11]

What I love about the Old Testament is this: (I've got to be careful with my illustrations now) suppose a young man is dating a young woman and he only knows this young woman in a work context. Suppose they work at MacDonald's together. They both work at MacDonald's and they see each other a lot only at MacDonald's. Question: When he only sees her in one context, does he really know her? How do you get to know a person? Do you get to know a person by seeing them in many, many different contexts; seeing them under stress, seeing them with their parents, is that pretty important? Seeing them with their parents, seeing them with their siblings, seeing them with their nieces, seeing them with their teachers, their authoritative figures, seeing them on the job, seeing them off the job. How do they party? When you see somebody in a hundred different situations, then you get to know the person. We are going to get to see God over a period of about 1500 years. God, in the Old Testament, is going to deal with hundreds and hundreds of people: Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, the 12 brothers, Moses, Aaron, Miriam, etc. We're going to see God interacting with hundreds of people and what I'm going to try to show is that God is very different than what you may have grown up to think.

So I think all of us, including the professor, have what I call "idols of the mind," in other words, false ways we conceptualize God. Part of becoming Christian is having your view of God blown apart. Not blown apart into atheism, but blown apart into

worshiping God for who he really is. Wonder, that's what I'm going to try to do, I'm just going to put the cards on the table. I hope to prepare you to wonder at the mystery of God. What's cool about wonder?

Let me just use myself for an example. So I go into the library, my brother—I was a little slow when I was in college—set me up with my wife basically in the library. He was trying to sell her some drugs [No-Doz]. She wouldn't take the "drugs." So he comes home to me, and I'll never forget it, he walks into the house and says, "Ted," now see, I was his older brother and I was kind of "straight" which meant "weird" back in those days. He was doing all sorts of really bad stuff, and he tried to drop some of the stuff on her and she wouldn't take it. So he comes home and he says, "Ted, you've got to meet this girl. She is as weird as you are! You got to meet this girl." So, I went to the library, and met her in the library and asked her out to Handel's "Messiah," which she wanted to see. So we went out then.

Question, do I know my wife (this has been 36 years now)? Are there still things about my wife that I still don't understand after 36 years? I want to tell you, you know what wonder is when you're fascinated with another person and you want to get to know them really intimately. Are there all sorts of things that come up in all sorts of different contexts with our children? They raise these issues and she goes off on one thing and I go off on exactly the opposite. Then we've got to get our act together because the kids are playing us off against one another. It is the good cop, bad cop game. In the process we have to deal with each other.

So what I want to tell you, what I want to do is to create toward God that notion of the mystery of someone whom you love, and so you want to explore who they are. God has sent us a love letter in his word—his Bible. When you really care about someone, do you notice little things about them? What I'm saying is the Bible going to tell us a whole lot of things about God and I want you to become fascinated and enamored with that. God becomes the object of your love, the object of your wonder, your mystery, and you

get caught up in that. Sorry for going off on that but it's one of the main purposes of the course: knowing God.

I. Other Course Goals [20:12-20:44]

Course goals, know the basic content of the Old Testament. People know the New Testament, Jesus walks on the water; people know a lot of the New Testament. A lot of the Old Testament people don't know. Once we get out of Genesis and when we hit Leviticus it's over. So Genesis is good, everybody knows Adam and Eve, Noah and the flood, and those kind of things. So Genesis is a good way to break in, but once we get out of there we're going to be swimming. So we'll learn the content of the Old Testament. I'm big on content learning.

J. Transmission and Translation of the Bible [20:45-22:59]

How did the Bible come down to us? What is its origin and transmission? I hold up this Bible (I use an NIV now). How did this NIV come into existence? Did God write the NIV? No, you know who wrote the NIV? Marv Wilson. That was supposed to be a joke; apparently it didn't go over too well. The honest truth is he was one of the translators of the NIV. Now I don't think he advertises that. Question, is it possible for Marv Wilson to make a mistake? You don't know Marv Wilson. No. So therefore you're guaranteed that certain books are all right.

But one thing we need to do right up front, is I see some of you getting really serious on me, do you understand sarcasm? Let me explain sarcasm. Now this is very important and it's very important to be said on tape. When I say something sarcastic, that means I meant the exact opposite of what I just said. If you take it for what I've just said, we will totally miss each other. So what I just said, Dr. Wilson is one of the greatest men I've ever met in my life; that's the truth. Now the truth is he does make mistakes. Like all humans, he makes mistakes. Now he makes a lot less than I do, but he's quite a

person. You'll be reading, by the way, his book, *Our Father Abraham*. It's a classic around here at Gordon. We'll be talking about that in a minute.

What I'm trying to say is, how did the Bible come down to us? How did Dr. Wilson get it? Well, you say, he translated it from Hebrew, because he knows Hebrew so well. That's true. Where did he get the Hebrew text from? Well, the Hebrew text came from a thousand A.D. But where did those people from a thousand A.D. get it from? It came from Moses all the way down to us. Did it have to get copied over and over again? When the people copied it, did they ever make mistakes? When people translated it, from Hebrew into Greek, and then Greek into the Latin Vulgate, did they ever make mistakes? When it comes over into English, do different translations disagree with each other? Which one do you pick? So how did the Bible come from way back then, and how does it come down to us now? We want to trace that out and be honest with our endeavors in that.

K. Textbooks [23:00-25:22]

So there's a whole bunch of things here as far as goals and I don't want to belabor that point. So let's jump into the textbooks on page two here. Jump over to your textbooks. In this course there's basically one, no two, things you've got to purchase. One thing you should have is a Bible. What translations are up to you. Do most of you use the NIV? How many of you use NIV? A lot of you use NIV. I know some of the translators. It's a good translation and was done by good people. Does anybody use the NRSV? The NRSV, okay, Kyle, are there others? NRSV is the New Revised Standard Version, it's a good version also. It was done in a more, how shall I say, broad English, more than just American English kind of way. Anybody use the ESV? ESV and RSV are close like this. The ESV is, in my opinion, and by the way, let me just do this. When I walk over here, that means I am giving you my opinion; over there is the Bible, this is my opinion. Do I have a right to an opinion? Yes, but when I walk over here, do you trust that or not trust that? It's me, trust it. What I'm trying to tell you is, this is my opinion and I could be wrong. But I have checked the ESV out in thousands of places

and basically it's a knock-off of the NRSV. But the NRSV is very good. ESV is good. Does anybody use the NLT, New Living Translation? You've got to be really careful with that one. Especially in the book of Proverbs and other places you have to be very careful with the NLT. Sometime just look up the book of Proverbs in there and just see the problems with it. [*Sad joke I was one of the translators of the NLT for Proverbs.*] I'm saying that with a smirk on my face.

So what other translations do we have? King James Version, does anybody do King James? You'll notice I will often quote out of the King James. I will often be looking at the NIV but I'll be reading King James in my head because when I was a kid I was trained in the King James Version [KJV] and the King James is still very deep in me. The King James is one of the most beautiful translations ever done anywhere. It's a phenomenal piece of work. Does anybody use the New King James Version? The New King James Version is very helpful and takes out a lot of the "thee's" and "thou's" that makes it more readable. It's a well done translation, the New King James. Those are all fine.

L. Introduction of the DASV [Digital American Standard Version] [25:23-28:33]

Now I want to introduce something to you guys. About two years ago I had girl in class who had trouble seeing. When I gave her a test I gave her a forty-six page test because, the font had to be over 24 pt. So each page was one or two questions, it was all I could get on some pages. She had trouble seeing. Secondly, the year before last, I don't want to use her name, but a girl sat right down in front, a great person, but she was blind, and she went around with a cane. Then I wondered how do you get the word of God into somebody like that? They need to be able to, in case of the one, I don't want to say her name, but let me just make up a name, Janice, had to be able to blow up the font. By the way, is a computer a wonderful thing for blowing up the font? Have you guys ever done that with the web where you push "control +" and you can make the font grow right on your screen. "Control -" shrinks it down again.

So what I decided to do was to make my own translation of the Bible, and you say that's really arrogant and it probably is and it's probably stupid. Anyway I did it. What I'm calling it is the DASV. DASV is the Digital American Standard Version. It is built off the ASV of 1901. I used the ASV as the basis then I modified it and updated it. What's the advantage when it's in digital format? It's online. If it's on the screen, can you print it? Yes, it's in PDF, it's in DOC (you guys use DOC, Microsoft Word), it's in HTML. Do you guys use PDF, HTML, DOC? What's the advantage of putting it in DOC? Can you drop it in your word processor? Can you cut and paste it? Yes. What's the advantage of PDF? It can be read on Macs and PCs and wherever. What's the advantage of HTML? When you click it, it jumps on the screen instantly. HTML is the language of the web. Plus I also then made, unfortunately with my voice, what are called audio MP3s. Now in the old days they used to have these things you'd put on your arm, they used to be called, I think it was i-pods. You put these things on your arm and then you put these things in your ears and you kind of go around with this thing and you go out jogging. Or if you're my wife and you've got to travel to Lowell every day and you're traveling an hour and ten minutes in the car you cut the MP3 and put it on a CD. Do you ever listen to books while you're in the car because you're traveling two and a half hours a day to go to work? So there are MP3 audios for the whole Bible. This means then, can you listen to the Scriptures? So that's one of the advantages to the DASV. I'm exploring other things such as images, images with text and combining images with texts and the digital format allows me to do that. That's up online and to be honest with you, two weeks ago Thursday, I finally finished it. After a long time, I finally finished it, and it's at my editor's now, Chronicles will be the last book. My editor is my mother. She's editing the last part of it. But anyway, the DASV [Digital American Standard Version] is available online for anyone who wants to use that as well.

M. Our Father Abraham by Dr. Marv Wilson [28:34-34:19]

Now the only book that you have to purchase for this class is Dr. Marv Wilson's

book *Our Father Abraham*. It's a classic here. It's done by Dr. Wilson, who teaches at Gordon. Are there used copies of *Our Father Abraham* all over this campus? Every student that's come here has had to buy this book, so there are used copies all over the place. So you should be able to get it fairly cheaply.

Let me explain the last part of this class, as far as what's required for this class. Let me walk over here to do that. The honest truth is, as I look at you guys, I could never have sat where you're sitting. When I went through college I was really poor. I ended up working forty hours a week and going to school. You say, "Oh, that's really something working forty hours and going to school that's must have been neat." When you work forty hours a week and go to school full time in engineering, it's not neat. It's not fun, it's a lot of down-right work and it's a real hassle. But I was dirt poor and my parents and no one in my family went to college. So I was the first one. This collar that I wear is white now, but that collar is really blue. Blue to the core; my parents never went to college. So I was the only one who went to college. My parents didn't have any money; they could barely afford to live. So did I grow up with a real sense of what money meant and the accompanying limitations of not having it?

Well, five years ago, I was assigning books for this class and the books were getting up to almost a hundred bucks. Have you guys bought your books? Have you paid a hundred bucks for books for classes? Old Testament was starting to be a hundred dollars for books. I said, "This is crazy." If I were a student and I came to this class and I was going to be charged a hundred dollars for books that would not be good. I thought there's got to be a better way to do this. I also know what it's like to publish books. I have published books and CDs etc., etc. Question: how much does the publisher make? Let me put it this way, this is my wife's thing, she says, "you spent all summer working on this article on wisdom literature, and they published it in the *InterVarsity Dictionary for Wisdom and Poetry*." So I spent all summer working on it and we're talking two to three-hundred hours-worth of work. How much do I get paid for that? I'll just be flat out honest, how much did I get paid for that? Two hundred and fifty dollars. Figure it out. My wife is a CPA—she did. And she said, "you're making less than a dollar an hour.

Why don't you go to a Sam's Club or Wal-Mart and be a greeter, at least you'll make minimum wage. That would be a 600% increase, Ted, instead of writing all this stupid stuff." What I'm telling you is, the publishers make 90% and the authors make less than 10%.

So now, my thing is and this is what I'm really into, leverage the Internet. Leverage the digital medium for the good of others and for the glory of God. Now how do we do that? Well that means I know a lot of scholars now because I'm an old man. I go around to my buddies and friends and I say, "Hey, you got a copyright on that article, can we use that article at Gordon College? Can I post it up online?" Now question, when I post it up on line, what's the advantage of that? Can I now post it in full text (HTML, DOC, PDF) can I also make it an MP3 audio file so you can listen to these articles? Now you can listen as well as read it. By the way, do some people like to read it as it's being read to them? You can actually set it up so it reads to you while you look at the text and get it in both your eyes and ears.

So, anyway, I've gone through and done that, and have basically everything you need in the course. So what's that going to cost you? It costs you a fraction of that. So you pay me ten bucks and that provides you with all the materials for this course. That's basically it. So what that does, to be honest with you, it saves everyone in this class at least fifty bucks and realistically more like seventy-five bucks.

You say, "But, Hildebrandt, you're making ten bucks a piece, you're making all this money." Let me tell you this after several years of doing this, how much do I make? The answer is right there "0"; because it costs me. Frankly, I have to pay some of these people for some of the material. We're going to see videos and the like. I've had to pay those people. My goal, and I've been pretty successful so far, is to make nothing and that's what I end up coming out with. By the time I'm done, how should I say, I use the content that you guys give me to develop more of this content. So that's kind of what's going on there. That's all the cards out on the table. That's kind of the way it is, but it's ten bucks.

So you say where is all of the material online that you're talking about? This is what they call the Internet. This is called...let me, "my name is Al Gore, I invented this." Sorry, I've got to be careful about this now. This is on video tape. This is what President Bush called "the Google." I don't know my own URL; this is the honest truth. So here's how you get to my site. By the way, it's outside Blackboard, it's out in public space. So when you go home you can get at this material from anywhere, it's on the web. I'm going to go to "the Google." This is how I get to my own site: I type in "Ted Hildebrandt," it's up here by the top in the search box. I type in "Ted Hildebrandt." I hit "search," and then there it is, do you see it; "Theodore," (Theodore's another name for "Ted") "Hildebrandt" and it says Gordon College, so I click this link to go to my website. After I hit it, I might bookmark it, because am I going to be going back there again and again, so I bookmark it.

N. Online Course Resources [34:20-37:28]

Here's the site. By the way, when you come in here, do you see the DASV, the Digital American Standard? Do you see that this says "Old Testament: BCM 101," that's us. So you go "Old Testament: BCM 101" and you click there; and what is here? The syllabus. Do you need this printed one? Yes, you do, because some of you are going to lose your syllabi. Is it always there? It's always there. So here is the HTML, DOC, PDF, for your syllabus. You've got copies of your syllabus now so you don't need that electronic one. Okay, here's some old study guides from old exams.

Here's your first week's assignment. What do you need to do for next Thursday? You're going to be reading Genesis 1-25—you can do it in the DASV. Here's the DASV. You can do it from a DASV zip file. Now there are some articles you need to read; and so where are the articles? You just go down here, and you see this one here, it says "Dr. Elaine Phillips: Theology Primer." So you've got HTML, DOC, and then you've got an MP3 there. The MP3 means what? You right-click on the MP3 link and you click "Save as," and then you save it down to your computer or jump drive and you've got the audio

for it ready to go. Now here's Dr. Perry Phillips. Dr. Perry Phillips has a PhD in astrophysics and he's writing on the Days of Genesis, the seven days of creation. He's a scientist, PhD from Cornell University, and he writes on the Days of Genesis; HTML, DOC, PDF, and MP3 so you can listen to it. Here's Don Carson; now Carson is a super-scholar and I've got his "Challenge to Pluralism" again in the three print formats and the MP3 audio so you can listen to that.

Now for this class, let me just give you the first couple of quiz questions for next Thursday; here's your first quiz question, did you (don't write this down, this is dumb). The first question is: Did you read Genesis 1-25? How much did you read? Did you read a hundred percent, ninety percent, or eighty percent? How much of Genesis 1-25 did you read in the last three weeks? Meaning I want you to do what? Read Genesis 1-25. Did you read Elaine Phillips' *Primer, Theology Primer*? Yes or no. Did you read Perry Phillips' *Days of Genesis*, yes or no (and how much if you didn't read the whole thing)? Now on the D.A. Carson article, I'm going to ask you specific questions. So Carson you need to read with more detail because I'm going to ask you one or two questions on the content of Carson's article.

Here are the memory verses; two memory verses, Genesis 1:27 and 2:24. By the way, here are all the PowerPoints; I use PowerPoints in class. Here are all the PowerPoints that I will have on the screen. Question: does that mean you will need to copy down all the PowerPoints? No, just download them and put them on your machine. You can go into PowerPoint, pull all the text out and put it in Word, or even take notes on the PowerPoint slides themselves. The PowerPoints are there so you don't have to write everything down. It's there so you can use those as part of the course materials. Do you see the benefit of that? So the PowerPoints are listed here.

O. Online Bible Quizzer [37:29-41:50]

Bible-robics; we'll do some "Bible-robics" and we'll do that in a few minutes. Here is a multiple choice quizzer. When you read Genesis 1-25, here are the stories that I

want you to know. You'll be reading big chunks of the Bible; I can't have you know everything, right? So I'll list the stories that I want you to know and master the details of. I'll ask you specific questions on those specific stories. Now Peter Story built a HTML5/Javascript quizzier, Bible quizzier, on the book of Genesis, so I'm going to click this Genesis drop down menu to show you what it is. It's kind of fun. Here's a Bible quizzier built online. This is all online, out there; you can do it from anywhere at any time.

Here's the book of Genesis, chapters 1 to 50. Then it asks do you want beginning, intermediate, or advanced levels of difficulty. What do you guys want to try? Advanced, okay, these guys are good. All right, let's try the advanced questions, and I'm going to click off the beginning, and we're going to click "next." Then about ten minutes later it will come up—it came up quickly. So, our first question: "What did Jacob put on Rachel's tomb?" Flowers, you usually put flowers on a tomb right? a pillar, a stone from each of his children? Did anybody see "Schindler's List," they put a stone. Anyways, an altar to the Lord? Somebody said an altar. So we're going to pick "an altar." Now, what color came up? This is supposed to be red, so the feedback is in your face when you get it wrong. The correct answer comes up in green--the growing color. So it was really a pillar, he built a pillar as a memorial. That isn't a bad guess, an altar to the Lord. They did build a lot of altars.

So then I hit "next" and we can go to: "At the time when the descendants of Shem were on the earth, the earth was divided in whose time?" And then it gives you these names. By the way are these advanced questions? Yes. Nimrod, that was an excellent guess, because Nimrod was a mighty hunter before the Lord, but she guessed and I don't want to push Nimrod because I'll feel bad again. I'm going to push Peleg. The word "Peleg" in Hebrew means "to divide;" you know like dividing the languages. Maybe, should I pick the right one? Why don't I pick Luddite just in honor of the Luddites? Do you know what a Luddite is, anyone? I'm going to pick Luddite and you see the answer was really Peleg. Peleg comes up as the right answer and it says, "No, Luddite is

wrong.”

[Student question] We shouldn't have picked the advanced questions, these are too advanced. If you picked the beginning questions it would say, “Who was Adam's wife?” or something like that. See what he's doing. Let me start over here, actually let me go back to the quiz selector, so you just go back to the quiz selector. He's paranoid, so let me just go here and hit “next.” Here's a beginning question. “Who lived the longest in Genesis 5?” Who lived the longest of anybody? Methuselah. So that's the quizzier. Now you say, I still didn't know Methuselah, so the Bible quizzier is online here. All the questions for the quiz will be taken from the “easy” section, the “beginning” level. So you can go over the “beginning” level ones and you'll come up with the hundred and ninety-three questions. It won't take too long to buzz through those. Beginning questions will come up. Methuselah will not be on your quiz, however. So does everybody see how this works? So let me get back to this Old Testament quizzier and I've got Genesis through Deuteronomy done. Then, quite frankly, I was writing seven hundred questions for the book of Joshua and, I've got to be honest with you, I just ran out of time. I haven't done anymore and I haven't been able to reprogram the Flash and there's a lot of stuff I haven't been able to do. I just haven't had the time to do it. But I've got Genesis to Deuteronomy done--to do this through Deuteronomy is a pretty big chunk by the way. So we'll have the quizzier for that. So then here are the stories that you'll need to know.

P. Transcribing Assignment [41:51-46:59]

Let's go back to your syllabus. One of the things that we'll be doing in the class is there's an attendance policy here and extra credit. But before I do the extra credit, let me describe an assignment and you can be thinking about this. I'm wanting you today to break up into groups. So you'll be breaking up into groups of six or seven. So look around and think about breaking up into groups of six or seven. Now, what you're going to do by next Thursday. Let me try to explain what is going to be happening. What

you're going to do is, I'm going to give you a ten minute section of audio and you're going to type up what the person said. I call it "transcribing." You know what transcribing is? You listen and you transcribe ten minutes and you've got it. Now there will be six people in your group that means ten minutes, ten minutes, ten minutes, you take the six people and you put them together and what have you got? You've got an hour lecture.

So I've got lectures by Dr. Dave Mathewson and Dr. Robert Vannoy. These guys are really super-scholars and we're going to transcribe their lectures to put it into what? HTML, DOC, and PDF. Now why am I doing this? Let me just walk over here again. Why am I doing this? Because, this never sells very well with the students, but if I keep saying it I'm hoping it catches on. When I went to college it was like "I'm going to college, feed me, feed me, teach me, all this stuff, teach me, teach me," and it was all this self-direction. What I'm wanting you to do is to think about the fact that you're at Gordon College. Is Gordon College a really incredible place? You're lucky to be here; I know we don't use the word "luck" anymore. But it's a special that you're here. My thing is, do we at Gordon College need to be developing things to help Christian people at other places who don't have it as well as we do? So what we want to do is create these lectures that are pulled from Dr. Robert Vannoy, a specialist in Samuel. We'll take his lectures and transcribe these lectures and make them available to people all over the world. By the way, will people all over the world come to Gordon College to use these lectures to help them in the Christian church? The answer is: "Yes." So I want you to think about learning in terms of producing things that help other people who aren't as privileged as we are.

Now you say, "Oh, yeah, Hildebrandt, that just means work." Yes, it means an hour's worth of your time. An hour's worth of work and we put it all together. So in each one of your groups of six or seven you're going to have one person who's an editor and they better be an English major or somebody like that. You've got one person who's an editor and you've got what we call scribes and you've got five or six scribes. The five

or six scribes will get an MP3 audio. They'll type it up. It will be about ten minutes and it will take you about an hour depending on how fast you type.

Let me tell you a very important secret; and you say, "Hildebrandt, how do you know all this stuff," I have done hours and hours of transcription myself, so I know exactly how long this work takes and the problems with it.

When you get your audio, if you put it on full-steam ahead, does the guy talk a lot faster than you can type? Yes. He's talking a mile a minute and you can't keep up. If you are in Windows and you're in the Windows Media Player there's a play button. It's got a triangle on the "play" button. If you right click on that play button you can set it to "slow," and it slows it way down. Now, question, what's the advantage? If Vannoy goes slow, can I almost keep up to him typing? I still can't keep up with him, but now I do a minute at a time, I'll do a minute of typing. What do I do, you grab the little scrubber thing at the bottom and you take it back. Do you know how to do that? Bring the scrubber back and then you play it again, one minute. Then you do it again. Type, then do it again. So then after about two or three times of pulling it back to go over the one minute have I got the one minute typed? Then I'll go to the second minute, and it'll be one minute to two minutes. Then I'll go through and I'll type as fast as I can the first time and I'll get about eighty or seventy percent of it. Then I'll scrub back to the one minute mark and I'll listen to it again. But the media player going slow is really important and really helpful.

Now Mac people, I'm not a Mac person, I'm a Christian. Sorry, but anyway, I shouldn't say that especially on the day when Steve Jobs stepped down today. Steve Jobs stepped down today, that's a big deal for you Mac people. Anyway, on the Mac, you can get the Mac to go slow. I don't know how to do it but I'm told if you go into properties or something in the Mac player you can get the Mac to go slow and you can set it to go slow. So Mac can do it too. Check with CET to see if they know how to do that, I don't know how to do it because it's Mac and I'm just a PC person. Mac people can download the free VLC Media Player and in the bottom right corner set the speed on that player to

slow by adjusting the number there. So that's coming up; so be thinking about the groups you're going to be breaking into.

Q. Testing and Quizzes [46:50-48:04]

In this course if you want a good grade you're going to need to take the tests. Basically this is how the class will work; every Thursday, quiz, quiz, quiz, quiz, every about fifth week, there will be a test. Quiz, quiz, quiz, quiz, quiz, test; that's how it goes. Okay? So every Thursday is either a quiz or a test that kind of rhythm. Now if you say, "I've bombed Hildebrandt's quizzes, I don't know who Methuselah's mother was, Hildebrandt had this question on Methuselah's mother, and I didn't know it, so I missed it and I want to better my grade." You can do extra-credit in here. You can do extra transcriptions, and by the way, we're taping this whole thing, so you can do transcriptions of this class actually. We'll put the transcriptions up as we get them too as well for the whole class to help other people. You can do other transcriptions also. I've got lectures from Dr. R. Laird Harris who talked about Leviticus and was an expert on Leviticus. So you can do that for extra credit, you'll have to do a whole transcription. You'll have to do the whole hour that will take you about six to ten hours. Then five points of extra-credit are added onto your final average. So that's one way to do it. You could do memory verses as well.

R. Honors Option [48:05-49:48]

I also want to advertise a little bit for the honor's option. What is the honors option? The honor's option on page five and it works like this: if you score better than a 92 on the first exam and you've got quizzes better than a 90, you can ask for the honors option. What that is, is you can get out of the final exam by doing two transcriptions yourself. What that amounts to is, two transcriptions are going to run you probably about ten to twelve hours. So you say, "well that's ten to twelve hours, I could get..." What's the advantage of not taking the final? Come final's week all the classes have finals.

Finals week is really tough with all these exams. If you can off load one of those finals and say I don't have to take a final in Old Testament class, does that free you up to study better for your other exams? Use your heads. So this way you can do the transcriptions. When do you have to do that? You can do that on your own time, whenever you want, and then you get out of the final. So there's a benefit to doing that. So that's called the "honors option."

Evaluations here are given for my benefit; I grade on a curve. But this is where I start my curve. So if you want to get the grade just do the extra credit work, and it lets you adjust your own grade. I believe in curves; I used to teach with an old guy, he was seventy-five years old. He said he didn't believe in curving. For him, curves belonged on roads, in baseball and on women, not on exams and grades. Now I say that, the guy was a seventy-five years old, give him a break. You say, "that's a very sexist statement." The guy's seventy-five, okay, let him live. I say, curves also belong on my test scores. So we will work at that.

S. Assignments for the Coming Week [49:49-51:33]

Next, if you flip over the audio project which is described on page six with the audio transcription. Then if you go over to page eight; this is what you need to keep open. This is where the action happens and this is basically, September 1. Do you see September 1? What is due next Thursday? You've got to read the "Theology Primer," you've got to do the "Days of Genesis," you've got to read the "Challenges of Pluralism." By the way, the "Theology Primer" and the "Days of Genesis," do you have to know all the details on those, or do you just have to read it? Just read it. You don't have to know the details. You do have to know details on the "Challenges of Pluralism." Read from the Bible Genesis 1 to 25. Basically, you've got to do your transcriptions, your transcriptions are due next Thursday too, which I see isn't listed here, but those will be due next week and you'll break into groups in a minute here.

You've got to break into groups but before you break into groups, you guys have

to know Genesis 1 to 25. I want to teach you Genesis 1 to 25 in Bible-robics. That means, everybody's up, we're going to do Genesis 1 to 25, here's how it goes. Everybody stand up and be thinking about breaking into your groups. But here's Genesis 1-25. [*Do Bible-robics*]

So seven to eight o'clock in this room every Wednesday night Kyle will be running the reviews for the exams. The quizzes are always on Thursday so he'll be doing it every Wednesday night here, seven to eight o'clock. That's good to know, he'll get you set up for that. Let's jump back in, we have got to do two more things. We've got a Bible assessment exam so we're going to try to assess the kind of biblical literacy knowledge level that you have. That'll be our first quiz, it doesn't count, but it's just kind of an assessment we do.

T. Proofs on the Existence of God [51:34-52:16]

Before we do that, I wanted to get started on some underlying presuppositions. We believe at Gordon College that this book, the Bible, is the Word of God. Now that makes some assumptions. If this is the Word of God, then our first assumption is that there is a what? There is a God. Do we live in a culture where atheism is trying to make a big comeback? There's about what, four percent of Americans who are atheists and they're trying to make a big comeback. So there's all this, Dawkins and all of this, etc. etc.

So why do we believe there is a God? By the way, can we prove the existence of God? The answer is: no. Is it reasonable to believe that there is a God? Yes, though we can't prove it. So what I want to do is to run through some of the proofs for the existence of God.

U. Cosmological Argument [52:17-54:34]

One of the proofs that we're going to use is the cosmological argument. By the

way, these arguments are actually all on the web. There's a whole sheet and I'll give you the sheet next time with these all printed on them. But the cosmological argument basically works like this, cause – effect, cause – effect, cause – effect. If I look at you, can I assume that you had some parents? By the way, is it possible for you not to know your parents but did you have parents at one point? Now you say, “But Hildebrandt, now they can do it in a test tube.” Okay, but that's not what I'm saying. What I'm saying is if I look at you, I can assume that you had parents. So you look at effects and think about the causes. You see a train wreck can you assume when you see a train wreck that something went wrong. When you see effects of things can you assume causes? Cause-effect, cause-effect, cause-effect. Can cause-effect, cause – effect work all the way down over thousands of years of causes-effects?

Now what happens when you get back to the first cause? What is the first cause that caused everything? Cause-effect, cause-effect, cause-effect work all the way back, what's the first cause? You say, well, the first cause was the whole universe comes together, in one big, actually it was small, it was about the size of a grapefruit, wasn't it? It's supposed to be the size of a grapefruit or a watermelon. It was all together once, then what happened? Boom, it exploded and the universe came into being. What caused that initial explosion to happen? By the way, even scientists who don't believe in God have to come up with a way for the first cause to get this thing going. We, as Christians, would say the first cause is what? “God.” And so, in other words, cause-effect, cause-effect, cause-effect, we go back to the original cause, and the first cause is God. Do other people have to propose something else as the first cause? By the way when you've got the whole universe together in a watermelon and you've got to blow that whole thing up, do you have to have something powerful enough that can defy gravity and just blow the whole thing up like that? What kind of force does that take for a universe? So the first one is the first cause and we would suggest that God is our first cause, other people may propose other causes but when you use this cause and effect thing going back it's like that.

V. Teleological [Jolly Green Giant] argument – Argument from Design [54:35-60:49]

This one I like a lot. This argument is called the teleological argument. It is the argument from design. What this means is, I call it my “Jolly Green Giant” argument. You guys are all sitting in chairs; do you see how the chairs are arranged? Rows, aisle there, aisle there, aisle there, aisle there, aisle there, and about ten rows going back. Now what’s going to happen is, there is a jolly, green giant, and we’re going to unhook all of the chairs, [don’t do this], but we’re going to unhook all of the chairs. The jolly, green giant then is going to pick up the building of Jenks, and he’s going to shake it and he going to put it down. When he puts it down I want the chairs to be in exactly this same order. By the way, there’s what, 110 chairs? Not a big deal. 110 chairs, I want them exactly the way they are now, aisle there, aisle there, aisle there, aisle there, these rows, three there, four there, okay, exactly like this set up. Now I’ll let him do it a billion times. He will shake Jenks a billion times and put it down.

Question: do you think after a billion times it would come out exactly like this just once? You say, we’re Americans, and we don’t do billions anymore, we do trillions. Now I wouldn’t laugh too hard if I were you because you guys are the ones who are stuck paying. So I’ll give you a billion trillions, the giant is going to shake it for a billion, trillion years and he’s going to keep doing it. How many of you think in a billion, trillion years that the chairs would line up just like this? How many of you think that after he did it the first time that these chairs would be so tangled up that they would be a mess forever?

When you see order, if you came into this room and you were just born out of the cosmic ether and you came into this room and you walked into this room as your first experience as a little baby walking in, and you looked around and saw these chairs, would you assume these chairs were from a glacier that pushed these chairs into this order?

Let me take you a different way, walk with me around Sinai. Walk with me through the desert of Sinai, which I did for many weeks because my guide said we had to walk Sinai. Well, walking in Sinai there rocks everywhere. All of a sudden we walk up on this thing, there's a circle of rocks about this big, ten feet around, and on the western side, there's two rocks set up like this and there's a rock that goes over this like this and there's a hole in there on the west side and you can kind of crawl in there. It's kind of like an igloo made out of rocks. Now when we saw those nawamis in Sinai, that igloo, for the first time; and, by the way, there were ten of them, and they all had the doorway facing to the west. It was like for midgets or something, you had to get down there to go in. Anyway what I'm saying, when we hit all ten of those, they all faced the west and the doorway was about this high. Did we assume it must have just happened that way, that the glacier just kind of dropped them down that way? How many of you, when you walk up and saw ten of them, all facing the west, with the doorway, hollow in the middle, how many of you would assume that that's just natural causes—there was no plan for that it just happened that way? When you see that level of order, do you not say somebody did that?

Some of you are from New Hampshire. Have you ever walked through the woods and all of a sudden you're back in the woods and you see this row of rocks, all lined up straight and it looks like a rock wall. When you see that rock wall all lined up straight, did you assume that the glacier did that or that people did that? When you see that level of order, order demands a what—a person who ordered it, right?

When you come into this room and you see these chairs all lined up like that, is this obviously the work of a human being? Somebody set this up. Is it luck that the chairs came like this, and if you shook it a million times it would be a mess.

Basically this is an argument from order, because the universe is a universe having many more times the order of this room. Therefore there must be an Orderer, someone who orders this stuff. In other words, it just doesn't luckily happen; otherwise you'd have a chaotic mess, but there isn't a chaotic mess. So that leads to a thing called "intelligent design." By the way, are there different people who have different opinions

on this thing, intelligent design? Again, I want to walk over here, are there different people on this campus that have different views on intelligent design? Some people say, “No, I don’t believe in intelligent design” evolution is more their thing. Other people are more creationistic--know God created things. Intelligent design says what? That the universe is designed, that the universe has a Designer.

Now, by the way, the people that developed this, the scientists would say, these people that do intelligent design are a bunch of morons, they’re not really scientists. Let me just tell you about William Dembski, he’s not a real scientist, he’s just got a, let’s see, a PhD in mathematics from the University of Chicago. Oh yes, and I forgot to say, he also has a PhD from the University of Chicago in philosophy; a double PhD. So he’s a real idiot, isn’t he? You say, that’s the University of Chicago; we’re Harvard people out here. I just want to tell you there are other schools that are decent outside Massachusetts. The University of Chicago is a top-flight school. He’s got two PhDs out of the place and one in mathematics. A person who gets a PhD in mathematics, does that say something? Think about that, yes. Does he know some things about science? The answer is, yes. He’s one of the people who’s behind intelligent design, and what I’m trying to say is there are tons of people who hold intelligent design who are first class scientists. So be careful about this, “well, scientists don’t hold this,” that’s wrong. There are tons of scientists who hold intelligent design.

So anyway I just want you to think about some of these types of things. Can we prove the existence of God? No. Do these things lead us, when we see order in the universe of the magnitude that we see it, to think that someone ordered this stuff? I ask you to look at this classroom, if you came in here, would you not assume somebody put these chairs this way? It didn’t happen just by chaos or luck. So all I’m saying is the universe is of orders of magnitude higher than ordering these chairs.

W. Dr. Perry Phillips Big Bang and the Creation of the Universe Lecture [60:50-62:30]

Dr. Perry Philips, PhD in astrophysics from Cornell University, is that decent--

PhD, astrophysics, Cornell University? He's married to Dr. Elaine Philips. Dr. Philips is going to do a talk on the "Big Bang Theory" next Monday night at seven o'clock; down in Jenks 237. I'll send you guys an email on this. Perry Philips is going to discuss the Big Bang Theory and how he thinks that leads to the idea that there is a God. A first-class scientist, I know Perry Philips very well. I lived with Perry and Elaine, and we lived as two couples in Israel for a year together. Do you get to know a person really well when you've lived together like that for a year? That's one of the reasons I want to tell you, just between us, here, Dr. Perry Philips is one of the most godly, Christian men I've met in my lifetime and I consider him a dear friend of thirty-something years now. But is he also a full quality scientist? The guy has a Ph.D. in astrophysics, very bright, very, very bright too. So he's doing that Monday night and it's a free lecture, seven o'clock, Jenks 237. If you've ever wondered about the Big Bang, this is very, very good. [His lecture is posted online on our web site.]

We have one more thing to do here and that is to do this assessment. So I'm going to pass this out if I could get somebody to help me down here. I'll give you this stack, and this stack, and just kind of pass them out over there.

Transcribed by Ashley Holm
Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt 2
Final edit by Grace Wood

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 2[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)**A. Introduction and Prayer [0:0-2:24]**

This is lecture number two by Dr. Ted Hildebrandt on Old Testament History Literature and Theology. The lecture today will be on the doctrines of inspiration, canonization, transmission, and translation.

One thing I should say that somebody did last year that I thought was really cool, I had a girl who was sitting over here and her father wanted to take her Old Testament class with her. We're talking helicopter parent, but anyway, actually, I really enjoyed the guy. I ended up emailing him. This guy emailed me back and forth and it was really cool. He would go through the readings, and I got a kick out of that. By the way, was that really neat that he could see what his daughter was learning? You don't think that's neat...okay, I thought it was pretty neat.

Let's open with a word of prayer, and then we're going to run through some stuff here today.

Father, we are so grateful that you have spoken, and that you have spoken to prophets who were men and women of God, and they recorded Scripture. Then you had it preserved for us for thousands of years through all sorts of ravages of time. You've had it preserved for us and translated for us into English so we can understand it, and we still have it. Many of us even have multiple copies of it and we thank you for your word that you've spoken. We thank you for your word in nature, and we just, as the passing of this hurricane, realize that the heavens declare the glory of God. So we look at the heavens and we praise you for your greatness and for the universe that you've made. We thank you most of all for your son Jesus Christ who died for our sins. We thank you so much for your love and your compassion. I pray that you might help us today as we go over some things that are rather tricky. We pray that you might give me the ability to speak them in

ways that build up faith rather than tear it down...and that the name of your son might be honored by this class, in his precious name we pray. Amen.

B. Review: Cosmological and Teleological Arguments for God's Existence [2:25-6:26]

Last time we were saying that the Bible (we are going to be studying the Old Testament), that this book is the word of God. So the first thing that we need to show is that a belief in God is reasonable. Now, can we prove that there is a God? No. Can we show that it is reasonable? Can people prove how the Big Bang happened 16 billion years ago or so? Can people prove that? No. Is that an assumption on their part as well? So is it only Christians who have faith in assumptions? Do other people also have assumptions? Yes. Science has them, every culture has them. So, is there a God?

We talked about the cosmological argument, which was basically following cause-effect, cause-effect, cause-effect, all the way back to the initial cause; the initial watermelon or grapefruit, and what caused the universe to come into existence. We as Christians would say the initial cause that was involved in blowing the watermelon or grapefruit apart was God, and that God was involved in the creation of the universe. So what cause was the first cause to cause all of the rest of this stuff to happen? We would say that's God. The first cause is the cosmological argument.

We also used the teleological argument. The teleological argument was an argument from design. The universe is very, very well structured; very well ordered. One guy has written a book, the six numbers, and if you change any of these six numbers, the whole universe changes. For example, the gravitational pull, what happens if the gravitational pull was different than what it is now? Suppose gravitation was just three quarters of what it is now. What would have happened to the universe when it exploded? Instead of gravitation holding things together, the universe would do what? It would have been blown apart. What happens if gravitation, on the other hand, was stronger than it is now? The universe would go out, and it is possible it would be sucked back together. But

the way it is, the gravitational pull seems to be perfect in the way that it allows for us to live. There are other factors too. The size and the weight of a proton, and what if that was changed? It would change everything. And so, this guy goes through six numbers and says the universe is incredibly balanced around these six numbers. Now you could say that's luck, right? That we just lucked out. But doesn't it make you say, "That's just too many things to be luck?"

So it's kind of like we used the example of this room with the chairs in this room. You walk into this room and you look at these chairs, would you assume that it was just luck and chance that these chairs popped in the way they are now? No, when you look at the chairs in rows you would conclude: "Somebody did that." How do you know that those chairs were put there by somebody? Because there is too much order. You've got three rows here, you've got no chairs sitting out in the middle, they kind of angle up, you've got ten in a row like that, they're all lined up nicely. You say "This couldn't just be by luck, there must have been a designer who designed this room and built it like this. So that's the argument from design, it's called the teleological argument.

Then we talked a little bit about intelligent design and actually I think last time I got my people, William Craig, mixed up with a guy named William Dempski, the mathematician that had the double PhD was Dempski out of the University of Chicago. Craig is also an apologist, on the west coast at Talbot seminary, is anybody familiar with it? Anyway, Craig is out there, he also argues apologetics, but Dempski is one of the big ones, double Ph.D., Intelligent Design. Now different people will establish then, how did this happen? Intelligent design says that there is so much order in the universe that you need someone, you need an intelligence, to design this because it's not just luck and chance otherwise, there'd be more chaos.

C. Moral Argument for the existence of God [6:27-9:39]

Now here's our next argument. This is the Moral argument. Do animals have morals? We went out to (I took my son who just got back from Afghanistan) Yellowstone National Park. What's one of the problems with taking a walk in Yellowstone? Are there

big critters out there? What happened was there was a fifty-seven year old man and his wife who went for a walk. It turns out that there was a mother grizzly bear. The grizzly bear saw the man and went after him and killed him. What's the problem with the grizzly bear? Is a grizzly bear able to take a human being pretty easily? Just their claws are as long as my finger. The grizzly bear goes like that once and you're gutted. These animals are incredibly strong and they can run really fast. Anyway, this guy was devoured. His wife got away, by the way, do you know how she got away? This is the truth... she started hollering at the bear and nobody can take a woman screaming at them so the bear took off... That was a joke (I have to be careful about these kind of things now that I'm being taped) but what I am saying is, how did the woman get away? Do you know what she did? This is the truth, what she did was while her husband was devoured by the bear, she pretended that she was dead. The bear came up, nosed her, may have clamped into her (I think she had some minor wounds) but the bear did not devour her because the bear figured she was dead and left her alone. That's the truth, she got away by playing dead. That's pretty freaky, isn't it? She totally went limp and pretended like she was dead and she was spared.

My point is, if an animal devours a human being, is that an immoral animal? Do animals have morals? No, they eat each other! That's what I'm saying; they devour things naturally. A human being that kills another human being, is there something immoral with that? We've got laws that call that murder. By the way, are there different levels of murder too? Some 85 year old person is in a car, and they don't know what they're doing. They stepped on the gas pedal instead of the break and ended up running a kid down. It ended up happening down in Boston. Suppose the kid gets killed, is that old person a murderer? Well, they should not be driving but that is a different question. What we're saying is there was no malicious intent or forethought. That person was probably devastated from the fact that they killed someone.

In other words, human beings have morals. Where did those morals come from? If you don't believe that there is a God, then where did morals come from? By the way, can

secular people come up with places that morals come from? Yes, they can, but do they have to work a lot harder than we do, saying there is a God, who spoke and said “Thou shalt not” what? “Commit murder. Thou shalt not lie, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not commit adultery,” that’s pretty straight up. So, where did morals come from? It’s more of a problem without God than with God.

D. Pascal’s wager as proof for the existence of God [9:40-13:16]

Pascal’s wager. This is one I like. Does anybody like gambling? I don’t, but let me just say this. We’re going to roll seven and eleven on a couple of dice. Each die has six sides, so how many possibilities, can come up with two die? You guys probably do this in statistics. Six on each die, so six times six, so thirty-six different combinations. Now seven, you can get in how many ways? One and six, three and four, etc. So we’re going to roll dice, and here’s the way its going to be. Because I care about you guys, we’re going to set this up. If I roll the dice and I don’t get seven or eleven, in other words, you win and I lose, I will give you a dollar. If I get the seven or eleven, you’re going to pay me ten thousand dollars. Does anybody want to roll? What’s the problem? I roll them once and I lose, I pay you just a dollar. I roll them twice, I lose, I pay you a dollar. Three, four, five, ten, I roll them ten times, I paid you guys what? Ten bucks. I win once, and you pay me what? Ten thousand. Question: will I roll with you all night like that? Yes. Why? If I lose, I’ve got what to lose? I lose a dollar. I’ve got very little to lose. But have I got a huge amount to gain when I win? Very little to lose, everything to gain.

Pascal’s wager works like that, it says this: “If there is no God, what have I lost?” Very little. Suppose there is no God, and you say “Well, you believed all your life and it was a lie and God doesn’t exist.” What have I gained from that? I’ve gained a wonderful family, a wonderful wife, I couldn’t ask for more. So I’ve got all that stuff still. If, on the other hand, I believe that there is no God, and all of a sudden I die and I’m face to face with this God who doesn’t exist and I’ve blasphemed him all my life and I get fried after that, is there a problem? In other words, you’ve got nothing to lose and everything to

gain. If there is no God, and I believed there was a God, I didn't lose almost anything. If it turns out there is a God and I didn't believe in him, I lose everything after this life goes down. That is called Pascal's wager, and he's saying if you believe in God and it turns out that you were wrong, you didn't lose very much of anything. If you believe that there was no God and it turns out there is, you've just lost your soul and that's a big deal. Pascal's wager--don't roll dice for money.

E. The Jesus Argument: Liar, lunatic, legend or Lord [13:17-20:46]

What do you do with Jesus? You can say, "I don't believe in God." Okay, what do you do with Jesus then? Did Jesus claim to be God? Jesus said, *Egw eimi*. This means "I am." I am what? When Jesus said "I am," how did the Jews respond? They wanted to stone him. Why did they want to stone him? "Because you, a mere man, claim to be" what? "God." Who is "I am that I am"? You remember in the Old Testament, "I am that I am." Is that the name "Jehovah," God's most sacred name? Jesus says "I am" and they try to stone him because they said "you just made a claim to be God. Therefore we're going to try to kill you, stone you, for blasphemy. Because you, a mere man, claim to be God." "In the beginning," John his apostle writes, "In the beginning was the word. The word was with God and the word was God.... And the word became flesh and dwelt among us." So he's talking about the *logos*. The divine being, the *logos*, the word of God, now becomes flesh. Jesus claimed to be God. So C.S. Lewis said this, Jesus is either a liar, a lunatic, or he is who he said he was, he's the Lord.

Now Jesus being a liar, what's the problem with that? When you read the works of Jesus, does he seem like much of a liar? "I am the way, the truth, and the life." Jesus spoke the truth and lying clashes with his moral character.

If a person in this room claimed that you were God, we'd think you were what? Crazy. Jesus claimed to be and, by the way, did his own brothers and sisters think he was crazy? In the passage in Matthew 12, they came to take him away because they thought he was crazy. Was Jesus a lunatic? Are there lunatics that think they are gods? Especially when they take a certain amount of substances. Is Jesus a lunatic? Have you read the

Sermon on the Mount? When you read the Sermon on the Mount, “Blessed are the poor, blessed are the merciful for they shall obtain mercy, blessed are the pure in heart for they shall seek God...” Are those the statements of a lunatic? If you’ve ever read the Sermon on the Mount, is that the work of a lunatic? Isn’t that some of the most incredible literature ever written anywhere? I don’t think you’re going to get to far with this idea of Jesus being a lunatic. The teachings of Jesus are incredible.

Jesus was Lord, that’s Lewis’ conclusion. Lewis skipped this one, and it bothers me because I think today, a lot of people still don’t like Jesus as God. Everybody likes Jesus as a souped-up Mahatma Ghandi. So it is for many “Jesus was a good prophet,” a kind of Martin Luther King on steroids. But anyway, where everybody has problems with Jesus is his claims to be God. That’s where they have problems. Jesus was a good prophet, and everybody loves Jesus as a good prophet, but as soon as Jesus claims to be God, that’s when people freak out.

Now, where did this “God-ness” of Jesus come from? Some of the critics today will say that this idea that Jesus was God was actually a legend, that actually developed over a period of time. So this legendary Jesus developed. But I want to ask you about his apostles, who they say designed these legends about Jesus. What do you know about the apostles? The apostles were really pretty courageous people. Early on Jesus’ disciples were very “Jesus, you go to the death, and we will go to death with you. We will stick by your side. We are right there with you, we believe in you with our whole hearts.” All of a sudden Jesus gets captured in the garden of Gethsemane and what happens to the disciples? These guys were: “Excuse me, somebody could get killed around here. They’re going to kill somebody, we need to get out of here!” So the disciples take off. Now I ask you one question; at the cross of Jesus, where were all of the disciples? They were hiding in fear. It was the women who stuck with him.

But then what happens? Three days later, all of a sudden, they go to the tomb, and what happens to the disciples then? Is there a transition with the disciples? Will the disciples who were fearful and ran away now die for Jesus Christ after the resurrection?

Tell me what happens to the 12 disciples (well, one of them kind of did the bucket list thing and didn't make it). So Judas is gone, but those eleven disciples, what happened to all of them, except we wonder about John, what happened to them? Do we have records of what happened to them? Every one of them died horrible deaths, let's use Peter as an example, Peter was crucified upside down. If he just made this up, the legend of Jesus being God, would you die for something like that? By the way, one or two might die, because they were crazy or something like that, but would all eleven of them die and never say, "Stop, I just made that up, I was just kidding, don't kill me." No, they all walked to their death, and were martyred. Even John, they started to fry him in oil. What I'm saying is, did they believe this with all of their heart? They believed it to the point of what? Death. By the way, was this just putting a bullet in their head? No. Many of them were tortured to death, and that's how they went to their deaths.

So this idea that the disciples just made up these legends, what's the other problem with that? If the disciples just made up these stories, were there other people around them that could blow the whistle on them and say "that's not true"? Jesus rose from the dead, the disciples said, and there were people around who said, "No, that didn't ever happen, we were there, it never happened." What's the problem with that? Paul says, "Hey, if you don't believe me about Jesus resurrecting from the dead, there are five hundred people still alive here, you can go ask them. Five hundred people all saw Jesus rise from the dead, besides the twelve apostles, and besides me, Paul, and I saw Jesus on the road to Damascus, alive after he was dead." So in other words, they can't make it up because there were other people who would have disconfirmed their stories. Paul is saying to go ask the people who were eyewitnesses. So Jesus is pretty good. Jesus Christ claims to be God, and there is reason for believing that. Now does this prove it? It doesn't prove it, but it is reasonable to think some of these things.

F. Personal Testimony argument for the existence of God [20:47-22:21]

Personal testimony. Do you know people who suggest that they have met God? Are there people in this room who would claim that they have met God, including the

professor? I swear I have seen the handiwork of God, this last year, praise God, I mean, have you ever prayed something that really, really matters? My son, last year, around this time, was over in Afghanistan. He was getting shot at every day. He was outside the wire for twenty-eight straight days, getting shot at every day. Did I pray for him? Did some of his buddies not come back? Other people did not come back. He came back. God spared him. I praise God for that. People will say he was lucky, it was just the luck of the draw that he didn't get killed, but I can go over and over things that show that God answers prayer. Does personal testimony count? Are there millions of people that believe in Jesus Christ that claim to have a relationship with God? Yes. Now do you just dismiss that because they're all a bunch of whackos? You need to think about that. You might say, "Well, yeah, you are, Hildebrandt!"

G. Predictive Prophecy as proof of God's existence [22:22-24:45]

Here are some other things that come from the Bible itself. In this book does God know the future from the beginning? From the beginning to the end, does God know the future? Now, do you know the future? Is there anybody in this room or on this campus who knows the future? Question: what will happen to the stock market tomorrow, up or down? Nobody knows! In other words, it's been so erratic that you can't tell tomorrow what's going to happen. Now, you've got a God who predicts things 700 years before they happen. By the way, is 700 years a little bit of a length of a time? 700 years before Christ, Micah the prophet in Micah 5:2 says, "Hey, when the Messiah comes, he's not going to just be born anywhere, the Messiah is going to be born in Bethlehem of Judea."

You could say, "Yeah, but there were millions of people born in Bethlehem and it was just his luck of the draw." Tell me, how big was the town of Bethlehem? The town of Bethlehem could fit on the quad here. We're talking three, four, five hundred people max. We're Americans, our cities are big: New York City, L.A., and Boston. We do big cities. Over there, their cities are towns, and actually you'll notice, in the DASV, I often translated it "towns" instead of "cities" because these places are so small. Most of the places and towns that you read about in Israel would fit on Gordon's campus, including

Jericho. By the way, does anyone remember how many times they walked around Jericho in one day? Seven times. What does that tell you? Is this a huge city that they go around seven times or is this a small town that they go around seven times? Yes, small, Jericho is small. So what I'm saying is, if Jesus comes from Bethlehem of Judea, was that a small town to be from? It is predicted 700 years before he's born. What town is Jesus born in? Bethlehem of Judea. There are prophecies like that, let me add one prophecy to another prophecy to another prophecy, and you just start adding this stuff up and you say it can't be just the luck-of-the-draw. The Bible has got this down! Who knows the future? God knows the future. You would expect God to be able to say what the future is and to get it right and he does.

H. Miracle Accounts as proof of the existence of God [24:46-27:26]

Another thing, miracles. You've got a record. Moses walks up to the Red Sea and he goes, "Wham bam!" and guess what happens? The waters part, the Jews go across. The Egyptians come trucking in after them and the water falls and drowns all of the Egyptians! Now you say, "That was just luck, the miracle, the wind was blowing they had a Noreaster that day and it blew all of the water back, but it was strong enough to blow 50 feet of water but the people could still walk through it?" Then they get to the other side and all of a sudden this manna started coming down from the sky. It doesn't usually happen that way. Then they are out in Sinai, a major desert, they haven't got any water, so this guy goes up with a stick and whacks a rock and all of a sudden this water comes out of this rock and satisfies all of these people. You say, "Miracle?" They go up to the Jordan River and the Jordan River parts too and they march around the city seven times and they go, "Hey, you guys, come out and play!" and the walls all fall down! Actually, what that was, was that they were jiving, they were walking around like that, all jiving and the ground was shaking... really? Enough for big walls to fall down? Yes, that would be miraculous. Jesus saying, "Hey, you've got five thousand people here, how much fish do you have? Let's feed these people." Or Elijah, going up on Mount Carmel, and a lightening bolt coming down at his request, frying that altar while these 400

prophets of Baal are off screaming to their gods and cutting themselves as slashers. So these are miracles.

If you're a critic of the Bible and don't believe in God, what are two things that you've got to get rid of in the Bible? You have to get rid of prophecy and you have to get rid of the miracles. You say "I don't believe in miracles, there is no God, so there can't be any miracles." You've got to go through miracle by miracle and explain them away throughout the whole Bible, including this guy being born of a virgin. You've got to get rid of that, although I guess we could do that today. But do you see what I'm saying, Jesus was born of a virgin, but they would use something like, "Maybe it was a German soldier," or "maybe it was artificial insemination" to explain the virgin birth away from Christ. They have to get rid of it because the virgin birth was a miracle (Isa. 7:14).

I. The Jews as proof of God's existence [27:27-33:27]

Now, here's something that came up with King Frederick in Prussia, he said, "Prove to me that there is a God in one word." This advisor responded: "the Jews." Tell me about the Jewish people; tell me about the Babylonians. Do you remember the Babylonian empire? Babylon was a magnificent, huge empire. Where are the Babylonian people today? They're nowhere. What about the Assyrians? The Assyrians in Nineveh, 1850 acres of land, a huge city, a huge empire, but where are the Assyrians today? Nowhere. The Moabites, the Ammonites, the Edomites, all of the -ites and -tites of the Bible, where are all of those groups of people? They're gone. Question: If I asked you where the Jews were today, what would you say? New York City. To be honest, there are as many Jews in New York City as there are in Israel, did you know that? There are a lot of Jews in Israel and I have a lot of respect for them. I actually lived in Israel for a year. But things are getting bad there now and you need to pray for the peace in Jerusalem. All I am trying to say is, over the centuries, have people tried to purposely destroy the Jews? Has that happened repeatedly, over and over again in history? Yes, the latest being with Hitler in the Holocaust, 6 million Jews were wiped out. Is that a lot of Jews? Did the Jews survive that? Is there still a group of Jewish people even after that

happened? Now by the way, are there people today who say the holocaust never happened? Yes. Three or four days ago, Ahminajab has said that he is committed to totally destroy Israel. This is just recently. Is he going to make a good shot at it probably? Yes. He is trying to create a nuclear weapon to do that. So Israel has got some major problems going on.

Question: the holocaust never happened? Ahminejad has his own opinion; he says that the holocaust never happened. You have your opinion, and you say the holocaust happened. It's your opinion versus his opinion. How do you know who's right? Everybody can have their own opinion. It is just his opinion versus your opinion. In post-modernism, for you guys it's just "Well, you think this and its okay to think this and I think that and it's okay. We can peacefully coexist." Does anybody ever say what really happened? His opinion is that it never happened, does that matter at all? Did it happen or not? Does it matter whether I acknowledge it or not? If I don't acknowledge it, does that mean it didn't happen? No. It doesn't matter what I think. It happened. And by the way, some of the people that went in to Auschwitz and some of those places, did they say it was so horrendous, "No one will ever believe this." Eisenhower had his troops document those atrocities because he said, "Nobody would believe what we just found here." He purposely had that documented.

Now if you don't believe that, let me tell you a story about a lady named Sonya Weitz who stood on this platform. She is what they call "a survivor," and I'm sorry if you guys go off in a different direction when I say "survivor." When I'm talking about a "survivor," I mean someone who is a survivor of the holocaust. She was put on a cattle car, on a train with her sister, naked with hundreds of other people, like sardines. In her family, everybody was killed and only she and her sister survived. I don't know how they survived, she tells the story. She has been on this platform before. "Well," you say, "it's just your opinion" versus... Question: was she there? And she describes the holocaust. She's passed on now, by the way, are these people getting older? I am debating on whether I should put it online or not. It is just an incredible story, a woman who went through the holocaust and actually went into the concentration camps. Her family was

destroyed, and she stood on this platform and told what happened to her. Question: is the holocaust legitimate? Yes! How do you know that? Because there is an eyewitness, this person was there. This isn't reading it in a history book, she was there.

So anyway, the Jews. How do you know the Jews are going to last? Are the Jews going to last until the end? Abraham's promise, land, seed--that their seed would multiply as what? The seed would multiply as the stars in the heavens and the sand of the seashore. He was to be a blessing to all nations. The covenant is land, the land of Palestine, seed, that the seed would multiply, and that he'd be a blessing to all nations. Are the Jews going to be here when Christ comes back? Sure enough. So, anybody that tries to destroy them, what usually happens to them? They end up having problems and so I'm worried about the next time this happens, I think it's going to be real serious. So the Jews, have persevered over all of these other people in the Bible who are gone, yet the Jews still survive. Again, this is the handiwork of God.

J. Where did the Bible come from? Step One: Inspiration [33:28-38:50]

Now, we're going to switch gears. Where do we get our Bible from? So we're going to go and trace through this, and let me move a little more quickly. I'm going to do some of this out of my head just so we can speed this up a little bit. Does the Bible claim to be from God? Does it make that claim? Does your calculus textbook claim to be from God? Does your sociology, psychology, or chemistry textbook claim to be from God? Are there hundreds of thousands of volumes from our library that don't claim to be from God? There are how many books in our library that claim to be from God? Is there probably just a handful? Does the Bible make that claim? Yes, it does. 2 Timothy 3:16 says, "All Scripture is inspired by God." The actual Greek word there is *theopneustos*, which means "God breathed." "All Scripture is God breathed." When I'm talking up here, if you're sitting in the front you know this, when I talk, do I talk using breath? Yes, breath is how you speak. "All Scripture is God breathed," the word of God is breathed out into the prophets, and the prophets write it down. Paul says, "All scripture is God breathed and profitable for doctrine, reproof and correction ..."

Here's one that is interesting, over in 2 Peter 1:21, Peter says this, "For prophecy never had its origin in the will of man." Is that really important? Prophecy came, but did it come from man or did it come from God? Peter says that prophecy never came from the will of man. By the way, were there prophets who went negative, who spoke from their own will, and said, "Thus saith the Lord," when the Lord hadn't "thus saith-ed"? Were there prophets like that, "thus saith the Lord," and God had not talked to them. Those people are called what? False prophets. Were there a lot of false prophets in the Old Testament? When Elijah, the good prophet, goes up against them, what's the ratio of true prophets to false prophets? One to four hundred. There were a lot of false prophets. The true prophets say, "Thus saith the Lord..." and they spoke from God. Peter says that, "prophecy never had its origin in the will of men. But men spoke from God as they were carried along by the Holy Spirit." These men did not speak from themselves, making this stuff up, they were "carried along by the Holy Spirit," and so that's 2 Peter 1:21, the origin is in God.

Here's another one. "In times past," the writer of Hebrews tells us, "God spoke to the prophets in many different ways and times." Did God speak to the prophets in different ways? Sometimes he appeared to them; sometimes he spoke to them, and in all different ways. "But in these last days," the writer of Hebrews says, "he has spoken to us in his son." Jesus Christ becomes the word of God incarnate. The word of God, the Old Testament word of God, where God spoke to the people, Jesus Christ now becomes. "In the beginning was the word and the word was with God, and the word was God... And the word became flesh and dwelt among us (John 1)." The word of God gets incarnated in Jesus Christ. So the prophets did well, but does Jesus do better? Yes, Jesus blows everything away. Now you've got the expression of God, not in words in written phonemes and morphemes, you've got the word in flesh. Jesus is God in flesh, Hebrews points that out.

Here's another one, Jesus does this, what does Jesus say about the Old Testament? Does Jesus state that the Old Testament is from God? Jesus says, "Not one jot or tittle

will pass from the law until all is fulfilled.” What are a jot and a tittle? A jot is a *yodh*. It is the smallest Hebrew letter. It’s like half of a letter. It is the smallest Hebrew letter. What is a tittle? A tittle is, well, do you know what serif versus sans serif fonts are? Do know how the Times New Roman font has a little mark on the end of a “d”? It has that little thing that hangs out on the d, that’s called a serif. Sans serif would be more like Arial where the d is just a straight line and then a circle. When Jesus says not one jot or tittle, the tittle is a serif. It’s the little hook on the letter. Jesus says not one jot or tittle will pass from the law until all is what? Until everything is fulfilled. Did Jesus have a fairly high view of the law? Jesus said, “I did not come to destroy the law, I came to do” what? “To fulfill it.” Jesus takes the law as the fulfillment of his life. So Jesus has a very high view of Scripture as coming from God.

K. Four Steps from God to us: Inspiration, Canonization, Transmission, Translation [38:51-50:52]

Now, there are four steps in this process from God to us.

The first step is called “inspiration.” Inspiration is God’s spiration breathing, God breathing his word into these prophets. The prophets spoke and they wrote it down. Now by the way, if the prophets didn’t write it down, is it lost to us? Did God ever speak to people who never wrote it down? He did. For example, look at the book of Huldah. Where is the book of Huldah? Has anyone read Huldah lately? Huldah was a prophetess, God spoke to her as a prophetess, and we don’t have any of her books. She either didn’t write it down or maybe she did and it was lost. But inspiration, the prophets wrote it down as God’s word.

Canonization: which books are authoritative?

What is canonization? Once God’s got the content written down, do the people of God have to collect those books as sacred books? So the prophets write this content

down, God comes down, speaks to the prophets, “Thus saith the Lord...”, and the prophet writes it down. Canonization is the people of God then collect those books that are considered holy. Do the people have to decide which books are holy and which books are not? Are there some books talked about in Scripture that are even mentioned in Scripture that are not holy books? In the book of Kings it says, if you want more about King Josiah, go to the annals of the kings of Israel and Judah. Do we have the annals of the kings of Israel and Judah? No. They were not considered sacred books, they were considered the annals of the kings of Judah. But did the writer of Kings use those annals to give us some of his writings? Yes. So, were there other books in the ancient world floating around that we don’t have that are not canonical? But the ones we do have, the Jewish people, the people of God, collected them and said, “These are the ones that are from God.” That collection of books and sanctioning of those books is the process of canonization.

Transmission: the copying of the text by scribes

Next is transmission, that is, scribal copying. Did the books have to be copied over and over again for thousands of years? Do scribes make mistakes? When you copy a thousand page book, do you make mistakes? I will give you a word processor with spell check, even then, can you type a thousand pages without error even with spell check? Is it possible if you went back over it a number of times you could probably get it? I think you probably could. I think I’ve done it myself. What I’m saying is, it is really hard to get it right. These guys are copying by hand. Question: copying a thousand pages by hand, is this a problem? When copying by hand a thousand pages you’ve got hand writing problems and all sorts of things.

So scribal errors, I will show you errors, I will show you errors in your Bible as a result of the scribing process. Now, after you’ve got it copied over and over and over again for 2,000 years or whatever, now you’ve got to do what? The Bible was originally written in Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek. The Old Testament was written mostly in Hebrew. After they came back from the exile to Babylon, they wrote in Aramaic and spoke in Aramaic, and then in Greek after Alexander the Great came through. So we’ve

got it in those languages and we've got to get it translated into what? Hebrew, of course not. We need it in English. So we have to get it translated. What's the problem with translation? When you translate between languages do things get lost in translation? Do languages match up perfectly? No. And so there are some words, I think of the word *hesed*, I struggle with how to translate that word. Do I translate it into "loyal love" or "steadfast love" or just "love" or "mercy"? How do I translate that word, when there is no single English word that matches *hesed* it just doesn't exist in the English language. Question: Have I got a problem as a translator? No, I just use the NIV and you don't have to worry about it [joke]. But do you see the problem of going between languages?

Various Means of Inspiration

So let's look at the process of inspiration, how did God inspire his word? With Moses, does God speak face to face? In Numbers 12, God says of Moses, "Moses is not like the run of the mill prophet, he is not a normal prophet." He says, "Normally with prophets I speak to them in dreams and in visions, with Moses it is not like that. With Moses I go head to head, face to face." By the way, it's so face-to-face that when Moses comes down from the mountain, what is his face? Does anyone remember? His face is shining and the people say "Hey, Moses, you've been up talking to God, you just stay over there, I don't like your shiny face Moses, cover that up." So Moses does what? Moses drops a veil over his face! When he goes up to talk to God, he pulls the veil off, and when he comes down to talk to the people he puts the veil on. So Moses is a prophet and he has got that kind of interaction with God. Normally God came down and told the prophet, "Thus saith the Lord..." and the prophet would quote, "Thus saith the Lord..." Isaiah, Jeremiah, all of the prophets, *coh amar Yahweh*, and then they quote from the Lord. So, God speaks to them in words, and they reveal it. God spoke in dreams, and in visions. He even appeared to them in a fiery bush.

Now here's another way God spoke: God spoke in his son. Jesus, as we said, becomes the incarnate Word. Jesus is the ultimate revelation of God because what you've got is the Word becoming flesh. The Word, rather than being spoken, is now alive. The

Word now communicates to us, not just in words but in deeds and in miracles—incredible things—that Jesus did. The Word becomes flesh and now God incarnates himself in flesh. Can human beings go up to Jesus and punch him in the gut? Yes! Does anyone remember the Garden of Eden? Did people in the Garden of Eden walk with God and talk with God? Yes! What happens after the fall they are cut off now. But Jesus comes back, in a sense; does Jesus Christ bring us back to the Garden where God walks among us? But what do the people do? They beat him! It's terrible. So Jesus, "In the beginning was the word, the word was with God and the word was God... and the word became flesh and dwelt among us." It's a beautiful passage in the New Testament (John 1).

Now some writers, however, did research. In other words, it wasn't God coming down and dictating something in their ear. In the book of Luke, Luke's going to write a gospel about Jesus Christ, but did Luke ever meet Jesus Christ? No. Luke never met Jesus Christ. So, on what basis does Luke write a gospel about Jesus Christ? Well, Luke tells us where he got his data from. Where did Luke get his information? "Many have undertaken to draw up an account of the things that have been fulfilled among us, just as they were handed down to us, by those who were from the first eyewitnesses [Luke 1:1-4]." Did Luke get his material about Jesus Christ from eyewitnesses? Does Luke know the difference between eyewitnesses and secondary sources? Yes. Is he a good historian? He says, "I got this information from eyewitnesses." He checks with eyewitnesses and servants of the word, because he himself was not an eyewitness. "For since I myself have carefully investigated..." Where does the book of Luke come from? It comes from his careful investigations, talking and interviewing people who were eyewitnesses. "Everything from the beginning, now it seemed good to me also to write and orderly account." Now I'm going to order it, he says, "for you most excellent Theophilus...so that you may know of the certainty of the things you have been taught." So where did Luke get his information? Luke got his material largely from eyewitnesses whom he interviewed, and he tells us that [Luke 1:1-4].

Now what about this: Solomon, in Proverbs 25:1. Solomon wrote many proverbs,

but who built the book of Proverbs? Was it Solomon? No! Partially yes, but in Proverbs 25:1, it says, “These are more proverbs of Solomon copied out by the men of Hezekiah.” So Hezekiah [700 BC], at least 200 years after Solomon [960 BC], from the collection or book of Solomon’s proverbs, the men of Hezekiah copied these proverbs out from that bigger collection. Do you see how the Bible gained them? They had a big collection of Solomon’s proverbs, basically chapters 25 to 29 of Proverbs was copied out of a larger collection. The men of Hezekiah did that 200 years after Solomon’s time. So do you see how God inspires people in different ways? That is all I am trying to show you.

Here’s one that Paul does. Paul in Acts 17 when he is on Mars hill, when he is in Athens in Greece. He is walking around seeing all of these gods and he says, “Hey, you guys are right. One of your poets has said, ‘In him we live and move and have our being,’ as some of your poets have said.” Paul quotes Aretas, a pagan poet, and says what the guys said was right! Is that in Scripture? “In him we live and move and have our being, as your poets have said.” Paul quotes a pagan Greek poet, and that’s in our Bible now. Did God inspire people in all different ways? Paul had that quote in his head, and he puts it down and says, “No, that was right, what that guy said.” Now it is under the inspiration of Scripture. God inspired in different ways.

Now, there was external cooperation. Let me just do this quickly. When you pick up the Bible, if you’ve read other books, is the Bible an incredible book especially the moral quality? What are the two most important things in the Bible? “Love the Lord your God with all of your heart.” And what? “Love your neighbor as yourself.” Question: if you had to pick something noble in the world, are those some of the greatest statements ever? Love God with all of your heart, love your neighbor as yourself, these are huge things. The Bible reflects this moral quality that is absolutely incredible. The deepest human values and needs are met and expressed in Scripture. Is the Bible a deep book? You’d say, “No, Hildebrandt I know the book of Genesis...” I’m going to tell you that someone in the last class said “I’m pretty familiar with the book of Genesis.” I just want to tell you, I don’t know the book of Genesis and I’ve been teaching it for however many

years. Are there things in Numbers, among others, that I still wonder about until this day? The book of the Bible is incredibly deep, you could spend your lifetime studying the depth and the meaning there.

**L. Alleged Errors in the Bible: Camels, Hittites, David
and archaeological confirmations [50:53-60:05]**

Now here are some things about the Bible. Critics have attacked the Bible and what you get are things like this--let me just give you the argument about the camel. I love camels. Actually, the honest truth is, I hate camels. I slept by a camel one night and, if somebody says you have camel breath, that is not a compliment. Camels have the worst smelling breath, that was the worst smell I have smelled in my entire life. We slept by a camel and he breathed on our tent throughout that night. It was terrible, though I have a great deal of respect for camels.

So what's the deal with camels? Critics say that the Bible's got it wrong, and that there are errors in the Bible. The Bible says that Abraham had camels. When is Abraham's date? 2,000 B.C. The Bible says he has camels. Critics claim that research shows that camels weren't domesticated until 1200 B.C., and the Bible says Abraham had camels (ca. 2000 B.C.). It is obvious that people didn't know that Abraham couldn't have camels domesticated, because they weren't domesticated until 800 years later. The Bible has an error in it. I'm serious this has been argued. Lo and behold, some archaeologists are digging around and they come to place called Ebla. Ebla dates from about 2400 B.C. which puts it about how many years before Abraham? About 400 years before Abraham. Guess what they had in Ebla? Lo and behold, domesticated camels in Ebla, 400 years before Abraham lived. Question: the Bible said Abraham had camels, is that right? That's right. Did these critics get it wrong? Yes, they got it wrong.

Now here's another one, the Hittites. The Bible mentions that Uriah the Hittite was married to Bathsheba. There are also other Hittites in the Bible. The critics have said, "The Bible's wrong, we know all of the peoples in the ancient world, we have all of the archaeology, there is no group called the 'Hittites,' we don't have any record of these

Hittite people, therefore they didn't exist. The Bible's got it wrong, the Hittites did not exist." Lo and behold, somebody goes up into the northern part of Turkey, and all of a sudden they start digging around at Boghazkoy, and guess what? It turns out that this is the capital of the Hittite empire, and they dig up a whole culture of the Hittites! By the way, can you go to the University of Pennsylvania now and study the Hittite language? Yes! There is a whole culture with thousands of tablets from the Hittites, indeed the book of Deuteronomy is built off of a Hittite treaty form. So question: do we know now that the Hittites did exist and that the critics were wrong and the Bible was what? Right. What I am trying to ask is: is the Bible historically reliable? Yes. And what I am saying is that the critics who critique it, they end up being wrong.

What about David? This is even only thirty years ago, people were saying David didn't really exist. David was King Arthur in the ancient world, they just made up David, this figure of this great king who was benevolent. It's just like King Arthur, who never really existed. They projected all of their ideals back on David and made up this wonderful idealized king. We have no record in archaeology of David, and therefore he never existed. Lo and behold, I think it was in the 1980's, the archaeologist out there with a shovel, he digs up something about this big. Turns out it was a pomegranate, and the pomegranate dates from about the ninth or tenth century B.C., which is right around the time of David, and guess what the pomegranate says on the side. It says "*le DVD*". Now let me walk over here for a minute. This was the first record of the *DVD* in history. That there were going to be *DVD*'s and you've all been using them, and historically you can see how the Jews are brilliant and ahead of their time: *DVD*'s. Well, what's the problem with that? The reason I say the *le* which means "to" or "for", what is the problem with ancient Hebrew? They didn't use what? Vowels. So you've got the letters *DVD*, guess what you fill in there, you don't have to be too bright to figure it out. You have two places for vowels, what are the vowels? It is inscribed on a stone, who inscribes things on stone? Is that royalty or is that a poor man? Poor men use potshards [broken pottery pieces]. A rich man carves into stone. So this is royalty, this is David--"To David."

Guess where half of the psalms (well not half, but a ton of the psalms), guess how they start? “*Le David*” or, “For David.” So someone says, “How do we know that DVD means David?” Some critics still will not accept that and so they say DVD actually stands for some god, “To a DVD/god.” I’m not talking about your DVDs, no, they said there was a god called (and actually they used DWD) DVD from the ancient world. But what’s the problem with that argument? In all of our records, is there any god named DVD, with or without the vowels? No, there’s no record of that. Is that total conjecture on their part, because they don’t want to accept it. DVD probably means what? If anybody has ever done anything with Hebrew and you see DVD it means David. So we’ve got actual records of that now.

Now we’ve also got Jeremiah’s scribe, let me tell you about bullae. These guys, wore stuff on their rings. It was like a fingerprint. What you did on your bullae, you would stick it in wax or stick it in mud because they used to write on mud. You would stick it in the mud, and it left your print (and by the way you knew it was your print because it had your name on it.) This is what scribes did, this is how they “copyrighted” back then. That was a joke, okay? When they went bam on the document, that meant it was their document. Now there was this guy named Jeremiah, he wrote a few books, a big book actually and liked to lament. He had a scribe named Baruch, Baruch the scribe. Guess what? In 1975 you see it right there, that’s the bullae of Baruch. In Jeremiah 36, God comes down and says, “Jeremiah, I am going to start talking to you and you need to start writing it down. You need to get one of Hildebrandt’s Old Testament scribes to type this up for you because I am going to start talking and you need to write it down. So go out and find yourself a scribe. Moreover, I’ll tell you the name of the scribe. I want you to find Baruch, the son of Neriah, the scribe. You find this guy and he’s going to write it down for you.” Have we got the bullae, the signet ring of this guy? Do we have that? By the way, its Barakaya the son of Nariah the scribe, does it come from the exact same period? In 1975 this was found. The guy who wore that ring, did he write Scripture? Did he copy down Scripture from the mouth of Jeremiah? We’ve got the guy’s bullae. Is that

pretty incredible? You can't make this stuff up. This is incredible, we've actually got that, the actual bullae of the guy. It says here that this was his bullae, and he actually penned this in Jeremiah 36.

There is also Jerahmeel, Seriah, Gemariah--these are also guys mentioned in the book of Jeremiah and they have found artifacts with these guy's names on them. Is that pretty incredible? All I am trying to say is: the Bible is historically reliable. Do we dig stuff up 2,000 years later that confirms what was going on?

So we've got Balaam, does anybody know about Balaam and his talking donkey? Do know that this guy's name has actually been found, Balaam the son of Beor. They've actually found something in trans-Jordan with this guy's name on it--not just in the Bible, but outside of it.

On the Mesha Stone from the king of Moab, they found Omri. Omri is famous because he is the father of King Ahab. Do you remember Ahab and Jezebel? This is Ahab's father. He is actually in a record in Assyria, because in Assyria they called Israel "the land of Omri." So this guy is confirmed in Assyrian documents in the annals of the Assyrians, Omri is listed there. Sennacherib, the king of Assyria, is also mentioned in the Bible.

Resurrection witnesses are just some other things too, about historicity. Paul says there were 500 people who saw Jesus rise from the dead at one time.

M. Fulfilled Prophecy [60:06-62:32]

Now, fulfilled prophecy, I'm going to hit these quickly. Each one of these, to be honest, could take an hour, two hours, three hours, starting with Tyre. Ezekiel predicted in the Bible that Tyre, this massively strong city, would be destroyed; that it would be flattened like a pancake and thrown into the ocean. Guess what? Alexander the Great comes 200-300 years later and guess what he does. He comes up to Tyre and says, "Hey,

that city is going into the ocean.” He throws the whole city into the ocean, and the long story is that Ezekiel predicted the destruction of Tyre, and that is exactly what happened.

Isaiah tells us about Cyrus, 200 years before Cyrus lives. Isaiah tells us about Cyrus. Then you’ve got Cyrus the Persian coming and freeing the people. Cyrus is one of the greats, if ever you want to study someone great in the Old Testament. I call Alexander the Great, “Alexander the Grape,” you know, having fun with him, but Cyrus, I say Mr. Cyrus to him. You want to study a leader, a real leader, look at Cyrus--that guy has my greatest respect. His troops respected him so much, that after he died at 75 leading his troops into battle, the Medo-Persians carried his body a thousand miles to bury it with dignity and respect. Did he have the respect of his troops? They carried his body a thousand miles to give it a decent burial. Cyrus is a great warrior king. By the way, Isaiah also has intimations of Cyrus being an anointed one. An “anointed one” in Hebrew is what?--*Messiah*. You get this flavor that Cyrus is the anointed one, kind of a precursor of Jesus.

Then, of course, was Jesus predicted in the Old Testament? Yes, born in Bethlehem. If you want to read anything about Jesus, read Isaiah 53 and when you’re done it absolutely blows you away.

Here, in 1 Kings 13, it predicts King Josiah, 300 years before Josiah lived. Josiah is predicted, and it tells what he would do. The Bible predicts what the guy would do and calls him by name and tells what he would do 300 years before he lived. So does this book have some pretty spectacular things in it? Yes.

N. Canonization [62:33-74:36]

Now let’s cruise on here to canonization. Do we have recorded for us in the Bible, everything that God ever spoke? Well, do we have the book of Huldah? No. God spoke to Huldah, Huldah addressed the people. She was a prophetess of God, yet we don’t have her book. So there are some things that God said that he wanted for that day and age but not for forever? Do you say things that you just want your parents to know but nobody

else to know? So he talked, and he didn't record everything forever. Solomon, for example, wrote 3,000 proverbs. How many proverbs do we have in our Bible from Solomon? About 375. That means we've only got about a tenth of what Solomon wrote. You know Solomon wrote 1,000 songs, how many songs of Solomon do we have? Yea, they put the one Song of Solomon in the Bible and said "That's enough we don't want any more of that!" So anyway, there are 3,000 proverbs, we've got about 375. Did Solomon write a lot of proverbs that we don't have? Yes.

Here's a classic one from Jesus. At the end of John, John says, "You know, I wrote and told you a lot of things about Jesus, but if I were to tell you everything I know about Jesus, the books of the world couldn't hold it!" In other words, there are many things that Jesus did, that are not written in this book. John says that flat out: "There are many things that Jesus did that I didn't put in this book otherwise the book would have been too big." So John comes out flatly and tells us that there are a lot of things Jesus did that aren't recorded.

Now, when things were recorded from God, did the people sanction those things and take them as authoritative immediately? Or, did legend and tradition have to grow so that they grew in their authority? Were they instantaneously authoritative? Let's take Moses, for example, he walks down from Mount Sinai; he's got the Ten Commandments, right? He comes down to the people. Are those Ten Commandments immediately accepted as authoritative from God? After he busts the first ones he comes out with the second ones. But he comes down and those are immediately accepted and as a matter of fact the Ten Commandments are put in what place to show that they are sanctioned as coming from God? Where were the ten commandments put? They were put in the Ark of the Covenant. Have you guys seen Indiana Jones? What's in the Ark? You open it up and people's faces melt down. Anyway, the Ten Commandments were put in the Ark, does that show these Ten Commandments were immediately accepted as God's word and they were sanctioned as such. In 1 Kings 8:9, Solomon says he took the Ark into the temple. Remember Solomon built the temple, then he hauls the Ark into the temple and says,

“Hey, the Ark was supposed to have a pot of manna, Aaron’s budding rod, and the Ten Commandments. I pulled the Ark in here and the Ark only has the Ten Commandments, now that’s all that’s in there.” The other two things are gone. I always wondered how he found that out. He must’ve had an x-ray or something.

Then in Nehemiah’s day, what do they do when they come back from the Babylonian exile? They read the “Book of the law.” By the way, do the Jews to this day, at many of their feasts read the book of the law? Is it accepted as authoritative for that group? Do the people of God accept the word of God? So they say, “Okay, these are the books that are good, and that are in there.” Are there still people hunting for the Ark? What happened to the Ark? I got that question in the last class. I think the Ark, when they went to the exile, remember they went to Babylon. Remember Daniel, Shadrack, Meshach and Abednego, and Nebuchadnezzar, they went to Babylon. Basically Nebuchadnezzar flattened the temple of Solomon. They did what with the gold? They melted it down and they took all of the bronze and brass and hauled it to Babylon and it is just gone. Now, do some people think that the Jews hid the Ark in the Judean desert? There was a guy back just a few years ago that was spending big dollars hunting in all of the caves in the Judean wilderness trying to find this buried Ark under things. It’s kind of like Indiana Jones, but there are actually people who do that. I think the Ark is gone, and that brings up an important point too.

Preservation of God’s Word

The Ark is gone. Do we have the original copy of Isaiah? The original copy of Isaiah that Isaiah wrote, do we have that? Could God have preserved that? Yes. Did God preserve it? No. Jeremiah, Isaiah, Daniel, David’s psalms, do we have those? Do we have any of the Pentateuch, Moses’ writings? No. Did God preserve his word perfectly or did he turn it over to scribes? Now when scribes copy it, do they make mistakes? Why did God have his word lost, and not preserve the perfect original? I’m going to make a suggestion--I’m just making this up, but it seems to me that if God had preserved the Ten Commandments, what would the people do to that? People would worship it. If you had

the actual book of Moses, would people worship the relic rather than the God of the book? So my guess is that God said, “Hey, I want you to worship me! Not the relics. So let them go, and you worship me.” That’s why I think those texts were lost. Now, by the way, did I just make that up? Yes. But does it make a little bit of sense. If you’ve got a better one, come up and talk to me.

Here’s one, this is Revelation. Are there statements in the Bible that you should not add or subtract to Scripture? At the end of the book of Revelation, it says, “Whoever adds to this book, the curses of this book will be added to you. Whoever subtracts from this book, your name will be subtracted from the tree of life.” Is that a bad thing? That’s a bad thing. By the way, Deuteronomy 4:2 does the same thing. Moses says don’t add or subtract from this book, this is from God, this is a canonical work, don’t mess with it.

Peter, Paul and immediate authority

Now one of the ones that I love is Peter and Paul. You’ve got this statement from Peter. What was the relationship of Peter to Paul? Did Paul rebuke Peter to his face? Peter and Paul in the book of Galatians had it out. Peter was saying, “Maybe the Gentiles have to be circumcised, maybe they have to do all of this Jewish stuff.” Paul says, “No, you are wrong Peter.” Now, by the way, is Peter the big disciple? Paul is the newcomer. Paul goes to Peter, puts his finger in his face and says, “Peter, you’re wrong!” And he rebukes him to his face. What does Peter say about that? In 2 Peter, does Peter get the last word? In 2 Peter, this is what he says about Paul, “Bear in mind, that our Lord’s patience means salvation, just as our dear brother Paul has also wrote you with the wisdom that God gave him.” Does Peter acknowledge that God gave Paul wisdom and that Paul was writing to them? Yes. Peter acknowledges that God gave Paul wisdom. Now what was Peter by trade? A fisherman. What was Paul by trade? A tentmaker, yes, but was he more of a scholarly person, studying under Rabbi Gamaliel. So Peter is a fisherman. Here’s what Peter says concerning Paul, he says, “He writes the same way in all of his letters.” Was Peter aware of all of Paul’s letters? Did Paul’s letters take years and years before they became authoritative or were they immediately authoritative? Did Peter recognize

the authority of Paul's letters immediately? He says, "Paul wrote many letters, God spoke to him from wisdom, speaking in them of these matters," and I love this part, "...his letters contain some things that are hard to understand." Is that the fisherman speaking? If you've read the letters of Paul in the New Testament, Paul does write some pretty advanced ideas. And Peter acknowledges this, he says, "Paul writes God's wisdom, and I'm not sure I understand all of this." "Which the ignorant and unstable distort as they do," the what? They distort Paul's letters "as they do the other Scripture." This means he is putting Paul's letters on the same level as what? The scriptures, the holy writings. Did Peter accept Paul's writings immediately? Yes. And so those are important verses.

They were immediately authoritative and you can actually see this here with Daniel. Daniel cites Jeremiah, they were contemporaries, they lived at the same time. Daniel says, "Jeremiah said we're going to be in Babylon for 70 years. It's going to be 70 years." Daniel accepts Jeremiah immediately. So the people of God accepted the word of God immediately.

Criterion for Canonization

Now the question that gets raised here is why were certain books accepted and others rejected? In other words, they were accepted immediately but then what happened was, you've got a process. If Paul writes to Ephesus, the people at Ephesus get that letter but the people sitting over in Rome, they know nothing of that letter. Those letters had to be circulated, so you get the problem of circulation. And then the question is: Okay, we're sitting in Rome, can we get the letter to the Ephesians? Did Paul really write that? Was that really the one? So the early church actually struggled with that for probably 200-300 years. There was a process of canonization, but what I'm suggesting to you is this, is there evidence in Scripture that things were accepted immediately. But the problem seems to me more about circulation in the early church. But with the Jews you get the same kind of thing.

I want to cap it there, but let's do some Bible-robics!

Transcribed by Erika Abrahamsen
Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt-2

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture #3[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is lecture number 3 by Ted Hildebrandt on Old Testament History, Literature, and Theology. This lecture was on the transmission of the Bible from God to us.

A. Quiz Preview [0:0-2:43]

What are we working on for next week? Genesis 26 to 50. You'll finish the book of Genesis next week. So that will take care of that and then there's basically some other things. There will be an article by a guy named Sailhammer on "Cosmic Maps." So where will you get the article? Did anybody listen to it at all? Was it helpful or not? All right, so you will be reading Genesis 26 to 50 and the Sailhammer article. Also this week we are going to break into *Our Father Abraham* and there's select pages there. We won't read the whole book, but there are select pages for *Our Father Abraham*. So you will work with *Our Father Abraham* and then two memory verses. What haven't we got finished? Bible-robics. We'll finish the Genesis Bible-robics today. So basically there's Genesis reading, *Our Father Abraham*, the Sailhammer article, memory verses, and Bible-robics. That should do it, for next week.

There will be ten questions, worth ten points each, and largely what'll happen is if somebody misses this, I think there was a soccer game or something like that, they get a week to make it up, so I can't turn them back until the following Thursday. What I try to do is turn them back on Thursday night or Friday morning, so you'll get them returned probably next Friday. So then we'll just do quiz, quiz, quiz every Thursday and about every five quizzes then we do an exam. (*Someone asks a question*) No, that's for the exam; you have to get a score above a certain point on the exam and also on the quizzes to be included in the honors option.

So that's the assignment coming for next week. The other thing is, don't forget to turn in your ten bucks for the course materials, don't leave that go or it will be double this next week, I think it's next Thursday or something so just get that in ASAP.

B. Bible: from God to us [2:44-3:58]

Today is one of the most difficult lectures that I do in this course. Why do I introduce this at the freshmen level? I want to be honest with you guys and I want you to understand how the Bible came from Moses, and how the Bible came from Isaiah, and got down to us. So rather than leaving these things unsaid, then what happens is you jump into a university context and the university professor claims the Bible is full of errors and you have no clue what he's talking about. I want to give you these broad categories. The material I'm talking about today, frankly there are whole courses on canonization. There are whole courses, I've taken whole courses on textual criticism and so I'm giving you in about 30 minutes what took a whole course. I try to make things simple but I struggle with expressing these things to you. I really feel committed to tell you about them just so you know ahead of time what's going on. Today will actually be a pretty factual day. Some of the lectures, when we get into Genesis a lot of it will be my opinion and how I interpret texts in this context. What we're talking about today is not really my opinion, these are facts of manuscripts and we'll try to work with that.

C. Canonization [3:59-5:53]

So, canonization--last time we talked about this and basically we said that in the case, for example, with Peter and Paul, Peter said that Paul's writings were on the same level as Scripture. He said, "they distort Paul's letters as they do the other Scriptures." So the letters of Paul were accepted by Peter automatically as authoritative and Paul accepts that Peter accepts those letters as authoritative. Now, by the way, did it take quite a while for the church to collect all of Paul's letters? Paul wrote letters to the church at Colossae. That church kept the letter and other people didn't even know Paul had written that letter. In other words, did Jesus have a New Testament? No. Did any of the apostles, ever see

the whole New Testament? No. They wrote their books and then it was put out and it would have to be circulated. Do you realize that circulation—you say, “why didn’t they just email a copy of it to everyone, that’s what they should have done.” It took a long time actually to spread and to go from place to place.

So Peter accepts Paul’s books. Did Peter know of all Paul’s writings? There’s no way he did. So Paul wrote various things, Peter knew of some of them but he undoubtedly didn’t know of all of them.

So here’s another example with Daniel. Daniel lived at the same time Jeremiah did. Daniel was with Nebuchadnezzar in Babylon, Daniel was in the Lion’s Den and all that. Daniel says, “Hey, Jeremiah said that God told him, we’d be in Babylon for 70 years (Dan. 9:2, 24).” So Daniel quotes Jeremiah, saying this is what God told Jeremiah and he accepts Jeremiah’s authority immediately. Daniel accepts it immediately and says we’re going to be here for 70 years. Now again, did the Jewish books also have to be collected and spread, and things like that? So that makes time.

D. Criteria for Canonization: Does it claim to be from God? [5:54-7:30]

Now certain books are accepted and certain books are not accepted. How did you tell whether a book got into the sacred collection and which ones got rejected? There are certain principles for that and so this moves to criteria. The first main criteria that was used for the canonization process—the canonization process means: what it takes to get a book accepted into the canon, the sacred scriptures. The number one question, and this is the big question, is: “Is the book inspired by God?” In other words, “Does the book claim to speak for God?” So, for example, does it say, “Thus saith the Lord”? Does the book of Isaiah claim to speak for God? Yes. Does Moses say, “God told me and I wrote it down”? Moses says that. The books claim that God spoke and the author wrote it down. Jeremiah, “Thus, saith the Lord/The Lord told me this.” Ezekiel has got all these visions of bones, these dry bones coming together. Ezekiel sees the bones and he claims that God showed him this vision.

Now, by the way, think about this criteria. Is this criteria good enough to establish which books are authoritative and which books are not? Were there some books that claim to speak for God that probably were not included? Did some prophets say “thus saith the Lord,” and were not true prophets of God? Yes. Were there a lot of false prophets? Yes. So does this criteria by itself establish canonicity or do we need other things?

E. Canonization criteria: Was it written by a prophet of God? [7:31-8:28]

One of the other factors you can weigh is: was it written by a prophet? If it's written by somebody like Isaiah, do you say, “Isaiah's a pretty good guy, a prophet of God, a pretty good man.” Now suppose it was written by a prophet and I say I penned this one. I say, “I am a prophet of Ahab and Jezebel and I wrote this book.” Would you accept it into your canon? No. By the way, would it probably be very interesting reading? It would probably be very interesting reading, but you would not accept it into the canon because it probably was from a guy who was a Baal prophet. There were 400 Baal prophets. So, in other words, you've got to ask: what about the character of the person who wrote this? Isaiah, Jeremiah, Moses, Samuel, David, in the Psalms. So you ask, was it written by a prophet of God? Was it written by a man of God or woman of God? So, was it written by a prophet? What do you know about the person? That is a check and balance on this.

F. Canonization criteria: Does it agree with previous revelation? [8:29-9:04]

Does it agree with previous revelation? If you get a book written and in the middle of the book it says, “You know, Jehovah is ok, but Baal is better.” Is that going to be put in the canon or thrown out? Thrown out. Why? Because it disagrees with previous revelation, because God said, “You should worship the Lord your God and him only should you serve.” So if this book comes in and says Baal's the one, you've got to ask: does this contradict previous revelation? This becomes a criterion then for whether a book is canonical and accepted as sacred Scripture.

G. Canonization criteria: Does it come with the power of God? [9:05-9:59]

Here's another one: Does it come with the power of God? Now this one is subjective. Do certain books come with the power of God? When you read Scripture, does it change your life? Yes. The books are powerful. Now when you read your math book, question: does that have power to change you? Most of you go, I read the math book. You say, first of all reading a math book is almost like an oxymoron. Anyway, you know what I'm saying? But it doesn't get into your soul. You read, I was referencing just before I came here, Eli Wiesel's book *The Night*. Has anybody read that--Eli Wiesel's book *The Night*? When you read that book, does that penetrate your soul? Now I ask you, the books of Scripture do they move you? Is the power of God there? And the answer is: yes, but that's a subjective thing.

H. Canonization criteria: Was it accepted by the people of God? [10:00-10:50]

Here's another criterion: is it received by the people of God? In other words, did the people of God receive the word of God? In the Old Testament, who were the people of God? The Jews. So the Jews in the Old Testament, the nation of Israel, the 12 tribes, did they receive these books as the canon, as coming from the hand of God, or coming from the mouth of God? Therefore, we as Christians, where do we get our Old Testament from? Do we get it from Jesus and the apostles? No, the Old Testament canon comes to us from the people of God in the Old Testament which is the Jewish nation. They give us the Old Testament canon. So the Old Testament canon comes from the people of God in the Old Testament. Did they sort through which books should be in and which books should not be in the canon? They sorted through that stuff and they were the ones that were the experts on that.

I. Antilegomena: Books spoken against [Proverbs, Esther...] [10:51-11:52]

These books are called the Antilegomena. Now what is "anti"? "Anti" means what? Against. *Anti* is against. *Lego* (are there any of my Greek students in here?) *lego* means "to speak." So these are: the books that are "spoken against." The Antilegomena

are the books that are spoken against. There are five of these books. These five books were spoken against by the Jewish people. The Jewish people had questions about these and so they were “spoken against [Anti-legomena].” Now what’s the problem with these five books? By the way, do the Jews today accept these five books? Yes, they do. They accept them but they were questioned at one time. Is that helpful to know that the Jews questioned these books? Were the Jews careful about which books they accepted into the canon? It wasn’t just “Boom,” automatically you’re in. They questioned the books and were careful.

J. Antilegomena: Why was Proverbs questioned? [11:53-19:42]

Who’s got a Bible here? Can we do Proverbs chapter 26. If you guys have your Bibles, we’ll be using them quite a bit today--Proverbs chapter 26 verse 4. Then can I have somebody that’s a little bit more ornery give me, why don’t you do Proverbs chapter 26 verse 5. She’s going to do Proverbs chapter 26 verse 4 and he’s going to do Proverbs chapter 26 verse 5. So let’s, first of all let’s focus our attention on Proverbs 26:4. Proverbs 26:4 says, “Do not answer a fool according to his folly, lest you be like him.” So you meet a fool, should you answer him? No, it says “Do not answer a fool according to his folly” because if you try to answer you’re going to be like him. By the way, have you ever seen anyone come up and they’re asking a stupid question and I’m thinking, by the time you try to answer the question, you end up getting trapped within their folly? So Proverbs chapter 26 verse 4 says, “Do not answer a fool according to his folly, lest you be like him.”

Now, what’s Proverbs 26:5 say? “Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own eyes.” So the question comes up, do those two verses contradict each other? By the way, you can take this home and you can say to your parents, “Hey, my Bible professor showed me a contradiction in the Bible.” Here we go, these two, they contradict. One says to answer not a fool according to his folly and the very next verse says to answer a fool according to his folly. The Bible’s got a contradiction in it, that’s what we learn at Gordon College. Is there a contradiction there? Yes, but the word of the

Lord is flawless.

Now you know where he's getting this? If you ever want some place that tells you about the word of God and says how flawless it is and says it over and over and over, like a million, well actually 176 times. What chapter in the Bible has 176 verses? Does anybody know that? It's the longest chapter in the Bible. Psalm 119 is all exactly what he said, "The word of the law is flawless" and it goes on, over and over, 176 times. Psalm 119.

Question: Is there a contradiction here? Let's get out of quoting Bible verses and look at these verses. These verses contradict each other. [Student:] "I want to make a quick comment on the contraction. My Bible is in Portuguese and English and the Portuguese version, it made sense." Ok, so what's the Portuguese version say? ("Ok it says, "Don't respond to the folly with foolishness just like his....otherwise you will equal yourself to him. Respond to him with the foolishness he deserves, or the contrary, he will think that he's wise.")

[Hildebrandt's response] All right. Do you see what they did there? Did they try to explain the verse? Now is that a translation or is that an explanation? It's an explanation. That's actually not what the literal Hebrew says. The literal Hebrew, I'm sorry, says, "do not answer a fool." So in other words what I'm saying is, did the Portuguese people realize there was a conflict here? What they did was they wrote an explanation so that it would, modify it and that kind of thing. So that's what they were doing.

Now I will say this, so is there a contradiction there, yes. Is this wisdom literature? Wisdom literature says: Should you answer a fool or should you not answer a fool? Is there a time to answer a fool and is there a time not to answer a fool? Have you guys ever been in those situations? Sometimes is it appropriate to answer a fool according to his folly? Yes, what's worse than being a fool? Being wise in your own eyes. So if you see a fool and he's sliding down to arrogance, if you don't answer, he's going to become wise in his own eyes. The Bible says, "Hey, stop him from becoming worse than a fool, by being wise in his own eyes." However, if he's a fool and he's just asking dumb questions

and you're going to get caught in the question, don't answer a fool according to his folly. So, in other words, the Proverbs 26:4-5 clash like this, but what does it call from you as the reader? Do you have to be wise and discerning to know when this applies? So, in other words, is that the very point of wisdom, to see these conflicts and say, "Hey, I've got to be wise enough to know when to answer and when not to." That's part of wisdom.

So the Jews accept the book of Proverbs and I actually think, that's my area of expertise, Proverbs is one of the most wonderful books in the world, but I love these little conundrums in Proverbs. They just kind of annoy people and if they don't know the Bible, you can really harass people. "Look up this verse, Mom, read this verse and then that verse. Don't they contradict each other?" Then just watch them respond.

What I want you to do, is give up some of the stuff you got on your back. Read the text of Scripture. No, don't bring in Psalm 119. Psalm 119 is way over here. Read the verses themselves. They do conflict. There's no way you get around that. They do conflict. I mean read the first part A of 4 and A of 5, they conflict. If you can't see that, you need to see that. By the way, did the Jews see that? Yes, they did. That's why they spoke against these books; because they saw the conflict. So you have to see the conflict. "Don't answer a fool," the next verse says, "answer a fool." Those two things are contrary.

Now you can try to resolve the conflict, but you need to see the conflict so that you can resolve it. If you don't see the conflict, then there's nothing to resolve. What I'm saying is you need to see the conflict. The Jews saw the conflict. Most everybody who reads it sees the conflict, you need to see the conflict. You need to allow yourself to be jarred a little bit. So that you can work on resolving it and come to a solution.

Yes, it depends on the fool. It depends on the situation and so I don't think you want a one-answer-fits-all with this. It's trying to say, you've got to figure it out on the fly. What its doing is calling for discernment within you. It says, "Here are two options you have, you need to have discernment to figure out when to use this or not." Let's go

on to the next one.

K. Antilegomena: Why was Ezekiel questioned? [19:43-21:23]

Why did some Jews speak against the book of Ezekiel? Because Ezekiel talks in chapters 40 to 48 about this temple structure that is too big for the temple mount. Now do you know what the Temple Mount is? In Jerusalem, there's this place with a gold dome on top and basically this is the temple mount. When Ezekiel describes the Temple Mount, he's got it way too big. There's not enough room on the Temple Mount for what Ezekiel describes. So what the Jews say is, it doesn't work. When you go to start putting this miles long temple structure up there on the Temple Mount, the Temple Mount's not that big. It won't hold it. So some of the Jews who live in Israel, know Jerusalem, they know this is way too big. Does that make sense? So they questioned it. The solution to this is to ask: Ezekiel is talking about which temple? It is the future temple.

Is the geography of Palestine going to change? Is the Mount of Olives going to split open? Yes. So there's going to be a geographical change and so what he's describing is in the future. The future third temple, that's to come and there's going to be this massive earth movement. So apparently the temple's going to be bigger than it is now. But you have to look into the future. It won't fit there now. There's going to have to be some geographical upheavals. By the way, does the Bible say there will be geographical upheavals in the end times? Yes. So we're good. So they questioned Ezekiel because of the size of the temple. But we're okay with that because it's during the apocalypse in the future.

L. Antilegomena: Why was Esther questioned? [21:24-22:26]

Now, why was the book of Esther questioned? You know they said, "Esther's a woman, you know we don't like woman stuff, so we're going to get rid of that book" [joke]. Now why was the book of Esther questioned? Do the Jews take real pride in God's name--the name Yahweh or Jehovah? It's a big deal for them. The book of Esther never once uses the name of Jehovah, never once. The Jews went through the book of

Esther and they said, “You know, that book never mentions the name of God.” By the way, when you read the book of Esther, is God all through the book? Yes. God’s all over the book but his name is never referenced in the book. So the Jew’s questioned the book of Esther. Did the Jews accept the book of Esther? Do they even have a feast called Purim to memorialize Esther’s deliverance of the Jews from a Persian genocide? Purim is a famous feast to this day, we’ll talk about that later. But anyway, the book of Esther was questioned yet accepted even though it didn’t mention the name of God.

M. Antilegomena: Why was Ecclesiastes questioned? [22:27- 26:51]

What’s the problem with Ecclesiastes? My mother’s actually given me a lecture about Ecclesiastes. She says, “You don’t teach Ecclesiastes to those college kids do you?” And I say, “No, mom, it’s ok, we never get there.” She says, “Oh, I just can’t understand that book. I don’t know why that’s in the Bible.” And she goes off like that. Why do people have trouble, with the book of Ecclesiastes? It’s a kill-joy. We’re Christians actually so we’ve got to be happy all the time. When you read the book of Ecclesiastes, what is the major message? The major message is vanity, vanity, and all this vanity. In the book of Ecclesiastes he says, “Meaningless, meaningless, all is meaningless.” Question: do we as Christians like to say life is meaningless? No, because we’re Christians and everything’s got to fit together. However, have some of you felt at major points in your life, the meaninglessness of life? Yes. The book of Ecclesiastes expresses that. That’s why I love the book. My mother hates it.

Now, how do people get out of the book of Ecclesiastes? Don’t do this. But this is how they do it. They grab the last chapter. In chapter 12 it says, “Fear God, keep his commandments, this is the whole duty of man.” Have any of you ever heard Ecclesiastes taught as vanity, vanity, all is vanity but that’s messed up but in the end he comes around to “fear God and keep his commands.” So you’ve got eleven chapters of bad stuff and then in chapter 12 he redeems himself by saying “Fear God and keep his commands.” Have any of you heard Ecclesiastes taught like that? Eleven chapters of meaninglessness and then chapter 12 pulls it together.

I want to ask you, is God going to put eleven chapters in his Bible of things that are all wrong so we can hold onto the good? I want you to think about embracing the first eleven chapters. Are there going to be times in your life when you need to know that one of the wisest men that ever lived felt the meaninglessness of life? He felt that life was vapor. That's when you look around and notice there's a lot of life like that. I want you to embrace that rather than ignore it because frankly you're going to feel that at various points in your life. No, life is not one big happy time; I love Jesus, everything's cool. Maybe for you guys at 18, but I've got a 22 year old at home that's been through war. He doesn't do the happy-Jesus thing because he's seen his buddies blown to smithereens. So all I'm saying is be careful about your Christianity. Ecclesiastes can broaden you in ways you need to understand with some of the bigger questions of life that jar some people at the core of their being. If you go around "happy Jesus all the time," there are people who are going to blow you off as being shallow and trite. They will blow Jesus off as well because they are going to say that Jesus doesn't have anything to say to the real. What I want to tell you is, "Can Jesus speak to the meaninglessness of life?" Yes, he can. But you need to understand and embrace that and engage that in order to see Jesus' redemption engage there and what Jesus speaks to is the deepest part of human beings. Go back to the *Night*. Remember Eli Wiesel's *Night*.

So, anyway, Ecclesiastes is a wonderful book, don't throw out the first eleven chapters. Listen to the Byrds old song. There's an old music group after the Civil War called the Byrds and they sang, "There's a time for everything, there's a time to be born, there's a time to die. There's a time to..." So then think about it, think about Hildebrandt back in the Civil War with their muskets, singing the Byrd's song. But the Byrds did a wonderful song on this called, "Turn, Turn, Turn,"--"A time to born and a time to die" "there's a time for peace, there's a time for..." What? And for Gordon College, you'll like this. "There's a time for peace" Peace, peace, peace, do we do peace? Ecclesiastes says, "there's a time for peace" and a time for what? "A time for war." "A time to be born, there's a time to die." It is very interestingly balanced out like that. We only like one side of the balance sometimes. But Ecclesiastes is a wonderfully balanced book.

N. Antilegomena: Why was Song of Songs questioned? [26:52-30:36]

The other one my mom's given me lecture on is Song of Solomon. It is called the "Song of Songs." "You don't teach that to college kids, do you?" And the answer is: "No, mom, we never get there." So Song of Solomon is Christ's love for his church, portrayed in physical terms of a love relationship between a man and his wife. Do you believe that? A lot of the early church people taught it that way. They maintained the Song of Songs was the love relationship of Christ to the church. Is Song Songs a love song? Once upon a time they hired me to do a revision of the Jamieson, Fausset and Brown commentary. It is a famous old Bible commentary. They hired me to basically go in the Song of Songs and update the commentary from the 1800's up into the 20th century. So I was going through it, I knew it was bad, but I didn't know it was that bad. What happens is, there's a place called Ugarit. If this is Israel, up above Israel, just north of Israel, they've got a place called Ugarit. They found a bunch of tablets there from about 1200 BC in a language called Ugaritic that I've had the unfortunate privilege to be forced to learn. In Ugaritic, there is all sorts of imagery and guess what that imagery is very similar to? The imagery in Song of Songs. Do we know what he means when he's talking about all these lilies and all these plants, do we know what that means now? Yes, we do. Is it really, how should I say, is Song of Songs a very sexual book? And the answer is: yes. By the way, the good part is, a lot of it is based on imagery so you don't know what it's talking about and that's probably good. But what I'm saying is, yes. You respond, "Hildebrandt you're just making this up." I'm not making this up, this is the truth and we know what those images are and they are very, very, very explicit. By the way, who made sex? God did. So what you see here is this beautiful romantic relationship. By the way, does your generation have a problem with this? I call it the decade of decadence. You guys mature when? About 14, 15. People don't get married until they are in their 20s, you've got ten years. That has created a huge problem in our culture in terms of this whole sexuality thing? What Song of Songs says is, "No, it's beautiful. It's one of the most beautiful things in all of life."

The Bible describes it as just trees and flowers and so that's cool. So by the way, did the Jews have problems with the Song of Solomon? The Jews knew what it was talking about. These guys are all wearing their black hats and curly cues. All I'm saying is, did they know what this thing meant? They knew what it meant and they questioned whether it should be in the Bible. Now did they include the Song of Songs in the Bible? Yes, they included it but there were some questions about it, that's all I'm saying.

So those five are what they call the "Antilegomena." Now this is the canon of the Old Testament, these are the accepted books. Who gave us the canon of the Old Testament? The people of God in the Old Testament. Now who were the people of God in the Old Testament? The Jews. So the Jews give us the canon of the Old Testament. Did the Jews themselves question five of their own books? Yes, they didn't just get in automatically. They questioned. These are the Antilegomena. They questioned Proverbs, they questioned Ecclesiastes, they questioned Esther, Song of Songs, and they questioned Ezekiel. So those are the Antilegomena.

O. Apocrypha or Deutero-canonical books [30:37-35:18]

Now the Old Testament Apocrypha, what is the Old Testament Apocrypha? The Old Testament Apocrypha are books that are accepted by the Catholic Church but not accepted by Protestants generally. These will be books like Maccabees. Has anyone heard of the book of Maccabees? Maccabees 1 and 2, Bel and the Dragon, the Wisdom of Ben Sirach, the Wisdom of Solomon and others. By the way, are the Apocrypha books very important reading? Yes, they are. The Old Testament was started when Moses starts writing. The big question of the date of Moses, 1400 or 1200 BC there is a big debate on that. When does the Old Testament end? I always say, I call this guy Malachi, the last of the Italian prophets. Anyway, Malachi ends it 400 BC. What happens between 400 BC and Jesus? What happens between 400 and 0? Does the Old Testament tell us anything that happened after 400, when Malachi prophesied? No. There's nothing, zero.

The Apocrypha books come from that 400 year period, between the time of Malachi and the time of Jesus. One of those books that is very interesting and actually

when I do New Testament, we end up reading the book of Maccabees. There's this guy, Antiochus Epiphanes, he's kind of like a pseudo anti-Christ and he goes around killing Jews and doing some really nasty stuff. The Maccabees boys rise up and they're the hammers. They go out and hammer these Syrians. So the Syrians are beating up on the Jews and the Jews go after them. This is all recorded in the book of Maccabees [ca. 167 BC].

Now, the question: is that part of the word of God or not? It is really interesting history and it is really important history. By the way, you all know this, the Maccabees fought against the Syrian Antiochus Epiphanes and they overcame him. They cleansed the temple and they had a Feast of Lights to celebrate the cleansing of the temple from this anti-Christ figure, Antiochus. They called it the "Feast of Lights." You guys all know it, it's called happy what? You're Jewish. Happy what? Happy Hanukah! Where do you think Hanukah comes from? Hanukah comes from the Maccabees. About 167 BC, the details aren't important to us in Old Testament times but what I'm saying is the book of Maccabees is important reading. It is fascinating reading, but is it the word of God? These are two different questions? So it's important reading. Did the Jews accept the Apocrypha as the Word of God? Is the Apocrypha a part of the Jewish sacred canon? The answer is: no. Where do we get our Old Testament canon from? The Jewish people. The Jewish people don't accept the Apocrypha and so we don't accept it either. So the Apocrypha is very interesting reading but it's not on the level of the word of God and largely as Protestants we don't accept that. There are some conflicts with other parts of Scripture and things like that but I do recommend reading it. It's fascinating.

There is a tradition where those books were put with the Septuagint (ca. 150 BC) and into the Latin Vulgate (AD 400). And so they did a lot with the Latin Vulgate. They were in there. Now a lot of people think they were put alongside of the canonical books, that they were important reading but they were kept separate. But they said they were put in separate and all of the sudden like that and they slid in. Some of the doctrines that the Roman Catholic Church holds that the Protestants don't are included in the Apocrypha.

By the way, the first church council that accepted the Apocrypha explicitly was the Council of Trent, 1545. I don't know the exact date but it was in the 15 or 16 hundreds AD. Is that a little late? 1500 AD, that's a little late. So what I'm saying is that was a reaction against Protestantism. The Jews do not accept it. They read Ben Sirach. The Jews are experts on the Apocrypha because it tells their history for that 400 year period but they do not accept it as Scripture. There are big debates on this.

P. Pseudepigrapha [35:19-38:51]

Pseudepigrapha. "Pseudo" means what? If something is "pseudo"--it's false. So the Pseudepigrapha are the "false writings" accepted by no one. These are the writings that everyone accepts are bogus. They are false. Does anyone remember when you read Genesis in chapter 5 I think it was? It says, "Enoch walked with God and he was not for God took him." Do you know there's a book called the Book of Enoch? Wouldn't you like to read about Enoch? The Book of Enoch. When you're in the New Testament, the New Testament Pseudepigrapha, you've got a book called the Gospel of Thomas. Wouldn't it be really cool to read about Thomas. Remember doubting Thomas? He's got a gospel--The Gospel of Thomas. Now is this close to the Word of God or do these things get weirder and weirder? Actually, does anybody remember, this was about four years ago, critics of the Bible and Atheists pre-Easter they have what I call "an Easter Surprise." No, I'm serious, every Easter they come up with something in an attempt to discredit Christianity. This time they did the Gospel of Judas. Does anybody remember that? It came out right around Easter, the Gospel of Judas. So I got a copy and thought I'm going to read this just because I have to argue against it. I was really disappointed to be honest with you. After you read the first paragraph, it is obvious that the Gospel of Judas is a Gnostic text. As soon as I say Gnostic text you're talking second or third century AD. It's way late. In other words, it's written way after Jesus, it's a Gnostic text. I was really disappointed. It wasn't even a challenge. You want to be able to get a little meat to fight with. Even in the opening it was clearly a Gnostic text. So I read the whole thing, but it was just disappointing. It's clearly a late Gnostic text. As soon as I say

Gnostic text is that going to be Scripture because that's like a hundred years, two hundred years after the New Testament so it just doesn't fit time-wise. I hope they come up with a better one this year.

So that's the Pseudepigrapha. By the way, have any of you guys ever read stories about Jesus? Have you ever wondered what Jesus was like between when he was one and when he was sixteen--no wait before he was thirty? Some of these Pseudepigrapha have stories of young Jesus when he gets out there and he fights with kids. He picks up dust and makes it into a dove and he goes (like that) and the dove flies away. So all this is really cool stuff. The Pseudepigrapha will try to reconstruct the early life of Jesus based on the New Testament Pseudepigrapha. Does anybody accept the Pseudepigrapha as being gospel? No. But, by the way, will critics attempt to use it to discredit Jesus because they have wild and wacky stories. They are pretty interesting though. So yes, that's the kind of stuff they use. But again, for believers this is the canon, this is the Apocrypha, this is in the ball park. Nobody accepts the Pseudepigrapha as sacred Scripture.

Q. Scribal Copying of the Bible: Transmission of the text over

3000 years [38:52-40:36]

Transmission--this is where the going gets tough. Pay attention, this stuff is tricky. Did God use flawed processes to preserve his word? Did God use flawed people to preserve his word? How do you get the Bible down from Moses, who says wrote from 1440 or 1200 BC (there's a big debate as to whether Moses was 1440 or 1200). How do you get it from 1200 BC down to the 21st century? How did the Bible come down to us? The scribes had to copy it over and over and over again. But what's the problem when a book gets copied by hand without spell check over and over and over again? Do errors come in? Could you copy by hand, or do you know anyone who could copy a thousand page book without making a mistake? Now did God speak to the prophets? Yes, so we've got a direct God connection there. Are the scribes regular human beings copying? When did the Dead Sea Scrolls come up though? For 2000 years have people had the Dead Sea Scrolls? No. That's something that's only happened since 1948. So anyone

before that didn't even know about them. We'll come back and hit the Dead Sea Scrolls later.

R. I Samuel 13:1 text variant/copyist error [40:37-46:48]

Let me show you a copyist problem in your scriptures. Let me show you in your Bibles. Who's got a King James version? Anybody got a King James? Can you look up 1 Samuel 13:1. Has anybody got an ASV or NASV? Can you look up 1 Samuel 13:1? Who's got an NIV? Then who has an ESV or NRSV? Remember I told you the ESV was kind of a knock off of the RSV. 1 Samuel 13:1. Now what I want you to do is, if you guys got your Bibles, I want you to open them to 1 Samuel 13:1, and look and see what your Bible says. This is a scribal error. Now, by the way, does this mean you can agree with me or disagree with me or is this fact? This is fact. These are the manuscripts we have. They're reflected in your Bibles; listen to the various translations of the Bible.

By the way, the New King James version says basically the same thing as the Old King James. The King James Version for 1 Samuel 13:1 says, "Saul reigned one year and then he reigned two years over Israel." I want you to think about that. Does that verse really make much sense? Normally, if the guy reigned two years you would say, "He reigned two years." Does that cover that he reigned one year? It assumes that he reigned one year. So the King James says, "Saul reigned one year and then he reigned two years over Israel." Does that strike you as a little bit odd? I want you to think about it.

The NASV, shall I do the NASV out of my head? This is the NASV from 1977. It says what? She's got the new one that they fixed. It's more current. I'm going back to the original NASV and the ASV of 1901 and the NASV of 1977. In the original one it says, "Saul was 40 years old when he began to reign and he reigned 32 years over Israel." That's what the original NASV Bible said not the new one, they've corrected it. But the 1977 one says, "Saul was 40 years old when he began to reign and he reigned 32 years over Israel." How old was Saul when he died? 72.

Now many of you have the NIV. Look at the NIV. It says, “Saul was 30 years old when he began to reign and he reigned 42 years over Israel.” How old was Saul when he died? 72. Is that different? One says that he was 40 years old and he reigned for 32 years and the same verse translated in the NIV says he was 30 years old and reigned for 42 years.

Now the ESV (and RSV) says, “Saul was...years old when he began to reign and he reigned...and 2 years over Israel.” Now honestly which one’s giving us exactly what the text says? What did the Hebrew text say? Is the ESV and RSV right? The number is gone. By the way, did many of your translations in the footnotes tell you that the number is gone? Yes. Is that why you use the footnotes from your Bible? Are they important? So basically they put in the footnote: the numbers are gone. Now question: does it matter to you? Well, you say, I don’t believe it’s gone. Does it matter what you believe? To be honest it doesn’t matter what you believe, it’s gone. That’s the honest truth. It’s gone. It doesn’t matter whether you, your mother, your father, your pastor, your missionary...doesn’t matter what they believe. The number’s gone. The RSV tells it like that. Where did the NIV get the 30 and the 42? Actually, they went over to the book of Acts and Acts 13:21 gives some indication and they read the number back from Acts. They made up a number and put it in there. Yes, so the Hebrew text does not have 40. If you go over to Acts chapter 13, it has some of the numbers that help us. The Septuagint would also fill in the numbers. So what happened there? This a scribal error.

S. Mark 16 textual problem [46:59-49:50]

By the way, do your modern Bibles tell you when there’s a scribal problem? Are they honest with you telling you there’s a scribal problem? Turn in your Bibles to Mark 16, see how your Bible handles Mark 16. Mark 16 is a major scribal problem: it is very difficult to solve. Look at Mark chapter 16, the last chapter of the book of Mark. What does your Bible say after verse 8? What does your NIV do in Mark 16:8-9? Between those, what’s it got? “They went out and said nothing to anyone because they were afraid.” What comes right after that in the NIV? There’s a line. Then what does it say?

Does it say anything on the line or does it just give you a line? (person talks) Yes, so “Mark 16:9-20, some of the best manuscripts we have do not have those verses” and they indicate that with the line. By the way, are they being honest with you? They’re just telling you, “Hey, be careful with this.” Do they put it in there? They put it in there but they give you that warning. Some people say there are changes in diction and therefore it was added later. So there’s a big debate on this. By the way, was it fair for the Bible to put it in but put that line there and explain some of this? Yes.

Does the King James version put in a line? Did the King James, when it says, “early witnesses,” did the King James have any of the early witnesses we have today. The answer is: “No.” The King James was done in 1611. In 1611 AD, did they have all or any of these manuscripts? No, they didn’t have them. Does that mean the King James is totally flawed forever? Did they do the best they could at 1611? Do we know more now than they did in 1611? Do we have thousands more manuscripts than they had in 1611? Yes. By the way, do we know about manuscripts all over the world now? They were in England doing this in 1611, they couldn’t email somebody in Budapest and say, “Hey, give me your manuscript.” They were in England, it was 1611, and they were stuck. Don’t fault the King James translation for that.

T. 1 John 5:7 textual problem: Compare KJV and NIV/NRSV [49:51-52:18]

Another place that King James has a real problem is 1 John 5:7 and that verse was added later. All of your modern translations will drop this verse. By the way, have you got 1 John 5:7? Let me just tell you about the early church. The early church in the first couple to three hundred years of the church, did they argue over the doctrine of the Trinity? Did it take them a while to establish that doctrine? So they argued back and forth about it. When the church fathers argued back and forth, did they quote Scripture back and forth to prove their points? Yes, they did. We’ve got records of the argumentation. Did they argue using Scripture? It’s what you’d expect Church fathers to do, back in 200, 300, 400 AD, that kind of age.

Here’s what the King James says, in 1 John 5:7. I want you to think about the

doctrine of the Trinity here. “So there are three that bear witness in heaven: the Father, the Word,” who’s the word?—Jesus, the *logos*, “and the Holy Spirit. These three are one.” That verse teaches very, very clearly what doctrine? “The Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit. These three are one.” Is that the most clear presentation of the Trinity you can find anywhere in the Bible? There is no verse that’s even close to that. Did you know that that verse was never once quoted by the early Church fathers? When they were debating the Trinity, they never quoted that verse. Does that tell you anything? That verse wasn’t there. As a matter of fact, the first time that verse pops up is basically in the 16th century AD. Is that a little late? Actually, most people believe, there’s a guy named, I call him Erasmus the Rascal. Erasmus the Rascal wrote that into the Bible, some people think, on a wager. Somebody bet him he couldn’t so he translated it from Latin, back into Greek. And then what happened? The King James version used the Erasmus Greek text but Erasmus had written this verse in and so they put it in their KJV translations. So there’s no note in there, it just says that verse. You’ll notice all modern translations drop it because it is not found before the 16th century. Do you understand early manuscripts? Do we have it in the papyrus manuscripts? No.

U. General discussion of the accuracy of the text of Scripture [52:19-57:00]

I need to say this at this point. I worry about going over this stuff. Even last class one of the students said this is like, all of the sudden you say, “Holy cow, there’s all these errors, the whole Bible’s going up in flames. Who knows? Adam and Eve, maybe they didn’t live. I mean maybe, you know, Cain and Abel maybe that was a scribal error. The whole thing goes up.”

Now do you understand, the Bible. Let me just use the New Testament for example. We have 5,000 manuscripts of the New Testament. Can we compare those 5,000? Do we have means and mechanisms? There’s a guy down at Princeton, that’s all he’s done for his life for 67 years is study these manuscripts and their variances. Bruce Metzger is his name. This guy’s incredible. He studied these manuscripts all over the world and put them together. 5,000 manuscripts. We know about them, they’re codified

and all this kind of stuff. Tell me, have you ever heard of a guy named Plato? I forget this last name. Plato also wrote back then, how many manuscripts do we have of Plato? We've got 5,000 of the New Testament, how many manuscripts have you of Plato? You probably have what, 7-13 manuscripts of Plato. Oh, you say what about Aristotle? Has anybody ever seen the Aristotelian text? Ok, it's about this thick? Aristotle, he's got logic, rhetoric, ethics, that kind of stuff. You know it's really important philosophy, *Nicomachean Ethics*. Just worked through that a little bit ago myself. It's a wonderful text, Aristotle was quite a guy. You know how many manuscripts we have of Aristotle? 120 or less. How many do we have in the New Testament? 5,000. How many do we have of Aristotle? 120 or less. Do you see the comparison? Is the New Testament, better established than any book on the face of this planet? There is no close second. Do you realize not only do we have early manuscripts that the King James version translators in 1611 didn't have. We've now got papyrus. We've got a papyrus called P52, papyrus 52. It has part of the book of John on it and guess when this papyrus dates from? First of all, when did the apostle John die? Did he live into the 90s AD? We've got a piece of the book of John from within 30 years of when John lived. Within 30 years of when the man lived. We've got a piece of papyri. That's pretty incredible. Tell me what other book has that kind of documentation from back two or three thousand years ago. No, it's unique.

There's a guy named Dan Wallace, I taught with him when I was at Grace College. Wallace is a Greek geek. You know you have geeks of technology. He's a geek of Greek. He's got all bushy black, dark hair he's growing this beard now. He's got this big old beard, bushy beard, and he looks like he's really Greek. And he's even got Greek black robes and he's got this beard now. You know what he's doing? Dan Wallace has found that there's a manuscript over in Istanbul, where Constantinople was. He's going like he's Greek. Is he going over there so he can find this manuscript? He knows it's there. Does the rest of the world know about this manuscript? No, nobody's seen this manuscript. He's going over there trying to pry it out of their hands. So he's getting all Greeked up and he's going over there, all Greek to fit into this monastery. He's going

after that manuscript. That's the truth. You'd have to know this guy. I hope he doesn't pack any heat on him. I swear he'll get pictures of it or something but he's going after it. I mean he has thought about this a long time and he's worked at it and I think he's been over there and talked to them. He's trying to develop friendships with them.

By the way, why does he have to do that? Because the manuscript Sinaiticus was found at what place? Sinaiticus was found at Mount Sinai, at St. Catherine's Monastery. Do you realize what the guy did in the 1800s? He went out and stole the manuscripts from the monks. Are the monks still mad about that to this day? You guys laugh, I'm serious. I've been in St. Catherine's monastery. They remember that forever that the manuscript was stolen. Now, by the way, on my part, am I glad that they stole it? Yes, actually because it was sitting in this monastery, do you realize what they were doing with some of these manuscripts? The monks were burning the pages of the manuscripts to stay warm. Is that a problem? Do you realize that these manuscripts are like some of the best in the world? They were burning the manuscripts to stay warm! I'm glad the guy stole them. Okay, I'm sorry.

V. Why did God preserve his word imperfectly?—a suggestion [57:01-59:23]

We've got all these manuscripts, how do you correct for all the differences in the manuscripts? Now, by the way, can you guys do that? You don't read Greek and Hebrew so you can't do that. Does somebody else who's an expert like a Bruce Metzger do that evaluating of manuscripts. Now what happens is they edit together a Greek text or Hebrew text and then that's published and then guys like me read it. In the footnotes they tell you the various readings? Yes, they do, it's very handy. In the footnotes you can see all the different manuscript readings.

Now how do we correct for all this stuff and why didn't God preserve it perfectly? The answer is we don't know why God does what he does. I'm going to make up something here. So for this I'm going to walk over here because this is me making this up. Several other people have suggested this, a lot of people hold this. Why didn't God preserve his Word perfectly? Could he have preserved it perfectly? Is there any

manuscript that's perfect? We don't know because all we've got are manuscripts that come from a hundred years after and we've got to compare manuscript to manuscript, we wouldn't even know if we had it.

Do the manuscripts have errors? Yes, they do. Do you realize some of the scribes in the margins he says, "it is so cold in here that my ink is freezing up on me." I have a question: do you write well when you are freezing like that? No. So these scribes had really hard conditions. I don't fault the scribes. They did the best they could. They didn't have spell check and Word and that kind of support. Why didn't God preserve it? The suggestion is: if God had preserved his perfect Word like the ten commandments and left it in a box, what would people do to the box? They'd end up worshiping the relic. Do human beings make relics out of that kind of stuff? They would worship the relic rather than the God who gives the ten commandments. So I think that he purposely had his Word lost. I want you worshiping me instead of some text. So therefore the text is lost and we've got no relic, we've got thousands of manuscripts.

W. Evaluating Scribal Errors [59:24-60:38]

Let's talk about scribal errors. Do we know the types of errors scribes make? Yes, we do. Here's one: Genesis chapter 10 verse 4. What's the difference between the letter ד (d) and the letter ר (r)? First of all can you see that there's a difference? What's the difference? Does anybody see the little bump on the end of that one? That's a tiddle. Does anybody remember a jot and tiddle? That's a tiddle. This is a D (ד). This is a R (ר). Do you think the scribes ever confused D (ד) and R (ר)? Do you see how close those are? Let me give you an example. This guy's name is Dodanin, if you've got them all memorized from Genesis 10. This guy's name is Dodanin. But if you look in some of your Bibles, it won't say "Dodanin," it will say "Rodanin." Do you see that the R and D have been confused? So was his name Dodo or was his name Rodo? The problem is the letter looks so similar that they confuse letters like that on occasion. So the D and the R get confused. Now we know that's a problem so can we correct for that? Yes, we can. Comparing manuscripts you would expect that.

X. Orality and Manuscript transmission [60:39-62:53]

Here's another one. Let me just do this to you in English. Sometimes they spoke manuscripts. What's the advantage of doing an oral manuscript? I would be up here reading, "In the beginning was the Word" or "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth" copy this down. What's the advantage? From one manuscript in this class I could produce how many? 100. Do you see the advantage of doing it orally? But what's the problem with its being oral? Here's the problem orally: write down the word for me the word "there/their/they're". What's the problem? You've got "there", "their", and "they're" all sounding the same.

Now, let me just do Psalm 100 as an example of that. In the King James version of Psalm 100, it will say, "make a joyful noise to the Lord! Come into his presence with singing. Know ye, that the Lord, he is God. It is he who hath made us and (*lo' anaknu*) not we ourselves." Does anybody remember hearing this? That's the King James. If you look in your NIV and most modern translations, you'll see it's like this, "make a joyful noise to the Lord! Come into his presence with singing. Know ye, that the Lord, He is God. It is he who hath made us and we (*l'o anaknu*) are his." That is very different from "not we ourselves"--and "we are his." You know how those are pronounced? "and not we ourselves": *lo' anaknu*. You know how, "and we are his" is pronounced? *L'o anaknu*. What's the sound difference between, *l'o anaknu* and *lo' anaknu*? Tell me which one's which. You can't. It's pronounced the same way. It's *l'o anaknu*. But it can be taken as "not we ourselves," that's the way the King James Version translates it, "and we are his" is the way most modern translations because we understand more about the poetry now.

Y. Metathesis [62:54-63:28]

Metathesis—have you ever typed this: "thier"? Are your fingers used to doing "ie"? What's the benefit of MS Word? MS Word flips them. Have you ever had that happen? It flips them, so that's beneficial. So I recommend Microsoft Word. This is called "Metathesis," when you switch the order of the letters. When you switch letters,

that's called metathesis. If you ever read that in a manuscript, you'd know what that should be. It doesn't fake anybody out.

Z. Fission and Fusion [63:29-64:02]

So here's one. In the early Greek manuscripts, they were all written in capital letters with no spaces between the words. Do you like having spaces between the words? Tell me what this says. You guys read English. (people trying to read CHRISTISNOWHERE). Yes, you guys are a bunch of pagans. This is beautiful, this is liturgical, "Christ is now here." [Students read: Christ is no where]. Do you see what the problem is when you don't have spaces between words?

AA. Homeoteleuton: same endings [64:03-65:08]

Here's another one. This is called "homeoteleuton." I just like it because it's kind of a cool word. "Homo" means what? Same. "Homeoteleuton" means "same-ending." You guys all know this: same ending problem. Have you ever read across the page and you come across a word here and it's repeated down about three lines here and your eye skips down the page because you come across and then jump down. Let me take you to Jesus doing the parable of the Good Samaritan. The guy was beat up. There was a priest and he comes up to him and "he passes by on the other side." And then there's a Levite, he comes up to this poor guy who's beat up and "he passes by on the other side." What's the problem?—"Pass by on the other side," and "pass by on the other side" is repeated. In certain manuscripts, what would the scribe do? Did his eye jump down the page? He skipped one of the guys because his eye jumped down the page. Now have you ever read like that and you jump down the page? That's called "homeoteleuton," same ending, you jump down the page skipping some of the material.

AB. Dittography and Haplography [65:09-65:45]

Now here's another way to make an error, "Dittography." "Dittography" means, have you ever typed something and you type it twice when it should have only been

written once? Then you realize you did the same thing twice. Then I get really mad at myself, “Oh, I can’t believe I just typed that.” So then you erase it. That’s “Dittography.” It means it was written twice but it should’ve been written once. **Haplography** means it should’ve been written twice but they only wrote it once. So dittography and haplography are the opposites. Dittography means it was written twice but it should’ve been written once. Haplography means it was written once and it should’ve been written twice. You know you have made these kinds of errors.

AC. Harmonizing Corruptions [65:46-67:18]

Here’s another one: harmonizing corruptions. This comes from the book of Job chapter 3. In Job chapter 3 it goes like this. What’s happening to Job? Job gets the tar beat out of him. So Job’s getting the tar beat out of him and his wife comes up in chapter 3, her kids are dead, everything’s been blown up. She comes to her suffering husband. Now I’m going to quote you literally the Hebrew, tell me what’s wrong. In the Hebrew it says literally: “Job’s wife comes up and says, [Job’s got all these boils] ‘Job, bless God and die.’” This is quoted directly from the Hebrew, “baruk,” it means “bless”--“Bless God and die.” Now when you read that coming from Job’s wife, is it real clear what she really said. Did she say, “Bless God and die”? Yes, she was a very pious woman. No. when she comes to Job and all this tragedy and she’s says what? “Curse God and die.” What was one of the problems? Did the scribes not want to write “curse God”? Scribes did not like to write that. They put “bless God” there instead. Now, by the way, anybody reading that text, do you know that it should be “curse God and die”? Let me say that again: anybody reading that text, do you know that it should be “curse God and die”? Anybody reading it knows that. So what happens is the readers flip that. The scribes didn’t like to write that, so they put “bless God and die” instead. So that’s called “harmonizing corruptions.” They didn’t like writing “curse God and die” so they harmonized it into something they were more comfortable with.

AD. Conflation [67:19-68:15]

Now here's conflation. Conflation is an interesting one. Some manuscripts, this comes from the book of Revelation I believe or Acts. It says, So you've got fifty manuscripts that say "Church of God", "Church of God", "Church of God", and "Church of God". Then you've got fifty other manuscripts that say, "Church of the Lord", and "Church of the Lord". Now you're a later scribe, you've got fifty manuscripts that say "Church of God", and you've got fifty manuscripts that say "Church of the Lord", which one are you going to copy? Yes, so what did you do? By the way, let me ask, what would you do? If you have one manuscript that says "Church of the Lord", and one that says "Church of God", what would you do? They combine it and they say, "Church of the Lord God". So later manuscripts have this "Church of the Lord God." Now the point with conflation is, the text has a tendency to grow, because of this conflation tendency. So with conflation the text has a tendency to grow because of this conflation problem.

AE. Principles of weighing the manuscript evidence

Older & Shorter are preferred [68:16-68:56]

Now, here are some principles for deciding which manuscript readings are to be accepted into the Bible. Older manuscripts: if you have a manuscript dated from the 16th century and you have one dated from the 3rd century, which one do you put more weight on? 3rd century. Why? Because it's earlier. The older the manuscript, the more status it has--the older the manuscript, the better.

The shorter reading is preferred. Why do they prefer the shorter reading? You've got two sets of manuscripts going, why do they prefer the shorter one? Did the text have a tendency to grow over time? So the shorter one is probably the older and better one. So the shorter reading is to be preferred. "Church of the Lord" or "Church of God" but not "Church of the Lord God."

AF. Geographically spread out [68:57-69:51]

Now, let me just do this. Suppose we have one hundred manuscripts from

Wenham in Massachusetts. We've got, on the other hand, a set of five manuscripts that disagree with the Wenham manuscript. One of those manuscripts is from Washington, DC, one is from Philadelphia, we don't do New York City in Boston here, Boston is the other one, and L.A. is the other one, and Miami is the other one. Only got five, but we've got the same reading from Washington, Philadelphia, Boston, LA, and Miami and you have got a different reading from one hundred manuscripts from Wenham. Which reading would you accept? The five or one hundred. The five, why? Because they're spread all over the place. Would the ones in Wenham all be copied from each other? Would they all have the same mistakes? But the greater the geographical spread, the more valuable the reading.

AG. Manuscript families [69:52-70:31]

Now let's discuss the numbers and type of the manuscripts. What's a manuscript family? A manuscript family is when you have a parent, the parent is copied, that's called "the child." So you have the parent, the child, the child gets copied and do you see that they all go back to the same parent? So one gets copied let's say five times. They all go back to the same parent. Are certain families a better set of manuscripts and other families a worse set of manuscripts? So what happens is you can value these families of manuscripts. You have the Western family, the Alexandrian family, and then you can weigh the manuscripts and you can try to pick the best family of manuscripts.

AH. New Testament and Old Testament Scribes [70:32-72:07]

Let me hit one more thing here, as far as the New Testament. I want to contrast for you the New Testament and the Old Testament. Were the New Testament scribes that copied the New Testament, were they good scribes? The early Christians, were they educated or uneducated? The early Christians were uneducated. Were the early Christians: rich or poor? Poor, mostly. Were the early Christians sitting in their house, air conditioned house, or fleeing from persecution? Fleeing persecution. When you're fleeing persecution, poor and uneducated, do you make a good scribe? No. Are the early

Christian manuscripts difficult because they weren't professional scribes? Did the early Christians do the professional scribe training? Not much, later on they did.

Now tell me about the Jewish people. Were the Jewish people good scribes or bad scribes? Good. Professional--give their whole life to copying Scripture? Our best Hebrew manuscripts come from about 1000 AD – 800 AD, they're called Masoretic Texts (MT). These Masoretic Texts they copied sometimes they would say, this page has to have 25 “a”s. And they would count up on the page 25 “a”s. If one of the “a”s was missing, they would destroy your manuscript? Question: were those people very careful? The Jewish manuscripts were very accurate. However, what's the problem? Our best Jewish Masoretic manuscripts are from 800-1000 AD. What's the problem? Is 1000 AD late when Moses was 1400 BC? Yes.

AI. Dead Sea Scrolls [72:08-73:38]

Then, all of a sudden, in 1948, some Arab kid was out for a walk along the Dead Sea, he threw a stone into a cave. He heard a clink instead of a clunk and he said, something's in there. He went in and found a big old canister. He opens the canister and inside there's all this paper. He says, “woah, what's this? You can burn fires with this all night.” He pulls it out, turns out I think they sold the first one at 50 bucks. How much is it worth now? Millions. Actually, do you know what they did with the Dead Sea Scrolls? Some of the guys, when they took it up to Bethlehem, they wanted to make more money so you know what they did? They tore it up so they could sell 10 pieces instead of one. You say they didn't do that. Yes, they did. But anyway, we got these Dead Sea Scrolls in 1948. What's the benefit? Why do you say so much with respect the name of Marty Abegg, a good friend of mine who worked on the Dead Sea Scrolls and blew it open? I think it was cave 13 or cave 11, he blew it open with a Mac computer actually. Why do I have so much respect for Marty? The Dead Sea Scrolls are our best Hebrew manuscripts. The Dead Sea Scrolls, in 1948 jumped us back 1000 years to before the time of Christ. That's 1000 year jump. Can we now check how good those late Masoretic texts manuscripts are? Yes, we've got 1000 year jump now. Guess what they found? Are the

Hebrew texts accurate? The Hebrew texts are accurate. The Dead Sea Scrolls confirm this generally.

AJ. Gabi Barkai and Numbers 6 [73:39- 76:19]

Now, by the way, let me just tell you a story about a guy named Gabi Barkai, I studied under him in the 1970s, after the Civil War. Gabi Barkai has studied tombs in Jerusalem all his life and I'm talking all his life, some 40 or 50 years. Gabi can walk into a tomb in Jerusalem and as he knows every tomb in Jerusalem. He's a really bright guy. He walks up to the wall, put his hand on the wall and he'll say, that chisel mark was made in 300 BC. This guy is good. He's the best in the world. He has spent his whole life doing that.

Now what's the problem with tombs? Usually they bury the people with all their riches. Usually what happens to a tomb? The grave robbers get there and rip all the stuff off so you're left a few pieces of barley and fragments. Can you do some carbon-14 dating on it? But you're often left with nothing but mere scraps. Lo and behold, this is in the 1980s, they're digging to make a new hotel and they got the steam shovel out, they're digging up and all of the sudden they hit something. They said, "Holy cow, this a tomb." You've got a tomb in Jerusalem, who are you going to call? Gabi Barkay. "Gabi, get over here, we hit a tomb." What happened was, there was an earthquake and the earthquake collapsed the roof of the tomb onto the tomb. Question: is that good? Yes, all the stuff is still in situ. They opened this tomb and this tomb dates from 700 BC. This is from the time of Hezekiah, king of Judah. The tomb roof was collapsed, there's a woman in there, you can tell from the bones. She has got around her neck, a little amulet made out of silver. It took them 3 years to roll this silver amulet from 700 BC. It said something like this, and this is a good way to end the class, "The Lord bless you and keep you. The Lord be gracious unto you and make his face shine upon you and give you shalom." Have you ever heard that? Did your pastor ever say, "The Lord bless you and keep you and make his face shine upon you"? This is the priestly blessing from Numbers 6:24ff. Gabi Barkai found the earliest piece of Scripture ever found—600-700 BC. Does it say the same thing

that your Bible says? The same thing. So we can have confidence in Scripture. See you next week.

This is lecture number 3 by Ted Hildebrandt on Old Testament History, Literature, and Theology. This lecture was on the transmission of the Bible from God to us.

Transcribed by Lauren Arzbecker
Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt 2

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 4[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt teaching Old Testament History, Literature and Theology lecture number 4 on translation and the opening part of Genesis chapter 1.

Quiz Preparation [0:0-5:57]

Let's just review what we are doing for the quiz on Thursday. We've got a quiz on Thursday, every Thursday, quiz, quiz, quiz. This week we are working on Genesis 26 to 50. Are we learning all of it or just the what?—the listed stories [now in Quizlet questions]. The stories that are listed in the syllabus, those are the ones we are focusing on the content. There's an article by a guy named Sailhammer on "Cosmic Maps." Can you listen to that article as well as read it? You can listen to it, you can read it. The article's online. *Our Father Abraham*, the book by Dr. Wilson, there are some pages listed there. In the syllabus it also lists some questions. You do not have to do those questions. Those questions are only meant merely to guide your thinking. They are reflective questions just to help you focus on what the chapter is about. So the questions are merely for your benefit. You don't have to list them out or answer them or anything like that. There are a couple of memory verses. There will always be a couple verses to learn. This week is the week of the editor. You should've shipped your materials to the editors, the scribes should be sending your transcriptions to the editor. The editor, this week Thursday, will shoot it to me. The editor should go through the whole thing. If the editor is having trouble getting materials from somebody too and they still haven't turned it in, get that in. If not, you write this: this person didn't turn it in till Wednesday, and I had to turn it in on Thursday. I don't want a printed copy, it does me no good. I need it emailed to me either as an attachment or just control + A and select the whole thing and paste it and put it into the email. It's actually probably better to submit it as a MS Word attachment and send it to me as an attachment. Anything else? So that's what we are doing.

One other announcement, Kyle will be doing another review session on Wednesday night here at seven o'clock. That's correct Kyle? [Yes.] Okay, we are good. So Kyle's will be in here from 7-8. There's a conflict of interest here however. Dr. Perry Phillips is going to be doing the Big Bang Lecture. He was stuck because of the hurricane in Malone, Wisconsin. He's going to be doing the Big Bang, Wednesday night at 7:15 down in Jenks 237. So there's a conflict here, and you can either come here and do this or go down and listen to Perry Phillips discussing the Big Bang. He is going to discuss the creation of the universe, which is really pretty interesting. Now, I figured a way out around this conflict of interest. I am going to go down and video tape Dr. Phillips' lecture. Now what's the problem? If you know Dr. Phillips, is it much better to be there? It's like would you rather be at a U2 concert or would you rather watch it on a video? It's just not the same as being there. So I will video tape it. Give me a week; I'll need to process it. I'll try to put it up online.

The editors should have their transcriptions and turn it in. If you've got something freaked out on your computer or whatever and you can't get it done then email me, talk to me, but otherwise we'll go with that. Now attendance sheets are around. The other thing now is paying for the course materials. Remember to get your payment in to me. At the end of this week the price doubles so you will want to do that and get things in to me. Alright, I think that's it. Does anybody have any other questions? Yes, she says if there's time in class, that's my fault we need to make time, so at 20 after 4 give me one of these, a technical time out kind of signs, and give me something like this and then we'll go over the Biblerobics.

All right, let's open with a word of prayer, and then we'll get down into today's lecture. *Father we thank you for your kindness and goodness to us, and especially in this class for allowing us to read through, study, and reflect on your word. We pray you might help us today as we get into some of the details Genesis 1. Help us not to stray far from what you actually did in Creation, that we might not lose sight in the midst of all the details that we are going over, that we might not lose sight of your majesty and your greatness. For we realize that the heavens declare your glory. We pray that you might*

help us with our eyes, with our minds to see your glory and even in this day to walk in the light of the glory of your Son who loved us and gave his life on our behalf. So it's in His name we pray, in Christ's name, Amen.

Review [5:58-7:51]

The last time we were talking and so far in the course, let me just summarize the whole course. We started out initially trying to show that there are reasons why people believe in the existence of God. So we went through various proofs for the existence of God. Not that they prove things 100%, but that there are reasons to believe in the existence of God. Now, once we have God, then God has spoken. The process of God speaking is the process called, what word is used for when God speaks? **Inspiration**. God inspires the prophets. So God speaks to the prophets and we call it inspiration.

Now after God has inspired the prophets and spoken to the prophets then what happens with the people of God? The people of God collect the books. Now the collection of books takes over a thousand years. Moses wrote it 1400 BC, Malachi is writing in 400 BC. There's a thousand year gap there, so the Jewish people are collecting the word of God over a long period of time. They collect it and put it in various sacred places. Do other people come in and try to destroy the word of God? Babylonians come in; they torch everything, that kind of destruction. So the Jews are working with that, the books get collected. That process of collecting authoritative books is called **canonization**. So you have the process of canonization which is the collecting and sanctioning of the authoritative books.

After the books get collected what do they need to do? What needs to happen next? They've got to be copied over and over again. That's called the process of transmission. **Transmission** is getting the books copied from one generation to the next. In the process of copying do scribes make mistakes? When you were scribes on the Vannoy, or Putnam, or Mathewson materials did you make mistakes? Yes, that's why you have an editor. So, yes, scribes make mistakes, and do they make mistakes because they are evil? No, they make mistakes because they are human. They tried to do the best they could.

Process of Translation [7:52-9:38]

Now after the scribes have copied the word of God for 2000 years it has to be translated from what language? It has to be **translated** from Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek into English, so that we can read it. That process is called the process of translation. I want to look at the process of translation today. Can something get lost in translation? Sorry if we are using a movie title, but can something get lost in translation? Let me just illustrate: guy says something to girl, girl says something to guy, question, lost in translation? So you all know what I'm talking about. Now you put that in Hebrew. So what we've got is something like this and we're going to put this up, and we're going to focus on translation today, going between different languages. Do different versions and per-versions translate things differently? Do they have different theories of how they do translation? So what I would like to do today is to go over different theories of translation. Then I want to show you some different ones and then I want to jump into actually doing the book of Genesis chapter 1 today, or at least get started on that.

So here's where we were last time. Here are the processes of inspiration, canonization, transmission, and translation. This is the process basically from God to us and I think we talked about that last time. Now what I want to do this time is to work a bit on translation.

Translation theory: mistakes in translation Prov. 26:23 [KJV] [9:39-16:39]

Are there different ways to translate? Which one is best? So there's going to be different theories. Which one is best, why do we buy into which approach? Do translators ever make mistakes? Let's just put it up front. Do translators ever make mistakes? Who uses King James Version here? Is there a King James person? Here's a mistake in your King James Version. Now you say, "Hildebrandt you're coming off really strong." This is a mistake, it's wrong. Now, by the way, do I have a great deal of respect for the King James Version? Yes, but the question is: Is it perfect? The answer is: No. Here's an example in Proverbs chapter 26 verse 23 it says in the King James Version [KJV], "Burning lips and a wicked heart are like a potsherd." Do you know what a potsherd is? In Israel they made these pots out of clay, clay pots, and what happens to clay pots after a

period of time? Yes, clay pots get busted. So you've got these shards of pots that are busted pieces of pottery.

So "burning lips and a wicked heart are like a potsherd," a piece of pottery covered with silver dross. Silver dross, what is silver dross? We don't do that. When you want to purify a metal what do you do with it, gold or silver? Do you put it in a fire and then kind of bubble it and melt it down and then the crud rises to the top. What you do with the stuff that comes to the top? You skim off all the crud that's on the top. Does that purify your metal? You have to do the process many times and keep scraping bad stuff, or dross, off. So that's silver dross. It's the bad you skim off the impurities and you put it on the pot. You put silver dross on a pot, that sounds a bit odd.

The King James translators, first of all, when did they translate? 1611. What was going on in the world in 1611? About 1620, what was happening in America? There was a guy named William Bradford. Does anyone remember William Bradford coming over and founding the Plymouth plantation? In June 1620, so were talking nine years after the King James Version was translated. By the way the Plymouth plantation, is that a long time ago?

So this is old and were the King James translators all experts in Hebrew? Yes, many of the translators were actually experts in Hebrew. Question, did they know everything about Hebrew? No. The King James translators tell us in the introduction, explicitly, they admitted we didn't know some of the Hebrew words. This word "silver dross" is only used one time in the Bible. What's the problem with that? Meaning is determined by what? What determines meaning? I've said it about fifty times at least. What determines the meaning of a word? Context. What's the problem when the word is only use one time? Do you have trouble establishing the context? This word is only used one time. So the King James translators, they went to some Jewish people. They said what does this word mean? And of some Jewish people said this and they went to other Jewish people. What does that mean? They told them something totally different. They ended up with all these different meanings. What was their answer for what this word meant? They didn't know either. That's the honest truth. The King James translators

pointed out “we did the best we could. We looked in our best dictionaries, we checked our best people, and nobody knew really what some of these words were. These Hebrew words are rare words.”

Now you say, Hildebrandt how do you know that's wrong? Well, once upon a time just north of Israel, this is north of Israel 56-70 miles, there's a place called Ugarit. It's up in Lebanon--Ugarit. They found this place called Ugarit. There's a language called Ugaritic. So I've had the unfortunate privilege of having to learn Ugaritic. They found 20,000 of these tablets from Ugarit. They date from about 1200 BC. Ugaritic is a sister language to Hebrew. Is that very helpful? If you know Spanish can you fake some Portuguese? I took a whole year of Ugaritic and some of the times having this on tape really bothers me because my professor will probably get on my case, but I took a year's worth of Ugaritic. The honest truth is I faked the year. I read Ugaritic just like it was Hebrew. In other words, I knew Hebrew, so what I did was I took the Ugaritic and when I read the Ugaritic I just read it like was Hebrew. I read the whole year that way. At the end of the year I went up to my professor just as kind of a joke because I got a good grade in class, and I told him, I just read it like it was Hebrew. And he said, “Yes, because they're sister languages, so many of the words are very similar.” So I was able to get away with the year like that.

Now, let me go back here. Guess what word pops up in the Ugaritic text? This very word, this “dross” word that we don't know in Hebrew occurs in Ugaritic. What it means is, and I'm not sure whether I've got the translation down here, no I don't. What it means is what do you put on a pot? Normally on a pot you put a glaze on it. The word that we found from Ugaritic that is used here means that the potsherd has a glazing on it. It's glazed, that's all, it is a glaze. Now, by the way, does that make sense in this context that it's glazed? Yes, that this is what you put on pots. What he's saying is you've got fervent words with an evil heart it's like glaze on a mud pot. Do you see that? The glaze is all pretty, but it's on a mud pot. Fervent words with an evil heart, is like glaze, pretty nice glaze, on a mud pot—like putting lip stick on a pig. So that's this word, we now know what it means.

You say, “Well, the King James Version translators, they should've known better.” Why couldn't they have known better? Because Ugarit was only found in 1948, and it was frankly into the 1950's and 60's before anybody could even translate these texts very well. So what I'm suggesting is when the King James folks translated, there was no way they could have known what that word meant, it was only found in the last 70 years. So were the King James translators evil? No. They we did the best they could with 1611. The things were very different back then and to be very honest with you, we know much better now. So that's one reason for the movement away from the King James Version, as we know better now what some of these words mean, because we have some of these cognate languages that help us to understand how to translate.

Archaic Language Problem [16:40-18:07]

So now here's another one. Has the English language changed in the last 400 years? Here's 2 Corinthians 8:1 says this, “We do you to wit of the grace of God.” Now, I ask you, have you done anybody to wit lately? Have you said, “Man, I got done do wit. Have you done anybody to wit? Do we talk like this?” “I do you to wit.” When was the last time you said, “I do you to wit?” Now, then you ask the next question: what in the world is this talking about? “I do you to wit.” What in the world does that mean? How about if I translate it like this: “I want you to think about the grace of God.” Does that make good sense? “I want you to think.” Is anybody witty in here? Somebody's shaking their head. I like witty people; you can give me grief with it, because I enjoy arguing. “I do to wit” was “I want you to think about the grace of God.” Now, by the way, should we probably translate this differently today than it was translated 400 years ago? Because we don't do many people to wit anymore. But we do want people to think and so we do it as, ‘I want to think about.’ So the English language has changed.

Theories of Translation [18:08-26:47]

Now here are three or four theories of translation. Here's the first translation theory. You've got a word in this language and you've got a word in this language. So you to take the word in this language, and you translate it for the word in this language; **a word-for-word, literal** translation. One word in this language, one word in that

language, one word there, one word here, and that's how you translate. Now I want you to think about that. Do any languages matchup word-for-word? This word always means this in this language. If in our own language, even if I said to you in Bostonian English, "our ca", "we went to our ca." What's "our ca" mean in Boston? "ca" means for most of us, "car." "CAR" with an "r" on the end. Now what's the problem? When you say "ca," now you've got me saying it. When I say "car," do you know whether I'm talking about a railroad car? Is a railroad car different than a car, car? Qarqar. Does anybody know about the battle of Qarqar? Anyway, you've got a "car," like the one I drove in. Then you've got a "car" like when my grandkid was over and he was playing with the toy car. Is a toy car different than the real car, different than the train car? In other words, you can take one word in one language and always translate it another way, does that work? Do languages lineup like that one-for-one? No, they don't lineup that way. So this is word-for-word literal. It is a flawed theory, because languages don't work like that.

Now, by the way, do you like word-for-word literal though because is pretty nice? If you can get them one-for-one, is that really easy and you know you want to do that. So I guess what I'm saying is, go for word-for-word as much as you can, but is that going to breakdown eventually?

Yes, it's different, and the problem she's raising is she's translating from Portuguese to English for a song. Now what's the problem with song? Is song more poetic? Is poetry going to be much more difficult than just running narrative? When you've got poetry, the poetic words just don't come along. Believe me I've tried this I don't want to tell you how many hours I've spent literally hundreds of hours trying to translate Hebrew poetry into English. It is beautiful in Hebrew but it comes over in English and I can't turn it into poetry in English. That is really disappointing to me. I've tried, I've spent hours, I've spent at least 10 hours on one verse trying to do it and I couldn't get it right. That really has been annoying to me. So does poetry add a whole other dimension between languages? So word-for-word literal, do we like this? Is this a good method if you can get away with it? This is good if you can do it, but it doesn't always work like that.

So then they have what's called a modified literal. A **modified literal** is to take it as literally as you can, word-for-word, but at some points that will break down. At some points, it will breakdown. So you do a modified literal meaning go word-for-word but then when that doesn't work you've got to bail.

Now, here is a whole different theory. It's called **dynamic equivalence**. Now what dynamic equivalence does is it does not translate word-for-word. What dynamic equivalence does is it translates what?--meaning-for-meaning. Is that very different than word-for-word? So, for example, I think of the word *hesed* in Hebrew. What does *hesed* mean? You ask, "Hildebrandt what does that mean? You've translated it how many different ways in your life?" When I was younger I translated *hesed* as "love." So I translated it "love." You say, "Oh, that's nice, 'love.'" But then after you do that for a while you realize that's not what *hesed* means exactly. *Hesed* means more like, you say, why don't we just use the NIV? The NIV translates it "steadfast love." Now "steadfast love" is that a little different than "love"? "Steadfast love," and then you say I don't like the word "steadfast." Sounds like I don't know, so then I translated the word "loyal love." If you look in the DASV I did "loyal love" there. Now, by the way, is "loyal love" different than "steadfast love"? Is there a little bit of similarity between "steadfast love" and "loyal love"? Does loyal love have the idea of maybe a covenant or contract that you're loyal to someone? And so I like loyal love better. Then you say, "remember when you were back at Grace College and you said you used to translated it "stubborn love." Now is "stubborn love" different yet again, but do you see what I'm saying? Does it have something of that in loyal love? I like the phrase "stubborn love," and I did that for a while, but then what was the problem? I started realizing, for most people, is "stubborn" a positive or negative? Negative. So then I thought, I know what I mean by "stubborn love" and but it doesn't work as it's negative for most people, so I dropped "stubbornness" and that's when I went to "loyal love." Do you see what I'm saying? So what does *hesed* mean? And the answer is: I don't know. Love, covenant love, loyal love, steadfast love, stubborn love, kindness, you know what I'm saying? It has all these ideas, and so the word is a multiplex word. When I go to translate it into English, it's just more

complicated than I can get it into one or two English words. Dynamic equivalence is you try to do meaning-for-meaning you try to take the meaning for this and you try to put the meaning over there.

Then lastly, is what I call “**politically corrected views**” of translation. Now what’s a politically corrected view? The TNIV, Today’s New International, they published that, I think it was in England. Generally, what gets politically corrected? Gender is one of the big things that they’ll try to politically correct? I was in a meeting when they introduced the NRSV, the New Revised Standard Version. Bruce Metzger was up there, he’s an old, godly gentleman from Princeton, probably in his nineties now. Anyway it’s been a long while since I’ve seen him, I hope he’s alright. Metzger was introducing the NRSV and one of the women translators got up and she was railing on the NRSV because in the NRSV they still translate God as “he.” She was just so disgusted that a Bible would translate God as “he,” because that’s gender exclusive. It excludes women and so it’s terrible they call God “he.” She was going off and off on all this stuff. Metzger was just sitting there, and I remember, he’s got his elbows on this table, and this woman’s going off on the “she God,” and Metzger’s got his head like this and he’s just sitting there shaking his head. He’s got a thousand scholars out there; Metzger’s just going like this. Did she have an axe to grind? Have you guys ever seen a vegan reading of the book of Job? I’m not kidding you, I’m dead serious, there’s a vegan reading for the book of Job. So anyway, what I’m saying is do different people have different political agendas today? Can they read their political agendas into how they translate? Yes.

Now, question, do you like that or not like that? Well, I don’t like it because I’m an old man I guess, but you guys probably don’t even notice the difference. Because how can I say, you guys have been steeped in this PC stuff since the time you went to kindergarten, believe it or not. So what I’m saying is, be careful about the politically correct translations. That bothers me. When somebody’s got an agenda that they’re trying to read into Scripture, I have a problem with that. I don’t try to read into Scripture. Rather I try to listen to Scriptures. No, *Elohim* is a masculine ending. It’s a he. Okay, so you

know now, I don't want to get into the philosophical discussion, you know with the gender of God. That's for another time. What I'm trying to say is when you're working with a translation; you have to work with what the original writers meant and what they wrote. So we've got to work with that. There's a big debate between the author's original intent and recent reader response hermeneutics.

Proverbs 10:5 Translations [26:48-28:30]

Let's take an example, and let's look at Proverbs chapter 10 verse 5, and what I want to do is walk through different translations and try to play around with this and have fun. So the most beautiful of beautiful translations and this is the best that I highly recommended it is this one right here. Do you see how beautiful that is? Now listen to it. Listen to it.

'oger baqqayitz ben maskil, nirdam baqqatzir ben mevish. [Hebrew] Do you see how beautiful that sounds? That's Hebrew. By the way, can you see the *baqqa* here? Do you see the *baqqa* there? Do you see how he's playing with sounds? *baqqa, baqqa*--do you see how that goes? Do you see this one here?--*ben*. Is anyone here named Benjamin here? *Ben* here's your name. You see, by the way, you get in here twice, *Ben* and *Ben*. Do you see how it's repeated? By the way do you see how this one both starts with the *mem* with the "m" sound? The "m," and do you see this is a "sh," "sh, (ʃ)" "s (ʃ)" do you see how these two letters are the same? Is he playing with sound? So he's playing with sounds. Question, can you take the sounds then over into the English and play with sounds? It doesn't work in English. I've tried it, believe me. This is beautiful by way, you notice the Hebrews they always read this way. You guys always read backwards. Right?

KJV: King James Version (1611) [28:31- 30:27]

Now try this one, this is an English translation done by the King James translation in 1611, updated in the late 1880s and now you've got a New King James that was done a few years ago. But the King James version was updated in the 1880s, and the normal KJV is not really the 1611 version. It's the 1880's version. But anyway, this is King James 1611, "He that gathereth in the summer is a wise son." Do any of you "gathereth"?

Now, question, as soon as you see this, is this in archaic form? By the way, do you understand that? Yes, you understand that it's just got an "eth" on the end. Now you don't usually see this, we are more used to an "et" than an "eth." "But he that sleepeth," "sleepeth," do any of thou "sleepeth" in my class, better not. So no sleepeth thou. "But he that sleepeth." We don't say "sleepeth." We say what? Sleep. Yes, we just put an "s" on the end. "He that sleepeth in the harvest is a son that causeth shame." Is it clear, is that how you would translate that? You wouldn't do that right? Can you understand it? Yes, you can understand it. The King James has a certain beauty to it. To be honest I love the KJV, but the language is somewhat archaic. You have to take that into account. KJV was one of the best most incredible translations ever done and that's why it lasted for three/four hundred years and that's why people still use it today because it's so incredible.

NASV: New American Standard Version [30:28-31:30]

Now, I have, I'll show you some other ones. This is the KJV and let's go on. Here's the NASV. The New American Standard was an attempt to go word-for-word literal--word in Hebrew, word in English, etc. This is how they try to do it here, "He who gathers in the summer." Now by the way do we like the word "gathers" better than "gathereth"? Yes, so that's better, that's an improvement. "He who gathers in the summer is a son who acts wisely." Now by the way is "son who acts wisely," is that pretty long? "But he who sleeps," now this is an improvement also, "He who sleeps in harvest is a son who acts shamefully." Is this obvious and clear in what it means? First of all, yes, we understand it. It makes it perfectly clear. So this is good. Have they made some improvements here with the "gathers," the "sleeps"? Have they made some improvements? Have they lengthened "the son who acts shamelessly"? Have they kind of drawn that out? Is poetry short and concise or long and wordy?

NIV: New International Version [31:31-35:05]

Now I want to put the NIV up there so you can see the difference. The NIV says, "He who gathers crops." Now by the way where does "crops" come from? The NIV translators, do you realize those NIV translators added that word in there? The word "crops" is not in the Hebrew. They added to Scripture. Is that bad news? They added to

Scripture. Do you see that? Now who did the NIV? You say Hildebrandt didn't you say that Dr. Wilson did it? He worked on Isaiah not in Proverbs, and by the way I've told you about Dr. Wilson right? You have "thus saith the Lord," that's like, good, gold okay. Dr. Wilson says and it's good to go. You know what I'm saying. Now why did they put the word "crops" in there? Seriously they added the word "crops," "He who gathers crops." Why did they put that word crops in there? [Student response] That was really good. Yes. In today's English when we gather, "He who gathers," we ask gathers what? What is our next question. "He who gathers in the summer," we'd say gathers what? Are you going to gather marbles? Are you going to gather sand? What are you going to gather? When it says "crops" is that what it originally meant? Is that what the word, "qatzir" means? To "gather crops" But actually in an agricultural society, you'd say "gathers" and you'd pair it up with a harvest is what it obviously means. But in our day is "gathers" obvious? No, so they make it explicit by saying "gathers crops." Is that helpful? Is that helpful to us because we don't live in an agrarian society? So the "crops" is helpful.

Now, by the way, is that what it originally meant? That's what it originally meant. Is the word "crops" there in Hebrew? No, it's not, but it's embedded in the word "he who gathers," of course, you gather crops. So do you see what's going on there a little bit? "He who gathers crops in the summer is a wise son, He who sleeps during harvest is a disgraceful son." Do you see this "wise son"? Is "wise son" [NIV] different than a "son who acts wisely" [NASV]? Is the NASV really long and drawn-out? Now, I ask you in a Proverb, should a Proverb be long and drawn-out, or should a Proverb be pithy and punchy? "A stitch in time saves nine." Or should a Proverb be a long sentence? Is a Proverb supposed be short, crisp, pithy, and to the point? Is this "a son who acts wisely" drawn-out? Or is a "wise son" short and to the point? So does this fit Proverbs and the idea of the Proverbial genre? Does this literary form make it more punchy? "A disgraceful son," rather than "a son who acts shamefully." Do you see what I'm saying? So question: do I like this NIV translation better than this NASV? I personally like it. This one has some punch to it. Short like Proverbs although it adds the "crops" here to help in the frame of the agrarian background and then "disgraceful son" again punching,

opposing the “wise son” and the “disgraceful son sleeps during harvest.” By the way, is this talking about college? Yes.

NLT: New Living Translation [35:06-39:55]

Now let's go to a different one. This one's called the *New Living Translation* and in the book of Proverbs, the *New Living Translation* there are all sorts of problems. So let's look at some of them. “A wise youth,” now as soon as you see that has something changed? “A wise youth.” All the other ones said a what? A wise “son.” Does everybody see that? Have they neutered the gender and put youth instead of son so that it would not be an exclusive gender with “son.” Was it done for that reason? The answer is: Yes, it was done for exactly that reason. Did somebody right pages telling them that was not the right way to do it? Yes. Was that individual's suggestions ignored? Yes. When you lose, what do you do? You complain and that's what I'm doing. So anyway, it really still bothers me.

“Listen my son to your father's instruction.” Doesn't that sound very different than “listen my child to your father's instruction”? Yes. How old is the son? This guy's trying to get his son not to, how do you guys say, shack up or hook up with this woman, and is he a child? Now I don't know what you guys call it. This is what I'm saying, is this a father warning a son telling him not to have whatever. Is this kid a child? No, obviously he's a young adult. So what I'm saying is to use the word “child,” why did they use the word “child” instead of “son”? “Listen my son to your father,” “Listen my child,” do you see the difference in meaning there? I think anybody can see the difference there.

Question: when the editor over you does something do you have to bite your tongue and say “that's it.” You've got to chill out some times? I'm still mad about it. I think it's wrong but anyway, do I have respect for the people I translated with? The editor over me, I won't even tell you the names, but do I respect the guy? Yes, immensely, I enjoy the person and he made me to wit. He gets me to think and I just appreciate him so much, but I disagreed with him on this point.

So, “A youth who sleeps away the hour of opportunity.” Wait, let's finish this, “a wise youth works hard all summer”. Where's the “harvest crops”? Is the “harvest crops”

gone? The “harvest crops” is gone. Why did they take away the “harvest crops”? It says “works hard.” Is that the real point of the Proverb? Do you guys need to gather crops, or do you guys need to work hard? Is this telling you the meaning, without the image of the harvest of crops? Yes. Is that good or bad? What happened to the metaphor the crops and harvest? Is that beautiful metaphor of the harvest and the crops? Yes, it is, I like that. I don’t like when they take my metaphors away. The metaphors are rich. But does this help you understand the point of the Proverb? The answer’s, yes. This puts it right in your face, but I like the subtleties, I like the richness of metaphors. So this bothers me a little bit too. But I can see the point. You don’t put the metaphors in, you put the meaning of the metaphor in. By the way, is that more helpful for people who read the Bible? Are they sure to get the right point then? So what happens is you work with the point. Now “a youth who sleeps away the hour of opportunity.” What’s the hour of opportunity? Was it that you need to harvest when the fruit is ripe? If you harvest two months after the fruit is ripe, that’s no good. So is this again giving us the point of the Proverb without using the harvest imagery? So this is telling us the meaning, it’s a more meaning-to-meaning dynamic equivalent translation. So why is he working hard all summer that raises a whole other set of questions. But, by the way, do you college students, do most of your work at college or in the winter? You work in the summer right? Do you guys do summer jobs? Yes, so that’s maybe why it still fits as people work in the summer. But notice, “brings shame” about the son. Is the meaning of the Proverb really clear in this one without the metaphor? Yes.

The Message by Eugene Peterson [39:56-43:23]

Once upon a time, there was a guy named Eugene Peterson. He teaches up in Canada, and you know how the Canadians are. So, he is, how should I say it? He is a godly, godly man that I would look up to. I don’t know him personally, but I look up to him from the work he has done and I’ve read some of his work. He is a godly, godly man. Is he extremely creative? Now, what’s the problem with creativity? I’ll tell you because I tend to be very creative myself at points. It’s hard when you’re creative, there’s a fine line

between creativity, now I'm not talking about him, Eugene Peterson, there's a fine line between creativity and weirdness. I've never been able to find the line. But anyway, he, on the other hand, is a good scholar, top-flight scholar, and a creative individual, and he comes up with stuff that when you read it you say, I wish I had translated it like that. This guy is a genius. What I'm saying is Eugene Peterson, he's up at Regent University in Vancouver, Canada. He captures something of the prophetic, and the proverbial moment that I have not been able to capture. So I look up to him with admiration.

Now, it's going to be different, but this guy has captured it. Check this out, this is the translation of the same verse: "Make hay while the sun shines." Now, is that it? Has he got it? Do we say "Make hay while the sun shines"? He's got that idea of work hard during the summer. He's got it, "Make hay while the sun shines, that's smart. Going fishing during the harvest, that's stupid." Now, if I had to change a word it would probably be this one. "Stupid" is that real strong? Now is the Proverb real strong? Yeah, but I think I would tone this word down just a shade. But is there genius here? Does this capture the proverb? Do you see this? "Make hay while the sun shines, that's smart, go fishing during the harvest, that's stupid." This is *The Message* Bible. It's done by Eugene Peterson.

Now, while I respect Peterson, he's a genius, the problem with one person translating is, is it possible that it can be flat, flat, flat, genius, flat, flat, flat, genius. Do you know what I'm saying? Can a person be genius in every verse? Does he do this with every verse? No, I picked this out, but what I'm saying is he will have these verses that you just sit there and it just makes you smile. You just say, "he's got it." Now by the way is this word-for-word? No. Is this dynamic equivalence, meaning-for-meaning? Has he got the meaning-for-meaning thing?

Now, by the way, which one of these translations are you going to use? Is it possible when I'm wanting to smile that I use *The Message* to make me think about this text in a different way than I have ever thought about it before? So I use this? Is it possible that I use the NLT or NIV? Yes. Is it possible to use a different translation when you're in different moods and when you're doing different things? If you're a pastor

trying to prepare for a sermon, are you going to use something wild and wacky like that? Or are you going to use a more word-for-word literal to begin with? Actually if you're a pastor who is doing a sermon, would you probably do both? Yes, get this one, would the people in your church find resonance with this one? Yes, so you know, it depends what you're trying to do. Of course, what you really should do is read the original Hebrew. So here are some conclusions, kind of in the big picture.

Review of whole process [43:24- 46:32]

Well, let's kind of run through the whole process. Do we have better manuscript evidence today than they have had for 2,000 years? Yes. Better manuscript evidence than they've ever had. Is any major doctrine affected by all the scribal errors? Is any major doctrine really affected? The answer is: "No." No major doctrine is really affected. You say, "Oh, Hildebrandt, we've wasted all this time and no doctrine is really affected. But what I'm trying to say is, knowing that scribes copied this and that there are scribal errors helps, you understand better how we got our Bible. That's what I'm interested in, that nobody pop anything new on you. We've been through it now. You see how things come down and where they're supposed to be.

I want you to have a realistic view of transmission, scribes copying, and translation. In translation processes I just want you to be aware of the processes of the different translations and different scribal copying. There should be confidence in God's word. The benefit is you guys can pick up 10 or 15 different translations in English if you feel like it. So we live in a very rich environment informationally today.

Does anybody use the Net Bible? Has anybody ever heard of the Net Bible? Okay, there's a Bible on the net. It's hosted by some really good people, Dan Wallace and a bunch of these guys I know some of them, and they are excellent. It's called the Net Bible. I really enjoy the footnotes, the study guide from that Bible is very helpful. It's all on the Internet. I think you can actually order a copy now; you can actually get it printed.

So plurality I think the point is not to focus on the jots and tittles, but focus on the meaning of Scripture, and I guess that's my point. Don't focus on the jots and tittles so

much, the little points, focus on the meaning of Scripture and what it means for your life. How God is speaking to you, and communicating his word to you in terms of the meaning of Scripture, rather than just focusing on the jots and tittles which just get us upset. If God has spoken to us and told us many things, this book should be one of the most important guides in your life. Question, do I enjoy reading Plato? *The Republic*, I love reading Plato. If you've never read Plato, Plato's wonderful. Aristotle is more work, but Aristotle is a very mathematical logical mind. I enjoy reading Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* and other things. Question, when you read Plato, Aristotle, all the great people, what's this? [Reference to Bible] This is the Word of God. Question is it different than Plato? Plato was interesting, Charles Dickens is fascinating, but this is the word of God. So there's a huge difference then. How can I say this? This is one of the reasons why I invested my life into studying this book because God has spoken. God has actually spoken, and I want to hear what he has to say. So this is one of the most important guides for life then.

Scribes make mistakes [46:33-49:46]

Now, did God use flawed process in preserving his word? Yes he did. Now, by the way, is this a matter of my opinion. He did use flawed processes. I can show you the flaws and I have shown you some flaws. Now, did the scribes make errors? Yes, they did. Can we correct for a lot of those errors? Yes, we can. Did God use flawed processes? Did he use human beings to communicate his word? Did God use translational processes? Are there errors in some of the translations? Actually, to be honest with you are there errors in every one of our translations? Undoubtedly. Now by the way, are the translations today much more accurate than they have been? Were there errors in the King James translation? Yes, you've got to say it. I mean Mark 16, 1 John 5:7. Yes, you don't have a choice. First of all, I want to ask you, did God use scribes who made mistakes? Now then, if God oversaw that, did those guys make mistakes? No, it's not my opinion we have the manuscripts. We can compare the manuscripts. It's not "might have." Did the scribes make mistakes? "No, you weren't there," some might say, but if

you had 10 minutes to do research in library, could you find the manuscripts and actually compare the manuscripts if you could actually read Greek and Hebrew? Could you do that within 10 minutes? You tell me, what kind of mistakes? Well, wait, okay, you're telling me what you believe but I'm not asking what you believe. I'm saying what do the manuscripts indicate? We have the manuscripts, you can compare this manuscript it has Mark 16, this one does not have Mark 16. What do you do with that? One has it, one doesn't. 1 John 5:7 it's not in any of our ancient manuscripts. It's in the King James Version. What do you do with that? All I'm trying to get you to say is, did the scribes make mistakes? Yes or no? I've shown you, do you guys realize I've shown you mistakes that they've made? I've shown you flat out in-your-face you don't have an option there, it's a fact.

Now notice I'm standing right here next to the Bible. When I don't know something is factual, I walk over there. I'm telling you this is a fact. It's not whether you agree with me or disagree with me. I can give you a Greek Bible and it will list the problems down at the bottom, in the footnotes. Many of the Greek New Testaments do that. The Hebrew Bible does the same thing. The variant readings demonstrate the scribes made mistakes. Every scribe who copies a thousand pages makes mistakes.

Translators make mistakes [49:47-55:20]

Secondly, do translators make mistakes? Did I show you some differences in the translations today? Translators make mistakes. So we don't have a choice there. So what we're saying that the word of God is flawless, but the word of God has flaws. What's missing? What's he talking about? In this is the reason why I'm harping on this is because this is a really important point. And in other words, there's a really, really big and important point and it's what I've been talking about for three days, and I'm trying to get you to see the point. When God spoke to the prophet do we call that the process of inspiration? Is inspiration a hundred percent? Is inspiration when God talks to the prophet, and the prophet wrote it down; is that a hundred percent what God wanted written down? Yes. God spoke to the prophet, God said exactly what he meant and the

prophet wrote it down. So when he's quoting, I think what I'm hearing from you is Psalm 119. When he's quoting Psalm 119, which goes on for a hundred verses saying the Law of Lord is perfect. Is that talking about the inspirational process of God speaking to his people? Yes. Is that talking about the scribal process of copying? No, it's talking about the process of inspiration and you've got to separate those processes. That is actually what I'm trying to point out. Can a translator make mistakes? Can a guy like Erasmus add a verse to the Bible in the 16th century? Not, can he do it, he did it--1 John 5:7. Look in your King James Version. So, what I'm saying you have to separate the process of inspiration which is flawless, which is 100%, which is the word of God, but when you give it to the hands of scribes, scribes make errors, and so do translators.

By the way, how does he know that translators make mistakes? He's in this class. I'm sorry to be really gross, but does anybody have an NLT here? Okay, if you look in the NLT you'll find somebody who translated that. Question, do you know that I make mistakes? Yes, I've already made 100 mistakes in this class. So what I'm saying is I was one of the translators on the NLT. Do I make mistakes? Yes. Does God use flawed processes? Yes. Did he use my process? Yes, he used me. So, yes. [Student question] But I think you're missing the point and that's what I'm trying to say. What you're talking about is the process of inspiration. God to the prophet who writes it down.

Do the rest of you guys understand what I'm trying to distinguish here? Come up after class and we can talk about it, but actually you're missing the exact point that I'm trying to make here. What I'm trying to do is to get you to see that, and that's probably the most important point. It's probably the most important point I've talked about so far.

Illumination of the Holy Spirit [53:10-55:21]

Now, she used the word inspiration. I want to use a different word. I'm not inspired, okay? I'm not inspired. I asked for illumination. In other words, illumination is different than inspiration. Illumination, and she said a good point too, do we ask the Spirit to help us understand the word? That's called "illumination." Now, by the way, can that be flawed? Have you ever had one pastor tell you one thing and the other tell you

something else. You get two different messages. So what I'm saying is you've got to be careful with illumination because it comes through a human being. Does everybody hear what she said? That's exactly what I'm trying to say. The process of inspiration is flawless, perfect and the process of God speaking to the prophet, the prophet writing it down that's perfect. But then what happens is that book gets copied over 1000 or 2000 years and some of the scribes, everyone we have, every manuscript we have there's differences between the manuscripts. We've got to sort that out. God used processes that had problems with them, and then, by the way, there's translation and you get another set of problems translating between the languages. Now, can we use multiple translations to try to get it better than we've ever had it? But is it flawless in the sense of inspiration? It's not on the same level with that initial process that they're talking about.

The process of inspiration is perfect and so we've got to distinguish that. If you don't distinguish that, you are dead meat. When you go out and you try to say every word in this book there are no problems here, a good scholar, will rip you to shreds. What this is, is it a problem of God's word or is it a problem with the translators of the NIV? It's a problem with the translators of the NIV. Somebody doesn't like the NLT, they'll rip it up and say this Bible's the word of God, and then they'll open up the NLT and show you a problem. It's possible that Hildebrandt could've written that thing in there and he got it wrong. So I want to say I'm flawed, and so I do work and the NLT was part of that.

God uses flawed process and flawed people for his purposes [55:22-58:33]

So let's run through this. God used flawed processes. His initial process inspiration there's no problem with. Providence did not preserve it perfectly. With these manuscripts they're different, so God chose not to preserve it. What I'm suggesting to you why is that? Because God did not want us worshipping a book, God wanted us worshipping himself. So he purposely had the originals lost, we don't have any of the originals. We don't have what Moses wrote. But then this becomes important. If God used flawed processes to accomplish his purposes, then can God use me, a flawed person, to accomplish his purposes too. Yes, and this opens up then that God uses flawed people

to accomplish his purposes, and that we can engage in that. I find that rich.

So he calls us to study and figure things out and we need to focus on the meaning. We need to focus on the meaning then, and the impact it has on our life, because this is God's word. Are we in the best position we've been in 2,000 years? 2,000 years. Do we have better translation theories? Do we have better manuscripts than they've had in 2,000 years? We're in the best position of anybody in 2, yeah, 3,000 years. But what's kind of ironic about that? We have the best translations done off the best manuscripts that have ever been done. Question, does your generation reverence this book, or not reverence this book? Do you see the irony here? In other words, the thing is getting more and more accurate. We now know that it's not "silver dress," that it's "glaze". You say we know it's much more accurate than what we, understood, but yet to this generation, the Bible's out the window.

Yes, that's part of faith, so he's going back to Hebrews chapter 11 verse 1 and following, and that basically says we have to have faith. So what I don't want to give up, and what his comments are so right about, is I don't want to give up that when God spoke to the prophets they wrote it down, that's a hundred percent. If you lose that, if you lose what he is suggesting, his foundation, you are on a skateboard going downhill at 60 miles an hour. You know some of you guys can get hurt. So if you cut that off you're in big trouble. However, if you don't know about the scribal stuff and the translation problems can you get in trouble on the other side? Because a critic can level you onto the floor, because they can show stuff up in your face, and, well, they've got you.

But they don't have us because God has preserved his word and it is as accurate now. So you've got to work with that. We're in the best position in 2,000 years and that's comforting.

4 Processes from God to us [58:34-59:27]

Here are the processes and let me just kind of lay out these four processes. Inspiration is this 100%? **Inspiration**, 100%, God's word flawless. **Canonization** they gather the authoritative books together. Have we got the books? Pretty much we accept that from the Jews as God's people. The canonization is the collection of books and we're

good on that. **Transmission** is this where some of the problems in copying over and over again come in? We've got hundreds of thousands of manuscripts that all disagree with each other and this is where that happens. You'll have different theories of **translation** and have different translators and some of them will be good, some of them will be bad. Some will be good sometimes, bad at other times. Can we check the different translations by looking at multiple translations? So this is the processes used from God to us, and again you know what I'm saying, I mean this is the way it is. This is actual, historical fact at this point now.

Introduction to the Old Testament: brief historical overview [59:27-59:57]

Let me jump over, and we're going to jump over to here. What I would like to do is actually look into Genesis now. To do this, before we jump into Genesis 1, we are now actually going to jump into the text of Genesis. Genesis is a book of beginnings, and you guys have read it. What I want to do today is cover the first and second verse; we're going to make great progress. First and second verse, Genesis 1:1.

9 turning points through the Old Testament [59:58-76:08]

Before we do that, I want to cover the whole Old Testament in nine points. I want to do a survey of the whole Old Testament and then we'll jump into Genesis in the first two verses. So nine steps the whole big picture: first of all, you have what they call primeval history. Now, what's primeval history? **Primeval history** is Genesis 1 to 11. It's the time before Abraham. So that would include what? Adam and Eve, Noah and the flood, the tower of Babel, those basically are the big things. Adam and Eve, Noah and the Flood, Tower of Babel, all that in the first eleven chapters of Genesis. They call it primeval history, before Abraham.

Abraham's date is what? 2,000 B.C. In this class I'm not a big date person, but there's about five or six dates I want you to know for this class. It's real hard, Abraham's 2,000 B.C. Are you okay with that? Abraham's 2,000 I want you to know that date.

Then what happens? Then you have the period of the **patriarchs**: Abraham. Abraham, here at Gordon we call him Our Father, just to give a little advertisement to

Our Father Abraham, Isaac was his son. Has anybody ever heard about “Yitzhak Rabin”?--Yitzhak (Isaac) Rabin. In Israel today there’s a guy named Yitzhak Rabin. *Yitzhak* means “laughter” and you guys pronounce it Isaac, but it’s really Yitzhak. It means “laughter.” So Abraham has a son named Isaac. Isaac to be honest with you is a pretty minor character. Jacob is big because Jacob's name gets switched to what? Israel. Then he produces what? 12 tribes. Okay so you have Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is that where the 12 tribes of Israel come from: Judah, Levi, Simeon, Ephraim, Manasseh, etc. and down to Joseph. So those are the patriarchs.

After the patriarchs they go to **Egypt and the Exodus**. Remember Joseph was in Egypt, the brothers and the father, Jacob, come down to Egypt. They sojourn in Egypt for about 400 years. I don’t want you to know the date. Then who brings them out of Egypt? Oh, you say God brings them out of Egypt. Yes, he kind of does some plagues and splits the Red Sea. He brings them out by the hand of Moses. Moses there’s a big debate between 1400 and 1200 B.C. I don't want you to learn this at this point because we will argue this when we get to the book of Exodus. There’s a big debate about the date whether it’s 1400 or 1200 BC when they came out. Don’t worry about it now. Exodus, is the great redemptive act of the Old Testament. In the New Testament what is the great redemptive act? It's Jesus dying on the cross for our sins. In the Old Testament the great redemptive act is Moses leading the people out of the bondage of slavery of Egypt and in freedom going to Mount Sinai to receive God's law. So Moses is the deliverer of the Old Testament. Not in the same way, Jesus was. You know Jesus was Jesus. But Moses was the guy that led redemption. Now after they get out of Egypt they wander in the wilderness for 40 years.

Settlement of Canaan [Joshua/Judges]. They capture and settle of Canaan in Joshua and Judges. They take over Jericho. They go up to Ai, Hazor, Gibeon, and other sites. So Joshua and the book of Judges. Judges is going to be chaos. They try to settle the land, it works sometimes, other times it doesn't work. At times the Judges rise up and they beat up on the Midianites, and the Ammonites come back and whip them. So it’s sort of a back-and-forth with Judges, with some problems there. But anyways they take

and settle in the land of Canaan.

Then they settle for a while, and they say, you know what we need? We don't have a leader. We need a king. So the next period is what they call the period of the **United Monarchy**. The united monarchy means what? Israel is together, all 12 tribes, 13 tribes together. Who's the first king of Israel? Saul. He's a real big man on campus, he's real big. Saul is the first king. Saul has some problems and so David takes over. David is the man after God's own heart. David then is another date that I want you to know. This is very, very difficult David's 1000 B.C. Abraham is what? 2000 B.C. David is what? 1000 B.C. Now David has a son named *Shelomo*. I mean Solomon. His real name is *Shelomo*, but you guys call him Solomon unfortunately. But what I'm saying is when I say his name *Shelomo*, you guys know Hebrew, when I say *Shelomo*, do you hear the word? *Shelo-mo*. *Shelo-mo*. Yes, *shalom*. Okay, does Solomon's name mean *shalom*? It means what? Solomon was a man of what? Peace. He was even named *Shelomo*, his name was "peace." What happens with David and Solomon they do Psalms and Proverbs. David does Psalms, Solomon does Proverbs, Solomon does a couple of Psalms as well, but Saul, David and Solomon are what? Those are the three big kings of the United Monarchy of Israel. They ruled over the whole nation, that's why it's called the united monarchy.

As soon as I say united monarchy guess what's going to come next? **Divided monarchy**. Okay, and so next we get the divided monarchy. What happens after Saul, David, and Solomon? Solomon messes up at the end of his life with all of those women and goes down. Basically God rips the kingdom apart north and south. The north is Israel, the south is Judah. The ten tribes in the north, couple tribes in the south, plus or minus. Ten tribes in the north called Israel and Judah in the south. Then you have what? In the north a series of kings, they're all going to be bad, every one of them. Who's the most outstanding one you know? Ahab and Jezebel. Okay all the kings of the North are all bad. The kings in the south are going to have some good ones like Hezekiah. Some good ones, mostly bad, but there were some good ones.

So now the problem is we have got a number of kings in the North and a number

of kings in the South. Now who keeps the kings in line? You're going to say God keeps things in line. But how does God keep the kings in line? God uses what people to keep the kings in line? **The prophets.** Now I'm going to teach you the books of prophets. Okay, so here's a summary of the book of prophets. I'm going to do it in one word. This is the message of the prophets. One word: repent. The prophet's job was to go to the king and do what? Tell him to repent. The prophet went up and he stuck his figure up the nose of the king and he told him to repent. Then what does the king do? Who wins the prophet or the king? You guys are familiar with the New Testament, and so let's do one of the last prophets. He went up to the king and his name was John. What was his name? John the Baptist, and he goes up to the king and he says, "king you've got this wife" and he says, "repent." What does the king say? "Well I don't like that, my wife doesn't like that, so your head is gone." And so John the Baptist loses. And by the way did Jeremiah do the same thing? When you guys read the book of Jeremiah, we are just going to do highlights of Jeremiah. Jeremiah says this basically, he comes to God and says, "Thus saith the Lord." Jeremiah goes out to the king, "thus saith the Lord, repent, or you're going to be exiled to Babylon." Jeremiah goes back and God says, "thus saith the Lord." But every time Jeremiah says, "repent," what does the king do to him? He gets beat up. So after a while he says, "God, the last time I said, thus saith the Lord, I got put into a septic tank for three days and I almost drowned in the stuff, and after three days it wasn't just everybody else's stuff, but some was my own stuff. I was in the septic tank. What I'm saying is this is the real thing. It's what happened in the Bible. What I'm saying is this: Jeremiah almost died in that septic tank. He comes back to God and says, "O God, I just love the septic tank let's do it again." No, he comes back to God and says, "Hey, maybe we can do a little bit of water boarding, or something that would be better than a septic tank? I'm sorry, let me just straighten up." Now, okay, he comes back to God and says, "God every time I speak in your name I get beat up." He comes back to God and he says this directly to God. He says, "this is bad, every time I go out there and say the word of the Lord I get beat up." And he complained, "I'm just tired of this." Did the prophets get beat up? Yes.

Did you hear what happened to Isaiah? Isaiah was fleeing from the King Manasseh. Rumor has it he went in and hid inside the hollow of a tree. Right. They found the prophet hiding in a tree. Do you know what they did? They got out a saw and said, watch this, and they sawed him and the tree in half. Okay, that's the prophet Isaiah. You say the great prophet Isaiah, who saw the Lord and everything. Yes, sawed in two in the tree that he was hiding in from the evil king. Now that's not cool. I just want to tell you, did the prophets have a rough life? Do I have respect for the prophets, and should we have respect for these guys? Yes, they put their lives on the line.

So the prophets do battle with the king and who wins? I tried to show you, the King wins. Who wins in the end, however? Yes, the prophet turns to the king in the end and says, "Hey, you mess with me you're dead in two years." And guess what happens? Oh, yeah that's right when you go out for battle, the Lord bless you, good for you, go out for battle, yes go do it. God says in the battle you're dead. Guess what happens? Ahab. Boom, arrow, you're done. Okay, so let me get off that.

In the Northern tribes, what happens? We've got the northern kingdom of Israel, the southern kingdom of Judah. Kind of like the Americas; North and South. Northern kingdom, ten tribes, those ten tribes get carried off to Assyria. Where is Assyria? What's the capital of Assyria? Nineveh. As soon as I say Nineveh who comes to mind? Jonah and the whale, this is the story behind Jonah and the whale. So they go to Assyria in 722 B.C., the Northern kingdom, ten tribes in the North are hauled off to Nineveh and scattered all over the world. How long have those ten tribes been scattered? Are they scattered to this day? Tell me where do most Jews in this world live? New York City. That is the honest truth. So where do the other half of them live? In Israel and by the way, are there big problems right on the horizons with living in Israel? Are you going to see, I'm not a big prophet like that, I'm going to walk over here. I just want to tell you, is Israel going to have trouble in the next four years here? Are there people developing weapons right now? And actually did they just open that nuclear power plant in Iran, 60 watts of power, and are they upping that nuclear power plant to 1,000 megawatts shortly? It's already producing now. Just what was it, 2 days ago, that they just announced it?

Iran is producing nuclear stuff. Question, have they already said that they are after the complete annihilation of Israel [their words]? I fear that you are going to see this in your time at Gordon here. You're going to see something like that happen. By the way, I'm not just making this up. How should I say it, I'm really into studying these things, and it's really, really bad. I don't know, my guess is you're going to see God do stuff that's incredible. Because, will God let his people be totally destroyed? No, and so there's going to be something spectacular. I don't know, my guess is, let me get off, that was all conjecture. That was all conjecture, do you understand that? But, the northern tribes are they scattered to this day?

Did the Bible say that the northern tribes would be gathered back together? After 3,000 years almost, have the Jewish tribes been gathered back again? The Bible predicted they'd be gathered back and sure enough that's what happened. In 1948, you had to wait a couple of thousand years for this to happen. Is God's word flawless? Will what God said happen? And it had to wait 2,000 years. By the way can you tell me about another country that was scattered for 2,000 years and came back to be a country again? Tell me another one please? How many countries have we had do that? Israel. Have any revived a dead language as well? Not one, except Israel.

So what happens next, now the Northern kingdom has been taken away to Assyria, 722 B.C., the southern kingdom of Judah. Now what's the deal with the southern kingdom of Judah? It's capital is in Jerusalem, and in 586 B.C. the Babylonians come in and they destroy the First Temple in 586. Who built this temple? Solomon. Solomon builds the temple just after 1000 B.C. In 586 the Babylonians come in. Do they totally, absolutely level the temple? They totally, absolutely level the Temple. They haul the ark out. This sea, this big humongous bronze sea, they cut it up into pieces, and the whole thing is absolutely leveled. They go to exile in Babylon. By the way, who goes to Babylon? A guy named, what was his name that liked the lions and dens? Daniel, Shadrach, Ezekiel, and all that takes place in Babylon.

Now, by the way, did Jeremiah the prophet tell them they were going to Babylon? Did Jeremiah also tell them that they were only going to be there for 70 years? And so

guess what happens? After 70 years in Babylon they come back, the return. Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther and you've got the stories of the great coming back. The Jews are freed from Babylon and they returned to the land. Nehemiah builds the walls and some of these guys build the Second Temple. Why is the Second Temple important? The First Temple gets destroyed, the Second Temple gets built. Why is the Second Temple so important? Who comes into the Second Temple? Jesus. This is the Temple, these guys are involved in the building of the Second Temple. Jesus will come into that, destroy this temple, and in how many days? Three days he'll raise it up, that's Jesus. Finally Malachi, down in 400 B.C., ends the Old Testament at 400 B.C.

Now what happens between 400 B.C. and zero with Jesus? Yes, that's when the Apocrypha was written. So if you want to find out what happened in those 400 years you'd read something like 1 and 2 Maccabees, they tell the history of that period. But the Old Testament ends with Malachi 400 B.C.

And you say, Hildebrandt, for this course what do we need to know? It's really hard; what you to know three dates so far. Three dates: Abraham 2000 B.C., David 1000 B.C., Malachi 400 B.C. Is that hard? 2000, 1000, 400 B.C., and that gives you kind of a framework there for the Old Testament.

Creation [76:09-79:30]

So, now let me just set up this other thing about creation. Creation, so what? Does it make a difference whether the world was created or whether the whole thing just is a process of evolution? Does it make a difference whether the world was created or if the world just evolved? Does it make a difference? The answer is yes, this is a big thing.

Could God have used evolutionary processes to accomplish his purposes? Yes, he could have. Is there a big debate? Have you got some people who are creationists and say that God created wham-bam, and everything was created just the way it was? Do other people suggest more evolutionary processes like I look at some of you people, some have blue eyes, some have brown eyes, some of you have different colors. Question did that develop over time, the different colors of eyes for example? How much evolution do you

allow for? Are there some Christians who believe God created but used evolution as the process in a big way? Yes, some people go that way. Other people are more, you know God created, created, created, and that was it and it was done kind-of-thing. So you get this big debate within the Christian church actually. Even, by the way, do we even have a debate here at Gordon College in terms of how much and how you scale the evolutionary processes into or out of some these discussions.

How does that affect your weltanschauung? How does that affect your worldview? I like this word weltanschauung. It's a German word that means "worldview." If you view yourself as created in the image of God, is that very different than "I just evolved out of monkeys." I mean, it affects your worldview. Why couldn't the Bible talk about evolutionary processes? Evolutionary processes, when were those things even talked about? Was it in the 19th century, right? With what's that guy's name? Yes, Charles Darwin. So in other words, what I'm saying is, there's no evolutionary process in the Bible because they had no clue of this stuff. Those were developed in the 19th and 20th centuries. Yes, it's possible that God told them more things than what we know now. All we've got is the Bible, God could've showed Moses much more. I need to walk, over here. God's dealing with Moses. Did God deal with Moses face-to-face? And God's telling Moses, okay day one I did this. I am wondering if he played a 3-D video, and God's saying, "Okay, watch this Moses, this is what I did. We captured it on a screen." Now you understand I just made all of that up, but what I'm saying is the point that he's making is a really good one. Is it possible that Moses knew more than God showed him? More than what he wrote down? I would bet my house on that, yes. But now I don't know what he showed him, and how he did that, but that's a really good point.

Age of the Earth [79:30-80:25]

How old does the Bible say the earth is? This is a really important question. You guys have read Genesis 1 to 11 now. How old did the Bible say the Earth is? Does anybody have a verse on that? Give me please one verse? Excuse me, this is a quiz, did you read Genesis 1 to 11? How old did the Bible say the Earth is? Seven days she says, that was a good answer. Does the Bible tell you how old the Earth is? Is there any verse

in all of the Bible that tells you that? Zero, it doesn't occur. Do we know on the basis of the Bible how old the earth is? We don't know that. The Bible doesn't say. Now, by the way, is that very important admission? There is no verse in all the Bible that says how old the earth is. So that's a very important point to get down.

Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 [80:26-81:38]

Now, what I'd like to do next time is to go over and look at the relationship of Genesis 1:1 to Genesis 1:2. "In the beginning God created the" what?—"heavens and the earth. And the earth was" what?—"formless and empty and darkness was over the face of the deep." What is the relationship of Genesis 1:1 with Genesis 1:2? We'll look at three different ways of handling that and then the implications for dinosaurs, Satan, and Big Foot, we'll cover that. Now, Biblerobics. Everybody up. We've got to finish this Biblerobics for you guys, so we are going to go over it several times here.

Transcribed by Brittney Mattioli
Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 5[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in lecture number five, in the course Old Testament History, Literature, and Theology. Today's lecture will be on Genesis chapter one, on verses 1:1 and 1:2, and then, a discussion on the days of Genesis.

A. Quiz Preview [0:0-2:29]

A couple things for next week. You guys next week are working on guess which book? Exodus. You have to read the whole of Exodus, you think? [student: Yes!] See, there's energy. He's going for the whole thing. Actually, I cut back this year. When you read Exodus there are only select chapters. It's the first twenty chapters, Moses and Egypt, you've got to read that. But once you get to where the Tabernacle is, I cut back some of the reading on the Tabernacle because, to be honest with you, it goes through it twice. Then it's all these details about how the Tabernacle's built. We're just going to read select chapters of that. Look in the syllabus; it'll designate which chapters. Then know the stories of those chapters, and we'll go from there. There'll be an article on "The bloody bridegroom." Say "bloody bridegroom" fast, a few times. You'll have questions on that, when you read that in the text; and so there's an article on that. I think there's some memory verses too. So it'll be the normal assignment. Know the stories. No Bible-robics, for Exodus. No Bible-robics, I haven't developed it yet. I think I may try and develop it for Exodus this year and then there's your transcriptions. Your transcriptions from your editors should be sent to me in email form today and then we're through with that. So basically focus on Exodus. The other thing is the payment for the course materials; some of you still haven't turned in your money. I think tomorrow's the last day and then it goes up. Please get your payment in to me, either today or I'll be in my office tomorrow morning from nine until two. Make sure you get it up there because after tomorrow, it's double. I don't want to be chasing you guys down so take care of your debts.

B. Review: Inspiration, Canonization, Transmission, Translation [2:30-4:52]

Let's get started. We've got a lot of material to run through today. We're going to start out with Genesis 1:1 and actually start working with the text today. So far in this class, we've been talking about inspiration being one hundred percent, God speaks to the prophets. We talked about canonization, the collection of those books into the word of God. Then we've talked about transmission, that is, scribal copying. There's been some problems there. In translation there's also been some problems. So inspiration, canonization, transmission, and translation.

Now we're down to Genesis 1:1. So we're going to start today with "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Then we're going to notice what's in verse two, and how Genesis 1:1 connects up with Genesis 1:2. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Does the Bible agree that there is a beginning? Yes. Some cultures kind of have the earth going over and over again through these cycles. The Bible doesn't do that. Is there a beginning in the Bible and is there an end? Yes. So that means things are moving in a direction. There's a beginning, there's an end; that means there's direction, purpose, meaning, and things like that. It's not just all cycled over and over and over again like the movie *Ground Hog's Day*.

So, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Now, what's the next verse? This is where the tricky part comes in. "And the earth was formless and empty." What is the relationship between this verse and "in the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth"? What is the relationship with that and with "the earth was formless and empty and darkness covered the face of the deep. The spirit of God was hovering over the waters. And then God said, Let there be light and there was light"? So what is the relationship between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2?

There are basically three positions on this. We'll go through those three different ways of taking the relationship of these two verses and see how it affects things. What are the three different ways of looking at this and which views allow for the earth to be billions of years old? Is the earth billions of years old or is the earth only tens of thousands of years old? There's a big debate on how old the earth is. So the connection between these verses will allow for some people to say various options.

C. Genesis 1:1 and 1:2: Gap Theory [4:53-6:50]

Now, this first view is called the “Gap Theory.” This is the “Gap Theory,” it was held by--has anyone ever heard of the Scofield Reference Bible, from Philadelphia? Is anyone from Philadelphia? Scofield Reference Bible, Philadelphia College of the Bible, now called Philadelphia Biblical University, or whatever - had this view. This is the way the Gap Theory reads this: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." So there was an initial “wham bam.” God created stuff. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." “The earth then, became darkness and void, formless and empty.” When God originally made things, did he make them good? There was light, but it then became darkness, formless, and empty. What the Gap Theory suggests is that this is when Satan fell to the earth. Satan is an angel of light who was cast to the earth here in Gen. 1:2. That's why it's a period of darkness and this is when Satan made the dinosaurs. This is where the dinosaurs fit in. Satan is the creator of the dinosaurs, chaos on the earth, and this kind of thing. So in the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth. Then Satan is cast to the earth. Then Satan does his thing on earth. Then what you have after Satan does his thing, God says, “Let there be light” and there's light. Then you have the seven days of creation. But the seven days of creation are really seven days of what? Recreation. For this view, the seven days of creation God is reforming and recreating what Satan had messed up.

So this is called the Gap Theory. Do you see why it's called the Gap Theory? Because you've got God creating here (Gen. 1:1)--there's a gap where Satan comes in and chaos comes in, formless and empty (Gen. 1:2)--and then here God starts up again (Gen. 1:3) with “Let there be light.” So this is verse two, where there's a gap.

D. Analysis of the Gap Theory [6:51-11:57]

Now there are reasons to support the Gap Theory and let me just run through a few of the reasons here--the pros and cons of the Gap Theory. The Hebrew word *hayah*, which is the verb “to be” or “to become.” The Hebrew word *hayah* means “is” or “become.” It can mean either one, and so these people say that *hayah* means “became.” So the earth became formless and empty. God originally made it good, and then the Earth

became [*hayah*] formless and empty. It became dark. God had originally made it light. He made it and it became. So this word “become” says that Satan came down and perverted what God had originally made. This clarifies - did you ever wonder when Satan went bad? By the way, does Satan show up in Genesis chapter three with the serpent and all that? So he's down on the earth in chapter three, when did he really go bad? So this gives Satan a place then, with this Gap Theory. They're saying the earth became formless and empty when Satan was cast to earth (Gen. 1:2). He was an angel of light that was cast to earth during this time period. A couple passages people use to support this are Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28--they tell us a little about Satan's career. Isaiah 14's very questionable, Ezekiel 28 may have a better shot at it. But to clarify Satan's initial work, *to-hu va-vo-hu*. This is not tofu, this is *to-hu va-vo-hu*, and this means “formless and empty.” Basically formless, and I think the King James version says “void,” or something. It's “formless and empty.” “And the earth became formless and empty,” *to-hu va-vo-hu*.

The people who hold the Gap Theory jump over to Jeremiah 4:23, and they say, “Hey, there's a statement *to-hu va-vo-hu*, ‘formless and empty.’” It's used in Jeremiah as a judgment on sin. Therefore it ties in with Satan and a judgment on his sin. It gives the poor dinosaurs that have got to have somewhere to go a place. So this puts them in. Satan does his thing, he makes dinosaurs. Does Satan often duplicate the works of God? So now God's going to create some stuff so Satan tries messing around with making things. They're big and they've got teeth, and eat people. Well actually, there were no people, so that's it.

Now, here are some negative things on the Gap Theory. Jeremiah 4:23 to 4:26, indeed does mention the *to-hu va-vo-hu* “formless and empty,” but in Jeremiah it's a judgment on sin. But in Genesis 1 is there any mention of sin? Is there any mention of sin in Genesis chapter two? Sin comes in, in Genesis chapter what? 3, with the serpent. So what are these people doing in the Gap Theory, are they reading sin back into that context? Is there any sin in the context of chapters one and two? No. So this is a projection by them taking this back in, and the question is it seems out of context because in Genesis 1 there's no mention of sin. It seems to be dragging something into the context

that shouldn't be there. Is Satan the point in Genesis 1 or 2? Is Satan really the point? Is Satan mentioned anywhere? No. Even when he does show up in the guise of a serpent, is he really mentioned as Satan or as a serpent speaking? The serpent. We learn that the old serpent- dragon from the book of Revelation that tells us that the serpent was Satan. But you have to work with that. So Satan is not the point. They put Satan into Genesis 1:2. It just again seems out of context. There's no context for it. The word "became darkness" should be read as all your modern translations do: "was." "The earth was formless and empty." The earth did not "become" formless and empty, the earth "was." "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth, and the earth was formless and empty."

Now, does that make sense then? Does the Gap Theory allow for an old earth? With the Gap Theory, is it possible Satan was messing around down here for a couple billion years? Yes. So it's possible. The Gap Theory allows for an old earth. Does the Gap Theory actually give a place for the dinosaurs? Yes, it does. So this theory came up in the 1950's or 1960's, and was put out by the Schofield Bible. My Dad held this theory.

E. Genesis 1:1 and 1:2: Dependent Clause Theory [11:58-13:59]

Now, here's another way to look at the relationship between Genesis 1:1, and Genesis 1:2. Look at how Genesis is translated in some of your translations. I think the old RSV, translates it like this: Genesis 1:1. How does Genesis 1:1 start in your mind? "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth," right? Here's how some people [RSV] translate that first verse: "When God began to create, the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep." Does that change the meaning? "When God began to create, the earth was without form and empty." Is that different? What does this verse assume? The earth was already there and God came down merely to shape and form the heavens and the earth. Now, by the way, is that different then the way you would normally read that? "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." This view is called the Dependence Clause View. What it says is that the first verse is dependent on the second verse. "When God began to create, the earth was without form and empty." The earth was already there when he began to create. Is that what the Bible

is saying? The earth was merely there and God shaped it. So this is the view: “when God began to create the earth, it was without form, and God said, ‘let there be light.’” So this assumes then, what comes before God? The earth is already there. So the heavens and the earth are eternal as is God. God merely shapes the heavens and the earth. This is the view held by this Dependent Clause view.

F. Analysis of the Dependent Clause View [14:00-14:44]

So, to be honest with you, I have problems with this view. How does that change the meaning of the text? Well, what it does is it says three things are eternal, not just God. God does not create the heavens and the earth, it's not that God speaks and they come into being. They're already there. God merely shapes and fashions them. So, this view is quite different.

What are the problems of this view. I think this is what we've been going over here: it says that there are three things that are eternal: matter, energy, and God. God merely works with matter and energy. Matter and energy already existed, and God merely shapes them. I think that's a problem - I don't think that's what the Bible is saying. But that's what the RSV said.

G. Genesis 1:1 and 1:2: Independent Clause View [14:45-20:25]

Now, here is the Independent Clause View. We had the Gap Theory - there's a gap between Genesis 1 and 2, Satan's involved. The Dependent Clause View said that the earth was already there and God just shaped it. It was formless and empty and God just formed and filled it. The Independent Clause View goes like this. There is an initial creation. “In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth.” Wham bam--God creates the heavens and the earth. It's kind of like a summary title, it's a summary independent clause that summarizes the initial act of creation. “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.” This independent clause stands by itself. The second verse is a negative circumstantial clause. It says, when God created the heavens and the earth, what was it initially like? It was formless, and empty. When God originally made it, did he make it “formless and empty and darkness was over the face of the deep and the spirit of God was hovering over the waters”? Now, when God created the earth, did he

made it perfect or did he suddenly just wham bam and everything was there. All the animals were there. Did he just goes wham bam and everything was all there? Did he take time to form and fill it? So when he originally made it, it was formless and empty. Then in the seven days of creation, he's going to form it, he's going to shape it, and he's going to fill it. So this is a negative - notice it's a negative thing. He originally made the heavens and the earth, and they were formless and empty. How does he respond to the formlessness and emptiness? He forms it and he fills it. Then the main clause is: "God said, 'let there be light' and there was light," in Genesis 1:3. So then you have the main clause. So this is kind of the flow of it.

You say, "Hildebrandt, you hold this view, why do you hold this view over the other ones?" Well, will writers write with a certain style? Do you have a certain literary style? If I read probably a ten or twenty page document that you wrote, and you handed me another one; would I be able to tell if it was written by you or not written by you? Yes, I think I could tell for a lot of people. Some people not, but I could tell for a lot of people. People write with certain style. Moses then is a classic example of how this works: "in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth, the earth was formless and empty, and then "let there be light and there's light." So this is an independent clause, a negative circumstantial clause, and then the main clause. That's kind of just the structure of that. Independent Clause View, how does Moses write?

Now, how do I know how Moses writes? I don't know, but I've got the book of Genesis that claims to be written by Moses, so I look at the next chapter. Guess what I find in the next chapter? Starting with verse 4, in the chapter 2, you've got, "This is the account of the heavens and the earth when they were created." It's kind of like a summary statement--"This is the account of the heavens and the earth when they were created." Then what's the next verse say? It says, "When the Lord made the earth and the heavens, there was no shrub in the field (that had yet appeared on the earth), there was no plant in the field, and God had not sent rain." Are all those negative things that God had not yet done? No shrubs, no plants, and no rain. So you get this negative circumstantial clause saying there's no plants, no shrubs, and no rain. It tells you all these negative

things that are not there. Then you hit the main clause. The main clause is in chapter 2 verse 7, "The Lord God formed man from the dust of the ground."

How does chapter one differ from chapter two? In chapter one, does God work with the skies, and the separating of the waters above and below? It's about the world, it's about the universe. In chapter two the focus on human beings. So what you've got is this contrast between chapters one (which is the seven days and the creation of the universe) and chapter two. In chapter two, he says, "I'm going to focus on Adam and Eve now," and so he develops that in more detail. He mentioned Adam and Eve in chapter one but now he goes into more detail on how he formed and actually shaped Adam and how he formed Eve.

So this independent clause, negative circumstantial clause, and main clause sequence is that exactly the same structure that he used in chapter one? Yes. So what I'm suggesting is that this structure in chapter two helps us understand how chapter one should be understood. Does that make sense? I'm trying to use Moses to understand Moses. Anyway, that's the methodology I'm trying to use and I think it works pretty well here.

By the way, I should say about the Gap Theory that no one holds the Gap Theory anymore, my dad's dead by the way (I don't say that in a joking manner) but so are most of the people who held the Gap Theory. It's been discredited. There was a guy named Weston Fields, he's a friend of mine, who wrote a two hundred page book that destroyed the Gap Theory. Weston basically put it to rest. Nobody holds that anymore. Also the grammar, it doesn't fit the Hebrew grammar. It contradicts the literary structure that Moses uses and, by the way, it doesn't help us with Satan. Satan isn't in Genesis 1 or 2. Follow the literary patterns.

H. Creation texts outside of Genesis: Psalm 19 [20:26-21:55]

Now, does creation argue for the existence of God? There are some beautiful passages in the Bible, besides Genesis 1, that talk about creation. I'm going to show you several of them. One of those is chapter nineteen in the book of Psalms. Psalms chapter nineteen goes something like this, it says: "The heavens declare the glory of God. The

firmament shows his handiwork. Day after day they pour forth speech; night after night they give knowledge." In other words, the heavens declare the glory of God. If you were like Dr. Perry Philips, who gave that talk on the Big Bang yesterday, he's an astronomer, should you be able to use astronomy to look out into the universe and see the handiwork of God? Does astronomy declare the glory of God? In other words, you have God's word here. This is the Bible. This is God's word. Can we tell something about God from his word? Yes. Is this the most explicit? God has told us what he's like here. Can you also look at God's works and tell something about him? You've got God's word (that's flawless and perfect). You've got his word and through inspiration it was given to the prophets, but you've also got God's work. So God's work is seen in creation, so you can learn something about God from creation. "The heavens declare the glory of God." So Psalm 19 is helpful on that, in terms of seeing the work of God.

I. Modernity and Miracles [21:56-26:28]

Now, modernity, back in my generation these people basically said the universe is rational and natural; there's no room for God. There's no room for God because everything could be explained by cause and effect. It was a closed system. The universe is a closed system explained by cause and effects. There are no miracles; God cannot act in real space and time. There are no miracles. Miracles cannot exist. Everything is by natural causes and therefore miracles do not exist. Everything follows logical rules of cause and effect, cause and effect, cause and effect, all the way back to the beginning. There is no God at the beginning, there's nothing there. By the way, what's the problem? If you have a miracle, if the Red Sea just separates and people go across is that a natural phenomenon? No. Then you get across and then what happens next? Whoosh, it goes down, and all the Egyptians drown. You say, "hmm, that was pretty lucky." Or you say, "No, no - water doesn't open up like that." I've always taught my class, I'm on tape now but I need to do it anyway. You guys are going to go out and get a job someday, and it's really important that you learn certain skills on how to deal with real life besides academics. So I want to teach you about plumbing today. There are two things you need to know and then you can be a plumber. There are two things you need to know. Water

flows downhill, and payday's on Friday. Got it? Water flows downhill, and payday's on Friday. We're all Joe-plumbers now. So you can go and say, put in your resume, I'm a plumber. Anyway, I'm joking, but not really.

What I'm trying to say here, is when water separates with a wall on one side and a wall on the other and people walk in the middle. You know what I'm saying, water flows downhill. That's doesn't work. So that's a miracle. It's a miracle. God does that kind of thing. It's not natural. So the modernist, from the 19th and 20th century said any miracles in the Bible are mere legends. Any miracles didn't happen historically. Somebody made them up; they're just mere legends. That was modernity.

You guys live in what's called post-modernity. In post-modernity, they come in differently now as everybody has their own story. Question: does your generation believe in miracles? Does your generation believe in things that happen that are spectacular, you see it all the time. So you've seen stuff that's kind of incredible. Miracles don't bother this generation at all. Everybody has their own story, but the story of God is irrelevant to most. God's not a part of my story so then you can ignore him. But the miracle thing is not necessarily fought against in your generation. Your generation can accept miracles as no big deal. By the way, is it a deal? When God does a miracle it is a big deal. Anyway, post-modernity is more fragmented. Modernity everything was logical, it was connected, the closed universe worked like a clock. Your generation, you see nothing works. Right? Oh, that's right, you think I'm talking about the government, you're right? Anyway, you see how a lot of things, how should I say, let me just even go into the families. We just went to my daughter's marriage. I drove over Labor Day weekend out to Ohio to celebrate that with my family. All the kids were there, it was one of the best times of my life, actually. I'll never forget it. She got married. Question: is life chaotic? Life's chaotic! Yes, it's really chaotic. You know, you're intersecting with families that are all fallen apart. I guarantee that most of you have seen divorces go down in families, infidelity and all sorts of stuff. Life is often upside down. What I'm saying is that's the way the world is today. All this old order of modernity, everything being logically connected gives way to everything's upside down now. Everything's fragmented. Nothing makes sense; it's all

broken apart. You've just got to grab it where you can.

J. Moses and his sources for Genesis [26:29-28:18]

Where did Moses get his material? When I was younger, I thought God maybe just came down and zapped it into him. Maybe he put a chip in the back of his head - that was the Matrix. We can't really do it. Anyway, just put a chip in the back of his head and downloaded stuff into his brain and I thought this is what happened. Moses writes it down. God says, "*berahshet bara' elohim*;" and Moses says, "okay, slow down God, I've got a slow keyboard on my computer here." He types it up and writes it down. God zaps it into his brain and God spoke to him in words and Moses wrote it down.

By the way, for some of the prophets, did God come down and speak with them and they wrote it down on the spot? Jeremiah did it [Jer 36]. Not only did he do it once, Jeremiah writes it down; and God says, "Okay, Jeremiah, write this stuff down." First of all, he says, "Jeremiah get a scribe and I'll tell you, then you can tell a scribe what to write down." Jeremiah says, "thus saith the Lord," he goes to the scribe, and scribe writes it down. He takes it to the king. What does the king do? The king takes the word of God from the scribe, direct from God--he basically rips it up into shreds and burns the whole thing. It's, "holy cow, the word of God just went up in smoke," right? What's God say? "Jeremiah, come back here." He basically gets the scribe and he does it again. This time, it's in the king's face. Question: you burn the word of God, what happens to you? Bad things. It's not a good idea. Jeremiah did it and it's in the Bible; you don't want to be that king. So, anyway, the king tried to destroy it. Did Jeremiah dictate that text twice? He dictated it twice and the scribe wrote it down twice. Anyway, sometimes God speaks directly. What I'm trying to say is sometimes God comes down, sometimes he speaks and sometimes it's audible. Sometimes it's inaudible. Some of the guys actually heard it. Sometimes it was in their mind.

K. Enuma Elish and the Gilgamesh Epic [28:19-30:49]

What do you do with this? What do you do with the Enuma Elish? It's a Babylonian creation account. What do you do with the Babylonian creation account? By the way, have you ever heard of this guy, Gilgamesh? Let me just do Gilgamesh first

because he's probably more familiar to you guys. But Gilgamesh, is he before Moses? Many hundreds of years before Moses. Could he have copied from Moses? No, he's hundreds of years before Moses. Gilgamesh has Utnapishtim, we'll call him Utnap for short. Utnap goes out and the gods come before him and he's told to build a boat. So Utnapishtim builds his boat and by the way all these animals come to the boat. These animals, plus his family, and plus a whole bunch of other people; they put him on the boat. He's on the boat for a while; the flood comes, lifts up the boat, drowns out the people. By the way, in the Gilgamesh epic, why were the people flooded out, destroyed? Yes, they were too loud. See, you do that rap music, you see what can happen to you? All right. It was just too loud--no heavy metal. The gods were just upset that mankind was making too much noise, so they drown them. So they flood them out. But by the way, when they're in the boat, as the flood goes down, how does Utnap get off the boat? Does he send out some birds? Yes. He sends out some birds. So you've got a guy, builds a boat, gets his family and the animals on, the boat rises up, the boat goes down. He sends birds out, and then comes out. Does that sound fairly familiar? Did Moses know the story of Gilgamesh? Interesting.

Did Moses know the story of Enuma Elish, the creation account that comes from Babylon? Again, it's from before the time of Moses. You've got a divine spirit and primeval chaos. Light emanates from the gods (plural). Firmament is made, the dry land is made, luminaries are made and notice, man is made last. Then, after that, the gods rested. Does that sound familiar in terms of basic structure? Is it possible then Moses copied the stuff and just forget to put down in a little footnote the Gilgamesh epic and the Enuma Elish? Are there similarities there? Yes, there are.

L. Analysis of Gilgamesh and Enuma Elish [30:50-31:35]

Somebody here has done some ancient Near Eastern study and you say, "Hildebrandt, you faked them out because you didn't tell them the real truth. You picked out the content that's similar and dropped all the stuff that's dissimilar. You know how the gods made the ancient world? The gods had a war basically and they took one of the gods and cut her in two and made the earth out of one part of the body and out of the other

part, the sky. Is that a little bit different from the Bible? Yes. All I'm saying is I've kind of milked this in one direction. These stories are very different when you actually read them. The Enuma Elish is trying to promote Marduk the god of Babylon. However, are there similarities? Yes.

M. Explanation of similarities and oral storytelling [31:36-41:43]

Now, does that surprise me? And the answer is: no. We have not talked about and this is really important I'm not going to develop it--I'm going to do a terrible job at this. You need to take a course by Borgman or somebody who develops this more in depth. Originally when people were really, really old before Moses back at 2000 B.C. did a lot of the poetry, did a lot of the legends come down orally? Is oral transmission different than written? Noah gets off the boat. Shem, Ham and Japheth get off the boat; they're his kids. They were on the boat with Noah. Do you think Shem, Ham and Japheth ever told their kids about Grandpa Noah and what happened with all those animals? Yes. So Shem, Ham and Japheth tell their kids. Now, by the way, would their kids be able to go and talk to grandpa Noah and say, "Hey, grandpa Noah, Dad said this. Did it really happen like that?" Would grandpa Noah be able to straighten them out? Okay, did you ever have your grandpa straighten you out? Anyway, what would happen? After three or four generations would the story probably migrate? Would there be differences in the story? What's one of the beautiful things and one of the problems with oral tradition. When oral stuff comes down does it change generation to generation? Let me be more specific. My son gets back from Afghanistan. He's telling oral stories. He just didn't have time to write them down because he was actually getting shot at every single day he went out. So he didn't take the time to write this down. So these are oral traditions. Now he tells them (he's got a brother, Zach, and a couple sisters). We're sitting around the table and he's a wonderful story teller. So he tells a story and all of a sudden everybody is laughing their heads off. The kids leave. Elliot turns now to the old man (me), and his wonderful mother, and question: does he tell us the same story, only he tells it a second time and his parents are almost in tears. Question: was it the same story? Yes, it was the same story. Question: did he leave out some details? Yes, he did. When the kids left...he dropped

some stuff on us that just totally blew me away. Question: was it the same story? Yes, it was the same story intended for a different audience.

Can you tell a different story--you know who's great at this? Dr. Graeme Bird here. Did you ever hear him play the piano? You've got to take him when you get in his course say, "Hey, Hildebrandt says you've got to play the piano for this class." He plays jazz. So he'll play the same song, but does he ever play the same song the exact same way? No. He does jazz. So depending on who you are, do you tell the story differently to somebody whose twelve to fourteen, then you do to somebody who's fifty-four to sixty? Do you tell the story differently? When Dr. Bird plays the piano, he'll play it one way and then he'll play the exact same song and you can hear it's the same song, but is it different? It's jazz. So, what I'm saying, in oral tradition do people jazz the story? In other words, you never tell the story exactly the same way. Noah tells it to his kids - well Noah didn't tell it to his kids, his kids were there; but his kids pass the story down. Would you expect the story then to come down in variant forms? I think the Gilgamesh epic is remembering the Noahic flood. Only it's come down orally, so what you have with Moses here, is God comes down and says "Moses. Let me tell you what really happened." Now you've got it from God coming and saying, "Hey, this is what really happened." By the way, did the other people who passed the story down did they have the shell of the story? Yes, they did. But they, how should I say this, so God tells Moses what happened.

Therefore, I'm not surprised that there are echoes in other cultures that remember the story of the flood. I'm not surprised. God flooded them out. I would expect other cultures to remember that and pass it down. Now my guess is that they didn't know Jehovah, and what motivated it so they made up what was going on? Was it Baal, you know, flooding out Asherah, what's the deal here? Did the gods fight or what? Does that make sense to you, then? I would expect some of the stories to be similar, and then God gives Moses the revelation from God. That's how we account for Genesis, that's how we account for the similarities, and that's also how we account for the differences.

Now, by the way, is oral tradition beautiful? Yes. In some cultures, they memorize - when you go back to Homer, the Iliad, and the Odyssey. Some of the people in Croatia

have twelve hundred lines of poetry memorized and they perform it. Every time they perform it--some of you do theater. When you do theater, have you ever done theater one night, two nights, or three nights? Question is: every night different? Yes. It's the same play, but it's different every night you perform it. There will be something a little different in each oral telling.

You had a question. [student: Yes. So there's a flood, and everything got destroyed so after that point would all the stories be the same?] Yes. Right, so when Noah gives the story to his kids, they saw it. The story's the same. Now his kids come, and I want to say they probably checked back with Grandpa. So the story's probably pretty close. Now they had kids (grandpa dies, and the parents die). Now there's nobody to check the story. So it's like if I told somebody here to say something and you passed it down orally by the time it got through the class it'd be very different than what I originally said. So you know what I'm saying? Orally, the stories change. By the way, what I'm telling you is fact. We know this. We can compare in other cultures, Croatian cultures, the oral things have been checked out and you should just know that. If I started something here and I told them three sentences, and everybody had to repeat those sentences, by the time it got to you, would it be the same or different? It would be different.

[Student: what I'm asking is how long exactly is it between Noah and Moses?] We're talking thousands of years. I mean, Jericho, Joshua fit the battle of Jericho in Jericho there's a humongous tower there. It's from 8,000 B.C. So that means Noah has to come before that, so then you've got 8,000 B.C. down to Moses's 1400 B.C. So you've got at least 7,000 years there. Stories can change a lot in 7,000 years. The Gilgamesh epic, let's say is 2,000 B.C.? So we've got at least 5-7,000 years that it must be told over. My guess is that it was much longer than that. But I can prove - you can't have it any shorter than that, because you've got to account for towers there, the city of Damascus, there are various places that we know. So you know what I'm saying; you've got to give me at least thousands of years.

[Student: about how many years would you estimate between Noah and Moses?] No, I can't do that. Well, let me just tell you theoretically I can't do that. Let me just

caution you about something, okay. You know those genealogies in Genesis chapters five and eleven, did you read those? No, don't add those up. Genealogies have holes in them. When it says so and so is the father of - okay, let me just do Matthew, chapter one. Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham. Excuse me? Jesus Christ, the son of David (Matthew 1:1). "Jesus Christ, the son of David." Well you guys know, David's what? Give me a date. Jesus Christ, the son of David--that's a thousand years. Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham. Abraham's what? [students: 2,000 years.] So you guys know that! Question: was Jesus Christ the son of David? See, he said, "no." I say "yes." You know what "son of" means? "Son of" means "descendant of." "Son of" doesn't necessarily mean direct descendant. "Father" can mean, well you guys even say it until this day, "our father Abraham." Well, he's not really your father, is he? But also you see, the point that I'm making? Do you see what I'm saying? Go back into those genealogies in Genesis in chapter five and eleven, I will guarantee you there are holes there, and these guys are living 900 years anyway, and you've got huge gaps. You can't simply add them up. It's impossible. There are holes so I can't give you an estimate. All I know is Moses is about 1400-1200 and I'll tell you Noah has to be before 8,000, because we've got that tower at Jericho. So that's what, almost 6,500 years. Almost 6,500 years and how many generations? I don't know. By the way, it's not just the Tower of Jericho, you're going to have to push it back farther than that too. Good questions, I just don't know the answer.

N. Education of Moses [41:44-43:45]

Was Moses aware of literature like the Gilgamesh epic and the Enuma Elish? Well, you say Moses was raised out in the desert, chasing sheep. Moses didn't know this literature because he was Jewish. He couldn't read all this literature anyway because he was Hebrew. Question: was Moses ignorant? Actually, where was Moses trained? Out in the desert with the sheep? [student: Egypt]. Egypt. He was tutored as the Pharaoh's daughter's son. Would he have been trained in the wisdom of Egypt? Were the Egyptians exceedingly a literate and a brilliant culture? And we're talking old Egyptian going back to Ptahotep that goes back to 2800 BC. That's at least 1400 years before Moses. Was there wisdom literature 1400 years before Moses? Yes, there was a whole, Old Egypt,

there was Middle Egypt. So there was a huge literary tradition prior to Moses. Would Moses had known about Mesopotamia legends? Was there any trade between Egypt and Mesopotamia? Those are the two big cats, that's what they call the fertile crescent. There was trade going on back and forth all the time. So my guess is Moses knew some of these stories, and may have adapted them, adopted them, and God used Moses to straighten them up. Could Moses have borrowed some of Genesis from some of these sources, from these legends? And the answer is: yes, he could have. Is everything pagan people say wrong? Do the pagan people say some things that are right sometimes? And if they're right, then God can include that in the Bible. Are there some pagan people who speak in the Bible, and speak truth in the Bible? Let me do this. Are there even some donkeys who talk in the Bible and speak the truth? Yes. The donkey speaks the truth in Numbers 22.

O. *Toledoth* Structure of Genesis [43:46-44:42]

Now, this is the *toledot* structure of Genesis. This is, I think interesting, but it's interesting from a literary standpoint. *Toledot* means (it's translated in King James Version, I believe) “these are the generations of.” I think your NIV--if you've got your Bibles you may want to pop them open, as this is fairly interesting to actually look at how your Bibles do this. In Genesis 2:4, you've got one of these *toledots*, “this is the account of.” “This is the account of the heavens and the earth and the day they were created.” “This is the account of,” and what you find is, there are ten *toledots* in the book of Genesis. So Genesis is broken up into ten sections based on this phrase “this is the account of.” Is this how Moses breaks his own book up? This is how Moses, writing his book, breaks it up. This is his paragraph divider kind of thing.

P. Chapter divisions in the Bible added ca. 1200 A.D. [44:43-48:13]

By the way, if you went up to Moses and said, “Moses, how many chapters in Genesis?” You guys are smarter than Moses. If you went to Moses and said, “Moses, how many chapter in Genesis? Would Moses know the answer to that question? No, he wouldn't. There were no chapters back when he wrote Genesis. He didn't write in chapters. Your Bible has chapters in it. Do you realize those chapters were added about

1200 AD? Now, by the way, again, I'm standing over here. I'm telling you the truth. There was a bishop - Dr. MacRae was a guy I studied under, some rumors were that he knew this bishop person. But 1200 AD, MacRae always said he was riding on a horse, and sometimes chapter divisions would appear up, and sometime they'd be down there, and sometimes he'd get it right. Are some of the chapter divisions in the wrong place? Let me show you an example from your Bible from Genesis chapters one and two. Look at this, he missed the chapter division. Now by the way, does this mean the Bible made an error or does this mean the bishop in 1200 AD put the chapter division in the wrong place? Now let me prove that to you. Go look at your own Bibles, look at Genesis chapter two. Chapter one is what? The seven days of creation. But the problem is: are there seven days of creation in Genesis chapter one? Where is the seventh day? Is the seventh day in chapter one? No. The seventh day, as it says, "And thus the heavens and the earth were completed, and by the seventh day God had finished the work that he had been doing. So, from the seventh day he rested from all his work." That's in chapter two. The seventh day is in chapter two. Should the seven days of creation be put together? Yes. By the way, look down to verse 4. Now does your NIV Bible, your NRSV, ESV Bible divide between 2:3 and 2:4? Is there a space there? Some of you are shaking your heads no. Do a lot of your Bibles have a space there? There should be a space there. That's where the chapter division should of been put because of this phrase "this is the account of the heavens and the earth." This *toledot* structure is what Moses uses to divide the narrative into his ten sections. This is how Moses divides it. So there should be a little division there.

By the way, do some of you have those mini-Bibles where they put the text on top of the text? So they don't do white space because they're trying to get it really small? So some of them may have scrunched it together, not because they didn't know that the division is in 2:4, but just because they're trying to save space.

So actually go from 2:4 to 5:1. Here you'll see right at the chapter division in chapter five. How does it start out? "This is the written account of Adam's line." So now you've got the genealogy of Adam coming after that. Go to 6:9, you can see in my NIV it

puts the statement off by itself. "This is the account of Noah." So after 6:9, you get a story about Noah and his kids. Then you go over to 10:1, and you'll see the same thing, etc. etc. "This is the account of Shem, Ham and Japheth," and then it goes on to a genealogy of Shem, Ham, and Japheth. So "this is the account of," this is how the book of Genesis is structured using this phrase. Moses puts it in ten times and structures his book that way.

Q. Tablet structure of Genesis [48:14-52:35]

Did you notice while you were reading Genesis you get a little bit of history and then it gives you a genealogy? You read the history, and then you hit the genealogy. What do you do? You skip the genealogy. You hit the history, and then you skip the genealogy. Is that how we read as Americans? Were they more into genealogies then we are? So do your grandmothers and grandfathers do the genealogy thing?--so history and genealogy, history and genealogy. See how it oscillates in the text, back and forth between history and genealogy. It turns out somebody has developed a theory based on that fact based on some tablets they dug up.

First of all, what did people write on back then? They wrote on mud tablets in Mesopotamia in particular—mud/clay tablets. So therefore they took a pen or stylus, and they stuck it in the mud and the mud dries. Then you can read it--mud tablets. Are we glad they used mud tablets? What's the problem with paper? Give me paper 500 years old. What's wrong with paper? Paper ain't no more. Now when paper is with moisture what happens? It's goes to nothing; it goes to dust. Back to dust, from dust I came to dust I shall return. What's the deal with tablets? You put the tablets in these boxes, and then you burn the temple down over the tablets. You burn it to the ground. What does that do to the tablets? It fires them! What does that make these tablets? Hard as rock now. Question: do they last forever? We dig them up, 3000 years later and we dig a tablet out. Can we read them? Yes, you all should take Acadian and Ugaritic and you can read the tablets. No, seriously, some people go to the University of Pennsylvania. They lock them down in the basement there for half of their life and after they spend half their life there, they give them a Ph.D. But anyway, these tablets are fired. Do you know how

important it is that they wrote on mud for us? We've got these tablets, now, and we can read them after 3000 years.

What's the problem with papyrus and all the paper? The only place where paper is going to make it, like papyrus and that kind of material (they wrote on animal hides also) the only place where's it's going to make it is down in Egypt. Now why does it survive in Egypt? Because Egypt is very very very what? Dry. There's no humidity in the air. It's the Sahara desert, and you know, the Libyans are shooting at them so it makes it even drier. What I'm saying is, it is so dry that Egypt is the only place that papyrus really survives. Did the Egyptians write on rocks and carve stuff on rocks? That's really good for us too, because rocks last a long time. God did some stuff on rocks too with his finger. But anyway, this is how the tablets are structured with this oscillation of history/genealogy back and forth. You get that reflected in the Bible--this history, genealogy, history, genealogy oscillation.

What this guy noticed on some of the tablets that he was reading, that the tablet structure was the front of the tablet and then you have the back of the tablet. On the front of the tablet he noticed there was a title, a history, a colophon (it was a scribal note saying this tablet's mine), with a genealogy on the back. So a genealogy's on the back and the summary. When it comes into our Bible there should be an oscillation between history and genealogy, history and genealogy; front of the tablet, back of the tablet, front of the tablet, back of the tablet. So therefore what he's saying is: does Moses's style fit the style of writing of that day? Would you expect that? This may be an explanation of the why there is this history-genealogy interchange in Genesis.

Now by the way, do we know this? No, this is some scholar's conjecture. Does it make sense? It makes sense to me, but I'm not saying it's fact. I'm saying it is this guy's conjecture we don't know for sure, but it does seem to make sense. Yes. [student: what's a colophon?] A colophon is a scribal note, say, "I am Shafan, the chief scribe, and this is my tablet" or something like that. Or "this was written for Zimrilin, he was king and he didn't beat me up so I wrote this tablet for him" or something. You know, some little scribal note type of thing. Did Moses use this structure in the writing of Genesis?

R. Hebrew as a Canaanite Dialect [52:36-53:41]

Did Moses use literary patterns from his day? Did Moses use the language of his day? Moses wrote probably in Hebrew, right? What is the Hebrew language? Let me just of kind of be upfront and honest with you on this. Is the Hebrew language a Canaanite dialect? The Hebrew language is just a Canaanite dialect. Where did the Jews get the Hebrew language? They got the Hebrew language when Abraham moved into the land of Canaan. They picked it up there; it was a Canaanite dialect. It was developed about 1800 BC. Abraham picked it up from the Canaanite dialects, and then basically it was passed down and became the Hebrew language but it's originally a Canaanite dialect. Would Abraham have had a Mesopotamian language when he came in from his home in Mesopotamia? Yes. He gets into Canaan, and he adopts a Canaanite dialect which has come to be known as Hebrew, and it comes down to Moses.

S. God communicating in the Language of the People [53:42-56:03]

Now, did Moses write in the language of the people? Yes. Would he write in the style of the people? By the way, are there certain styles of writing that change over a period of time? If you wrote a letter, and you wrote an email, would there be two different styles for how you'd write a letter and an email? When you write on Facebook is that different than when you write an email? If you do a twitter, is that different from when you write on an email? Do we have different styles today? Yes. Would Moses have had different literary styles that he uses? Yes. And I will show you that the book of Deuteronomy is almost in the exact form/shape of a Hittite treaty. The content is different but the form is similar. Is that what we would expect? Moses uses the language of the time, and, he also uses the literary forms of the time. So the style, we'll look at that.

If Moses used the style of writing of his day is it possible he used the content that some of the people of that day held. In other words, for example, did the people in Moses's day hold that the earth was round or flat? Would they hold the earth was flat? [student: because it looks flat.] Yes, because you go out the door here and you see the quad, you know, it's pretty flat. You look around and the earth looks pretty flat. The

people in those days would have held that the Earth is flat. By the way is it even possible the Bible could even refer to something like that? Has anybody ever heard of the “four corners of the earth”? It is referred to in the Bible, Isaiah 11:12. “Four corners of the earth,” that means the earth's flat, doesn't it? Now when you say four corners of the earth, does that mean it's a flat earth? By the way some Christians have thought that it's flat because of that passage in Isaiah. Does anyone know what Isaiah means? Does anybody here and now talk about the four corners of the earth? If you said the four corners of the earth today does that mean you think the earth's flat? [student: No.] It's just a literary way of saying the corners of the earth (north, south, east, and west). You're not saying the earth's flat. The Bible's not wrong there, it's just people misunderstood it.

T. Moses' family background [56:04-58:29]

Where did Moses get the language he wrote? When I try to suggest that Abraham and his descendant Jacob picked up the language of Canaan when they're in the land of Canaan, and that was passed down to Moses; wasn't Moses trained under his own parents? He was trained by Pharaoh's daughter in the wisdom of Egypt but was he first trained by his own parents? Do you remember he was put in a basket and then put down into the Nile River? When Pharaoh's daughter picked him up, she said, “this is a child of the Hebrews.” (I think he was probably circumcised) and so she picked him up. Then what happens is Miriam, Moses's older sister, shows up and says, “Hey, I'm Jewish.” So she gives Moses back to his own sister--older sister, he's the younger brother. There's something wrong with that. Did your older sister ever boss you around? Anyway, so the older sister takes Moses back, to his own parents. Moses' own parents raise him, or, as my wife would say, “reared him.” So he's raised until he's probably twelve or thirteen into adolescence. When he gets to adolescence, he goes to Pharaoh's daughter. There he gets trained in all the wisdom of Egypt. Would he know how to speak Hebrew fluently? If you get raised in a family until you're 12 years old or so, do you know the language pretty much for the rest of your life? My son-in-law married my daughter is from Taiwan. He was raised in Taiwan until he was twelve. When it comes to English, can he speak English fluently? He still says “sheeps” and “deers.” Not deer, but “deers.” He puts an 's'

on the end of everything to make the plural. I mock him because he does that. Actually, he's got me licked. He took the SAT, the SAT was in English. He missed five points on the SAT. Is the guy pretty bright? He went to Harvard, went to MIT, the guy's very bright. But he still says "sheeps" and he still says "deers," so we get him for that. But question: does the guy still know Mandarin? He was raised until he was twelve in Taiwan. Does he still know Mandarin fluently? Yes. So what I'm saying, is Moses knew Hebrew in his childhood.

U. Pagans speaking truth and God's accommodation [58:30-59:26]

Can non-Jewish, non-prophets, pagan people say some things that are true? Yes. If Moses records what those pagan people say, it's still something true. It's in the Bible, then it's still true. So be careful with some of this stuff. Did God accommodate his the truth to express the truth in ways that were in harmony with how ancient man saw things? He accommodated himself in language. So God speaks in Hebrew, and he uses the literary forms of the day. How much did he accommodate himself? Did God come down and say to Moses: "Moses, you guys think the earth is flat, the earth is not flat, it's round"? Did God ever come down and straighten them out? No, that wasn't the point. God was coming down to tell them about their souls, and about redemption, not about scientific fact. So you've got to take a little break on that stuff.

V. Purposes of Genesis 1 and Hermeneutics [59:27-60:39]

Now, why did Moses include the creation? Why did Moses start out "in the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth." Did Moses write Genesis 1 and 2 to fight against evolutionary theory? Did Moses have a clue about evolutionary theory? No. That's in the 19th and 20th century? So Moses did not write against evolutionary theory. Moses had no clue, nor did any of the people he was addressing know that. Now what I'm working on here is "hermeneutics." Hermeneutics, does anybody know "hermeneutics"? Hermeneutics is the study of how you interpret the Bible. How do you interpret the Bible? Different people interpret the Bible differently. Hermeneutics is how you interpret. Notice what I'm pushing here. Fight against evolutionary theory - is that our problem fighting the evolutionary theory in our day? Did Moses know about that? I'm

trying to get you back into the original intent of the original author. In other words, the Bible is necessarily for me me me me me. We live in a narcissistic culture that says “me me me,” all the time.

W. Original Intent of the original author [60:40-61:49]

What I'm trying to do is get you out of you and look back at how Moses, as a writer, how he originally intended it. What did Moses originally intend? What was the original intent of Moses? So that's my hermeneutic, to try and get back to the original intent of the original writers. Did Moses probably write it as a polemic against polytheism? Were the people back then polytheistic? Many gods were doing all sorts of stuff. So it's possible, does that fit Moses' intent a lot better than evolution? Yes, because they were struggling with polytheism. So it's possible. He starts out, “No, no it's not Baal and Asherah who went to war, and Baal cut her up. There was one God and he made everything, and how did he make it? He spoke, and things came into being.” So Moses is possibly working against polytheism. I think this is the real point that Moses is dealing with in the book of Genesis. Moses is basically saying Genesis 1 is a doxology. It's for the praise and worship of God. It tells us something about God, his majesty, the greatness and goodness of God in the creation. The greatness and goodness of God in the creation account is what is featured.

X. Intertextual view of Creation: Psalm 136 [61:49-62:41]

Now how do I know this is a part of the purpose? I look over to Psalm 136, and Psalms shows us how the Genesis account can be used. Now, I'm going to put this up here, and just see this beautiful psalm. What does this psalm speak of? Psalm 136.

To him who alone does great wonders,
 for his loyal love endures forever.
 Who by his understanding made the heavens?
 for his loyal love endures forever.
 Who spread out the earth upon the waters,
 for his loyal love endures forever.
 Who made the great lights,

for his loyal love endures forever.

The sun to govern the day,

for his loyal love endures forever.

What's the point of this psalm? He looks at creation, and what does he conclude? It's very difficult to catch the main point. What does he conclude? "His loyal love endures forever."

Y. Integration of Faith and Learning [62:42-65:19]

So, in other words, can you look at the creation, and learn something about God? Some of you guys are going into science and some of you gals into science. Should you be able to look into science and should it lead you to the worship of God? Should your study of physics lead you to the worship of God? Should your study of biology lead you to the worship of God? Should chemistry lead you to the worship of God? Is physics only $f=ma$? Or $v=ir$? You could say, I know physics or whatever, $v=ir$. Okay, is that really the essence of it? Or can you see past the formulas to what? You're talking about galaxies, you're talking about what God made. You can see the handiwork of God. So what I'm saying is take the sciences. Yes, learn your formulas; but go beyond the formulas to see the beauty of God in creation in physics, chemistry, biology, whatever.

Here's another approach. These guys are in heaven in the book of Revelation [Rev. 4:11]. And guess what they're doing in heaven? This is what we're going to be doing in heaven. "You are worthy, our Lord and God, to receive" - to receive what? "Glory, honor, and power." Why is God worthy of receiving glory, honor, and power? "For you created all things, and by your will they were created and have their being." So this beautiful verse, reflects what's going on in heaven.

Does create always mean create out of nothing? There's a Latin term (and I do want you to know this), the Latin term, "create out of nothing," is to create *ex nihilo*. *Ex* - does anybody do Latin anymore? *Ex*, is "out of," *nihilo*, means "nothing." Does God create out of nothing? Can God create out of nothing? God spoke and it came into being. So God creates - "in the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth." He creates out of nothing, *ex nihilo*. Does God always create *ex nihilo*? Psalm 33:6, is a beautiful

verse. "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, the starry hosts by the breath of his mouth." God spoke and universes came into being. Did God always do it that way though? No. God brought man out of the dust. He shaped man, he created man out of the dust. Did he form man out of nothing? Some women would say, "yes." Did God form man out of nothing? No, he formed him out of the dust.

Z. Adam and Eve's names [65:20-68:54]

Now, by the way, because you guys don't know Hebrew, you missed some beautiful plays on words in the book of Genesis. God takes the dust of the ground, and he forms what? What does God call the being he shapes out of the ground, does he call him a name? He calls him "Adam." He calls him Adam. What does "*adamah*" mean? He takes the dust, he shapes it and he calls him "Dusty." No, this isn't a joke, this is the honest truth! "Adam," what does "Adam" mean? *Adamah* means dirt, ground, dust. So he shapes Adam out of the dust and he calls him "Dusty." That's the truth. Adam's name is a pun on "Dusty." There's a play on words there and it's beautiful.

By the way, what does he call Eve? Who names Eve? Adam names Eve. When does Adam name Eve? After Adam is told: Adam, you sinned, dust you are "Dusty," to dust you shall return. The next verse in Gen. 3:20 Adam turns to Eve. She has not been named on the earth so far. He turns to his wife, just after he's been told he's going to have to work his tail off and he's going to end up losing to the dust, he's not going to win (he's going to become dusty again. He then turns to his wife and says, "you are death woman. Evil woman. Destroyer woman." What does he name her? He turns to her and he says *havah*. And you guys know what *havah* is. You go to a Jewish wedding, they pull out the - oh you guys are under twenty-one, don't do this at a Jewish wedding. Anyway, at a Jewish wedding, they pull out, the things between them, and they say what? *Lahayim*. *Lahayim*. You guys know that --you've all seen "Fiddler on the Roof," right?

By the way, they don't tell you this at Gordon College, but one of the graduation requirements is you have to watch "Fiddler on the Roof," before you've graduated. I'm not kidding, I'm serious. If you go across that stage to get your diploma, Dr. Wilson's got one of those air soft guns, if you go across he pops you if you haven't seen "Fiddler on

the Roof.” So you've got to see “Fiddler on the Roof.” If you haven't seen “Fiddler on the Roof” you've got to see it. *Lahayim! Lahayim!*

By the way, what is the root of *Lahaym*? *Havah* and *lahaym* are basically the same word. He turns to his wife and he says what? What does *lahayim* mean? To life. He turns to this woman, and he calls her *havah*--you are “the mother of all living.” I'm going to dust, but you are “the mother of all living.” Does this woman bring hope to him that someday the serpent's head is going to be crushed? Where does life come from? Life comes from this woman. So he names her “the living one”—“the mother of all living”—*Havah*. Does that show a beautiful relationship between Adam and Eve? He doesn't curse her after he's just been cursed. He loves her and sees the hope that comes through her. It is through her seed that redemption will come to all mankind. This woman will bring redemption to all mankind, and he looks at her and says, *Havah*. You say “Eve,” but I like *Havah* better.

AA. “Days” of Genesis 1: Three approaches [68:55-69:36]

Now we've got about ten minutes left, and I want to switch over and switch discussions here to the days of Genesis. I want to go through this fairly rapidly and just hit this because I don't want to linger over this point: the days of Genesis and the creation account--seven days of creation. When was the earth created? What does the Bible say? I've tried to say before that the Bible doesn't tell us how old the earth is. There are three approaches to the days of Genesis 1 and I just want to run through those three approaches. So we'll do the days of Genesis.

AB. 24 hour literal day theory [69:37-73:36]

First of all, some people hold that the days of Genesis are twenty-four hour literal days, twenty-four hours dawn until dusk and evening, a twenty-four period. That is called the “Literal 24 Hour Day Theory.” A lot of the people who hold this are called “Young Earth Creationists.” Young Earth Creationists will hold that the earth is about twenty thousand years old, something like that--twenty, thirty, forty, or ten thousand years old. So it's called “young earth.” The earth is only about twenty thousand years old. Most of the people who are Young Earth Creationists will hold the actual 24 Hour Day Theory.

Basically, what they say is that the word *yom*, the word *yom* is the Hebrew word for “day,” is actually defined in Genesis 1:5 where God says in verse 5, “and God called the light day, and the darkness he called night.” So this oscillation between light and darkness, which is a twenty-four day, God defines as *yom* in Genesis 1:5. It is a twenty-four hour day. It's an oscillation of light and darkness which is a twenty-four hour period. So it's defined for us in Genesis 1.

The Sabbath--how long do you rest on the Sabbath? It also is a twenty-four hour period. Do you celebrate your Sabbath on Saturday? When does the Jewish Shabbat start? Shabbat starts Friday night when the sun goes down. They have Shabbat dinner on Friday night. Then on Saturday, they rest on Saturday. Then when does Shabbat end? [student: Sunday.] No, Saturday night. Okay, it goes from Friday night, after the sun goes down, to Saturday night, when the sun goes down. What do the Jews do Saturday night? Party. You will see in Jerusalem there will be ten thousand Jews, swarming the streets, buying all sorts of stuff, eating pizza (don't order a pepperoni pizza, but just pizza). There's a reason why I said that. Someone ordered one when I was in the store, there must of been two hundred people there and it went silent. The guy ordered a pepperoni pizza. But, you get it. We got out of there. We were obviously Americans, and I knew enough to get out of there when it goes silent like that. But anyway, that's all I'm saying. Shabbat goes down, basically Friday night to Saturday night. Saturday night is usually when they go out and have fun. Is that a twenty-four hour period? The Jewish Shabbat is a literal 24 hour period? Remember what God said in the Ten Commandments? “Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.” It's a 24 hour period. Exodus chapter 20 has the Ten Commandments. So again, it is a literal twenty-four hour period.

Here is another argument: day plus a number. Whenever you have day one, day two, day three, it's usually a twenty-four hour period. Whenever the word day is used with a number it's usually a twenty-four hour period in Scripture. In Scripture, there's about four hundred and ninety-nine of those references. I checked them out once upon a time and wrote a paper on that.

The appearance of age. Because the earth is so young, you say, “but the earth

looks like it's really, really old.” Dr. Phillips last night was describing galaxies that were ten billion light years away. That light started out from those galaxies ten billion years ago, and now the light we're seeing is really ten billion years old. These people would say, (Young Earth folks) “No, it didn't start ten billion years ago, God made the light already on its way. Adam was made looking like an adult. So the earth has an appearance of age.” That's what the scientists are seeing, God made it with the appearance of age. Does that argument bother anybody that God made the earth with the appearance of age? Does God deceive people? That's an interesting question.

AC. Symbolic Day [73:37-75:23]

Next is the Symbolic Day theory. This is another way, another type of day. There are people who hold the symbolic day and say the days of Genesis one, two, three, four, five, six, seven days, are not meant to be time. They're meant to be a logical or literary framework that Moses is using to describe the creation. It's a logical or literary framework that Moses is using to describe it. It could be that God came to Moses and said (he's on the Mt. Sinai). “Hey Moses, wake up. Moses, let there be light,” and Moses sees the light. Then Moses goes back to sleep, and the next day God shakes him. “Hey, Moses, wake up,” He says, “Okay, now watch this. Now I'm going to separate the waters above and the waters below.” Moses goes back to sleep, and comes awake on the third day: “Okay, let the land appear.” So, in other words, it's days that God revealed to Moses. It's not days of the actual creation, it's days when God was revealing it to Moses. Do you see the difference there? So these are what we call “revelational days,” as God took seven days to reveal it to Moses, not that it was originally that way. Here's another way to look at it. This I've often thought this is kind of an interesting way, that God showed Moses seven pictures. Moses is describing, in the first picture, God said let there be light. In the second picture, he separates things, and so on. Moses is shown these pictures, visually, in his head like when the prophets had visions. God is showing him in visions the creation. So Moses describes it as seven days. Perhaps it is a literary framework. Is this more an abstract approach to creation? Yes. The other ones are literal twenty-four hours, this is more abstract; and the symbolic days, Bernard Ramm holds

this. Some of the more abstract thinkers hold this.

AD. Day-Age Theory [75:24-80:00]

Here's what Dr. Perry Phillips holds, and this is called "The Day Age Theory." Perry believes that each one of the days of Genesis are ages, long periods of time. The word *yom*, in Hebrew, is the word "day." It has a variety of meanings and is not always twenty-four hours. For example, if I asked you if it was day or night out, what would you say? I've been in this building so long I don't know. If I say it's day or night, how long is "day" in that context? Is day less than twenty-four hours? You say, well we live in New England in December, the day is only five minutes. "Day" as a period of light can vary. Give me twelve hours, for daylight, and twelve hours of night. Then "day" would be shorter than twenty-four hours?

What about the Day of the Lord? How long is the Day of the Lord, the apocalyptic Day of the Lord? It's described in the book of Revelation, the Day of the Lord is a thousand years [Rev 20]. And then if you go over to Psalm 90:4, it says "a day with the Lord is as one thousand years and a thousand years is as a day." You guys all know that because you've seen Groundhog's Day. A day is as a thousand years. It is the same day, every day after day after day. A day is as a thousand years, a thousand years is as a day. When you're with an infinite eternal God, what's a thousand years? It's nothing. So, "a day" is used for a long period of time.

Here's another one: it's the time of a person's life. If I said to you, "in my father's day," how long would that be? Would that be about a seventy-six year period from about 1927 to 2004? Okay, so in my father's day, that would be in his life time. "Day" (*yom*) means many things. It means many things in English, and it means many things in Hebrew. The sun, by the way, was not made until day four. Are the first three days solar days? They can't be solar days because there's no solar, there's no sun. The sun's gone, the sun doesn't get put in until day four. So the first three days can't be solar days anyway. Now, by the way, does the day age theory allow for billions of years? Yes, it does.

Then this is probably the strongest argument. There's too much work on day six. Can God do stuff instantaneously? But what about man? He forms man out of the dust

on the ground on day six, he then brings all the animals to Adam. Does Adam have to name all the animals? Does that take time to name all the animals in the world? Then, by the way, after he names all the animals, Adam has to feel alone. Then, after that, what happens? On that same day, Eve is formed out of the rib of his side. Is that a lot to do in one twenty-four hour day? Now God can create really fast, but does a human being take time? So on day six there's so much.

These are the three approaches. Literal days, day one, day two, day three, where they're actual 24 hour days. These people are Young Earth Creationists, the earth is about twenty thousand years old for them. The Day Age - does this allow for a thirteen point seven billion year old universe that science can largely agree with? Yes. The Big Bang Theory lecture by Perry Phillips I'll have up on the web by Friday. Symbolic days, does this allow for billions of years too? Yes.

Now the question is, and this is the point of all this: How old does the Bible say the earth is? It doesn't say. Is that conjecture on everybody's part? You'll have some Young Earth people, you'll have some Old Earth people, and all I'm saying is: don't fight over these things. The Bible doesn't really say. People hold different opinions, it's okay to hold different opinions on this. Major on the majors, minor on the minors. The date of the earth - we don't know. Scripture doesn't say.

So, take care! We'll see you, Tuesday.

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt on lecture five on the course Old Testament History, Literature, and Theology. Today's lecture will be on Genesis chapter one, on verses 1:1 and 1:2, and then a discussion on the days of Genesis. Dr. Ted Hildebrandt.

Transcribed by Libbi Wilson

Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt 2

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 6[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt teaching Old Testament History, Literature and Theology. Lecture number six on genealogy not equal to chronology, the image of God, and the two trees in the Garden of Eden.

A. Quiz Preview [00:00-3:26]

For this week, you guys are working on Exodus and you have to read 20 chapters or something up to the ten commandments. After that its select chapters so you don't have to read the whole thing. Basically, you are skipping a lot of the tabernacle descriptions. There are two articles for this week, one is by a guy named Bruce Waltke, who's a super-scholar on the archeological evidence from Palestine under Joshua. So I think you will find it interesting. Now, this is important because there are two articles this week: one article that you are going to be responsible for, the other one I'm simply going to ask you did you read the Waltke article. I'm not going to ask you details from the Waltke article, there are a lot of details there. I'm just going to ask you to read it. Now on the "Bloody Bridegroom" article, that's the one I want you to focus on. So on that one I will ask you specific questions? So the "Bloody Bridegroom," focus on that one, the other one just read. Then there are a couple of memory verses. I think the memory verses are real hard. What is it, Psalm 23? I think it starts out "the Lord is my shepherd," you may have heard it a few times. So I want you to know "the Lord is my shepherd." By the way, that's a really important Psalm and you should know that. It comes in really handy. It's a just a very good Psalm to learn.

One other thing on the materials for this course we are double now. Some of you still have not paid for the materials for the course and so its twenty bucks now. I don't want to chase you down. After Friday, you are done taking quizzes and exams. You have got to turn it into your grade or it starts cutting in, you know you can't take the quizzes and you can't take the exams. So you need to get it in this week, it's not an option.

Alright, let's open with a word of prayer and then we will dive into the book of

Genesis today and get down the road.

Father, we thank you for your kindness to us and we thank you for the beauty that comes to us in the fall in New England. For the refreshing weather and we just thank you for that. We thank you for your word, we thank you that you have spoken, you had it written down and now you give us the privilege of reading it. We pray that you might help us as we try to interpret it that we might understand it aright. We pray that it might guide us to you to glorify and honor you, to worship you more accurately and to appreciate your Son that you gave in our behalf. So help us in our explorations in your word today. Thank you that we can call you “Father” even this day. In Christ’s precious name we pray, amen.

B. How old is the earth? Not a test of orthodoxy [3:27-4:58]

We want to start up by asking the question: how old does the Bible say the earth is? We have been discussing this quite a bit and the answer to the question: where in the Bible does it say how old the earth is? There is no verse anywhere in the Bible that says exactly how old the earth is. So you have to ask yourselves some questions about how much of a big deal you are going to make of this. We want to start out by saying, if the Bible doesn’t say specifically how old the earth is, do you have to be careful about making that a test of orthodoxy? Now what I mean by “test of orthodoxy” is: are you going to split churches over this issue of how old the earth is? Now, by the way, have some churches split over that? Is that the wrong issue? It’s the wrong issue because different people are going to have different opinions and it’s only their opinions because the Bible does not tell us how old the earth is. So I want to say that the age of the earth should not be a test of orthodoxy since there is not one clear verse in the Bible that says how old the earth is. It’s all conjecture. You can have your own conjecture, you can have all your reasons you want but it’s still conjecture. You don’t have a “Thus saith the Lord” on this one. So you have got to back off and realize: can your own conjectures be wrong? I say, your conjectures can be wrong.

C. Science and the Bible [4:59-7:56]

I'm joking, of course, because I will show you things in the next class period where I have changed my opinion over the years. I have changed how I thought about things. So be careful about that. You have got to be careful about pushing science into and grabbing science out of the Bible. Here are some examples. I think we mentioned some of these last time. "Poison" in Psalm 140, verse 3. Psalm 140 is beautiful. If you love the animals, Psalm 140 is your psalm. Psalms 140:3 talks about the poison of asps being under its tongue. Now that's serpents, snakes, and asps. When a rattlesnake bites you, is it because the poison is under its tongue or is the poison in the fangs? It's in the fangs. So this is a poetic description, is this meant to be taken scientifically that all of the asps, have got special poison under their tongues? That's not the point. So you have got to be careful about pushing science into or out of the Bible. This is a poetic description, it's not meant to be taken as a scientific description.

Here in Isaiah chapter 11, verse 12; it talks about the "four corners of the earth." Again you can't say: they all believed in a flat earth therefore the Bible teaches a flat earth. You're getting the wrong point. What it is saying is all over the earth, the four corners of the earth. By the way, even in the twenty first century, we talk about the four corners of the earth. People came from the four corners of the earth to go to New York City for 9/11--from the four corners of the earth. All we're taking about is north, south, east, west. We're not making a statement that the earth is flat. So you have got to be careful with that.

Job 9:6 talks about the pillars of the earth. Again, it's not a scientific description, it's not an electromagnetic description of how the earth is balanced. Job doesn't know about electromagnetism when he talks. It's just a poetic way of saying that the earth is stable, "set on pillars." So you have got to be careful about taking some of this poetry and pushing science into the Bible or drawing science out of the Bible.

The sun stands still, we are going to have to talk about that in Joshua 10. The problem there is understanding what it means by "stands still." The word there actually may mean "silent" and so we're going to have to talk about that and I'll deal with that

when we get to the book of Joshua. It's about three weeks ahead of me here.

Now, my point is major on the majors, minor on the minors. The age of the earth is a minor point; don't major on that and check your attitude. When someone disagrees with you, are you able to handle disagreements? It's really important. How do you treat people when you disagree with them on some of these theological points?

D. Genealogy is not Chronology [7:57-10:00]

This is another big point: genealogy. How do some people come up with the date of the early earth is ten to twenty thousand years old. People use the genealogies and what they do is they start adding up the ages of--this guy lived nine hundred years, this guy lived nine or sixty nine years, this guy lived... and they add up all the genealogies. You end up determining how old the earth is by adding up the genealogies. Can you do that? Are genealogies meant to give us chronology? Chronology has to do with *chronos* which is "time" in Greek. What does genealogy have to do with that? Father-son, father-son or whatever in the family come down like that. Chronology and genealogy are two different things. You can't mix them and I'll show you how they are not the same. So the two big genealogies by which people try to establish the age of the earth are Genesis 5--the genealogy of Adam; and then Genesis 11 with the genealogy coming from Noah down to the time of Abraham. So they add up those numbers of how old these guys lived. The problem with that is if you add up the genealogy, you end up with 4004 BC as the date for the creation of the world. If you add up the genealogies as Bishop Usher did, you come up with the earth being created at 4004 BC. Why can't that be? If the earth was created at 4004 BC, you need a flood at least a thousand years later because many of these guys live 900 years at least. Now if you're from 4000 BC, you're down to when did the flood happen? 3000 BC or in the 2000 range. What's the problem with that? Do we have written records back in to the 3000 BC from both Mesopotamians and Egyptians? So it can't be. By the way, there's a tower probably as big as those two pillars at Jericho that's ten thousand years old. If that tower at Jericho is dated 8000 BC, how can the earth be created at 4000 BC? Do you know what I'm saying? Did God make the tower? I'm

sorry, that was supposed to be a joke. God didn't make the tower. Human beings made the tower at 8000 BC so you have got to be real careful with it.

E. Matthew 1: Genealogy not equal to chronology, names skipped [10:01-16:25]

Now let me just show you this. If you've got your Bibles, hop over to Mathew 1 and I will show you the genealogy of Jesus Christ. Are there holes in the genealogy of Jesus Christ? Yes. So you look at Mathew 1, verse 8, it says Solomon was the father of Rehoboam, Rehoboam the father of Abijah, Abijah the father of Asa, and then verse eight: Asa the father of Jehoshaphat, Jehoshaphat the father of Jehoram. Then it says Jehoram was the father of Uzziah in verse eight. Mathew 1:8 says Jehoram was the father of Uzziah, is that wrong? Was Jehoram the father of Uzziah? And the answer is "No," he was not. Jehoram was not the father of Uzziah. Now that's a fact, whether you agree with me or disagree, it doesn't make any difference. That's a fact. Jehoram was not the father of Uzziah, he was the great great grandfather. There are three names that are skipped between Jehoram and Uzziah. You say, "you're talking real dogmatic here Hildebrandt, how do you know that?" Well, I don't know anything. I go to the Bible. If you go to 1 Chronicles 3:11 it tells us the names of the three kings that were between Jehoram and Uzziah. It lists the three kings that are skipped and their names are: Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah. So three names are skipped.

Now why would Mathew skip three names? He's coming down the list of the kings of Israel, would most Jews know the kings of Israel? We don't memorize the kings in this class but most Jews would know all the kings and they would know those three names were skipped. Why did Mathew do that? Let me read you, going down to verse 17. Check this out: Mathew 1:17. "There are fourteen generations from Abraham to David." What was the date of Abraham approximately?—2000 BC. What's David?—1000 BC. "There are fourteen generations from Abraham to David. There are fourteen generations from David until the exile to Babylon." So from David, 1000 BC down to 586 BC the Babylonian captivity, there are fourteen generations. Then it says there are fourteen generations from the "exile to Babylon to Christ." So there are fourteen generations

Abraham to David, fourteen generations David to the Babylonian exile, and fourteen generations from the exile down to Jesus. How did Mathew make it come out to be fourteen, fourteen, and fourteen? Guess what, he did it by dropping three of the names. Do you guys know about fudge factors? I was in science and they call these fudge factors. It didn't work out right, so we dropped three names to make it fourteen. Now you say, he didn't really do that? Yes, he really did that. We know the three names that he skipped.

Now why did he do that? One suggestion, and I think it's a good one, actually: in English we do what? Do you have letters that compose words? Are the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 different from the letters a, b, c? So we have two different systems--numbers and letters. Do you realize the Jews use their alphabet for their numbers? Now question: is that a problem? So "a" is 1, "b" is 2, "c" is 3, "d" is what 4, "e" whatever goes on down. Their letters and their numbers can at points create problems? Sometimes you don't know whether you're looking at a number or whether you're looking at a word. It's very interesting that if you take the Hebrew letter for "d" which is 4, "v" is 6, and you take "d" is 4 and you add those together: you've got 4 plus 6 plus 4, it's what? Fourteen. Who is this DVD? David. So the suggestion here is that Mathew is saying: Jesus Christ is whose son? The son of David, fourteen, fourteen, fourteen, David, David, David.

Do you see what he's doing? He drops those three to make it fourteen because that's what his point was. If you didn't get it, he says explicitly in verse one: "a record of the genealogy of Jesus Christ, the son of David." Then he builds that genealogy to show that. Now, by the way, is it okay to drop three names like that? The word "father," also means "ancestor." Jesus Christ, son of David, is the word "son" used there? There's how much from David to Jesus? Jesus was zero right? David is a 1000 BC. So there's, what, a thousand years there. Jesus wasn't really zero. I was just saying that to see if anybody smiled. So you got a thousand years down to the time of Jesus. So "Jesus Christ, the son of David," he was the what? He was a "descendant" of David. Jesus Christ's father was not David directly. His father was God and the Holy Spirit. But you know what I'm saying, David was his ancestor through Mary. So this is what I think is going on there.

So all I'm trying to say is: do we know for sure there are holes in genealogies? Yes. You can't use genealogy to establish chronology. There may be holes. Who knows how long those holes can be? So that leaves you with the 4004 BC. Nobody accepts that today. This is something Bishop Usher did way back. No one holds that today because, for example, at Jericho we've got remains in Jericho that go back to 8000 BC and so 4004 BC can't be right. We realize that in genealogies when it says "father/son," that there may be huge gaps. He may be the great great great great grandfather of so and so. So be careful with that.

F. Literary Patterns in Genesis 1: Fiat-Fulfillment [16:26-18:54]

Now, in the book of Genesis, we are talking about chapter one. There are some patterns here and I want to show you two patterns. These are kind of interesting in terms of the patterns of Genesis 1, the days of creation. This is called the Fiat-Fulfillment Pattern and here it is. See if you recognize this. It happens over and over again. Here's Genesis 1--the seven days of Genesis. Do you remember the seven days of Genesis? It always starts out: "And God said," There's an **announcement**. Then there's a **command** "and God said let there be--what? "Let there be light." Day two, let there be a what? A firmament above separating the waters above and the waters below. Let there be dry ground coming up, let the heavens bring forth sun, moon, and stars. So, "let there be." God makes a command. "And God said," there's an announcement and then there's a command—"let there be." "Let there be light" and then what's next? Then there is the **fulfillment**. God said, "let there be light and there was light." God said let there be x, this may be another way to put it. X sounds too impersonal, sounds like algebra class. But anyway, "let there be x and there was X." Whatever the day, there were the six days. Then God evaluates his own work. It's interesting. Does God evaluate his own work? After he has created it, does he look back and evaluate it? He **evaluates** it—"and God saw that it (the light, the sun, moon, and stars) whatever he was working on, God evaluates his work--"and he saw that it was good." Then there's the end of the day. "And there was evening and there was morning day--what? Day 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 7. On the seventh day, God rested. And God looked on the seventh day and he saw everything that

he had made and that it was what? Very good (*tov me'od*) “it was very good.” So at the end God reflects on the whole thing. It’s very good. Do you remember seeing this pattern over and over again with every one of the days? So this is kind of a literary structure that each of the days is put into and it’s helpful to see the organization of it. It’s called the Fiat and Fulfillment Pattern.

G. Parallel Day Pattern [18:55-21:58]

Now the next one is actually how I remember the days of Genesis. If I asked you what was on day 5, would you know just like that what’s on day 5? Would you know what was done on day 4? This is how I remember it: What was created on day one? “Ok,” he said, “let there be light” on day one. Now what day was man created? Six. If you know the first and the sixth day then you get all the other days. In the second pattern I’ll show you how to do this. Psalm chapter 33, verse 6 says: “By the word of the Lord, the worlds were formed” and so it’s talking about the power of God’s word. It’s the spoken word, calling things into being. Psalm 33:6 and 9 describe the creation by the word of his mouth. So God created speaking and this is kind of an interesting thing with the Fiat-Fulfillment pattern.

Now, here’s the Parallel Day Scheme. Now this is really neat and don’t kind of get all blown away. This is fairly easy. On day 1 “God said let there be light, there was light.” On the parallel day, on day four, he makes the what? The light bearers. What would be an example of light bearers? Sun, moon and stars. So on day 1 he makes the light, on day 4 he makes the light bearers.

On day 2 he separates the water above from the waters below. Now what are the waters below? The oceans. What are the waters above? Clouds. So he separates the waters above and the waters below. On day 5 he makes the fish and the birds. Where did the fish inhabit? The waters below. Where did the birds inhabit? The waters above. So you got the birds and the fish going on in the waters above and the waters below.

On day 3 he makes the dry land and on day 6 he makes the inhabitants of the dry land. Who are some of the inhabitants of the dry land? Us, people. So he makes people

and land animals. He makes land critters on the sixth day. So, by the way, if you know humans and land critters are made on day 6 and day 1 is the light. Do you know what day 4 is? Yes, it's the light bearers. If you know day 6 he makes the land critters, you know what day 3 is, the dry land. And then in the middle you have the what? The waters above and the waters below, the fish, and the birds. You see how all that works? I hope I'm not just dreaming here because this makes it really easy. If you know the first and last day, then you kind of can reconstruct the rest of it.

By the way, what day did I skip? On the Sabbath day, God rested. Question, did God rest because he was tired? No. He rested and so the Shabbat is set up not just because he was personally tired but God reflects on things.

H. Forming and Filling [21:59-23:14]

Now one other thing I need to point out about this chart: in Genesis, do you guys remember Genesis 1:2? "And the earth was darkness," and how should I say, the whole was formless and empty. Do you remember the earth was formless and empty and darkness was *tohu vavohu*. The world was "formless and empty," do you see what these days do? On days 1, 2 and 3--these are days of forming. In other words, the earth was formless and empty and what does God do? He takes the formless shape and he forms that which was formless. Then he does what? He fills that which was empty. So these first three days are days of forming and the second three days are days of filling. So that which was formless takes shape, takes form; and that which was empty gets filled.

By the way, even with human beings, he tells human beings we are to be "fruitful and multiply." We are to do what to the earth? Fill the earth. So you get this forming and filling in the creation account. I don't know but this just helps me put the whole thing together. If I know the first day and the sixth day I've got the rest of it. So this is the parallel day structure of the six days of creation.

I. Image of God in man [23:15-31:57]

Now, let's jump over and what I want to do next is talk about the image of God in man. So we want to start out with these kind of questions on the image of God in man.

What does it mean to be human? Is this a big question today? Are you folks in your lifetime going to face this big time? Let me just explain how it's going to come about that this is going to be a major question for you. First of all, is man one or two parts or three parts? Is it man, body, soul, and spirit? Or is it just body, soul/spirit? Or some people just say all you are is body. You are just your brain that's it. All you are is your physical body. So what is a human being? How are we composed? How are human beings different than the animals? We have got some people today who say: save the animals, kill all the people. Yes, to some, animals actually seem to be more important than the people. We've got some groups, I always get a kick out of PETA. I always tell people I'm a PETA person; I'm a Person who Eats Tasty Animals. That doesn't usually go over too well on some of you but anyway. How does cloning fit in? Can they take now some of your cells and actually build another you? Do you remember they did that with a sheep? Dolly. What happens if they do that with a person? Is that really you or is that really somebody different if you are cloned. What does it mean to be human at that point and what does it mean to be you?

Cyborgs--are human beings getting more parts from other places? In other words, all of a sudden what is it, Peter Stine gets a donated kidney. Do people donate kidneys to another person? Now you're walking around and you have a kidney from another person. Is that you or them? You've got what? Hearts being transplanted now between people. Livers, you think of Steve Jobs, I was told and I don't know whether it's true that he's got pancreatic cancer. This is a really, it's over kind of thing. Pancreatic cancer is fatal. But did Jobs get a liver, does anybody know? I think he got a liver didn't he? And the liver was transplanted. Is that really pretty cool that they transplanted a liver. In one sense, they transplant somebody else's heart into you, is that really you? My wife faces this problem, I call her my bionic woman. She just had a knee put in so she's titanium woman now. She's got this titanium knee. So you have got to stay away when she wants to kick you. She broke her ankle so she's got some plates in her foot and a few screws. So she always has a few screws lose there. I go to the airport with my wife and walk through the scanner and what happens? Take off all your metal. Now we don't go to the airport

anymore because of the way you get groped when you go in there. By the way, I say that and you guys laugh, its not a laughing matter. My son has a 25 year old wife, 25 year old. Every time they go to the airport, her number gets called every time. Does that give you a clue? Does that get you angry? My son actually ended up driving out to his sister's wedding 22 hours so his wife wouldn't have to get checked out at the airport. I don't know. All I'm saying is some of the stuff the TSA is doing now really bothers me. They do it in the name of safety but it's a lot of bad stuff.

Let me talk about spiritual machines. So what I'm saying is, is it possible for body parts of people to be swapped? Different leg parts and arm parts and things like that. By the way is that good? Yes, it's good for some people. I mean, some of the guys have their legs blown off and they get put back on. What about spiritual machines? Do you know anything about Moore's Law? Moore's Law basically says this: that computers double in intelligence every 18 to 24 months. It's about every 2 years computers double in intelligence. I want you to think about that. Now back when I was in high school just after the Civil War, they had a computer and our first school computer was this big by this big. It was huge and it had two memory units. So you did $A^2 + B^2 = C^2$, you could do the A^2 , you could do the B^2 but you didn't have a third place to put C^2 . There were two memory units and the hole computer cost 5000 dollars. Now what happened? In 18 to 24 months it went from 2 to what? 4. Then another it went from 4 to what? 8. Then from 8 to 16, 16 to 32, 32 to 64, and then all of a sudden it starts going up. So what happens after a period of time? Now it goes to one megabyte, it goes to 2 megabytes, it goes to 4 megabytes, 16, and now all of a sudden we're doing what? Gigabytes and it goes from 1 gigabyte to 2 gigabytes, to 4 gigabytes, 4 to 8, to 16, to 32. And now we get terabytes. One terabyte goes to 2 terabytes, 4 terabytes, and every 18 months it's doubling in intelligence.

Question, can a computer play a human being in chess? Can a computer win? Yes, so they can program a computer to win at chess. The computer keeps getting smarter and smarter; is it getting smarter more quickly than you guys are getting smarter? Yes. So what Ray Kurzweil down at MIT is saying is that this stuff here is carbon. This is carbon

and this stuff here only works so well. The computers keep doubling in intelligence and what he's suggesting is by 2025 computers will be smarter than you guys. I'll be dead but it will be smarter than you guys. Why? A computer's intelligence doubles all the time. What he's saying is that carbon is history. What he's saying is that the future is silicon. What's going to happen is that computers will go by us in intelligence by 2020 or 2025. You guys will be alive, its' what? 10 to 15 years from now when this kind of stuff is going to happen. Do you already have robots that you can talk to and tell to do activities? Now are they really pretty stupid at this point? Yes, and that is what he says, they are about the intelligence of a mosquito. But what's the benefit for them? Every two years they double. Do you see where it's going? Eventually, will we have computer probably as robots that are able to talk to you in open conversation? Actually will they be smarter than you are? This is where we are going. So then what does it mean to be human when you have a machine that's smarter than a human being? What does it mean to be human?

So we look out at the technological landscape and we say, "Wow, there are some pretty big things happening. Now what does Scripture say about this. This is the verse that is critical for understanding what it means to be human. When God makes humans in Genesis chapter one this is what he says. This is a big verse that's very significant and meaningful. God says, "Let us," does he say "let me" make man? No. He says, "let us make man in our image and in our likeness. And let them" do what? "Rule." So is man designed to rule? "Let them rule over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the livestock, and over all the earth, and over all the creatures that move along the ground. So God created man in his own image. In the image of God he created him, male and female he created them." Man is made in the image of God. Are the animals made in the image of God? No, man alone is made in the image of God.

J. 4 aspects of the Image of God in humankind [31:58-41:45]

The question is then: what does the image of God mean? What is it? So I want to go through four aspects of this image of God. These aspects combine and they are not mutually exclusive, they overlap. But just four aspects of the image of God. Let me run

through the four of them first, then we will cover them in detail. First, human beings have **spiritual and moral qualities**. Human beings have spiritual and moral qualities. There was a grizzly bear up in Yellowstone Park just before we got there. A grizzly bear eats a human being, kills a human being. Is that grizzly bear immoral? A grizzly bear eats salmon, is the grizzly bear immoral? Do grizzly bears eat stuff? Is that what they do? Is it moral or immoral? It's what grizzly bears do. That's a good response, it's amoral. It's not moral. In other words, it doesn't work in that category. A grizzly bear, you can't give a grizzly bear a lecture and put him in jail and say you are going to jail for five years for eating this guy. I don't mean to make light about it. Obviously the guy was killed and his wife was spared and it's really bad. But question: are you dealing with an animal? The animal doesn't have a sense of right and wrong. It's as he said, it's amoral.

Now if a human being eats somebody. Is that a problem? Is he going to hit me with this "it was an amoral act"? Now we would say it's immoral. Do we eat people? If you eat people is that a problem? That's a problem. Now by the way, is there a difference even in morality, is there a difference if somebody eats somebody else we say that's a problem.

Are there different levels of morality? My son, for example, when he was young, my son was supposed to be down at a Bible study with Child of Evangelism Fellowship. They were doing a neighborhood Bible study. I come home, my son is riding his bike around the neighborhood and I came in a different way. So he didn't know where I was coming from. He gets home and I say, "Hey, how was the Child Evangelism?" He says, "Oh, yeah, it was great dad." I say, "Oh really? What kind of story did they tell?" And you see him roll his eyes like this. "It was Noah and the Flood, Noah and the Flood." So he starts telling me about Noah and the Flood. He makes up this story. Did my son lie to me? Basically, have all my kids lied to me? To be honest with you, yes. So I catch my son lying to me. Is that on the same level as cannibalism? Would you say, it's a little different. Some people say: all sins are the same. Well, then you can go to the cannibals first because if they are all the same then you shouldn't have any problem with that. But what I'm saying is, you know my son telling me a lie like that, was it wrong that my son

lied to me? Yes. There are things you have got to deal with but is that different than eating somebody? I would say there are some differences there so you have got to be careful and discerning.

[Student speaks] She's saying they are all the same but there are different consequences and I want to say, no. Yes, the consequences are different for sure. She is right that the consequences are different. Yes, the consequences are majorly different. But I want to say that also. In other words, isn't there within you a different reaction if somebody is going to be a cannibal versus lying about attending a Bible study. What I'm saying is get a handle on that. Yes, they are both sins. First of all, they are both sins and that's where they are the same in that they are both sins. But I want to distinguish, how should I say; doesn't your gut tell you that cannibalism is worse than my son lying to me? Your gut should tell you something on that and if it doesn't, then I'd like salt and pepper when you take me down. Anyway, sorry... So there's a big debate on this and we will work on that.

Now, yes. (student speaks) Yes, and that's what she would be pushing that all sins are the same. But what I'm saying is you are going to see different reactions from people and from God on different sins. In other words, will God get really frosted over some sins versus other sins. By the way, they are all sins and they are all sins that can damn you to hell so to speak. But is God's reaction different to some of them in terms of when we go through the Old Testament? You're going to see a real strong reaction for some sins and not for others. I want to try to come to grips with that. I want to try to understand that so I can understand God better, but excellent point.

Now **relational** simply means that part of the image of God is relational. That "let us make man in our image;" there is a plurality there and so part of the image is relational.

Dominion and rule, that the image of God has something to do with us as human beings ruling and having **dominion** over the earth. We want to look at that **rule aspect** and how that works. By the way, can you see the perversion of this, that people rule? Do people try to rule other people? Does power corrupt? Absolute power corrupts absolutely.

So what you have here is humankind, sinful humankind, taking this rule and trying to use it to dominate and that's a real problem.

This one I'm going to have the hardest time selling to you guys. What I'm going to try to suggest is **we actually look like God physically**. There's physicality to God and we look like God. You say, "Hildebrandt, is God a bald old man?" No. We look like God I'm going to try to say as far as our humanity not in the particulars of being old and fat.

Now let's work through this. Spiritual qualities--the ability to make moral choices. Human kind is made in the image of God. He is given the ability to make moral choices. Animals don't make the moral choices that we know man is capable of making. Where do we find proof for this? We go to the New Testament and it's really kind of interesting. Colossians in the New Testament parallels the book of Ephesians. There is a lot of overlap between Colossians and Ephesians in the New Testament. So we've got a parallel passage between Colossians 3:10 and Ephesians 4:24. It says: "And have put on the new self which is being renewed in knowledge in the image of its creator." In the image of its creator, it's being renewed in what? "In knowledge," do human beings have the ability to know? We have the ability to know and we are being renewed in the image of Christ. Do you see what's happening here? Does the image need renewing? The image was damaged in the fall and the image then needs to be renewed. Here in Ephesians it says: "And to put on the new self, created to be like God." We are created to be like God. How are we like God?—"in true righteousness and holiness." Can human beings be holy? Let me say it first this way: God is holy? "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God almighty." God is holy. Do human beings have the capacity to be holy? Yes. "Be holy," God says, "because I the Lord your God am holy." Righteousness is opposed to wickedness. Are human beings moral beings? They have the capacity for righteousness; do they also have the capacity for wickedness? So he's saying be renewed in the image of Christ. The image of Christ is like being made like God "in true knowledge, righteousness, and holiness." I believe it's in the confession that way. So this is where we get that basically there is a spiritual-moral aspect. Human beings are made spiritually and

morally like God: we can know, we can be righteous or unrighteous, we can be holy, and we can be unholy. But we have the capacity to be holy, righteous, and to know. So this is the moral side of the image based on these verses.

Now, what happened in when the fall happens, when Adam and Eve fall into sin. Did we lose the image of God? James tells us—no, but the image may be marred. The image may be marred but we didn't lose it totally. So James 3:9 says: “with the tongue we praise our Lord and Father and with it we curse men who are made in God's likeness.” James is saying: human beings are still made in God's likeness therefore you shouldn't curse them because they are made in God's likeness and God's image. Does that mean that everyone in this class is made in God's image? Yes. Should that affect how we treat one another then? Yes. Does that affect how I treat you as students made in the image of God? Yes. Does that affect how you treat me as one made in the image of God? That should affect how you treat people in response to this. People are still made in the image of God but its marred and there are implications. We will talk about the implications more later.

K. Relational aspect of the Image of God [41:46-49:46]

Now, another aspect of the image of God is the “us-ness” of the image of God. The “us-ness” of it or the **relational aspect** of it is “Let us make man in our image.” The “us” is it singular or plural? Plural. “Let us make man in our image.” So we are made in the image of God as an “us.” Man is built for relationship and so how do you understand that plurality “Let us make man in our image”?

There are different ways you can understand it and this kind of goes through some of those. Let me just start out with the plural of majesty. Did your mother ever just say to you: “we have decided that you shouldn't be going to this place.” “We have decided” and the assumption is it's the father and the mother who decided but it was really the mother deciding and she says “we have decided.” But does she get to say that because she's the mother and the implication is the dad is in there. When the king says: “we have decided,” is it really the king making the decision, but does the king get to use the “we” and we call it the “royal we”? Does the king get to do that? Yes. It's like the king when he says, “we

have decided,” it is really just himself but he’s the king. In Hebrew they have a thing called the plural of majesty. In English we’ve got the singular that means you got one item. Plural means what? Two or more. So we use plurality to assign the number of something, whether it’s singular or whether it’s plural, multiple numbers. In Hebrew, they do singular and plural but they also when something is really really really big, they also use the plural. This is the plural of majesty. So you would have what? “Stuff” and if you want to say the stuff was like really really big you would say what? “Stuffs.” You would put an “s” on it to make it like that. Now for us, when we say “stuffs” that means many “stuff.” But when they say “stuffs” and “stuff” they may really mean this is “big stuff.” Sorry, I should have used probably a different word here. But anyway, do you know what I’m saying with the plural of majesty then? In other words, it’s so big that “let us make man”; God speaking in an “us” kind of way is a plural of greatness and majesty. That’s a possibility based on Hebrew grammar for why the plural “let us make man” is used.

I think there are some other better possibilities here—“heavenly court.” Does anybody remember Isaiah chapter 6? God is in his heavenly court and God asks the question: “who will go for us?” The plural is used there. God is speaking to these heavenly beings, “who will go for us”? Isaiah says: “here am I Lord, send me.” Does anybody remember Job? In the book of Job, the first chapter, God is up there and he basically says: “Have you guys considered my servant Job?” And he’s talking to the group in the heavenly court. There is an “us” there and “the satan” says, “Well, Job is good but he’s only this good because you bless him with all this stuff. Let me take that away and he will curse you to your face.” So this “us” is of the heavenly court, does that make sense? “Let us make man in our image,” that God is talking in the heavenly court. I think there’s confirmation of this both in Job 1 and Isaiah chapter 6. I want to put a plus sign here indicating that I think this view has a good shot at it.

Now maybe God is talking to himself. Did you ever talk to yourself? “What are we going to do?” “Should we do this or that? If we do this, then there are going to be all these consequences. If we do that, there are going to be all of these consequences. What

should we do?” Do you ever talk to yourself? Okay, you guys don’t talk to yourselves. Anyway, I talk to myself. So you can use **self-deliberation**, “what should we do” within yourself. By the way, does the Bible have very much self-deliberation like that? Almost never, to be honest I couldn’t tell you right now a passage where you get this with God talking to himself. So the self-deliberation I think is bogus. This is wrong. It rarely ever occurs in Scripture so I don’t think you want to go that way.

Some people say the “let us make man in our image” is the trinity: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. This is a discussion among the Godhead: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. “Let us make man in our image” that’s the trinity. A lot of people suggest this and I’m not ready to say it’s wrong but I ask you: would Moses have understood the trinity? Would Moses have understood Father, Son, and Holy Spirit? As a matter of fact, in the time of Jesus, this is 1400-1200 years later, did they understand Father, Son, and Holy Spirit? When Jesus said he was the Son of God, did they want to stone and kill him. So what I’m saying is, how well was the trinity understood back then? I don’t think Moses had a clue on the trinity. Yes, he could have but the problem is nobody would have known that. Suppose God showed Moses the trinity, but when Moses comes down from the mount none of those people are going to have a clue of what he’s talking about because God in the Old Testament is one. The Lord our God is one and they really push that. So I’m not sure how well he knew the trinity. So what I’m saying is: would Moses have understood this very much? By the way, did it take the church 300 years to figure out the trinity? The early church really wrestled over the trinity. So what I’m saying is I don’t know how well Moses understood the trinity in “let us make man in our image.” It could be. I don’t want to eliminate it but all I’m saying is I have got to get back into Moses’s shoes. What I’m wanting to suggest is that if you start saying Moses is writing down things that he has no clue of, you have got to be careful with that because it’s possible he wrote better than he knew. But I have got to have some good reason for that. In other words, if he’s telling you something in the future, it’s possible he wrote better than he knew. I don’t want to eliminate that possibility. I’m just saying I don’t think he understood the trinity. Would he have understood the heavenly court? Yes, because the

other cultures also had heavenly court ideas. So the heavenly court idea seems more natural to me given the historical framework into which he would have been writing.

Now, by the way, is it possible that's wrong too. I wasn't there, I mean I'm old but not that old. So what I'm saying is: I wasn't there, I don't know. So I want to keep the trinity, but put it on the back burner, however. I want to bring forward the heavenly court. But either of these are going to be options. Can we do that, say we don't know, but that those are two valid options. This one thumbs down to, this one here is possible but I doubt it; I think it's too specific.

By the way, does the "us" shape us? Is it "me" or is it "us" that shapes us? Does your culture shape who you are? Does your family background shape who you are? To quote somebody, does it take a village to make a person? Does it take a "we" to make a "me"? So what happens is your background shapes who you are. We are relationally built is what I'm saying. Does the "us" build the "I"? Just look around. All you guys are from different areas. You all come from different backgrounds and each shaped you in a different way than other people, which is really neat because we are all unique in that sense. So the "us" is shaping the "I". Human beings are built for relationship. I guess that's the point I want to make. Are human beings built for an "us" context? Yes. We are built from an "us" context to an "us" context. So relationships can be really important for the image of God and the shaping of that.

L. Ruling/Dominion aspect of the Image [49:46-54:48]

Now, this thing with ruling let's look at this: the image of God is ruling. "Let us make man in our image in order to rule." In the Old Testament God is the sovereign. Now, if I say "sovereign," what do I mean by "sovereign"? God is the king. God rules, he is the great King. Let me just say, God is the great king. He puts humankind on earth to do what? To rule. Do we rule in place of God? Are we like, the term I want is "vice-regents." The president of the United States rules the United States but can he really rule everything? No. So you have governors in different states ruling. By the way, are almost all great kingdoms set up like this where you have the great king and then you have

people ruling under him--ruling little areas under him. So what you have in this creation account is that God creates humankind in his image to rule over the fish of the air, the birds of the sea, and the creatures that crawl around. We are actually in God's place ruling over the creation. We are little "gods" in one sense ruling over part of his creation. That's a terrible way of saying it but do you see the point? Has God given some of his rule over for us to administer? Maybe that's a better way of saying it. Has God given over some of his rule and we, as vice-regents, rule in behalf of the great King.

Now, how does this get established. It's very interesting. The kings of the ancient world would have representatives who would rule in their place. In other words, you would have the great king and the great king would have sub-kings over various areas that the king had conquered. So your kings would have representatives and they would rule in the king's place. Does anybody remember Cyrus, Darius and those Persian rulers? They basically had this huge kingdom and they ruled through the various satraps who ruled under them in the name of Cyrus or in the name of Darius. It happens in almost every kingdom where you have a big king who rules over the whole thing. Then there are these governors, diplomats who will rule over the other thing and that's the way it was back in the Assyrian times. Notice the emphasis in Genesis 1:26 is on ruling.

Now what are the implications for this in terms of meaning and destiny? Is humankind built to rule? We are God's vice-regents representing his rule on this earth. Does it matter how we rule the creation? Humankind is given to rule over the birds of the air and fish of the sea. Humankind is given to rule over the earth. God has given his rule over to us. Therefore, do human beings need to take care of, for example, the environment? Are we ruling in God's place over God's good earth? Does it make a difference how we rule in terms of the environment? Therefore, should Christian people be involved in environmentalist type efforts? Now, I'm not a real big tree hugger or anything like that. But do we have a stewardship for ruling over the animals and over the earth? So there is a basis for environmentalism. Is there a basis for environmentalism right back in the image of God and this rule that we have that God has committed to us over the world? Yes. You have got to work with that. God controls everything. But he's

committed some of the control and movement to humans. Now, he still controls us too, but with that ability to rule comes certain responsibilities for us that we are to rule in his place. Therefore, we have certain responsibilities on how we manifest the rule of God on this earth. It should reflect the glory and goodness of God but not usurp his power because he is the great King. He rules everything.

M. Physical Resemblance as part of the image [54:49-61:47]

Now, this one is going to be the hardest to sell. What I'm going to try to suggest here is that we actually look like God physically. Now you say, how did you get this? Well, there are two Hebrew terms: likeness and image. The terms for likeness and image are *tselem* and *demut*. If you do a word study on these two words *tselem* and *deumt*, "image" and "likeness," they are both very physical terms. They are not moral terms. They are very physical terms. So, for example, let me just give you one example from 1 Samuel 6:5, it says that the Philistines made images, *tselem* or *demut*. They made these physical images of rats out of gold. Now question: did these gold rats look like rats? Yes, but they were made of gold so they weren't real rats. They looked like rats though. Could you look at that gold rat and say that's a rat but it's in gold. So what I'm saying is that there's a physical resemblance and we see that here.

By the way, you guys all know this. In the ancient world in Israel did the Israelites ever make "images" for themselves? If I say "images" to you, would those images be physical images. Did they make physical images of Dagan, Baal and Chemosh and some of the ancient gods. They made these physical images of them. They were physical images and then the people bowed down to those images. What were the images made out of by the way? We know what they were made out of? Yes, someone said "gold,"-- those were the rich ones. What did most people make them out of? Stone and wood. Generally, you made your images out of stone and wood.

But anyway, let's get out of there. But what I'm saying is the images were things that were physical. So what I'm trying to suggest is that these two terms here are both very physical terms. "Images" usually were something very very physical. So what I'm suggesting then is that we actually physically we look like God.

Now let me push that one step further. Suppose I'm an Assyrian king, you're lucky I'm not. The Assyrians were very very cruel. They were the Hitlers of the ancient world. You had the great Assyrian king and when he conquered a new territory, guess what he did? When the Assyrian king would conquer a new territory, he would put up a statue of himself. What did that statue mean? It meant that "I the great king, my statue is in say Zophar or Damascus; that means then that I am king in Damascus and Zophar." So the king would put up a physical image of himself made out of stone. That kind of reminds me of, who's that guy? There was a guy in Iraq that had this big statue of himself? Do you remember they pulled down Saddam Hussein's image. In other words, the image meant what? I am king of this territory. Now look at what God does. God makes an image of himself and puts it on the earth. Is that a way that God is declaring his sovereignty, his kingship, over the earth? We are that image of God. He puts us down here to rule in his place and so that there is a physical resemblance. We resemble God. As the Assyrian king makes a statue, an image and puts it over the territory that he rules, now God also puts his image in us and put us on the earth to symbolize and implement his rule.

Now let me just push this a little bit further. Somebody may say, "wait a minute Hildebrandt, Jesus said 'God is a spirit and a spirit hath not have flesh and bones as you see me have.'" So if God is a spirit and does not have flesh and bones, how are we made in the physical image of God? You said you have been really camping on this thing about physicality. But God's a spirit, he's not made, he does not have flesh and bones." I want you to think about Jesus. Did Jesus take on human form? Yes, he did. Did he only appear as a human or was he physically human? He was a human. When Jesus got killed, did he really die as a human being? He died. When he comes back to life after he's been dead, did Jesus just rise as a spirit or did Jesus rise physically. As a matter of fact, he goes up to what was that guy's name? He says, "Hey, check it out, put your fingers here. Put your fingers in my side. It's me, this is me, I was crucified." Do you remember doubting Thomas? So he says to Thomas... By the way did Jesus after the resurrection, did he sit down and eat food with his disciples? Yes. So was Jesus physical after the resurrection?

Was the resurrection physical? Is Jesus going to be in a human body for eternity? Did Jesus rise from the dead and is he alive forevermore in a human body? Jesus, in the future, and it's been a couple thousand years now, he's still in a human body for eternity. Is it possible that Jesus was in a human body or like a human body before the creation and that we were made in the image of Christ, the physicality that we were made in was the image of Christ. Therefore, can Christ become a human being because we are compatible. Can Jesus become a dog? Would Jesus become a dog? You know what I'm saying? Is a dog incompatible? Can he become a human being? Yes. He can because there is compatibility there. So what I'm saying is that Christ, from eternity, had a "human form" and we as human beings are made in that image. When Jesus comes down, he can morph himself into a human being. Is he compatible so that he can be that way for the rest of eternity? Yes, he's compatible with that. Does that make sense? So I'm arguing that we actually look like God. The terms *tselem* and *demut* are physical terms. What I'm suggesting is that we are made like Christ. We are made in the image of Christ.

After the fall, do we have some problems with being immoral and sinful. Are we being recreated in the image of Christ? Is being like Christ our destiny? So that's where we're going and so we are going back to the garden in a certain sense. The image of God is in us, it's been marred because of sin. We are going back to becoming like Christ. Now we are built in the image of Christ is what I'm suggesting. Therefore there is compatibility.

O. Implications of the Image of God in humankind [61:48-64:22]

Now I want to raise a couple of other things here. There are some implications to this that are really wonderful. Look into the future. 1 John 3:2 talks about the image going into the future. "But we know that when he [that is, Jesus], appears, we shall be like him." When Jesus appears, will there be a transformation in our bodies? "We shall be like him for we shall see him as he is. Everyone who has this hope in him" does what?-- "purifies himself." Does the hope of Christ's return purify us? Do we purify ourselves waiting in the hope of Christ's return?

Do you know someone who has lived in light of the coming of Christ? My father

was old; I remember him when I was young going to the window and he would go to the window almost on a daily basis. He would go to the window, he would look out the window and he'd say: "You know, Jesus may be coming back today." Did that shape his life? You better believe it did. Did he love my mother because Christ may be coming back today? He probably loved my mother for other reasons too. Did he love my mother? Yes. Did my father try to be the best father he could be because what? Christ may be coming back today and I have to face my Maker. So you got a really beautiful thing there that transforms and gives hope. What I'm trying to suggest is does hope transform who you are?

Let's suppose my wife is a CPA now. Suppose you guys are going to become CPAs. If you start to become a CPA at Gordon College and you take all these courses, will your hope of becoming a CPA shape how you learn and what you learn because of your hope? You hope that you are going to be able to do something or have this kind of vocation or career. So you shape your studies to do that. Does hope shape who you become? What he's saying is we have this hope that Christ will come back and when we see him we will be like him. The image of God in us will be renewed and we will be made right, we will be purified in his sight when Jesus comes back. Is that a big hope? That's a big hope, someday we're going to see Jesus and he's going to transform us into his image.

P. Image in Others [64:23-72:42]

Now, there are some other things here too. C.S Lewis's book *Weight of Glory* I think deals with this. Can you see the image of God in other people? Can you see the image of God in people you dislike? Are they made in the image of God? Is there goodness? Is God's goodness embedded in every individual in one way or another? Is it possible they can be a really evil person? But are they still made in the image of God.

I want to give two examples of this and I'm going to walk over here because I want to get away from the Bible on these examples because they bring back bad memories for me. Once upon a time I went to a place called Grand Island High School. There was a girl in Grand Island High School called Mabeline. Mabeline was, I don't

know how to say this, she was the most homely girl at the high school. It was like you didn't want to sit or be by her because you would get whatever she's got and you don't want that. It's like cooties or whatever it was. So everybody abstained from Mabeline because she's one of the untouchables. Did everybody in the school mock this poor girl out? Actually it was so pathetic that after a while they didn't even mock her out. But nobody wanted to be around Mabeline. Question: was Mabeline made in the image of God? Yes. To treat her like that, was that appropriate? I wish I was sharper. I was not. I didn't do any of the cruel stuff to Mabeline but I didn't do anything to reverse it either. What should I have done as a Christian? Is it possible I should have befriended her and made her feel the image of God in her and brought that out. I was not smart enough to do that when I was a young kid and I'm ashamed of that, it was bad. We had a reunion at Grand Island High School. This was many years later. Kevin Carr, a guy who I went to high school with said: "Hey ,Ted, do you remember Mabeline?" Who could forget Mabeline? There was only one Mabeline in the school. "Mabeline has become a Christian. She's a sister in Christ now." When Kevin told me, I thought "holy cow." Christian people should treat all people with dignity and respect.

Now let me go on to another example. Once upon a time, my wife and I went to a concert. It was a Michael Card concert. He was a guy after the Civil War, who used to sing Bible songs. So we got some free tickets because Anita, a girl who stayed at our house all the time, and she ate our food, she lived with us basically. She was with this WDCX, a Christian radio station. So she got free tickets. We got to sit in the booth with all the privileged people. So it was all, this red rope and roped off section. So we pranced down and she lifted up the rope and we got to sit right in front. Michael Card was doing a concert here and there was a big old speaker here. My wife hates loud music and I'm sitting in front of the speaker. I like it loud because I can't hear. Anyway, so I'm sitting in front of the speaker and I'm saying this is going to be a great concert. He's about, I'm talking 15 feet from us. So we are sitting down there and I'm thinking, "man, these are special seats." Whenever I go to a concert, I'm usually sit way in the back and I have to use binoculars. So this time we're right on top.

So I'm sitting there in the seats right basically about there and all of a sudden this guy comes walking in. He lifts up the rope and he sits down next to me. I think, "This guy is a big shot, you know they're all big shots down here where we were sitting. He then proceeds to take off his shoes and with his stalking feet, he puts his foot right here. They were theater seats, he puts one of his feet there on the seat in front of him and one of his feet there. There is this lady, her hair is all done up and she's really all decked out, and this lady's got this guy's two stalking feet like six inches from her nose either way she turns. Everybody starts going: this is getting a little weird, I've never seen it that bad before. So anyways, Anita pops up then because she knows the guy shouldn't have been sitting there. So she runs around and comes down the side. She comes in and starts talking to the guy. Now Anita you'd have to know this girl is tough. I don't know how to describe her. This girl has seen a lot of life. I'm talking a lot of major stuff. She's a tough girl. She comes down, talks to the guy. I don't know what the guy said to her but all of a sudden she just starts backing up like this and she walked away. I thought, "Holy cow, I had never seen her act like that before." I don't know what he said but I have never seen her back off like that before. She's a pretty aggressive young woman. So she comes back around, sits down.

Then I start talking to the guy and the guy starts telling me his story. He was in this laundry mat and 40 guys jumped him. He's got a third degree black belt and he just blew all 40 guys away. So I'm talking with this guy and my wife meanwhile leans over to Anita and says: "It's okay, Ted talks real well with people like this." So I was thinking: 40 guys, third degree black belt. Turns out my son and I were at that time working on our black belts. He's third degree, this should be interesting and so he continues talking. He runs computers out of his head. He did 20 computers at a time. He doesn't use a keyboard, mouse or anything or even speech. He runs them out of his head, 20 computers at a time. So he's going off and the stories are getting a little stranger and stranger.

So meanwhile, at intermission, what happens, all the people take off, they are all gone. I stayed there and talked to the guy through intermission. They come back, we sit down and finish the concert out.

At the end of the concert, obviously, does this guy have problems? Yes. So I stand up and I said, “I want to feel your power” because he was telling me about all his power. So I said, “I want to feel your power.” So this guy gives me a bear hug and starts squeezing me. I’m figuring out what I’m going to do if it gets bad. I can take care of myself, I’m a big boy. He starts squeezing me and I said, “I want to feel your power.” So he starts really squeezing down on me. Then he made a mistake, he tried to pick me up. He picks me up off the ground and his back goes out. He goes, “Oh, my back, my back.” Just like that, all of a sudden all the mythology of this grandiose fantasy was gone. Poor dude hurt his back. I mean, I didn’t try to do that.

I ask you this, was he made in the image of God? Should I have treated him with dignity and respect? Yes. Did you know that night God showed me in small ways what I should be doing with my life. God used that guy to communicate his will for my life. What’s God’s will? That guy helped me sort that out. What I want to say is I praise God for that guy. What I’m saying is be careful, God speaks through all different types of people. Somebody I know now that they are around homeless people all the time and it’s kind of like they walk around homeless people all yucky all these homeless people. You know one of those homeless people could be Jesus? They could be an angel for all you know. So what I’m saying is, when you see people do you look at them with dignity and respect even though they are in the plights of life. God can use those people to speak through you and to you. What I’m saying is: treat all people with honor and dignity.

The image of God by the way, is this a little thing or is this a big thing? This is a big idea. What I’m saying is the image should allow us to connect to others across all sorts of boundaries for we look and we see the glory of God in other people. And even, by the way, is it possible that another person can’t even see it in themselves? Can you bring that out? This is our gift.

God told us, we are made in God’s image and that we can become more like God when we see that image in other people by giving them the glory and dignity that they may never have had from their father, their mother, anybody. We can give them the dignity and respect for being made in the image of God. It’s wonderful. This is really

important stuff. This is a big deal. People are made in the image of God, that's a big thing.

Q. Tree of Life [72:43-77:32]

Now, let me jump over to one more topic we want to hit here: the tree of life. Let's try to go through this quickly. I'll tell you what, do you guys want to stand up? Why don't we run thorough the Bible-robics just to get some breath in you guys.

I just want to cover the two trees and we will be done for the day. The tree of life, what is the function of this tree of life in the Garden of Eden? You have the tree of life described there. How would they have known what the tree of life was? Would they have known what death was? If you understand death, than you know life is the contrast to that. But what if you never really experienced death?

Is it possible that there was death before the fall into sin? Is it possible that the animals died before there was sin, before the fall? Now this is something to think about. I don't have an answer on this but I had a professor once who spun my head with it and I still don't know the answer. Is it possible that before the fall? Did amoebas eat other things? Did little critters, did bacteria eat things? Did lions eat stuff before the fall? Did lions eat other animals? So what I'm suggesting is: is it possible that there was animal death before the fall and that Adam and Eve knew what death was because they saw it in the animal world although they had not experienced it themselves? I don't know. So anyway just put that in the back of your minds, it's possible maybe. Some people think that there was animal death before the fall and that's how Adam and Eve would have known this. Then with the fall you get human death. Yes, did you have a question? (student speaks) Does everybody see that she's taking a different tact? It's interesting. She's saying they would have known dust, to dust you should return because you came from the dust. But when did that dust return? When were they told that? Later in chapter three, but maybe they knew that earlier, but we have to project that back.

Now let's think about some other things here with this tree. Does Genesis 2:16 imply that they could eat of the tree of life before the fall? In Genesis 2:16 it says, "and the Lord commanded man, 'You are free to eat from any tree in the garden.'" Except how

many, one or two? One. “You are free to eat from any tree in the garden, but you must not eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.” Does that imply then that they could actually eat from the tree of life? Yes. It implies that they could eat from the tree of life. The one tree that they couldn’t eat was the tree of knowledge of good and evil. So this is interesting.

By the way, what happens when they sin? They get kicked out of the garden. God throws them out of the garden after they sin. In chapter 3 verse 22 it says this: “and the Lord said, the man has now become like one of us, knowing good and evil. He must not be allowed to reach out his hand and take from the tree of life and eat and live forever.” So Adam and Eve are kicked out of the garden so they would not have access to what tree? The tree of life. So the tree of life is removed from humankind at this point when they get kicked out of the garden.

Now what’s really interesting to me is Revelation 22. When New Jerusalem comes down and the waters go out, guess what tree reappears in the New Jerusalem? The tree of life reappears on both sides of the river giving fruit in twelve seasons. There are twelve so it’s giving fruit every month of the year and the leaves were for the healing of the nations. Is the tree of life still around? Somewhere, not here. When the New Jerusalem comes down the tree of life is there and we get to participate in it. So, in other words, the tree of life is still there and the book of Revelation has it. By the way, does the Bible begin with this tree of life, and after the fall we are cut off from the tree of life. You see that the rest of the Bible basically gets us back to the tree of life. That’s kind of interesting. The Bible begins and ends with this tree of life.

R. 3 Views of the Tree of Life [77:33-80:12]

Now, here are three views of the tree of life. Some people think that the tree of life was a magical thing. You chomp on the fruit and you live forever. Does the Bible do much with magic? No, actually there are miracles in the Bible. But the miracles are usually there for a purpose. There is a reason, it’s not just magic. So this magical view I think is down the tubes.

Some people think it was more like health food. In other words, it was the perfect kind of food that was balanced. If you ate from this tree of life, it was the perfect food combination. It was like walnuts, a lot of omega 3s. So eat a lot of walnuts and you will live forever. I'm just kidding. Walnuts are good for you. Perfect health food, does it really seem like the perfect health food when you're reading the Genesis context on this? No, again it doesn't seem correct.

Here's a suggestion, it's the one that I buy and that I think is interesting. The tree of life was a sacrament. That is by eating the fruit it didn't give you the nourishment to live forever but the tree of life was like a sacrament. When I say sacrament, what comes to your mind? Sacrament is the Lord's Supper, the Eucharist. In the Lord's Supper, the Eucharist, you take a cup and this cup is my what? It's my blood of the New Covenant. Question, is it really his blood? No, you drink it, it's grape juice or wine or I've had apple juice sometimes, even Kool-Aid one time. I don't recommend the Kool-Aid as there are enough Kool-Aid drinkers in this world. Let me get back. The cup stands for the blood of Christ. The cracker, you break the cracker (unleavened bread). "This is my body, which was broken for you," that kind of thing. So the bread stands for his body, which is broken, the blood from the cup of juice. So they stand for something. By the way, can you violate those images? Remember in 1 Corinthians he says: "don't eat the Lord's Supper unworthily." He doesn't want the images violated. So I wonder if the tree of life stands for right life and right relationship with God and that it is taken as a sacrament. Now you have life with God forever and so it's taken like a sacrament. Rather than the food that actually nourishes your body to live forever, it's taken in a sacramental way. Does that make sense? I like that. It makes a lot of sense of a lot of things. So I take it as sacrament.

S. Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil [80:13-84:17]

Now, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is a little tricky. How would Adam and Eve know what evil was? If somebody has experienced only good and never evil, what do we call that kind of a person? Blessed, right? We would actually have used

the term “naïve”? What were you going to say? (student speaks) Ignorant. I want to put a better face on this. Actually, that’s probably what went through my head too but I want to use the word “naïve.” Is naïve a little better? In other words, a person is naïve, if they have never experienced evil and you know how that goes.

So what did “evil” mean for Adam and Eve before the fall? Why would God put this tree in the garden? This is tree of knowledge of good and evil. Why was it put in the garden anyway? I’ve got a couple of suggestions here. One is that I think choice is necessary for one to be a moral agent. If a moral agent never makes a choice, are they really a moral agent? Do you see the importance of making a choice? So the tree is put there because human beings needed to make a choice.

Is that one of the problems of college? Is it possible to study all sorts of things theoretically in college? Is it a very different thing to actually make a choice? To choose something, it’s very different. Is it possible to talk about war at Gordon College? Is it possible to talk about killing someone else at Gordon College in a theoretical way? Is it very different for my son to go to Afghanistan and have to decide whether he’s going to pull the trigger to end somebody’s life? What I’m saying is: all this college stuff kind of fades away when there is an actual decision to do something. Be careful that you don’t start thinking: because you know how to deal with things theoretically, you know life and what I’m saying is “no.” College is built for this and it’s good but you have to know when you actually make decisions in real life it’s very different. You have the consequences; you’ll have all sorts of things going on. So be careful about college, it can go to your head sometimes and that’s bad.

But making choices, do you need to make actual choices to determine your moral agency? Yes. Here’s another one that I think is important in terms of choice and love. Did God make us so that we had to love him or did God give us a choice? God gave us a choice. What I’m saying is: would you like to marry somebody who is forced to marry you and they didn’t have a choice. They had to marry you. Do you want to love someone who chooses to love you? Does that choice of someone to choose to love you, does that mean a whole lot? Yes. So my guess is that God says, “I’m not going to force them to

love me. They get to make that choice. Will they love me or not?” What did human kind do? Now you say, “I don’t want to love you.” By the way, has anybody ever told you that? Have you ever gone out with a girl and she dumps you? Does that hurt bad? Have you ever been out, girl’s been out with a guy and the guy just dumps the girl? How does that make you feel? Do those rejections hurt at the core of your being? Now God basically is told by man what? “Hey, we don’t want you. We’re going to choose our own way.”

Question, does that hurt God? By the way, does the Bible describe God being hurt like that? Yes, Isaiah chapter one. Ezekiel is the worst. In Ezekiel 16, God describes his own hurt being rejected by Israel after having helped them and helped them and nurtured them and loved them and all they do is kick him between the legs. That’s kind of a summary of the imagery there. So choice and love seem to be involved.

T. The Serpent speaks the truth?—Genesis 3 [84:18-88:40]

Does the serpent speak the truth? What I’m going to suggest to you is that the serpent speaks the truth. Now you say, “Wait a minute Hildebrandt.” Let’s read this. It says, “Now the serpent,” Genesis chapter 3, verses 1 and following: “Now the serpent was more crafty than any of the wild animals the Lord had made.” The word “crafty” can be translated as “shrewd.” I like “shrewd” better. “He said to the woman: did God really say you must not eat from any tree of the garden? The woman said to the serpent: we may eat of the fruit from the trees in the garden but God did say you must not eat from the fruit from the tree that is in the middle of the garden. You must not touch it or you will die. You will not surely die, the serpent said. For God knows that when you eat it, your eyes will be opened.” Question, when they ate it, does it say that their eyes were opened? Yes it does. Is Satan telling the truth? Yes, the serpent is telling the truth. Let me finish this: “your eyes will be opened and you will be like God.” Does God in chapter 3 verse 22 say: “the man has now become like one of us.” “Your eyes will be opened, you will become like God and you will know good and evil.” God says, “man is now become like us, knowing good and evil.” Does Satan tell the truth?

Let me just tell you a story: once upon a time my daughter played basketball in

sixth grade, she played with this other girl. This other girl lied all the time. No, seriously, she lied to everybody about things that didn't even matter. Did everybody in the school know that this girl was a liar? Everybody knew it. Question, did she ever fake anybody out or did everybody expect her to lie? Everybody expected it out of her. The only person she really fooled was who? Herself. She thought she had everybody faked out. Everybody knew what she was up to. Is Satan always a liar?

Does Satan quote Scripture? When Satan comes after Jesus in the temptation in the wilderness, does Satan quote scripture? He takes Christ up to the pinnacle and says, "throw yourself down, for the Psalm says, 'His angels will bear you up.'" Satan is quoting Scripture. Are scriptures true? Yes, does Satan speak the truth? Now let me just tell you a secret about rat poison. When you put out rat poison, you put it in good hamburger. Now is that hamburger good hamburger that you could eat? Ninety-nine percent of it is good hamburger. But what's the problem? It's one percent poison, the rat eats it and what gets it? The one percent. The other ninety nine percent is that good healthy hamburger? Yes.

What I'm saying is a person that tells the truth, tells the truth, tells the truth and with a small lie, is that the one that fools people? With Satan, he tells the truth, the truth, the truth. Question, in the midst of the truth, does he have embedded a wicked lie that will destroy them? So what I'm saying is be careful. Is Satan an angel of light or is he Darth Vader that's always evil? Is Satan an angel of light? Does he deceive people by telling them the truth but then amidst that truth is embedded this lie. So what I'm saying is Satan is really subtle, shrewd, and tricky. He is very evil because what happens is he embeds evil in things like the truth. He embeds evil in things like righteousness, goodness, and all those things but in the inside there's this thing that's devastating.

So with the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, Satan comes in this positive way. I'll tell you what we'll do next time: how did Adam and Eve become more like God in their experience of evil? Then how did they get destroyed and cursed by it? So we'll look at that next time. So take care and we'll see you on Thursday.

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt teaching Old Testament History Literature and Theology.
Lecture number six on genealogy not equal to chronology, the image of God, and the two trees in the Garden of Eden.

Transcribed by Allana Notaro
Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt-2

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit. and Theology, Lecture 7[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in Old Testament History, Literature and Theology, Lecture 7 on Genesis 3, the Fall and Genesis chapter 4 on Cain and Abel narrative.

A. Review and Preview [0:00-1:46]

For next week you guys are looking at the book of Leviticus which will be some work for you. There are two articles now. All this material is on the web as usual, just go to the web and the two articles are there. There is some reading in Dr. Wilson's book *Our Father Abraham* with the two articles and then select chapters in Leviticus. I selected out ones that I think will be the most meaningful for you from the book of Leviticus. Next week we'll be finishing up memorizing Psalm 23 "The Lord is my shepherd." So that's coming.

We want to jump back in, and I want to get out of the Garden of Eden. A guest comes here and I thought it would have been so nice if we could have been with Abraham walking in the land of Palestine. He asks where are you in the course, and you say, "Well were still in the Garden of Eden," and so we'll try to work at that. Last time we talked about the serpent and the serpent speaking the truth to the woman but yet lying at the same time. Also, we talked about the deceptiveness and subtleness of the serpent. We noted basically that the serpent said that they would become more like God. God himself in chapter 3.22 says that, "Now the man [humans], have become like us knowing good and evil." So apparently Satan was correct in that analysis.

B. Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil: God, us and evil [1:47-5:25]

What I want to do today is to ask: How did Adam and Eve become more like God by eating the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil? I want to work first of all with this: do you know the difference between objective knowledge and subjective knowledge? Objective knowledge is knowledge of good outside of you. Subjective knowledge is knowledge of good inside yourself (subjective meaning inside yourself).

There's objective – outside, and subjective – inside. Did God have knowledge of good outside of himself? He looked at all of creation and he proclaimed it was good (*tov*) and after its completion *tov me'od*, very good. So there was good, outside of himself. I want to acknowledge that God has knowledge of good outside of himself. Does God have subjective knowledge inside himself? Yes. Does God know evil? If God doesn't know any evil, then he is naive. God is not naive. God knows evil, but is it inside God or outside of himself? Now, does he experience evil inside of himself? No, we say God is perfect, good, righteous, and holy--so, no. So that's the knowledge structure I wanted to look at with God.

Now let's look at Adam and Eve before they're tempted. Did Adam and Eve have knowledge of good outside of themselves before the fall? Adam and Eve had objective knowledge of good outside of themselves. Did Adam and Eve know goodness inside of themselves prior to the fall? Yes, they knew God had made them good, and so they had subjective knowledge of good. Before the temptation, did they know evil in any way? No. So are they like God or unlike God at this point? They are unlike God because they have no external objective experience of evil.

At the point of temptation, this is before they actually participated, at the point that Satan says "Hey, eat the fruit." They gain objective knowledge of evil outside of themselves. They experience it in the serpent. At this point, did they become more like God? Here is the lie, because not only did they gain this objective knowledge, but also when they ate of the fruit, what did they gain? Subjective knowledge of evil. Is this the lie? Yes. The serpent/Satan gets them to participate in the evil. So, in one sense, did they go beyond where God was in terms of their participation and evil? Yes. They do become more like God knowing good and evil at this point, but the problem is they go beyond God and participate in the evil. So, that is one way to look at this.

C. Process of Temptation [5:26-8:19]

I want to walk through the process of the temptation and do this rather quickly. In Genesis 3.6 it says this, "Now the serpent was more crafty than any of the wild animals

the Lord God had made. The woman said to the serpent, ‘We may eat of any fruit of the tree in the garden, but God did say that we must not eat from the fruit of the tree in the middle of the garden.’” Going down to verse 5 the Serpent says, “But God knows that when you eat of it, that your eyes will be opened and you will be like God, knowing good from evil.” This is the temptation process. Let’s break it down. “When the woman saw the fruit of the tree was good for food.” I want to call that was “the lust of the flesh.” What I want to do is compare these two verses. 1 John 2.16, “All that is in the world – the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes and the pride of life” lists those three things. It lists three things and the same three things that are in 1 John 2.16 exactly fits here in Genesis 3. First, there is the lust of the flesh: it's good for food. The “lust of the eyes” the Bible says “it was pleasing to the eye.” The fruit looked really good. Then the pride of life comes in and, check this out, it is used “for gaining wisdom.” It was fruit for gaining wisdom. How many of you would pay for that? You eat the fruit and you get wise. It would save you from going to college. You could go to the dining hall and eat the fruit and you would become wise. There’s a connection of wisdom with this fruit. There are a lot of wisdom motifs in Genesis 3. So the same pattern then is found in the 1 John 2 process of temptation: the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life as in the temptation with the serpent in Gen 3.

Now what happens? Man’s dilemma, is it different than the woman’s? Satan speaks directly to her; she dialogues with the serpent. Adam’s dilemma, I want to suggest, is different. What is the only thing that Adam has ever experienced that he knows is not good? Adam has experienced “not good.” “It’s not good for man to be alone.” Did he know that? Yes. He had that experience and that was why Eve was made. Now what’s he facing? Adam’s temptation is different because Adam is now facing the fact that Eve has eaten the fruit. If Adam says, “No, I don’t want the fruit,” what is he again? He is now by himself again, alone. She had eaten the fruit and has participated in evil, so Adam’s temptation is different. However, she gives him the fruit and Adam eats. So now they’re the same, but they’re still tempted differently.

D. Results of the Fall [8:20-18:10]

Now here are the results of the fall. Are there consequences to human actions and choices? What makes a difference between a sixteen-year-old kid and a twenty-two year old? Let me use my son. What's the difference between my son when he was sixteen year old and at age twenty-two? As a 16 year old did he think that he could do things in life and that there would be no consequences? A young person does things and thinks, "I can do it and can get away with it" or "there will be no consequences" or "I can overcome the consequences." So, at sixteen, he thought there were no consequences. In his case, he joined the Marines, much to his mother's chagrin and mine, and went off to Afghanistan and he's been to Iraq. One of his friends was shot dead; another was shot through the neck. They were good friends. His friend is on YouTube actually. He survived the shot through the neck and he's got a patch and we saw him running to the Medivac helicopter. He survived a shot through the neck. It missed the artery by about a millimeter. My son when he was sixteen was immortal, he could do anything without consequences. At twenty-two, does he now know what mortality is and that he could die? Yes, he does. Does that change the way that he looks at life? Yes, because now he understands this: act and consequence. Are actions connected to consequences? Is that the difference between someone who's sixteen and now, in his case, twenty-two? Although when I talk to him it feels like I'm talking to an old man at twenty-two, it's pretty pathetic, because he has seen so much of life, too much.

So what I'm suggesting here is that this connection between act and consequence is really big in Scripture. By the way, we won't be doing much with the book of Proverbs but if I were to summarize the whole book of Proverbs, Proverbs is largely telling the young person that actions and character are connected with consequences. Actions and character lead to consequences. So we see this concept now. There are consequences.

Adam and Eve sin, they are adults, and there are consequences. What happens here is that there are consequences between God and man. Man goes into hiding. Where does he hide? He hides in the bushes. So God comes walking, and asks, "Where are

you?” They answered, “I heard you walking in the garden and I was afraid.” Notice man’s response to God now is one of fear. But remember the fear of God is what? Now you say, “But fear does not really mean fear.” Oh, really? Is that true? So we have to have a big discussion about what it means to fear God. That’s coming. But here man is hiding in fear and shame. So what happens is he says, “I hid because I was naked.”

God said, “Who told you that you were naked? Have you eaten from the tree that I commanded you not to eat from?” The man courageously says, “I did it. It was I. Don’t blame her. It was wrong. I deserve to die, don’t blame her.” No, okay, this is the first man, he goes, check this out it is pretty pathetic, the man said to God – “the woman that you put here with me she gave the fruit to me and I ate of the tree.” So what does God do? “The Lord says to the woman ‘What is this you have done?’” And the woman says, “Not me, not me, it was the serpent!” So then God goes, “Serpent, let’s start with you.” So God moves from the man to the woman and finally to the serpent. The serpent then gets the first curse.

Let me go back to finish this out now. What you have now is the separation between God and his people. God with his people is this concept here. Do you know what this word means? “Immanuel.” You see the word “El” on the end, it means “God” in Hebrew. Immanuel means “God with us.” What happens is God is with them in the garden walking with them and talking with them. God is with his people, but now that they have sinned there is a separation where human beings go into hiding. So what happens? What you’re going to find in Scripture is, God now goes to absconditus. In other words, there is the hidden God now rather than the God that is with you in the garden. Now, God is hidden. Man hid from him. Does anybody remember, when you guys read Exodus, do the people see God on the mountain and the mountain is shaking at Mount Sinai, the people are what? Do they say, “God show yourself,” or do they say, “That’s enough, back off.” So God basically has gone into this absconditus or hidden state around humankind. By the way, what does the rest of Scripture do? Does the rest of the Bible from Genesis 1-3 tell us how God comes back to be with his people? Jesus then, “He shall be called Jesus because he shall save his people from his sins.” And he is

called what? “Immanuel” – God with us. Then Jesus goes back, now the Spirit dwells in us. Ultimately, Christ comes back and gathers us to be with him: “and so we shall be with the Lord forever.”

So ultimately all of Scripture, all of it is pointing forward to the time when human beings will come back to be with God. God is redemptively working out the details of what happened in Genesis 3. What happened in Genesis 3? The rest of the Bible is this great redemptive work of God by which God redeems his people. He comes in the Tabernacle. Where does he dwell? You say, “Hildebrandt, you skipped those tabernacle chapters so we didn’t read it.” In the tabernacle God is dwelling in the midst of his people. When Solomon builds the temple, what happens? The shekinah glory, the “glory cloud,” comes down and God dwells with his people. With Jesus we now have God in flesh with his people. So the rest of Scripture is going to be this God absconditus, the hidden, becoming Immanuel--God with his people again. This draws us ultimately to be with God forever and ever. Does the Garden of Eden begin the Bible, but does the garden of Eden also end the Bible where we are back again in God’s presence in the end? Is that the great hope? Are Christians hopeful people? “Oh, everything is going wrong in the world and this place is going to blow up.” Question: are Christian people hopeful? Yes, because we look forward to a day when we will live with God forever and the Garden of Eden is revisited.

What else happens here? Are human beings affected by the sin? We know that human beings die. What does the Bible say: “the wages of sin is death.” So coming out of the sins of the garden humankind dies. Is it only human kind that has been affected by the fall into sin? The Bible says, “No, all of nature, all of creation,” Romans 8.22, says “all of creation groans waiting for the coming day of redemption.” The creation itself groans waiting for this great redemptive act of God to happen. How does creation groan? You’ve got famines, tsunamis, earthquakes, plagues, disease, cancer and all these bad things happening. Nature itself is waiting for the coming day when things will be made right. Have some of you realized how messed up things are in the world and have you

realized a longing for things to be made right? Someday this thing is going to be made right and it will make sense. All the things that are wrong are going to be made right and we long for that and we, along with creation, groan for that. That is what this verse is talking about in Romans “all of creation groans waiting for that coming day of redemption.”

What happens to people as far as our bodies? They go from dust and then return to death. “From dust you are, to dust you shall return.” There is a toll paid in the body. By the way, when Jesus rises from the dead, does only his spirit raise from the dead? Or, does he rise body and all? He rises in the body as evidenced by “put your finger in my side” and so on and so forth. Does our body get raised? Yes. We are raised from the dead, including our body, all of us.

Man and woman have conflict and blame. Man starts blaming woman, woman blames man, but in this context the man blames the woman. Is Adam a stand up guy? No, the guy blames his wife. That’s a good move I’ve done it many times. I don’t fault the guy (actually I do). So the movement is one of conflict and blaming. I want to develop this theme by coming in the back door.

E. Curses of Genesis 3: the curse of the Serpent [18:11-23:30]

So let’s go through the curses. We’ll start with the serpent and work down from there to the woman. What does God do? Adam blames the woman and the woman blames the serpent. God starts with the serpent and then moves back to the woman and ultimately moves back to the man.

The serpent comes and God says to him in chapter 3.14, “So God said to the serpent, ‘Because you have done this, cursed are you above you above all livestock and all the wild animals; you will crawl on your belly and eat dust.’” By the way, is there a play on this word “dust”? What’s Adam’s name? He’s called *Adam* because he’s taken from the *adamah* [dust]. So his name is “Dusty.” What does the serpent eat? Dust. Is there a play on this dust? Is Adam/Dusty going to go back to the dust? That’s his death. So there’s a cycle going on.

To be honest with you was Adam's name really "Adam?" You realize Adam's name was not Adam as sure as I'm standing here. Eve's name was not Eve. The Hebrew language was not in existence before 2000 B.C. So Adam's name would have been in some other language. But would his name still mean "Dusty." The meaning of the name was probably still the same, but the Hebrew language did not exist back before 2000 B.C. So you have to be careful. Is the guy's name really Peter or is it something else when you go between languages.

How was Jesus's name pronounced? Jesus's name is pronounced *Yehsus* in Greek. Now Jesus' name in Hebrew would be, see if you recognize this name: "Joshua." His name was *Jehoshua*, can you hear Joshua. It means "Jehovah saves." He is named "Jesus because he will save his people from their sins." It takes the meaning of his name, even though it's Joshua, and comes over in the Greek as "Yehsus." So there are name changes between languages.

Let's get back to the serpent. The serpent eats dust. Genesis 3.15 is one of the really significant verses in the Bible. This is a really important verse. Some of the controversy on the date and age of the earth, as you realize, these questions are not that important because the Bible does not really say. But Genesis 3.15 does say some very interesting things. God says, to the serpent "Ok, serpent you're going to move on your belly and eat dust." It also says, "I will put enmity between you and the woman, between your offspring and hers. He [who is this "he"?] will crush your head." Who will crush the head of the serpent? Don't go to Jesus quite yet. Who in the context here is this "he," in this context? It's the offspring of the woman. "I will put enmity between you and the woman between your offspring," the sons of Satan, and the offspring of the woman. The offspring of the woman will crush your head, and the serpent will strike his heel. So, what you have in this passage is this "proto-evangelium." Proto means "first." So proto-evangelium means "the first gospel." So what God says in this first curse on Satan and the serpent, he says it's going to be through the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent that there will be enmity, there is going to be conflict there. The seed of the

woman, one of the woman's descendants will crush the head of the serpent. Who is the one who is coming to crush the serpent's head. It will be Jesus who does this. Some people take this, as I do, as the first message of the gospel to say that through this woman, the hope is that the serpent will be defeated, that the descendants of Satan will be defeated. It would be through the woman's seed that this is going to happen. This means then there is hope. Right from the first curse, there's hope that Satan is not going to triumph, that death and the dust will not triumph, but that the woman's seed will crush his head. So there is hope right here in this curse on the serpent and Satan.

F. Curse on the Woman [23:31-45:56]

Moving on to the woman. "He said to the woman, I will greatly increase your pains in childbearing and with pain you will give birth to children." I do not know this by personal experience, but I have witnessed it. It was one of the most neat things in my life. I have four children and a grandson and I've witnessed the birth of all four of my children. Is there pain in childbearing? Yes.

On the last child, the one I've told you about, Elliott, who went into the Marines [infantry]. When Elliott was born he didn't come really on time. So we're in there. I'm up at the head of my wife and you do this breathing. This is really old stuff now. So I start the breathing routine. The nurse is down there. I'm thinking, where is the doctor? The doctor is not here. The nurse looks at me and says "hey, you're a doctor aren't you? I need help down here." I said "Lady, I'm a doctor but not that type of doctor. I do the breathing. I can do this really well." I start making all these excuses, I'm really getting nervous. If she asks me to go down there I'm going to faint. I do this end here I don't do that end there. She says, "get down here right now. The baby's coming I need help right now." There's no doctor. Holy cow, I didn't pass out. I helped deliver Elliott and maybe that's what's wrong with him. This is on tape too. Sorry Elliott. But actually I helped deliver Elliott our fourth child. He was fine. A half hour later the doctor comes strutting in there and it's like, "where were you?" Do you know what was worse? The dude charged me 1200-1500 bucks and I'm saying wait a minute I delivered the baby I'm

going to send you a bill buddy. Actually he is a personal friend and a good doctor but he showed up half-an-hour late was a problem.

Where are you going with this? So my wife is there; I'm a Christian and the Bible says "She shall have pain in childbearing." So here's my point. If I say, "my wife has to suffer pain in childbearing because she's a Christian and the Bible says she shall have pain in childbearing," is that okay? That's ridiculous. Do we fight against the curse? Yes. We give her anesthesia to fight against the curse. Guys, we go to death, what do we say? "God cursed us to die, so we should just give up." No, we fight against the curse. So, we fight against the curse. Woman shall have pain in childbearing, do you give her anesthesia, do you fight against the curse? Yes, you do. You fight against the curse. You fight against the curse that's why God loves the Red Sox. Guys, if you get married make sure you're at the birth of your children because it will be the most wonderful thing in your life. It's really important to your wife too.

So there's her pain and something else happens here and this is really tricky. We fight against the curse, and listen to this. What does Genesis 3.16 mean? It says this: "your desire will be for your husband, [this is part of the woman's curse] and he will rule over you." This is part of the woman's curse. What is the "woman's desire"? "The woman will desire her husband, but he will rule over her." So the big question in this very tricky verse, is what is the "woman's desire"? What does Genesis 3.16 mean?

Now first of all, she will desire her husband sexually and he will say "back, back" and put the brakes on. I just want to say that's not realistic. That's not what usually happens in marriage and I've got 36 years in marriage. Does it mean she will desire her husband sexually? This is not usually what happens in marriage, at least from my experience.

Other people suggest that her desire will be for her husband, that is, she will desire to be subservient to her husband and that he will rule over her. I'm married to one of the nicest women in the world. She's wonderfully kind, caring and gentle person; is her desire to be subservient to her husband. Yeah, right. So I question the reality of that. In

order to graduate from Gordon College you've got to see Fiddler on the Roof. If you don't Dr. Wilson pops you with that air-gun on the way out. You've got to see Fiddler on the Roof. This is just a Hildebrandt thing and I don't count for much here. There is movie that I think is really significant. I teach Greek on the side too. It is called "My Big Fat Greek Wedding." It is legitimate. I've got a friend who is totally Greek and he said that movie describes it to a "T." The husband comes in, "The Husband is the head of the family." And two women are over on the side. Unfortunately my wife and I were watching it together. The Husband comes in, "The husband is the head of the home." The wife turns over and she's got a younger woman that she is trying to mentor. And she says "Yes, dear, the husband is the head of the home." Then she turns aside to the girl and says, "Yes, the husband is the head of the home but the wife is the neck and turns the head wherever she wants it." I look at my wife and it's over what can I say. There's truth to that. So this idea that it would be a curse that the woman would desire to be subservient doesn't fit well either. So, this second option for the meaning of the woman desiring her husband also is probably not that likely.

There was a woman from Westminster Seminary who wrote an article concerning the meaning of the "desire of the woman," and she brilliantly noticed that the exact same literary phrase was used in Genesis 4.7. Now what I want to do is comment on: how to interpret passages that are difficult? What is the woman's desire? This is a difficult passage. Hermeneutics is how you interpret Scripture. If you have one passage that you know what it means, you should work from the known to the unknown. If you don't know what something is, you should look at other places where it may be more clear, and you bring the clear to bear on the less clear. This is a methodology. So she looked over in chapter 4.7, that's the Cain and Able story. It's the same exact structure. God comes to Cain and says this, "and if you do what is right Cain, will you not be accepted? But, if you do not do what is right, [now this is it] sin is crouching at the door; it [sin] desires to have you [Cain], but you must rule over it." Is that pretty clear? Sin is crouching at the door like a lion ready to devour Cain, but he must hold it in place? Does sin master Cain? Yes, he killed his brother.

What is this saying about the relationship between men and women? “Her desire will be for her husband,” as sin desires to overpower Cain, so the woman will desire to overpower her husband. The husband then must rule over her. So what you’ve got is there’s a power struggle and conflict in marriage and this is part of the curse. Do you fight against the curse or do you give in to it? Do you simply accept this or do you fight against the curse. I want to discuss how we fight against this.

Is there going to be a power struggle in marriage? I’ve been around for a while, and I’ve seen many other marriages. My daughter just got married Labor Day weekend I zipped over to Ohio and then drove back on Monday which is why I was so tired in class. My daughter married a guy who is a lawyer, a University of Chicago lawyer. Does he argue in his marriage with my daughter? Does he use logical arguments just like he would argue a case in front of a court? The problem is my daughter is very bright, brighter than her father. Does she argue back to him? They get in this escalating argument. He jacks it up because he doesn’t want to lose the case. If you’re a lawyer you’ve got to know when to chill out. So he applies these arguments. But what is the problem, my daughter never loses. So she jacks up the argument. He jacks up the argument. Pretty soon I’m praying they won’t kill each other. She doesn’t know when to back off. So they would really go at it. It was murder. It wasn’t really murder. That’s what I was worried about. Honestly, I’ve preached many sermons and at my own daughter’s weddings. One of the most important things: you say “I just love him, I just adore him.” After about one week of marriage that is all gone. Is learning how to fight in a marriage one of the most important things you can do? There are certain things that are ugly and dirty that you shouldn’t do. So you need to learn how resolve conflict. You need to know when to back off and you need to know when to charge forward. In other words, there is this dance you do and you need to learn how to dance. A lot of that is dealing with conflict. You say, “No, no, we won’t have conflict, I love him so.” I’ll tell you right now. Actually this is terrible; but I told my kids. Have a fight with him. Find out how he fights. You say that is really terrible it is probably bad advice but... So what I’m saying is there will be conflict in marriage.

Let's look at male and female relationships in the Bible. This is not the big discussion, we'll wait until Judges to do the big discussion but I just want to introduce it here. Some people say that the woman was to be the "helper" of man. Therefore she was viewed as subservient or lower than the man, much like the electrician and the electrician's helper. The electrician is the main deal. The help is the go-fer that runs to get the screwdriver or whatever. Therefore, Eve was considered the helper and she was secondary to the man because of this word "helper." In Hebrew, it is *etzer*. You know this word but you don't know that you know it. Guess who is called the *etzer*, besides Eve? Think of the old hymn, "God our help in ages past, our hope for the years to come." Nobody knows these songs anymore. It is God who is called "the helper." The word comes from Ebenezer. *Eben* means "stone"; *ezer* means "help." It means "stone of help." God himself calls himself the *etzer*, but you wouldn't say that he was a helper like the way in which Eve was a helper. He is a helper in the sense of a deliverer or the one who saves us. Therefore, you cannot use the fact that Eve is down here because then God would also have to be subservient, which we know he is not. So that argument doesn't work.

Here's another argument. Adam named Eve and Adam named the animals, and so that shows that he is the "King." The naming shows his dominion over the animals, and so he then has dominion over her because he names her. But in chapters one and two, Eve's name is not mentioned. It only says God made them male and female. His name is given as Adam but her name is not mentioned. Her name first pops up when Adam is told "Dusty, dust you are and to dust you shall return." Right after he is told that he will die, he turns to his wife at that point and names her. "You death woman, you curse woman." Oh, excuse me. Is that what Adam does? The timing here is very significant, he names her right after he receives the curse. In chapter 3.20, "Adam named his wife *Havah*." You guys all know *Havah* we did this before *lehayim*, to life. He names her "the living one," the mother of all living. He doesn't see her as a curse, but rather that through her, she is the mother of all living. It is through this woman that the offspring who will crush the serpent's head will be born. He looks at his wife and sees the mother of all

living. Is he showing his dominance in naming her or is he rather recognizing her character and destiny? He is recognizing her character and I like better than character here, her destiny. That is, through her, the seed will come that will bruise the serpent's head. That is beautiful because he is honoring her through this, especially since he was just told "Adam, you're dead, you're going to return to dust." In Eve, the hope is expressed that someday this is going to turn around and he sees that in his wife. It is a beautiful passage there.

So what about some other places in the Bible? In the New Testament, let's just do two verses in the New Testament then we'll go back to the Old Testament. In Galatians "so the law was put in charge to lead us to Christ." Then in Galatians 3.28, in the church of Christ, "there is neither Jew nor Greek (it was better to be a Jew in the Old Testament because they had the promises of God, Gentiles were outsiders), neither slave nor free (in Christ we are brothers and sisters in Christ, whether rich or poor), male nor female... you are all one in Christ Jesus." There is no hint of this power structure stuff.

In Ephesians 5.22 is a verse I grew up with. My father fit the Greek model there. It often was preached at the church I grew up in, "Wives submit to your husbands as to the Lord." I was taught that all my life. "Wives submit to your husband." I'm the husband now. It didn't go over too well. No, the truth is it went real well, my wife was a very submissive person. She taught me many things. I'm trying to teach you what she taught me. That's another discussion. There are some other stories on that. She didn't cause conflict. She was the neck that turned the head. The head thought he was the head but then the neck turned the head. But what is interesting to me is that, as I tried to teach you in this class, when you interpret the Bible how do you interpret the meaning of words? Context. Context determines meaning. When you're in Ephesians 5.22, would you suggest that 5.21 is fairly close to the context? Absolutely. How come when I was younger I rarely heard a sermon on Ephesians 5.21. It's the preceding verse. It says, "Submit to one another out of reverence to Christ." Should the wife submit to the husband? Yes. It says here that they should submit to one another. Should the husband

submit to his wife? Yes. So the question is does my wife serve me? Do you see how egotistical and narcissistic that is? The question is rather, how do I serve my wife? Her question is: how do I serve my husband?

The question should be how should I serve my spouse? What happens to the power struggle then in light of this? You fight against the curse by giving up power not by grabbing for power. Who is my model? Is anyone in here Grace Brethren? Jesus comes down, “I am the king of the universe, bow down and worship me. I am the King of the Universe. The father and I are one. You guys are servants, I am the king of the Universe.” No. Jesus pulls up on the disciples and they are going to eat dinner and he says, “take off your shoes.” If you are Grace Brethren they still do this to this day. Then what does Jesus do? He washes their feet. Is the power struggle over? Here is the king of the universe getting down and washing his disciples feet. Power struggle? No, he gives up his power, and really becomes the king when he washes the disciples feet. Is that leadership? It was because of acts like this that the disciples were willing to go out and die for Christ. What I’m saying is be careful about this verse here. Beware of power grabbing in marriage conflict. When I was first married, I was a very insecure person who initially grabbed for power, but what I’m suggesting is to be like Christ and learn how to give it up. Therefore the power does not result from conflict, what happens is: how can I serve her? Is that how you fight against the curse? The curse is that there will be this power struggle, there will be this conflict in marriage. The solution is to fight against it not by grabbing power but by serving the other.

G. The curse on the man [45:57-52:59]

Now let’s look at man’s curse. Man has to face his own curse. Is work a curse? Back in Genesis chapter 3, “To Adam he said, because you listened to your wife and ate from the tree that I commanded you to not eat of, cursed is the ground because of you. Through painful toil you will eat of it all the days of your life. It will produce thorns and thistles for you and you will eat the plants of the field. By the sweat of your brow you will eat food until you return to the ground.” Is work a curse? You say, “yes, work is a

curse.” No, go back before the fall, when Adam and Eve were in the garden before there was any temptation, was Adam given a task to do? Was Adam to take care of the garden and work the garden? Were Adam and Eve to work the garden before the fall? Yes. Work is not the curse. The curse is the futility of work. Have you ever worked for something, and then watched it all fall apart? There’s a wonderful country song that says, “Do it anyway.” She says, “I’ll go out and sing a song that no one will remember the next day, but I do it anyway.” I think there’s a lot of life like that where you have to do it anyway. You can work really hard for something and then watch it fall apart. The futility of work; have some of you known that futility? It’s devastating when it happens, when you put your heart and soul into something and you then have to watch it fall apart. It’s the futility of work that is the problem.

Some of you folks are asking, “What am I going to do with my life?” What I want to suggest is that you find some type of employment – have you seen people that work from 9 to 5 every day and they hate their work? They can’t wait to get out of work at 5 o’clock. It is freedom to them. On the weekends, I don’t have to work anymore I just hate that job. They party because they know on Monday they’ll have to go back to work. Do some people live that existence? My brother is a vice president at Buffalo of a big subway system, and we had a big discussion as we are both old men now. We looked back on life. Now I love what I do here at Gordon College. It’s the best thing I can do in my life and God has called me to do this. I get up every day at 5.00 or 5.30, to work on stuff, and then after this class I’ll be working on editing this video until about mid-night so it can be up tomorrow morning for you. I love what I do. My brother says, “I hate what I do. I can’t wait to retire.” What I’m saying is: is it possible for you guys to find something that you love to do? Yes, there is a convergence of your vocation and your passion when this happens there is synergy. So, I recommend finding the convergence of your passion and your vocation and go for that.

So, futile work is the problem and that haunts all of us. Man struggles with the dust. Basically, we’re all going to dust--to die. Some of you know what death is like

because some of you have had fathers and mothers go. It's hard to watch. A few years ago my father died from cancer, and I had to help him with that whole process. It was horrendous. Others of you have had friends who have been killed in car accidents...fathers, mothers, grandfathers and grandmothers and friends who have passed away. Is death a problem? Death is a big problem. I hate death. I hate what cancer did to my father. I hate it. But what I want to say is that when Jesus comes down, what does he do? It's like Jesus comes to earth and says, "You guys, what's your worst problem?" What's the big problem? It's not futility in work, but death. Jesus said, "Bring on your biggest problem on, and watch this? I'll conquer death by doing what? I'm going to conquer death by dying. I'm going to die and then I'm going to rise from the dead." Do we as Christians have hope beyond the grave? Is death the final answer? Death is not the end of this thing. So we as Christians look to Jesus. Jesus rose from the dead. Jesus says that when he comes back, when we see him and we shall be like him for we will see him as he is. Someday even my dad is going to rise up. I always wonder what he thinks about when I'm teaching this class. He is probably up there chuckling. Someday my Dad will rise again and we're going to be with the Lord forever. What concept is that? This is the Immanuel concept where we are back in the garden with God forever and ever. So the Scripture starts that way and the Scripture ends that way with us coming back to God in our bodies, alive from the dead like Jesus to live with him for ever and ever. That's a beautiful story. That's the best. Death is not the victor, Jesus blew that away. This is the good news. Yes, man's going to struggle, we're all going to die. I've got less time than most of you guys but it's okay.

We're going to move a little more quickly now. Genesis 1-3 sets up the whole rest of the Bible. That's why I have taken so much time on it. The creation accounts and the garden set up the rest of the Bible which is God's work of redemption in bringing us back to himself. You have seen this in the book of Exodus. Did you see redemption there? Israel was enslaved in Egypt and what did God do? He came down and freed his slaves, took them and gave them his law. He set them free on his land. So God is redeeming his

people out of Egypt, and he is going to free his people out of the bondage in Babylon and bring them back. In Jesus, he is going to bring us back to himself. Ultimately, someday it is going to be a face to face forever. So this is where the whole thing is moving. So Genesis 1-3 sets it up and after that you have the redemptive movement of God redeeming his people over and over. Do his people always say, “Oh, now God is redeeming us and we will serve you forever now?” What do his people do? He gives them manna, what do they do? It’s like Lane food, “I’m sick of this. The same food all the time.” Most of us who don’t live on campus say that would be really nice because tonight I have to go home and cook chicken and broccoli. It gets long after a while when you have to cook and you can’t cook.

H. Cain and Abel [53:00-61:29]

Now let's move on to the Cain and Able story. This is the first account of murder in the Bible. Cain is going to kill Abel. Who offers the meat offering, Abel or Cain? Abel does the meat offering. Is the meat offering going to be with the shedding of blood? Meat offering is with the shedding of blood. When I say cereal offering, what is the problem with cereal offerings? I'm not talking about Cheerios. When you talk about cereal in the ancient Near East, it is basically wheat and barley. By the way, does Cain offer up the crops of the ground, the wheat and barley? Yes. Which one was acceptable to God? Abel's offering was acceptable. When I grew up, people said the reason Abel's was acceptable was because it was a blood sacrifice. "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission for sin." Abel's offering was accepted because it was the shedding of blood and therefore it was an acceptable offering. Whereas Cain's was not a blood shed offering; so his was not acceptable. Cain's did not shed blood but was grains and cereals. But Cain's was not rejected because it was not a blood offering. Is that the real reason why God accepted Able's offering and rejected Cain's offering? The answer is: "No." Did God command Israel to offer cereal offerings? Yes, he did in Leviticus chapter 2. When you go to Leviticus chapter 2, God commands Israel to offer up their grains, the first fruits of their harvest. Grains were legitimate sacrifices to God. Cain's problem was not in the material that he offered. Did Cain have a bad heart and hatred toward to his brother? The issue was his heart, not the stuff that he offered. So don't get misguided because God had told them to offer up cereal offerings.

She says that Abel offered up the choicest. I want to object to that because it moves the crime to the offering when it was not in the offering itself, but it was the heart of the one who brings the offering. Throughout Scripture that's more of the point than the particulars of the offering. So, I think that we are misguided when we try to get it down to the type of offering. I think that misses the point. God says in a lot of places, "I desire mercy and not sacrifice." So the problem is sometimes we focus on the sacrifice

and don't realize what he is really asking for is mercy, justice and righteousness--that's what he focused on.

So God comes to Cain and says "Cain, if you do this you're in bad shape." Cain said to his brother Abel, "Let's go out into the field." While they were in the field Cain attacked his brother Abel and killed him. The Lord said to Cain, "Where is your brother Abel?" "I don't know," he said. Then he makes this classic line. This is a classic line you should all know: "am I my brother's keeper?" This is a classic line in Scripture. Cain said to God, "am I my brother's keeper?" What was the answer he was suggesting to God? Cain thought the answer was: No, I'm not my brother's keeper. That is what Cain was insinuating in this rhetorical question. Cain thought the answer to this question was that he was not his brother's keeper.

However, are we our brother's keeper in actuality? Yes. So Cain kills his brother. This brings up a lot of things in terms of the construction of Genesis. Have you ever seen the good brother/bad brother situation in a family? Do you get other things like this going on from the competitive nature of siblings? Do you ever have competition between brothers and sisters in the family? I was in a family with five kids and I was the oldest. My last sister was born five or six years after the rest of us. So my father when I grew up, I don't even know how to say this in your culture. My father was a strict person. I would call him a man of the belt. Now as soon as I say that you guys and cry, "Abuse, abuse. He actually hit you with a belt." We called that discipline in those days, not abuse. Did my father love me? The answer is "yes," and that is why he did that. He was strict with us. He was very strict with my brother and I, but by the time my sister who was five years in the gap there, my sister, my brother, and I stood back and wondered how she got away with everything. She had my father wrapped around her little finger. Did we get jealous? We could see the difference. What happened here? What happened here is that my father loosened up as he got older. So the competitive nature that you see here is also seen in Genesis.

Tell me about sibling rivalry in Genesis. Give me an example of sibling rivalry in Genesis. Leah and Rachel had a big time sibling rivalry. You said, Jacob and Esau.

Has anybody got another one. Joseph and his brothers is a good example. The theme of sibling rivalry is a big recurring theme in Genesis.

When I was a kid, my brother and I used to fight all the time. One time he got really angry at me, picked up a butter knife and threw it at me as hard as he could. “Holy cow, what are you doing with a knife?” So I threw my arms up in protection and the knife landed in my arm and stuck in my arm hanging there. I’ll never forget the feeling of having this knife hanging out of my arm. My brother is the greatest guy in the world. He’s crazy, but he’s great. So after that we both immediately thought, “When dad comes home. This is bad. He’s going to kill us when he gets home.” So, he tries pulling on it and we can’t get it out. So, we went to my mother. Why did we bring our mother into it? We have to face our father and that is absolute terror. So we went to my mother to try to get her on side. She can’t pull it out either. So, then what happens? I had to pull it out myself. So then what happens? My dad comes home, we hear the car and we run for the hills, hiding under the bunk beds. We’re ready. Dad gets home, and my mother goes out to smooth this out the best she can. All of a sudden, we hear my dad started to yell. He starts yelling and we hear it down in the basement. “Cain! Cain! He tried to kill his brother!” Now my brother and I are both old men now. So you have these two old men just sitting around laughing because we remember this thing with my dad. This has always been a very special passage for me. I should say that my brother is my best friend in my life. But I don’t recommend throwing butter-knives.

I. Curse on Cain [61:18-64:41]

Now let’s discuss Cain’s curse. Cain gets cursed, and what happens with the curse of Cain? The curse of Cain is that he is to wander. He is condemned to be a wanderer, going from place to place as part of his curse. Cain is going to be that for the rest of his life--a wanderer, which means he is going to be alone pretty much for the rest of his life. So we are back to this aloneness thing. Is aloneness one of the worst things in the world? I say this because a lot of my life has been spent alone and it is one of the worst feelings, feeling like you are alone in the entire universe. It is one of the most depressing things I

have ever experienced in my life. Do people have problems in our culture when they are wanderers? Do people move a lot in our culture? When you are young, you are pretty settled, but when you get older you start to move a lot. My wife and I moved eight times in the first eight years of our marriage. One of the moves was to Israel, and the other one was back to Bristol, Tennessee. Anyway, what I am saying is we moved eight times and after a while, we moved and moved and moved. It's great to travel, but have you ever traveled so much that you become tired of always traveling and you just want to go home? What is home? My wife and I have struggled with understanding where home is for us now. It's almost like our roots have been cut off. Where's home? It's kind of like where you are is home. It's like that because we have no roots. I just want you to think about that. I don't know what to do about this myself. You have a sense of home, the feeling of place and belonging and you put your own roots down there. I know our culture is all about wandering, but what I'm saying is to be careful about wandering because you can end up wandering all your life. Cain was cursed with this wandering. Wandering is fine when it comes to exploring, but you must be careful not to lose that sense of home, rootedness and feeling of belonging or a sense of place.

So Cain becomes the wanderer. In chapter 4 it says, "Cain went out from the presence of the Lord." So what you get is Cain moving to what? Is he moving toward or away from God? He is moving away from God and hiding from God. So, that's Cain's problem there.

So the story of Cain is rather tragic as the first murder in the Bible. By the way, did Cain say, "Wait a minute, I murdered my brother, but you did not give the Ten Commandments yet. They don't come along till Exodus 20. I did not do anything wrong. You did not tell me not to kill him. I did not know what that meant and that it was wrong." Did Cain know the Law of God written on his heart? Do human beings have consciences? Yes, the Law of God is written on their heart (Rom. 2). He knew it was wrong. You have to work with that in terms of the revelation of God in history.

J. Flood: Sons of God and Daughters of Men [64:42-68:25]

Here's another one: the Flood. I want to introduce this. You have the flood, where the sons of God married the daughters of men in Genesis 6. Who were the sons of God? It says, "Now when men began to increase in number on the earth, daughters were born to them. The sons of God saw the daughters of men were beautiful, and they married any of them they chose. And God said, 'My spirit will not contend with man forever, for he is mortal. His days will be 120 years.'" So he's limiting it down. Later it says God was grieved over the sons of God marrying the daughters of men. Who are these sons of God and these daughters of men? I want to suggest three solutions to this. I want to tell you that I've taught and believed each one of these at various points in my life. So, I'm not sure what the answer is one hundred percent guaranteed. I'm saying these "answers" are possible solutions.

Why did God get so angry at these sons of God marrying these daughters of men? Why did they have kids that were Giants or Nephilim? Why were their children so special? By the way, most people always skipped this. Nobody can figure who these people were for sure. But everybody skips this, "The earth was filled with violence because of them." God says, "I will surely destroy the earth." He destroys the earth not only because of the Sons of God, but also because the earth was filled with violence. What is the Hebrew word for violence? Now when you say *Hamas*, it is a hard "h." Nate says he loves humus. You love *humus*, but it is terrible in America. But in Israel, you eat the real stuff. It's amazing. It's like eating a Philadelphia cheesesteak outside of Philadelphia. It's just not the same. There's a certain place in Israel that has the best humus in the world. The other thing you have to eat it Baklava some time. Anyway, *Hamas*, let's get off the food stuff. Why do you guys know what that Hebrew word means? It is because you have heard of the group Hamas. The group in Israel today is called Hamas. What does that word mean in Arabic and Hebrew? It means "violence." Do you get a clue what is going on with them? Violence is their thing because it is embedded in their name. We have the Sons of God and the daughters of men, and this is going to take longer than I want. So I don't want to break off the discussion. What I do

want you to do is to do the whole book of Genesis in sixty seconds. We'll do Bible-robics in sixty seconds and then we're done.

Transcribed by Dave Clemmer and Ted Hildebrandt
Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt-2

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit. and Theology, Lecture 8[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in the eighth lecture of his Old Testament History, Literature and Theology class. This lecture will begin with the sons of God and the daughters of men in Genesis chapter 6 and proceed to Abraham, God's friend, the geography of Mesopotamia as well as three cuts in Abraham's life and his three alleged "children."

A. Quiz Preview [0:00-2:00]

All right class, let's get started. We've got a lot to cover today. I have got to catch up a couple slides from the other class. For this week you guys are working on what? Leviticus, select chapters in Leviticus. There are two articles--one that you're responsible just to read, the other one you're responsible for content on the dietary laws. I think there's also some reading in *Our Father Abraham* as well and then a couple memory verses. So I think that's pretty much it. Yes, there will be a content question on the *Our Father Abraham* as well as the article. I think that's about all we have there.

All right, let's open with a word of prayer and then we'll jump into the Genesis 6 passage and try to get through that again.

Father we thank you for this day. We thank you for the privilege we have in this place of being able to examine your word, to explore ideas that others have thought and to wonder about your greatness and goodness and your great mercy that's been expressed to humankind as well as the great moments of wrath that have come on us. I pray that you will help us to learn to love you in spirit and in truth. Thank you for your Word. I pray that you might help us to reflect it, even this day, in our lives. In Christ's name, Amen.

B. Genesis 6: Sons of God and daughters of men [2:01-3:27]

Let's pick up the story. We're working on Genesis; we have finally gotten out of Genesis 1 to 3. So today we're going to move into chapter 6 and we're going to try to

move through things rather quickly to get up into Abraham's life. So we were going to talk about the flood and what's going on there with the sons of God and the daughters of men.

In Genesis chapter 6, let me just read this story there. It says "When men began to increase in number on the earth and daughters were born to them, the sons of God saw the daughters of men were beautiful, and they married any of them they chose. Then the Lord said, 'My spirit will not contend with mortals forever, for he is mortal, his days will be 120 years.'" So what you get is a shrinking down of human longevity. Remember they were all living to be 900 and something? Now God says their days are going to be shrunk down to 120 years. "The Nephilim were on the earth in those days--and also afterward--when the sons of God went into the daughters of men and had children by them. They were the heroes of old, men of renown." So the question is: the flood comes as a result of the sons of God marrying the daughters of men, why does God get so upset with that? Who were these sons of God? So we want to work through some of the questions. Who were the sons of God and why did God get so angry? Actually, the flood is the result of this.

C. Sethite View [3:28-5:06]

The first his suggestion is that the sons of God were the worshippers of God and the daughters of men were ones that didn't know God. So basically it would be an interfaith marriage. Actually what you have here is what's called "the Sethite view."

The Sethite view is that the sons of Seth were the godly line. The sons of Cain were the ungodly line (daughters of men). There was this inter-marriage between the sons of Seth and the sons of Cain. By the way, in other parts of Scripture does God get upset over intermarriage between believers and nonbelievers? Do you remember in the New Testament it says, "do not be unequally yoked with non-believers"? Jewish people marrying--do you remember Solomon marrying other wives from other cultures and that led his heart astray to worship other gods? So the Sethite view plays off of that and says that basically the line of Seth was Abel's replacement and so Seth becomes the godly line

after Abel was killed. Cain's descendants intermarry and that intermarriage is the problem. So this is called the Sethite view. There's some support for that as seems to fit naturally in the context. My problem is the term "sons of God" is never used to exclusively identify Abel's descendants.

D. Kingship View [5:07-8:07]

There's a second suggestion that's pretty interesting and it's this: that the sons of God were the kings and nobles. That the kings were called... and by the way in ancient Mesopotamia did the kings call themselves the "sons of the gods"? That title was used because the King was considered a son of the god. So what it would be then is that these kings, these people of acquired power, these "sons of God," the kings, took women which would be basically developing their harem. In other words, they took women into their harem and they multiplied wives. Do harems present a big problem both in the ancient world and in the Bible? So this would be the kings establishing a harem taking women into this harem--multiple wives and that becomes a problem.

Now I skipped something. It's very interesting to me and it's something that I don't think most people pick up that it was not just these sons of God marrying daughters of men but there's another word that is involved here. This is over in verse 11 of chapter 6. It says "Now the earth was corrupt in God's sight and full of violence (*hamas*)." So apparently there was violence mixed in here too, that was also part of the problem. Now what is the Hebrew word for violence? The Hebrew word for violence is *hamas*. Now some of you may be used to humus. Does anybody like humus? I don't like the American humus. I like the real Arab humus. It's what you get in Jerusalem right across from the fourth station of the cross on the Via Dolorosa. The guy has the best humus in the world. It's like eating a Philadelphia cheese steak outside of Philly. It just doesn't work. Do you know what I'm saying? In Philadelphia you get the best. Humus and *hamas* are not the same thing. *Hamas* means "violence." By the way, have you ever heard of the Palestinian group called *Hamas*? Do you understand? There's a whole group in Israel today named Hamas. Do you understand what the root of this word means? It means "violence." What are these people bent on doing to Israel? Violence. So this *Hamas*

group, even their name means “violence.” So everybody says, “Well, *Hamas* is really a peaceful organization.” They’re really just trying to play the Palestinian rights card. What’s their name? *Hamas* does that tell you anything? I mean it should tell you a lot but most people don’t know that.

So anyway, these kings were involved in this and some people think then that these kings were involved in violence, oppressing the people that were below them and so this *hamas* was happening. That’s the second view. Is the kingship idea is going to be developed in the Bible? Did the kings have multiple wives in a bad way later on with Solomon’s 700 wives, and 300 concubines. So there’s some grounds for that.

E. Angel View [8:08-19:05]

This last view is called the angel view. I should say actually at various points of my life I’ve held each one of these views so I don’t feel real dogmatic about this. The view that I hold currently is the “angel view” possibility. Largely it’s because in Job chapter 1 verse 6 it talks about the “sons of God” coming before God. God says to Satan “You’ve been out considering the world, have you considered my servant Job? Satan says ‘Oh, yeah, Job is just good to you because you’re good to him. If you take away what he’s got he’ll curse you to your face.’” So that was God in the heavenly council addressing them as “the sons of God.” The sons of God were angels that came before God. Something interesting over in Hebrews chapter 13.2 it also says regarding angels and human beings. Hebrews chapter 13 verse 2, sorry for jumping over to the New Testament, but it says, “Keep on loving each other as brothers. Do not forget to entertain strangers, for by so doing some people have entertained angels without knowing it.” So can angels take on human form? Apparently sometimes people don’t know it and it’s possible they were angels.

Now I’m going to tell a story here so how I’m going to walk over here and this is going to be a story. So once upon a time, I was in Warsaw Indiana and I was driving down Route 15 and there was a guy hitchhiking. Now question: do people hitchhike much today anymore? Not much anymore. Did people in my generation? I hitchhiked home from college and all over. So this guy was hitchhiking and I thought “Man, I

haven't seen a person hitchhiking in a long time." It looked like he was obviously Hispanic and he needed a ride. He was probably in his mid-30's. So I thought I drove my car past him once and I thought you know I should pick him up. Now question do I have a problem here because my wife always freaks out when I do this kind of thing. But I said, "Hey, it's just me and I've got at home my wife and kids but in the car it's just me. So I was coming back the other way and so I thought I'm going to pick him up. So I picked the guy up. As we rode he told me he got drunk or something, he was in his bed, in his house, and the police came in and yanked him out of his bed and hauled him down to jail. He actually got tried for drunkenness. He claimed he wasn't drinking and driving because he didn't have a car, obviously. "They came in my house and got me and pulled me down here." So he tells me his tale of woe. So we drive and I thought you know it would only take me 5 minutes to drive him to the other route, Route 13, and then he'd have a clear shot to Syracuse which was where he was going. So I drove the guy over there and this is no joke and pretty weird. The guy gets out of the car and so we talked and I really enjoyed the conversation. It was great. I got to help the guy out and he gets out of the car. As the guy gets out of the car, this is the honest truth, I still don't know what to make of this. He looks at me and he says "You know some people have entertained angels unaware." He shut the door and walked down the road. I swear I didn't make this up. This actually happened. Now I don't know whether he was just a Spanish guy who had a little too much to drink and it was still in him or something else. As I was sitting there I was like where in the world did that come from—a Spanish guy quoting the Bible to me. It was freaky. But anyways, I'm not saying he was an angel because I couldn't see his halo but all I'm saying is--you never know.

Now let me go back and take this in a different direction. Is it possible then you're down in Boston and there's a homeless person sitting on the side of the street. Is it possible? Hebrews 13 is about showing hospitality. You never know. So what I'm saying is Christian people should we feel compassion, give hospitality and those types of things toward homeless people. You never know that might be an angel sitting there and you just never know (Mat. 25.35ff.). So all I'm saying is be hospitable and generous.

Hebrews seems to indicate that there are angels who take on human form. By the way, you guys already know this. Remember when Abraham and those three guys came up and Sarah made dinner for them? Were those angels who came up and apparently you have got to figure that out. But wait a minute Matthew 23 it says that angels neither marry nor are given in marriage. Well, what I'm suggesting is that these are fallen angels. These are not angels in heaven, but these are fallen angels and that this is a possibility.

Now that's a different question. He's talking about the Yahweh (Malach) the Angel of the Lord in the burning bush (Exod. 3). It calls him the "Angel of the Lord." Now let me just work with the angel concept a little bit. The word "angel" simply means "messenger." So sometimes in the book of Revelation it talks about "the angel" of the church at Colossae or Laodicea and that simply means "the messenger" that went to that church. So it doesn't necessarily mean an angel flying with wings kind of thing. It may simply mean "messenger." The term "angel" can mean "messenger."

Now it's also the Angel of the Lord. So it could be the Lord's representative was in the bush. But the problem is that title "the Angel of the Lord" is used and when you're in the bush, when the bush goes to speak, what does he say? The bush is asked "What is your name?" Let me just do the bush thing. So Moses goes up to the burning bush and he asks "what is your name?" and do you remember just before that the bush said, "takeoff your shoes because you're standing on holy ground." Now does a normal angel come up and say "Hey, take off your shoes. You're on holy ground." Do you worship an angel? By the way in Daniel and the book of Revelation a guy drops down and starts worshiping this awesome angel. The guy's bowing down and the first thing the angel says is: "Get up. "Don't do it. I'm not God." The burning bush--take off your shoes. Is this a regular run-of-the-mill angel? And then when he asks him his name he says, "I am that I am." An angel doesn't respond like that. That's God's name. So in the burning bush we have Jehovah/Yahweh, God in the bush. It's the angel of the Lord. A lot of people would suggest that it was Jesus Christ, the supreme incarnate Christ in the bush. He is God and he speaks and he is Yahweh. So he says my name is Jehovah and my name is "I am that I am." The Angel of the Lord title seems to be a title that designates also God

himself and when the Angel of the Lord speaks, a lot of times, it's God. So you have got to work with that. Sorry for going off on that tangent.

Where are we here? Angels don't marry. So what we're saying is these angels are fallen angels. There's also a passage in Corinthians that talks about angels looking down on women. It gets pretty weird. So, I'm just saying it may have been angels. There may have been angels intermarrying with women. By the way, would that explain then the fact that they were having children that were giants and strong. So that's a possibility.

Now, which one of these answers is right. Like I said, I've held, at various points in my life, each of these positions. So I don't know which one's exactly right. I'm with this angel view now. But there are certain things you just can't know.

Now people say what about the Nephilim? Nobody knows who these Nephilim are. That's back before the flood. So we don't know who these Nephilim are. When you don't know something, by the way, this is an important hermeneutical principle: when you don't know something in Scripture, how do you tell the meaning of a word? Context. I'm going to say this a hundred times in this course. What determines meaning? Context determines meaning. But you look at the "Nephilim" term and you say. We know that the Nephilim are a group of people so we know that from context. Do we know what group of people it is? The answer is, "No." So when you don't know from context where do you go next? A lot of times you go to the etymology or the history or root of the word. So what's the etymology? What is the root, the historical meaning of that? To *naphal* means "to fall." So these are "the fallen ones." The Nephilim are the fallen ones. Can you see how that ties in to the fallen angel view?

What's the problem with depending on etymology for meaning? This is a classic example. So I go home to my wife and I say, I never call her honey but anyway, "Honey, you are 'cute' in the original sense of that word." Well, what's the problem with the word "cute"? The word "cute" in the original sense of the word meant "bow-legged." And so that's probably not a good thing to say to your wife because she'll probably think... anyway, you don't want to go there. When you say the word "cute," did you ever use it in the original sense? Do meanings change over time? Can you go back to the history of the

word and claim that its original meaning is what it means now? No, it doesn't, so you have got to be careful. By the way, if you're in English and you want to find the history of a word where do you go? For you guys the first place you go is the Internet. But after the Internet if you go to a real book, they have real books with real pages in them. There are two volumes about this thick it's called the OED, the *Oxford English Dictionary*. In the *Oxford English Dictionary* [OED] will it go on the word "cute" for two pages of cute until it gets back to the root meaning of the word in Anglo-Saxon or Latin or something like that. Then it will give you the original root. Does the history of a word, its etymology, determine its meaning? No, it doesn't. So you have got to be real careful about this. Be careful of those kinds of etymological arguments. Meaning in context is what determines meaning not the history of the word. So I don't put much stock in the Nephilim are "fallen ones" approach. I put a big question mark by that. I think it's just the only straw we've got so we just grab it.

F. God's Grief and Tears in Heaven [19:06-24:49]

Now this is interesting, in Genesis chapter 6 verse 6 it says this concerning God: "And the LORD saw how great man's wickedness on the earth had become and that every inclination of the thoughts in his heart was evil all the time. And the LORD was grieved that he had made man on the earth and his heart was filled with pain." My question comes up: Is there grief or are there tears in heaven? I just like Eric Clapton so it's one of my favorites. Are there tears in heaven? The answer is: I think Clapton was right. Would you say God is pretty much in heaven? Yes. We're not there, he's there. Does he feel grief in heaven? The Bible states explicitly that God feels grief. What I want to suggest to you is there is grief in heaven. God himself, as it says in Scripture, feels grief and that he feels pain in heaven. So what I want to suggest to you is there is grief; there is pain in heaven.

Can God be broken hearted? What I would like to suggest to you, and I'm staying over here for this one, is who is the being in the universe that suffers the most? What I'm suggesting to you is that God is the most grieving being in the universe because he made things right and it got all messed up. He loves us and when pain and weird stuff happens

he grieves over that. So God's the most grieving being but you say, "but wait a minute but doesn't the book of Revelation at the end of the book of Revelation 22 state that God's going to wipe away all tears. At the end of the Bible when God wipes away all tears, what does that assume? That there were tears to be wiped away. So what I'm saying is God wipes away all tears assumes that there are tears in heaven. So Clapton is right. There are tears in heaven.

Now question: is there coming a day when those tears will be wiped away? Is that now? It's not now. As long as there's sin and corruption does God feel pain? Someday the world's going to be made new and those tears will be wiped away. What an interesting way to look at God here. Is God sorry over something he did? Does God have regrets? Do parents ever have regrets over their kids? I love my kids but there have been moments where I had regret. Can my kids make choices and I feel the pain as a parent of their choices? Can they make choices that hurt really badly? You better believe it. As a matter of fact, the more I love them the worse it gets. If I didn't give a rip about my kids, would I care? But the fact that I love my kids, does that make me vulnerable? You see what I'm saying? It is the fact that I love my kids that makes me vulnerable. Well, we better get out of there. One of my children made choices that really has been devastating. What I'm saying is if I didn't care, it wouldn't hurt.

God made man. So he's gone back and saying he's thinking back on the whole thing and he's feeling grieved with the whole situation. Let me back it out a little bit. He was grieved that he had made man. If they were still in the garden would he be grieving? No. So he is grieved why? There is this intermarriage, there's this violence, there's this stuff he describes in the chapter. So that's why he's grieving. It's over their wickedness, their evil. So then he takes a step back from that. He's thinking about why did I ever make man since all they're doing is corrupt. They're all totally corrupt and that's when he focuses on Noah.

What I'm saying is take it with what it says and you have to put that in context right. The context in Genesis 6 is this intermarriage and the violence that's happening. So I'm saying you can't take this verse out of context and just say it says, "God regrets

that he ever made mankind and so he's just bailing out on them totally." No, there was a reason why he felt that way and you need to explore the reason why? It's a really important point. You've got a verse and you can't yank it out of context. You have got to look at it in context. Why did God feel that way? It tells you in the context why he feels that way. So you have got to relate it to other verses. You just can't pull it out of context like that. So we're back to the main thesis: context determines meaning. You can't take things out of Scripture sometimes and then universalize them, you have got to understand the context in which they're given.

G. Can God change his mind? [24:50-25:43]

Can God change his mind? Going back to what she was just raising. Can God change his mind? He makes man, can he change his mind? Are we going to see God change his mind? Actually you guys have read Exodus, did God change his mind in Exodus? Yes. Remember when they make the golden calf and he comes down to wipe them out. Moses prays and God changes his mind. He almost killed Moses and backs off on that in Numbers. So we ask what does it mean for God to change his mind? I don't want to develop the whole thing here but God made man and he has apparently regrets over that. What does that mean for God to have regrets? Again we're going to see this in later texts so I just want to drop it in at this point and say we're going to get to other texts that are much more explicit where we'll have more context and we can actually sort out what that means. But all I want you to do is just have you think about can God change his mind. What does that mean?

H. The Curse of Noah on Ham [25:44-36:50]

In chapter 9, Noah comes out of the ark with all the animals two by two and seven of the clean ones. Why seven clean ones? Because he needs to sacrifice the clean ones afterwards. By the way did Genesis ever tell us about clean and unclean animals? No, when did we learn about clean and unclean animals? It's way over in Leviticus. Leviticus, which you guys are going over this week, tells us about clean and unclean. But did Noah know which were clean and unclean? So it is possible God created a whole bunch of guidelines that had not been recorded for us but Noah knew which was clean

and unclean.

So Noah comes out of the ark and what's the first thing he does? "Noah was a man of the soil and he proceeded to plant a vineyard and he drank some of its..." What? Wine. What's the problem when you've got a vineyard when you have no refrigeration? You better drink it quickly or is it going to turn. You take it, and you turn your grape juice into what? It's going to turn that way anyway. It's going to turn sour or you turn it into wine. So he plants a vineyard, and now he's been on a boat for about a year or something like that? He comes out, plants his vineyard, he drank some of its wine and he became drunk and lays uncovered inside of his tent. "And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw his father's nakedness and told his two brothers outside, but Shem and Japheth took a garment, laid it across their shoulders. Then they walked backwards and covered their father's nakedness." Their faces were turned the other way so that they would not see their father's nakedness. Noah awoke from his wine and found out what his youngest son had done to him and said "cursed be ..." and then "the lowest of slaves will he be to his brothers" and Noah goes off and curses.

What did Ham fail to do? Cover his dad. Now, by the way, is it a problem that a child sees his father. My son and I used to do Tae Kwon Do together. So now we'd go over there, did I hide from my son and say "Son, you have to leave here because I don't want you to see your father's nakedness"? So your father will never shower in front of you. Is that what this is talking about? No. So there seems to be something more than just that. So rather than covering his father like he should have, does he expose his father? Yes. He goes off to get his brothers. Now do his brothers do the right thing and walk backwards to cover their father's nakedness? This is a really hard thing in our culture, is pride and shame really big in certain cultures? And in certain cultures you've got this taboo that it is really wrong to shame your parents. Do some cultures feel that very very strongly, the notion of shame and honor?

By the way, do some cultures feel that very strongly? Now I'm talking about Detroit. Do you remember that? These two girls in the car in Detroit and their father was shamed by these two girls dating non-Muslims? The girls are in the car and the girl in the

backseat is on her cellphone and her father pulls out a gun and shoots his own daughter in the car. That was in Detroit, in America, and the girl in the backseat, she's screaming on the phone "Dad, dad" and she's screaming on a 911 call that her father just shot her sister. The father then turns the gun in the back, and you hear the gun go off then the cellphone drops silent. Did that happen in America, in Detroit? Now by the way, you guys are giving me a lot of blank stares. Do you guys not know about that? Now let me just say this. Did the media put that out there or did the media cover that up? It was covered up. Why? Because it was politically incorrect to say anything about the background; the obvious background of the Muslim father. This guy was so offended as a father that his girls had shamed him that he killed them. By the way, are there honor killings quite frequent in America? Will you ever hear about them in the media and the answer is: no. Now you guys must ask yourselves "I wonder why we never hear about this." Now there's some political agenda stuff there. This is political correctness gone amuck. Now question: in that culture that that father was in, is shame and honor a really important idea?

Do you guys remember that tsunami that had hit Japan? And do you remember some of the leaders they were worried that the leaders there were going to commit suicide because they were shamed because they didn't know that the tsunami was going to come in there and destroy that nuclear reactor? They were worried that some of the leaders in Japan were going to commit suicide. In that culture if you are shamed by not doing something like that the people can react strangely.

So what I'm saying is, in America, do we care about shame and honor? In our culture. Are we a no shame culture? In other cultures shame and honor are really really important. So what you have here is the shaming of the father, the exposing of the father.

Several years ago, I read Ugaritic literature. In Ugaritic literature, this is just north of Israel, in some of the Ugaritic tablets, it says that one of the duties, and it's listed out explicitly, that one of the duties of sons is to cover their father's nakedness. That was the duty of a son. The duty of the son is to cover their father's nakedness. So it would be like... your father gets drunk. Should the son drive the father home and take care of the

father, instead of exposing him? So I think that's what you've got here-- the shaming and dishonoring of the father.

So Noah then wakes up, finds out what his sons did, finds out what his other son had done, and so he then he curses his son and he says, "the lowest of slaves will he be to his brothers." Now Ham's descendants go where? If you follow the family tree do we have the genealogies of these kids? Ham's descendants become Cush. Cush's goes down into Ethiopia and so basically Ham's descendants go down into Africa. When Noah curses them he says, "The lowest of slaves will he be to his brothers." Some people have argued that this is the curse on Africa and that this curse "the lowest of slaves will he be to his brothers" that Ham is cursed and that his descendants will be slaves. This is a curse on Africa and the African slaves. The Bible tells us that this is the curse of Noah. Therefore it legitimizes that in some sense. Have people used that argument? Yes, that argument has been used.

I misread the text but she caught me. Well, let me read what it actually says. "Noah gets up and says cursed be Ham?" He doesn't say that. He says "Cursed be Canaan." Canaan's descendants--this is real hard. Canaan's descendants settle where? In the land of Canaan. Where's the land of Canaan? That's the Promised Land, that's the land of Israel. Now Canaan's descendants become who? That's really tough again. When you don't know who they are just put a "ite" or "tite" on the end. Jebusite, Hittite, Gergashite. So it's what? So here it's Canaanite. The Canaanites settle in the promised land which would eventually be the land promised to Israel.

Do you see the point here? So Canaan is being cursed here, it's not the descendants of Ham in Africa. This has nothing to do with the Cushites and the Africans and the slavery there. It has everything to do with the Canaanites. Now, by the way, will the Canaanites and the Israelites butt heads? There's going to be battles later on between the Canaanites and the Israelites. So this foreshadows those battles with the Canaanites, not the enslavement of Africans.

Have you still got this thing? Ham is the son of Noah and exposes Noah's nakedness and defiled or shames his father. I think what you have here is *lex talionis*, the

law of retaliation. You'll see this later and we'll develop it more. This is the eye for eye, tooth for tooth; as you have done to me, so it will be done to you. So I think what Noah does here is he says, "As you, Ham, have shamed me and you are my son, so your son will shame you." So I think that's what he's doing by saying "Canaan" here. Now by the way is this conjecture? Yes. This is conjecture on my part. I'm trying to put it together why the Canaanites are cursed. But it seems to be this reciprocal thing as you have done to me, your son will do to you. Canaan is picked out I think because that's a foreshadowing of what Israel will do and so you get that foreshadowing already set up in the scriptures.

This gets pretty complicated so where did Ham's descendants settle? We said some of them went down to Africa but some of them were the Canaanites. Was the curse to enslave the Africans? No. This has nothing to do with that. Canaan is the one who's cursed here not Cush and Ham's other descendants. So who was actually cursed? Canaan.

I. Individual and corporate personality [36:51-41:10]

Now this is the broader question and this one gets difficult as well. We're dealing with lots of cultural issues here and some these cultural issues get really hard. Especially when we live in America. Do we deal with lots of shame and honor in our culture? No. But in other cultures it's life and death as we've experienced in America even lately with some of the stuff that's gone on then hushed up. Is it right that the children suffer from the sins of the parents? I also want to think about it in terms of how does punishment happen? We are Americans, do we see ourselves as individuals? We see ourselves as individuals. Do you realize that in other cultures, they don't see themselves as individuals but they see themselves as part of a group? Their identity is wrapped up in their family group. By the way, will the Bible have certain family groups be judged as whole families? So you get this idea that this judgment falls on a whole group of people.

Now, even as Americans does this group thing happen even in America? For example, my son and I were discussing something like this and he came up with this. He said, suppose you guys were born in Afghanistan. Now question, you're not Taliban,

you're just farming your little plot. You've got 2 acres of ground and you got a few sheep and goats, mostly goats. You're poverty stricken, you've got a wife and couple of kids and all of a sudden you didn't do anything and all of a sudden there's this 6 foot 2, 200 pound marine guy busting in the door of your house and he goes through everything in your house. Did you do anything to deserve that? You didn't do anything to deserve that. What did you do? The only thing you did to deserve that was that you were an Afghani. You were an Afghan person. Does the Taliban do bad stuff and does that affect other people? Yes.

Let me put it in an American context. Don't do this. You're out driving in a car and it's one o'clock in the morning and one of your friends has had too much to drink and is driving. You're in the car and there are four kids in the car, and he's been drinking too much. When he gets in a wreck, who walks away? He does. Is it possible other people in the car get killed and he walks away? Does that bother me? You better believe it bothers me because in one case I knew the kid's name. He was a friend of mine. What I'm trying to say to you. Is it possible to be in a car and why is this person killed? Is it just the fact that he's in the car with somebody else who crashes the car. It wasn't any of their faults at all. They're the ones killed and he walks away. Do you see what I'm saying? So is it possible for somebody to make a decision and it affects other people in the group? Yes. That's just the way it is.

So what I'm saying is the group thing affects others and actually the apple falls close to the tree too. Are there things that go down in families from parents to children? There's a family I know about, there's been a marriage in the family and the guy who married into the family is always saying of the daughter "The apple doesn't fall far from the tree" as he looks at the mother of the family. Now question: Is there a connection between mother and daughter? Is this guy who married into this crazy family, is he seeing there's a connection between the mother and the daughter? Yes. He says that it's a family I'm sure you're vaguely aware of. But you know what I'm saying there are family traits. We better get out of there. Let's get over to Abraham.

J. Abraham: God's friend [41:11-42:58]

We're going to jump into the Abraham narratives now. We're out of the garden of Eden, were out of Noah and the flood, and let's jump over and look at Abraham. We're finally making it to Genesis 12. We're going to start moving faster too. I can't answer all the questions in Scripture that you guys have but I will try to hit on the ones that I think are big questions and handle those. Abraham's going to be one of the most incredible individuals in the Old Testament. Dr. Wilson, some people say he's met him, he says that Abraham's a good guy. So anyway, I shouldn't say things but Dr. Wilson's book *Our Father Abraham* is excellent. Dr. Wilson is up there with Father Abraham in my opinion. I can't tell you how much I respect Dr. Wilson. He's done a study on Abraham and I think for good reason.

I'm going to give each of these patriarchs a title from Abraham, to Isaac and Jacob. The title for Abraham is "Abraham is God's friend." Now did I just make that up? No. Here's James chapter 2 verse 23 "And the Scripture was fulfilled that says 'Abraham believed God and it was credited to him as righteousness.'" Does that sound familiar? "And Abraham was called God's friend." Is that a pretty big title, for somebody to be called "God's friend"? What does it mean to be God's friend? I'm going to try to show you through our study of Abraham what it means to be God's friend.

By the way am I saying Abraham's perfect? No. Abraham's going to have his problems like all human beings have their problems but Abraham's called God's friend. I'll come back to this. This is the last slide. We'll come back to this on Abraham being God's friend.

K. Geography of the ancient Near East [42:59-46:26]

Now before we do that we have got to do a little bit of geography. Have you guys downloaded the PowerPoints? These maps are in the PowerPoints. You don't have to try to draw these maps. I could never draw these maps very well. But anyways. I just want to run through this map. This becomes important for all the rest of the Bible. This is the playing field. This is the chess board. We're going to start over here on the Persian Gulf.

This is the Persian Gulf. We've got the Persian Gulf here. Now we want to come up here--the Euphrates River and the Tigris River. How do you tell which one's which? Does anybody know E.T? E.T is Euphrates/Tigris. You can always tell which order they come in. E.T. is the Euphrates and Tigris. Ur of the Chaldees, we've got the Persian Gulf down here. What country is this? Iran. What country is this? Iraq. So we're familiar with these two countries. These are mountain folk, these are the plains folk. Do the mountain folk and the plains folk always fight? Yes. So these people (Iran) are always going to be trying to push down, these people (Iraq) are always going to be trying to do what? Push back. By the way is that true today? Has that been true for 2000, 3000, yeah, 4000 years? Here's the Persian Gulf, we come in here and here's Kuwait. Over here we have the Tigris and Euphrates running.

Does everybody see Ur here? That's Ur. Now Abraham was from Ur of the Chaldees. If I say to you Warsaw, what comes to your mind immediately? Warsaw, Poland. You guys say Warsaw, Poland. If I just say Warsaw, you guys think of Poland, but I'm thinking about Warsaw, Indiana where I used to live. So because Warsaw Indiana is on a lower level than Poland do I have to qualify that by saying Warsaw, Indiana? I think what you have is when it says Abraham is from Ur of the Chaldees, it's exactly that. This is the big Ur in Sumer and in most of your Bibles they will put that Abraham is from here and he goes all the way up north. He's going to go up to Haran here. What I would suggest to you and I'm feeling more strongly about this but I still don't know for sure because we don't know. What's been suggested now is that there is a northern Ur from up here and that Abraham came down to Haran as he makes his way down into Israel. By the way, does that make a lot more sense than going from here and instead of going over to Palestine this way, going way up to Haran? So the suggestion is that there's a northern Ur up here. That's an Ur of the Chaldees. So he's specifying it's where the Chaldeans came from, and that he then comes from this northern Ur. We don't know where that place is. There's literally hundreds and hundreds of tels up there that we don't know where the place is. So what I'm just trying to say is there's a northern Ur and there's a southern Ur. I'm going with the north now myself but I taught the southern Ur

for decades, but I think I've seen some good argumentation now that there's a northern Ur.

L. Mari [46:27-47:38]

Now what other places are really important? There's another place called Mari here. This place called Mari is right where the Euphrates comes up and from here if you've got to go on a double humped camel with a driver on the floor, you can make it all the way across. So this is the first place when you come here you can grab water, but what's the problem? Why didn't Abraham just go across like this, go across the desert? Have you ever been in a place where you're caught in a desert and you're on foot. There's no cars, you can't just jump in the car with every direction as far as your eye can see it is absolute desert. Does that scare the daylights out of you? The answer is, I was 25 when that happened and it was as far as your eye can see and there was no way out and you've got your feet, no cars, no nothing. Question. Is that spooky? I just want to tell you. You come out into the desert here. Now does anybody go out there? Yeah, well today, you see people drive cars out there. But when you've got just a camel, even the camels don't make it across here very well. But they can make it from here, so Mari is going to be an important place. They found a bunch of tablets at Mari. So we're going to have tablets from Mari from the time of Zimri Lin and Hammurabi (ca. 1750 BC).

M. Nuzu [47:39-48:31]

The other place we're going to get tablets from is Nuzu. They found several thousand tablets at Nuzu. Nuzu is where a lot of the customs come from. We're going to see a lot of ancient customs. I'm going to tell you this or that is a custom of that day. How do we know that? They are found in these tablets at Nuzu. So Nuzu will tell us a lot of the customs coming from the background of 17, 18 hundred BC within a couple, 300 years of Abraham. So these two places Mari and Nuzu are going to give us a lot of information about the time just after Abraham. It's going to be really helpful to us when we interpret the Bible.

No. no. She's referencing down here at a place Sinai possibly here, it was called Mara that meant bitter; the water was bitter. It's down here in Sinai. This is the Sinai

Peninsula. Mari is totally different, it's on the Euphrates River.

O. Haran and Ebla [48:32-50:45]

So as you come up here, Mari and Nuzu, here's Haran. Who's famous from Haran that you know? Rachel and Leah were from there, and who got them hooked up--Laban? Does anyone remember Laban? Do you remember Rebekah? She was also from Haran, remember she did the watering with the camels thing up here in Haran. So Abraham's home, after he leaves Ur he sets up camp in Haran. That's where Terah, his father, dies. That's where Laban is, that's where Rachel and Leah are from, that's where Rebekah is from. So Haran's their home. Abraham then leaves and comes down this way. Now two sites over toward the Mediterranean, one is called Ebla. The Ebla site, comes from about 2400 BC. It was discovered, I believe, in the 1980s or 70s. Now by the way, why is 2400 BC important for us? Abraham was what? 2000 BC. Is Ebla 400 years before Abraham? So that's going to put Abraham in a framework. You know what I'm saying? It's going to give us what it was like 400 years before Abraham.

This place called Ugarit was another significant place. By the way, this place, Ebla. There are real problems there. Ebla is in what country? Syria. Does Syria like having people find Bible fulfilled stories in Ebla. So what's happened is they first came out and said Sodom and Gomorrah were found in the Ebla tablets and then the Syrians got a hold of the stuff with some of the Italians and now basically to be honest, we don't know that much about Ebla. It seems like the site has been shut down. There's a ton of stuff there and it's a shame the world hasn't been able to get at it because it's so political. By the way, is there really some tough conflict going on in Syria right now? Do you realize the Syrian President Assad is killing his own people? His father killed 10,000 in one village. So Syria's going through some really bad times right now. Now what's the capital of Syria? Damascus. Damascus is one of the oldest cities in the world and so it's really quite a city. This is Damascus and Syria.

P. Ugarit & Egypt [50:46-53:23]

Now up here, Ebla, 2400 BC, a bunch of tablets we don't know what's in them because the Italians got a hold of it and the Syrians. Ugarit dates from about 1400 to 1200

BC. In Ugarit they've found thousands of tablets and there's actually a language called Ugaritic which I've had the unfortunate privilege to be able to learn to read in transcription. Guess what they've found there? In the Bible have you ever heard of Baal? In the Bible we're told that there's this god Baal and we don't know much about him. We realize that there are whole Baal myths now. We've got tablet after tablet telling us myths about Baal and Asherah, his consort. So we have tons of stories, we know who Baal is now, largely out of Ugarit. So Ugarit's going to give us things around the time of the judges.

Finally, then we come down into Israel we've got the Sea of Galilee, Jordan River, Dead Sea. We come over here and this is Sinai, you can see the Sinai peninsula here where they crossed over into Sinai. Here this is what country? Egypt. That city is Alexandria and it's named after...? Alexander the Great. What was Alexandria famous for? A library. It was like an early Library of Congress. This library tried to get every book in the world that was scroll. It was an incredible collection. It was burned, torched so we don't have any of their records but we have records that this place was the center of learning. Alexandria was the Boston of the ancient world. In other words, it was the center of education and learning--huge libraries and education. As soon as you come down to Cairo and Memphis. When I say Memphis, what's the first thing that comes to you mind? Memphis, Tennessee? Does anybody do Memphis Tennessee? And the reason why I always bring that up is because of the king. The king is buried in Memphis. I said the king in the last class period and they didn't know what I was talking about but for my generation there was only one king and that was Elvis. Memphis Tennessee. If you ever go there wear your blue suede shoes and hit the streets of Memphis.

There's another place down here called *Tel Amarna* and this is where they have the *Amarna* letters. This is not important for us right now but it will be later on. So Egypt is here. Egypt is the gift of the Nile. If you take the Nile out, what is left of Egypt? Desert, thousands of miles in each direction. Egypt is the gift of the Nile. Actually get on your Google Earth satellite imagery. Can you actually go down and see the Nile River? It's really kind of cool from a Google satellite image.

Q. Map Schematic [53:24-58:45]

Now let me show you another map that kind of schematizes this whole thing and I forgot one city as I did. Here's southern Ur, here's Babylon, Mari, Nuzu, and Nineveh.

As soon as I say Nineveh, who comes to mind? Jonah. When I was younger I thought Jonah rides this whale, the whale spits him up, and then he goes to Nineveh. What's the problem with this picture? The whale's out here. Did the whale swim all the way around Africa, then swim up the Tigris River? What's the problem? Tigris River is 3 or 4 feet deep in places so it was a real skinny whale. So the whale spits him out up here on the shore of the Mediterranean. Did the whale spit Jonah out here? No chance. He would have had to swim all the way around Africa. The Suez canal had been built yet. So what happened is, the whale spits him out here. Does Jonah have to walk a long way over there? It just puts Jonah in a different context getting out of the whale and going and preaching the next day. He had a long way to think about it before he got over to Nineveh. So Nineveh was the capital of Assyria with really nasty people there. I'm just making generalizations now, but they were the Hitlers of the ancient world. They were an incredibly cruel people. Jonah preaches repent, what did the people do? They repent and it was incredible. Their repentance shocked and saddened the uncompassionate Jonah.

Now Mari, Mari has over 25,000 tablets. There were 5000 found at Nuzu. Nuzu's the place where we get a lot of our customs from. Ebla there was about 18,000 tablets, many of those we're still waiting to be translated, Ugarit, I think, in my mind, I remember was about 12,000 tablets found there. It was a whole new alphabetic language called Ugaritic. This was a whole new language for us too. So these are the places I want you to know. Is that ok? So work on learning these places. E.T. right? Euphrates, Tigris. And then by the way, just for the nuts of it, what's this? Sea of Galilee, Jordan River, Dead Sea? That's an artist conception or a misconception probably.

R. Reading and writing [55:37-58:46]

Now, I actually found some of these cuneiform tablets online. I just wanted you to see them. Remember I told you they stick in the mud when they write with a stylus? This

is actually a Mari tablet from about 1750 B.C. There's this guy called Zimri Lin, he was king of Mari, and guess who Zimri Lin butted heads with? You know this guy.

Hammurabi. Hammurabi and Zimri Lin duke it out. We've actually got tablets now from Zimri Lin saying, "Hammurabi is beating up on me." So do you see the way these tablets are stuck with the stylus? You can actually see the end of the stylus and the front of the stylus? It's like a bull rush kind of thing and you stick it in the mud and can you see that they stick it this way then they stick it this way. They stick it different ways. This is a syllabic language. A syllabic language means that each syllable gets a symbol. How many different syllables are there? If I gave you the two consonants r and d how many syllables can you make out of "r" and "d"? You can make "rad", you can make "rude", you can make "rid", do you see what I'm saying? So just out of r and d you can make 15 or 20 different syllables. Now if each one of these syllables had a different symbol and you had 800 syllables, and you had to learn the 800 symbols before you could read or write, who could read or write in this culture? Only the very wealthy. You would have to be a scribe, to learn to read. So that meant only the elite could read. Could the common person read this stuff? Probably not. So basically, these are written by scribes, professional scribes, high class people, and very few people could read it. This is from one of the Mari tablets, you can see how it is. By the way, these mud tablets, what happens when they burn the temple down? It fires it; it gets harder and so that's why they were preserved.

Now here's one and this is really cool. This is from Ebla. By the way, can you see the columns and how they write in columns? Do you see that? This doesn't show it, but on the side- sometimes they'll stick in the side. The tablets are about as wide as your iPad. They'll stick them in the side and they'll write down the side of these things as well. It's pretty weird isn't it? But this is what a tablet looks like. This is an amazing tablet. Are a lot of these tablets busted? This is a full tablet. This is kind of an amazing one. By the way, this is an Ebla tablet. Is it possible that a doctoral student at University of Pennsylvania would spend 5 to 7 years working on a doctorate reading this one tablet and then when he gets it done he will get a PhD? Yes. This is what happens in the

basement of the University of Pennsylvania. They've got all these tablets that nobody's ever read before. They're kind of like dungeon dwellers. They'll put them down there, the guy stays down there for 5 years, he comes out, he reads the tablet, he gains a tablet and they give him a Ph. D. That was a joke. But there's some truth to that. But anyway, so this is a tablet, showing what they look like.

S. Importance of the Alphabet [58:47-60:12]

Now, here's one and this one is really neat because, what is this? This is an Ugaritic tablet you'll see how it's small and it's different but what's different about this one is this one's from about 1400-1200 B.C. This is the time of the Judges. This one's alphabetic. What is the advantage of the alphabet? Syllabic languages, you have learn 800 symbols before you can read and write. With the alphabet it goes by phonemes not syllables. It goes by how they're said and there's only about 22 to 30 different sounds. Therefore the alphabet is only 22 or 30 symbols. How smart do you have to be to learn 22 symbols? Can a kindergartener learn 22 symbols? So with the alphabet is this an amazing new technology? Can a common person read after about 1800 BC? Is the alphabet an incredible invention? I guess this is what I'm trying to say. Is the alphabet an incredible invention that allowed the common person to be able to read? In the book of Judges they catch a kid running out of this town. The guy catches this kid, grabs him and says, "Hey, write down all the names from the elders of the town." And the kid writes them down. He was just a kid, a common kid. Caught randomly. He writes it down.

T. Printing Press and the Digital [60:13-62:48]

Now, let me just push one or two more things. Does the alphabet democratize learning? Does the structure of the alphabet, 1800 BC, does it democratize learning? Yes, it does. Push it one more. About 1450's AD you have got a guy that developed a thing called the printing press. Now, instead of one person copying one manuscript with a printing press you have got one person able to produce a thousand manuscripts. Question does that again democratize learning? The printing press. You see what an incredible invention the printing press was in the 1450s. Gutenberg changed the whole map.

Now, what's happened? Now, how big is your alphabet? Two, the digital "Alphabet" 0/1. We've gone from 22 down to two. Your alphabet is 0 and 1. With your alphabet, with 0 and 1, can I write your alphabet in ASCII code? Yes. With a 0 and 1 can I put this in a jpeg image and turn that 0 and 1 into a picture with 16 million colors? Yes. Can I take that same 0 and 1 alphabet and can I turn it into sound and put it in a mp3 audio that you can play and you can hear? Can I take that same 1 and 0 and put it into a video and play those images at 30 frames a second? The 1 and 0, in your generation, do you see what's happening? This is your generation. This is tremendous what has happened in the last 30 years? And question can I take that 1 and 0 and can I put it on my computer and communicate to a guy who's studying Greek and watching my avatar in India? Then just before school starts a guy in South Africa using that 1 and 0--can it go all over the world? Is learning getting democratized? Then my question to you is as Christians, do we use that 1 and 0 now, the power of the 1 and 0 for the glory of God and the good of others or do we abandon it so evil uses it? Will evil use it? Yes. So what I'm suggesting is you guys live in a digital age that to be honest, I'm jealous in a certain sense. I'm an old man. I'm kicking off here in just a little while probably. That's the honest truth. I'm getting to be an old man, but there's so much just right in your face. What I'm saying is grab it, go for it. It's tremendously powerful and it's happening in your generation. It's really cool. So anyway, the alphabet's really important.

U. Abraham's Three Cuts: Cut family ties [leave Ur] [62:49-64:27]

We're going to talk about Abraham, and Abraham's got his three cuts. Abraham is Genesis chapters 12 to 25. The first cut that Abraham has to make is with his own family. The Lord told Abraham "Leave..." This is the call of Abraham. "Leave your country, your people, and your father's household and go to a land that I will show you. I will make you into a great nation and I will bless you. I will make your name great and you will be a blessing. And I will bless those who bless you and curse those who curse you." First cut, he has to leave his family. By the way, is it hard to leave one's family? Now you guys are from America we move all over the place. You say, "no, it wasn't hard at all I came to Gordon College and it's all good." When you're raised in those cultures;

you were reared in an extended family. All your brothers and sisters, your cousins, your nephews, your father and mother not only live there but your grandfather, your grandmother and all their siblings live in the same town. When you left that kind of a village was it a big deal to leave? That is a big deal to leave. The first thing God says to Abraham, "Leave." Who's going to be your family now? Basically, God's going to lead him to a land and show him a new land so the cutting of family ties is a big deal. Why is it that when God calls people so often there is this leaving behind of something? Moses has to leave the Sinai desert and go back to Egypt. So a common thread that happens quite frequently in Scripture is the cutting of family ties.

V. Melchizedek and the rescue of Lot [64:28-67:48]

Now, in chapter 14, Abraham is out chasing down... do you remember, Lot? Lot was Abraham's nephew. Lot and Abraham split and then there was this king, Kedorlaomer who comes down and kidnaps Lot. He hauls Lot and his family off as plunder. Abraham gets his 318 guys and they go out to capture this king. They recapture Lot, and he's coming back. Abraham is victorious. He comes back and as he's coming back, Abraham runs into this guy just out of the clear blue. He runs into Melchizedek. *Melchi* means king, *zedek* means righteousness--king of righteousness. So he runs into Melchizedek, the king of righteousness. By the way, Melchizedek is the king of what city? Is this important too? Yes. He's the king of Salem. But when in Hebrew you say "city of," you say Jeru-salem. And if you say *Jeru* "city of Salem," and you say "*Jeru* Salem" very fast, you get what? Jerusalem. This king is king of Jerusalem a thousand years before Jerusalem was the city of David. Melchizedek was king of the city of Jerusalem [city of peace].

Melchizedek shows up, what does Abraham do to this guy? Abraham gives him a tenth of everything he has. This guy is not only a king but he's also a priest. So he's a priest and he's a king. Furthermore, he's a priest of the Most High. Abraham pays him a tenth of everything he has. Does Abraham honor this guy? Yes.

Now somebody in the last class asked me this. In the book of Hebrews is Melchizedek, Jesus? Is Melchizedek pre-incarnate Christ? Some people think that

Melchizedek was the pre-incarnate Christ. I kind of back off from that myself. I think that this guy is a king and a priest and so he typifies Christ; he's like Christ in the Old Testament, but he's not really Jesus. He appears out of nowhere and then actually after chapter 14 we never hear about him again. He's gone. So he just kind of appears, Abraham pays him a tenth, and then he's gone again. So some people think it's Christ, I think he probably just typifies Christ as a person who is a priest and a king like Jesus would be. So that's why he does similar things to Jesus. There are different approaches and Hebrews picks that up. So that's Genesis' Melchizedek, who is an enigmatic person. The honest truth is we don't really know. He just appears, then vanishes from the text.

The point of why I raise this is in the Old Testament is it only the Jews that know God? Did Melchizedek? Was he Jewish? No. Abraham didn't have any kids yet so he can't be Jewish. The guy's not Jewish and does he know God? Does Abraham honor him with a tithe for knowing the most high God? Yes. So what I'm suggesting is that in the Old Testament don't think that it's just the Jews. There are other people that are going to pop up in the text that you're going to read about that came out of nowhere and they know Jehovah God. So that's interesting to me. Here's a guy who's non-Jewish. He knows God; he's a priest of the most high and he's a king of Jerusalem.

W. Second Abrahamic Cut: Cutting a Covenant [67:49-72:47]

Now another cut here is in chapter 15, and this is a tough one. In chapter 15 down about verse 10 or so, as the sun was setting, verse 12: "Abraham fell into a deep sleep and a thick and dreadful darkness came over him. Then the Lord said 'Know for certain that your descendants will be strangers in a country not their own and they will be enslaved and mistreated for 400 years.'" What would that be? "They will be enslaved and mistreated for 400 years." Did God tell Abraham beforehand that his descendants are going to go into Egypt for 400 years and that they would be mistreated and enslaved? God tells him that ahead of time. Then God comes and tells him some other things and then God says basically, "I can't give you the land yet because the sin of the Amorites is not yet full. So Abraham, I'm going to give you this land, but I can't give it to you yet

because of the sin of the Amorites is not yet full.” What is the implication? Is God saying that the sin of the Amorites is getting fuller and fuller and when it reaches a certain level then he’s going to bring in the Jews to destroy them? But it’s not yet full so they can’t have the land.

Then verse 17 of chapter 15: “When the sun had set and darkness had fallen, a smoking firepot with a blazing torch appeared and passed between the pieces.” Abraham had to cut this animal in two. Then this blazing firepot goes between the two parts of the animal. Now is it obviously something symbolic is going on here? It turns out that we’ve got a good guess at what this scene means. There’s two things that it could be. First, this animal used to be one, and is now cut in two as this animal used to be one, now God and Abraham are made one in the covenant. By the way do we have covenants even to this day where two are made one in a covenant? Just think about that. Yes, marriage. And so what you have here is this covenant where God and Abraham being bonded together with the union symbolized as this animal was one, now we’re becoming one and that’s possible.

Has anybody ever done this? You guys probably don’t do this in your generation but in my generation we had this thing called blood brothers. So Dave Remes and I, when we were younger, we cut ourselves, don’t do this. Well, actually you do this slashing stuff. Sorry, that was a sick joke. All right. But Remes and I wanted to be blood brothers. We were really good friends, he was my best friend, we wanted to be blood brothers, and so he cut himself, I cut myself, and we swapped blood. Don’t do that today. But anyway we didn’t know any better back then so we swapped blood. So this idea of blood bonding things together is what I guess I’m trying to say.

Now there’s another approach to this and I think the second one is probably more accurate. What this is jumps out of Jeremiah chapter 34 verse 18. The symbol that’s used in Jeremiah is that this animal’s cut in two that is if you violate the covenant, you will be cut in two like this animal. So this is called the ratifying of the covenant. How do we ratify covenants today? Have you guys ever been to the bank and you get a notary and the notary embosses that paper? That’s like ratifying the covenant. It’s approving it; you

know when they stamp an emboss it, and it's good. So this is the ratification or solemnizing of the covenant. As this animal was one, and was cut in two, if you violate the covenant, you will be cut in two. Now what happens with that? Who passes between the two parts? God does. So what God is doing here is binding himself to Abraham, the smoking fire pot represents God, possibly, and what it's saying here is that God is binding himself to Abraham in this covenant. God is solemnizing that he will keep his covenant.

Now, by the way, what is the covenant of God? God promised Abraham three things. They are: the land [the promised land, the land of Canaan]; the seed, that his seed will be multiplied as the what? Stars of the heaven. His seed will be multiplied as the sand of the seashore and that he would be what? He would be a blessing to all nations. So Abraham was promised the land, the seed and that he will be a blessing to all nations. God promised that to Abraham and in this process of the cutting of the animal and the firepot going in between, God is saying "I will keep my covenant. I will make this covenant with you. I am bound by this covenant. You will get the land, the seed and the blessing." So this is the ratifying of the covenant where God participates in this Abrahamic Covenant.

X. Abraham's Third Cut: Circumcision [72:48-78:36]

Now there's one more cut and this is the cut of his flesh in Genesis chapter 17. I need to tell you a little story when I'm bringing this up. Once upon a time I taught at another school for 22 years. It was a place called Grace College. It's a very conservative school, a very God-centered Bible-centered school. I had down front this girl who sat there. Have you ever seen students and they take every word down that you say and they are, "Oh, I just believe everything professor Hildebrandt..." It was when I was younger. So she was really into it and she would write everything down, so we were going over this text about Genesis chapter 17. This girl raises her hand and she asks, "Professor Hildebrandt, it says in this chapter that Abraham was circumcised and he circumcises his son, what is that anyway?" Now the first thing I thought was, do students set professors up? So I look her straight in the face and I'm expecting this little smirk on her face like

“I got you now, what are you going to do.” So I look at her and she gives me this blank look as if she’s so innocent. She’s just ready to write down the answer. I’m saying “Holy cow, she’s really asking me,” I mean in truth she’s asking me. I’m thinking: I can just see it now: Hildebrandt gets fired for drawing pictures on the board. So I go home that night and I tell my wife, I said, “you can’t believe it, this girl *bemet* [in truth] in front of the whole class, this girl asked me what circumcision is. Can you believe that?” My wife turns to me and she says, you know, when I was in about 7th or 8th grade I didn’t know what it was either. I went and asked the pastor what it was. I thought “Holy cow this is pretty weird” and then I realized, most males now are circumcised at birth. What I’m saying is a lot of guys don’t even know. So let me just say: what it is, is, at the end of the male’s penis there’s skin that hangs out about a half inch or so what happens is the doctor cuts it off. It’s called the foreskin. He cuts that foreskin off. Now by the way that happens when you’re a baby. I know this because I had two boys. When they do it to a baby, they barely whimper. I’m not kidding, I had more of a problem with it than my sons did. It was over and the babies barely whimpered. Try that on an 18 year old. Is that a problem? By the way, in the Bible, is that going to be a problem later on? Abraham was circumcised at 75, is that a problem? That’s a problem. So anyway, just some things to think about.

By the way, is this circumcision, is this a big deal? Is circumcision how the Jews identify themselves? Are the Jews “of the circumcision” and if you’re a Gentile you’re what? Uncircumcised. Have you ever heard that terminology, “uncircumcised Gentiles”? So that’s how the Jews used it as an ethnic marker demonstrating you’re in Judaism. Now did other cultures circumcise besides the Jews? Yes, other cultures did. But is God saying here, “while other cultures also circumcised, circumcision for you means a sign of the covenant.” This is how it is sealed. The covenant is sealed in your flesh. Now let me just go over here for a second and are any of you from a Presbyterian background? Presbyterians baptize children and let me get some of these points up here on circumcision. This becomes an unconditional covenant the land, seed, and the blessing. Are some of you Presbyterian background? In the Presbyterian background do they

baptize babies? Yes, they do. Do you realize it's on the basis of circumcision. The Jews were supposed to be circumcised in the eighth day. Now that circumcision shows that they were part of the covenant community. The Presbyterians, when they baptize babies, they are saying that our babies, like circumcision, and in baptism, our babies are part of the covenant community of believers in Christ. Is that why they baptize babies/infants? It's to basically welcome those infants into the covenant community.

Now, by the way, are some of you Baptist? You don't baptize babies. But can you see why the Presbyterians would do that? Like circumcision in the Old Testament and baptism in the new, you're including those infants into the covenant community. So that's kind of where that comes from. Abraham's covenant is the land, the seed, and the blessing.

Once Abraham has circumcised himself and his child, the covenant is unconditional. That is, Abraham has fulfilled the conditions of the covenant which means then that God is now obligated for the land, the seed, and the blessing. It is an unconditional covenant now. The Abrahamic covenant is unconditional. Now when you get into the Mosaic Covenant, did they have to obey it in order to get blessings and cursing? Did they have to obey it and then if they disobeyed they got the cursing? With Abraham, the covenant is unconditional. So God will work with Abraham's descendants guaranteed. They will get the land, the seed, and be a blessing to the nations. What happens now there's going to be other covenants that are conditional. They will be conditioned based on their obedience. The Mosaic covenant is conditional so I just want to say once he's circumcised, that's it. The covenant's ratified in that sense.

Y. Critics problems: Camels [78:37-80:18]

Now there are some problems. These are general problems that critics actually find with text. In Genesis chapter 12 it says that Abraham has camels. Now what's the problem with that? Years ago, they said that the Bible had an error here because they said camels were not domesticated until about 1200 BC. What? Abraham's date? 2000 BC. So they say Abraham is 800 years before camels were domesticated, therefore the Bible's got an error here. Abraham could not have had camels that were domesticated. Therefore

the Bible's got an error. Lo and behold, guess what happens? They find in Ebla, 2400 BC that's 400 years before Abraham, and guess what the guys in Ebla have? Domesticated camels. So critics criticize the Bible on the basis of camels and frankly they have found out now that even 400 years before Abraham, camels were domesticated.

Have you ever been around camels? The other question I have is: are camels ever domesticated? These animals have personality and some of the camels are really really ornery. I'll tell you some day when we have some stuff although this is on tape now, I'll tell you some camel stories. We stayed in the Bedouin tent for several nights. The Bedouin raise camels... and the guy went off one night and told us three hours of camel jokes. This is the honest truth. Their whole culture is built around the camel. Camels are amazing creatures. Camels are phenomenal animals.

Z. Critics and the Hittites [80:19-81:28]

The Bible says that Abraham ran into some Hittites in Genesis 15:20 but critics said "Hey, there's no record of any Hittites and we know a lot about the ancient world and there's no mention of the Hittites." And so because the Bible mentions Hittites and Philistines back with Abraham, this can't be right. So the Bible must have errors in it. Well, once again, guess what happens. Some guy's up digging around in upper Turkey and all of a sudden he comes on Boghazkoy. It's the capital of the Hittite empire. Not only is there a Hittite capital but we now know it was a whole empire. There's a whole Hittite language. You can go and again get a PhD learning to read these Hittite texts which some of them I assume have not been translated yet. There's a whole culture of Hittites. Now we know about them. They were from up in northern central Turkey. We know there were Hittites. By the way does anybody remember Uriah the Hittite was Bathsheba's husband with David. So he was another Hittite, but Abraham ran into Hittites too and we know now that there was a whole Hittite empire up in Turkey. So again critics again were wrong.

AA. Dan in Genesis 14:14: Anachronism [81:29-85:24]

Now this third one is a real problem. If you have got your Bibles, let me just read it to you. In Genesis chapter 14 verse 14, this is a serious problem. I need to try to

explain this one. It says, “When Abraham heard his relative Lot had been taken captive, he called out the 318 trained men born of his household and went in pursuit as far as Dan.” Now where is Dan? The city of Dan, if I’m Jerusalem here, then Kyle, way in the back of the room there is Dan. Dan is the northern-most part of Israel. Now you say, “Hold on Hildebrandt, what’s the problem with that? He chased him up from the south where he was in Jerusalem, all the way up to the back room there. There’s no problem with that.” The problem was that Dan was not named Dan until the time of Joshua and Judges.

Basically, the tribe of Dan, if this is Israel here, the tribe of Dan settled out by the Coastal plain with the Philistines. Dan didn’t like being around the Philistines because what happened when they were around the Philistines? The Philistines did what to people? They killed them. Dan says, “We don’t like these Philistines. They beat up on us so we’re going to take our tribe from where the Philistines are on the coastal plain here, and we don’t want to fight with the Philistines all the time, so we’re going to move our whole tribe back up to where Kyle is. We’re going to take the whole tribe and shrink it down to one city.” That city was called “Dan.” It’s a famous city in Israel, but it was named “Dan” only later. It originally was Laish.

So what you have here is what’s called an **anachronism**. Now what does “chronism” mean? Do you see the word “chronism” there? Chronology, *chronos* means “time.” Anachronism means “out of time.” In other words, the city of Dan, Abraham couldn’t have known the city of Dan. I guess that’s what I’m trying to say. Dan would not be named that for another 800 years. You say, “Well then how come it’s in the Bible in Genesis?” I think it’s the same thing if I said to you “We’re going to go to Liberty Tree Mall.” Where is Liberty Tree Mall? In what town is it? Does anybody know Danvers? I said we’re going to go to Liberty Tree mall in Danvers, everybody would know where that is. But if I said to you “We’re going to go to Liberty Tree mall in Salem Village,” would you know where that is? Danvers many many years ago used to be called Salem Village. Nobody remembers that now. So the problem is if I’m writing a modern book and I put “Salem Village” will anybody know where that is? No. But if I said “Danvers”

would everybody know? Yes. So what I'm saying is the text seems to have been updated here. The text seems to have been updated and so the original name which was "Laish" is updated to Dan. Now is it possible that Joshua did it. Who finished the Pentateuch? Did Moses finish writing the book of Deuteronomy? No. Moses is what at the end of Deuteronomy? He's dead. It's pretty hard, at least from what I'm told, it's pretty hard to write when you're dead. So the book of Deuteronomy was probably finished by Joshua. Is it possible that Joshua could have inserted this name later or somebody even later than Joshua inserted it because he thought, "Hey, you guys don't know where this town is. If I say, Dan, everybody knows where Dan is." So the text was updated. This is a serious issue for some people but I think to be realistic we got to say Abraham didn't know the name Dan because it was only much later that Dan was up there.

[Student comment] She said does that make it wrong? What I'm saying is no it's not wrong, it's just that the name was updated. The language was updated because nobody knows where Salem village is and everybody knows where Danvers is. All right, so this is this is a big one here.

AB. Abraham's "Three" Kids

Son number one: Eleazar of Damascus [85:25-86:29]

Abraham's got "three kids." We'll just do these quickly. First of the three was Eleazar of Damascus. What's Abraham's problem? Sarah is barren and can't have kids so let me just kind of narrate this story. So Abraham comes to God and says, "God, you said you're going to bless me with this land, seed, and blessing but I haven't gotten any kids. This is doing me no good." And he says "Moreover, I don't have any kids and Eleazar of Damascus, my servant, is going to get it all. All the inheritance is going to go to Eleazar of Damascus." So this is the first one of Abraham's "kids." Eleazar of Damascus, his servant, was going to receive the inheritance. By the way, is that legitimate? The answer is, yes. We know that from Hammurabi's code and some of these ancient law codes that if a person died and had no children who got their goods? The servant got the goods. So this is following the ancient laws that Eleazar of Damascus would get Abraham's inheritance. God comes to him and says "No, it won't be Eleazar, it will be somebody

from your own flesh.” So it’s not Eleazar but this is the first one Abraham thought that he would have, his servant.

AC. Ishmael and Hagar: son number two [86:30-89:51]

So then what happens with Hagar? This is actually a really important text in Genesis chapter 16. Let me just narrate this story. Hagar is Abraham’s handmaiden, his servant. Who sets Abraham up with Hagar? Sarah. Sarah says to Abraham “I can’t have kids. Go into Hagar and conceive with her and the child then will be my child and therefore he will get the inheritance and he’ll be our child.” Now, that is exactly like the laws of Hammurabi. They’re following the laws and the customs of their day. Now this is a big issue. We have to get out of our culture. Did the code of Hammurabi say that it was all right for a master to go into his maid and that whatever child was had would be his adopted child? Yes. It was allowed in the laws of Hammurabi.

Now you say “Wow, this is Abraham’s cheating on Sarah.” Is Abraham cheating on Sarah? Did Sarah see it that way? Did Abraham see it that way? No. I think what you have got to do is take this out of... as one fellow in the last class says “Abraham is having sex with this other woman.” Is that the American way of thinking about it. Did Abraham think about it like that? “Abraham’s having sex and cheating on his wife.” No. They’re thinking about it like this. My wife and I can’t have kids. But if we couldn’t have kids, is it possible they can take part of me, part of my wife, and find a woman who we pay 10 to 20 thousand dollars and they put it in this other woman and she, this surrogate mother, has the child? That’s what’s going on here. Can Abraham go to his doctor and put the parts in a test tube and put it in the other woman? Abraham can’t do it; so he has to do it the natural way. So basically what you have got is you have to put it in the context of the surrogate wife. This is not cheating on his wife; his wife set this up. Hagar’s the surrogate wife.

Now, by the way, even in modern times when a test tube baby is put in another woman and she bears that child, do you remember that case in New Jersey? The woman bears the child, does the woman who bears the child want to keep the child? Do you remember that? The woman who bore the child was attached to the child and she didn’t

want to give it back to the husband and wife.

Does this cause problems even in the modern America with test tubes and babies? This still causes a problem. Was there a problem then after Sarah gave Hagar in to her husband's lap? Is there jealousy between Hagar and Sarah? Yes. Did it work back then or were there problems associated with this?

Does this mean that God approves of this? Or was this what they did in their culture? Are there things recorded in the Bible that are not necessarily saying this is true for all time? If it was part of their culture it was not meant to be universalized. So you have got to separate cultural norms from moral universals. You have got to separate those two. By the way, does God cover for Ishmael and Hagar? Does God protect them? Yes. God takes care of them even after Sarah kicks them out and they go out into the desert. So this is a pretty big deal here.

AD. Third son: Isaac, son of the covenant [89:52-91:03]

Finally, you get this Isaac, he's the son of promise born of Sarah and Abraham when they are very old. What does Isaac's name mean? Isaac means "laughter." Sarah laughed, did Abraham also laugh? He also laughed. So his name is Isaac, laughter. This is the son of the promise then, the greatly desired and anticipated son of the promise. We'll call it quits there and we'll see you on Thursday.

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in the eighth lecture of his Old Testament History, Literature and Theology class. This lecture began with the sons of God and the daughters of men in Genesis chapter 6 and proceeded to Abraham, God's friend, the geography of Mesopotamia as well as three cuts in Abraham's life and his three alleged children.

Transcribed by Young Chang
 Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt 2

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 9[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in OT History, Literature and Theology lecture 9 on Abraham, Sodom and Gomorrah, the Akedah or the binding of Isaac and the beginning of the story of Jacob.

A. Quiz Preview [0:00-1:20]

Class, let's get started. For next week you are working on the book of Numbers and it's only select chapters in Numbers. Numbers is a big book there are a lot of genealogies in the early part of it. We will skip over some of the genealogies so you'll read only selected main passages. There will be an article I don't know whether it's *Our Father Abraham* and memory verses. That will be for next Thursday and the Thursday after that we'll have our first exam. Our exams are different from our quizzes. The exams are over what we talk about in the lectures and the memory verses. Don't forget about the memory verses they'll come back up, back up and back up. Do think about the lectures. There are some old study guides if you want to look those over just to prepare for that. That will be the week after next Thursday.

B. Abraham: She's my sister [1:21-6:32]

We're going to try and push through a bunch of the book of Genesis today. We're going to deal with Abraham and hopefully get out of Abraham and into Jacob and Isaac. So we want to move rather quickly. Some of the material we cover today will be rather tricky so I ask for your patience with that. You can't really discuss all sides of these things because they're complex issues. We'll start off with Abraham. There are four questions that come up in Abraham's life that I want to discuss. One of them that comes up is in chapters 12 and 20. He does it twice, he says "she's my sister." Sarah is so gorgeous and she's 75 years old, it must have been different back then. Therefore the king is going to hit on her. So "tell the king you're my sister, so he won't kill me." So that comes up. Then later on it happens again, "say you're my sister and spare me." In

chapter 12 it is Pharaoh and later on it's Abimelech of the Philistines. What's going on with this "you're my sister" routine? It's kind of interesting. Does everyone remember that Isaac does the same thing with Rebekah (ch. 26)? The apple doesn't fall from the tree. You see this happen, the same story happens three times. Everyone says that it wasn't lying because she was Abraham's half-sister, but was it meant to deceive? I'm going to say Abraham was lying.

Why is it that everyone wants to marry the "sister"? Some people have suggested it goes back to some Near Eastern customs, when you see something happening repeatedly something that we're not used to, suspect it may be a cultural issue. I think what you have happening here, and there are different ways to look at it, there are different sets of customs that can be applied to this passage. Dr. Gordon Hugenberger, by the way, if you get on the website for Genesis he has 48 sermons on the book of Genesis. Dr. Gordon Hugenberger, from Park Street Church, is probably one of the greatest preacher's I've ever heard. He's just incredible. He has a different take on this, but what I think is going on is you have Abimelech and Pharaoh see this guy come up with this woman. In the ancient world did a woman need a protector? Even in modern times sometimes women need protectors. What I think happened was she is a woman by herself. And what happened was that a man would see a woman by herself and come along and adopt her as a "sister." That means he would come along and be the protector brother and what would happen was when she gets married, the protector brother gets the dowry. He protects her, she gets married, and he gets the money. So you can see how both would benefit. So when Abraham says, "she is my sister." The king says, "Ok, this guy probably wants to get her married off, so I will take her into my harem, and then just pay this guy off." So that's possibly what's going on.

Does God protect Sarah? Now I'm not saying what Sarah did was right or wrong, but probably in that culture it's something you did to save your own life. It seems that God protected her when she went into the harem. You remember the one king had a dream at night where God says, "If you touch her, you're a dead man." The guy comes out and says to Abraham, "Hey, you said this was your sister, that's quite some sister

you've got here buddy," and it just goes off like that. Why would God want to protect Sarah? Who is going to have the child called Isaac and if she is messed up with the Pharaoh or Abimelech then the child wouldn't be Abraham's. So in both instances God protects her from that so it would be known that it's Abraham's child. So I think you have God stepping in there and protecting her because of the line that will be coming through Isaac.

Those are some interesting stories, this custom of adopting and protecting this sister and then marrying her off. I think this was just part of that culture, even to this day you have points at which women need protectors. But you say, women are every bit as good as men. My wife takes the car to the auto mechanic is it different than when I take it? Yes, it is, that's just the way it is. So, anyway, you say you have a great mechanic; well, I haven't been able to find too many mechanics like that.

C. Angelic Visit: Laws of Hospitality [6:33-13:03]

In chapter 18, there are going to be three guys that come to Abram's house. These three guys come, and let me just work with this a little bit. Chapter 18 verse 1: "The Lord appeared to Abraham near the great trees of Mamre while he was sitting at the entrance to his tent in the heat of the day. Abraham looked up and saw three men standing nearby. When he saw them, he hurried from the entrance of his tent to meet them and bowed low to the ground." Then, what does he do? He invites the guys into his tent and washes their feet. Again is that what you did to people coming across the desert? You allowed them into your tent. These are called "Laws of Hospitality." These Laws of Hospitality are really big in the desert.

Once upon a time, I think it was for about three nights, we stayed in a Bedouin context. It was a Bedouin tent and they had Bedouin camels. So we got to ride these camels. One night the guy went off and played this little lute thing and the Bedouin fellow went off for about three hours telling camel jokes. I just didn't know you could do that. But this guy went off describing each one of his camels each of which had a different personality. I should say if you ever get the chance to ride a camel, horses are about this wide, and camels are about this wide. So when you ride a camel, I used to do

taekwondo quite a bit, but when you try and get on one of these camels it's too big this way, so for 45 minutes you get split whether you want to be split or not. So when you get off, have you ever seen those cowboy movies where the guys are walking all bow legged? When I got off the camel after 45 minutes I couldn't straighten up my legs.

By the way camels have different personalities. Just one more story about camels and then we'll get back to the Bedouin. When you get on a camel, they're kneel down and push their tail end up, so you're on this thing and it will throw you forward like you're going to go off and then the front will pop up and you will be up. By the way when you're up on a camel are camels up there? You're up high. So I get on my camel and I've watched them before so I rock forward then I rocked backward. Well, I had this friend, well he wasn't really a friend, but he was this Southern Baptist boy and he was about 6'4 and he weighed about 350 lbs. He was a big boy. Well, I told you these camels have personalities, so this big ole' southern Baptist boy gets on the back of this camel and you're watching, and we go up, and then all of sudden he goes up and you see this camel kind of go "This guy is kind of heavy I don't want to carry him!" So this camel rolls over sideways and rolls this dude right off and then stands up straight. The camel kind of looks over as if to say, "Man, you're too big for this back!" So he rolled him and we got a big laugh out of that.

Going back to the Bedouin, they have these laws of hospitality. So the Bedouin that was there says, "So you're mortal enemy shows up at the door of your tent, the laws of hospitality in the desert, are serious. In the desert, people die from no water, but even if he is your mortal enemy, you have to feed and house your mortal enemy for three days." Now what you do is feed and house him for 3 days and then you kill him. But you have to do this Law of Hospitality for three days. So when you're in the desert you're required to do the Laws of Hospitality and required to help those that are in need. Does that make any sense as to how they work together in the desert? Hardship engenders community.

By the way, you guys know this, there was a fight in Afghanistan, it was the highest they've ever had a fight I think it was at about 10,000 or 11,000 feet. There were

these navy seals up there and what happened was they were surrounded by the Taliban and they got blown out of the water. So what happened was the Taliban basically got the best of them and three of them were killed and one of them was shot to bits and he crawled into this town in northern Afghanistan. When he got there, they don't call them sheiks there, that's the Arab term, I'm not sure what the Pashtuns call them. My son calls them elders, but I don't know the Pashtun word. Anyway, they come to elders of the town, and this guy comes crawling up having been shot, and the elder comes up to see him and once he is in the town and approved by the elder to be in that town, then does that town have to protect him? That's part of their laws. The Taliban chased him down and got to the town and said, "Hey, you've got an American in there." Would the elder have fought the Taliban and destroyed half of his town to protect that guy? Yes, he would have. Once you're in their territory it's like we have to protect this guy. This guy was protected because of these Laws of Hospitality. Did he survive? Yes, he did. A student in the last class actually has the book because the guy ended up writing a book. He was shot up pretty badly and he was in Northern Afghanistan. The name of the book is *The Lone Survivor*. My point is, are the laws in Afghanistan still functioning as in Bible times? I mean it's really kind of amazing because you go back thousands of years and they're still doing things very similar, in terms of these Laws of Hospitality.

What happens here is Abraham accepts these people in, they feed them, he washes their feet, and then these guys turn to Abraham and say, "Abraham, Sarah is going to have a child." What does Sarah do? She laughs and therefore they later name the son "Laughter" or Isaac which means "Laughter."

D. Sodom and Lot [13:04-13:44]

The three guys are there and start looking down toward the Dead Sea. Then they wonder if they should tell Abraham what they are going to do. "Well, Abraham is going to be the father over many nations so we should probably tell him what we're going to do." So they say, "Ok, Abraham, we are going to go down there and smoke Sodom and Gomorrah. We're going to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah." Now what's Abraham's problem with that? Who's down there in Sodom? His nephew, Lot, is down there with his

kids, his nieces. So does Abraham have a problem? They're going to go down there and blow the city out and Abraham thinks, I need to stop this for Lot's sake.

E. Bartering with an interactive God [13:45-17:53]

So down in chapter 18 verse 20 it says, "So the Lord said, 'The outcry against Sodom and Gomorrah is so great, and their sin is so grievous, that I will go down and see if what they have done is as bad as the outcry that has reached me. If not, I will know.'" He then turns away towards Sodom. Who jumps in their way and says, "Wait a minute, you can't go down there and blow them out like that." So Abraham remained standing before the Lord and asked, "Will you sweep away the righteous with the wicked?" Do you see how Abraham is applying these things because he knows the Lord respects the righteous? So he asks, "What if there are righteous people down there? Would you smoke out or blow out these people that are down there even if there are righteous there? What if there are fifty righteous people there?" Now in that culture do they barter for things? When you're in the old city of Jerusalem you come in and they immediately say, "Oh, my friend from America, special price for you today my friend." Then they tell you a price three times what it's really worth, "special price just for you." Do you barter with the guy? You barter this guy down to half price and you go out of there thinking, "Man, I got him down to half price, I got a deal!" He's walking away saying, "I got that guy." But that's the way it works, you barter for everything over there. I've had guys, how should I say this? My wife, for example, got to ride on a camel all it cost was the guy grabbed her leg a little bit so that she could get up on the camel, that's what she had to do to get up on the camel. I had a guy offer me, I think it was 3 camels for my wife and I told him, "No, I wanted at least 5." I've also had guys try to sell me their daughters, and this is the honest truth, they tried to sell me their daughters, but it's just part of the culture. You have to roll with it. I was there for a long time, I lived there for a year and we were down in Sinai for about 3 weeks with the Bedouin, but there was bartering everywhere over there.

Abraham says, "God, if there is 50 righteous there, 50 righteous will you destroy the righteous?" God says, "Ok, I won't do this for fifty righteous." So Abraham says, "Well, what about 45?" He barterers back and forth with God and finally he says, "Will

you destroy the city for 10 righteous? And God says, “Okay, I won’t destroy the city if you can find 10 righteous.” What was Abraham’s concern? Abraham’s concern was Lot. Is God going to take care of Abraham’s concern? Yes, but will he also take care of his concern and still smoke the city? Yes, so he gets him down to 10.

I just want to look at that interaction between Abraham and these angels and it turns out to be God himself. Is this a real interaction? Are God and these angels actually interacting with Abraham or did God know what he was going to do all along and he’s just playing games with Abraham? What I want to say is that I think this is a real interaction. I think what you have here is a real human being interacting with these divine beings. So I don’t think foreknowledge gets you out of this. Well, what he was going to do is what he was always going to do, but that doesn’t solve the problem. I think this is a real and legitimate interaction between a human being given in this context, he bartered him down to 10. I don’t think foreknowledge accounts for this I think this is a real interaction, but you have to be careful.

F. Anthropomorphic and anthropopathic Language? [17:54-21:19]

There are two terms I want to introduce to you guys. Is this just anthropomorphic language? Now what is anthropomorphic? Does anyone know what *anthropos* means? Do I have any of my Greek students in here? *Anthropos* means “people, humans, and mankind,” that kind of thing. *Anthropos* is humankind and “morphic” is, when something morphs it what? It changes form. *Anthropomorphic* means you are portraying God in human terms. Let me just do this for you. Scripture says, “The eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth.” Do God’s eyes have legs on them that they run to and fro throughout the whole earth? It talks about the hand of the Lord, his mighty hand and outstretched arm when you read in the book of Exodus. It uses human terms to talk about God. That’s what you call “anthropomorphic” when one uses human bodily terms when talking about God’s eyes, his mouth, and his face. There’s a person that I know that just wrote a whole book on the face of God and the presence of God, seeing God face to face.

Anthropopathic is different. *Anthropos* is humankind, you can see it again, but instead of in the form, anthropomorphic, it's anthropopathic. That means God is portrayed with human emotions, and pathos. You've read enough of the Old Testament now; have you seen God get angry? Yes. Well, some say, "God doesn't really get angry, it's God and he doesn't have human feelings." I want to suggest to you that it is very likely that God has emotions. We're portraying God in human terms, but, by the way, do we have a basis for doing that? We are made in whose image? We're made in his image, so I would like to suggest that very likely God has emotions. Does God have the emotions of love and compassion? We see the love and compassion of God and we also see the anger of God.

Anthropomorphic means he is portrayed in human terms, like the hands of the Lord and the face of the Lord, in human physical form. Morph means "form." Anthropopathic describes giving God human emotions like love, compassion, and anger.

In Genesis 6 it says, "and the Lord grieved because he had made man," there was a really good comment made in this class about God wanting to destroy all of mankind. We need to come back to that in another context. God was grieved is an anthropopathic description.

Some people want to suggest that God is not really bartering with Abraham but he is just being portrayed as doing that. It's not a real thing, God knows what he is going to do and it's not real. It's just God is portrayed in human terms. I want to suggest that it is real and that God really enters into an interaction with mankind.

G. Can a human being have impact on God? [21:20-22:13]

This raises a question: Can a human being have an impact on God? Remember we saw in Genesis 6, the sons of God marry the daughters of men and we saw *hamas*, there was violence on the earth. Did those people raise God's anger and his grief? Yes. So what I'm suggesting is that human beings can have an impact on God and that's pretty incredible to me that God allows himself to be influenced by what happens on the earth. He is actually involved with it and he actually cares. If he cares, then he is going to be

involved and it is going to have an impact on him for good or for bad, for anger or for love, for kindness or whatever. I'm just raising this thing about humans' ability to impact God. It's kind of incredible when you think about it.

H. Sodom and Gomorrah: Homosexual rape [22:14-42:35]

Now, the next one is going to be more difficult, and we'll have some difficult things to discuss here. So they go down into Sodom and Gomorrah in chapter 19 then, "The two angels arrived at Sodom in the evening, and Lot was sitting in the gateway of the city, when he saw them he got up to meet them and he bowed down his face to the ground, 'My Lord,' he said, 'turn aside to your servant's house, you can wash your feet and spend the night, and then go on your way early in the morning.' 'No,' they said, 'We will spend the night in the square.'" Now does Lot want them to spend the night in the square? No, because Lot knows what goes on down there. So Lot pushes them and it says he insisted so strongly that they did go with him to his house. He insists, you can't stay out in the square. So they come into his house and he prepares a meal for them, baking bread without yeast, interestingly enough.

Before they had gone to bed, every man from every part of Sodom, both young and old, surrounded the house. They called to Lot, "Where are these men that came into you tonight? Bring them out to us." I'll use the King James here: "bring them out so we can 'know' them." Ok, so when the Scripture says "know" them that's as a man knows his wife. Do you know what a euphemism is? "Eu" means good "pheme" is the Greek word for "speaks." So a euphemism is when you say something good about something that's not really good. So basically when they say, "Bring them out so that we may know them," actually the NIV translates it correctly, "Bring them out so that we may have sex with them."

This brings up this issue, which is a very difficult issue, but of course the issue really here is hospitality. These people were inhospitable to these visitors to their town, and therefore they are condemned for their inhospitality. That's what the sin of Sodom was, this inhospitality. What I just gave you is the gay interpretation of this passage. It had nothing to do with homosexuality it had everything to do with hospitality. Now when

you read that passage did you think hospitality? You say, “Yeah, they were real hospitable!” No! Is this homosexual rape basically? So what happens is these guys--well, let me just read the text here: “Where are these men that came into you tonight? Bring them out to us, so that we may know them.” Lot went out to meet them and shuts the door behind him and says, “No, my friends, don’t do this wicked thing. Look I have two daughters that have never slept with a man.” How many of you remember that and just cringe? Do you just say, “Holy Cow, this guy has two daughters and he’s just going to put them out for these wolves?” “Don’t do anything to these men for they have come under my protection of my roof.” In other words, when guests came to his house, was he required to protect his guests over his own family members? That was part of the custom. Remember that guy in Afghanistan? They would have fought to the death to protect him over their own families. So this is a pretty big interesting response here.

So he says, “you can have my daughters.” Is that a problem? What do fathers do for their daughters? Do fathers protect their daughters? You don’t mess with my daughters. You want to come and ask my daughters to marry you, you have to come and talk to the old man. When you talk to the old man, the old man sits in his chair and you’re sitting over there. The old man believes in non-verbal communication and so there is this little thing sitting behind him about this tall, has a little “cha-chink” thing on it, and it sits right behind him. And the point is, you ask me about my daughters and the non-verbal set up is there. Now, by the way, what is that meant to communicate? If you mess with my daughters do you mess with me? Yes! Do you know what a 12 gauge is? I’m serious you don’t mess with my daughters. Both my daughters are married and they both married great guys, better than I could have wished for. You just have to set up parameters. So what I’m saying is this notion of putting his daughters out there, why would he do that? Part of it would be these hospitality laws and he had to protect the guests. Is it possible, and this is just a conjecture on my part, that it would be less of a sin for them to violate his daughters, than for these men to commit a homosexual acts with these guys? Some people have suggested that. What you have here is basically homosexual rape.

Now what happens with the angels? You mess with the angels and all of a sudden these guys are blind. You can't mess with them. Are homosexual acts sin? And what I'm wanting to go over now is, I know many of you have been trained in environments and I know the school environments today are training kids, systematically training kids from kindergarten on up that this stuff is all okay. And I want to say to you is, what I'm saying to you now, in 15 years will be considered hate speech in America. Now you say how do I know that? If I were to say what I'm going to say to you now that homosexual acts are sin, if I were to say that England it would be considered hate speech. I could be put in jail in England. It usually takes about 10 to 15 years to come over here, but it's setting up here now. Does the Bible have a problem with homosexuality? Well, Sodom and Gomorrah are a fairly clear statement. You say that's homosexual rape it's not two homosexual lovers. If you bounce over to some other passages. Leviticus 18:22 says this: "Do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman." Is that fairly clear? "You don't lie with a man as one lies with a woman because that is an abomination." The next verse says, "Do not have sexual relations with animals." The Bible says that. By the way I should say, are there countries in the world today where bestiality is practiced? There are some countries and our troops have come across this on a fairly regular basis.

All I'm saying is these things are in Scripture. If you go over to Romans 1:26 this is another one of these passages. All of these passages will be interpreted in a different way obviously if a person is gay, they'll have this other interpretation of these passages. When you read them you say these passages are fairly clear, how can you miss this? In Romans chapter 1 it's talking about sin coming into the world and there is this downward spiral and God gives them up and they sin more, and then they spiral down and in verse 26 it says, "Because of this God gave them over to shameful lusts, even their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural ones. In the same way men also abandoned natural relations with women and are inflamed with lust for one another. Men commit indecent acts with other men." Now is that fairly clear?

Another one that's really clear is 1 Corinthians 6:9 and it says this, "Do you not know that the wicked will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived, neither

sexual immoral sin, nor idolatry,” is idolatry a sin in Scripture? Idolatry is all over the place. “Nor adultery, nor male prostitutes, nor homosexual offenders.” In Corinth they had male prostitutes. Homosexual offenders are put into the category with all that, I don’t want to go through the whole thing but is the Bible pretty consistent on this?

Now what do you do with folks that are gay and how should Christians react to this issue of homosexuality? I’m going to walk over here and tell you a story and some basic things. Over the years some of my best friends, by the way, I used to teach at a really conservative school in Indiana, and one of my best friends there was a lesbian. For this class I’ll call her Susie, that wasn’t her real name but that’s just what I’ll call her. She was raped by her baseball coach when she was 12. When she was 16 her uncle took her out and violated her, and her uncle took her out and did some other stuff that you can’t even talk about. She was so angry with men that after she told these stories of her life and she walked out of my office and punched the concrete block wall full force and just about busted her knuckles. She was a tough girl, very athletic, and very strong actually. So we got to be very good friends and she couldn’t go home and she had mental problems so they put her in an asylum in a hospital and I would go in there to visit her and there is this guy standing there about 6 inches away screaming at her. I knew her really well, and you could just see she was about to pop this guy and take his face off. So basically I signed these papers and we got her out of there. Did she hate men? Yes, she hated men and I thought she was going to kill this guy.

So she comes over to my house and stayed with us for quite awhile. And my son comes home from the Marines and didn’t know this and he was making some comments that I didn’t think he should be making. And I said do you remember Susie? Susie was a lesbian so you need to think twice before you say some of that stuff. He was totally blown away. She actually came over and helped me build a concrete wall. It was the first time I ever laid block and we faced it with brick and she helped me do it. She was a really good worker. In the meantime, I had been working with concrete for 3 days and do you know what happens to your hands when you work in concrete? I have this rule: real men don’t wear gloves. I know that’s stupid and my wife tells me that’s stupid. So I work with

concrete one day and the concrete dries out your hands after one day. The second day you work with the concrete you start getting these cracks in your hands. The third day, the wounds open up and you have open sores on your hands.

Now Susie calls up and says, “I have to go to Fort Wayne for an AIDS test.” This is when this stuff first started coming out, because you’re thinking you can’t get AIDS like that. It’s no big deal today because we can solve it. Anyway, we didn’t know back then what the deal was, and she had to go take this test. So I said, “Sure I’ll take you over there,” because no one in the school knew what was going on.

So I drove down there and I’ll never forget driving down Route 30 and we’re coming by Columbia City, about halfway to Fort Wayne I’m thinking, “Oh God, I got these open wounds on my hands, what if she comes out of this thing crying and she cries on me, and I don’t know what to do! I have four kids and a wife.” Things like that are going back and forth in my head. I was worried because I don’t know how this stuff is spread. When I get down to bottom-lines with myself and I’m really upset and don’t know what to do. I basically ask myself, and I know these sounds trivial but it’s not trivial to me, I ask myself: what would Jesus do? I know, you say, I know what Jesus would do he would say, “Be healed!” I realized if she came out and she’s crying would Jesus embrace her and allow her to cry on him? She came out of the test and she had tears in her eyes and yes the tears went on me. After about 2 or 3 weeks she got the test back and that she didn’t have it. I was as happy as she was.

She really struggled with some of this stuff. What is the Christian response to being homosexual? Is it possible to love someone like that? My bottom line is: is it possible to hate the sin and love the sinner?

Let me switch examples. Let me use my brother-in-law, I’ll call him Charlie. Charlie is a few years older than I so he had to have been in his late 40s. He had this beautiful \$30,000 truck. My brother-in-law really struggles with alcohol. He went out drinking and driving--bad move. He totals his truck, damages someone else’s car. The government is after him, so what do we do? I have this maxi-van with about 200,000 miles on it, and we go up there and put everything he owns in this maxi van and drive to

our house. He stayed with us for about 6 months while he was recuperating. Question: Do we love Charlie? Do my children love their Uncle Charlie? Yes. Question: Do I hate alcoholism?

I've said this frequently in class and I'll say it again: if alcoholism was standing right there as if it was a person, and I knew that if I killed it right in front of you that I could destroy alcoholism for everyone on the face of the planet, I would, with my bare hands, kill it right in front of you. I wouldn't care. I'd lose my job. I wouldn't care. I hate alcoholism. I hate it. I've seen it destroy. I've got a friend who's in the cemetery now because of that. I hate that stuff. Drinking and driving. Anyway, let me get off that. Alright, I hate it. I would kill it. Question: do I love my brother-in-law? I just got to see him up in Wisconsin about two months ago. Do I love the guy? I love the guy. Question: do I hate what alcoholism has done? Yes. Is it possible then to use that same kind of thinking to ask, "Is it possible to love someone who's a gay person and hate the stuff that's in their life?" And the honest truth is, I'll never forget when she left, Grace, when she was leaving. She gave me a hug that I never think I'll forget. Now by the way, does she hate men? Yes. She hates men. She gave me a hug and then she said to me: "There are only two men in my life that I could ever trust. One was my brother and you're the other one." I'm telling you this was over two decades ago. Question: do I remember that like it was yesterday? Yes. That was one of the nicest things that anybody's ever said to me.

When she left there did she struggle for years? Is that something you just check out of like that? Now, I want to tell you, when it gets into you like that, it takes years. Now my brother-in-law, is he going to struggle with alcohol for the rest of his life? It's actually the cigarettes that are going to kill him. But what I'm saying is, I love the guy. But he smokes too much, he drinks too much. It catches up to you when you get old. But what I'm saying is, will people struggle with that? And the answer is, yes. Should the Christian community know how to love? And what I'm saying is undoubtedly in a class this size, to be honest, there are undoubtedly people who are gay in this room. Should Christians know how to love across those kind of boundaries? Now does that

mean I accept that? And the answer comes from Romans. Romans says, “love what is good and hate what is evil.” What bothers me around here sometimes is that we seem to love everything. And the Bible says, “hate what is evil.” What I’m saying is: learn how to hate what is evil. But is it possible to hate what is evil and still love the people who are watching their lives get destroyed?

I’ve got another friend who’s probably one of the brightest man I’ve ever met in my life. Knows the New Testament in Greek and is an incredible guy. His son got involved in heavy drugs and I’m talking cocaine and heroin and stuff like that. His kid was a really really bright kid. His father had to watch his kid go down the tubes? Question: would his father have died for his son? Yes. And he can’t do anything. I mean, the kid’s involved in this stuff and it’s just destroying his life. So the father loves his son, but does he hate what drugs can do to destroy a person? Seeing that, what has the father’s done, now that he’s retired? Guess what he works with? He works in a halfway house working, counseling with people that are addicted to drugs. So my thing is balance. I don’t know how you get it exactly right. But to love what is good and hate what is evil. It is important to hate what is evil and yet to still care for the people. By the way, is that what Jesus did? Yes. You say, “Well, all we have got to do is be like Jesus.” Yes, try that for a while. Being like Jesus is difficult. So this balance and this issue is difficult. Let’s get out of there. This is my bottom line actually, and I’m sorry for the pun, but this is the bottom line: loving the sinner and hating the sin. I think that if you go off only on loving the sinner and there’s no hatred for the sin, you’ve lost. If you’re only on the hatred of sin and you hate the person, then I think you’ve lost there too. So I think it takes a tension and it’s a pretty tricky tension to get right.

I. Akedah: the binding of Isaac [42:36-54:05]

Now this text is even more difficult. This is one of the most incredible texts in all the Bible. It’s Genesis chapter 22. I want to go through this text. Up until this point in the book of Genesis God comes to Abraham and God is the Great Promiser. He comes to Abraham and every time he comes to Abraham he says, “Abraham Abraham! I’m going

to give you a son. I'm going to give you many descendants, as many as stars of the heavens, as the sand of the seashore. I'm going to give you this land, this Promised Land. I'm going to make you a blessing to all the world, all the nations--the land, the seed, the blessing." He keeps repeating that covenant promise over and over again. And he keeps telling him, "Abraham, you're going to have a son--not Ishmael. Abraham you're going to have a son--not Eliezer. Abraham you're going to have a son by Sarah." And Abraham waits until he's an old man, he's nearly 100 years old or whatever when he has this child. He's waited a long time.

Now in chapter 22 God's changes his role. God is no longer the promiser here. Now God takes a new role: he tests Abraham. So God changes his role with Abraham. He's going to test him. Chapter 22 then, let me start off with this. It says, "Sometime later, God tested Abraham and he said to him 'Abraham.' 'Here I am,' he replied. And then God said, 'Take your son, your only son, Isaac.'" He is the son of the promise, the one that you waited so long for, the one with Sarah, the special child, Isaac, Laughter. "You take him [the kid's probably about 16-years-old now. So do parents get attached to their children over time? So he loves this kid.] and now take your son, whom you love, and go to the region of Moriah. Sacrifice him there as a burnt offering." And you say, "Well, hey, we know about burnt offerings. We just started the book of Leviticus?" Yes, what's the problem with the burnt offering? It's usually called a whole burnt offering. When it says the whole burnt offering, usually what happens? Is the kid going to walk away from this? No. When you're a whole burnt offering, the whole thing gets burned up. You're fried.

"Go to Mount Moriah and sacrifice him there as a burnt offering on one of the mountains I will tell you about." There seems to be a specific place—"on one of the mountains I will tell you about." Can you imagine what's going through Abraham's head now? God just told him to sacrifice this kid that he's waited for, that he's loved. It's got to be incredibly devastating.

What's the next verse say? It's very interesting how the text does this. This is the next verse: "Early the next morning, Abraham got up." See because if you're going to do

God's will, you've got to get up early because "the early bird gets the worm." It's really important he got up early in the morning. Early in the morning, you've got to get up early in the morning. Then after he got up early in the morning, "he saddled his donkey." If you're going to go for a ride for three days to the north there, you have to saddle a donkey. You're going to ride a donkey, so you've got to saddle it. So he got up early; he saddled his donkey; and he took two servants with him. Now you need the servants because you've got to haul all this wood for the fire and you need the servants to help you out. So he's got two servants who were helping him out. He took the two servants with him and his son Isaac. "When he had cut enough wood," oh, yeah, if you're going to have a sacrifice, you need wood to burn there so that's really important too. If you're going to go sacrifice to God, you have got to bring the wood. You don't want to get caught with no wood. "So he cut the wood for the burnt offering and set out to the place that God told him."

What this proves is that Abraham's feelings don't matter. Is there any mention of Abraham's feelings here? Not one. Abraham got up early, saddled his donkey, cut the wood--no feelings whatsoever. He just obeyed God. He obeyed God, there's no place for feelings. This text does not even mention the struggle that Abraham had. It's not important. He just obeyed God. Question: is that right? No, it's not right. Is the text working you here? It's telling you about saddling the donkey. Do you care whether he saddled his donkey? He cut the wood. Do you care whether he cut the wood or not? Do you give a rip that he took two servants with him? You don't care. Is it giving you all extraneous information? Why is it doing that? It's inviting you into the text. Giving you all the space, by listing this kind of crazy stuff that doesn't have barely anything to do with anything, and it's inviting you to ask, "Who is to supply the feelings of Abraham in this narrative?" The reader. It's calling you, as the reader, telling you all this extraneous stuff to invite you in to say, "Holy cow, what's going on in his head?" So that you can feel what Abraham feels and it's an invitation by telling you all these extraneous details. I think it's an invitation giving you the space to ask yourself: "How would you feel if God asked you to give up your son?"

So he goes down and he said to his servants, “Stay here with the donkeys while we go over and worship then we will come back.” The New Testament cites this, that Abraham thought that even if he killed him, that God would raise him from the dead. Now is that pretty good not knowing anything about Jesus back in that time? Does this guy believe God? Abraham took the wood and burnt offering and he goes down and then Isaac shows up and Isaac is going to say a few words.

Now I forgot to press the buttons here but let me just tell you, this story here is called “the Akedah.” In Jewish circles this is a famous passage for the Jewish people and this is called “the Akedah.” The Akedah refers to “the binding of Isaac.” “Akedah” means “binding.” So it is the “binding of Isaac.” This is the binding of Isaac passage.

This is a famous passage with so much of a struggle for a son after all this time. Now, rapid fire, there are no emotions shown. What I’m suggesting is that this is good literature. This good literature invites you into the story. You are to supply the emotions, the tensions, and the pathos of the narrative. God the Blessor turns to God the Tester. So God makes this massive shift here.

Painful obedience and what you’ve got, let me just read some of the rest of the story here. It says, “Abraham answered...” Let’s get Isaac into this story. You can see Isaac’s about 16 right? The father’s how old? The father’s in his hundreds, the kid’s 16 right? And the kid’s says, “Um, Dad like did Mom forget to tell you? Did you forgot something here Dad? Like we have got the wood and the fire all right Dad, but where’s the lamb? Did Mom forget to remind you to bring the lamb?” So Isaac here says, “Father.” “Yes my son.” “The fire and wood are here, but where’s the lamb for the burnt offering?” “Dad, did you forget something?”

Then Abraham says, now check this out, “God himself will provide the lamb for the burnt offering.” Can you hear the echo? It’s a two-thousand year echo. “God himself, my son, will provide the lamb.” Does God actually do it? The lamb is his son. Is anybody Baptist in here? And you go with this guy John the Baptist and what does John the Baptist say? He says, “behold the” what? “Behold, the lamb of God which takes away the sin of the world,” as he announces Jesus Christ. So this passage echoes

Jesus Christ. Abraham is told to offer up his son. Abraham is spared from actually going through with it. Will God actually go through with it? Now that brings up a whole lot of things.

Are any of you guys philosophers in here? Philosophers probably understand things better than I do. There's a guy called Soren Kierkegaard. He's written a book called *Fear and Trembling*. To be honest with you, I had to read the work three times before I could figure out and appreciate what he was doing, but it was one of the most profound books I've ever read. It's called *Fear and Trembling* and it's built off of this narrative. It's a real short thing, about 40/50 pages, but it's absolutely profound. A year ago I had a massive struggle with this passage.

A year ago right now my son was in Afghanistan. My son is a "boot." A "boot" means that basically he's a Marine and that means he's on the ground and that means he's got an M16. He's a Lance Corporal in the infantry. He's actually got a 50 cal machine gun and he's an on the ground kind of person. Every day he went out --and he called and told us this--every day they went outside the wire, they got shot at. His best friend took a bullet right straight through the neck. It missed by 1 mm his major artery. We have video of Hadley running to the helicopter as he was shot through the neck, putting a compress on his own neck as he's running to the helicopter. You'd have to know, this guy is totally courageous. But he got shot through the neck. Other friends of my son didn't make it, they weren't that lucky. Sometimes the bullet went to the wrong place. Twig is dead -- one of his best friends. Other friends I don't even want to discuss. He saw it all. He saw stuff that human beings should never see in their lives. He saw it all.

I'm in Massachusetts with my Old Testament class teaching Old Testament. My son's over in Afghanistan getting shot at every day for 28 days straight he was outside the wire. He barely got any sleep because when you sleep, you never know. Just like that, these guys can be on you and so he got very little sleep. He's still not sleeping right until this day. So anyway, did I learn to pray to God? Did I have to let go of my son and say, "God, you're going to have to take care of him."

Now question: should a father protect his kid? Now you say, you don't know

Elliot. He's big...he's 6'2"/6'3", 220 pounds now. He takes care of himself now. But question, they're shooting at him and I can't protect him. My kid is there and I can't protect him. I always protect my children. So I feel helpless. When you feel helpless, what do you do? You pray. Because that's all you've got. I learned a lot about prayer last year. The honest truth was that for much of the time last year, I was praying God would kill me. I just said, "God, the old man goes first. The kid's got to know, the old man goes first. God spare his life. If you're going to take somebody take me, don't take him. Spare him, I'll go. Take me, take me right now. Take me in front of an Old Testament...I don't care where you take me. Just take me, let him live."

Now it so happens that God got him back here and physically he didn't get hurt or anything like that. Is there a lot of stuff going on in his head? Yes. But anyway we're working with that now. We love and are proud of our son. What I'm saying is that feeling of helplessness and God asking and you're having to give up something like that. I learned something about this story...now that's irrelevant.

J. Stages of Faith Development [54:06-61:23]

Let me move a little closer to this and I want to talk about different stages of faith--different stages of faith development. I want to look at three of them that I've just constructed off this narrative. I want to first talk about "**easy faith.**" Do some people accept Jesus as their savior because if you believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, you will be saved. If you believe in Lord Jesus Christ you get eternity for free. You go to heaven and walk on streets of gold. Everything's good. God changes your life. Your sins are forgiven and everything is good. You learn joy. You get joy and peace and all these wonderful things from Jesus. So I want to call this "easy faith." In other words, you accept Jesus for what you're going to get and you're going to get all of these wonderful things. I want to call that "easy faith." By the way, did some of you come to know Jesus because it was what you were going to get out of Jesus? I want to say for myself, that's probably true. This is "easy faith."

There's another level after that that I want to call "**faith of resignation.**" This is where God asks you to give up something. In my case, when I graduated from college I had a job as a systems engineer at Cornell Aeronautics Lab all set up and the guy wanted to hire me. It would've been making fifty thousand dollars, which was a lot of money back then. I realize it's not as much now but we're talking back after the Civil War when that was a lot of money. I looked at the job and I thought, "You know, I think God's calling me someplace else." I told the guy from the job, "I'm going to go to seminary." Now when you go to seminary, instead of getting fifty thousand dollars and getting wealthy, you get to seminary and you get instantly poor. Then I got married and then you get really poor. It's good being poor yourself but when you get married you have to support this other person. It gets expensive and you can't cut corners like you used to. Like riding your bike 25 miles a day through downtown Buffalo and things because now she doesn't want to ride on the back of your bike. So now you've got to actually get a car and make it work. But I looked at that and I said what? "Do I count that job as trash?" The "faith of resignation" allows me to deprecate or to diminish, to downplay, and to think of that thing that I could have had and diminish it and say, "I didn't want it anyway, it was no good. It wouldn't have been good for me anyway." It probably wouldn't have been. So I diminish, I deprecate or devalue I put down the thing that God required of me. I devalue, or I depreciate that which God has taken from me. Paul says this, "The things that I counted gain are counted trash for me." I don't want them. God took them and that's okay. When I depreciate that which God has taken it is the faith of resignation.

Is that it? That's not Abraham. Can Abraham depreciate his son and say, "Awe, he was not much of a son anyway." Can he do that? No. And that's the next stage of faith that I just want to bring up here. What I want to call this unreasonable "pure faith." This is "pure faith" where God asks you for what I want to call "the precious." Sorry for the overtones with this but God says, "I want 'the precious.'" Now notice I say, "the precious." How many of these do you have? You have just one. And God says, "I want it." When God asks you for "the precious," can you say it doesn't mean anything to me? I gave it up and it doesn't mean anything, can I say that about my son? I give him

up and I trust him to God. He doesn't mean anything to me. No. Is it like you're giving up your soul? The most important thing in your life, there's only one of them. He asks for that one thing. You can't deprecate it, you cannot devalue this. "Abraham, I want your son." Absolutely devastating. Some critics look at this passage in the Bible and they say, "What a cruel God that would put somebody through this kind of playing with human beings like this!" I had a guy last semester and at the end of the semester I asked, "What did you learn in the Old Testament class?" He said, "I learned God's cruel and likes to kill people." Excuse me, did you read the same book I read? No, he didn't, he missed the whole point unfortunately. So that was what he came away with—sad, really sad.

Do you really understand what's going on here? Is God being cruel here? I don't think so. I think there's something else going on. This is huge for Abraham, absolutely huge. What is Abraham's title? Abraham's called "God's friend." How do you know when you have a really, really good friend? Does a good friend know how you feel in your gut? Does a good friend know you, good, bad and ugly? Does a good friend know you inside out? Does a good friend sympathize with your hurts and pains? Will a good friend know you in sorrow? What will a good friend do? Will a good friend, when you're in grief, will they give you advice? If somebody's hurting, you give them advice right? Wrong. You grieve with those that grieve. Do you have friends that know how to grieve with you?

Now I just want to work with this with God. Is God going to go through with this sacrifice of his son? Is God going to go through with that? Question: can Abraham understand some of that now. What is it like to have to sacrifice your son? I've thought often, "What would I do if I were God and my son, Elliott, and they were beating the snot out of him and they were about to crucify him and I were God, what would I do?" You can just imagine..."Hey, you guys like atoms? Watch your atoms blown all over the universe..." Or maybe you just take your finger like this..."Oh, you guys on planet earth and you're beating my son like that? Watch this!" And you go, "flick!" and all of a sudden earth's out by like Pluto. Hey, it's a little cold out there as they're instantly

frozen. What I'm saying is, if you had to watch your son beaten and put to death on a cross, what does that tell you about God? What that tells me about God is: Does God love us? He could have gone "flick!" and fried the whole place. Does he allow them to beat and massacre his son in a brutal, brutal death? Yet it just tells you the extent of God's love. I guess that's what I want to get across with this point is the extent of God's love.

K. Spatial Doubling [61:24-62:52]

Abraham then is God's friend. Abraham knows how God feels. Therefore he's his friend because God allowed him into this sacred space. Now I'll tell you something else. Notice Abraham is told to go three days journey north to a mountain called Moriah. Where is Mount Moriah? Jerusalem. Where would Jesus die? Jerusalem. Do you get this? It's what I want to call "spatial doubling." This has happened to me once in my life. My daughter was born in Warsaw, Indiana hospital and I was at all my childrens' births. Sixteen years later, my grandson was born in that same hospital and I swear it was the same room. I was in the room and my head was bouncing back and forth between sixteen years from when she was there and when my grandson was there. I was mentally bouncing back and forth. It was the weirdest thing ever. I want to call it "spatial doubling" where the same thing happens a kind of a deja-vu thing. God takes him up to Mount Moriah in Jerusalem and that is absolutely incredible. So I think he sets the place and says, "Abraham I want you to be in the very place my son would be sacrificed 2000 years later. So go where it's going to happen in this place."

L. Jacob: strife and deception [62:53-63:55]

That's the end of that. Okay, so let's do Jacob. Jacob's a lot easier actually. I think we can relate to Jacob more. Here we have got Jacob--strife and deception. Jacob is going to be Isaac's son. Remember we have Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. You've got strife and deception here. By the way, what is strife and deception built off. Jacob has how many names? Do you guys know the two names of Jacob? Jacob it's not exactly the root of this but it sounds like this notion of "deception." Strife is going to be what "Israel" means. Israel means "He who struggles with God." So Israel and Jacob, these

are his two names: deception--Jacob; Israel--strife. Strife and deceptions are major themes in Jacob's life.

M. Predestination and Freewill [63:56-69:44]

So we want to jump into Jacob here. Childhood images: Jacob is born in chapter 25 of Genesis and his mother, Rebekah, is going to have two kids. It says this: "Isaac prayed to the Lord on behalf of his wife because she was barren. The Lord answered his prayer and his wife Rebekah became pregnant. And the babies jostled with each other and she said, 'Why is this happening to me?' So she went to inquire of the Lord and the Lord said to her, 'Two nations are in your womb and two peoples from within you will be separated. One people will be stronger than the other and the older will serve the younger.'" So right from birth, who was chosen? Jacob was chosen. That's all that matters. Jacob is chosen. Which means then that who is not chosen? Esau. So this gets to be a question then on this thing about how God can chose one and reject the other before they were even born. Did Esau have a chance? Jacob was the one that was chosen before birth. So what do you do with all this kind of determinism.

This brings up the issue of predestination versus free will. God predestined them before they were born. Jacob would be the child of the choosing and Esau would not be. How much of it is predestination, chosen and fixed? And how much of it is free will? You should recognize in this class, have we developed right from the Garden of Eden the ability of human beings to make choices? Is that a big theme in Scripture, the ability of human beings to make choices? But here, the predestination side comes up that God chooses Jacob before he's even born. By the way, if you jump over to Malachi chapter 1 or you could go over to Romans. Let me do Romans 9, but it's quoting Malachi. Romans 9.13 I think it says, "So that God's purpose in election might stand: not by works but by him who calls -- she was told, [she, being Rebekah], 'The older will serve the younger.' Just as it is written: 'Jacob have I loved, Esau have I hated.'" Before they were even born, "Jacob have I loved, Esau have I hated." Did Esau stand a chance? What does that mean that God hated Esau? What's the deal with that?

Some people take that love/hate to be kind of a comparative thing. So it's God saying, "I love Jacob more. Esau was loved less." So it was a more or less kind of thing. It didn't mean absolute "hate," it was just "more"--a relative thing. I think probably a better way to explain that is working with the covenantal terminology. "To love" someone meant "to choose" them; "to hate" meant "not to choose them." So the love/hate terminology is terminology of the covenant. God makes a covenant with the one, he does not make a covenant with the other. So this is a big debate and we should say if a person is not chosen then, are they still responsible? Was Esau responsible? What should Esau have done? Now does Esau turn into a really profane person? Is it possible that Esau could have said, "Jacob is the chosen one" and chose to get under Jacob and support him in his role? Is that possible? Does anybody remember there's a guy named Moses in Exodus? Who is Moses' older brother? Aaron. Who is his older sister? Miriam. So Miriam and Aaron are older, but who is the one that is chosen by God to lead Israel? Moses. Do Aaron and Miriam have to get under to support Moses? Is that what they do? Except in Numbers 12, there's some controversy, but most of the time that's what they do. They get under him. Is that what Esau should've done? He should have come out in support of Jacob. Now does Esau do that or does Esau want to kill his brother? So we get into tension there. What I want to suggest is that Esau still made choices. He still had choices of how he was going to respond to this. So a person who is not chosen is still responsible. Is that fair? Yes, that's fair. God chooses...by the way, is life fair?

My son really struggles with this at a certain level. What would have happened if he had been born in Afghanistan? Would his life have been totally, absolutely different from being born in America and having his old man be a professor. By the way, are all of your lives different? Is life fair? Is everybody in this class on exactly the same playing field or do all of you come from different backgrounds with some pluses and minuses in various areas? Yes, we're all different. This idea of everything has got to be level on the playing field of life is crazy. Is life fair? No, that's just the way it is. I was born to a poor family. My brothers and sisters barely went to college at all. We didn't

have the money, we didn't have the provisions. Other kids, they all went off to college. We have different families, you got to work with that.

N. Names and birth of Jacob and Esau [69:45-71:45]

So, now, here are the two boys' names. I want to work on this a little bit. Jacob's name has the sound of, it's not etymologically connected necessarily, but the sound is that his name means "heel." "Jacob" also sounds like "deceiver." The name sounds like "deceiver" and "heel-grabber." When they're born, when they came out, Esau came out all what? Red and hairy and Jacob came out grabbing the heel of his brother. So they called him basically an echo of this term "heel" that is Jacob and later that term also connected with "deceiver." Esau comes out and he's all red. Red red, they call me "Red." His name is "Big Red." Basically, Esau is "Big Red." Esau's descendants become the Edomites. The "dm" in Hebrew means "red." So Edom will be associated with red. By the way, what are the color of the rocks in the country of Edom? Has anybody ever seen the picture of Petra? They're red. It's red Nubian sandstone. So the place where he comes to dwell is red sandstone in the land of Edom.

Then, by the way, now this is just me being kind of funny, but not really. Every time you see the Edomites in Scripture, what will the Edomites, Esau's descendants, do almost every time? They'll kill Jews. The Edomites kill Jews. That's what they do. So there's always going to be this tension with the Jews. They're going to kill a lot of Jews. They're Esau's descendants. Esau or "Seir" as he's called. "Seir" means "hairy." So basically we've got one kid named Harry (hairy) or Big Red. That's his name. By the way we still name people Harry today, spelled with two "r's." But his name is "Harry" because he was all hairy from the start. And so Big Red is there.

O. Jacob and Esau and the Red Stew birthright [71:46-73:11]

In chapter 25 here at the end, let me just narrate this story. So Esau is out hunting. He's a hunter. Jacob is a man of the field. Jacob's got some stew. What color was the stew by the way? Red stew. Do you get the play on "red" here? Red stew for Big Red.

So Big Red comes in and he's starving. He's been out hunting and doesn't have food. He comes in to Jacob and Jacob's got this red stew. "Hey, Red, do you want some red stew?" Red [Esau] says, "I'm going to starve. What good's my birthright?" So basically Jacob barter for the birthright. Jacob says, "You give me the birthright and I'll give you the stew." Esau says, "I'm going to die if I don't get that stew so who cares about the birthright?" He doesn't. By the way, was that legitimate to barter for the birthright? And the answer is: yes. We know that now from those Nuzu laws. We've actually got laws that say that it's absolutely legal to barter for your birthright. They barter for everything and your birthright can be bartered for. Just because it was legal, does that mean it was nice? Was Jacob being nice to his brother when he had no food? So I want to say, it's legal. We know it's legal, but we're saying we're not sure that it was the nicest thing to do with Esau.

P. Jacob's lying to Isaac [73:12-77:7]

Now the deception of Isaac, what happens here? There's a really nasty verse in chapter 25 verse 28. Check this out: "Isaac, who had a taste for wild game, loved Esau. But Rebekah loved Jacob." What happens when the father loves one child and the mother loves the other child. Parental favoritism leads to what? Sibling rivalry. So you get these siblings clashing. When parents favor one kid over another, you're going to have warfare among the kids. So this is the problem of parental favoritism -- the father loves Esau, the mother loves Jacob. Now there's going to be a major problem here.

Now what happens? Isaac's old. He's blind. He can't see. He calls in his son Esau and he says, "Esau, I just want the best steak ever. And so go out and shoot the animal and bring it back and cook it just the way I love it. Then when you bring it back I will bless you." Esau goes trucking out with his bow and arrow and he's going to go out and get this animal. Who overhears the telephone call? Rebekah's there, she overhears the whole thing. She schemes, "Hey, Jacob, we've got to make a move now. Your father's blind." Do you take advantage of blind people? Of course. "Dad can't see you and so you're going to go in there." But what's the problem? Dad can't see you but Harry is what? Harry is hairy. So Jacob says, "I don't think so." So the mother says,

“Okay, get me a goat, we’ll cook the goat up.” By the way, I should say this too. Do you know that goats in Palestine, if you ever touch the back of those goats you get splinters in your hands? The goats’ hair is so wiry and thick, there is no human being on the face of the earth that has hair that thick and wiry. So it’s not the backside of these goats. It’s really nasty hair. On the underside of the goats, in their armpits and the underside, it is really fine hair almost like soft leather. So that’s what she must have stripped out and put on him. So she puts it on him.

Jacob says, “Here I am with the food, dad!” And all of a sudden it’s like, “Hey, his voice sounds like someone else.” He calls him in there. What’s he do? Does he grab Jacob, neck and hands? And he says, “Oh, the guy’s hairy, must be Harry.” So he eats the food. He blesses Jacob and gives him all the blessings. Then Jacob trots out and then who trots in next? Esau comes in and “Here I am, your son Esau, whom you love.” Then the father freaks out realizing he’s been tricked. So the father’s been tricked at this point and you get this tension then that’s going to be between Jacob and Esau. Who gets the blessing?

Did the father realize that he had done wrong? Esau says, “What’s the matter Dad, have you only got one blessing?” Isaac said, “I blessed Jacob and he will be blessed.” I think Isaac realized that he should’ve blessed Jacob because that’s what God’s promise was. By the way, does God use all this trickery and evil to accomplish his purposes? God uses even human evil to accomplish his purposes.

There’s going to be a conflict next and next time we’ll look at this conflict of what happened with this Jacob and Esau struggle over this blessing of the father. Have some of you felt the blessing of your father? Let me just end there. Is the blessing of father important to you? I had to wait until I was about 42-years-old until I felt the blessing of my father. I just want to say that some of you know what that means to have the blessing of your father. It’s beautiful thing. So we’ll treat Jacob and Esau next. We’ll see you next time. Start working on Numbers.

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in OT History, Literature and Theology lecture 9 on Abraham, Sodom and Gomorrah, the Akedah or the binding of Isaac and the beginning of

the story of Jacob.

Transcribed by Elizabeth Alewine and Lauren Cain
Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt 2

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 10[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt teaching Old Testament History, Literature and Theology, Lecture 10 on the finishing up of the Jacob stories as well as the introduction and conclusion of the Joseph narrative concluding the book of Genesis.

A. Quiz and Exam Preview [0:00-2:58]

Class let's come to order. We've got a lot of material to cover today. We're going to by hook or by crook finish Genesis today. So we have got a lot of stuff to cover today. You guys are working on Numbers this week in articles and the book of Numbers. We'll have a quiz on Thursday. The following Thursday, a week from Thursday, we're having our first big exam. The exams are over what we've covered in class. There are old study guides up online if you are interested in that. I will produce as of Thursday night/Friday morning a new study guide out Friday morning of this week. But if you want to look at the old ones, there is a lot of it that is the same. Now Kyle has an announcement here about review sessions for the exam. Kyle Lincoln...

Let's open with a word of prayer and then we'll get down into what we are talking about today. Let's begin: *Father, we thank you again for this opportunity to look at your word. We thank you for the great patriarchs: Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; and for the many things we can learn from their lives and also that we can learn about you by watching the way you interacted with these people all of whom had problems but all of whom you dealt with and you cared for. We thank you that you haven't given up on us that even when we have problems that you care for us and you love us as demonstrated in your son's love, Jesus Christ, and it's in his name we pray, Amen.*

B. Jacob gets the birthright: Red Stew [2:59-4:27]

Last time we were talking about the deception of Isaac and Jacob and his mother Rebekah were tight, and Isaac and Esau were tight. Isaac tells his son Esau, “go out and get me some game that I love. Barbeque it up just like they do in Tennessee.” Then Jacob’s mother overhears that and she’ pulls Jacob aside. She says, “Hey, we’re going to go in and deceive him.” Jacob gets rigged up with these goat hair things and he goes in and deceives his father who is blind. His father grabs him and doesn’t realize it’s the wrong son. So he blesses Jacob. Esau comes in and says, “Dad, you’ve only got one blessing and my brother ripped me off.” Isaac seems to know that he’s done wrong and he says Jacob is to have the blessing. Isaac tells Esau, “the blessing needs to stay with Jacob, I will give you a blessing but you’re going to serve your brother.” So you have this deception of Isaac and this parental favoritism, the father favoring one and the mother the other, causing this sibling rivalry resulting in Jacob’s lie, his deception. Jacob’s name sounds like “deception,” or “heel grabber.” Heel grabber on the way out of the womb but the Hebrew also sounds like “deceiver.” It’s not from the direct root but it sounds like “deceiver.” So Jacob deceives his father, which is really a bad thing, seeking the power of a father’s word.

C. Consequences of the Deception of Isaac [4:28-10:09]

Now, what I want to suggest is while Jacob lies to his father and gets away with it so to speak, does Jacob’s lie have consequences? It has consequences for Isaac because this guy is a blind old man. Now he realizes everyone that he should be able to trust he can’t, even his own family! Can he trust his wife? His wife has betrayed him, his son has betrayed him, and so now he’s a blind old man realizing he can’t trust any of the people who are closest to him. So Isaac, it says, was trembling. He’s a blind old man and now he’s left with no one to trust.

What happens because of the lie against Esau? Esau starts plotting, saying, “When dad dies, I’m going to kill Jacob.” He’s going to let it go until dad dies, but once dad dies, “I’m going to kill him.” By the way, was Esau the kind of person that would do

something like that? Esau was a hunter, who goes out and kills animals, and Esau would do something like that. So Esau starts plotting the death of his brother

Now Rebekah was also in on the lie, Rebekah was the wife of Isaac and the consequence for Rivkah, or Rebekah is her favorite son is going to leave for 20 years and she is left with whom? Her daughter's-in-law. Esau had married two Hittite women and Rebekah can't stand these women. Have you ever seen a mother-in-law with daughters-in-law, is that a problem? There are all sorts of tensions there that can happen. You've got loyalties to the son. Is the son loyal to his mother or is the son loyal to his wife? So you get this kind of conflicted loyalties in the son/husband. By the way, I've often said when you're out looking for a good man, is one of the things you should look for is how that man treats his mother? The way a guy treats his mother, that's important. Rebekah can't stand Esau's wives.

Jacob has to leave for 20 years. He's going to flee to Haran up in northern Mesopotamia. He's not going to see his family for 20 years, even his Internet service is going to be cut off. There's going to be no connection to family for 20 years. So are there consequences for deceiving a father? Were there consequences for everyone involved? Yes. So this is a big deal.

Now Jacob is going to flee because his brother's plotting to kill him. When he flees, where does he go? As he's going, I'm going to use this room as a metaphor of the land of Israel. You guys are the Mediterranean Sea, and you guys are the mountains of Israel. Up there is the Sea of Galilee. In this canyon is the Jordan River, and I'm the Dead Sea. The Dead Sea's about 1270 feet below sea level, which means the water all flows into it. How does the water get out? It doesn't flow out, it has to evaporate. What happens when the water has to evaporate? The sea turns saltier and saltier. The Jews don't call it the Dead Sea they call it the Salt Sea. It's 33% salt is that a high salt concentration? The oceans are generally about 6 or 7 percent. It's 33%. When you get in there, you float without having to do anything, so you basically can stand upright. When my mother was there, I feel bad saying this on tape but she doesn't have Internet, she'll never watch this. Does fat or muscle float better? Fat floats. My mother goes in the Dead Sea and her legs

came out from underneath her and she couldn't get her legs down to stand up so they had to drag her over to the side and have someone stand her up because she couldn't put her feet down because she was buoyant because of the salt. By the way for women they put salt on you to suck bad stuff out of you. They call it Ahava creams from the Dead Sea and you take these mud baths and put it all over you it's supposed to be good for you, I don't know about that. That's the Salt Sea.

What country is this? It's on the other side of the Jordan River. This is the country of Jordan. Today King Hussein, his wife is actually American, he's a good king over there. We'll come back to this in a minute.

D. Jacob's Ladder at Bethel [10:10-18:36]

Where's Jacob going? He's from down south so he goes north to a place called Bethel. What does "el" mean? *El* means God, *El* is a short form of *Elohim*. "Beth" means "house of." So Bethel means "house of God." You know "Bet" from "Beth-lehem" – "House of bread." So Jacob goes up there and while he's there, this is where Jacob's ladder takes place.

Let me just read chapter 28 verse 12 and following. He goes there and then he goes to sleep. He's fleeing from Esau because he's afraid Esau's going to kill him. He lays down. Do you remember in Sunday school it says he lays down on a rock for a pillow and then he has the Jacob's ladder dream. He had a dream in which he saw "a stairway resting on the earth with its top reaching to heaven and the angels of God ascending and descending on it. There above it stood the Lord and he said, 'I am the Lord, the God of your father Abraham, the God of your father Isaac. I will give you and your descendants the land on which you're lying.' As soon as he says, "I'm going to give you the land," what is this? This is the renewal of the covenant. "As I was with Abraham and I gave Abraham the covenant that you would get this land, that your seed would multiply as the stars of heavens, and you would be a blessing to all nations. I gave the covenant to Abraham, I reiterated it to Isaac and now I'm giving it to you, Jacob." And it says, "I will give you the land and your descendants will be like the dust of the earth and you will spread out to the west, to the east, to the north, and to the south. All peoples on

earth will be blessed through you.” So that’s the land, the seed, and the blessing again reiterated now to Jacob in this time of transition.

So Abraham’s God, Isaac’s God, now becomes Jacobs’s God. God meets him here but what’s this stairway to heaven? A lot of people suggest, and I think they’re right; that what you have here is a ziggurat. What’s a ziggurat? In Mesopotamia a ziggurat is a step pyramid, which is different from what they have in Egypt. Egypt had those slick pyramids that were rectangular. At the front of the step pyramid they had a stairway that went to the top and at the top was the house of the god. So some people believe what Jacob is seeing here is a Mesopotamian ziggurat. The ziggurat was actually like a mountain. The people built a mountain so their god could dwell on top. So God uses that imagery, because Jacob’s familiar with that imagery. Jacob’s ladder may have been a ziggurat form. Again, we’re guessing on that, we aren’t sure, but it seems like the stairway going up to God at the top would be a ziggurat configuration.

I want to suggest that this is where Jacob meets God for himself and therefore there’s this covenant renewal where Abraham’s God now becomes his God. I want to suggest to you that Jacob leaving his family and meeting God for the first time is like the college years. Have some of you grown up in Christian families where you go to church and your parents are religious so you’re religious but the question is: are you really religious? Then you leave your family and you get to college and at college can you become whoever you want to become? Now it’s not what your parents believed in, it’s what you believed in. So at college, in a lot of ways, there’s this differentiation where you become your own person. I went through a secular university where I was trying to build up my faith and they kept trying to tear it down and I had to decide: do I want to accept God? Do I keep the principles that I grew up with or do I become a new person? So I had to make a decision on those things. So in college there’s this differentiation in terms of meeting God for yourself. So in a way Jacob going to Bethel is this meeting of God for himself. God is the God of Abraham and Isaac but is God Jacob’s God? So Jacob has to answer that question. He meets God at Bethel and that’s what happens.

Now Jacob in verse 18 sets up this memorial stone and you’re going to see the

patriarchs and other people like Moses and Joshua are going to set up these memorial stones to memorialize things. By the way even to this day do we set up memorials. If you go to Washington DC are there memorials? Has anyone been up the Washington monument? Real tall. Did you see they had an earthquake, some guy had a video camera while he was up on the top of the Washington monument showing the whole monument starting to move? Do you think that'd be fun? They filmed that and apparently they're worried about cracks in the memorial. Washington memorial commemorates Washington, I go to the Vietnam memorial, have you been there? It memorializes those people who died there. My father would go to the Korean War memorial they just built. There's a new Martin Luther King Jr. memorial that has just been built as well, I haven't seen that yet. It looks pretty interesting so we'll want to go see that the next time we go down. So we memorialize things in stone.

By the way, he is going to come back here in 20 years. He's going to leave and come back to Bethel and it's going to be pretty interesting what happens here at Bethel 20 years later.

Now down just a little bit in verse 22 let me read this: "Now Jacob made a vow, he said, 'if God will be with me and watch over me on this journey I am taking, and if he will give me food to eat and clothing to wear, so that I return in safety to my father's house, then the Lord will be my God.'" Is Jacob making this conditional? He's saying, "God, if you bring me back here and give me food and clothes then you'll be my God." "And this stone that I have set up as a pillar will be God's house." Do you get the play on words here? God's house. What is that? Bethel means "God's house." Do you see how he's setting up the stone? He said the stone then would be "God's house." There's this play on the words for Bethel. "And of all that you will give me I will give you a tenth." Where does this tenth come from? Moses will give the law later on and you guys have read the book of Leviticus and other things and it will say a tenth. Is there any commandment in the scriptures so far about a tenth tithe? No. Jacob just seems to know to give God a tenth or tithe. By the way did Abraham also pay Melchizedek a tenth after the battle for Sodom and Gomorrah. So it's pretty interesting both Abraham and Jacob

seem to know about this tenth pay or a tithe. He says when you bring me back here I'll give you a tenth of everything I get while I'm gone.

E. Jacob at Haran: Rachel, Leah and Laban [18:37-20:11]

Well, what happens next? Jacob takes off from Bethel and he's going to go out the door back there and he's going to go up to Haran in Mesopotamia. When he's in Haran who's going to meet? Where do you meet women in the ancient world? If you're going to meet women where do you hang out? At the well. You meet the woman at the well. Now by the way does this happen with Isaac and Rebekah? Rebekah is out there at the well and the servant pulls and up and says, "if she waters my camels she's the one." What does that mean? She's a good worker. So you always meet women at the well. Where did Moses meet Zipporah, his wife? At the well.

So Jacob's at the well. It says here Laban had two daughters, the name of the older was Leah and the name of the younger was Rachel. Leah had weak eyes. I'm not going to elaborate, but Rachel was lovely in form and beautiful. Jacob was in love with Rachel and said, "I will work seven years in return for your younger daughter Rachel." Couple things, is this bartering for this girl? Saying, "I'll work for you for seven years then you give me your daughter." Is this girl chopped liver? Did she have to agree to it? They usually have the right of refusal. She agrees to it. Jacob labors for her for seven years.

Jacob and Rachel: nature of love/lust and time [20:12-22:48]

One question I had when I was a younger man is what separates between love and lust. When I grew up in the church they basically taught us that you had agape love, which is what? God's love. You had eros-love which was "sexual attraction love." So it was agape-love and this lust, desire, eros or erotic love. It was always so clear you know agape love was over here and erotic love was over there. Then unfortunately, well fortunately for me, I met my wife and when I met my wife all of a sudden it was like these two things got like this and my question to myself was, and this was a serious question for me, am I erotically in love with this woman because she was beautiful, she's

wonderful, she's talented, she's everything I dreamed of but am I in love with her? I lust her but do I love her? Do you see the difference? Do I love her or am I just attracted to her? So I struggled with that whether this was really love or was this lust. I had to sort that stuff out and today nobody probably struggles with this anymore this is old stuff. What I'm saying is I really struggled with that because I wanted to truly love her.

Now Jacob looks at Rachel, he works for her for seven years, at the end of the seven years Rachel looks at this man. Does he love her or not? How many of you guys would work seven years for a girl? Seven years, is that a long time? Does time separate between love and lust? Is lust a consumptive now kind of thing? And let me be really corny, Can love wait? Can love take time? So I'm saying after seven years is Rachel pretty sure this guy loves her? This guy has worked for her for seven years. I'm just saying it's beautiful. The text here is beautiful it's kind of corny but let me just read it because it's so beautiful. But we don't often do beauty, we do better with sarcasm than beauty in our culture. "Jacob was in love with Rachel he said, 'I'll work seven years in return for the younger daughter.' So Jacob served seven years to get Rachel but they seemed only like a few days to him because of his love for her." That's beautiful, in other words, he's saying, the seven years just flew by fast.

F. Jacob and Laban: the deceiver gets deceived [22:49-28:39]

Now is this the end of the story? This is just the beginning of the story because Laban the father-in-law's got a good deal here. So what happens next. Why is it ironic on Jacob's wedding night? So Jacob's out there and they go to the big wedding party. First of all in that culture how much of the woman do you get to see? Does anyone remember those pictures in Sinai when my wife was doing this ball game back and forth with this woman in Sinai. Did anyone see that she had a veil on her like this? It was all gold pieces, we're talking real gold. How much would it be worth today with the price of gold? But anyway she was covered with gold like that? It was actually incredible. In those cultures what you see of the woman is it mostly just her eyes. All of the rest of her covered. So now they're in this wedding scene and you say well he would still know her

eyes and it's different because it said Leah had "weak eyes."

Is it possible that the women got switched in the tent situation? Now what's the problem? You guys are at Gordon College, this place is lit 24 hours a day. But when you get out to a place where you don't flip the switch to get the lights on, does it get really really dark at night? And when you're in a Bedouin tent that's made out of black goats hair when you're inside it gets so dark. Have you ever been in the context where you can hold your hand up in front of your face and you can't see it? It gets pitch dark in these places.

So what happens? There's a big switch-a-roo and what's going to happen there? So let me just read the text. "Laban gave his servant girl and when the morning came and Jacob comes out of the tent, when morning came he turns around and there is Leah." Who was he expecting? Rachel. Had he been deceived? Now is it easy to get deceived in the culture by the way when women covered themselves? Possibly, I better walk over here, Kyle, because I don't want to get struck. Possibly, in other words there was a big party, and there would've been talking at the party, but when they went in the tent then there was probably silence in the tent that way in the night, other things were going on. I probably want to get out of that one.

While I'm over here let me just tell you, my son was in Afghanistan, I told you that before, and they were in a battle with Taliban type people. It was really interesting they were going after three Taliban and all of a sudden the Taliban disappeared. He said they were like ghosts they just disappeared, and then all of a sudden he looks down the road and there are three women walking down the road. In Afghanistan, do the women totally cover themselves even over their faces and never walk without a man accompanying them? They have these little things that are like grids that they look out of so you can't even see their eyes. So some individual, who was a marine, starts seeing these three women walking down the road and he tells his commander he says, "Let's shoot them, that's those guys." And the commander says, "Oh, yeah, right we're going to shoot women. Marines don't do that kind of stuff. And my son said, "No, those are the guys." Now question: could they go up and accost these women? You're in Afghanistan,

can Marine soldiers go up and accost a woman? No, it violates the culture and the Marine I know swears till this day that was how those three Taliban got away. They dressed up as women and got away. He could also tell by the way they were walking and basically that's how they got away. They weren't able to accost them because they had to have a female interpreter to come up to accost them. They couldn't do that so those guys got away. Was that a pretty slick move, to dress like women and get away? Anyway, that actually happened.

Now, so all I'm saying is he wakes up, when I was a younger person I always thought how would you feel, you get married and your wedding night is like the best night of your life. You get up and you turn around and you see Leah. How would you feel as a man? A number of years ago I changed my perspective. How would you feel if you were Leah? You just spent the night with him and he turns around and he looks at you and you see his face, is that terrible? You know what I'm saying do you know what it would feel like to be rejected like that? Now, by the way, Leah's the older sister. Is there something between older and younger sisters? No, I'm serious I've had to face that in my own family my younger daughter got married first. It's unspoken. I mean I don't think we ever talked about it in those terms. Is there stuff going on when the younger sister gets married first?

What does Laban do? So there's a switch going on there. Why is this ironic? Does the deceiver get deceived? And so all of Jacob's trickery, lying, and deceiving, all of a sudden, on his wedding night the deceiver gets deceived. It kind of suits him. You know what I'm saying, he finally gets what's coming to him. I don't want to make any ethical [lex talionis] evaluation but this is kind of ironic.

G. Jacob and Polygamy: Historical narrative: normative or non-normative?

[28:40-35:15]

Now Jacob is polygamous. What it sets up now is Laban says, "Okay, okay, in our culture you have to marry the older daughter first before you get the younger daughter." So Laban says, "Hey, Jacob, it just costs you another seven years. They'll just seem like a few minutes to you because you love her so much, right? So give me another

seven years.” Is Jacob going to work 14 years for these two girls? He probably got Rachel after his week with Leah was completed. He’s probably given Rachel right after that but he still had to work the 7 years. That’s probably how it went down. He works another seven years for the younger one. Now Jacob is polygamous? Is polygamy cool in American culture? Has anyone followed that Warren Jeffords? The guy that had all these wives down in Texas and the guy was put in prison. I think some of the girls he was marrying were 13 or 14 year olds. Really bad stuff, this guy’s bad. It’s part of the Mormon tradition way back, Joseph Smith who himself had multiple wives. The Mormons around the turn of the century eliminated polygamy but some of the ones that are going back to the original Mormonism they still have many wives. They push that and a lot of them are silent when it comes to condemnation of that. So you have got to be careful with that. Jacob was polygamous.

Can you use that to say, “Jacob was polygamous; therefore we should be polygamous?” What I want to suggest to you is that when you’re dealing with historical narratives you have to separate between that which is normative and that which is non-normative. In other words, does the Bible sometimes just describe what happened and it’s not putting an approval or disapproval on it. It’s just describing what happened. It’s not meant to be universalized. Jacob lies to his father. Are we supposed to lie to our parents? No. Did Jacob do things that were wrong? Jacob did things that were wrong and therefore you can’t take things directly out of history because the Bible often times is just recording history. It’s what happened--right or wrong tis’ what happened.

By the way, this is one of the reasons why I love the Bible. You say, “because Jacob’s polygamous, you love the Bible?” No, let me explain. In many of the other cultures when you go to Mari and you’re going to talk to Zimri Lin and he’s the big king of Mari when he puts the kings’ annals together does it attempt to make Zimri Lin look like the big shot? Zimri Lin does all these great things, because of Zimri Lin you have a good life, because of Zimri Lin you have water in the canals, etc. In the other cultures are the kings portrayed as these people who do all these wonderful things? What’s the problem with Bible? Tell me about the great kings of Israel. You say, “Well, Israel had

their big kings too! David was a man after God's own heart," and then you start thinking. Yes, David, what was her name? Bathsheba. Yes, so you've got to back off with David, but David's really the man. So you say Solomon, well Solomon was the wisest man who ever lived. Solomon was a big king of Israel. Solomon yes, what was it? 700 wives, 300 concubines, and then he serves other gods? Okay, so you say Rehoboam? Well, he was a disaster and you start going down the king list. So in the Bible do all the kings, the great men of Israel, Saul the first king of Israel, do they all have warts? Do they all have problems? Does the Bible cover their warts? Does the Bible cover their sin? Or does the Bible tell it how it was? So what I'm saying is the other cultures made their great men look like these great heroes. In the Bible all of their heroes have problems, every one of them. So that's why I love the scriptures because, do I have problems too? Those guys all had problems. Did God deal with them and love them and care for them? Yes, I have problems too does that mean God's going to throw me away? No, that means God loves us beyond our faults. So the Bible tells it like it is and that is a rare book in the ancient world. That is really rare.

Jacob's got problems. The fact that Jacob's got two wives now is that going to be a problem? Does polygamy work? The Bible tells you the results. Did it work having two wives? Then they start a competition on who's going to have the most kids. It's very interesting here when you look at this but let me come back to this.

So what I'm suggesting is that when you're reading history you have to be careful about separating that which is normative, that which is for all time, and that which is non-normative. In other words, Jacob did this and it wasn't really right but he did it anyway. So it's only meant for that time and that place it was something that he did. He lied to his father that's not meant to be for all time. We are not to lie to our fathers. So you have got to separate when you're dealing with history, between the normative and the non-normative, between description and prescription, that's really important.

Now God comes along and I love this, go down in chapter 29, Jacob's got two wives Rachel and Leah, which one does he love? Rachel. Whose womb does God open? Leah's. God sides with the underdog. You see this over and over again in Scripture. God

sides with the unloved wife and God opens her womb. Can Rachel have kids? No, Rachel can't have kids. So Rachel's womb is closed and Leah's womb is open. By the way, Jacob's this cheating deceiver, yet do Jacob and Rachel and Leah build the 12 tribes of Israel? Do you understand? These are where the 12 tribes come from. Jacob and Rachel and Leah and their handmaids produce the 12 tribes of Israel. You say if I were going to do the 12 tribes of Israel you'd try to make their mother a little more respectable, make a better story; but it's really this polygamous relationship. God opens the womb of Leah. Leah then had Reuben, who's the first-born, and many other children afterwards.

H. The Mandrake plants and fertility [35:16-38:18]

We'll see what happens with Rachel. Rachel says, "Hey, I need to have some kids too. So what happens in chapter 30 verse 14 it says, "during the wheat harvest (which is in late spring) Reuben went out into the fields and found some mandrakes." What are these mandrakes? Mandrake plants, we're told are what Reuben, the oldest, brought to his mother Leah. Rachel said to Leah, "please give me some of your son's mandrakes." But Leah said to her, "wasn't it enough that you took away my husband will you take my sons mandrakes too?" Leah gets a little huffy here. Leah says, "Hey, you stole my husband and now you're taking my son's mandrakes." What's the deal with this mandrake plant business? "Very well," Rachel says, "he can sleep with you tonight." So Jacob gets sold for a couple mandrake plants. These women are bartering over whose going to sleep with the husband and they sell him off for a couple of mandrake plants. "He can sleep with you tonight just give me a couple mandrakes." This guy's worth a couple plants, not too good.

You ask what's going on with these mandrake plants? It's believed in the ancient world that these mandrake plants were largely for fertility. If you got these mandrake plants, now there's probably not much to this, but these mandrake plants were viewed by their culture as fertility plants. We would say maybe an aphrodisiac. You take this and it makes you sexually potent. Maybe that's what they call ancient Viagra! I've never had that thought before but this is the ancient form. We better just get out of that but this is how it would have been thought of in the ancient world.

Now what's the problem here. The problem is this. Who is going to give Rachel her child? Is it going to be because she got the mandrakes? The text makes it very clear, she does get the mandrakes but the text also makes it very clear, "God listens to Rachel" and she gets pregnant and had a son. But if you go down to verse 22 it says, "God remembered Rachel and he listened to her and he opened her womb and she became pregnant and gave birth to her son. And she said, 'God has taken away my disgrace' and she named him [her first son]" and this is important, who was Rachel's first son? Joseph. "God has added, Jehovah has added to me, may the Lord add to me another son." So Rachel has a son. Who gives Rachel her son? Is it a result of the mandrakes? No. God opened her womb and she has Joseph.

I. Joseph is Rachel's firstborn [38:19-40:03]

Is Joseph going to be a gem? Joseph is one of the few gems of the Bible, Daniel is the other one in the Old Testament. These two guys are above reproach but all the other guys have problems but Joseph's going to be a really good guy. So her first son Joseph was not a result of the mandrakes, God does it.

By the way, Joseph was Rachel's first son, who was Rachel's last son? Benjamin. Ben-ya-min this is very important *ben* means "son of", *yamin* means "right hand." In those cultures your right hand was the hand of honor. Let me just say this if you're in an Arab culture and the Arab dude comes up and shakes with his left hand do you understand that's a major insult? The right hand is the hand of honor and blessing. If he shakes with his left hand what does that mean? They do certain things with their left hand and only their left hand in certain rooms of the house before they flush, if you know what I mean. That is always done with the left hand with or without toilet paper. Okay, now understand you're Americans but over there they don't have luxuries sometimes and I'm talking toilet paper. Now, so if a person shakes your hand with his left hand, all I'm telling you is that's a major insult. I've had that happen to me by the way before I knew. I thought, "that's really weird," and I went back and talked to someone they told me what it meant. So you don't want to do that. You shake with your right hand, the hand of honor, not the left hand, it's a big deal. "Son of my right hand," Benjamin is a beautiful

name. My grandson is named Benjamin, “son of my right hand”--son of the blessing, power, and things like that. So Benjamin and Joseph are going to be the two sons of Rachel.

J. Rachel’s death at Bethlehem and biblical echoes [40:04-43:39]

Where does Rachel die? She dies having Benjamin at birth. Now do women die in our culture having infants? Usually not in American culture, but in other places in the world women do die having children. It happens all over the place. Rachel is going to die having Benjamin at birth. Now what happens? Where does she die? This becomes significant. Rachel dies but where does she die? She dies just outside a town called Bethlehem. Now why is that significant? Because of her death they set up a memorial to her. They set up a memorial on the major Ridge Route highway that goes down the spine of Israel. They set up a memorial to Rachel outside of Bethlehem and she is viewed as the matriarch of Bethlehem.

Now in the time of Jesus, does anyone remember Rachel gets mentioned in the time of Jesus in Matthew chapter 2 verse 18? And what happens in Matthew chapter 2? Who finds out that Jesus is born in Bethlehem? The wise men come to Herod and Herod says, “Go down to Bethlehem find the young child and when you have found him bring back word to me.” Did the wise men ever go back to Herod? No. They skedaddle out of there. When Herod realizes he’s been tricked by the wise men, what does Herod do? He goes to Bethlehem and kills all the infants 2 years old and under. Do you remember what the biblical texts say there? Matthew 2:18, this right after the slaying of the infants of Bethlehem it says, “and a voice was heard in Rama (to the north, quite a distance to the north) weeping and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children refusing to be comforted because they are no more.” So what you get is this kind of echo. Rachel dies outside of Bethlehem and 2000 years later you get this echo with Jesus. Rachel is weeping for her children, the children of Bethlehem because she’s the matriarch of Bethlehem. So basically you get this echo and that’s in the time of Jesus.

But you say, “Hildebrandt, you forgot something because Matthew is quoting Jeremiah.” Jeremiah says, “Rachel weeping for her children is heard all the way up into

Ramah.” Why is Jeremiah quoting that since Jeremiah is in the middle between Jacob and Jesus? Why would Jeremiah have said that? Because that’s when the people were taken captive to Babylon. This is the Babylonian exile that Jeremiah is referring to, when Daniel, Shadrak Meshach and Abednego and those guys all get hauled off to Babylon. Jeremiah is referring to the destruction of Jerusalem saying Jerusalem is destroyed and Rachel is weeping for her children as they get hauled off to Babylon.

So you get this echo from Rachel’s death outside Bethlehem, then you get this echo from where the children are exiled to Babylon and then on to Jesus Christ who is born and those infants are slain. So you get this kind of triad echo though Scripture and it’s really kind of interesting with Rachel dying outside of Bethlehem. You can go there to this day and see the a memorial to Rachel outside of Bethlehem to this day.

K. Rachel and the family gods [43:40-46:11]

So Rachel dies now what’s going to happen? Let’s back up a little, Jacob’s going to be leaving Mesopotamia, so he’s from outside the door he’s going to be leaving Laban. Laban’s ripped him off and he’s ripped Laban off. They’re kind of back and forth and so his family starts to leave but as they start to leave, and this is in chapter 31, Rachel steals one of the family gods. Laban chases after Jacob catches up with Jacob and says, “Jacob, what are you doing? You’re running away from me? You stole all my goods, you stole my daughters, you stole my grandkids, I’m never going to see them again. What are you doing Jacob? Moreover, Jacob, you stole my gods too!” Jacob objects, “I didn’t steal your gods. Anybody you find with your gods, you can kill. I didn’t take your gods. I don’t want your stupid gods anyway.” Well, he didn’t say that because we’re going to find out later that Jacob’s probably messing with foreign gods too.

What happens? Laban comes in and the father approaches his daughter [Rachel]. You know how a father approaches a daughter and the daughter looks at him. Now Laban had gone to shear his sheep and Rachel stole the family gods. Laban pursues and then Rachel says to her father, “don’t be angry my lord, I cannot stand up now (let me use the King James Version now because I like it better) “father, I can’t stand up now for the manner of women is upon me.” So she’s sitting on the family gods. She says, “I can’t get

up dad, because you know it's that time of the month. So I can't get up." Is that pretty slick?—Rachel lies to her father. By the way you may wonder how big is this god that she's sitting on? I think you've got to remember that you've got tribal gods, big ones, but when you're talking about family gods you're talking 6 inch gods.

Why did she want the family gods? Some people suggest that whoever had the family gods had the inheritance and so she could show up 20 years later and say, "Dad, see I'm part of this family. Therefore I get part of the inheritance." So there were some possible inheritance rights involved. Somebody suggested in the last class, it was a very interesting suggestion, that maybe the gods had to do with fertility and Rachel was trying to say she was going to serve the family gods so she could be more fertile. Did the gods really give her children? No, Jehovah gave her children but she may have been playing with other gods. Well, she was playing with other gods but most people thinks it's inheritance but it was an interesting suggestion in class about the fertility option because there were fertility gods.

L. Jacob at Peniel: Esau Meeting [46:12-57:40]

Now, let's go to the wrestling match in chapter 32. This is an important chapter. As Jacob is coming down from Mesopotamia from Haran, he passes Damascus. He's on what they call the King's Highway. He comes down right to where this fellow with the black shirt is there's a wadi, a valley, that goes down there is called the Wadi Jabbok. They call it the Jabbok River, I'll never forget going to the Jabbok River. I go there I'm looking for this Jabbok River right? It was a few feet wide... I'm talking inches deep... Yes, I looked at it and said where I come from that's a little bit too big for a ditch but I've seen ditches bigger than that and I was really disappointed because I was expecting the Jabbok River. I get there and seriously you could've jumped over it and it was only about inches deep. So do you understand do they have a lot less water? I grew up on the Niagara River, that's a real river. These things, when they talk, when I was younger they would say, "I've seen the mighty Jordan roll." Have you ever seen the mighty Jordan River is about as wide as this room, it averages 3 feet deep. Now where I come from do

we call those rivers? The Niagara was a river, where I grew up they call those “creeks.” So all I’m saying is there a lot less water over there? In America we are used to, Lake Erie, and Lake Superior. Have you ever been out on Lake Superior? Oh, you guys do the ocean here! So what I’m saying is we’ve got a lot more water, over there, there is a lot less.

So what happens? Jacob’s coming down and where’s Esau? This is the Dead Sea; Esau is from down here, in the land of Edom. Esau, with 400 of his men, are going north. Now, is that going to be a problem? Okay, Jacob’s going to be meeting Esau with 400 of his men. Is Jacob scared to death? Does anyone remember Karate Kid 2? Where Sato after all those years was going to get Mr. Miyagi because he was still angry with him for stealing his woman and he was going to kill Miyagi after all these years. Do people harbor anger for decades? Within a family, I’m talking about your own families, do brothers and sisters and fathers and family do they ever harbor anger towards someone for generations, often for 10, 20 years?

I knew a guy named Herb King, I worked in a maximum security prison and Herb was in prison for 35 years for murder. He finally got out, as an old man when he got out, in his late 50s. They gave him his 75 bucks and he caught a bus from Indiana State Prison down to Georgia where he was from. After 35 years he walked in the door of his house, and this is the honest truth, and by the way, I’m using his real name now because it doesn’t matter anymore. He walked in after 35 years in a penitentiary. He’s finally free and he walks into his house and there was a guy with a 12 gauge in there on the day he walked into his house he got blown away. The guy killed him after 35 years, shot him dead. He walked in the front door, bullet to the chest. He’s dead. Question: had that guy been harboring anger toward Herb for 35 years while he was in prison? Herb’s in the graveyard now after 35 years. Do people harbor that kind of resentment?

Is Jacob when he hears that Esau’s coming up with 400 guys scared out of his mind? The last time that he saw Esau, Esau swore he was going to kill him, and he’s got 400 guys with him. Jacob’s got what? A bunch of women and children. Can Jacob defend himself? He can’t. Now, by the way, is Jacob a man’s man? I have a problem with Jacob,

there's some stuff here that really bothers me about him. When Esau's coming to him first of all he sends Esau gifts. Is that a really smart thing? Somebody's really angry at you do you give gifts? I try flowers. Gifts work sometimes, not all the time, but sometimes. It's worth a try. Flowers are good, okay. You get about 50/50. Chocolate also works, and you have to work it out. So he sends Esau gifts. Do gifts pacify anger? Sometimes they do.

He's scared. So what does he do? He divides up his family and who does he put first? He's a man's man and so he says, "Hey, it's my brother. He's coming to kill me, I should be the first out there, so you guys hide in the back, if he kills me or goes after me, you guys run for your life." Is that Jacob? No, what does this guy do? He puts Leah and the kids out front and Rachel at the back and where is he? He's in the far back. Is this a man's man? I'm sorry; the word that comes to my mind is "coward." Is this what a father should be doing? Should a father protect his family or should he hide behind his family? Okay, I'm sorry this really bothers me about him, that's about as low as you can get in my book.

So what happens? That night he's at the Jabbok Wadi. He's down there by himself, and all of a sudden he has this wrestling match. Let me see verse 24 here, and check this out. It says, "that night Jacob got up and took his two wives, his maid servants and also Jacob was left alone and a man wrestled with him till day break. And when the man saw that he could not over power him he touched,"—"the man saw that he could *not* overpower him," is very interesting. Is Jacob able to go head to head with this man? So the man could not over power him but then finally the man touched the socket of his hip and puts his hip out. So his hip was wrenched as he wrestled with the man. "Then the man said, 'let me go for it is day break.' And Jacob said, 'I will not let you go until you bless me.'" Is Jacob really into this blessing thing? "I will not let you go unless you bless me." The man asked him, 'what is your name?' 'Jacob' he answered and the man said, 'your name is no longer Jacob but Israel.'" First of all, when you're in trouble do you pray? Jacob's in trouble, he's got to face Esau. Do you pray when you're in trouble? Yes. Jacob makes the prayer.

Let's talk about Jacob's name first. Jacob's name means what? It kind of sounds like "deceiver," and now he's going to be given the new name "Israel." What does Israel mean? Is-ra-el, "El" means "God," "Israel" means "he who struggles with God." By the way, the name "Israel" is that descriptive of the Jews for all time? Have the Jews wrestled with God throughout their generations, for millennium on millennium? The Jews have struggled with God and so they are named Israel, "he who struggles with God." This becomes the beginning of the national name "Israel" that's given to the 12 tribes, which come out of Jacob. Jacob is given a new name and that's really kind of a neat thing, he moves from "deceiver" to "he who wrestles" or "struggles with God."

Now, Jacob names the place Peniel. When you look at this term Peniel, *Peni* means "face," *El* means "God." The name of the place means "Face of God." Why does Jacob name it Peniel? The text tells us explicitly. It says, "I'm going to call it Peniel [or 'face of God,'] because I saw God face to face and my life was spared." Jacob thought that he was wrestling with whom? A man? No. He says it wasn't just a man. Yes, he was called a man but "I saw God face to face." So he names the place Peniel. What people have suggested and I would agree with this is you have what's called in the Old Testament a "theophany" or a "Christophany." A "theophany" means that someone saw God. Do you remember on Mount Sinai, God was at the top of the mountain. The mountain is shaking. Moses is up there and his face shines and he comes down. That's a theophany where God appears. It blows people away and the glory overwhelms people. That's a theophany, an appearance of God. A Christophany is an appearance of Christ before Christ was actually borne. What I'm suggesting is Jacob wrestled with a man and the man couldn't defeat him. He couldn't get away until he touched Jacob's hip and put it out. What I'm suggesting is that very likely "the man" was Jesus Christ, in the flesh beforehand. Jesus Christ with just his normal strength was wrestling with Jacob until the morning and then he puts his hip out. So I'm suggesting that this was a Christophany. Jacob concludes this wasn't a normal man, "I saw God face to face" and if "the man" was Jesus then he's God. So does that make sense? That's kind of how I look at this and many other people look at it the same way.

Why did the angel change his name? “Deceiver” to “he who wrestles with God.” Now he’s seen God face to face and wrestles with him and we’re suggesting that’s Jesus.

Some people look at chapter 32 verse 32 and let me read this to you first: “The sun rose above him as he passed Peniel and he was limping because of his hip.” He’s got to meet Esau in the morning. How many of you have ever had dreams and some big guy or something is after and you can always do what, you can always run away? You always run and get away. Now what does God do with Jacob, Jacob’s hip is gone. Can Jacob run away from Esau? No. He can’t run now, he’s got to face Esau. In other words, he cannot be in control and say I’m just going to skedaddle, I’m going to run away from him, at least I can escape him because I’m faster than he is. Now, with his hip out, he’s got to face Esau face to face and he can’t get away.

Now, in chapter 32 verse 32 it says this, some people think this verse was added latter by later editors, “to this day the Israelites do not eat the tendon attached to the socket of the hip because the socket of Jacob’s hip was touched near the tendon.” So the text says “to this day” they still don’t eat that tendon that’s by the hip because of Jacob’s hip--“to this day.” Was that statement added later? The narrative is telling you about Jacob. We don’t eat that “to this day,” seems to be added later. Is Moses much later than Jacob? Yes, at least 400 years. Is it possible Moses wrote, “we still don’t eat the tendon” and it was 400 years after? Could this statement in Genesis 32:32 have been written by Moses? Sure it could have. Moses is 400 years after and he puts in this explanatory statement about why they don’t eat the tendon that’s by the hip socket. So it doesn’t have to be added later, long after the time of Moses. Moses could have written it.

L. Jacob’s Meeting and Lie to Esau [57:41-63:31]

Now we come to the meeting with Esau. Family members meeting after years and years and they finally meet. Esau falls on his brother and he’s weeping and hugging, finally after all this time. Have you guys ever been away from brothers for a long period of time? You get back there and it’s this beautiful thing there’s nobody like a brother or sister that you’ve grown up with. So they meet years later and it’s a really beautiful time.

Now does Jacob lie once again to his brother Esau? The answer is that after all this time Jacob is going to lie again. They're meeting at the Wadi Jabbok. Esau comes up with his 400 guys. He tells Jacob, "Jacob, I don't want your gifts, take your gifts back I'm wealthy. Why don't you come down and see my place? I live down by the bottom of the Dead Sea in all these red rocks, Nubian sandstone, Petra it's beautiful down there. Why don't you come down and see me? Jacob says, "Oh, yes, I'll come down and see you." So Esau says, "Well, my guys will protect your sheep and goats for you and we'll go down together." But Jacob says, "No, no, my sheep and goats they've got to go slow. So Esau you just go back home and I'll come down and visit you. You just go back home."

Now if you don't know anything about geography you won't know that he lied. Where is Jacob? Jacob's up there. Esau goes back home. The next thing you read in the text, in the next chapter in chapter 34, where is Jacob? Jacob is over here at Shechem and that's where his daughter gets raped. Did Jacob lie to Esau, telling him that he's going to meet him down here, and then he goes in the opposite direction. Is this guy still lying to people? It drives you nuts after all this time he still lies to his brother. By the way, you know that from the geography.

Now here's where Esau gets off and let me just kind of run through this. Esau becomes the father of the Edomites. The Edomites are his descendants. So whenever you see Edom, or Edomites in Scripture, those are Esau's descendants. By the way, I should say whenever you see Edomites in Scripture the Edomites will always do pretty much do the same thing. What do the Edomites do? They kill Jews. When you see them in Scripture and you see Edomites remember, Hildebrandt says, whenever you see an Edomite he's going to kill a Jew. I'm serious that happens, I'm exaggerating, obviously, but most of the time the Edomites are killing Jews. The whole book of Obadiah can be summarized, Obadiah's only one chapter, but the whole book is about the Edomites and how the Edomites killed Jews. Curses come upon them for killing people in a helpless position. So the book of Obadiah the prophet is largely geared against the Edomites.

Now the most famous Edomite that you know is named Herod. Herod was an

Idumean. Do you hear the “D” and the “M” it is the same “D” and “M” [Edom]. Herod was an Idumean. That meant that King Herod, the king of the Jews, was an Edomite. Now, how is it that you’re an Edomite and you’re King over the Jews? Well, if you can’t be a Jew what’s the next best thing you can do? So when Herod goes to marry someone, what should that person be? A Jewish princess. Have you ever heard of the Maccabees? Herod picks one of the Maccabean Princesses. Her name was Mariamne, and she was a princess in the Maccabean line. Do the Jews revere the Maccabees? Maccabees gave them the feast of Hanukkah. The Jews revere the Maccabees because they were heroes. He marries one of the Maccabee’s girls. Now what’s the problem with Herod? Does Herod kill people? He kills his own wife, Mariamne. She’s a Jewish princess. Is this guy really stupid? Does anyone remember Anthony and Cleopatra? Also you know Marc Anthony because he’s still singing. Cleopatra hated Herod.

Herod killed his wife and Herod killed his sons also. Herod built this place down in New Testament Jericho, and I had my son there and it’s covered in barbed wire because they don’t want you getting in there. But Herod took his own sons into these pools that he made and he had some of his men drown one of his own sons. Is this guy a butcher? So when I went there we climbed through the barbed wire and I had to get pictures. So I put my son, and he doesn’t know any history, he’s a computer geek, so I put him in the pool and I took a picture. I was going to put my hand on his head like I was pushing him under or something but I got a picture until they came and chased us away. We weren’t supposed to be in there. We got ripped up with the barbwire. You got to be careful with the barb wire it snags you. But if you’re going to come all the way from America to a place like that, are you going to let a little barb wire stop you? No. I hope you’ve got a little more guts than that. But then you’d be able to run fast too, nobody’s touching your hip. Somebody says you didn’t really do that did you? Yes, I did. He didn’t know!

This is the Salt Sea here. You guys call it the Dead Sea, 1270 feet below sea level. Here’s the Jordan river and the Sea of Galilee. This is the country Jordan and the Mediterranean Sea. Esau’s down here in Edom southeast of the Dead Sea. He comes up

here on the Kings' Highway. They meet here, this is where Jacob wrestles with the angel at Peniel by the Jabbok Wadi. Jacob says, "I'm going to follow you back down to Edom, Esau," and the next thing we hear, Jacob is over here at Shechem, and his daughter gets raped there.

M. Lot, his daughters and Moab and Ammon [63:32-68:51]

Now there are a couple other things I've skipped earlier. Do you know who Moab is? Moab is a story I skipped. The story happens back with Sodom and Gomorrah. Lot was spared from the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah. What happened to Lot's wife? Lot's wife turned back and she turned into a pillar of salt. So now Lot doesn't have a wife, he has two daughters. Do the daughters have any children? No. So what happens is in the cave they get their father drunk and they have sex with their father and they produce then, do you know what "abba" is? "Abba" means father. "Mo-ab" means "from father." The Moabites are "from father." They're Lot's descendants from his daughter. The Moabites - is that a really cool title "from father"? It's not a cool title at all. By the way, you know someone who's famous in Moab because there's a book named after her: Ruth, the Moabitess. So are the Moabites going to be in the line of David? David's great-grandmother Ruth is going to come from Moab. So Jesus Christ, the Moabites are going to be in his line.

Ammon was the other one. The other daughter had sex with her father after she got him drunk too producing Ammon. Has anyone ever heard of Ammon Jordan? Till this day Ammon is still there. So one of Lot's descendants was in Jordan in Ammon and the other one was here with Moab.

When I was teaching, I taught for a decade in a maximum-security prison in Indiana, and there was a guy in that prison named Probo. Probo was one of the smartest guys I've ever taught in my life. He was an Indian, big guy, nobody ever messed with Probo in the prison. Probo was in the Vietnam war. He was trained as special ops. There was a DMZ, a de-militarized zone, they dropped Probo on the other side of the demilitarized zone with no guns, only a knife and his hands. He was trained to kill people. Why didn't they give him a gun? Because if you sounded a gun they would know

you were there, so everything had to be secret. He had a knife and his hands and he killed people on the other side of the DMZ. When he got back to America, what did they do? They put all kinds of medals on him and he was a great hero. One night he was in a bar and two guys jumped him. Is he the wrong guy to jump in a bar? Two guys jumped him, what did he do, just instinctively? He did his thing and guess what? There are two dead guys next to him. What happened to Probo? He gets put away for 35 years. When Probo walks through the prison did anybody mess with this guy? No. Everybody knew who he was, what he did, and they knew what he could do. It's Mr. Probo. So anyway this guy is pretty intimidating, he's an old biker kind of guy.

He was in my Old Testament class and I was teaching Old Testament at night, I'd teach during the day at the college and go over there at night. I'm watching Probo and he didn't take a single note in the class. He was a non-believer and so he would ask all these questions trying to destroy the Bible. We got all into it and it was all cool. I looked at Probo and he didn't take a note in the class and I said, "this first test I'm going to nail that dude. He's going to pay for not taking a note he wasn't even paying attention." He took the test; he got a 98 on the first test. So I just came to him and I said Probo what's the deal? You didn't take a note, how'd you get a 98 on that test? It turns out that he was trained, he had a photographic ear. Anything I said he could quote it back, he could quote back what I said when I couldn't even remember what I had said. He could quote it back word for word.

Well, we came to the passage about the daughters getting their father drunk and having sex with their father. Probo raises his hand back there, cocky old Probo, and he says, "Uhh professor, when you're drunk like that you can't have sex like that." "This just shows an error in the Bible. I mean obviously that can't be right, that doesn't happen like that." I'm standing there thinking, I'm sorry but the honest truth is I've never been drunk. I was thinking "Holy cow, Hildebrandt he's got you on this one, I mean what can you not do when your drunk. I don't know? And so how do you argue with this guy's experience?" So I'm thinking of all these reasons in my head, my head's going back and forth, usually I've got a smart whippy answer. Now I'm totally stumped. It's this guy's

telling me from experience, what do I do?

Luckily for me, providentially for me, old Robert was down front. He was an elderly Black man, sitting down front. He turns around, looks Probo straight in the face and he says, “Probo that ain’t right,” he says, “I’ve done that!” I said “All right, all right.” Sometime before the course ends, if I forget and will someone make me come back to Probo, there’s a good ending to that story. So Moab and Amon are two important tribal groups we’ll see later on from Lot.

N. Jacob returns to Bethel [68:51-71:09]

Now, Jacob returns to Bethel, what happens here? In chapter 35 when he comes back to Bethel, this is 20 years later. First of all, he gets rid of his foreign gods. What does that tell you about Jacob? Jacob gets rid of his foreign gods. Was Jacob an idolater? Did he worship other gods? So my guess is that Jacob does it like this: “Well, Jehovah is kind of my God, you know the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. You know Jehovah’s my God, but I like these other gods too because you can never have too many gods. You know, you might just need some extra protection.” So I think what you have here is Jehovah plus these other gods (henotheism). Jacob’s saying he uses them for protection. It’s like an added benefit. Jacob gets rid of his foreign gods. He’s now back at Bethel and he’s got to face the real God, so in chapter 35, he rids himself of his pagan gods.

God then comes and reiterates that his name will be changed from Jacob to Israel. So there is a reiteration of this name change to “he who struggles with God.” His name “Israel” is reiterated there. Then what would you expect to be reiterated once again? As he comes back to God at Bethel, God reiterates the covenant to him also. What is the covenant? The covenant is the promise of the land, the seed is to be multiplied and that he would be a blessing to all nations. So the covenant is reiterated to Jacob now as he comes back to Bethel. Bethel later on in Israel’s history will be a place of idolatry. It will be a place where Israel leaves God and it’s interesting how the name Bethel gets taken and goes into idolatry. Later on we’ll see that as Jerusalem takes center stage.

Rachel dies, we talked about that. Rachel dies after he leaves Bethel. Rachel dies outside Bethlehem on his way down to see his father Isaac. Rachel dies having

Benjamin. We said that was echoed at the time of Jesus' birth in the time of the slaying of the infants, as well as in Jeremiah about the Babylonian exile. So Rachel's death gets echoed in Jeremiah in the exile and then down to Jesus in the slaying of the infants. So Bethel is going to be a significant place. Bethel is going to be a religious place for Israel. This is a place where they meet God at Bethel--"the house of God."

O. Jacob and the 12 tribes of Israel [71:10-73:45]

Now, first of all, I do not want you to learn all 12 tribes of Israel. I want you to know four of them. You'll see right off which ones I want you to know. They'll be in yellow. First of all, you've got, let me just put them all up here. Leah has the bulk of the children. Reuben is the firstborn, but there are two I want you to know. The first one is Levi. Why is Levi important? Levi becomes the priests. Moses and Aaron come out of the tribe of Levi and Aaron's descendants will be the priests. So the priests and Levites will be out of the tribe of Levi. They will be the kind of the holy tribe given to carry the tabernacle and to minister before the Lord. There will also be Levitical cities later on. Levi is a very important tribe.

The other tribe from Leah that's important is Judah. Now why is Judah important? Who will be from Judah? Jesus will be from there, but before Jesus, who? David. The kings of Israel, David, Solomon, Rehoboam, Hezekiah, Josiah, all the kings of the southern kingdom will come from Judah. So Judah will provide the kings as Levi will provide the priests.

Now with Rachel, you need to know both of Rachel's kids. Her firstborn was Joseph. Joseph is going to be a really important character in Genesis. Her other son is Benjamin. Why is Benjamin important? The first king of Israel will be from the tribe of Benjamin. His name will be Saul, but when I say Saul, who do you know in the New Testament named Saul? Paul. Guess what tribe Paul is from? He's also from the tribe of Benjamin. Was Paul the apostle probably named Saul after king Saul from the tribe of Benjamin? Yes. So those are the four I want you to know: Levi, Judah, Joseph and Benjamin. Later on the tribe of Joseph will split, Joseph will be the northern tribes and Judah will be the southern tribe. The country's going to split north and south. Joseph will

be in the north; Judah will be in the south. Joseph will actually split into Ephraim and Manasseh his two kids who get an inheritance with the other tribes. Ephraim is going to be the dominant tribe in the northern kingdom and Judah will be the southern kingdom, later on. So those are the 12 tribes of Israel and those four are real important.

P. Rape of Dinah [73:46-77:14]

You will remember there's one girl up there, her name is Dinah. Why is it that Christians skip chapters 34 and 38. I just want to go through the stories and see if you've ever heard sermons preached on these. Why do Christians skip these? Chapter 34, first of all, is the raping of Dinah. Now "Dinah the daughter of Leah had born to Jacob went out to visit the women of the land. And when Shechem the son of Hamor (I call him the Donkey-man because that's what his name means "donkey-man") goes out and meets Shechem the son of Donkey-man the ruler of the area saw her, he took her and he violated her" that's another way for saying what? He raped her. So Dinah gets raped, now why is this guy Shechem really really stupid? Do you mess with a girl who's got 12 brothers? No. That's really stupid.

But after he violates her now what happens? When Jacob heard that his daughter Dinah had been violated his sons were in the fields. So Jacob, in a fury and rage got his sword and went out there and went after him. Is that what Jacob did? Is Jacob a man's man or is he a what? What should he have done as a father? Should he have been out there first? What's Jacob do? It says, "Jacob kept quiet until they [the brothers] came home." Does that bother me about Jacob? This Jacob guy, I have a big problems with him. Now, when the brothers get home, is there going to be a problem now? The 12 brothers come and it says, "the brothers were filled with grief for their sister, and fury." Grief and fury, is that bad combination?

So the 12 brothers go out, now what happens? Jacob tries to keep the peace a little bit, and let me just narrate the story. So he goes to Shechem and Hamor and they say, "My son Shechem has fallen in love with Dinah, he wants to marry her." And Jacob says, "Okay. But you see we're Jewish and we're of the circumcision and you guys ain't of the

circumcision. You're uncircumcised. So you need to go back and tell your people that they all need to be circumcised." By the way, do Hamor and Shechem go back and convince the whole town to be circumcised? Is that a big deal? Yes. They say, "We can intermarry with these guys. We can trade with them and they can trade with us. We'll marry their children and they'll marry our children. We'll intermarry with them." So they agree, "let's be circumcised." So they convince the whole town to be circumcised.

You remember the rest of the story. By the way, does it take all 12 brothers? No. Just two brothers go in, Levi and Simeon, those two brothers go in and take out the whole town. Just two brothers and it says on the third day when they were still, I think the text here says, "in pain." Obviously they're helpless and I shouldn't laugh. It's not good, in other words, this is something that happened that's defiling to circumcision. This is a bad thing. So anyway this is the storyline of Dinah. Now why is that story in the Bible? Has anyone ever heard a sermon on that? Okay, we've got one here, that's interesting.

Q. Judah and Tamar (Gen. 38) [77:15-81:50]

Now go over to the story of Judah and Tamar. That's in chapter 38. Let me just narrate this story quickly here. First of all, the background of the story: Judah had married a Canaanite woman, is that good or bad? That's bad. His son Ur had taken this woman Tamar who was also a Canaanite and married her. What happened to Ur? Judah's son Ur marries Tamar, and his son dies. Now, what's the second son required to do when the older has son died? He must marry the wife and have a child for his brother. In other words, they're not his kids he's to have children for his brother, in honor of his brother. They call it the Levirate marriage and it was part of the culture back then. What happens to the second son, Onan? He marries her but in the process of having sex with her he purposely spills the seed on the ground. God gets so hacked at Onan, God takes him out. So now Ur married Tamar, he's dead, the second son married Tamar, and now he's dead; You've got your third son, are you going to give your third son to this woman? Everyone the woman touches goes dead. Now this is serious. So Judah says, "My son's not quite ready yet." Tamar sees what's going on. So Tamar puts on the dress of a prostitute. Judah, and you have to be aware of the text; Judah's wife had died, that is significant.

Judah's wife is dead. So Judah, the father, doesn't have a wife now, he's out on the road travelling and he comes up and here's Tamar decked out like a prostitute covered up so he doesn't know who it is. She says, "Hey, what do you want big guy." "How much is it?" And he says, "Do you take Visa or MasterCard?" And she says, "Well, I've got either one. I'll can tell you haven't got change so what I want from you is your signet ring." Now, by the way, why is that signet ring important? Is that Judah's signet ring? That's what he sticks in the mud that indicates that it's him. Or as my wife would say, "it's he." "So I want your staff and your ring and then you can go get the goat and bring it back to me." So he goes into her, and she conceives. When he goes to send the goat in payment, she disappears and he says, "Oh well, she's gone."

Now little bit later on, Tamar's found to be pregnant. "My daughter-in-law she is pregnant, bring her out, she should be burned for defiling our family like that." Then Tamar comes out and says, "Hey, Judah, you remember these?" And it's, "Um, um, um, oh, well," and Judah's caught. You say, "this story's in the Bible?" I mean this is what happened. It's in the Bible. Now is the Bible approving of this story or is it simply telling what happened? It's telling us what happened (descriptive not prescriptive). By the way is Judah a big tribe of Israel? Judah is David. As a matter of fact Tamar, is in the genealogy of Jesus Christ. In Matthew chapter 1, guess who shows up? Tamar. In the genealogy of Jesus Christ, can you believe it has its background in this story.

Now you say, "Okay, Hildebrandt, what's going on? Why are these two stories in the Bible?" I've got a suggestion and what I'm going to suggest to you is that what you have here is the elimination of the older brothers. Who are the older brothers? In the first story here who gets eliminated? Levi and Simeon, you say Reuben's the oldest yes—well, Reuben slept with his father's concubine so he's out of the picture too. So Reuben's gone, Levi and Simeon are gone, here's Judah's gone as well. I think it's eliminating the older brothers. It's showing the corruption of the older brothers because who is the focus going to move to? In the end of the book of Genesis the focus is going to move away from the older brothers to whom? Joseph. Joseph is going to be a gem. Joseph and Daniel are your two major winners in the Old Testament. So I think that the text is using

this as a literary technique to move you away from the older brothers to focus on Joseph and I think that's what's going on here.

R. The Joseph Narrative [81:51-84:01]

Now I want to hit the Joseph narrative, this is going to be fast. I want to compare Jacob and Joseph. Jacob and Joseph in the book of Genesis are compared. The two were very different characters but yet have similar lives. For example, in both the Jacob story and the Joseph story you have the supremacy of the younger brother. Jacob is the younger brother, Esau is the older brother. Jacob is supreme. Joseph is the younger brother, the older brothers are all corrupt, Joseph is the winner. So there is the supremacy of the younger brother. In both the Jacob story and the Joseph story you get strife and deception in the family. By the way, you can see deception in the name "Jacob." You can see strife in the name "Israel." Do you remember when I started out Jacob is strife and deception? Those are Jacob's two names: Jacob and Israel. Basically, the parental favoritism leads to sibling rivalry. Did Jacob favor Joseph over the other kids? Do you remember the coat of many colors? So Jacob favored him and whenever you have parental favoritism does it lead to the brothers and sisters duking it out? So, parental favoritism leads to sibling rivalry and strife in the families. In both cases the younger one who was the special one was separated from his family for 20 years. Jacob is separated from his family up in Haran. Joseph is separated from his family down in Egypt. Then, both Jacob and Joseph prosper in a foreign land. Joseph is going to come up so he's right under Pharaoh. Jacob gets all his wealth from Laban. So they both prosper in a foreign land. Finally, lastly here, both of them at the end of their lives are reunited with their estranged brothers. Jacob is reunited with Esau although there are some problems with that, and Joseph is reunited with his brothers. At the end, do you remember Joseph and the brothers come together. So the stories of Jacob and Joseph are somewhat parallel in the way the story forms, although they're two totally different characters.

S. Joseph and Wisdom [84:02-85:53]

Now another major shift, I want to compare the Joseph narrative in Genesis to show a connection to Joseph and wisdom literature by making some comparisons. In

order to do that, I want to tell you a story. “Once upon a time,” you know you’re getting a story when you hear that. “Once upon a time, there was a person of very high status who had a problem and he went all through his kingdom searching through this kingdom. I want you to think of the story, he goes through all of his kingdom trying to find someone to solve the problem and finally he or she tries, and it fits. The person of low status, solves the king’s problem and she is put over the whole kingdom and they all live happily ever after.” What story am I telling? Some of you say, “Cinderella.” That’s the Cinderella story. I think some of you said “Pretty Woman.” No, no, actually I’m dead serious this is the story of “Pretty Woman” built on the Cinderella story [Aladdin too]? Do you understand there’s a form to this story that’s very similar. Now is that what you have with the Joseph story too? The king had this problem, he’s got these dreams and no one can solve it. He finally goes down to the prison and finds this person in prison who can interpret his dreams. He then interprets the Pharaoh’s dreams correctly and what happens to the person of low status? He’s lifted up to be a person of high status and they all live happily ever after. He does the famine thing and they go 7 years without food and he’s got food for them and they’re good to go. That’s the same kind of structure as the Cinderella story that you have in the Joseph story that’s why the Joseph story is so beautiful, it follows that same kind of narrative pattern.

T. Joseph, Potiphar’s wife and wisdom [85:54-89:19]

Now, does Joseph resist the wild woman? Remember Potiphar’s wife goes after him and by the way if that happened anywhere else in the Bible there would’ve been a very different outcome. But Joseph is a man above reproach. He does not take advantage of Potiphar. Even in his uprightness does he end up in jail? Yes, so this guy is good. In Proverbs, does the proverbial father warn his son not to mess around with wild women like that? Yes. Proverbs chapters 5 and 7 are major wisdom warnings about wild women. Joseph actually models that.

Are wise men good at interpreting dreams? Daniel is a wise man in Mesopotamia and Daniel too interprets dreams for Nebuchadnezzar. Joseph interprets dreams for

Pharaoh. He's considered a wise man and a wise man knows how to interpret dreams--so the seven years of plenty and the seven years of famine. He saves during the seven years of plenty and then has for the seven years of famine. He was with the cupbearer and the baker in prison.

Here's another one. In Egyptian wisdom literature the wise man is called the silent man. Now, by the way, in America is the wise man the silent man or is the wise man the one that's always shooting off his mouth? In ancient Egyptian literature, and I'm talking for 2000 years, the wise man was considered the silent man. Did Joseph hide his emotions from his brothers? When he first met his brothers did he hide his feelings and was he silent? He plays this role of this wise sage. He plays the role of the silent man here. When I say wisdom literature, the fear of God is the beginning of wisdom and this fear of God motif actually occurs with Joseph.

Then lastly, and this is my favorite one. Jacob the father dies, and now Joseph is left with his 11 brothers. His 11 brothers are scared to death. What are they afraid of? Joseph is in a position of power, they're in a position of weakness. The brothers come to Joseph and say, "Joseph don't kill us! We really didn't mean to hurt you all those years ago." Joseph says what? "You intended to harm me, but God intended it for good." This is a reversal! Does God do the reversals? He takes what's evil and turns it into good? Joseph says, "you intended to harm me but God intended it for good" and the whole thing's changed. This is God's redemptive work, he takes what's bad and turns it into something that's wonderful. He does it with Joseph and he does it with our lives too.

We are done with Genesis! We'll start with Exodus next time. See you Thursday.

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt teaching Old Testament History, Literature and Theology, Lecture 10 on the finishing up of the Jacob stories as well as the introduction and conclusion of the Joseph narrative concluding the book of Genesis.

Transcribed By Kristen Sawyer
Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt 2

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 11

[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History, Literature and Theology course lecture number eleven on the first four chapters of the Book of Exodus.

A. Quiz Preview [0:00- 0:49]

Today since we finally made it out of Genesis. We're going to tackle the book of Exodus today, and we'll set that up hopefully in this class. In the next class we'll finish off the book of Exodus. So, let's begin with the book of Exodus just working with it and then I'll be trying for the rest of the semester to catch up with you. Next Thursday's important, it's our first exam. So just keep that in mind. The study guide is coming out tomorrow morning.

B. Title of Exodus [0:50- 1:26]

What does the title of Exodus mean? *Ek* (or “*ex*”) in Greek is the word “out” or “out of” it's the preposition “out”, *odos* means “the way” *Ex-odos*, so it's “the way out.” Exit [ex-it] the room. So Exodus means “the way out” and the book of Exodus is about the way out of what? The way out of Egypt. So this is the way out of Egypt and the way out of Egypt is largely what the text is about.

C. Survey of Main Movements in Exodus [1:27- 7:50]

There are basically five movements, in the Book of Exodus and these five major things pull together. The first would be the birth and call of Moses. We haven't met Moses yet, but in the beginning of Exodus we meet Moses as a baby, in the birth and call of Moses. Then a couple/three chapters are on the call of Moses. So Moses becomes a big player for the rest of the Pentateuch. By the way when I use the term Pentateuch, do you guys know what is the Pentateuch is? Yes, William. Yes, the first five books of the Bible. *Penta-* like Pentagon, means “five.” *Pentateuch* means “book.” There are five books. I should say this though, did Moses ever see a book in his life? The answer is: a book like this that has a binding, the binding of books started about 100 AD. 100 AD we started

having books/codex bound together. Before that what did people have? Scrolls. So Moses would have been writing on scrolls. Often times in the Bible when it says “Book of the Covenant”, it's really talking about a scroll. It's translated as book in our modern language so you have to make a shift there. Now “the birth and call of Moses,” he writes the Pentateuch/Torah, so he's going to be the author of the first five books of the Bible.

Next is the ten plagues of Egypt. Moses goes down into Egypt and basically there's going to be the dual between the God of Israel and the “god” Pharaoh. Pharaoh is considered a god. The question is going to be: is it going to be the god Pharaoh or is it going to be the God Jehovah? Are you going to fear a god you can see, Pharaoh who has chariot that can run you down, or are you going to fear the God whom you can't see? So God establishes himself. A lot of the plagues are going to be a dueling between Pharaoh and God. God establishes himself in the ten plagues of Egypt. So we'll look at those ten plagues.

The crossing of the Reed Sea is a big and major event when Israel leaves Egypt they cross the Reed Sea. I put Reed Sea just to be kind of ornery. You guys probably know it as the Red Sea, but it is the Reed Sea. We don't know exactly which sea it was. The Hebrew term is *yam suph* which means “Sea of Reeds.” The Hebrew text does not say “Red Sea” Hebrew text says “Sea of Reeds.” So I say the Reed Sea. So they cross the Reed Sea, God splits the water, they go cross, the Egyptians are drowned, that's a big deal. So the crossing of the Reed Sea is a very big deal for Israel that's when they actually leave Egypt. Let me just finish this and we'll talk a little more about that.

The tabernacle is next. Once they cross the Reed Sea they get out into the wilderness. God has them build a tent for him so that he can dwell in their midst. So you get this tabernacle structure which we skipped over a lot of the details because every board and every plank is measured. They describe it in great detail. Is anybody from Lancaster area in Pennsylvania at all? There's an actual tabernacle structure down there isn't there? I've been told that in the Lancaster area some of the Amish folk have actually built an actual tabernacle that you can go through down in the Lancaster area in Pennsylvania. I've always wanted to see it. Tabernacle is built and God will dwell in the

midst of his people. It is portable; it's kind of like a portable Temple and when they move, God moves with them. Some people suggested that manatees as far as what the skins were the sea cows. I get really iffy on a lot of the animals. I want to say we're 3000 years later and the animals are hard to identify. First of all they have different animals over there and so sometimes the translation is hard. So, yeah, "sea cows" has been translated "manatees." The honest truth is when I was over there, I didn't see any manatees. I think they may have been there possibly, but it maybe something else. All I'm saying is back off on that one. I'm not sure what the honest truth is. Sorry about that, I have to be honest with you. I mean there's a big discussion over what the animal was. I've never been convinced by any of the discussions, so I'm sorry. We'll come up with a lot of animals when we get into Leviticus. We'll be talking about the rabbit and the hare. There's trouble when you translate between languages with the animals, especially between cultures.

Next you have the Torah and the giving of the Torah or the law at Sinai. The word "Torah" is a Jewish word if you talk to the Jewish people and you say tell us about the Torah largely it's the law, the law at Sinai and the Ten Commandments that were given there at Sinai. This is the major covenant. What was the major covenant in Genesis? It was called the Covenant with Abraham or the Abrahamic Covenant. The Abrahamic Covenant was based on what? Circumcision, right? Abraham circumcised his child and then the Abrahamic Covenant: the land, the seed multiplying and being a blessing to all nations that was the Abrahamic Covenant. It was reiterated to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and on down. Here is going to be the Sinaitic Covenant, the Sinai Covenant is going to be based not on circumcision so much as on obedience. So God will give his law and then the people are supposed to keep that law, that covenant, that he gave them. There will be specifications and stipulations. Now, you guys have just read Numbers. Did Israel keep the law? No. Are they breaking this right off the bat? They're breaking the law so this gets to be a problem here with this Sinaitic Covenant, the giving of the law. So that is a summary overview.

D. Exodus as the great redemptive act of the Old Testament [7:51-9:24]

Now I want to jump over next to,... but before we do this I want to review this and kind of step back and look at the whole big picture of Exodus here. The book of Exodus is a great book in the Old Testament.

What is the great redemptive act in the New Testament? First of all, who is the real redemptive act, who does it in the New Testament? What's the person's name? Jesus. We've got four Gospels about Jesus that give us all this historical detail. What in his life that is considered the climax? Yes, it is his death and resurrection, his crucifixion, his dying on our behalf and the resurrection from the dead. So that's the great redemptive act in the New Testament, Christ's dying for our sins and rising again from the dead. Defeating death is a pretty big enemy to defeat. So Jesus rises from the dead giving us hope.

In the Old Testament, what is the great redemptive act in the Old Testament? In the Old Testament it is Moses leading the people out of the bondage, out of bondage of Egypt. So the great redemptive act in the Old Testament is going to be this exodus; this coming out of Egypt. So, we'll come back to that and show you that this is huge. In other words, as Jesus death and resurrection were huge in the New Testament, so the coming out of Egypt is huge for the Israelites. They'll go back over and over again to the fact that "God delivered us out of the hands of the Egyptians and out of the hands of Pharaoh."

E. Oral and written nature of Torah [9:25-13:52]

Now who wrote this material? Was it just oral. In other words, did this material that's coming down to us in our Pentateuch/Torah was this just oral? Or was it written? How does it come down. There will be big debates and the tension between this "writtenness" of it and the "oralness" of it. So this comes up in several ways, but let's look at what the actual Bible itself says. In Exodus chapter 17 verse 14 you get this statement: "Then the Lord said to Moses", how is God communicating with Moses? Is it oral or written? "And the Lord said to Moses" God is speaking to Moses. Moses is apparently hearing, so it's oral. God to Moses is oral. You say, "Hildebrandt, what about the Ten Commandments? Was that oral or was that written?" Okay, that was written. God wrote down the Ten Commandments right in the stone, right? So God actually wrote that

himself. But here and in most places, God is speaking to Moses and he tells Moses “write this on a scroll as something to be remembered.” God commands Moses to write down what God said. So God's going to speak to Moses and Moses is going to write it down. So, is this Pentateuch/Torah, is this all oral tradition handed down through hundreds of years, or is this written down? God says it, Moses is commanded to write it down on the spot. So that's important. By the way does that assume that Moses can write? Yes. By the Way, Moses was trained in Pharaoh's court, he was trained by his own family, so yes Moses was a very literate person.

God says, “Write this on a scroll to be remembered and make sure that Joshua [reads] it.” I misquoted Scripture. It doesn't say that. It says, “and make sure Joshua hears it.” Do you see this shift here? Moses you write it down, and make sure that Joshua hears it. Was the Scripture to be read out loud so people could hear it? So it was written down but then, by the way, there were there a lot people in that culture who probably couldn't read. Therefore, it would be read to them orally. I'm not saying Joshua couldn't read because Joshua will probably be writing the book of Joshua and finishing up Deuteronomy, but he says read it out loud so Joshua can hear it. So it goes from the written back to oral. In other words, it goes: God speaks it, it starts out oral; Moses writes it down and after having it written down it goes back to oral and it is read in front of the people. So it's this dance back and forth between oral and written. Can the oral check the written? Can the written check the oral? So you get this kind of checks and balances between the two. It's interesting both oral and written are mentioned in Exodus 17.14.

If you go over to another passage, over here in Exodus 24.4, you get a similar type of thing where God says, “Moses went and told people.” Notice the oral “Moses went and told the people all the words and the laws.” Is that oral? Moses is telling them; it's oral. He's telling them of the words and the laws. They responded with one voice. “Everything the Lord has said, [again oral], everything the Lord has said we will do. Then Moses wrote down everything the Lord had said.” Do you see this oscillation back and forth? He told the people what God said, the people then confirmed the covenant

saying we will do it. Then and Moses writes it down. Now is it hundreds of years later, they say we will do it? In this same verse here it says Moses wrote this stuff down. So this oscillation, this reciprocation goes between oral and written going back and forth. Again we see that in Exodus 24.4.

Now, if you jump over to the New Testament, it's interesting in the New Testament, in the Book of John, the fourth Gospel, it says, in the first chapter of John 1.17, it says "for the law was given through" whom? "Moses." Okay, so you've got a clear statement in the New Testament: "The law was given through Moses."

F. Critics and biblical authors [13:53-16:51]

Now you say, "Hildebrandt, why are you making a big deal about this? We all know Moses wrote it. Do you realize one of the big things that the critics always do and you can tell, they do the same thing every time, they take a book of the Bible, and it says the Psalms of David. What will the critics do? They'll say, well it says Psalms of David but it doesn't really mean that because David didn't really write that. Isaiah, you know the prophecies of Isaiah well, it really isn't Isaiah and so clunk, they throw out Isaiah and they throw out David. It says Samuel but obviously Samuel isn't right so clunk, it's out. Well Joshua, you know Joshua wasn't writing either. Basically, they go through and they do a hit job. If the Bible says these guys are authors, the critics will basically go through and they try to dissect the author from the writing. Now why would they do that? Why try to get rid of the author from the writing? What they're trying to say is these things are handed down which means that they're just legends and that they're not really historical. It's not really from the real person. These are just legends about the person. What does that do? You see how that undermines the historicity of the Scriptures? So that technique then of removing the authors is pretty common. Moses gets hit big time.

Yes, Hannah? John 1.17 says, "for the law was given through Moses." Now here, Jesus himself makes some comments in John 7.19-22. Let me just read these two verses. Jesus himself is on record, the first is in John the narrator John there in 1:17, in John 7:19 it says this: "Jesus then said to them, I did one miracle and you were all astonished. Yet because Moses," Jesus says Moses, "yet because Moses gave you circumcision." Now

by the way, is that true? Did Moses really give them circumcision? Did Moses command them to be circumcised? Yes, he did. But question, did he give them circumcision? Actually it says here Moses gave you circumcision, although actually it did not come through Moses, but from the patriarchs. Which patriarch first did circumcision? Abraham. So, the text notes that it didn't come directly through Moses, it was through the patriarchs. "You circumcise the child on the Sabbath. Now the child can be circumcised on the Sabbath so that the law of Moses may not be broken. Why are you angry with me for healing this man on the Sabbath? Stop judging mere appearances and make right judgment." So, here Jesus says from Moses came the law of the Sabbath and circumcision. So Jesus himself affirms that Moses wrote it. I usually say that if Jesus and the apostles think Moses wrote is it good enough for me? Yes. I think Jesus is God so he's pretty good on this.

G. Exodus elsewhere in the Old Testament [16:52-17:41]

How is the book of Exodus looked at elsewhere in Scripture? If this is the great redemptive act in the Old Testament, what I'm going to show you now is that the Exodus that we're going to be talking about gets echoed through the rest of the Old Testament. So there will be these echoes where, the Exodus themes of being delivered out of bondage and slavery and set free. It's almost like, what was that movie where, "Freedom!" you know at the end of the movie [Brave Heart]. But this idea of them being set free and that God is the great liberator is all based on the book of Exodus. So you're going to hear this echo of the Exodus through the whole rest of Scripture. You're going to hear it, and I just want to look at some of this in terms of this theme. The Exodus becomes a metaphor for deliverance, deliverance and the great redemptive act of God in the Old Testament.

H. Exodus in the Prophets [17:42-21:02]

Now, let me just give you an example of this in the prophets. Here is one in the prophets. I'm curious as to how many of you have heard this before. In Hosea 11:1 it says, "When Israel was a child, I loved him." God is portraying himself here as a what? "When Israel was a child, I loved him." God is portraying himself as a father who loves

his kid. He's saying when I was the father, and Israel was my child I loved him. "And out of Egypt, I called my son." Who is God's son? His son is Israel. Did Pharaoh try to damage God's son? Yes. Did God damage Pharaoh's son? Yes. Do you see how it goes there? So, he says, "out of Egypt I called my son." His son was Israel so he encapsulates the whole nation and portrays it as the relationship as a father has his love for his son.

The second part of this then changes the whole thing. Have any of guys ever been in a grocery store and watched parents with their kids? Is that a disaster? I have four kids and I learned how to handle the grocery store. What you do is you put them in the cart and that way they can't get away. So I recommend that. You just have to be careful with the food especially if they crash around too much. Now, the other one that comes back to mind is I had a daughter who had a very strong personality even to today she's a strong feminist. She's had her own mind ever since she was a little kid. So she was a little kid around four or five in kindergarten. We were in a T.J. Max type store and I will never forget we were going down the aisle and there's about a 60 foot long aisle and she's running away. Do you ever see kids run away from their parents when they're in the store? It's terrible because you can't control them in the store. So she is running down the aisle and it's about 60 feet long. I look and I just watched her just to see. Will most kids when they get very far away from their parents and she's going to run around the corner just before she goes around the corner to escape, will kids look back at the parents just to get a fix. You know what I'm saying, that this is home ground. So usually what will happen at least with my kids when they went on the end there, they'll look back to get the clue of where you are just to get a fix of where they are. Well, my oldest daughter, she runs down there and she never looked back. I was waiting for the look I thought I'm going to get the look and see and then I'm going to jump around the next aisle and cut her off? She went down the aisle and never looked back. She was gone. Check this out.

What happens with Israel? God says, "I called my son out of Egypt but the more I called Israel the further they went for me." Is that exactly what happened? God said "I brought them out with great a mighty arm and an outstretched hand" and the more I called them, the more they took off and ran away. So this verse is a classic about the

Exodus from the prophets.

I. Exodus and New Testament [21:03-29:07]

Has anybody ever heard this verse before, “Out of Egypt I called my son”? Guess what, in Matthew 2.15, remember the infants who were killed in Bethlehem? Herod killed the infants and God's warned Joseph and Mary in a dream. He said, “You guys have to go down to Egypt to get protection because Herod's going to do some bad stuff here.” Joseph and Mary went down to Egypt and then Jesus when he comes from Egypt and he doesn't go back to Jerusalem, Jesus goes up to Nazareth down in Galilee. When he does that, does Jesus come out of Egypt? Jesus himself comes out of Egypt. This verse then is quoted of Jesus, “out of Egypt I called my son” i.e. Jesus. So what you have in the Exodus account, is that God calls “his son Israel out of Egypt.” Does Jesus himself in one sense stand for the whole nation of Israel? In himself he reenacts, what God's other son Israel did. So you get this echo in Jesus of what the nation of Israel did. Jesus is the new Israel in Matthew. Did Israel make it or did they botch it up? Israel botched it up. Now you have the new Israel coming out of Egypt and is he going to do it right. Jesus knew Israel comes out of Egypt. Is Jesus himself going to go into the desert to be tempted? Guess what happens in Matthew chapter 4? Jesus comes out and goes into the wilderness and is tempted by Satan. Do you see that Jesus becomes the new Israel? So these things in Israel as a nation get echoed in the person of Jesus. “Out of Egypt I called my son” and you get this back and forth between the nation of Israel and Jesus who becomes the new Israel.

I'm sorry that was Matthew chapter 4 where the temptation comes. Chapter three he's baptized. “Oh,” you say wait a minute Hildebrandt, “he's baptized in chapter three, comes out of Egypt in chapter 2, and he's baptized in chapter three.” The baptism, when did Israel go through the waters? And Jesus goes through baptism. You see the similarities here? And then going through the waters then does he go into the desert to be tempted? Okay, you say, it gets pretty freaky but you start hearing these echoes. Is that maybe why Matthew set up his Gospel like this to show that Jesus is the new Israel? Take it or leave it but anyway there are some things going on there.

This time we'll jump over to the apostle Paul. The apostle Paul picks up the exodus in the New Testament. In 1 Corinthians 5 he says that Jesus is our Passover lamb. Now what do they do with the Passover lamb? Do you remember that? They killed the lamb and they put blood where? You got a doorpost here, you've got two door posts and the header going across. They put the blood over the doorway. Then, the angel of death sees the blood and what does the angel do? It passes over. That's where you get the name *Pesach* or "Passover," the angel of death sees the blood of the door and "passes over." Who is our Paschal lamb? Who is our Passover lamb? Whose blood got put on the door so the angel of death passes us by? Jesus. So then Paul says explicitly Jesus is our Passover lamb.

Then what else happens? Jesus the night before he was betrayed he took what? He took the bread. Now, how many of you in your churches when you do the Lord's Supper or the Eucharist, how many of you use unleavened bread? Do some of your churches use regular bread? Some of the churches now are using regular bread but do you see when Jesus said it was unleavened bread because when Jesus does the Lord's Supper, what are his disciples celebrating? The Passover. Why is it unleavened bread? Does anybody remember that? Because they had to leave Egypt in haste and they didn't have time for it to rise. So God says, "you guys are going to get out of Egypt so fast don't put leaven in the bread because you are not going to have time to let it rise. Then they would eat unleavened bread for seven days and as part of the feast.

By the way, that is what our Eucharist does, or the Lord's Supper, it's unleavened bread. Now how does Jesus interpret that bread? That bread is my is what? My body, which is broken for you. The cup that they drink is a cup of wine is my what? My blood. Does Jesus take the symbols of the Passover and reinterpret them as applying to himself? So you see even Jesus, takes the cross, his death and the shedding of his blood are symbolized as coming out of these Exodus symbols.

By the way, I should say you're at Gordon College. Gordon College has a wonderful privilege here. We have a unique man here, Dr. Marvin Wilson. He is connected in incredible ways to the Jewish community on the North Shore here. We have

had at Gordon College a Pesach or a Passover dinner, put on by the Jewish community. There must've been in Bennett Center were probably 1000 people here. So we all went to the Passover dinner and it was really cool. I wanted my kids to go, so my kids went and they asked all their friends. So we had a whole bunch of people. We sat down at the table, and then all of a sudden the Rabbi came up to me, I never met this guy in my life. Now is it clear that I'm a *goi*, that I'm a Gentile? I used to have hair but anyway the color of this hair and the nose shows I'm not Jewish. I mean sorry this isn't Jewish. I mean you can tell just by looking. He comes up to me and approaches me and I'm sitting at this Pesach table and he says, "would you pray at the meeting?" Now, I'm going, "whoa, there's like 1000 people here I'm obviously a Gentile. I was wearing my *kippah* but that doesn't make you Jewish." And so I couldn't figure out why did this guy ask me to pray in front of everybody. So I didn't know what was going on. Afterwards I caught Dr. Wilson running around campus and I said, "Hey, Marv, this guy called me out of the clear blue to pray for these people. I'm a Gentile." And he said, "apparently whoever had the biggest family unit in the group would be asked to pray and you had the biggest family." Well, I had ten kids but they weren't all my kids. Most were all the friends of my children. So anyway if you ever get a chance to go to a Jewish Passover dinner, do it. When you sit there you will be shocked at how so much of the imagery goes right into Jesus. So it's beautiful if you ever get a chance to go to a Pesach dinner, go. The food is good too. Passover is connected to the Lord's Supper.

Then here's something you may not have caught and actually I have a good friend Dave Mathewson put me onto this. In the book of Revelation, are there a lot of plagues in Revelation? Yes. Do you know the plagues in the book of Revelation many of those plagues echo the plagues that were found in Egypt. In the book of Revelation does the sun go dark? Yes. In the book of Revelation are there locusts and stuff that come out? Yes. So what you have is the Exodus plagues echoed in the book of Revelation the last book of the Bible when God's going to kind of do all this and the earth is trembling and all this big nasty stuff happens in the book of Revelation, much of that imagery is built off of the Exodus. So all I'm saying is this little book of the Exodus gets echoed through

the whole Bible. It's kind of incredible.

J. Exodus and Psalms [29:08-31:16]

If you read Psalm 78 for example, Psalm 105, or Psalm 106, those Psalms are just full of Exodus. So Psalms as well as the prophets refer to Exodus. Now speaking of the Psalms, here's one called the Great Hallel and this is actually read at the Passover time. You know this term because you guys say, "hallelujah." Hallelujah, okay "jah" is Jehovah. So Hallel means "praise Jehovah," praise the Lord. I realize I was a Baptist so we always did "Amen." But if you're charismatic you go "hallelujah." That was a joke, but okay. As everybody's looking all serious here that was a joke. The Great Hallel. This is what is read at Passover time. Here's how it starts, "when Israel came out of Egypt" so as soon as it does that what is it talking about? "When Israel came out of Egypt" that's the Exodus, "The house of Jacob from the people of foreign tongue." The people of a foreign tongue are the Egyptians. "Judah became God's sanctuary and Israel his dominion." God dwelt in the midst of his people in the tabernacle. "The sea looked and fled." What's that talking about, "the sea looked and fled"? It's the parting of the Red Sea. Is the sea being personified like a person as if it's afraid of God and running away. "And the sea looked and fled, the Jordan turned back." By the way, when does the Jordan turn back? Is that in the Pentateuch? No that's the book of Joshua. So he moved from Exodus now to the entering of the Promised Land. "The mountains skipped like lamb, rams the hills like lambs." When did the mountains shake? It was when God was on Mount Sinai. Remember the mountains trembling? So this is a poetic description in the Psalms of the Exodus. Here they are singing this at the feast. Then, they will sing the Great Hallel and they do this till this day. So, in the Psalms, the Prophets, the New Testament, the book of Revelation the book of Exodus is important and is echoed.

K. Ancient Egyptian History: survey [31:17- 37:36]

Now, what was Egypt like? The Greek historian Herodotus has called Egypt the "gift of the Nile." Do any of you guys ever do Google maps? Have you ever done Google maps to look at your house. If you ever get on Google maps, do Egypt and you find in Egypt, what color dominates that whole area? A sandy brown because you've got

desert for a 1000 miles. You've got desert for like 2000 miles on the side. And what will happen when you do your Google maps, you'll find there is a thin ribbon of green. There'll be a huge yellow-brown, sandy brown area and there'll be a little ribbon of green coming down. That's the what? That's the Nile River. They basically irrigate out of the Nile River and you'll see a little strip of green. In other words, "Egypt is the gift of the Nile." You take the Nile away, where is Egypt? Nowhere. Egypt doesn't exist. It's basically where water and life come together.

Now, first of all, number one I don't want you to know this. I say I don't want you to know this I'm just going to run through this. This is summary of all of Egyptian history. This is the Hildebrandt summary of Egyptian history. Are some of you taking the real thing off of Prof. David Wick and Western Civilizations? Wick is phenomenal. You're getting some of the best ancient Near Eastern teaching you can find anywhere. I've sat in his class I got what you guys are getting in college, I had graduate courses that weren't as good as what Dr. Wick does. The guy is a phenomenal teacher. By the way it always disturbed me when I would sit in the back of his class and he would tell the funniest jokes and the students would just sit there and I'm roaring. He's got a real dry sense of humor but he's telling jokes half the time in his class. This guy is really humorous but you've got to get tuned into it.

I'm going to do all the Egyptian history on one screen. Now I just want you to get a sense of the flow of Egyptian history. You have the Old Kingdom, the Middle Kingdom and the New Kingdom. These are the three kingdoms of Egypt. The Old Kingdom starts back about 2700 BC and runs down to about 2100, and this is when the pyramids were built. What's our date for Abraham? 2000 B.C. Were the pyramids already built, when Abraham was in Egypt? Yes. Abraham saw that. The pyramids were there already before Abraham's time about 2700-2100 B.C. This is the great building project. They built all of these massive of things. The First Intermediate Period, these intermediate periods are going to be periods of chaos. The Intermediate Periods are when there's chaos. It's when foreigners come in and beat up the native Egyptians and then there's chaos. So the First Intermediate Period is largely when Abraham was there? So when Abraham goes down,

is Egypt strong or weak? Weak. There's chaos going down there so he will fit in with foreigners coming in. So this is the First Intermediate Period with Abraham.

Then you have what's called the Middle Kingdom. The Middle Kingdom is what I work with a lot when I do wisdom literature. So the Wisdom of Amenemope, the wisdom of various people it comes with a lot of arts and literature from about 1991 BC. Can some of you remember 1991? It was 1991 to 1670 BC. So anyway, this is the period of literature and this is when a lot of wisdom literature is developed. This is the building period. This is the literary period.

Then you have a Second Intermediate Period. That's when Israel's in Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period. A lot of people said the Hyksos group comes in there and creates chaos. Israel is in there too. Does anybody remember the text that says the "Pharaoh that knew not Joseph"? In other words, Joseph was favored by the one Pharaoh, but there was a Pharaoh who knew not Joseph? Some people think that that's the Hyksos invasion. When the Hyksos took over, they didn't know the Jews from anybody, so they enslaved the Jews. So this is the Second Intermediate Period.

The New Kingdom is a period of expansion. This is when, what's the problem with Egypt? Is Egypt a very expansionist culture? No. Egypt was very provincial. As long as they had their Nile, were they happy? They were like the breadbasket of the ancient world. They provided wheat and food for everybody else. They didn't go out much, I'm saying they weren't conquerors going out all the time. They were kind of like what I think about China. Is China a really big strong country that could dominate a bunch of areas? But China, in times past, did not go out dominating other peoples, they're kind of more provincial. They work within their own society. Egypt was kind of like that. They weren't expansionistic except in this period when they did go off and went up to Mesopotamia. But normally they were not that way.

So then finally, after the New Kingdom Period of expansion, then there's this what they call the Third Intermediate Period and this is down around the time of David and Solomon, which is really interesting. So during the time of David and Solomon, is Egypt strong or weak? Weak. David and Solomon come to power and their kingdom expands

basically because Egypt is weak. By the way, at the same time, Mesopotamia was weak. So David and Solomon will flourish because both Egypt and Mesopotamia were weak at that time. So the kind of flow for Egypt: Old Kingdom, Middle Kingdom and the New Kingdom with these Intermediate Periods of chaos in between.

L. Geography of Egypt, Goshen, and Sinai [37:36-44:22]

Now, let's look at a little bit of a map. Here's a map we see the Salt Sea or the Dead Sea. You come down here you've got the Gulf of Aqaba, named after the city of Aqaba in Jordan. This is the Red Sea. Down here this is the Gulf of Suez. What city is named after right here? This Gulf of Suez is named after the city of Suez right here. The Gulf of Aqaba is named after the city here that's called Aqaba in Jordan. They call it Eilat on the Israeli side. This is the Sinai Peninsula. Can you see that it's a peninsula here? This peninsula is like a huge plate here and it actually has, this part here lifted up and then you get this drop into the Red Sea. Let me just explain this. I've actually gone swimming here. If I say the name Jacques Cousteau, does that mean anything anymore? This guy was really good at swimming but he said some of the most beautiful coral reefs in the world are found along here and I would agree with that. I don't have his experience but I've swum around here. Let me just tell you about the Ras Mohammed. You're down at the very tip of this Sinai Peninsula and you're going to go swimming. So you walk out of the water it's this deep. I was raised in the Niagara River so I'm kind of like a fish. So the water doesn't scare me and I enjoy swimming. So I'm walking out; it's about knee deep, and you take one step one step and the water is 600 feet deep. Yes. Remember I told you that platform lifted up? When the platform lifted up. Then it shattered down and there's a 600 foot drop off. What happens is you're in the water so you basically you float like this and where you're out now is 600 feet deep. When you look down, what's down there? It goes like, it's "holy cow, that's really deep." I can't see the bottom I mean I can't even see close to the bottom. Anyway, what happens is you turn around and look at this cliff that you just came off of and there will like be all kinds, I don't know what the official name is but it's like barnacle things and all these tropical fish that are really

colorful fish. We're swimming out between these corals and these barnacles and stuff and you can just float there and just watch these fish. It's really, really cool.

Now you say, "Yes. You're watching these fish and a shark comes up behind you," but I didn't see any sharks, but they may have them there. What happens is you float back up and get back on the cliff and it's knee-deep. So it's really fun.

But anyway, this is Sinai and a lot of people put Mount Sinai down here and if you ever get, actually I was going to tell you, if you ever get a chance to get down there, it is dangerous territory now. The terrorists blow up stuff down there now. So when I went there it was after the Civil War there were barely any roads back then. Now it's all built up; the terrorists had blown hotels up two or three times down there. Okay, let's get out of here.

So this is Sinai, then come across here. This is the land of Goshen, this is Memphis. I always say this is Memphis because that is where the king's buried. This is the Nile and the Nile Delta. You were familiar with that because this is the land of Goshen, which is going to be important for us. Who's going to live in the land of Goshen? The Hebrew slaves. Now even in America do we have places called Goshen? Has anyone ever heard of Goshen College? We name these things after Goshen where the Jews settled there in Egypt.

Why did the Egyptians settle them there? You've got a couple things going on. The Jewish people, what is their trade by nature? They're shepherds. What are the people that live along the Nile? Farmers. Do shepherds and farmers get along real well? What happens with the shepherds when the shepherd brings a sheep over to your house and you've got a farm, what does your sheep do? Eat the farm plants. It's like in America didn't we have the cattlemen versus the farmers in America? When a guy brings his cow in and eats your cornfield, you're done. They had the same conflict there. So basically you tell the shepherd stay out of here and leave the farmland alone. Again, Egypt was the breadbasket of the ancient world and the wheat was grown here.

Now the other reason why they're out there was because when Egypt gets attacked, how can Egypt get attacked? They seem to be more provincial. Can Egypt get attacked

from the west? All the Libyans over here say they want to beat up on Mubarak. So they come across the desert. Are you going to cross the desert to attack from the west? No, it's a thousand miles of desert. Even a two-humped camel can't make that one. So you're not going to come this way. Nobody can attack you from this direction from the west. Well, maybe somebody will attack from the south? If they try floating down the Nile River that would be some great whitewater rafting. You just flow down with the current. What's the problem? In seven places you've got what? Cataracts. Now that maybe fun in a whitewater rafting boat, but when you've got an army that's not good. So basically they're cut off from the south by the cataracts that protect them. Is anybody going to come attack them from the north, across the whole Mediterranean Sea to attack Egypt? Is that a long trip across the Mediterranean? Are you going to lose boats, men and who knows what else you're going to lose. So nobody, by the way, you put them up here in this Delta area. What happens when their land is in the swamp? Is anybody familiar with Williamsburg in Virginia? You put them in a swamp, what happens? There are mosquitoes. What do mosquitoes do to people? They sting them and infect them with malaria. Do the mosquitoes kill people? Yes, Williamsburg. One-third of the people died.

So therefore what was the only direction Egypt can be attacked from? Right down through here from the north east. So where are you going to put the Jews? Put them here that way when you're attacked from here, who will your attackers have to kill first? The Jews in Goshen. The Jews become a buffer zone. So Israel adds protection, then the Jews can be killed before they actually face the real Egyptians. So this land of Goshen then is located here, and we'll see more about the land of Goshen later. That's just kind of a brief layout of some of the things.

M. Pharaoh's persecution of the Jews: Taskmasters [44:22-47:26]

Now, let's look at Pharaoh's ways of dominating the Jews. In Exodus 1 and 2, you get this--I want to put this into a bigger context. What is God's plan for the Jews? Let me go back before the Jews. What was God's plan for all humankind? They were in the Garden of Eden, Adam and Eve were told to work the garden and they were told to do

what? Multiply, and do what? “Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth.” God's destiny for humankind was that they multiply and fill the earth. Now what happens? God says to Abraham's descendants they are to do what? They're going to be what? As many as the sand of the sea shore or the stars of the heavens. They are to multiply and be fruitful. Abraham's descendants are to be fruitful and multiply. So God's destiny for Adam and Eve gets taken over by Abraham. Now, who stands in the way of that? There's a guy named Pharaoh, and Pharaoh says wait a minute. There are way too many of these Jews we have to kill these Jews. There are too many. They are multiplying too much.

So Pharaoh will oppose God's plan for the multiplication of the seed. Do you see that? So Pharaoh here is going to go at odds with God. Pharaoh is going to attack God's son to destroy God's son, and God will attack whom? He will attack Pharaoh, because Pharaoh attacked God's son. Will God take out Pharaoh's son? You see the similarities here? Pharaoh will try to destroy God's son, God will take out Pharaoh's son. So he is resisting God's major plan for Israel.

What happens? How does Pharaoh do it? It is in chapter 1 of Exodus starting at verse 8. “Now Joseph and all his brothers and all their generation died, but the Israelites were fruitful and multiplied greatly and became exceedingly numerous, so that the land was filled with them. Then a new king who did not know Joseph came to power. But he said, ‘the Israelites have become much too numerous for us. Come, we must deal shrewdly with them.’” So then in chapter 1 verse 11, “they placed slave masters over them to oppress them with forced labor. And they built the cities of Pithom and Rameses.” So Pharaoh says there are too many, they're multiplying. How are we going to get their numbers down? We will enslave them, we will oppress them and we will work the daylights out of them. If we work the daylights out of them will they have time to have children? No, they're going to be too tired. So he puts taskmasters over them and the taskmasters enslave oppress them. Israel became slaves so that this gets really bad for Israel. The more they oppress them, however, what happens to the Israelites? The Israelites get stronger. They are worked hard and all of a sudden they get stronger and they multiply all the more.

N. Hebrew mid-wives [47:27-56:27]

Well, that didn't work, so we have to go to plan number two. Plan number two is to go to these midwives. Let me jump down to chapter 1 verse 15. "And the king of Egypt said to the Hebrew midwives, whose names were Shiphrah and Puah." How many with midwives are named here? Two. Do we know the names of these midwives? Shiphrah and Puah. You say, "Hildebrandt, do you really care about that." No, I don't, but what's interesting to me is can you tell me the name of Pharaoh? What's Pharaoh's name? Pharaoh is Pharaoh. Is this ironic? Is it Amenemope? We do know the name of Pharaoh or is this Pharaoh just named Pharaoh. Do we know the names of these Hebrew midwives? Do you see the irony here? We know the names of the midwives but we don't know the name of the Pharaoh. Do you see what's going on with the text? Is Pharaoh being denigrated by the fact that he has no name but these two midwives have names? I think there is some literary play here going on with these midwives.

So what happens with these midwives? He comes to the midwives and he says this: "when you help Hebrew women in childbirth on the delivery stool, if it is a boy kill him but if it is a girl let her live." This is gender-based discrimination. This is terrible. The boys get killed but the girls get to live. That is just not right. This is gender inequality. This is terrible. It's not an issue because it's just boys after all. Do you see what I'm doing there? Do we have cultures today that are saying let the girls die and let the boys live? It is the same thing. There are countries that are doing that right now. So I'm saying that this is a big problem here when they are killing boys.

Now what midwives do? Are these midwives smart? "The midwives however feared God and did not do what the king of Egypt wanted. And they let the boys live. Then the king of Egypt summoned the midwives asked them 'why have you done this? Why have you let the boys live?' Then the midwives answered Pharaoh, 'Hebrew women are not like the Egyptian women. They are vigorous and give birth before the midwives arrive.'" Is that the truth? Are Hebrew women indeed different from the Egyptian women in the child birthing process? Are these women lying to the Pharaoh, playing off of the prejudice that the Jews are different than the Egyptians? Are they

playing off the prejudice to get at Pharaoh? Yes, they are.

Does God bless liars? Is it okay to lie sometimes? Some people call this altruistic sinning. What does the Bible say about that? Thou shalt not what? Lie. It's a sin. Did God bless these women? Yes, he did. As a matter of fact, when they go to Egypt, guess who leaves with them? Shiphrah and Puah. They think, "that's our job we're going to go deliver some more babies." So they left with the Israelites and when they took off God blessed them and they had a part in Israel.

Now the question comes up: How do you understand this? This is going to come up again and again, so let me just say how I would understand this. Let me give you a couple of examples. Once upon a time we lived in Indiana for about twenty-two years. My children were raised and reared in Indiana. Is anybody from Indiana here? Okay, Indiana. You have to understand Indiana is different from Massachusetts, believe me. In Indiana, they only have one sport. They only play one sport in Indiana and that sport is basketball. When my son he was in fourth grade, the high school coach was scouting him out at fourth grade. This is a high school coach scouting a fourth grade kid! They started training these kids in basketball from the time that they were born, I'm serious. I played ball at Houghton College so I thought well I'm going to teach my son how to play ball. So I took him out and I thought well you know when he gets older I'll let him beat me; when he's in the ninth or tenth grade, I'll let him beat me. But I was trying to work with him.

When you've got a kid who's about seventh grade, there's right hand and left. Which hand is the weak one? His left hand's weak. So basically I wanted to develop his left hand. So what I would do is push him one way to develop his hand to force him to go to the left. So we're out playing and this little kid of mine, this seventh grade kid looks at his father and I'm trying to get position to force him to go left. He goes like this. He actually tried to deceive me. The kid tried to deceive me like he was going to take a shot or something. He actually threw a fake in order to deceive his father. Deceptive little rascal! I go up to swat him but then he goes around me. Deception of the father is the worst kind. He lied to me. Was there intent to deceive? Was there intent to deceive his father? There was intent to deceive.

Now question: You laugh because you say in basketball, is it okay to have the intent to deceive? As a matter fact most of the game is throwing fakes. Part of football is the same way. You get them thinking you're going one way but you go back the other way. By the way, in war is it the same way? America is going into Kuwait. We have all our troops and it's all our troops were going in this way and then guess what? Generals fake them out because they go in the exact opposite way as they were seeming to go. Is that part of war? You fake like you're going to do one thing then you actually go the other way. So this is part of war.

You have to ask yourselves in the case of the Hebrew midwives, is it okay to lie when someone is going to kill babies? Let me put it into another context. Suppose you're in Germany or in Holland and you get a bunch of Jews in your basement and the Nazis come to your door and they say, "Have you got Jews living here?" Well, I am a Christian and I'm sworn never to lie. "Yeah they're down there in the basement." So the guy asks you up front: have you got the Jews in there? You go, "Yes, they're right there." Is that a great atrocity that you participated in? Would you say, "Will you hold on, I'll go get them"? You have the same thing in a war context. When they're out to kill somebody do you deceive? Is that part of the quote "game"? You say, "Hildebrandt, are you saying it's okay to lie every time?" This brings up the claim: does God bless liars? And the answer is: did God bless the Hebrew midwives? Yes, he did. Did they fear God? Is that why they did? What they did was because they feared God. It's like if somebody is going to come to your door and say I'm going to kill your family, where are your sons; where are they? And you say, "Well, they're hiding in the bed there." That's not good. You say, "No, I'm not going to do that and you're going to tell them something different.

Does this mean total relativism? You say, "Hildebrandt are you opening up to ethics that the situation determines what's right and wrong?" Does the Bible clearly say lying is wrong? Does the Bible clearly say "thou shalt not lie"? Is the Bible consistent in saying that in all of Scripture? Are integrity and honesty really important features? However, having said that, are there certain contexts in the preservation of life that you use deceptive tactics? Yes. Is war one of those contexts? Basically what you've got is a

war going on here before with Pharaoh. So I think the thing with the Hebrew midwives was right. God looks at it and blesses them. So I'm saying it doesn't open a can of worms to say, "Oh, I lied to my mother because she was really going to get angry and I didn't want to make her feel bad so I lied to her to protect her from herself." Okay, that's a bunch of baloney. What I'm trying to say is you have to take context into account. You see the importance of context. The Hebrew midwives in the fear of God they deceived Pharaoh and they were blessed as a result of it.

O. The Nile River and Moses [56:28-60:34]

Now, the last one what happens here? Let's run on through this. Pharaoh says, "Okay, this baby thing isn't going anywhere. Let's not have the midwives do this. Let's throw the male babies into the river." Now, by the way, is the Nile River a god? So throwing the babies into the river, are there critters in the Nile River? You throw the babies in there, are babies helpless? Babies are helpless. You throw them into the river and the baby is going to drown and if it doesn't drown one of the crocodiles or whatever they've got there is going to get them. Are there manatees in the Nile River, do you know? I don't know you got me on this manatee thing now. But anyway the babies would die.

Now what is really cool here is Pharaoh was using the Nile River to destroy the infants. How does God use the Nile River? Does God use the Nile River to deliver Moses? The very thing that Pharaoh was trying to use to destroy the infants God turns it and uses it as Moses gets floated down the river, special delivery, right into the arms of Pharaoh's daughter. Do you remember how they made this box saying and they coated it with tar and put Moses in it. He goes down the river and Pharaoh's daughter picks up the box and she says, "I am drawing this baby out of the water." So she names him "drawn out" which means what is drawn out is Moshe. Moshe for you guys is Moses. So "Moses" means "drawn out." His name is basically "the one drawn out" of the water like this and his name becomes "Moses." She picks him up and she says, "This must be one of the Hebrew children." Now, how did she know that this was a Hebrew child? Is it possible that he was wrapped in a kind of cloth that the Hebrews would have made?

That's possible that he was wrapped in a distinctive cloth different from different cultures. That's possible. Is it also possible that there were other possibilities? Yes. She picks up the child and says, "Holy cow, this kid is circumcised already." So she may have associated that with the Jews.

Now who is standing by and says, "I can take care of that baby for you? You need a babysitter?" Yes, Miriam, Moses' older sister. The suggestion here is that Pharaoh's daughter would have suggested that the river god had just provided her and maybe she was barren or something and the goddess or the god of the Nile had just presented her this baby. That seems like a likely possibility of how she would have understood it from her perspective. Now what we know is it was Jehovah who shipped him right down in there. Do you see this? I'm trying to bring this up again. Do you see God who is taking that which is evil and turning it to good? Why is that important? When your life is falling apart, and really bad stuff is happening to you what I want to tell you is, God can take that bad stuff and give it a few years and God will take the worst thing that ever happened to you in your life and all of a sudden turn it around for good. You say, "Hildebrandt it can't be this thing is so bad for me," but I want to tell you some of the worst things in your life God will turn around and they will actually be the things that become the most important in the redemptive process for you. I say that now and we're going through situations in our own family now and I've seen it happen over, and over, and over again. So when really bad stuff starts happening, I want to tell you start looking up because God's at work. Now you may not understand it and frankly you may not understand for two or three years or even longer, but God is at work and when disaster hits look up. Aslan's on the move.

P. Three stages of Moses' life [60:35-63:30]

Now three stages of Moses's life. These are fairly straightforward. For the first forty years, Moses initially was raised by his own family. So by his sister Miriam he would've been trained. They were Hebrews and they were Levites. After he probably became of age, you get these rites of passage. You know what I'm talking about with these rites of passage? For Jewish kids the rites of passages around the time of

adolescence-- have you ever heard of Bar Mitzvah? Some of you may have had Confirmation--has anybody gone through Confirmation? You know twelve or thirteen years old you are welcomed into the adult world. So there is this movement from child to adult via these rites of passage. By the way, will different cultures have different rites of passage? So he is raised, or reared by Pharaoh's daughter as her son. Would he have been very literate? Would he have been trained in the wisdom literature of Egypt? Yes. Moses would've been very highly trained. Is he being raised by his family or by Pharaoh's daughter? The answer is: yes. Both of those are right. Early in his life he's raised by his family, but for the dominant part of his adult life he was raised by Pharaoh's daughter. Yes, that's the first stage of his life--forty years there.

The second forty years of his life, he goes out and he's a shepherd in Midian. Now by the way, when you think of a shepherd, do you think of a guy out on the side of the hill watching his sheep? Do you realize how boring that is? Have you ever seen sheep? I want to tell you I have not seen in my life a much dumber animal. I'll take you over just down by Bradley Palmer State Park, the guy has sheep. They are dumb. Really dumb. No there are animals that are really smart. Are there really smart dogs? Yes. They almost understand what you're saying. Sheep are just the opposite. When you're out there watching them day after day in the desert, is that a really, really boring job? So when you think about this shepherd thing be careful that you do not idealize it. It's really hard labor. Moses is in the desert as shepherd here for forty years in Midian. This is where he marries Zipporah, his wife, has some kids while he's out in Midian. Midian is Sinai. This is out in the Sinai Desert and the tribe that he is with is the Midianites with Jethro, who is the priest of Midian.

Now God then calls him and tells him go back from the desert and be a deliverer for forty years then Moses then leads the sheep of Israel through the desert. Now he's a shepherd of Israel. So he turns in his sheep for Israel and leads them through the desert and brings them out. So there's this play on the different types of sheep.

Q. The Call of Moses [63:31-72:30]

Now, let's look at what Moses' relationship with God was like and this is chapters

three and four. With many of the people in the Bible, you're going to get this vocation, or calling, where God comes and calls a prophet to his service. Moses is going to receive a call from God, and I just want to see how Moses and God interact here.

But before I do that, I want to jump in here just to say why did God do the Exodus? Why did God deliver them at this point? The text tells us that God comes down and says he's going to deliver them as a result of their prayers. What I am trying to suggest to you with this verse I am going to read to you next is that prayer is exceedingly powerful. The whole Exodus is prompted by the Israelite prayer and here it is: “the Lord said,” in chapter 3 verse 7, “I have indeed seen the misery of my people in Egypt. I have heard them crying out because of their slave drivers and I am concerned about their suffering, so I will come down to rescue them.” “He heard their cries,” their pleas for help, and he says, “I am going to come down and rescue them.” Prayer makes a difference. God listens and comes down.

Now, what he does is we have to have a deliverer. Is it all right to ever resist God's will? When God calls a person does the person ever resist the call of God? Moses is going to be one of the huge figures in the Old Testament. Let's look at his call and how he reacts when God comes to him. Many think they would say, “God whatever your will for my life is I just want to follow you. God just take me and use me for your service.” Is that what Moses says?

Excuse me, that is not quite what it says here in our Bibles. God comes to him in chapter 3 and in verse 11. Let's just get the interaction between God and Moses. God comes down and says I am going to bring my people out of Egypt with a strong arm and an outstretched hand but Moses said to God, “who am I that I should go to Pharaoh to bring out the Israelites out of Egypt?” And God said: “I will be with you.” Does Moses jump on it and say, “Okay, God let's bring them out of Egypt?” No, Moses says, “who am I to go to Pharaoh?” God says, “it's not who you are, I will be with you.” What is the name for “I will be with you”? What is the Hebrew term? Does anybody know of a term? “Emmanuel” means “God with us.” So when God says, “I will be with you” this is “Emmanuel.”

God says “Moses I know you can't do this going to Pharaoh, but I will come with you.” And Moses says, “God, if you are with me who can be against me. Let's go!” No, he doesn't do that either. He backs off again and the next time he says this: and this is in chapter 3 verse 13 and following. Moses says, “suppose I go to the Israelites and say to them the God of your fathers has sent me to you and they ask me what is your name? Then what shall I tell them?” Moses says, “Excuse me God, I don't know your name. Hi, I am Moses, what's your name? I don't know your name. Now I have to tell them that I met some God in the desert. They're going to think I'm dehydrated and my brain's gone. What's your name anyway? I don't even know your name?” By the way, is that a big thing to ask God about his name? Yes.

What does God say? First, there is a bush that's burning and out of this bush that's burning comes this statement. “God said to Moses, ‘I am who I am.’ This is what you are to say to the Israelites: I AM has sent me to you.” Now what is this “I am that I am”? You say, “wait a minute Hildebrandt, you've got this here. Can you pronounce this for me? What's the problem? Why can't you pronounce this? There are no vowels. Now did the Jews drop the vowels on purpose so that it can't be pronounced? Why did they do that? Did they want the name of Jehovah pronounced? No, because they are afraid that people would take the name of the Lord your God in vain. So they took the vowels out so that you can't say it. Now by the way, if you're going to insert vowels, there will be an “a” here and an “e” here. They used to say “Jehovah.” Has anybody heard that term? The “a” would be here so it would be “Yahweh” and the “e” would be between the “w” and the “h” okay. So it would be “Yahweh.” The “w” can sound like a “v”. And this is God's most sacred name. This is the “I am that I am” name, and we will look at that in a minute.

Now, Moses receives God's most sacred name: “I am that I am.” Does Moses follow God? No, he makes up another excuse. He says, “Hey, if I go down there,” chapter 4 verse 1, Moses said, “what if they do not believe me or listen to me and say the Lord did not appear to you? “What have you got in your hand?” Moses says, “I have a stick, a staff.” God says, “Throw it down on the ground.” What happens to that staff? It becomes a snake.

Now what's going to happen when he goes to Egypt? What are the magicians going to do? They're going to do the same thing. What snake is going to eat the other ones? Moses' is going to eat them. Is this snake a symbol in Egypt? Have you ever seen Pharaoh's hat, the hat that pharaohs wear? What's coming out on the front of Pharaoh's hat? It's a cobra, a snake. So what you have happening here is you have a power play going on between Jehovah God and Pharaoh. Pharaoh's snake is going to get eaten up by Moses'. So what you have is the power play between Moses and Pharaoh and God is going to defeat the snake of Egypt.

Moses still won't give in. So Moses starts next, he starts "bbbbbut GGGGGod I can't tttt talk very well". A lot of people think that Moses was a stutterer; that he could not talk correctly. Some people think he's a stutterer while others think that he was talking about rhetorical skills that he's been out talking to sheep too long and he realizes when you go into Pharaoh's court you have to have rhetorical skills and all his rhetorical skills were long gone. So it is either one of those two.

So God comes to him and says, "Moses, who made your mouth? I made your mouth and if I want to I can make a donkey talk." But Moses still doesn't give up. Finally, in chapter 7, Moses says, "Okay, God I'm not going to go. Send somebody else." Again, you see Moses's resistance and reluctance? He is so reluctant to follow God that is what I'm saying. Beware of people who claim they were just going to follow God and do his will as their heart's desire. Here's Moses one of the greatest man who ever lived and do you see what he's doing? All I'm saying is be careful, we have a lot of braggadocio in our culture today. When someone faces the real God you're not out there saying, "Yes. I'll do it." Actually your shoes are off and your face is to the ground. So be careful with that.

Moses says, "Send somebody else." What does God do? "Hey, Moses you have a brother, Aaron. He's on his way now to meet you. I know that you can't speak well. So I'm going to tell you what you're going to do. You, Moses, are going to speak to Aaron. Then Aaron is going to be your prophet." What does that mean? He's setting up a structure. As God speaks to the prophet and the prophet speaks to the people. So now

Moses is going to speak to Aaron and Aaron is going to speak to the people. So it tells us what the role of the prophet is. The role of the prophet is to speak the Word of God. Now, Moses is going to be like a god to Aaron and Aaron is going to speak. As you get this prophetic structure and Aaron is going to be like a prophet to Moses.

R. The Meaning of Yahweh: “I am that I am” [72:31-76:30]

Now the burning bush happens here. The bush is burning but the bush is not consumed. So what happens? He comes up to the burning bush and what happens? You are standing on holy ground, take off your shoes you are on holy ground. We’ll study holiness when we get into the book of Leviticus, but this is a sacred place. This is a special place because this ground is holy. “Take off your shoes you are on holy ground.” Now, what does this “I am that I am,” mean? What I want to grapple with is that God’s most sacred name, the name Jehovah, what does it mean? Three suggestions: the name comes from the ANE. If I say ANE, do you all know what that is? Ancient Near East. Old Testament scholars, use this abbreviation for Ancient Near East. Are names an important part of the dimension of the Ancient Near East? Do names have meaning? Abram changed to Abraham, Jacob changed Israel, Joseph’s named Joseph, Moses’ meaning “to pull out.” Names meant something back then and God is giving him his most sacred name.

Some people think that God’s name meant “I am what I am;” that God is saying from the bush “I am that I am” that God is the **self-existent one**. And “I am what I am” that is the bush is on fire but the bush doesn’t burn up. God does not need the bush to consume it to be a fire. God is a fire within himself; he needs nothing. Now by the way, do we need something for our existence? Let’s start out with water and food. We need something for our existence; God needs nothing to sustain his existence. He is the self-existent one; he is who he is. “I am what I am;” he needs nothing, that’s one way to take it.

A second way to take it, is David Freeman this guy was out of Harvard and University of Michigan, he holds the sovereignty view. He takes it as an imperfect tense

in Hebrew. It could be translated literally: “I will be what I will be.” Moses asks, “what is your name?” And he's telling Moses “I will be what I will be--you will see who I am.” God will declare who he is by the great miracles that he does in Egypt. God was kind of putting Moses off a little bit here you will see who I am when I do all these miracles in Egypt. That's the second view. I've said that this is probably the least likely in my opinion.

Third interpretation this is the one where God is saying here: “I am what I said I would be.” If you read the next part of the passage here, God said to Moses “I will save the Israelites, the Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, God of Isaac and the God of Jacob.” So he is the God of the fathers. God is now going to keep what he promised to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. He's now going to give them the promised land and the seed. God is the covenant keeper and God is keeping his promise. So this name Yahweh or Jehovah means that God is the covenant keeping God. He keeps his word and Moses is going to see that God is now going to do what he promised. God is the ultimate promise keeper. Now his name Jehovah/Yahweh is going to be that he's going to keep his word to the patriarchs.

S. Exodus 6:3 contradiction? [76:31-78:44]

Now, why does the Bible contradict itself? In Exodus 6, it says this, in verse 3, “God also said to Moses I am the Lord. I appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as God Almighty.” What does God Almighty mean? El Shaddai, have you ever heard that song, “El Shaddai”? He says, “Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob knew me as El Shaddai, they did not know me as Yahweh. They did not know my name Jehovah.” But what's the problem? When you go back to Genesis 49:18, you have Jacob saying this: “I look for your deliverance O LORD.” How is LORD spelled? Capital “L”, capital “O” capital “R” capital “D”. LORD is all capitalized, that's a substitution for Yahweh/Jehovah. When it's all capitalized, that means the Hebrew word behind it is “Yahweh.” So it is all capitalized. By the way, if it is only a small “L”, that means what? It means lord in the sense of “Sir” or “mister” or “master” or something like that. But Jacobs says, “Lord, I look for your deliverance, O LORD” and he uses the name Jehovah. Therefore what is

going on here Exodus 6:3 tells us that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob didn't know God's name Jehovah but yet we see Jehovah used by Jacob in Genesis. Is it a contradiction in Scripture? We're out of time so we'll just leave that "contradiction" to simmer and next time we'll tackle that.

Transcribed by Tyler Berube

Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt 2

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit. and Theology, Lecture 12[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History, Literature and Theology course, Lecture #12: The Plagues and the Tabernacle in the book of Exodus.

A. Exam Preview [0:00-3:14]

Class, let's get started. We've got quite a bit to do today. Thursday you guys have got an exam going. I sent you information about the review sessions and study guides. So you should have that. Looks like in the last class we will just get through Exodus. The Leviticus questions will not be on there. It is over however far we get. Largely it'll be multiple choice, probably about 80 multiple choice. There'll be a couple memory verses. Then an essay, an integrative essay, where you will have to pull things together. It's not something you can really study for. The essay will be basically three points on the back of a sheet of paper. How do you write an essay? Let me just say in this class this is how you do it. You've got an introduction, point one, two, three, conclusion. In the introduction, you're introducing. Then you developing your three points or so and then in your conclusion you wrap up with what you've concluded. That's the basic structure of the essay. You will put it on the back of your answer sheet. Peter asked if the multiple choice questions will be pulled from the online quizzier. No. It will be from the class lectures and the study guide-ish kind of things from your class notes. There won't be any of the other stuff. We did that on the quiz so this will be totally different. Are there any other questions or comments? Okay. Let's open with a word of prayer and then we'll get down into the book of Exodus and try to finish Exodus today. Let's begin.

Father we thank you for this day. We thank you that you are the great redeemer and that you bought your people back out of the land of slavery. You set them free and you led them through the wilderness. We pray that you might give us hearts that follow after you closely and not rebel as the Israelites did so frequently when you blessed them with manna, when you blessed them with water, when you blessed them with meat to eat.

We pray that you might help us to realize your goodness and your grace to us and from thankful hearts to praise you and to follow you and to be obedient to your Word. We pray you might help us as we go over some difficult things today in your Word. Give us understanding in them. We thank you most of all for Jesus who is our Passover lamb. In his precious name we pray, Amen.

B. Names: Yahweh and El Shaddai [3:15-4:49]

All right, let's get started here. Last time we raised a question at the end of class and we didn't answer the question. This is Exodus 6:3, where it says, "I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac and Jacob as God Almighty." The word God Almighty, "God" is going to be what from the Hebrew, do you guys know what that is? Yahweh will be translated LORD, that will be Yahweh/Jehovah. When it says "God" it's usually *El* or *Elohim*. Then "God Almighty" is *El Shaddai*. So *El Shaddai*, he's saying "Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob knew me as *El Shaddai*." But it says, "but by my name Yahweh I did not make myself known to them." So the name Yahweh they did not know.

However, when you go over to Genesis chapter 49 verse 18 you have Jacob blessing his children and he says, "I look for your deliverance, O LORD," or "O Yahweh." So Jacob knows the name of Yahweh and he blesses his children in the name of Yahweh. Yet Exodus says that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob did not know the name. So there apparently seems to be this tension, this contradiction, between what Exodus says that the patriarchs didn't know the name Yahweh, and Genesis, which says no, he did.

C. JEDP: Source Critical Theory [4:50-10:27]

Now the critics get a hold of this and they say: "see what you have in the Bible are different sources and these different source documents contradicted each other. When the editor put those source documents together, he didn't smooth over the text to take care of this contradiction." So this becomes known as the source critical way of looking at the text and I just basically want to put it up. So they suggested that Moses didn't write any of this material. The first thing they assume is Moses didn't write any of this and about 850 BC there was a writer who favored Jehovah's name. They call this writer who

favored Jehovah's name, the "J" source. So this is the "J" writer and he favors the name Jehovah when he writes. He writes it about 850 BC. What are the two dates you need for this class so far? Abraham is 2000 and who is the 1000? David. So If I say 850 BC to you, is that after the time of David by about 150 years? Could this then have been written by Moses? No. Is Moses 400 years before David? So this is saying it's 150 years after David, that this J-writer is writing some of this Pentateuch. He favors the name Jehovah. Now 100 years after the "J" source, there was an "E" source, and he favors the name Elohim. What is the name Elohim, how is that translated in your Bible? It is translated "God," and both *El* or *Elohim* can be translated "God". Jehovah, how did they translate Jehovah in your Bibles? LORD. This is the name Yahweh or Jehovah when you have in your Bibles in all capitals with "LORD," that means it's the name Yahweh. Does that make sense?

So Jehovah and Elohim, these are two writers that are writing. What happens is somebody comes along and takes this J document and the E document and puts them together. But when they did that they didn't see that these two verses contradicted each other and so this is what they call a seam between these documents. They put these two documents together and there's a seam here where there's an error, a contradiction between the two documents put together.

Then what happens is you have another document and that is the Deuteronomist. He's writing the book of Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy gets written in this critical theory about 620 B. C., which is the time King Josiah who "finds" the book of the Law. The critics will say he didn't really find it, but had it written or was written just before he became king. So the deuteronomist is responsible for writing the book of Deuteronomy.

Then lastly the P-writer. The P-writer is a priestly writer. A lot of times this would be associated with Ezra, the priest after the Exile (ca. 500 BC). When you look at the Pentateuch, is there a lot of priestly stuff in the Pentateuch? The priestly stuff would be the book of Leviticus, how to do sacrifices, how to do feasts and detailed things like that. So the priestly writer put in all these priestly details.

Then the Pentateuch was compiled about 450 BC out of these four documents.

This is called the JEDP theory. Do you see why it's called the JEDP theory? And these were documents that the critics say were written, and then they got compiled under Moses' name. Therefore what we have in the Bible was not really written by Moses at all.

Now question: is this what the Bible says or is this all theoretical conjecture that they made up. Yes, it's theoretical conjecture that they made up. Have they ever found one document of J or one document of E, or one document of D? Have they ever found any document or hard evidence to support this? Zero. So this is all totally theoretical. It was made up in the 19th century by a guy named Julius Wellhausen and was adopted in the 20th century. If you guys were sitting in a university context they would assume this theory. They would go on to some other things probably but this would be assumed as underlining a lot of the work in the universities. This is basically a critical theory that's taught everywhere.

Now, by the way, does this contradict what Scripture says? Does the Scripture say that Moses actually wrote this down? Yes. The Bible says that Moses wrote this down. We've given you references that Moses wrote Genesis.

Now does Moses write all of the book of Deuteronomy? No, because he's dead at the end of the book, so he can't write that. But who's following after Moses? Joshua. So does Joshua fill in the rest of Moses' life? It's not a very difficult thing suggest since that they worked together all the time. So this is the JEDP theory.

Now you say, "Okay, Hildebrandt, how did you solve the problem? How come the one says that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob did not know the name Yahweh? What I'm suggesting here is that this theory, by the way, this is simple and as you move here it's more complex. So these JEDP sources move from simple to complex. What other theory moves from the simple to the complex? It is built on evolutionary model. This basically plays with Darwinism too. You know there's pros and cons of the evolutionary framework, but they've kind of embedded this in the source theory.

D. A Proposed Solution to Exodus 6:3 [10:28-12:25]

Now here's the way I look at this as far as a solution. It says, "Abraham, Isaac and Joseph did not know me by the name Yahweh." Now you say, "wait a minute, Abraham

didn't know the name Jehovah?" Wait a minute Hildebrandt, go back to Ebla, this is 400 years before Abraham, in Ebla there is mention of the name "Yahweh." Apparently the name "Jehovah" was known 400 years before Abraham ever lived. So is it saying he doesn't know the name or he doesn't know the meaning of the name? What I'm suggesting to you is that God is saying this: They knew me as El Shaddai, I came to them and I promised Abraham, and I promised Isaac, and I promised Jacob, I was the Great Promiser in the book of Genesis, I promised all these things. You Moses are going to know me as Yahweh because now I am going to show you that I am the covenant keeper. You are going to see me keep my promise. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob knew me as the Promise Maker. You, Moses, are going to know my name Yahweh that I am the God who keeps my promises. And you are going to see me keep my promises to Israel. I'm going to free Israel out of the land of Egypt, I'm going to bring them into the promised land and give them the land that I promised to their father Abraham. So what's being said here is not that they did not know the name, they knew the name, but they didn't know the meaning of the name. They had seen God make all these promises but they had never seen God fulfill all these promises. Now, in Exodus, Jehovah/Yahweh announces to Moses, you're going to see me now fulfill my promise. I'm going to bring them out and bring them into the land of promise. So do you see the difference there? They didn't know the meaning of the name, they knew how to say the name. Now Moses is going to be able to see the promise fulfilled.

E. Bloody-Bridegroom Passage [12:26-16:43]

Now what's happening with Zipporah? In the end of chapter 4, Moses is going, God says, "Moses go back to Egypt and deliver my people, pull them out of there." So Moses goes back and on his way back, he runs into something. Chapter 4.24ff says this, "At a lodging place on the way, the Lord met Moses and was about to kill him." Now who is the "him" that was about to be killed? Was it Moses or was it the son? The actual Hebrew is somewhat ambiguous there. It says "him" but you don't know who the "him" is. Is it the kid or is it Moses? So, "he was about to kill him, but Zipporah," that's the "bird lady", Moses' wife, "took a flint knife and cut off her son's foreskin and touched

Moses' feet with it. Surely you are bridegroom of blood to me! So the Lord let him alone." What's going on with this here? It's interesting, she cuts off the foreskin of her son and she touches Moses' feet with it.

Now I should be a little honest with what the word "feet" means. Do you know what a euphemism is? A **euphemism** is when you want to say something that's not appropriate, so you make a euphemism and you say something else. So when somebody dies do you say, "he died" or do you say, "he passed away" or "he went to be with the Lord"? If they say, "they went to be with the Lord," you say, "Oh good!" If they told you "he died," that's not so good. So do you see euphemisms with death and with bad things.

The word "feet" in Hebrew can also mean male genitals. Now I don't want you to go through the Bible and say, "Hildebrandt says the word 'feet' always means 'male genitals'." So every time you see, and "Jesus washed the disciples' feet," and you say, "holy cow!" Do you understand? I've got to back off from that I'm sorry. I shouldn't have used that as an example. He says they're taking off their sandals, is it really clear that sandals are on your *feet* feet? But what I'm telling you is that there are about two or three passages in Scriptures where it uses this word "feet" to refer probably to something else. Does anyone remember the book of Ruth? Ruth comes in with Boaz and she uncovers his feet. You have to ask some other questions there as well. This is one of those passages.

Does it have to do with the circumcision? So the people are suggesting that she circumcises her son and takes his foreskin and touches Moses' "feet?" Do you see the symbolism there from the son to the father? But all I'm saying is that it doesn't occur very often, it occurs very rarely in Scripture, but it does occur. I'm trying to be honest with you guys.

So first of all, who did God attack? Did God attack Moses or was the son attacked? That text is somewhat ambiguous. Why did God attack him, whoever it was? Then the third question comes up here is: are there similar stories in Scripture? Does anyone remember the story of Balaam? And God says to Balaam, "okay, you can go." Remember, he's going to go, Balak says, "Balaam, I'll pay you money to come down and

curse Israel for me.” At first God says, “don’t go with him, the guy is going to have you curse Israel.” The guy comes back and says, “Hey, I’ll give you whatever you want if you come down and serve me.” So God says, “Okay, Balaam, you can go.” So Balaam goes and what happens? An angel with a sword comes and is about to kill Balaam on the way down. So you say wait a minute, God tells him to go but this angel is there opposing him. So you get this idea that God tells someone to go but then there’s this opposition. By the way, is that a similar thing you saw with Jacob? Jacob is called to come back into Israel, when he comes back into Israel this angel of the Lord meets him and wrestles with him and puts his hip out. You get this come back and go to a land I will show you and then you get this opposition from God. It seems to be a similar type pattern here and there are different ways of looking at it.

F. Three Approaches to the Bloody-Bridegroom passage [16:44-23:57]

I want to propose three ways built off three people that have made suggestions here. The first is a guy named Brevard Childs, he was at Yale University and I assume he’s retired now. He was old many years ago. He’s a great Old Testament scholar from Yale University. He says that the boy was sick and it was God who struck the boy that the “him” there is not Moses, it’s the boy. The boy was sick and then the boy was circumcised and the boy got better. What this is is what’s called an **etiological tale**. Do different cultures have different stories explaining why they do things a certain way? Different cultures will have different stories. For example, if someone sneezes in class you say what? Bless you. Are there stories to explain why you say, “bless you”?

Different cultures have different things. In Massachusetts culture, I learned that I get rammed in the back of my car three times when I got here. Three times somebody rear-ended me. I was stopping at a stop sign, and bam, I got hit from behind. I stop at another sign and bam I get hit in the rear. After a while I learned what? Do people in Massachusetts roll their stop signs? Yes they do. I got the back of my car wrecked up because I didn’t roll the stop sign so they just rammed right into the back of me. So question, did I get a hint after a while? I’m not from this area, so now I do what? By the way, I’m not saying, you guys as college students should do that. The police love to pick

up college students, so when you come to a stop sign, stop. All I'm telling you is that people roll stop signs here. Now why do people roll there stop signs in Massachusetts? Someone told me this etiological tale of why they roll them. Because in the winter snow is a problem here. If you stop in the winter, what happens to your car? It gets stuck. So you roll your stop signs, and then then they just do it all year round. Do you see how that was like a tale that they told to explain some phenomenon.

So the suggestion is that here the story is telling us then why Moses is doing circumcision. So this is an etiological tale to say this is why we do circumcision. God almost killed Moses' kid, he was circumcised, he was spared, and this is why the Jews do circumcision. A tale like that is called an etiological tale.

Now a second view is done by Walter Kaiser. Walter Kaiser was the president of Gordon Conwell Seminary for quite a while. He is a great Old Testament scholar and an evangelical too. He says that Moses was the one that was sick. When God struck "him", it was Moses and the boy was circumcised. The point of the story is obedience. Moses had not circumcised his own son and therefore God is calling Moses to say, "if you're going to lead my people, you need to be obedient to me." The leader needs to be obedient as a model for the people who are under him. So he's saying, "Moses you need to be obedient to me and your own son is not that way."

Here's a second reason that I'm kind of putting out to Kaiser's suggestion. Some people suggest this, that Moses' son needed to be circumcised because do you remember Passover? At Passover who dies? The firstborn son. If his son was not circumcised, can his son stay and eat the Passover. Or does his son have to go outside the door with the blood on it because the son is not circumcised. If the son is outside the door, what happens to that son? He's dead. So what God is saying is, "Moses, there's going to come a situation later on, circumcise your kid so he can eat the Passover with you and won't be kicked out." So this could be like a premonition that he's taking care of this problem. By the way, this argument is conjectural. Does biblical text say that? No, that's conjectural on my part. I just think there might be some truth to that. So this is Walter Kaiser stressing obedience.

So then why does Zipporah get so ticked off? Zipporah actually gets really angry and it turns out that Allen Ross says that Moses was struck down and the boy was circumcised. What I like about Ross' bloody bridegroom argument is that it explains why Zipporah was so angry. What Allen Ross suggests is that Zipporah was used to adolescent circumcision. In some cultures they do circumcise adolescents. What's the problem with being a guy? Well, there are several problems, but one of the problems with being a guy...when a girl gets to be a certain age does her body signals the girl to woman change. And there's definitely things that go on in her body. In a lot of cultures the boys to men transition is a problem. Some cultures use things like Bar Mitzvah to indicate when a boy becomes a man. That sounds like a pretty good question. When is the boy a man? That's what I was afraid of, some of the women say, "Never." There's a part of the boy that stays with all of us, at least with this boy, and I'm an old man now.

So because the culture has this problem especially with males in transition into adulthood some of cultures will use adolescent circumcision as kind of the gateway or rite of passage. Once the boy has been circumcised now he is welcomed into the adult community. So Zipporah is used to adolescent circumcision and she was not used to neonate circumcision. Neonate means baby circumcision. So when she has to circumcise a child who's not ready for adulthood she is really, really upset with Moses. It's gross to circumcise a baby from her perspective. Who would ever do that to an innocent baby? What I'm telling you is that is the best time in life to do it. But anyways, so she gets really upset, by the way, in the narrative does Zipporah, "the bird lady", does she fly away? Is she gone when Moses is down in Egypt? Where is Zipporah? She is nowhere to be found. Miriam is there; Aaron is there, and the people are there. Zipporah, many people think and I would be in agreement with this, seems to have gone back to her father Jethro the priest of Midian in Sinai. So she actually goes back and leaves Moses as a result of this. She gets upset and leaves. So she doesn't appear in the text, she's gone after this. I like this interpretation because it explains Zipporah's anger and why she may have left. Again, it's somewhat conjectural but I think it makes sense of a lot of the details.

G. Date of the Exodus [23:58-24:28]

Now, when did Moses cross the Red Sea, or the Reed Sea? The date of the Exodus is one of the most hotly debated topics in the book of Exodus. When we go through this on a college level course, you should be aware that there is a huge debate over the early date and the late date of the Exodus. I'm going to run through the arguments and then we'll make an analysis of this. So there's going to be this big debate over when did Moses leave Egypt.

H. Early Date: 1445 BC [24:29-30:13]

First of all I want to give you the early date. The early date most people date to around 1445 B.C. 1440 is called the Early Date Theory. Where did they get the early date from? They get it from the Bible in 1 Kings 6:1 it says this, and you should be able to figure this out, "480 years before Solomon's fourth year, Moses came out of Egypt." Now, you don't know Solomon's date but whose date do you know? David's a 1000 BC. Is Solomon before or after David? Solomon was David's son, so therefore when it's his son, they usually come after. So we've got David's 1000, now we're down into the 960's. If you take the 480 and you add that to the 965 you end up with this 1445 B.C. date. Do you see where they get that? David is 1000 BC and Solomon is right after that, about 30 or 40 years after that, and you take the 480 years before Solomon's fourth year, then that gets you back at about 1445 BC.

So Scripture tells us about this 480 year period, but not just in Kings. In the book of Judges 11:26, Jephthah is a judge. Remember how we said this is Jordan over here, the Sea of Galilee, Jordan River, Dead Sea? You guys are Israel and you guys are the Mediterranean Sea. Jephthah's over here fighting with the Ammonites and he's telling the Ammonites "My family has owned this property for 300 years." Now does that tell you anything? He says, "my family has owned this territory for 300 years." When did that territory get acquired? Under Moses. When does Jephthah live? Jephthah is about 1100 B.C., so if Jephthah says my family has owned this for 300 years, and it's 1100 BC, what date does that put you back to? $300 + 1100$ puts you back to the 1400's. So these two scripture verses seem to support this early date then and so that's a good thing.

Now there is the Merneptah Stele. First of all what's a stele? What's a tombstone look like? A tombstone is a rock usually about 6 inches thick, kind of rounded corners about this high. A stele looks like a tombstone only they stand about six feet high. And what happens is they're made out of rock. The ones we saw were about six feet tall and 4 inches thick. They were made out of rock. They carve stuff in the rock. "I am the Great Pharaoh of Egypt and everybody bow down and kiss my feet." So they carved on the front of this stele, on the back of them, sometimes on the sides of them. And these are called "stele." You learn how to read these steles and they tell you history. On the stele from Merneptah it says, and we know the date of Merneptah is about 1200 BC, it says that Israel was in the land. If Israel is tenting in the land at 1200, so then they must have entered it before then. So the 1445 date fits well with Israel being settled in the land at 1200, they came in at 1400 and they've had time to settle down. So that's the Merneptah Stele in support of this early date.

Lastly are the Amarna letters. These letters are really neat letters. They're written in Acadian. The Amarna letters, what are these? Right in here is Jerusalem. The Jebusite, or the Canaanite guy who is king of Jerusalem writes to Pharaoh and we actually have copies of these letters. These letters date from 1400 BC. Abi-Heba of Jerusalem writes to the Egyptian Pharaoh and says "Pharaoh, how come you won't help us? I've been asking you for help. This group called the Habiru are swarming us and they are overpowering us and we need some of your help Pharaoh. Why won't you help? I've written you before but you're not helping me. These Habiru are coming in all over the place." Now what does that sound a little bit like? "Habiru" sounds like "Hebrew" and in the past some scholars have made the association that the Habiru were the Hebrews. Don't do that. That's incorrect. The Habiru is a much bigger group than the Hebrews. There are Habiru all the way over in Mesopotamia, that the group of Habiru is very big, is it possible that the Hebrews were a type or sub-set of Habiru? The Habirus were pictured as more like gypsies that move from place to place and they were coming in now as these hordes wandering in and taking over the land. The King of Jerusalem is asking Pharaoh for help. Why won't Pharaoh help him? Is it possible that the Pharaoh just got his tail whooped in

the Exodus and he's saying I'm not messing with those Jews anymore. These Amarna letters seem to fit this 1400 BC date. This is why I would actually hold this early date.

I. Late Date for the Exodus: 1260 BC [30:14-39:58]

Now, some of my good friends hold to what's called the late date. They have the privilege of being wrong if they want. No actually they may be right and I may be wrong. This is one of those questions that I'm not sure on. I think I'm right, but I can see why they say what they say. The late date dates from about 1260 BC. So you have the early date [ca. 1440 BC] and the late date [ca. 1260], this is a big argument. The first and strongest of their arguments, they say is Exodus 1.11. It says that "the Israelites built two cities, one called Pithom and one called Rameses." The city of Rameses was probably built in whose honor? Rameses. Rameses II, who is the big Rameses dates from about 1200 BC. So if they built a city it would be to this Rameses. By the way have you guys ever seen the movie "The Ten Commandments"? The Pharaoh in The Ten Commandments with the bald head, his name was Yul Brynner. Anyways, he plays Rameses. So in the movie The Ten Commandments, which date did they take, the late date or the early date? They took the late date, and they make Rameses the Pharaoh. By the way does the Bible ever tell us the name of the Pharaoh? It never does. Actually that fits with early records before 1000 BC, because before 1000 BC they didn't usually name the Pharaoh. After that period, they call him Pharaoh Neco, Shishak or whatever. Rameses is here, Exodus 1.11 says they built the city in honor of Rameses, so therefore the 1200 date fits best.

Burn levels at Lachish is another argument for the late date of the Exodus. What are burn levels? First, we've got to do a little archaeology. So you're going from Gordon College, you're going to work on Ashkelon with the guys from Wheaton. You're going to go dig a tel. What is a tel? It's a city mound, layered cities on top of cities. It's like a layer cake. Now, by the way, where are you? Let me use Jericho for an example. First of all, if you're going to build a city in the ancient world, what's the first thing you need. You've got to have water. Are you going to build a city in the desert? No. Are you going to build it by a spring or a well? All the cities are near springs or wells because you've

got to have water. Now once you have water, let's do Jericho. Jericho has this huge spring. Your city starts out on ground level. You build a wall around your city, and then where do you put your trash? In the recycle bin and they take it out. Okay, now we're talking 8000 B.C., where do you put your trash? The people put their trash kind of like Massachusetts; they just throw the trash on the street. So what happens? They throw the trash on the street, by the way does sand get blown into the city? And so all of a sudden the city has a tendency to do what? Trash, more trash, trash, trash, does the city build up? So in the tel of Jericho, it started flat on the ground but by the time it gets done, it's 75 feet high now. 75 feet high and is it layer upon layers of cities of different ages.

Now let's be archaeologists. You're standing on top of the 75 foot mound. What do you want to do? You want to dig it. So what you do is you basically get a 10 by 10 foot square and then what do you need? You need slaves, so you go to Gordon College and other colleges and say "Wouldn't you like to be an archaeologist and you can really study archaeology!" So you go over there and they turn you into slaves. You end up digging 10 by 10 foot squares and they give you a toothbrush to dig all this stuff. Why do they want you to use a toothbrush? They don't want you to break anything and does everything have to be recorded as you move down through the stratas you have to record every little thing and take pictures.

Now you're digging down this 10 foot square and you get down a ways. Can you tell that dirt has a certain color to it. All of a sudden you get to a certain layer and the dirt gets all black and soot. So you got a 6 inch layer of soot there, what do you think immediately? I would think actually the guy had a woodstove and it got out of hand and it burned his house down. Is it possible the guy burned his house down here? Now suppose we start digging over there, and when we get to same layer we hit this soot layer. By the way will soot stain the soil? It will stain the soil. We get down to a certain layer and boom we've got another 6 inch soot layer. We've got a soot layer there and a soot layer here. Now what conclusion do I come to? The city was burned down at that layer. So this is what's called the burn layer. And this is what's called a tel. A tel is a city mound and then the archaeologists dig down. By the way the more they dig down, does it

get older or younger? The more you dig down it gets older. Then you try to date things with carbon 14 dating, with pottery dating, with material remains dating, you try to date things at each level as you dig down.

What they found is that there are burn layers indicating that the city of Lachish was burned about 1200 BC. Actually, it's found in several cities in Palestine around 1200 BC which would mean then that possibly Joshua came in and smoked several cities and burned them down? So some people suggest that this is Joshua burning things down around 1200 BC, which would fit this 1200 date of the Exodus. Do you see how that argument goes? By the way, archaeology is really a wonderful thing, but is it hot and dry and it's a lot of work. Why would you want to go to Ashkelon is because there's a beach right next door on the Mediterranean Sea, about 50 yards away. That's the place to go. You just have to dodge some Arab missiles from Gaza but other than that you're all right.

Now here's another reason. The Bible says that 480 years before Solomon they came out of Egypt. How do they get rid of this 480? What they suggest is that a generation is 40 years. 40 years per generation times what gets you 480? Is anyone a math major here? How many generations of 40 years does it take to get 480? 12 generations. Now I ask you how many years between you and your parents? Is it usually 40 years? Well your generation may be, but did some of your grandparents get married when they were 18 years of age? My mother had me when she was 19. If my daughters came to me, let's not even think about that. Let me not get into that. So what I'm saying is, is it really 40 years or is it more like 20 years between generations. So if you take it as 20 years, what does it do to that 480 number? It cuts it in half. So what they're suggesting is 12 generations of 40 is the way that the scheme was rendered, but an actual generation is 20, so it was really 240 years and not the full 480 years. That's how they shrink that number. How many years was Moses in the wilderness for? 40 years. So that 40 year time period may have been just kind of a standard measurement kind of thing. They tagged that onto the generation. They may have done that. These people were suggesting that kind of shrinkage here. It's conjectural. We don't do that, but it does make some sense because a generation is shorter. Their calendar was off some, they did lunar

calendars and different things, but it wasn't that far off. This is like hundreds of years off. We'll use that lunar calendar actually during some of the feasts. We can use the different calendars, and that will help us some. But when we've got 480 years going to 240, that doesn't get us there. Save that argument, that's an excellent argument and we'll use that later on.

So the early date and the late date. Is this really boring stuff? Yes, it is. So we'll get on, but this is a big debate in the book of Exodus, on whether it was 1400 or 1200 BC. This is a big debate and there's good people on both sides of this.

J. Number of Israelites leaving Egypt [39:59-52:03]

Here's another question. This one's really tricky. How many people left Egypt? Here you've got statements, clear statements in Exodus 12:37 and repeated again in 38:26, and in the book of Numbers it repeats it again. Remember how Numbers numbered the tribes? So it totals it up that there were 600,000 men that came out of Egypt. 603,500 men in the book of Numbers, so 600,000 men come out of Egypt. Now what's the problem with that? 600,000 men, 20 years old and upward. Do men usually have wives? We're trying to figure out how many people came out of Egypt, so if you get 600,000 men coming out, would you give me that each Israeli man had one wife? Now what's the problem with that? One man, one woman, we'll just do that. So there's 600,000 men, and 600,000 women. And by the way which one probably out-populated the other one because the Egyptians were trying to kill the males, so there were probably more females, kind of like Gordon College. But let's assume 600,000 men, 600,000 women. Would you give me two nice American children for every family? Now what's the problem with two children in that culture? Is it possible in that culture for someone to have 10 or 12 children? Some of them would have none, but would you give me two. If you do that and add it up, this number 600,000 men and women and two children each, you end up with 2.4 million people coming out of Egypt. Is that a problem? Is that a lot of people?

Have any of you guys ever been down to Boston for the 4th of July? If you ever get a chance to do that it's incredible. Now by the way when the fireworks are over in

Boston, everybody's leaving at the same time. Have you guys ever been down there? You've got half a gazillion people trying to make it through these streets. They just shut the streets down and the people are walking down the middle of the streets. What's the population of Boston? When you get in these crowds, it's just a swarm of people. There are 600,000 people in Boston.

What's the problem? 2.4 million people now you're walking them through the desert, is this going to be a problem? Well, let me just point out some of these things. What about water? You've got 2.4 million people with water problems, they're in the Sinai desert. Is water a problem? Let me tell you about Sinai desert, I lived in the Sinai desert for 3 weeks. Ora Lipschitz is an expert in Sinai was taking us down. Ora comes up and she tells us when you get in the desert, your body will not register that you are thirsty. So what will happen is your body will say I don't need any water, so you've got to eat these crackers. You eat these crackers because they make your mouth water and then you will say my mouth is dry, I need to drink something. You eat the cracker and then it tells your body I need to drink something. If you don't eat the crackers, what happens? Your body says it's not thirsty then your body gets dehydrated from the desert.

We had this one German dude, I'll call him Hans. So Hans, big tough German guy says, "I'll drink when I'm ready. I know my body." So we're out in the desert, 3 days later what happens to poor old Hans? He's in the back of the bus rolling around (groaning) and he has this massive headache. Now what happens when you get dehydrated? Your brain is mostly made out of what? Now, I'm not saying this as a blonde joke. What is your brain mostly made out of? Is there a ton of water up in your brain? So when you get dehydrated, what happens to your brain? Your brain shrinks. Now when your brain shrinks, it pulls in from your skull, and what does that do to you? It hurts like the worst migraine headache you've never had in your life. You can't see. It actually can affect your seeing. Your brain shrinks because of this and with Hans rolling around in the back, did he have the worst headache he'd ever had in his life? Everyone knew he wasn't eating the crackers, kind of like it served him right. Nobody says that, but we were all thinking it. Anyways, so Ora walks back up there and she says one word to

him, “crackers?” After that, Polly was eating his crackers. When we walked up Mount Sinai we left at 3 A.M. in the morning because it was cold and we had to carry a gallon of water. What I’m saying is you need at least a gallon of water a day. When you’re in Sinai with a gallon a day, what’s the problem? You got 2.4 million people and a gallon of water a day for each one of them. What’s the problem with that?--2.4 million gallons. You tell me how much water that is? How many of you picture Moses prancing up to this rock, taking his little stick, and striking the rock and a little water comes out? You got 2.4 million people, do you need a ten inch pipe blasting water out there? 2.4 million people, is that a lot of water on a daily basis?

What about the food? When I was younger I thought the manna came down like snow. You’ve got 2.4 million people. I have four kids, how much does it take to feed four kids? I want to tell you, a lot. I used to think it was this manna floating down. Have you got to have trainloads of manna to feed 2.4 million people? You need tons and tons and tons of food to feed 2.4 million people.

Here’s another one. Hannah said they’re spread out, that’s exactly right. I’ve been in Sinai. Sinai has these granite mountains. What’s the problem with granite mountains? Granite mountains will cut your feet. They’re very hard to walk on. You don’t walk on the mountains, you walk in the valleys. Now if you walk in the valleys and you’ve got 2.4 million people, does that spread them out? It’s possible that the people in the front had water and it would be three days until the people in the back got up there. What happens in the desert in 3 days? You’re cooked. What I’m saying is that they get spread out like that in the wadis. Wadis are another term for valleys in between the mountains.

What about the midwives? You guys have read about the midwives in chapter 4. The names of the two midwives were Shiphrah and Puah. Does anyone remember Shiphrah and Puah? You’ve got two midwives and you got 2.4 million people. Have we got a problem here? I came from Warsaw, Indiana. I’ll give you the whole hospital in Warsaw, Indiana. If you’ve got 2.4 million people, can that hospital service that many people? No chance.

What about the taking of Canaan? Israel, they sent out the spies up in the land.

There are giants up there. If you've got 2.4 million people are giants a problem? All you do is surround the city and eat all the food. The big giants have nothing to eat because you just ate all the food. 2.4 million people are going to be like locusts, the giants are going to starve to death. I don't care how big he is, the bigger he is the harder he falls because he's going to need a lot of food and there's going to be nothing to eat there. So what I'm saying is 2.4 million people is a lot of people.

Now you say, "Hildebrandt what do you do with this?" All I'm telling you is 2.4 million people, by the way, if the Bible says it, do I believe it? Does that settle it? In my head am I going "2.4 million people, is a lot of people out in the desert like that. And then the size, I just can't imagine that." This is a problem for me. Now what do you do? Some people take the word *eleph* which is the Hebrew term for "thousand." They take the word thousand in Hebrew and they say the word *eleph* can be translated "thousand," but it can also be translated "clans" or "families." And so then it would be 600 clans or families. They figure out clan size, family size, and this would be about 72,000 people. By the way, is 72,000 people still a pretty big group to take through the desert? That's still pretty big, but it limits it down. So some people use that *eleph* and taking it as "clans" to get it down. It still doesn't do it...that solution has never really satisfied me. The word *eleph* is the word for thousand, so 600 thousand or 600 "clans." So the word would be 600 clans, and we got 50 to a clan or something like that. So it would limit the size down.

This is one of the problems with Scripture, to be honest with you, I don't know the solution to this. I probably should just skip this, but part of it I want you to see is what do you do when you run into a problem in Scripture that you don't know how to solve? Is it possible that they used a different base system than we use. We use a ten base system. Is it possible like in Babylon's where they have a 60 base system, so they counted differently? It is possible. What I'm saying is that with this problem, I don't know what the solution is. Some people think that number is a hyperbole, it's an overstatement for emphasis. Again, I'm struck with that. The Bible uses hyperbole all the time, but it's usually with "all" statements or something that's usually pretty clear. The numbers that project that, I don't know if there's evidence for that. So this is one that I'm stuck with.

In other words, what I'm trying to say is: are there things in the Bible that still need to be solved? This is one of those big problems and I'm not sure how to solve it exactly. I've thought about it a lot, I've wrestled with it, I've read on it, and I still don't know.

My guess is that the way they numbered things is differently than the way we do, and we are understanding their numbers differently than what they meant. So that the way they numbered things and they were conceptualizing is different than the way we understand it. I think that our two cultures have missed each other on this numbering thing. In other words, what I'm trying to tell you is, I don't know. I wish I did, I've read a lot of scholars and I don't think anyone knows, really. There have been a lot of suggestions, but the suggestions all fall apart. This is one that we don't know. Were there a lot of people that came out of Egypt? There were a lot of people that came out of Egypt. Let's use the words "a lot." This is one of those problems. How do you deal with conflicts like that? What I'm trying to say is that there are some conflicts in Scripture that take you back and you just wonder how you solve this. I think we're just missing some data on how they were meaning these things to be understood. I think it's a missing between the two cultures in terms of numbers.

K. Plagues of Egypt: Three reasons for the plagues [52:04-55:56]

Now plague cycles, what do we have with plague cycles? There are at least three reasons for the ten plagues of Egypt. The first reason was that it was a judgment on the gods of Egypt. In Exodus 12:12 it says that he's bringing these plagues "on the same night I will pass through Egypt and strike down every first born both men and animals and I will bring judgment on their gods." Who is one of the main gods of Egypt? He says I'm going to take their first born, Pharaoh himself was considered a god. God says I'm going to take his first born; he's not going to be able to protect his own child. They mummified him and they basically sent him on to the afterlife. The way they conceptualize their gods, some of their gods got chopped in two and they had battles between the gods and one god would kill another god. So their gods were very human-like.

Here's the second reason: "that they may know that I am Yahweh." God said in

the plagues he's going to reveal who he is. So in the plagues you're going to see the revelation of God's character, might, strength and his power. This is going to happen here, "that they may know that I am Yahweh." The plagues are going to reveal his character.

Then thirdly, there seems to be this *lex talionis* nature of it. Now what is *lex talionis*? *Lex* means "law," *talionis* means "retaliation," the law of retaliation. If I said to "you eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth," that's *lex talionis*. What you have here I think in Exodus 4.23 is that God says, what has pharaoh been doing to God's firstborn? Pharaoh has been trying to destroy God's firstborn through killing the infants, through working the daylights out of them, through enslaving them. What's going to happen is God says, "therefore because you were seeking to destroy my firstborn, I'm going to take your firstborn. You, Pharaoh, as god are not able to protect your own kid. You destroy my kid, your kid's gone." So there is this kind of like eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth thing. This is the law of retaliation. [Question from student] Yes, that's New Testament and we'll leave stuff for the New Testament. What I suggest is that you have to be very careful about taking some of the statements from the Sermon on the Mount, for example, and trying to universalize them. I know people do that, they try to take statements from Sermon on the Mount and universalize them. All I'm trying to say is there's different ways that God himself does things. Does God favor shalom and peace, yes, but are there other times when God's at war. So you can't take a single statement and universalize it like that. I'm afraid people do that making Jesus this wimp with turn your other cheek on a person. I think if you read the book of Revelation, he's not too wimpy. So you've got to be careful with that, but it's really good that you feel the tension, because we want to feel the tension and to wrestle with that.

L. Hardening Hearts [55:57-57:54]

Now, does God harden people's hearts? Here you've got some statements, who hardened Pharaoh's heart? Here you've got a statement that God hardened it in chapter 4.21 where we just were. It says, "God says, I have given you power to do [miracles] but I will harden his heart, [pharaoh's heart] so that he will not let the people go." He will

harden Pharaoh's heart, but you know what's interesting? God hardened Pharaoh's heart, but there are also a bunch of passages that say Pharaoh hardened his own heart. So therefore in the resurrection whose wife shall she be? In other words, did God harden Pharaoh's heart? Yes. But Pharaoh hardened Pharaoh's heart too. So the answer is what? Yes. In other words, is God involved in activities and humankind is also involved in activities. This takes us back to the free will and predestination kind of thing. Does God determine things? Yes. Does humankind determine things? Yes. Is it possible that you can have two agencies working on the same event? From God's perspective, God hardens Pharaoh's heart in judgment on Pharaoh because of the evils that he's done, and God hardens his heart as a judgment on him. Is it possible that Pharaoh hardens his heart in rebellion against God? So what you have is the same event happening for two different reasons with God meaning one thing by it and pharaoh meaning another thing by it. It's the same event. So who hardened Pharaoh's heart? God hardened it and Pharaoh hardened it.

M. Plagues on Egypt [57:55-61:13]

Now, there were the ten plagues of Egypt. I don't want you to know all of these. I would like you to learn four of them. The ones that are in yellow are the ones I want you to learn. Now the first plague is the plague of the snake. Do you remember Moses cast down his rod and it becomes a snake? The magicians threw down their rods and they became snakes. Then what happens? Moses' snake does what? It eats them up. By the way, is the snake the symbol of Egyptian power? What is on the crown of Pharaoh? It has what coming out the front of it? A cobra. So the snake is a symbol of Egyptian power. What does Moses' snake do? Eats it up and destroys it. So the snake is a famous plague. Then he strikes the river and the river becomes like blood red color. So the river becomes blood. Was the Nile considered a god in Egypt? Yes. Egypt is the gift of the Nile. So the Nile is taken down in terms of the blood. Now you've got all these other ones: frogs, gnats, flies, hail, locusts, and things.

The darkness, why is the darkness important? Ra or Re is the Sun god. Is the sun god the big god in Egypt? So what God is saying is I'm going to take the sun god down

and he causes darkness. Lastly, the firstborn, I think the firstborn is a judgment on Pharaoh because Pharaoh cannot protect his own son. So those are the ones I want you to know: the snake, the blood, the darkness and the firstborn. They had other gods, the cattle gods, the one that I used to see in Sinai is Hathor, Hathor is a cow god.

Now this pattern here is the pattern of the plagues. God makes an announcement and God tells Moses: “Moses I’m going to do a plague,” and God gives instructions. “Moses, take your rod, go down by the river, and you and Aaron go down there.” So God gives some **instructions**, Moses goes down to the river, strikes the river, turns it red, and then what do the magicians do? **Magicians duplicate** it. We’ll look at the magicians in a minute. I always thought if the magicians were so powerful, rather than duplicating the plague, they should do what? Undo the plagues. So, in other words, Moses strikes the river to become blood. The magicians if they had any stuff in them, they’d turn it back to water. But they duplicate the miracles, and that’s interesting. **Pharaoh then responds** usually saying, “please stop all these flies, stop all these locusts from eating that place out.” Pharaoh asks for help. Then **Moses and God respond** usually in grace backing off of the plague. Then after Moses and God back off, **Pharaoh’s heart gets hardened**. Once his heart gets hardened then you start back up on the next plague.

So this is the cycle, can you see how all the plagues ran through this cycle, and Pharaoh’s heart gets hardened and it starts again on the next cycle. This is the cycle that happens in the book of Exodus on the ten plagues.

N. Magicians as a foil [61:14-63:12]

Now, the magicians actually are a foil to Moses and so the magicians are really pretty important in the narrative. Initially the magicians oppose Moses, so they are a foil to Moses. Moses does a miracle, the magicians duplicate it. So initially they oppose Moses and Aaron. They are a foil, so there’s an opposition. But what happens interestingly enough is during the plague of the gnats is the Egyptian magicians can’t pull it off. The Egyptians magicians confess, “This is the finger of God.” So what you have is the magicians go through a transition. They initially oppose Moses, but now they, in the end, become a testimony and witnesses of Moses’ and God’s power through Moses. They

warn Pharaoh this isn't just magic tricks anymore, "this is the finger of God." So it's an interesting transition that the magicians go through.

Here's another thing that happens during the plagues. There seems to be a separation of the land of Goshen. Does anyone remember when the hail came in and the hail is bombing out Egypt and destroying everything? Over in Goshen it's nice. God separates his people in the land of Goshen and the plagues only fall on Egypt. There's this separation of Goshen, where the Israelites live, and basically the plagues don't fall on them. God is protecting his people as he's bringing judgment on others. That's kind of a neat thing.

O. Passover [63:13-69:47]

Now let's hit the Passover here. The Passover happens in chapter 12. Let me just walk through this. If you ever get a chance to go to a Jewish Pesach service, go to it, it's really worth seeing a Passover service. There are three things involved in the Passover service. One of them is the lamb. What happens to the lamb? They kill the lamb, they drain the blood, and what do they do with the blood of the lamb? They put it on the door frames and across the lintel. When the angel of death looks down and sees the blood, what does the angel do? Passes over. That's where the name Passover comes from. The angel of death "passes over" when it sees the blood on the door frames. Does anyone remember "when I see the blood, I will pass over you"? It used to be an old hymn that narrated this Passover event of seeing the blood and passing over. By the way, what do they do with the lamb? They roast the lamb on an open fire and they eat lamb that night. They're supposed to eat the whole lamb up in one night. Lamb is good meat. So they eat the lamb and blood is placed over the doorway, that's what happens to the lamb. Today they don't kill lambs, but back then they probably put it in a bowl and then used a swab thing to swab the blood around the doorframe.

Bitter herbs, they were to eat the bitter herbs to remind them of the bitter slavery in Egypt. What do they use for bitter herbs today? Has anyone ever been to a Pesach service? Does anybody do horseradish? Have you tried that? My father used to love horseradish. All I can say is when you eat it, it's like you had hair in your nose, you don't

have hair anymore. It burns everything out of you. You only need a little bit, and actually if you're smart you'll smell it ahead of time. The smell will be enough for you to know that you don't eat this stuff. Some people eat horseradish, my father ate horseradish outright. You want to taste something bitter, try horseradish. Does anybody like horseradish? So there are people that like horseradish. So for the bitter herbs they eat horseradish now to dip. (Question from student). Your eyes start watering; it's almost like onions only worse.

Third is unleavened bread. Why were they to eat unleavened bread? This Passover feast starts the Feast of Unleavened Bread. The Feast of Unleavened Bread lasted for 7 days. God said you're going to have to leave so fast from Egypt that you're not going to have time to let the bread rise. In other words, in order for bread to rise, you have to let it sit and the yeast works and the bread grows. He says you're going to have to leave so fast you won't have time. Eat unleavened bread.

Even to this day, if you go over to Israel during Passover time. By the way, Passover time is Easter for us as Christians, this is when Jesus is going to die, the Lord's Supper and then he's going to die. So right around our Easter is their Passover. When you go over to Israel to this day and you do the Passover if you walk into a grocery store, it was a dime for a loaf of bread. I've been in a grocery store in Israel, and you pick the bread up off the shelf, it's not wrapped in paper, you pick it up and it is still warm. Is this good? This is really good; it's like homemade bread. We've taken it home and eaten it, its great bread.

Now the problem is, on Passover you're going to go in and buy your bread, what's the problem? Have you ever seen that white butcher paper? And all of a sudden you go to the bread place where this wonderful bread is, and it's all covered over with white butcher paper and they won't sell you leavened bread. That means you have to eat crackers. I need my peanut butter and jelly sandwich, I eat that every day of my life and so what do I do? If they won't give you leavened bread you go over to the Arab section and buy the bread over there. The other thing I should say, they make these bagels for about a dime. You get a bagel like this, it's a loaf of bread, it's round with sesame seeds

on it. I'll never forget my last bagel out of Damascus gate. I come out of Damascus gate and this Arab dude is out there selling these bagels. So I buy this bagel off him and then I take a bite of it and it was really good bagel and I'm starving. The only problem is when I went back for a second bite, I looked at the bagel and there's only one thing worse than seeing a fly in your bagel, and that's seeing half a fly, I did. Half a fly there, and I had already swallowed, and that was my last bagel from there, I just couldn't do it anymore. You get so used to it in that culture where they let the food sit out. The food is just sitting out and the flies, you get used to it after a while. But I could never get used to that. So anyway, unleavened bread, they go for 7 days with unleavened bread and this is the Feast of Passover which kicks off the seven day Feast of Unleavened Bread.

What about the children? I love the way to Jews do their children in their feasts. In chapter 12.26, it describes the children's role. In many of our churches what do we do with children? Do we dismiss the children and get them out of there? The Jewish children participate. What do kids love doing? Ask questions. So here it says, when your children ask, "What does this ceremony mean? Then tell them it is the Passover, a sacrifice to the Lord who passed over the house of Israelites in Egypt." So what happens is the children are prompted and allowed to ask questions, and then the parents answer the kids' questions. What does that do to the family structure? Does that bond families together? The kids participate in the worship with their parents by asking questions which is what they want to do anyway. So it's beautiful with the children and how they incorporate them is beautiful.

P. Passover and the Lord's Supper [69:48-71:41]

Now what about the Lord's Supper? "Jesus on the same night he was betrayed took bread and broke it and said, 'This is my body which is broken for you.'" So the Lord's Supper is actually the Passover feast with the lamb, only this time, who is going to be the lamb? Jesus is going to be the Passover lamb. The bread is broken. By the way, many of you in churches to this day when you do communion you'll do unleavened bread, based on the feast of Passover. What is Jesus saying? Jesus could die any time,

but when does he choose to die? Right at Passover, because Jesus is the new Exodus. As Moses delivered them from the slavery in Egypt, Jesus is going to now deliver them from the bondage of sin. So Jesus is doing a new Exodus, and who is Jesus? In 1 Corinthians 5.7, Paul tells us that Jesus is our Passover lamb.

Do you remember when Jesus was on the cross and he wasn't dying fast enough? What did they want to do to him to get him to die faster? They're going to break his legs, because when you're on a cross you asphyxiate because you can't breathe. If they break your legs then you can't hold yourself up anymore. By the way, were they supposed to break any of the bones of the Passover lamb? No. Were Jesus' bones supposed to be broken? No. Just like it was prophesized in Isaiah 53, Psalm 22, wonderful passages of Jesus' crucifixion, Jesus' bones were not broken. So Jesus is our Passover lamb. So this whole thing of moving out to freedom, breaking out of Egypt becomes ours in Christ.

Q. Where did Moses cross the Reed Sea? [71:42-72:30]

Now here's another question that comes up. Where did Moses cross the Reed Sea? Now notice I'm being ornery by saying "Reed Sea." In Hebrew, the term is *yam suph*, which actually literally means "Reed Sea." *Yam* means "sea," *suph* means "reed," so *yam suph* means "Reed Sea." It does not mean Red Sea, it means Sea of Reeds. So the question is which sea is this. So there are two main suggestions, and then I had this guy from Wisconsin that was emailing me for about three months, beating me up about going to Arabia. I'll show you where he thinks crossing the Reed Sea was way over by Arabia. He thought that very strongly, I think he's wrong, but anyway.

R. God as warrior [72:31-76:08]

So let's work with these guys here, but before we do that, let me hit on this one. They're going to cross the Reed Sea and check this statement out from the Scripture, chapter 14 verse 14, it says this: "Moses answered the people 'Do not be afraid, stand firm and you will see the deliverance the Lord will bring you today. The Egyptians you see today you will never see again. The Lord will fight for you, you need only be still.'" "The Lord will fight for you." Does God get involved in war? What does Exodus 15.3

say? It says this, “The Lord is a warrior.” They’re singing after they cross the sea and they sing in praise of God and one of the things they praise God is that “The Lord is a warrior. Yahweh is his name. Pharaoh’s chariots and his army he has hurled into the sea.” “The Lord is a warrior.” What I’m saying is, and your generation is all peace, love, and peace, love. Is God a warrior? Actually some of the kids were dressed up today like the old 60’s kind of thing. Is God considered a warrior? Is that one of God’s titles that he is a warrior?

It’s really funny, I hear all these people saying war is not the answer. Sometimes is war the answer? Sometimes it is. Ecclesiastes says, “there is a time for peace, and there’s a time for war.” So what I’m saying is, and you have to be very careful in academic settings as we are the peace kind of people. In academic settings, do we argue peace and love? In the real world, there are people over in Afghanistan fighting and dying right this day probably as a result of what’s going on in the world. I had to struggle with that for seven months when my son was over there. He’s been back now for quite a while. Does he still have the remnants in his head of stuff that he saw that he’s told my wife and I about? He says, “I’ve seen stuff that nobody should ever see in their lifetime.” Do you know what it’s like to see your friend blown the smithereens? You have to pull his body off the wall, and you say it’s like beef jerky, put it in a box and pray to God that his parents don’t open the box. There’s a lot of stuff that goes down. All I’m saying is that war is really, really ugly and bad. However, God portrays himself as a warrior.

By the way, is that just God, or does Jesus also portray himself as a warrior too? You say well Jesus is love and peace, turn the other cheek. Did you ever read the book of Revelation? Read Revelation 19 sometime, Jesus is coming back as a warrior as well. I’m just harassing you on that. It’s okay to disagree on that question. Last class period we had a student who’s a friend of mine who’s a pacifist and was getting in my face and it’s okay. Different people hold more pacifistic things, while some take more of a just war position. I’m more of a just war person myself. It’s okay to disagree on that, different people hold different standards.

S. Where did Moses cross the Reed Sea? [76:09-79:15]

Where did Moses cross the Reed Sea? Here they are in Goshen, this is the land of Goshen where the Jews are settled. Now there's two places they could go across the Bitter Lakes or Lake Timsah, they could cross here. By the way would that fit the Sea of Reeds? These are less saline than the ocean. The ocean is salty, do reeds grow really well in salt? No. So when it says "Reed Sea," some people think it was these because these have less salt and there are reeds on these lakes. By the way, are these lakes big enough to drown an army? "Well," you say, "no, because it's only three feet deep," but these lakes are big enough to drown a whole army. These lakes are big, so some people suggest they went to cross the Bitter Lakes and then went down to Sinai. That's one view, the Bitter Lakes or Lake Timsah.

The other way is that they cross the top of the Red Sea. This would be the Red Sea crossing, they came down here and this is the Red Sea and the Gulf of Suez arm of the Red Sea. Then they crossed here and went down to Mount Sinai here. So that's the second view.

Now, a third view that this guy from Wisconsin is promoting says that Moses came across from the land of Goshen. By the way, why didn't Moses just go up into the land of Canaan? It would be a lot shorter to go that way. God's taking them into the desert, this is going to be God's honeymoon with Israel in the desert, where he's alone with them in the desert. The other thing he says explicitly in chapter 13, he was afraid because who was up here? The Philistines were up here and he said if I take them straight up into Canaan, they're going to run into the Philistines and turn around and run back, saying I don't want to fight with the Philistines because the Philistines were nasty fellows. He says, "I'm not going to take you directly into war with the Philistines because you won't be able to handle it." So he takes them out into the desert.

Now third view then is that Moses takes them all the way across Sinai and Pharaoh chases them all the way across the desert and Moses crosses here at the Red Sea at the Gulf of Aqaba. They've actually found a chariot wheel here, so this guy has made a case that because of the chariot wheel, this is where Moses crossed and then went down to Mount Sinai in Arabia.

Now where is Mount Sinai? Mount Sinai is here. Mount Sinai is here. Mount Sinai is here. Mount Sinai is here. Mount Sinai is here. Mount Sinai is here. Mount Sinai is here, here, here, here, and here. Where's Mount Sinai? There are actually over twenty sites for Mount Sinai. When Moses was up on top of Mount Sinai, did he sign off and say, "I was here"? No. So do we know where Mount Sinai is? No. So there are over twenty sites for Mount Sinai and nobody really knows where it is. By the way, if you ever get a chance, go to this one at Saint Catherine's Monastery here. It's worth the trek down there, it's just a wonderful old Monastery. It's been there since the 300's AD and there are wonderful monks down there and just really some cool artifacts. I recommend it.

T. Sabbath [79:15-83:28]

Now the Sabbath, we have about three more things to do here, the Sabbath. Why do we keep 9 out of the 10 commandments? Thou shall not murder, thou shall not lie, thou shall not steal, we revere all of commandments, but how come we don't do the commandment of observing the Sabbath? You say what does that have to do with Wisconsin roads? I grew up in New York, and in New York they have pot holes that are so big they will eat your car. Actually most roads in Massachusetts have pot holes, in New York the pot holes have roads. You get into Wisconsin though the roads are like glass. I ask what's the difference?

Part of it is the way Wisconsin builds their roads. They tile the water out from underneath it, they put a bunch of crushed rock on so the water is able to escape, and they make their roads with a good base. That good base makes it so that the roads last. What I'm going to suggest to you is that the Sabbath principle is a good base to set your life on. Now I'm talking hypocritically here, and this is a lecture as much to myself as it is to anybody, because I've had a really hard time with this Sabbath thing. I have some friends who are very Sabbath oriented and other friends who just work seven days straight.

One of the things concerning to the Sabbath is that you remember what God has done and that you reflect on life. What happens when you just truck through life, just running as fast as you can and you never turn around? Can you make sense out of life? Do you need to turn around and take time to bring life together? Remembering your past

is needed in order to have the present make sense out of life. So remembering is a really important principle.

Rhythm, you guys know about rhythm. What happens when you have to write a paper for class? You stay up all night writing the paper. You violate the day-night rhythm by staying up all night. What happens the next day? Is the next day good or bad? What happens if you have to stay up two nights in a row? Is that like murder? Don't do that, it's just really bad. In other words, is there a certain daily cycle you need to observe? Actually as college students I just tell you to try to get your sleep, it's really important. There are daily cycles, are there also weekly cycles? What happens if you violate the weekly cycle? I used to work with a guy and he worked seven days a week. He would drive a truck and he would go to college, he was one of my students and I would see him in school. Then on weekends he would drive trucks and he would work 30 hours over the weekend. After a while, he'd go to school, work, and then go to work. He never took a break. Question, after about three months of doing that, did he know which end was up? He lost all sense of meaning and purpose in life. He was ready to quit everything because he just couldn't make sense of things. So just be careful about that.

Renunciation of work is your master. Work is not our master, and so the Sabbath breaks that cycle of work and allowing us to renounce work as our master.

Refreshment, do you need to take a break sometimes on the Sabbath? My parents when I grew up would always rest on Sunday. There's something to be said for that.

Here's another one, role model. Did God himself rest on the Sabbath? Did God rest because he was tired? No, God rested on the Sabbath, he looked at everything he has made and saw that it was very good, *tov me'od*. So God rested and God is our model and so there's something to be said for that as well as it being one of the Ten Commandments.

Do we need time to reevaluate and rethink things? Let me go back here. So these are basically the rationale for doing the Sabbath.

By the way, does the New Testament say that we must obey the Sabbath? Paul in Romans says that some people observe the Sabbath and some people do not and consider

every day alike. So what I'm saying is that you can make a commitment for yourself, but be careful about forcing it on other people on those who may have other commitments.

U. Tabernacle [83:29-89:58]

What do we know about the Tabernacle? This is a major verse, "Then have them make me a sanctuary for me and I will dwell among them." I will dwell among them, what name of God does this trigger in your head? Immanuel. What does Immanuel mean?—"God with us." "I will dwell among them." Israel is in the desert and where are the Israelites living in the desert? They're living in tents. If God is with the Israelites in the desert, where does God live? In a tent. The Israelites are living in tents in the desert, so God is living in a tent with them. Some people that are friends of mine say that the Tabernacle has this notion of the holy of holies with the cherubim, that this is heaven on earth. In other words, the tabernacle is like a little bit of heaven on earth because of the cherubim. Other friends of mine say that the tabernacle symbolizes the return to the Garden of Eden. Now both of these suggestions I never have been able to get off on. These suggestions are made by some people that I very much respect, but they have never made much sense to me. What makes more sense to me is the tabernacle is a tent and God is tenting with his people. That seems to make more sense than this "heaven on earth" idea, but some people will go in that direction. So for me it's more of God tenting with his people.

Now, I'm going to put up a drawing of the tabernacle. This on your PowerPoint that you guys can download. Here's a drawing of the tabernacle, let's just kind of walk through this. First of all, and I'm going to walk over to the other side here. Let's get the size of this thing. The whole tabernacle is 150 feet long by 75 feet wide. How long is that? How many yards? 150 feet is how many yards? 50 yards. What's 50 yards that you know pretty well? That's like half a football field. Is this huge? Is it about as wide as a soccer field? Now that's the outer core. The inner tabernacle itself is 45 feet by 15 feet. Could that fit it in this room? From here to the back wall is that about 45? And 15 feet, this room wider than 15 feet. So the tabernacle could fit right in here. All I'm saying, is this huge? No, it's not.

When you come in, what direction do you come in from? The east, which means your back is to the rising sun. Is the sun a problem for gods in that culture? Now, where are the tribes of Israel? There were three tribes on this side, three tribes on this side, three tribes on this side, and three tribes on this side. Are the tribes camped around this? There were three tribes on each side.

When you come in from the east and you drop your sacrifice off, who picks up your sacrifice right here and kills the animal? The priests. So do the priests operate in here? You bring your animal here, your sheep or goat, the priest then takes it and burns it on this altar of burnt offering. This is about 7 ½ feet long and they burn the animals up here.

Now, by the way, when you slay an animal is there going to be blood? So this is the laver. A laver looks like a bird bath, it actually does. This has water in here. Why would the priests need water at this point? They got messed up with the blood, so they wash up here. This is the laver and the altar of burnt offering out here.

Now when you go in here you have this, I'm sorry this is a terrible drawing. This is what the Jewish people call a Menorah. A Menorah is a seven branch candle holder. Have you ever seen those Jewish ones with the seven branches? It's a lampstand. Why do you need a lampstand inside this tent? It gets dark in there. This is the Menorah, the lampstand. This is the table of Shew bread here. It is like a coffee table. On this coffee table is the Shew bread, 12 loaves of bread. How many tribes are there? 12 tribes, 12 loaves of bread. This is the incense altar. The incense altar is 6 inches by 6 inches, probably about three feet tall. On this, they burn special incense that God said had to be mixed in a special way. When you came in by the tabernacle, would you know that you were in God's presence by the fragrance that you smelled? Do fragrance or odor and presence go together? Can you tell you're in someone's presence sometimes by the way things smell? I put it in a bad way, but in other words, does smell trigger presence. Yes, so you have the fragrance I should say.

Now here there's a curtain that goes across here. This is the Holy of Holies. The "Holy of Holies" means the most holy place. There's the ark of the covenant there. The

ark is about this big by this big, on top of the ark are the cherubim. Where does the blood get put? Once a year the priest goes in there, on what day does the priest put the blood between the cherubim? The Day of Atonement, the most sacred day, Yom Kippur. If I said Yom Kippur, does that sound familiar? On Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement, they bring the blood in and put in on there. So this is the ark. They carry the ark on their shoulders as they walk.

V. Three Things in the ark [89:59-91:28]

There were three things in the ark. This should sound like a multiple choice question to you. The Ten Commandments are in the ark. Aaron's budding rod, Aaron was to be the leader since his rod budded. They took Aaron's budding rod and put it in the ark. Then they took a pot of manna, they gathered up some manna and put it in there. By the way what does the word "manna" mean? Do you see there's kind of a play on words here with "manna"?—It means "what is it?" They didn't know what it was, so they called it "what is it?" So these three things then are found in the ark of the covenant. Later on in Israel's history these two things will be gone, and the only thing that will be left in it will be the Ten Commandments. So the pot of manna and Aaron's rod were lost while the Ten Commandments are the only thing left in the ark.

So that's the tabernacle. We've got a test on Thursday. I had one more slide to go, this slide here won't be on the exam. So don't worry about this question on abortion.

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History, Literature and Theology course, Lecture #12: The Plagues and the Tabernacle in the book of Exodus.

Transcribed by Nicole Turk
 Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt-2

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 13[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History, Literature and Theology course, Lecture #13 on the Book of Leviticus: holiness, purity laws, and problems.

Ac. Quiz Preview [0:00-2:33]

Class, let's get started here. We've got a lot to do today. We're going to try to cover the book of Leviticus, which is the most fascinating book in the Old Testament. We're going to try and make it dance today for us.

For Thursday's quiz, what do we have up? Thursday it's Quad Break. So you have Thursday off. Merry Christmas! For the following Thursday you're working on the Book of Joshua. Joshua's about twenty-four chapters. It's not that big or bad. There's an article there on the concept of war, and so that might be interesting to you. It's on war and loving your neighbor as yourself, so it puts those two ideas together. Then there are also some memory verses. Psalm 100 starts out "Make a joyful noise to the Lord." That's another famous Psalm, not quite as famous as Psalm 23, but there's a couple verses and there's Joshua 1:8 which is a really classic verse in the book of Joshua. So, you will be working on Joshua. I'm going to start trying to catch up with you guys. I'll probably never catch up with you all semester but I'm going to start moving faster. We'll get a good chunk of the book of Leviticus done today, probably not the whole thing. So you are going to be working on Joshua.

We're going to jump back into Exodus and we'll get into Leviticus. Before we do that let's open with a word of prayer and then we'll get down to it.

Father, we thank you for this day. We thank you for your kindnesses to us and giving us your Word. We pray for our brothers and sisters in Egypt that are struggling this day, who are under persecution. Churches being burned. Christians being killed. We remember our brothers and sisters and we pray that you might protect them and that you

might give them a sense of meaning and purpose amidst all the chaos that's going down there now. Help us in this class as we go over the book of Leviticus. I pray that you might help me to explain it in a way that is good, that is accurate, and reflects your holiness and your goodness. You are a holy God. It is a great privilege to call you Father and to know that you gave your son Jesus Christ on our behalf. And it's in his precious name that we pray. Amen.

B. Exodus Law on Abortion?—Not [2:34-10:54]

Let's finish up the book of Exodus. What I'd like to do is kind of introduce this one law in Exodus. This is called a case law. What is a case law? Do you realize there are laws like: Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not bear false witness? Those are general principle apodictic laws. There's a whole other type of law that is called "case law." A case law goes like this: if Johnny drinks and Johnny drives, then Johnny will get put in jail. It's an if-then type of law that gives you specific cases. That's why they call it "case law." If the person does this, then this will happen. It is if-then with specific cases prescribing what should happen.

So what we have in Exodus chapter 21, here, is a specific case law. Let me just read the passage from Exodus 21.22. It says: "If men who are fighting—" So you've got two guys fighting. "If men who are fighting hit a pregnant woman..." So you got two guys fighting and what happens. The woman tries to break it up or whatever, she gets into the fight. You've got two guys fighting and then if the woman who's pregnant gets hit. "And she gives birth prematurely, but there is no serious injury, the offender must be fined." The guy who hits the pregnant woman must be fined "whatever the woman's husband demands and the court allows. But if there is serious injury, you are to take life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound and bruise for bruise." We would call that what? The *lex talionis*. Do you remember the eye for eye, tooth for tooth? That's actually listed here. "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, burn for burn" and this is called the *lex talionis*, the law of retaliation. The law of retaliation is given in this case law.

Now, what is actually going on here? You've got two guys fighting, this woman jumps in, she tries to break the fight. The guy punches her. Now, it says there are two situations that come out of that. One is if there's no injury. No injury to whom? The guy is fined that hit her. There's no injury to the woman, but the woman apparently miscarries or has a child and the child, it's assumed here, the child dies. So then, the guy who hit her has to pay a fine for the loss of the child. So then what happens is you have here a situation where basically there is this premature birthing with the baby suffering an injury, most likely death because premature birth back then, they don't do the premies like we do in hospitals today that save the life of the mother and the baby. Back then, the baby would often die. But notice what the penalty is. The penalty is that a fee is to be paid. So this raises the question about the fetus. Is the fetus a person before the fetus is born? And fetus now, there's been a miscarriage as a result of the woman getting hit. Notice a fee is charged here that is arranged by the husband. So apparently it's negotiable. This fee is negotiable and it may depend on what month she was, whether it was early or later and things like that.

But if the woman is hit and we said, if there's damage done to her, well, let's go back. If the woman is hit, then it's eye for an eye tooth for a tooth. Eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth for the woman, if she's damaged. Now, why would there be less for the fetus that dies? Why would there be less of a penalty? By the way, in that culture, too, if a slave gets hurt, was there fee paid for a slave being hurt rather than eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth? So, is there a certain hierarchy for how a fine is applied? Now, does this passage have anything to tell us about the abortion issue? People have used this passage for abortion. Is abortion really the question here? Is this passage addressing the abortion issue? No, it's not. Two guys are fighting, a woman gets in the middle, and bam! They hit her and she has a miscarriage.

Now, let me just work another aspect of this. Does intent matter in terms of punishment? I'm driving down Grapevine Road. There's a kid riding his bicycle. The kid, all of a sudden, out of the clear blue, just turns his bike and swerves right in front of

me and I hit the kid, I kill the kid, the kid's under my car. I just killed the kid. Question: do I go to jail the rest of my life for murdering that kid? Do I probably regret that for the rest of my life? Yes. But do I go to jail for that? Now, by the way, in that situation did I kill the kid? I killed the kid. Question: do I go to jail for murder? Why *don't* I go to jail for murder? You go to jail for manslaughter?! Would I go to jail here? If the kid swerved right in front of me like that? Part of my defense would be, was it my fault or was there anything I could do? The brakes were good in my car and you don't understand, I probably didn't even hit my brakes. The kid just swerved out and it was over. Question: was there any malice and aforethought? Do malice and aforethought count? Yes. Now, is it possible, suppose my brakes were bad and my brakes couldn't stop my car. Would you call that, what? Negligence. There could be negligence and things like that, but in that case there was no malice and aforethought.

Now, let's go back to the woman getting hit. The guy's getting the woman off his back. The woman's trying to pull this guy off her husband or something and he goes *wam!* He gives her an elbow or something like that. Question: is the guy trying to hurt the woman to get the woman off his back? Yes. So for her, it goes eye to eye. Question: he hits the baby and the baby miscarriages. Was there any intent against the baby? There was no intent against the child. So, in other words, yes, the woman, he was trying to hit her but he wasn't necessarily trying to hit the baby. So, I think there's a distinction there between those two. So a fine is given for the child. Does this have anything to do with abortion? No, it doesn't. You have to be really careful about pulling verses out like this and using them for purposes for which they were not given? This was not given to give us the Bible's position of abortion. This, by the way, does this have to do with a fetus? Yes, it does. But it's not given for that purpose and I think you have got to be careful about pulling verses out like this and using them for purposes for which they're not designed or intended. That's my point for this. Be careful about pulling verses out of context of Scripture and using them for a different context for which they were not designed.

This is called a case law. If two men are fighting and if the guy slugs the woman, then this is what it's called "case law." If-then. If this happens, then this happens, then this would be the punishment for that. So the implication for some is the fetus is human. This does not really address that issue, however. That's not the point of this. Is the fetus valued? Yes. But it doesn't answer the whole question. By the way, I'm very much, very, very strongly pro-life, but what I'm saying is you have got to be careful with the context. Develop good arguments and don't use verses like this, that aren't meant to be used this way.

C. Introduction to Leviticus [10:55-12:24]

Now, over to Leviticus. Leviticus, the most fun book in the Old Testament! I'm going to try to make this interesting. Actually, to be honest with you, once upon a time I taught a whole course on the book of Leviticus and actually we had a great time. The problem is the book of Leviticus is thousands of years from our culture? The major theme of the book is this: "Be holy as I the Lord your God am holy." This is the major theme: "holiness."

By the way, this book is called the book of Leviticus. If you take the -cus off the end here, who is the book about, the book of Leviticus? It's about Levites and who would be the other group of people? Levites and priests. What's the difference? What are Levites? They're of the tribe of Levi. So they're Levites, if they're from the tribe of Levi. What are the priests? Where did the priests come from? Aaron's descendants, yes. So Aaron is a Levite, but Aaron's descendants are priests. Aaron was designated as a high priest, his children, his children's children also become priests. So Aaron's descendants are the priests. The Levites carry the Tabernacle equipment. The priests do what? The priests minister at the altar and in the Holy of Holies and things like that. The priests get engaged in doing sacrifices, whereas the Levites are the ones that haul the Tabernacle.

D. Extrinsic and intrinsic religion [12:25-14:03]

Is religion uniquely personal and private with few external requirements? In our culture, have we *privatized* religion? Is it almost out of place to speak in the public arena

about one's religion? Have they silenced, as far as a public expression, the public articulation of Christianity? Has it almost been silenced in the public arena? Your religion is supposed to be something that's personal and private, something that you keep to yourself.

It's kind of funny in our culture, isn't it? Question: is it more inappropriate to speak about *religion* in public or to see *sexual acts* in public? Which is more accepted in our culture? Yes, did you get the irony there? It's incredible! Something that should be very private is made public and it's okay. Something that should be public has been silenced. So, is this something I want you to think about in terms of how has religious expression has been silenced in our culture? It's been very purposeful and I've watched it happen over forty years. It's very particular and now it's almost impossible to speak about religion in public. Does religion have external things? Does religion have its external expression or is it only personal and private?

E. Cult in Old Testament Studies [14:04-23:57]

Here's another one: what is the *cult* in the Old Testament? Now, when I use the word "cult" often times peoples' heads go back to this guy Jimmy Jones and drinking Kool-Aid and all the people that are dead—that's a cult. A cult is people brainwashed and they're go into this cult closed kind of context. That's what *we* think about "cult."

When you're in Old Testament studies, you can't think like that. In Old Testament studies the cult is anything you do externally to symbolize your religion. So, for example, when we prayed before class, question: did I bow my head and close my eyes to pray? I bowed my head—is that part of the cult? Yes, that's part of the cult, that's something I do externally. When someone prays, do some people take off their hats to pray to show respect? Does anybody do this--cross themselves? Is that an external act of worship that you do to symbolize religion. Those are external things. Some of you come from churches that do a lot with the cult in terms of external things like liturgy. Do some of you come from churches that have a lot of liturgy? Do some of you come from churches that have almost no liturgy? So you get into the different traditions. Cult is

anything you do externally to symbolize your religion.

By the way, will some people symbolize their religion externally by wearing a T-shirt? I'm in Greek class and a kid's T-shirt says, "Jesus Rules." Is that an external expression of his religion? So you could say anything that you do externally, liturgy typically in churches is the cult. Is there a lot of external expression of religion in the Old Testament? Yes. They had to think about how they approached God in various ways. So, the cult has to do with the importance of externals as you approach God.

Do externals matter or does only your heart matter? Do externals matter when you approach someone? Now, I used a ritual, I call it "a torture ritual" I have with my wife. I probably shouldn't say it like that, you have to understand, my background as I grew up. I grew up playing athletics since I was a kid in high school I played soccer, basketball, and tennis--three seasons, three different sports. When I went to college, I played two different seasons--basketball and tennis. I don't work out anymore, it's obvious. But when I was younger, did I work out every day. Sweat was part of my life. Does sweat bother me? The answer is: no. I've been sweaty half my life. So then now all of a sudden I find myself married. So I'm out cutting the lawn and then I do the weeding and I'm doing all this work outside and I come in and I got a t-shirt on. So I'm drenched with sweat. Then I have this ritual and I come up to my wife and I say, "Honey...do you love me? How much do you love me? I want a hug!" I come and I usually check how much she loves me. Now the question is, does she love me or love me not? When you're sweaty like that, love me not. But what I'm saying is, what happens? How come when I approach my wife and I'm all sweaty like that--does approach matter? Does that affect how she thinks about me? When I'm all sweaty does that gross her out, and she says, "Get away from me! Get away from me!" "My wife doesn't love me anymore!" No, it's time to take a shower buddy! Time to get your act together. So what I'm saying is: approach matters. How does that affect how we approach God?

The other day I was in my office. Usually when I study in my office, I kick back in my chair I put my feet up on my desk and I read. That's how I read. I kick back, I put my

feet up on my desk and I read. All of a sudden I hear a knock at the door. I turn around (this is the third floor, Frost with all of the faculty up there and nobody goes up there but faculty, nobody can find their way up there and it's like a maze!) So we're up there and all a sudden I turn around and *honk!* There's the president of Gordon College! I've got my feet up on my desk going "Holy cow! There's the president!" Now, question, did I get a little bit embarrassed about that? This is the president of the college. Do I want to be sitting there with my feet up on my desk when the president of the college stops by? I just never have seen the president in 12 years up there. Do I like this guy? He's a real go-getter—so, he's up in my office and all of a sudden it's like "Whoooah! I'm not used to having the president up here." We had a conversation. He's a really good guy. But what I'm saying is: the president shows up—okay, now suppose Elaine Phillips, who I've known for 35 years, as a good friend. Elaine pops over and I've got my feet up on the desk. Is that a big deal? No. She knows me, it's no problem. Question: president shows up, big deal? So question: does it matter, the stature of the person on how you approach? Do you approach your friends the same way you would approach someone who is your boss or somebody that's very significant? How would you approach the president of the United States? Would there be a sense of "He's the president of the United States!" There's that sense of respect.

So, what I'm saying is as you approach God, are there certain things God says that are repulsive to him and are there certain things that God likes? Actually I'm referring to Psalm 15. Does God like gossipers? No, he doesn't. So you gossip and come to God? God says, "I don't like that." Does God like people that are righteous, that are kind, that are just, that are fair, that are compassionate to the poor? Yes. Those people God likes.

So this whole, book of Leviticus then describes how one approaches a holy God. There's certain things that are an abomination to him, that are offensive to him, and that are disgusting to him. It's like coming to him with a soaking wet T-shirt and asking for a hug. It's just not appropriate at that point because you're coming in the wrong way. So the book of Leviticus describes this approach.

Now, here's another way to look at pretty much the same thing: what in life is secular? My car's low on gas. I'm going to go buy some gas on the way home probably or tomorrow morning. Question: when I go to buy gas is that secular or sacred? Well, it's impoverishing is what it is. But is it secular or sacred? When I go to the gas station it's a secular thing. I'm going to go up to Sam's Club probably this weekend and buy some food because my son's coming back and he eats like a horse. So I need to buy all this food and stuff. When I go up to Sam's club is that secular or sacred? That's again a secular activity. I go out shopping and I buy all this food and bring it home.

So, what would be sacred? Would going to church, would that be more sacred? Reading my Bible and praying would those be more sacred things? My question is when my wife goes shopping is that secular or sacred? Yes, actually it turns out as many of you answered the question and as a guy you just have got to get used to that. That's sacred time. But anyways, sacred is going to church, reading your Bible, praying, and doing those things are considered sacred.

What the book of Leviticus tells us is, and this is a big message of the book of Leviticus, and this is an important message, the book of Leviticus tells us that the whole of a person's life, *everything* we do is sacred. *Everything we do* is sacred. When the Jewish people sit down to eat, did they have to think about God in the types of food that they eat? Yes. When an Israeli woman has a child does she have to think about God in the having of that child and how many days she's unclean for? As a matter of fact, even when the Israeli people are in the desert and they go to relieve themselves, do they have to think about God? Can they relieve themselves just anywhere? Did God tell them that they have to relieve themselves outside the camp and they have to bury it? Yes. So, all of life is sacred.

One of the great sayings of Dr. Wilson here is—how many of you here see your studies as sacred? Is it possible to study or do your studies as something that's totally secular? Can Calculus be made sacred? What Dr. Wilson says is this: "Study is the highest form of worship." In other words, what he's saying is take your studies, can you offer your studies up to God. Can even your study of mathematics or biology, chemistry,

physics, whatever, literature, be offered up to God? So all of life, and especially study, is the highest form of worship. All of life is sacred that's the message of Leviticus. Everything is special. Everything is sacred. There's no secular-sacred distinction in this. Leviticus says that which is secular and sacred, they're one. All of life is sacred and to be lived out in the presence of God.

F. Holiness Theme in Leviticus [23:58-29:21]

Now, what does holiness mean? This is the key verse in the book of Leviticus. You may be vaguely familiar with this verse. "Be holy because I the LORD—"Notice how this is spelled. Capital L, capital O capital R, capital D. What's the Hebrew term behind this? This is Jehovah or Yahweh. See how it's all capitalized? So this is the term for God. "—because I am LORD your God, I am Yahweh, I am Jehovah your God." God would be what the Hebrew word? "Elohim." God's most precious name. He says, "...because I the LORD your God am holy." So you are to be holy because God is holy. We are to reflect his holiness. Now 1 Peter 1.15 in the New Testament echoes the same command. So in other words, this isn't just an Old Testament concept. 1 Peter says the same thing: "Be holy," so we as Christians are to be holy, "because the LORD our God is holy." So Peter echoes the same type of thing.

Now, what does it mean to be holy? The root idea of holiness, I like this phrase here: totally other. What holiness or *qadosh* means is that God is totally other, that God is totally different than anything you've ever experienced. God is different. He's totally other, he's totally different than anything you've ever experienced in your life. By the way, what does that tell us? When we actually meet God are we all going to be shocked? When we meet God are we all going to meet the Totally Other? In other words, there's nothing in this world that's like God. He's totally different. All our imaginations, all our wonderings, God is different than anything we can imagine.

The idea of holiness means this idea of separateness. He's different. He's separate. He's separate from the rest of creation. There's nothing like him. He's separate, he's distinct from creation. God is totally unique. He's *sui generis*--he's one of a kind.

There's only one like him in the whole universe. He's special. That may be another way to say holiness, is to say, "he's 'special'." Holiness is making something special, something separate, distinct, and unique.

Isaiah says it this way. By the way, the book of Isaiah also has a lot on the concept of holiness. Isaiah says this: "To whom will you compare me?" Now first of all, what kind of question is that? Is he expecting an answer to that question? "To whom will you compare me?" What's the answer? Is he asking for a cognitive answer? Is that a rhetorical question? Does a rhetorical question expect an answer? No. So what is he doing here? A rhetorical question is a statement in the dress of a question. What he's trying to say here? "To whom will you compare me?" What is the statement he's making there? There is no one like God. There is no one who is like God? So the statement here "To whom will you compare me?" There is nothing you can compare him to, there is no one you can compare God to. Or "Who is my equal?" [God has no equal,] says the Holy One." Old Testament scholars call this the "incomparability of Yahweh." He is totally different than anything we know. There's nothing we can compare him to, he's totally different.

You need to keep some ideas—now, I thought you were going to go the other way. Some of you will say, "Well, we can know something about God because we were made in God's image, so therefore we know something about God." Okay, we have got to put that aside and say "Yes, God is love." Do we know how to love? Yes, we know how to love. Do we know compassion? Yes, okay. Do we know justice, righteousness, and those types of things. We have ideas of those things, but what this is saying is go beyond that. In other words, those categories don't describe God who is beyond all those things. So the holiness thing is about the beyond-ness of God. It's not saying there are totally no connections. In other words, when you start reading a statement like this, he's saying because we're made in his image there are things where we are similar to God and I think that's what Lewis is referring to there. But there's another sense in which, while we are similar to God in some ways yet there are other ways he's beyond anything we've

ever experienced in life. So, the holiness points out that beyond-ness? So the holiness focuses on that beyond-ness, the other-ness. That would be another way to say it. So, this is a beautiful verse in Isaiah.

G. Holiness does not mean remoteness [29:22-31:52]

Here's another one from Isaiah about this idea of separateness. God is separate, He's distinct from everything. But does separateness mean remoteness? Check this verse out from Isaiah 57.15, this is a beautiful verse. It says, "For this is what the High and Lofty One says." So God calls Himself, "this is what the High and Lofty One says." He's high, he's lofty, and he's out there. "This is what the High and Lofty One says: He who lives forever"—in other words, eternity in both directions, "He who lives forever, whose name is," what? "Holy." Okay, and that's the focus here. "Whose name is Holy." He's totally different. He lives forever. He's the High and Lofty One. He lives forever. His name is "Holy." He says "I live in the high and holy place." The holy place is where God lives. His name is holy and he lives in the high and holy place, a place set apart, separate, special, unique. He says "I live in this holy place." So you get this image of this guy high, lifted up, holy and then the verse turns with this "but" here. It's beautiful. He says, okay, this high and holy God, who does he live with? "But also with him who is contrite and lowly in spirit." What does "contrite" mean? It means "the broken ones." Who does God live with? The high and lofty God, the holy one who's separate, who lives in this high and holy place, he lives with the broken ones. Do you see the turn? You get this holy God, rather than living with all those who are high and holy, he lives with people that are broken, the contrite, the lowly in spirit.

Now, by the way, what does our culture tell us? Do you have to promote yourself? You have got to be confident, you have got to promote yourself, you have got to brand yourself, you have got to know yourself. With whom does God live? With the lowly in spirit, with the humble--the humble; with the broken ones. This is beautiful to see. So God's holiness, does it mean that he's remote? God lives with the broken ones. And this—I love the way this verse just shifts from this High and Lofty One to those who are

lowly with whom he lives. This is another beautiful verse from Isaiah.

H. Response to holiness: Fear of God [31:53-37:54]

Now, what about holiness? Does holiness mean that we should be afraid of him? When God's holiness comes is there this fear that comes? By the way, what does the Bible say? "The fear of God is the beginning of wisdom." But how many of us have been taught that the fear of God doesn't really mean the "fear" of God but that you reverence God, that God is awesome and the fear of God doesn't really mean "fear," it means "reverence." I just want to tell you that the fear of God means the "fear of God"--the terror of God. Now by the way, does the notion of the fear of God also mean reverence and respect? Yes, it does. It also means obedience as well. Actually, I've worked on that concept. I actually just did a paper last November on the fear of God. It's online now. It's an interesting concept. Part of the fear of God is this notion of fear. How many of you fear—are there certain individuals that cause fear? You're travelling down the road, all of a sudden the man pulls up in back of you. He's got a set of lights across the top of his car and you have no clue how fast you were going. Question: fear?

I experienced this last weekend. My son was flying out from Logan Airport out to Denver to visit my other son and they're going to go elk hunting. So I have a gun a 30-06 and it's in a case. So my son and I went down, we took him down. His plane was at nine-twenty so we were down there about eight-thirty or so. My son and I walk up and I take my gun case and so he's going to go out and so he has a gun for my other son in Denver who scouted out all the elk. We put the gun case on and they're going to check luggage. So it's going to go through. Apparently, you have to declare that you're flying with a gun even if you check it in. And I, to be honest with you, didn't know the laws and my son didn't know the laws either. So they took the gun case and things and then my wife and I went home.

So he was supposed to be getting on his airplane. All of a sudden about nine o'clock we get this phone call from my son saying, "Dad, how do you get this case open? They want me to open this case." I said, "What do you mean 'open this case'?" He said

they pulled him aside just before he's supposed to fly out. They pulled him aside and forced him to open the case. I said, "Well, I gave you the key to it." He said, "Yeah, but the key won't work." And so I told him there's this special thing where you have got to monkey with the key. So I got him monkeying with the key and he said, "Okay, I got it, I got it." So then he hangs up. About ten minutes later he calls up again and says, "Okay, now how do I *lock* this thing?" And I say, "Okay, well you go back and you have got to get in the right way and you have got to feel it a little bit." And I said, "Don't snap the gear or you're done." So then, all of a sudden, he goes and he calls back.

Meanwhile, my wife is freaking because she realizes he's gotten pulled aside for flying with a weapon without declaring it. That is a felony. It is a federal felony. My wife is freaking out and she's sobbing and sobbing and sobbing and it's "I can't believe you let him go without that. You didn't tell your son!" I said, "I didn't know you were supposed to declare it!" Meanwhile, my other son calls up and he starts screaming (he never screamed at me in his life), he says, "Dad, I can't believe you..." Anyways, he goes off on me and he says, "You'd better get your tail down there! Your son is being hauled off to jail right now and he's going to need your help! You'd better get back down there." I said, "Okay, okay, I'd better get back down there."

Meanwhile, Zach then calls my daughter, who is married to a top lawyer and my son-in-law who's a lawyer tells Zach that he knew a friend who carried on a gun without declaring his weapon, as well, and he was put in prison for two years. The guy that was put in prison was a lawyer. So now, all of a sudden we jump in the car, we're going down there and Robert's calling. He's got a good lawyer friend in Boston and this is like 11 o'clock at night and he's saying "This is going to cost you thousands of dollars and he still may end up in jail because I'm not sure I can get this done." So he's calling up his lawyer friend. We're going down there. Question: was there fear in me? I'm going down there realizing it's my gun. Is it possible "Gordon College Prof. sits in jail for giving an unauthorized weapon to his son." I'm thinking, "I prayed for this kid for seven months when he was over in Afghanistan getting shot at everyday. God brings him back to

America and when he gets back to America they put him in jail!” So, I’m freaking out and going down. But question: was there fear? Now, question: was there fear of the law? Of the police? Have you guys ever had the fear of the police? So there was real fear. So now, you say that doesn’t mean that with God...Police can put me in jail. Does God have power to do other things *beyond* that? So all I’m saying is the fear of God, you need to think about that. I know we’re in a “no-fear” culture but what I’m saying is you need to think about that.

By the way, I actually met the guy that interviewed my son. I came down there and I said, “Excuse me, can anybody here tell me whether Elliot Hildebrandt got on the plane to Denver?” And the guy was going to punch it in the machine. There was another guy kicked back in the corner. He says, “Yeah, he’s on his plane.” So then I said, “How do you know him?” I said, “What did you memorize all the people in the list of the plane or something?” And I was just joking around with the guy because I wanted to make light of this because it was really serious. The guy says, “No, no,” he says, “I only know the names of those guys that are trying to carry on firearms.” Okay, so I just backed off. Did he talk his way out of it? Apparently, he talked his way out of it and the guy gave him a break. He didn’t report Elliott because otherwise it would have been real serious. So question: as a parent, I know never to do that again.

I. Holiness responses: cleanness from sin [37:55-39:01]

So, there is the fear and dread of God. Isaiah is standing before God and God is up in the heavens and these angels are winging around God saying, what? “Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God Almighty.” Isaiah looks at a holy God, seeing these seraphim, cherubim type beings going around with six wings flapping and saying “Holy, holy, holy” and what happens? Isaiah feels what? “I am a man of” what? “Unclean lips and dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips.” He feels his own shame in front of the presence of a holy God. But the angel then takes a hot coal and puts it on his lips and burns and purifies him and says, “Isaiah, you’re my man.” This is Isaiah 6, it’s the call of Isaiah where the angel says—and God basically comes and says to Isaiah, “You’re going

to speak for this holy God that you saw. You're going to be a prophet, Isaiah, and you're going to speak God's Word." So a lot of the book of Isaiah's about holiness because Isaiah saw God in his holiness and then felt this tension between himself and God with his holiness.

J. Holiness moves to the selection of a special people [39:02-39:54]

God's holiness then, he is holy, he is special, he is unique. He moves to select and make a people holy. So God's holiness leads him to select a people and he says here in Exodus 19.6, "You will be for me a kingdom of priests," the whole nation--a kingdom of priests, "and a holy nation." Out of all the nations of the earth, Israel was special. Israel was unique, Israel was separated and special to God. A holy nation, separated from all the other nations of the earth. It is through that nation that God would send his Son. So God's holiness moves to select and make a people holy.

K. Making things holy: Shabbat [39:55-42:03]

Now, can *we* make something holy? Now this is a little bit weird, but just follow me. Can *we* make something holy? The answer is: yes. Remember the Ten Commandments tell us, "Remember the Sabbath Day" to do what? "To keep it holy." How was the Sabbath day holy? Is the Sabbath day a special day? Are we supposed to reverence this Sabbath day to make it special? We don't do, what on the Sabbath? Work. You're an Old Testament Jewish person. You don't do work on the Sabbath. By the way, when is the Sabbath? For the Jewish folks it is Saturday? When does the Sabbath start? Friday night when the sun goes down. Most Jewish families, when the sun goes down, the Jewish family will have Shabbat dinner as a family together and that's when they'll celebrate it as a family. They usually have Shabbat dinner Friday night when the sun goes down and the family eats a dinner. They call it Shabbat dinner. When does the Sabbath end? It begins Friday night when the sun goes down and it goes till when? Sun down Saturday night. What do the Jewish people do Saturday night after the sun goes down? They party! The sun goes down, Shabbat is over. Saturday night the sun goes down and everybody's out on the streets. If you're ever in Jerusalem, you must go to Kikar Zion

[Zion Square] and you'll see ten thousand, at least ten thousand Jewish people swarming all over. Everybody's having a good time and they're all out in the streets dancing, partying and getting down. And this is on Kikar Zion, they call it "Zion Square." So anyways, that's the Sabbath. So Sabbath you don't work Saturday night when the sun goes down, boom, then the lid's off and they have fun.

L. Sanctify and holiness [42:04-43:35]

Now, you can sanctify something. Does anybody do Latin? The first part of this, do you see this word 'sancti'? What's another "sancti" word that you know? Sancti is the Latin word for "holy." What's another "sancti" that you know? Sanctuary. If I said a sanctuary, is a sanctuary a holy place where we go to worship? By the way, let me just say this: what about a bird sanctuary? Have you ever heard of a bird sanctuary? Is a bird sanctuary a place that is special for birds? Yes, so the idea of sanctuary being some special place for in that case birds.

[Student asks a question] Jewish folks do it on Saturday because that's the seventh day. It got moved to Sunday basically by the early Christians actually celebrated Sabbath because they were Jewish. The apostles were all Jewish, Jesus was Jewish. They celebrate the Sabbath—when Jesus rose from the dead, they switched to celebrating the seventh day, the special day to celebrate the resurrection of Christ on Sunday on the first day of the week. There was also probably some tensions between the Jewish folk and Christian folk and so largely they moved it to Sunday because of the resurrection. Some of the people celebrate both Saturday and Sunday. But largely the resurrection because the resurrection was on Sunday the church moved our special day to celebrate the resurrection of Jesus. Good question.

M. Holy Oil [43:36-46:40]

So sanctify something means "to set it apart." To set it apart as something special and these are special things to make holy. "How do you make something holy?" What types of things can be holy? There's holy oil. Now when the Bible says "oil," what type of oil does it mean? I heard a preacher once get up and say "Asher will dip its foot in oil"

and that means that the tribe of Asher has oil underneath it and they needed to drill for oil because the Bible says there's oil down there. It says, "Asher will dip its foot in oil." Is that totally bogus? Totally, absolutely, crazy. Whenever the Bible refers to oil it's not referring to 10-20 or 10-30 weight car oil. It's talking about olive oil. They do everything with olive oil. They cook with olive oil. They take olives, they press them, it makes olive oil. They do everything over there with olive oil. By the way, it's really good on bread. Oil is a holy substance. What do they do with the oil? They oil someone, that is they put oil on someone's head. We call that what? Anointing.

Now what is the Hebrew term for taking this holy substance of oil and designating somebody as holy? What do we call that process of taking oil and putting it on someone's head? You say we call that "anointing" but what's the Hebrew term for that? You all know it. I'll say it. It's called Messiah. "You oil someone." You messiah them. Can you hear the word? It's the word *messiah*. The term "messiah" actually comes from—the messiah is the oiled one. So, for example, who was oiled in that culture? Would the priests be oiled or anointed with oil? Would the kings? Does anybody remember Saul? You haven't read that part yet but Saul and David were anointed with oil as kings of Israel. So the kings would be anointed. So the Messiah is the oiled one.

How does the oiled one come over into the New Testament? The New Testament's in Greek. Do you know what the Greek word for "oiled" is? "Christos." Does anybody hear this? Jesus, what? Jesus Christ. You thought it was his last name. No "Jesus Christ" isn't his last name. Jesus, the what? Jesus, the Anointed One. Jesus, the Messiah, the Oiled One. So olive oil is used. When you want to make something holy, you anoint it with oil. So oil is this special substance.

N. Holy Incense [46:41-46:57]

Incense is another thing that's really pretty holy. They would burn incense in a really holy context and the fragrance would fill the air and there would be a special, holy incense. So these are two things that were considered holy in various contexts.

O. Holy Places [46:58-51:35]

Now there are holy places. Do you remember? Moses walks up, he sees this bush burning, so Moses goes, “Whoa! Look at that! This bush is burning the daylights out of itself there!” He walks up and he says, “the bush isn’t burning.” So he walks up, he takes a look and all of a sudden when he takes a step forward what happens? The bush says what? Mission accomplished! The bush says, “Take off your shoes. You’re on holy ground.” So was that place holy? Why was that place holy? There was a bush that was on fire. Why was that place holy? It was a special place because God’s presence was there. Moses approaches and what’s the problem with the approach? You’re getting too close. Take off your shoes. It’s holy ground. Do some religions even till this day express their feeling of holiness by taking off their shoes? So this is holy ground there.

The Holy of Holies. Now what does this mean--the “Holy of Holies”? if I said to you “the Song of Songs” what am I referring to? Song of Solomon, but it’s called “The Song of Songs.” When the Jewish people say “the Song of Songs” plural, what they mean is that this is the best song ever. It’s a way of doing superlatives for them. The Song of Songs means the absolute best song. So when they say the Holy of Holies what does this mean? This is the most holy place. This is as that song is the best song ever, so this is the most holy place ever. The Holy of Holies is the most sacred place. So it’s a way for them to say the best, the most holy, or the holiest of all. Like we would use “-est” on the end of a word to make it the “most.”

“The Lord is in his holy temple. Let all the earth be silent before him.” The Lord is in his holy temple. Why is the temple holy? Because his presence is there. His presence then makes that place holy. Let me just narrate what she just said. It’s exactly right. On the day of atonement, once a year they would go into the Holy of Holies. They were so afraid that something would happen to the High Priest, they basically would tie a rope around him and then a bell. And if he went down then—well the problem is, they went down because they weren’t pure. The other priests go in and what happens to them? They go down, too. So to circumvent the problem they put a rope on him so if he goes down

they can pull him out. So that would be for the tabernacle Holy of Holies.

Now what we have so far here, we've had the Holy of Holies in the Tabernacle. The Tabernacle where they move in this tent that we've looked at. Eventually the Holy of Holies will come to reside in the temple and you'll have it behind the veil there of the temple.

By the way, you all said "the holy mountain." What is the holy mountain? What is the name of the mountain that God calls "My holy mountain." What mountain is that? Mount Zion. Has anybody ever heard of that? Mount Zion, is in Jerusalem, the temple Mount. God calls it "My holy mountain." By the way, let me just do another one, just out of my head. Do you guys remember Mount Sinai? You guys have read Exodus 32. Remember the mountain shaking? God's presence was on the mountain. God's people were they allowed on that mountain or were they told to stay off of it? The whole mountain became holy. God's presence was there. Moses gets to go up. The people stay off the mountain. The animals were to stay off the mount, too. So God's presence in a place makes it holy. Have some of you experienced places that are special places to you where you've met God? Those are special places. I want to call those holy places. They are special places where you've met God. Different places and different things are holy.

P. Holy Days [Holi-days] [51:36-53:08]

Then here are some other things that are holy. If you say this fast three times, what do you get? "Holy Days." Holy days becomes what? Holidays. This is what we call holidays. The "y" changes to an "i" (by the way, "y" changing to an "i" is no big deal linguistically). It's our holidays--holy days. What's a holy day? It's the Sabbath. The Sabbath as we said they celebrate on Friday night, which begins the Sabbath. They have family dinner and then they celebrate the Sabbath with no work. Then on Saturday night the Sabbath ends. The Bible says, "Remember the Sabbath day and keep it holy." So the Sabbath is a big important point. The Jews will have a series of feasts and by the way, will the feasts be listed in Leviticus? Are the feasts going to be important for the priests? Do the priests have to officiate at the feasts? Yes, so the book of Leviticus is going to go

through the feasts in detail because the priests and Levites officiate at these feasts. That'll be Leviticus chapter 23. So these are holy days. There are special times. Are there holy times today? Do some of you have special times that you meet with God? So I'm saying time and then we looked at space. So time and space are experienced in the presence of God and that time and that space become holy.

Q. Violation of holiness: Nadab and Abihu [53:09-54:49]

Now, what happens when holy things are violated? Do you remember these two guys, Nadab and Abihu? Whose kids were they? Yes, these are Aaron's two sons. Did they offer up an unauthorized fire before the Lord in Leviticus chapter 10. What happens to them? They get consumed and they're destroyed. So these two guys, Aaron's kids, offer an unauthorized fire. They are smitten dead in the presence of the Lord. They violate the holiness of God and the holiness of God consumes them. By the way, do you think that affected Aaron very much? When Aaron goes in there, do you think Aaron went bouncing in there saying, "Hey, I'm the high priest, so these kids they didn't know what they were doing. So *I'm* here now." Do you think Aaron went in like that? Or would Aaron go, "Wooooah." So do you see the change of attitude that would've happened? These were Aaron's kids, too. In our culture, do we always get a second chance? The consequences never really come to bear on us because somebody will come to bail us out. So the consequences fall on these kids with no second chance. I think you need to think about that. Consequences happen. God doesn't always move with grace and compassion in long suffering that means that there's no consequences to anything. It's pretty strong here with Nadab and Abihu in Leviticus chapter 10.

R. Violating God's holiness: Uzzah [54:50-56:51]

Here's another one that's also difficult. This one was difficult for David, King David. What was David doing here? This guy's name is Uzzah. The Ark of God had been out with the Philistines. The Ark of God had been going from place to place with the Philistines. The Philistines were getting killed so they say, "We have got to give this ark back to the Jews." So the ark comes back into the Jewish territory. David then makes

Jerusalem his capital and he wants to bring the ark of God up to his political capital. So then Jerusalem would be the religious capital as well as the political capital. So David captures Jerusalem. It was owned by the Jebusites before. David was the one who captured Jerusalem and so that's why it's called the city of David. So David now is trying to bring the ark up to Jerusalem. They put it on a cart. The cart's going up. It's kind of like New England, there's rocks everywhere. So what happens is the cart hits a rock and the ark is going to fly off this cart. What does Uzzah do? Uzzah puts out his hands to stabilize the ark. He touches the ark. What's the problem when you touch the ark? *Boom*, he's dead. You guys all know it from Indiana Jones: you open up the ark and what happens? Everybody's face melts down. By the way, did that scare David? What did David say? David's bringing the ark up to Jerusalem all of a sudden Uzzah's dead and he calls it "Perez Uzzah"--"the breaking forth on Uzzah." David says, "Whoa, keep the ark there." David then didn't bring the ark up at that time but will later.

Next time they bring it up, they bring it up on the priests shoulders, carrying it up, offering sacrifices every seven steps all the way up to Jerusalem. Then David dances before the Lord with all his might, we'll get into that later. But this bringing of the ark of the Lord to Jerusalem, Uzzah, violated the holiness of God and he dies.

S. Violating holiness: King Uzziah [56:52-57:59]

Here's one that you're probably not aware of. This is King Uzziah from 2 Chronicles 26. Uzziah was thinking he was big stuff. So Uzziah's the king and he's going to show everybody he's the big King. He says, "Hey, I'm going to go offer incense by myself. I don't need a priest. I can go do it myself." The priests go, "Uzziah, don't do it! Uzziah! Don't do it! Back off, Uzziah!" Uzziah says, "I'm the king. I'm going in there." He goes in there and goes to do the incense thing and what happens to his hand? All of a sudden *ssshhhhhooooom!* The guy gets leprosy and he's covered with leprosy. By the way, when you've got leprosy are you clean or unclean? Unclean. So all of a sudden the priests just rush him out of there. By the way, Uzziah then, has leprosy for the rest of his life and lives as a leper for the rest of his life for violating, again, that holy space. So

these are three examples of people violating that holiness and you can see the kind of the response that you get there.

T. Sanctifying holy things [58:00-59:37]

Now, how are things made holy? Things are designated or what they call sanctified. “Sancti,” is the Latin word for “holy.” “Sancti” is the Latin word as seen in “sanctuary.” Has anybody ever heard of the study of sanctification? What is the study of sanctification? The study of being made holy. By the way is anybody in the Holiness Movement? In my day they used to have the Holy Rollers. So you basically set apart something for a special purpose. You sanctify, you designate it, often times with oil. How does the transmission go? The transmission goes usually through touch. You anoint someone with oil. Has anybody ever heard the phrase, “laying on of hands”? When you’re designating a minister or an elder in your church or a missionary, have any of you guys done that with a missionary? They come up and they lay hands on you. It’s supposed to be by the laying on of hands through touch you’re designating this person to be a special person who’s going to be a missionary to a special place. You designate that person as being special--dedicated to that cause. So usually it’s through touch and usually it’s through oil. The holiness is usually touch and oil, anointed. You anoint the person, you touch the altar and the altar is holy.

U. Jesus and holiness [59:38-62:59]

Now, here’s a really cool story with Jesus, in Matthew 9.20, and this also occurs in some of the other Gospels. Jesus is walking through a crowd. There are all these crowds around Jesus all the time. “Feed me! Feed me!” Anyways, all these crowds are around Jesus. Question: when you get a crowd like that do people push people? You know, touch people? I mean, we went to a basketball game down at the Celtics there and the guys come running out there. There was one guy that came out. Question: was everybody trying to touch him? Everybody was trying to touch him. This hand touched him. I had Michael Jordan’s sweat on my hand. I would never wash that. This is the honest truth. I did. My son made me do it, but anyways, he went over there....so, we did Michael! I got

him! Michael Jordan—I'll never wash that hand again? Do wash that hand. Everyone's pushing Jesus. Jesus stops in the crowd and says, "Hey, who touched me? Who touched me?" The disciples say, "C'mon Jesus! You've got all these people around here! 'Who touched me?'" You know, Jesus is, "Who touched me?" "There's a hundreds of people pushing you and touching you." But Jesus says, "No, somebody touched me." Now question: you can see the disciples, sometimes they just didn't understand the guy. So he turns around. Somebody touched him, did something happen? Something happened. He turns around and there's a woman behind him.

The woman's got an issue of blood. Now you've read Leviticus. There's a woman there who's got an issue of blood. Question: Is she clean or unclean? She's unclean. What happens when somebody's got leprosy, somebody who's unclean, touches somebody who's clean? What happens to the person who's clean? You've got leprosy and you touch a clean person. When unclean touches clean, what happens to the clean? The clean becomes unclean. What happens to Jesus? The woman touches Jesus. Does Jesus become unclean? No. It backfires. The woman becomes clean. She's healed! Is that cool? Does that totally violate Leviticus? Is all that Leviticus stuff there, is she unclean? She's unclean. She touches Jesus. All of a sudden. She is healed. Beautiful! Absolutely beautiful! So you get this really cool stuff happening with Leviticus and Jesus, "Who touched me?" Well, yeah, she could've been killed. Is it possible with Jesus being holy? My guess is that Jesus is getting pushed around by everybody in the crowd so it probably wasn't that high on the priority list and she was hoping that Jesus would heal her and that's actually exactly what happened. When you're like that it's probably worth the risk? So that's a beautiful story with Jesus and Leviticus and the background of that story.

V. Summary chart of Leviticus: unclean/clean/holy [63:00-66:44]

Now, actually before we do this, this next chart, I love this next chart. This is one of my favorite charts of all we do in PowerPoint, this one is my favorite. This one chart has the whole book of Leviticus. I'll never forget, I was teaching this whole course on Leviticus and I stole this chart off of Gordon Wenham and his commentary on Leviticus.

When I saw the chart it was like the whole book of Leviticus just flashed in my head. This one chart's got the whole book of Leviticus in it. Sorry for overstating it, but this explains the whole book of Leviticus. It's an overstatement, a hyperbole.

You have three different states. You have the state of being "holy." You have the state of being "clean." And you have the state of being "unclean." The woman with the issue of blood she was what? She was unclean. You have got "clean" and then you have got "holy." Now, in much of the book of Leviticus, does it tell you about who's unclean? If a woman has a child, she's unclean for thirty days after having a child and she needs to get purification. A guy does certain things and he touches things he shouldn't because he's unclean. He's got to wash up. If you're unclean, how do you get to clean? If you're unclean, you cleanse. What substance do you use for cleansing? Water. So for unclean to move to clean, you wash. The Jews have a ton of ceremonies where they're washing their hands. By the way is that good hygiene? So they're washing their hands. The other substance that can cleanse, but they don't wash in is blood. So would you have sacrifices taking you this way? The blood shed for the sacrifice. So water and blood cleanse and you become clean.

Now how do you move from clean to holy? For moving from clean, you sanctify. What substance is usually used for sanctifying? Olive oil. You usually use oil, olive oil, for sanctifying, usually anointing and touching. It's made holy. A lot of the book of Leviticus is about this movement.

Then, what happens when something is holy goes the other way? When something is holy, you can profane that which is holy. You can defile or profane that which is holy and it goes down this direction. When you've got something that's clean, you pollute it and it becomes unclean. So you go down this direction coming the other way. Is much of the book of Leviticus telling you these three states and the movement between these three states? Yes. This is like the book of Leviticus in just one chart (student asks question) Yeah, that's why you had to listen very carefully to what I said. When you hit holy here and you profane it, it moves in this direction. Actually it doesn't move directly to clean, it actually moves off the chart when you profane stuff. The same thing here, when you

pollute something that's clean it kind of moves down, right off the chart. So you've got to be careful. On the coming up they work very specifically coming up. But going back down, you're exactly right. It's like you're on a slippery slope here. It's bad to profane stuff. Good observation.

W. Purity Laws [66:45-68:56]

Now, for the purity laws, why is a pig unclean? Why is a catfish unclean? When I was growing up we ate catfish? Do any of you eat ham or bacon? So why is a catfish unclean? Why is a woman—now this is a little trickier—why is a woman unclean after childbirth? Isn't childbirth a natural process? Isn't childbirth approved of God? Why is a woman after childbirth considered unclean? Here's another one: a married couple after having relations is considered unclean. Did God ordain that right from the beginning? Yes, a man and wife are to become one flesh. But so here, a married couple after having relations is unclean. So how do you think about this thing of uncleanness. How are we to understand it? Do you see the differences in these things? So I want to explore the different rationale for that and these purity laws. By the way, is this really foreign to our culture? So what we're doing is we're moving to another culture and we're moving back three thousand years. So in some sense you have got to get out of the American way we think about things. They thought about things very differently way back then.

Here's another one: Why was a priest with a deformed hand not allowed to serve. I've got a good friend Floyd Votaw and he's a librarian friend of mine. He's got a deformed hand. Would he be allowed to serve as a priest? He couldn't serve as a priest. If you say, "Well that's discrimination against the handicapped!" You've totally missed the point of the book of Leviticus. So how do you make sense out of all these things? So that's chapter 21 verse 5 and 17 and other places. Let me try to tackle that now.

X. Alleged explanation of the purity laws: totally arbitrary [68:57-69:37]

Some people say that these purity laws are **totally arbitrary**, that God said, "Do this because I said so." By the way, have your parents ever told you to do something just because "I said so"? Is God totally arbitrary? So that doesn't usually work real well. God

being totally arbitrary doesn't fit his character or his normal pattern of behavior. He usually does stuff for a purpose. So this one I find the weakest of the arguments. To be honest with you, I'd throw that out. It just doesn't match God's character. He doesn't ask people to do things just totally arbitrarily. It seems always to connect with his character, destiny, purposes or goals.

Y. Cultural/cultic view [69:36-70:49]

Here's an explanation: cultic or cultural? What God is saying is: "Hey, you guys, I want you guys to be different than the Canaanites." The Canaanites, when they build an altar what do they build their altars out of? Cut stone. The stones fit together and they build their altars out of cut stone. God says, "I don't want you to build your altar like that. I want you to build your altar out of uncut stones." Now, by the way, when we go back three thousand years, can we tell a Jewish altar from a Canaanite altar? We can tell immediately. Canaanite altars are made out of cut stone down in a place called Arad. For example, you see a Canaanite altar made out of cut stone and the Jewish altars are made out of uncut stone, at least some of them. The Jews actually did make some out of cut stone [e.g. Beersheba]. They weren't supposed to, but they did. So, in other words, "the Canaanite culture does it this way." God says. "I don't want you to do it that way. I want you to do it differently so there's a difference between your culture and Canaanite culture." Some of the laws seem to be explained by this difference in culture. So this does explain some stuff. The difference in culture between the Canaanite culture and the Israeli culture does seem to explain some things as ethnic markers.

Z. Hygienic View [70:50-73:34]

Now here's another one: the hygienic. There was a guy in the 1950s named McMillan, who wrote a book called *None of These Diseases*. He was a medical doctor. He went through the book of Leviticus and he asked, "Is this healthy?" Now, by the way, did the Jews know anything about germs? The Jews had no clue about germs--absolutely no clue. Even the people in early America. Do you remember—has anybody ever been to Williamsburg and how many people died just because of basic health concerns. They

didn't know about germs and these people died because of it. Hygienic then is the way the Jews always wash their hands? Is that very healthy? You don't eat pork. Back in those days did pork have trichinosis? Now, by the way, when you guys go to eat pork, does pork have trichinosis in America anymore? It's all been bred out. So you guys don't have to worry about it. But back when I was growing up earlier, you would not leave pork sit out very long. Would you eat pork without cooking it? Now, today the trichinosis is not a problem. Actually, has anybody ever seen some—this guy that married my daughter, he eats raw hamburger. Has anybody ever seen somebody eat hamburger, without cooking it? They eat ham—raw hamburger? Yes, I'm not kidding you! The guy eats raw hamburger. I don't know. I thought that was really weird. Cook your hamburger, please! But there was trichinosis back then with pork.

By the way, a woman is unclean after childbirth. Should a woman get a break after childbirth? This is the way they did it. For thirty-three days a woman, is unclean after childbirth and it's—by the way, is that a healthy thing for her? Yes, it is.

So many of the rules, let me just do this one more. Think about this in terms of bacteria. When you had to do your number, were you allowed to go to the bathroom inside the Jewish camp? No. The Bible says when you're inside the camp of Israel, you have a problem, you have got to go, basically you have to go outside the camp and you have to bring a paddle with you to do what? You have to bury it outside the camp. Burying it outside the camp, is that healthy? Because if you did it inside the camp, would there be all sorts of flies and disease? And God says, "Hey, no, no, no, when you do your number, do it outside the camp. Bury it outside the camp." Is that healthy? I mean, we still do it today. We call it septic tanks and things like that to this day. So what McMillan does is go through and says a lot of these rules are just downright healthy rules. Does that explain all of them? No, it doesn't.

AA. Yuckiness/Wholeness View [73:35-79:32]

I'm going to propose another one now. This is actually built off a sociologist named Mary Douglas. I've kind of adopted it as my own. But this next one that I'm

going to show you explains some of the really hard ones. The ones that I can't figure out and I have no clue on. This is what I want to call the "Yuckiness View." Does each culture have that which within the culture is yucky? Go back to a ritual with my wife. I like hamburgers. I like them with ketchup. I love ketchup. And so I put ketchup on both sides of the burger. I crunch into it and then I get this ketchup thing going down here and then I go to my wife and I say, "Do you love me? I want a kiss. I want to kiss my gorgeous bride." And I've got ketchup coming down and I know I've got ketchup coming down and I want to see: "Do you love me? How much do you love me? Will you kiss me?" Of course, she won't! "Get away from me!" "Go wipe your mouth!" Question: when I approach her and I've got ketchup hanging down my mouth, question: is that yucky?

Let me use a different example. That was a bad example. Let me use a different example. I'm in a place called Grace College. There's a girl from another part of the world. In that part of the world, this is no joke, they eat spiders. So she's in the dorm and there's a spider and she pops it. Question—yeah, okay? Bad. Does everybody see that? Is that—yuckiness, okay? Now by the way, did she see it as yucky? No. By the way, insects are a good source of protein. She pops it—this is kind of gross to us. I think she was doing it partially for effect. But she popped it. So what I'm saying is yuckiness, different things in different cultures.

Let me do this: Dave Slusher's a friend of mine. Dave had a brain tumor and the brain tumor was right behind his eye. He went to Cleveland Clinic and they went into his head and they pulled the tumor out. It was about the size of a golf ball. While they were in his head they cut a nerve that runs your eyelid up and down on this nerve impulse. They cut the nerve on one of his eyelids. So what happens is his eyelid came down and it was permanently down. So he can see through one eye but his eyelid was down on the other side. Now, what happens to your eye when your eyelid goes down after a period of time? Will your eye atrophy? And so he went blind in one eye. So now he goes up to people. When people come up to Dave, he's very gregarious person and is a wonderful

conversationalist, a delightful big guy. He comes up to people. Will he watch people's eyes to see when they do what? Yes. He comes up to them, he'll talk with them and he's watching their eyes the whole time. Will they look around just talking to him? Then all of a sudden will he see their eyes just stare at that downed eyelid? Yes. Now, by the way, if he's talking with kids will kids be really dramatic? Have your parents ever told you not to stare? So you come up to Dave and he's got this bad eye and all of a sudden you're going, "Holy cow, look at that!"

Now, you're coming in to worship God. Does God want you staring at his eye or does God want you thinking about him in worship? You come up on a priest that's got a deformed hand. You bring your sheep or goat up to offer a sacrifice and you've got this priest with a deformed hand. What are you going to be watching? This one armed priest taking down your sheep. I'm sorry, but how's this guy do this thing? He's got one arm taking the sheep down. Is everybody going to be thinking about how this guy's going to pull this off? I'm not that weird, you guys think the same thing. You're just too polite to say it. But, what I'm saying is do you see how that could take the focus off worship. Everybody'd be thinking: "How's this guy going to wrestle this sheep up there?" So therefore God's saying, Let me use a different word, "I don't want that which is non-normal." In other words, "I want things to be normal so that when you come there's nothing yucky. When you come to my presence, everything should be normal so you can focus on me and not be distracted with this other stuff." So, for example, when you do your number you don't do it in the camp. Now, all of a sudden somebody's walking in the camp going to worship and all of a sudden, "Uggghhhh!" they step in it. And they start trying to wipe it off and they go to worship and they've got this stuff on their foot and it smells. God says, "Get it out of the camp. When you come into my presence I want you to focus on me." So that's what's normal. Now, by the way, what is normal, will that be different in different cultures? And so, that which is whole is allowed as God knows their culture and he says, "That which is whole. When you come before me, I want everything to be normal. I don't want anything to create dissonance when you're coming

to worship me.” So this yukkiness view, I think each culture does have these yucky things and God’s saying, “Don’t do that when you’re coming to worship.” So I like this one because it explains some of the hard ones and says some of the stuff we just don’t know the culture. It seems that there is a cultural differentiation, so that the focus can be on God in an act of worship rather than on the particulars that are around.

AB. Rules for eating Kosher [79:33-86:52]

Now, how do we eat kosher? Let me just tell you in the last class Nate, who is actually Jewish, and I don’t know if anybody in here is Jewish. When you go to the grocery store what do you do? You pick up the can and you look for, it’s got a circle with a K in it. It’s kosher. I’m joking, but not really. Do you guys know about the K on the can? Yes. So if it’s got K on the can, it’s kosher. How do you eat real kosher land animals? There’s two rules for land animals. They have got to do what? Split the hoof and chew the cud. Therefore, is beef good? Beef, is good; sheep, good; goats are good. Pigs are no good why? They split the hoof but don’t chew the cud. So pork is not kosher. By the way, did pork have problems with trichinosis back in those days as well? So, pork is out. You go to a Jewish person. You say, “Hey, let’s go out to get a ham and cheese.” Okay, now just between the two of us, have I seen Jewish people eat pork? Yes. Should you as a Gentile offer them pork? Is that an insult?

Once upon a time, remember I told you Saturday night, everyone’s partying in Jerusalem. Once upon a time I was out at Richi’s Pizzeria getting some pizza. So we’re going out we’re going to get some pizza. There are all these people pushing and yelling their orders for pizza. And all of a sudden, somebody yells out, this is the honest truth, “Pepperoni pizza!!” And all of a sudden, all of these people that are yelling, the whole place becomes like dead silent. Now, what’s the problem? You saw my hair, I did have hair back in those days. Is it clear that I’m not Jewish? Everybody’s looking around. Are they looking around for a Gentile? I was a Gentile. Is that the time where you get out of there? So all of a sudden you start backing up, you realize what’s happened. I didn’t do it! I’m not that dumb. I didn’t do it, but they’re looking around and I’m a Gentile. And so

we just backed out and then took off as fast as we could because that's not cool. Pepperoni pizza...don't do that. Don't do ham, because ham is not kosher.

Now, that's land animals. What about sea creatures? Two rules for sea creatures. Sea creatures' have got to have—actually, do it this way. What's normal for a fish? It has scales and fins. Is that a normal fish? It has scales and fins. So do you see how that normality thing fits in here? Now, that means what? Bass are good; Trout good, Northern Pike good, and Walleye are good. What other game fish do we eat? Salmon good. Halibut good. Tell me about catfish? What's the problem with catfish? Scales and fins. Have you guys ever picked up a catfish? Catfish has got what on it? Skin, not scales. It's like an eel has skin. So they don't do catfish. They don't do lobster either. Actually when I grew up, my dad used to catch catfish, too. I like catfish but if you're Jewish, it's not kosher. That's another thing people suggested, because they're bottom-feeders and things like that where there are also more of a chance for disease. I look back and I say that may be, but I like this idea of normal, that a fish with fins and scales is normal. I think I'd take that over the bottom-feeder because you know, another fish we never ate was carp. Carp are suckers on the bottom but they have got fins and scales. I'd rather eat a catfish than a carp any day.

Yes, let's get on with this. We've got flying creatures. What kind of flying creatures? No birds of prey. What are birds of prey? Birds of prey are birds that eat blood. Do you get the notion that eating blood is not good? The Jewish people are not allowed to eat blood. The birds of prey eat blood. Could you eat a hawk? No hawk. Vultures, good or bad? Bad. Owls, good or bad? Bad. Any of these kinds of birds of prey, like vultures, hawks, owls, and these kinds. What about pheasants? Pheasants, good. I got a family of turkeys that come everyday in my yard now. Are turkeys good? Turkeys are good. What other kind of birds? Oh, quails! Did the Jews eat quails? Do we know that? Remember the quails from the wilderness.

Now, the fourth one here is insects. They actually allow them to eat insects: hoppers, yes; flyers, no. Can you tell me somebody who ate grasshoppers? Does

anybody know from the Bible somebody who ate grasshoppers? Yes, John the Baptist. When I was out in Sinai, Ora, who was our tour guide, (we were out in Sinai for three weeks) she made us walk everywhere. She said, “You’re not riding, you’re walking.” She made us walk and at one place she said, “I’m going to have you walk up here.” We had to walk up over the ridge. And she said, “When you go up there,” she said, “be careful about these black grasshoppers.” They have black grasshoppers. In the desert are many things poisonous? They only get like one chance to strike and so many are poisonous. She said these black grasshoppers will spit and it’s like a bee sting when they will spit. She said, if it hits you in the eye, it will poke out your eye. So we’re out there, walking down this path and guess what? All of a sudden, right in front of us, a black grasshopper sits like that? So I see this black grasshopper. I said, “Hey, I came all the way over from America. I’ve got to see a black grasshopper. I’m going to get a picture of this thing!” So, I’m trying to get down there. I’ve got glasses. I’ve got a camera. So I’m getting down to this black grasshopper. My wife, meanwhile, is screaming, “Black grasshopper! Run! Run! Black grasshopper!” I’m trying to get this picture. Problem was when you do it without a telephoto lens, what’s the problem? The black grasshopper in my picture is just a little piece of black and I totally blew the picture. Anyways, it was a disaster. So stay away from that black grasshoppers. Oh, by the way, grasshoppers, I always said, put grasshoppers in batter, call them chicken wings, nobody’ll know the difference. Do insects have high protein? Yes. And so for insects: hoppers, yes; flyers, no. Hoppers would be grasshoppers. Grasshoppers, locusts, that kind of thing. Whereas flyers would be things like bees and mosquitos.

AC. Three problems in Leviticus [86:53-90:29]

Now, three problems that come up and we’ll just, after we finish this slide, we’ll call it a day. I had a friend Kevin Carr who was in a secular university. The professor in the secular university said, “The Bible is full of scientific errors.” So Kevin, being a wise cracker he was, raises his hand and says, “I’ve read the Bible through several times and I’ve never seen any scientific errors!” The professor says, “Oh, really? You’ve read the whole Bible, right? What about Leviticus 11.6?” And you just see Kevin cringing:

Leviticus. He's a Christian. Does he know Leviticus very well? So the professor says, "In Leviticus 11.6, it says the rabbit chews the cud. The rabbit does not chew its cud." By the way is that true? In order to chew cud you need how many stomachs? Do you need multiple stomachs to chew cud? A rabbit doesn't chew its cud. Is that correct? That's correct. However, is the Bible always talking in scientific terms? Does a rabbit look like it's chewing on things? Now, it's possible—is this the language of appearance? In other words, the language of appearance is not necessarily a scientific description that it's actually cud come up from their stomach. The rabbit chews its food over and over and over again. Is it also possible that this term "rabbit" is a mistranslation and it's really talking about a rock badger? In other words, when you go between countries and you're three thousand years different, is it possible you've got the translation wrong between animals? So it could be a translation problem. It could be that it's just the language of appearance.

The second one is bats. The bats are considered birds in chapter eleven, verse nineteen. The bats are grouped with the birds and you don't mess with the bats. I told you about this guy named Probo who was in prison. Probo was a nonbeliever in prison. Probo puts up his hand when he gets in class and says, "Professor, I found an error in the Bible." And he says, "It says that *bats* are *birds* and everybody knows that bats aren't birds." I ask you: a tomato, what is it? It's a fruit. Question: what happens if you're in another culture and they call a tomato a vegetable? Is that a big deal. Does the whole world have to use the American classification system? Does a bat fly like a bird? You say, "Well, a bat's a mammal." Did they have to follow exactly our classification system? No. They classify things differently, than we do. So it's just a matter of a classification difference. Don't miss the whole point there.

The third thing that's a problem in the book of Leviticus that a lot of people have a problem with is this prohibition against homosexual behavior. Leviticus 18.22 and 20.13 are two passages that come out and say, "Man shouldn't sleep with another man" kind of thing. So those are three problems in the book of Leviticus.

Now, what we will do next time is talk about the sacrificial system. We will finish Leviticus next time. So, take care. Have a good time with a long week end here.

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History and Literature course, Lecture # 13 on the book of Leviticus: Holiness, purity laws, and problems.

Transcribed by Megan Sideropoulos
Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt 2

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 14[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt and his Old Testament History, Literature, and Theology course: Lecture number 14 on the sacrifices and feasts of Leviticus and the beginning discussion on the book of Numbers.

A. Leviticus Review/Preview [0:00-3:53]

Let's begin with a word of prayer and then we'll get down into class for today: *Father, we thank you for this day. We thank you for a beautiful fall day in New England, and we realize that the heavens declare the glory of God. Oh Lord, our Lord, how majestic is your name in all the earth. You've given us eyes to see, ears to hear, tongues to taste, and hands to handle your creation. We just thank you for your goodness and your greatness. Thank you for Jesus Christ and for the great sacrifice that he made and for all the sacrifices in the Old Testament that were harbingers pointing to Christ, the great sacrifice for all time. So we thank you that you loved us enough to send your Son. We pray that you might help us even this day to walk in his footsteps. In his precious name we pray, Amen.*

Let's jump back into where we were last time. We're going to finish Leviticus today and get into the book of Numbers, and so we've got quite a bit of details to work on in Leviticus. We're going to be doing two things today in Leviticus. One will be the sacrifices. I'll teach you guys how to be priests and how to perform priestly sacrifices. Then the other thing is, after doing the really kind of heavy priestly material, we'll talk about the feasts of Israel. The feasts of Israel were times of celebration. So, let's start up with the sacrifices.

One of the questions that comes up as you approach the book of Leviticus is that there are all these sacrifices. You wonder, "Why are there so many different types of sacrifices?" So I want to explain the different types of sacrifices, embedding it in a context of the different aspects of sin. So I want to run through these are different aspects of sin that come up. Normally when people think of sin, they think it is kind of a unitary

flat concept. In other words, sin is sin, and it's just you did something wrong and that's it. But actually sin is a complex of things, and so we want to look at that.

B. Different Aspects of sin: Anger/propitiation [3:54-5:19]

The first thing that sin does, and we see this in the book of Numbers which we'll be looking at later, is that when people sin, God responds with anger. In the book of Numbers, you remember, when they're wandering in the wilderness, God gets angry as a response to sin. How do you handle anger? There's propitiation. What is propitiation? Some of you know what propitiation is. In my case, I did something that I knew my dad was going to be very angry about, so did I voluntarily, all by myself, cut the lawn without him asking so that when he got home, he saw that the lawn was cut and he'd be favorably disposed. I come home, my wife's mad at me for something, and so I did something that was wrong, will I buy flowers? Do flowers kind of cover it over? Sometimes, yes. Can flowers backfire? If the flowers are patronizing then flowers don't work. So you have got to be careful with flowers – they can go either way. What I'm saying is you do something nice to try to appease their anger. So propitiation has to do with God's anger that needs to be propitiated or calmed down. Again, we'll be talking more about anger – our culture doesn't do well handling or understanding anger at all.

C. Aspects of sin: pollution/purification [5:20-6:04]

Sin causes pollution. There's a defiling nature of sin that causes pollution. Have any of you ever been in an environment that is so sinful that you actually physically felt dirty? I've been in such environments occasionally where you actually feel dirty. This is idea of pollution – you feel the pollution, the filthiness of sin. So there's need for purification. A lot of times purification in Scripture will be done with what substance? Water. They'll use water for purification. So from the pollution of sin there's need for purification/cleansing.

D. Aspects of sin: guilt/shame/atonement [6:05-7:11]

Now there is guilt and shame. Have any of you ever done something wrong and we used to have this tradition where, basically, you run into your bedroom, you dive into your bed, you pull the blanket and the pillow over your head and hope you don't get

caught. This is the idea of needing a covering for shame and for guilt. By the way, do we live in a no-shame culture? There's nothing that shames us, but in those days, shame was a really big thing. What do you do to shame? You make atonement for it. What does "atonement" mean? "Atonement" means you provide a covering for shame. So, Adam and Eve sin in the garden. Do they feel shame? So what do they do with themselves? They cover themselves. They hide in the bushes. There's a need for covering. This covering is called "atonement." There is a need for covering for shame and guilt.

E. Aspects of Sin: damage/reparation [7:12-9:58]

Does sin actually do damage to other people? Somebody steals something, does it actually damage someone else? Stealing something actually damages someone else. So reparation when you steal something, and you get caught you have to pay it back. You have to pay it back in multiples of four. You've got to pay back four times what you took. So that's reparation. By the way, does our culture deal with reparation very well? A person does a crime; do they have to make reparation or do we just throw them in jail? We throw them in jail. A person violates and damages another person but do they ever have to make reparation to the person they have hurt? Mostly, not, in our culture. There the person has to face the person they victimized, they have to make reparation. In our culture, we just lock them away and the victim ends up having to fend for themselves. So, this is the idea of reparation. The damage is done, sin does damage to a person. Reparation is that you have got to actually try to fix what you did.

So, for example, somebody does something wrong in our culture. Have any of you guys ever seen where they have to do so many hours of community service. In other words, they violated the community so the judge says "You need to do 40 hours of community service." Is there something good about that? The person can actually work to repay the damage that they've done. So that's the notion of reparation. I wish our culture had more of this notion of reparation. I think it would actually help a lot of the people who have violated others, if they actually had to repay the damage.

[*Student question*] Propitiation is a response to anger and trying to appease the anger of God. So propitiation is an appeasement kind of thing. In my case it would be, I

buy flowers for my wife and I ask her to go out to dinner. I try to make it up to her for something I did wrong. So I'm trying to appease her anger that I'm expecting. Reparation would be she has this very special thing and I just busted it. Reparation would be what? I'd get her a new one and hope that she maybe wouldn't even find out. But you know what I'm saying, appeasement would be what? I busted it, she's going to be angry, and I try to appease her anger. Reparation is "Hey, I'll get you a new one." So that would be the difference between the two. Good point.

F. Aspects of sin: communion broken/confession [9:59-12:00]

Communion is broken. Sin breaks communion between people. A person that lies about another person, gossips about another person, breaks communion with people. So the community is damaged with sin. How do you restore community? It's done through confession. By the way, do you remember in the New Testament, it says that "if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins"? The sins are to be confessed in the community. Then there's restoration. Have any of you guys been in a church where there's been some real bad sin in the church, and the church gets together, the person confesses their sin, and the church gathers around this person, and restores them? This is the process of restoration. Those are really important processes: confession of sin and restoration.

So there are all these aspects of sin. Now, will there be different aspects of the sacrifices that deal with these things? So the sacrifices will be set up to work with some of these concepts here. This is how we do our sacrifices. First of all is the importance of blood. Hebrews 9.22 says, "without the shedding of blood, there is no remission of sin." Ultimately, whose blood would be shed for the remission of sin? Jesus' blood. So Jesus dies. Is Christianity, in a sense, a bloody religion? It very much is. It's through the blood of Christ that we're made whole, we're cleansed. By the way, do you get the irony there? By Christ's blood we are cleansed. Is blood usually a cleansing agent? Usually it is the staining of blood, but here blood is used for cleansing. "Without the shedding of blood, there is no forgiveness of sin" in the New Testament. In the Old Testament the Jews were not allowed to drink blood. They had to drain the blood out of the animal before they

would eat the meat. So blood was specially sanctioned in the Old Testament, in the book of Leviticus here, they're not allowed to eat blood.

G. Five Types of Sacrifices: Whole Burnt Offerings [12:01-13:24]

Now, what did the sacrifices look like? I want to go through, basically, about five of these sacrifices, which are the major types. Five different types of sacrifices and these are from the early chapters in the book of Leviticus. Our first sacrifice is the whole burnt offering and this one's really complex. What gets burnt up in the whole burnt offering? The whole thing gets burned up. So, the whole thing gets burned up, and that's why it's called the "whole burnt offering." Is this going to be the most expensive sacrifice? Yes. When was the sacrifice given? It was given in the evening and in the morning. So in the morning they'd do a whole burnt offering and in the evening, they'd do a whole burnt offering. The whole animal would be burned up. This is the most expensive of the sacrifices. The thing is totally dedicated to God as the whole animal is burned up--totally dedicated to God.

H. Sin/Purification offering [13:25-16:18]

Now, another type of offering that occurs in Leviticus, chapter 4, is what's called the "sin" or "purification offering." The different translations of your Bible will translate these offerings differently, but they're really the same thing: the sin and the purification offering. In this offering, the status of the person counts for something. So if you're a priest, you have to offer a bullock or some big animal. If you're a community leader, you offer something more. If you're a regular person, you offer up a sheep or goat. So if you're a priest, you have to offer up much more. If you're a commoner, you offer up simply a sheep or a goat for yourself. What's very interesting with this sacrifice is, if you're poor, you can offer up two turtle doves. Now, this brings me over to the New Testament. Think about the book of Leviticus. Mary has Jesus as a son. She gives birth to Jesus. Is Mary unclean? Is a woman after childbirth unclean? 33 or 66 days. After her period of uncleanness is over, does she have to come and offer up a purification offering? Yes. When Joseph and Mary come for purification, what does Mary offer up in the New Testament? Does anybody remember that? Two turtle doves. What does that tell us about

their status in that culture? Was Jesus reared in a middle class family or was Jesus reared in a poor family? Two turtle doves tell us Jesus was not rich. You say, “Well, carpenters make good union wages!” That’s just down in Boston. Jesus was raised in a poor family. Mary offers up two turtle doves. That tells us they were not people of high status at all and probably more the reverse of that. Whenever purification is needed, they offer up this type of sacrifices.

The other thing that’s important about this one is that the priest got to eat some of this. They would wave certain parts of the animal before the Lord and they themselves would get to eat some of it. By the way, in these sacrifices, was God providing for his priesthood? Did the priesthood actually get food out of these sacrifices? Yes. So, God’s taking care of the priesthood because the priests are not going to have a lot of land. The priests didn’t have farms and land inheritance. They got Levitical cities but they didn’t do a lot of the farming like the other people. So when they brought the sacrifices, the priests would get to eat part of the sacrifices.

I. Reparation offering [16:19-18:21]

Now, the next sacrifice is translated many different ways in different translations: the reparation offering. I like this best, calling it the reparation offering, but almost no translation translates it like that. When you see reparation offering, what is the purpose of this offering? Reparation. Before you offer this one, suppose you stole somebody’s sheep or goat. Before you offer this one up, you have to pay that person back four times what you stole. So you have to make reparation before you offer this one up for some violation. It’s also translated the “trespass offering” or the “guilt offering.” So these are three names – usually it’s translated by one of these. I like “reparation” because it actually tells more what the actual function of this offering is. So it’s for reparation, for paying back.

These two [reparation and purification] are done in almost exactly the same way. In other words, part of the animal is burned up, and the other part the priest gets to eat. So in both of these, part of the animal is burned, waved before the Lord, and the other part the priest gets to eat.

Now, let's suppose you're a priest and you see somebody coming with a sheep or goat, which sacrifice do you want? Do you want the whole burnt offering or do you want one of these? The whole burnt offering, do you get to eat any of that? No. With one of these, do you get to eat some? Yes. Would this be a problem for the priests that laid around as people start coming, their mouth starts watering when they see the sacrifices come. Actually, we're going to see this guy named Eli and Samuel. You're going to see Eli's kids ripping off the meat of the sacrifices. Now, by the way, is that really pretty bad when you rip off God's sacrifice? So for Eli's kids, it's not going to go too well for them. Do you see the problem? These kind of sacrifices, they get to eat some, whereas with the whole burnt offering they did not. So they start hoping for a reparation or purification offering.

J. Fellowship offering: Freewill, Vow and Thanksgiving [18:22-19:56]

Now, another one, and this is the fellowship offering or it's called the "shalom," the peace offering. Peace is "shalom" in Hebrew. So it's called the fellowship offering or peace offering. There are three different ways that this one is executed. It can be just done for a **free will** offering. In other words, you can just bring an offering to God because you want to bring an offering to God. By the way, have any of you heard of a free will offering? This is the background for that. It's just done, not out of obligation or responsibility, it's just you choose and you bring and you offer up a free will offering to the Lord.

This one is also used for the completion of a vow. We're going to look at the Nazarite vow today. When you complete a vow, you do this fellowship, or peace offering, and that's how you finish the vow. You make a sacrifice to the Lord. Sometimes you can do it as a *todah* as a *thanksgiving*, just to "give thanks to the Lord, for he is good, for his mercy endures forever" kind of thing. His *hesed* endures forever prompts a thanksgiving offering. So this peace offering is done for these three reasons.

But what's really neat with this one is guess who gets to eat this one? It's called "the fellowship offering." That means the people that bring the animal get to eat some of this too. So the people themselves get to eat this one. So this one you would eat with your

family and the priests together. This would be a communal meal that's why they call it a "fellowship offering" because everyone gets to eat part of it.

K. Grain Offering [19:57-21:57]

So these are the major offerings in Israel with the animals and then there's one more. I don't like calling this one a "cereal offering" because when I say "cereal offering," what goes through your head? All of a sudden you've got Cheerios going through your head or your Post Toasties or whatever. Actually "cereals" are what? Grain. So it is called the "grain offering." Does anyone remember the two types of grain that Israel had? Wheat would be one. Does anybody remember the other? Barley. Yes, that's right. Wheat and barley are the two grains that were grown in Israel. So you'd offer up this wheat and barley. Was this offering with blood? No. This was a wheat and barley offering. It could be done with oil and salt but no yeast. There seems to be something with yeast making the bread rise that's unacceptable. No yeast, but it could have salt and it could have oil. When I say oil, we're meaning what? Olive oil. So you could put olive oil in with the grain and mix it up and go up from there. So these are the different offerings.

Yes, there would be incense in the environment and you could offer up – actually there's an incense offering. God had special incense made. There are different aspects of that. The priests had special incense that they burned on the incense altar. God specified the formula for that, so there was a particular odor or fragrance when you walk into the Tabernacle that was specified for the priests. But there was also an incense altar and you could burn incense in that area but it's not like the rest of these that are more sacrificial kinds of things.

L. Feasts of Israel: 2 seasons [21:58-26:08]

Let's move on from the sacrifices. We've done all the sacrificing, and that's the hard part. Now let's look at the feasts. Do the Jewish people celebrate? Yes, they do. Do you realize that the one guy that was in prison who the Arabs had kidnapped was a Jewish soldier who's been in prison for five years. He was set free today. So the Jewish people today will be celebrating his release. It's a big deal in Israel even to this day.

So there is a philosophy of seasons. Let me just describe the seasons. In New England, do we get four seasons a year? Some people think really we only get summer and winter. But actually what you're seeing right now is fall. Have some of you gone up to New Hampshire in the fall and seen the mountains covered with leave-changing trees and the beauty of that? If you ever get a chance in the fall, I've been told that the wind is blowing the leaves off the trees this year. New Hampshire is absolutely gorgeous to see the trees in fall colors. So we have fall, we have summer, and we have winter. Are winters big in New England? Then we get spring. And spring is a time of the coming to life. So we get four seasons a year.

Now what I want you to conceive of – is anybody from California here? Yes. The weather in Israel is like, at least I'm told, California in that they get two seasons a year in Israel. For the summer, you get about four or five months of absolute dry. Every day is exactly the same. So when you go to get the weather forecast, here's the weather forecast in the summer in Israel: "the same," "the same," "the same." It just goes on like that because every day you go out, it's sunny. It starts out cool in the morning. It gets hot in the day, and then what happens in the evening? It gets cool again. It gets almost cold at night. And then the next day starts – cool in the morning and warm in the day. No clouds, every day is sunny. Four months absolutely dry. It's the summer season. That's one of their seasons.

What happens then, in the winter is that they get their rainy season. So they have what's called the earlier rains and the later rains. The earlier rains will be in September, October, November – the early rains. Then they get the later rains in the spring. And so they have the early and later rains.

They get a rainy season and a dry season. Does that affect things that they only have two major seasons like that? So in the spring, they're going to basically get their wheat and barley in the spring harvests. Can wheat and barley make it through the summer with four months of no rain? No, they can't make it. So the wheat and barley, they come off the rainy season and your grasses grow.

Then, basically, you get this. If you ever go to Israel try to go in the spring, if you

have a choice. You go in the spring because you're coming off the rainy season, what will happen to the desert? You've got a desert that's all brown and looks like a desert, and then all of a sudden, the rain will hit the desert and what will happen? All the grasses will grow and these little crocus flowers will cover the desert with flowers, and it will be absolutely gorgeous. You see the mountains covered with these flowers and green. What's the problem? How long does that last? It lasts for a couple weeks and then what happens? The dry, warm, summer wind comes in, and what does it do to those grasses in a matter of days? It just turns them brown, and then all of a sudden the whole thing goes back to brown. Then you're brown for the rest of the summer. But for about two weeks in the spring, it's absolutely gorgeous. So in April often times, it's beautiful to be over there. The desert blossoms like a rose, so to speak. Then all of a sudden everything just withers and dies and the summer comes.

M. Passover [26:09-27:19]

So wheat and barley are grown in the spring. We're going to go through the five big feasts of Israel, and these feasts are feasts of harvest. When do you celebrate? You celebrate after you've harvested the crops. So, in the spring will be the wheat and barley harvest. What is the date for Passover? You guys all know this. In Christianity, we celebrate what at Passover time? Easter. That's our Easter. When Christ died and rose again, that's when they celebrate Passover. So we're talking about the spring. Passover is celebrated – what do they do? They've got a lamb, a Passover lamb, they've got the bitter herbs, and what's the other thing? Unleavened bread or crackers. So those, basically, those three things at Passover, for the Passover dinner, the Pesach dinner, and then they go seven days eating unleavened bread. Seven days eating only unleavened bread. Unleavened bread remembering that they had to go out of Egypt quickly and they didn't have time for it to rise. That's Leviticus 23, it tells about the Passover and unleavened bread. Now, that's in the early spring. They start the harvest of the wheat in the early spring.

N. Feast of Weeks [Pentecost] [27:20-29:26]

Now, seven sevens is what? Does anybody do math here? Seven squared... forty-

nine. Plus one is... fifty. Seven sevens is the Feast of Weeks. You see why they call it the Feast of Weeks? It's seven sevens. Seven sevens is seven weeks. A week of weeks. Seven times seven – the Feast of Weeks. Seven sevens and one day added to that makes it fifty: Pentecost. When I say “penta,” what’s “penta”? Penta is five like pentagon. So Pentecost is how many days after the Feast of Passover? Fifty days later. So you have Passover and then you do seven sevens plus one. The weeks of weeks is seven sevens, and you end up plus one, you get fifty, and that becomes Pentecost. Pente – five – cost.

By the way what happens at Passover in the New Testament? Jesus dies. You’ve got the Lord’s Supper and then Jesus goes through and he’s crucified and three days later rises from the dead. What happens at the Feast of Pentecost in the New Testament? Acts chapter 2. “The spirit comes down.” By the way, do we even have churches that are named after this? You have what used to be called the Pentecostal movement. Does anybody go to Pentecostal churches? There are Pentecostal churches – that’s where it comes. By the way, what’s a special passage for them? Acts chapter 2 is about the Spirit coming down, speaking in tongues and that kind of thing. So the Pentecostal churches are based on this in Acts chapter 2.

Now, this is Passover and the Feast of Weeks. This’ll be what? Early – what do we say – April? This one will be fifty days later – we’re into June. Then, usually something like in June the wheat and barley harvest comes to an end.

O. Gleaning [29:27-31:23]

What is gleaning? When you go out to harvest the wheat and barley, there will be some stocks. Just like grass is with stocks, that have the heads on it. The head will have wheat and barley in the head. You take a sickle, you know what a sickle is – you know the communist sign is the sickle. You grab a handful of these stalks and you chop it. Grab a handful, chop it. Chop it, chop it. So you do it by hand. Is it much better to do it with a John Deere tractor? They didn’t have the John Deere tractor, so they’re going to chop it by hand. Now, as they chop it by hand, is some of that grain going to fall on the ground? A lot of it won’t, but some of it will. Were they allowed to pick up the grain from the ground? No. They had to leave – if they chopped the grain, they chopped the stalks, and

some of it fell on the ground, they had to leave it there because the poor followed the reapers--gleaning. Did the poor have to work and pick up the extra grain that was left behind?

They were also, when they pulled out their John Deere tractors and they're doing their fields, they were to round the edges of the corners of their fields. In other words, they were not allowed to reap all the way into the corners. The corners of the fields were to be rounded. Who would harvest the rounded parts of the field? The poor. So, do you see, this was Israel's way of helping to take care of the poor. By the way, did the poor have to get out and work for this grain? It wasn't like they just got it handed to them. They had to get out there with the reapers and follow the reapers and work. They had to go to the corners of the fields and they had to harvest those corners of the fields. So this is called "gleaning." When we get into the book of Ruth, we're going to see that Ruth is a gleaning machine. She's a worker and she goes out and she gleans the fields after the reapers. So this is in the spring. The spring harvests what? Wheat and barley. Those are your grasses kind of things growing up.

P. Fall Harvest [31:24-34:57]

Now, it goes four months without any rain. When plants don't have water, they do what? I tried to tell my wife this. Some people have a green thumb – she's got a brown thumb. Every plant we have in our house is killed. You have to put water in them occasionally. Four months of no rain. Now you ask, "how do plants live?" What happens every morning, they get dew. Why? You guys are the Mediterranean Sea. The Mediterranean Sea comes off of this warm moist air. The land's had all night and what happened to the temperature? The temperature at night drops. The land is cool, the warm moist air comes in off the ocean, the Mediterranean Sea. When the warm, moist air hits the cool land, what does it do? It condenses on the land and causes dew. I've been out on the roads and the dew has been so thick that I've seen the dew go into storm sewers. In other words, it collects; it's so thick and goes down. The dew, then, is how the plants survive the summer. It's the little moisture they get.

Now, what types of plants did they raise for the fall then? Four months of nothing

but sun. By the way, do grapes like sun? To be honest with you, what plant today does Israel grow that's the best in the world? What kind of fruit likes sun--likes a lot of sun, solid sun four, five months straight? Oranges. You get oranges the size of grapefruit over there. They are the best ever. I swear, it's worth the trip just to have some Jaffa oranges. Their oranges are phenomenal because they've had solid sun for five months. So, here they do grapes. Grapes grow and they do a lot of horticulture with grapes and the tending of grapevines. By the way, will the grapes be referenced a lot in Scripture? Have we seen grapes produce what? Wine, grape juice and that kind of produce. We'll see a lot of grapes in Scripture.

Figs will be on these palm trees. They'll have this big clump of figs about that weigh, I don't know, forty, fifty pounds – and there will be all these little figs coming off. Figs are really sweet, and what they'll do to the figs is they'll mash them up and turn it into fig jam. They'll basically spread it on bread. So the figs are something that's really sweet and they'll take it off these palm trees. They'll have these huge number of figs, they'll smash it up. They'll put the fig's sweetness on babies' gums and the baby's mouth for sweets. So figs will be there.

They do a lot with olives. Do the people over there eat a lot of olives? I can't stand olives, so I didn't make it too well. Olive oil – I love food cooked with olive oil. They'll do a lot. They'll crush the olives, make oil out of it, and olive oil will be one of their major products. Whenever you see oil in Scripture, we are referring to olive oil. This is a big staple for them. They will send it all around the world. Figs, olives, and grapes those are what they harvest all fall. This is when they harvest in the fall – usually September, October-ish.

Q. Feast of Trumpets [34:58-36:28]

In the fall, they'll have the Feast of Trumpets. This is called "*Rosh Hasanah*." *Rosh* means "head of the year," so the beginning of the year begins in September. They have a couple different ways that they figure their years.

Now when I say trumpets, what's the problem? You think of a trumpet, you think of what? A brass trumpet playing notes, ta da ta da, that kind of thing. When they say

trumpets, it's a shofar which is a ram's horn. It comes out like this, and it will kind of be a circular thing. They're about this big. They cost about 125 bucks for a little one. You get the big ones with the double swirls; they'll be about \$250, I paid less for my Bach trumpet, when I was playing trumpet. By the way, on these ram's horns, can you play a tune with a ram's horn? Everything's will be this "BRAAAHH" sound. It's not like a trumpet like you guys play, some sort of ode or something on your trumpet. This will be just – they'll be making this big "BRAAAHH" sound coming out of this shofar. It will just be a blowing of this ram's horn. If you ever get to Israel and you want to get something cool a shofar is really good. I wish I had had the money to get it, but they're very expensive. These ram's horns, they still have them to this day. In the fall of the year, starting of the year, "BRAAHH" – the trumpet will go off and they call that the Feast of the Trumpets. This is the start of the New Year.

R. The Day of Atonement [36:29-39:29]

The Day of Atonement will be a 10 days later in this first month. It's called *Yom Kippur*. Now "Yom," you know because we studied it in Genesis 1. "Yom" is what? Genesis 1--"day." So this is day. Yom Kippur is the Day of Atonement. This is the most sacred of all the Jewish feasts. This is the most sacred, the most holy. This is the one where there is quiet reflection on life. A very, very high holy day. Of all the feasts this is very somber when you're reflecting on your sins. Now what actually happens on Yom Kippur?

This is Leviticus 16. Basically, they have two goats. They bring the two goats up, and do you remember that they cast lots for the goat? So one goat is set free, and the other goat is what? Sacrificed. They take the blood, so the blood from the one goat is then taken. Once a year, the blood goes in to the mercy seat. Remember we had the Ark of the Covenant? The Ark of the Covenant was a box like this. On top of the box was this mercy seat with the two cherubim with their wings touching over the top. Between the cherubim was called the mercy seat, and once a year, they would take the blood of this goat that was selected, and they would put the blood on the mercy seat.

Now, by the way, Josephus and some later guys tell us that the priests were scared

because when you're in there, if the blood wasn't accepted, God could kill you on the spot. So what they did was they tied a rope around the priest so that when the priest went in to the Holy of Holies and God killed him all the other priests don't have to go in and try to drag him out and get killed too. So they tied a rope around him with a bell on him, and then if the guy goes down, they just haul him out with the rope. That's a later tradition. But this is the high and holy day when they take the blood and put it on the mercy seat.

What happens with the other goat? The other goat is set free. Do you see the imagery there? One goat dies and the blood is shed; the other goat goes free, and that goat is the scapegoat. So the scapegoat gets set free, but one dies for it. Can you see the idea of substitution there? That would actually play in with Jesus Christ that one person dies and the other person goes free. So this is a high and holy day.

By the way, if you're going to attack the Jews, what's the day that you want to attack them on? Has anybody ever heard of the Yom Kippur War? This is when they were attacked. Now, this is the most high and holy day. Would some Jews not fight on this day? The problem is most Jews are secular, at least a lot of the Jews in Israel are secular. Will they fight? They will fight, and so what happened is that when they got attacked, they attacked back and blew them away. They were attacked on their Yom Kippur and that just shows you something.

S. Feast of Tabernacles or Feast of Booths [Sukkot] [39:30-44:26]

Now, the Feast of Tabernacles. What is that? The Feast of Tabernacles is when they have to go out and live in tents as they did for forty years in the wilderness wandering. So the Feast of Tabernacles commemorates the wilderness wandering when they were in the wilderness with God and the hardships – the hardships of the desert when they were out tenting with God, moving from place to place. It's called *Sukkot*. *Sukkah* is the name of this hut. They have to build these tents and they have to live in these tents.

When I was in Israel, Dr. Perry Phillips, Elaine Phillips' husband, and I went down because we wanted to go to Me'ah Shearim. Me'ah Shearim is where the real

religious Jews live in Jerusalem. Have you ever seen the real religious Jews with the black hats and the black curly q's. They're always walking around "Shema Israel" and they're bouncing like that. So we wanted to go down to see how the Orthodox Jews celebrated with these Sukkahs and see how they built these tents. So we went down to Me'ah Shearim and we noticed that there were all these women hanging on the outside bars of this one place and we heard this music. So we walked up – and, by the way, do the Jews separate men and women worship? Yeah. So the women were not allowed in, and there was a room, bigger than this room, and there's this guy up there wailing on the clarinet. So he's wailing this music, and there's about, I don't know, 200 guys in this room, bouncing around with their hands on their shoulders and bouncing around. So Perry and I think, "Hey, you know, we're males, it's okay. We're not Jewish, but by the way, when you're not Jewish – do you have to wear a kippah on your head then? So, obviously, you look at me, I'm not Jewish. So we got a kippah, put a kippah on our head, and we go down into this room. Well, what they don't tell you is that this is like a football game with no rules. These guys start coming up, and they start bashing you in your ribs. You're going there thinking this is like a community thing, you're with them. All of a sudden, BAM! You get hit. Then BAM you get hit from the other side. I'm a pretty big boy, so you don't start bashing me like that. So we're getting whacked, but you have to get whacked to the music. So every time there's a beat, you're getting whacked. So we said, "Okay, I'm not going to whack anybody back," but I did start protecting myself because it was getting hurtful. What I was really worried about was the hat on my head because what if that hat comes off is there going to be a problem? Yes. You could get stomped to death, and I'm dead serious about that. After we got whacked enough, I was, "It's time to get out of here. We've had enough of this." But it was just all dancing to music, but it was real physical. It was kind of like a male dance. It was like a bash kind of thing. It was, actually, really cool, but I just didn't feel appropriate whacking back, you know what I'm saying? Anyway, although I've been trained – I played football, so I could have done the flipper thing on them, but I just – I thought, "Yeah, all I need to do is do that and then I'm going to have ten guys on me." This isn't too good anymore.

[*Student question*] Well, if your yarmulke falls off – you’re supposed to be wearing a yarmulke, to show respect. If it comes off, then it’s like you’re not showing respect. Yeah, these boys don’t care about accidents. They care that the yarmulke’s on your head. What we should have had, we should have had a hairpin to clip it on our heads. That’s how they keep it on, but I didn’t have a hairpin and so – I was just trying to balance it on my head while getting whacked. It wasn’t good.

So we get out of there, and we come down the stairs and we go out. I want to see these Sukkahs. They are going to build these tabernacles/huts, so we go to see how they build their tabernacles. This is how they build their tabernacles: they use 4x8 sheets of plywood, and they build two sheets of plywood high, and they build two on one side, two on the other, two on the other, and basically they make themselves a little hut, and they put palm branches across the top. So it’s just these 4x8 sheets of plywood.

I thought they were really going to do tents or something like that and it’s just this plywood. I was in electrical engineering, so I notice the electrical cord, and so I look, at the house there and I said, “That’s an electric cord coming out of there. It’s going into that sukkah.” I thought, “What’s this electrical cord going into this sukkah for? They’re supposed to be roughing it out in the wilderness.” So I go up to this guy’s sukkah, and I poke my head in there to see – I just wanted to see why there is an electric cord going into this sukkah. So I poke my head in there and here is this dude, sitting in a La-Z-Boy chair watching television in his sukkah! I’m thinking, “Yeah, Moses, you’re out in the wilderness roughing it, and this guy’s sitting in a La-Z-Boy chair watching television.” It kind of took everything out of me. I’m not saying that everybody over there was watching television. I’m sorry. The one guy that I looked at was watching television. I’m not saying they were all wired like that, they weren’t all wired, I should say that. There was one that was wired and that’s why I looked in there. But anyway, so there are the sukkahs. So that’s the Feast of Tabernacles, remembering the wandering in the wilderness. These are all in September-ish.

T. New Testament Implications [44:27-46:31]

Now, one thing I should say about the Feast of Trumpets – do many of these feasts

have New Testament ramifications? The Feast of Passover, the Feast of Tabernacles. Somebody has once said that Jesus is going to come back on the Feast of Trumpets. This feast has never been “fulfilled.” We don’t know what it really means. It’s just they blow the trumpets. Remember when the trumpet sounds, Christ will descend? And so some people associate this Feast of Trumpets, saying Jesus will come back in – what was it? – 2010 when the trumpet sounds. Oh, 2010. This is 2011. Ah, I missed it. Anyways, what’s the problem with that? Is it possible there is something with this Feast of Trumpets? Question – what did Jesus say? Does Jesus say explicitly, “No one knows” —the what?—“the day or the hour.” So what I’m saying is, I can’t say that this Feast of Trumpets is it.

When somebody starts saying, “This is when Jesus is going to come back.” We had that guy Camping this spring 2012? Does anybody follow that? From the spring, there was this wacked out guy that was saying, “Christ is coming back” just before graduation! Don’t take your finals! Why should you take your finals? Jesus is coming back, right? So anyway, this guy said that and then it didn’t work out as always. This has been going on since, I’ve been around since the sixties. I can remember this stuff. That’s not the eighteen, but the nineteen sixties. You know what I’m saying – so be careful. When anybody starts saying Jesus is going to come back and they use the Feast of Trumpets, should you put a big question mark by that? Get away, this is goofy. So, but there may be something to it, I don’t know, but nobody knows. Jesus says, “No one knows the day or the hour.” So just keep that in mind.

But these are some of the fall feasts. So spring feasts – wheat and barley harvest. Fall feast – grapes, figs, olives – these three feasts in the fall. Did we just go through Yom Kippur? Was Yom Kippur – what was it? Just three, four weeks ago? Does anybody remember Yom Kippur? It happened about three or four weeks ago, that we went through that period.

U. Sabbath and Sabbatical Year [46:32-49:32]

Now, other special times in Israel. Israel had special times of the Sabbath. Every once a week they celebrate the Sabbath--Friday night to Saturday night. From when the

sun goes down on Friday night, basically Saturday is their off day, and they celebrate their Shabbat. Shabbat shalom. Shabbat is on Saturday. It is Friday night to Saturday night. We've talked about that already.

They also have what's called the Sabbatical year, and this is pretty neat. They had a Sabbatical year every seven years. They were to let the land rest. Every seventh year, they were to let the land rest. Would the land regenerate itself then? You know, plants decompose fertilizing the land. So every seven years, they were supposed to let the land rest for a year, and then they could farm it for another six after that.

They were also supposed to release debtors from their debts. Their indentured servants were to be released on the seventh year. In that culture, a lot of the people that became servants. Why was that? Okay, there's a famine in the land, you can't feed your family. There's a rich guy. He's got a big plot of land, and he is able to feed other people. Your family's going to starve. What should you do? Do you tell this guy, "Okay, I will work for you. I will become your servant because I can't feed my family"? And so basically, as a result of debt and famine people would indenture themselves to richer people. By the way, were they supposed to be set free every seven years? So every seven years, you'd be set free from debts and be able to start all over again.

Now, one of the problems is, did the Jews ever practice the Sabbatical year? Did they let the land lay fallow for a year after six years, and then a year off? They never did this. So Leviticus chapter 25, the Jews never did it. Did God keep track of this? He sure did. God kept track of it, and when they go to Babylon, when Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego get hauled off to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar, God says, "You're in Babylon for seventy years." Why seventy years? God says, "My land has not had its rest." God kept track of those seven years he added them up and says, "You're out of here. Now my land is going to get its rest. For seventy years, you're off the land because you didn't do this." So God kept track of it and the Babylonian captivity is seventy years based on this.

[*Student question*] Servants. Yes, your debts would be released. Now there's different ways you get servants. The Jewish servants would be released. Is there another

way you get servants? By going into war and capturing, those kind of people, and that's something different. But the Jewish servants would be set free from debts. But the ones captured in war, I think, would probably continue on because they're in a different environment.

V. Year of Jubilee [49:33-50:59]

The Jubilee year is every seven sevens. Do you get that idea again, of seven sevens? Seven sevens plus one is every fifty years. So it's got that seven-seven thing again. Seven sevens plus one – fifty years, and this is in Leviticus 25. This is when – suppose you fell into poverty and you're getting poor. Can you sell your land for money? Do people pay money for land? So you sell your land for money, but that's your family inheritance. So what happened is every fifty years you were supposed to get your family inheritance land back. Now, what's the benefit of this? In other words, every fifty years, does your family get to start over again? Would this have a tendency, then, to eliminate poverty because every fifty years you got it back to start over again? Would it also eliminate people getting really, really, really rich? Because every fifty years, what happens? They had to give it all back. So this was a way of modifying things. It's an interesting way to structure things I think – avoiding the very, very wealthy and avoiding extreme poverty as well. So every fifty years, the land, the inheritance came back to the family on the year of Jubilee. Slaves were set free on Jubilee as well (manumission of slaves).

W. Purim [51:00-55:09]

There are a couple other feasts. The Feast of Purim is an interesting one from the book of Esther. Does anybody remember – we haven't read Esther yet, but let me just give you a snapshot of Esther. In the book of Esther – it's during the Persian period. Xerxes is king of the Persians. This is after the Babylonians. Who beat the Persians? Alexander the Great. So it goes: Babylonians, Persians, Greeks. That's the sequence. Who's after the Greeks? The Romans. So that's the sequence: Babylonian, Persian, Greek, Roman. So the Persians are taking over, and this one guy doesn't like Mordecai who's a Jew, and he says, "I'm going to kill all the Jews." His name is Haman. So

Haman says because he was not given due respect he thought he should have, he's going to kill all the Jews. Meanwhile, Esther is the queen with King Xerxes. So, she's the queen and she's Jewish. She finds out that Haman is trying to kill all the Jews. So she speaks up then and invites Haman to dinner. She speaks up and ultimately Haman is hanged.

Haman had a gallows built that he was going to hang Mordecai, her uncle, on. Basically, what happens is, Haman is hanged on his own gallows, and the Jews are allowed to fight back. So they avoided this holocaust, this genocide. By the way, in every age, do people like to kill Jews? I mean, this goes back all the way to the Persian period. So here, the Jews are spared this genocide largely because of what Esther did. So they celebrate the book of Esther.

Now, here's how they celebrate it. I'm sitting on a curb, studying my Hebrew, and around the corner, come a bunch of little kids all dressed up like cowboys and cowgirls and carrying these bags with candy, and they come up to me asking me for candy. I think, as an American this is a Jewish what? Halloween! I said, "I didn't know that Jews did Halloween!" So I think, there's a Jewish Halloween! They don't do Halloween. This is the Feast of Purim – celebrating Esther's sparing of the Jewish people under the hand of God. This is how they celebrate it. They go and they ask for candy and the kids all get candy. The kids all get these noise makers too. Have you ever seen these things? They're on the end of a stick and they're like this, and the kids swing them like this, and they make noise? They also have these things, they blow out that make noise. What happens is, when they go to the synagogue to celebrate the Feast of Purim, they will read the whole book of Esther. In public, the synagogue rabbi will read the book of Esther. Now, is that long? It's not that long of a book. But the book of Esther says that the name of Haman is to be drowned out forever. Haman was the guy that was trying to kill the Jews. So Haman's name was to be drowned out forever. Now all these kids are sitting there with these noise makers, so what happens? The rabbi gets up there and he tries to read, ... "Haman!" and he tries to get Haman's name in before the kids can drown him out. So what happens is, he'll read the story of Esther, and the kids will be ready, they're ready to drown out Haman's name. So the guy will try to slip it in before they can do it. By the

way, is that a really cool thing for the kids? Yeah, the kids participate – the kids get to drown out the rabbi? Can you imagine that? In the Baptist church I grew up in you just sit there with your hands folded, except when your parents can't see you, you're shooting spitballs off people's heads, but other than that. Do you see how the kids participate? They drowned out the name of Haman. This is the Feast of Purim. It usually occurs in the month of March, around then. It's really kind of a cool feast for the feast of Esther. Now Esther is way after the Pentateuch and Moses.

X. Hanukkah [55:10-57:08]

Now here's one that you probably know the name of real well--the feast of Hanukkah? If I said to you, "Happy Hanukkah", when does Hanukkah happen? Usually around what feast for us? Around Christmas time. Hanukkah is usually in December, around Christmas time, just before Christmas time. Hanukkah is actually a celebration of what the Maccabees did about 165 BC. Is anybody familiar with book of Maccabees? It's in the Apocrypha. It's after the Old Testament was finished, these Maccabees – basically the same type of thing was happening. This guy named Antiochus Epiphanes was a really nasty fellow up in Syria. Syria was coming down into Israel trying to kill the Israelites and destroy them. They weren't allowed to circumcise, they burned the Scriptures, they killed Jews and were trying to dominate and Hellenize the Jews. What happened is, these Maccabees rose up – their name actually means "hammer" – the Maccabees rose up and revolted against the Syrian ruler and they purified the temple. When they purified the temple, God multiplied the oil of the temple, and so the lampstand lasted for eight days instead of for seven. So they celebrate, then, the Feast of Hanukkah celebrating the Maccabean purification of the temple. By the way, did Jesus celebrate Hanukkah? John chapter 10 verse 22 says flat out it was the Feast of Dedication and Jesus was going down there. So even Jesus – by the way, was Jesus pretty Jewish? Yes, it was Jewish. Jesus is Jewish and he celebrates the Jewish feast of Hanukkah. So John mentions the Feast of Dedication/Lights which is the Feast of Hanukkah from the period of the Maccabees. So these are feasts of Israel, and it's kind of a neat thing. The Jews like to celebrate their feasts and so do we.

Y. The Book of Numbers [57:09-58:00]

So now, I want to jump over to the book of Numbers. A lot of people don't like the book of Numbers. There are too many genealogies, too many names and numbers and things. So the book of Numbers is often passed over very lightly. I want to tell you that the book of Numbers, theologically, has shaped me as much as probably any book in the Bible. And you say, "Are you kidding me?" I'll show you why. There's some really interesting and dynamic stuff in the book of Numbers. It tells about the forty years wilderness wandering when Israel wandered in the wilderness. When they wandered in the wilderness, they had no what? They had no food, no water, no leadership. They had plenty of problems. They were complaining about everything. So, the wilderness wanderings in the book of Numbers is usually considered a negative book, but I want to share some things out of that.

Z. Nazirite Vow [Numbers 6] [58:01-70:18]

In the book of Numbers, chapter 6, we get the story of this Nazirite and what's called the Nazirite vow. So this is from Numbers, chapter 6. There are three rules. How do you become a Nazirite? Do you guys want to become a Nazirite? How do you become a Nazirite? There are three rules, basically for dedicating yourself to the Lord in the way of this Nazirite vow. The first thing is don't touch dead bodies. Now you say, "Well, that's pretty good. I don't want to touch dead bodies anyway." In our culture, other people touch dead bodies for us. In that culture, did they have undertakers or did members of the family have to prepare the body for burial? Yes. And so, if you're a Nazirite, you're not allowed to touch dead bodies, that kind of thing, so that was important.

The Nazirite was not to eat any product of the grape. That means certainly no wine, no grape juice – you could not even eat grapes and you could not eat raisins either. Nothing from the grape was allowed, so no product of the grape at all.

Third – now soon as I put this third one up there, everybody's going to think the same thought. When I put this one up there, who comes to your mind? You're not allowed to cut your hair – Samson? Samson comes to everybody's mind because Samson

was not allowed to cut his hair. By the way, does Samson have some problems with some of these other ones though before he got to the hair? Samson was a Nazirite. He was a Nazirite from birth, so he never got to cut his hair from birth. Question – he wasn't supposed to touch dead bodies, what's the problem with that? Did Samson *make* dead bodies? Yes, okay, so you get the hair – the hair for Samson was the last straw.

These are three things then for a Nazirite vow, and a person would dedicate themselves especially to the Lord. They would take no grapes, no razor on their head, and no touching dead bodies.

Now what was the function of it? The person was separating themselves to Yahweh, they take a vow to separate themselves, especially to the Lord. It showed that God was over one's food, God was over one's family, and God was over even how one kept one's own body. God was over one's food, family, and own body. It was a visible memorial.

If a person has taken a Nazirite vow – by the way, did you have to take a Nazirite vow forever? You had to be born like Samson was a Nazirite from birth and he was a Nazirite all his life. Do you realize that many people took the Nazirite vow for just a year, for two years, or half a year, or something like that? You could take the vow for a shorter period of time. You didn't have to do it for all your life. Now Samson did it for all his life, but as normal people you could just do it for a select period of time. By the way, if you looked at Samson, would you know he's a Nazirite? Why? He never cut his hair. Tell me about the guy's beard and his hair. Now my wife, we grew up kind of back when they had these people called "hippies." So my wife had her hair down her back. Apparently, your hair stops growing when it gets a certain length. Now the guy's beard, I've never grown my beard that long, but I think the same thing with the guy's beard, but would Samson be a big head of hair? He never had his hair cut ever. Has anybody ever seen a picture of Keith Green? Actually, one of my heroes is this guy named Keith Green, and his that haircut reminds me of Samson actually.

Giving up things for God – food, family, even the way one decorates one's body. This is about giving up things for God. Now, how do you complete a Nazirite vow?

When you're finished your Nazarite vow, how do you finish it off? Well, first of all, you offer up a sacrifice to God. Doesn't that just sound natural? You're going to finish your dedication vow to God and you offer up a sacrifice. The second thing you do is you shave your head – has this got to be painful? You shave your head and burn the hair on the altar. So all of a sudden the guy goes from a big head of hair to a shaved head and the hair is shaved. [*Student question*] Yes, Samson. When I say – how many of you say Sampson and put a “p” in your Samson? Does anybody put a “p” in their Samson? You guys are working from the Greek Septuagint, although you didn't know it. Does Samson's name have a “p” in it? No, it doesn't. But everybody usually pronounces it Sampson based on the Septuagint, the Greek text of the Old Testament. They don't even know why, but actually his name is Shimshon. Shimshon is based on the word for “sun.” So Samson's name really means “sunny.” So “Sunny” is Samson's name. Samson – he was a Nazirite from birth. Samuel was also a Nazirite from birth. A lot of people don't associate the Nazirite vow with Samuel, but he was also a Nazirite from birth.

Here's one in the New Testament: Paul. The apostle Paul takes a vow at the end of his ministry as he's coming back to Jerusalem, trying to raise money for the poor people of Jerusalem. Paul takes a Nazarite vow. By the way, does that mean then that Paul needs to go to Jerusalem and burn his hair on the altar? Does he shave his head and burn his hair on the altar? Remember all these people were telling Paul, “Paul, don't go up to Jerusalem. Paul, if you go up to Jerusalem, they're going to capture you there and it's going to be really bad for you.” Question – Paul had taken a Nazirite vow. Does he need to go to Jerusalem to burn his hair on the altar? Yes, he does. Paul carries through on that. Once he gets up there, do they put him in jail? Yes, they do. So, that's the way Paul was. But anyway, he does a Nazirite vow for a period of, I don't know, a year or two--the apostle Paul does that.

Now this raises another question then: Was Jesus a Nazirite? You say, “No, because I've seen pictures of Jesus and he's always well-shaved.” Was Jesus a Nazirite? When I was younger, I was taught that Jesus was a Nazirite, and therefore, Jesus did not drink wine. Therefore, because Jesus did not drink wine, you should not drink wine. Jesus

was a Nazirite. What's the problem with that argument? Yes, Jesus not only drank wine, he made wine. But then you say, "Well, that was grape juice and it wasn't really..." and you go off on all that, but Jesus was not a Nazirite. Jesus was a Nazarene. What's that mean? A Nazarene means he's from the town of Nazareth, that's all that that means. Jesus was a Nazarene, means he was from the town of Nazareth in Galilee. It does not mean he was a Nazirite. Jesus was not a Nazirite. He was a Nazarene from the town of Nazareth. It's significant with what do you do with the alcohol thing? Does the Bible teach abstinence from alcohol? Jesus drank wine. In the Passover cup – we know what was in the Jewish Passover cup. It's wine in the cup. You say, "Is it legitimate and can I drink wine as a faculty member of Gordon College? Yes, as long as it's not on campus. I think they've got a rule, the faculty can off campus. I'm a teetotaler like all the way around. Largely, I don't drink alcohol unless I'm in a cultural situation like I'm in a Jewish context and the guy hands me some wine and you're doing a ceremony and you participate. I counseled with a woman for quite a while whose husband was an alcoholic. He would come home and beat up his kids and do all sorts of really bad stuff. My brother-in-law has had major problems with alcohol. I told you, we picked up everything the man owned, brought it to my house. Another friend of mine, Eric Zimmerman, a real good student friend of mine was killed dead one night when a drunk ran through a stop sign, killed Eric dead on the spot. My friend, he's in the grave to this day because of that. So I kind of, after Eric died, I don't drink.

What's really interesting, I don't drink. Do all my kids drink? Yes. My one son's actually brewing it in these five gallon pails. So it hasn't worked really well in that sense, but I know what I've got to do is right for me.

The Bible, by the way, does not condemn alcohol. The Bible condemns drunkenness. Is the Bible explicit that drunkenness is a sin? The Bible is explicit about drunkenness is a sin. So drunkenness is the problem.

By the way, when you're in Israel – I lived in Israel for a year! The people over there drink wine with their meals. I – to be honest with you, I never saw a drunk in Israel. If you're Jewish and you get drunk over there, do you want to be drunk and walk into the

Arab section? I just want to tell you, you get drunk over there, you could be dead. And so the people don't. They drink in moderation. So, you have got to be careful. The Bible doesn't say abstinence. I abstain for other reasons, but not because the Bible commands that. You've got to work with that.

Now, this fellow in the last class hour, he's from a church where the church takes a stand where they don't do alcohol in the church. Should he go back into that church and say, "My professor says that Jesus drank wine." Is that really ugly? When you're in a context like that, again, I would not make a big deal out of it. If you're in a community where they don't drink and it's a big deal for them, I guess what I'm saying is: chill out. You don't have to go in there as the big – you're going to enlighten them on alcohol kind of thing.

I was in a church, the pastor of a church for a bit in the Tennessee area, where they split the church over alcohol. They blew the church up over alcohol. I come in, knowing that the church is split over alcohol – I came in as a preacher, I walked out the first day – I'll never forget it – the elder board was all lined up and I go to shake their hands and every one of those elders is either chewing or smoking or spitting. Guess what these guys did for a living? They raised tobacco. This is down south. They raised tobacco, and they're all tobacco farmers. They just split the church on alcohol. Now I'm from the north. Did that boggle my mind? I thought, "You split the church over alcohol, which is okay, and yet you guys all raise tobacco, which is killing everybody."

So what I'm saying is did I get up there and make my next sermon on the evils of tobacco? Do you understand why they did the thing over alcohol? These guys were a bunch of moon shiners up there. They were making moon shine in radiators and they were getting lead poisoning from the stupid radiators! So, you know what I'm saying. There were major problems in prohibition days. These guys went over on the other side.

So what I'm saying is, you've got to fit in, I guess is what I'm saying, once again – major on the majors, minor on the minors. There are some things that just aren't important enough to fight over. So if I go into a church where everybody's an abstainer type person, I just abstain. If I go into a church that everybody drinks, I just try to explain

to them why I don't drink, but if I'm in the context where it would be offensive to them, I do. I'll drink whatever I have to drink. So what I'm saying is, just think about fellowship and community as it is more important than what you drink. I guess that's what I'm saying.

AA. Numbers 6 and the priestly blessing [70:19-74:31]

The oldest piece of Scripture is Numbers chapter 6. Let me just tell you the story. I think I've already told this. Do you remember the JEDP theory? Critics say that Moses didn't write this. The Pentateuch was written by a J writer who liked Jehovah's name, the E writer who favored Elohim's name, Deuteronomy was written kind of a separate thing by Josiah, around the time of Josiah, and then the P document was the most advanced, and it was the priestly document because of all the complexity of the priestly regulations. The priestly code was written – the P document--about 550 BC to 450 BC after the exile to Babylon.

Now, let me read to you the priestly blessing out of Numbers. “The Lord said to Moses, ‘Tell Aaron and his sons, This is how you, Aaron, as priest, are to bless the Israelites: Say to them, The Lord bless you and keep you. The Lord make his face to shine upon you and be gracious to you. The Lord turn his face toward you and give you peace.’” How many of you have heard a pastor say, “The Lord bless you and keep you, make his face...” If you go to Park Street Church, Dr. Gordon Hugenburger will end with this priestly blessing at every church service. It's a priestly blessing.

If you are Jerusalem, you guys are the Mount of Olives, there's a valley that comes down here called the Kidron Valley, between the Mount of Olives and Jerusalem. It goes down to the Dead Sea here. There's another valley that goes down this way and cuts across here. They were building a hotel right here and the digging machine, all of a sudden hits something. It was a tomb. This tomb had collapsed – and I think I talked about this earlier – the tomb had collapsed by an earthquake. When they got there all the stuff, including a woman with a silver amulet around her neck, was found there. The woman was still in place with an amulet around her neck. It took them – I was told three years to unroll that silver amulet. Actually, when you're talking tombs in Jerusalem,

you're talking one man, and that name is Gabriel Barkay. I got to study under him back in the seventies, that was that nineteen seventies, and Gabi Barkay was my teacher. One of the really neat things for me was this last semester, we had a Gordon student – by the way, you guys can study in Israel on Mount Zion at the Jerusalem University College. One of our students came back and said, "You know, I took archeology of Jerusalem off Dr. Gaby Barkay" and I thought, No, he can't still be alive. He was old when I was there in the seventies. This guy is so old. He still smokes a pack of cigarettes a day too. I don't know how he does it. But anyway, but he's the resident archeologist of Jerusalem. I've been with him when he walks into a tomb, walks up to the wall of the tomb and touches the chisel marks there and can tell you within a hundred years of when that chisel mark was made. This guy is an exceedingly bright Jewish man who has studied tombs in Jerusalem all his life. He is the world's leading expert on tombs in Jerusalem. He's been in them all, and they got him to find this. He ends up publishing this.

This is the earliest piece of Scripture. When does it date from? It dates from 600-700 BC. Why is that significant? Because the critics were saying the priestly document (P) came from 450 BC. We actually have a piece of Scripture around a woman's neck from 600-700 BC. This is the earliest piece of the Bible that has ever been found. Who was living when this was going around this lady's neck? Do you realize King Hezekiah – has anybody ever heard of Hezekiah? Hezekiah was living when this was going around this lady's neck. Hezekiah in the Bible! So this is really a tremendous find. I was so happy, to be honest with you, for Dr. Barkay that he got to be in on this. This is coming out of the book of Numbers. Numbers 6, the priestly blessing is the earliest piece of Scripture ever found.

AB. Numbers Literary Cycles [74:32-76:10]

The book of Numbers goes on a cycle, and these cycles happen over and over again, and here's what the cycle looks like: first of all, **they have a problem**. What's their problem? Their problem is they're in the desert, and when you're in the desert there's no what? There's no nothing, so to speak. When you're in the desert, there's no water, there's no food, there's no – you've got all these problems. So there's hardship in

the desert and the people will face a problem. Then what do the people do? **The people complain.** And what do they say? They say, “Moses, we wish we were back in Egypt where we ate all these leeks and melons and we had all this food and water,” the Nile River. So the people complain. Then what happens? **God responds.** Does God get angry at the Jewish people in the desert? Yes, you saw it. He gets angry and it mentions God’s anger like a gazillion times, and so God responds. A lot of times God gets angry at the Israelites, and then who jumps in after God gets angry? Moses jumps in and says, “God, don’t do it! Just take it easy on them” and Moses jumps in and **Moses then mediates.** Then what happens? It’s kind of interesting. Does God relent? He’s angry at Israel. He’s going to destroy them or do something – fire or snakes or whatever – and then God relents. Then usually at the end of the story there’s a **summary** that summarizes the story.

AC. Numbers Mini-Cycle Numbers 11:1-2 [76:11-78:11]

Now, what I’d like to do is take a mini-cycle, and I’ll show you this whole cycle in two verses. That’s why it’s called a mini-cycle it’s only two verses, yet has the whole cycle. Then we’ll look at a big cycle. So we’ll do a little cycle first, then we’ll do a big cycle. Two-verse cycle for this pattern in Numbers. Numbers, chapter 11, verses 1-2 – two verses, here’s how it goes. Numbers, chapter 11, verse 1: “Now the people complained about their hardships in the hearing of the Lord.” So the people complained about their hardships. What’s the problem? The problem is the desert hardships. By the way, is the desert a hard place to live? You better believe it. So, desert hardships, and then the people complain. “Now the people complained about their hardships in the hearing of the Lord.”

Then what do you expect to happen next? God responds. “Then when the Lord heard them, his anger was aroused. Then fire from the Lord burned among them and consumed some of the outskirts of the camp.” So, God sends this fire, it consumes things, and people. Fire burns the outside of the camp.

Now what happens? All this is within two verses – this whole cycle. Then what do we have left? We need to pull it together as a lesson at the end, and so it says, “The

place was called Taberah because there the fire of the Lord died down.” So the place was called Taberah. The place got its name from this fire that happened there. This all takes place in two verses.

AD. Numbers 11:4-25 Complaint and Lament Distinction [78:12-87:54]

Now, I want to move to a big cycle, and the big cycle is one that Moses gets involved in personally here. This has to do with the manna. The people get sick of manna and they want meat to eat. They don’t like God’s manna and they want meat to eat. So they come to Moses complaining about that.

Now, before we do this, I want to of set this up. The people complain, and what’s God’s response? The people complain, and God responds in anger and judgment. But what happens when Moses complains? When Moses himself complains, does God get his anger aroused? Does he judge Moses? How come when Moses complains God actually helps him? I want to do is make a distinction – that’s a really important distinction between complaint and lament. I want to make a distinction between these two words – complaint and lament. The words are exactly the same. They are both complaints to God, but the meaning is totally different, and that’s why I think what’s going on – why Moses gets helped and Israel gets judged is because of this distinction between lament and complaint.

Let me use my wife as an example. I’ve been married for – I was saying 36 years, but I need to do the subtraction in my head, and there’s too much up here – but over 36 years. So we’ve been married a long time. Does my wife love me? The answer is, after 36 years, you better believe it. I mean, she’s been through thick and thin with me, but it’s mostly been thin. And so, yes, I know she loves me. We were about in our mid-thirties – she was probably 35-ish, 36-ish. My wife is a very introverted person, a very quiet person – a very social person but very quiet. I’ve never heard – when my kids did all sorts of crazy stuff, I’ve never heard my wife yell. She’s not a yeller. She never yells at my kids. She’s quiet and an introverted person, as am I when I’m outside of class. One day, I did something that was really stupid, and so she started hollering at me, and it was really loud. I had never had seen her raise her voice like that, and she started screaming at me.

Now at this time, we were living in a house that was about – have you ever lived in a city where the houses next to you – you can about put out your hand from the window and you can touch the house next door– there’s a sidewalk between your houses and that’s it. And so we had houses on both sides, a window – it’s summer –it’s all open, and she starts screaming with this voice, it’s like, “Holy cow!” I tell her, “Annette, quiet down, quiet down! I mean, they’re going to call the cops!” And as I tried to quiet her down, guess what happened? Instead of quieting down, she gets louder. I didn’t even know that her voice could go that loud. I had never heard her do this before! So I’m trying to quiet her down saying, “People are going to call the cops on us! They’re going to think something’s going bad here so quiet down.” She would not. She just kept on screaming at me, and screaming at me.

Did she scream at me because she loved me or because she was so angry at me? Let me just do two different screams at me, okay? One scream at me is, “You are such a jerk! I will never let you do – you should never do that again! That was the dumbest thing – I can’t believe you!” And then she says, “I’m out of here. I never want to see you again. I’ve had it with you. I never want to see you again. I’m gone.” What kind of gone is that? “I am gone gone. I can’t take that anymore. I’m out of here.” Okay, is that one type? Was that what my wife was doing when she was screaming at me? No.

What she was doing was saying, “Ted, you did it again. I will not allow you to that again. You are a better man than that. I demand better out of you. And I will not let you do that again because that was just totally disrespectful and totally out of line, and you’re better than that. And I will scream at your face until you become that better man that you should have been.” Now question: is that a totally different way of coming at it? The words can actually be very similar, but in the one case, she’s screaming at me, grabbing on to me saying, “Do better! I love you! You can do better!” The one is coming at a person, the other one is bailing out. Do you see the difference?

When Israel complains, they’re doing what? Are they going after God or are they bailing out? They’re bailing out. When Moses comes at God, is Moses going to get in God’s face? Yes, he will. I’ll read you some of that here. Moses will get in God’s face.

He's not bailing out on God, he's coming after God and saying, "God, this is not right. You've got to do better."

There is the difference between complaint and lament – what I'm really talking about is the book of Psalms. You guys know the book of Psalms because Psalms is psalms of praise to God, right? "Oh, give thanks to the Lord for he is good, for his *hesed* loyal love endures forever." And we sing all the wonderful praises out of Psalms. Let me try – you guys learned Psalm 23 right? But before Jesus, did they sing this for a thousand years? Yes. "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me? Why are you so far from my groanings?" Or go back to Psalm 13 if you don't like that: "How long, O Lord, will you forget me? Forever?" Picture – you're in a church, and some dude stands up and starts his prayer like this: "O Lord, how long will you forget me forever? How long will you" – Would that go over really well? The elders would pull him aside and say, "You know, do you understand? God doesn't forget you. God knows everything. God loves you and has a wonderful plan for your life." What does the Psalmist say? The Psalmist says, "How long, O Lord, will you forget me? Forever?"

Now, that's in the book of Psalms. You want a really bad one? Most of the laments – you're right – most of the laments end on a positive note. Somebody was on my case last year saying, "All laments turn around into positive." No, no. You don't know Psalm 88 – I shouldn't even tell you guys this – Psalm 88 – there's only one psalm in the whole that's a lament and guess how it ends? Most of them come up for air at the end. Does Psalm 88 come up? No. It ends in darkness. And so what I'm suggesting to you is – this is very interesting--Psalm 88.

Now where do you go from here? There is an inability of Christians to verbalize lament. In other words, as Christians, everything's got to be okay. God's in control of everything. God has a wonderful plan for your life. God loves you and has a wonderful plan for your life. Everything's got to be okay. You, as a Christian, should always have a smile on your face because God is just so wonderful. Question – did Moses always have a smile on his face? Did the Psalmist have a smile on his face all the time? What I'm suggesting is, be careful of the people that are high all the time. Also be careful of the

people that are low all the time. Is life lived in the ups and downs of life? Be careful about this Christian everything's-got-to-be-cool thing because I'll ask you – is Moses a man of God?

Listen to Moses as he addresses God: “Moses heard the people wailing,” because there was no meat to eat. So Moses – this is chapter 11 of Numbers, verse 10 – “each at the entrance of his house, and the Lord became exceedingly angry, and Moses was troubled. And he, [Moses] asked the Lord, ‘Why have you brought this trouble on your servant?’” Is that a rhetorical question or is that a real question? “Why have you brought this trouble on your servant? What have I done to displease you to put the burden of these people on me? Did I conceive these people? Did I give them birth?” Moses is saying, “I didn’t give them birth. You put all these people on me– I have got to carry all these people on my back, God. I didn’t give these people birth. I didn’t conceive all these people.” What is the implication? Who conceived these people? Who gave them birth? God did. So Moses is using these rhetorical questions to do what? To accuse God.

Let me finish this first and then we’ll come back to that. “Why do you tell me to carry them in my arms as a nurse carries an infant to a land you promised on oath to their forefathers? Where can I get meat for all these people? They keep wailing to me. Give us meat to eat! I cannot carry these people by myself. The burden is too heavy for me.” Is Moses coming at God in a very, very strong way? By the way, is this Moses, the man of God? Is he one of the greatest prophets in the Old Testament? Notice how he comes at God in a really strong way. What I’m saying is, these things are written for us. He’s lamenting and God deals with him.

AE. Disciplining in Anger? [87:55-91:52]

Now, are you supposed to discipline your children when you’re angry? How many of you have been told, “You never discipline your children when you’re angry”? I ask you, how many of your parents have disciplined you when they were angry? Does God discipline his children when he’s in anger? Now, by the way, is anger a problem? Too much anger can lead to violence and bad stuff. A lot of the guys I know in prison are in prison because in an angry fit of rage. The guy stole his girlfriend and he went out and

got a gun and killed him because he was so angry and jealous. So anger can be really bad. But, on the other hand, have we, living in modern culture, kind of castrated the anger out of our being? Is anger ever appropriate? Does God get angry? We can't handle it as Christians. We love the God of love. God is love, peace. He loves everybody. He has a wonderful plan for your life. You guys have read Numbers. Does God get hacked sometimes? Yes, he does. So you've got to be really careful about stuff. God disciplines people when he's in anger.

Is all anger wrong? The New Testament says, "Be angry and" what? "sin not." "Be angry and sin not." When you see injustice, should there be anger? When you see injustice there should be anger. "Be angry and sin not."

So, in other words, there's a time to be angry and a time not to. Moses uses rhetorical questions, then, not as rhetorical questions to ask questions, his rhetorical questions are his aggressive coming at God. He's rebuking God. Rhetorical questions are often used by the prophets to rebuke the people. In Moses' case here, he's using the rhetorical questions as a rebuke to God. Now here's another one – this is a strong one – is it possible for a Christian to long for death? This is Moses, the man of God, he says, "God, if this is how you are going to treat me, put me to death right now." By the way, do I recommend that prayer to people? No. You're talking with God – what's the problem there? God can put people to death. Does Moses have a phenomenal relationship with God? Yes, he does. Was Moses so down that he says, "God, if you make me carry all these people, I can't do it anymore. If this is how you're going to treat me, kill me. Just take me out right now."

Now, what does God do? Does God rebuke Moses? No, God helps Moses, and God says to Moses, "I'm going to take the spirit on you, Moses,--bring the elders and the leaders of Israel together,--I'm going to take the spirit off you, Moses, and I'm going to put it on these seventy people. Was Moses carrying a load of seventy people? No wonder why the guy was down. He was carrying this load – it's too heavy for him. God distributes the load of Moses onto seventy leaders of Israel. So the spirit of Moses is spread. It's a beautiful thing when God deals with Moses. Moses gets in God's face, but

it's the kind of things where he's saying, "God, do something!" God does something and takes the spirit and puts it on these seventy people. So that's a really neat thing.

Now, next class, we're going to deal with Numbers, chapter 12. Numbers chapter 12 will answer this question: What does God think about interracial marriage? Now that's not a big a question in our culture today, but there's biblical data for that. We want to look at that next time.

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt and his Old Testament History, Literature, and Theology course: Lecture number 14 on the sacrifices and feasts of Leviticus and the beginning discussion on the book of Numbers.

Transcribed by Sarah Woodbury
Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt 2

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 15[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History Literature and Theology course. Lecture number 15, on the book of Numbers.

A. Quiz Preview [0:00-0:54]

Class let's get started, for next week you guys are working on the book of Judges and Ruth. Judges and Ruth go together. There will be articles, we may be back to *Our Father Abraham* and there may be memory verses. So largely it will be Judges, Ruth, articles, the normal routine that we go through. So get that down and we'll make progress then with the books of Judges and Ruth that will be setting us up for the transitioning to the monarchy after that.

B. Interracial Marriage and the OT [0:55-6:03]

Today we've got a lot to go through as we'll be hitting the book of Numbers. We're going to be hitting some pretty interesting and difficult concepts today so let's jump into it. Numbers chapter 12: let me just read this to you and it's regarding interracial marriage. Interracial dating, by the way, I realize in our culture now the interracial thing is not a big deal but it has been in the past at various times and it was in the past for ancient Israel.

So here we are in Numbers 12 and it says: "Miriam and Aaron began to talk against Moses because of his Cushite wife." Now what is a Cushite wife? The land of Kush is generally said to be the land of Ethiopia. What color are folks from Ethiopia?—Black. So Moses' brother and sister, Miriam and Aaron, are both older than he was. Remember his older sister when he was a baby and getting floated down the river? His older sister took care of him. Aaron was his older brother. So "Aaron and Miriam began to talk against Moses because of his Cushite wife, for he had married a Cushite." Now some people think that's Ethiopia and that Moses had remarried. Do you remember that his wife took off on him after the circumcision of their son. His wife disappeared from

the narrative. Some people think she went back home and that Moses remarried someone else and it was a Cushite that he had remarried. Other people think that this is Zipporah. In other words, Miriam and Aaron had not really met Zipporah very much, and therefore they were upset because she was a Midianite. Jethro was a Midianite. She was the Midianite but Midianite can be cast as Cushite. Cushite is a bigger category. Midianite is like a tribal name. So it's possible this is Zipporah. In either case, I'm going to suggest she's dark skinned. That's part of the issue here and so Cushite is possibly Ethiopia. They say, “‘Has the Lord spoken only through Moses? Hasn't he also spoken through us?’” The Lord heard this and at once the Lord said to Moses, Aaron and Miriam ‘come out of the tent of meeting all three of you.’ So the three of them came out and the Lord came down in a pillar of cloud and he stood at the entrance of the tent and summoned Aaron and Miriam and both of them stepped forward. He said to them ‘listen to my words.’” Then let me just see if we've got this. So what does the Bible say about this topic of interracial marriage in regard to Moses and his Cushite wife? This kind of sets it up. But then God switches this discussion here to their prophetic function because Miriam and Aaron are challenging Moses.

The Lord said, “Listen to my words. When a prophet of the Lord is among you, I reveal myself to him in visions.” How does God reveal himself to a prophet? In visions. He says, “I reveal myself to him in visions, I speak to him in dreams.” So are we going to see the prophets dreaming dreams and we are we going to see the prophets use visions. What's the difference between dreams and visions? Dreams are at night when your asleep. Visions are when your wide awake and you see a vision. That's how God deals with prophets but then notice what he says here: “I reveal myself to him in visions, I speak to him in dreams; but this is not true with my servant Moses. He is faithful in all my house. With him I speak face to face.” So God says, “with prophets I use dreams and visions, but with Moses we go face to face.” Is that a pretty big statement about Moses? Is Moses a unique prophet in the Bible. God goes to him head to head, face to face.

“With him I speak face to face, clearly and not in riddles. He sees the form of the Lord. Why then were you not afraid to speak against my servant Moses?” So God

rebukes Miriam and Aaron for what they did. Now, this raises another question here and I want to suggest to you that there's kind of ironic justice here. There's some irony here.

“And the anger of the Lord burned against them and he left them and when the cloud lifted above the tent there stood Miriam leprous, like snow.” You say, “Hildebrandt why do you say that's ironic justice?” Here's my take on this. Miriam gets upset with Moses' black wife and God says, “Miriam, you like white? You like white? OK, I'll make you white Miriam, I'll make you real white.” He turns her skin “leprous, white as snow.” So I think there's a play on this thing here. God says, “You like white I'll make you solid white.” She becomes leprous and so I just take that as humorous irony.

Why wasn't Aaron struck with anything? Aaron doesn't get it here. Some people say why does he pick on women, is it possible Miriam was the main spokesperson. But is it also possible that what's the problem with Aaron getting leprosy? Aaron is the what? He's not just a priest. Aaron is the high priest. Aaron's the high priest for the nation. If he gets leprosy that's not good as it would affect the whole nation. So Miriam gets the leprosy and Aaron gets off the hook but he's rebuked by God. This is a passage about the interracial marriage so what I'm saying is be careful about condemning interracial marriage. Aaron and Miriam did it and it had pretty serious the consequences. God got on their case.

C. Moses and Humility and the authorship of Num. 12:3 [6:04-13:14]

Now, there's a verse I skipped here, and I want to kind of raise it. I skipped chapter 12 verse 3, this verse is used to show that Moses did not write the Pentateuch. Moses could not have written this verse in chapter 12 verse 3. It says in the midst of this conflict between Moses, Aaron and Miriam you get this statement. Now who's writing this I'm suggesting that Moses is writing this and here's the statement. How could Moses have written this? “Now Moses was a very humble man.” Now is Moses writing this: “Now Moses was a very humble man”? Does something strike you about that? People had conflicts with and they ask: how could Moses write that? That would be a very arrogant statement? “Now Moses was a very humble person.”

By the way, what is the nature of humility and what is the nature of pride? Is pride

easy to see in somebody else? Is it almost impossible to see in yourself? Pride is very easy to spot in somebody else, very difficult to see inside yourself. This means then that if you're dealing with pride as an issue, are you going to discover it yourself? Probably not. What do you need to help you? Now here's the religious answer, the Holy Spirit and that's a good answer. Do you need a friend? Would a friend be able to tell you whether you are proud and arrogant? Would a friend be able to see it in you?

Once upon a time I asked my wife the question. It's the last time I asked that question, she told me the truth. Does she know me? Yes, she does. I was thinking we had this loving relationship she'd be kind and gentle. She pulled out both guns and bam! That's the last time I asked that question. But what I'm saying is most likely she got it right. Can she see the contours of pride and arrogance in me. The answer is yes. So what I'm asking, do you have to have the ears to hear good friends telling you stuff? Be careful about pride and humility. Now Moses writes this statement. Is it possible for a humble person to know they're humble? I suppose it's possible.

Now let me read the rest of the verse: "Now Moses was a very humble person more humble than anyone else on the face of the earth." Now he's humble but more humble than anyone else on the face of the earth. You got to be kidding me. Is that an arrogant statement? Now you say God told him to write it, so he just wrote it down. So how do you work with this verse. Some people say Moses could never have written this verse. This verse doesn't come from the pen of Moses. It would be odd from the pen of Moses. Is it possible that Joshua is writing this in here? By the way is Joshua going to finish the book of Deuteronomy? Where is Moses at the end of Deuteronomy? He's dead. From what I've been told it's pretty hard to write when you're dead. So Moses didn't write the ending of the book of Deuteronomy. So Joshua probably wrote the end of the book of Deuteronomy. Is it possible the Joshua went through these narratives and made comments at points? So is it very possible that Joshua could have said, "Moses was the most humble man on the face of the earth." Is it possible that Joshua would have looked up to Moses and Moses was his mentor. So that's a very likely statement from the person

of Joshua. So it's possible. By the way, the NIV puts it in brackets just to say that it may have been an insertion from Joshua or something like that.

Here's another way to look at it. Could a humble person write this. We've asked that question before. Is humility really the issue? He's being attacked by his brother and sister, is humility really the issue? I'm not sure humility is really the issue. There's another way to translate this. This word '*oni*'. It can also be translated another way. It can be translated not "humble," but that Moses was more "oppressed." The word that's translated "humility" here can also be translated "oppressed." Let me read this verse like this now with the word "oppressed" instead of "humility." The word can mean either. "Now Moses was a very oppressed man more oppressed than anyone else on the face of the earth." Could Moses have written that statement? Yes.

Moses is saying, "the people of Israel are on my case and I'm sick and tired of these people asking me for food and for water. The people are one thing, now my brother and sister are on my case and so now even my own family is doing this to me." So Moses was feeling more oppressed then. So if you take it in the sense of "oppressed" it fits Moses and it fits the context here really well. So to be honest with you I like that translation. Now what's the problem? Your NIV, your NSRV, your King James all say "humility" and Hildebrandt says "oppress" which one's right? No, actually, you realize Dr. Wilson did part of the NIV and Wilson's never wrong. That's just about the honest truth. But what I'm saying is that I've got to back off. It can be translated "humility." It may be "oppressed" so frankly I think it says "oppressed" but I could be wrong; all the other translations say "humility." So I've got to have a little humility here and say "oppressed" myself. I give it about a 60-40 split. I'm not saying it dogmatically or anything. I think it's probably right but I could be wrong too. But I like it, because I think it fits the context better.

D. Sending out the Spies into the Promised Land [13:15-14:14]

We're entering chapters 13 and 14 this is after Numbers 12, where Moses is described as the most humble man on the face of the earth. In chapters 13 and 14 Moses

is going to send out spies into the land, and these chapters 13 and 14 are huge chapters in the Old Testament. This is absolutely huge because they're going to go out and spy out the Promised Land. Remember, you guys are the land of Israel. You guys are Jordan, sea of Galilee, Dead Sea. You guys are Israel. You guys are the Mediterranean Sea. They're sending out spies from a place called Kadesh Barnea. Kadesh Barnea is down over here in the northern Sinai desert, and they're sending the spies up into the Promised Land right to here where this fellow is scratching his neck. He's Hebron. They're going to come up to Hebron and they're going to get these phenomenal grapes that are good even to this day. They're going to come back carrying these grapes back from the Promised Land.

E. Can God change his mind? Is God static or dynamic? [14:15-18:43]

So let's just kind of go through some questions then on this spying out of the promised. There's some questions that I want to ask of the text in Numbers chapters 13 and 14. First question is: can God change? If God is perfect, how can he change? Is God static or is God dynamic? Dynamic would have more the sense of change, static would have more the sense that God is fixed, he can't change. So God, is he static or is he dynamic? What does the text say? Is it possible for him to think or interact? How does God think or interact with people as part of change is when you go back and forth talking to people that you change and you interact with. How is relationship possible with someone who never changes?

What never changes? Have you ever had a relationship with a rock? Did you ever have a pet rock? Now you can talk all you want to the rock, you can pet it, dress it up and be nice to it but it's still a rock. The rock never changes so after you're done with it, you say, the rock is still the rock. How do you have a relationship with something that doesn't change. It's a problem, right? I don't care in whatever movie if the guy never changes its going to be a problem. So, here we go.

If he's dynamic, you say God does interact with people, if he is dynamic, in what sense or areas is he dynamic. Is everything up for grabs? I mean could God change everything? I mean if he gets up one morning and says, "you know I've been good all my life. You know being good is really boring, I want to have an exciting day maybe I'm

going to try being bad today. I'm going to be bad and have some excitement today." If God wants to be bad, can he do that? It kind of goes back to those philosophical questions, what can't God do? Can God make a rock so big that he can't pick it up? You say well that's brilliant. There must be no God then because if God can't make a rock that's so big that he can't pick it up so he must not be all powerful. Do you understand embedded in the question is the contradiction. So it's a dumb question is what it amounts to. But can God change everything about himself, or are there certain things that God can't change within himself and how do you work with that? Does God still experience choice, can God make a choice in the now? And you say, "Hildebrandt what does now mean for God." We're in this thing with time but can God make a choice now or did God make all his choices before the foundation of the world? Therefore now he's just trucking through I made these choices a long time ago so now I'm just going through this, this, this, and this. So now God's just going through what he chose a long time ago. Can God choose now, or were all the choices made already? So these are some kind of questions that come up with this.

F. Sending the Spies [18:44-21:45]

Now, here's the story Numbers chapter 13: Giants in the land. Was Moses wrong for sending out spies into the land? Someone once told me that Moses was wrong for sending out spies into the land because he should have just trusted God and gone up there and taken the land without sending out the spies. Why is that not right? Because in Numbers chapter 13 it says, "the Lord said to Moses 'Send some men to explore the land of Canaan.'" Who told Moses to send the spies out? God did. So Moses was not wrong. By the way, would Joshua send spies out into Jericho? You guys have already read that! Joshua sent out spies and then they went and took Jericho. There's nothing wrong just because one serves God doesn't mean one has to be dumb. So you send out spies to spy over the land to see how you're going to take the territory. So God told them to send out the spies.

When the spies go out what did they see? A beautiful land chapter 13 verse 26 and following they go out and they see a land flowing with milk and honey. I love this phrase

have you ever heard this phrase before “the land flowing with milk and honey?” I always get a kick out of this because when you guys hear milk, you guys think “Cow.” Question, how do cows do in the desert? When it’s talking about milk is it talking about cow’s milk? No. What kind of animals do you have in the desert? Goats. So when its talking about milk its talking about goats’ milk, not cows’ milk. When its talking about honey you guys are sitting there thinking about nice honey you pour out of the jar it’s all this sweet honey. A lot of people think this milk is goat milk and this honey is date jam. In other words, they take the dates and beat them up into this jam that's really sweet. But the problem is if you tell Americans they go up to the Promised Land of “goats milk and date jam,” every body's going to say I don't want to go up there. Let’s stay down here and go to McDonalds. But that's probably the truth. It’s “goats milk and date jam.” Cows are up in the area of Bashan area.

G. Kadesh Barnea [21:46-29:33]

Actually I should tell you a story about Kadesh Barnea. Once upon a time I went to Israel and I was developing this program called *Get Lost in Jerusalem*. So my son, Zach, and I were shooting these pictures and we went down along here in the south by Egypt, and we pulled up to a checkpoint which was Egypt on the other side and Israel on this side. The Israeli soldiers came up and I said we want drive down this road. There was a road that went down and I wanted to drive down this road because down this road was this 2000 foot tall mountain that I could climb up and get a picture of Kadesh Barnea. Now why is Kadesh Barnea so significant? There’s a spring there and when the Israelites wandered for 40 years in the wilderness where did they wander around? Kadesh Barnea right there. I could get a picture of it from up on this mountain even though its in Egypt I could shoot down. It's about 20 miles down.

So we pull up to the checkpoint and the guy says: “Hey, I can’t let you in there because you have to either have an Israeli soldier with you or you got to have a gun. We didn't have a gun, so I thought. Stink I came all the way from America this guy’s not letting me in there. I know this road goes down in there. So my son and I go about a half

mile back down the road and I see this dirt road going off to the side so I thought to myself, “you know I bet you anything that dirt road goes around that checkpoint.” I thought, “nuts on this, I didn’t come all the way from America, I’m going to do this.” So we get in this little car going down this dirt road you know rocks bouncing all over the place and guess what, it went right around the checkpoint they never saw us. So we get back on this one lane road. There are not two lanes, one lane. We drive up it about 50 miles down, we get up on this mountain and I got the shot of Kadesh Barnea. I got it. Now, as we were going down the Egyptian soldiers are driving back and forth on their Humvees and they’ve got machine guns and my son's screaming at me, “dad were going to get killed these guys are right there they can shoot us.” We’re under 50 yards away. So he’s freaking out about these guys but obviously they didn’t shoot us. We got there.

We got the pictures. So he was harassing me about these machine guns and getting shot. So I thought he’s desperately afraid of heights and I know that and this road is literally eight feet wide that’s the whole road so we’re going up on this mountain and I come to this place and I notice there’s a couple hundred foot drop so I pull the car up right on the edge of it. I hop out and say, “Hey, Zach, let’s get a picture. He opens the car door and its 400 feet straight down.” You said, you wouldn’t do that to your kid? I’ve been there, done that. You could just see the terror on his face he looks down straight down. There were no guard rails.

But that wasn’t the real problem that was just for fun. Now, what happens is you drive about 150 miles down and now what the real problem is I come up to the checkpoint below Beer Sheva. Now what’s the problem. On which side of the checkpoint am I now? I come down the road and I pull up to the checkpoint but what’s the problem now. I’m on the do not trespass territory and I’m on the wrong side of the checkpoint and I pull up. So here’s what you do when your caught and I thought, “O man, we are so fried. This is really bad because now we got to get out but we can’t get out because we’re in this no trespass zone kind of thing. So that’s when you play the really stupid American. I’m just a dumb American. So I pull up and I say does anybody know

where Beer Sheva is around here? Well, Beer Sheva is here, obviously I know the land like the back of my hand. The guy looks at me, what do you mean Beer Sheva? Well, I say we must be lost we can't find our way to Beer Sheva. Where is that? How do I find that? And also I understand Hebrew. Can I hear him talking in Hebrew to these other guys? I can understand what he's saying. He thinks I'm an American. Well, I could hear him it wasn't too good what he said. So then this sergeant guy pulls up and he says, "Well, I'm going to Beer Sheva you can follow me." So I say "OK, thank you, thank you. So we follow him up and got out of that mess but that was pretty tricky actually and that wasn't too much fun.

So the Israelites come up to Kadesh Barnea into the land. They bring back all these grapes saying, "Here is the fruit of the land, it's the land flowing with milk and honey." But what's the problem? They've got grasshopper vision. They say basically chapter 13 verse 33 thereabouts it says, "we seemed like grasshoppers" to these Anakim and Rephaim. Do you remember these giants that are in the land? "The Anakim and Rephaim and we seem like grasshoppers in our own eyes and we seem the same to them." These people up there are so big they'll squash us like grasshoppers. We can't go up there; there are giants up there. So they bail out.

Then comes the accusation against God. By the way, when the 12 spies went up there, who were the only two that didn't bail out? These names are important. Caleb and Joshua. Will Joshua take over for Moses after Moses passes off the scene. Caleb, did you guys read anything about Caleb in the book of Joshua? Do you remember Caleb got his own land, all the other people over 40 are going to die. Caleb, I call him the "dog man" Caleb means "dog." Is this guy is a fighter, and do you remember even in his old age he's about 75 years old he says, "I'm going to go out and take the land just like when I was a kid. He comes out even when he's an old man taking over his territories. He's ready to fight for his land. So he's really a courageous person. God blesses both Caleb and Joshua.

But the people come up with this accusation against God in chapters 13 verses 3

and 4 check this out: “Why is God bringing us to this land only to fall to the sword, our wives and children will be taken as plunder. Wouldn't it be better for us to go back to Egypt?” And they said to each other, “we should choose a leader and go back to Egypt.” By the way, does God get frosted at them for this bailing out on him? When they're ready to enter the Promised Land, they would not trust him to go into the land. They want to bail out and go back to Egypt.

H. God's resolve to destroy Israel [29:34-32:01]

Now, what is God's response? Joshua and Caleb were men of courage, men of vision, and they said, we can go up there and we can do it by the strength of the Lord. The others voted it down. So is the minority always wrong? Here you've got the minority, two against ten, and the minority was right. They should have gone up into the land. Joshua and Caleb are blessed by God.

But now what's the problem? Does God get torqued at the people? God's response, chapter 14 verse 11: The Lord said to Moses, notice how he does it. He does it in rhetorical questions. Here's God now coming on with rhetorical questions. “How long will these people treat me with contempt? How long will they refuse to believe in me in spite of all the miraculous signs?”

If only I could see God do a miraculous sign I would believe in God for the rest of my life. Have you ever thought that? If only God would do a miracle in my days I'd believe for the rest of my life. Did these people see God? Yes. Did they believe in God? No. Even with miracles people don't believe in God. They had miracles all over the place, manna every day, and water from a rock, yet they still don't believe in God. “How long will they refuse to believe in me in spite all the miraculous signs I have performed among them.”

Then God says, “I will strike them down with a plague, but I will make you [Moses] into a nation greater and stronger than they.” Moses says, “God, these people been a pain in my backside too. Do it. Go for it God and make me into a nation. That's a great idea God. I like that!” No, wrong. What does Moses do? Moses then disagrees with God, does God say he's going to strike the nation down? God says, “I'm going to strike

the nation down and I'm going to make you [Moses] into a nation greater than they are.” That's what God says in verse 12. God says, “I’m going to strike them down, I’m going to make a nation greater than they are.” Largely it was as a result of their unbelief and holding God in contempt.

I. Moses argues with God [32:02-35:05]

How does Moses argue with God? God says, “I'm going to wipe them out.” “Moses said to the Lord, ‘Then the Egyptians will hear about it, by your power you brought these people up from among them and they will tell the inhabitants of the land about it.’” Then let me jump down to verse 16: “And the Egyptians will say the Lord was not able to bring these people into the land he promised them on oath so he slaughtered them in the desert.” So, in other words, Moses is saying, “God your reputation is at stake, the Egyptians are going to say, ‘Hey, God brought them out of Egypt well enough, but he couldn't bring them into the Promised Land so he killed them in the desert because he wasn't strong enough.’ So God, if you kill them in the desert that's what the Egyptians are going to conclude. Your reputation is on the line here.”

Then Moses continues in the second part of his argument. He says, “Now may the Lord’s strength be displayed just as you declared.” God, you’re mighty, you’re strong, here is your strength Lord: “the Lord is slow to anger, abounding in loyal love and forgiving sin and rebellion.” Now where does this statement, “God is slow to anger, abounding in love” occur? Does anybody remember when Moses was hid in the cleft of the rock that God passed by and it was said that God was slow to anger, abounding in love? Moses is quoting that back to God here. So what you get is Moses is saying, “God you can’t destroy them because of your character. Your character is one who is slow to anger, strong to love, you’re a forgiving and a loving God. You can’t destroy them because of your character and your reputation.”

So Moses is praying to God, and then what happens? Down in verse 20, we see what happens. God does not strike them down. Verse 20 God says this: “And the Lord [Yahweh] replied ‘I have forgiven them as you asked.’ Does prayer make a difference? God says, and let me read the verse explicitly, “The Lord replied ‘I have forgiven them as

you asked. Nevertheless as surely as I live and as surely as the glory of the Lord fills the whole earth, not one of the men who saw my glory and the miraculous signs I performed in Egypt will go in.” So that means that they wander for 40 years until all the older people die. 40 years in the wilderness and so anybody that saw the coming out of Egypt doesn't get in. Does the next generation go into the land with Joshua? The next generation goes in, the old generation dies out. Did the Lord spare them as Moses asked? Yes.

J. Forgiveness and consequences [35:06-36:25]

This raises another question about the nature of forgiveness? Is it possible to be forgiven and yet there's still consequences? When I was younger I thought, well you're forgiven and all the consequences just evaporate so that you don't have to face the consequences. You just pray for forgiveness and God just lets you go. There are no consequences. Did I ever tell you about the time my brother stabbed me in the arm? Now question: did I forgive my brother? Yes, I forgave him. But was there still a scar on my arm? Yes. So in other words he was forgiven but were there still consequences? It's kind of like I told you about my friend Eric, there's a drunk guy who kills a young person. Is it possible for the parents to forgive the drunk that killed their son? It's possible. Is the son still dead, do the consequences still stand? So I'm telling you be careful, consequences can follow even with forgiveness and these people were that way.

K. Can God change his mind? [36:24-37:35]

Now, let me go back and just hit some other things here. I want to deal with this issue: did God change his mind? In verse 12 he says, “I will strike them down and make you into a greater nation.” Moses prays for seven verses and then in verse 20 God says, “I forgive them as you asked, I won't wipe them out. I was going to send a plague and destroy them and raise you into a nation. I won't do that now, Moses. I will forgive them as you asked.” Did God change his mind here? My question is can God change his mind? I want to suggest that God can change his mind. Numbers 23 and 19 is what you're looking for. Anyways, so can God change his mind and the suggestion is that, yes, God changed his mind here.

By the way, can you change your mind? Can you do something God can't do?

You say, “Well, I can sin and God can’t sin.” I’m talking just about changing one’s mind not right or wrong. If you can change your mind and God can’t change his mind, do you see what I’m saying?

L. Prayer and changing God’s mind [37:36-39:04]

Did God change his mind here I’m going to wipe them out, Moses prayed. That tells you a whole lot of things about prayer, doesn’t it? Does prayer make a difference? When I was younger I was taught you pray not because you’re going to change the mind of God, you pray because you want to be obedient to God. You pray because God has commanded you to pray. Is Moses praying here because God commanded him to pray, or is Moses praying because he wants to make a difference? Does Moses want to change the mind of God on this issue? Yes, he does. So he pleads with God, “God, you can’t do this” and he pleads with God. So I’m saying, does prayer make a difference? I want to say Moses prayed to God, and 8 verses later God says, “I won’t, I will forgive them as you asked.” What I’m trying to tell you is that prayer is very, very significant. Do you realize that in prayer we can address the God of the universe? The God of the universe, “Samuel,” means “God listens.” There are times to be honest with you, I’m a very boring person, there are times I can’t even get my wife to listen to me. God listens, the God that made the universe listens! He responds then, by saying, “I will forgive them as you asked.” This brings up this huge debate.

M. On choosing multiple goods [39:05-41:26]

Student Question: So we change our minds on what we’re going to do before it’s a mistake and we change it do a better option. So God changed his mind and then that was a mistake, but God can’t make a mistake. So how can he change his mind. If God is perfect, then how can God change his mind because God certainly was unable to make a mistake?

Hildebrandt Resumes: let me tackle it this way. I think you’re thinking about the perfect and the good as singular. What happens if the good is multiple? Have you ever changed your mind not because one was wrong and one was right but because there were

two goods there and you could have picked either one and you picked one versus the other? Or maybe not even better, maybe you decided to choose the other one just to choose it? So what I'm suggesting is that there may be multiple good options and God can pick between them. Maybe the perfect isn't *the* perfect but maybe there's possibly multiple perfects out there that could get God from point A to point B. So that's what I'm suggesting here. Maybe the future is not singular, but maybe the future has potential in terms of possibilities, and there are multiple possibilities. In other words, can God accomplish his purpose, and can he accomplish that purpose through multiple ways? And if you allow for those possibilities, does that allow for human freedom, and does it also allow for God to interact with human beings then as far as how that future will be shaped?

N. God as unchangeable [41:27- 46:23]

Now, Hannah, I need you to pull Numbers 23.19 did anybody do Malachi? She's going to read a verse, she's going to contradict me here. Alright, I'll contradict myself, here, look in your Bible to chapter 23.19 staying in Numbers. We can go over to Malachi and do the same type of thing. In Numbers chapter 23 verse 19 it says that "God is not a man, that he should lie, nor the son of man, that he should change his mind." So that seems to contradict what I just said, right? That God cannot change his mind because he's not a man.

So maybe there's a difference in how God changes his mind and how humans change their minds. The suggestion over here is that we change our mind from something wrong to something better. Is it possible that God changes his mind between multiple goods and then that opens up possibility? Now, when can God not change? God cannot change when he's given us his promise. When he's promised something, does God have to keep his promise? So he can't change his mind when he's promised something.

Every time God opens his mouth is it always a promise? Every time you open your mouth is it a promise? Now by the way, can you make promises? Yes, but how much of your life is promises? By the way, is some of your life promises? Yes, but do

you often talk in other ways and in all sorts of different ways. So what I'm suggesting here is that what this passage is saying is that when God gives us his word, he can't change his word because he's made a promise. He's told Abraham, I'm going to give you the land, the seed, and the blessing, so God can't change that. However, how God gives Abraham the land, the seed, and the blessing, the "how" of that, can change into all sorts of different ways that God could do that. Jesus has to be born at Bethlehem. Micah chapter 5 verse 2 says the Messiah's got to be born in Bethlehem of Judea. When Mary and Joseph came down is it possible they could have gone through Samaria or gone through the Philistine plain? Are there many ways that they could have gotten to Bethlehem? What God is saying is that, "No, Jesus will be born in Bethlehem." How you get there allows for human flexibility and human choice.

God comes to Saul I think it's in chapter 13 of 1 Samuel thereabouts I think it's 13.13, something like that, God comes to King Saul and he says, "Saul, if you would've obeyed me I would've made your descendants kings over Israel forever, if you had obeyed me." What I'm suggesting here is, let me just put it this way in philosophical terms. Can God do an if statement? If you do this, then I will do this, but if you do that, then I will do that. Can God do conditionals, an if-then? Can he have multiple if-thens. If they do this, I will do this etc. This passage in Saul's case he says, "Saul, if you had, I would've made your descendants kings over Israel forever but you didn't so I'm going to seek out a man after my own heart,"--which is David. So there God definitely had two paths, Saul made the choice and then God responds and David becomes king. So yes, that passage in 1 Samuel is great, there's another great one in chapter 21 on the city of Keilah when we get are there I'll go over. So what I'm suggesting is that there's conditionality with God, not everything is fixed with God. Now, by the way, are certain things fixed with God? There are certain things that are fixed and there are others that are not fixed. Now does that allow for multiplicity and does that allow for human freedom?

O. Rumination on the mystery and wonder of God [46:24-56:35]

Now, you say, "Hildebrandt are you saying that you solved the free will versus predestination problem? And the answer is: no. The honest truth is what I'm trying to do

is confuse you. But what I'm saying is that it's possible there are multiple perfects for God to choose from. Because I think God is big enough; I don't have to actually answer how God can deal with conditionals. All I'm doing is citing Scripture, God gave an "if" to Saul, and says, "Saul, if you had obeyed me, I would've made you king forever." God himself says that, so now I'm not dealing with my conjecture of multiple perfects I'm dealing with what the Bible says. If Saul had obeyed God, then he would have been king forever, but since he hadn't now David's in the same situation. So God himself uses conditionals if statements.

By the way, I would say the conditional goes all the way back to the garden of Eden as well. There's a tree in the garden, "If you don't eat it, your good. If you do eat it your bad and you're out of here." So I think right from the beginning, there is this if-statement with human beings and my guess is that the if-statement then comes from our Father who also makes choices.

Now, is it always okay to disagree on this issue? By the way, I'm not trying to convince anybody, I'm basically trying to confuse you. Is it possible that a professor can confuse students to try and break them away from God and to show fallacies in the Bible and show all the negative stuff and confuse students to break down their religious beliefs. Is that what I'm trying to do with this, and the answer is: no. I am trying to confuse you, but what I'm trying to confuse you for is for you move from thinking that you know something that you don't know, to saying God is wonderful--that God is full of wonder. The wonder rather than saying I can't understand you and I'm out of here. Is another way to do it would be like I would do with my wife. We've been married for over 36 years. Do I understand my wife?--no! And so I come into this women's head and I say I just do not understand, after 36 years you'd think I'd have a clue by now. Now if I don't understand you and I bail out is that one move. Is another move to come and say you are wonderful, I don't understand you please help me understand you? Is that a movement towards someone in love? What I'm saying is that God is wonderful and that wonder that confusion should attract us to him, to say, "I want to explore, I want to know more about God." I want to trace his thoughts to see how God moves, to see what God loves, what he

likes and dislikes and how he thinks about things. That wonder, attracts us to a devotion to him and a pursuit. The wonder causes us to pursue God. Rather than confusion the mystery attracts us.

But what happens is that if we think we know about God then what? If we think we know do we pursue? No, because then we're satisfied with what we know. We feel comfortable. When I was younger I held one position and I would keep reading these scriptures where God is so dynamic. So I moved more towards the dynamic but a lot of my best friends are really into the predestination side of things and I've sort of moved away from it over the years largely because of texts like this.

Now, by the way, if you want ways out of my way of thinking about things or others ways of thinking about things you can say that God knew ahead of time that Moses was going to pray. He knew ahead of time that Moses was going to pray so this whole thing was he says, "Moses I'm going to wipe them out" because he wanted Moses to stand up for the people. He knew that Moses would, and he knew that he wasn't going to wipe them out. So he was doing it more for Moses's development. Does everybody see that? So God here is just doing this so that Moses will become a better man. Is any of that in the text here or did we just make that up? None of that is in the text. That is conjecture.

Now, the other way to work with this is to say that we as human beings cannot understand God. So God portrays himself like a human being. He portrays himself like a human being so that we can understand him. So it looks like God changed his mind although he never really changed his mind. God is portraying himself anthropomorphically. God puts himself in human terms so we can understand him. That's used also for these kind of passages they say God is just telling us a human way of looking at it but that's not really the way God really is. But again I don't really buy that because are we made in the image of God, can we understand a whole lot about God?

Having said all that, let me jump to my favorite passage on this whole discussion and I think it is in Isaiah chapter 40 verse 28. Isaiah chapter 40 is one of the most incredible chapters in the Bible, and in Isaiah chapter 40 he says this. "Do you not know,

have you not heard, the Lord is the everlasting God the creator of the ends of the earth. He will not grow tired or weary.” Beautiful verse, right? And then it says this: “And his understanding no one can fathom.” That tells me are we ever going to figure this thing out? And the answer is: no. It works really well for bull sessions going half the night discussing with different people from different backgrounds but God says, “no one can understand my understanding.” We can understand a lot of about God. Can we say we understand nothing about God? We can’t say that because he has revealed himself in his word, but we cannot understand completely about God. We can’t encompass God with our thoughts. Can we get comfortable with how we think about God in our minds. Our minds then become idols. In other words, we have boxes in our mind in which we contain God. What I’m wanting to do is blow those boxes away to say: God is God. This should raise mystery and wonder that attracts you to pursue him for the rest of your life.

Some of the contradictions like with Moses’ humility are translation problems and to be honest with you some of those are pretty easy because you just get it. Other contradictions will be things like logical contradictions you can work through, there will be different types of solutions. Some of them will be cultural or linguistic differences and those we can work with. There’s other big ones in Scripture like predestination versus free will that we’re stumped on. I think that at that point that's when you move to wonder and mystery. In a certain sense, you have to realize in our own humanity that we’re finite and God is infinite. Now by the way can finite understand some of the infinite? Yes, We can map some of the infinite but there’s going to be parts of the infinite that you have no clue of but it’s really part of the infinite that's around you. So at certain points there’s a humility needed to say that his understanding is unfathomable. This leads me to pursue him more, not to give up. It leads me to pursuing God more. Not pursuing him to contain or to exhaustively understand him but rather to explore the wonders of God.

P. Korah Rebellion [56:36-62:01]

Now, let’s get through this Korah rebellion. Chapter 16 in the book of Numbers is Korah’s rebellion. Let me just kind of explain this and talk through this. In chapter 16

Korah, Dathan and Abiram are Levites who come to Moses and say, “Moses, you and Aaron aren’t such hot stuff. We’re Levites too. We want to be special to God too.” When I say special what comes to mind? What makes you think you’re so special to God? And so basically this is a demand to be special and separate. So Korah comes to Moses and says, “Hey, we want some of those rights you have as leader.” So this is kind of how it goes down. In this narrative Moses does something that he rarely does anywhere else. Normally when people come at Moses, God steps in, and God gets angry saying, “I’m going to wipe them out.” Here, Moses himself gets angry at the people and in chapter 16 verse 15: “Then Moses became very angry and said to the Lord, ‘Do not accept their offering.’” Moses is praying for the people or against the people? He’s saying, “don’t accept their offering.” So here Moses is taking a new role, this is the role of the anti-mediator. Normally, Moses is the mediator between God and his people, but in this case he’s the anti-mediator. He’s saying, “God don’t accept their offerings or sacrifices.”

Does God have a sense of humor. Well this is kind of an ironic sense of humor. God comes to Korah and says, “you want to be separate and special? OK, separate all your people over here.” God says, “and then I’ll separate you. I’ll separate you permanently.” The ground opens up swallows them all up wham-bam right down into the grave. So God says, “you want to be separated? I’ll separate you.” It’s kind of like Miriam, “you want to be white Miriam? Okay, I’ll make you totally white.” Here, you want to be separated, Okay I’ll separate you.” The ground opens up and swallows them all up and Korah goes down into the pit.

This has to do with power struggles among leaders, and people when you have a leader will people under the leader sometimes undermine the leader? They project all sorts of bad motives on the leader. What the passage warns against is that Moses is the leader and when these people come to say, “Moses, we don’t think you’re so hot; we want to have all the privileges you have.” God says, “No, Moses is my man. He’s the leader.” So you have got to be careful about undermining leaders and making bad statements and things and this passage is one of those passages.

Moses takes on this new role as the anti-mediator rather than the mediator. All

through the book of Numbers he's mediated as he's prayed on behalf of the people. The mediator's role is really important. Have you guys ever prayed for somebody where it really really matters? I've got four kids and I prayed for my kids and I only pray one prayer for my kids. It's always been like this, "I tell God right from the start I pray one prayer, I'm a very simple person. It's just Okay God it's the same prayer every day: I pray that my kids grow up to love God with all their heart. I figure if they love God with all their heart the rest of life takes care of itself. So I said, "God, I want my kids to love you." Now I'm lying. Last year right at this time my son was in Afghanistan and he said every day they went out they got shot at. He had friends that were blown to smithereens that he had to pick up parts of them. But anyway he says he hopes he can forget and that he never wants to remember it. Things he saw he said "that no human being should ever see." And it was really bad. I prayed to God last year at this time that he grows up to love God but I said, "God I've got one other thing. My son, I don't want him getting killed. You know it's like the old man is supposed to go first and then the kid. So please God spare the kid." Question did I pray that God spare his life or did I beg God to spare his life? I begged. I begged. I just want to tell you I learned a lot about prayer last year. By the way, did God spare his life? God did. His head's all messed up, but God spared his life. We just talk every night. We talk for hours and hours and work through a lot of this stuff that he's still unsettled with. But anyways what I'm saying is does prayer change things?

Q. Moses as prophet and sheol [62:02-66:14]

Now Moses, this guy's a prophet, he makes a short term prophecy. There are short term prophecies and long term. Moses says, "if I am the prophet of God, Korah and you are attacking me, if I am a true prophet, the ground is going to open up and swallow you down." Guess what happens. Does the prophet's word get fulfilled? Yes. And they get swallowed down. Moses is shown to be a true prophet because his word comes true exactly the way he said it. So the ground opens up [Numbers 16.33] and swallows them down into the pit. They went down alive into "the grave" as the NIV translates it. This

word “grave” is the Hebrew word “sheol.” “Sheol” was the underworld, it’s sort of a murky word. It can mean “the grave.” It means the physical grave but it also means the grave beyond that like a murky world, the realm of shadows and the afterlife kind of thing. It’s a complex word but here it just means opens up the ground, they died and they were in the grave.

Did the Jewish people have a different view of hell than we do? It’s hard to know exactly what their view of hell was because I think their view of hell has also changed over time. Back in these kind of days it’s very murky. They did not have very much of a view of the afterlife. You know what I’m saying there’s not very much given. You guys have read a lot of the Old Testament now, is there a lot of talk about heaven? It’s the same thing with hell. It wasn’t really a clear cut kind of thing. By the time of Jesus and the New Testament there seems to be much more data going to the place where the fire burned up. So there does seem to be foreshadows like Sodom and Gomorrah burning and things like that, places of burning and torment and that kind of thing but its real murky in the Old Testament. Largely its based of that word “sheol.” Sometimes the word “sheol” simply means they put the guy in the ground in a grave and sometimes it has this more expansive meaning. So it’s really tough in the Old Testament. If I’m not mistaken in this you actually see a development of the Jewish understanding and then coming up to the time of Christ it’s still in the process of change. So it’s a really good question.

Hell, we usually view as permanent separation from God but the problem with this term “sheol” is that sometimes it just means the afterlife and doesn’t just mean heaven or hell. So while we make clear distinctions the Jewish people at this time did not. So I want to kind of leave it murky because the honest truth is that’s the way it was back then.

What determines the meaning of this word “sheol”? The context. In some contexts it means they just put them in the grave, nothing more. Others will be this limbo connotation area that’s undifferentiated afterlife.

R. Can people change? [66:15-71:32]

Now, some people never learn. After these people get swallowed up, what happens in verse 41? Here it says, “the next day the whole Israelite community grumbled against Moses and Aaron, ‘You have killed the Lord’s people,’ they said.” And what happens, God says, “hey, we’ll fry them too. And now Moses switches roles. He says, “God don’t do it.” Basically, these people never learn. Now you say, I’m a young lady and I love this guy and he’s got all sorts of problems. He’s got all sorts of problems but I can help fix him. Yes, some of you are all shaking your heads because you know exactly what I’m talking about: Yeah, right! Question, I’m dead serious: is change in a person at core levels almost impossible? Now I come back to Eric who had it right: can the Holy Spirit change the core of a person? Yes. But is core change in a person really, really, hard? Can a good woman change a man? I’ve seen that happen too but is it really rare. So what I’m saying is be careful. When my daughters or a young women comes to me and says, “I’m going change this guy,” I’m always in the back of my head smirking saying “naive.” I would never call anybody naive but I’m sure thinking it.

Changing...I know a guy I want to use another example. We’ll change that because it’s on tape but I know a guy who wanted to quit smoking. Now question, is smoking a pretty simple thing. Your body wants cigarettes and you smoke cigarettes. Now can a body change? Question: could he quit smoking?--no. You see that lasted 50, 60 years, and what I’m saying is that change is really hard for people. Did you know that people who have heart bypass surgery and they know they’ve got to change what they eat and they’ve got to start exercising, did you know that after people have major open heart surgery two years later of 90% of those people are doing the same thing they were doing beforehand. Can people change? Do you know what I’m saying? It’s scary when you think about it.

Now are you guys in an age of change? You are growing up and there are a lot of things changing. What happens, you hit 25 and you kind of fossilize? Actually, the honest truth you kind of change all your life. So it’s interesting you know what I’m saying is you blink and how old are you guys 18-19 years old. How fast did your life go by pretty fast? You blink again and all of a sudden you’ll be 25 graduated from Gordon College and in a

career, blink again and your 35 and you'll have kids. Then all of a sudden you blink again and you stop and then wait a minute you blink one more time and you're an old man like me! What is the conclusion? Does anybody know that country song? The conclusion is "don't blink." What's the point of the song? Does life go by really fast? How does that fit into this? Life goes by really fast, can things change? Who are the agents of change? Can you choose and shape your future? Can you make choices that change the future?

The world is out there we live in a day that's incredible! As much as I hate to use it because of these stupid Mac computers, but Steve Jobs died. Question, did he make a difference in the world in a big way? What I'm saying is that some of you people here you're going to be able to make choices that change the world. *Carpe Diem* - make your best choices you can to be the best person you can. Change the world for good! Are there people who are wanting to change the world for evil? You guys have got the vision. Make daily choices does that mean you've got to get up when its 5:30 to get up and do your work? No, it's easier to sleep in. You do your work, you go after it. Make choices that will make you the kind of person who can change the world for good. We live in an incredible day today in which you have all kinds of choices in front of you, it's like a smorgasbord and what I'm telling you is: go for it. Make a difference in the world for good. Commit yourself to good and then make those choices. So anyway, can people really change?

S. Moses and the rock [71:33-77:12]

So what about Moses hitting the rock, you say even he blew it. I think a lot of people miss in chapter 20 with Moses. This is where Moses does a sin actually and God nails him for it. People always skip this. How does chapter 20 where Moses strikes the rock and he commits a sin and he's judged, how does this chapter start? "In the first month the whole Israelite community arrived at the Desert of Zin and they stayed at Kadesh. There Miriam died and was buried." The chapter opens first with the death of Miriam. Was this a big thing for Moses? Miriam was the older sister when Moses was floating down in a basket and helped train him. She died. By the way, how does chapter

20 end? The story of Aaron's death. So chapter 20 has Moses in the middle of chapter 20 what does he do? He strikes the rock. Is chapter 20 a really bad day for Moses? His sister dies, his brother dies, and he strikes the rock. If I were writing the Pentateuch this is the one I would want left out.

This is Moses, he goes to the rock and God tells him to speak to the rock and water will come out. Why did God nail Moses so hard just for hitting a rock? Why did God judge Moses so hard just for hitting the rock? What's wrong with hitting a rock? Is there anything inherently wrong with hitting a rock with a stick to get water? No. So let me just run through this. What was wrong with hitting a rock? There was nothing wrong with hitting a rock except the real issue doesn't have to do with hitting the rock, the real issue is found in verse 12: "But the Lord said to Moses and Aaron, because you did not trust in me enough to honor me as holy in the sight of the Israelites, you will not bring this community into the land I am giving them." Moses is going to wander with them for 40 years, Moses is going to wander this is the Dead Sea area. He's going to come up along the side here and right where Eric is. Moses can't cross the Jordan River. So on Mt. Nebo here Moses is going to go up on the mountain where he's going to die. He's going to be able to look over the mountain, look and see Israel, but he can't go over there. He has struck the rock. Why? "Because you did not trust me." Is trust and faith a big deal? This is what Christianity is all about. This is it. "Abraham believed God and it was counted to him for righteousness." Here, Moses did not trust God.

Does God judge the thoughts and intents of a person's heart? You may not be able to judge those thoughts and intents but God judges the thoughts and intents of the heart. Moses' heart was not right here. What he did physically was fine but his heart was not right, his heart was not trusting.

The other problem is the responsibility of leaders. Are leaders judged more severely than common folk? Leaders are judged more severely. I always have this nightmare that I've died and gone to heaven and all my students, that is you guys, are coming by and St. Peter's got me off to the side saying you can't go into heaven. I'm watching and all my students are going into heaven. He's saying, "Hildebrandt remember

all those crazy things you said in class about me not changing my mind? Well, I changed my mind now stay outside here. Let all your students go in." So while you guys are trucking on in you can wave at me. Maybe one of you guys can be like mediator and say, "please, let him in."

But the truth is when you're up here talking all the time do I say a lot of stupid, crazy things. Frankly, I worry about that. Someday I've got a judgment for all the dumb things I've said in front of class. When you take a position of leadership is there a higher level of responsibility and you've got to be aware of that and be careful. Moses blew it.

Then lastly, are there consequences for actions? Do your actions have consequences? This is one of the fundamental things about wisdom, with actions, there are consequences. What's really neat is can there be positive consequence for actions? Can you do good things and then have good consequences? And there are negative things you can do to earn negative consequences. So there are consequences and what does that tell us? Does today matter? Do the things you do today, do they matter? Yes! Today matters; the things that you do matter. It makes a difference. So, is life is so rich, grab each day. Each day the things you do matter. With Moses, what would have happened if he had missed that day that he struck the rock? He would have gone into the Promised Land. But he made some bad decisions that day and it affected the next 40 years of his life!

T. Snake on the pole (Num. 21) [77:13-79:44]

The people complain again in Numbers chapter 21. The people complain at what happens? God sends venomous snakes out and the snakes start biting the people. Now how does he get out of it? He puts a bronze snake on a pole and holds it up and says "you need to look at this snake that bit you. You look at the pole, you look and live." Does anybody remember the song, "look and live, my brother, look and live"? An Old gospel hymn it went "look and live." But this isn't really why this is so important. In the New Testament Jesus is talking to Nicodemus and here's how this goes. Jesus in the New Testament is talking to Nicodemus and he says no one had ever gone up into heaven

except the one who came down from heaven. Who came down from heaven? The son of man. Nicodemus, just as Moses lifted up the snake in the desert, so the son of man must be lifted up so that everyone who believes in him may not perish but have eternal life. Why? "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son that whosoever believes in him shall not perish but have everlasting life." That snake on the pole what does that tell us? Does that tell us how much God loves us? The snake on the pole, becomes the son of man who is God's son who is crucified on our behalf. "Whosoever believes in him shall not perish." That snake on the pole is the setup for John 3:16 where Jesus is now saying the Son of Man is going to be put on a pole, and whoever believes in him--eternal life. It's incredible but God loves us and each day counts. Let's do it! All right, end of class see you guys.

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History Literature and Theology course. Lecture number 15, on the book of Numbers.

Transcribed by Henry Hagen

Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt 2

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 16[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History, Literature and Theology course, lecture number 16, on Balaam and the book of Numbers and the Covenant renewal and the land concepts in the book of Deuteronomy.

A. Quiz Preview [0:00-2:28]

Class, let's get started. I am going to pass these attendance sheets around. For Thursday what are you guys working on? The book of Judges and Ruth. There is no *Our Father Abraham*; there is an article and some memory verses. Article, memory verses, Judges, and Ruth, know the stories and all that. So that will be coming for Thursday.

Today, we are going to finish the book of Numbers and get into the book of Deuteronomy, and then we will have one more class on Deuteronomy. I think that is where we are. Welcome to Old Testament class, and let's have a word of prayer, and then we will get into it.

Father, we thank you for your goodness to us and especially in New England in the fall, it is just amazing the beauties that are outside. Father, you have given us eyes to see the multitude of colors of the leaves changing. You have given us noses to smell the great smells of the fall, and the falling needles, and ears to hear and friendships on this campus to share. We thank you for your many goodnesses as your grace is extended to us every day. We thank you for the way that you were gracious to the Israelites and disciplined them but yet brought them in your loyal love into your fold. We thank you that you are the great shepherd of Israel, and that you love your sheep and we also are your sheep, Father, the sheep of your pasture. We thank you for Christ, our great shepherd, the good shepherd and it is in his name we pray, amen.

Let's jump in. We are going to fly through this because the other class is a little bit ahead of us. So we are going to kind of move through this a little more quickly.

B. Lessons of Numbers [2:29-7:48]

Last time we were talking about the book of Numbers and we were working with the freewill/predestination debate on whether God can change his mind and whether he did change his mind when he said that he was going to destroy Israel, Moses prays and then 8 verses later, he does not destroy them as he said there in the beginning. There are certain lessons from the book of Numbers that I want to clock through. This is what I see from the book of Numbers: that one person can make a difference. Moses prays and the nation is spared. So one person can make a difference. Moses makes a difference for the people.

Prayer changes things. Prayer matters. I don't view prayer as just something we do to obey what God has commanded us, so that we pray just to obey. But no, we pray because we have things on our hearts. We want God to interact with us in a certain way. Moses prayed and God's wrath backed off and God relented. *Naham*--he relented of what he was going to do. So that is important.

In the book of Numbers, you've got a contrast between Israel's faithlessness (Israel is always wanting to go back to Egypt, Israel is always complaining to God), and God who is faithful. So God is shown to be faithful and Israel is shown to be faithless. The faithlessness of Israel is contrasted with the faithfulness of God. That is another big theme in the book of Numbers here.

Forgiveness and yet consequences: We are in the book of Numbers and God says, "I have forgiven them, Moses, as you asked me to do." And yet there were still consequences. It is an interesting thing, forgiveness yet there can still be consequences that follow—40 years in the wilderness.

This is a response to one of the questions that we were wrestling with at the end: Is God dynamic or static? What I tried to suggest in the book of Numbers and elsewhere in the Old Testament is that God is dynamic, not static. He interacts with his people, he goes

back and forth and he listens to Moses' prayer and interacts with it. He is relationally interactive with Moses and with his people. God responds (I guess that is another way of saying it). He is not just the initiator who says, "I am going to do it this way, because I decided to do it this way, and this is the way I am going to do it." He responds to their interaction.

Complaint versus lament: We made a distinction between complaint and lament. Let me just make this distinction again. I am not sure that I was real clear on it the first time. Complaint and lament can use exactly the same words. You know, "My God, My God, why have you forsaken me?" "How long, O Lord, will you forget me, forever?" They both can use very strong words, but complaint is a movement away from God that says basically, "God, how long will you forget me? I am out of here, I do not want you anymore." So complaint is a movement away from God with the expressing of those words. Lament is a wrestling with God, saying, "God, please...", "My God, My God, why have You forsaken me?" ("Do not forsake me!"). So a lament is a movement towards God, a complaint is a movement away from God, often using the same words. They are very strong words, but one is a movement away and the other is a movement towards.

These are some big themes that I see out of the book of Numbers and that is why I love the book of Numbers. I think it is a very theological book and it has a lot to teach us. Now here is one of my favorites out of the book of Numbers: This is a red heifer. Now you say, "Hildebrandt, that is not a heifer." It is supposed to be a picture of a red heifer. Sorry, this is the best I could do. It is a red cow, but this one is from Texas. Now you say, "Why do you get off on these red heifer things?" Israel, when they want to cleanse something, they start out with things that are not cleansed. How do they cleanse stuff? You cleanse with water and you cleanse with blood. For example, if the Jews are going to build the third temple (that will probably be World War III because there is a mosque on top of that platform or a shrine on top of the Dome of the Rock), but if the Jews build a temple, do they have to be able to purify the instruments that are there? They have right now a seven-and-a-half-foot high gold menorah, I have seen it with my eyes. A seven

and a half foot high good menorah is ready for the third temple. What happens? The Rabbis have approved it, but does that have to be purified by the blood of a red heifer? Do you know that in Israel, this is coming out of Numbers, chapter 19, now that they have a red heifer? They have a red heifer in Israel now; it is up in Galilee. Is that important for the Jewish people that they have a red heifer?

C. Balaam: Introduction [7:49-13:22]

Now Balaam--I like this guy's name. It is kind of ominous. Why did the Moabites hire this Balaam? This is Numbers chapters 22-24 and these are some famous passages. You have probably heard of Balaam before. Why did the Moabites want to hire Balaam? What do Og and Sihon have to do with it? Og- imagine naming your kid that, the kid goes to school, "Hi, I'm Og." He was king of the Amorites and so was Sihon. Israel wipes these two kings out. What does that have to do with Balaam? The story does not connect up real well if you do not know some geography. Og and Sihon were Amorite kings, that Israel destroyed. What does that have to do with Balaam being called down from Mesopotamia?

Why did Balak (Balak was king of Moab) send all the way to Mesopotamia to get Balaam, a professional curser? Do you know what a curser is, a professional curser? A cursor: it kind of blinks on your screen and goes up and down. No, this is a guy who is actually paid to curse. He was a prophet who was paid to curse people. Why did they send all the way to Mesopotamia? Did the king not have his own professional cursers? Why did they send all the way to Mesopotamia? I want to look at that question. Were the Israelites the only ones who knew Jehovah? The Israelites were not the only ones who knew Jehovah as their God. We have seen Melchizedek already, and I want to suggest that Balaam knew Jehovah God. Balaam knows Jehovah God. He is a foreign prophet from Mesopotamia, and he knows Jehovah (Yahweh).

Having said that, this is the map. What is with this map? Here is the country of Moab. This is a canyon; it is about 3,000 feet deep. It is almost as pronounced as the Grand Canyon. You walk up and it is straight down for about 3,000 feet. It is a 3,000-foot

canyon that is a border. Between Wadi Arnon and Wadi Zered is the country of Moab. Who is down below Zered? Below Zered is Edom. Edom is whose descendants? Esau's descendants. What color is Esau? Red. What color are the rocks down in Edom? Red. There is a place called Petra here--the red rocks of Petra. There are Esau's descendants.

Moab is here. Moab is "from Abba." Whose descendants are Moab? Does anyone remember Lot? Remember Lot and his daughters in the cave? They produced Moab—"from father." By the way, you guys this week are reading about a Moabite woman. Her name is what? Ruth. That takes place right here. Ruth is a Moabitess. It's from Lot's descendants. This is Esau and this is Lot. Ammon is the other one of Lot's descendants. Moab and Ammon, are they related to Israel? Moab and Ammon (these are Lot's descendants) are related to Israel.

Did God allow Israel to attack the Moabites and the Ammonites? No, he did not. The Israelites come around Edom here and they go up the King's Highway here and they cannot attack Moab and they cannot attack Ammon. Those are their brothers. They came up here, but who is here? The Amorites. The Amorites are from the west, so the Israelites cut in here and defeat Sihon and Og, the kings of the Amorites. They take over this territory right here. Where is Moses going to die? Moses is going to die right here on Mt. Nebo. Does anybody remember how he goes up on the mountain and God shows him the land of Israel from Mt. Nebo. He overlooks the land. By the way, Jericho is right here. So they are going to cross over and take Jericho. Moses will die right here. Israel settles then in this land of Sihon. Why is the king of Moab afraid of Israel? Because they just conquered Sihon and Og and the Moabites are afraid now that the Israelites are going to come south down this way. So the king of Moab wants Balaam to curse Israel. Balaam is going to come up here and he is going to curse Israel. He is going to come from Mesopotamia, he is going to come down to Moab, and Moab is going to pay him to curse Israel. Israel will be settled right here. That is kind of the geography of this situation with Balaam.

D. Balaam's character: Is he good or bad? [13:23-20:54]

Now what is the most famous story with this guy Balaam? Is Balaam good or bad? Actually in the book of Numbers was Balaam good or bad? In the book of Numbers I want to suggest to you that he is pretty good. Actually he gives four oracles. Does Balaam prophesy from God four times saying exactly what God told him to prophesy? Yes, he is good but then some of you said, “No, he is bad.” The answer is that Balaam is the Judas of the Old Testament. Now by the way, was Judas good or bad? Well, you might say, “Judas betrayed Jesus. Judas was bad.” But wait a minute, before Judas turned bad, was Judas good? Was Judas one of the twelve apostles that Jesus sent out to do miracles in his name? In Matthew 10, Judas was sent out and proclaimed the gospel of Jesus Christ and does miracles in the name of Jesus. By the way, do you remember when Jesus said, “One of you is going to betray me”? They all looked around and did any of them suspect Judas? No, they did not. So what I am saying is that Judas was one of the twelve apostles and then he turns bad. Balaam is very similar to that. He is good and then he turns bad. We are going to see that change in him. He is portrayed as both a saint and as a sinner. In the Old Testament he is portrayed as largely pretty good.

Let me read you a couple statements that Balaam makes in Numbers, chapter 22. Numbers 22:8 says this, “‘Spend the night here,’ Balaam said to them, ‘and I will bring you back the answer the Lord gives me.’” Down to verse 13, “The next morning Balaam got up and said to Balak’s princes, ‘Go back to your own country, for the Lord has refused to let me go with you.’” Is Balaam faithful to what God told him? Yes, he is. He will not go.

What happens? Balak, the king of Moab, sends more guys and they come out to him and ask him to come down again. And verse 18 says this, “But Balaam answered them, ‘Even if Balak gave me his palace filled with silver and gold, I could not do anything great or small to go beyond the command of the Lord my God.’” Is Balaam a Yahweh worshipper? He sure is. He says, “I can’t do that even for gold or for silver.”

By the way, this sets up what will be the greatest tension in Balaam’s life. This is the greatest tension: money or do God’s word. Proclaim God’s word or go after the money that is going to be the tension that Balaam feels. He will be faithful to God’s

word, he gives four oracles that we will go over.

Now you say, “Wait a minute, but I thought Balaam was a bad guy?” Yes, he is a bad guy. If you go over to Jude in the New Testament, verse 11. Balaam is listed with the great apostates of all-time. Balaam was viewed as the Benedict Arnold, Lee Harvey Oswald, or somebody like that. Judas is a classic example from the Bible. Balaam is listed with Judas and the bad people and the same thing occurs in the book of Revelation. Balaam is viewed as a traitor. That is the word I want, “traitor.” Balaam is viewed as a traitor, one who served God initially and then turned away. In the New Testament, he will be a major bad guy. Did Balaam know God? Yes, he did. We have got a clear statement here that Balaam says, “I will only say what Yahweh, my God tells me.” So he did know God, he was not Jewish, but he still knew God.

What about his name? I love his name. Balaam, it means “destroyer”. So this guy comes down, his name means “destroyer.” It sounds almost like a 3-D game on a computer or something. Now while I say his name is funny, do you realize that they have actually found this guy’s name carved on a stone from 800 BC. It’s from a place called Deir Alla, which is in Jordan. It is interesting, the events with Balaam happen in Jordan and they have found a stone with Balaam’s name on it from 800 B.C. in Jordan. It was found in 1967 and it was translated first in 1976. Is this fairly recent? Now check this out: this is actually a quote from this marker, “The misfortunes of the book of Balaam, son of Beor.” By the way, is Balaam, the son of Beor, our Balaam? Yes, he is. If it just said “Balaam,” there could be more than one Balaam, but it says “Balaam, son of Beor” and that is our guy. “A divine seer,” was that exactly who he was? “A divine seer was he. The gods came to him at night and he beheld a vision in accordance with El’s utterance. They said to Balaam, son of Beor...” and it goes on. Is this pretty incredible that they actually have records and this is not just fairytales? In other words, this guy has got a talking donkey, this has gotten to be a legend that is made up, right? Was the guy real? The guy is actually carved in as real from 800 B.C., so this is pretty incredible. You do not often get this kind of confirmation and this is just spectacular. By the way, you had to wait until 1967 for it to even be found and to be translated in 1976.

Balaam's major struggle is whether he is going to go with God's word or whether he is going to go with money. This is going to be his tension. Will this be some of our tension at various points of our lives, whether we are going to go for money or serve the Lord? This is a big tension that a lot of us have felt.

E. Balaam and the Donkey [20:55-26:43]

Now the donkey narrative: this is a classic passage. Does anybody remember having the tension? God says, "Okay, Balaam you can go with them." Then Balaam goes with them, and then all of a sudden this angel comes with this "lightsaber" sword and is about to take off his head. You say, "Wait a minute God, I thought you said he could go and then you try to kill him? What is with that?" God gives you permission. It is like a parent who takes back his word or something. What is going on? I think what is going on is that God said, "Balaam, you can go," but what was the one condition? "You've got to say exactly what I tell you." Balaam probably figured in his head, "Maybe I can make some money out of this. God told me to say this, but maybe I can say this other thing so I can make some money. Maybe I can have my cake and eat it too." I think Balaam is playing with these ideas and God is going to stop him in his tracks to warn him again, "You better say exactly what I tell you." So I think the donkey narrative is in there to slow the story down to warn Balaam to do exactly what God says.

So what happens with the donkey? "Balaam got up in the morning and saddled his donkey," (this is from chapter 22, verse 21), "and went with the princes of Moab. But God was very angry when he went, and the angel of the Lord stood in the road to oppose him. Balaam was riding on his donkey, and his two servants were with him. When the donkey saw..."

Now there is a play on words here. Balaam is a prophet, what is a prophet called? A prophet is called a "seer." Who sees here? Does the seer see the angel or does the donkey see the angel? The seer should see the angel, but who sees the angel? The donkey sees what the seer cannot. Do you see the irony there? The seer cannot see, but the donkey does see. There is a play on the word "seer."

“When the donkey saw the angel of the Lord standing in the road with a drawn sword in his hand, she turned off the road into a field. Balaam beat her to get her back on the road. Then the angel of the Lord stood in a narrow path between two vineyards.” By the way, vineyard walls are made out of what? Rocks, they make their walls out of rocks and that is a problem. There are two vineyard walls on both sides. “When the donkey saw the angel of the Lord, she pressed close to the wall, crushing Balaam’s foot against it. So he beat her again. Then the angel of the Lord moved on ahead and stood in a narrow place where there was no room to turn, either to the right or to the left. When the donkey saw the angel of the Lord, she lay down under Balaam, and he was angry and beat her with his staff.”

Then what happens? The seer cannot see, but the donkey sees. What does the seer do? The seer speaks the word of God, right? The seer is a prophet; he speaks for God. Who speaks here? “Then the Lord opened the donkey’s mouth, and she said to Balaam, ‘What have I done to you to make you beat me these three times?’ Balaam answered the donkey, ‘You have made a fool of me! If I had a sword in my hand...’ Do you get the irony of this? Balaam says, ‘If I had a sword in my hand...’ Who has a sword in their hand? The angel standing in front of him. Balaam says, ‘If I had a sword in my hand, I would kill you right now.’ Do you get the irony? This angel with a sword is standing right there, and Balaam says, ‘If I had a sword in my hand, I would kill you right now.’”

“The donkey said to Balaam, ‘Am I not your own donkey, which you have always ridden, to this day?’” The donkey starts reasoning with Balaam. “‘Have I been in the habit of doing this to you?’ ‘No’, he said. Then the Lord opened Balaam’s eyes...” (Now the seer can see.) “...and he saw the angel of the Lord standing in the road with his sword drawn. So he bowed low and fell facedown.” What question does the angel of the Lord ask him now? This is beautiful. There is so much irony. “The angel of the Lord asked him, ‘Why have you beaten your donkey these three times?’” That is the same question that the donkey asked him. So the donkey says, “Why have you beaten me three times? I just saved your life.” Then angel says, “Hey, Balaam, why have you beaten your donkey these three times?”

By the way, does the angel care about the animals? Does God care about the animals? You need to look at the book of Deuteronomy sometimes it is really interesting with God's care for animals. Here the donkey is getting beaten and the angel says "'Why have you beaten your donkey these three times? I have come here to oppose you because your path is a reckless one before me. The donkey saw me and turned away these three times. If she had not turned away, I would certainly have killed you by now, but I would have spared her.' Balaam said to the angel of the Lord, 'I have sinned...'" And Balaam backs off and he says he will only do what God says. Balaam backs off when he sees this angel ready to lop off his head. So that is the story of the donkey. Can you see all of the irony in there?

Is this a great story to tell the kids? Kids like talking animals, so this is a great story for kids. It is a great story for us too because he is telling him to be faithful. So the donkey sees more than the seer. Then the donkey speaks better than the prophet. So the narrative is slowed down, warning Balaam do not go after money, go after the Lord.

F. Balaam's Four Oracles: First Oracle [26:43-28:20]

Now Balaam is going to give four oracles here. What are oracles? Prophets give these little short poems or oracles where they speak the word of God. Balaam is going to speak God's word. Balak, king of Moab, is going to get Balaam to try to come up and get in a place high enough to curse Israel. So Balak, king of Moab, is going to try to get Balaam to curse Israel and he is going to try it four times. So these are the four oracles. The first oracle starts in chapter 23, verse 7, and you get this statement: "Balak brought me from Aram, the king of Moab from the eastern mountains. 'Come,' he said, 'curse Jacob for me; come denounce Israel'" And then Balaam says, "How can I curse those whom God has not cursed?" Who curses? Does Balaam curse or is it God who has the power of the curse? Balaam says, "I can't curse those whom God hasn't cursed. Who can curse but Yahweh? Jehovah is the only one who can curse. I can't curse." So basically Balak King of Moab says, "I brought you all the way down here and you won't curse them for me." So the first oracle comes down, and Balaam will not curse. Instead of cursing Israel, he blesses them.

G. Balaam's Four Oracles: Second oracle [28:20-36:21]

Balak, king of Moab, moves Balaam around, put him in a different position and puts him on high “Mountain of Spies” and then Balaam comes down with this statement. He uttered this oracle, “‘Arise, Balak, and listen; hear me, son of Zippor. God is not a man, that he should lie, nor a son of man, that he should change his mind. Does he speak and then not act? Does he promise and not fulfill?’” This is a very classic verse that God does not change, and actually, if you want another one that is kind of interesting, you go to I Samuel, chapter 15, verse 29. And it says. “‘He who is the Glory of Israel does not lie or change his mind; for he is not a man, that he should change his mind.’” That is I Samuel 15.29. So you’ve got these two verses that say God does not change.

This raises a question, didn’t we see God change when he said he was going to wipe out Israel and then Moses prays and God relents. So how do you work with this? How do you fit this that God does not change when we have seen God change? God relented from what he was going to do. How do you fit those together? What I want to suggest to you is that God is a promise keeper. If God gives a promise, he will keep his promise. Who did God make promises to? Did God make promises to Abraham? To Isaac? To Jacob? Did we see the promise? We saw the promise of the land, the seed, and the blessing. It was given to Abraham and it was reiterated to Isaac and Jacob on down to the Israelites. This was the Abrahamic covenant that he made with Abraham. God keeps his promises. By the way, will that Abrahamic covenant be fulfilled a thousand years later? Will God keep his promise over a thousand years? Two thousand years? Yes. God keeps his promises, although it may take two thousand years sometimes, he keeps his promises. God’s character is also another thing that does not change. God’s character: his righteousness, his justice, his holiness, his compassion, his mercy, his grace and his wrath. God’s character does not change.

Is every time you speak a promise to someone? Do you ever just goof around when you are talking with someone? You are just talking, but not making any promises. By the way, are there times when you make promises? When would be a big time in a person’s life when they would make a big promise? At a wedding, when you promise

“for better or for worse, in sickness and in health, ‘til death do us part, etc.” Those are big promises. People make big promises. Do people always keep their promises? That tends to be a problem. Does God keep his promises? So do we always promise or do we sometimes just play around and talk to people? Are we ever sarcastic? Do we ever say the exact opposite of what we mean? Yes, we do. Now is that evil to be sarcastic? No, it is not. Will God be sarcastic sometimes? Does anybody remember the prophet Elijah? Elijah is sarcastic. The prophets of Baal are bouncing around and Elijah says, “Hey, you guys, you better scream louder. Baal is on the pot, and he can’t hear you. Yell louder, he can’t hear you.” Is Elijah mocking them out? Does Elijah believe in Baal? Elijah in I Kings 18, doesn’t believe in Baal; he is mocking them out. So what I am saying is that do we have all different sorts of ways that we can communicate? Can sometimes we just express how we feel? Now is that a promise? So we can express our feelings, we can express our commitments and promises, and we can express sarcasm and jokes. There are many ways that we can express ourselves.

What I am suggesting is that if we can express ourselves in different ways, can God also express himself in different ways? When God gives you a promise, he is going to keep his promise. But God can also communicate other ways and not everything he says is necessarily a promise. Sometimes he is just talking or doing something different. So God then is involved in creative possibilities. Sometimes there are possibilities, and sometimes God himself explores those possibilities. There are conditional statements with God. God says, “if you obey me, then this will happen and if you disobey me, then this will happen.” There are “if’s” with God. There are conditional statements with God. Therefore, the future is not all locked down.

Now certain things in the future are locked down. Jesus will be born in Bethlehem was locked down (Micah 5.2). But there are other things that are not locked down and depend on a person’s reaction or interaction with God. I want to get off of that free-will/predestination issue. By the way, is it okay to disagree in this class. The answer is, yes. Nobody knows how to solve this one. I have given you how I think about it, but you might think about it differently, which is totally fine. After I am all done thinking I have

solved the problem, I realize how big of a fool I am. I have no idea what the mind of God is like. I work with Scripture as best as I can, and this book is all that I have got. Different people take different positions and I am not saying that I know any more than anybody else. I am just trying to wrestle with the various passages. It is okay to disagree on this one.

Are some of you guys from Presbyterian backgrounds? If I said, “reformed” would you know the word? That is actually how I grew up, in a Calvinistic reformed tradition. Is anybody Wesleyan? Does anybody do Salvation Army? Salvation Army and Wesleyan tradition are more of the free-will groups. Over my life, I have kind of migrated more from the reformed over to the free-will side. I am not saying that is right or wrong, that is just where I am, largely from my study of Scripture, but I am not sure that I am right.

Now to totally shift gears, I want to focus on Balaam’s four oracles. These are really neat, I think. Balaam mentions this in the second oracle, down in verse 21. Balaam says this, “No misfortune is seen in Jacob, no misery observed in Israel. The Lord their God is with them; the shout of the King is among them.” He parallels these two things: he parallels, “The Lord their God is with them;” with “the shout of the King is among them.” Who is Israel’s king? Jehovah, their God, is their king. So in this passage Balaam says, “I can’t curse them. Their king is Jehovah. Moses is not their king. Jehovah, Yahweh, is their king.” That is in the second oracle.

H. Balaam’s Four Oracles: Third Oracle [36:22-38:44]

Balak then takes over oracle three. They migrate over to a different place. Let me read a little bit of the oracle, “...the Spirit of God came upon him.” By the way, is there the Spirit of God in the Old Testament? Yes, the Spirit of God came upon Balaam and he uttered his oracle. Here is the oracle, “The oracle of Balaam son of Beor, the oracle of one whose eyes sees clearly, the oracle of one who hears the words of God, who sees a vision from the Almighty, who falls prostrate, and whose eyes are opened.” So he falls on the ground with his eyes open and then he gives this prophesy. That is what is called an “ecstatic utterance.” The prophet is going to give a prophesy from God so he falls

down to the ground, his eyes are open, and he gives this message from God. It is kind of like (now this is pretty weird), being slain in the Spirit. In the old days they used to have this thing, slain in the spirit, and this is kind of like that. The guy goes down and he gives this prophecy from God.

Now notice what he says in chapter 24, verse 7 concerning the king, “Water will flow from their buckets; their seed will have abundant water. Their king will be greater than Agag...” Agag is a human king. Is he saying that Jehovah, their king, will be greater than a human king? That would be a dumb statement, right? Of course, God is greater than Agag. Is this referring to a human king? “Their king will be greater than Agag; their kingdom will be exalted.” So here in this third oracle, you have got a human king being referred to, a king that will be greater than King Agag. So what you have in the two oracles of Balaam is one oracle that refers to God as their king, and you have another oracle where he is referring to a human king who will be greater than Agag. So you have got these two kings that Balaam is referring to.

I. Balaam’s Four Oracles: Fourth Oracle [38:45-41:49]

Guess what he is going to talk about in oracle four? Yes, a king. In oracle four he comes up with a king, and check this out in chapter 24, verse 17, “I see him, but not now; I behold him, but not near.” Is Balaam saying that he is a prophet? “I see him, but not now; I behold him, but not near. A star will come out of Jacob; a scepter will rise out of Israel.” Who usually carries a scepter? A king. A scepter is a metonymy for king. It is a figure of speech for a king. He says, “...a scepter will rise out of Israel. He will crush the foreheads of Moab...”

But notice here the parallels here between “a star will come out of Jacob” and “a scepter will rise out of Israel.” A scepter and a star are being paralleled. In what other place in the Bible (I think it is the only other one, outside of Revelation) are a star and a king associated? Yes, at Jesus’ birth. You had what happen at Jesus’ birth? The wise men came; the magi came. By the way, where were the magi from? They were from Mesopotamia. Where was Balaam from? Mesopotamia. How did the wise men know to follow that star and go to Jerusalem and ask, “Where is he who has been born King of the

Jews?” Is it possible, (now this is total conjecture on my part), that Balaam’s (who is from Mesopotamia) four oracles went back to Mesopotamia with him and the wise men were reading the oracle of Balaam? Was this guy still a famous prophet 600 years later [ca. 800 B C], so that these prophesies were known? The magi see a star and know to go to Jerusalem to seek the King of the Jews. So what I am wondering is if this passage was used by the magi to find out about the star that led them to a scepter in Israel and that this refers to Jesus. Would this tie together the divine king and the human king? This is all conjecture. I hold it with an open hand, but it seems to make sense to me. This is a really cool Messianic prophesy of Jesus, a star and a scepter. I just wonder if it came from Balaam to get the magi at Christ’s birth.

J. Why is Balaam portrayed positively in Numbers? [41:50-48:45]

Now what do we know about Balaam here? In the first two oracles, I was trying to deal with issue of change, and then we went back to the second, third, and fourth oracles this time looking at what they say about the king. By the way, the oracles are long, about 10 verses each and I did not read through all those oracles. Why is Balaam portrayed so positively in the narrative? Balaam seems to give forth even a Messianic prophesy in these great oracles.

I think what is going on is there is a contrast in texts. There is a contrast between Israel’s unfaithfulness and Balaam’s faithfulness. Balaam, a pagan poet or prophet, is more faithful to God than Israel is. So there is a contrast between Balaam and Israel. The pagan prophet is more faithful to God at this point.

Can you look at different people in different ways? Is a person totally bad? Personally, I know the guy who has the most life sentences against him in Indiana. He holds the record in the state of Indiana with about 11 life sentences. I will call him by his first name, Dave. He is a friend of mine. Is Dave a totally bad man? Did Dave do some really, really bad stuff? Yes, he did. But is he totally bad? No, he is not. I know multiple murderers, and many of these guys are my friends. Yes, they did some things that were

really bad, but there is some good there. Can you see some good in a bad person?

On the other hand, can you see some bad in a good person? What about your parents, brothers, and sisters? Do you know all the bad stuff about your brothers and sisters? What I am saying is you can choose how you look at a person.

The Balaam story is told with a positive light on Balaam initially, but then the story changes. By the way, when you get married, is your wife good or bad? Is your husband good or bad? What you are going to find out is that your husband or your wife has some very positive things and some very negative things. If you focus on only the positive things (like in my case), you will think your wife is the most wonderful person in the world. What are the bad sides? She does not have any bad sides. I say that because this is recorded on tape, I have been married to her for 36 years and know that she has problems. Do I also have my own problems? She can look at my problems and that can be all that she chooses to see. If you keep looking at problems all the time, what happens to your marriage? It goes down the tube. She is probably the best thing that has ever happened to me in my life outside of Jesus Christ. What I am trying to say is that do you see the perspective you take? Think about your roommate, can you think negatively or positively? You can destroy the relationship if you only see one side of things.

Here is what Balaam did: in Numbers 25 it says, “While Israel was staying in Shittim, the men began to indulge in sexual immorality with Moabite women, who invited them to sacrifices to their gods.” So not only is it sexual immorality, but it is also immorality in the context of pagan worship. That is what they did in ancient days: part of the worship was immorality. “The people ate and bowed down before these gods. So Israel joined in worshipping the Baal of Peor. The Lord’s anger burned against them.” Now all of a sudden, Israel is going to be cursed. Why is Israel cursed? Because they sinned.

Here is how it went down most likely. How did Israel get cursed? Balaam refused to curse Israel himself. He refused because God told him to say exactly what he told him. However, did Balaam know that the only way to get Israel cursed was to get them to sin? So it is believed that Balaam told the Moabites to put their women out there to seduce the

men into the worship of these other gods. Israel would sin and God would judge them. Balaam set that up. Is that really evil? Yes, and Balaam set that up. You see a bit of that in chapter 25 and you see Balaam's death in chapter 31. This is 6 chapters later, it says they killed all these people and they also "killed Balaam son of Beor with the sword." So Israel catches Balaam and they kill him. Down in verse 16 it says, "They were the ones who followed Balaam's advice and were the means of turning the Israelites away from the Lord in what happened at Peor, so that a plague struck the Lord's people." So Balaam gave the advice for these Moabite women to go out and seduce. Balaam was the guy behind that. Balaam is a Judas kind of figure. Is he going to go after money or the word of God? He proclaims the word of God, but then he goes after this money thing and offers his advice to get Israel cursed. God does curse them because they sinned. Why is Balaam portrayed so positively? Because of the contrast between Israel's unfaithfulness and his faithfulness. That is the book of Numbers.

K. Introduction to Deuteronomy as a Covenant Renewal [48:46-50:36]

Now we are going to jump over and catch the book of Deuteronomy. This book of Deuteronomy is going to be a very interesting book. The book of Deuteronomy ends the Pentateuch or the Torah (the 5 books of Moses). Deuteronomy is a covenant renewal. What is a covenant renewal? God comes to Abraham and makes a covenant with him and says, "Abraham, you believed in me, I will give you the land, I will give you the seed. Your seed will multiply as the stars in heaven and you will be a blessing to all the nations of the earth." Is that covenant of Abraham reiterated to Isaac and Jacob? It is called "covenant renewal," when it passes down from one generation to the next. In Deuteronomy, we have got a generational passing between Moses and what? Moses is going to be up Mt. Nebo here overlooking Jericho because Moses cannot enter the Promised Land. Instead God is going to show him all the land. He cannot cross the Jordan River and he is going to die on Mt. Nebo. God is going to bury him and take care of him. Moses has got to give up the power and give it to Joshua. The book of Deuteronomy is this passing of the "baton" from Moses to Joshua. Now Moses is going

to say, “Joshua, here is what is coming in the future. This is what the land is going to be like for you. I cannot go over there, but Joshua, you are going to take the next generation across.” This is going to be a covenant renewal. By the way, you get that same type of thing with Elijah and Elisha. You get two prophets, the mentor and the mentee.

L. Deuteronomy major themes: Promise to possession, testing to resting

[50:37-55:16]

Now facing change: I want to look first at the book of Deuteronomy and it has almost an existential way about its bigger meaning. So far in the Pentateuch, we have seen God’s promise. God promises and promises. He promises to Abraham, he promises to Isaac, he promises to Jacob, and he promises to Moses. But do Abraham, Isaac and Jacob possess? Abraham possessed one piece of property out of the whole Promised Land. What was that? The cave of Machpelah, where he buried his wife Sarah. The only place that he ever owned in Israel was the place where he buried his wife. To this day, you can go to Hebron and go to the cave of Machpelah. I do not recommend it. The last time I was there, two women were shot dead a half-hour before we arrived. It is not a real good place to go especially when you do not know what you are doing. But Hebron has the cave of Machpelah. It is a very famous place although it is very dangerous today.

Testing versus resting. The Israelites were in the wilderness and it was a time of testing. No water, no food, no leadership, they said, no meat to eat. So God tested them in the wilderness for 40 years. Now when they go into the promised land, is their testing going to be over? The testing will be over and God says they will experience rest. Deuteronomy looks at this land and says, “You’ve been tested in the wilderness for 40 years. You guys are going in and you are going to find rest. That will be wonderful for you guys. You are not just going to get the promises, but you are going to possess what has been promised to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.”

Transient versus permanence: you guys are college students, transient or permanent? Actually, I look at some of you, and probably “permanent.” Wouldn’t that almost sound like purgatory to be trapped in college for the rest of your life? Wouldn’t that be like *Groundhog’s Day*? Actually, if you want to get trapped in college for the rest

of your life, you know what you do? Become a professor and that's what I did. The honest truth is these are some of the best days of your life. I know that sounds really weird, but these college days are some of the best days of your life. You will look back on it and you'll miss these days. Transient versus permanent. Have you guys ever traveled, traveled and traveled?

This summer, my son just got back from Afghanistan? We drove out to see his brother. We drove the car 33 hours out to Denver, Colorado. After we got done in Denver, we went up to Yellowstone and through Idaho and all this. We couldn't even get a potato in Idaho, how sick is that? We drove back through South Dakota, through Minnesota, Wisconsin to say hello to Uncle David. Now he's been traveling in Afghanistan and been getting shot at almost every day. He comes back to America and we go on this trip across country. At a certain point did he want to be transient or did he just want to be home? Instead of sleeping in a foxhole, did he just want to sleep in his own bed? Is that a big deal? That was a big deal. So where we hit Wisconsin and he said, "Dad, I'm just tired of traveling. I just want to go home. Let's go home." So we drove for 26 hours straight. I don't recommend that. What I'm saying is have you ever had to travel, travel, and travel and you just long for a place where you can settle and be permanent where things aren't always in transition? So Israel is in the wilderness. They're what? They are wandering in the wilderness. Transient, transient, transient. Moses said that the transience is going to be over and you guys are going to settle. You are going to have your own property. You are going to have your own house, you are going to be able to settle in the land, settle down and be permanent there and even raise your family.

M. Space and Place [55:17- 59:23]

Now there's a guy named Walter Brueggemann and he has written a book called *The Land* and I've stolen these concepts out of him, but I think they are really important. Brueggemann talks about space. Now what is space? Space is like chaos. A phrase that I love is what I call the W.U.D. Theory. You know what W.U.D. is? The World Upside Down. Have any of you ever experienced that, where everything is upside down,

everything is crazy? What should be right is wrong, and what should be wrong is right, the world's upside down. The world upside down, that's space. Chaos, transient-ness, space, that's where you don't belong and you travel through space. You travel through space, but you don't belong there. This is space. The wilderness is space. It's a place of hardship. There's no food, there's no water, there's not enough sustenance. It's space, it's chaos.

You move from space into place. Place, if I had to pick one or two words, one would be "home." Do some of you guys have a sense of home? Home, belonging... Home is a place where I can be myself. Everybody knows me as I am, weird as all get-out. By the way, are they all weird too? We are all weird together. We know that everybody's weird, but we're family and we're at home. We belong there. Have you ever been in environments where you felt you didn't belong? That's space, but at home, you can relax, you can be yourself for who you are. They know who you are. You don't have to say who you are, they know who you are. They know you and you know them. It's okay, you're all weird, and you're kind of in this thing together. So that place, that sense of home...

My son-in-law who married my daughter, (that's why he's my son-in-law) he's got a birthday coming up in January. The guy is going to be 41, I can't believe it. Anyways, he's quite a bit older than my daughter is, but he is a really neat guy. He came from Taiwan over to America and his family has been all broken up and his family is all in California. They are really far away and the family has been broken: father, mother and things like that. He longs for what? He realizes now, he's mid-life and he has got more friends than you can believe. You guys have got Facebook, he has got more friends than you can believe, more than Facebook. He has tons of friends, but he has this sense that these are all friends. Do friends come and go? Friends come and go, and he is realizing "I want family." But he says "My family is in California and they're all broken up." So he has kind of been adopted into our family, so he's part of our family now. Our family is very, very cohesive I hope he feels like he is a member of our family. Is he a member? "Oh, he married in, yes he did." So he is part of our family so when we do

stuff. Our kids can hardly wait to get together. My two sons are shooting elk right now. They are shooting Bambi. With the way they shoot... well actually I shouldn't say that, my sons are both expert marksmen. Anyway, they haven't been able to get anything yet. But what I'm saying is this sense of home, this sense of belonging. Can you rest at home? You can rest, you can relax, and you can be yourself. So that's the difference between space and place.

This is the wilderness. This is the Promised Land. When they go into the Promised Land, they enter place, this sense of where they belong. Now they can find a home here. They aren't wandering anymore. Wandering is gone, now they can set up a permanent place.

N. The Impact of the where question [59:24-62:37]

This raises some things. Is the "where" you dwell important? Does the "where" question affect your life? Do you act the same way in an Old Testament class as you do in a basketball game? Does "where" affect how you act? Do you act the same at a basketball game as you do when you go shopping at the mall? Maybe so. Where you are shapes how you act.

Does the "where" question shape you? Does where you grew up affect you? I remember I had a student whose name was Zachary. He was a really great kid. Before we were flying to Israel, we were flying out of the Chicago area. We were down in Indiana and came up to Chicago. We were flying out of O'hare to go to Israel to study in Israel for three weeks. We went up to northern Chicago to pick Zach up. We were picking Zach up and he was an inner city kid. He said, "I've got to stop off at a sidewalk before we leave." So he had some flowers and went over to the sidewalk. We found the sidewalk and he put the flowers on the sidewalk and I don't know if you know what that means. I didn't know what it meant. It meant that there was a 3-year-old girl who was riding a tricycle and gangbangers got on both sides and this 3-year-old girl was shot dead. They put flowers on the sidewalk as a memorial. So it was like, "Whoa... this is heavy. We are going to Israel, and we dropped the flowers off. Zach got on the plane and he flew over to Israel. When he flew to Israel, he took the first test over there because you have to test on

Bible geography, and he flunked everything. He was getting 30's and 40's. I bring this student over there and he's going to flunk out

So, finally, I pull him aside and I say, "Zach, what's going on? We have got to get this grade thing under control here otherwise, you are going to be blowing this whole thing off." So then he told me the story of that girl that was shot. He said it brought back all sorts of memories for him. When Zach was a little kid, he was in a house and his brother was a drug dealer. He said that these guys broke into the house and he had to watch as his brother got shot to death. So here is a little kid watching his older brother getting shot to death. He said when that little girl went down, all of a sudden his older brother came back. He questioned, "Could you focus on Bible geography when all that stuff comes back?" It totally just blew him away. Did the "where" of Zach's life affect him?

Now you can deny that and say that you never want to remember that again. What I want to suggest to you is that's not the way to do it. Can you forget stuff like that? You can't forget that. You have got to integrate those memories into your life, you can't just dismiss it and try to forget it. So the "where" question is a very important concept.

O. The Land: not deserved [62:38-64:09]

Now let's work with the land. I want to hit various verses here and we'll go through this quickly. By the way, this land is called the what? The Promised Land. The land of Israel is called the Promised Land, obviously because God promised it to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, etc. In Deuteronomy chapter 9, verse 4, it says, "After the Lord your God has driven them out before you, do not say to yourself, 'The Lord has brought me here to take possession of this land because of my righteousness.'" God is saying and Moses is telling them, "When you go into the land, don't think it's because you are hot stuff and God is giving you the land because you are so good. No, no, no. God is not giving you the land because you're so righteous. Don't you ever think that." (Verse 4 continued) "No, it is on account of the wickedness of these nations that the Lord is going to drive them out before you." Why is God going to drive out the nations? Because of their wickedness. Is it on account of your righteousness? No, it is not because of how

good you are, it is because how bad they are. By the way, when you guys read the book of Joshua, did God drive the Canaanites out of there? Was it brutal sometimes? God says it was because of their wickedness. That culture is being judged now because of their wickedness. It is not because of your righteousness that you're getting the land, it is because of their wickedness. It is not based on your merit and it is not based on your effort.

P. Land as Gift [64:10-65:29]

If you go over to chapter 6, verse 10 and following it says, "When the Lord your God brings you into the land he swore to your fathers, to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to give you--a land with large, flourishing cities you did not build." Did you see the turn there? You are going to get large cities, but you did not build those cities. (Continued into verse 11), "...houses filled with all kind of good things you did not provide, wells you did not dig, and vineyards and olive groves you did not plant--then when you eat and are satisfied, be careful that you do not forget the Lord, who brought you out of Egypt, out of the land of slavery." What is going to be their promise? It's a good land. God is going to give them cities they didn't build, olive groves they didn't plant, wells they didn't dig. God is going to give them all this good stuff as a gift.

When they eat and are satisfied, God says, "Be careful in being satisfied that you don't forget that you came from where? You were slaves in Egypt and I redeemed you out of Egypt." Are the people supposed to remember their slavery, their bondage? They are supposed to integrate that, understand it, and never forget their roots.

Q. Land as promised [65:30-67:08]

It was the land that he swore to give to their forefathers. It is the Promised Land. God promised that land to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Now God is fulfilling his promise. They are actually receiving the promise that God made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. This is the great rip-off in life. The promise was given over and over and over again to the fathers. Did the fathers get any of the land? No, Abraham bought the tomb to bury his wife. Who gets the possession? Who actually gets the land? The descendants. How many of your parents are giving you something that they never had? Have some of you felt

that? Your parents gave you stuff that they themselves never had. I went to college, my father and mother barely finished high school. I went to college and they didn't pay for my college. I had to pay for it myself, but they supported me and gave me food and a place to stay while I was going to college. But what I'm saying is that a lot of times do the parents sacrifice on behalf of their children to give them what they never had? So you get this thing here where the promise comes to the fathers, but the descendants get possession of the promise.

Now, by the way, when the descendants get it, do the descendants appreciate it as much as the parents who give it? No, the parents value it, but the children take it for granted. They forget where they came from.

R. Land as participating in a tradition [67:09-68:18]

Participating in a tradition: there is an inter-generational thing between parents and children here that's being passed down. It's called tradition. Now if I say, "tradition," what comes to your mind? *The Fiddler on the Roof*. I've said this before, and I'll say it again. When you graduate from Gordon College, everybody here that is going to graduate from Gordon College, you must watch *The Fiddler on the Roof*. If you do not, Dr. Wilson will be there with one of these air gun things. When you go across to get your diploma, he's going to pop you one. So you better watch *The Fiddler on the Roof* before you graduate. He knows who's watched and who hasn't. I'm just kidding, but I do recommend the movie, it's one of those phenomenally good movies. Traditions from the parents to the children and the tradition is passed down through generations and generations. By the way, in our culture is tradition usually a negative thing? We want to break out of tradition. Here you see this being passed down from generation to generation. The land is a gift that's passed down

S. The Land as gift [68:19-70:30]

Now, the land is a gift. We have said that about ten times now. The land is a gift, God's giving the land. They don't deserve it. God is giving them the land as a gift. This gift shows God's choice in loving them. Let me just read chapter 7, verse 7, "The Lord did not set his affection on you and choose you..." Does God choose to love somebody?

Can you choose to love somebody? Is love a choice? “No, it’s just chemistry. I get around this person and...” No, no, no. Is love a choice? Here we get this, “The Lord did not set his affection on you and choose you because you were more numerous than other peoples, for you were the fewest of all peoples. But it was because the Lord loved you and kept the oath he swore to your forefathers that he brought you out with a mighty hand and redeemed you from the land of slavery...” God chose you and that’s what is significant and special. It’s a good land; it is a land flowing with milk and honey. We have said that phrase, “milk and honey.” It’s a real famous phrase. “Milk” is probably what kind of milk? Goat’s milk. The honey is possibly honey, but it’s also possibly date jam mashed up. It’s a land that’s filled. It’s filled with cities, it’s filled with wells, and it’s filled with gardens. They didn’t build the cities, they didn’t dig the wells, and they didn’t plant the gardens. God’s going to give them this filled land. The land is going to be a satisfying land. What’s the problem going to be? When they eat and are satisfied, what’s their problem? They’re going to forget the Lord, their God and that’s going to be a big problem. So the land is a satisfying land and Moses is looking over there.

Can you see Moses up on Mt. Nebo drooling and just saying, “O how I wish I could just go into the land. I’ve been out in the desert for 40 years. This stinks. And here all these people are the ones who are going to go eat these grapes, olives, and pizza.”

T. Place God is going to put his name [70:31-71:54]

Chapter 12 is a really important chapter. Actually chapter 12, you could talk about for hours. God says to Israel, while Moses is up here on Mt. Nebo. Moses tells them that God is going to pick a place in Israel and that God is going to put his name in that place. So chapter 12, verse 5 is a classic on this topic. But the whole of chapter 12 says this, “But you are to seek the place the Lord your God will choose from among all your tribes to put his name there for his dwelling...” Where would God put his name in Israel and dwell there forever? What place would that be? Originally it went to Shiloh. The tabernacle went up to Shiloh, but is that where it stayed? No, David is going to bring it up to Jerusalem. Jerusalem is now going to be the city of David and the city of our God. God will put his name in Jerusalem and the temple will be built in Jerusalem. God will

put his name there. What you have in Deuteronomy 12.5 is the centralization of Israel's worship foreshadowing what's going to happen here with Jerusalem in David's time. Jerusalem until this day is considered a holy city and the Lord's presence is there.

U. Major problem: Forgetting [71:55- 74:55]

Now major problems: a major problem for Israel that Moses warns them about is that basically forgetting where they came from. Where did Israel come from? They were slaves in Egypt and Moses warns them, he says, "Don't forget where you come from."

Do some of you have memories of where you came from that you would love to forget? I told you that my son got back from Afghanistan. When he was in Afghanistan, he was shot at every day, he saw friends take hits, some of his friends were blown up. Rez, one of his friends that he trained was blown a hundred feet in the air and fell down and broke almost every bone in his body. He lived, the problem is, my son says when he goes and talks to him, he says, "Rez, Rez" and Rez is not there, you know what I'm saying? When he got shot up like that a 100 feet into the air, something happened to his head and it's not Rez anymore. If you fell 100 feet, that's 10 stories, is that a long way to fall? Rez is not Rez anymore, he's been busted up really bad. He's still alive though.

What I'm saying is that my son got back and he was telling all these stories, and we were saying, "You've got to write all these things down." I've actually got the first one that he wrote now. He turned it into an English assignment over at North Shore. His comment to me was, "Dad, I've seen stuff that no human being should ever see. I want to forget it. I don't want to remember it ever again, I just want to try to forget it."

The question is: is it good to forget some stuff? I think it may be. What's the problem with forgetting? When you try to forget, is it still in you? What happens is that it's integrated in. But can you forget stuff like that? You can't forget that. Will it pop up at certain times then if you don't integrate it? What I'm saying is that is it really good to talk about these things and integrate these things in rather than rejecting and just forgetting everything. Integrate them into who you are. Is this part of who he is now? That's part of his history now and he has to own that as much as it's terrible. I don't know how you do all that, but I know that it doesn't do you any good to suppress it and to

forget it. You've got to integrate it. All of us have certain parts of our past that we wish we could forget. What I am saying is be careful about forgetting. Remembering and integrating is probably the way to go, it will lead to a more mature person. If you forget, then you get this real weird stuff happening. Let's get off that.

V. Remembering [74:56-78:23]

Remembering: God tells them they are to remember the what? The house of bondage. They were slaves in Egypt. Remember that you were slaves. That's a bad memory for them, but God says, "Remember you were slaves because I delivered you out of that slavery." Remember, you came out of Egypt. You crossed the Red Sea. Remember, God's deliverance with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm. Do you remember reading that a number of times? God said, "I brought you out with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm." God is the deliverer and God is the place that they should put their faith and trust. God is the one who redeemed them out of Egypt and their slavery and bondage. God tells them to remember.

By the way, does anybody know the Hebrew term? Is anybody named Zachary in here? Zachary or *zakar* means "to remember." I have a son Zachary and he was named that and he has been true to his name.

Remembering then, is a basis for praise. Do you guys remember things where you met God and God did wonderful things in your life? That memory then causes you to come back and praise God. So memory is a basis for praising God. They were to remember that they were brought out of Egypt, the mighty hand, the Red Sea split, God provided manna from heaven, God brought them to Mt. Sinai. At Mt. Sinai, God in a certain sense, married Israel. At Mt. Sinai, God gave Israel his covenant and God married them so to speak. Then God took them on a 40-year wilderness wandering, which was kind of like a honeymoon. Now God is taking them into the land. God is bringing his bride home to the land that he promised to them and he wants them to remember. Remembrance is a basis of praise.

By the way, when you get into the book of Psalms, are there all sorts of memories of Israel's history? Psalms 78, the whole thing is all remembrance of what you guys just

have been reading. “For his steadfast love endures forever,” Psalm 136. Again, it goes through Israel’s history, coupled with “God’s steadfast love endures forever.” The basis of praise, the whole book of Psalms is based on this.

So reflective questions: where do you dwell? And what do you remember? Does your memory become a basis for praise? How do you experience the presence of God in the “where” in which you live? Do you experience the presence of God at Gordon College? When you’re in Lane? When you’re in various places? Just before I came to class, I was walking down some steps in Frost Hall and as I was walking down the steps, a man named Bruce came up. And as Bruce came up the steps, question: did that cause God to come into my mind to think about Bruce in relationship to God? Yes, Bruce has got cancer. Question: do I need to be praying for him? I need to be praying for him. So I see Bruce and it calls me to the throne of God and to say, “God, be merciful.” Okay? So experiencing the presence of God in the “where” of which you live.

W. Moses as author of Deuteronomy and JEDP source theory [78:24-81:45]

Now, let’s look at Moses in the writing of Deuteronomy. We are going to connect up these two things we’ve talked about the land in existential terms, in terms of meaning. This is going to be more academic now. Moses in Deuteronomy, who wrote the book of Deuteronomy? We saw Deuteronomy is covenant renewal. Moses is passing the baton on to Joshua. The covenant is being renewed, Joshua is being reminded of the things that he is responsible for and the covenant. Does anybody remember this: the old J.E.D.P. theory? Deuteronomy is big in this J.E.D.P. theory. The J.E.D.P. theory says Moses did not write the Pentateuch, but instead you had a “J” writer who liked the name Jehovah so he wrote with Jehovah or Yahweh and so they called it the “J Document.” He wrote about 850 BC, which was about 150 years after the time of David. So this is long after Moses is gone, 500 years after Moses. After the “J” writer... You had the “E” writer and he wrote the part of the Pentateuch... (This is how critics see that the Bible was put together). The “E” writer wrote in the name Elohim. He liked the name, Elohim. He favored that name, so he usually calls God by the name, Elohim. He writes about 750 BC. Now what happens is that “J” and “E” get put together into a “JE Document” and these

two documents are source documents.

Then, Deuteronomy stands by itself. Deuteronomy dates from about 620 or 612 BC and this is remembrance of Josiah. King Josiah “finds” the book of the law in the temple, but everybody knows he didn’t “find” the book of the law. Josiah had the book of the law written with Moses’ name on it. So this is what they call a “Pious Fraud.” In other words, Josiah wanted to do good reformation he wanted to reform and make the people go back to God and so what he did was put out a fraud in Moses’ name. So he says, “We are going to write this document. We’re going to sign it like it was Moses’ document. We’re going to find this book of the law.” Josiah’s going to do the reformation in his time and bring people back to the Lord. So that’s where the book of Deuteronomy came from. They call that a “Pious Fraud.” Can you see what that means? Josiah wrote this book of Deuteronomy.

Now, by the way, does the Bible say that? The Bible says who’s writing the book of Deuteronomy? Moses. So Moses is there writing and talking. By the way, is there any external evidence that supports any of this JEDP? Is there any archeological evidence of any of these sources? Not a shred, as a matter of fact, some of the archeological evidence like “P” the priestly writer, 450 BC, we found that in Numbers 6, we’ve got a priestly document from 600-700 BC, 300 years before this. So we’ve actually got archeological evidence that contradicts this theory. So this is basically how critics coming out of the 19th century, coming into the 20th century, said that this is how the Pentateuch actually got built up and that it was not really Moses who wrote the Pentateuch, but it was these “Pious Frauds” that have written in Moses’ name.

X. Deuteronomy and Hittite Treaties [81:46-92:12]

Now, should we be able to tell the difference between a document that was written in 620 BC and Moses who was back about what—1200 or 1400 BC. There is about 600 or 800 years between. Do document types change over 600 or 800 years? Does the format you use change over 800 years? Well check this out, they say Josiah finds the book of the law, and this is what 2 Chronicles 34.33 says, Josiah found the book of the law, Deuteronomy. That’s what the Bible says, but critics say “No, Josiah wrote it.”

Now, Hittite treaties... Let's talk about treaties. We've got Hittite treaties. When do the Hittite treaties date from? 1200 BC. Is that very close to the time of Moses? If you take a late date, that's from the very time of Moses. So the Hittite treaties, and treaties that come from this period, are from right at the time of Moses.

This treaty form has a **preamble**. What's a preamble? The preamble says, "I am Lugal Zigazi. I am king of Aram and I am the great king. I rule from sea to sea and I am the big man." So the preamble tells who the king is and his domain. The preamble tells the name of the king who is going to do this document.

The next section in these treaties is the historical prologue. The **historical prologue** tells the benevolences of the king. It says, "I am the great king and I helped your father when he needed water that one time and I helped him. A lion attacked him and I killed the lion. He ran out of food and I gave food to his children. So I am the good king." So the historical prologue tells of the benevolences of the king; the good, wonderful, kind things that the king does. By the way, when the king starts telling you how kind and good he is, what's coming next? Is this a setup? This is a setup.

So what you get next are the **stipulations**. The king says, "Hey, because I've been really kind and good to you, you need to follow my law. What's my first law? You must pay what? Taxes. By the way, let me hear you all say that, you must pay what? Taxes. And by the way, are you guys going to be paying taxes for the rest of your life because we got a 15 trillion dollar debt on your back. I will be dead. I'm serious, when I look at you guys and my kids, I just look and my shoulders sag down. It's good you guys don't know how badly you're messed over. This is really bad. Let me get out of here. Stipulations: the king wants what? Stipulations. "Pay me money, obey my laws, and hear my law." You know, you've got to pay traffic tolls when you go on the thruway, you've got to pay taxes, you've got to be obedient, you've got to be loyal to me, you have to do all these things. The king has his stipulations.

Now, when you have a law covenant, do you have to have **witnesses**? What's a covenant people make today? Marriage. In a marriage, do you have to have witnesses to the marriage? Yes. So there are witnesses. This is a really cool one. In the Bible there

will be witnesses like when you have a marriage. Actually, I performed a marriage when my son got married. Therefore, I had to sign off as one of the witnesses as a minister.

Who is God going to call as his witness? God calls heaven and earth to witness. It's really a cool thing, because there's nobody who can witness God, so he calls heaven and earth to witness against him, the mountains and that kind of thing.

At the end of the covenant, there are **blessings and curses**. Blessings if you obey, and curses if you disobey. Now we want to make a shift here, these are the Hittite treaties. 1200 BC, right around the time of Moses. Check this out: Assyrian treaties date from what? 700 BC. Is that very close to the time of Josiah? The Assyrians were brutal. They ruled by fear. For example, you entered one of their cities, they had a pyramid of skulls at the entrance. What's the non-verbal message that was trying to communicate? If you disobey them where does your head end up? Now, by the way, is that pretty convincing argumentation? Yes.

I've been in the British Museum. If you ever get to London, you want to go to the British Museum. You walk into the British Museum, and the first thing right there (it's incredible), you have the Rosetta Stone. Not on a computer Rosetta Stone, they actually have the real Rosetta Stone. If you walk in further and you see the Assyrian empire. You see some of the things of the Assyrian Empire and you see a stake sticking up like that and you see a human being put on the stake, flailing and you see the stake driven right through them. Question: is that cool? What's the message that is trying to communicate? "If you mess with us, you end up what? We have a little stake out, right? Now you're on the stake." How do you know that? When Jonah is told, God says "Jonah I want you to go to Assyria to Nineveh, go to Nineveh, Jonah." Jonah says what? "I don't think so." What's the message God tells him? "Tell the people of Nineveh to repent." Jonah says "Yeah, right, I don't want my head in the pile God. I'm out of here, I'm going to go find some fish and take a ride."

The Assyrian treaty, here's how the treaty goes. The two treaties have different forms. The Assyrian treaty comes from the time of Josiah, at 700, Josiah was 620 BC. So that's the time of Josiah, this is the time of Moses. The two forms are different forms, the

both have a preamble. The historical prologue, the Hittite treaty has a historical prologue, telling of all the king's benevolences. The Assyrian treaty does not have a historical prologue. Why doesn't the Assyrian treaty have a historical prologue? Because they don't tell of the benevolences they did, because they terrorized people. So there's no historical prologue in the Assyrian treaty. Then you go down. Stipulations, both the treaties have stipulations--laws that you're supposed to do for the king. Witnesses, both treaties have witnesses. Then check this out: blessings. The Hittite treaty has blessings, but the Assyrian treaty has no blessings. By the way, does that make sense? The Assyrians are what? They're brutal. They say, "Hey, you obey me, I'm not going to bless you. You deserve to obey me, you just must obey me. I'm not going to bless you." But they have what? Instead, they have curses. Both of them have curses.

Now I ask you this: if you're going to tell whether a treaty was written in 1200 BC or at 700 BC, what are the two places you're going to look to distinguish these documents? If it has a historical prologue, it's early or late? Early. If it's missing a historical prologue it's late. If it has blessings, it's early. If it has no blessings, it's late.

The book of Deuteronomy: check this out--does Deuteronomy have a preamble? Yes, it does. In chapter one, God identifies himself as the great king. God is, the great king. Historical prologue, chapter one to chapter three, God tells of all the benevolent things that he's done for his people. Does God list many of those things, bringing them out of Egypt, providing manna from heaven for them, providing quail to eat and things like that? So there is a historical prologue. Are there stipulations in the book of Deuteronomy? There are general stipulations, the Ten Commandments, love the Lord your God. There are also specific stipulations, and that fits the Hittite treaty to a "T." By the way, there's a guy up at Gordon Conwell Seminary, his name is Meredith Kline, he's the guy that compared these two treaty forms and showed that they're totally different, that they're different at these two places at least. They both have witnesses, Deuteronomy has witnesses. Question: Does Deuteronomy have both blessings and curses? Yes, it does, it has blessings and it has a historical prologue. Therefore Deuteronomy, was it written in 700 or 1200 BC? 1200 BC. Can you see the argument? These two document

forms are different in the historical prologue and the blessings. Deuteronomy has a historical prologue and the blessing, therefore it fits perfectly with the 1200 BC document which is from the time of Moses and not from the time of Josiah. Is this a strong argument? This is a strong argument.

Now question, will critics be able to tear this apart? Yes, because the critics are going to take everything apart, but this is a really pretty strong argument for Deuteronomy being from the time of Moses.

Now general stipulations and with this we'll quit. Next time I'll teach you the Ten Commandments, and you won't even have to sweat it, you'll know the Ten Commandments. All of you will know the Ten Commandments just like that. So next time we'll be up for the Ten Commandments. Read Judges and Ruth for next time. Thanks.

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History, Literature and Theology course, lecture number 16, on Balaam and the book of Numbers and the Covenant renewal and the land concepts in the book of Deuteronomy.

Transcribed by Joel Perkins
Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt 2

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 17[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History, Literature and Theology course, lecture 17 on the book of Deuteronomy, the institutions of Israel and the various understandings of the concept of law.

A. Ten Commandments: BIG LC SPAMS [0:00-2:09]

We will try to get through most of the book of Deuteronomy today; although we probably won't be able to get through it all. There are going to be some difficult things to explain today, so as far as cognitive stuff this is probably the most difficult day we'll have in the course. It's some pretty heavy stuff. We'll be dealing with law and grace and difference between the Old and New Testament and things like that. So there will be some pretty interesting material. Before we get to the heavy content let's do some lighter stuff. First of all, I want to teach you the Ten Commandments. The Ten Commandments are the foundation. They're called the general stipulations. They're kind of foundational to everything else in the Law. I had trouble memorizing the Ten, it's kind of like the 12 apostles, you always lose one, you've got to go through them a couple times. So I decided to kind make a goofy acrostic here for it. So here are the Ten Commandments: B.I.G. L.C. S.P.A.M.S, okay? Now from my generation, do you guys know what "spam" is? Probably people don't know what spam is. Spam, they put this stuff in a can and it stays good for 30 years. Actually, you guys are probably eating the spam that they built when I was in high school. Nobody really knows what spam is, but it's supposed to be a meat substitute. Okay so BIG LC SPAMS. This how we'll do the 10 commandments.

B. No Blasphemy [2:10-3:32]

The BIG, here will be all about God. The first one will be: No Blasphemy. No blasphemy. No taking the name of the Lord your God in a light or trivial fashion. To be honest with you I don't know what to do with myself in your generation. I hear students

even on Gordon's campus and my son just brought home a girlfriend that he had, and every other word out of her mouth was "Oh, my God, oh my God, oh my God." Instead of saying exclamation point, people say, "Oh my God." Is that taking God's name in a light and trivial way? Let me just illustrate it for you: a teacher gets up in front of a high school class in Massachusetts, you know Massachusetts how schools are here, and a teacher gets up and all of the sudden the teacher bumps her leg against the desk and she says, "oh my God." Okay, is that allowed in a Massachusetts school? Sure, it would be. The same teacher gets up and she goes like this folding her hands and bowing her head "Oh my God." Is that allowed or not allowed? No, she would lose her job. So I'm saying it's just really interesting. I think you need to think about using God's name and how you do it; whether you use it in a light and trivial way. He says that I don't want my name used in a light and trivial way. No blasphemy.

C. No Idols and other gods [3:33-4:37]

No idols. No idols would be the "I" in "BIG." Again we don't worship Baal, Asherah and Dagon. We don't have idols of stone. Some people would say that we have idols of car, money, houses and things like that and you could make a case for saying those things are idols. I also think about the idols we make in our mind. When we conceptualize God in a way that is much less than who he really is. You have got to be careful of about becoming comfortable with you own way of conceptualizing God. The ending of the book of 1 John he warns us; "beware of idols." So I think that that is a really valid thing. Actually, I've had to face my own idols and realize my own idolatry in the 21st century. We're not doing Baal worship anymore, but we do our own kind of 21st century idols.

So, there should be no blasphemy, no idols, and no other gods before me. So, there should be no other gods before me. Those three; no blasphemy, no idols and no other gods; those are all God focused.

D. LC SPAMS [4:38-8:07]

Now the LC, is no lying. That's pretty apparent. No lying. No C, is no capitalism, I mean, no coveting. Is our culture built on coveting? So there should be no lying, no

coveting, no coveting your neighbor's house. Don't covet your neighbor's wife. Don't covet your neighbor's stuff, and so no coveting. This is a real problem in America where everybody covets everybody else's stuff. That is partially how our country is built. So there should be no lying, no coveting, or no stealing. People have the right to personal property. That's how you would say it in a positive sense. People have a right to personal property. You should not steal their belongings. Does your roommate ever steal your stuff? Be careful, stealing is not good. It's a sin against God.

No lying, no coveting, no stealing. What no stealing does is it says a person has the right to personal property. Let me just take this, you shouldn't lie which means, how would you put that in a positive sense? You should tell the truth. So you should be a truth speaker. You shouldn't lie, you should be a truth speaker. You shouldn't covet other people's stuff to get it for yourself. Instead, you should be generous. And so do you see how each of these can be spun around and put in a positive way. You shouldn't steal stuff, but you should rather be giving generously to other people.

Now parents: Honor your father and your mother, that your days may be long on the earth. So this is the one that deals with parents. This is the only positive one. All the others ones are don't lie, don't steal, and don't do this or that. This is a positive one: Honor you father and your mother. It's a big thing. You know it gets into the question: what do I do when my father and mother aren't honorable? You know, my mother was drug addict and my father walked out on me. It gets to be a real difficult situation: how do you honor parents. It's a tricky situation sometimes.

No adultery. A is for adultery. No adultery. Jesus speaks on this in the New Testament. Jesus says, "You have heard it said of old time, thou shalt not commit adultery." But what does Jesus say? "But I say unto you, he who looks on women lustfully in his heart has already committed adultery already in his heart." Jesus takes these commandments and drives them into the heart. He doesn't say, "Oh, I have never committed adultery because I've never been married." Jesus says if you have lust you have already committed adultery. By the way, in our culture do we actually applaud adultery? Are half of our movies about adulterous situations? In the old days they used

wear red letter on them. Now you're a hero in our culture. In our culture the celebrities turn over wives and turn over husbands and it's applauded, almost. So, adultery; be careful about adultery.

E. Murder versus Killing [8:08-11:01]

No murder. No murder is the "M." Now notice; does that Bible say, "thou shalt not kill," or does it say, "thou shalt do no murder"? It says, "no murder." Is there a difference between killing and murder? Did the Israelites kill people in war? Were they violating this commandment? No, God told them, in some of the cases, to go out to go to war. Another case that I would use, like myself I fear going down Grapevine Road. A kid's riding his bike. These kids ride their bikes now, and all of the sudden the kid swerves in front of my car and I run the kid down and kill the kid. Question, have I murdered the kid? Now, is the kid dead? I rode my car over him. So I killed him but did I murder him? Murder implies hatred or malice and forethought. Those two words are key: malice and forethought. In other words, there was no malice on my heart toward this kid. He just happened to swerve in front of me; I couldn't stop. So for murder the key is: malice and forethought. In other words, if you planned ahead of time to kill a person, and so malice and forethought that is murder. You've got to make a distinction between killing and murder. By the way do even our laws in America make a distinction between killing and murder? Yes. Do we have different degrees of murder and different degrees of killing.

I want to say this respectfully for the honor of parents. Suppose my mother-in-law, my mother-in-law's got Alzheimer's. Good or bad? Bad. Really bad. Suppose she got in the car and started driving the car. Could she kill somebody? Could she kill herself. Suppose she hit the gas pedal instead of the break and she missed it because her coordination's gone. Could she actually ram into somebody and kill them? Would she be considered a murderer? Now, by the way, should she be driving a car? No. So this is a bad illustration. What I wanted to say is, let's suppose a person gets drunk and goes out, drives and they're drunk driving and they kill somebody. Are they a little bit more responsible than my mother-in-law who's got Alzheimer's? You know what I'm saying?

She is totally out of her wits. Now she shouldn't have been driving the car in the first place, but a person that's drunk, are they more responsible? Why? There is a neglect there and responsibility. Did they do it with malice and forethought?--no, the problem was there was no thought. There are different degrees of murder and killing. So, there should be no murder. Murder is with malice and forethought. Instead we should affirm life.

F. Sabbath [11:02-11:39]

Then lastly, the last one is the "S", is remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. So the Sabbath is part of the Ten Commandments. Ten Commandments: BIG LC SPAMS. Can you think through it that way? Yes sir, Peter. (Student): What's the L.C.—(Hildebrandt): L.C., Library of Congress. Oh, yes, it's just L.C. BIG LC SPAMS. Lying and coveting.

G. *Shema*: Deut 6:4ff [11:40-13:26]

General stipulations--and so I want you to know the Ten Commandments. Another general stipulation is what is called the *Shema*. Every Jew in the world, I swear, knows these verses. This is the John 3.16 if you're Jewish. Deuteronomy 6.4, is called the *Shema*, because the first word is *shema* that means "to hear." "Hear, O Israel, [*shema*] Israel. Do some of you know, if you go over to a door post over here, have any of you gone to a Jewish house and when you go in the door post there is a little "W" on the door and you see them go like this and like that. Does anybody ever go to a Jewish house and you see them touch the door post where there is what looks like a "W." The letter W in Hebrew is this "Sh" sound. When you go into a Jewish house they will have a little, this "sh" letter. It'll be on the door, and that's to remind them when they enter the house to remember what? *Shema* Israel. "Hear, O Israel, Yahweh's our God, Yahweh is one." So they'll go and touch it, kiss their hands like that and you'll see them when they go in the house. It's just another way to remember Scripture. So, "Hear, O Israel, Yahweh's our God"—by the way what's the next verse after that? "Hear, O Israel, Yahweh is our God, Yahweh is one and you shall" what? "Love the LORD your God with all your heart and mind," so it goes on. This is the great command "to love the LORD with all your heart."

So this is part of the *shema*.

H. Institutions of Israel [13:27-14:30]

Now, as there are the 10 commandments very broad, foundational laws for society and for Christianity and Judaism. There is a huge transition happening where Moses is giving the reins over to Joshua. There is going to be a big transition. As Moses is letting go what he is doing is setting up the institutions. Moses is over here on Mount Nebo. They're going to go down in, cross the Jordan River over to Jericho. Moses can't cross the Jordan River, so he's up on Mount Nebo and he's looking over to Israel. What he does is he sets up the institutions. In other words, this is almost like, what we call the Constitution. Moses is saying that when you get into the land these are the institutions that are going to rule your country. So Moses sets up these institutions in the Mosaic Law.

I. Prophets [14:31-20:56]

The first institution he sets up are the prophets. In chapter 13 we see what Moses has to say about the prophets. He says, "if a prophet, or one who foretells by dreams, appears among you and announces to you a miraculous sign or wonder, and if the sign or wonder which he has spoken takes place." So the guy comes to you and he announces that he has had a dream and then he announces a miracle and the miracle actually happens, is the guy a true or false prophet? You still don't know do you? Is it possible, if this guy does a miraculous sign or wonder and "this miraculous sign or wonder takes place. And he says, 'let's go after other gods.'" Is he a true or false prophet? He is a false prophet because what he said contradicts Scripture. What he says contradicts God's previous revelation when he says, "not to go after other gods." What did the Ten Commandments say? "You shall have no other gods before me." So you know the guy is a false prophet. What happens with false prophets? He says, "the LORD your God is testing you to find out whether you will follow him with all your heart, with all your soul. It is the Lord your God you must follow, and him you must revere [or fear]. That prophet or dreamer must be put to death." Moses is warning them that there would be prophets in the future, but he warned them that some of them would be false prophets.

What's the difference between a false prophet and true prophet? How many false prophets to every true prophet? Did Israel have a lot of true prophets and few false prophets or did they have a ton of false prophets and very few true prophets? Does anybody remember Elijah and the prophets of Baal up on Mount Carmel? There are 450 prophets of Baal, there's one Elijah against the 450 prophets of Baal. This is how it goes in Israel. If you had to summarize, what is the message of the true prophet? The false prophet was supposed to be what? Killed. What did Israel do to the false prophets? They applauded the false prophets. Who did they kill? The true prophets. What was the message of the true prophets, if I could summarize the message of the true prophet into one word; this is really crass, but If I could summarize it in one word it would be what word? *Shuv*, "repent." So the real prophet gets up, he says, "repent" to the people. What do the people do? They beat the tar out of him. So, that's the true prophet.

Now the false prophet, there are many false prophets and what do the false prophets say according the book of Jeremiah? "It's all right. Peace, love, harmony, peace." So Jeremiah says the false prophets say, "Peace, peace when there is" what? "No peace." The ones that are always proclaiming peace and love and all of these wonderful things; what does Jeremiah say? Those guys are false prophets. The true prophet says, "repent." So what I'm noting is this contrast between true and false prophets. Israel's got a lot of false prophets. The false prophets they applauded; the true prophets they ended up killing a lot of them.

Does anybody remember the story of Isaiah? Isaiah was fleeing from—this is rumor it's not in the Bible, this is what legend/tradition has, but part of it comes out of the book of Hebrews—Isaiah was fleeing from king Manasseh who was a really nasty, bad king and this guy is bad. So Isaiah is fleeing and hides in a tree. Isaiah hides in the trunk of a tree. And what happens is Manasseh's men catch up to him; see he is in a tree. So what do they do? They take a saw and they cut the tree in half. The book of Hebrews refers to some of them were "sawn asunder," that's Isaiah who wrote the big book of Isaiah. Let's get out of there.

Now the other passage that Moses brings up about the prophet is this, and this is a

good passage too, in chapter 18. Moses explains what a prophet is and he says in chapter 18 down to verse 17 where it says, “the nations who will dispossess you listen to those who practice sorcery and divination, but as for you, the Lord your God has not permitted you” [you don’t do sorcerers, you don’t do divination]. “The Lord your God will raise up a prophet like me [Moses].” Moses says that, “God will raise up a prophet like me. You must listen to him for this what you asked of the Lord your God at Horeb.” Then verse 18. “I will raise up a prophet like you [Moses] from among all your brothers. And I will put my words in his mouth.” What was the prophet to do? The prophet had God’s word put in his mouth. Therefore what did the prophet say? “Thus saith the Lord.” This is the King James way of saying it, “thus saith the Lord” because God put his words in the prophet’s mouth. The prophets spoke for God. That’s what *prophemi* means: he speaks for God. He speaks in place of God. Moses says, “God is going to raise up a prophet like me.”

When Jesus comes along does anybody remember what the Jews asked Jesus. They said to Jesus, “Jesus who are you? Are you the prophet?” [John 1.21, 25] What is “the prophet”? Who is “the prophet”? The prophet comes right out of here from Deuteronomy chapter 18. God told them that he would raise up a prophet like Moses. So they asked Jesus, “are you the prophet who is to come, or are you the Messiah, are you the son of David? Who are you? Are you the prophet?” So this passage gave some expectation that the Jews were expecting “the prophet” to come and that God would put his words in his mouth. They asked Jesus, “are you the prophet?” Jesus said what? No. So it’s an interesting passage there.

J. Judges [20:57-29:13]

Here’s the second institution that Moses sets up back in chapter 16 verse 18. It’s the second institution and this is the institution of the judgeship. By the way, was Moses a prophet? Yes, Moses was a servant of the Lord. He’s the big prophet in the Old Testament. Moses is among the best and biggest. Was Moses also a judge? Does anybody remember in the book of Numbers that God took the spirit off him put it on the 70. Then 70 people judged because Moses was judging all the people and he just got

weighed down by that.

So here he gives some instructions for judges. He says you're going to have judges and in Deuteronomy chapter 16 verse 18 he says this: "Appoint judges and officials for each of your tribes in every town." Was justice to be local? Every town was to have a judge. Why would you put judges in every town? So that justice is accessible to the people. You didn't have to run 20 miles to get justice. It was in your own local vicinity. So he says, "put a judge in every town, your God is giving you and they shall judge the people fairly. Do not pervert justice or show partiality. Do not except a bribe." So the big thing for the judge was that a judge was to positively judge fairly with justice and negatively the judge was not to accept a bribe. Are money and justice to be connected to each other? What does the Scripture say? Should money and justice be connected or should they be disconnected?

In our culture, once upon a time I was teaching in Indiana state prison, which is a maximum security prison. Guys are sitting in the class and I came up and I said, "well, in America its really good because in America you can't bribe judges." Guess what those guys did in prison? They laughed at me. They said, "you want to know the judge you want to know how much?" Now you may say that these guys are in prison probably because they were bribing.

What I'm saying is: Are money and justice connected in America? The honest truth is, let me tell you a story of one of my friends. He was in prison. It was supposed to be, I think it was for 15 years. He had been in prison for 8 years. He swore he was innocent, absolutely swore he was innocent. A lawyer then came to his parents and said for 20,000 dollars we've got a technicality that can get your son out of prison. How many of you, if you were parents, would pay 20,00 dollars to get your son out of years of prison. Would you pay the money. 20,000? Yes. Think about what you're parents pay to send you to Gordon college. They get off cheap like that. So the parents paid the 20,000 dollars and guess what happened to the lawyer. He comes back to them and says I almost got this case but we're going in the wrong direction. I found another direction. I need another 20,000 dollars and I can get him out. I can do it. They came up with the

second and when the second was done he came back a third time and said, “I’ve got it now, I’ve got it nailed, 20 more thousand and I’ll get him out of jail.” It was \$60,000 total. Question, do you know what those parents did? They went out and took out a second mortgage on their home to get the money. Guess what? I was at the trial. Did he walk out of there a free man. He walked out of there a free man. I’m serious the lawyer got him off, \$60,000 and on the third try, the guy got the case thrown out and he was exonerated and he got out. If he had been a poor man would his tail still be in jail? But because his parents had money, were they able to get him out of jail? Are money and justice connected? You say well that’s not right. It shouldn’t be like that but that’s just the way it is. One of my favorite songs is called “that’s just the way it is.” You say that’s just your friend. That’s my friend in Indianan State Prison.

From my generation we only have to say two letters. Is money and justice connected, just two letters: O.J. I’m sorry that’s my generation. Is money and justice connected? If you’re a poor person does your tail go to jail? If you’ve got money do you get out of jail? Is that pathetic?

What happens if you’re a celebrity. You’re a celebrity and you do something wrong. Do you get a pass “O, I didn’t really mean it and it was all a mistake.” So you get “O, we don’t really put you in jail. We’ll give you, let’s see, what do they call that ‘community service.’ We won’t put your tail in jail. You’ll get community service because you’re a celebrity and you didn’t know any better. So therefore we’ll let you go, okay?” What happens if you’re really a celebrity and you become famous because of your case? Once you become famous will you get some of the best lawyers in the country seeking you out because you’re so famous? To get you off and they’re defense lawyers and they get you off. Can you even—I better not even say it—can you even get away with murder and walk? Yes! You write a book about it and you make a million dollars or make a movie on it and that kind of thing. Is there something in your gut that tells you that in America something is wrong with this justice system? What I’m saying is Moses says that money and justice should not be connected. There should be no bribing. Money and justice should not be connected.

It seems to me in our culture that money and justice are connected and, believe me, I could stand here and tell you case after case after case—actually one even happened to me and it was right in my face. He just laughed at me because he knew that I didn't have enough to make it right because it would cost me 10,000 to 20,000 dollars to make it right. He knew he was wrong but he knew that I didn't have enough money to hire a lawyer so he took advantage. Did he win? Yes, so, that's just the way it is. So Moses says that money and justice should not be connected.

Moses also says, "Set up cities of refuge. So on the east bank over here in Jordan set up some cities and over there on the west bank of the Jordan. If you kill somebody accidentally, suppose you're out with an axe—this is a classic example—and all of the sudden the axe-head flies off and hits somebody and kills somebody. Where do you run to? You run to a city of refuge. The elders of the city of refuge come out, they talk through your case, and if you are innocent you can stay. The avenger of blood—now who is this avenger of blood? If somebody killed you do you realize that the family members would come after you and there would be an avenger of blood from the family of the person you killed. He would come after you and kill you. So when you went into the city of refuge; the city then would protect you. The avenger of blood was not allowed to kill you if you were in the city of refuge.

Now what happens if you kill somebody on purpose and you fled to the city of refuge? The elders go through the case and if the elders say you killed the guy on purpose the elders would hand you over to the avenger of blood. So that's no good. So you don't want to go to these cities of refuge if you're not innocent. But if you were innocent you could go to a city of refuge and be protected from the avenger of blood. So, cities of refuge were pretty important for the administration of justice in Israel.

K. Kingship [29:14-35:08]

Now the institution of the kingship: In chapter 17 of Deuteronomy we've got the law of the kings. Was there a king in Israel in Moses's time? No. Actually, you guys have just read the book of Judges. Was there a king in Israel during the period of judges? "Everyone did that which was right in his own eyes and there was," what?-- "No king in

Israel.” So there’s no king in Israel. Moses tells them that they will have a king. Moses tells them that they will have a king in Deuteronomy 17. He sets up the institutional expectation for the king and here’s what he says: “when you enter the land your Lord your God is giving you and have taken possession of it and settle in it, and you say, ‘let us have a king over us like the nations around us.’” By the way, is that exactly what they would say, you guys are going to be reading the book of Samuel this week. That’s exactly what they say, “they want a king like the other nations around us.” Moses said, “it’s okay for you guys to have a king. You’re going to have a king.” “Be sure to appoint over you the king the Lord your God chooses.” So God’s going to be involved in the selection of the king and he must be from your own brothers. Does the king have to be Jewish? He’s got to be one of your own brothers. He’s got to be born a Jew. “Do not place a foreigner over you. One who is not a brother Israelite.”

The king must not do three things. First of all, Moses says he should not acquire a great number of horses. He shouldn’t multiply horses. Now what’s the deal with multiplying horses? Horses back in those days are what?” Instruments of war. He said don’t multiply horses because if they did that their trust would be in what? Would their trust be in God or would their trust be in their horses for war? So he says, don’t multiply horses. I want you to trust in me, not in the strength of your horses and then go back to Egypt because Egypt was one of the places that they got their horses from. He says, I don’t want you going back to Egypt.

Number two he says: don’t multiply wives. “He must not take many wives or his heart will be led astray.” Can you tell me a king of Israel who had many wives and his heart was led astray? Solomon, or *Sholomo*. Solomon had 700 wives and 300 concubines. Some people say he was supposed to be a smart man. We’ll get into that. I have actually I spent half my life studying Solomon and that narrative with Solomon is really interesting. There’s a great deal of irony and upside-downness in Solomon. The wisest man turns out to be the what? Yeah, and so you get this connection that wisdom and folly are actually—on the backside—can actually be connected in certain way. But don’t multiply wives because it will lead your heart astray. That is exactly what happened

to Solomon with his 700 wives and 300 concubines.

Then, the third thing that you're not supposed to multiply—and this is critical I think for our age: do not multiply silver and gold. The king must not accumulate large amounts of silver and gold. The king is not to use his position of authority to acquire and accumulate gold and silver for himself. Should people use their position to accumulate wealth for themselves? Moses says no, the king should not be acquiring personal wealth because where does the king get all his silver and gold? Does he get it from the people? So this is Moses saying no the king should acquire a large amount of silver and gold for himself. Now by the way did Solomon have a lot of gold and silver? Was that a gift from God? So what you've got Solomon is an interesting kind of mix there, and we'll have to look at that later.

So, for the king there is no multiplying horses, no multiplying wives, no multiplying personal silver and gold. The king is not to do those things.

Now what is the king to do? That's what he is not to do, multiply those three things. There was one commandment for the king; it says this in verse 18 chapter 17, "when he takes the throne of his kingdom, he is to write for himself on a scroll a copy of this law." So the king himself is to make a hand written copy of the law. Why is he to do that? "...taken from the priests and Levites. It is to be with him, he is to read it all the days of his life, so that he may learn to revere the Lord his God and to follow carefully all the words of this law and these decrees." He's to write the law so that he'll know the law and be able to rule according to the law.

So this is the king. Was Israel to have a king? Yes. Did God through Moses tell them they would have a king like the other nations? Yes. Before the king who was their king? Before the king himself, God was their king. But God tells them that they're going to have a human king. He's not to multiply those three things [wives, horses, gold]. He's to make a copy of the law. Who would ultimately be the human king over Israel forever? Jesus will be the ultimate king of Israel. But Jesus will stand as whose son? As the king of Israel, David's son. David will be the king of Israel and Jesus will stand as David's greater son, so to speak. Jesus is the son of David, the king of Israel. So

you get that thing going on with Jesus.

L. Priests and Levites [35:09-36:45]

Priests and Levites are another institution that Moses sets up here. What's the problem with priests and Levites, chapter 18 verse 2? It says, "they shall have no inheritance among their brothers." The priests and Levites don't have any land. They did not receive land from the Lord. All the other tribes get land, the Levites are not to have any land, why? What was their inheritance? The land was not their inheritance. The text here says you get no inheritance among their brothers because the Lord is their inheritance. So, what was the inheritance of the priests and Levites? They didn't get the land they got Levitical cities. The Lord was their inheritance. Are the priests and Levites going to be scattered all over Israel then? I believe there are 48 Levitical cities scattered throughout Israel. So there will be priests and Levites scattered all over. One of the jobs of the priests and Levites will be to teach the law.

So, these are the major institutions that Moses setup on Mount Nebo. He can't go over to the promise land, so he sets up these institutions ahead of time. Do you see that the book Deuteronomy is like a constitution; setting up the institutions that will run the government the next hundreds and hundreds of years. Moses sets that up and these are the institutions he sets up.

M. Law and Its modern relevance [36:46-44:14]

Now this is where it starts to get tricky. In Deuteronomy chapter 22, how do you take the law from back then to the 21st century? How do you take the Mosaic Law and apply it to today? How does the Mosaic Law fit? How do you go from the back then, 1400/1200 BC, to now? How do you bring it over to the 21st century AD? How do you make that 3000 year jump? How do you go from back then to now?

Let me just give an illustration of this. Deuteronomy chapter 22, verse 5, says this on women and pants. Should women wear pants? Deut. 22 verse 5 says this: "A women must not wear men's clothing." Pants, a man wears the pants in the family. Pants are men's clothing. Women should not wear men's clothing, so women shouldn't wear pants. Now let me just give you an example of that. We got back from Israel and I got my first

job teaching in a Bible College in Bristol, Tennessee. I loved it down there. I was working at the school during the week I was just making \$5,000 annually working 80 hours a week and that's not much money. So what did I do? On the weekends I would do preach at various churches.

My wife was an English major in college. There was this large church probably 2000 member church and do a lot of the big churches have schools associated with them? So this pastor was over to the school. The pastor read this verse from Scripture that said, "a woman must not wear men's clothing." He concluded pants are men's clothing, therefore all the girls who went to the school had to wear skirts. They could not wear pants. My wife was teaching there. So that meant she had to wear a skirt all the time. Now my wife, to be honest with you, the first year that I dated her we were back in the early 70's. All the girls wore blue jeans. I wore blue jeans I never barely saw her in a dress before we got married. So now she's got to wear a dress every day to work and she was an English major so they had her teaching, algebra. She was an English major—algebra, and she was a gym teacher there. She came home one day saying this girl slid into second base. Now what's the problem when you slide into second base and you're wearing this thing called culottes. This girl ripped her legs all up and my wife came home, just shaking her head saying this girl's got scars on her legs for the rest of her life because she didn't have pants on the slide into second base.

So my wife has to wear a dress all the time and we're youth group sponsors. So we do what good Christian people do? We go out bowling. So we got the youth group out bowling, my wife knows how to bowl fairly well and so my wife goes and grabs the ball she runs down there and pitches the ball. She's got a skirt on. All the sudden her dress like flips up and it's like holy cow--show time. We've got these 16 and 17 year old kids here. Keep it down. You don't want any free shows on here. So I kind of pull her aside and give her this you know you can't bowl like that anymore it's too revealing tip. So, then my wife has to go out and bowl like this. She goes up and throws the ball down, I won that day. But the problem was I always told her I'd pay 50 bucks to see the pastor's wife snow ski in a dress. Wouldn't that be funny?

He was taking Deuteronomy 22:5 and applying it to today. Now was the way he applied it kind of crazy? Yes. I think all of us acknowledge that. It was absolutely crazy. By the way, did my wife wear a skirt for that whole year, actually two years? She did. Can we fit into different cultures? That's a different culture than we're used to. So they were very strict on this and so my wife wore a dress. The same way when I went to a Mennonite church and I had to preach on Father's Day and they told that the Mennonites don't wear ties because they think ties are worldly. So that's why I won't wear a tie. I had to teach for 22 years with a tie wrapped around my throat. I couldn't stand it. So when I came here I swore I would never wear one again. But, no, when I went to Mennonite church I got the King James Version because that's what they accepted. So what I'm saying is when you're in different cultures, when you're in Israel you put a *kippah* on your head. When you're in different cultures you fit in. So my wife wore a dress for two years there. You know it's no big deal those are minor things but we do disagree about how the pastor interpreted the Scripture there. We disagreed with how he interpreted the Scripture there, but he is the pastor of the church. You fit in.

Now how do you go from the back then to the now? We all have the sense that that wasn't right. Let me read the rest of this verse to you. So then we say this verse is stupid, but it's not talking about pants. By the way, what did guys wear back then? Do we know what men and women wore back then? Do we know that for sure? The answer is: in the Ben Hasani image we've got pictures of people. Women wore robes down to their ankles, guys wore robes down here so guys wore skirts. So what does that mean, do we all have to dress just like they dressed? That's why for the guys they say, has anybody ever heard this: "you gird up your loins"? Basically you take up your garment and you tuck it in your belt because when you're running you don't want to trip over this crazy robe they wear. You gird them up and that's the way men ran. Do we have to dress the way they dressed? By the way, is part of the way they dressed because of the environment that they live in? Yes. We live in a different environment so you don't have to go on doing these things.

What is this really talking about? So then you say this verse is irrelevant to us and

you just throw it out. Is it really relevant to us? Let me read the verse to you to see how you would apply it. It says, “that the women must not wear men’s clothing nor a man wear women’s clothing for the Lord your God detests anyone who does this.” What is this really talking about? Yes, is it fairly clear? I had a friend at another school where I taught and he used to put balloons in certain parts of his body and wear nylons. Then he used to go to the mall and walk around the mall because he liked the way people would look at him. Was he a little bit... yes he was. Is that more what this verse is talking about? It’s not talking about pants versus skirts.

So how do you go from the back then to the now? This passage is talking about what? There should be a differentiation between the sexes. I think Hannah hit it right when you said women’s pants are different from men’s pants. So you know you work with that. The real issue is the differentiation of the sexes that they’re not contributing to the confusion of the sexes. By the way, we live in America do we confuse everything? Yes, we kind of like it, right?

N. Culture and Law [44:15-45:22]

This is the bigger question and this one is really tricky. What is the impact of culture on the law? When I was young I thought God came down on Mount Sinai and God said, “I am God here is my law--wham-bam. This is my law, this is the way I want it done. This is the perfect law of God and this is it.” Totally ignoring culture, God says this is how I want this world to work. Does God in his law take culture into account? So what I want to suggest to you here is there’s much more of an interactivity between culture and law. We’ll just show some examples of that. The king was to involve himself in writing the law and making copies of the law. Do we have a king today? No, we don’t. We threw off George we don’t have a king and so the king was to write the law. Is he supposed to write a law and make a hand copy for himself. Now he doesn’t have to he’s got it on his Blackberry, iPhone or iPad.

O. Jesus and the Law [45:23-51:30]

What’s Christ’s view of the law? So I want to look first at Christ’s view of the law and then contrast that with Paul’s view of the law and come back to the question of

law and culture. What did Jesus say in Matthew chapter 5 verse 17? Jesus says this: “Do not think that I have come to abolish the law or the prophets. I did not come to abolish them,” but to what? “Fulfill them.” “I did not come to abolish the law but to fulfill them. “I tell you the truth until heaven and earth disappear not the smallest letter” which is the *yodh* “y” letter. Its half a letter. “Or the least stroke of the pen” a jot or tittle—does anybody remember when the King James Version said, “not a jot or a tittle will pass from the law.” A tittle is a serif. You guys know serif vs. sans-serif fonts. Arial is sans serif whereas with the Times New Roman you have seen the little serifs that come off the letters on the T’s and the P’s. They’ll have the tittles or serifs on them. Serif is what is called a tittle. It’s just a little wing-ding that comes off the letters. He says not the smallest letter or a wing-ding will disappear until the law is fulfilled.

How does Jesus defend himself against Satan? In Matthew chapter 4, just back a page here, Jesus is tempted in the desert. He’s been fasting for 40 days and 40 nights in the wilderness. Who comes to challenge him? Satan comes to him and says, “Hey, Jesus, you’ve been fasting for 40 days, you hungry Jesus? You’ve got some stone here Jesus. Why don’t you turn these stones into bread?” And does Jesus say, “Satan, I know who you are, watch this. I’m going to blink my eyes and your molecules are going to go like on each galaxy. I’m just—bam and you’re out of here.” Did he? No, he didn’t do that. What did Jesus say--turn these stones into bread? Jesus said, what? “Man does not live by bread alone but by every word that comes from the mouth of God.” What is Jesus doing? Jesus is quoting Deuteronomy. “Turn these stones to bread,” Satan said. Jesus responded, “man does not live on bread alone.” He’s quoting Deuteronomy 4 to Deuteronomy 8 and that section there.

Satan takes Jesus to the top of the pinnacle of the temple, to the highest point in the temple and says, “Jesus, throw yourself down because—and, does Satan quote Scripture? Satan actually quotes Scripture and says, “Jesus throw yourself down. It says in the book of Psalms that his angels will bear you up. Jesus turns to Satan and says no I’m not going to throw myself down. You shall not do what to the Lord your God? “You shall not or tempt the Lord your God.” Where’s that come from? The book of

Deuteronomy. He's quoting again the book of Deuteronomy saying, "you shall not tempt the Lord your God."

Finally, Satan takes him up to the highest mountain possibly Mount Hermon or Tabor. He shows him all the kingdoms in the world, and says, "bow down and worship me and I'll give you all these kingdoms." Jesus says what? "You shall worship the Lord your God and him only should you serve." He is quoting Deuteronomy chapter 5--the Ten Commandments. All three times when Jesus goes to defend himself against Satan, he quotes from Deuteronomy to defend himself. Christ uses Scripture to defend himself against Satan. Question do we need to use Scripture to defend ourselves against Satan? Seems to make sense. Jesus uses Deuteronomy all three times in the temptation of Christ to defend himself.

Did Jesus have a very high view of the law? When Jesus was asked: "what is the most important thing in the law." What did he say? "Love the Lord your God with all your heart." And then what was next? "Love your neighbor as yourself." These are the two great commandments. Where are they from? "Love the Lord your God, it's the *Shema*. "Hear, O Israel... You shall love the Lord your God"--Deuteronomy 6.4. Where's the other one from? Does anyone remember that one, "thou shall love your neighbor as yourself"? Did you guys memorize it? I thought I had you memorize it. It's Leviticus chapter 19, "love your neighbor as yourself." It comes from Leviticus. So, Christ's greatest commands are from Leviticus and Deuteronomy.

On the permanence of the law Jesus says, "heaven and earth will pass away" but what? The law, "not a jot or tittle will pass from the law until all is fulfilled." So the law is permanent. Jesus affirms that as well.

Now, does Jesus critique the law? Some people look at the Sermon on the Mount here and the Sermon on the Mount can be interpreted different ways. There's a whole a whole literature on the Sermon of the Mount just hundreds of different wonderful ways of understanding and the Sermon on the Mount. But one of the ways of looking at it is Jesus says, "You have heard it said of old time, thou shalt not kill, but I say unto you whoever is angry at his brother without a cause has committed murder already in his

heart.” So what is Jesus do? Jesus takes the law and drives it into the heart. Jesus takes the law and applies it to the heart. His objection is not to the law itself, but his objection is to the Pharisaic misinterpretation of the law. He drives it into the heart. So he says what? “You’ve heard it said thou shalt not commit adultery.” Jesus says, “whoever looked on a women lustfully has committed adultery already in his heart.” So is Jesus affirming the law by driving it into the heart and saying that motives count here. So does Jesus have a very high view of the law? If a person is a Christian are you going to have a high view of the law? If you’re follower of Christ, Jesus had a very high view of the law. That’s my point here.

P. Paul and the Law [51:31-57:18]

Now what about Paul? Paul if you go over to chapters in Galatians, Paul brings up this law and gospel contrast in Galatians chapter 5, verse 4. I just want to read this verse for you. Is Paul so positive on the law? Paul says, “You who are trying to be justified by the law have been alienated from Christ.” Let me read that again. “You who are trying to be justified by the law have been alienated from Christ.” In other words, if you try to use the law to be justified then you’re alienated from Christ. So there is this tension between Christ and the law. You have fallen, if you use the law like that, away from grace. So that’s really a negative thing on the law that the law actually takes you away from Christ. So Paul in the book Galatians is going have some problems with the law.

Now you say is Paul negative on the law? And the answer is “no” because if you go over to Romans chapter 7, verse 12, Paul says, “the law is holy, righteous and good.” So Paul in Romans says that “the law is holy, righteous and good,” but in Galatians he tells them if they use the law to earn their salvation that way that then grace is no good to them. It has actually taken them away from Christ. So there’s this tension in Paul in terms of the holy, righteous and good law [Rom. 7] and this law that he talks about in Galatians. He gets a pretty negative and highlights the condemnatory nature of the law in Galatians chapter 3. Let me just turn over the page here to 3.10. It says, “All who rely and observe the law are under a curse, for it is written cursed is everyone who does not continue to do everything written in the book of the law.” Clearly, “no one is justified

before God by the law.” Why? “No one is justified by the law because the righteous will live,” by what?—“by faith.” I ask, does anybody know where that passage comes from, it says, “the righteous will live by faith.” That’s a fairly important concept in the Bible. “The righteous will live by faith.” It’s an Old Testament quote. Does anybody know the book of Habakkuk? Sure enough, it’s in the book of Habakkuk. Habakkuk is a wonderful little book, if you’ve ever got some time it’s short, about three chapters. It’s wonderful book and in that book it says, “the righteous will live by faith.”

Paul says the law never justified anybody. Let me read that Romans 4.3, contrast over here with Romans 4.3. Paul says this, “What does the Scripture say? Abraham, kept the law. He was circumcised and God then counted it for righteousness.” Is that what it says? It says, “Abraham believed God and it’s credited to him for righteousness.” Now why is Paul brilliant? Paul is absolutely brilliant here. Why is his using of Abraham absolutely brilliant? Is Abraham before or after the law? Abraham is hundreds of years before the law. Is Abraham the great one for circumcision? Was Abraham the one with the covenant instituted by his being circumcised and solemnized? Now, Abraham then introduces circumcision is big—was Abraham saved by keeping the law or by being circumcised? No. The Scripture tells us clearly Abraham was justified by what? Let me just read that again, this is a really important. “Abraham believed God and it was counted to him for righteousness.” So Paul goes back to Abraham because do all the Jewish people claim that Abraham is their father? It’s like *Our Father Abraham*. So what he does is he goes back to Abraham to precede Moses and says Abraham was saved by faith so you also are saved by faith not by keeping the law.

The law is meant, and this is the fundamental problem, is the law meant to show us how good we are? The law is meant to show us what? Our sin. What happened is the Pharisees took the law and did they turn it on its head? The law was used to show others how good they were, not to show them their sin. What Paul is saying is: “No, no, you’re misunderstanding all of it. The law’s purpose was to show us our sin, not to show us how good we are.” The law shows us our sins so that we turn to whom? Christ, as savior. That’s the function of the law. God chose us, we’re sinners and we need a savior and

that's the foundation of the law. The law has a pedagogical function. The law is a mentor, the law is a "schoolmaster" I think is how the King James Version says it. The law is a schoolmaster that brings us to Christ. The law brings us to Christ because we realize our sin and we realize that we need a savior. So the law has set us up to bring us to Christ to show us our own faults, to show us our own sin so that we turn to Christ. So that's the function of the law. The function of the law is to show us our sin, not to show that we're righteous.

Q. Civil Law [57:19-60:33]

What still stands? Let me have you conceptualize the law like this: this is what I was taught growing up. I think it's useful and you'll see me critique it in a minute but just think through this. People take the law the five books of Moses and they say certain parts of the law of Moses are civil laws. They're civil laws, they're laws for the government. Do you need law—does the government need laws? A government needs laws, unless you're an anarchist or something.

For example, one of the laws that Israel had was that if you had a house and you had a flat roof most all of their houses are flat roofed, that you put a parapet, a little wall around the roof of your house. Now why would you do that? Yes, so if a person is up there they just don't go walking and fall off your roof and hurt themselves. So you were required by the law to put a parapet around the roof of your house. By the way, do you see that would be a safety requirement that a nation might want so that people don't get hurt. Is that so farfetched now? How many of you put a parapet around your roof?

Now you say we live in New England all our roofs are steep. Why are they so steep? The rain runs down and what's worse than the rain sometimes? The snow goes off your roof. If you have a flat roof in New England you've got a problem, just look at Frost Hall. So what you want is steep. Do we need parapets around our roofs? None of you go up to mediate on your roof do you? Actually, I've been on top of my roof, I've got a real steep roof it's about 50 feet up there and I've sat right on the top of the peak—I was actually nailing on shingles after my singles blew off. So I had to nail it down upside-down. There was nobody there to help me and I realized that if I fell, it was one of

the few times in my life where--I'm not usually afraid of heights. I realized that my sons not are around, so if I did fall there was no one to help me. It was kind of a different thing for me at this age in my life. I'm thinking twice about heights now, which is disgusting.

Now civil law, now let me go back to this. I've got neighbor, what about this parapet around the roof? We said we don't have flat roofs they are all steep now. What about my neighbor who has got a pool. Does he have to put a fence around his yard to protect so kids don't walk over and fall in the pool? Is that pretty much the same law to protect, people from harm. As a homeowner are you responsible to make sure people don't get hurt on your property? So they put a fence around the pools today and that's very similar to that same type of law. So there are civil laws. There are civil laws for the government. Now question: are you the government? Do you have follow those laws? We're not really the government Israel was.

R. Ceremonial Laws [60:34-61:48]

The Jews also had ceremonial laws. Ceremonial laws are what? The laws of the priests and Levites. This is how you do sacrifices and how you do feasts. What was the word we used for the rituals, we would use in English this word "rituals." The rituals are prescribed in the law. It specified the rituals that the priests go through. What was the other word that we used in Old Testament circles that's a really important word to know. What do we call the ceremonial or the ritual? "The cult." In the Old Testament, remember we use that word "cult". The cult is these external acts of worship, the rituals that you go through and that can be labeled "the ceremonial law."

Now question how many of you have sacrificed anything lately? I mean a real sacrifice of sheep and goats. Do we do these ceremonial laws anymore? Are we priests and Levites? Is the temple gone? The temple's gone, the altar is gone, so we don't do those ceremonial laws. So the civil laws are governmental laws and we're not really a government or nation like Israel was. The ceremonial has to do with the priests and their sacrifices.

S. Moral Law [61:49-63:01]

So what do we focus on? In the Old Testament we focus on the moral law. Now are there certain parts of the law the Old Testament that are moral like, “thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not steal, and thou shalt not lie.” Are those moral precepts--“Thou should do no murder, thou should not commit adultery,” these types of things?

So what happens here is a lot of people divide the law into three categories. Is this law civil, is this law ceremonial or is this law moral? Then when the suggestion is we don’t necessarily keep these first two but the third one, the moral law of God--love the Lord your God with all your heart, love your neighbor as yourself--we keep the moral law. So that’s what’s important there.

So we segment the law and then how do we transfer the law over? We transfer over just the moral part of that law. Does that make sense then? Does this make the law easier to handle? We’ve got the civil law that’s for nations, but we’re not nations; ceremonial law for priests, but we’re not priests; and the moral law that’s what we follow.

T. Critique of the Civil, Ceremonial and Moral Law Distinction [63:02-65:20]

Now let me critique that a little bit. My problem with this is how do you determine whether a law is civil, ceremonial or moral law? Sometimes are the ceremonial laws linked in with moral laws? Does the book of the law, Moses first five books of the Bible, come to us as an organic whole? It comes to us organically connected. You just can’t rip things off and put them in categories like that. When you start ripping it apart and say well this is civil, this is ceremonial, and this is moral; you’re dissecting the law. You can’t do that. The thing is moral. Now this is immoral to do that. You can’t just break things apart like that. Is putting a parapet around your wall is that a moral issue? Yes, actually it is as much a part of your responsibility as one who owns the home. It’s partially civil but it’s also partially moral as well. So what I’m suggesting is that this categorization here violates the organic connection, the organic unity, the interaction with Scripture with itself. While I like—these categories and feel they are useful, but I think you’ve got to be careful at dissecting, and dissecting the law. So to be honest with you I like some of the idea of this but you’ve got to be careful and back it off

some rather than seeing the civil, ceremonial and moral as three separate containers ignoring their organic unity.

Now here is the better way I think of coming at this question of law. What is the underlying universal principle? For example, care for the poor. Is care for the poor in the Old Testament good? Is care for the poor in the New Testament good? Yes. And so you get these more universal principles. Love God, be holy because I the LORD your God am holy, are these universal principles? So what you do is you look at are those universal principles that are trans-cultural. They go beyond culture and they work in whatever culture and each culture will manifest it differently but it's basically the underlying principle that works in every culture.

U. Cultural re-particularization [65:21-66:52]

Cultural re-particularization--now what do I mean by cultural re-particularization? Do we struggle with Baal worship today? Does anybody really struggle with Baal. You know in the Old Testament they weren't supposed to worship Baal. We don't even know who Baal is anymore. We don't do sacrifices of sheep, goats, or grain anymore. Do we do clean and unclean? No, we don't really do that anymore. Did their altars have to be built in a special way? Yes, the Jewish altars were supposed to be built of uncut stone in contrast to the Canaanite altars which were made from cut stone. We don't build altars anymore so these rules don't really apply to us.

But then you've got to ask can you go underneath the cultural particulars to a universal underlying principle? Can you take the cultural particular off and find the underlying universal principle? That's the case with Baal worship. Would that have to do with idolatry and whatever shape that takes place in your culture? Sacrifices maybe understood as Jesus Christ dying for our sins, and realizing and confessing sins. So what I'm suggesting is then that each law in the Old Testament will come from a culture you've got to pull off some things—the cultural particulars and look at the underlying principle.

V. Jesus, the Law and Culture [66:53-72:24]

Now let me just do that a little bit more—the key then is this underlying principle

rather than the cultural particular. Jesus gives a model of this I think in the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus says if you're angry with your brother in your heart don't you know—you've committed murder already in your heart. So Jesus basically takes the law and drives it into the heart. So, what I'm suggesting then is, we should work with the principles that underlie the cultural particulars.

Now I want to make one more step and this next step, actually I discovered a few years ago and this is difficult. Did God accommodate himself to culture when he gave the law? In other words—I originally thought when he came down at Mount Sinai gave his perfect law that this is the way it's supposed to be in heaven. This is perfect and this is the way it supposed to run. But then I came across a statement in the New Testament that Jesus makes in Matthew chapter 19 verse 8. Let me just read this to you, I think it's transformed the way I look at the law. The question is on divorce and the Pharisees say this, "why then, they asked, 'did Moses command that a man give his wife a certificate of divorce and send her away?'" Did Moses allow for divorce? Deuteronomy chapter 24, Moses allows for a man to divorce his wife. Question is that perfect? Is that a perfect world? Moses allows for divorce. What does God say about divorce in Malachi? God says, "I hate divorce." Is that fairly clear? He says, "I hate divorce." It's fairly clear what God thinks about it. He hates it. You say well if God hates it in Malachi, why did Moses allow for it in Deuteronomy chapter 24? Jesus here tells us the why; does Jesus know the why behind the law? Yes, Jesus was there. So Jesus says this, "Moses permitted you to divorce your wives" why? "Because your hearts were hard." Did God adapt his law because of the hardness of these people's hearts? Yes. He doesn't come down and say here is this perfect law, you guys have to do this. He says, "No, that perfect law is not going to work with these people because they're so corrupt."

Now what's that mean? Many, many years ago I taught this passage and I was in a small college in the mid-west called Grace College. I went over this passage and I said do you know what Jesus means here is that guys are so corrupt if you can't divorce your wife what would men do to their wives? Till death do us part. We've promised and therefore what would men do if they can't divorce their wives, yet they hate their wife

and they want to get rid of her, so what would they do? They would kill their wife. They kill their wife to be out of the marriage. So I go off and I'm talking about this even in America do some guys kill their wives to get rid of them in America? So I'm going off like this and this lady comes up to me afterwards—probably a 35 year old woman—comes up to me and she says, “who told you? You're not supposed to know. Nobody here is supposed to know. How did you know?” She's getting all paranoid and suspicious. I said, “lady, I just made that example up of this guy killing his wife—I wasn't referring to anything in particular.” She says, “No, no you were talking about me. You just laid out my whole situation. Who told you?” Basically what had happened was this lady was from Colorado—this is so many years ago it doesn't matter now—she was from Colorado. Her husband took out a hit on her. I forget what it was, \$10,000 or whatever. She found out that her husband had paid somebody to kill her. She found out about it so she took the kids and she fled to Indiana. We had these places, I think they're called “safe houses” where women can go with her family and be protected. So she hid at a safe house and nobody was supposed to know where she lived or what had happened. She was taking a course at a college trying to get her education. Did her husband pay to have her killed? Yes, and she was fleeing from that. So I'm saying even till this day you get this.

Jesus says, “because of the hardness of their heart.” Did God adapt his law because these people hearts were so hard? He didn't want these women getting killed and so he said, “Hey, okay, you can do divorce that I hate.” Now by the law is divorce God's perfect will? God says that he hates divorce, but that he would allow what he hated because he didn't want these people killed. So what I'm saying is God adapted to the culture. So you've got to be careful if you just say God came down and gave his perfect law—this is how it's supposed to be in heaven. No, God said these people are such sinners I've got adapt to this or they're going to kill each other. Do you see how that changes how you look at the law? Sometimes you've got a law of divorce because of the hardness of your heart.

W. Canonical continuity or clashing [72:25-76:22]

Here's another thing I work with: canonical continuity or canonical clashing. Do certain parts of the Bible say that it's okay if I eat lobster even though it's unclean? Catfish: clean or unclean? Unclean. Did the Jews have real sharp distinctions between clean and unclean. But in the New Testament, does Jesus, in a vision, tell Peter to get up and eat? It's all clean. Peter says what, "No, Jesus I can't do that because my mouth has never had anything unclean," in Acts chapter 15. And God says, "Get up and eat, don't call unclean what I've called clean." Peter is told to eat all this non-kosher stuff in the New Testament because God's trying to show that the kosher laws have passed now. If you're a Christian do you have to eat kosher? The answer is, no. Acts chapter 15 tells us that as Christians we don't have to eat kosher. So some of the law gets changed and there's these canonical clashings. The Old Testament did it this way and in the New Testament, we're not going to do it that way and so there's a clashing between them. When you see those clashings you know what? Is that part of the law cultural? Was it for that culture and not for our culture? So when you see the clashing then you can see these divergences in culture. Culture is changed and therefore the law needs to be changed.

What I would say is that the law is not passing away. What was the function of that law? The function of the law with eating kosher food was that an ethnic cultural—how should I say—marker for the Jewish people that they were part of the Jewish community. What's happening now is not a passing away of the Jewish people, it's actually expanding because now the Gentiles are included in. In other words, you don't need these cultural ethnic identifiers anymore because the church is the whole world now. So it's not passing away so much as expanding and being blown out. Expanding in the one sense, it's being fulfilled by its being expanded. Not as you say "passing away" meant that the law would be violated. The law still is good. It has fulfilled its purpose. Its purpose was the identifying the Jewish people and now it's got to give way because that ethnic exclusivity is giving way. It's not passing away. So I'm saying it would be expanding and going on to greater things. It's fulfilled in a more comprehensive way, in a more expansive way. So it's not like this is bad now--no, no. It had its place, it had its

time and now it's actually still got its place and time, but it's actually being blown out now. It's becoming more comprehensive.

The law—there are some things that change like the dietary laws are real clear because Acts makes it real clear. We don't have to eat kosher. So there is continuity and there is discontinuity. Between the Old Testament and the New Testament there's continuity but there are also some aspects of discontinuity. The discontinuity will often be in this fulfillment to the greater that is coming. So here it was smaller and then once we get into the church it will expand and become more comprehensive.

X. Law good and bad uses [76:23-78:10]

Is the law good or bad? Well, if the law leads you to legalism, the law is bad. If they find security in performance then the law is bad because you're getting secure in the law not in your faith in Christ. The externalization of religion--if one keeps the law and the law then gives them external markers that you're religious because you have these external markers that again are not the function of the law. If the law leads you to feeling so good about yourself so that you start condemning others because others don't keep the law and you do keep the law and you start looking down your nose condemning other people, that's not the function of the law either. So the law can be bad in that sense. It can lead you to a sense that I'm better than other people and largely lead you to pride. Wouldn't it be better to say that it gets misused in those situations because the law is always right. Yes, I want to do it this way, so we'll do it this way. So the law can lead some to pride with the person taking the law allowing it to lead them to pride and earning one's salvation. A person can take the law and say if I keep the law then I can earn my salvation. If the person believes they earn their salvation, do you they depend upon grace?

So the law can have these various functions and even the term "law" is used in many different ways. These are some negative ways that the law can be misinterpreted and misused.

Y. Misuse of Grace [78:11-80:23]

Now what about grace? You said you speak very highly of grace. What about

grace? Is grace good or bad? Grace can lead to license. A person can say, “God will forgive me so I can go out and do this bad stuff that I know I shouldn’t be doing saying, “God will forgive me.” Therefore grace actually ends up being an enticement to sin because you figure God will forgive you. Paul says grace is good but if grace leads you to sin, God forbid. Paul says that. The mentality that I can do anything and I’ll be forgiven can be a problem. If a person has the mindset that I can do anything and I’ll be forgiven then grace is leading you down the wrong road. So grace has this negative side as well.

This is the big one--the valuing of sin. This actually a big problem I think in our culture. Our culture pushes grace. It has led to the disconnection between act and consequence. That’s one of the biggest things in our culture that keep many young people in foolishness rather than allowing them to move on to wisdom. The disconnection with act and consequence because they think they can act with no consequences. The problem is there are consequences and so sin gets devalued. Some think you always get a second chance. So in that kind of thinking grace is bad.

Next time when we get to this section we’re going to talk about some laws that are very difficult. One of those laws will be the laws of war. So we want to talk about some laws that rattle our bones and we’ll hit those tough laws next time. Take care. See you on Tuesday.

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History, Literature and Theology course, lecture 17 on the book of Deuteronomy, the institutions of Israel and the various understandings of the concept of law.

Transcribed by Sam Mason
 Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt 2

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 18[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History, Literature and Theology class on the difficult laws from the book of Deuteronomy and an introduction to the book of Joshua up to the taking of Jericho.

A. Quiz Preview [0:00-2:26]

For Thursday you guys are working on 1 Samuel. Somebody just reminded me after last class that there's an assignment for Get Lost in Jerusalem in there, and the problem is I haven't set you up for the Get Lost in Jerusalem software. So let me check that out and we'll push that back a week. I will show you Get Lost in Jericho today and so we'll take a virtual trip to Jericho. You guys want to go to Jericho today? Yes, we'll go to Jericho. It will kind of be a virtual trip to Jericho. But the same type of technique that you see for Jericho will be the same technique that you use for the Jerusalem adventures. For Thursday you guys are working on 1 Samuel and some Psalms. Do everything on that except for the Get Lost in Jerusalem and I'll set that up for you for the following week.

Today is going to be another one of those difficult days where we're going to struggle with the book of Deuteronomy and this is going to be some hard stuff. So we'll ask for a word of prayer, ask for guidance for what we're going to be discussing today. *Father we thank you for this day. We thank you for your word that you've spoken. You spoke to a people 3000 years ago and you had it recorded for us. We pray that you might help us in the 21st century to be able to get back into the shoes and to be able to understand what you were doing 3000 years ago. It's hard for us Father, at various points to understand that culture, that time, some of the laws that were made, we really are clueless about that. Give us as much understanding as you can. We pray that these discussions today might be honoring to you and that we might give glory to you and thank you for your wonderful son Jesus Christ, and in his precious name we pray. Amen.*

B. The Irony of Tolerance and Diversity [2:27-6:05]

We are going to talk about some tough concepts today. So I want to discuss some laws from the book of Deuteronomy that rattle our bones. This is always a difficult time and actually it's been interesting for me over the years to watch college students and to see you folks who pride yourselves in diversity and tolerance. Are diversity and tolerance your two major ethical principles of the 21st century? Diversity and tolerance. Can you tolerate all sorts of things? A person, how should I say, in days gone by, things would be considered really immoral. Now a guy sleeps with a girl and what happens, it's just like no big deal. It happens on television, it happens in movies, and it happens in real life. No big deal. Yet years ago it was a huge deal.

However, in our culture if you say the wrong things and use the wrong words you get crucified, you absolutely get crucified. So now, we are so into tolerance, but yet does our tolerance lead to intolerance? What I'm suggesting is that all this emphasis on tolerance and diversity has actually led to intolerance. So, for example, at the Catholic University down in Washington D.C. There's some Muslim students taking classes at the Catholic university. These Muslim students said that they are offended by Jesus on a cross. At a Catholic university they actually have crosses with Jesus on the cross. These Muslim students are offended by that and they wanted them taken down because they are offensive to them. Now is this going to go to an American court and are they going to decide whether a Catholic school has the right to put a crucifix up? Is there something wrong with this picture? When was the last time you were in a mosque and you told them that you were offended and told them you wanted a cross in the mosque. See what happens to you? So what I'm saying is that we have become so intolerant of Christianity, it's crazy, everything's upside down.

Now what's the problem? You guys now have to go back 3000 years. Question, does our culture have all sorts of stuff that's changed in the last 50 years? Now you go back 3000 years and you're going to see law codes from 3000 years ago are really out of sync with the way they think. The irony to me is that Americans in the 21st century, are we really judgmental when we look back and say, "how could they do these things, they

were so cruel?" We look back on these people as barbarians. It's kind of ironic that we sit in judgment yet we're supposed to be so tolerant. Do you see the irony there?

I'm going to show you some things that are hard to understand. To be honest with you, I struggle with these things until this day. I'm not sure I have the answers to all these things. But they're things that I think I should put out on the table and hopefully ten years from now when you guys are really smart you'll figure it out and send me an e-mail and tell me what the answer is on some of this. But we'll work with some of these laws. These are laws from the book of Deuteronomy that rattle our bones. They clash with our culture, they clash with our mindset and they clash with how we think about things.

C. Tough laws: war [6:06-17:33]

Some of those laws have to do with war. Particularly in the book of Joshua We'll discuss the concept of war in the book of Joshua. But I'll introduce it here. We actually won't work with it until we get fully into Joshua. Joshua's got a lot of battles. Joshua fit the battle of Jericho that kind of thing--laws of war. So if you go to Deuteronomy chapter 20 verse 4 there's a whole section here about laws for war. By the way, are there laws for war in our world today? Is anybody familiar with the Geneva Convention? Are there certain ways of doing things that are fair. For example, do we protect prisoners of war?

Anyway, here are some laws that come out of Deuteronomy chapter 20 then, it says in verse 4, "the Lord your God is the one who goes with you to fight for you against your enemies." Jump down to verse 4. "The officers shall say to the army, has anyone built a new house, and not dedicated it yet? Let him go home." In other words, if you build a house and haven't dedicated it, haven't lived in it yet, you're allowed to go home. Is that a good law? If a person goes to war and they just built a house, where is their head going to be? Are they going to be back in their house that they've never lived in? They're going out to fight a battle, is their head going to be really into it or are they going to be back there? So God says, "If you've just built a house and never lived in it or dedicated it, go back home, live in your house, let others fight." Does anybody remember, back after

the Civil War they had a war called Vietnam. In Vietnam days they drafted students. So I was a college student and you got a number. I forget, I think I was in the 230's, so that meant if I was in the 230's I would not be drafted. If you got a low number, suppose your number was ten, you were history. Were you drafted into the army whether you liked it or not, out of college, so what do you do then? Well, you get married. If you got married, you got a deferment. I think it was Dick Cheney who did that? I say that because you guys know Dick Cheney as Darth Vader, actually he's one of my heroes. I say that to get in your face a little bit, you need to listen to Cheney's lectures; they're some brilliant things there actually in spite of what the media culture thinks about him.

So if you have a house you get a deferment and then a second rule comes up. It says there's a marriage exemption. If you're engaged to a woman, and you're in the process of getting married to her, are you supposed to go off to war? No. By the way, what's the problem? If a guy is off to war and his head is on his wife at home is he going to get killed in the war because his head is not in the war. By the way, even in America in the 1960's and 70's was there a deferment for somebody who was married? You got a deferment. Do these laws make sense to us? So these fit in pretty well. Not all the war laws do.

"Give peace a chance, all I am saying is give peace a chance." I saw somebody smile, least he knows, an old song from the 70's, "Give Peace a Chance." This is Deuteronomy chapter 20 verse 10. It says when you march up to attack a city make its people an offer of Shalom [peace]. When you come up to attack a city, offer the city shalom/peace. If they accept and open their gates all the people shall be subject and forced to labor. They shall work for you and basically they would be woodcutters and water bearers. So you spare the city. This again is good, a give peace a chance kind of thing.

When you read Joshua, do you ever remember them doing this? You know, they come up to a city and say, "hey, peace baby, peace, come out." It's never recorded. Just

because it's not recorded does that mean they didn't do it? No. They did a lot of things that aren't recorded. So it's possible that they did this but it's never really recorded.

So that brings me to another point I want to make in the book of Deuteronomy, are there a lot of things said that there is no record that they actually did. Is it possible that they had laws that they actually didn't do? Question, in America do we have laws that nobody does? Shake your head, yes. We have tons of them. Actually now people are saying even the government itself says we choose not to enforce these laws. There are laws on the books and government says we choose not to enforce them. So give peace a chance, all I am saying is give peace a chance.

Those are the easy ones, this one's a hard one. It's called the *herem*, principle and this is down in chapter 20 verse 17. The verb form is *haram*. Now *herem*, its pronounced *herem*, it's a hard h, *herem* means "total destruction." It means, actually let me go back one step, it actually means "devoted to the Lord." But how you devoted it to the Lord was by burning it up and killing everything in the city: men, women, children, and animals. The whole city was totally destroyed. By the way, did they ever do this and destroy a whole city: men, women, and children? What was the name of one of the cities they did that to? Jericho. Did they spare somebody in Jericho? Yes, Rahab the harlot was spared but the rest of the people in the town were killed. So this *herem* principle is really hard for us as Americans, you say, "Holy cow, they go in there and kill everyone, men, women, and children, how can you do that?"

Is this a hard one, men, women and children and animals were dedicated to the Lord and burned up? Various things were killed by the sword. Somebody asked: how do you account for soldiers going in killing babies, killing everyone in the town? How do you account for that? The honest truth is I don't know what the answer to this one is. It bothers me some, I get certain things, and when we get into the book of Joshua we'll try to get into explanations for it, but still, it's really harsh.

Did America ever do anything like this? Well, actually we dropped a bomb, and it destroyed every man, woman, children, and animals. I don't want you to think that

because you're 21st century Americans you're above all this stuff and they were cruel barbarians. Actually, a lot of people got killed when the atomic bomb went off, men, women, children and animals, everything. By the way, that's bad, we don't want to be dropping bombs all the time but they did that in order to spare lives. Because if they didn't who knows how many more would have died. I don't want to get into the justification of this. Part of it is the justification of war; and part of it is when you're in America and you're sitting in a college academic setting are we always saying peace and love and everything like that? Because what, do we actually have to get out there and do the fighting? No. We have somebody else do it for us and we want to sit back in our academy with our brilliance and tell them what they should be doing while they are actually the ones who have to do it. Do you see the arrogance of the academic position? What I'm saying is be careful when you think you have everything figured out when you never had to pull a gun and actually put a bead on somebody. It's a very different thing than what you'd imagine. So what I'm saying is be careful about the academic arrogance.

The other question that I come up with was God judging this Canaanite culture? Yes, he was judging it. He says, "I waited 400 years; the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full." He waited 400 years. Then he sends Israel in to do this as a judgment on this culture. Does God judge cultures? Yes, Sodom and Gomorrah. Now he's using the Israelites to do that. But you say what happens to all these people? When infants get killed, what happens on the other side? In other words, am I a finite human being, do I understand how God works? Can I sit in judgment of God? I was just asked how do you justify God doing that? I don't justify God. Does God justify me? I can't justify God because I don't understand all this. What happens, I know what goes on in life, but what happens after life? Is it possible that these babies who are killed go to heaven and things are better for them? I don't know. I don't know what happens afterwards to all these situations. So what I'm saying is that I can't make a judgment on that, all I can say is I trust God.

There's a certain point where you've got to back down. I put these laws up here partially because I want to break your heads open. To give you stuff where you can't put God in your nice little "God loves you and has a wonderful plan for your life box." These kind of laws break your head open on that and say wait a minute, God's beyond my understanding. I can't understand God. My thing is that I can't even understand my wife, how am I going to understand God? I can't understand another person sometimes who's really close to me, how can I understand all of why and how God administers things? Can God administer justice on the other side of death that I have no idea about? So I can't make a judgment necessarily here on God when I don't have the whole picture, I have nowhere to stand to make a real judgment on that.

So these *herem* laws are really hard though. The whole thing is devoted to the Lord and burned up to the Lord. Israel didn't do that a whole lot, they did that on Jericho and on Ai and Hazor, they did it on three cities, so it's a big deal. This is usually a hard one for Americans, especially for 21st century people to get a hold of. We'll come back to the *herem* when we actually see it in Joshua. Joshua actually implemented that one. It's a tough one now.

D. Rape Laws [17:34-20:07]

Other laws that rattle our bones: rape laws. The Bible actually has some laws on rape in chapter 22 verse 23 let me just summarize these verses. The Bible makes a distinction between a rape in the city and a rape in the field. Whenever you get these rape situations do you get a he said/she said kind of thing? He said, "No, it was consensual. She consented" But she said, "I didn't consent!" So you've got his version was consensual, her version is it was not consensual. You got these big debates.

You know recently this guy from the IMF, I think he was running for a position in France. Are you guys aware of this? He was running for a position in France. This woman in New York City was a cleaner, and she apparently claimed that he molested her, so he was put in jail in New York City and, by the way, the election was held in France. Then immediately after the election was held what did the women do, she

dropped all the charges. Does anybody say, “hmm does that sound a little bit fishy?” Would people put somebody up to that? These issues are complex. I’m not trying to stick up for this guy, all I’m saying is does this smell fishy when all the charges get dropped? He can’t go to the election and you just wonder about this. It’s complicated.

So they say in the city, if a woman is being raped, she’s responsible to scream. What happens when she screams? People come and help her. She’s responsible to scream if she is in the city and being raped. What’s the problem out in the country in the field? She screams and nobody’s there, so it doesn’t matter. So in the field it isn’t going to make any difference, she’s not required to scream. She can scream all she wants, and nobody’s going to hear her because she’s out in the field. So it made that distinction. Now are there a lot of other things that we say well if I was doing it I would do it this way. If she’s in the field she’s required to scream to show no consent, and basically she is violated. Of course, afterward you can just take a DNA check and you can check what the deal is. No DNA tests back then. I mean none of this kind of forensic stuff.

E. Death Penalty [20:08-23:33]

They do have these death penalty laws. This is another one if you’ve ever written papers for your high school teachers. Do you agree with the death penalty or not? Of course, in Massachusetts these things are long gone, places like Texas and Florida they still do the death penalty until this day. People freak out on it depending on all sorts of situations. How did they handle it in biblical times?

False prophets. It says in Deuteronomy 13:10 if the guy is a false prophet he has to be put to death. Now I want you to ask a question about this. You guys have read quite a bit of the Bible now. You haven’t read the prophets yet. In Israel when they had false prophets did they usually put them to death or did they usually applaud them? Yes, they usually applauded them. So while Deuteronomy says false prophets were to be put to death usually the false prophets were the ones who were congratulated. Everybody loved the false prophets because the prophets said, “peace, love, and harmony.” The true prophets said, “repent, God’s going to judge you.” People didn’t like that in the Old

Testament. What happened to the true prophets? Did the true prophets get butchered?

So what I'm trying to say is there dissonance between what the laws of Deuteronomy said and what Israel actually practiced? But I ask you in America is there a divergence between the laws and what gets practiced? So, for false prophets Israel didn't do this. They should have, according to law, but they didn't do it.

Now, I want to ask another question. Should they have done this or is there another way of looking at these death penalty laws? And so I want to ask that question. We're going to come back to that in a second.

Let me put some other ones up there. Idolaters should be put to death. What's the problem with this? If the person is an idolater he should be put to death. Were there some kings who were idolaters? Yes, the guy's name is Manasseh and Solomon.

Manasseh, or if you don't like Manasseh, you could do Ahab and his wife Jezebel. So you've got idolaters were to be put to death. Again did Israel put idolaters to death? Some of their kings were idolaters. So these laws did not seem to be followed too well in Israel.

Now here's some that get harder. Check this one out: a rebellious son is to be put to death. You say, Hildebrandt you'd be a dead man. The rebellious son was to be put to death. You say, "holy cow, put to death for rebelling against your parents?"

By the way, isn't our culture built on rebellion against parents? Because parents are fools, they're from a previous generation and they know nothing, because they aren't with it. I mean your parent doesn't even have an stinking iPhone many of them. How can they know anything about life they're not on Facebook? What I'm saying there is terrible because Facebook gets a little bit too personal. Anyway I crossed the line there. Actually I did it on purpose. My kids told me to stay off Facebook and I have taken their advice.

F. On law as statement of values [23:34-27:37]

I want to come back to this death penalty for these things. I asked my son-in-law now, actually he is a University of Chicago lawyer. He graduated from the Chicago

University of Law. He works for the Heritage Center down in Washington D.C. It's a think tank down there and he works with the Supreme Court. He actually knows some of the Supreme Court people. He's actually been before congress. So this guy knows law, he's taught law. What's that school in Cleveland, it's Case Western or something like that. Anyway, he's taught at Case Western and he's taught law at other schools. So I asked him about these death penalty laws and I said, "it really seems, I can't understand these death laws about the rebellious son."

The non-virgin that marries, you say, "holy cow, half our culture would be out." A non-virgin who marries was to be put to death. What Robert told me, and I think this is really a good piece of wisdom from him, what he said is that a lot of times law codes are not meant necessarily to be actually implemented, but that the law codes themselves are establishing a set of values. In other words, they're sanctioning values saying, "these things are important."

A rebellious son, what is the value that that is sanctioning? It actually goes back to the Ten Commandments which says what? "Honor your father and your mother." By the way, is that one of the basics of society? So what he's suggesting then is that this has not to do necessarily that these things need to be implemented but that they suggest the values that God has and how strongly he objects to something. Now does that help you, do you see the switch there? From "this is what you need to implement" versus "these are a series of values that are being inculcated." He suggests that for law in general the big question is often times to inculcate a certain set of values. That makes sense to me. Now question: does it totally solve the problem for me? No, but it helps me and I'm about eighty percent or seventy percent helped. So there are still some things I wonder about, but it does help me.

Hannah's saying "How does it mean anything then it becomes meaningless if it's not enforced," that's exactly what Robert is saying. You're thinking enforcement with the law, he's saying, "no, the law itself is meant to be a statement of social values." It says that these are values that you really need at the core of your culture. So each culture has

its laws not always necessarily meaning that the laws are going to be implemented just the way they are in the law books, but that they state what a culture values and what a culture disvalues. So what I'm saying is that the whole concept of how we think about law needs to shift and I think that is helpful for me. What he ends up doing is saying that laws are value signals, that they signal values not just as moral legal codes. I'm afraid that I was thinking about it as a clearly moral legal code and what Robert's done is push me back up to the social values.

Now question, I think Hannah has something there, too. Does something bother you? Some of you still want to see it as legal code because it's kind of written in that way. I'm not ready to give this up yet. But this other way helps me to soften it some. So it's just something I want you to think about you do not necessarily have to agree with it. To be honest with you I never actually thought about it in this way until just last year we had this big discussion on this and it made sense.

G. Lex talionis: eye for an eye [27:38-33:18]

Now, other difficult laws are the dismemberment laws. This is an easy one that you're familiar with. This is called *Lex Talionis*. This is "eye for eye, tooth for tooth." Now you say what's the deal with that? So he punches out your tooth. You punch out his tooth. Eye for eye, tooth for tooth. Then we'll all be toothless, right? How is that justice? Eye for eye, tooth for tooth. Well, let me just say, is it justice? Eye for eye, a tooth for a tooth.

In other words, what this law is trying to say is the punishment is to equal the crime. Now what can happen in certain cultures i.e. Hammurabi's code and some of the other cultures, is it possible that you knock someone's tooth out, if the person's a king he will take off your head for knocking his tooth out. So what this is saying is you can't overreact. In other words, your tooth for tooth, the damage you did is the punishment you receive. It has to be equal. You can't overreact and say I'm the king and he knocked out my tooth, take off his head. In some of the other cultures this overreaction is common. If you do something wrong there is this total overreaction depending on who

you did it to. “An eye for eye, tooth for tooth” says that crime and the punishment must fit each other. So this is actually helpful making sure that a person doesn’t over react.

Have any of you guys ever been in situations like that where there’s vengeance going on? Somebody does something to the person and the person responds harder and more harshly. Then this person responds back harder and more harshly and it just escalates. What the law is saying, no, an eye for eye, a tooth for tooth. As it has been done so the punishment must match the crime.

The other thing with this, and this happens in America, I was just watching this last night it was kind of interesting. There’s a guy that comes in to rob a Seven Eleven store. Let’s say he’s got a gun on him and there is a seventy-two-year old grandmother, this is at one o’clock in the morning, she is out talking to the guy in the Seven-Eleven store. A guy comes in to rob the store. You know what Granny does? This is the honest truth. This grandmother grabs this scanner thing and she starts whacking on this guy when this guy tries to steal stuff. This guy is trying to steal this stuff and Granny is going like this. It’s all caught on camera so it’s the funniest thing. She’s beating on this guy. The guy steals the stuff, he runs out of the store. Now let’s suppose he got caught in America. He stole a hundred dollars and he got a head injury from Granny. She won. It was pretty impressive. I wouldn’t want to tangle with that woman.

So in our culture what happens is: he stole the hundred bucks, he’s got a gun, under his arm. What would happen to him, would he get put in jail for armed robbery? I would hope he’d get put in jail. So in America, do we incarcerate people for punishment?

How many people are in jail in America? Is it 2 or 3 million? The figure 2 million sticks in my head. Now, I’m not sure. I think that figure sticks in my head. 2 million people incarcerated. Is that a lot of people in prison?

By the way, does that cost America a bunch of money actually to keep people incarcerated? What’s the cost to have someone incarcerated for a year? I believe it is over \$30,000. By the way, if you’re from California, okay hopefully nobody’s from

California. But if you're from California they have so many people incarcerated in their prisons and their budgets in debt. So California is underwater billions of dollars and what they're saying is we can't afford to keep these people in prison. So they were going to set these guys loose on the street because they can't afford to keep them in our prisons anymore.

Now what's the problem in ancient times? Did they have prisons in ancient times? The kings had access to prisons, but very few? Joseph was in prison. But only the king would have a prison like that.

So what I'm saying is when a person did a crime, could you have the privilege of putting that person in prison? If an armed robber comes in to rob a Seven-Eleven in Bethlehem they don't have a prison to put the guy in. So what happens is they have to meet out justice immediately. In other words, they have to do justice immediately if you don't have prisons. Even with some of our prisons do they ever try to do things immediately? Have you guys ever heard this? If a guy steals something from somebody he actually has to go back and face the person he stole from and repay twice what he stole, 3 times, 4 times what he stole from that person. Is that actually a good thing that he actually has to face the damage that he's done to another person? Yes.

Now, we've got major criminals like Bernie Madoff. He has had to face the people that he ripped off and he laughed at them. So I'm saying there seems to be little remorse there. But there seems to be something in the Old Testament where you stole something, then you had to repay it with twenty percent. They didn't have prisons. You can't put them in prisons. So therefore if they do something and it destroys your hand then you destroy that person's hand. So it's immediate justice that is dealt out, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. Because of the lack of prisons they had to do justice differently.

H. Polygamy [33:19-35:00]

Here's another one--polygamy laws. The Bible has laws on polygamy. Deuteronomy chapter 21, verse 15: "If a man has two wives and he loves one but not the

other.” Wait a minute, are you telling me here that the Bible approves of polygamy. Chapter 21 verse 15 it says the guy has two wives and he loves one but hates the other. There’s a law in the Bible about that? Does that mean God approves of polygamy? No, God made man and woman, Adam and Eve. However did people back then have polygamous relationships. Jacob with Rachel and Leah. Bilhah, the hand-maid etc. This law protects whom? Which wife does it protect? Which wife needs protection? The unloved wife. So what this law says is: “if a guy has two wives, the unloved wife is to be protected.” He must feed her, he must treat her well. The unloved wife’s kids also get part of inheritance. You can’t disinherit the unloved wife. Does this law protect the unloved wife? Is this a good thing?

Well, the best thing is that there’s no polygamy, but it says if there is, and in that culture there was, then you have to protect the unloved wife. That’s the polygamy laws.

I. Slavery Laws [35:01-37:45]

This one is similar. Slavery laws, chapter 15 verse 12. So if a fellow Hebrew sells himself to you and serves you for six years, in the seventh year what happens? He goes free. So yes, there are slavery laws in the Bible, does that mean the Bible approves of slavery? By the way, is this African type slavery, go over there, capture people put them on boats, pull them over here and then they’re a slave to that person for the rest of their existence? This is saying that a guy sells himself to somebody and in the seventh year he goes free. Why would a person sell himself to somebody else? Debt. In our culture we would call this indebted servitude. Would some people call this bankruptcy? In other words, this guy’s going bankrupt and can’t afford to feed his family? Did they have famines back then? When they had famines you couldn’t run to the grocery store, there was nothing to eat, and your family would starve. So you sell yourself to a rich man, help him harvest his crops and then you get what? You get food for your family, so you can feed your family. After six years you can start over again.

The Bible has slavery laws but it protects the slave. Are these hard laws? But by the way, is their culture different than our culture? Yes. But they do things differently and

of course they're wrong. Do you see the irony there? We can sit in a seat of judgment. What's ironic to me is how judgmental our culture has become if you don't fit into our little P.C. world that we have in the 21st century. Actually, over the last years I've seen students tighten up and tighten up, up until last year when I asked a student what was the most important thing you got out of Old Testament and he said "God kills babies." Now I'm saying I hope you guys get passed that and your thinking goes a little bit beyond that. So what I'm saying is you've got to wrestle with real life and a God who is bigger than you can imagine and you've got to get out of your American ways of looking at things.

J. Animals [37:46-41:51]

Now animal treatment is another topic that is really interesting. Deuteronomy actually has laws regarding animals. What are the laws regarding animals? Now these laws do not apply to cats, of course. I have all these cat jokes but they don't go over too well with certain people.

Chapter 22 verse 10 is an example. There are actually quite a few animal laws. It says, "do not plow with an ox and a donkey yoked together." Now why does it say don't plow with an ox and a donkey together? Is an ox a massive animal, can an ox pull a plow very well because it's a really strong animal? A donkey is what? A little skinny animal. Donkeys are good to ride on, but are they are not necessarily good for plowing compared to an ox. You put a donkey and an ox together is that a real problem for the donkey? And, by the way, it's a problem for the ox too because the ox is going to be doing all the work while the donkey is riding along. So it says, "don't yoke an ox and a donkey" because it's not fair to either animal.

Does this even come over to the New Testament? In the New Testament it says, "do not be unequally yoked with unbelievers." So you can see an adaptation of this law of the ox and donkey. Paul in 2 Corinthians is saying, "believers should not be married with unbelievers. Do not be unequally yoked." He applies this law then to that situation. So don't link donkey and an ox because it's not fair to either animal.

Go over to chapter 25 verse 4 which is another interesting law on the animal situation. Deuteronomy 25.4 “do not muzzle the ox while it treads out the grain.” What happens they take the stalks of grain, they cut down the wheat and they lay it out, and the ox walks around on it. Now when he walks around on it what does he do? His feet crush the grain. It’s got these shucks around the kernel, the kernels are hard and the shucks are not. The ox walks on it and shucks the grain and then the people throw the grain up in the air and the chaff blows away. But the ox is the one that is stepping on it. Have you guys ever done black walnuts? If you get black walnuts you put them in your driveway and you drive your car over them and it shucks the black walnuts automatically. I’m experienced at this because when I was younger my father made me do it by hand and my hands were stained black and every year I went to school. So I went with my hands in my pocket and then we learned this trick about driving the car over them. It was really great, it was like an ox, but do you have to feed the ox? Yeah, you have to put gas in the tank. What does this mean feeding the ox? It means the ox is doing work for you and when an ox is doing work for you, they should get part of the grain for themselves? It is only fair to the ox that if the ox is doing all the work that it gets some of the food.

In other words, you’ve got animals, do you need to take care of your animals. Are you required by law to take care of your animals? Yes. If they do their work for you, they should get part of the take for themselves. It’s only fair. So even the animals have rights in Scripture--Deuteronomy 25. Three years ago I heard a woman do a lecture on animal laws in the book of Deuteronomy and it was absolutely brilliant. It was just so interesting all these laws in regard to animals. Does the Bible, this is terrible, have a very high view of human kind? Yes, it does. But does the Bible also have a very high view of animals and animal treatment too? Yes, it does. So it’s interesting and here are a couple animal laws.

K. Israel and the Church [41:52-47:15]

Here are some final questions concerning the church and Israel. The church is not Israel. Israel is a nation. Does the nation need laws about murder? Does the nation need

laws about theft? Does the nation need laws about rape? Is the church a nation? The church is not a nation so it doesn't do justice and it doesn't have courts per se in a civil sense. So you've got to make a distinction between Israel and the church. Israel is going to have some laws that are nationalistic laws that are not for the church. What are the differences? Israel is a nation; the church is an assembly or group of people, so it's different. You've got to separate them.

One of the basic things I look at is the underlying principle. In a lot of these laws their culture 3,000 years ago was very different than our culture. So how do you take these laws out of Deuteronomy and apply them to today? By the way, did Paul apply them in the New Testament? Does anyone remember that "don't muzzle the ox while it treads out the grain"? Is that applied in the New Testament to somebody's who's working for you, should you feed them and take care of them. Should you pay the person who's doing you a service a decent wage? Just as you don't muzzle the ox, so the person who is doing the work for you should get a part of it. So it's applied in the New Testament to the elders of the church that if they work for church they should be paid. So you look for the underlying principles.

What are the underlying principles for divorce? What did Jesus say about this issue? What is the relationship of culture in relationship to the law? Jesus said God allowed for divorce because of the hardness of your heart. Does God approve of divorce? No. In Malachi God says he hates divorce. Yet he allowed it because of the hardness of their hearts. If he didn't allow for divorce, what would they do? They would kill each other.

Does that happen even until this day? I was just thinking about, do you remember this case in Tennessee? This woman was saying that this guy was complaining about her burnt food so she got a 12 gage shotgun, the guy was in bed, bam bam, shoots this guy in the back while he's in bed because she burnt the food and he said something about it. So in marriage there is conflict, and if you don't allow for divorce, people will kill each other as they do until this day.

So that doesn't mean that God approves of divorce. You have to look at the underlying principle. Should marriage be a place of love and harmony between two people? Yes, but it isn't always that way. You have to take realistic positions otherwise they're going to kill each other. If the noise gets up that high, allow them to divorce. What's the underlying principle? It's better to be divorced than to be dead. So the law is made not because he likes divorce but it's made because of the underlying principle of valuing life.

This one's a new one for me. The law is a value signal, the law shows what God approves of and what he values. If you've got two wives in a polygamous situation, who does God side with the loved or the unloved wife? Does God protect the underdog? Would that be underlying principle, does God protect the underdog, the unloved wife? God makes these laws that help protect the poor and the suffering. Deuteronomy's full of that.

So the law is a value signal more than that these are legal requirements, they have to do this, they have to kill the false prophets and idolaters. It's a statement of values that idolaters and false prophets are really bad and God doesn't like them.

Israel is not America. America has prisons and so we can solve some of our justice issues by putting people in prison. By the way, how many of you would rather have immediate justice than go to prison? Would it almost be better to take your medicine and get it over with than sit in prison for 2 or 3 years, 4 or 5 years, 10 years? So you need to think about that in terms of how justice is distributed and I'm not sure that prison is always as fair or humane as we make it out to be.

These are some of the things that rattle our bones, I'm not saying I have solutions for all of these, I just want you to look at some of these things and to say wow, there's a lot here to think about.

L. Old Testament and Change [47:16-48:54]

Sometimes the Bible itself clashes. In the Old Testament were the Jews to eat ham? Were they to eat lobster? Were they to eat catfish? They are supposed to eat kosher in the Old Testament. In the New Testament are we told that we don't have to eat kosher? We're not Jewish, we don't have to eat kosher anymore. In Acts chapter 15 you get this clash where Peter is told to get up and eat things that are not kosher. God says, "No, Peter, these guys are Gentiles that are coming into the church now and Gentiles don't have to eat kosher, and it's okay." So it's a clash between Old Testament and New Testament. The New Testament says, it's time for a change, they don't need to eat kosher and they don't need to be circumcised. And all God's Gentiles said, "Amen."

Do you see what I'm saying? There are transitions over time with some of these things too, so you have to ask developmental questions.

This has been some pretty hard stuff and I'm not saying we solved everything but one thing we did solve is that's the end of Deuteronomy. The book of Deuteronomy is a wonderful book; it's a book of covenant renewal where Moses is giving the leadership to Joshua and he renews the covenant. He summarizes it, sets up the institutions for Israel in the future. Love the Lord your God with all your heart, soul, and mind is there, so that's a big deal.

M. Introduction to Joshua [48:55-51:09]

What I want to do next is go over to Joshua, we're going to have a bunch of maps, and we're going to set this up. Joshua involves the taking of the Promised Land. You guys are going to be the Jordan River, I'm the Dead Sea, and this is the country of Israel, and you guys are the Mediterranean Sea. So the geography here in this classroom, I want to set it up. Joshua is going to take the people into the Promised Land. We're going to look at three victories, two problems, and then the issue with war.

First let's discuss the nature and transition of leaders. There is, in the book of Joshua, a transition in leadership; the transition is from Moses to Joshua. Whenever there's a transition in leadership can there be problems. Are certain people going to be

loyal to the old leader? Is the new leader going to do it exactly the way the old leader did it? No. By the way, would you like to be Joshua? Was Moses the man? He wrote five books of the Bible, goes up to Mount Sinai and comes down with the Ten Commandments. Moses speaks to God face to face.

Now Joshua comes along and he's got to fill Moses' shoes. Would you like to step into those shoes? Those are big shoes. Joshua's got a lot to fill. So now there is this transition of leadership in the book of Joshua, we're going to see a lot of that initially. But what you find is that God is the ever present hero. That actually it was not Moses but it was God's presence that split the Red Sea, it was God giving the law at Sinai. So what you have is God is going to come and say, "now Joshua, as I was with Moses so I will be with you." God was the ever-present hero. So now God is going to be the leader so to speak and as he led through Moses, he can lead through Joshua. So the focus on the transition of leadership needs to be on the Lord.

N. Leader's need for encouragement [51:10- 53:08]

Do leaders ever really get down? Did Moses, Moses the man, ever get down? So much so that he said, "God take my life, if this is how you're going to treat me." Moses really got upset and got down. You're going to see this happen with Elijah too. A lot of the leaders in the Old Testament are really going to get down. Jeremiah writes the book of Lamentations, that kind of says it all. A lot of these guys get really down. God comes to Joshua, and look what he says, it's kind of funny here, I think it's our next point.

Look what he says. "No one will be able to stand up against you Joshua, all the days of your life. As I was with Moses I so I will be with you. I will never leave you nor forsake you." Is that a beautiful statement? "I will never leave you nor forsake you." God says to Joshua, "Immanuel, I will be with you." But then he says, "be strong and very courageous." God is going to say this "be strong and courageous" numerous times to Joshua. It makes me think Joshua was a little bit queasy about taking over this leadership role. God tells him "be strong and very courageous because you will lead these people to inherit the land I swore to their forefathers to give them." Then he says it again, "be

strong and very courageous and be careful to obey all the law my servant Moses gave you.” Then if you go down to verse nine he says again: “have I not commanded you? Be strong and very courageous.” So God says to Joshua, I don't know how many times here, “be strong and courageous.” Apparently Joshua needed some encouragement and God's going to give that to him, to tell him to be strong and courageous, as he is going to lead his people.

O. Comparison of Moses and Joshua [53:09- 56:27]

Now, do people compare the old leader with the new leader? Have you guys ever been in a church where you get a new pastor and everybody compares him with the old pastor? This guy's better, this guy's worse. This guy did it this way, we've always done it this way and this is a new other way.

What's interesting is God Himself says, Joshua, “as I was with Moses I will be with you.” The Bible itself sets up this comparison: both Joshua and Moses split waters at the beginning of their ministry. Moses splits the Red Sea and Joshua splits the Jordan River. He doesn't split it, but the waters go down and he goes across the Jordan River. As they crossed water, the Red Sea or the Reed Sea, so Joshua's going to cross water and in chapter four verse fourteen, this comes up with the Jordan River. They cross the Jordan River on dry ground.

God hardens the heart of Pharaoh for Moses. In Joshua, God hardens the heart of the Canaanites. So the Canaanites resist. So God hardens the hearts of both the enemies of Moses and God hardened the hearts of the enemies of Joshua.

This is an interesting one: I think it was back in Exodus 17, Moses goes out to battle and Moses holds up his spear and when he holds up his spear, what happens? They win, and do you remember his hand gets tired and his spear goes down and then they lose? Aaron and Hur hold his hands up. So you've got these two guys holding Moses' arms up and pretty soon they get tired so what do they do? They end up propping rocks underneath Moses' hands to keep the spear up there. Joshua also goes into battle and guess what he does? Holds up the javelin and they win the day. It is the same thing

Moses did. Hold up the javelin and get the victory. You get the same kind of thing: Moses did it holding up the javelin to claim the victory and so did Joshua.

Here's another one. Their victories are put side by side. I think it's in Joshua chapter twelve. It lists here are the victories of Moses, and next it lists here are the victories of Joshua. They are put side by side to compare the two, and it's just interesting that they are parallel there.

Then, lastly, and this is one that is really neat too, Moses sees the angel of the Lord. Where does Moses first meet the angel of the Lord? In a burning bush. Moses sees the burning bush and he comes up and says, "whoa, look at this burning bush." He comes up to the burning bush and what does the angel of the Lord tell him to do? "Take off your shoes, you are on holy ground." So Moses goes, "a burning bush, a talking bush. What is your name?" And it says "I am that I am." Joshua meets an angel of the Lord. He comes up and the angel of the Lord tells him, guess what? "Get your shoes off, you are on holy ground." So both of them approach this angel of the Lord and both of them take off their sandals because they are on holy ground. So what I am trying to say is there seems to be this parallel drawn between Moses and Joshua that is done in the early chapters of Joshua.

P. All Israel Together: Unity [56:28-58:43]

Now, some background things here: this is a unique time in Israel's history. All Israel is together. It's kind of like early America where all the people are Americans and everybody was together. If you look at George Whitefield going up and down the coast, and one of the great things Whitefield did was link the thirteen colonies together with the support of his orphanage down in Georgia. The people from Massachusetts contributed to the people in Georgia, and the people from Connecticut contributed to Georgia. He went to Philadelphia, and Benjamin Franklin commits. So what you have is George Whitefield going up and down the East Coast linking the states together. They struggled with their identity at this point.

You have this same type of thing early on with Israel. This is going to be one time

where they are together. Israel split North and South, just like America in the civil war. Does anyone remember there were two and a half tribes that were set in Transjordan and the other nine and a half tribes went into the promised land? There were Reuben, Gad, and half of the tribe of Manassah who settled in Jordan. So when Joshua goes across the Jordan River, do these tribes want to go or do they say, “we already have our land. We are not going to go over there and fight for you guys, we have our land already.” So what happens is, Joshua tells them, when they go through the river, how many stones do they pick up? Twelve stones. Those twelve stones symbolize the twelve tribes. Do the people of Reuben, Gad and half the tribe of Manasseh, while they have their territory, have to cross the Jordan River and fight to take over this land? Yes, they do. Then later on they are allowed to go home. This is a time when all of Israel is together, and they go into battle. So Reuben, Gad and half the tribe of Manasseh have to cross the Jordan River to help the other nine and a half tribes.

Q. Significance of Jericho [58:44-60:05]

Why was the taking of Jericho so significant? We are coming up on some maps here that I want you to take note of that. Is Jericho a big deal? We even have a song, "Joshua fit the battle of Jericho" that used to be sung in schools. But you can't sing that in school anymore, but maybe in church. Is that kind of ironic? Can you sing this in public schools anymore? Some of the schools still do it, but you get into all kinds of trouble when you start doing these things that are quasi-religious. People freak out in this culture now. Tolerance?

Where is the location of Jericho? The location of Jericho is critically important. When you play sports, is the first game of the season a big deal? The first game kind of sets the tenor. So this is their first battle in the Promised Land at Jericho. It's your first game of the season. What's its location?

R. Map: Survey of Geography [60:06-65:30]

Here's the location, let me just point out some things here in terms of this map. Do you see this wall of mountains here, coming down and there's another wall of mountains

over here. Do you guys know what plate tectonics are? You've got these two continental plates, and the two plates meet right here. What happened was the plates pulled apart, they went apart and down. What happened here was it basically left this thing which is 1270 feet below sea level, lowest place on the face of the earth below sea level. All the water goes into the Salt Sea or the Dead Sea, how does it get out? It evaporates and leaves the residue behind. That's why it's 33% salt. So what happened is the two plates went apart, you've got one here and one here. This is in a canyon, or what's called the Rift Valley, so you've got 10, 20 miles across here. It's a canyon between where these two plates have separated. It goes between the Sea of Galilee it goes all the way down to Gulf of Elat down into the Red Sea and down into Africa. These two plates disconnecting and you get to see it right here.

Moses is going to be right here at Mt. Nebo. The Israelites are camped right here, on the plains of Moab. Moses is going to die on Mt. Nebo here. Joshua then is going to take them down the cliffs and cross the Jordan River. They're going to cross the Jordan River on dry ground and Jericho will be right here. Is Jericho in the canyon or in the mountains? It's in the canyon, it's about 800 feet below sea level. Is it going to be hot in the canyons? Does anyone know Death Valley? Is it going to be hot in the canyon, extremely hot? 120 down there all time in the summer. Jericho has a huge spring that puts out, I think it's 10,000 gallons of water an hour or a day. It just pumps all this water out. Question when it's really hot in the desert down there do you need water? So is this going to be a really important place? When you're going across the desert you're going to catch your water here at Jericho and then you go up to Jerusalem. Did you notice that Jericho and Jerusalem are kind of on the same level? By the way, do you notice the top of the Dead Sea that it's about 3 or 4 miles up over here from here to here from the top of the Dead Sea to Jericho.

Now I just want to draw some things here. This is what's called the Kings' Highway in Jordan. It basically went from Mesopotamia all the way down to Arabia, to the spice routes. When they would do the trading of spices, they would travel on the

Kings' Highway. This is like for you guys Route 1. Does route 1 go up and down North America? You know what I'm saying, Route 1. It's a major highway, it's called the Kings' Highway in Transjordan east of the Jordan River.

Then you have another one on the coast. This one on the coast is like Rt. 95. Do you do Rt. 95, up and down the coast? Down to New York City. Always go around New York City. You've got Rt. 95 going up. This way this is called the Coastal Highway or the Via Maris [Way of the Sea]. If you've got goods in Egypt and you want to transport them, what do you do? You go up the Coastal Highway. So this like Rt. 95 this like Rt. 1.

How do you get from Rt. 1 to Rt. 95 or from Rt. 95 over to Rt. 1?--Jericho. Can you cross here? You can't cross here because you hit the Dead Sea. Do you want to cross here? No, you don't want to cross here, it's all desert. You want to come up here and catch the other one and go up. Is Jericho going to be on a trade route? By the way, this is west, this is east. Is Jericho on a major east-west trade route. Not north-south, but an east-west trade route, connecting the two N-S highways. It's almost like an H. Anyone crossing here is going to cross through Jericho.

Now, here's another way to look at it. Turn your head sideways, this is the Dead Sea. This is actually a satellite image, let me hit a couple buttons here. Up here is Mt. Nebo, this is where Moses dies. This is where the Israelites are camped on the plains of Moab up there. Moses dies on Mt Nebo. Joshua's going to cross the Jordan River. Can you see the Jordan River, the dark area coming down into the Dead Sea? They'll cross the Jordan River and hit Jericho. Jericho will be located right there. So Jericho is right next to the cliffs there. It is just north in relationship to the Dead Sea a couple miles. Can you see it? Has anyone ever heard of Qumran, the Dead Sea scrolls? They are found right in this area here and the north western corner of the Dead Sea.

S. Virtual Jericho Panorama [65:31-75:00]

Now, wouldn't it be neat if we could go to Jericho? Why don't we do it. So what

I'd like to do next is take you to Jericho. But I need to do some screen changing of my resolution to make it look better. So some patience please.

We want to go to Jericho and here we are at Jericho. Have I talked about what a tell is in this class? A tell is a mound of civilization, its layer upon layer of civilization, like a layer cake. Can you see? This is Jericho right here. This is called the tell of Jericho. Is this layer on layer of civilization? It goes back to 8000 BC. This is one of the oldest cities in the world. By the way, when this started out it was on ground level. Can you see that it's not on ground level now it's about 75 feet high. Can you see that it's been built up? People start throwing their trash in the streets, what happens you do that for 100 years? The city starts going up. So that's what happened. So this is Jericho. Now I want to explore Jericho. The same things you do on this are the same techniques you use on Get Lost in Jerusalem which is now up online. Remember you guys are supposed to do a walk-thru of Jerusalem.

So anyway let's go explore. So can you see from the map you can roll over these points and you can see the things over on the side here. So anyway let's go over here to get a view. Now you can see this is Jericho from the side and if you use the shift key, you can actually zoom in, which is pretty handy. Then you can look around and you can go like that and see the whole city of Jericho. You can see over here they've got one of those Gondola cars and you ride right up the cliff. If you pay a few bucks you can go up to the Mt. of Temptation where Christ was tempted on that mount. Let's look around, let me just show you the Mt. of Temptation, let me back out a little bit, there's our car. Let me back out a little bit and then here, do you see that mountain up there. Do you see there's a monastery of the top of that cliff? It looks like a fortress but it's a monastery. A bunch of monks live up there, it's called the Mt. of Temptation. That's where they allegedly took Jesus up, remember Satan took him up to a high mountain to show him all the kingdoms of the world, bow down and worship me, that's the place. Do you believe that? No, I didn't think so. Nobody believes that except for the monks that are up there. So this is allegedly the Mt. of Temptation.

Once upon a time I climbed up these cliffs and walked across the desert behind these cliffs about 20 miles, but I'll tell you that story later when we talk about the city of Ai in the desert going to Gibeon. Let's get back to Jericho. I'm going to spin back around to Jericho. You can see what it looks like down there, is it pretty deserty? You can see their houses down there. What if you do this, watch this. Watch it. Does anybody get dizzy?

Let's go to Jericho to the top. I'm going to take you over to the side so we can look at a trench, you'll actually be able to see where the archeologists dug in. This is a place where they've dug in. Do you remember how I told you about the burn layer? There's a burn layer. Can you guys see the burn layer? You can actually see it's about 6 inches wide. You can see the soil has been stained black by the fire. That's called a "burn layer." If you turn down this is a rampart coming up to Jericho. Can you see what the archeologists did here? The archeologist dug a trench and they went through and dug down and they classified all this material they dug out of this trench. They don't do this trench style digging anymore, it's an old technique that the Germans used I think in 1933. But if you go back around here and you look up you can see there's a wall here. There has been a big debate over that wall whether it was Early Bronze, or Late Bronze, or no bronze. There's big debate over the walls of Jericho. Have you heard they found the walls of Jericho fallen down? If you take Kenyon's position they say there are no walls. I just heard a woman do a debate on this and she said the Bible's wrong. She says archeologically that there were no walls at Jericho at 1200 when Moses went in. There were no walls so the Bible is wrong. It is just myths and legends, archeology proves that. Now you say what about Bryant Wood's study on this site when he says that the Bible was right. Now by the way, is archeology always the same or does it change its mind every 10, or 20 years. So that's an example of some of the walls there.

There's another place I want to go. Now you see how you can operate this, when I spin around and it turns to an arrow. When it turns to an arrow I can click there and when I click there I go there. So now we're up there. Now we're looking back on those walls

we were looking at formerly. You can make your way around the site. I'm going to cheat. By the way, if you don't know what you're looking at you can click this. It comes up and it tells you information about what you're seeing.

So I'm going to go up the mountain here. I'm going to go over here to this side here. Do you see this is the tower here? It's called a Neolithic tower, it dates from about 8000 B.C. from the new stone age. Is Jericho one of the oldest cities in the world? Really old and largely because of the spring of water. Here's a really ancient tower. Over here, can you see a little bit of the stones how they're made out of mud brick? They made walls out of mud brick, you can see the mud brick right here. Well let's get out of here. Do you see how this operates? You can look around. If you want to zoom out you can press shift key and you can zoom in to check it out. If you hit the control key you zoom back out. I'm going to jump back to the map and go down here, and actually if you're a tourist this is what you'll see. See the wires there? They have wires that will take you up on gondolas to the Mt. of Temptation. Is that kind of gross? You should walk, and be part of the land on foot.

But I always do this one because it's my favorite because, well, my friend is here. Do you see, is he smiling? He's smiling. You know he's a happy camel. And do you see that he has a full nose? You say, "Hildebrandt, what are you talking about?" A lot of the camels you'll see that they have their nostrils ripped out. They do that and it's animal cruelty. Do a lot of the camels have their noses ripped out? People are really cruel to camels over there. But are camels really ornery too? It's kind of a two way street. You can see how well this camel has been taken care of by looking at its nose. But this guy wanted too much so I wouldn't let my wife go up on this one. The guy down in Sinai let her go up, he just grabbed her leg and that's all it cost me.

Then here this is the Temptation Restaurant this is the Mt. of Temptation where Christ was tempted. So this is Jericho and somebody just told me something really bad. Wesley has been there recently this whole hotel is gone now. So they destroyed the whole hotel. It's really sad.

So that's Jericho, does it give you kind of a sense of how it works? You'll have Jerusalem, and be able to go exploring in Jerusalem. So let me get back up to my regular resolution.

T. Rahab and Jericho [75:01-83:58]

Back to Jericho. We're going to talk about Rahab the prostitute and some of this stuff going on with her. Joshua chapter 2, let me just read the initial verses about Rahab. She's the harlot of Jericho. It says, "Then Joshua son of Nun secretly sent two spies from Shittim and said, 'Go over the land, especially Jericho.' So they went and entered the house of prostitute named Rahab." Why would they go to Canaanite prostitute's house? Would it be easy access, in and out? Would she know everything that's going on in the city? Would she be a good person to talk to if you're a spy? So they go in, she's a Canaanite prostitute, and they stay there. The king of Jericho was told, "look, some of the Israelites have come to spy out our land. So the king of Jericho said to Rahab, 'Bring out the Israelites who have entered your house because they have come to spy out the whole land.' But the woman had taken the two men and hidden them. She said, 'Yes, the men had come to me, but I did not know where they came from.'" Question, is that a flat out lie? As soon as those guys said two words would she have known where they came from and that they were Jews and weren't Canaanites? Are there dialectical differences that anyone would know exactly. I say, "I'm going to go get my cah, down in Boston." As soon as I say, "cah" or "I had a good idear." Question, do you know I'm from Boston if I say "idear"? They even put a "r" in "larw," it drives me nuts, I can't even pronounce it.

But if I say, "Y'all coming over to my house tonight." Now have I just gone below the Mason Dixon. My wife, she always used to get really angry at me because she said, "I ain't learning my kids to talk like that" because we were down in Tennessee. But I liked the way the people talked down there. They're really relaxed. But this is on tape, and I'll probably get crucified. My wife, is a real English major she speaks English proper...ly.

Rahab hides the two spies and then she tells the king what? It's really cool. She says, "They were here, but they went back. If you guys run after them, quickly you can catch them." So she sends them on a wild goose chase. By the way, did Rahab lie to the king's men? What does that remind you of, who lied to protect the lives of somebody and God approved of it and blessed them? The midwives in Egypt. Have you got Jews in your basement? No, they went that way. By the way, does God approve of Rahab? The whole city is destroyed and who is spared? Rahab. Does Rahab get approved of by God? Not only does she get spared, but who's genealogy does Rahab the Canaanite prostitute end up in? Jesus'. When you're in Matthew chapter 1 and you're going down the genealogy and you see Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and it goes all the way down, and you find Rahab the Canaanite prostitute in the line of the Messiah.

All I'm trying to say is in war can you use deception, the same way in basketball when you throw a fake. It's accepted in a war context. Generals try to fake each other out. She deceives them, and does she get away with it? She gets away with it.

Now what happens? Down in chapter 2 there's a wonderful statement here. Listen to what Rahab said, "before the spies lay down for the night, she went up on the roof and she said to them, 'I know that Yahweh has given you this land.' [Note she uses the name Yahweh], and that great fear of you has fallen on us. So that all who live in this country are melting in fear because of you. We have heard how Yahweh dried up the water of the Red Sea."

Did she know about the Red Sea crossing? How would she have known that? When traders came out of Egypt they would bring that story right up out to Jericho? They go across would she know these stories? She tells the spies. The spies don't tell her about the Red Sea crossing. She tells the spies, "we know about what your Yahweh did drying up the Red Sea. And what you did to Sihon and Og, two kings of the Amorites east of the Jordan whom you completely destroyed. When we heard of it our hearts melted and everyone's courage failed because of you. Yahweh your God is God in heaven above and earth below." Is that a better statement then you get from most of the Jews? So she

goes on and she says, “please swear to me by Yahweh that you will show kindness to my family because I have shown kindness to you.” I show kindness to you, you show kindness to me--*Lex talionis*. Does God spare Rahab the harlot? She lets the guys out the window, they say, “you have got to tie a little red cord on your window and then we'll know it's your house.” When the walls go down guess whose house is left standing, and guess who gets spared? Rahab. She gets accepted into Israel and ends up in the Messiahs' genealogy. This is an incredible lady.

Now I want to show you one other thing that you miss if you don't know the geography. What is the role of women in war? Do women go out and say, “Hey, I know taekwondo and Brazilian Ju Jitsu, I can take you out” or, do women in war outfox the men? They outsmart them. You just have to beware of women with nails, hammers and pegs. So what she does is really interesting. She's in Jericho down in the valley.

When you're being chased by your enemies what direction do you usually go? When I was younger, I'm not talking about gangs, we had two groups in our neighborhood, one group was smokers and drinkers and the other guys were sports kids. So basically we banged heads. So they started chasing us and when you get chased what direction do you run? You always run home, and so what happens here, the spies get out of the city and they would naturally run back to Mt. Nebo and back to all the Jews where they had protection. If they run that direction, east, who are they going to run into? The King's men are coming back from the Jordan River. So what does Rahab tell them? She says, do not run to the Jordan River or you'll get captured. Run instead, in the exact direct opposite way they would have run, run up to the mountains to the west. So she tells them climb this mountain, sit up on the mountain. When they're sitting on the mountain can they see the kings men come back to the city? Then what you do is you run around them and you're all safe. By the way, is that really wise and good advice? She's really shrewd and she gives them some really good advice and spares the lives of these guys and that's how she wins the day. So Rahab was quite a lady and she's the hero.

U. Crossing the Jordan River [83:59-89:21]

So they're going to go up to the Jordan River and cross the Jordan River. What do you know about the Jordan River? It's "chilly and cold. Chills the body and not the soul." Let me just talk a little about the Jordan River. First of all I grew up on the Niagara River. Is the Niagara River a real river? Have any of you guys been over to Niagara Falls? It's about a mile wide, it's a real river. I get over to Israel, and I go up to the Jordan River. The Jordan River on average is 60 feet wide and 3 feet deep. Question, where I come from is that a river? We call those creeks. My father-in-law came over to visit us in Israel and we took him all over Israel and at the end he kind of gets upset with me, he says, I want to go see the Jordan River. I've been all over Israel and I haven't seen the Jordan River. I say, "Grandpa, I don't want to take you down there. It's a waste, it's just like Woods Creek, it's nothing." So I say, "Okay. One night let's go down there." So I drive my car up at night and I shine my lights on the Jordan River he then really gets mad at me and he says, "that's not the river, that's an irrigation ditch." It was, in fact, the Jordan River.

Now you say wait a minute the Jordan River is sixty feet wide and three feet deep, what's the big deal about crossing the Jordan River? I forgot to tell you something. When were they crossing the Jordan River? They are going to celebrate what on the other side when they get to Gilgal? They're going to celebrate a feast of Passover. So they're going to cross the Jordan River and celebrate the Passover.

Do we know exactly when that is? Is it in the spring, about our Easter time? What's the problem with the Jordan River in the springtime, that's coming out of the rainy season, it's in flood stage. The Jordan River in flood stage can be a mile wide. By the way, did the spies get across the river without divine intervention? Did the spies cross the Jordan River on their own? It can be crossed even at flood stage by a person who knows how to swim. By the way, people have drowned in the Jordan River too, I don't mean to make too light of this. So the spies get across it.

Is God going to dry up the Jordan River? Yes, he is. Crossing the Jordan River, was it a miracle or was it by natural causes? In chapter 3 verses 15 and 16, let me just

read these verses talking about the Jordan River and the drying up. Listen very carefully. By the way, when they went across the Red Sea, do you remember what it said in the Red Sea? There was water on the left and the right piled up, on both sides like a wall. The Red Sea was piled up on left and right when they went across--not so with the Jordan River. Now the Jordan River is at flood stage all during harvest. It's the spring harvest, during the harvest of wheat and barley. "Yet as soon as the priest who carried the ark reached the Jordan, when their feet touched the water's edge, the water from upstream stopped flowing." Do you see what's going on? Is the water piled up like a wall or did it stop flowing from upstream? "And it piled up in a heap a great distance away at a town called Adam." About 10 miles north of where they crossed, the Jordan River goes through a canyon. That canyon wall has collapsed twice in history, that we know about. The canyon wall has collapsed and formed a dam and dammed up the Jordan River. In 1927, one of those collapses happened. It's actually recorded we've got written record of it. The canyon wall collapsed and the Jordan River dried up. It says, "that the water stopped up at Adam," which is exactly where this canyon is. Is it possible that God used natural means to establish his purposes? By the way, is it still a miracle? It happened twice in history that we know of, twice in two thousand years. The priests go up and put their feet in it and all of a sudden the water goes down. Is that a miracle of timing if nothing else? So I'm saying it was a miracle of God, but God could use natural means and it seems like here the water did pile up at Adam. So it's possible that he used the collapsing of the canyon walls.

[Student question] What would happen is that the canyon would collapse, it will make a dam, and the water will back up, back up, back up and it will put more and more pressure on that dam and eventually blow it out. Have you guys ever made sand castles with water and dams? When you get enough water and the water breaks through, and it overflows everything. So it was a miracle of God but God may have used the collapsing of the Jordan canyon. So that's basically what we wanted to talk about, and we'll catch the 12 stones next time.

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History, Literature and Theology class on the difficult laws from the book of Deuteronomy and an introduction to the book of Joshua up to the taking of Jericho.

Transcribed by Karli Balmer

Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt 2

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 19[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament, History, Literature, and Theology course. Lecture number 19 on the book of Joshua, The walls of Jericho, the problems at Ai, and the treaty made with the Gibeonites, as well as the concept of war and *herem* in the book of Joshua.

A. Quiz Preview and Demo of Get Lost in Jerusalem [0:00-13:13]

Let's come to order. Let's run through what we're working on for Thursday. I'll have the study guide ready tomorrow morning, first thing, and I'll email it to everybody. Is that alright? Then I'll also post it online. So, it'll be up online and also you should have it in your email. The reading for next Thursday is 2 Samuel which is largely 24 chapters. It's all about David. Do you guys know a lot of the stories of David? This is about David and Bathsheba. These are the stories you probably grew up knowing about David, David and his son Absalom. So 2 Samuel and then 1 Kings chapters 1 to 11 that's largely about Solomon. So, what you're reading for this coming week is David and Solomon. Those stories are fairly well known to everybody. The exploring Jerusalem in *Get Lost in Jerusalem*, we're going to be going over that next. Okay? So just give me a second with that. There are some memory verses from Psalm 51. There are one, two, three, four memory verses. These are "Create in me a pure heart, O God." They're verses that are songs that many of you have sung. They are very, very famous verses out of Psalm 51, which is David's psalm reflecting his sin with Beersheba. So, there is the reading of 2 Samuel, the reading of 1 Kings 1-11, these memory verses, and then the *Get Lost in Jerusalem*.

What I would like to do is to show you *Get Lost in Jerusalem* now. It's on any of the machines that are networked at Gordon here and on the Internet. For example, I go in the Science building. Are any of you guys aware of the first floor of the science building? If you go in from the Frost side there and you take an immediate left. There's a room

there full of these beautiful, large monitors and you can use them. The only problem is you have to boot up in Windows [although as of 2012 it is on the Internet and can be accessed on both PC and Mac platforms]. We only use the best in this class. So you have to boot up in Windows. Then you go to all programs. Are you guys familiar with Windows? You go up and you boot up in Windows and there's this little button on the side, lower left side. You press that and you go to all programs and you *Get Lost in Jerusalem* and you'll pull it up from there.

So, let's look at that now and I want to go over it a little bit here. So I'm going to call up this program from here. *Get Lost in Jerusalem* full screen and just kind of run through some of it with you. So, here we call the program up, this will be the same thing you'll get. When you see these initial things here, you can click the button to click through all this stuff. So I'm going to click this button and jump into the program. Now the first thing you need to know with this program is how to turn the music off. It is the day the music died. Here's how you kill the music. Right here do you see that little music note button? So let's kill that and bam the music is gone. No more music. Now what we're going to do here is go through this program. There's a gaming section. Actually my son Zach wrote the gaming section when he was 16 years old. I taught him how to program and he did the games and so there are the games here.

Well, we're going to explore virtual Jerusalem. Now, let me say before we jump in. There are three sites that I want you to know. These are the important ones. One is going to be what's called Area G. Area G is an archeological excavation. You're going to see a bunch of rocks, and you should know what those rocks mean. I'll show you how you can find out what they mean. Area G will be your first one.

Hezekiah's tunnel is the second one. I want you to go through Hezekiah's tunnel. So Hezekiah's tunnel. Start on the east side, go through it, come out the other side and then go back through it. Okay? So, Hezekiah's tunnel you should be on the outside of it, walk in it, through it, out the other side and then come back through--Hezekiah's tunnel.

The other one that I would like you to look at is what's called Warren's shaft. Here is Warren's shaft. Then just read some information on it. Warren's shaft,

Hezekiah's tunnel, and this Area G, those are the three things I want you to look at. Take you about a half hour to look through these panoramas.

Let me, actually let's look for that and then we'll go to Warren's shaft. So I'm going to go in. Now, how do you go into the program explore virtual Jerusalem? It has all this other stuff but we're just going to explore virtual Jerusalem. So I'm going to click here. Then you can see there's a map or there's a list of sites. The list of sites will be able to tell exactly where we're going to. So I'm going to go to the list of sites, if you go to the map, let's see if this works. You see how this is a map of Jerusalem with all those red dots? If you roll over the red dot, it comes up and shows you where it is. If you click, you go there. Now, I don't want to go there, so I'm going to go to the list of sites. Here's the list of sites and they're listed, alphabetically. You can see here it says area what? Area G is right there. Under area G, actually I don't want to go there. I'm going to do Warren's Shaft. But let's just see here, if we got Warren's Shaft. I'm going to have to click over one. And there it is right at the entrance of Warren's Shaft.

Okay, there's a little arrow, arrow thing here, over on the side. That's how you get back. Do you guys want to go to the Wailing Wall? Let's go to the Wailing Wall. Now, the Jews call it the Western Wall and so I click here, and now we're at this Western or Wailing Wall. I spin around a little bit and here we are. Can you see? Here is the Western Wall. There's the Dome of the Rock by the Western Wall. Then if you can look around to see what's up here, because we're kind of overlooking it, if you look over here, there he is. That woman's leg is faked, that's all Photoshopped. So anyway, these are the people we're with. See the people looking down.

Now, if you actually want to go down to see the Western Wall, do you see that the cursor turns into an arrow? It turns into an arrow, and then you click, and now we're down here. I want to get closer, so I'm going to get an arrow that gets closer, and now we're closer, and here's the Western Wall. This is called the Western Wall. By the way, do you see these are all men, and the women are on the other side of these screens. They worship in separate communities: okay? So the women are over there, the men are over here, and you have to wear a *kippah* on your head when you go there.

I always like taking women in here because you'll never get to see this. This program will show you something that women will not be able to see in real life. Now I want to get closer to the Western Wall. This is actually really close to it. You can see that they tuck their prayers in the crevices of the rock. By the way, you can send in an email from America and they will put it in here. Now when they put your prayers in the wall that means it goes directly up, do not pass goal, it goes right up and so it's quick. This is really quick, it goes directly to heaven. You put them in here and you only have to pay fifteen dollars or whatever it is.

Now, I'm going to turn over here. What I want to do is take you in, there's this little place in the side on the left here to go in there. Women are not allowed in there at all. The honest truth is I didn't know if I was allowed in there. So my son and I went in here and this is what it looks like. I wanted to see what's called Wilson's arch. Wilson's arch is right here. Herod built that. Remember King Herod with Jesus? Herod rebuilt the temple, that arch goes back to Herod's temple and Jesus. Herod didn't want to walk down in the valley and up, because he was too lazy. So he wanted to build something straight across so he wouldn't have to walk down into the Central Valley and up. Wilson's arch was built so that Herod could walk directly over to the temple. You can see the Jewish folks here reading their books, and rabbis and various things. You see this guy with his prayer shawl on. This is kind of what it looks like and there's Wilson's arch. He kind of just doesn't fit in, does he? Anyway that's my son. I put him out over here to scout because I wasn't sure whether I was allowed to take pictures in there, and so I'm snapping the pictures and he's supposed to keep his eyes on these guys in case we have to make a fast get-away because they'll bust your camera if they don't like you taking pictures. I wasn't sure if I was supposed to be there or not. Nobody messed with me. But he was over on the side, keeping his eye out so I can take pictures.

So then we can go back out. We'll go back and then we're here back at the Wailing wall. You can see here there are some guys with their prayer shawls coming up to the wall. So do you see how to get around in the program? Just kind of spin and look for these arrows.

Now, by the way, if you don't know what you're looking at, what do you do? Then come down here and over on the far side there or right here, if you click on this icon, do you see what it says? It gives text explaining the panorama. So you click on this and all of a sudden there's an explanation on the Western Wall, the Jews don't like it if you call it the Wailing Wall. It should be called Western Wall as it's the Western Wall of the temple.

Now, if you don't want to read through this, then it has a button here, where there's a speaker. These are actual sounds from the site. It will talk to you and tell you what you're seeing. By the way, you can still go over here and you can still mess with the picture. So this is the western wall. If you want to hear the music, does anyone recognize this? Is anybody Jewish? That was the Jewish national anthem.

Now, by the way, if you want to get to another site, you can either pick these arrows and walk between sites or you can come up here. This is really important: this is a list of sites. You go back and then you just click down here, and we're back to the list of sites. Do you see how this works? So you can kind of jump in wherever you want and just look on the alphabet here, and you can jump into the site or roll over over here and you can kind of see them on the side. Then when you click on them, you can actually jump into them. This is available then on all the network computers and the Internet. So it's just go down to the Windows icon there bring up, click "All programs." It will list a gazillion programs go down and *Get Lost in Jerusalem*. Then you can go in and explore it and read about it or have it read to you. Spend some time in each one of those three sites. Those were the three sites. Now that's *Get Lost in Jerusalem*.

Let me just say, I used to have this project that I did with kids, students that I would walk them through Jerusalem. They would follow the back of my head. When they got all through Jerusalem did they know where they were? No. All they knew is kind of like if you're the second elephant the view is always the same. I'm walking through Jerusalem, these kids are following me and they had no clue where they were. So what I did was I started this exercise called *Get Lost in Jerusalem*. I'd walk them into the middle of Jerusalem and then I'd say, "Oh, I'm lost. I don't know how to get out of here. I'm not

going to lead you anywhere. You're going to lead, and find your way home because we got to be back to the school for lunch in three hours. So then we would basically wander in Jerusalem for three hours. By the way, would they usually, eventually find their way back? Yes! And question, when they were leading and they had to make the decisions, did they actually learn Jerusalem then? Yes. And so that's, why I call the program *Get Lost in Jerusalem* as a result of that. You can actually learn your way through Jerusalem based on this program.

Let me kill it. To kill it you can either do the 'x' thing or you can just hit the escape. We're out of there and let's get into Joshua. So let's *Get Lost in Jerusalem*. Hope you have fun playing with it. If you ever go to Jerusalem, I think, it's very similar to being there.

B. Joshua: Crossing the Jordan River [13:14-15:18]

Last time we were talking about the book of Joshua. Joshua was coming into the land and crossing the Jordan River. We talked about the Jordan River being about sixty feet wide to three feet deep in normal season but we said that this was in the spring. The Jordan River is at flood stage during the spring. We said that the river probably collapsed north of where they crossed, about ten miles, and the Bible even, in chapters 3 verse 16 tells us the river actually was dammed up, up at Adam. That has happened twice from what we know of history. In 1927 and I think was 1200 AD that they have record of this canyon wall collapsing, damming up the Jordan River. We said it was a miracle of timing because the canyon collapsed exactly when they went across.

Now, we've got to buzz through quite a bit of material to finish up in Joshua. Now when they crossed the river, God had them pick up twelve stones. These stones then are taken and put up as a memorial so that they can remember from the presence of these twelve stones. Now why are the twelve stones significant? What do the twelve stones stand for? Twelve tribes of Israel that are going into the promised land. But question: Were there really twelve tribes going into the promise land or were there two and a half; Reuben, Gad and half the tribe of Manasseh, already settled over here in Transjordan? So, actually, only nine and a half of the tribes got to enter the land over here. The other

two and a half tribes were over here. So Joshua says no, no you guys can't sit by because you got your land already. You've got to come and help us fight the Canaanites. So the two and a half tribes had to agree to send their fighting soldiers over to fight for the land.

When they go across they go across as what? All Israel. So this is a very special time in history for Israel when all of Israel is together. Later on they are going to split north and south. There's going to be tribal tensions later on. But at this point they are all together and they go into battle together.

C. "Until this day" [15:19-18:19]

Now, in Joshua chapter 4:9 it says this: "Joshua set up the twelve stones, that had been in the middle of the Jordan at the spot where the priest who carried the Ark of the Covenant stood. They are there till this day." I have been in Israel and they are there till this day just like the Bible says. The stones are still there--piled up, everywhere. There are stones, piled up, hundreds, thousands of them. Okay? When this says that these stones are there "till this day," does it mean to the twenty first century? No. It means "till this day" meaning when the book was written.

Critical scholars pull this statement out and they say, "wait a minute, what Joshua is saying is the events of history happened here with Joshua but yet this book seems to have been written hundreds and hundreds of years later. So that the writer of the book says the stones are still there "till this day," hundreds and hundreds of years later. When you write history do you want events and the writing of history to be close to each other? Or, do you want the historical event and then hundreds of years later, the event to be written? You want it close together. So critical scholars say no, no this book was written hundreds of years later and that the stones are there still till this day means hundreds of years later. Then you have time for legends to grow up and all these miraculous stories to be accreted. The only problem with that is that this is written hundreds of years later. If you go to Joshua chapter 6 verse 25 it says this, "But Joshua spared Rahab the prostitute, with her family and all who belonged to her, because she hid the men Joshua had sent as spies to Jericho—and she lives among the Israelites to this day." "She lives among the Israelites to this day." Question: Is this "to this day," hundreds of years later or is this

within her lifetime? How old was Rahab when the guys entered the city? Was she one or two years old? No, she was a Canaanite prostitute. So this is probably within 50-60 years at max, and probably less. “She is alive to this day.” What’s Joshua saying? Joshua’s saying, “Hey, you want to know about these stories? If you want to know about these stories you can go ask Rahab, she’s still alive till this day. You can go ask her and she’ll tell you about these stories, she’s still living.”

So is the historical value of the book confirmed? Yes, in a lot of a ways. So this statement then with the stones and Rahab is interesting because Rahab being there tells us that this wasn’t being written hundreds of years later. It was being written in a lifetime of Rahab the harlot.

D. Gilgal [18:20-22:18]

Now Gilgal. When they crossed the Jordan River and let me just kind of map this out. Israel’s over here on the plains of Moab. It is here. They’re going to come down into the Rift Valley and they’re going to cross over the Jordan River. When they cross over the Jordan River, Jericho’s right here, they’re going to cross over the Jordan River and they’re not going to Jericho at first. However, they’re going to go to a place called Gilgal just north of Jericho to set up camp. It’s probably a mile away from Jericho or so. So they’re going to go to Gilgal and set camp at a place called Gilgal

At Gilgal three things happen and these are important things. First of all, they celebrate their third Passover. They hadn’t celebrated Passover when they were wandering in the wilderness for forty years. They didn’t celebrate every year, the Passover. They celebrated it when they came out of Egypt. There was one other time and then now this is the third time. But why is that important that when they cross the Jordan River, the first thing they do is celebrate Passover? What does that tell us? They’re remembering the Lord. Does it tell us what time of the year it is? It’s in the spring. It’s at our Easter time. So they’re crossing at Easter time. By the way, that is exactly when the river floods. It mentioned the fact that the river was flooding during the flood stage during Passover. That is also when they harvest their wheat and barley. This is the spring growth of the wheat and barley. So they cross over, and the third Passover is celebrated

there. This tells us then that it was in the spring when they crossed over. Let me skip circumcision for a minute.

The manna stopped once they got into the promised land. God says no more manna. Manna was for the wilderness. You guys now are to eat the fruit of the land. You're supposed to eat the crops of the land, the wheat and barley harvest was going on and the crops were there. You eat from the produce of the land now, no more special product from heaven. The manna stopped.

Now the third one was circumcision. They've been wandering in the wilderness for forty years and apparently they hadn't circumcised their males. That's a problem. So God says, before you go into battle against Jericho you have to circumcise all the males. Question: Is that a problem? Do you guys remember what happened at Shechem. They're going to be going into battle with the Canaanites. Would you want to have all your people circumcised just before you go into battle? No, so that's a problem. Nevertheless did Israel do it because God commanded it? They did it. Did that weaken them because they had to be circumcised just before they are going into the battle? I often thought, now this is just a kind of a Hildebrandt weirdity kind of thing, but God has them circumcised and then command them to walk around Jericho and be silent. You see these guys all walking around Jericho remember they walk around seven days once each day. It's terrible but my brain does go there.

So then remember on the seventh day they walk around Jericho how many times? Seven times in one day. You saw Jericho. Could you walk around seven times in one day? Yes. You know what I'm saying. It's from here to Lane; approximately, as far as size. You know the length of it. Could you walk around this seven times in one day? And then they yell, play the trumpets, the walls come down, and they go in and take the city. So this is what happened in Gilgal. Are they going make it a holy site then? Is Gilgal a special site for Israel? Yes. Samuel is going to later on offer up sacrifices as is Saul, unfortunately for Saul. Remember Saul offered sacrifices that he shouldn't have offered. That was at Gilgal. It was special, it was considered a holy site down by Jericho. So there are three things, at Gilgal before they actually embark on taking on the land and attacking

of Jericho. God sets them aside at Gilgal and they kind of get their bearings straight.

E. Archaeology and Jericho [22:17-28:32]

Now what happened? The walls of Jericho come tumbling down. They walk around Jericho seven times, they yell, the trumpets are blown and the walls fall down. In the 1930s there was an archaeologist called John Garstang who went over and he was an excavator at Jericho and excavated for many, many seasons there. He found the Late Bronze walls. Yes, he found the walls of Jericho falling outward just like the Bible said. When I grew up in Sunday school class they quoted Garstang, the major excavator of the archeology of Jericho. They told us, look at that, Garstang found the walls of Jericho fallen out just like the Bible said. Archeology proves the Bible. Garstang found the walls falling outward.

All of a sudden in the 1960s and 70s there was a woman named Kathleen Kenyon. Actually, they call her Dame Kenyon, she's British you know British they're always a little smarter than everybody else. So they call her Dame Kenyon and she excavated at Jericho for many, many seasons. Actually for 20 years she excavated there. She is the chief excavator of Jericho. She wrote many books *Digging up Jericho* etc. She discovered that what Garstang called his Late Bronze walls that would have been in the time of Joshua, she determined that those walls were misdated by Garstang and he missed it by eight hundred years. So instead of those walls being there when Joshua went through, those walls would have been back in the time of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. So she said that the walls were misdated and that during the time of Joshua she concluded there were no walls around Jericho. She concluded there were no walls around Jericho during the Late Bronze period but that the walls that were found date were from the Early Bronze which is back in the time of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

So, does archeology prove the Bible? Now archeology does what? Here it disproves the Bible. Does archeology prove the Bible or disprove the Bible and this raises the question.

Lo and behold there is a guy named Bryant Wood and he comes from the 1990s. Now when you're more current like in the 90s, is that going to be better information than

something from the 60s or 70s? Anything from the 60s and 70s has got to be wrong, right? It's old, really old. So anything old has got to be wrong. Just ask Al Gore. By the way, Kathleen Kenyon died.

When I was in college, I was in an Electronic Engineering program and we did all these labs. Have you ever been in a lab context where you know mathematically what your data should turn out to be. You know what you just did in the experiment and you know what your experiment did turn out to be. Do you guys know what fudge factors are? These are things we got very good at this. I don't know what you guys call them today. We called them fudge factors and basically, you went into the lab knowing what it should be and you know what you got and you say, "man, we messed up. We've got to make this thing work." And so what you did is you did these fudge factor and you made your lab work. Our lab hit right on every time. People don't do that in science do they? No, no, it's electrical engineering, it's not really science. But anyway, I'm just being factitious here. Did you ever do data to support your theory and ignore other data that doesn't support your theory? It turns out that Bryant Wood, now that Dame Kenyon has died, got in to examine her data and found out that when she said there were no walls there and the wall's date was from the wrong period, she was only citing data that was supporting her theory. Was there a whole host of data that contradicted her theory that she ignored? Yes. He found that data and said, "O, look at this, she's just ignored this, pottery, this cemetery around there where people were buried. The cemetery around there does that tell when people died and when that happened? So Bryant Wood has shown that some of this is all wrong. He goes back and says this wall was dated correctly by Garstang, or thereabouts, and it should be a Late Bronze age.

So question, does archeology prove the Bible, disprove the Bible, or are these things debated? Every ten or twenty years do the "scientists" change their mind on this? There is this big debate on this thing. All I'm saying is, you've got to be really careful when somebody gets up and says, "Archeology proves the Bible." You've got to be really careful about that because I could show you a number of places where archeologists say, "No, archeology disproves the Bible." So what I'm saying is, there are scientists who are

working with historical stuff, do they have all the data? They don't have all the data. Do they have their own theories? Are certain archeologists working almost purposely to disprove the Bible? Are other ones arguing trying to prove the Bible? So all I'm saying is be careful, archeology is an art and a science. So you got to be careful about the data. If you want good archeology what do you do? You take Dr. Wilson's course on archeology and he will tell you the truth. Dr. Wilson teaches archeology here.

Does the archeology give us truth then? All I'm doing is putting question marks beside them then. Be careful about putting too much weight on archeology. Archeology changes over the periods. We get more and more data. We learn to interpret things differently over a period of time. They have become much more scientific, carbon 14 dating has become much, much more accurate than it was twenty years ago.

F. Ebal Atlar discovery [28:33-33:56]

Here's one that happen, I believe it was in the 90s. I think this is a really cool. In Israel, they have this place called Mt. Ebal. Some people call it "Mt. He-Bald" but I don't like that. So it's called Ebal. Mt. Ebal and Mt. Gerizim and these are two mountains. The Jews when they went in with Joshua the people reciting the curses on Mt. Ebal and the blessings were on Mt. Gerizim. Between Mt. Ebal and Mt. Gerizim there's a valley and in that valley is where Shechem is. Does anyone remember Shechem? It's where the woman at the well took place in John 4. Does anyone remember Jesus and the woman at the well? That was at Shechem. So between Mt. Ebal and Mt. Gerizim there's this place called Shechem where the patriarchs went and where Jesus went later on.

I was at Shechem. Last time I was at Shechem, I was taking pictures. Now what's the problem when I take pictures? Do I take pictures in three dimensions? They're 360 degrees. Normally people go up and there's a stone monument there, and they take a picture of the stone monument. But because I do panoramas, do I do 360s? So I took pictures of the stone thing there and then I took pictures around. But while I was taking pictures around I was taking a picture of these woods over here and little did I know that there were a bunch of Arab soldiers sitting in those woods watching me take pictures. I just took a picture of them hiding in the woods. Is this cool? This is not cool. So all of a

sudden I finish my 6 pictures around with my wide angle lens and all of a sudden, out of the bushes and the woods on the sides these six guys that are Arab dudes carrying machine guns come out. This is trouble. And so they come up and you're taking pictures. You took pictures and they're freaking out about my camera. I'm thinking "I hope they don't steal my camera or bust my camera." Do you know what I'm saying? I come all the way over to take pictures. Luckily for me or better providentially for me, there was a missionary from Ammon. He had spent ten years in Ammon Jordan. He knew how to speak Arabic fluently. My buddy jumps in the way with these guys and starts Arabic, you know *mahasalami* kind of stuff. So he starts doing his thing and he talks to them. He tells him it's okay this guys just a dumb American. He's just taking pictures. He doesn't know what he's doing. I say that's right. I was really grateful for him. He talked, as a missionary, he talked to them in Arabic, in fluent Arabic and did you know I was assuming what they would have done was rip the film out of the camera. Rip the film out and do that. I was assuming, I was just hoping that they wouldn't take my camera. They did not even open my camera. They let me go. He talked through that. I got the camera and we're "let's go back to the bus right now." We've had had enough of Shechem.

Now, up on Mt. Ebal, this is in the 90s, the archeologists on the mountain where the curses were read. There was an altar, there was a hill there, and the archeologists start digging down and when they started digging down they found a huge altar. Not one of these little altars like at Beersheba, you know this high and this big. This is a huge altar made of uncut stone and there's a ramp that goes up to it. Now what does that tell you? Made of uncut stone with a ramp? Did the Canaanites make their altars out of uncut stones or cut stones? This is uncut stone. Were the Jews to make altars out of uncut stones? Were the Jews to make steps up to their altar? No steps. They were to make ramps up to the altar. Guess what, this had a ramp with uncut stones. Question: is this a Jewish altar? They would later find it dated it back to Joshua. What they're suggesting is that this altar is from chapter 8 verse 30 where it says this: "Joshua built on Mount Ebal an altar to the LORD, the God of Israel as Moses the servant of the Lord had commanded the Israelites." What they were suggesting is that they actually found the altar that Joshua

built. Now, soon as somebody says they found the altar that Joshua built showing that the Bible is historically accurate, what happens the next day? Other archeologists get there and attack this thing saying, “Oh, it was misdated to the wrong period. They missed it by 300 years and therefore it’s not the altar of Joshua. We don’t know whose altar it is but it’s some big old, honking altar up there.” So is there going to be debate over this? Is there debate over this to this day. They go back and forth on the debate. So all I’m going to do is say, now do I think it’s Joshua’s altar? This is one I think is from Joshua, I think they’ve got it right. But there’s a lot of controversy over this and this is what happens in archeology.

All I want you to do is get a sense for archeology. Does archeology prove the Bible? Yes. But you’ve got to be real careful with that. Otherwise, you get archeology disproving the Bible at certain points and you’ve got to sort through this. Everybody’s got their theories and things get misdated, there are all sorts of problems. So you’ve got to be careful. They’re learning more about the culture, archeology is one of the great sciences of the world. Things that we’ve learned about the ancient Near East, but you’ve got to be real careful. It’s really debated a lot.

G. Gibeonite deception and alliance [33:57-34:47]

Now, Joshua’s down at Jericho. You can see the Dead Sea there, Salt Sea, and then just up from there is Jericho. Joshua made an alliance with the Gibeonites. Let me hit the button here for the Gibeonites, the city of Gibeon. Do you remember the Gibeonites dressed up in old clothes, they brought old food, and they said, “we’ve come from thousand miles away. Look at all this stuff, these sandals were good but now they’re all worn out. We want to make an alliance with you because we’ve been hearing about your God. We want to make an alliance with you.” Question? Are they from very far away? No. They are from dead center in the middle of Israel. Dead, smack dab, straight center of Israel is where they came from. The Jews did not know. The Jews by the way never consulted with God and made an alliance with the Gibeonites.

H. Southern League [34:48-35:26]

Now when they make an alliance with the Gibeonites, what happens? Jerusalem,

Hebron, Lachish, some other cities of the south, five cities, gathered together and they say, “We’re going to attack the Gibeonites because they made an alliance with Israel.” So these five southern cities gather together and they come up to attack Gibeon. Gibeon screams out to Joshua. They send men down to Joshua saying, Joshua come and help us. Joshua’s going to march his troops all night and this is where the sun is going to stand still. Do you remember that? This is where it happens. This is the context for the sun standing still--the five southern cities coming up against Gibeon, Joshua marching all night.

I. Desert walk from Jericho up to Michmash [35:27-42:29]

Now, when I was in Israel I was about 25 years old at the time. And I had two friends, they were both Daves, we had called ourselves DDT, Dave, Dave, and Ted, and we would go out for walks in the desert. So this is desert here. Once you get passed this road, do you see this road here? This is called the Ridge Route. Once you get over to the other side east of the Ridge Route, this is all desert. Now all the water gets dropped off here from the Mediterranean Sea which is down here. Once you get over the ridge this is desert. It’s like California, on the front side of the mountain there’s water, but on the back side of the mountain there’s what? Desert. So the desert is here and we usually walked out on the Judean desert from Jerusalem down to Jericho. But we decided one day that any wimp can go from Jerusalem down to Jericho. It’s all downhill for 20 miles or so. So we decided we’re going to be like Joshua’s men. We’re going to start at Jericho, we’re going to climb these cliffs and we’re going to march the 20 miles across here. We’re going to go up to Mickmash just like Joshua’s men. By the way, it’s uphill. Jericho’s about 800 feet below sea level, this is up about 2500 feet above sea level. So you got about a 3300 feet climb and then you’re like climbing 1800 feet first and then setting off across the desert. So we were, how should I say this, I was in really, really good shape. At that time I was an athlete, I played basketball for college and other things like that. But I was in top shape. We were used to walking in the desert, so we were all tanked up with our water.

We started our climb this first set of cliffs to come out of this Rift Valley. We

climbed the first set of cliffs. As we get up, the temperature starts rising and it gets hotter and hotter and the desert starts getting up to 110. All of a sudden we're walking across this desert and, by the way, do you walk on the valley or do you walk on the ridge? You always walk on the ridge. We did this when we came out of Bethlehem when we walked in the valley, and there was some 12 year old kid, and this is the honest truth, 12 year old Arab kid is sitting up on the top, we were down about 300 feet in this gorge. He starts chucking rocks at us. So we're looking down and bam, bam! These rocks so we look up, this kids laughing his head off, throwing these rocks, rocks big enough to knock off your head. They're falling 300 feet they hit you guess what? You've got a problem. So here's this kid laughing and three big American guys, he's got us pinned down. He's chucking rocks, and, we take off running because we couldn't get back up to him. There are cliffs there and so we took off. We learned a lesson from that: you don't walk in the valleys. You walk on the ridges. So now we're walking on the ridges across the desert. When you're walking on the ridge that means that you can't get across, you can't just jump onto the road.

All of a sudden we start running out of water. When you start running out of water and it's a 110, 115, 120 degrees all of a sudden you're getting dehydrated. What happens when you get dehydrated? Do you guys know, have any of you guys fainted and just before you faint you start seeing white stars and everything starts getting white closing in on you? All of a sudden we're walking in the desert and things are going awful white and the vision is going, closing in. You look up and when you look up you see that there are these critters above with a wing span of 6 feet circling overhead. It turns out, you probably know why they're circling overhead. Then you look up and all of a sudden from my day and age, you remember a movie that you saw when you were a kid called "The Birds." Is it still out? That thing is old! So I'm seeing these birds. So Dave says, "We just have to get over of this mountain 394 and we're marching. Yeah, we're out of water, and it's getting really bad. We walk up mountain 394 we're climbing this mountain, we get up and he says, "If we just get over the mountain, Michmash will be on the other side and then we can go down into town and go get something to drink." So we're marching

up this mountain. We get up to the top of the mountain and we come over the ridge, he's talking about milkshakes, it was terrible. I was about ready to kill him. We get up over the top of the mountain, we come up over the ridge and there's no Michmash. He read the map wrong. Then we just about did kill him.

When you look out it's a sickening feeling. Do you guys have respect for the ocean? Here you bend down over the ocean, no seriously, you look out over the ocean and you see it's massive. If I ride out in the ocean, I would be a speck and it would just gobble me up. I had the same respect for desert. Have you ever been in a desert context when you look out and everywhere you can see is just desert far as the eye can see. You feel as a human being like you are so puny. All of a sudden you know you're dehydrated and you know you're in trouble and he just read that stupid map wrong and then it means you got to go down into the valley and climb the next mountain and hope that the Michmash is on the other side. We went down the valley climbed the next mountain got over the top.

When we came into Michmash and we're beet red. All the people in the Michmash asked, "Where did you come from?" We came from Jericho. "Oh! You don't go through desert in days like this. It's hot today." Yeah, we know it's hot. Jericho? "You know nobody comes up from Jericho. You just don't do that." The guy invites us in to his store and he says, "anything you want to drink my friends, anything you want to drink, free, it's on me." So we thought man this is great, I never had an Arab do something free like that. You always have to barter. This guy said free. We're like heroes of the town. All these people came and they're like these Americans, you know we go out to the desert. They don't tell you so then you start drinking this stuff.

Your brain is mostly made of water. Okay. Some people may say air but mostly water. What happens is when you get dehydrated, your brain actually shrinks because it's got a lot of water up there. That's why you have a lot of trouble seeing. Your brain actually is collapsing and also when it pulls in from the cavity of your head, you get the worse. I don't have migraine headaches. I never have, but you get a headache that is so strong that it almost takes you off your feet. It hurts so bad and you can't see. It's just

because your brain has caved in the cavity of your brain is still out there your brain's freaking out.

Then you start chugging this soda right? They don't tell you that every time you chug this stuff your body goes down, you're dehydrated and it can't accept the water because you're drinking too much. So everything that goes down, guess what? It comes back up. Now that is really, I would say the worst feeling, because you're dying because you need something to drink. Everything you put down comes back up. When you're retching your guts out and you wonder, "what's going on here?" I just need something to drink but I can't hold anything down. So meanwhile we got a free ride, we were the heroes of the town, it was terrible. But anyway, we get home and we end up doing warm milk on a spoon. A spoonful at a time, you have to rehydrate slowly. Some of you guys probably know more about this than I do. We didn't know what we were doing, all we knew was none of us could get anything to stay down. So you had to take it in real, real slow so your body won't up-chuck. So this is my experience with the desert.

J. Sun Standing Still at Gibeon [42:30-44:32]

Now you say, "Why, Hildebrandt, do you tell all these stupid stories?" Well, I want you to think about Joshua's men. They travel from Jericho up to Gibeon, which is about another 10 miles across here. All night they march. You guys ever pull an all-nighter marching 30-40 miles uphill about 3300 feet difference over 20 miles and your marching all night. Question, are you ready to fight the next day? We're talking hand to hand combat the next day. You haven't got any Red Bull or Monster to drink. Question, are you going to be ready to fight? Joshua then prays for what? Joshua then prays as they're fighting here, Joshua says, "Lord, we've got to beat these guys. Give us another 24 hour day period." Have any of you pulled a two 24 hour periods like that? Now I want to ask you about the sun standing still. That's where we're going. They march all night and then Joshua asks for another 24 hours. Does that seem to make sense or does that raise more questions?

Are there other ways to look at that 24 hour day lengthening thing? I'm saying I'm not sure it fits the context. If I were Joshua I would be asking for a shorter day because

we just marched 30 miles. By the way if you march at night in the desert what's the problem? Do you go out in the desert at night like that? The answer is, No. They tell you, by the way you learn pretty soon, do you listen to the traditions? When they tell you, you don't walk in the valley, do you walk in the valley? Well, we ignored that and we just about got our heads knocked off. They told us you don't go out there at night because what happens at night you can't judge well and people have walked off cliffs. And next day they find them dead in these canyons. You don't walk at night. By the way, do our troops fight at night purposely? Our troops fight at night because we have the advantage at night because of these night goggles. I know my son was in Afghanistan, both in Afghanistan and Iraq, they would go out on night patrol because we have the advantage at night because of night goggles. If you don't have those night goggles are you in trouble? And so that's what they're saying.

K. Sun Standing Still Options [44:33-52:54]

So anyway with Joshua and this southern campaign then. The Gibeonites in their deceitfulness dress up in these old clothes and they bring old food with mold, their wine skins are all cracked and they say, "O, you know we took this bread fresh from the oven. Look now it's all moldy. We're from far away, so make a treaty with us. Joshua, make a treaty with us." They make a treaty with them. Then they call out: "we need some help now this southern league Jerusalem, Hebron, Lachish, these other cities are attacking us."

So Joshua marches his troops all night and in chapter 10 verse 11 he describes then the sun standing still. As they fled before Israel, Israel marches all night gets up there and attacks helping to protect Gibeon. As they fled before Israel on the road down from Beth Horon to Azekah, "the LORD hurled large hailstones down on them from the sky, and more of them died from the hailstones than were killed by the swords of the Israelites." Does that make sense? "More of them were killed by the hailstones than by the Israelite swords. That day the LORD gave the Amorites over to Israel, Joshua said to the LORD in the presence of Israel:" and this is what he says, "Oh, Sun, stand still over Gibeon." So the sun stood still over one horizon "and moon, over the Valley of Aijalon," which is the other horizon. So sun stand still over there, moon stand still over

there. “So the sun stood still, and the moon stopped, till the nation avenged itself on its enemies, as it is written in the Book of Jashar.”

Have any of you read the book of Jashar? It's assigned for next week. Where's the book of Jashar? Is it part of the Bible? By the way does Joshua cite the book of Jashar? This story, if you want an elaboration on this story see the book of Jashar. Where is the book of Jashar? Nobody knows. The book of Jashar has been lost. By the way does the Bible site many books that have been lost, from the past? Was the Bible the only book running around the ancient world? No, here he mentions the Book of Jashar which is long gone. Nobody's seen it in the last three thousand years. But Joshua apparently recorded this story from it.

“The sun stopped in the middle of the sky and delayed from going down a full day. There has never been a day like it before or since, a day when the Lord listened to a man.” This is a very interesting statement here. So the sun standing still, what does this mean? Some people say this is Joshua's missing day. This is a 24 hour period when the sun stood still. By the way, I ask you, does the sun stand still or does the earth spin? The sun goes up because of the spinning of the earth. So, actually you've got to stop the earth from spinning. Question: does that cause problems? The oceans would go whosh. So the earth's spinning. Could you do light bending? Could he do bending the light and make the earth look like the sun's standing still.

So I don't know how God did it but still some people say, “They put this into a computer and the computer has found that there are 24 missing hours. My problem with computers is, do you know the GIGO principle for computers? Garbage In, Garbage Out. Do computers tell you out what you put in? So all I'm saying is be careful about using computers to prove the Bible. On the sun's standing still be cautious on the computer solution.

Does Joshua want 24 more hours for his troops to fight? What I'm going to tell you is that I think his troops are dead tired. He's asking for relief and some people suggest that what he's really asking is for the word for is that “stand still” can also be translated as “silenced.” So what he's asking is the sun to be silenced. His troops are

getting beat on by the sun, the sun is intense over there, and the sun is beating down and he says, “Lord, silence the sun.” By the way, do the clouds come in with the hailstones, and do the clouds silence the sun? So some people think what this is calling for is silencing of the sun. The hailstones when the clouds come in silence the heat of the sun. The hailstones take the Canaanites out and things cool down. This is what Joshua asked for.

Now, by the way, does the text really say here in the NIV that the sun stands still. So this doesn’t fit. I want to give this thing a 20% possibility or less. Or maybe about a 15% possibility.

There’s a guy named John Walton. He teaches at another school, I don’t like to mention the name, it’s a place called, I think it’s called, it’s in Chicago. It’s a place called Wheaton. John Walton teaches there. Walton is a crazy man, that’s why I like him so much and he comes up with the most interesting, fascinating, well-researched ideas that are creative. He’s an incredible scholar and I like him because of he’s creative and all sort of other things. But anyway, John Walton was examining old Babylonian omen texts. This is no joke--Babylonian omen texts. Now what are Babylonian omen texts? Omens are when you put a curse on somebody or something like that. The omens are bad omens. Did you guys ever hear of bad omens and good omens? Actually, you guys are around Salem so you probably know about this--bad omens and good omens. What he’s suggesting is that what’s going on with Joshua is that God put the sun over here on one horizon, the moon on the other so that the Canaanites would see that and realize this is a bad omen. This is a very bad day to fight. The Canaanites would freak out because of the sun and moon position and they would read that as that the gods had spoken against them and that they are fried because the gods are saying that it’s a bad omen against them. His insight is based on these omen texts. So what Joshua is saying is put the sun here and the moon there is: “give them a bad omen so that they will run and our guys will get relief.” In other words, our guys won’t have to go out and fight. Then God takes them out with the hailstones. Does this make sense? This could possibly be an omen, he says the sun over Gibeon, the moon over Aijalon and he sets this up as a bad omen. I really like this

suggestion, it sounds half crazy and it probably is but so am I. So I just I want to give this a shot. I'm not saying that's the way it is, I'm saying that I'm probably going to go with the sun stood still. But I like this because it explains so many things about his troops being tired and asking for relief. So can we give this a 5-10%? I think this is an interesting interpretation. I think it's possible it's based on these ancient omen texts and he may be onto something.

Hannah? No, no, no. I'm saying this first one, this is a standard one, most people hold. This is 80%. And I want to do this one about 15%. I want to do this one about 10%. What did I just do, 80, 20, 15...it doesn't add up, it adds up to more than 100. I'm just messing with you. But it's just, what I'm trying to say is that this one's probably the standard, and this one's probably unlikely, but I just think it's fascinating because it explains things. To be honest it explains stuff that I have never been able to explain before and that's why I like his suggestion.

L. Power of Prayer [52:55-54:08]

Check this out. Chapter 10:14, "the sun stopped in the middle of the sky and delayed going down a full day. There's has never been a day like it," What is so unique about this day? "There has never been a day like this before or since." What is so unique about this day? "A day when the Lord listened to a man." Did Joshua pray and God have the heavens set up according to Joshua's prayer? This is incredible and what I'm trying to say is, what does this verse tell us? Does prayer matter? Does prayer change things? Does prayer make a difference? It says this day has been like no other day. God listened to the voice of a man and set the heavens according to Joshua's request. We're coming up to the day of prayer, does prayer matter? Yes! You can address almighty God, God listens. He listened to the voice of a man. That is incredible. Like I said, I've got four kids. My kids don't listen to me. God listens to me, and that's incredible. So it's something to think about. This is a big passage.

M. Book of Jashar [54:09-54:47]

Now what about the book of Jashar? It's found in Joshua 10:13, the book of Jashar. I'm just trying to say there were other books in the ancient world that were

running around, other historical records. Joshua cites the book of Jashar apparently on the record of the sun standing still. He says, “go over and see the footnote here, on this book of Jashar.” The book has been lost, it’s not an inspired book, but does it tell the truth? Apparently, Joshua said that this book was telling the truth about how the battle went down. But, are all books that tell the truth inspired by God? Not necessarily. Joshua just cites this book and I think it’s interesting.

N. Northern Campaign: Jabin King of Hazor [54:48-57:47]

Now, the northern campaign, we saw the southern campaign, now there’s going to be a northern campaign. They defeated the five southern kings and now they’re going to go up north and they’re going to run into this guy, Jabin King of Hazor. They are going to defeat Jabin. You’re going to see a couple Jabins. There’s like Jabin 1, Jabin 2, Jabin 3, and Jabin 4. There’s probably 20 Jabins in a row up at Hazor and in the book of Judges you’re going to see another Jabin King of Hazor. Here’s a map and I’m just going to put a circle around Hazor. By the way what’s this? Sea of Galilee. Can anybody see, does that look like a little harp? Does it look like a harp a little bit? They actually call it Lake Kinneret. Kinneret in Hebrew means “harp.” So they actually call it Lake Kinneret--harp. It later became known as the Sea of Galilee or the Sea of Tiberias. Tiberias is that a Roman name? Bad. Okay who hangs out at the Sea of Galilee? If you’re in the Bible and you don’t know what the answer is, what name do you give? Jesus. So remember, Jesus hangs out fishing in the Sea of Galilee, storms in the Sea of Galilee, feeding people by the Sea of Galilee. The Sermon on the Mount is beside the Sea of Galilee, right here probably. So Jesus is at the Sea of Galilee. Now Hazor is a little, I don’t know, 5 or 6 miles up here. Hazor is the biggest archeological site in all of Israel. It’s about 250 acres I think. Is that a lot of land, 250 acres? That’s big. I mean by American standards, it’s not big. We’ve got these thousand acre fruit farms now and things like that but 250 acres for a city like that, in the ancient world is huge. How big was Jericho? I said from here to Lane [ca. 400 yards]. Jericho you march around 7 times. Hazor, 250 acres. It is much much bigger than Jericho (ca. 11 acres). So they’re going to have iron chariots up here. The guy at Hazor, Jabin, gets his chariot and comes up here and where are they going to

fight? They're going to fight right here. There's a huge wide open valley where the chariots will run well. That valley is called the valley of *Har Megiddo*. The valley of *har*, *har* means "hill of Megiddo." The valley of *Har Megiddo* you say that real fast in English and you get the valley of Armageddon, *har megiddo*, the valley of Armageddon. This where Armageddon is right here. Now we'll look at this more closely later. This is the valley of Armageddon. Megiddo's right here.

So this is where they come down to do the battle. Joshua goes up, does he win? Joshua always wins, well not always. But he defeats them. They go up to Hazor, they burn the city down, Joshua takes Hazor down. Hazor's the big city in the north.

O. 2 Problems: Ai Defeat [57:48-59:17]

So they did the south, they did the north, and now what? You got two problems. Joshua's going to face two problems. These are significant problems. He's going to go to Ai. Ai is the little town, Joshua's going to be down here near the Gilgal-Jericho area, down in the bottom of the canyon here. Ai is going to be located right about there. He's going to go up, fight Ai, but what happens? He sends his spies up there and the spies say, "The city of Ai, they only have 200-300 men up there, this is no big deal. Don't take the whole army of Israel up there Joshua, just send a couple thousand men and we'll blow Ai out. It's no problem there's only 200-300 men up there. Give us 2,000 men and we'll take it easy." Did you see the arrogance there? Who's winning the battle? We're winning the battle, we're good enough, we've got this under control.

They send their 2000-3000 men up to Ai and guess what happens? They suffer their first loss. Have any of you guys played sports? You go into your season and you have your first loss? Is the first loss a killer? It just takes the wind right out of the team. You know you're psyched up, you're going to go out there and blow them out and then you do your first loss, it's devastating. So anyway, they go up, they get their first loss from Ai, a small town that defeats them. Ai is so small, when you go to Ai you can about throw a stone over the top of it, it's that small. I mean, I'm talking the quad, I'm talking less than the quad. It's a small, small, very small city, Ai although we're not sure exactly where it is. There's a big debate on its exact location.

P. Achan's sin [59:18-66:14]

What was the problem? Achan sinned. Achan sinned and there was sin in the camp. Do you remember Achan? He went into Jericho and he stole some gold and he stole a Babylonian garment, a Babylonian robe. A Babylonian robe and gold, and he did what? He took it into his tent and what did he do? He buried it under his tent and hid it. What was to happen to all the stuff from Jericho? All the stuff from Jericho was *herem*, it was to be devoted to the Lord. All of it was to be burned up to the Lord. The wealth of Jericho, the gold and silver, was to be taken into the treasuries of the Lord. Jericho was Israel's first what? It was their first victory in the land and God said, "from your first victory, I get all the plunder." The first victory was Jericho, that's why Jericho was so special. It was the first victory in the promise land and God says Jericho is mine, the whole thing comes to me. Achan stole some of the goods and so there's sin in the camp. God knows there's sin there. They go up to fight against Ai. God says I'm not with you anymore, you're on your own. So you lose. Now notice, they cast lots to find out who did it. They come back and they say, "God, what's going on here?" Joshua's comment is very interesting.

Let me just work with this thing with Achan. They cast lots and the lot falls on Achan. Achan says, "Okay, I stole the robe, I stole the gold, and I sinned." They kill Achan but they also kill Achan's family. Again as Americans we do everything as individuals. We are individuals and everything is done individually. Some people try to mitigate that, why the family was killed by saying the family knew that he had buried these stolen objects in the ground. So the family was partially responsible because they didn't tell anybody. These other guys went up and got killed for this. So the family was partially culpable because they knew what their father had done. That's part of it.

Another way of looking at this is through the lens of corporate personality. In American culture everybody is individualized. I do, everything is I and self-focused. In other cultures, it's a very "we" culture. You look at the units, in other cultures are not individuals, units in other cultures are family groups, or clans or tribes. So this is called: corporate personality. There's a kind of a corporate-ness to it. It's very foreign to our

thinking as Americans but it's very important if you're going to understand other cultures who see themselves as a group. So that's possibly what's going on here. Just talking about Achan getting stoned and the family it helps seeing the family as a unit. Now that's not saying, notice what I'm saying is there's a relationship between individuality and corporateness. What I want to do is kind of back off the individuality and say that there's corporateness involved in this. Now that doesn't mean every time and in every situation it's always corporate. What I'm saying is it's not always one way or the other but as Americans do we even have the notion of corporateness. That's what I'm trying to work with. Although as Americans do we have the notion of corporateness? Did the Americans fight the Germans in World War 2? And so, we label this as a group kind of thing. So this is individual versus corporateness. That's not saying it's always one way or the other. But you have to work between the two of them.

I think one of the other problems when they went against Ai was this notion of habituation. They assumed that God was on their side and that God was predictable. God is always on our side. We're the Jewish people. We're the chosen people. God is always on our side. He's always against the Canaanites. Therefore God becomes predictable. This became a real problem. Rather than realizing each situation is an individual choice and so committing each individual choice to God rather they said, "Oh, yeah, of course." This is the assumption that God is with us. Have you ever been in churches that have this concept that God is with us in this church. They always assume that God is with them and opposed to others. I think you've got to be really careful about this assumption that God is with us. Using that in this case they went up to fight against Ai and God was not with them. Why was he not with them? Because they had sin in the camp. They had sin in the camp and so God says, "No."

What's interesting the people sin and then Joshua blames God. Joshua says, "O, God, why did we ever come across the Jordan River? I wish we hadn't come across the Jordan River." Who said something like that by the way? I wish we didn't come across the Jordan River that we stayed on the other side. Isn't that exactly what the Israelites said when they came out of Egypt? We want to go back to Egypt where there were leeks,

melons, food, and water. Joshua verbalizes the same thing and the problem is, does the sin of one person affect the whole community?

Have you ever seen that happen? Let me use an illustration of a pastor. I had a pastor friend who actually was one of my students. I taught the book of Psalms to him and he was my pastor then years later. He was a really great guy. He had five kids. He got into a compromising situation and committed immorality with someone in the church. Is that a problem? So now he is caught with this other women, he's got five children and a wife. Did that affect the whole church? So what I'm saying is does sin affect corporately? Here Achan did the sin and it affected the corporate group. The sin of one person affects others. So is this just the Achan sin? You've got to be aware of that. How should I say, we're not just individual marbles going through life. We're connected to one another and the sin of one person affects and impacts the group. Do the sins of your parents affect you? Did you're sins affect your parents? So there is this relationship back and forth between the individual and the community and we still get that even today.

Q. Gibeonite Deception [66:15-68:25]

Now, there is the Gibeonite deception. Here's the second situation that was a problem. Ai was one of the big problems. Second one was the problem of the situation with Gibeon. Gibeon had this ruse that they came from very far away. They wore old clothes, they wore sandals that were worn out, all their food was moldy. They came to Israel and they said we want to make a treaty with you guys. Israel thought that they were from very far away, when they were actually from where? They were dead center in the middle of Israel.

So this is what I get out of this. Be careful about no-brainers. In other words, you don't have to ask God because the answer is so obvious that you don't have to ask. Then chapter 9 verse 14 here's what it says, it's an interesting comment. "the men of Israel sampled their provisions but did not inquire of the Lord." They sampled their provisions and saw that they were all moldy and old but they did not inquire of the Lord. When they did not inquire of the Lord, they made a big mistake. They made a treaty with the Gibeonites. They didn't ask God about that. Something that seemed so obvious turned

out to be a really big problem for them. So what I'm saying is you need to trust God in the uniqueness of each moment and in each decision. Have any of you made decisions that actually were going to be a total disaster and they turned out to be one of the best things that has happened to you? Have you ever made a decision where you thought it was obvious what to do and when you got in the situation it turned out to be really terrible? What I'm saying is we don't know the future. We don't know when something that looks so good can turn out to be the most ugly thing in the world. Something that looks terrible can turn out to be good. We depend upon God because we don't know the future. Each decision needs to be put that way.

The Gibeonites, made a treaty with Israel. Israel made them woodcutters and water carriers. So they said, okay, we made a mistake here but you guys have got to serve us now. So the Gibeonites were the adopted into Israel as woodcutters and water bearers. They became kind of servants to Israel, cutting their wood and carrying their water.

R. Division of the Land [68:26-73:07]

Now, we've got about twelve minutes left and we've got to do this land division. I'll just hit this quickly. And there's four tribes I want you to know. There are six cities you want to know. Now, by the way, where do you find these maps? These maps are all on the PowerPoints. Download them. So these are basically four tribes and six cities and then I just want to go through them. First of all, do you see the Dead Sea, the Salt Sea? Draw a line right from the top of the Dead Sea and what city do you hit right here, right across from the top of it? Jerusalem. Okay that's how you can picture Jerusalem. North of Jerusalem is what tribe? Benjamin. Why is Benjamin important? Who is going to come from Benjamin? King Saul. The first king of Israel is from Benjamin. So Jerusalem is right on the border just west of the top of the Dead Sea. Benjamin's to the north.

This tribe is Benjamin. What tribe is to the south? Judah. Why is Judah important? Who's from Judah? David. So David's from down here, Saul's from up here in Benjamin. So what's the relationship of Judah and Benjamin? Judah is in the south, Benjamin sits right on top of it. Jerusalem is on the border between the two, north and south.

Let me just jump over to another map here. There's Jericho, as far as cities go you see Jericho's north of the Dead Sea just a little bit. Another city is Gibeon. Do you see Gibeon just north of Jerusalem a little bit to the west? So you've got Jericho and Gibeon. Gibeon's a city of the Gibeonites. And then lastly, Jerusalem and Jerusalem's over here. I just want you getting used to these major cities in Israel? Jerusalem, Jericho, Gibeon, these are major cities. You also know these two tribal areas are Judah and Benjamin. Here's the tribe of Judah. Do you see the Dead Sea here and where is Judah? Judah is right next to the Dead Sea. So it lines up with the Dead Sea on the east. This is the tribe of Judah to the west of the Dead Sea.

Up in the north here's where Jerusalem is just right across from the head of the Dead Sea just about 20 miles or so. What's south of Jerusalem? The city of Bethlehem. *Bet-Lehem*, *Bet* means "house of," *lehem* means "bread," House of bread, Bethlehem. Who's from Bethlehem? Don't give me Jesus this time. Who's from Bethlehem? David. David's home town is in Bethlehem. Jesus will be born in Bethlehem according to Micah 5.2. David's from Bethlehem. David will capture Jerusalem, by the way. Then Hebron is down here. She's queen of the south. This is like Atlanta. Hebron is like Atlanta, the queen of the south. Hebron was be the place where Abraham buried Sarah. Remember all that with Abraham who is in Hebron.

Then there is only one more city and then I think we got it circled and that's Beersheba (sounds like Beer-sheva). Beersheba is down here. It says *beer*. Has anyone ever heard it said as Beer-sheba? Beersheba, that's when I was younger, that's how it was pronounced. Beersheba. *Beer* means "well of," *sheva* means "seven." So it means seven wells. So Beersheba is the southern boundary of Israel. So this city down here is the southernmost point in Israel. Beersheba's to the south in the Negev.

By the way, do you see that these line up on a route? This is a major route running through the north and south. There is a major ridge route there. And so there's Jerusalem, Bethlehem, down to Hebron, and down here there's a road that runs like Route 1A in Wenham.

So, now, north of Benjamin is the tribe of Ephraim. Ephraim is like Judah in the

south. Ephraim is in the north. It's the major tribe. This is the schematic that you probably need to learn okay? Judah's next to the Dead Sea, Benjamin is on top of Judah, Ephraim is on top of Benjamin. Does that make sense?

Now, where is the tribe of Dan. Dan is out here, but who's out here along the coast? Philistines. What do Philistines do to Jews? Kill them. So Dan moved to the north, the northern most point. The tribe of Dan which was here collapses. The tribe collapses into a single city. That becomes the northern most city. The tribe of Dan moves north because they don't want to get beat on by the Philistines.

S. War [73:08-76:12]

Now, we're going to buzz through this. This next discussion is going to have to do with war. This has got to go quickly. I know there's a lot of stuff that could be discussed for days with this but... We talked about the Holy War or *herem*. *Herem* meaning "devoted to the Lord," destroyed, burned up to the Lord, dedicated to the Lord. This is what happens. The *herem*, the destruction, the men and women, children and animals is what happened in Jericho. Israelites were told to give them a chance of peace. They were to come to the city and say, you guys can submit to us, and we won't destroy you. You have peace. Basically, the question is for a lot of people, and this is really a hard thing, how can God destroy these cities when men, women, and children, even the animals get killed. I'm not sure that I've got the answers for all of this but one of the principles is that God is judging the land of Canaan. For 400 years God says he let the iniquity of the Amorites kept rising up and God spared them for 400 years. After that 400 years then God sends Israel in to destroy them. So, Israel becomes an instrument of God to destroy this culture because this culture was so wicked. God says it's a judgment. In other words, Israel is going in there destroying this culture as a judgment on the Amorites because of their sin. So that's number one. This isn't just Israel fighting a war with somebody. No, this is Israel executing God's judgment on them.

The second point that comes up here is the consequences of leaving them in the land. If Israel left the Canaanites in the land, the Canaanites would do what to the Israelites? They would get them to worship their pagan gods. That's actually what

happened. Israel didn't destroy them all in the land and some of those Canaanite people then taught Israel their idolatry for which Israel would be judged later on. So God said, "Wipe them out because I don't want them contaminating you guys and teaching you idolatry." Israel did not do that so this is a problem. So this is the second reason for total extermination, so that none of them would teach Israel about their gods.

By the way, ultimately it comes down to this. Who has the prerogative of life and death? I walk out and fall dead on the front of the Library or something like that. God has the right for life and death and you just have got to admit it at a certain point. You have just got to kind of back off. We humans don't have that call.

This *herem* was rarely practiced. It was practiced at Jericho, Ai, and Hazor. Maybe one or two other places but it was rarely practiced in Israel. So you've got to be careful. Now, some people think the *herem* was practiced, Israel *herem-ed* everything and destroyed everything. No, actually it was only three places really and so you got to be careful about magnifying it too much.

T. 3 Views of war: Non-resistance [76:13-81:07]

Now, I want to hit next, war what is it good for? I want to talk about when would you ever think about is war as legitimate? Is war ever legitimate? What would you be willing to die for? Then another question, what would you be willing to kill for? Would you actually kill somebody? On what basis would you kill somebody and how do you feel about war? Can academics decide these questions? Usually in academic settings are they people that approve of war or disapprove? They usually push peace? Academics, are they usually capitalists or socialists? The university I went to was mostly socialists. So what I'm saying is that I think these things are very complicated.

Let me just hit these quickly. Jesus said what? What is the non-resistance position? The non-resistance position says basically this: you go into the army as a medic or chaplain. I won't pick up a gun to hurt somebody but I will go in as a medic or chaplain to heal. So they join the military as a medic or chaplain. Based on this statement Jesus said turn the other cheek. If someone slaps you on one cheek turn the other. Peter picked up the sword and what happened? He lopped off that guy's ear. What did Jesus

say? Did Jesus rebuke Peter for taking off that guy's ear? By the way, what did Jesus do to that guy's ear? He put it back on. Jesus said to do what? Hate your enemies or love your enemies? Very interesting statement Sarah. Love your neighbor. If you love your neighbor as yourself are you going to be killing your neighbor? So how do you work with this? There are verses that support this kind of approach using the separation of the church and state. Jesus said, "if my kingdom were of this world, my servants would fight." What is the implication of this statement? My kingdom, is it of this world? No, it's not. So my servants won't fight. Many of the early Christians died not defending themselves against the Roman Empire. So Jesus said these types of things. Christ dies and this is an example for others. He doesn't defend himself. He dies without defending himself.

This is the non-resistance position now, what I want to do is show you the other side, and then we'll call it a day. Dualism. Can we say we're of God's kingdom and we're not of the Kingdom of this world? Do most of us live in this world? Do we eat? Do we do other things in this world? So do we have dual citizenship? Do I have responsibilities to America? Do I have responsibilities to America? As well as being a Christian am I also an American? What are my responsibilities as an American?

Here's another passage Jesus said, "I did not come to bring peace, I came to bring the sword." Jesus said in Luke chapter 22, "I did not come to bring peace, but the sword." What did Jesus mean there? Did Jesus mean we should pick up the sword and go after it? No, this passage has been taken out of context. Jesus said, "I did not come to bring peace, but the sword." In other words, is the sword going to be used on you disciples? It was not that the disciples were to use the sword, but the sword would be used on them. Did most of the disciples die a violent death? So Jesus, when he says that. Then what if you saw somebody being raped? Would you actually physically hurt the person that was raping the person? Now, you're doing violence to that person but the person is doing violence to them. Do you just stand by and say, "Sir, I'm a conscientious objector and I don't want to hurt you. I will tell the police on you so you better do this fast." Or would you go pounce on the guy and knock his lights out? So what I'm saying is, when one country's doing

something to another, what would happen if America hadn't gotten involved against Hitler? Is it possible that Hitler would be ruling all of Europe by now? So what type of war does non-resistance have to face, and what are some of these questions?

We didn't talk about pacifists, and we didn't talk about just war. We better get out of here. All right let's go. See you on Thursday.

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament, History, Literature, and Theology course. Lecture number 19 on the book of Joshua: the walls of Jericho, the problem at Ai, and the treaty made with the Gibeonites as well as the concept of war and *herem* in the book of Joshua.

Transcribed by Hannah Jang

Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt 2

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 20[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History, Literature, and Theology course lecture number 20 concluding the book of Joshua and pacifism vs. the just war theories, and then on to Judges, with an introduction to the book of Judges and the judges Ehud, Deborah, Barak and Gideon.

Week preview

Class let's get started. Let's open with a word of prayer. We've got some things before we get started let me just announce what's going on with this week. We've got a quiz this Thursday over largely I Kings. We did chapters 1 through 11 for the exam so basically chapters 12 to 22 or whatever is left there. Finish that up and then Ecclesiastes chapters 1 to 3 and 12 and then there's an article by Roy Zuck. So we'll do that on Thursday. Then Tuesday I got to actually work with the assignments. Some things because of Thanksgiving, has been jacked around. So we'll have a quiz on Thursday like we normally do. Then Tuesday we'll have an adjusted one for Tuesday. If you're going home early because you're flying out of here or because you've got something going on, Tuesday, you've got to take the quiz when you get back. People keep saying, well, can I take it on Monday? The answer is no. It's not made up yet. I make it up just before I get to class. So take it when you get back from Thanksgiving vacation.

Question: So is the quiz on Thursday is going to be on Kings 1 through 22 or 11?

Chapters 12-22. Look on the website. The website, has got it right. So follow the website. All right, let's open with a word of prayer and then we'll finish Joshua today and get through Judges we're going to try to move rather quickly today, so let's begin.

Father thank you for this day. We thank you for your kindnesses to us and allowing us to study your Word in this kind of context where people are trying to integrate your Word and your presence into every discipline. We thank you for this class where we can focus on your Word that you've spoken to Joshua. You've led the Judges.

Father you've led us also in the way that we have gone in life. And we pray that you might be with us now in this hour as we explore your Word. In Christ's Name we pray. Amen.

Pacifism

We need to finish up Joshua and we were right in the middle of war when the class broke for the exam the last class period. So I want to kind of finish up our discussion of war. We had talked about non-resistance people who won't go into battle per se but they'll go in as medics and chaplains trying to do something positive in a war context. Pacifism, a lot of these pacifism people don't want anything to do with war, not even in a positive way of helping as a medic. Largely they'll cite passages like this where the kingdom is described in terms of beating the swords into plowshares. Taking the weapons of war and using them for farming purposes and shifting the purposes of those things. This is the kingdom that God brings, not war but peace and harmony, and with the land, the plowing and turning of the soil and that kind of thing.

The kingdom of God is described in Isaiah as the lion lying down with the lamb, or the wolf lying down with lamb. And *shalom*, the pacifists will really focus on this notion of *shalom*. Peace and harmony, and the kingdom coming, when someday the lion will lay down with the lamb. This is what the kingdom is about, and we should be about kingdom business. But now, we should be thinking about peace and harmony, rather than the dissonance and conflict that we have in the world. So they'll use these passages, prophetic passages, to say that we're part of the kingdom of God and therefore there should be no war in that regard.

These folks also, many of them will not defend themselves. Jesus gave us a model of dying for one's faith. Therefore if a soldier comes up, you die for your faith and you don't fight back and you're totally non-resistance and you go to jail, you suffer the consequences of your pacifism. Other people may do violence on you but you do not retaliate in any way. So it's a pacifistic stance largely trying to follow Christ. Christ allowed the Romans to crucify him, and he died on a Roman cross. He could've blown

them away, he could have defended himself, just blinked his eyes and blown them to smithereens but he chose not to do that, not to defend himself in a violent way. So I, to be honest with you, love the fact that in our country we have pacifists. So you say well, “I’m not a pacifist myself.” But I love the fact that there’s a presence of pacifists here and I think it’s kind of like salt or like leaven. A little bit of salt; do you need a little bit of salt on your meat to make it taste good? So I think these people are like leaven and salt in a society. They remind us that peace is the way of Christ and things and that we need to think seriously about that.

The problem I have is if everybody is a pacifist, does somebody need to protect these people? No, I’m serious. I mean if everyone were a pacifist, what would have happened with Hitler? We’d all be speaking German probably. So, I just, think you got to be real careful with trying to map this out on everyone because there’s evil in the world and sometimes evil can be resisted by pacifist means and other times somebody’s got to do something.

Question: If everyone’s pacifist, wouldn’t that include Hitler?

If everyone’s pacifist, that would include Hitler. There’d be no more problems. The problem is there is evil in the world. You’ve got people like Hitler. You guys want to go Stalin? Or Mao? I mean Mao killed 60 million people in China. Is there evil in the world? And when you’ve got evil in the world, sometimes you’ve got people in power and they do bad things and need to be stopped. By the way do we have policemen? Do policemen use force to stop bad stuff happening? What would happen if you didn’t have any policemen? I don’t want to even think about it.

Just War Theory

I like this just war theory. These are people who say it’s Okay to go to war for a just cause. So then you got to ask what is a good cause? I think most people would acknowledge, when Hitler was dominating and going through Germany and killing 6 million Jews, that this guy needed to be stopped by force or by whatever means necessary. Hitler had to be stopped. So most people would acknowledge that that was a good cause. Then you go to war. What constitutes a good cause then? A country stops

selling us a oil. Do we have the right to bomb them because they won't sell us oil anymore? No. We say that would be an unjust cause that would simply be a materialist cause. That's totally unacceptable. In America, of course, that would be a problem. Does Joshua point out that some wars are right? Did Joshua go to war? When Joshua crossed the Jordan River to take the Promised Land, did he take the Promised Land by war?

I always get a kick out of people saying war is not the answer. I look and I say, how do you know that? How do you know that? Is war the answer sometimes? Does war provide us the answer sometimes? And the answer is: yes. Joshua goes to Jericho and took the land and at God's command. War was part of the solution. So you can't make these great generalizations: war is not the answer. You just can't make that statement because you don't know that. So you need to think about some of these things, Joshua went to war.

I like Ecclesiastes. You guys are going to be reading Ecclesiastes 3. It says there's a time for what? There's a time and a season for everything. Is there a time for peace? There's a time for peace and there's a time for what war. There's a time for love and there's a time for, guess what? Hate. And it mentions that and you say well it's never all right to hate. No, actually the New Testament tells us to hate evil.

Now again in our culture we just love everybody. But the Bible says hate that which is evil. And so I like this passage in Ecclesiastes because there's wisdom there. "There's a time for peace and a time for war." If you get those two times mixed up you could be in trouble. So that's an interesting passage. God himself portrays himself as a warrior. When he led them across the Red Sea, God portrayed himself as a warrior leading Israel and that's explicitly stated in the Exodus chapter 15. So God uses warrior imagery and portrays himself that way.

In Psalm 18, also big Psalm, God is warrior. So there's a whole theme that God is a warrior. Now by the way do we do all our themes God is King do we emphasize God is King? God is King is emphasized. The sovereignty of God is emphasized. What I kind of laugh at is it's kind of ironic that nobody mentions the fact that God is often portrayed as

a warrior leading his people to victory--military victory. Yet that theme of God is a warrior has been played down because again we love everybody, peace, harmony and all this kind of rhetoric. What he's saying is no there's bad stuff going on in the world and God gets involved sometimes.

What is Jesus' perspective. Now you say, "Well, Jesus turned the other cheek. Jesus said peace and harmony." But what is the portrayal of Jesus in the book of Revelation? In the book of Revelation chapter 19 verse 15 and following, Jesus comes back the second time and when Jesus comes back the second time in the book of Revelation is this the meek and mild Jesus? No, a sword comes out of his mouth. Now I've heard one person actually in our chapel here say and this was totally absurd to me, he said, "The sword is truth and justice. The sword coming out of Jesus mouth is the truth and justice."

Can you make the Bible say whatever you want it to say? Is that legitimate? Do you just sit idly by when someone twists a Bible like that?

First of all is the imagery of a sword. Are we talking truth and justice? The sword it says in the context there the sword came out of his mouth to slay the people. This is the battle of Armageddon and the sword was slaying people. So to say its truth and justice is this guy making this stuff up. What I'm saying is that it doesn't fit the context of the sword. Jesus was slaying the people in the battle of Armageddon. So when he comes the second time it's not going to be meek and mild Jesus getting slain on a cross. When he comes back the second time he comes as King to rule and establishes his rule by destroying his enemies. Now whether you like that or not that's what's being described. What I'm saying is be careful. Did you see how when Jesus first came did they want a king to rule? When Jesus came initially they wanted a king to rule to throw off the Roman yoke? They wanted that and Jesus came peacefully. My guess is when Jesus comes the second time we're going to want this lovey-dovey teddy-bear Lamb-of-God pacifistic, Jesus but he is coming to reign and he's coming in power. So be careful you

don't get your two comings of Christ mixed up.

Rules of War

How does one fight a good war? Can someone be involved in a good cause but execute it in a bad way? Can someone have a good war, the cause is right, but they do it in a wrong way? See you've got to ask how is a good war fought? By the way is this why you have things like the Geneva Convention? When you capture somebody you can't just torture them and kill them. You've got to respect their rights they do have certain rights. By the way other countries abide by that but what's the problem now are we fighting other countries or a lot of times are we fighting these Al Qaeda/Islamic State type groups that are cells. Do they go by the Geneva Convention? No. Do they lop off people's heads? Are the Taliban in Afghanistan? America's over there building schools so their children can go to school? What does the Taliban do? The Taliban says if you're a woman or a young girl and go to that school we will chop off your nose. Have you seen the pictures of the Afghani girls with their nose chopped off? Do they actually do that? You say there should be laws against that. Tell them that. The Bible gives various reasons for going to war. So I've listed some of the reasons why Israel went to war. Here are some of the reasons that are listed from Scripture.

Reasons for War

One is they went to take the land. God told them to go cross the Jordan River to take the Promised Land. They were to do that in a military way to burn down the cities. So land acquisition that was a reason for going to war for Israel. Divine command, God commanded them to go to war and God told them to go in and wipe out the Canaanites that the iniquity of the Amorites had raised for 400 years. God said now its time for a judgment on this culture. If somebody comes today and says, "God told me to go to war." Question: Would you say the person's wacked out? God doesn't speak like that he speaks through his word now. You've got to be real careful about "God told me to go to battle" against somebody.

Moral violation: What was a moral violation when they went to war? Does anybody remember that woman that was chopped up and her 12 parts sent out? That was a moral violation. The people were just morally stunned this woman was chopped up and so they went to war against the tribe of Benjamin. They almost wiped out the tribe of Benjamin because of this moral violation. The raping of this woman and killing her and then this guy cutting her up into pieces and things like that and sending her out. That was a moral violation.

Insult, David goes to war for an insult over here with the Ammonites and this is a kind of interesting thing. The king of the Ammonites dies, so David says to the son, “your father was a good man, and I want to send you some tribute here and I want to be nice to you as I was with your father. I want to make an alliance with you as I did with your father.” Well, the young kid over here says, “My father’s dead. You aren’t sending those guys over here because you want to support me, you’re sending them because they’re spies. They’re spying out the land.” So what he does is he says okay. So David sends all his big elders over there. His elders come in with the royal robes and the young king over here says, “Ok, take those guys shave off half of their beards.” You see what he’s trying to do is humiliate them with their beard, “shave off half of their beard and cut off their robes at their buttocks.” So basically these guys are streaking back home with robes that only cover just part of their body so that’s thoroughly an insult. David then gets insulted and then he sends out Joab to go to war against the Ammonites and that’s when the story of David and Bathsheba happens as a result of that insult, that moral insult.

Defense is a big one. Israel’s attacked a lot by oppressive regimes coming in from the Moabites, Ammonites, and the Philistines are always beating up on the Jews. So in order to defend themselves they go to war in defense. The Israelites were commanded to pay taxes to the Moabites and the Moabite king comes in and says you've got to pay tribute to me. Israel says, "we don't want to pay tribute."

By the way is this kind of like America, no taxation without representation. We need to revolt and the American revolution from the oppression of the king whether it was legitimate or illegitimate. I mean big question but this notion of being oppressed by another people through taxation or various things.

Then lastly, Israel goes to war to help others and sometimes Israel goes to battle to help another group fend off oppressors. So Israel sometimes helps others. So these were all reasons for going to war.

Now each one of these has its pros and cons. In each one of them you need a lot of discernment to know when to apply it but those are some of the reasons why war was done.

Preventative War

Now here's one that's new for America and this one is called Preventative War. I'm not sure how I feel about this; part of it really bothers me. In other words you strike first to avoid them striking you. What I am talking about now, let's be more explicit than I probably should be. Iran is trying to develop a nuclear weapon. Israel says, "If Iran gets a nuclear weapon, are they going to use it on us." Had they already said they're going to try to wipe Israel off the map, I mean those are explicit statements from their leaders. "We're going to try to destroy Israel." Therefore, is Israel going to go over and destroy them before they get to do the nuclear weapon or does Israel sit there and say, "Well, we'll just wait until they do the nuclear thing and then we'll respond"? What's the problem with that? They do the nuclear thing and is it possible there won't be anybody to respond to because everybody will be dead, or there will be a lot of people dead and so they won't be able to respond. So do you do the first strike type thing? This is a very tricky question. It's preventative war and I'm not sure what I think about that and things.

The future problems that you guys are going to face are: in the old days you had countries going to war with other countries right? What's the problem now? Is it country going against country? No. It is small groups going against small groups. You've got Al-Qaeda groups, you've got Hamas groups, and you've got Hezbollah groups. These

groups come even in America with cells in America that are ready to be called to do all sort of dastardly deeds. So future problems, what do you do if you've got a nuclear weapon in cities? All of a sudden they claim that they've got a nuclear bomb in New York City, what are you going to do? What if they've got nuclear bomb in New York City, Washington, and Philadelphia? What are going to do? Boston? They pick those four cities. What are you going to do? They blow up one and then they say, "We got three other ones. On your knees America!" What are you going to do?

So these are major questions, some major problems now because the weapons have gotten so much more powerful and there is no national identity with some of these groups now. You got just wacked out people, individuals who do not wear military garb. They're not representing a country, and they're just promoting their own wacky ideology. They feel like they can go around killing people. So there are ideological groups of individuals of those countries and how do you fight a war against them? How do you fight a war against individuals who are not associated with a country? You guys are going to have to figure this out. It is your generation that is going to have to figure this out. This is like it has never been before. These are new things and the stakes are getting higher.

I'll just put it flat out. My guess is that in your lifetime you're going to see things that will pale what I have seen in my lifetime. It is going to make it look like it is nothing. It is going to come in your lifetime because of the capability of doing all these things now and all you need is one crazy person doing some bad stuff now. The bad stuff before, if a guy has a gun, is that one thing? When you start working with nuclear weapons and you're working with biological, when you start working with all this other stuff it can devastate entire populations. Are people crazy enough to do that? Well, when you see two planes flying into a building, are people crazy enough to do that? Do they believe in their killing? This is pretty sad, but as someone in my son's class says, "It doesn't make a difference, it doesn't bother me, just make sure I can watch TV and I'm ok." He actually had someone in his class say that and this kid was probably 19-20 years

old. Is that a problem? Wake up time. Be careful, your generation has got some major decisions to face here.

Joshua 1:8

Now here is how the book of Joshua opens and we want to end on this note. This is a positive note then coming back. “Do not let this Book of the Law depart from your mouth; meditate on it day and night, so that you may be careful to do everything written in it. Then you will be prosperous and successful.” Prosperity and success predicated on meditating on the Word of God, the Law of God, and implementing it in your life. So the book of Joshua begins that way, kind of linking itself with the Law and saying meditate on the Word of God. That is an important thing and a good thing is we’re done in Joshua.

The Judges: a description of their roles

Now, we’re going to jump over here to Judges and we start Judges. We’re going to pick up kind of a new theme. Moses was kind of the big guy in the Old Testament. Joshua, his understudy, then follows Moses. When you say Joshua rises to Moses’ level, they were compared in a lot of ways, but Joshua is kind of down a little bit.

Now the period of judges is going to be a time of fragmentation and chaos in Israel. We’ve got all these little judges doing their thing. The major theme in the book of Judges is going to be “everyone did which was right in their own eyes.” The book of Judges is going to be a transition book. The book of Judges is a transition; there was no king in Israel. So the book of Judges moves from a 200-year period or thereabouts, saying there is going to be a movement to a king. Now who is actually king during the period of Judges? God is king. God is king during the period of Judges. These judges all administer under God and go to victory and in various ways God raises up these judges. But God is largely the king and Israel is going to move then to a human king as Moses predicted in Deuteronomy 17.

Now meet the Judge. Moses set up the institutions in the book of Deuteronomy in chapters 16 through 18. He set up the institutions of Israel and one of the institutions was this judgeship. The judge was to do two things: 1. He was to distribute justice. He must

distribute justice in the land. Who particularly needs justice?--the poor, the fatherless, and the widow. Do they need justice? So the judge was to take the fatherless and the widow and to give justice to make things fair so that even the widow and the orphan could get justice. 2. And the judge was not to take a bride. Money and justice were to be separated. Judge was not to take bribes. So Moses sets up this thing.

When you read the book of Judges, however, were any of the Judges sitting around doing court cases? No. So what Moses describes kind of misses what the book of Judges does. Most of the judges are out doing what? Actually, the judges are more what?--military deliverers. So in the book of Judges, Samson does not sit around doing court cases, he is out beating on Philistines. So the military deliverers are leading Israel to war. Judges chapter 2:16 describes this, let me just read this, “Then the Lord raised up judges...” and what did the judges do? “...who saved them out of the hands of these raiders.” So the role of the judge was a deliverer. He was a deliverer, a kind of “savior,” to save Israel from the hands of these oppressors. So they really take on this role of a military deliverer and here is another way to look at it as almost a tribal or regional chieftain. It is important to realize that. When you read the book of Judges, you cannot just go from one judge to the next judge. They’re not necessarily in chronological order and they overlap. They’re in regional areas, they’re regional chieftains. So, therefore, Samson may be going off at the same time as Jephthah, Jephthah is over here in Jordan, Samson is over here and so they judge in different regions.

The judges may overlap each other because they’re all in different regions from each other. They’re petty chieftains or tribal chieftains, and they rule for 40 years, for 80 years or rule for 20 years and times like that. They’ll rule as a petty chieftain.

Conflict between Joshua and Judges

Now each generation participates in this. There is an interesting conflict between, and I want to bring this up, Joshua and the book of judges. At the end of the book of Joshua, Joshua 21, if you look at verse 43 there, it’s interesting how Joshua was reflecting back it says in Joshua 21.43- 45 “So the Lord gave Israel all the land he had sworn to

give their forefathers.” Is this statement true? "The Lord gave Israel all the land he swore to give to their forefathers and they took possession of it and settled there. The Lord gave them rest on every side just as he had sworn to their forefathers. Not one of their enemies' withstood them. The Lord handed their enemy's over to them. Not one of all the Lord's good promises to the house to Israel failed everyone was fulfilled.” Is that true?

Joshua says we took all the land. Question: Were the Philistines still in the land after Joshua? Samson fights Philistines. What about the city of Jebus, the city of Jerusalem? Did the Jebusites own the city of Jerusalem after Joshua? Yes, they took it, but the Jebusites got it right back apparently. Later who would actually take the city of Jerusalem? David takes it. This is after hundreds of years David takes the city of Jerusalem. The Jebusites had it. So can Joshua say he took all the land like that?

Well, actually, if you go over to the book of Judges, Judges presents another vision. Judges chapter 1.19, turn over three or four pages to Judges 1.19. "The Lord was with the men of Judah they took possession of the hill country but they were unable to drive the people from the plains because they had iron chariots." Now what's the problem with iron chariots? When it said iron chariots what goes off in your head? You see Ben Hur and the gladiators with these iron chariots chomping down on people in these big huge iron chariots. Do you realize in Israel they burn their chariots. Question: what were the chariots made out of if you are going to burn the chariots? They are made out of wood. So when it says iron chariots don't think Ben Hur, with the huge chariots. Think instead wood chariots with iron reinforcement in certain places. So they would have an iron shield in the front and reinforced with iron in certain places but it wasn't a massive iron, chariot that you would see in a Ben Hur movie. So they are wood chariots reinforced with iron. By the way, would chariots work well on the plains? Do chariots work well on mountains? No, your going to hit rocks and you're going to blow a tire. In the mountains, you hit rocks you're going to fall over in your chariots. So they work well in the plains. Israel couldn't defeat the chariots. So Joshua says they took it all, Judges says wait, we didn't take the plains because they had iron chariots. So do you see the conflict there?

So you say well which one's right? Here it continues let me finish this out with Joshua. How can Joshua say we took all the land, all the promises were fulfilled? You have to read things in their context. Joshua at the end of his life is reflecting, did Joshua do everything that the Lord commanded him to do? Did God bless Joshua beyond his imagination? Yes, and Joshua was reflecting on that the end of his life. By the way when an old guy reflects at the end of his life he looks back and sees all the good things that the Lord has done for him. Now does that mean when he says "all" does that mean every little detail? No, he is just saying basically the Lord gave us all the success. We were successful in taking the land and he is making these global statements but is he reflecting back on a whole life. This is an old person reflecting on their life, they look back and they see it a certain way. Is it okay for an old person to do that? To reflect on life and see it in a whole cloth rather than all the little details? Yes, it's okay to do that. So what I'm saying is that Joshua is saying, "I finished my life. I finished what God called me to do. We took all the land God gave us. All his promises, everything was fulfilled." Joshua was just reveling in God's goodness to him.

What happens after Joshua, do things change? Yes, because there's still these little pockets of resistance in the land and then the book of Judges has to face those pockets of resistance. It's just a different way of looking at things. What I'm saying. Be careful about taking a Scripture passage and universalizing and absolutizing it. You don't want to absolutize or universalize a lot of the statements in Joshua. He's making comments and in a grandiose kind of way. It's okay to do that.

Now the conditionality of the covenant Judges chapter 2, verses 20, says this: "Therefore the Lord was very angry at Israel, because Israel had violated the covenant." The Sinaitic Covenant that God made with him at Sinai, the covenant with the blessings and curses and all the Ten Commandments and all the commandments God had given, "Israel has violated what I laid down for their forefathers and has not listened to me." God says, "Therefore, I will no longer drive out before them any of the nations Joshua left when he died. I will use them to test Israel." So in other words, there are still some

groups inside of Israel, God says, “I will no longer drive them out. Because they have violated my covenant, I will use them to test Israel to see whether they will keep the way of the Lord and walk in it as their forefathers did.” So now the inhabitants of the land that were left, God uses them to test Israel, to see whether they would follow him or not.

So now what happens is you also get the transition between generations. Does each generation have to know God? Can you have slippage in the knowledge of God between generations? Does your generation know God the same way my generation did? Does my generation know God the same way my parents generation did? Does each generation have to come to their own way of knowing God? Is there slippage between the generations? I see it between my parent’s generation and my generation and I think I see it in your generation as well.

Gathered to their fathers

Judges chapter 2 verse 10 says this: “After that whole generation had been gathered to their fathers.” What does this “gather to your fathers” mean? Let me just describe this. In their culture when they bury a person they basically put them on a bench. The bench is about this long, they are in a cave. They are in a cave usually the hole is about this big so you have to bend down so they slide the person on a bench and he is wrapped up in all sorts of linen and spices like a pizza. They put them in there and then he’s in there. What happens after a period of time is a person melts down and decomposes and the bones are left. After a certain period of time just the bones are left then what they do is--I’m sorry for being so morbid, but this is about the phrase “gathered to their fathers.” They then gather up the bones of the person and underneath the bench there is a hole underneath the bench and what they do is they take the person’s bones and they put the person’s bones in the hole underneath. That’s when they’re “gathered to their fathers.” They are in the hole where those who went before you were put and they were put down there. Now “you’re gathered to your fathers” I’m not making stuff up this is the truth. So then they slide the next person in and then they wait and they gather them to their fathers. Does that make sense? They don’t do it like we do. We put somebody in the

ground like that and do it that way.

Actually, their bones get mixed up when they gather them to their father's. It's just the bones are all mixed up. I've seen some of these things they're all mixed up. They have multiple kokim tombs and they have 8 or 10 different nooks that go in like that. So there's room. I mean and if there's not room they will chip another out, but so there's more than one bench. So they can handle multiple people. Sorry let's get off that.

But the other thing God says then so they're gathered to their fathers. Let me go back to this chapter 2 verse 10, "after that whole generation had been gathered to their father's, another generation grew up who neither knew the Lord nor what he had done for Israel." In other words, they didn't remember the crossing of the Red Sea. They didn't see that. They don't remember the taking of the land, they didn't see that. So as this new generation grows up they've never seen what God had done for the people and God points this out. Down to chapter 3 verse 1 says, "These are the nations the Lord left to test all the Israelites who had not experienced any of the wars in Canaan. He did this only to teach warfare to the descendants of the Israelites who had not previously had battle experience." So part of the reason he leaves them in the land is every generation needs to learn how to defend themselves in war. So he says partially the reason for leaving them in there is so they also learn how to go into battle to defend themselves. So he leaves them in the land for that purpose.

Judges Cycle

One of the main themes of the book of Judges is the need for a king. The book of Judges is a period of chaos and it points out then this need for a king to rule over Israel. So Judges is pointing out this need. With the Judges there's chaos and there's need for harmony in the whole picture. The major theme is: "everybody did that which is right in their own eyes" and so it is chaos. Everybody is doing their own thing. Kind of sounds familiar doesn't it. "Everybody does that which is right in their own eyes." This is the Judges cycle.

This is the literary cycle and we are going to actually walk through this cycle. In

the book of Judges there will be this literary cycle. It will start out like this: people will serve the Baals and the Asherahs. The Asherah was the female, the Baal was the male and it's amidst all sorts of really corrupt practices. We actually know a lot of Baal worship. We know it's very corrupt worship. The gods do battle and they kill one another, they chop them in half and they take part and make with half the sea and with half the land. So there is a lot of really cruel and crude stuff with these gods, as well as really immoral practices. The people actually go after Baals; God delivers them, Jehovah delivers them, but they go after Baals. God gets upset when they do that and so God sells them into the hands of the Ammonites, and he sells them into the hands of the other foes.

Then what happens? When they get sold into the hands of the Moabites and Ammonites and other peoples, then cry out to God in repentance. They cry out to Jehovah and they repent. The people repent; they cry out to the Lord. Now what happens after they repent this is when God relents and God rises up a judge. God raises up a judge, and this is when the judge gets involved after the people repent and then the judge is raised up. Then what happens, the judge is victorious and the judge is given rest for x number of years, twenty, forty years, or eighty years there's rest. There's peace, there's harmony while God blesses that judge. They defeated their enemies, and now they have a time of peace.

Ehud

Now this is the Judges cycle. After having read Judges, do you remember this kind of cycle going on in Judges? Now we're going to do Ehud for the mini-cycle. Ehud is a very special guy. Ehud is going to be our first judge we look at and this will be a mini-cycle. We'll be able to see the whole cycle in just less than a chapter here. In chapter 3 verse 12 it says. "Once again the Israelites did evil in the eyes of the Lord, and because they did this evil the Lord gave Eglon king of Moab power over Israel."

So Israel did evil in the eyes of the Lord, what was the retribution? The retribution was God sold them into the hands of Eglon king of Moab. Now what do we know about this Eglon, king of Moab? We know one thing about him, he is what? Yes, the Bible

describes in great detail this guy is overweight, fat. Now in America when you think overweight, obese, you think negative. In that culture those people value fat. Actually who were the people who were overweight and obese like this were the kings. The kings were the big guys because they had all the food coming their way. Actually, fat is used as a word for strength. So it's very different in the Old Testament when you read about fat, fat means success and prosperity. That's what it means: success and prosperity. So it's very different than how we think about this.

This guy, it goes into detail, he's from Moab. Then what happens? Ehud comes on the scene as the judge. God lifts him up but what's the deal with Ehud? Let me just read through this. "Again the Israelites cried out to the Lord and he gave them a deliver, Ehud a left-handed man." He was a Benjaminite man and they sent him to pay tribute. What do we know about Ehud? We know that he is left-handed; Ehud has a difference. We suppose most people are right-handed. He's a lefty. When you come up to somebody and you check them for their weapons, are there certain places people carry weapons? Until this day if you are checking people for weapons where would you check? Now most people are right-handed, so if they're right-handed, where do they wear their sword? You don't wear your sword on your right leg because if you try to pull it up this way, you're going to stab yourself. You put it on your left leg, and you draw it across, right? So you put it on your left leg and you draw it across like this. So when Ehud comes in, where do they check him? They look at his left leg, there's no sword there; they know the guy is clean. Question: does he have a foot and a half dagger on his right side?

Let me just read because I think it's almost meant to be humorous. "Now, Ehud had made a double-edged sword about a foot and a half long." And by the way is that important "about a foot and a half long"? It becomes important later on. All these little details tie in. "Which he strapped to his right thigh under his clothing, and he presented the tribute to Eglon king of Moab, who was a very fat man. After Ehud had presented the tribute, he sent them on their way, the men who had carried it. And at the idols near Gilgal he himself turned back and said." So he goes back down to where they're crossing

of the Jordan River and then he turns back and he goes back to Eglon and he says, “Eglon, I’ve got a secret message for you, O king’ and the king said, ‘quiet’ and all his attendants left.” Now why would the king leave himself just with this one Israelite guy. You’d say he wanted to protect himself, the question was is the king a big guy? He’s a big guy. He is not afraid against this scrawny little Israelite guy. He’s not afraid of him. He’s a big guy. So he tells all his attendants to go. Ehud says, “I’ve got the secret message.” He says, “I have a message from God for you.’ And as the King rose from his seat, Ehud reached with his left hand, drew the sword from his right thigh and plunged it into the King’s belly and even the handle shank went in after the blade which came out his back. Ehud did not pull the sword out, the fat closed in over it.” This is too much information. Do you see how all the details come together, unfortunately?

“Then Ehud went out to the porch and he shut the doors of the upper room behind him and locked them. And after he had gone, the servants found the doors of the upper room locked and they said, ‘He must be relieving himself.’” Now, when the king’s on the pot, do you disturb the king? No. So Ehud locks the doors and the servants come up and say, “Well the doors are locked, the king must be on the pot. You don’t disturb the king when he is one the pot.” And now what’s Ehud’s going to do?

Ehud’s Escape

In the NLT, does anybody have the NLT? NLT makes an interesting translation here. Has anybody ever seen *Shawshank Redemption*? In *Shawshank*, how does the guy get out of prison? Do you remember? He goes through the wall, but then do you remember? Do you remember that long scene when he goes through that what is it? The pipe and it is that sewage pipe. It turns out that Ehud escaped through, as the NLT correctly translates it most likely, “through the latrine.” So basically, you’ve got a hole. He goes down through the sewage thing and gets out through the latrine.

Now whenever this story comes up it always reminds me of I have four kids and they were raised in a kind of suburban kind of neighborhood in Indiana. We went on a vacation up to northern Minnesota, and I am talking really really far up; right next to the

border of Canada, in northern Minnesota. Now my kids had never seen these things. They were called “outhouses.” My children had never, well my two girls had never seen one. And so we’re out. It’s night. We pull up to the camp. We set up camp, and it’s dark. Now my daughter has to go and my wife’s got to go too. So they had a double holer out away from the camp ground. So, now do you know girls about six, seventh grade? Have you ever seen them when they get to the really klutzy stage? They drop stuff, and they are klutzy. She was going through this klutzy stage. So she takes the flashlight out. My wife, you know, knows what to deal is. So they go out there. My wife bops around the other side because my wife knows as she grew up in northern Minnesota and so she knows what to do. So she bops around the other side. She goes in here.

My daughter goes in, and it is, “is this place safe?” First of all, you know, what’s the deal? There is no light switch here. It’s pitch black down here. So what she does is she takes her flashlight and she shines it down in the hole. “Now is somebody down there? What’s down there? I want to find out. I don’t know what’s down there?....” She is curious. And she just looks down there, one second. But she is also very klutzy, and she, and this is the honest truth; she drops the flashlight down the hole. The flashlight then does its loop, and sticks shining up. My wife is on the other side, and this flashlight light shines up. And it is, “holy cow.” So my wife goes flying out of there and my wife was, “holy cow.” So my daughter comes out, “oh no.” So then they come back to the camp. Now I am the father and they come back and it’s “Rebekah, that’s our flashlight. That’s the only flashlight we have. Rebekah we need to go back out there.” You said, “you wouldn’t do that.” I sure did. Anyway. So we marched her back out there. “You got to go down and get that flashlight back. It is the only one we’ve got.” She was “Dad, are you going to make me do that?” She was going off and I said “I was just joking with you.” Anyway, it was pretty funny. So go back to Ehud.

Ehud goes down the chute. He goes down the chute through this stuff and out. And that’s how he escapes. That is what it says in the NLT. The NLT uses the word and “he escaped through the latrine.” That’s probably the right translation. The other

translations cover it over and just say he escaped. They don't tell you that it was probably a *Shawshank Redemption* type escape. But that's Ehud.

God uses Ehud's uniqueness

By the way, I missed the point. One of the little points that I wanted to raise is this. Ehud was left handed. He had something that was different. Something that was weird from the normal population. Question: "did God use his weirdness for his glory; the fact that he was left handed?"

Now I just want to suggest that when I was younger, I always wanted to fit in with other people. Half my life I realized I'm just plain weird. I just didn't fit in. I didn't fit in anywhere. I was always the weird one. I mean I could do all this stuff. Play sports everybody wanted me on their teams. But I always knew, I just didn't fit in really. I was weird. So I ended up trying to cover up my weirdness for most of my life. I spent time and energy trying to make people think I was normal. Then I realized, I in my mid-twenties, "Give up man, you're just weird. Just acknowledge it and be out with it." But I look at some of you and I say, "you're in the same ball park." What I am saying is so then we can be weird together. But what I am saying; what I am trying to say is this. The thing that you think is your weirdness is your biggest asset.

Yes, actually, when I left Grace College. I taught there for 22 years. I'd wondered why I never got fired there. And one of my friends who knew me real well, said, "Ted." I said, "how come I never got fired here? I mean all my friends got fired, and I didn't get fired." And the guy says, "Ted, you were so far out there. Nobody knew where you were. So they just let you go because it was just..."

So what I am saying is. I really mean this strongly: the thing that you think is the really weird thing about you, I'll bet you anything God will use. God uses the weirdness and the very thing that brings the one sense shame, and you try and cover it up, God uses that thing the most. You think it is the most devastating wrong thing but God will turn that into a benefit. "You meant it to me for evil. God meant it for good" kind of thing. God takes a person's individuality like that. So it is unique, and God uses that.

God used Ehud. I mean there were all these Israelite guys. Who did God use? He used the left hander, and used that particular uniqueness for his glory. What I am saying is be careful. Don't try to cover up and destroy your own weirdness. Allow yourself to be weird. Allow yourself to, and how should I say it, enjoy that. It's that very point that's different that often times God uses.

Map

Now here's just a map trying to lay out the territory. The Moabites were up from there, and they come down here to Jericho and they had taken Jericho. Is this really close to Israel? Here is Jerusalem, yes. So the Moabites had been really aggressive. Ehud's going to drive them back. Actually these guys are from up there, and that's where the Moabite king was up making an alliance there. Ehud comes down to Gilgal down in this area crossing the Jordan River, and then he turns around. He goes back up, and that's when he gets the king. So that's the area, the territory, where it takes place. So we're just getting a sense of the geography of it

Question: On the previous slide, we don't have the repentance as part of the cycle.

Yes, the people cry out to the Lord. I forget where it's mentioned exactly here. Yes, there it is verse 15; the repentance there. "And again the Israelites cried out to the Lord. He gave them a deliverer." So that would be their repentance and then God's relenting giving them a deliverer. Good point! Keep me honest.

Deborah and Barak

Now, what's the deal with Deborah? Deborah's in Judges chapter four and five. About this woman, it says this: Judges chapter four, verse four, and this has to do with women in leadership. Deborah is a leader; here's what it says: "Deborah, a prophetess, the wife of Lapidoth, was leading Israel at the time." So she's a prophetess; She's married, to Lapidoth. She was leading Israel at the time, and "she held court under the palm tree of Deborah, between Ramah and Bethel in the hill country of Ephraim." Israel came to her to get court cases decided. So she is married, a leader, she tells men what to do, and she's approved by God. Who made her a prophetess? Does a person make

themselves a prophet? No, God makes you a prophet. What does a prophet do? A prophet says, “thus saith the Lord.” The prophet speaks for God. What does a prophetess do? A prophetess speaks for God and that is exactly what Deborah did. She was also a judge. She actually had her own palm tree and the people would come to her and she would make judicial decisions. She was a judge in Israel, she was leading Israel, and she was a prophetess.

How does that fit, then, with some of the other statements in Scripture? How do you explain all that with this woman in leadership? Then you’ve got some statements from Paul in the New Testament that say, in 1 Corinthians 14.33, that the women should be what in the church? They should be silent in the church. Or you’ve got over in Timothy, “I suffer not a woman to teach a man.” Paul’s making these statements saying “women no, no, they shouldn’t be in leadership positions.”

These passages bring up once upon a time I was at a small Bible college down in Bristol, Tennessee area, and on the weekends I would be like a circuit rider preacher. In other words, I’d preach at five different churches. So I’d go to one church one week, the next week, and then I’d go around the circuit. One of the churches, I would say the average educational span, most of the guys probably had never graduated from high school. Most of the men in the church had never graduated from high school.

There was a woman in the church, and she had a master’s in English Lit. The church decided they wanted to study the book of Ecclesiastes. Is Ecclesiastes simple, or complex? Ecclesiastes, you’re going to be reading it, for this Thursday, Ecclesiastes is a complicated book to understand exactly what’s going on there. Actually, I just this year I’ve come to a kind of a new understanding of Ecclesiastes. By the way, somebody make me say this say “hey Hildebrandt what do you think about Ecclesiastes?” because I got a new take on that I think, that I actually developed this semester.

But, these guys never finished high school, this woman had a master’s in English Lit. Could she teach the book of Ecclesiastes? Probably better than anyone else in the church! So I came in and I said “Hey! I am seminary trained in things like that, but I

don't understand the book of Ecclesiastes. I'll be the first one to admit that." So I thought "I'm going to listen to what this lady does. She's a English Lit. person, she'll give me a literary way of understanding Ecclesiastes. It may help me."

So I sat in her class. Do you realize some of the men in her church wouldn't come into her class because she was a woman? And they used these statements, "I suffer not a woman teach a man." So then they used this statement and things to support their position.

Now question: Do you see the conflict there with some of that approach? And so how do you work with that, I put "answers" in quotation marks--I'm not saying these are "answers" but it may help.

Once upon a time I was in a doctoral dissertation, the guy was presenting a doctoral dissertation and I was one of the readers that had to kind of approve this guy's dissertation. He made the argument and this is the argument he made. "God uses women, when there are no good men and that God used Deborah because there were no good men." So I think this is the answer to the book of Judges.

Nobody's going to argue with me, but everybody's ok. So I'll have to argue myself. That's one of the dumbest things I've ever heard. Ok? I'm sorry. Does this alienate both men and women? Let's say there's no good men, so God uses a woman. So it actually ends up alienating both sides. Were there good men in the time of Deborah? Yes, there were. Did God use her because there were no good men? I don't think so. I'll show you other cases where there definitely were good men and God still uses a woman. This is a pathetic argument.

Is this God using someone? If God uses someone, who are you to say that this woman is second rate? Is God using her to lead Israel? So who are you to contradict God? God pretty much makes choices. So when you start saying, "God shouldn't be using a woman like that," you say, "well, yes, he's God he does what he wants." So, this argument I think, is alienating to both sides. It's demeaning. This, approach is demeaning

both to men and to women. I can't accept it and so I gave the guy a bunch of grief on his dissertation.

Then he also came up with this second argument: Deborah is the exception. The exception proves the rule. Now, "unfortunately." I was a math major when I was in college. Not unfortunately, I loved mathematics. When I got into teaching college they didn't have any logic teachers. So I ended up teaching logic for a number of years. In logic when you make an "all" statement how do you contradict an "all" statement? If somebody says "all women are like this; that all people are like this, all people from Massachusetts are like this," how do you refute an "all" statement? How many counter-examples do you have to have? One. When you make an "all" statement are you really vulnerable? Because you have to prove that all of them are that way. All they've got to do is find one counter-example and your argument's done.

By the way, when you write papers, should you stay away from "all" statements? Do you understand? "All" statements put the burden of proof on whom? On you. You're very vulnerable when you use an "all" statement. Now if I said, "some Massachusetts people are like that." Question: how do you refute a "some" statement? Is it almost impossible to refute a "some" statement? They have to show all, and then the burden of proof is on them to show all and often you can't do it. So what I'm saying is when you write, be very careful of using "all" statements.

If all women are to be like this, if all women are not allowed to be in leadership, all women are to be silent, all women are not allowed to be teachers, if you've got one exception, the exception doesn't prove the rule, the exception shows you that the rule doesn't work. You can't say all women should be like this or all men should be like that. That kind of thinking just doesn't work. So this argument here, Deborah is an exception, she sure is, but the exception shows that the rule doesn't work. Women can be in leadership and it's not a problem.

Now some people use progressive revelation, they say, “Paul is the one that we should accept over everything else.” But do you see what that does? It privileges Paul’s writings. Should we be privileging Paul’s writings over other parts of the canon? Is the Old Testament part given by God as were Paul’s writings. I went to a place where they said, “Here’s Romans, and this is Galatians, and we look at the whole Bible through the lenses of Romans and Galatians.” What’s the problem with that? They’re all bent out of shape because they love the book of Romans and Galatians. Shouldn’t you interpret the Bible through the lens of Genesis and through the book of Exodus? And shouldn’t you come at it this way through the Old Testament to the New rather than turning around and interpreting it all like that? So what I’m saying is be careful about privileging one part of Scripture over another. If this is God’s word the whole thing is God’s word, you start privileging sections. I find that to be offensive actually.

Then what about Paul himself. Check this out. Paul himself says, and these are important verses I think in this gender conflict thing, Paul, in Galatians 3:28. This is a famous verse. People have argued over this for years now, Paul says “there is neither Jew nor Greek,” what’s that mean? You’ve got the Jewish people and the Greek people. In the Old Testament there were Jews and Greeks and the separation between those were circumcised and uncircumcised. “In Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek” no difference Jew or Greek. “Slave or free” we’re not just slaves and free anymore, we’re brothers and sisters in Christ. There’s not slave nor free. “Male or female you are all one in Christ.” So there are all those boundaries that were between the Jews and Gentiles, between the slaves and free between the male and female, those boundaries are gone. We’re all one in Christ and Paul says that in Galatians 3:28.

The other one I like, and let me just do this out of my head is Ephesians 5:22. It says, “Women, wives submit yourselves to your husbands.” And all God’s men have used this to say, “wives submit yourselves to your husband.” But what’s the preceding verse say? Ephesians 5:21 says “submit to one another out of reverence to Christ.” This

means then should I submit myself to my wife? Yes, “submit to one another out of reverence to Christ.”

Jesus Christ is a great example. Is Jesus Christ the big leader? Jesus Christ is the big leader of the Christian church. How does Jesus express his leadership? Does he come and say, “hi, I’m the big leader, all you guys bow down.” What does Jesus do? He says take off their sandals, and then what does Jesus do? He washes his disciples’ feet. He who is the king of the universe becomes the servant of all. Does that leave us a model for leadership? It’s not, I am the big leader. No, it’s I washed their feet.

I remember a story about Andrew Jackson who was president I think in around 1830, Andrew Jackson. Why was he such a great leader? I don’t agree with everything the guy did but he was a great leader. He was in a battle of context. He was leading his troops off to war, some of his guys got hurt. Andrew Jackson got off his horse, he’s the big general, he rides the horse. He gets off his horse, puts his wounded men on his horse while he walks. Question: Would those men have died for him because he did things like that? Yes, they knew that he would sacrifice himself on their behalf and so they would sacrifice themselves on his behalf. He walked while they rode and they said, “wow, now that’s a leader.” That’s what Jesus did.

Three Cardinal sins: money, sex, and power

It leads me into what I’m going to teach you about sin today. There’s three big ones: money, sex, and power. Now money, you guys are Gordon college students so you don’t have to worry about that, that’s not going to be a problem. Sorry, but to be honest with you the biggest thing that scares me and actually should scare you is fifteen, T. Fifteen T and you guys should be scared out of your minds. Fifteen trillion in debt. You don’t even know what that means, I don’t even know. It is a lot of money. Money, don’t worry about it you won’t have to worry about the money thing.

Sex is dirty. If you’re a Christian you do sex you get caught, you’re busted. It doesn’t work real well. So sex is dirty, let’s face it. The one you need to worry about and actually if you’re going to do sin don’t worry about money you’ll never have it. Sex it’s

dirty and you'll get caught. If you're going to do sin, do power. Power is the clean one. No, seriously they don't catch you and actually you do power right, everybody thinks you're the big honking leader and you're the man. So if you're going to do it do power, it's the clean one. Question: was I being sarcastic? Yes, I should have walked over there but I'm afraid he won't move the camera. So what I'm saying is money, sex, and power which is the most tricky the most insidious, power. That's what I'm trying to say power is the most insidious because it comes on a person. Power does what? Power corrupts, absolute power corrupts absolutely. Be careful about power, it's really subtle and it gets into a person and it sucks the marrow out of their being before they can even know it. So what I'm saying is, be careful. It's the clean one that looks good. But you've got to be careful with power.

Let's get back to Deborah. Now what's going on with Deborah? It seems to me competence and gifts, not gender, are the issue. Competence and gifts are the issue. Huldah is going to be a prophet for us in the Old Testament. She is a prophetess. Now you say, God only used prophetesses when there were no good men. No. Huldah was a prophetess when a guy named, I think his name was Jeremiah's running around. He was a fairly good man. Jeremiah writes the biggest book in the Old Testament actually. It's bigger than Psalms, not as many chapters but it's longer. So Huldah is prophetess when Jeremiah's around. There were good men around but God still used her as a prophetess.

If you go into the New Testament somebody said, "Well, all these Old Testament prophetesses and such, the Old Testament's all messed up. What happens when you go to the New Testament? You have Phillip's prophesying daughters. He's got like five or seven, I forget which, five or seven of these prophesying daughters. They're Phillip's prophesying daughters. That's in the book of Acts that's after Pentecost, after the Spirit's come, during the church age. So what you've got is women in leadership in both testaments.

So what do you do with Paul statements and things? Well, when I think I see conflict in Scripture between statements like that we've got to say culture is probably

involved in it. Is Paul addressing a particular problem at Corinth that makes him say that? There are there particular problems that are being addressed that is what he is talking about. Now, I'll actually pursue that in your New Testament class as you go over Corinthians and Timothy we'll point out some of those solutions, but I think it's largely solved because of cultural issues that were problems back in those days.

Now, where does Deborah do her thing with Barak. Barak is the general. They go out and they're going to fight with iron chariots. Jabin, king of Hazor comes down with his iron chariots. Question: Is this going to be a great place for chariots? It's flat, do chariots work here? Yes. Do chariots work here on the mountains? No. They work here on the plains. Do you see this plain looks like an arrowhead here. This plain kind of looks like an arrow head coming down. This plain right here is called the Megiddo plain, or as you guys know it--Armageddon. This is Armageddon. This is the Armageddon Valley. It's the largest valley in all of Israel. It's a great place for a war. By the way, Megiddo is right here that's why they call it Armageddon. Megiddo is the name of the place. There is a tel where they did the battle, this is the tel and this is where they did the battle.

Women and War

By the way, in the story of the battle, whose going to take out the chief general? Is it going to be a man or a women? A woman is going to take out the general and God says, "Barak, because you are such a wimp, a woman is going to take out this man." So what happens? Sisera gets off his chariot, he comes trucking into this lady's house, and says, "Hey, Jael, we've got an alliance with you guys." So, he says, "man, I'm really thirsty, give me something to drink." She says, "Oh, I don't have anything, I just have this nice warm milk." So he takes the warm milk and then what happens to him? He is dead tired, fighting war is really hard. He takes the warm milk and he goes to sleep. What is she good at – the woman? What skill does she have? Can she fight Sisera hand to hand? You know, I can do this battle, no. What does she do? Is she good with pegs and hammers because she puts tents up and takes tents down? Does she know how to use a hammer and a peg? So she gets out her hammer and bang, bang Maxwell's silver hammer

comes down on his head. Boom, the peg goes down his head and she pegs the guy and takes him out while he is sleeping.

Question: How does the woman fight in battle – does she out fox him? Is she shrewd? Yes, she is shrewd and she out foxes him. She gets him when he is weak like that and she takes him out. She wins the days. Jael is the great victor and God wins the victory here with Deborah and Barak. So they are successful. They defeated Jabin king of Hazor.

Jabin I and II

By the way, does anybody remember the book of Joshua? You probably don't, but in the book of Joshua, it also mentioned that Joshua defeated Jabin, king of Hazor. Some people say the Bible has got errors in it. It's got Deborah defeating Jabin but Joshua had already killed Jabin. It is most likely that Jabin was a family name like Jabin I, Jabin II like you had in Egypt. Has anybody ever studied the Ptolemies in Egypt? Let's do a little Egyptian history. Egyptian history Ptolemy I, Ptolemy II, Ptolemy III, Ptolemy IV, you have 24 Ptolemies in a row. So now you know all the history of Egypt. I'm just being facetious, but Jabin was probably the same thing, it was probably a dynastic name. Jabin was king and he died.

Gideon versus Midian

Now Gideon and Midian, what happens here in chapter 6 of Judges. Gideon is going to be--do you remember that article you guys read? The book of Judges kind of moves up with Gideon and Gideon is kind of like the peak of the book of Judges. After Gideon, the book is like going to go down, there's going to be lots more sinful things happening. So it kinds of rises up this guy Gideon.

Gideon in the Winepress

He is threshing wheat in a wine press. We need to know some information about what is wheat in a wine press. First of all, how do you harvest wheat? Normally the wheat is in stalks, of about a knee high or a little bit higher. You take a sickle and you go with your hands, you grab a bunch of stalks and you chop with the sickle. You chop

stalks, chop stalks and then all the stalks are laid down. Then you take these stalks and you put them on a threshing floor. A threshing floor, that pillar to this pillar where I am is about twice as big as most of them are. They're about half of this size. They're often up on the top of mountains. They shave off the top of mountains and make a flat area up there. Then they take all the stalks and put the stalks on there with the wheat. The wheat is in the chaff, and you know about the chaff is a husk around the wheat. The wheat is a kernel.

The question is can we as human beings eat the chaff? Eating the chaff is like eating grass. Can human beings eat grass? Our digestive system doesn't do cellulose like that. So you can't eat the chaff. Do we eat the wheat though? We eat the wheat (unless we're gluten free). So you've got to separate the wheat from the chaff.

So they get up on this flat area, the animals walk on it. Now as the animals walk on it, the hard wheat gets shucked and the shuck comes off and then what do you do? You throw it up in the air and all the chaff which is light gets blown off by the wind. Why do you want your threshing floor up on the top of a mountain? There is wind up there. So the wind blows the chaff away. But when it does that, by the way, can you see the chaff, it's almost like clouds. I've seen this in Israel where they do the chaff thing and it looks like clouds. You can see it from ten miles away.

So what do the Midianites do? The Midianites are smart, do the Midianites let the Jews plant their crops? Yes, they do. Do they let them harvest their crops? Yes, they do. When do the Midianites step in? When they are doing the threshing, the Midianites say, "Okay, now we've got pure grain," and the Midianites go up and say, "Give me all that grain, it's mine."

So what is Gideon doing? Gideon is in a wine press. A wine press, the ones I've seen are about this big and round, they are holes in the ground where wine gets pressed. Gideon is down in this wine press hole threshing and trying to get the chaff off the grain. So he is throwing it up and down, up and down, but now it only has gravity to work because there is no wind in the wine press. Does he feel like a mighty warrior or is he

hiding from Midianites? He is hiding from the Midianites and this angel then comes up to him and Gideon was threshing wheat in the wine press to keep it from the Midianites. The angel of the Lord appeared to Gideon and said, “The Lord is with you, mighty warrior.” Does Gideon feel like a mighty warrior, or does he feel like a chicken down there, hiding, trying not to get caught by the Midianites.

“But sir,” Gideon replied, “If the Lord is with us why is all this happening to us? Where are all his wonders that our fathers told us about?” Gideon goes off. God then calls Gideon and says, “Gideon, you are my man, you are going to lead Israel.” So God calls Gideon. The Lord told him, “Go in the strength that you have and save Israel out of Midian’s hand. Am I not sending you?” “Lord,” he says, “How can I save Israel? My clan is the weakest of Israel,” and he starts making excuses (cf. Moses).

Gideon and the Fleece

Has anyone ever heard of the fleece story in the later part of chapter 6? Gideon sets out the fleece. People use this fleece for determining God’s will. You put out the fleece and you pray to God, “God if this happens, then I know you mean to do this.” They call that putting out the fleece. Was this passage of Gideon putting out the fleece, for Gideon to determine God’s will? Did Gideon already know what God’s will was? Yes, God had told Gideon what he wanted him to do. He knew what God’s will was. Putting out the fleece was a test. Was he testing God? Yes. In other words, be careful while using the fleece to determine God’s will. This passage says he already knew God’s will. This was only to test God.

Now how did he test God? He said “God, make the fleece wet and the ground dry.” In the summer, the dew that comes in from the Mediterranean Sea which is warm and the ground gets cold at night. So basically, the Mediterranean moisture comes in and hits the cold land. When it does, it precipitates in dew. But when dew goes on the fleece, what happens? The fleece is like a sponge. Does the sponge naturally stay wetter while the ground dries up? The ground dries up, the water goes right into the ground. So Gideon says, make the fleece wet and the ground dry. That is what normally happens.

Yes, so Gideon's not too bright, he says, "Oh, hey, that's definitely what normally will happen. Oh God, I get one more try. This time, I want you to make the ground wet and the fleece dry." That is really tricky. Now, that one's tricky because, the dew comes down, the dew covers everything. To make the fleece which normally holds the water dry and the ground wet, that's a real miracle. It's all a miracle when you are dealing with God, but it's just pretty incredible.

Determining God's will and the fleece

So this passage comes up then about finding the will of God. I just want to talk a little bit about finding God's will. Kids come into College, what are you majoring in? What do you want to do with your life? My daughter graduated from Gordon College and she had no clue on graduation what she wanted to do with her life. It's terrible. So what happened? Seriously, she was about two years after graduation, she was rummaging around, she was a Biblical Studies major, she did not know what she wanted to do. After about two years, she said, "you know, I think I want to be a nurse practitioner." So then she went back, took all this chemistry and courses and now she is a nurse practitioner. But what I'm saying is it took her years after college to figure this out.

So determining God's will these are just some abstract guidelines that I would use myself. First of all, you ask if it is moral. Question: should I go out and steal, should I go out and lie, should I go out and cheat, should I go out and kill somebody. The answer is: No. Those are immoral, they're wrong. So in other words, is it moral, is it in God's will. He stated lying is wrong, cheating is wrong. So the moral will, so I know I don't have to ask myself about that.

The question I ask myself quite frequently is what is the good? I am an old man, I am looking at the end of life. I am saying what is the mostest, goodest I can doest the quickest. In other words, what is the most good I can do? Every day I get up with this question: what is the most good I can do for this day? So you ask what is the good, what is the good that I can do?

Now, pursue your passions, each of us have different interests in things and you

need to pursue things that you are interested in, that you're passionate about. You hope that can coalesce with what are you gifted in? What are you gifted in? What is your weirdness, what is your gift, your creativity, what really gets you going? What are your gifts? Follow those things.

Then you ask also, what do I feel God's calling me to do and there comes a sense of God's calling in your life.

But sometimes you can't figure these things out very well. Let me just give you an example. When I was in college and went through for electrical engineering and mathematics. That was my undergraduate degree. After I finished in January, I went to seminary. When I went to seminary, what did I study? Abstract algebra, complex variables in seminary? No, I studied Greek and Hebrew. When I got to seminary, I found out I loved studying Scripture. After I graduated from seminary, I went on to graduate school after that. I thought regretfully, "God, I wasted three years out of my life. Three and a half years out of my life, I was killing myself going to school taking twenty hours of engineering courses, working twenty and thirty, forty hours a week. I killed myself going through college." I said, "God, I wasted my all that work that I put in there. I totally wasted it. And now I am doing Bible, what does Bible have to do with electrical engineering"?

All of a sudden about ten years, fifteen years later, somewhere in the late 80's and I picked up a thing called a PC. And I said, "Holy cow, this is ten times easier than it used to be and look at all we can do on this PC". Then what happened? So then I started doing all this with the computer. Question: am I able to do Biblical studies and computer together. By the way, do you guys benefit from that? Because what happens, you got all these course materials, you've got audio, you've got text and how much you pay 10 bucks for this material. If you buy a textbook in here, everybody in here saved about 50 to 75 bucks because you do it online now. Can we really do cool stuff online? Yes. But what I'm saying is there was about a ten to fifteen year period in my life where I said, "I can't figure out what God was doing." In other words, I wasted a huge part of my life and I

couldn't figure that out. What I'm saying is, you may think that you can't figure out what God's done in your life, but if you give it time over time, ten, fifteen, twenty years later all of a sudden the light bulb will go on and you'll say, "Aw stink, that's what was going on and I never understood the connection."

What I see happening is that God takes the things that you think are the biggest problems and he turns them. Do you remember Joseph's statement? "You meant it to me for evil, but God meant it for good." So you see this redemptive work of God where God takes the things that are the most mucked up things in our lives and he turns them. The biggest problem we end up having turns out to be the thing God uses in spectacular ways for his goodness and for his greatness. We know then that it's God doing it, it's not us doing it. God has redemptively touched us in a way that's made us special.

So, just some things to think about with this open and closed door? God opens doors, other doors are closed. One of the biggest things I think for people is failure. Is failure one of your best friends? Failure is really, really important to know how to handle failure. Failure can be one of the biggest blessings in your life.

I always remember the story of Michael Jordan. Does anyone remember who Michael Jordan is? This guy played basketball in the 90's. I never watched professional sports, but I watched Michael Jordan. I honestly I played in college, Houghton college. It was just like I never saw anybody that could do what he did every game. How could he do that stuff? It's impossible. Michael Jordan got cut from his high school basketball team. What I am saying is how do you deal with failure? Failure is really important. Open and closed doors, how do you handle the open and closed doors?

Finally, let me pull a thing from Henry Nouwen. He talks about prayer. He says when you pray, you have to pray with open hands. If you pray like this [clutched fist]. You shouldn't pray like this. You're talking to God. You pray with open hands and God puts things in your hands. It's his grace. It's his grace. So, a lot of life is praying with open hands. You can't demand. Things that you think are going to work out beautifully and things like that. You hold things for with an open hand. God places, as Niles Logue

used to say, “God puts bouquets of grace in your hands.” You can’t clutch them, he puts them as gifts in your hands. So that’s to do with Gideon and the will of God.

Gideon and Midian Battle

Now, our next big one is Gideon and Midian. Let me just finish out Gideon and we’ll call it a day. Gideon gets the battle and Gideon goes out to fight. What happens? God’s going to give him the victory. Let me just narrate the story here chapter 7 the Gideon and Midian battle. What happens here? Gideon goes out and gets 32,000 guys. Do you want a large army or small army to be victorious? You want the largest army possible. God looks at it and says, “Gideon you’ve got too many guys.” He says, “Too many warriors, if you win the battle, you are going to think it’s because you won the battle. I want you to know that I am the one who is winning the battle. So anyone who is fearful let them go home.” Are people fearful in war context? Is a war context threatening?

I could tell you a story about Hadley, one of my son’s best friend. Hadley was fearless, knew no fear. He had been to Iraq and knew no fear. My son was one of his closest friends. He goes to Afghanistan. He was shot through the neck. It missed his major artery by a millimeter and he would have been dead. Hadley took a month or two off, I forget, whatever. They’ve patched him up. He came back. When he came back to battle, did he know fear now? Yes. After having been shot through his neck, all of a sudden it was when you go out there again this is it you and you get shot through the neck again. This is not good. So what I am saying is fear and battle.

What is going to happen? 22,000 leave. He’s left with I don’t know 10,000 or something like that. Now, God takes him down to drink. It’s a hot climate. All the guys that dumped their head in the water and lap just out of the water, let them go home. How do most people when they’re really thirsty drink? You dive into the spring and get in head first? He said the ones that bring it up and lap to their mouth, those are the ones that I want. How many were there? 300. All the rest, thousands go home. Gideon has 300. Sounds like the “300” Spartans or something.

Now some people say Gideon is wanting a few good men. Is that what God was trying to do, get a few good men? The answer is: No. That's exactly the opposite of the point of this story. Was God trying to get a few good men to show that a few good men can win the victory? No, he was trying to show them who was going to win the victory? He was going to win the victory. It's not these few good men.

So what they do was they basically go around and they surround the Midianites and they've got this lamp full of olive oil with a wick on it ready to burn. They've got trumpets and three hundred guys surround them. The Midianites, by the way, are a complex of what they call mercenaries. So there's mercenaries mixed in with these guys. Gideon surrounds them. They break the lamps kind of like a Molotov cocktail. They break the Molotov cocktail. Everything goes up in fire. They blow the trumpets and the Midianites and mercenaries figure they're surrounded and they start fighting each other. Then, the army breaks down and the guys kill each other. Gideon wins the battle with 300 guys. Who won the battle that day? The Lord won the battle and the victory was his.

We'll call it quits there. I think that clock is slow and we'll finish it up next time. So, see you on Thursday. We've got a quiz on Thursday.

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History, Literature, and Theology course lecture number 20, concluding the book of Joshua and Pacifism versus the Just War theories. And then on to Judges with an introduction to the book of Judges and the judges Ehud, Deborah and Barak, and Gideon.

Transcribed by editor: Bri Young, Abigail Nash, Abby Swanson, Katie Zablocki, Dolapo Anyanwu, and

Jensine Chang

Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 21[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History, Literature, and Theology course. Lecture 21: finishing up the book of Judges with Samson, the tale of the two Levites, and then the book of Ruth.

Abimelech

All right, let's talk about the book of Judges. What we were talking last time was about Gideon fighting Midian, Gideon defeating the Midianites with the sword of the Lord, Gideon throwing down their Molotov cocktail lamps and catching things on fire, blowing the trumpets and winning the victory against the Midianites. What happened after Gideon's big victory is that Gideon has a son and the son's name is Abimelech. Now the name is really important. His name is Abi-melech. *Ab* means what in Hebrew? *Abba*: father. So *Abi* is "my father." *Melech* means "king." "My father is king." Who is his father? His father was Gideon. Was his father king? No, he wasn't. Are there any kings in Israel in the time of Judges? No. So is this name really kind of an interesting name? It clashes with the book, my father is king but he wasn't king. But his name is Abimelech, nevertheless.

Jotham's Fable

Now what happens is Abimelech takes over. He's the older brother. What he does to all of his other siblings is he kills them all off. There's I don't know, thirty, forty, fifty, there is a ton of them. He kills off his brothers and sisters. What happens is Jotham, one of the youngest guys hides and gets away. Jotham then goes up on a hillside and he's going to tell a fable to his brother and this is in chapter 9 of the book of Judges. He's going to tell this fable. I'll just narrate and give kind of a summary of the parable. But basically he goes up and he tells this story. "The trees of the forest went out to make themselves a king." By the way, what is a fable? Are there fables in the Bible? What's a fable? Usually a fable is like an animal talking, or a tree talking. Well, here the trees of

the forest go out to anoint themselves a king. “And so they go to the olive tree and they say to the olive tree: olive tree would you be our king? You give us olive oil and all these wonderful things that we eat. Olives that we can put them on a pizza. And we would just love to have an olive tree for our king. And the olive tree says, I can’t be your king. If I am your king, there’s no olives and that’s no good.

So they go to the vine. And they say, hey, vine would you be our king? You can party all the time now when a vine is our king. There will be wine for everybody. The vine says, I can’t be your king because if I am your king, I can’t produce the grapes to grow that makes the heart of man happy.

So, finally they go to the bramble bush. Have you guys ever been in Texas? A bramble bush is a bush that there’s no leaves on. All it is thorns and thistles. It slices your legs up when you try to walk through them. They’re usually about knee high. They’re low very thorny bushes, with almost no leaves. They’re just these thorns and thistles. So what happens is they come to the thorn bush and they say: thorn bush would you be our king? And the thorn bush says, I will be your king. Come hide in my shadow.

Now why is this so ironic? The thorn bush doesn’t have any shadow. The thorn bush is good for what? It is good for nothing. Yet it claims it’s going to be the king. What is Jotham trying to say about Abimelech through this story? Is Abimelech least likely to be the king? And yet he’s pretending like he’s the big king, but he’s really the least likely. The olive tree is gone. The vine is gone. And here is this bramble bush, now this thorn bush is trying to become king.

So this is a fable. This is a fable that Jotham tells. It’s a fable that’s recorded in the Bible. So if you want to get people mad say: there are fables in the Bible. And people will get all bent out of shape because a lot of people think the Bible is a fable rather than history. But there are fables in the Bible. This one is told by Jotham, about the trees making this bush their king.

By the way, is this sarcastic fable meant to put down his older brother? And so that’s what this fable is there for. The thorn bush fable is a satire on power. I think we’ve said this before, money, sex, and power. We talked about this last time. Power is the one

that gets Abimelech. He kills his own brothers. So that he can have power and be the next ruler. Often times you see that kind of thing. So sad. This is a sad story.

This is the end of Gideon. Do you see how Gideon was really a good person? But do you see after Gideon leaves, his sons they go onto this warfare in their family and just destroys his family. So Gideon's clan goes down.

Now, the first kingship attempt is Abimelech. Some people associate this with the first kingship attempt. A failed attempt at kingship is found here in the book of Judges. In the book of Judges there is what? "There is no king in Israel, and everyone does that which is right in their own eyes." Right? Abimelech makes a run at the first attempt at that kind of petty kingship in the book of Judges. It was failed attempt, however.

Jephthah

What about this fellow Jephthah? He is famous for basically one thing. He's a Gileadite. He didn't really fit into society well. So he was driven out because he was not accepted. His mother, there was some illegitimacy there. What happens? Does God ever say the exact opposite of what he means? And chapter 10 verse 14, God says this: "But you have forsaken me." He's talking to the people of Israel. "He says you have forsaken me and served other gods. So I will no longer save you." God's role as the rescuer. "I will no longer save you." And then God says this: "Go and cry out to the gods you have chosen. Let them save you when you are in trouble." Is God commanding his people to idolatry here? He says, "Go to the gods you've made and cry out to them!" Is God commanding idolatry, here? Is this sarcasm? Is God being sarcastic? He says: "I'm no longer going to save you because you guys are worshiping these idols. Okay, go to the idols, let them save you." That's sarcastic. He's wanting to tell them "get rid of their idols and come back to him." But he uses sarcasm here, saying the exact opposite of what he meant. Is there sarcasm in the Bible? Actually, does God get sarcastic? Yes, he does. You've got to be real careful with sarcasm.

A lot of times I use sarcasm. Can sarcasm be very detrimental? I'll never forget my daughter when she was in sixth grade. She came back to me ten to fifteen years later and she said, I remember when you said and quoted some crazy thing that I had said, but

I was being sarcastic. She didn't get the fact that it was sarcastic. She thought that that was what I actually held. So what I'm saying is be careful with sarcasm because sarcasm can do damage on people who don't understand. But God uses it here. So there's a place for sarcasm and there's a place not for sarcasm. Sounds like Ecclesiastes or something doesn't it.

So context determines meaning. It is clear here that God did not mean for them to be idolaters. By the way, this is the point. God is using sarcasm to do what? What is the function of the sarcasm? Does the sarcasm function to rebuke them? So he's using sarcasm to rebuke them. You have got to pick that up from the context then.

Now, what happens? Jephthah goes out. He says, "Okay, I'll fight for you guys. I will lead you. I'll be the judge." God makes him a judge. Then it says this: "The Spirit of the Lord came on Jephthah." This is chapter 11.2. "He crossed over Gilead. And Jephthah made a vow to the Lord." And this is the vow this is what Jephthah is most famous for, his vow. "Jephthah made a vow to the Lord: if you give the Ammonites into my hands, whatever comes out the door of my house to meet me when I return in triumph from the Ammonites will be the Lord's and I will sacrifice it as a burnt offering." He goes out to battle against the Ammonites. The Ammonites are over here in Jordan. What happens? He comes home. Who comes out to meet him when he comes home? His daughter comes out to meet him when he comes home.

So now this raises a question about vows. You have to be careful about taking vows before God. Ecclesiastes says some interesting things on this. Let me just read this. Ecclesiastes 5. There is great wisdom in the book of Ecclesiastes, by the way. It says this: "Guard your steps when you go to the house of God. Go near to listen rather than to offer the sacrifice of fools who do not know that they do wrong. Do not be quick with your mouth, do not be hasty in your heart to utter anything before God. God is in heaven and you are on earth, so let your words be few." Jump down to verse four, "When you make a vow to God, do not delay in fulfilling it. He has no pleasure in fools; fulfill your vow. It is better not to vow than to make a vow and not fulfill it." What does he say? "When you go into the house of God let your words be few." I worry sometimes about some of these

youth rallies they had when I was younger. People would get up there and say, “do you commit yourself to reading three chapters of Scripture every day. How many of you will do that? Everyone stand up.” They make a vow to read and things like that. What I’m saying is be very careful about doing that. God does not delight in fools. Just be careful about making vows before God.

Jephthah makes this vow, “whatever comes out the door of my house.” Now the question comes up, then, does Jephthah burn his daughter up? Does he burn her as a sacrifice? Let me just say this: Probably 80-90% of Old Testament scholars say that Jephthah burned his daughter up. Now what should that do? I’m going to tell you that I don’t think he burned her. But what should that put in the back of your mind? Hildebrandt’s the professor of this class, he’s got it right. No, no. Hildebrandt is most possibly wrong on this. But does he still think it’s right? What I’m saying is I know that most of my friends who are Old Testament scholars would disagree with me on this point. But let me tell you why I think that Jephthah did not burn his daughter up. I think he didn’t. It is a minority position. So what I’m trying to say is, do I have to admit that I can be wrong sometimes? Yes. And I may be wrong here. I just want to warn you that this is a minority position. He may have burned her up.

But here are the reasons why I think he didn’t. So first of all when she is told when Jephthah returned to his house at Mizpah who should come out to meet him but his daughter dancing to the sound of tambourines. Her father’s come home from the war. It’s like a military guy coming back from Afghanistan. His kids come to welcome daddy home. Then it says, “She was his only child.” Why does it bring up that she was his only child? Just notice that “she was his *only child*. Except for her, he had neither son nor daughter.” So it makes it really, really explicit. “‘My father,’ she replied, ‘You have given your word to the Lord. Do to me just as you promised. Now the Lord has avenged on your enemies.’” She says, “Okay, I’m in with this too, father.” She says, “Give me two months.” She has one request from her dad. “Give me two months to roam the hills and weep with my friends.” Why? Because I’m going to be burned up. No. “Let me go two months to roam the hills to weep with my friends, because I will never marry.” Now,

if you were getting burned up as a sacrifice on an altar would you be worried about the fact that you never married? Or would marriage kind of take a second place. If you're going to be burned with fire, isn't that a little more important than being married? But notice here she says: "because I may never marry. You may go. And she went two months in the hills." She and the girls grieve out on the hills. And why? Because she will never marry. "In two months, she returned to her father and he did to her as he had vowed." What is the next line: "and she was a virgin." And you say: wait a minute, he just burned her up. Who gives a rip at that point if she's a virgin or not? This guy just smoked his daughter in the sacrificial fire. Why would it mention, "and she was a virgin"? Do virgins burn hotter? What's the deal? I'm sorry. If he just burned her up, why would you mention right after you burned her up that she's a virgin?

If something else happened, however, is it possible that what he says that he would offer up whatever came out the door of his house that there are two ways of taking this? Is it possible to read it like this? The Hebrew word for "and" can also be translated "or." Is there a difference between "and," and "or"? What if you take it this way? "If you give the Ammonites into my hands, whatever comes out of the door of my house to meet me when I return in triumph from the Ammonites will be the Lord's **or** I will offer it as a sacrifice." Now, the NIV says "will be the Lord's **and** I will offer it as a sacrifice." Is that different than saying "I will dedicate it to the Lord **or** I will offer it as a sacrifice"? That allows him to dedicate his daughter to the Lord.

By the way, is it important then that she's a virgin, that she never married, that she's dedicated to the Lord? What does that mean? Will she have any children? She will never have any children. That means that Jephthah will have what descendants? She is his only daughter. By the way, in the ancient world was it a big thing to have no descendants? Did your line end at that point? And that's why she's weeping, he's weeping because his line is over. She is his last shot at having descendants and now it's cut off. She's dedicated to the Lord. She will never marry; she's a virgin; she will have no children. Does that make sense? I think this is what happened. He dedicated her to the Lord.

By the way, if you go over to Numbers 8, and Dr. Hugenburger at Park St. Church, pointed this out, I think it was a brilliant observation. I never noticed it in the past. That's why I love going to his church. Every time I go to his church I learned something new. He pulled this thing out of Numbers 8.11, check this out. Numbers 8.11, it says, "Aaron is to present the Levites before the Lord as a wave offering." The Levites are to be presented as a wave offering. Does that mean that he kills all the Levites and waves them before the Lord as a sacrifice? No, it means he dedicates them to the Lord as a sacrifice.

Does anybody remember Romans 12.1. "As a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service." We are to dedicate ourselves to God as a sacrifice as well. So that it's more of a dedicatory thing when it refers to human beings.

Do I have to kind of back off myself to say what? Most Old Testament scholars disagree with me. Is it likely that I'm wrong here. The honest truth is that the NIV is translated with an "and" instead of and "or." So with certain points you got to be humble. But can you still be stubborn? You can still say that "I think he didn't burn her, I think he dedicated her to the Lord." The context kind of indicates that. But I could be wrong here. So, that's Jephthah.

Shibboleth

Now, Shibboleth and Sibboleth... This is a SAT vocabulary question. What does Shibboleth mean? Shibboleth is an in word that gets you in to a group. Are there certain groups that have certain words that they use to get you into their group? If I said, I'm part of the 99%. That would get me into what group? Occupy Wall St. Yes, I'm part of the 99%, on these salaries you can guarantee that I'm not part of the 1%. So that's a big thing for them.

Various groups have certain buzzwords that they use. Have you seen this in high school? Do they still do this in high schools? Different groups have different buzzwords that they use. The athletic guys talked a certain way, people who are doing drugs in my day talked a different way. So, different people talk with different jive talk. So, here's

what happened with Jephthah. Jephthah is fighting over in Jordan. The Ephraimites that were fighting were in a different area. They didn't come over to help Jephthah. So they come over to Jephthah and they want to make war with Jephthah and say "you didn't invite us to war." We're going to come over and now raise cane with you. So Jephthah sets up at the Jordan river. As the Ephraimites cross the Jordan, he gets them to say "Shibboleth." But he knows that because they're from Ephraim, they can't say shibboleth, because they always say "Caa" [for "car"], and they say "idear" and he knows that because they say those words he knows they're from Boston. He knows that there are regional dialects. If I say "y'all come down to my place" As soon as I say "y'all" what happens? In New England when you say "y'all" your IQ goes down 20 points. That's how it is in New England. On the other hand, if you talk with a British accent in New England your IQ goes up 20 points. I'm just joking, but not really.

So what I'm saying is when they cross the Jordan here, he says "say shibboleth" and they say "sibboleth." Then he said those guys are Ephraimites. He knew it by the way that they pronounced it, that they were lying. Then he killed the Ephraimites. So this shibboleth is used now, in general, in the English language to mean a buzzword within a certain group, which means you're identified with that group. So every group has these buzzwords or special code words.

By the way, do we as Christians talk in a certain language that's different. I'm saying we have different buzzwords as well. Every group will have those. So those group identifying code words are called "shibboleths."

Introduction to Samson

Now Shim-shon--how many of you guys pronounce this word Sampson? With an "p" in it? Sampson. We pronounce it with a "P". Is there any p in Samson? Actually what you're doing is you're using the Greek pronunciation. The Greek has a "p" in it and it has come over into English. By the way, you see that "SMS" *shamosh* means "sun." So actually his name means "Sunny." So, Samson if you were to really translate his name means "Sunny." I'm just joking around, but not really. I call Samson, "Sunny."

Now, what do we know about Samson? First of all let me just do some territorial

things with Samson. Where are the Philistines? Let's do a classroom activity: Sea of Galilee, Jordan River, Dead Sea. You guys are Jordan, you guys are Israel and you guys are the Mediterranean Sea. Where are the Philistines going to be? Right on the Mediterranean coast. The Philistine's are always going to try to attack to the Jews from the west. Where are they going to attack the Jews? Where are the Jews? In Jerusalem, in Israel. The Jews are always up in the mountains. So the Philistine's would always come up into the mountains.

But there are only certain ways that you can get into the mountains. So, one of those ways into the mountains is up through Beth Horon, upper and lower Beth Horon. By the way, the roads are still there to this day. Till this day, when you want to go up into the mountains, you follow the same roads that have been there for two or three thousand years. This is the Beth Horon entrance. There's another entrance here. This is the Kiriath Jearim entrance. That's where David took the ark up to Jerusalem. So this is where David brought the ark up. Remember and the guy touched the ark and was killed by the Lord? Uzzah, Perez-Uzzah. And so this is the Kiriath Jearim entrance. Now, where is Samson? Shim-shon, or Sunny, lives right in the area of Zohar and Beth Shemesh, house of the sun. That is where Samson is from.

Samson's Wife from Timnah

Now where is Samson's first wife from? When he goes to get married, his wife is from Timnah. Do you see how close that is? So he goes up, and that is where Samson hangs out and where she hangs out in the neighboring towns. So Samson meets this Philistine woman and that's when he goes down and has contact with her.

Now one other entrance that is important later on for us is the Elah Valley. By the way, do you see the town Gath here? Who is famous from Gath? He's a big guy who didn't like kids throwing stones at him: Goliath of Gath. When Goliath of Gath comes and fights Israel they fight in this Elah Valley. The Elah Valley goes right up into what town? Bethlehem. David is from Bethlehem. David comes down from Bethlehem here and this is where David fights Goliath right here. This is how you enter. If you want to get up into the mountains, this is how you do it, and this is where they fought. Goliath

was from Gath and David was from Bethlehem and they fought in the Valley of Elah. So Samson, Shim-shon, he's going to hang out right here in the Kiriath Jearim entryway and he's going to meet this girl from Timnah.

Samson's Early Narrative

Now, chapter 13: here's what happens with Samson. "Again the Israelites did evil in the eyes of the Lord." So you've got this rebellion, and then retribution. "Again, the Israelites did evil in the eyes of the Lord. And so the Lord delivered them into the hands of the Philistines for forty years." Did the Philistines like to beat up on Jews? Yes, they did. The Philistines worked with iron. They had the technology on their side and they would go after the Jews.

What happens is, there is a man named Manoah. He's got a wife. An angel comes to Manoah's wife and he said you're going to have a son and when you have a son, from his birth, he's not to take anything of the grape, and he's not to cut his hair. In other words, from birth he's going to be a what? He's a Nazirite from birth. Never cuts his hair for his whole lifetime. By the way, she is even told, "don't drink any wine." You've got a baby in your belly who's going to be a Nazirite and you as his mother are not to drink any wine. This just means in pre-natal care you shouldn't do drugs, right? No, that was a joke, not really, but you know what I'm saying. Is she not to drink wine because it's alcohol? Or is she not to drink wine because he's a Nazirite? It is because he is a Nazirite.

Samson's Marriage to the Philistine woman from Timnah

So Samson is born and Samson grows up. Then Samson goes down to Timnah and he finds there a woman that he wants to marry. In chapter 14, "Samson went down to Timnah and saw a young Philistine woman. And he returned and said to his father and mother, 'I have seen a Philistine woman in Timnah. Now get her for me, for my wife.'" He sees the girl, but question: in ancient times did the parents arrange marriages? Did the parents have to arrange the marriage? I think this is a good thing. Actually, it's crazy but that's the way they did it back then. I shouldn't say it's crazy. By the way, do some cultures do that until this day; where the parents arrange marriage? So he goes to his parents and says "get this girl for me that I've seen."

I've often asked: What is love? Geography plus hormones equals love. You can write that down. Geography plus hormones equals love. Why did Samson fall in love with this girl? She was located in Timnah in the next town over. Who do you fall in love with? The people you're around. The people you work with, the people you go to school with. You know? Does geography have a big part to do with it? Geography has a big part to do with it. So Samson, right next door to Timnah, falls in love with this girl. But his parents come back. "His father and mother replied, 'Isn't there an acceptable woman among your relatives or among all our people. Must you go after the uncircumcised Philistines to get a wife?' But Samson said to his father, 'Get her for me. She is right one for me.'" It's interesting, the parents here, and this is a point that I want to bring up as far as his wife from Timnah seemed to have an inability to say "no" to Samson. Samson gets what Samson wants. Samson wants this girl, they object to it, and he overrides their objection. He gets this girl from Timnah, the Philistine from Timnah.

Now, the Lord was also involved in this and was going to use Samson's attraction to this woman to defeat the Philistines. So Samson goes down the first time and what does he do? He meets a lion. Samson, a very very strong guy, rips the lion apart with his bare hands. He takes the lion apart, kills the lion and then he goes down to see his future wife. He comes back a second time and when he comes back to the carcass of the lion, what's in the carcass of the lion? There are some bees and some honey. So what he does is he grabs it. I always wonder how you can do that without all the paraphernalia but smokes them out or whatever and he gets the honey. So now he's got what? Now, by the way, it tells you the story about this lion and the honey because that is going to become important later on.

So then he goes down there, he's this big strong guy who's going to do some incredible feats. He is really tremendously strong. Obviously, endowed by the spirit of God but also, really just a strong guy. Have you ever seen a big strong guy, the athletic type, who wants to also be the smart guy? So Samson here has got to prove he's the smart guy. So he's going to tell them this riddle. So he goes down to the wedding and they're in this seven day wedding feast. Samson says: "Let me tell you a riddle" Samson says to

them. “If you can give me an answer within the seven days of the feast I will give you thirty linen garments and thirty sets of clothes. If you can’t tell me the answer then you must give me thirty linen garments and thirty sets of clothes.” “Tell us the riddle,” they said. “Let’s hear it.” “He replied,” and this is the famous riddle. There are riddles in the Bible too! “Out of the eater came something to eat, out of the strong came something sweet.”

So, then what happens? They can’t solve the riddle and on the fourth day, they asked Samson’s wife. If you can’t get it from facing up the man, one to one, what do you do? Go through the wife. Question: is that effective? Yes, it is. I don’t recommend it, but it is effective. Been there done that, kind of thing, if you know what I mean.

So, okay...on the fourth day they said, “Coax your husband into explaining the riddle to us or we will burn you and your father’s household to death. Did you invite us here to rob us?” Then Samson’s wife threw herself on Samson sobbing. ‘You hate me! You hate me! Don’t you really love me! You’ve given my people a riddle and you haven’t told me the answer!’” You’re at your wedding, and this is like a seven day feast wedding, and your wife starts balling. What do you do?

Now, I always feel like when I go to this passage I better bring this up. I know a young man who when he got married they went through the wedding. By the way, is there a lot of pressure on the woman? When you’re going to a wedding is there a huge amount of pressure? Yes. Are weddings now worse than it’s ever been as far as the pressure goes, in my opinion? So this woman was very, very pressurized. They went through the ceremony and everything seemed to go well. They went down in the basement of a church. They had a reception there. They ate dinner with everybody, going around greeting everybody. That’s cool. And when it’s all over they get in the car with the cans and they ride off in the sunset and they go on their honeymoon night. The guy goes “finally at last, I’m married to this woman. This is the best day of my life.” This guy’s so happy. They get to the hotel and all of a sudden she starts crying. The guy is trying to figure out, “What did I do?” Did I say something wrong? Was there something I shouldn’t have done? What do you want? Do you want flowers? What? What do you

want? I'll get what ever you want! Why are you crying like this? "I don't know why I'm crying." Have you ever asked a woman why they are crying? If they don't know why they're crying, how are you supposed to figure that out? What's wrong? Did I say the vows wrong? I said the vows right. So you're freaking out because you've never been married before and all of a sudden she starts crying.

All I want to tell you is: have you ever been in a situation where the adrenaline is really strong and there's so much pressure and adrenaline, adrenaline, adrenaline and then all of a sudden you get to relax? When you come down all of a sudden you start crying for no reason? That's what can happen. Well, that is what happened in that wedding, I'm very familiar with. The woman starts crying and it wasn't that he did anything wrong. But it was because the wedding and all the pressure was over. It was all over now and it just took her down. So, all I'm saying is that it's not cool when a wife cries at a wedding. It's not a good thing. But it happens because of these cycles. I'm just wanting to warn you because nobody warned me and it was a night that didn't work out too well.

Why is Samson stupid? His wife threw herself on him sobbing, "You hate me! You hate me! You don't really love me! You told a riddle to my people but you haven't told me the answer." Now Samson is going to say some things here. Are tears powerful? Is Samson strong? A woman cries and the strong man, what? What do you do when a woman cries? You're helpless. Big strong Samson is helpless before a woman's tears. What can you do? So there are the tears, but then what happens is, and what I'm going to suggest is how not to treat a woman.

This is Samson's response. She's crying, "You haven't told me your beloved wife." He responds: "I haven't even explained it to my father and mother he said. Why should I explain it to you?" Rule number one: you don't bring the father-in-law and mother-in-law in to it. You bring the father and mother-in-law it, it explodes. It's ugly. You never do that. That is really stupid. Now you say, Hildebrandt how do you know that? I know that's stupid, been there done that. I'm just telling you this is the voice of experience. You don't bring the father and mother-in-law into it. You deal with it without

those external things. So what Samson did here was really stupid. You don't say, "I haven't even told my father and mother. So why should I tell you?" What does that do to her status? He has just placed her over or under his father and mother? Under. He's supposed to be married to this woman. This is really stupid. "And so then she cried the whole seven days of the feast. So on the seventh day he finally told her because she continued to press him. She in turn, explained the riddle to her people. Before sunset on the seventh day, they came in and said: "What is sweeter than honey? And what is stronger than the lion?" And they solved his riddle.

Then this guy just doesn't get it. This is really funny. I mean it's really terrible, don't ever do this. They got his riddle: What is sweeter than honey? What is stronger than a lion? Samson said, "If you had not plowed with my heifer, you would not have solved my riddle." This is called speaking metaphorically. When you speak metaphorically and you use a heifer to metaphorically symbolize your wife it's not good. Now, by the way, are there certain animals that the Bible uses to symbolize a woman like a gazelle. They're beautiful animals. No, no in the Song of Solomon. A heifer, no, you don't use a heifer. That's terrible. So Samson here, just really...it's over.

So what happens is, the spirit of the Lord comes down in him with power. He goes down and kills 30 Philistines and brings back their garments and gives them to the guys. Then what does he do to his wife? "And burning with anger he went to his father's house and Samson's wife was given to his friend." Now, this is something you've got to know. In those kind of contexts you had a friend who is like your best man. If the guy bails out, then the best man marries the woman. So what Samson says is, he's in this marriage process. It falls apart and so the other guy steps in and so Samson goes back home. This is a disaster.

Student Question: How often and why do guys bail out?

Samson bailed out because he was angry because his wife betrayed him and didn't tell him. But if she hadn't betrayed him, what would they have done to her father? They would have killed her father. So, yeah they had backups even back then. But the reasons are often complicated. So, this is how Samson gets started. This is his first wife, his wife

from Timnah. Three strikes and you're out. This is his first strike.

Now concerning the Spirit of God on people of the Old Testament, it says, "the Spirit of God came on Samson and he went on and slew the 30 Philistines." So the Spirit of God is his strength. What is the relationship between the Spirit of God and the people of the Old Testament? Did the Spirit of God ever leave people in the Old Testament? Can you tell me a situation with a person where the spirit of God left him? King Saul. Now some people think that when the Spirit of God leaves him that means Saul is not a believer in God anymore that he lost his salvation. No, no, no. The Spirit of God endowed them with special gifts. Samson was endowed with the gift of strength. Saul was endowed with the gift of kingship. When the Spirit leaves him that means that the spirit of kingship leaves Saul. It doesn't mean he's necessarily a nonbeliever. Saul has other problems that make that clear. But it wasn't the Spirit of God. Some people feel that the Spirit of God only came in Acts 2 in the New Testament at Pentecost. The Spirit comes down at Pentecost. Was there the Spirit of God in the Old Testament? Yes, it was, and it came on people, endowing these people with certain gifts. In Samson's case it was strength, with Saul it was kingship. So you're going to see the Spirit of God working with people in the Old Testament. It wasn't that the Spirit of God wasn't here. It's in Acts 2 but I'll leave that for your New Testament Prof. So, the Spirit of God was in the Old Testament endowing people with gifts.

Samson and the Gaza Stripper

Now, that's Samson's first woman. Who is the second woman? Samson goes down to Gaza. I call this woman the Gaza Stripper. No, it's the Gaza Strip. You realize the "stripper" fits in there. So this is Gaza. He goes down to Gaza. "Samson went down to Gaza where he saw a prostitute. He went in to spend the night with her."

Now, I told you how much respect I have for Dr. Gordon Hugenburger. He is a top thinker and just quality, one of the best preachers I've ever heard in my life. Dr. Hugenburger goes over to Hebrews 11...and in Hebrews 11 it says: one of the great heroes of faith is Samson. Samson, in Hebrews 11 is listed among the great heroes of the faith. So he comes back and he says he doesn't see the foibles as being negative, even

Samson going into a prostitute. I thought, “how does he do this?” he stopped his sermon series on Judges before he did Samson. I was just on the edge of my seat waiting for a solution. But I found out, here’s what he does: He says, who also in Israel went into a prostitute that was totally kosher? Does anybody remember how Joshua sent out the spies? And the spies went into whom? Rahab the harlot. Now were they in there for her business or were they trying to get information. This was a spying endeavor. So Dr. Hugenburger, apparently, and I have not heard him say this, I heard it through the grapevine, he said Samson’s going to this woman’s house maybe in a spying kind of context. I think he was spying but it was on something different then the land, if you know what I mean. So I would take this as Samson doing this with women again. So I would take this in a negative context.

But what I want to use this passage for is this woman, the prostitute at Gaza, the Philistines surround them and say, “in the morning we’re going to kill Samson.” So Samson wakes up in the middle of the night and he pulls the doorframe out of the wall and walks off with it. Now this is what is really important to me, in terms of the strength of Samson. First of all, if you pull this doorframe out of here, would this be a big thing to carry, this doorframe? This doorframe is made out of metal and, to be honest with you, it’s cheap metal or sheet metal. It would be about 30-40 pounds. That’s not too much you could carry 30-40 pounds for a long way, right? When you pull the doorposts in the ancient world they weren’t made out of cheap metal, they’re made out of posts. Are we talking about 100s of pounds? Yes, hundreds of pounds.

Samson hauls them. The other thing, have you guys ever done has anybody ever put up hay in here? When I was down in Tennessee we put up hay. I was a young guy about 25 and so these guys get these 100, 200 bales of hay. They said “you get in the truck and you throw them up to us in the loft.” So I get in there and these bales of hay 30-40 pounds I’m throwing them up there. So I’m throwing these bales of hay up there. These are nothing because they think I’m a city slicker and they’re the country folk. They’re the farmers, the strong ones. So I’m throwing those bales of hay up there and I throw you know 20 bales of hay up there. Then I throw 30 bales of hay up there. Then I

throw 40 and 50. By the time they were done with me I was pushing the bales up with my shoulder I couldn't lift my arms anymore because it was just too much.

Samson carries things about 20 miles and it was all up hill. He sets them up in front of Hebron. We know where these places are. It's about 20 miles and it's uphill. Question when you carry weights up hill, is uphill a problem? Yes and 20 miles is that a good distance to carry this kind of weight? Is this guy a hulk? This guy is a massive individual. A normal human being, you'd be lucky to walk 20 miles up hill like that, and he is carrying this couple hundred pounds at least up this way. So Samson is incredibly strong. By the way, the Spirit of God comes on him to empower him and he's extremely endowed. So, this is when he hauls the walls there or the doorway actually now.

Samson and Delilah

Next woman, and this is the final woman in his life, Delilah. Delilah is very famous even to this day she's got a radio program. But it says, "Sometime later he [Samson], fell in love. This is chapter 16 verse 4, "fell in love with a woman of the Sorek Valley whose name was Delilah." Notice this says he fell in love with her. What's the problem with that? Have many of you guys been trained in kind of Greek thinking where you've got *agape* and you've got *eros*, right? And *agape* and *eros* love are very very different right? *Agape* love is very spiritual and self-sacrificial love and *eros* love is erotic, very lustful. So erotic love is lustful, *agape* love is spiritual. In Greek we make this separation between *agape* and *eros*. In Hebrew they don't have that distinction. The word for love is the word *ahav* and it includes both love and lust. So this brings the question out is it always easy to separate between love and lust? When I was younger they tried to portray lust over here and real love over here. What I'm saying is, when you actually fall in love sometimes do the love and lust get all entangled? So be careful about this Greek analytic way of thinking. The Hebrew thinking is much more organic and holistic.

So Samson falls in love with her. Now she nags him and basically the Philistines show up to Delilah and they say, "Delilah do you want to make some money?" And Delilah says, "O yeah." And so they said, "tell us the secret of his strength and we will

take him down.” They’re going to pay her some silver and notice what is she doing? Delilah is selling Samson. Notice here is the woman selling the man for money? Often times that is reversed, but in this case, it is Delilah selling Samson.

So she comes to Samson and she nags Samson, “‘Tell me the secret of your great strength and how you can be tied up and subdued.’ Samson answered her, ‘If any one ties me up with seven fresh thongs that may not be dried I will be as weak as any other man.’” Guess what? He wakes up and he’s got seven thongs tying him. “Samson, the Philistines are on you,” what does he do? He snaps the things he and jumps up. Now when you guys read this did you realize how stupid he is. She does this over and over again how can anyone be that dumb. I want explain, I don’t think that’s the point here. This narrative is compressed. Is it possible that these different trials with the seven fresh thongs, going to seven ropes going to tie braids of his hair, is it possible that this was over months and months of time and that this narrative was spread out? When you write history do people ever take the narrative and compress it. So what happens is that it makes it seems like all these events were one after another and after another and closely related. It could of be that they were separated in time. What I’m trying to say is Samson is not as dumb as he looks. So this may have been spread out over a considerable time period.

Well, finally she gets down, he starts playing with the hair braiding like that. Nagging does seem to work. What I’m suggesting with Samson here is that time compression is how history is written. By the way do historians ever take events that are maybe 50 years apart and put them back to back in history? Just because that’s the way they’re writing history and they don’t want to go through all the details. So history always involves some sort of compression. If you take history at Gordon College here you’ll find some wonderful historians that talk about historiography, how history is written. A lot of times events that are distant from each other are put back to back because you collapse history, you compress history. If you were to write a totally exhaustive history it’d be too much for anybody to read. All history is compressed.

Now what’s interesting with Samson is Delilah cuts his hair and she tells the

Philistines, I think I got it this time. This is it. So she shaves his head cuts his hair and Samson then is captured by the Philistines. What is the first thing they do to him when they capture him? When he's really strong you want to use his strength but you want to incapacitate him what do you do? You blinded him. So they blind him, they gouged out his eyes, and now he's strong but a child can attack him because he can't see where he's coming from. By the way, they take him out then it says, "when the people saw him they praised their god saying, 'Our god has delivered our enemy into our hands.'" But is God going use Samson even in a blinded state to accomplish his purposes.

Samson's end at the Philistine temple

So what happens is the people pull Samson out and they make him do tricks. It's like a circus and you get this big strong guy and he's going to do all these tricks. Samson does these tricks but then Samson says to the boy that's with him guiding him. First he prays to God then Samson prayed to the Lord, "Oh sovereign Lord, remember me. O God, please strengthen me just once more, and let me with one blow get revenge on the Philistines for my two eyes." Is Samson pretty vengeful here? He wants vengeance for his two eyes. Would you have liked him to have said, "I want for your name, God, to be honored. I want to show you're the victor." But, instead, he's worried about his two eyes. Samson reaches for the two central pillars. He's going to take the two central pillars and he's going to collapse the whole building down on about 3000 people. Samson kills more in his death than he killed in his life.

Now what's interesting here we've got two pillars in this room. If you knock down these two pillars would this whole building collapse? I don't think so. I think there's enough cross beams that would possibly hold the roof. Do you know what they have found on the Philistine plain? They have found some Philistine temples. Do different cultures produce different styles of temples? Yes. Israel's temple, by the way Solomon's temple was built on a Phoenician model by Hiram why? Because he hired Hiram from Phoenicia to build it. When you look at the Israelite temple that Solomon built its very similar to ones built up in Phoenicia. The blue print is exactly what you've got up in Phoenicia. The Philistine temples, they found have two pillars in the middle of them with

load bearing walls. In other words, all the weight comes to those two pillars. You take those two pillars down and what happens to these Philistine temples? The whole place collapses. So is archeology showing that this actually works? You take out the whole building that is weighted on these two pillars. So this has been a really interesting confirmation. The Bible says Samson takes down the two pillars and the place collapses. Samson dies and this is the life of Samson.

Now, how can Samson be listed as a great hero of the faith? Given all this messed up life. To be honest with you, there's a lot of messed up stuff. I think that the Bible is showing us that some of the great heroes of the faith, had messed up lives. That gives me hope, because I've got a messed up life. Hopefully not that bad, but you know what I'm saying. Have you seen almost everybody in the Old Testament we've seen, has every one of them had problems of one sort or another? David is the man after God's own heart, well you know about David now right? So you have got problems with all these people. So I think with the Bible's saying is that believers in God are not better than everybody else, they've got problems just like everybody else but they believe in God and God uses them to accomplish his purposes. They're flawed heroes. It's wonderful to be able to be a servant of God even though you got stuff going down. So Samson's a hero but he's not perfect, he's got his problems and such is real life.

The tale of two Levites

Now here is the Tale of Two Cities, no, the tale of two Levites. The book of Judges ends with these, what I call, tales of two Levites. Well first of all, let me start this story. This is the first Levite, a Danite Levite. I'm going to chapter 17 and 18 in Judges. There's a guy from Ephraim, where is Ephraim? Ephraim is right above Benjamin. So it's just Judah, Benjamin, and Ephraim, so it's right up in there. There's a guy in Ephraim and he's got a lot of silver and gold. So he makes himself an idol. Then he says, "Hey, I've got an idol now." But all of a sudden a Levite is passing through Ephraim and this guy, Micah, says to the Levite, "You know I got this gold/silver idol here, why don't you come be my priest? I've got this idol and I will pay you, you can live with me, I will pay

you and give you shelter. I'll give you food. I will take care of you and you be my priest." So the Levite then becomes Micah's priest. Micah makes the idol and then he hires this Levite to be his priest. Now he's got an idol and a priest, this guy's got a pretty good gig going. He's got this religious corner here.

Now what happens? What was the problem the tribe of Dan had? The tribe of Dan is out by the Philistine plain, which means the Philistines were beating up on the Danites all the time because they're tribal territory was right out with the Philistines west of Benjamin. So the Danites said, "We're tired of fighting the Philistines we're going to go north. We've heard it is really really nice and it is one of the most beautiful places in Israel in north. So the Danites migrate north. When they migrate north what tribe did they have to go through? Ephraim. So they go by Micah's house and they say, "Hey, this guy Micah's got one of these metal idols and he's also got a priest, this Levite. So the tribe of Dan, now this is a whole tribe moving, and this whole tribe is going to consolidate down from being a tribal territory down to being a city. North of Israel back where Kyle's sitting. Dan is going to be the northern most point of Israel. The tribe is moving from the Philistine territory all the way up north. They come by this Levite and say, "Hey Levite, why don't you come with us? If you come with us you can be a Levite and can be a priest for a whole tribe. You don't have to be one for some little family, you can be a priest for a whole tribe."

So the Levite says, "Hey, that's a pretty good gig, I'll go with you guys." So the Levite goes north. The Levite then goes up to the city of Dan to the extreme north and he sets up an idol there. This priest then becomes the priest at Dan. Is this idolatry in Israel? So this is where Dan is this associated with this idolatry. It even says here in a certain place, "Therefore the Danites set up themselves idols and Jonathan son of Gershom the son of Moses, and his sons were priests for the tribe of Levi until the time of the captivity of the land. They continued to use idols Micah had made, all of the time the house of God was at Shiloh." So the tabernacle is going to be at Shiloh. All the time it was at Shiloh, the Danites are worshipping an idol up in Dan.

Now there's going to be one other place that an idol is set up later on. This

narrative is setting you up for that later on. Later on there's a guy named Jeroboam, do you remember him? And he's going to set up idols in what two places? One's going to be in Dan coming out of this narrative I believe, one of them is going to be at Dan. Where's the other golden calf going to be that he's going to set up? Does anyone remember the place? Bethel. Yes, down in Bethel. Why does he set it up in Bethel? Is Bethel a holy place? What happened in Bethel? Is Bethel where Jacob's ladder took place? It is here Jacob met God in Bethel. So Jeroboam uses that place and sets up a golden calf and says, "This is Yahweh, this is Jehovah, this calf." God says, "No, I'm not a calf, I'm not a golden calf." God condemns Jeroboam for setting up idols at Dan and Bethel. So Dan was in the north and Bethel was in the south. So this narrative sets up this problem that Israel will have later on.

Levite and his concubine

That's the first Levite, the Danite Levite. Now our second Levite and this story is in chapter 19 and this story is a rather gross story of the Levite's concubine. So I just want to put some geography on this. First of all, do you see here there's a main road running right here? This road is Route 1. Now this road it's not Route 95, 95 is a big super highway. This is called the Ridge Route. It's the Ridge Route. It runs on a ridge north and south, down the spine of Israel. This runs on a ridge and it's called a Ridge Route. So you come from Bethel, you travel Mizpah, Gibeah, Jerusalem, Bethlehem on down to Hebron on this is the Ridge Route.

First of all, when you've got a Levite with a concubine is that a problem? The Levite's got a concubine and the concubine runs home. So she runs home to Bethlehem. Then the Levite chases her and he runs and he catches up to her in Bethlehem at her parent's home. Then it's kind of like a thanksgiving vacation a little bit. Have your parents ever when you come home they say, "can't you stay just a day or two more?" Do your parents ever do that? "Can't you just stay just a little bit longer?" And so what happens is the Levite stays at the concubine's house for a little bit longer. Finally, he says, "We got to get out of here. I've got to get going." So they leave late in the afternoon. They come up here it's about five miles when they walk up passed Jerusalem.

When they get up to Jerusalem the lady's tired and she says, "I'm just tired of walking why don't we stay here at Jebus." But the guy says, "No I don't want to go into Jebus." The Jebusites who live there are not Jewish. So he says, "I want to go up to a Jewish territory." So I'm going up to Gibeah from Bethlehem. So he comes up and passes by Jerusalem. He won't go in there because these people are not Jewish. He comes up to Gibeah and he says I want to be with the Jewish people there in Gibeah.

Now what happens when he pulls in to Gibeah? This is where it gets nasty. The storyline goes like this. He pulls into town and it's almost a Sodom and Gomorrah situation. He pulls into town and he's out in the neighborhood in the common square. An old guy comes up to him and says you shouldn't be here. Come home with me. He invites the concubine and the Levite home with him, and says you shouldn't be out here.

Once upon a time I was traveling in the city of Los Angeles I've never been there before. We drove all the way out to California. So I said I wanted go down Los Angeles. I want to see the beach in Los Angeles and so my friend refused, "I don't want to go down to Los Angeles." He was supposed be taking us around. I said we're going down Los Angeles and so finally he said we'll go down to this place called Venice Beach. So we get down to Venice Beach and we look around there with my kids. We get back in the van that we had and we're trying to get up on the thruways. These thruways are going over our heads and but we can't get up to the thruways. So we're driving around all these neighborhoods in LA. We have no idea where we are. We pull up, there's a guys about 6' 5" big dude. We pull up I role down my window and say, "Can you tell us how to get on the thruway here?" The first thing the guy said to me, he did not even answer my question, the first thing he says, "You shouldn't be here, you shouldn't be here." Question, when a guy like that says "you shouldn't be here," question, should we not be here? Yes sir. We'll try to get out of here as soon as we can. How do you get to the thruway? So he told us how to get there but was it really clear we were out of our neighborhood.

So what you have here with this old guy warning him don't stay in this town square or it's going to be bad for you. Come home with me. So they come home with him

and what happens? The guys show up at the door and then what happens? They start beating on the door like in Sodom and Gomorrah. “Bring the guy out to you to us that we may have sex with him,” or “that we may know him.” The guy does almost the same thing pushing his daughters out, the Levite’s got his concubine so he pushes his concubine out. You remember the story because it’s so gross you can’t help but miss it. The guys abuse the women all night she comes the next day she’s where? The Levite opens the door the next day and there’s his concubine laying on the ground. He says “Get up let’s go it’s time to go now.” But the concubine doesn’t move and all of a sudden he realizes: his concubine is dead.

So then what he does is he puts her on his donkey and takes her back. Then what does he do? It gets worse. He is so ticked off these guys killed his concubine he starts chopping her up. He chopped her up into 12 pieces and sends her body parts to the 12 tribes of Israel. By the way, when you’re kosher Jewish and you get this body part--the tribes freak. It’s “Whoa, we’ve never seen anything like this in Israel before. What’s going on here? This town of Gibeah we’re going to go take out those people. They need to be punished for what they did.” So the tribes, the 11 tribes, get it together. They go up against Gibeah and the tribe of Benjamin which is located with Gibeah. The tribe Benjamin says we’re not giving Gibeah up. So the whole tribe of Benjamin goes to fight the other 11 tribes of Israel.

Benjaminite Inter-tribal Warfare

So now you have tribal warfare and what happens? The Israelites go up to attack them and they lose the first time. They go back to God, “God what’s going on, these people are evil. We’re trying to do what’s right.” God says, “Go up again.” They go up again and the tribes of Israel defeat the Benjaminites but then what’s the problem? They kill all the Benjaminites but 600 of the guys get away. They go up on this defensible high territory where they can’t get to them. So there are 600 Benjaminites left. They want to go up and kill the 600 Benjaminites but what’s the problem? If you kill the 600 Benjaminites what happens to one of the tribes of Israel? It’s like the black rhinoceros they become extinct and there are no more of the Benjaminite tribe. So they realize, we need

to call time out. There's only 600 of these guys left. We've got reconstitute the tribe or we're going to lose one of our tribes of Israel.

But then what's the problem? How are these guys going to reproduce? They've got to marry somebody but all the guys that were in battle swore they will not give their daughters to be married to a Benjaminite. Would you want to give your daughter to a guy like that? No. So they said, "We will not give our daughters there." So then thought, "what are we going to do now? We've got 600 guys. We've got to give them children and let them multiply again. There's a city right over here called Jabesh Gilead and the men of Jabesh Gilead did not come to battle. So what they did was they went to Jabesh Gilead rounded up 400 girls and brought those 400 girls over to the Benjaminites.

Now you've only got 200 left that don't have wives. So now what are we going to do? We've got 200 that don't have wives. By the way, don't laugh, I think you want to do it the way the Bible does this dating thing. You want to date just the way the Bible does it. Kiss dating Good-bye just like the Bible does it. So they go to Shiloh and the girls are coming out for a feast and they're going to be dancing at Shiloh where the tabernacle was. They're going to dance. They said, "what we'll do with these 200 guys we'll put them in the bushes. When the girls come out to dance the guys come out of the bushes catch them and whichever you catch is yours."

Now I've always said Gordon College we've got a quad. Do it like the Bible says? So this is, yes I'm joking. That's what happens to these other guys. So now the tribe of Benjamin is reconstituted. Now you say why do you tell the gory story, this is what my mother would say. You don't have to tell those stories Ted. There's these really lurid stories in the Bible you shouldn't be telling college students these. My question is to myself though is the concubine raped and killed divide and conquer, this is how they got the wives for Benjamin, Jabesh Gilead provided the wives. This Jabesh, by the way, the reason why I mention that is this could become important for us later on. There's a guy I won't say his name but he was from Jabesh Gilead then the Shiloh dancers and that's where they come up with these wives for the Benjaminites.

Now why does the Bible include this story and the Bible doesn't tell us why but I

think we've got a suggestion here with the story of the Benjaminites. What is the book of Judges setting up? There is no what in Israel? In the time of the judges there is no king in Israel and everyone does what is right in his own eyes. Who is going to be the first king of Israel? Saul. What tribe is Saul from? Benjamin.

I believe this story is setting up the reign of king Saul. I believe this story in the book of Judge is put in there to set up the tribe of Benjamin. By the way when they go to make Saul king do you remember what Saul says? He says, "I'm from the least tribe." Does everybody why he's from the least tribe? Yes. So Saul is going to be from the tribe of Benjamin, so I think this story is put there as a background to king Saul.

Ruth

Now, are next story is one of the most beautiful stories in the Bible. It's the story of Ruth. Green Fried Steel Magnolias these are movies in the past about women friendships. Are women friendships different from guy friendships? I've watched my wife over like 30-60 years. I've watched how my wife makes friends. It's how she makes friends and the nature of her friendships are different than guys and guys friendships. What you have in the book of Ruth is two women you don't often get to see this in Scripture. These two women are best friends who become really close friends. It's a beautiful story of friendship in the book of Ruth.

Here's what happened in the book of Ruth. There's a series of tragedies happen in the book. First of all, they're from the town of Bethlehem. Naomi is an older women and her husband Elimelech are from Bethlehem. There's a famine in the land. So when there's a famine in the land what do you do? You migrate. You migrate from a lower elevation to a higher elevation because a higher elevations gets more rain water. So they come from Bethlehem which would be over here. They go down across the Jordan River and come up to this side over to Moab. Moab's about 500-700 feet higher and so what happens is they get more rain over here. Therefore they come over to Moab to get crops.

They then settle in Moab and then what happens? She has two sons Mahlon and Chilion . When her two sons are over in Moab what kind of women are they going to

marry? Geography plus hormones equals love. They're going marry Moabites. Their two sons Mahlon and Chilion marry Moabite women and one of those women is Ruth. So Ruth is Naomi's daughter-in-law and her son marries her.

Now what happens in the narrative? All the men do exactly the same thing. This often happens with men. All the men do what? Die. It's usually what guys do. All the men die. Now what happens is you've got three women by themselves. Three women in a culture by themselves is that hard? Yes, especially in that culture.

By the way, is that true in our culture? Yes, I'll never forget I had a student friend that was down at our house all the time we kind of adopted her as our daughter. She was from California and she was out in Winona Lake, Indiana and she took her car in. She was like our daughter and she was down at our house all the time. So she took her car in and her battery was dead. This guy named Pinky had a gas station and he replaced her battery. Now when a battery goes dead the first question I ask is the alternator good or did the alternator kill the battery? So it's not really the battery's problem it's the alternator killing the battery. So the guy replaces the battery, charges her big bucks for the battery and about two or three weeks later guess what? The second the battery goes dead. She goes in and the guy is trying to charge her now double for the battery and the alternator. So she comes back saying I don't know what to do? Now question, because she was a women did Pinky take advantage of her? Yes, he did.

So I was furious and so I got in my car. I've only done this one time in my life. I drove and I parked my car, he had two garage doors going into his garage. I parked sideways in front of both of them, so no cars could get in or out. I went in to see Mr. Pinky. I started, he had his costumers all lined up there sitting there. I proceeded to tell him he was ripping off this girl. I did it very gently at first. He got a little belligerent. So I raised the tone of my voice so I was shouting at him about how he was ripping off this young girl. Meanwhile all his costumers were sitting right there. Get the point? And so I'm being very boisterous. Then he's saying I've got to get my car out there. I said, "I'm sorry, I'm not moving my car until you give back her money." I wasn't going anywhere. So finally the guy he's hollering at me that finally goes over to the register. He picks out

her check and throws it back at us. Once we got our money back guess what? We left.

By the way did I say out of poetic justice today if you go down to Warsaw Indiana and you look where Pinky's gas station was, guess what happened to Pinky's gas station? This is no joke two years later there was a bulldozer went there and they paved it and made Pinky's into a parking lot now. So anyways I thought there was poetic justice there.

But what I'm trying to say is that you've got Naomi, Ruth and Orpah. Orpah goes back home but Ruth goes back with Naomi back to Bethlehem. You get these women by themselves in their culture, are they very vulnerable in that culture? Very vulnerable in that culture.

So now what you've got is males all die. Something that's easy to miss in the book of Ruth that's really important are the names of the characters. The names of the characters are important. Check the name of this guy: Elimelech. They used to have a song like that in my day in age. It was called Elimelech, Elimelech, Elimelech. Anyway it was Elimelech. *Eli* means what? "El" is God. "Eli" is my God. What is "melech"? King. Elimelech is "my God is king." This is in the period of judges. Who is king over Israel? Elimelech "my God is king." Is this a good name? In the period of judges "my God is king." Mahlon and Chilion the names of the two kids mean "weakly" and "sickly." What do "Weakly" and "Sickly" do in the narrative? They die okay. Do you see how these names fit incredibly? "Weakly" and "Sickly" die.

Now does Naomi play off her own name? Naomi, the mother who lost her husband, comes back into town and this is in chapter 1 verse 20. "Don't call me Naomi," Naomi means "pleasantness." "Don't call me Naomi" or pleasantness, "call me," what? Does anyone remember that: "call me Marah." What is Marah? Bitterness. Why call me Marah? "Because the almighty has made my life very bitter I went out full but the Lord has brought me back empty." I am bitter. So she says, "don't call me pleasantness, call me bitter [Marah]." By the way, just to finish this out do you know what "Ruth" means? Ruth comes from the root that means "friendship," or "friend." By the way, what role does Ruth play in the narrative? Friend to Naomi. By the way, Boaz and he is one of the

heroes. What does Boaz mean? Boaz means “strength.” What role does Boaz play in the narrative? He is the strong one. Do you see how learning Hebrew is really cool? All of a sudden this thing you say, “Wow, look at this.” It’s kind of incredible.

Now on the friendship between Naomi and Ruth, Ruth makes this really wonderful statement here. Naomi has just said she’s the old lady, she’s lost her husband, she’s lost her two sons. She turns to Ruth who’s her daughter-in-law and says, “Go back to your home. You can’t come with me. If you come with me I’m old if I had a child today you wouldn’t wait for him to grow up to marry him. So go home. The Lord has dealt bitterly with me.” And she tells her to go home. This is what Ruth’s response is, “but Ruth replied, don’t urge me to leave you or to turn back from you, where you go I will go, where you stay I will stay. Your people will be my people, and your God my God.” Isn’t that a beautiful statement? “Where you go I will go, where you stay I will stay, your people will be my people and your God my God.” Is Ruth a friend? A friend indeed. So this is a beautiful thing here Ruth demonstrates loving loyalty.

You know I forgot there’s a Hebrew word here that’s really beautiful for this kind of relationship. It is the word *hesed*. I haven’t talked at all about it very much. *Hesed*, I’ve translated it different ways in my lifetime, I used to translate “stubborn love.” It’s not just love but it’s a love that won’t quit. It’s a stubborn love that just pursues. Now in the DASV I translate it “loyal love” in other words it’s a loyal love that sticks. It’s Ruth who is loyal to Naomi. She exhibits the *hesed* kind of love this loyal love. So this is a great example of *hesed*. By the way, who has the great *hesed* of all times? God has loyal love for his people. So that word *hesed* is used.

Now what happens here is Bethlehem is down here. I’d just try to add a little geography on it. Moab is up there so they migrate from Bethlehem over there Elimelech and Naomi. They marry and all the guys die. Ruth and Naomi come back to Bethlehem. Now let’s kind of finish up this story. Do circumstances affect one’s view of God? When I was younger I was told circumstances shouldn’t affect your theology. However, look at this: “call me Marah because the almighty has made my life bitter. I went out full but the Lord has brought me back empty.” Do circumstances affect the way people look at God?

My son just got back from Afghanistan. He was shot at almost every day that he was over there. Question, did that effect how he views God? Has he had to really wrestle with how he thinks about God when he's seen people blown up? Yes, it affects the way you view God. Your circumstances affect how you view God. I think you have to deal with it.

Now Ruth goes out. She's a gleaning machine. What's gleaning mean? Gleaning means she goes out after the harvesters. So they go out and they take a sickle and they cut the stocks down. When they sickle the grain what happens? Some of the grain falls on the ground. What do the poor people do? The poor people follow behind picking up the grain that the reapers drop. Basically the reapers drop grain accidentally and the poor people go get pick it up, that's what's called "gleaning."

What happens? Ruth goes out gleaning. She's with the poor people trying to glean food. Does Boaz notice her? Boaz notes her and he says, "everybody knows that you are a virtuous women, a VW where have you ever heard of the virtuous women before? Proverbs chapter 31. He calls her a Proverbs chapter 31 woman. The guys tell Boaz that she's been out working all day. Does Boaz take care of her? Boaz says you don't go into anybody else's field stick with my field. Is Boaz trying to protect her? Don't go to somebody else's field. Then he tells these guys drop some grain for her.

So when she goes home she has all this grain. Naomi says, "who's field were you in?" She says Boaz's and all of a sudden Naomi, match-maker, match-maker, she says, "Boaz is related to us you know." So she coaches Ruth and says he's going to be up on the threshing floor tonight. When you go up there uncover his feet and lay down next to him and he will tell you what to do. By the way when she goes up and uncovers his feet remember what I told you about "feet" in Hebrew. Feet can mean something else [male genitals] and it probably does in this context. Does it mean that she uncovered his feet? Probably it means something else.

Is she offering herself to Boaz? She offers herself to Boas. Is Boaz going to tell her, no? Now, by the way, if anybody else in the period of judges had a women offer herself to the guy you know it would have been over. Boaz says, he can't. Why? Because

there's a kinsman redeemer closer than he is and he's going to tell her, "No." Now she has offered herself, is she going to feel hurt that she's been rejected? She has just offered herself, her whole self, to him and he's going to say, no. Is she going to be hurt? So Boaz tells her you are a virtuous woman, everybody knows that. He tells her I've got to check with this guy that's a closer kinsman redeemer than I and if he says, "no," then I will marry you. So he tells her, "no" but does he honor her? Does he, I don't want call it flattery, does he compliment her? He is careful to spare her dignity? He tells her to go home before the lights come on so that no one will know that she was there. He protects her reputation and he gives her food to go home with it. This is called the Levirate marriage. When someone dies in the family, you marry into the family and you raise up kids to the person that died. This is called the Levirate marriage where you have to marry a person and raise children for the person that is dead.

Now you say, "wait a minute Hildebrandt. Why is this story of Ruth in here?" In chapter 4, Ruth is the great grandmother of guess who? David. Ruth is the great grandmother of David. In the last chapter of Ruth, you get a genealogy going from Boaz down to David. Which means what? The story of Ruth points forward to whom? To David. The book of Judges last chapters about the Levite's concubine points forward to Saul. Do you see how these two stories set up the first two kings of Israel in a really neat way. So the story of Boaz, Boaz is what? "Strength." Does Boaz protect her? That is a really important role, protector role that Boaz fulfills. And we are done.

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History, Literature and Theology course lecture number 21, finishing up the book of Judges with Samson and the tale of the two Levites and the book of Ruth.

Transcribed by Hannah Towers and Maria Theo

Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 22[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament, History, Literature and Theology Course, Lecture 22, on the book of 1 Samuel: Eli, Samuel, and the selection of Saul as the first king of Israel

A. Roles of Samuel: prophet, priest, judge, and king maker [0:00-4:24]

We had finished the book of Judges and we said that as the end of the book of Judges pointed forward through the Levite's concubine to Saul. We said the book of Ruth points forward to David. So these two kings of Israel are going to come into play in 1 Samuel. Samuel, Saul, and David are going to be the big characters of the book of 1 Samuel.

Now, why is Samuel so highly respected? This guy is one of the very highly respected people in the Old Testament. It turns out if you look over to Jeremiah chapter 15, let me just read this from the book of Jeremiah. Now Jeremiah is hundreds and hundreds of years later, Jeremiah is probably around 600 BC, Samuel is probably about 1100 BC so there is about 500 years difference there. Will people remember you for 500 years? Here's, 500 years later, what Jeremiah said about Samuel, "And the LORD said to me, even if Moses and Samuel were to stand before me, my heart would not go out to these people, send them away from my presence." "Even if Moses and Samuel were to stand before me," God says, "I still wouldn't listen to them." Now, by the way, is Moses the great intercessor for his people in Old Testament times--Moses in the wilderness? Moses and Samuel are grouped together by Jeremiah here. So this is very interesting--Moses and Samuel. Those are two huge figures, and Samuel is said to be with Moses on that level.

Samuel is going to be the last of the great judges. So with Samuel we're probably down to about 1100 BC, I don't want you to know his exact date, but it's about 1100 BC.

The date that we know is David is what? David's 1000 BC. David is going to be a young kid. So Samuel is the last of the great judges.

He's also a priest. He is given over to Eli and reared as a priest. He will be a priest ministering at the tabernacle of God. He is also a prophet. He speaks for God. What is the great message of the prophet? The great message of the prophet is, "Thus saith the LORD." The prophet speaks for God. He usually says, "repent." But the prophet says, "Thus saith the LORD." So Samuel is going to be a prophet, priest and when I say prophet, priest... and what comes next? Prophet, priest, and king. Doesn't your brain go prophet, priest, and king? But he is a prophet, priest, and judge. Why is he a judge? Because there is no what, in Israel at this time? There is no king.

Samuel is going to be the one who is the first king maker. God's going to ultimately pick the first kings, but Samuel, on a human level, will choose and anoint with oil [messiah] the first two kings of Israel for God. So Samuel is going to anoint Saul and then he's going to anoint David. Samuel's going to be involved in that.

There is a huge transition taking place in Israel now. This transition is from the judges period to the kingship. The kingship is going to last what? How long will Israel have kings? "And he shall reign forever and ever." So the kingship is being set up now with Samuel. Samuel is going to initiate that and he is going to anoint the first two kings of Israel [Saul, David]. The kings are going to go on. Jesus Christ himself is going to be called the son of David in the kingship over Israel. So kingship or monarchy is being set up here. This is a really important point in Israel's history.

B. Authorship and literary pattern of 1 Samuel [4:25-7:26]

Now, did Samuel write the book of Samuel? The answer is: No. Samuel is dead in chapter 28, and from what I've been told, it's pretty hard to write when you're dead. So he is dead in 1 Samuel 28. So the book is about Samuel not necessarily written by him. Now, probably the guy had notes. Samuel probably had diaries, journals, and things that people who wrote this book might very well have worked from the prophetic record that

he had but as far as writing it, he is dead in chapter 28, so he is not writing beyond that point.

Now, here's the literary pattern. We had a literary pattern in the book of Judges and here's the literary pattern for the book of Samuel. It's actually similar. First of all, you've got: the demise of an old leader. So there will be an old leader, the old leader in the book of Samuel will be Eli. There will be the demise of the old leader. The old leader's going to be bad and go away. Then, secondly, God will select a new leader. Initially the old leader was Eli and then Samuel will be the new leader. So the new leader will take over and there's a succession of leadership. This change of leaders takes place between, in one case, Eli to Samuel, and then from Samuel to Saul, and from Saul to David.

Then what happens is, and this is important, what does the new leader in 1 Samuel, have to do? He does it every time: the leader must win a military victory. So after the new leader is selected by God, the first thing a new leader does is wins a military victory. This will happen, by the way, David, gets anointed king in chapter 16. Guess what happens in chapter 17? What is David's great victory? Everybody in the room knows it! What is David's great victory? Goliath! So he is anointed (ch. 16) and then what's the first thing he's got to do? He's got to win a military victory. So David defeats Goliath in the next chapter (ch. 17) after he's anointed. So you get this connection between the selection and the deed that he does.

Then what happens? There are problems with the new leader. Saul has problems, David has problems, Samuel has problems, and basically the demise of an old leader and it cycles back around.

So that's basically how the book works here. Dr. Borgman, who has written a book on David, and actually I've got a lecture posted by Dr. Borgman, who notes in the book of Samuel there are all these echoes. In other words, the book of Samuel says the same thing multiple times. So there are these echoes in the book, and you've got to listen for those echoes or these repetitions that are in the book of Samuel. Repetition is one of

the keys to understanding 1 Samuel. So we will see that as we go on but this is the basic structure.

C. The Samuel Cycle: Demise of an Old Leader—Birth of Samuel [7:27-14:31]

Who is our first cycle? This is our first Samuel cycle. So let's walk through this. Our first cycle is the demise of the old leader. 1 Samuel chapter 1, our old leader is Eli. Eli is a priest of the Most High God. Where do priests minister at this time? The Jews don't have Jerusalem because Jerusalem won't be captured until the time of David. David will be the one who captures Jerusalem. Jerusalem is owned by the Jebusites at this time. So where is the tabernacle set up with Eli? Does anybody remember the name of the place? Shiloh. There is a place called Shiloh. The tabernacle was set up for a couple hundred years at Shiloh. So Eli is the priest at Shiloh in chapters 1 and 2.

Then there's a woman named Hannah. My mother always used to say, whenever she got really angry, "So help me Hannah!" There is a husband named Elkanah and he's got two wives. Have we seen this before a husband with two wives? Yes, we've seen this before. Remember Jacob with Rachel and Leah. Here we've got two wives again. One is called Hannah, the other Peninnah. Who has all the kids? Peninnah has all the kids. Hannah can't have kids. Is that a problem in the ancient world? We've seen the story of the barren woman. Have we seen this story over and over again? So Elkanah has this wife Hannah, he loves her, but she can't have children. She's heart broken, she wants to have children and it says the LORD had closed up her womb. Her rival, Peninnah, was "provoking her in order to irritate her."

Now, Hannah's husband Elkanah isn't the smartest man in the world--not the sharpest knife in the drawer. Here is what Elkanah says to his wife. His wife is totally distraught, she can't have children, her rival is egging her on, just irritating the day lights out of her. So Elkanah comes to Hannah and he wants to say something really comforting to her, and this is what he says: listen to this guy, "Elkanah, her husband would say to her, 'Hannah why are you weeping, why don't you eat?'" Do you notice what is going on? She is distraught. How many people when they get distraught don't eat? He notices

she's not eating. Is that one of the signs of depression that a person doesn't eat? So he picks up on this and he's says, "Why don't you eat? Why are you down hearted?" And then he makes this statement, "Don't I mean more to you than ten sons?" [cf. Ruth 4.15] What's the answer to that rhetorical question? Of course not! I want the ten sons! "Don't I mean more to you, Hannah, than ten sons?" No. So you shouldn't ask those kinds of questions. You just don't ask those kinds of questions. So this guy is a little off there, he should have known his wife better and that's a bad question to ask.

So Hannah then makes this vow in chapter 1 verse 11 "O LORD Almighty, if you will only look upon your servant's misery and remember me, and not forget your servant, but give her a son then," check this out "I will give him to the LORD for all the days of his life and no razor will ever be used on his head." What has she dedicated her son to right from birth? Yes, this is a Nazirite vow. Is Samuel going to be a Nazirite from birth? Now, who is the other Nazirite from birth that we know about? Samson. By the way, is Samuel going to be big and strong? No. But he is dedicated to the Lord right from birth. His mother says no razor will come on his head.

Now, here is the problem, Eli, who is the priest, sees her praying to God, and listen to what Eli's reaction is: "As she kept on praying to the LORD, Eli observed her mouth." Verse 13 of chapter 1, "Hannah was praying in her heart and her lips were moving but her voice was not heard. Eli thought she was drunk. And he said to her, 'How long will you keep getting drunk? Get up! Get rid of your wine.'" Eli rebukes her. This woman is pouring out her heart to the LORD. So Eli jumps all over her case and says, "you're a drunk woman and get out of here. You're drunk and shouldn't be in the tabernacle of the Lord." It's really kind of ironic, isn't it that Eli rebukes Hannah? Well, let me just say, why this is ironic. Eli rebukes Hannah for being drunk, but what were Eli's own kids doing? Were they messing around with women in the front of the tabernacle? So my guess is, have you ever seen a parent project the evil of their kids onto other kids? I think what Eli is saying, he knows his kids are messing around with these women, doing immoral behavior in the tabernacle area, and so he thinks she is one of these immoral women who's drunk and getting into trouble in the tabernacle. So he

rebukes her. But it turns out, is she really righteous? Is she more righteous, in a certain sense, than he is? So he projects what his own kids are doing onto Hannah and this was wrong.

God comes and gives Hannah a son. The son's name is "Samuel." Samuel is a beautiful name. You guys know this first word, remember? What does "Shema" mean? Does anybody remember that: "Shema Israel"? Deuteronomy 6.4. "Hear," exactly, "hear." So Shema means "hear." "Heard of," and what is the last part of his name? "Heard of El," or "El listened." Who is El? El is God. "God listened." So what does Samuel's name mean? "God heard," "God listened," God heard her prayer and gave her Samuel. So, "God listened," it's a beautiful name--Samuel. So Samuel is named and God listened and gave Hannah this son.

Hannah then dedicates him to the Lord by giving him over to Eli. By the way, who else made a vow to God and may have delivered over to God their child? Does that sound a little bit like Jephthah? Remember Jephthah made a vow and there may be an interesting parallel there.

D. Eli's Sons Hophni and Phinehas [14:32-17:21]

Now, Eli's sons, what did we learn about these guys--Eli's sons? There are two big problems with what they were doing. There were priests under Eli; Eli would be the main high priest. His sons Hophni and Phinehas were ripping off meat when people brought sacrifices. Did the priests get to eat some of the meat? If it were a purification offering, or if it were a sin or guilt offering, the priests got to participate in that. If it was a whole burnt offering, the priests did not get that because it was wholly burned up to the Lord. But his kids, whenever they saw a sacrifice, they figured, "hey, it is steak time, we're going to chow down." So they stuck their fork in and took whatever meat they wanted and totally defiled God's sacrifice. All the people knew this. When they brought their sacrifices to God for their sins, the priests were ripping them off. So it totally defiled God's sacrificial system.

They were also committing immorality with women by the tabernacle. So these women would bring offerings and pretty soon the guys are trying to get them to go to

bed. So this was really bad. Now, it's even worse than that because in pagan religions, there is Baal worship and Asherah worship. Baal worship was a fertility god. Do you guys remember Baal in the Old Testament? Baal was a fertility god. Part of the worship service for Baal worship was that a guy would go into the priestess and priestess would be housed in the temple. The guy would go into the priestess, if she conceived and she was fertile, there is all sorts of imagery here. Actually, I don't want you to think about the imagery, I want you to think about the ideas. But if the guy goes in and impregnates the priestess, and she is fertile that meant his land would be fertile. Do you see the similarity? It was a fertility rite and they would practice these fertility rites in Israel. By the way, is that pretty immoral? It was part of the worship of Baal, is that really gross? But you get the idea, the guy wanted his land to be fertile so he would go see the priestess and there was this kind of sympathetic or symbiotic relationship between what happens with the woman and what happens with his land. So what you have here is kind of an aping of that same thing in that tabernacle courtyard with Israel, which is totally against what Jehovah God wanted.

E. Samuel's childhood [17:22-18:29]

In contrast to Hophni and Phinehas, Eli's sons, you have this wonderful statement in chapter 2 verses 25 and 26, let me read this statement. Who comes to mind when I read this statement? "Eli's sons, however, did not listen to their father's rebuke. For it was the Lord's will to put them to death. And the boy Samuel continued to grow in stature and in favor with the Lord and with men." Does anybody remember, let me just read this again, of whom also is this line said almost word for word? "And the boy Samuel continued to grow in stature and in favor with the Lord and with men." Does anybody remember over in Luke chapter 2 it says, "Jesus grew in stature and in favor with God and with man"? That is almost exactly the same phrase that is used of Jesus. It is used of Samuel here. So it's kind of interesting, Samuel is a good person. He grew up and grew in favor with the Lord and with men.

F. Eli as a father [18:30-19:41]

Now, how is Eli as a father? It turns out that Eli as a father seems to be a weak man and he seems to be a weak father. His sons were doing evil, and he didn't stop his sons from doing it. He is a weak father and has bad sons. Now I want to look at this kind of father-son relationship as it goes on in the book of Samuel. When I was younger, I studied the book of Proverbs, I was a young father, in my mid-twenties and I had my first child. I really didn't know what it was like to be a father, and so I decided I was going to do my academic work and I was going to study the book of Proverbs. Why did I study Proverbs for most of my life? Because Proverbs is: as a father speaks to his children. So I wanted to be a good father. I thought I am going to be this good father and then that would guarantee me good kids, right? If I'm a good father, then my kids will turn out right because I'm a good father. I just want to expose some of that, I have grown up a lot since then, but I just wanted to point this out. We will come back to this but Eli was a weak father.

G. The Call of Samuel [19:42-24:38]

What about the call of Samuel? The call of Samuel in chapter 3 is a beautiful story. Do any of you teach children in Sunday school? This is a great Sunday school story. Samuel is sleeping in his bed, Eli, the priest, is sleeping in his bed, and all of a sudden the Lord comes to Samuel at night and says, "Samuel, Samuel." Samuel wakes up and says, "Whoa! Eli called and so he goes trucking in to Eli and says, 'Eli, what do you want?' Eli says, 'I didn't call you go back to bed.'" Do kids ever get up at night, and when something scares them and run into their parents? How many times do our kids, when we had thunder and lightning in Indiana or tornadoes and all of a sudden the kids, ZOOM, they're out of their beds and you wake up and your kids are crawling all over you because they're scared.

So Eli sends him back. "Samuel, Samuel." Samuel wakes up again and runs into Eli. "Eli, what do you want?" "I didn't call you!" By the way, when you're a parent, are kids going to wake you up in the middle of the night? Yes. It's part of the game, unless you've got some kids that are highly sedated. No, don't do that! Seriously, some kids are

different, some kids sleep through the whole night, other kids will keep you up all night repeatedly. I wish for you the kind that sleep through the night, it's quite different.

So anyway, finally the third time, Eli figures it out and says "I'm not calling this kid. It must be God calling him." So Eli turns to him in chapter 3, "And Eli realized that the LORD was calling the boy." Chapter 3, verse 9, "So Eli told Samuel, 'Go lie down, and if he calls, you say, Speak Lord, for your servant is listening.'" Do you get the play on words here? What's Samuel's name? Listening. So there is a play on Samuel's name here. "Speak Lord, for your servant is listening." The heard of God one, is now the one listening.

So Samuel went and laid back down in his place. The Lord came and stood there calling as he did those other times, "Samuel, Samuel." Samuel says, "Speak, LORD, for your servant is listening." The Lord said to Samuel, now this is interesting and this is heavy. God is speaking to Samuel. "See I am about to do something in Israel, that will make the ears of everyone who hears it tingle. At that time, I will carry out against Eli, everything that I spoke against his family from beginning to end. For I told him that I would judge his family forever because of the sin he knew about. His sons made themselves contemptible and he failed to restrain them." Is one of the roles of a father to restrain his children? Yes! Can your parents restrain you? How many of you have snuck and done stuff that your parents have no idea what you did? He is judged here because he didn't restrain his kids from doing this evil in the presence of the Lord. "For I told him I would judge his family forever because of the sin he knew about. His sons made themselves contemptible and he failed to restrain them. Therefore, I swore to the house of Eli, the guilt of Eli's house will never be atoned for by sacrifice or offering."

Now, you're little boy Samuel. Who is rearing you? Eli is your step-father, he's the priest. Do you look up to this guy who is rearing you? Samuel looks up to him. He is his hero and now the next morning, what is the first thing Eli is going to ask? "Hey, Samuel, Samuel, what did God say to you?" Would you want to be little boy Samuel telling Eli that God says, "Eli your family is fried. It's over." Would you want to be a little boy doing that? By the way, is that the role of a prophet, however? And so sure

enough, the next morning, Eli gets up and Samuel answers, “Here I am,” and he says, “What is it he said to you?” It says down in verse 17, Eli asked, “Don’t hide it from me, God deal with you ever be so severely if you hide anything from me.” So Samuel comes out with it and tells him that he and Eli’s family are history because of what he did.

So Eli is rejected, and Eli’s two boys, Hophni and Phinehas, are rejected. God, now, is selecting a new leader. The new leader is Samuel. This little boy Samuel is called of God. This is a call of God. You know we talk about vocation and the call of God. This is Samuel’s call of God and it’s really kind of a neat call. It has that kind of little kid feel to it. By the way, can little kids relate to this story? It’s a great story for Sunday school class and for little kids; even for adults.

H. Geographical Setting: Map work [24:39-26:49]

Now, the demise of an old leader, you’ve got Eli, what happens now? He knows he’s history, but before we get to the picture, I just want to say, there is a map coming up here, and I want to kind of layout the territory for this. First of all, do you see Shiloh here? The Philistines are going to be out here in the coastal plain. This is the Philistine plain by the Mediterranean Sea. The picture is turned sideways in a Jewish way of thinking about it. Here is the Mediterranean Sea, the Philistines are going to be out here, the Jews are in the mountains. Here’s Shiloh. Is Shiloh really well protected? This is where the tabernacle of God is going to be. By the way what is down here? Jerusalem is to the south about there. Do you see this route that goes right here? This is called the Ridge Route. It goes from north to south from Jerusalem, to Bethlehem, to Hebron on down. This is called the Ridge Route. Is Shiloh a little bit off the road? Kind of like Grapevine Road or Gordon College. It is a little bit off the main drag. Is Shiloh really well protected by the mountains? The Philistines are down here, do the Philistines have to go all the way up through the mountains to get to Shiloh? So it’s very well protected. Shiloh is there, that’s where the tabernacle was for a couple hundred years.

Now what’s going to happen is, they’re going to bring the Ark out of Shiloh and they are going to bring it down this road. That actually exists to this day. They are going to bring it down to Aphek. Aphek is where the Philistines are going to be, and they are

going to do battle out here on the Philistine coast plain. But who is going to have the advantage when they fight on the plains? The Philistines. So the Philistines are actually going to capture the Ark of God here. This is where Hophni and Phinehas, Eli's kids, are going to die right here at Aphek. There's going to be a battle, and it is going to be down here. The Ark is going to be lost and they are going to haul the ark down to the Philistine cities. So this is kind of the battle scenario. The Jews are safe up in the hills but are not safe out on the Philistine plain. There is going to be a battle there. So that's kind of the geography of it.

I. The Demise of an Old Leader: Eli [26:50-30:22]

Now, the demise of an old leader, they go back, and they are going to fight the Philistines. So the Ark is going to be captured here and lost to Israel. They bring the ark out, and when I was younger, I used to think they were wrong for bringing the ark out to fight the Philistines. They may have been wrong, partially, but has Israel ever brought out the ark to battle before? When we were in the book of Joshua, does anybody remember a battle that they had where the ark led the way? Yes, when they walked around Jericho. The ark led them around Jericho once a day for seven days and seven times on the seventh day. The ark led them into battle. So they had precedence for doing this from over in Joshua and it turns out Saul himself will bring out the ark and take it out to battle. So in the book of Samuel itself, they actually do this again taking the ark into battle.

The problem, I think, with this is the idea that you've got God in a box. Did anybody ever see Raiders of the Lost Ark? All of a sudden you open the Ark and everybody's face melts down, it's special effects, Indiana Jones style. So what's going to happen is, they bring out the ark, and they think they've got God in this box. If we bring this box out, then God will have to fight for us because God is on our side. We've got God captive in this box. God's in this box, therefore God must be on our side. What I'm suggesting is, is God captive to this box? And the answer is, no.

I wonder sometimes, how many of us, including myself, think about God as in the box, but now that God is in the box of our mind, God is on our side? Can we always be

guaranteed that God is on our side? Whose side is God on? Is God on God's side? You know what I'm saying? So we can't manipulate God, I think we get comfortable and we build boxes that we put God in our minds, and we get comfortable with the god in our minds. We think about God in a certain way and we get comfortable about it. This is one of reasons why I like this class because everyone is used to the lovey-dovey God who is up in heaven and loves everybody and has a wonderful plan for their life. God just is gracious, good, and kind, and then you guys read the Old Testament. All of a sudden it's "Whoa! God's doing what? He's just smoked those people." You've got the ground opening up and you say, "holy cow." Is it actually a different God from the Old Testament to the New Testament? Or is it the same God? Then all of a sudden, you think maybe it's a different God. I love this course because it allows you to see how God breaks out of the box. It doesn't fit into this nice little American lovey-dovey teddy bear that we've got in heaven. All of a sudden you realize, God is a real God, there is a thing called justice. There is a thing called holiness. These things matter and there's big things going down and they aren't all good. God is not always on our side so to speak. I think it's a really dangerous mistake to make. So breaking God out of the box of our mind, I think, we suffer from sort of the same ways of thinking.

J. The Ark is Captured by the Philistines [30:23-32:26]

What happens? The Ark is captured in chapter 4 verse 18. Hophni and Phinehas, Eli's two boys, are killed in battle. So the two sons of Eli are killed in battle, and a messenger runs from Aphek all the way up to Shiloh. Eli is an old man, he's not going into battle and he's apparently heavy too. They come to Eli and the messenger tells him this, in chapter 4 verse 18, "When he mentioned the Ark of God, Eli fell backward off his chair, by the side of the gate, his neck was broken and he died for he was an old man and heavy and had lead Israel for forty years." Was Eli really a bad person? I want to say, Eli wasn't a bad person, he seems to be a weak father over his sons. His sons were doing some really bad things and he should have stopped them and he didn't. He led Israel for 40 years. His sons die. Is that a problem? Should the father always die first, before the

kids? That is the natural order. In other words, the father dies first. I faced this a year ago in this very room in this context, my son was in Afghanistan. I gave him lecture after lecture, and I told him who dies first? I told him the old man dies first, right? So don't go getting any ideas about being some hero over there. I want you to come back alive. The old man goes first. That's me, and not him. Does it really, really hurt a parent when their child dies? You know what I'm saying? It's like the parent should die first, that's the way it should be. We really struggled with that last year. He came back, now he's back in America. He's got his limbs many of his buddies did not come back like that. Many of them didn't come back at all, well they came back but in a box and worse than that.

K. Ichabod [32:27-35:37]

But anyways, so it's just interesting here, Eli hears about his sons, and has no big reaction but when he hears about the ark, he falls over backwards. So the father and the sons die in the same day. So Eli now is off the scene. Who is going to take over now? Who is ready to take over? Eli is off the scene, his sons are all gone. Well, we've got one little boy that we've got to get in here first. His name is Ichabod. As soon as I say Ichabod, what's the next word you think of? Ichabod Crane...yeah everybody thinks that. Ichabod. It turns out that Phinehas' wife was pregnant when he went off to war. Does this often happen, where guys go off to war, the girl gets pregnant and the guy goes off to war? The guy gets killed, now the kid has no father. I mean, does that happen here in America, now? Yes. So Phinehas goes off, and Phinehas is killed. The wife then is having a boy but what happens is the mother dies too in the process of childbirth. By the way, in the ancient world, did women die in childbirth? That was fairly, I don't want to say super-common, but it was fairly common. In America, now, it's not a problem as much, but in the ancient world, a lot of women died in childbirth [cf. Rachel]. So she dies in childbirth, now she's expiring, the nurse says, "Don't despair, you have given birth to a son, and she did not respond or pay any attention." She's dying. "And she named the boy, Ichabod." *Ich* means "no." *Chabod* means "glory." "No glory." "The glory is departed." So she names this child, "the glory is departed." Do you see there is kind of a double entendre meaning here as well? The glory is departed; does she mean that her

husband died in battle? Probably. Her husband died in battle, the glory is departed. Has the glory also departed in a sense that the ark has been lost to the Philistines? God's glory has been removed. So it's a double play on things here. The glory has departed, meaning her husband's death but it also means the ark has been lost and that is probably the more significant.

When I was a young kid, I went to a real conservative fundamentalist Baptist church. Have any of you ever been in a church where they kick out the pastor? So they're in the process of kicking out this pastor and it's getting pretty intense, the pastor then gets to the sermon and he pulls everybody out of the church. There are about 300 people in the church and everybody, all the people are out on the street by the church and he stands in front of them and he says, "They are going to write Ichabod over this church in ten years." Now, what did he mean by that? The glory is departed. He was calling for the demise of this church. If you kick me out, this whole church is going to fall because I am the great one. It's probably good that they got rid of him, but what I'm saying is, is that really arrogant, "They're going to write Ichabod over this church." You can just see the arrogance coming through. Whether the church was right or wrong, in this case they were probably right in doing what they did.

L. Philistines and the Ark [35:37-41:38]

Now, what happens? The Philistines get the ark. What's the deal with the ark? Well, there's going to be a problem with the ark. I want to introduce now, if I said the word "pentapolis" to you, this is a Greek word, "pentapolis." Penta means "five," like pentagon, penta means "five." Polis means what? City. So you have a pentapolis, are the five cities. These are the five cities of the Philistines and they're famous places, even to this day. If I point to this one here, this is Gaza. You have all heard of Gaza, the Gaza strip that Israel has had so much trouble with. There is so much embattlement with Israel to this day, Ashdod, Ashkelon, Gath, Gaza, and Ekron are the others. These are the five famous Philistine cities. What I want to do is just show you a map. By the way, you guys can download these maps on PowerPoint. Here is the Mediterranean Sea. Joppa is where

Tel Aviv is today. So this is Tel Aviv. Our first place is Ekron. The battle took place here at Aphek. This is where the ark was captured. They came down here to Aphek and the Philistines captured the ark. They took the ark over this direction to the five Philistine cities. Ekron is one city. Gath is next. By the way, you all know somebody by name from Gath. He was a real big guy: Goliath of Gath. Goliath was from Gath, and that's where Goliath's hometown was. These are the two (Gath and Ekron), notice that these are closer to Israel, toward the mountains. They are still on the plains but they're closer to the mountains.

Then there's three out by the coast. Two internal and three out by the coast. The first one is Ashdod. Ashdod is here, there is some sand going through here. Now when you look where Ashkelon is, where is Ashkelon? Is it right on the coast? Ashkelon is right on the coast here, what do you know about the Mediterranean Sea? If you go to Israel, this where you want to go swimming. It has beautiful white beaches, the water is about 72 degrees. It's not like New England, you don't have to get used to the water. You walk in and it's a perfect temperature, and the waves are coming in and you can body surf. By the way, Boston area is connected to Ashkelon. Harvard University has excavated Philistine remains here for a ton of years, with Stager down at Harvard who has excavated there for a long period of time at Ashkelon. It kind of makes you homesick. The only problem is, Harvard, I think, my last recollection of Ashkelon, was that Harvard bailed out of it. I think a college west of Chicago picked it up. Some school, I don't like to say their name but it's Wheaton College. I think John Monson and Wheaton College took over from Harvard and is excavating at Ashkelon. So if you want a beautiful place on the coast to swim, the only thing is you've got to look out for missiles from Gaza, but that's a different story, sorry. Gaza is down here. So do you see, it's Gaza, Ashkelon, Ashdod. Those three are on the coast.

What comes right up through here? Why were the Philistines so brilliant for putting their cities along here, because what's coming up this road here. This road comes from where? What's down here to the south? Egypt. Is Egypt the bread basket of the ancient world? Egypt is going to be sending all their goods up to Mesopotamia. They are

going to be coming right up this road. When you've got cities on this road, does that mean money? Yes. In other words, people ship things. Are any of you guys from New York? You got it in New York, you put up a toll booth. With a toll booth, you make money. So what they've got is toll booths coming up here and that's going to make the Philistines a ton of money through trade [just kidding]. Largely anything coming out of Egypt is going to come right up here. This is called Via Maris or Coastal Highway. This Coastal Highway is Route 95. It comes right up here. It is a major road to Mesopotamia. So the Philistines are right on that and so they're going to benefit from all the trade that is going back and forth from Mesopotamia and Egypt. The Philistines cash in. So they are in a pretty good place.

Whenever I see Gaza too, I remember I had a conversation with a Jewish fellow and he told me to go to Gaza. I was in Jerusalem and I could not figure out why he told me to go to Gaza. I was trying to figure out why; I told the guy I don't want to don't to Gaza, I'm in Jerusalem, why would I want to go to Gaza? Then I asked around and said, it was really weird the guy wanted me to go to Gaza but what's that? Gaza is considered a really really hot place. The guy wasn't really telling me to go to physical Gaza; he was telling me to go to another place that's very, very hot. I had no clue, I was trying to understand what he meant by Gaza. I don't want to go to Gaza because he was telling me to go. Let me use another word, "Sheol." He was telling me to go to in English what would be a bad place. They use Gaza to do that, it's a euphemism when you tell somebody where to go, so you tell them to go to Gaza. But does every language have idioms like that? The people know what they mean but if you're an outsider you have to try and figure it out. It has nothing to do with Gaza, the guy just told you to go to Sheol.

M. The Philistines and the Ark [41:39- 45:47]

So the Philistines captured the ark. This is in chapters 4, 5, and 6. They bring the ark into their city, and they set the ark in front of this god Dagon. Dagon was originally believed to be a fish god but that's not correct; it's probably either a grain god or a fertility god. But the god is made out of stone. They put the ark in front of this god, and

what happens? *BOOM*... the god falls over, knocked down. What do the people do? The people come in and their god has fallen down, almost prostrate there in front of the ark. So they pick up their god. You can see them putting some nails in the god's feet to make sure he stands up straight. Do you get the irony of the people having to set up their god? They set up their god, and then what happens? They come in the next day, and the god has fallen over now, and he fell so hard that the head falls off and the hands are just busted off. So all they've got is this torso of this god busted up down in front of God in this almost worshipful position in front of the ark.

So, what happens with the ark? There are other problems now that come with the ark, the plagues. Wherever the ark is taken, people start dying from a plague, and the Philistines start dying from city to city. So what they start doing is shipping the ark, they UPS it from one city to the next, but wherever it goes, people are dying. So finally the Philistines say, "we've got to get rid of this ark, it's going to kill us!" So the Philistines say, "how are we going to return the ark?" In chapter 6 verse 4 the Philistines ask, "what guilt offering should we send to them?" They replied, "five golden tumors, five golden rats, according to the number of the Philistine rulers." In other words, five, why five golden tumors? Why five golden rats? There are five rulers of the five cities in the Philistine pentapolis, so they each chip in a golden rat and a golden tumor.

By the way, did you also remember what they did with the calves? They took cows that had calves, and they hooked the calves up to the cart that was pulling the ark. Normally calves will do what? If you've got the mother cows behind, where will the calves go? Will the calves go back to their mother? Yes. The Philistines said, "We'll see if this is really from God or not. If those calves go up the hill to Jerusalem and up toward the hills back to the Jews; then we'll know it's of God; but if the cart turns around, then we'll know it's no big deal." Guess what happens with those calves? *Zoom*, straight up to Bet Shemesh--right up into Israel territory. They then sacrifice those calves to the Lord.

But why the golden tumors and why the golden rats? It is believed that this is what's called "sympathetic magic." People believed rats and tumors caused the plagues.

What do you associate that with rats and tumors? Yes, the bubonic plague, the black death. So it's believed that they made models of the tumors that were killing them and they figured out that it was done by rats. So they then made these models and sent the models away. If you send the models away, that means that the disease will go away. It's kind of like voodoo where you take a doll and you stick a doll with needles and this doll represents a person. If you do something bad to the doll it happens to the real person. Have you guys ever heard of that kind of thing? So I think it's that same thing. They send the five tumors away made out of gold, to honor God. They send the rats away and hope the disease will leave them. So the ark does go away, and the five Philistine cities did sympathetic magic.

N. Ebenezer and Samuel's first victory [45:48-51:08]

Now, Israel gets the ark back. But Eli's dead. Hophni and Phineas are dead. Samuel takes over. What's the first thing he's got to do as the new leader? Samuel's got to win a victory. So in chapter 7, Samuel takes over and he wins his first victory at a place called Ebenezer. He sets up a stone--Ebenezer. Can anybody see the word "ezer?" Does anybody remember we talked about *ezer* before? What did we say then? Does anyone remember back in Genesis, Eve would be Adam's *ezer* "helper." "The stone of help," who is Israel's stone of help? God is Israel's *ezer*. So Samuel sets up this stone honoring God for having delivered them at Ebenezer. It's really cool, Samuel said, "Assemble all Israel to Mizpah, and I will intercede to the Lord for you. And so they fasted and they confessed, 'We have sinned against the Lord.'" Is Samuel a good leader? He gets his people to confess before they fight. "Then they said to Samuel," verse 8, of chapter 7, "Do not stop crying out to the Lord our God for us, so he may rescue us from the hands of the Philistines." So they're going out to battle, Samuel's going to be in prayer while they go out to battle. He's going to intercede for them. They go out to battle and he intercedes to God, who does that remind you of? Yes, does anybody remember Moses in a similar structure? Moses interceding for the people.

Now this brings up a problem, however. If you go from chapter 7 verse 12, it tells of how Samuel names the place Ebenezer. There's a problem because back in chapter 5, two chapters earlier, it says, "after the Philistines had captured the ark of God, they took it from Ebenezer to Ashdod." But suppose I'm a Bible critic and a Bible critic says, "Wait a minute, you have a contradiction in the Bible here!" The Bible says that it was named it in chapter 7 verse 12 when Samuel named that place Ebenezer. But here you are back two chapters earlier, which is probably, quite a bit earlier, years earlier, and it's called Ebenezer back here in chapter 5 verse 1. That's not right, it wasn't named Ebenezer in chapter 5, you have to wait until chapter 7 verse 12 until Samuel names it Ebenezer. So that's a contradiction in the Bible and that's an error in the Bible. This is what critics would point out. It's named in chapter 7 verse 12 but yet the name Ebenezer was used two chapters earlier. Obviously the historian's gotten mixed up and it's a contradiction; and it's an error in the Bible.

Do you know what an anachronism is? "Chronism" can you see "chronism" there? "Chronism..." does anybody do Greek? *Chronos* is "time." "Chronology," you guys would say "chronology" is "time." Anachronology means it's out of sync; it's out of time. This is what you call "an anachronism." When is the book of Samuel written? Is Samuel written much later? Samuel is dead in chapter 28, so it's written after the lifetime of Samuel. It's written later. What you have happening here is the person who's writing the book is looking back and he calls that place "Ebenezer" because that's what everybody in his day calls it, Ebenezer. So it would be like this. If I said to you, the witches, remember we had the witches in Salem Massachusetts in the sixteen nineties. And I said to you, "the witches were taken up to Danvers." Now do you guys all know where Danvers is? Liberty Tree Mall. Now if I said "Danvers," everybody would know where that is. Question: did I just make a contradiction? Yes, when the witches were taken up there was it called Danvers at that time? No. But if I said "Salem Village" to you, how many would know Salem Village? Almost nobody. So what I do is I call it by its present name just so you guys know where it is. Is that the way history is written all

the time? You don't call it by the original name; if you said Salem Village nobody would know where it is. So what I'm saying is this isn't a contradiction, this is just a guy who's writing later, he calls it what everybody in his day calls it: Ebenezer. Then he narrates how Ebenezer got its name later but he uses the term earlier. Now is that a big contradiction or do we do that all the time? Yes. So it's no big deal. But critics get on this and they say, "Oh, see? There's a contradiction in the Bible it wasn't named until that chapter 7 but it was used back in chapters 4 and 5 as a matter of fact." You say, "chill out, if that's the only contradiction you're got you're in trouble." So, anachronism, some of the things when a guy's writing later he's going to use the names that he's familiar with; he's going to put those back in the narrative.

O. Samuel's sons and the call for a king [51:09-52:51]

So, now, what's the problem? Samuel wins his first victory but now Samuel himself has a problem, and in chapter 8 verse 3 it says, let me start with verse 1: "When Samuel grew old he appointed his sons as judges of Israel; the name of his firstborn was Joel and his second Abijah, and they served at Beersheba. But his sons did not walk in his ways; they turned aside after dishonest gain, accepted bribes, and they perverted justice." What was the judge not to do? A judge was to establish justice. The other thing a judge was not to do was to accept bribes. Money and justice were not to be connected. His sons perverted justice rather than establishing it. They perverted justice and they accepted bribes. He's the last big judge and he tries to make his sons judges.

"So all the elders of Israel gathered together and came to Samuel at Ramah and they said, 'Samuel, you are old, and your sons do not walk in your ways. Now appoint a king to lead us such as the other nations have.'" Why does Israel call for a king? They call for a king because Samuel's kids are no good. Samuel's kids are perverting justice and taking bribes. The people look at his sons and say, "Samuel, you're a great guy. We've got nothing against you. You're a godly person; you're a good person. Your kids, however, are all messed up. We need a king to rule over us." So they call for a king and that's how kingship gets introduced into Israel. It is Israel's calling for a king because of

the failure of Samuel's sons.

P. On fathers and sons [52:52-57:31]

Now, on fathers and sons, let's do a little review here. Was Eli a fairly godly person himself? Eli seems to be a fairly godly person himself; I want to put a plus there. He should have restrained his sons, but Eli's sons, Hophni and Phineas turn out evil, so evil that God takes them out. Eli was not a terrible person, he was a good person in many ways, but his sons were evil. Is Samuel a good godly person all the days of his life? Samuel is a winner. Yet his sons turn out terribly. They accept bribes and they pervert justice. So is it possible to be a good father, a good person, and have your kids turn out bad? I thought that if I were the ideal person, then my kids would turn out wonderfully, you know "the apple doesn't fall far from the tree." Is that always true?

What about this guy, Saul? I'm going to try to show you that Saul is a jerk, to put it bluntly. Saul has got major problems. This guy is a jerk. He tries to kill David repeatedly. This guy is against God in so many ways. But tell me about Saul's son Jonathan. Is Jonathan the gold standard? Actually, when I was looking for guys to marry my daughters in this arranged marriage I had in my head, I was looking for guys like Jonathan. I was hoping that my daughters would meet somebody like Jonathan, because this guy is a gem. Jonathan was whose best friend by the way? He was David's best friend--"likes attract likes." Jonathan's just a good person. Is Jonathan better than his father? His father's got all sorts of problems trying to kill people and David; Jonathan's a gem. So here you've got a bad father. Is it possible to have a bad father and the kid turns out great? Yes.

Now what about David? What's the problem? Is David the man after God's own heart? David's the man after God's own heart, but David had a problem with Bathsheba and Uriah. So David's not perfect. David has one son Solomon, and Solomon turns out to be the what? The Einstein of the ancient Israel. He's the wisest man who ever lived. So David has a winner of a son, but what about Absalom, David's other son? David's other son Absalom tried to kill whom? Actually, you guys beat me to it. He kills his other

brother and then after he gets done killing his brother Amnon, then who does he try to kill? Absalom tries to kill David, his own father! Freud was right! He tries to kill his father. Absalom tries to kill his father. So Absalom was really bad.

My conclusion to this is does each generation has to come to know God for themselves? I can know God. Yet can my children throw God away? Does each generation have to come and become its own person and have its own way of doing things? My son and I were just discussing this the other night. He warned me. He said, “Dad, when my generation gets in the positions of power,” he says, “you better fear for your life.” He was really serious, I thought “chill out, you guys will mature. Your generation will mature just like we did, I hope.” He’s really negative and was not convinced.

Student comment: “God has kids, but he has no grand-kids.”

Ok, I’m going to repeat that, just cause it’s so good: “God has kids; he has no grandkids.” Now I really agree with that, every generation has to own God for themselves and come to know God for themselves. It’s really important.

Q. The Call for a King [57:31-62:13]

Now, they say we want a king. Was it wrong for Israel in chapter 8 and following to ask for Samuel for a king like the other nations? I was taught that Israel was wrong because they were trying to be “like the other nations.” So they were just trying to fit in and compromise and be just like the other nations and that it was wrong for them to ask for that. However, that’s wrong. Moses back in Deuteronomy chapter 17, at the end of his life he’s writing the book of Deuteronomy. Moses says, “you will have a king, like the other nations,” and he uses those very same exact same words. “You will have a king, just like the other nations.” All from Deuteronomy then moving through Joshua through Judges are expecting this king to come. Moses told them that they would have a king. Is Israel to have a king? Ultimately, the whole kingship thing is moving toward whom? Who is the ultimate king of Israel? David! David moves on to whom? Jesus, who’s the

what? The son of David, king of Israel. “And he shall reign forever and ever.” So the whole kingship thing is moving to David then on to Jesus Christ, and the rule of Christ who will rule over Israel and over the world forever. So the notion of the establishing this kingship is in God’s plan. Is this something wrong that Israel has asked for a king? No. Moses said that they would have a king like the other nations, and now they’re requesting a king like the other nations just like Moses said.

Now I agree with you that they’re doing it for the wrong motives. But the quote is, in other words, they were to expect a king and they were to expect a prophet like Moses in Deuteronomy 18. Now, Israel had priests, did the other nations have priests? Israel had priests and the other nations had priests. So they had priests like the other nations. Did the other nations have prophets? We’ve seen Baalam and some of the other prophets. The other nations had prophets, and Israel had prophets as well like the other nations. Did the other nations have judges? Like the other nations, Israel had judges. So for them to expect the king like the other nations was normal and Moses even told them they would have a king like the other nations.

The problem that needs to be established correctly was not that they wanted a king like the other nations, this is the problem: the problem was who was Israel’s king at this time? The king at this time was God. So by calling for a king like the other nations, the problem was not that they called for a king because God told them they were to expect one, the problem was that they were calling for another king in lieu of God and in rejection of God.

Does God have feelings? I want to read a verse here; did God’s feelings get hurt? Check this out: chapter 8, verse 7; start with verse 6: “And when they said ‘give us a king to lead us,’ this displeased Samuel. So he prayed to the Lord.” By the way, is Samuel hurt? His kids weren’t good, right? His kids were bad. So they come and say, “Hey, Samuel, we don’t want your kids; we want a king.” Is that going to hurt Samuel? Samuel’s going to feel rejection; rejecting his family. So Samuel goes to pray to the Lord, and here’s how the Lord responds; check this out, it’s beautiful: “And the Lord told him,

listen to all the people are saying to you. It is not you [Samuel] they have rejected. But they have rejected me as their king.” “But they have rejected me as their king” that’s the issue. Should Samuel feel rejected, God’s saying, Samuel, don’t feel rejection. It’s not you they’re rejecting, it’s me. That’s a pretty strong statement from God. He realizes that his people don’t want him to be their king any more. That is the issue. So this is a beautiful verse where you can kind of see into the inside of God.

R. Saul and the prophet/seer Samuel [62:14-66:23]

Now they’re going to go out and make a king. Who’s the first king they’re going to get? Saul. Saul comes out of the Ramah area up there, and, what’s Saul doing? In chapter 9 Saul’s out chasing his father’s donkeys. He’s roaming the hills trying to find these donkeys, and finally his servant says, “Hey, it’s getting late we’ve been out here a long time, we have got to find these donkeys.” The guy says, “Well, I know that there’s a seer here that we can go to and he’ll tell us where the donkeys are so we can find them.” So in chapter 9, verse 9, it says, “The servant said to him again. ‘Look,’ he said, ‘I have a quarter of a shekel of silver. I will give it to the man of God so that he will tell us what way to take.’ Formerly in Israel, if someone went to inquire of God, they would say, ‘Come, let us go to the seer,’ --this is that word *roeh*, the seer, that word is important— “because the prophet—the *nabi* —of today used to be called a seer.”

Now what’s going on with that verse? Let me just kind of develop that a little bit. He said what we call today a *nabi* [prophet], back in those days when Saul was chasing his father’s donkeys, he was called “the seer.” What does that tell us about the date of the writing of the book of 1 Samuel? In the book of Joshua, were the events of Joshua the crossing of the Jordan River and the taking down of the walls of Jericho down recorded almost immediately? They’re there “till this day,” who is alive “till this day” when the book of Joshua was actually written? Rahab the harlot. Joshua says, “Hey, you don’t believe me, go ask her, she’s still alive. You can confirm everything I’ve written down here. Rahab the harlot and many of the people who crossed the Jordan River, they’re still

alive, talk to them.” So the historical events were here and the writing was right next to it. It was written within the same generation as the events described.

Now in 1 Samuel were things written down immediately? Did Samuel probably take notes? Did Samuel probably have a diary, an annals of Samuel? Yes, he probably did. But was this book is written down so much later that, the language had actually changed. “The prophet of today used to be called the seer.” Does language change over time? But, by the way, does it take time for language to change? So what I'm suggesting here is, the events of 1 Samuel are here, but the writing of the book is much later. Now sometimes the events happened and were written down immediately. Here, is it clear that the language had time to change? Does the English language change? I ask how many of you if I said to you the word “cassette,” would you know what a “cassette” is. Let me go back generations, if I said to you the word “record.” So you guys know what a vinyl record is. When we go in the future is it possible that your children will not know what a CD or a DVD is? Is it possible that your children will not know what a CD or a DVD is, because everything's going in the cloud now. So basically CD's, DVD's are becoming irrelevant. So I mean you've got a couple years before this actually pans out, but these things are going to be gone.

So all I'm saying is, the event's happened here, but apparently the language had changed so that the seer back then is now called the prophet. The language had actually changed, and the writer actually comments about it and says, the *roeh* seer is now called the prophet, the language had changed so much.

S. Saul made king: on pride and humility [66:24-72:06]

Now, the focus on Saul is what? It's on his height. He's a head taller than everybody else, and so basically Samuel says don't worry about it, your father's donkeys have been found. Don't worry about it "you to whom all of Israel looks." Saul says wait a minute, I can't be king, I'm from the tribe of Benjamin and the tribe of Benjamin is the least tribe of Israel and my clan is the least of Benjamin. By the way, did everybody know why Benjamin was the least tribe of Israel? Because they were almost wiped out

because of the evil. So Saul comes out like that and says these kind of things that he's not fit to be king. So it sounds like in chapter 9 verse 21—"Saul answered, 'But am I not a Benjamite, from the smallest tribe of Israel, and is not my clan the least of all the clans of the tribe of Benjamin? Why do you say such a thing to me?'" – that he's going to be king?

It sounds like humility. How many humble people have you really known in your life? By the way, how many arrogant or proud people have you known? Can you see pride and arrogance? Is pride and arrogance really easy to spot? I think of a proud person I know actually, a senator in Massachusetts. My daughter used to work for a senator up in New Hampshire. This senator from Mass would sometimes come in, and if he ever got egg on his face, he would come in to the people who worked for him and treat them like dirt. "Your job is to make me look good and I look bad now and so you are fired." He would ream them out because his face was tarnished because of these people. Is that a sign of arrogance? You're my slaves to make me look good.

My daughter worked for senator Sunnu up in New Hampshire. There were about ten people working in this office or so. One day, the senator was totally humiliated, one of the girls in the office set it up so that he was totally blindsided and made to look like a fool. He had egg all over his face. Everybody in the office knew this girl really messed up big time. Now, the senator comes into the office, the big senator, he walks in there 'fear and trembling,' everybody's working on their computer, looking over trying to see what he's going to do. The senator in NH walks up to the girl's desk who did this and by the way at this point she's like "dahhh, I know I made a really bad mistake--" he walks up to the girl's desk and everybody is ready for a hammer to come down on this poor girls' head because she really did mess up. You know what he did? He comes up to her desk, walks up to her directly and cracks a joke and says, "you know, we all make mistakes at certain points in our lives just don't let it happen again." Question: was that humility? The big senator, could have squashed her, and said "you made me look bad" and could have really come down hard, instead he was a gentleman. Was that something, for him to do that, to

say "we all make mistakes" and to put it in that context, so she could relax and realize her mistake. I want to say that guy was humble.

How do you tell the difference between arrogance and humility? Here's the check: if you give somebody who's proud, power, how do they use it? If you give somebody who's humble power, how do they use it? Will a proud person use power very differently than a humble person will? Will a humble person use it for the benefit of others? Will a proud person use it to bolster themselves?

I always get a kick sometimes, students come up to me and say, "O professor, you're so humble" and all this kind of stuff. Then I go home and talk to my wife, and my wife says "you are the most arrogant person I know." So then what do I do? Do I believe my wife or the students? Well, of course, the students! She doesn't know what's going on in the real world. Question: who's right? The honest truth is, my wife. She knows me. She reads me. She's known me for thirty-six, seven, eight, longer than that, years. So she knows me like a book. So do I need to listen to what she's saying? Pride is easy to spot in someone else, very difficult to spot in yourself. Is it possible that you've known humble people that you have just passed them by and didn't even realize them because they're humble and just walked right on by?

Now you say, "what about Saul, Saul seems humble." "I'm from the least tribe of Benjamin" is this really humility or is this insecurity? Insecurity and humility can look alike externally. How do you tell the difference between insecurity and humility? If you give an insecure person power, how will they use it? To bolster themselves. If you give a humble person power he'll help others. Question: was Saul insecure or was he humble? How did he use power? Did he use power to go after David? Did he use power to go after the priests of Nob? Saul was an insecure person. So don't be fooled by this pseudo-humility, that's really insecurity I believe.

T. Saul among the Prophets: Spirit of God in the OT [72:07-82:51]

Now, the Spirit of God comes on Saul, in chapter 10 verse 10, the Spirit comes on him and what does he do? He starts prophesying. It says, "And when they arrived at

Gibeah, a procession of prophets met him; the Spirit of God came powerfully upon him, and he joined in their prophesying. When all those who had formerly known him saw him prophesying with the prophets, they asked each other, “What is this that has happened to the son of Kish? Is Saul also among the prophets?”

So the Spirit comes on him. This was the Spirit of God in the Old Testament. The Spirit of God was in the Old Testament and his works were usually endowing people like kings and prophets with special gifts. Actually, when the Spirit of God came on Samson, what did it do for him? It made him big and strong. So the Spirit comes on and endows with gifts in the Old Testament. When I was younger I thought the Spirit of God came down in Acts chapter 2. Did the Spirit come down initially on the earth in Acts chapter 2 in Pentecost? No. The Spirit is in the Old Testament, it's gifting various people, kings and prophets with special gifts. In the New Testament the Spirit is still here, but the work of the Spirit in the New Testament is different. In the New Testament, the Spirit binds the body of Christ together, so that Jews and Gentiles can be one body. So the work of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament, in this Acts chapter 2 context, is binding the body of Christ together. So it's just a matter of changing the work of the Spirit.

Now, Saul is made king three times. Here, the second time, they go up to Mizpah and this is going to be a public anointing in front of all Israel. The first one was at Ramah with Samuel is a private anointing. It's a private selecting of Saul as king. Samuel and Saul were on a personal level in the private context of a home. Now at Mizpah, Saul is put out before all the people. When they go to call Saul, where is Saul? Saul is hiding. He's scared to death. They drag his tail over there, you can see somebody pulling him by his belt out of the baggage, and he stands up, a head taller than everybody else. By the way, did they want somebody big and strong? Yes, he was to lead them into war. So God picks this tall strong guy and drags him out of the baggage to make him king. Saul then has to do what? As a new leader he has to win a victory. He goes over to Jabesh Gilead, and he defeats the Ammonites. Where is Jabesh Gilead? It's across the Jordan.

Did anybody make a connection with Jabesh Gilead? This is Saul's first victory over the Ammonites at Jabesh Gilead. Does anybody remember Jabesh Gilead? This is a million dollar question; last period nobody got it.

When the Benjamites were down to 600 guys, and all the majority of Benjamites were killed, where did they get wives for the remaining Benjamites? Jabesh Gilead. Is it likely that Saul's grandmother came from Jabesh Gilead and that he is going back defending there because that's where his family roots were from? Now I don't know that, but it sure makes sense as to why he would go to Jabesh Gilead and protect them. So Saul protects Jabesh Gilead.

The third time Saul is "made king" is at the covenant renewal at Gilgal. Now this is really important at Gilgal. They go down to Gilgal. Is that a holy place? It's down by Jericho. They crossed the Jordan River and went to Gilgal and the manna stopped, circumcision, they had their third Passover at Gilgal. So now, they go to Gilgal and they renew the covenant there. Now this is a really important concept. When Moses' passed succession onto Joshua, what does Moses do? He writes the book of Deuteronomy as a covenant renewal saying that the power is going to be transferred from Moses to Joshua. As the power succession goes from Moses to Joshua, they need to recommit themselves to God through a renewal of the covenant. At the end of the book of Joshua, he's going to pass it on to the judges. At the end of that book of Joshua guess what you have in Joshua 24, you have a covenant renewal ceremony. Whereas Joshua is fading off he passes on to the new generation, they recommit themselves to the covenant. Now what's happening here? Samuel, last of the judges is moving over to the kingship, and as there is a succession between the judges to this new king or from theocracy to monarchy, so there's the renewal of the covenant at Gilgal; a renewal of the relationship.

By the way, is this college going through a succession transition right now? From Judd Carlberg, president for many years, to Michael Lindsey, the new president. Whenever there's a transition of power, should that be the time where there's a

recommitment to God in one's relationship? So this is kind of interesting with the renewal covenant there.

Now Samuel responds, and his response here is very interesting in chapter 12 verse 3. Samuel says, "Here I stand. Testify to me in the presence of the LORD and his anointed, whose ox have I taken? Whose donkey have I taken? Whom have I cheated?"

Samuel stands up in front of all the people and says, "Hey, have I stolen anything from you? Have I taken anything from you, cheated anybody in this whole place?" They all say, "No, you've been a good leader." Is that a pretty good commentary on Samuel?

He says this at the end of chapter 12 verse 23, "As for me, far be it from me that I should sin against the LORD by failing to pray for you. I will teach you in the way that is good and right." Did Samuel see it as a sin if he did not pray for those people? He said, "I am not in power now, I'm out of power, the new king is going to take over, but I need to pray for you."

How many of you pray for your leaders? How many of you pray for Michael Lindsey as he leads this institution. I set up a thing when I walk into Frost Hall, I forget everything, so I make little markers. So when I walk through the door of Frost, I remember to pray for basically three people, Michael Lindsey, Dan Tyman who is another one of my heroes, and Bruce Webb. Bruce has been a faculty member for here over 30 years and he has stage 4 cancer. You know what that means? That means he's history. I pray for Bruce as I go in there. As a matter of fact just before I come over to teach this class I was talking to him. You need to pray for people and you need triggers. Samuel says, "far be it from me to sin and not to pray for you" and so praying for others is really, really important and Samuel did that role.

Now, what is 1 Samuel 13? This is something you can take home to your parents to show off how smart you are and so they can get mad at Gordon. The King James version says, "Saul reigned one year and then he reigned two years over Israel." Does anybody remember we started the semester off with this? You remember the old NASV says "Saul was 40 years old and reigned 32 years over Israel" is that different than the

King James. "Saul was one year and then two years over Israel." By the way, has the King James got to be wrong? That verse is dumb... he reigned one year then two years then three and then four...

The NIV goes the other way, NIV and NLT go, "Saul was 30 years old when he began to reign and he reigned 42 years over Israel" is this different too? The old NASB says 40 and 32 and the NIV says 30 and 42. Here is the NRSV and ESV, the ESV was an ape off the RSV unfortunately, and they say "Saul was ... years old and reigned ... years." What are the NRSV and ESV telling you? The number is gone.

Now how does this affect your view of the inerrancy of Scripture and the inspiration of Scripture? The number is gone. Nobody in the world knows it. Nobody currently living that I know knows this. What's the view of inspiration; does this affect our view of the inerrancy and inspiration of Scripture? No! What does inspiration have to do with? Inspiration has to do with God speaking to the prophet and the prophet writing it down. Did the prophet write it down well? Yes, he did.

What happened? It gets copied over and over again. Is this a scribal problem? This is a scribal problem. The scribes were human beings who copied God's word for 1000 years. So the scribes had problems. Is this a problem for inspiration? No. Inspiration has to do with God speaking to the prophet and the prophet writing it down. This is a problem with transmission, a scribal problem with the text getting copied over and over again. So this suggests that there are transmission problems in the Bible. Does God want us worshipping the Bible, or does God want us worshipping him?

So that's it. Thank you for staying and have a great Thanksgiving and greetings to your parents and brothers and sisters and I hope you all have a great thanksgiving. Take care!

Transcribed by Charis Tualofai and Beth Crandall
Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt 2

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 23[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History, Literature and Theology course lecture 23 on the book of 1 Samuel: the demise of Saul and the early stories of King David.

A. Quiz Preview [0:00-4:46]

Class, why don't we get started? We've got the audio speaker back today. Welcome back from Thanksgiving, and I hope you had a great Thanksgiving having time with friends and family and just a good time. Probably, like me, you come back exhausted. So now, we've got two weeks of school left. I think Friday is reading day right? Couple things with this class: Thursday, we've got a quiz, by the way. Go from the quiz material listed online. Let me just kind of run through that. There is an article on there on the imprecatory Psalms. There are certain psalms called "imprecatory psalms," they're the ones that say, "may they cast your baby against the rocks," "may someone strike you in the jaw and break your head," that kind of thing. Those are imprecatory psalms. John Day writes an article on how to understand those imprecatory psalms. I think it will be helpful in terms of understanding. There is one memory verse from Job. Then selected psalms, most of the psalms that you're going read, you'll be familiar with them. Then Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, but in Ezra, there are only select chapters. In Nehemiah there are only select chapters as well. I'd like you to read the whole book of Esther. It's not that big. You need the whole book of Esther to make the story flow. So selected parts of Ezra, selected parts of Nehemiah, and for Esther, read the whole thing. Then the article and the memory verse and there are select psalms. So it shouldn't be too bad, it should be an interesting week with those readings.

The other thing, if any of you guys are doing extra credit transcriptions, all of those are due on Thursday. That's a hard date. If you don't get them in by then, you don't get them in. So it's a hard date, you have got to get it in by Thursday, you had all

semester to work on this, so that's it. I have got to have them all in by Thursday.

The other thing is, some of you were not here on Thanksgiving for our wonderful Tuesday quiz. You flew out or whatever and hopefully you had a great time. I'm going to stay after this class. Class ends at about 4:30, give me 5 minutes to talk to people and just square up things at the end of class, and then if anybody who wants to stay at 4:35, we'll do the quiz here. If you don't want to do the quiz here, you can come up to my office. I'll be in tomorrow, Wednesday, from 9 o'clock in the morning until 2 up in Frost 304, except for chapel time. I've got a meeting at chapel time, faculty meetings, people like to yak and yak. I'm sorry, but the meetings run over sometimes, so if you come back from chapel, give me a couple minutes. Sometimes the meetings run over just a few minutes, but I'll be back right after. But chapel time I won't be there, but I will be there from 9 until 2 except for chapel time.

That's for tomorrow, and Thursday, and then we'll have one more quiz on the following Thursday, and after that we'll be up for the final exam. The final will not be comprehensive. It'll cover material just from the last exam. So hopefully that will be a good thing.

Let's open with a word of prayer, and then we'll get into David today. Let's begin with a word of prayer. *Father, we thank you for Thanksgiving. It's a wonderful time of the year back with family and friends and back to our roots. We thank you that you've told us "to rejoice in the Lord always and again I say rejoice," to be thankful, to give thanks over all things. And we thank you most of all for the gift you have given us in your son Jesus Christ. We thank you that as we go over the book of 1 Samuel today and we look at David, that we can see some likenesses of Christ in David, who is a man after your own heart. Even Jesus Christ, your son, came as the son of David. So I pray you may help us as we explore the life of David today. I thank you once again for your son Christ and for giving us your word. In his precious name we pray, Amen.*

B. Saul's trouble: Gilgal Sacrifice [4:47-11:05]

We are going to pick up where we left off last time. Before we get to David, we've got to do Saul. So we have got to wind Saul down. He was the first king of Israel, now we are going to see the downside of Saul. This is Saul's mistake which takes place then in chapter 13 at Gilgal. Now, there's a quite a bit of a detail, actually in the first class, this is after Thanksgiving, and I could just see people fading out. I think everybody is tired after Thanksgiving. I thought maybe everybody would come back refreshed. So, Saul is scared. Why is Saul scared? You guys are Jordan, you guys are Israel, Sea of Galilee, Jordan River, Dead Sea. This is the canyon between the two countries, between Jordan and Israel called the Rift Valley. He goes to Gilgal. Why is Saul scared? Because Gilgal is located down by Jericho in the base of this Rift Valley. He's worried that the Philistines are going to attack them. Now where did the Philistines usually hang out? If this is Israel, the mountains of Israel, you guys are the Mediterranean Sea, the Philistines are where? Out along the Philistine coast. They were along the coastline. It's flat out there. They like it for their chariots. So the Philistines live on the coastal plain. If Saul is over here in the valley and he is worried about the Philistines attacking him, what's the problem? That means the Philistines had come through the mountains of Israel and are all the way through and are ready to attack them here. Is that a really dangerous position to be in when the Philistines have actually gone through Israel and now are coming out to Jericho.

It would be like Cuba attacking Montana? You guys would say, "Let them have it." If Cuba attacked Montana, would that mean that Cuba has come up and gone through much of America to get to Montana. Is it game over? Most of the places of serious defense would have been taken already? That's what this is like. The Philistines have come through the mountains and Saul's scared to death. He should be scared to death.

What Samuel tells him in chapter 13 is, Samuel says, "Okay, you go down to Gilgal, and I will be there seven days later, and I will offer up a sacrifice and we'll get the Lord's blessing on this." Well, seven days later, where is Samuel? All of a sudden, the prophet Samuel doesn't show. These prophets are always late to meetings. So it says in chapter 13, "Saul remained at Gilgal, and all the troops with him were quaking with fear.

He waited seven days.” When you’re fearful, what does fear make you want to do? Do you want to stay put when you’re afraid or do you want to run? Fright leads to flight, you want to run.

So these guys are down there quaking in fear but Samuel had not come to Gilgal and Saul’s men began to scatter. So he said, “Bring me a burnt offering and a fellowship offering, I’m going to offer the burnt offering.” Now what’s the problem? He’s a king. Is he a priest? No, he’s not. Do you see what power does to a person? He is the king, and now he’s expanding his power. Do people in positions of power like to expand their powers? So now he’s expanding his power, he’s taking over priestly functions saying, “I’ve got to do this or my guys are all going to scatter.”

By the way, as soon as he starts to offer the sacrifice, guess who shows up? Sure enough, he starts offering the sacrifice and Samuel shows up. This is chapter 13, “‘When I saw that the men were scattering,’ Saul said, ‘and that you did not come at the set time and the Philistines were assembling at Michmash, I thought now the Philistines will come down against me at Gilgal, and I have not sought the Lord’s favor. So I felt compelled to make a burnt offering.’” Samuel’s response: “‘You have acted foolishly,’ said Samuel, ‘you have not kept the command the Lord your God gave you. If you had kept the Lord’s command, he would have established your kingdom over Israel for all time.’” That is a very interesting statement. “Saul, if you have kept the Lord’s command, he would have set you up for all time.” Saul says, “O but I wanted to offer a sacrifice to God.” That was a pious cover-up. He uses piety, he uses religion to cover his sin. Is that move very common?

So Samuel isn’t fooled by that, and Samuel rebukes him, but in the process of rebuking him, he says, “If you had kept the commandment, God would have made you and your line kings forever over Israel.” This means then, is there an “if” with God? God said, “If you had obeyed, I would have made you king forever.” That means that there is a possibility that God was open to, but Saul made a decision contrary that and God responded to that. So there is an “if,” a possible “if” that never happened God said, “If you had done the other, I would have made you king forever.” So this is one of the cases

where you see possible futures, multiple possible futures. Here is Saul, if you had, then he would have made it. So everything is not fixed. It's not determinism where everything is fixed and fossilized, and God saying we're going to move from point A to B to C to D, and everything is fixed. No, God said, "If you had done that, I would have made you king forever." So this is my reaction against determinism. I think that passage is against that kind of determinism that everything is fixed in the future. It seems like the future is more flexible and more able to be impacted.

C. Jonathan's Story in chapter 14 [11:06-18:59]

Now, what's beautiful with this literature...1 Samuel is beautiful literature. Let me just kind of set this up. Saul in chapter 13 disobeys by offering up the sacrifice. Saul goes down in chapter 13. In chapter 15, Saul's not going to kill the Amalekite king which God told him to do. So Saul in 15 is going to go down also. So in chapter 13, Saul goes down, and chapter 15, Saul goes down again. What's housed right between chapters 13 and 15? Well, chapter 14! Chapter 14 is in the middle and chapter 14 is about Jonathan. So what you get is, Saul down in 13, down in 15, and then in the middle of this, Jonathan emerges as this wonderful young man by contrast. I just want to run through Jonathan's story in chapter 14.

There's not too much about Jonathan. I always tell people, in the Old Testament, there are two heroes in the OT that are flawless: Joseph and Daniel. Those two guys are above reproach. Everything said about Jonathan is good. The problem with Jonathan's story is that he's only got a few verses. You don't get a long description about Jonathan. Chapter 14 is the longest, so he's not on the same level as the lengthy narratives on Daniel or Joseph.

But the story goes like this: Jonathan and his armor bearer are out in the field. They're walking to the east of Michmash, where the Philistines were. What you need to understand is, and I've been to the place, Wadi Suwenit. The cliffs on both sides are about 250 feet high. On both sides you have cliffs. Jonathan and his armor bearer are walking in the valley.

Why do they tell you in Israel never to walk in the valley? I think I've mentioned this before. When we were east of Bethlehem out in the Judean desert, there were three of us all about my size or a little bit bigger, and this 12 year old Arab kid was sitting up on the top. We were walking in the valley and we didn't know this rule that you never walk in the valley. This 12 year old kid starts throwing rocks down at us. When a stone comes down 200-300 feet, question, do you have to run? So the kid is up there, laughing his head off as three big American guys are trying to dodge this kid's stones because, I mean they were coming hard and fast and the stones were rocks. It would have taken off your head. He was just laughing his head off. We were furious but could we get the kid? By the time we would have gotten up there, he would have been long gone, so we ran for our lives. We learned a lesson that day, don't walk in the valley.

Where is Jonathan? He's in the valley. Is he vulnerable? Where are the Philistines? The Philistines are 250 feet up. Have they got plenty of rocks up there? Yes. Listen to what Jonathan says here, it's really interesting. Jonathan said to his young armor bearer, "come let's go to the outpost of those uncircumcised fellows. Perhaps the Lord will act in our behalf." Check this out: "Nothing can hinder the Lord from saving whether by many or by few." Where do we get something similar to that where the Lord gives deliverance by the many or by the few? Does anybody remember Gideon, having all those troops and sending all those guys home. God says, "Hey, it just takes 300. 300 is all I need, and we'll take on the whole Midianite group." The Lord saves by many or few. This a wonderful statement. "The Lord can save by many or by few. So just my armor bearer and me, we can do this." "Do all that's in your mind," his armor bearer said, "go ahead, I am with you with heart and soul." Did that armor bearer trust Jonathan?

My son came back from war and he talked about you have some people that lead you into war that you would follow into the thickest battle. You would follow them to the death. Yes, have you got other guys you wouldn't follow across the street? One of the problems my son had, he was a group leader. The guys that followed him, would they have gone to death with him? Yes. Because they knew who would go first. When the door had to be knocked down, when they had to find the IED, who would go first, would

my son be the first one through? That's very stupid. Anyway, so he'd be the first one. My wife and I knew that so that's why we were happy when he got shifted to another assignment. We were just happy because some of his friends did not come back because they had led by going first.

This armor bearer says, "Jonathan, there's a bunch of Philistines up there, there's over 20 Philistines up there, there's only two of us against 20. Guess who wins? By the way, do we have to climb a 250 foot cliff? You climb a 250 foot cliff and then you do a hand-to-hand combat, with 20 guys? What do the Philistines say? The Philistines are reacting to this too. "Both of them showed themselves to the Philistine outpost. "'Look,' the Philistines said, 'the Hebrews are crawling out of their holes they're hiding in.' The men of the outpost shouted to Jonathan's armor bearer, 'come up to us and we'll teach you a lesson.'"

Now, what did Jonathan tell the Lord? If they say come up, then we'll know God has given them into our hands. If they say stay down, then we'll know the Lord's not given them to us. They say, "come on up here Jew boys, we're going to teach you a thing or two up here." They've got 20 guys. They're going to clean these guys out. So they come up. By the way, could they have taken them out when they're climbing the cliffs? All you've got to do is throw some rocks down there, it's going to knock them off the cliff.

But they let them get up there and what happens? Jonathan said to his armor bearer, "climb up with me, the Lord has given them into our hands." So they get up there and the Philistines fell before Jonathan and his armor bearer, and they killed behind them in the first attack, Jonathan's armor bearer killed some 20 men. Two guys against 20, Jonathan and his armor bearer take out 20 guys. Is Jonathan a warrior? Sometimes you get in scripture you think, "O Jonathan is just a meek little king's son." Is this guy a warrior? Yes. Two guys take out 20, and then what happens? God gets involved and panic struck the whole army because God causes the ground to shake. It was panic sent by God. So God shakes the ground. All of a sudden the Philistines realize what? These Jews have got this God who split the Red Sea and now the ground is shaking, we're

going to get out of here. So the Philistines are terrified from what happens.

Here's something that I didn't realize when I was younger. In the Philistine army there were Jewish mercenaries. How did Jonathan win the day? Well, Jonathan is a hero; Jonathan is a mighty warrior. I don't want to take that away from him. But were there Jews in the Philistine armies? Who, later on, will join the Philistine armies? David does that. At this time with Jonathan the ground shook, the Philistines freaked, and then if you go down to verse 20 it says, "Saul and his army assembled, went to battle. When they fought the Philistines they were in total confusion, striking each other with swords. Those Hebrews who had previously been with the Philistines had gone up with them to their camp went over to the Israelites." So the Israelites who were mercenaries in the Philistine army, when the Israelites attacked, those Israelites flipped sides and actually went against the Philistines. So that was the part of the battle too. The Israelites who were mercenaries flipped sides and Jonathan wins the day.

D. Saul's Vow and Jonathan's defended by the people [19:00-27:30]

So a great victory at the hands of Jonathan and the Lord wins the victory. It's a big deal. Now, what's the problem? Saul gets involved. Now, what's Saul's thing? Saul makes a vow that no one should eat any food, before they defeat their enemy. So Saul makes a vow. Saul had bound the people under oath saying, "cursed be the man who eats food before evening comes." Basically, "we're going to chase after those Philistines and totally defeat them. Nobody can stop for food."

Now what's Jonathan's problem. Jonathan just climbed a cliff of 250 feet and hand to hand combat fought 20 guys, is Jonathan hungry, do you think? Yes, the guy is starving. So what happens is he's going through the woods, he sees some honey, he scoops it, he eats and feels better and encouraged by that, and then what happens afterwards? All of a sudden, somehow the thing turns against him and they cast lots and it comes down to the lot falling on Jonathan as having broken his father's vow. His father then, is going to do what to his hero son? By the way, did Jonathan know that his father made that stupid vow? Jonathan had no idea that his father had made that vow. He was just starving going through the woods, he didn't know about that. So Jonathan was

totally innocent, and yet his father was going to kill him. Is that wicked? Jonathan is a hero.

Who saves Jonathan's life? It says, Saul says, "You will die." So the men, Jonathan's troops, rescue him from the hands of his own father. His war buddies rescue him from the hand of the king, his own father. What is one of the fundamental roles of the father? One of the fundamental roles of a father is to do what to his children? To protect his children. Here Saul is going to kill his own kid.

Yes, Hannah? (student asks) Does everybody hear she's ahead of me on the narrative here, does everybody hear what she's suggested? The next chapter, Saul is going to spare the king of the Amalekites which God told them to kill, and yet here, he's going to kill his own son. What I'm saying is, this whole thing is upside down. So he spares the foreign king, but he's going to kill his own son.

Once upon a time, I had two daughters. I was in the house and I was doing dishes. I was the father of two young daughters and they were out playing trucks in the back yard. My daughters' got these two trucks, they fill them up with stones and they haul them, dump them. I didn't do the doll thing, I like trucks better, but anyways. So they're playing out back. I'm doing the dishes, and I'm looking out the back, watching my kids playing in the dirt, they were about from here to the pole.

As I'm doing the dishes, this guy comes down. There was a walkway down through the woods, there were woods on both sides. There was a walkway down, and then it went down to the beach. There was a beach across the street and over the way from us so people used to travel on it all the time. So I'm doing the dishes and all of a sudden his guy, about 40 year old guy, comes down, he's bear-chested, big beer belly, actually, I better be careful about that, he comes down. Then I noticed about half way down all of a sudden, he stops. He starts staring at my daughters. Now I'm sitting there thinking, "well, everybody walks through here and it's okay" but he stops and I am still doing the dishes, but am I watching that guy like a hawk. So what are you watching my daughters for? Get down to the beach, continue going. And the next thing, the guy climbed over the guard rail. He climbs over the rail and I see him going through the

woods and I see him creeping up on my daughters in the woods.

Something went off of me, I've never experienced anything like it. In high school, I played football, I played everything, Basketball, I played, all the sports. I've been in conflictual settings, if you know what I mean. To be honest, I've never lost it, I mean it was tight, things were happening, but I never totally lost it. All the sudden when I was doing the dishes, I just totally lost it. I dropped those dishes and I went running out the back door. I was totally, I want to say, I was insane, I mean it was total, I was freaked. I go running up into the woods, that dude got away. I don't know how he got away, but praise God he did get away because I know what would have happened. I wouldn't have killed him but I would have busted every rib on both sides.

So I called the cops. When you're in the small town, what's one of the benefits of a small town? Yes, so I called the cops, so Terry comes over, probably shouldn't say this in tape, but Terry comes over. I said, Terry, I never had this happen in all my life, I was out of control. I was totally out of control. I was just about to kill that guy, Terry." I called the cops now, would you guys put me in jail or something, what would happen? I was totally out of control. It scared me, I was actually shaking. Terry said, "Ted just calm down, I'm the one who writes the report. I'll take care of you." You guys say "that's not justice and you kind freak out like that" it's good to have a friend like that, he said "we'll take care of you." About three days later, the guy was, in our generation we called them "flashers," but I don't know what that means in your generation. This guy's down by the bushes and there were some girls walking by, and he's ready to flash these girls. Andy Galvin who is about 6'4" weights about 260-270 pounds sees this guy getting ready to do his thing. Andy then runs out starts chasing this guy down. It was the same guy that I had chased. This time, he's chasing him, all of a sudden the pastor of our church is in a passing car and sees Andy, who's a member of his church, chasing this guy. The pastor of the church gets out of the car, goes out and tackles the guy. Then Andy sits on him. When Andy sits on you, you aren't going anywhere. So he sits on him, and then they called Terry who was the cop. They were hunting for him because he did this to couple other towns around the neighborhood. But I was glad that I didn't catch

him.

My point is this: is one of the deep down roles of the father to protect his children. Is that so deep in someone that when you see your children threatened, would your parents freak out if anybody was going to hurt you? Some of your parents would go right through the roof?

What I'm saying is: do you see what Saul's doing? Saul is the father now and the father is going to hurt his own son. Do you see how messed up Saul is? It's totally against everything that should be in a father who should love and protect his son. Saul was the major jerk. I guess that's my proof: Saul is a jerk. I don't know what else to say. Saul is a jerk when he comes at his son like that.

Now, what happens? The irony here, and this is what Hannah pointed out before, Saul will kill his own son because his ego is violated, and yet when it comes to God, God ordered him to kill Agag, the king of the Amalekites, yet Saul won't do what God commanded him to do. So, for Saul, if you violate Saul's word, it means death. If you violate God's word, no big deal. This is God's word, "Well, I did capture him, I just didn't kill him," and he makes excuses. So here's the great irony.

So I think chapters 14 and 15 are linked through this irony. His own word he takes so seriously as he was going to kill his son. But God's word, he won't do it. So there's this great irony between these two chapters. Well, that's Jonathan. Jonathan's a hero, a good guy.

E. Saul's disobedience with the Amalekites [27:31-31:39]

Now Saul, this is chapter 15. Chapters 13 and 15 are when Saul botches it up and this is when God gets on him on chapter 15. There is an interesting statement from God in chapter 15.11 it says this, "The word of the Lord came to Samuel. I am grieved that I have made Saul king because he has turned away from me and has not carried out my instructions." God says, "I am grieved." What does it mean for God to grieve? God says, "I am grieved that I made Saul king." Does God have any regrets? God says, "I'm grieved that I made Saul king." Now, I don't know, what does that mean? I don't know exactly what that means but it just means God reflects on this situation. I want to bring

out the notion, is there grief in heaven? Here it says, God says, “I am grieved that I made Saul king.” It is a very interesting statement about what goes on in heaven. So I always come back to that song. Are there “tears in heaven”? Yes, Eric Clapton was right, there are tears in heaven. God says, “I am grieved that I made Saul king.”

Now, what happens here. God tells Saul to go out and wipe out the Amalekites. Why did God tell him to go wipe out the Amalekites? What had the Amalekites done to the Jews? When the Jews were passing through the wilderness, there were people that were weak, stragglers behind. There were stragglers who were weak and they were straggling behind and the Amalekites snuck up on the Jews from behind and killed the stragglers, the weak ones. So what happened is, God said because the Amalekites took advantage of the poor and the oppressed, the Amalekites are to be wiped out. He tells Saul then, “This is the time and you’ll be the one that does it.” So Saul goes and then Saul doesn’t do it.

In chapter 15, verse 14, when Samuel meets Saul, “the Lord bless you, I carried out the Lord’s instruction.” Well, that wasn’t true, but Samuel said, “what is this bleeding of sheep in my ears?” God told you to wipe out their goats, their sheep, everything were to be destroyed, including the king. “Why do I hear this bleating of sheep?” Saul answered, “the soldiers brought them from the Amalekites, they spared the best of the sheep and the cattle.” Why did they spare the best of them? To sacrifice them to the Lord. So he gives this pious cover-up, but God said to wipe them out. He says, “O, no, we saved the best so we can sacrifice them to the Lord.” Samuel is frosted because Saul uses this pious kind of cover-up in order “to sacrifice them to the Lord, your God at Gilgal.”

Samuel replied, “does the Lord delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices as much as in obeying the voice of the Lord?” Sound familiar? [It’s our memory verse]. That’s the context for that passage. Does the Lord delight in sacrifice? Saul was saying, we saved the best sheep for the sacrifice. But God says, he doesn’t want your sacrifices, “to obey is better than sacrifice, to heed is better than the fat of rams. For rebellion is like the sin of divination, arrogance, like the evil of idolatry. Because you have rejected the word of the

Lord, he has rejected you as king.”

In chapter 15 now, Saul knows it's over. God has rejected him. So God has rejected him and then God is going after man after his own heart here. As long as your heart is right, it doesn't matter what you do, is that true? No. Saul said “My heart's right and I was going to offer this up to God.” God says, “No, what you did was wrong.” What you do matters, not just what your heart is saying. Well, my heart was right. It doesn't matter sometimes whether “your heart” is right or not, it's what you do, as well as your heart. It is not one or the other, it's both/and. You've got to have both right. What you do has got to be right as well as the motives of your heart.

F. God and change [31:40-32:54]

God's desire down in verse 22, is “to obey is better than the sacrifice,” that's what we just looked at.” Now, what's interesting down at chapter 15 verse 29, here's a beautiful verse, “for he who is the glory of Israel does not lie or change his mind. For he is not a man that he should he should change his mind.” Does anybody remember, wait a minute, didn't you just say God can change his mind? How does this work? I guess I go back to the thing, can God change his character, is his character firm? His character doesn't change. When God gives his word, does God keep his word? God is a promise keeper. Is God able to say things in the future that never happen? Is God able to change his mind, I'm going to destroy them, Moses prays, and then God spares them. So be careful. It doesn't mean God can't think. By the way, does thinking mean change? God thinks, so be careful. It's his character that doesn't change, his word doesn't change, but you've got to be careful about mapping that into a universal.

G. David is anointed [32:55-34:27]

Now we finally break into David. So here comes David now, Saul's said to be history, in 1 Samuel 15. Saul goes down, and now we know that there's going to be a new guy. But what happens in chapter 16? The first verse in chapter 16's got a problem. “The Lord said to Samuel, how long will you mourn for Saul since I have rejected him as king over Israel? Fill your horn with oil.” Now when a prophet fills his horn with oil,

what does he do with the oil? He anoints people and who does he anoint very often? The king. So he's got a horn of oil, he's going to anoint something. He's going to anoint the next king. So he says, "Fill your horn with oil [olive oil], and be on your way. I am sending you to Jesse of Bethlehem." So David is going to be from the town of Bethlehem. Beth-lehem, *beth* means "house of," *lehem* means "bread." So Bethlehem means "house of bread." This is where David's home was and who is the other famous person from Bethlehem? Jesus is going to be born there. It's the city of David where David was born too. "I'm sending you to Jesse to Bethlehem, I've chosen one of his sons to be king." Then Samuel says, "how can I go? Saul will hear about it and kill me." The Lord said, "take a heifer with you and say, 'I have come to sacrifice to the Lord,' and invite Jesse to the sacrifice."

H. God and the deception of Saul [34:28-37:48]

Was that heifer taken purposely to deceive Saul? He's got a horn of oil, why is he going down to Bethlehem? He's going to anoint the next king. God says take a heifer and tell Saul you're going down to sacrifice. Is that heifer purposely meant to deceive Saul so that Saul doesn't kill Samuel. By the way, would Saul kill Samuel? Would Saul kill his own son? Later on, would Saul try to kill David repeatedly? So would Saul kill Samuel? Of course he would have. God says take a heifer. Now this story should remind you of two other stories we already have had in the Old Testament. Who's involved here? Who sets up this deception, does God himself set it up? He says, take a heifer. Tell him you're going down there for a sacrifice. So God's involved and plans in this one.

Now, where were two other stories where this has happened? We've seen this twice before, does anybody remember that? Yes, remember the Hebrew midwives in Exodus the early chapters? "All the Jewish woman have the children before we get there because they're not like the Egyptian women, when they have their babies." So the Hebrew midwives lied to cover that. By the way, did God allow the Hebrew midwives to go out with the Jews and become part of Israel? Yes.

Does anybody remember the other story where there was a deception used and God approved of it? Yes, Rahab the harlot. The king's men come and she says, "O they

were here but they left, they went that way. You better go fast to catch them.” She was hiding them up on the roof, and the Rahab was accepted into Israel. Remember the red chord and the window by which Rahab and her family were spared? Actually, Rahab appears in whose genealogy, by the way? Rahab, the harlot, is in Jesus Christ’s genealogy (Mat.1).

So what I tried to suggest earlier was with this kind of deception to move it out of the category of evil, and put it into the term of shrewdness. When you’re dealing with evil, do you have to be shrewd? Let me put it in a different way. The Hebrew word for shrewdness is the word *arum*, *arum* is also translated, “wisdom.” So the word that’s translated, depending on translation, sometimes is translated “shrewd” and actually the word in Proverbs and other places is translated “wisdom.” When you’re dealing with evil, do you have to be wise, do you have to be shrewd? By the way, this isn’t just me making this up, Jesus says, “be wise, or shrewd, as serpents and harmless as doves”—“as innocent as doves.” So “be wise as serpents and harmless as doves.” I think what you’ve got here is that God is being shrewd because he knew Saul would kill Samuel. So he’s saying, “Okay, we’ve got to outfox him,” and they did. Some people get bent out of shape, I don’t think it’s a big issue. Lying to save life in a war or evil context is okay.

I. David’s anointing [37:49-39:51]

Samuel is anointing Jesse’s son, and who does Jesse bring out, but his first born. “Here’s my first born.” God says, “No, I don’t want his first born.” His second born, his third born, he brings out all his sons and finally it’s, “Hey, I don’t have any more sons,” and he says, “O, yeah, there is the young guy, but he’s the baby of the family, he’s watching the sheep, bring him in.” But the Lord said to Samuel, chapter 16 verse 7, “do not consider his appearance or his height.” Now in Saul’s case, did they consider his height? “Do not consider his appearance or height, for I have rejected him. The Lord does not look at things man looks at. Man looks at the outward appearance but God looks at the heart.” It’s no joke, I heard somebody take this passage once, and say to young women this, “man looks at the outward appearance, but God looks at the heart, but man does look at the outward appearance, so honey, you better take care.” I’m dead serious.

I heard somebody say that. I just about croaked. Is that totally against everything this verse is meaning. Is the whole point of the verse the opposite of that? Does God care about the heart? Do people take the Bible and twist the Bible? And this is one of those cases, I'll just never forget it, it was one of the dumbest things I can't believe I heard this, because the point of this passage is "God looks at the heart." Question, does that give us the clue about David? Is David going to be the man after God's own heart? David is going to be the man after God's own heart. By the way, does that mean David is perfect? Is David going to have his problems? He's going to have his problems too, but notice he's a man after God's own heart. So that sets up David then. We know his heart.

J. Saul and the evil spirit from the Lord [39:52-45:41]

Now what happens in chapter 16 verse 13, it says, "so Samuel took the horn of oil [olive oil], and anointed him [David], in the presence of his brothers. From that day on, the Spirit of the Lord came on David in power." You get this association of anointing with oil and the Spirit of God coming on David. You see that this anointing with oil and the coming of the Spirit is poured out on David. Does anybody ever talk about being anointed with the Spirit? In being anointed with the Spirit, that oil represents the Spirit of God and being anointed. When David is anointed king, the Spirit of God comes on David.

But then the next verse says, "now the Spirit of the Lord had departed from Saul and an evil spirit from the Lord tormented him." When Saul lost the Spirit of God, did he lose his salvation? The Spirit goes off Saul. Does he lose his salvation because the Spirit is no longer with him. Does God sick evil spirits on people? It says "an evil spirit from the Lord came on and tormented Saul." Does God force evil spirits on people?

Now I want you to think about this first of all. In the Old Testament so far, have you seen many demons running around? Now, by the way, you go into the New Testament, Jesus and demons, do you have a lot of that? In the New Testament, you have Jesus and the demons, all the time. In the Old Testament, have you guys read much of that? Have we seen demons? In and with Genesis, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph, did you see any demons? Moses, demons? Joshua, demons? Judges, demons? You kind

of work through this. There's not much demonic activity. Is this saying God's sickening demons on people? Is that totally out of context for the Old Testament? It really is. What's the problem, the evil spirit came on Saul. Does the word "spirit" mean different things? Actually even in English does the word "spirit" mean different things in English? You say, "that school has spirit." Do you mean that school has the Holy Spirit? Maybe that's true at Gordon College. Actually that was really stupid. Let me back off that, sorry I said that, that was wrong. What I'm saying is, "a school has spirit," you meant what? They have enthusiasm, right? They have spirit. Do we even use the word "spirits" for other things? Somebody's had a party and someone brought spirits there. We talk about the spirits as alcohol. Will we ever say a person is down in spirits today? We would mean what? Their spirit's down. Is the person depressed? Will we use that? The Hebrew term *ruach* can be used for many many things including wind and breath, but it can also be used for various kinds of spirits.

Let me read the rest of this context. I don't think this is God's forcing demons on Saul. I think the rest of this will explain this. Saul's attendant said to him, "see an evil spirit from God is tormenting you." Now, what is the solution to this evil spirit problem? "Let our lord command his servants here to search for someone who can play the harp." Now what's the deal with playing the harp? Demons don't like harp music, it reminds them of heaven and they freak out? They say, "I've got to have my what is it called, heavy metal music," or "I've got to have," what's the demon music, they feel comfortable with? Rap and other music like that or whatever you guys use. But, of course, if you play country music, it drives them crazy. So harp music...Is that really what's being said here? No.

But notice this, when the evil spirit comes on him, then find someone who can play the harp. I ask you, how many of you, when you're down, listen to music? That's what's happening here. Saul is down in spirits, why is he down in spirits? Because God's Spirit is off of him and he realizes he's no longer going to be king. He is losing power as king and he's depressed about it. So he is depressed and when he's depressed what happens? They call for a musician to come to make him feel better, so I think that's what

this is. It's not an evil spirit [demons] so much as he is depressed. This depression comes from the Lord.

(Student asks question) When I was reading it, it makes me think of Job and how God allowed the devil to touch him. So it made me think not necessarily from God, but the evil spirit that God allowed to come to him.

Hildebrandt's response: So everybody see, she jumped into Job 1 and 2 where the satan's going up and down. Is that possible? Is that really rare in Old Testament though? I mean outside of Job, it's really rare. With the music thing, I'm associating the music when I say he's down in spirits because God has removed the kingship and he's depressed, and so he gets the harp player. Who's going to play the harp by the way? David. Is David going to write a lot of Psalms then? He is a musician. So you're going to see a lot of David in the Psalms. But that is an interesting connection with Job 1 and 2. Now, does God send evil spirits on people? What we tried to say is, no, this is more like depression with the music lifting his spirit. So that's what's happening here.

K. Spirit of God in the Old Testament [45:42-46:23]

Did people in the Old Testament have a relationship with the Spirit of God? The Spirit was on Saul and the Spirit left him. Was that a spirit of salvation or was that the spirit of kingship? It was the Spirit coming on the person, anointing the person with the endowment of kingship. So when it leaves Saul, it means the kingship is leaving Saul and the kingship is going on David. The Spirit is endowing David with the gifts he'll need for kingship. So it's not salvation like the endowing of the Holy Spirit as you would have in the New Testament. But the Spirit of God was very active in the Old Testament. Here's a case in point and there are many others.

L. David's first victory as the new leader [46:24-58:02]

What has David got to do with it? He's now become king, what's the first thing he's got to do? He's got to win a victory. The story of David and Goliath is David's first victory. He gets anointed in chapter 16, and what is chapter 17? David and Goliath. So it follows. David is the anointed king, and then there is David and Goliath in chapter 17

immediately following.

I just want to bring up this map. First of all, Jerusalem and Bethlehem. David is going to be from Bethlehem. Where is Goliath from? Goliath of Gath. The Philistines are going to go from here, Gath, and they're going to go up here. Goliath and his boys will go up here, passed Azekah, up unto the valley of Elah. This valley of Elah is there until this day. Are the Jews on the plains or are the Jews hiding in the mountains? The Jews hide in the mountains because the Philistines have chariots. So the Philistines will come up into the valley, and the Jews will hide in the mountains. Then Goliath's going to go out and taunt the Jews. The Jews are in the mountains. Goliath comes out and challenges them to come down and fight them.

David is going to go out and he's going to have a sling shot. He's going to pick up five stones. Why did David pick up five stones, rather than just one? Okay now, she said it with a straight face, but it's actually a joke I heard. David picked up five stones, because he heard that Goliath had four brothers. That's a joke, okay? You should smile. Actually she's better at telling jokes than I am.

He picks up five stones, we don't know why he picked up five stones. By the way, if you ever go to Israel with Dr. Elaine Philips and her husband Dr. Perry Philips, you'll go to the valley of Elah, and you'll actually cross the stream and you can pick up five stones from the stream. When I say a stream, how wide is a stream? This stream is about this [4 feet] wide, you just walk right across it. So David goes out with this, let's get over to David's victory here.

David goes out, and David comes down, he's supposed to bring some food to his brothers. His brothers are in battle and David's coming down with the food, from home, to feed them. Do you ever send troops food to eat? Have you ever eaten k-rations? Do the troops need food? Yes, sometime ask me about my son and what they did for food.

David asked the man standing near, "what would be done for the man that kills this Philistine and removes this disgrace from Israel? Who is this uncircumcised Philistine that he should defy the armies of the living God?" This is a 16 year old kid speaking. Goliath – big, Shack kind of character. David is a 16 year old, little kid. "They

repeat it to him, ... when Eliab, David's oldest brother, saw David speaking with the man, he was burned with anger at him and asked, 'Why have you come down here, and with whom did you leave the few sheep.'" Why don't you go back to the sheep, David and take care of them in the desert? Eliab, his older brother says this, "I know how conceited you are and how wicked your heart is. You've only come down to watch the battle." Do little kids like to watch the battle? Do the older kids have to fight the battle, they're scared to death and may die. The little kid comes down to watch the battle.

Notice he accuses David of being conceited. Is David conceited? Are his words very courageous and very much in your face? But is he conceited? I want to suggest he is not. His older brother doesn't know David's heart. David's confidence is in the Lord, not himself. So David comes off or at least his brother accuses him of being conceited, but David is actually dependent on the Lord. On the other hand, did Saul initially look humble? But was Saul really humble? No, Saul was insecure. So what I'm saying is, is it possible for somebody to look like they're humble but not be humble? Is it possible for somebody to look like they're proud and not be proud? In other words, can we judge another individual's heart? They may come off as really arrogant but may not be. David here comes off with these really arrogant statements.

Do you remember what happened? He goes up to Saul, and Saul says, "Hey, put on my armor." David puts on the armor but he's a little kid. "I can't fight in this flak jacket, it weighs 60 pounds, I'm not going to do that." So he takes it off and he says to Saul, "I killed a lion, I killed the bear when they attacked my sheep, and I'll kill the Philistine too." By the way, killing a lion and a bear, is that a pretty big deal? Without a 30-06 or something like that, is that a pretty big deal? That's a big deal. So David goes out.

Now he goes out, but how does he go out? He goes out with no armor, with a sling shot and stones, against this giant. Actually the giant in chapter 17 verse 41, interacts with David. Meanwhile, the Philistine comes out with the shield bearer, so he's got the guy carrying his shield, "in front of him kept coming closer to David. He looked David over and saw that he was only a boy." So here you've got this big huge guy coming out

and they send a boy out to fight him? When you're a warrior, do you want a worthy opponent? Yes. My son has talked to me often about this. When he was in Iraq, one of the reasons he hated being in Iraq was he said there were no worthy opponents. The people were whimpish; there was nothing to them. When he got to Afghanistan, did they have worthy warriors there? Yes, indeed. In Afghanistan, they have warriors there.

Anyway, he looks David over and he says, "They sent a kid out to fight me?" "He was only a boy, ruddy and handsome, and he despised him, and he said to David, 'am I a dog, that you come out,'" little kid with sticks and stones, are you going to break my bones? This giant is just floored, and "the Philistine cursed David by his gods, he says, 'come here, and I will give your flesh to the birds of the air and the beasts of the field.'" The big guy is speaking to David.

By the way, is this a great story to tell to the kids? Why does this story work so well with kids? Are kids little people with giants all around them? No, I'm serious. Did you ever see that movie, "Big"? But anyways, it's kind of like it is, little kids and big bodies all around them. So for little kids, it's a great story.

Now David's going to respond to the Philistine, here's David now, this big guy's just finished bellowing out, now David said to the Philistine: "You come against me with sword and spear and javelin but I come against you in the name of the Lord almighty, the God of the armies of Israel, whom you have defied. This day the Lord will hand you over to me and I will strike you down and cut off your head." Those are pretty strong words, and "today I will give the carcass of Philistines," he goes on "the whole world will know there's a God in Israel." The guy moves closer and what does David do? He takes out his sling shot, and hits him in the forehead, and takes him down. Now whether the stone in his forehead killed him or not, it took him down. David then does what? He goes up, by the way, did the Jew have swords? Do you realize that the Philistines had a monopoly on the iron producing? So the weapons were made by the Philistines, the Jews had a lack of metal and metallurgical know-how. So David takes Goliath's own sword and lops off his head.

Now, what's the deal? This is going to sound really weird, but this is the truth.

Archeologists have found a large head, just the head, with a stone that cracked the skull and split the skull. This is the honest truth, I'm not making this up. A stone, dead center in the guy's forehead, and it cracked his skull and they've actually found it. I'm not sure what the exact date of this is, but they found just a head, a very large head with a stone, right dead center in the head. Now, you're saying, Hildebrandt, you aren't saying that's Goliath they found? No, no. I'm backing off from that. Isn't it interesting that they found a guy with a cracked skull, busted his skull open with the stone and they actually found one archeologically. I'm not saying this is Goliath. Would that be really dumb to say it's Goliath? That would be really dumb to say it's Goliath. Now, all I'm saying is that you can see people with sling shots did take down big people with stones cracking their skulls. This is fascinating, it is absolutely fascinating, they found somebody like that, I'm not saying it's Goliath though, so you've got to back off.

Hannah? (student asks) Yes, you've got to be careful, yes there are some debate on the figures. The figures in the Scripture here is he is 9 feet tall or something like that. I mean even Shack isn't that tall. What most people think is what it's measuring is him with his head piece and his whole military equipment, which may have gone up higher than that. But I do want to say that this guy is big. It's probably to the top of his head dress that they were measuring to. In the LXX he's 6 foot 9 inches.

So David's righteous anger and the sibling's jealousy accuse him of wrong motives that he just wanted to see the battle. Then we just read the story of the giant coming out and David taking the giant down with the sling shot, and taking off his head. By the way, is that sword going to be special for David? David killed Goliath, and later on David is going to come back to that sword. We're going to see that happen just shortly here.

So, what happens? David wins the battle, the women always cause trouble. So they go out singing a victory song. The victory song they were singing is chapter 18 verse 7: "Saul has slain thousands, and David his" what? "Tens of thousands." Saul hears that and what happens with Saul? "Saul kills thousands and David is tens of thousands." Saul gets jealous of David. Does jealousy lead to murder? I think I've told you guys I've

taught in a maximum security prison for 10 years. There's a guy named Brian in there, who basically was about 19 years old and his girl ran off with somebody else. What did the young man do? The young man was jealous of this guy, he got a gun and blew him away, killed him. He spent 25, I think it was years in prison. He's out now, actually he's a wonderful believing person, really a dynamite person. But does jealousy cause people to kill people? So Saul gets jealous of David because "Saul's killed his thousands, and David his tens of thousands." Saul gets jealous, and the song drives Saul bananas and he goes after David.

M. Saul's attempts to kill David [58:03-62:27]

Now here's how the old leader's going to go down now. Saul attempts to kill David. He's going to try to kill David in several ways. The first way, he tries is through his daughter Michal. How would you guys pronounce her name? I don't know how it's pronounced in English so I'll just say Michal, like the Hebrew, *Michal*. They used to have a song, Michal [Michal, my belle] anyways.

So Saul's daughter Michal was in love with David. Beautiful thing. When Saul was told about it, it pleased him, he said, "I will give her to him," he thought, "so that she may be a snare to him." He is going to use his daughter's love for David to kill David. Is this guy wicked?

So what does he do? David comes up and realizes it's a big thing, when you marry the king's daughter. What do you have to have when you get married? All guys know this, you've got to have the same thing. When a guy gets married, he's got to have money to marry someone. You have to have a dowry to pay. So David comes up, David's a poor man, and so in the words of Simon and Garfunkel, also in chapter 18 verse 23, they repeated these words. David said, "do you think that a small thing to become a king's son-in-law. 'I am just a poor boy and my story's seldom told,'" and he goes off. I'm sorry, that was actually paraphrased from Simon and Garfunkel. He said, "I'm only a poor man and little known," and David says, "I don't have any money to pay this king, how can I come up with the king's dowry for the king's daughter?"

The king says, "No problem David, I'll take care of it. I just want a 100 Philistine

foreskins.” So David goes out, sets up a little bucket and a little bell, and he says, “donations, donations! Philistine foreskins, Philistine foreskins!” And the Philistines come up and donate all these foreskins and David goes back. Ah, no. You say, “Hildebrandt, that’s really bad.” I got this imagination, I don’t know. I was born this way.

Now, Saul knows, what is the only way David is going to be able to get a Philistine foreskin? There is only one way he’s going to be able to get that. He’s going to have to do what? He’s going to have to kill a Philistine. He has to come up with a hundred Philistine foreskins, does that mean that David goes against 100 guys? Is that a problem? Will one of those guys take him out? That’s what Saul figures from 100 Philistines. What does David do? David comes back with not a hundred, but he comes back with 200. Is this really gross? Now somebody, I forget, it was a couple years ago, student sat in the back row, most of the time the kid skipped the class, knew nothing of what went on in the course and he pops in and said, “David killed Philistines like that, that’s wicked, he just killed them and threw their foreskins, the Bible is wicked for David’s doing this....” Question, is everything David’s does sanctioned by God? Did David do a whole bunch of stuff, that was good and some of the stuff that was bad? Are they at war with the Philistines? They’re at war with the Philistines, so I don’t know how much we need to justify. It’s what happened, it’s what the king required, it’s what David did. There’s no commentary, it’s just history, people do bad stuff. You got to chill out on some of that.

Now, another way Saul tries to kill David. David’s playing the harp. Saul’s feeling down, and David’s playing the harp, Saul grabs his spear and what does he do? He chucks his spear at David, is David a warrior? David plays the harp but can he also dodge spears at the same time. This guy is quick, the spear comes at him, he dodges the spear, dodges the bullet, so to speak. Now, what happens? So he dodges it in chapter 19 where Saul actually tries to spear him to death.

Then Michal, his wife, puts an idol in his bed, covers it up with sheets, Saul comes in thinking, he’s going to kill David, he pulls the covers back, and what’s there? This idol. What does this tell you about Michal? Did she have idols? Did Saul’s family have

idols there? It just tells you, was Jehovah worship pure or are these families all messed up? So you have Michal's idol hiding which she uses the idol to hide David, and David gets away from Saul. So Saul tried to kill him, at least those times.

N. Jonathan warns David [62:28-65:52]

Now this is one of the most beautiful stories in the Scripture concerning David and Jonathan. Jonathan knows that his father is going to try to kill David. Jonathan has suspicions. "Never," Jonathan replied, "you are not going to die. Look, my father doesn't do anything great or small without confiding in me," Jonathan says, "Why would he hide this from me? It is not so." David says, "and yet, surely as the Lord lives, and as you live, there is only one step between me and death." So David and Jonathan go out there.

Let me just set the story up. Jonathan is known for his bow and arrow. David is a sling shot guy. Jonathan goes out, he's going to practice shooting the bow. When he practices shooting the bow, he tells David, and they set up the signal. Do friends ever set up signals? He says, "if I tell the kid to go beyond it, I missed, you've got to go back to get the arrow, the kid's going to go out and get the arrow." He's going to shoot the bow, the kid's going to chase the arrow down and bring it back. "If I tell the kid, go beyond, he said if I go like that, you know that my father is going to try to kill you."

So they set up the signal. Jonathan goes in and talks to his father. You know what his father does? His father picks up a spear and chucks it at Jonathan, he's so angry at Jonathan. So now, Jonathan goes and he says, "he's going to try to kill David." So he goes out, shoots the bow, the arrow goes, Jonathan tells the boy, "go beyond," and David knows it's over. Their friendship's at an end at this point. So David and Jonathan know that David's got to take off. They're not going to see each other. After the boy had gone, this is chapter 20 verse 41, "after the boy had gone, David got up from the south side of the stone and bowed before Jonathan three times with his face to the ground. Then they kissed each other and wept, but David wept the most." So you get this kind of comment on David, they kissed each other and wept, and David wept the most. Jonathan said to David, "Go in peace, for we have sworn friendship with each other in the name of the Lord, and the Lord is witness between you and me, between your descendants and my

descendants forever.”

Would David later on be true to this vow, that he made with Jonathan to take care of Jonathan’s descendants? Does anybody remember Mephibosheth, Jonathan’s son who was lame in both legs? David takes care of Jonathan’s son after Jonathan is long dead. David takes care of this. Have you guys ever heard of blood brothers? Now you guys don’t do it in your age, because no one should share blood with anybody, I don’t recommend this, but when I was young, we just didn’t have it that way. So Dave Remes is my blood brother. So when we were young, you cut yourself, and then you shared blood with one another. Then he’s like my blood brother for life. No seriously and so you have this. David and Jonathan are really tight, male friendship (cf. Ruth).

Now what’s going to be the problem with the story here is, they split up at this point. The next time we’re going to see Jonathan is when he’s dying. It’s kind of sad, but it’s what friends are for. He’s trying to warn David.

O. David’s flight and hiding from Saul [65:53-68:23]

Now, David is going to flee. David realizes that Jonathan’s told him, "Saul’s going to try to kill you." David’s going to flee, so David starts running. There’s a map here that I want to go through four places David’s going to run to and we’ll chase this down later with the narrative. Let me just show you on the map where it is. First of all, David’s go up to Anathoth, in your Bible’s it’s called Nob. Does anybody remember the priests of Nob, who protected David? So David is going to go to the priests of Nob. Saul’s from over here, David goes to the priests of Nob, they’re going to give him the sword of Goliath and they’re going to protect him. But then the priests of Nob are all going to be killed, 85 of them are going to be killed.

David then flees from there, he flees down to Gath. Now why was that really stupid? That’s Goliath’s hometown. You just took out the big guy from their town. He’s the biggest guy they’ve had probably ever, and David just took that guy out and chopped off his head. David goes down to Gath and then goes into the town and says, “Hey, I want to be a Jewish mercenary with the Philistines now.” I just want to say, not too

bright, I don't know. There's a problem, I don't think that was the brightest move that David ever made. So he goes to Gath, that doesn't work out for various reasons.

So David then hightails it up the place called Keilah. The city of Keilah, this is where I gained insight the first time in Scripture on some things. You know how I always push that thing that there are multiple possible futures? I will show you in the text at Keilah. David is going to ask God whether Saul comes down and he asks God some things about the future, and there seems to be multiple futures here at Keilah. We'll look at that in a minute. Saul is going to come down here, the Philistines went up and attacked Keilah. David protects the city of Keilah from the Philistines. So David should be the town hero but they would betray him if they had the chance.

Lastly, David goes up to Carmel that's in the Judean desert. There is a guy named Nabal who has a wife named, does anybody remember the wife's name? Abigail. This is where Nabal and Abigail and that whole situation takes place with David up at Carmel.

So David is going to run away from Saul because Saul is trying to kill him and David is going to flee to these four places. What I would like to do is just go through the places and hit each one of them and just give a summary of the stories rather than going over them in detail.

P. Nob [68:24-70:27]

In chapter 21, David goes to this city, city of Nob. Nob could fit on the quad. These are small towns. He goes to Nob, which is a priestly town. They have the sword of Goliath. Does David have all sorts of swords? David doesn't have all sorts of swords because of Philistines control iron working, so there's not too much metal going around. David gets the sword of Goliath. His troops get food from the priests. What kind of bread did the priests have? The priests have the holy bread and so the priests of Nob give David's men who were kind of unclean-ish kind of people, they give them the food that only the priests should eat, and then what happens? When David leaves, he's been fed, he's got the sword of Goliath now, and when he leaves, who shows up? Saul is actually just down the road from there, I don't know, 5 to 10 miles from there. Saul shows up.

There are 85 priests of Nob, he ordered his troops, “you go in there and kill those priests. Those priests helped David and David’s against me.” What did Saul’s troops say? “We’re not doing that Saul, these guys are priests of God. We’re not going to go in there and kill these guys.” So his troops refused to go in.

So what does Saul do? He talks to Doeg the Edomite, one guy and he says, “you go in and kill the 85 priest of Nob.” The priests were helpless. The Edomite, is whose descendent? You should know that by now. Esau’s descendent. Whenever you see Edomite in the Scripture, what did the Edomites do to Jews? They killed them. Who’s the most famous Edomite you know? You all know this person, Herod. King Herod that killed the infants in Bethlehem, he was an Idumaeon which were the descendants of the Edomites. So Doeg the Edomite kills the 85 priests of Nob, really bad scene. David flees, he gets away, but the priests are dead at Nob.

Q. David at Gath [70:28-73:24]

David then runs to Gath. He goes into Gath and this is a funny story actually, in the second part of chapter 21 here in 1 Samuel. David gets into town, he comes marching in with these guys, he’s got all these warriors with him, “Hey, we want to join you Philistines. We will be mercenaries for you guys.” The women in town remember the song, “Saul has killed thousands, and David his tens of thousands.” So they say, “isn’t this the David that they said had killed the tens of thousands and you’re going to let him be in our army?”

All of a sudden David realizes this is going badly, so what does he do? He pretends he’s like crazy. It says saliva goes down his beard and he’s spitting out on himself kind of like, I’m doing it up here. It’s coming down on his face, and they say, “this guy’s crazy, this guy is out of his gourd, why would we mess with him?” By the way, do people ever use insanity like that, was that a very smart move on David’s part? Yes, because things were going against him and he probably would have gotten killed there.

When he pretends he’s insane, let me just tell you another story from the prison. This is a maximum security prison. The walls are 40 feet high with barbed wire on the

top, they were about 10 feet thick. It was built in the 1800's. There's one guy in the prison who would go up to the wall, this is no joke, every day, this guy would go up and scream at the wall. He would go up to the prison wall and he would scream at the wall. All the guys in there in the prison, everybody in there is crazy okay, but is there cra-zy? This guy was cra-zy. You don't go up and scream at a wall all day and do that day after day. So everybody in the prison knew this guy is like cra-zy. Now question, do you mess with cra-zy people? You're a big guy, "I lift weights 8 hours a day, I'm a big and strong guy." Question, he's cra-zy, do you mess with him? Can you intimidate a cra-zy person? Question, suppose he's just a little guy, a crazy little guy, is it possible he might pull out some sort of weapon and stick you because he's absolutely crazy. He doesn't care how big you are because he's crazy. He doesn't know fear because he's stupid. So it turns out people don't mess with crazy people, even in the prison. Actually, I had some people in my class that thought this guy wasn't crazy at all. They thought that he was just pretending to be crazy because he didn't want to be messed with.

Now David pretends to be crazy and, by the way, does it work? Question: if you kill a crazy person, what happens? In ancient days, they were very superstitious. If he's crazy and you kill him, what he's got can come on you. So you leave crazy people alone. You don't want to get what they got, so you don't hurt them, lest whatever they got comes on you. So it's kind of this assumption of sympathetic magic. You leave it alone so that it doesn't come on you. So David actually has a pretty smooth move there but he's kind of dumb to go there in the first place, in my opinion.

R. David at Keilah: God and multiple futures [73:25-77:41]

Next, he goes to Keilah, and this is in chapter 23. In the city of Keilah, and let me just narrate the story. The city of Keilah is being attacked by the Philistines, so the Philistines are beating up on this small town of Keilah. David and his boys go up there and they deliver this town from the Philistines. So David frees this city from Philistine domination and delivers the city.

Now David then comes to the Lord, and says, "Bring out the ephod" and he says, "I've got something I want to ask you." "O God of Israel," this is chapter 23 verse 10, "O

God of Israel, your servant has heard definitely that Saul plans to come down to Keilah and destroy the town of Keilah on account of me. Will the citizens of Keilah surrender me to him? Will Saul come down as your servant has heard?” So David said, “God, I’ve got two questions. Will Saul come down here to try to kill me?” And secondly, “If he comes down, will the city deliver me up to Saul or will they try to protect me?” God says, “David, Saul will come down. Number two, they will deliver you up to Saul.” What’s David say? “Thanks God, I’m out of here.” David takes off. But God said, “Saul will come down and they will deliver you up.” Did that ever happen? Saul did come down, did they deliver David up? No, because David skedaddled and got out of there.

So did God tell David something that never happened? Had David stayed in the city, would he have been delivered up? Yes. But David said, “Okay, now that I know that they’ll deliver me up, I’m getting out of here.” So God told him something that was possible in the future, but David chose a different direction so that that never happened. Does God know possibilities that never happen? Now had David stayed there, it would have happened. But David said, “I’m not stupid, I’m not staying here if they’re going to deliver me up, I’m getting out of here.” So God told him here something that never happened. So this is the situation at Keilah. I think this shows God knew things that never happened. He knows things in the future that are contingent. In other words, they depend upon what happens and there are apparently multiple futures. David chose to interact, not by staying there, but by getting out of there and thereby avoiding being delivered over to Saul.

So does God know only what is or does God know what is possible? What I’m suggesting is that God knows not only what is, but he also knows what is possible. There are millions of possibilities. So that God’s omniscience is not just singular in knowing of a singular future, but God’s omniscience is incredible--multiple possibilities of future, millions of possibilities – God knows them all.

So I ultimately, and at this point, you can obviously disagree with me, some people have a more deterministic way of looking at the future. I think that this leads to the open possibility for choice and freedom and that human beings can make choices and

that human beings can help shape the future.

I love Isaiah chapter 40 verse 28. God says this: “no one understands my understanding.” Do we know how God knows the future? Can God choose to know the future in all of its richness of possibilities? Can God choose to know the future as singular? So what I’m saying is, we don’t know how God knows the future, and I just want to back people off because some people are so dogmatic on this. They say God knows every...and they think they know what God knows. What I’m saying is we don’t know how God knows the future. Here he knew something that never happened and yet he knew what would have happened had David stayed there. So be careful with that.

S. David at Carmel: Abigail and Nabal [77:42-81:36]

Now Abigail and Nabal are in chapter 25. It is an interesting story here with Nabal and Abigail. Let me just kind of run through it quickly so we can make sure we finish the book today. The story introduces David out in the desert and David is protecting Nabal’s sheep. Nabal is a rich guy, he’s got many sheep and goats. David is protecting the guy’s sheep. Who hangs out in the desert? In the desert, that’s where the banditos are; that’s where the criminals are. So basically it’s criminals out there. David is protecting Nabal’s sheep from these criminals, thieves and various people that would’ve hung out there. David sees that Nabal is shearing sheep and he’s going to kill some of the sheep and have some of the meat. So David sends down to Nabal and says, “Hey, I’ve been protecting your sheep, how about we kill a couple of sheep too and have some food.” Nabal says, “who’s David?” and blows David off. He says, “David, get out of here” and pushes David off. David says to his guys, “get your swords on, we’re going to go down and take that Nabal out. We’ve been out here working our tails off for this guy.” So David gets real serious about it, and then what happens?

In the first verse it describes this woman Abigail and it says, “She was an intelligent and beautiful woman.” By the way, is the narrative setting you up for what’s coming later? Is David going to marry this woman? She’s intelligent and she’s beautiful, what happens? She’s married to Nabal, that’s a problem. What’s his names mean? “Nabal” means “fool.”

So Abigail finds out that David's coming to kill her husband, what does Abigail do? Abigail gets all sorts of food and brings the food out on donkeys to David. Then David says, "May God deal with David, be it ever so severely if by mourning that one male is left alive." Then she fell at his feet and said, "My lord, let the blame be on me alone." Does she sacrifice herself on behalf her husband? Have you ever see a woman sacrificing herself trying to protect her husband? She does it. "Let it be on me alone, please let your servant speak to you. Hear what your servant has to say. May my lord pay no attention to that wicked man Nabal." Who is she referring to? That's her husband. Does she know her husband? She knows the guy. "He is just like his name, his name is fool." This woman, she's intelligent and she's beautiful. Does she know her husband's a fool? Yes. Are many women married to husbands that are fools? Don't ask my wife. What happens? Does she sacrifice herself, does she lay herself down and say, David, let it all fall on me, spare Nabal, her husband. Is this woman noble?

David then takes the food, backs off, and then let me just finish the story with her. Do you see what happens? She goes back to Nabal, what's Nabal doing? Nabal's partying, he's drunk. Do you tell a drunk man anything? No. She does not talk to him when he's drunk. When he wakes up the next morning and he's sober, she tells him what she's done and it says, "his heart failed." She tells him and "his heart failed and ten days later, the Lord took him." Ten days later, who did it? Did David do it? David didn't do it. The Lord took him.

Now Abigail is what? She's a widow. Can David marry her without having to kill her husband, since the Lord took him. So David then marries Abigail. By the way, what happened to David's earlier wife, Michal, does anybody remember that? Yes, exactly, she was given to one of David's friends, like his best man, we've seen that before with Samson. She was given to his best man and now David marries Abigail. David is going to have problems in this area, I don't mean to say David's perfect.

T. David at Ziklag and the Philistines [81:37-82:33]

Now David just goes to Ziklag to the Philistines. It's a city in the far south called Ziklag. It's out of the way. David does down there and actually joins the Philistines. It's

real interesting in chapter 27 it mentions this, “So on that day, Achish gave to David Ziklag, it has belonged to the kings of Judah ever since.” That statement in chapter 27 verse 6 actually indicates, “Ziklag has belonged to the kings of Judah ever since.” “The kings of Judah,” does that show that this verse was written after the kingdom split? Do you remember after Solomon, the kingdom split north and south (ca. 931 BC). This verse indicates that 1 Samuel was written after the time of Solomon, when the kingdom split. So this is a little indication of that. It’s not a big deal and I don’t want to you know it, but it does occur there.

U. David Spares Saul [82:34-84:52]

Now, David spares Saul, we’ll have to do this quickly. Saul goes into a cave, what’s Saul doing? Saul’s taking a dump in a cave, turns out David is in the cave. David is in the cave, David’s got his knife. Saul, when he’s doing that, is he totally vulnerable? David could take him out, yet David only cuts a little piece of his robe off. Saul comes out of the cave. David comes out and says, “Hey, Saul, you missing a little something?” And then what’s he do. Do you remember how Saul changes? He’s, “O David, my son David, I love you David.” You know, this is all baloney, but is Saul bipolar you know what I’m saying? So Saul comes out, pants down in the cave, “David, my son.”

A second time, David’s out there with his guys at night, and they’re up on a hill, Saul’s down in the valley. Who’s Saul’s general who was supposed to protect Saul? Abner. Who’s David’s general? Joab. Does anybody remember that David’s general is Joab. What does Joab do in the narrative? Joab does what to people? David’s general Joab kills people. Saul’s general Abner, is actually a pretty good guy. Saul’s general is Abner.

So what happens is David comes down into the area where Saul’s sleeping and steals Saul’s spear and his water jug and takes it back up on the hill and he says, “Hey Abner, you’re supposed to be protecting king Saul. Hey, Saul, you missing a little something?” And Saul’s spear and his water jug are gone and Saul does this again, “O David, my son, David.” He goes off like that again.

What does David say, and this the important line here. David respects the king and he says what? Don't touch the Lord's what? Don't touch the Lord's anointed. David is really careful not to hurt Saul. God is to take care of Saul. David would not strike Saul even though he had opportunity and even though his own guys are telling him strike him through, David won't do it. He won't touch the Lord's anointed.

V. Saul and the Witch at Endor [84:53-90:21]

Now, chapter 28 and this is good. This is a really important passage. Saul in 1 Samuel chapter 28, Saul is going to fight the Philistines in the valley of Jezreel. The valley of Jezreel is what, 20-30 miles wide, it's flat. Question, did the Philistine love the Valley of Jezreel because it was flat and they had chariots. Saul's going out against the Philistines, he is scared to death. He knows he's going to be defeated one of these times. So he goes to the Lord and he asks the Lord, but the Lord will not answer him by dreams or by the Urim and Thummim. Have I talked about the Urim and Thummim at all? The Urim and Thummim were, people believe, like two sticks that the priest had his breast plate. The breast plate was like a pouch, the priest took out the Urim and Thummim and they were cast down, and the Urim and Thummim would give answers from God through the priest. It was like casting lots. People believed that the sticks could give two answers, if they both came up the same color, then it would be, yes. If they both came up the other colors, it would be, no. If they came up mixed color it would be, no answer from God. So you've got to get three answers out of the Urim and Thummim, these lots they would cast: a yes answer, a no answer and no answer from God, in other words, God's not answering. So they cast the Urim and Thummim, and there was no answer from God.

So what Saul does is, "I've got to find out something about what's going to happen." So he goes to this witch, the witch of Endor. He goes to this witch and the witch says to him, let me just narrate the story to do it quickly. He goes to the witch and she communicates with the dead. By the way, do we have any people in our day and age which communicate with the dead, what city are they from? So this woman says she can speak to the dead so Saul says, "Bring up Samuel." The woman then all of a sudden is startled. She freaks out and says, "Holy cow, there's Samuel" and she sees Samuel. As

soon as she sees Samuel, she knows that this is not her power doing this, that Samuel is coming up. She screams then and she says, “You’re Saul, you’re Saul, you tricked me, you’re Saul.”

Then Samuel addresses Saul directly, and Saul asks, “what’s going to happen, in the future.” Samuel replies, “Saul, why have you disturbed me by bringing me up?” Was Samuel happier where he was, on the other side of death? Why is this passage is so important? Do you ever wonder what’s on the other side of death? This passage, 1 Samuel 28 tells you some of that? Samuel says, “why did you disturb me by bring me back, bringing me up?” Saul says, “the Philistines are after me and they’re going to kill me, and I want to find out what will happen.” Samuel says it’s no problem Saul, “you and your sons will be with me tomorrow.” Saul says, “Yeah! We’ll be Samuel.” What’s the problem? Where’s Samuel? Dead. So Saul goes into battle knowing that he’s going to die.

Now, what’s the problem? Are people on the other side of death aware of what’s going on in this world? Was Samuel aware of what was going on in Saul’s life? Was dead Samuel, aware of what’s going on in Saul’s life? Samuel not only was aware of what’s going on but Samuel was able to tell him what would happen the next day, that he was going to die.

My statement to you is this, when people die, are they aware what’s going on in your life? Your grandfather, your grandmother, your parents even, that have passed on, are they aware of what’s going on in this world? I want to tell you, I think on the basis of this passage, Samuel was very aware of what was going on. I think, for example, my dad passed away a number of years ago. I think he’s aware of what I’m doing now, probably thinking, that kid still doesn’t get it right, but anyway, you’ve got to be careful.

What I’m saying is that the people on the other side. How I think about it, does anybody remember the movie *The Matrix*, they had it in the old days, the movie called *The Matrix* where there are two parallel worlds. I’m saying that there’s two worlds, and the two worlds interact with each other? I think something like that’s going on. So what I’m suggesting is, based on this passage, the people on the other side of death are

basically aware of what's going on here.

Can witches bring back people back from the dead? No. This witch did not bring Samuel back. Samuel came back from God, not from this witch. Dead people are aware of this life. The implication multi-generationally is your grandparents and your great grandparents aware of what's going on in your life.

Does that change the way you think about things? If you know people are aware of what's going on in your life, does that change things? I think it does, it's something to think about. Anyway, enough on witches, let's get out here, take the our broomsticks and go.

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History, Literature and Theology course lecture 23 on the book of 1 Samuel: the demise of Saul and the early stories of King David.

Transcribed by Daniel Kim

Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt 2

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 24[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History, Literature and Theology course, lecture number 24 on: David--his compassion, his passion and his hatred of evil.

A. Quiz Preview [0:00-1:27]

Class, a couple of things for next week, for next Thursday. You folks are working on the Prophets. So there will be select readings on the Prophets. I have not checked the online syllabus, so do the selected readings there. Give me until tomorrow morning to get that accurate, but you can start working on some of the prophets. For some of the select readings, I'm not sure if the syllabus is right. My guess is the syllabus is right but I want to double check it against the online syllabus. I'll have that perfect for tomorrow morning. But we will be working on the Prophets. Next Thursday is our last quiz day. Isn't that going to be a sad day. Then after that we have just got the final left. The final will go from the last exam. I will probably put out a study guide for the final after our last Thursday class, the next Friday morning.

B. David's Compassion [1:28-3:09]

Well, let's jump in. Today we are going to focus totally on David's life. Previously, we introduced David and Saul, with David when he was younger and his marriage to Michal, Saul's daughter and then his fleeing from Saul who was trying to kill him for a number of years. At the end of the book of Samuel, Saul himself is going to this witch of En Dor. Does the witch of En Dor bring Samuel up? No, she does not bring Samuel up. She is more startled, I think, than anyone when Samuel actually comes up. She freaks out and then Saul talks/interviews with Samuel. Samuel tells Saul, "you and your boys are going to be with me tomorrow." This means Saul is told in chapter 28 that he is going to be dead, that he is going to be with Samuel who had already died in chapter 25.

So today I want to look at some things about David. The big thing with David I'm

not going to take 2 Samuel chronologically, rather I'm going to deal with it more thematically. The theme that I want to develop is that David was a man after God's own heart. My question is: what does it mean to be a person after God's own heart? So I want to look at king David as a model of what it means to be a person after God's own heart. In order to do that, I am going to take themes in David's life. The first theme in David's life that I want to examine is David's compassion. So I am going to go through various scenarios of David's compassion, then we will talk about David's passion, and finally, we will talk about David's hatred of evil.

C. The Death of Saul [3:10-9:06]

First, on his compassion, who killed Saul? Does anyone remember reading the end of 1 Samuel? It says Saul killed himself and then when you turn over to the next one, and let me just read 1 Samuel chapter 31 verse 4 and following, it says, "The fighting grew so fierce around Saul and when the archers overtook him, they wounded him critically." So a guy shot a bow and arrow and the arrow hits Saul. He is wounded critically. They could not get the Medivac helicopter into to him. "So Saul said to his armor bearer, 'draw your sword and run me through or these uncircumcised fellows will come and run me through and abuse me.' But his armor bearer was terrified and would not do it." By the way, who also had an armor bearer? Does anybody remember Goliath? Goliath had his armor bearer and now Saul's got his armor bearer and the armor bearer is probably really loyal to Saul and carried his weapons out for battle. Saul tells the armor bearer to kill him but the armor bearer won't do it. Does it take quite a bit for a person to kill another human being? It's a big deal. I don't know whether you guys know that in World War II a lot of the guys that went into battle shot their guns into the air. They did not shoot at another person because to draw your gun and shoot another person is a really hard thing to do. So in a lot of the earlier wars the people shot their guns into the air. It is a huge percentage of guys who never really actually put a bead on somebody and actually took them down. So that is interesting. Those kinds of facts don't usually get out. But what happens is then his armor bearer is terrified and would not do it. "So Saul took his own

sword and fell on it. When the armor bearer saw that Saul was dead....” So Saul is shot critically, but he is still alive. Then he falls on his own sword because the armor bearer won’t kill him. “When the armor bearer saw that Saul was dead, he too fell on his sword and he died. So Saul, his three sons and his armor bearer and all his men died together that same day.” So you have this tragic ending for Saul. But what is interesting is when you turn the page--so in chapter 31 of 1 Samuel it is Saul killed himself. He fell on his sword; he killed himself. We call that suicide. He committed suicide when he fell on his sword.

But when you flip the page and go over to 2 Samuel, chapter 1, it says this down about verse 10. There is an Amalekite who got away. So there is an Amalekite who comes to David. Let me just tell the story. The Amalekite comes to David with the crown of Saul and the band from his arm. Now, by the way, will David immediately recognize that crown as being Saul’s? Yes. So the Amalekite comes to David with the crown and the band and then the Amalekite narrates the story. “I happened to be on Mount Gilboa,’ the young man said, ‘and there was Saul leaning on his spear with chariots and riders almost upon him and he turned around and saw me and he called out to me, and I said, ‘what can I do?’ He asked me, ‘who are you?’ ‘I am a Amalekite,’ I answered. And then he said to me, ‘stand over me and kill me, I am in the throes of death but I am still alive.’ So I stood over him and I killed him because I knew that after he had fallen he could no longer survive. I took the crown that was on his head and the band on his arm and I brought them here to my Lord.”

So the question is who killed Saul? From what I understand, you can only get killed once. So did Saul kill himself or did this Amalekite kill him? This becomes a question and there are basically two options. Now there may be more. You guys are more creative than I am so there may be more options but here are two possible options on this. One is, Saul was shot. He then fell on his sword but he was still alive. When you fall on a sword like that, does a person die slowly usually? Does it take a lot to die? So he falls on his sword he is still graveling around and he is still alive. Then he calls out to the Amalekite, “come over and finish me off.” So that is the first scenario: the Amalekite is

telling the truth. Saul had fallen on his sword, though he had given himself a mortal wound from which he was going to die but he calls to the Amalekite and says “come finish me off more quickly so the Philistines don’t catch me and do some sort torture on me and it gets really ugly.” So, in that case, the Amalekite would be telling the truth, that’s possible.

I think what is probably more likely is, that the Amalekite is lying. What happened is Saul fell on his sword and Saul died. Then the Amalekite is lying to David. He grabbed the crown off Saul’s head and the band off his arm and brought them to David because what does the Amalekite want? He wants a reward and favor from the new king. He is bringing the crown to the new king and so he makes up this story and tells it to David hoping for a reward.

Now what is the problem? The Amalekite tells David. With David, do you touch the Lord’s anointed? No. This Amalekite has now claimed that he has slain the Lord’s anointed. So this guy gives his own death sentence. By the way, there is some irony here too. The guy claims he is a Amalekite. Do you remember Saul in 1 Samuel 15? Who was Saul supposed to wipe out? What tribal group was he supposed to wipe out? The Amalekites. He refused to do it and now you get an Amalekite standing over Saul in his death. My guess is that the guy is lying, wanting a reward from David. He goes to David and David says, “You messed with the Lord’s anointed. You’re a dead man.” So David puts the Amalekite to death.

D. Suicide Discussion [9:07-16:54]

Now you say, this isn’t real compassionate, but there are things here that I think we need to talk about. When a person commits suicide, do they go to hell because of unconfessed sin? Now I realize this isn’t really much of a question in Massachusetts because in Massachusetts everybody goes to heaven. But in other parts of the world, they think that there is a place called “hell.” So if a person commits unconfessed sin, their last act is a murder of themselves. Therefore there is unconfessed sin and the person is rebelling. So some people think that if a person commits suicide they automatically go to hell. I think that is wrong. Let me tell you one story and then let me illustrate it out of

the text. By the way, when I look around the class this size, there are likely some of you who know what it is like to have friends and family that have committed suicide. Is that a real serious issue?

My son got back from Afghanistan and when he got back from Iraq, a lot of his friends just got drunk all the time. They are Marines and they get drunk all the time just to try and forget what they saw. Another of his friends, he said this guy was totally well-adjusted, was a quiet guy. Somebody went into his room and got him just before; he had an M16 up his mouth and was going to pull the trigger and somebody broke into his room and knocked the gun away. But unfortunately, there were some other people who they didn't get to in time and there were people he came back with that committed suicide (Bunches, we remember).

The one for me that is most outstanding let me tell you a story about Mr. Mill (pseudonym). Mr. Mill was a multimillionaire. He was from Columbus, Ohio. He was in a very big business. He was so well known in that town when he would go into his favorite restaurant, they didn't even ask Mr. Mill what he wanted to order. They knew what he wanted and so they ordered for him. This guy was a limo, a multimillionaire kind of guy. I was teaching with his two sons, both PhD's wonderful young men. At the time we were in our early thirties. He had a wonderful family, wonderful wife, and big business. He retired from the business. He didn't have anything to worry about for the rest of his life. He was well set. When he left the business, he lost his reason for living, because the business was so much a part of his life and now all of a sudden he is sitting around and he doesn't know what to do with himself. He is getting more and more depressed. Then one day his wife went out to the garage and he had strung himself up and hung himself in their garage.

You ask: how did you get in on this? They called me because I was the same size as he was and so I got all these really expensive clothes that he had bought. I wore Mr. Mills clothes for probably ten years, at least. I actually still have them. What was amazing to me was his shoes. I have really wide foot and I take a 10 ½ triple E. In other words, I always have to get 12s or something because my feet are so wide, I can never

find shoes that fit so I always get them really long. Mr. Mill broke his toe when he was younger and guess what size shoes he wore? A 10 ½ triple E. I can't even go to a shoe store and find them. Whenever he bought shoes, he bought two pairs of them. So until this day, actually when I was recently at my daughter's wedding I was wearing Mr. Mill's shoes. They were very nice. They were 100 dollar shoes. For you guys that is not much today for shoes but back then those were beautiful leather shoes. Mr. Mill was a Christian all his life. He was involved in the church during his life. His two sons, were teaching with me in a very Christian school. His wife also a wonderful Christian.

Question, did he go to hell because he hung himself like that? I want to say, first of all that would be really wicked and cruel to ask his wife. You would never think to say anything like that. Hopefully you are smarter than that.

What does the Bible say? This is a real issue. Have you ever been around somebody...

[Student speaking] "also somebody who has depression, you have to look at mental and physical ability so he wasn't really responsible for his acts."

[Hildebrandt] I have a problem with some mental illnesses and not being responsible for their acts. I know I am probably going overboard but I am just thinking about that Norwegian guy. Do you realize the Norwegian guy who blew 77 people away, they said he was crazy. So the guy is not going to jail. Now they will put him away for some psychiatric diagnosis. So there is balance with that.

I don't know where the line is for responsible or being irresponsible. I also know and I have had personal experiences with my dad, when my dad was dying of cancer. I look up to my dad. I think he was a better Christian man than I will ever be. I really, really respected my dad, but when he was going down, and he had cancer all throughout. I can't tell you how much pain that was--pancreatic cancer. I was pumping him with morphine. He would not let anybody else give him morphine. I was the only one he would let give him the morphine. I didn't know what I am doing. I am not a doctor but he would not trust anybody else. But I was giving him morphine but toward the end he pleaded for death. What do you do when he is pleading wanting to die? He wants to go

and be with the Lord and his pain was just horrendous. What do you do? There are conflicts over this kind of stuff. Praise God, I didn't have to make that decision because about three days later he died of his own accord but it was really horrendous.

Some of you know what I am talking about because you have had friends who have committed suicide or family members, it just rips your guts out. Let me just go to a passage. What does the Bible say about this? Do you remember back in 1 Samuel 28? Samuel comes up and what does Samuel say to Saul? "Tomorrow you and your sons will be with me." Well, you can say, that simply means they will be dead. But notice he says, "tomorrow, you and your sons..." Now we don't know about the rest of his sons but one of the sons who dies here that we do know is Jonathan. Question: is Jonathan one of the best of all of the Bible? So I want to say if Saul and his sons go to be where Samuel is, it is a good place. So I want to say, heaven probably. It isn't conclusive if you know what I am saying. I can't do a philosophical or exegetical analysis to prove it but I'm saying, it seems to me that the evidence leads in that direction.

[Student speaking] "But what I was trying to get at was, how mental take physical manifestations and say somebody dies, him killing himself is really the depression. You know what I mean? It's not him.

Hildebrandt's response: Yes, what I'm saying is I don't know where the line is for somebody that is down and I have to leave that out but it does seem like the text indicates that Saul and his sons went to be with Samuel, which is a good place. So I want to say that we have some biblical data for that.

E. David's Compassion: Eulogy for Saul [16:55-21:03]

Now here is where David gets back on. David does the eulogy for Saul. Now do you know what the word eulogy is? Eulogy is what? Usually when somebody dies you do a eulogy. The word "eu" on the front of a word means "good" in Greek and English. Does anybody know what a euphemism is? A euphemism is when you "speak well." This is a eulogy. "Logy" is from *logos*. *Logos* means, "in the beginning was the *logos*, in the beginning there was the word." The "good word." So what happens is he is going to give a eulogy, a "good word," for Saul, but was Saul the very one who had been trying to kill

him for years. Here is what David says about Saul. “He’s gone. Praise God, the guy is dead. He had been trying to kill me for years. He finally got what was coming to him.” Is that what David said? Here is what David says in his eulogy. David is a poet, as you know, from the book of Psalms. David writes almost half the book of Psalms.

David says this, “Saul and Jonathan, they were loved in gracious in life.” Do you remember when Saul was trying to kill him? He says in the eulogy, “he was loved and gracious and in death they were not parted. They were swifter than eagles, stronger than lions. O daughters of Israel, weep for Saul who clothed you in scarlet and finery. Who adorned your garments with ornaments of gold. How have the mighty fallen in battle!” Is he praising Saul here? The guy has been trying to kill him for years, the guy who is the king, that is. The Spirit had left him and had come on David. Saul had been trying to kill him. This is amazing. So this shows me David’s compassion, that David is not vindictive. He is not vengeful. Saul tried to do all sorts of nasty stuff to him, but when he dies, David laments for Saul.

Now this part is kind of really weird. I hate bringing it to text but this is the way in the twenty-first century, these texts are looked at. He says, “I grieve for you Jonathan, my brother.” Was Jonathan David’s best friend? Jonathan was David’s best friend. His best friend has just died. Is that a big deal? When one of your best friends dies, does that do something to you? My son can tell you about that. When somebody you care about and is your best friend and they die, that affects you big time. “I grieve for you Jonathan, my brother. You are very dear to me. Your love for me was wonderful, more wonderful than that of women.”

How do people in the twenty-first century understand that? They take it as if David and Jonathan had a gay relationship. Does that have anything to do with anything here? No, it doesn’t. So to read that in, you can say we do reader response. You can do that all you want but what I’m talking about is the fact that David and Jonathan were friends. Is it possible for males to have friendships without being gay? So what I am saying here you have got two guys that are just like blood brothers--close. They were close in battle, close in life and here he dies. David says, you know I had a special

relationship with this guy Jonathan. He was David's best friend. So be careful about how the scriptures get twisted in the twenty-first century. I think it is wrong.

[Student speaking] "Didn't he also have a bad time with some of his wives?"

[Hildebrandt] Yes, David had plenty of wives and we are going to get to that. Give me about ten minutes and we will get to David's wives. I mean some of them were good.

Did everybody hear that? He said the reason he lost moral love for women was because he had such a bad experience with women. No, don't do that. Let's do something different here. Interesting suggestion, I have never heard that before.

F. David's Compassion: Ishbosheth [21:04-23:20]

Okay, now Abner and Ishbosheth, who are these guys? First of all, Saul is dead. You guys are Israel, Sea of Galilee, Jordan River, and Dead Sea. You guys are Israel, Jordan, Mediterranean Sea. [Prof. Hildebrandt designated sections of the room as geographic landmarks] David takes over Israel. So David gets this territory. Saul's son is named Ishbosheth. Ishbosheth takes over this area in Jordan. So Ishbosheth had this [Jordan]. David has this [Judah].

Now was Ishbosheth really the guy's name? The guy's name is Ishbosheth but actually, when you look over in Chronicles, you say Hildebrandt why don't you like the name Ishbosheth? Would you name your son this? Ishbosheth means "man of shame." Would you name your kid "man of shame"? You say that is a really odd name for a kid. No one would ever do that to their kid I don't think. But what happens is if you go over into Chronicles, you see that his real name was Ishbaal. Ishbaal means what? "Man of Baal." By the way, in Hebrew when I say, "Baal," what comes to your head? Baal worship and things like that--Baal and Asherah worship from the Canaanites. That probably wasn't how the kid was named. Baal can also mean "owner" or "master." "Man of the master," which would be Saul which is "man of the master" and that he was the big baal [master] guy. In other words, Saul was the owner/master. So I think what you have here is that Ishbosheth is his nickname. The later scribes did not like writing the name Ishbaal and they didn't because it meant "man of Baal." So the guy after his own lifetime was probably called Ishbosheth, "man of shame." So I think that Ishbosheth is a

nickname. Do you nickname people with various names especially if someone has got an offensive name?

“Yes, Hannah.” [Student speaking] “What do you think Nabal’s name was really?”

[Hildebrandt] Nabal’s name may have meant “fool” but it may have been his nickname too. It is hard to say. With Nabal, all we have got is Nabal’s name with Ishbosheth we have got his other name too. So this one we know because there is actual text but you’re in 1 Samuel 25 there with Nabal is the only name you’ve got.

G. Death of Abner: David’s compassion [23:21-29:13]

So, Ishbosheth is Saul’s son but what we need to know is, who was Saul’s general? King Saul had a general whose name was Abner. David had a general and his general’s name was Joab. So those are the two guys. Saul, his main general was Abner. David’s main general was Joab. Now when Joab appears in the narrative, what is Joab going to do? Almost every time he does exactly the same thing. Joab does what to people? Yes, Joab kills them. Joab is a killer. Joab is David’s general and almost every time he appears in the narrative he is killing somebody. Abner is Saul’s general and he is going to do some things there too. Joab then is going to kill Abner. Let me just tell you the story of how this happens and then I want to look at David’s compassion in the story.

Joab and Abner were the two generals of David and Saul respectively. They got together at a pool called the “Pool of Gibeon” (2 Sam. 2). Do you remember the Gibeonites? They were the ones who made an alliance with Israel. There is a pool in Gibeon about from that pillar to this pillar to around where I am. It is a huge pool. From these pillars, there is a pool and Joab’s men and Abner’s men sat around the pool. Joab and Abner, the two generals, say, “Hey, why don’t we let these young guys get up and grapple and fight each other to see whose guys are tougher.” So the guys get up and they start getting into battle and then it gets thicker and thicker and all of a sudden people start killing each other. So Abner decides, “I’m getting out of here. This is getting dangerous. These guys are killing each other.” So Abner takes off running. Now Abner is the big, strong general. Joab’s younger brother is a guy named [Asahel](#) and it says he was “fleet of

foot,” which meant he was quick. So Asahel chases after Abner and Abner turns around to Asahel and he says, “Asahel get off my tail. I don’t want to hurt you, because if I hurt you, I have to answer to whom? Your older brother.” Do older brothers take care of younger brothers? When I was young this happened and forty years later, my brother remembered this. When I was young, my brother came home from school one day and some kids had jumped him and beat him up. He got home, I’m the older brother, what did I do? I whipped off my belt, put it around my fist and I went out and took care of business. So when I got home, it was just over. It’s over; it’s cool. They won’t be bothering you again. Did you know forty years later when one of my kids was getting married my brother was telling nasty stories about me and what he said was, one of the things I remember about my brother was that whenever I got in trouble like that, he would take my side. He protected me and he took care of business. He remembered that forty years later where I had totally forgotten about it. What I’m saying is the older brother protects the younger brother.

So what happened? Abner says to Asahel, “get off my tail. I don’t want to fight Joab. So just back off.” He takes the butt-end of his spear and he pushes the kid back with the butt-end of his spear. But what’s the problem? The butt-end of the spear goes through the kid and he ends up killing the kid by accident and now Joab is going to be on his case.

So now what happens? Abner is over here with Isbosheth in Jordan and Isbosheth has got Saul’s concubine, who is named Rizpah. I could never understand that. It is like “the floor lady.” Rizpah means “floor.” But anyway, Abner says can I have Rizpah the concubine of Saul and Isbosheth freaks out. Abner says, “I fought for Saul for twenty years and now you give me nothing. I’m going over to David.” So Abner takes himself and his troops and he goes over to David and he says to David, “I want to make an alliance with you. I’ll bring the kingdom over to you David. You’ll have territories on both sides of the Jordan River now.” Abner and David make an alliance. Joab is not there. Joab shows up and he says, “Hey, David you should have never made an alliance with Abner. Abner tried to kill you. What did you make alliance with him for?”

So Joab sends and says, “Abner come back here.” Abner comes back thinking he is going to talk to Joab. Joab takes out his knife and sticks him under the fifth rib and kills Abner in cold blood. So now Abner is dead and he has been killed in cold blood. What is David’s response to this? Joab stabbed him. This is chapter 3 verse 32, it says, “they buried Abner in Hebron and the king wept aloud at Abner’s tomb and all the people wept also.” Abner was killed in cold blood by Joab. It was murder; Joab killed him. “The king sang a lament for Abner. Then the people came and urged David to eat something.” Why did the men come and try to get him to eat? David wasn’t eating. When something is really tragic you don’t eat, right? So David is fasting and just not eating because he is so upset with this. “While it was still day, but David took an oath saying, ‘may God deal with me, may if be so severely if I taste bread or anything else before the sun sets.’ All the people took note and were pleased. Indeed everything the king did pleased them. So on that day, all of the people and all of Israel knew that the king had no part in it.” So David wept for Abner and he said and he wouldn’t eat until the sun was down and all the people knew that David had nothing to do with the murder of Abner and that it was Joab’s fault.

So David is compassionate and even with his enemy here. He shows respect to Abner even though Abner had tried to kill him. So David’s response and the people’s response is the people know David had compassion on Abner, his enemy. He weeps for him and this is kind of how the story goes down. That is the second situation where David shows compassion.

H. Mephibosheth and David’s Compassion [29:14-33:15]

Here is another one. This is over in chapter 9--2 Samuel chapter 9. This is a beautiful story, not totally beautiful but it’s Mephibosheth. Say that three times fast. David now is king over everything. He has gotten Israel; he had gotten Trans-Jordan. David is the king over everything. David says, “are there any of Saul’s descendants that I can help?” David is in position of power and now he says, “are there any leftover of Saul’s descendants that I can help?” They say, “Yeah, there is one guy named

Mephibosheth but he is, what is Mephibosheth's problem? He is lame in both legs.

Apparently when the nurse was carrying him, either she dropped him or fell on him or something and the guy is crippled in both legs. Now, by the way, in our culture if you are crippled in both legs, is it really a big problem? You can get prosthetics. You can get, you know elevators taking you up. You can get a wheelchair. You can even race in a wheelchair. In our culture, it is a problem but not huge. Did they have wheelchairs? Did they have escalators? Did they have elevators and things like that? No.

Mephibosheth is whose son by the way? Jonathan's son. Remember David made a vow with Jonathan that he would take care of his descendants forever. So David basically takes care of Mephibosheth and this is a beautiful situation. He says, "Mephibosheth you can eat at my table from now until forever. You are considered like one of the king's sons. I will feed you forever." That was the first welfare program ever in existence, David taking care of Mephibosheth. So that is kind of the storyline behind it.

This is the point I want to draw from it. The goodness of a person can be seen, can be measured, on how they treat people who cannot pay them back anything. Suppose you want to get a promotion and you are working down at a corporation down in Boston like my son was. A guy comes in he works four hours a day and you come in and you work eight and nine hours a day. The guy works four hours a day and even in those four hours he barely does any work. But question, what does the four-hour-a-day guy do? He goes out golfing with the boss every day or whenever the boss goes out on weekends. He goes golfing all the time with the boss. Time comes for raises who is going to get the raise, the one that goes out golfing with the boss or the one who does the work? The one that does the work should get the raise. No, the one who is working four hours a day, coming in at ten and going home at two, going out golfing with the boss, he gets the raise. Is that how it works? You do favors, you become friendly with somebody and then all of a sudden you get the promotion. Now is that fair? Is that right? No, it's not but that is how it works often times. Do people work employers that are over them to try and garner favors from them? That is how it normally works. So you want to go against that.

You say what did Mephibosheth have that David needed? Nothing. In other

words, David did not get anything out of this. This is grace; this is compassion. David has compassion and is gracious to Mephibosheth and provides for him. It is wonderful what David did. He is not wanting anything from Mephibosheth. So how do you treat people that are outcasts? How do you treat people that don't fit in? That is a mark of your character. Everybody always wants the people who are on the top but how do they treat the people on the bottom? David is a compassionate guy. He goes after Mephibosheth and invites him into his home and takes care of him for the rest of his life. Mephibosheth had his problems, as seen in some of the later chapters we are going to skip.

I. Absalom and David's Compassion [33:16-48:53]

Now what about Absalom? This is one I want to camp on for a while. Absalom was David's son and Absalom is going to get into some trouble here big time, so I want to work through the Absalom story. This shows David's compassion very, very well.

First of all, here's how the story goes down. You may remember it. There was a guy named Amnon "and it came to pass" let me start with chapter 13 verse 1, 2 Samuel 13.1: "In the course of time, Amnon, son of David, fell in love with Tamar, the beautiful sister of Absalom, son of David." So Amnon, the son of David falls in love with Tamar, the daughter of David. Is that a problem? Yes. Now, by the way, is Amnon half-brother to Tamar? By a different wife David had Amnon, so they are what? Half-brother, half-sister. So Amnon falls in love with his half-sister. Remember how I said geography plus hormones equals love. So geography, they are close together.

So Amnon is sick with love is it really love or is it lust? What is the difference? Lust is a very consumptive--now kind of thing; whereas love is, I'm sorry but I'm going to be really corny, but love waits. Love can wait, lust can't. So what I am saying is that Amnon can't have her because she is his sister. So Amnon has a nasty friend named Jonadab who makes a suggestion of how to take care of the problem. "You pretend like you are sick and you tell the king, 'I want Tamar, my sister to bring me in some nice,' (what is it you eat when you are sick), chicken soup? So bring in some nice chicken soup so that it will make me feel better. I'm sick.'" So she brings in the chicken soup. She prepares it or whatever it was and then Amnon sends everybody else out. Then what does

he do? He is stronger than she is and he rapes her. By the way, if you ever want a passage this 2 Samuel 13, do you actually have the dialogue between the brother who is going to rape his sister and the sister trying to defend herself. It is actually verbally described here. It says, “but he grabbed her and he said to her, ‘come to bed with me my sister.’ ‘Don’t my brother,’ she said. ‘Don’t force me. Don’t do such a thing.’” Does it record the narrative between these two? It is narrated here. It is incredible the Bible records something like that.

Amnon rapes her because he is stronger than she is and then he throws her out. This passage just makes you so angry. “Then Amnon hated her with an intense hatred. In fact, he hated her more than he loved her.” Can lust turn to hate? Yes. This is what happens. He throws her out and she says, “throwing me out is worse than what you have already done to me.” So this is really bad.

Now, what happens here? David’s family is having problems. Why is David’s family having problems? David and *Bathsheba lies behind this in chapter 11. Now how do you tell? Love can wait, lust can’t. What is the role of a father? Is the role of the father in the family to administer justice to his kids? The role of the father is to administer justice. Does David do anything to Amnon? David doesn’t do anything. So what happens when the father doesn’t administer justice, do the kids take care of it among themselves? When the father does not administer justice the kids take care of it themselves.*

So what is going to happen is Absalom is Tamar’s brother. Now, by the way, what do we know about Absalom? Does anybody know? There used to be a guy named Keith Green. I love his music. He has a big old head of hair. This guy Absalom is known for his big head of hair, he was handsome guy. He was one of the most handsome in all of Israel. So Absalom is her older brother and he says, “sister, you go, I’ll take care of it.” So what he does is he throws a big party and he invites Amnon. He says, “get Amnon drunk and then when Amnon is drunk, kill him.” So Absalom has his half-brother killed for raping his sister, Tamar. Absalom kills his brother. Does it kind of echo back Cain and Abel? So Absalom kills Amnon.

Now what happens (2 Sam 14)? After Absalom kills Amnon, he flees from the city and goes up towards Damascus out of reach of David. Absalom hides out for a while; he flees. Now is Joab a really smart guy? Joab is maybe not too bright himself, but when you want wisdom, what kind of a person do you go to? When you want somebody shrewd or wise who do you go to? You go to a woman. When you want to bring compassion out of a man, who do you go to? So Joab goes to a woman and the woman comes in. She is the wise woman from Tekoa. Tekoa is just south of Bethlehem, maybe about ten miles south of Bethlehem. So since they are sister cities, David would have known Tekoa well. So Joab gets this wise woman of Tekoa. By the way, I should mention, Joab is from what town also? Joab is from Bethlehem. Joab is from the same town as David. Is it very likely that David and Joab grew up together and all their life they were together? So Joab knows David from back when they were in grade school. They didn't have grade school but anyway, back when they were kids. He grew up with him. Joab becomes the great fighter and David respects his abilities because he is very gifted at doing what he does.

But now what happens? Joab goes to the wise woman of Tekoa and says, "Go tell David this story." So the wise woman of Tekoa goes to David and says, "David I'm a widow. I don't have a husband. I have only two boys and my two boys got into a fight with one another and one killed the other one. Now the townspeople are wanting to kill my last son. But if they kill my last son, I'll have nothing. David would you pardon/spare my son?" And David says, "I'll spare your son." Then what does the wise woman of Tekoa say? Just kidding. You thought it was my son. Why would you spare my son, David, would you not spare your own son? Spare your son Absalom. Forgive him. Let him come back. You've spared my son, why won't you spare your own son? Do you see the argument there?

So David says, "Okay, Absalom can come back but when he comes back," and this is part of the problem, David says, "I don't want to see his face. He can come back to Jerusalem and he can be with his buds when he comes back, but I don't want to see his face." I want to call that partial forgiveness. Is partial forgiveness dangerous and bad?

Yes. Partial forgiveness is going to grieve the heart of Absalom. Absalom is going to get more and more angry at his father. Now when I say Oedipus Complex, what are we talking about there? As soon as I say Oedipus, what comes into your head? Good old Sigmund Freud. Did Sigmund Freud have it right on some things? He had his problems, I'll give you that. Absalom is going to try to kill his father. He's going to get so hateful towards his father; he's going to go after him to kill him. So this is breeding in Absalom's heart now.

Now, let me just set this up. Where does Absalom go to breed the revolt that he needs to revolt against his father? I've skipped this. When David first became king, where did David first administer his kingship from? He administered it from a town called Hebron. Is Hebron the hometown where Abraham and his wives were buried? Hebron is a very noble city. The people, even to this day, are noble. I took a picture of a guy in Hebron, and the last thing I remember of that was being chased down the road. He chased me with a butcher knife. I outran him obviously, but he was running after me, and I ran for my life. The butcher knife was about that long, but I took a picture that was wrong that violated him, and he then proceeded to chase me. I got the picture though. It's a long story. I don't want to get into it. I was wrong. I should have been more sensitive to his culture. I was a young kid and I was too stupid at the time. I didn't deserve to get the knifed, however, but I did deserve to be chased.

Hebron is a noble city. Here's how it worked. David was king in Hebron for seven years, and the last thirty-three years of his reign, he moved the capital up to Jerusalem. So the people of Hebron are noble and dignified even to this day, and they said, "David, when you were nobody, we were good enough for you, but as soon as you got to be the big king, you moved everybody up to Jerusalem. So now Jerusalem is your big capital, but we were good enough when you were nobody." So are the people in Hebron going to feel snubbed by David? Yes. So Absalom goes to Hebron because he knows that's a weak point, and he also knows the character of these people. He says to them, "Hey, I want to be President of the United States so I tell all you college students there will be no tuition. You don't have to take out loans. The government will cover all your loans, and I

will take care of it. The prices of your schooling will be slashed to a tenth, and there won't be tuition. There should be free education for all. I'm running for President of the United States. Please vote for Ted Hildebrandt, he approves this message." When you promise people something for nothing, people vote for you. So Absalom goes down there. That's exactly what he does. He says, "If I were king, I would do this," and he tells the people exactly what they want to hear. So pretty soon the people say, "Absalom should be king." So he rallies the people at Hebron, and he marches up to Jerusalem after David.

Now what's the problem? When you go after David, and you're Absalom—is Absalom a pretty boy? I don't know how else to say it. Absalom is a big, handsome guy with all this hair. Tell me about Goliath. Tell me about the battles. Is David a warrior? David's a warrior. Could David have stood up to his son and taken him on and probably taken him down? Yes. David's a warrior. Did David choose to do that? No. David, when he heard his son was coming up fled the city, and he fled out of Jerusalem down to the Rift Valley, and up over into Jordan. David flees from his son. David doesn't want to hurt his son, so David flees.

Now what happens? Chapter 18, Absalom's catching up with David. So David can't get away now. David realizes that the two armies are going to go to war with one another. So it says, "The king commanded Joab, Abishai, and Ittai," and this is what the king said. "He's says, 'Be gentle with the young man Absalom for my sake.'" In other words, don't kill him. "And all the troops heard the king giving the order." David didn't just tell Joab on the side, David announced it in front of all the troops, "Be gentle. Don't hurt Absalom."

Now what happens? What's Absalom most famous for? His hair. He's riding on a donkey. He goes under a low oak tree. They have these low hanging branches from the oak tree. What happens? His hair gets tangled up in the branches. The donkey runs off, and Absalom is swinging in the air with no donkey under him. He's caught in the tree by his hair. Who would be the one person in Israel you would not want to meet at that point? You're totally helpless and guess who shows up? Joab shows up, sees him

dangling in the breeze, and Joab thinks, “I know what to do.” He takes three darts and jams them into Absalom’s heart. He kills him and he falls down. Ten men surround him, and they take him out. So David’s son Absalom is killed by Joab and his boys, after David had urged mercy.

Now, watch David’s reaction, and then I want to watch Joab’s reaction after this. David gets news after his boy has been killed. Now, by the way, had his boy tried to kill him? Had his boy violated his concubines in front of everybody attempting to totally violate David? Yes. Absalom dies. Here’s what the narrator says. “The king was shaken,” chapter 18, verse 33: “David went up to the room over the gateway and wept. As he went, he said, ‘O, my son Absalom, my son, my son Absalom. If only I had died instead of you. O, Absalom. My son. My son.’” Have you ever seen a person grieve, where they keep saying the same thing over and over and over again? They’re grieving. David is grieving, deep grieving. Joab was told, the king is weeping and grieving for Absalom and the whole army. The victory of the day was turned into mourning because that day the troops heard, “The king is grieving for his son. The king covered his face and grieved aloud, ‘O my son Absalom! O my son, my son, Absalom!’” David is really shaken up. His son, whom he loved, is dead now. So this is David weeping, showing his compassion for his son who tried to kill him.

I think what is more interesting to me than this is Joab’s reaction. Joab is the one who killed him. David’s weeping and check out what Joab says here. This is really interesting. Does Joab know David really well? Joab had grown up with David. Joab had been in war with David. They had been chased by Saul together. Joab knew David like of a book. Joab is going to give an indictment against David and he’s going to nail David. Listen to what Joab says. He’s going to make an accusation against David. Joab is really ticked. He killed Absalom. Yes, he did. But Absalom should have died, according to Joab. “When Joab went into the house of the king and said, ‘Today, David, you have humiliated all your men who have just saved your life and the lives of your sons and daughters and the lives of your wives and concubines.’” Then he says, “‘David, do you know what your problem is? I’ll tell you right now, David. This is your major problem,

David. You love those who hate you.” Now all of a sudden you’re sitting here thinking, Can you hear the echo? You love those that hate you. Echo. Echo. Echo. Sound like somebody else you know? You love those that hate you. Does it sound like Jesus? I mean, you can’t get much closer than that. So you get this echo with Jesus. “You love those that hate you.” That’s what Joab, who knows David’s heart, says, “That’s your problem, David.” Is that the very thing that makes him a man after God’s own heart that he loves those that hate him? It’s a beautiful statement, chapter 19, verse 5 and following there. Joab’s got it absolutely right. David is a man after God’s own heart. He loves his enemies.

J. David’s Passion: Ark to Jerusalem [48:54-59:52]

Now, that’s David’s compassion. He has compassion on his son Absalom. He has compassion on Saul. He has compassion on Mephibosheph. But what about David’s passion? For this, we’ll jump back to chapter 6 in 2 Samuel about the ark. I want to bring up this map here and describe what’s happening.

First of all, remember the Philistines back in 1 Samuel? The Philistines captured the ark, so they’re down here—Gath and Ekron. The Philistines have taken it here. The ark then is taken back up to Bethshemesh. Cattle basically haul the ark back up to Bethshemesh and the ark is down here. Now, where is David at this time? David’s at Jerusalem. David is an administrative genius. This guy is really sharp. David captures Jerusalem. Jerusalem is known as the “City of David.” It’s his city. He captured it, so it’s his city. It’s the City of David. It’s the political capital.

Now what does David say? David says, “I know Jerusalem is the political capital,” but David says, “The ark is down there in a tent.” He says, “I want to bring the ark to Jerusalem.” By bringing the ark to Jerusalem, what does David do? He consolidates the power, so Jerusalem will not only be the political capital, but now it will be the religious capital. It would be like Rome being brought to Washington D.C. or something like that—the political and the religious coming together into one. So David’s going to haul the ark up. He’s going to haul it from Bethshemesh up here to Kiriath-jearim. As he goes up into hills, this is where the ark’s going to hit a rock. Uzzah’s going to die here in

Kiriath-jearim, and in a later time, David's going to bring the ark up from Kiriath-jearim to Jerusalem. David's going to house the ark there in a tent in Jerusalem. It is going to be like a tabernacle structure in Jerusalem. David's going to bring the ark to Jerusalem.

Before we get there, let's just walk through what happens as the ark goes up to Jerusalem because there's some really cool things there. This ark coming up to Jerusalem shows David's passion. Before we get to the passion, the joy of David is found in 2 Samuel 6. Let me first hit Uzzah. As the ark is going to Jerusalem, they put the ark on a cart. Now, first of all, is the ark supposed to travel on a cart? When they travelled in the wilderness and when they went around Jericho, how was the ark to be transported? With poles on the priest's shoulders. The priests were to hand-carry the ark on poles. They put it on a cart. The cart goes up into the mountains, hits a rock, and the ark is going to fall off the cart. What does Uzzah do? Uzzah reaches out his hand. By the way, how big is the ark? The ark is about this big by this big. You know what I'm saying? Is the ark big enough that you could handle it. One person probably couldn't pick it up because it was overlaid with gold, but what I'm saying is it's only about this big. It's like a small cedar chest. What happens is, it's going down because it hit a rock. Uzzah sticks out his hands to try to keep it on the cart and God slays Uzzah on the spot. When you violate that which is holy, is there usually a quick action from God on the spot? Does anybody remember Nadab and Abihu in Leviticus 11 when they offered up an unauthorized fire to the Lord, and Nadab and Abihu, Aaron's sons, dropped dead.

Is it possible that Uzzah had proper motives to save the ark? But sometimes, just because your motives are right, does it also matter what you actually do? Well, you say, "But my motives are good." No, no. It matters what you do as well as your motives. It's not an either or. My motives were right, but what I did wasn't right. No, no. They both have to be right. What you do has to be right, but your motives have to be right also. So he may have had right motives, but what he did was violate something that was holy. Uzzah went down. David freaks out. He says, "Whoa, I'm not bringing the ark up here. The one guy's dead already. We're not going to do that." David was upset with that.

So David leaves the ark there for a while. Then David realizes God's blessing on

the place there, so David comes down and brings the ark up. This time David goes down and they carry it up on the poles with the priests carrying it. Then every seven steps, they offer up sacrifices to God. Sacrifices all the way up. Then I want to read about David's celebration as he brings the ark into Jerusalem. So now the ark of God is coming into Jerusalem for the first time. This is David's celebration. He's bringing the ark to the City of David. It says, "David, wearing a linen ephod danced before the Lord with all his might."

I was reared in a really strict Baptist church, and we didn't dance. It was like illegal to dance. You say, "It's all right, Hildebrandt. White men can't dance anyway." That's probably true, for me anyway. It's really interesting here. Did David dance before the Lord? Is this guy-girl dancing, like after basketball games, me and my good friends—this wasn't a good scene actually. Here David's dancing before the Lord and praising God—just leaping and praising God. It says, "David, wearing a linen ephod." He took off his royal robe. So he's just in his t-shirt, and David's down there, getting down with the people. He takes off his royal robe, and he's getting down before the Lord. He's dancing with all his might "while he and the entire house of Israel brought the ark of the Lord with shouts and with the sounds of trumpets. As the ark was entering into the City of David, Michal, the daughter of Saul, watched from the window," and she said, "How proud I am. Look! There is my husband bringing the ark of God into his city, Jerusalem, and my husband is leading the way as the King of Israel. Isn't this exciting?" Not. Here's Michal, "and when Michal saw David leaping and dancing before the Lord, she despised him in her heart." Is it possible for a wife to despise her husband? I've been there sometimes, usually for good cause in my case, but she despises him. This is the happiest day of David's life. He's dancing before the Lord, just praising God.

Then he comes home to see his wife, and here's how she greets him. "When David returned home," verse 20, of chapter 6—David's coming home to bless his household, as a father would bless his family. "David returned home to bless his household. Michal the daughter of Saul came down to meet him and said, 'How the king of Israel distinguished himself today, disrobing in the sight of all the slave girls.'" "David, you know, you really

turned them on—getting down, and they really like seeing the king." "And slave girls, as any vulgar fellow would." Is she being sarcastic, cynical, and degrading her husband? Her husband comes home happy and excited. He goes in and meets that. You can just see it. It takes him down.

Now, there's some things here that I don't want to say David's always the smartest guy in the world. David does something here that from my perspective is stupid. I know this to be true. I'm going to tell you it's stupid, but when you see it, you'll know it. Don't do this. When you're married, don't do this. David responds, and I'm critiquing this. So she says, "O, David, you turned all those little slave girls on, didn't you, David?" David then says to Michal, "It was before the Lord, who chose me, rather than your father." When you do the "your father" business—where is her father? He's dead. Is that cool? "He chose me rather than your father." That "rather than your father" part—I'm telling you when you're arguing with your spouse, you don't bring the father-in-law and don't bring the mother-in-law into it either. That's just like off the table. I just want to tell you just don't do that. In a critical way, this is stupid. I can tell you from experience, it will blow up in your face. This is not good.

But then David does say some things here that are good: "or anyone from his house, when he appointed me ruler over the Lord's house." Then David says this, and this is beautiful: "I will celebrate before the Lord. I will become even more undignified than this. I will be humiliated in my own eyes, but by these slave girls you spoke of, I will be held in honor." Did you see that? He says, "I'm the king. I will humiliate myself in front of them. But by them, will I be held in honor." A king that comes down and is with the poor people—do the slaves then honor that? Is that a big deal?

I could use that example here at Gordon college. This is the honest truth. I'm sitting up at my office, the wonderful office. Some of you have been up there. You've seen my wonderful office. I've been up there twelve years. I've never had a president of Gordon College come up, and I've never seen him on the third floor of Frost ever, in twelve years. I'm here all the time. All of a sudden I'm sitting in my office, feet kicked up, and all of a sudden I hear a knock on the door. I turn around, "Come on in," figuring

someone wants to take a late quiz or something. I turn around, and there is the president of Gordon College. I'm like "whoa." It's a total shock, but the guy comes up to the servant corridors and says, "Hey, what do you think about this?" So we start talking together. Does that blow me away? That blew me away. Am I impressed with that? The president like that—that he would get up and do that. That's impressive: a person of high status comes down and visits a person of low status. Maybe that example doesn't fit exactly. But this is really interesting here.

The next verse the narrator puts in is this. This is a sad verse: "And Michal, the daughter of Saul, had no children until the day of her death." You see how the narrator says this? Kind of evens it up. She despised David when he was praising God. She has no children until the day of her death. All I'm trying to show here is David's passion. David is a passionate person, and he loves the Lord. He gets really excited. He dances, the ark dancing—Michal's response, and then David saying, "I will humble myself, but those people who are the underlings, the lower class, will hold me in honor."

K. David's Passion: Building a house for God—Davidic Covenant [59:53-63:22]

Now, this is another one of David's passions. He brings the ark to Jerusalem, but what's the problem? The ark is in a tent. Where is David living? David is living in a palace of cedar. I always wondered how that smelled. David's living in a palace of cedar, and David says, "God," in chapter seven, "God, you're living in a tent and I'm living in a cedar palace. I want to build a house for God." But what happens there is there's a play on words with this term *beth*. Remember when we said *beth lehem* was "house of bread?" *Beth* means "house." *Beth-el* means "house of El." David says, "I want to build God a *beth*. I want to build God a house. I want to build God a temple."

Then, what does God do? God comes down and says, "David, you're not going to build me a temple because you're a man of blood. Your son Solomon, who is a man of *shalom*, he will build the house for me." But God says, "David, you want to build me a house, a temple?" God says, "David, I will build you a house." But when God uses the term "house," there's a play on words there. He doesn't mean he will build a temple for David when he says, "I will build a house for you, David." He's saying, "I will build your

descendants, a dynasty.” In other words, “Your house will be your descendants. Your descendants, David, will sit on the throne of David. I will build you a line of descent such that your sons will sit on the throne of David forever over Israel.” Ultimately, who is going to be the son of David then who sits on the throne? Who is that one who will build David a house forever? Jesus Christ. So this is called the Davidic Covenant.

This is really important. Let me just back up. What covenants have we had so far? We’ve had the Abrahamic Covenant. What did God promise him? Land, the seed would be multiplied, and he’d be a blessing to all nations. We’ve had the Sinaitic Covenant where they went to Mount Sinai, and God gave them his law, the Ten Commandments: thou shall not lie, thou shall not steal, thou shall not do murder, thou shall not commit adultery. He gives them his law, that was the Sinaitic Covenant. So you had the Abrahamic covenant and the Sinaitic covenant giving the law. Now you have the third covenant saying, “You’re going to bless all nations, and how is it going to be administered? David, I’m going to make your house, your descendants, your line, to rule over Israel forever.” This is the Davidic covenant, and it points straight to Jesus. Jesus will be the son. By the way, Jesus will be called what? The Son of David. When Jesus goes into Jerusalem riding on a donkey, what will they say to him? “Hosanna! Hosanna! The Son of David!” They’ll call Jesus, the Son of David. He’s the Messiah. That’s the one they hoped would rule over Israel. This is called the Davidic Covenant and it is built off this play on the term *beth* or house. David wants to build God a house [temple]. God says, “I’ll build you a house [dynasty].”

By the way, did Nathan the prophet get it wrong here? Nathan the prophet told David to go ahead and build the temple. God steps in and says, “Wait, Nathan, you’ve got that wrong.” So God actually corrects Nathan the prophet here.

Anyway, it’s a beautiful passage. This is the Davidic covenant. It’s one of the three major covenants in the Old Testament. It’s really pointing straight to Jesus.

L. David’s Hatred of evil [63:23-64:25]

Now David hates evil. When the Amalekite comes and says, “I slew Saul,” What does David do to the Amalekite? He kills him because he touched the Lord’s anointed,

and David says, “You don’t touch the Lord’s anointed.” So David has a really harsh time with evil. So David has a hatred for evil, and he kills the Amalekite. David hates evil. By the way, does the Bible say to cooperate with what is evil, put up with what is evil? Does the Bible say hate what is evil; love what is good? I see a lot of love for what is good in this area. But do we really hate what is evil or do we try to tolerate it and kind of cooperate with it? We tolerate it. We’re a very tolerant people right? So we tolerate evil. It’s okay. We can handle it. The Bible says, “Hate what is evil. Love what is good.” By the way, that’s in the New Testament. Sorry for jumping ahead there.

M. David’s evil with Bathsheba [64:26-78:46]

Now we want to look at David’s personal evil. This is in chapter 11 and is probably the most famous passage of David that everybody knows: David’s sin with Bathsheba. Let me start with chapter 11 verse 1. It says this. “In the spring,” 2 Samuel, chapter 11, verse 1, “In the spring, at the time when kings go off to war.” Why is that a slam on David? First of all, why do the kings go off to battle in the spring? When do the crops come up? The wheat and barley—in the spring. So if you take all your troops out in the spring, can you rip off the farmers and get food for yourselves. Who is the genius who did war all year round? Who is one of the first people who did that? It actually wasn’t him [Alexander]. It was his father who built this fighting machine, where they could have supply lines so that they can go all year round instead of just in the spring. Does anybody know Alexander the Great? His father Phillip of Macedon actually built the system and Alexander implemented it. But normally kings went off to war in the spring because they could just live off the crops that were coming up naturally.

David’s troops were going out to war over here in Jordan. It’s saying, “In the spring, when kings go off to war.” Is David going to go off to war with his men, or is David going to be sitting at home shacking up with this girl? So this is a slam on David right from the start. Kings go off to war. “One evening, David got out of his bed and walked around on the roof of the palace.” Is the roof of the palace, high or low? Palaces are always what—high or low in the city? The palace is always high. David’s palace is always high. David’s on the roof of his house. He looks over to the other roof from his

house, and there was a very beautiful woman, and David—well, let me read it, “From the roof of his house, he saw a woman bathing.” I thought, “Oh, what do you mean? This woman’s got a bathtub up there. She’s taking a bath, and David looks down, sees this woman like that.”

First of all, a lot of people accuse Bathsheba of trying to seduce the king. Is that true? I want to say that’s not true. First, let me just explain houses in Israel. The houses in Israel are smaller than from over here. That’s the house. Question, when you’re in the house, do you have privacy? There’s no privacy in those homes. Do you understand? Basically, things are open. When you want privacy, when you want to be by yourself, where do you go? You go up to the roof. The roof is where you have privacy. You don’t have privacy down in your home. There are animals and there are people walking in and out. When you want privacy, you go up on the roof. She’s bathing up there. Is this her bathing in a big tub? First of all, would they have a bathtub? Would you waste water like that in Israel to take a bath in Israel with water? Would people waste water like that? No. She’s probably taking a sponge bath on her roof. David looks down and sees her. This isn’t her displaying herself.

Anyway, David looks down so be careful—just be careful here. The process of temptation is next. So David looks. He sees that she’s beautiful and sees that she’s bathing. So he sees with his eyes. So the process of temptation, comes through the eyes. Question: do guys have problems with their eyes? The answer is: yes. But for me, it’s always the second look that kills you. Why is the second look so important? The first look is just what? You may see something that you really shouldn’t be seeing, but when you look back the second time, is there intention there? So what I’m saying is, watch out for second looks.

A classic for me was when I remodeled a house once in a place called Winona Lake, Indiana. And our house was six feet, well maybe ten/twelve feet from our neighbor’s house on this side—maybe ten, twelve feet from our neighbor’s house on that side. I gutted the house, rewired, and replumbed it and all that. So we’re moving into the house. So, I’m on my way up to school. I walk to school. I’m a morning person—a

serious morning person. I usually get up—this morning I think it was about ten to five. I just want to tell you, my wife gets up a lot later. When you get up at five or five thirty, it's dark out, so I go out the door of my house. It was early, about six, six thirty or something like that, and I walk out the door of my house. I'm going to walk to school. It's about two blocks up to the school. As I walk out the door of my house, there is Kim, our neighbor, about a twenty-five year old woman, who's married to her husband Rich. There's a window there and it had frosting on it. You know what I'm saying? Frosted windows usually you can't see through them. But what's the problem when you put a light behind the frosted window? All of a sudden, there's no frosting there. So I'm standing there, and here's this woman standing there *bli kol-bushah* as the Hebrews say—stark naked. She's taking a shower right there. And I'm like, "Holy cow!" You know? I'm thinking, "Wow, six o'clock every morning we get free shows." So this is—no, no, no. That was a joke. So, I go up to the school. Do I have a problem? And you say, what do I do tomorrow? I have a wife. Do I tell my wife? You say, "Are you out of your mind? You don't tell your wife that kind of stuff." I have a wife. Does my wife know every thought that goes through my head? Do I tell my wife stuff like that? You say, "No, you don't do that." Yes. We have a totally open, honest relationship. I went home that day, and I knew I had to tell her. I said, "Annette, you've got to do something. Just go over to Kim and tell her to put up a curtain or something and we're cool. I said you've got to go over and talk to her and tell her to put up a curtain to cover that window." What did my wife say to me? She says, "How can I go over there and tell them to put a curtain up there. My husband has a problem. How can I tell her to put a curtain up there?" She says, "I can't do that." So she didn't do it. So now do I have a bigger problem?

Do I now have to purposefully and intentionally walk out the opposite door of my house, to go to school from that side every day for about a year and a half. Then when Joe and his wife, the next couple, moved in, what was the first thing I did. I was over there. "Joe, you've got to get a curtain up on this window," as soon as Joe moved in, and he put it in right away, so it wasn't a problem after that.

What I'm saying is, you get in some situations. You have to be careful about your

eyes. We live in an Internet age, do you have to be careful about your eyes? As I look over in that seat over there, I see a student at Gordon College looking at pornography at Gordon College. You say, “How’d he get passed the”—anyway, in that seat right over there. What I’m saying is, “Is this a big problem in our culture?” It’s a big problem. So, I’m saying, “Guard your eyes.” Especially the guys—guard your eyes. Guard your heart--second looks.

Now, what happens? David sees her, but if he doesn’t act ... does he take action now? He invites her up. Is this Bathsheba’s problem? He invites her up. Some people say, “O, she’s going up to seduce the king.” When he invites her up, where is her husband? Her husband, Uriah the Hittite, who isn’t even Jewish, is out fighting David’s war out over in this area in Jordan. David invites her up. When David invites her up, is she thinking she’s going to get seduced, or is she probably thinking, “What is David going to tell me?” Her husband’s out in battle, so she’s thinking David’s going to tell her that her husband’s been killed, hurt or something like that.

So she goes up to see the king. The king seduces her. Now, by the way, is she partially culpable? It’s a mutual consent kind of thing at that point, but then, what’s the problem? The problem is, I want to say, “Back off this blaming of Bathsheba.” It’s always the woman’s fault. I don’t think so. I think she consented to it eventually, but I think her coming up to David she was probably thinking that he’s going to tell her that her husband was dead and report that.

Now, David and Bathsheba have relations. She finds out she’s pregnant. Has her husband been out on the field for quite a while. She finds out she’s pregnant. Does that take time? Her husband’s been out on the field, so David does what? He’s got to cover his sins, so what does he do? He invites Uriah the Hittite back and says, “Send Uriah back here.” So Uriah comes back. David comes in and says, “Hey, how’s the war going? What’s going on out there?” What does David figure? The guy’s been out on the field for at least the past three or four months. When he gets back home, who’s the first person he’s going to want to see? Is he going to want to see the king? Forget the king, he’s going to want to see his wife.

Now what happens? Does he go down and see his wife? No, and I've heard some people say, "Well, that shows you that Uriah had a bad relationship with Bathsheba, and that's why Bathsheba cheated on him because he had a bad relationship with her." No. Does Uriah tell us exactly why he doesn't go back down to his wife? Uriah explains to David why he didn't. He says, "David, the ark of God, Joab and all my buddies are out fighting a war. How can I go and sleep with my wife when the ark of God is out there?" Do you hear the irony there? The ark of God is his concern and he's a Hittite. He's not even a Jew, and he's got more respect for the ark than David did. So what happens then is David says, "Okay. The guy won't go sleep with his wife. When you want to get someone to do something they wouldn't normally think about you get them drunk." So David says, "Let's get Uriah drunk." When Uriah gets drunk, is he going to go home? Even drunk, he won't go home. Has this guy got core moral principles?

So now what happens? David sends Uriah back out to the front lines, back out over to Joab. He tells Joab, "Put him out on the front line, and then pull your troops back, so Uriah will be killed." Is Joab worried about killing people? This is Joab. So Joab puts him out there, pulls the troops back, then sends the message back to David: "Uriah's dead. Everything's taken care of David." So David gets away with it.

This is David's sin—not only the immorality with Bathsheba, but now the murder of Uriah the Hittite who showed great uprightness. Uriah was a good person. He worked with the Jews. It is very interesting in the genealogy of Jesus Christ, whose name gets in there? "She who was Uriah's wife." In the genealogy of David, it doesn't even mention Bathsheba's name. It mentions Uriah's name in the genealogy of Jesus Christ in Matthew chapter 1. So I want say Uriah was a good man.

He was off at war, and by the way, when guys are off at war, do their wives cheat on them? My son was in Iraq. He said, "Every one of the guys he was with who was married—every last one of them except one, their wives cheated on them when they were gone. The guy goes into battle fighting for his life. He knows that his wife is at home cheating on him, sleeping with somebody else. How do you fight a war when you know that kind of stuff is going on? The only one who was faithful in Iraq, when he went to

Afghanistan, he came back. The only one left when he got back from Afghanistan got shot through the neck. It missed by less than a millimeter his aorta coming down. He goes to his wife and says to his wife, “Honey, I love you.” She gets him back, and she’s like all over him. He says, “I’ve got to have space. I’m not the same person.” He’s seen all sorts of stuff. There’s a lot of evil that happens in war. He says, “I just need some space. I can’t just be like I was. I’ve changed now, and I just need some space.” She couldn’t give him space. And the next thing she did—ran up the credit card to ten thousand dollars, “See you later, Charlie,” and divorced him. That’s really sad. Hadley was the only one left. Does my son have a good view of these things? No! He’s all messed up. But what I’m saying is, “In war, do these kind of things happen in the background?” The answer is: yes.

Now, what happens? Nathan shows up. Nathan is the prophet, and Nathan is going to go to David and Nathan is going to tell David a story about a guy with a little lamb. Does David know about sheep and getting attached to little lambs? David knows all about that, and Nathan says, “There was a really wealthy guy, who had all these sheep. This other guy had just this little lamb to rest in his arms. The rich man had somebody come to his house. The rich man says, “We need to have a little bit of lamb for food here.” So he went and took the lamb from the poor man and ripped it off and butchered it. David was furious, “that guy deserves to die.” Nathan looks at him and does what the prophets do the best. He says, “David, you’re the man. You’re the man, David. You’re the one. You had all these wives, but this guy had one wife, you took her, and you killed him.”

So Nathan is a prophet. What is the role of the prophet? The role of the prophet is to rebuke the king. Now, what does the king do, usually? He kills the prophet. The prophets usually lose. Remember John the Baptist, you get your head cut off. Jeremiah, you get put in a septic tank for three days. But with David—does David kill Nathan? No. David repents. I want to look at David’s repentance next time. We’ll actually go through the process of repentance.

Okay, see you on Tuesday!

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History, Literature and Theology

course, lecture number 24 on: David--his compassion, his passion and his hatred of evil.

Transcribed by Paula Gomes and Allee Keener

Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt 2

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 25[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History, Literature, and Theology course lecture number 25: David's sin with Bathsheba and transition to Solomon.

A couple things before we get started. Let me just say that the test for this class is on Monday from 9:00-11:00. Is that correct? Can anyone confirm that? Monday 9:00-11:00 right here. I think that is correct. So Monday 9:00-11:00 in here for our final exam.

There are a couple other things. The review sessions, Grace has got this room reserved on Friday night from 6.00-8.00. She'll be doing a review session in here. On Tuesday night it won't do you any good. So Friday night and Tuesday night in here from 6.00-8.00 in the evening she has got the room reserved for a review session.

I'm feeling kind of lousy with this thing in my throat and I coughed half the night away. So I'm glad I'm not sitting where you are or I'd be falling asleep. When you teach it is hard to fall asleep. But also when I get sick I get cranky. So I'll probably be a little bit more cranky than I am normally. But I also realize that I am cranky. So I realize this is a New Testament concept but it is called the concept of grace. I would like to introduce a little bit of it here. Some of you skipped class, shame on you, Tuesday before Thanksgiving and you still have not taken the makeup which is a week over due. You get a week to make up your quizzes. Tomorrow I will be in my office from 9:00 until 2:00 if you haven't taken that Tuesday quiz after you shamefully skipped before Thanksgiving, you can come in and take the quiz. Tomorrow is absolutely it. This is just a special deal. Does that make sense for everybody? So if you haven't taken it please think about it. After this it is over. I'm down the road. I'm returning it to the other people who took it.

Now one other thing, on the transcriptions that some of you have done for extra

credit. It was due Tuesday, last week; it was due Dec. 1. If you've done one already it is over. But if you have not done anything and you realize you are in trouble in this course and you want to do extra credit I've had several people bail out. So I've got about ten of these transcriptions if anybody is interested. If you have already done one it's over. If you had one and didn't do it I don't want to mess with you again. But if you have not tried it and you'd like to try it there are about ten of these transcriptions. Email me and I'll try to set that up for you. That's what they call *charis* which means "grace." So that's where we are for the course. The makeup is on Wednesday.

The other thing, is I cleared off my desk for the first time in a long time and I have a bunch of quizzes here. The people turned in their quizzes with no names on them. I have no clue who these people are. If you go to Blackboard, Blackboard will have your grades listed. You guys have been to Blackboard. They are not weighted there but they are listed. If you find you took a quiz, you know you took the quiz, it may be you didn't write your name on the quiz. So I've got the quizzes here that are unnamed. And if you find that to be the case come up and see me and we'll try to figure out which one is yours. I think that's all I need to say. Any questions on any of that?

We've got a quiz on Thursday and then a final exam on Monday. The final will not be comprehensive and I will have a study guide out for you guys Friday morning. I'll teach this class Thursday late in the afternoon and Thursday night I'll produce the study guide. Friday morning I will be emailing you the study guide so that you'll have it for the weekend. So the study guide will be coming out this Friday morning first thing in the morning. The exam will cover from the last exam until now, or until Thursday. The exam is Monday 9.00-11.00.

Let's begin with a word of prayer and we'll get started: *Father, we thank you for this day. We thank you that you put things in our lives to make us realize that we are but dust. That life passes, we get sick and things happen so easily to us. We're so frail in one sense. Father we thank you for your Word. We thank you for David who was a person after your own heart. We pray you may help us to learn things from David and his son Solomon who you gave the gift of wisdom. May we also have wisdom for this*

time of the semester, Father, when there is pressure on everybody. We pray you might help these folks to study hard and learn much and that even their studies might be an act of worship to you. Realizing that you have given us minds to explore all these different disciplines that you have created and to see your handiwork in art, and history and music, and science, sociology and psychology. And now we have the great privilege of reading your word. We pray you might help us to understand it this day, in Christ's name, Amen.

Review of David's Sin with Bathsheba

We are going to jump back into David. We were talking last time about David and Bathsheba. We talked about David's sin with Bathsheba, right? When kings went out to war over here in Jordan. Joab and the boys are fighting while David's over here in Jerusalem. He has an affair with Bathsheba. He calls Uriah the Hittite back. We talked about the process of temptation and how guys often times have a problem with their eyes, and the problem with "second looks" and intention, and action based on desire. Then I've heard people preach this passage and they blame Bathsheba for this thing. I don't think Bathsheba is really at fault, David's the one who's at fault here. But it's a normal thing, and I kind of like it, whenever a guy gets in trouble he always blames it on the woman, it's a good method--doesn't work in my house, but some people try to pull it off.

Uriah, as it turns out, is an upright person. Uriah comes back from the war in Transjordan where he has been for several months fighting, and he does not go back and sleep with his wife even though David's trying to set that up to cover over the pregnancy. So Uriah is upright. The reason Uriah doesn't go to his wife is because the ark of God is out fighting and Uriah says, "how can I sleep with my wife while the ark of God is in a tent in battle." David then gets him drunk, but even drunk, Uriah doesn't go down to her.

Nathan the Prophet confronts David with a story

Nathan tells the parable about the guy with the little lamb and the guy with hundreds of sheep, and how the guy with hundreds of sheep takes the other man's one sheep that he had. Nathan is rebuking David. Nathan is the prophet--the prophet rebukes the king. The prophet keeps the king in check. Then what usually happens is, the prophet

goes to the king and says “repent.” Then what does the king usually do? The king beats up on the prophet. So the prophets get beat up a lot. The kings have a lot more power than the prophets do. The prophet speaks the word of God.

Another role that I didn’t develop last time, do you remember how God gave his word in the covenant, this treaty, this oath, between God and the people from Mount Sinai? The prophet is kind of like a prosecuting attorney, that he goes at the king and says, “King, you’ve sinned, you’ve broken the covenant with God.” So the prophets are like prosecuting attorneys prosecuting on the basis of the covenant of God and they come to the king. They are a check and balance, almost like in America how we’re supposed to have checks and balances, between Congress, the Executive Branch, and the Judicial Branch. This is a system of checks and balances between the king and the prophets.

David’s response: repentance

So Nathan goes to David, tells him the story of the little lamb, David gets really upset, Nathan says, “David, you’re the man. You took this guy’s one little wife that he loved. David you’ve got how many wives now? You took Uriah’s only wife. David you’re the man.” Nathan’s a good guy. David doesn’t beat up on Nathan, David repents. We want to walk through that.

Let me read the story, “Then Nathan said to David, ‘David, you are the man. This is what the Lord God of Israel says, I have anointed you king over Israel, I delivered you from the hand of Saul. I gave your master’s house to you and your master’s wives into your arms. I gave you the house of Israel and Judah. If all this had been too little I would have given you more.’” God just tells David all the benefits. Then he says, verse 10: “Therefore the sword will never depart from your house because you despised me and took the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be your own.” And God says then, “Out of your own household I am going to bring calamity upon you. Before your very eyes I will take your wives and give them to one who is close to you.” I’m going to take your wives and give them to someone else. So, it will be just like how David took Uriah’s wife. Now who would take David’s wives and violate them openly? It’s Absalom, David’s own son who’s going to violate his own concubines in full view of everybody. So David is going

to be shamed by his own son Absalom. What happens next? “You did it in secret but I will do it in broad daylight before Israel. Then David said to Nathan ‘I have sinned against the Lord.’” David repents. He realizes he’s sinned. He doesn’t get mad, he admits, “I have sinned against the Lord.” “Nathan replied, ‘The Lord has taken away your sin. You are not going to die. But because by doing this you have made the enemies of the Lord to show utter contempt, the son born to you will die.’” So now David knows that the son who’s going to be born is going to die.

Now how does that affect him as a father? He starts fasting and praying. He knows God has already told him the child is going to die, nevertheless he prays. Is it possible to pray against God’s will? David already knows God’s will is to take the child but David prays against it anyway. He’s hoping that God might be merciful and God might change his mind. We’ve seen God be merciful in several examples in Scripture. So David prays for that mercy: “David pleaded with God for the child and he fasted and spent nights in his house laying on the ground. The Elders of the household stood beside him to get him up from the ground but he refused and he would not eat any food with them.” So David now is fasting, he won’t eat any food. He is really really upset. “On the seventh day the child died. David’s servants were afraid to tell him that the child was dead. [Why were the servants afraid to tell David the child was dead] while the child was still living we spoke to David but he would not listen to us, how can we tell him the child is dead, he may do something desperate.” David’s child dies because of David’s sin. It is possible they think David may kill himself. He may do something stupid because he’s so upset. “David noticed that his servants were whispering among themselves and he realized that the child was dead. ‘Is the child dead?’ he asked, ‘Yes’ they replied ‘he is dead.’”

Now watch David’s reaction here, it’s really kind of interesting: “Yes, they replied, he is dead. Then David got up from the ground and after he had washed his clothes and put on lotions and changed his clothes he went into the house of the Lord and he worshipped, then he went into his own house. At his request they served him food and he ate.” Now all of his servants are freaking out saying, “Wait a minute, we told you the kid was dead.” When David is told the kid is dead he gets up, takes a shower and eats.

What kind of grieving process is that? “So his servants asked him, ‘why are you acting this way? While the child was alive you fasted and wept but now the child is dead you get up and eat?’” He answered, “While the child was still alive I fasted and wept, I thought, who knows, the Lord may be gracious to me and let the child live. But now he is dead, why should I fast? Can I bring him back again?” Then David makes this statement, “I will go to him, but he will not return to me. And David comforted his wife Bathsheba and then they had another son, by the way, their next son was named what? *Shlomo* (Solomon).

Stages of Repentance

So, I want to talk through the stages of repentance. I want to use Psalm 51 because it is the story of David’s repentance. So David actually records his reaction to this incident with Bathsheba in Psalm 51. It’s a beautiful Psalm you’re going to recognize some of these verses. First, let me set the stage. Has somebody ever said they were sorry to you? Has someone ever hurt you, and then said they were sorry? Are there different ways of saying you’re sorry?

Try this, last night I was teasing my wife and she was getting more and more angry and I thought it was funny that she was getting all upset over this thing that was so minor. So I kept at it and she kept getting angrier and angrier. I thought this is totally absurd and then I realized I had gotten her really, really angry. So I said to apologize “Annette, I need to apologize. I’m sorry that you feel that way.” Question: what kind of an apology is that? Is that an apology for what you did? Is that like the worst apology ever? You’re putting the blame on her for overreacting. “I’m sorry you’re feeling that way.” That’s really stupid. That’s no apology at all, as a matter of fact is that an insult? “I’m sorry you feel that way.” It’s like saying, “you’re the one who overreacted, chill out!” I’ve seen people apologize like that and it was bogus.

The first thing to do is acknowledge “I did it and it was wrong.” I shouldn’t have egged her on last night unto the point she got angry. It was wrong. The first thing you’ve got to acknowledge was: “I did it and it was wrong.” It is an acknowledgement that it

was wrong.

Now, do some people have a difficult time acknowledging they were in the wrong? The first stage of repentance is to realize that what I did was not right. Now David says this, “Have mercy upon me, O God according to your unfailing love, according to your great compassion, blot out my transgression, wash away all my iniquity, cleanse me from my sin for I know my transgressions, my sin is always before me. Against you and you only have I sinned and done what is evil in your sight. So that you may be proved right when you speak. Surely I was sinful at birth.” Then he goes on, this is where it turns beautiful, “Cleanse me with hyssop and I will be clean. Wash me and I will be whiter than snow. Create in me a pure heart, O God, and renew a steadfast spirit within me. Do not cast me from your presence or take your Holy Spirit from me.”

Now, when he says “God, please don’t take your Holy Spirit from me” what was probably going through his mind? Have we seen the Holy Spirit taken from another king? The Spirit of God went off Saul to come on David. So David is saying “I know I messed up but don’t take your Holy Spirit from me like you did with Saul.” So, “I did it and it was wrong.”

The second level to repentance is “I did it, and it hurt you.” This is the stage when the person realizes that what they did actually hurt the other person. We live in a very narcissistic society that’s focused on the “I” and “me.” What this says is you’ve got to get out of yourself and realize with compassion the damage you’ve done on another person. I know a couple that’s on the verge of divorce. This guy goes to his wife whom he loves and he says to her “I love you.” After all the stuff she’s done to him he says, “I still love you. I love you and I want to let you know that I’ll forgive whatever you’ve done, I just love you.” She looked at him and she said, (they’ve been married for five years) “I don’t love you, and as a matter of fact, I’m not sure I ever loved you.” Question: what does that do to that guy? In other words, this is all about her and her happiness. Did she realize what she just did to him? The problem is she can’t get outside of herself. So she just stuck a knife in him and yet it’s like nothing ever happened because she didn’t

have any feelings outside of herself because she's so centrally focused on herself. It's called narcissism, you can only feel for yourself. In marriage you have to be able to feel what's going on with the other person, you have to put yourself in their shoes and say, "I'm really so sorry I hurt you like that" By the way, suppose you did say something like "I never loved you in the first place," what should you do after that? Now is there a need for an apology? "I really didn't mean to hurt you like. I'm sorry. What I said was really wicked."

So first of all, "I did it, it was wrong," acknowledging what you did, then "I did it and it hurt you," realizing the damage in the other person. But David doesn't stop there. David says, "I was sinful from the time I was born." In other words, David says this isn't something that I'm just going to change, it's not, "O, I did something wrong, but I won't do it again." Now David's saying, "No, it's not what I did, it's me. The whole of my being is corrupt. It's not just what I did, it's me at the core of my being, I've been sinful from the time I was born." It's "I wholly I." In other words, this singular act the killing of Uriah and the taking of Bathsheba, is not just a separate act that was done. This reflects who I am, to the core of my being, I'm a sinner to my core. "I wholly I." This is when a person realizes how sin is in the core of their being.

The last stage I want to look at is just briefly, David makes a statement in Psalm 51, verse 4, "I know my transgression and my sin is always before me." Then David makes this statement, question: is this statement always true? David says, "Against you and you only have I sinned" (he's talking to God) "and done what is evil in your sight." Is that statement true. "Against you, God, and you only have I sinned." Is that true? I don't think that's true. I'm not saying there's an error in the Bible. This is poetry. In poetry do you have hyperbole? What is hyperbole? It is an overstatement for emphasis, an exaggeration. In poetry do you focus on one thing at a time and give it all sorts of metaphors in poetry focusing on that one thing. I think David here is focusing on his relationship with God. He is so focused on God all the other things drop away. Now has David sinned against Uriah? He had killed Uriah! Had he sinned against Bathsheba by

taking Bathsheba? He had sinned against Bathsheba. But his focus now is on God, when he sees God everything else pales so he says, “Against you and you only have I sinned.” I think it is a poetic expression. I don’t think he’s denying that what he did hurt Bathsheba, we see that the child dies and Uriah is dead. I don’t think he’s downplaying that, but he’s focusing on his relationship with God. It’s a poetic expression. It’s a hyperbole not meant to show that he’s downplaying what he did to Uriah. This is the stage when a person realizes that their sin affects their relationship with God. So there are different stages of repentance.

Let me give an example of that. Once upon a time we moved to a church of about three hundred or four hundred people. One of my former students that I taught the book of Psalms to in a seminary/college context was the pastor of this church. He had a wonderful wife with five kids, young kids, probably all below ten, and a wonderful wife. We went to the church and he would preach. He was a good preacher, so every week we would go and hear him preach. One week they caught him in an affair with the church secretary. Now that’s a problem. He then got up in front of the church and with great tears he acknowledged what he had done and repented in front of the church. By the way, do tears always mean repentance? No. I saw one of my best friends in tears and it wasn’t repentance. Be careful, tears can be used deceptively. Now I think in this case it was legitimate, he was caught, he confessed his sin in front of the church, he wept, and the church embraced him. About two weeks later he said, all right, it’s over now, I won’t do that again, I’d like to get up and start preaching again. What do you think?

There are different levels of repentance. He repented for having gotten caught, but when we talk about repentance does he have to reestablish with his wife a relationship? Does that get reestablished in two weeks? Trust, how long does it take you to break trust? In a snap. How long does it take you to re-establish trust? A *long* time. Question: does he have all sorts of things he needs to talk to his kids about and his wife. The church realized that this guy doesn’t have a clue what he did. After two weeks to get back up and preach? The church was good, it worked with him for about a year or two. I think he ended up getting into life insurance or selling cars or something like that afterwards.

Anyway, he needed to get his relationship back with his wife first and that takes time.

Now, I was personally hurt because I taught him this passage about David and Bathsheba! It's like, I taught that, why didn't you learn that? So I'm ready to judge him. Question: is that the way I came off with him? The answer is, no. Now I'm going to show you the "one step" principle. It works really well up on the front here. If I'm on the edge here, if I go just a half of an inch could I fall on my head because there's a step here. All it takes is less than half an inch and I'm down. I use the one step principle which says "there but for the grace of God go I." I'm not in a position to say, "Hey, man, you committed a sin before God, look at all these people that are all messed up now." I'm not the person to point my finger because that could have happened to me, "there but for the grace of God go I." One step and I fall on my face. So what I'm saying is that when you find people who are repenting, be careful about judging. Jesus said it the best, "He who's perfect cast the first stone." Should the Christian community out of all communities be the most compassionate when a person has fallen into sin? Now, by the way, does that mean we excuse sin? No. He needed to be worked with for a long time as he reestablished his relationship with his wife and kids. All I'm saying is be careful in these areas.

So David gives us a great example of repentance. The power of cleansing: "cleanse me with hyssop and I shall be clean." Have you ever sinned and felt the filthiness of it? "Cleanse me with hyssop and I shall be clean, wash me and I shall be whiter than snow." Beautiful passages. "Create in me a pure heart O God." Wonderful statements you sing the songs in church even to this day. "And renew a steadfast spirit in me."

Can God use a person who has committed immorality? Can God use a person like David who has murdered? I think the answer is yes. David writes this Psalm, does he write it before or after his affair with Bathsheba? David writes Scripture, Psalm 51, one of his best psalms actually, after his sin with Bathsheba. He is a broken man and he's praying for God's forgiveness. I used to work in a maximum security prison, to be

honest, a lot of the guys I know are murderers. I was just thinking of Chris today. He must have been in prison for 25, 30 years. He murdered somebody when he was 19 years old. He's out of prison now, he's doing God's work in a wonderful way. Can God use a person who's a murderer? This man is in jail 25 years and now he's an older guy and he's out helping kids. I've seen it happen over and over again. One of the guys I most look up to was Allen Naskew. Everybody in Gary Indiana knew this guy. You name it he sold it and did drugs. He was in prison. One of the most godly fellows I've ever met in my life was a dealer. He'd get up at 5 in the morning and he'd be by his toilet seat. I don't want to get into details in the prison. He's on his knees and the other guys thought he was sniffing something, they used to mock him out, but he was praying. What I'm saying is be careful, God can use people even after major, major sins. He seems to delight in using the contrite or broken ones.

I say that because some of you during your life will do stuff and feel you are beyond redemption and that God can't use you now because of what you did. That's not true. God uses broken vessels. God's in the process of redemption. He takes broken things and he fixes them! And that's us.

Do babies go to heaven?

Back to David: Do babies go to Heaven? Now this question comes up in 2 Samuel chapter 12. After seven days the child dies. Do babies go to heaven? Chapter 12, verse 23, "But now that he is dead why should I fast, can I bring him back again? I will go to him but he will not return to me." Now does that mean that after the child is dead that David is going to die? The question is, what does the Bible say about infants who die? Is there anywhere in the Bible where it says babies go to heaven? There's nowhere in the Bible that says what happens to babies. It doesn't exist in Scripture. Question: back in David's time would this be a really important question? Did they lose a lot of babies back then.

Do we lose a lot of babies now? Once upon a time I had three kids. My wife got pregnant with a fourth kid. We were not ready financially or emotionally because we had

three young kids and we didn't know whether we could handle this. It took several weeks to try to get up because when we told the other kids we wanted to be really gung ho. Finally, we got up for it and we were ready to tell the kids that they were going to have a baby brother or sister and we're all for it and this is good. I walked into the bathroom and it looked like a slasher movie. Blood was everywhere. My wife was in a white gown, it was totally red. I picked her up. I ran down to the car. I don't think I've ever driven so fast my entire life, I just hit the gas pedal and we were at the hospital. It was really scary, she was as white as a ghost. I get into the hospital, I'm covered too, sitting in the emergency room and all of a sudden I hear over the loud speaker "vital signs unstable." I took Latin so I knew "vital" meant like, "life!" "Vital signs unstable" means, holy cow-- is she going to die? I didn't know someone could lose so much blood so fast. What happened. God spared her and they pumped a whole bunch of blood into her, but long story short. What I'm saying, is it really important to me to know what happens to infants? I've often thought when I get up to heaven some kid's going to come over and be like, "Hey, old man! I've been waiting for you, what took you so long?" What happens to infants like that?

Now I want to give just another aspect of this and this is totally conjecture on my part. Now, some people argue like this: all humans are sinful through Adam's sin, "Adam sin comes upon all mankind" (Romans chapter 5). Babies are human. So all humans receive sin through Adam sin. Babies are human and therefore babies are sinners. Well what happens to sinners? Well, if you're in Massachusetts's nothing because everyone goes to heaven in Massachusetts. Other places in Scripture it says the wages of sin are death. So all sinners must face the penalty of eternal punishment unless they believe. But how does a baby believe? A baby can't even understand what you're saying? So therefore using this line of argumentation certain people will conclude that infants don't make it. They never accept Jesus, so they don't make it. That is the way some people argue.

Now I want to argue a different way. In Isaiah chapter 7 verse 15, now remember, nowhere in Scripture does it say that babies make it. But in Isaiah chapter 7 verse 15 it

says this and this is a fairly famous passage, “therefore the Lord Himself will give you a sign, the virgin will be with child” (sounds familiar, doesn’t it). “She will give birth to a son and you will call him Emmanuel.” This is quoted in the New Testament referring to Jesus. “He will eat curds and honey when he knows enough to reject the wrong and choose the right.” So is this trying to say that when a child gets to a certain point, “eating curds and honey,” that the child will recognize what’s right and wrong. Some folks use this then to say there is an age of accountability. Before that point the baby doesn’t realize if he’s sinning or not, the baby’s a baby. But at a certain point, by the way, that point would differ for each person--it’s not just “at age two you are accountable,” babies really differ. Some kids know right from wrong earlier, others later some will have to wait until they’re 15 or 16 until they get that awareness.

Now the question is, when David says, “I was sinful from the time my mother conceived me,” is that poetic language? Is that hyperbole? I don’t want to push the poetry into being a doctrinal statement necessarily. So I think you ought to be careful about doing that.

Another verse that’s been helpful to me is this other one in Genesis 18:25, “will not the Judge of all the earth do right?” Who ultimately makes the calls? God makes the call. God’s going to do what’s right. So I may not know, but I trust him.

But the question comes up: why doesn’t God tell us what happens to infants? That’s a really important question to me, and frankly, to David it would have been a very important question also. I’m going to make up a reason. I’m making this up, the Bible doesn’t tell us this. Suppose God said all infants before the age of two are innocent and therefore automatically go to heaven and God said that in the Bible. What would people do? Would people kill babies? Have many cultures killed babies anyway. Now they would have rational for doing that. Would Christians kill babies if they knew all babies before the age of two go to heaven? Would Christian people go into Islamic countries (I think they called it the Crusades) and kill infants? Abortion clinics would be “mass evangelism,” right? It would give approval to abortion clinics because they would be sending all these babies to heaven. So what I’m suggesting is that God doesn’t tell us

whether or not they go to heaven because he doesn't want us to do that and he knows that we are corrupt and this kind of stuff would happen. Now, do I have a clue why God does this? I don't have a clue, I made it up. I just want to be honest with you. It does make sense to me but you have to be careful, God knows why he does these things. God could have told us but he's chosen not to. I wonder if it's because the human heart is so corrupt he knew we would end up killing infants. But big question marks there, Hildebrandt just made that up.

David's Numbering the People

Let's continue on with David. Another sin that David did over in chapter 24 says, "Again the anger of the Lord burned against Israel and he incited David against them saying 'Go take a census of Israel and Judah.'" So David sends out Joab to number the people. What's interesting to me is that if you look at the other verse over in 1 Chronicles chapter 21. We haven't done much with Chronicles but Chronicles parallels Kings. Here's what it says there, "Satan rose up against Israel and incited David to take a census." In Kings who incited David to take the census? God. In Chronicles, who incited David to number the people? Satan. Do you see, as monotheists do we have a problem? We have one God who is over everything. Is God over what is good and evil? Is evil outside the control of God? No. We have one sovereign God, he is the king over everything. Is it God over here and Satan over there. Is that the way the Bible portrays it? No. Satan is under God.

In the book of Job, could you say that God did that to Job? Yes, you could say that, but did Satan do that to Job? Satan was allowed to do that by God. I think this is what you get here too. God is going to judge Israel but what he does is he allows Satan then to cause David to number the people so they would be judged. So God is going to bring judgment on them; he uses Satan to bring that judgment. So Satan is being used as an instrument of God's bidding. Now Satan is trying to do evil and God is trying to do good with it.

David in 2 Samuel chapter 24 verse 10 acknowledges it was sin on his part. And

after he had counted the fighting men he said to the Lord, “I have sinned greatly in what I have done.” Why is David a man after God’s own heart? Because he acknowledges his sin. He repents and he keeps turning back to God even though he’s done some pretty bad stuff. He turns back to God, he repents.

God gives him three options: you’ve got three years of famine, or you’ve got three months of running from your enemies, or you’ve got three days of a plague. David looks at that and says, “who’s involved with the plague? If the plague comes, it’s God. Therefore if it’s God, maybe I can pray to God and God will spare my people. Maybe God will be merciful to us. So I’m going to pick the three days of plague.” Three months before the enemies will they be merciful? Probably not, but God’s involved with this one.

This angel basically stands up and is slaying the people and David prays. But then what happens. This angel is slaying the people from the threshing floor of Araunah the Jebusite. David sees this angel slaying the people from the threshing floor of Araunah. God tells David “buy the threshing floor of Araunah.” Now when I say, threshing floor, is the threshing floor high or low. It is at the top of the mountain. This threshing floor of Araunah is a flat area where they would do their threshing on a high place. This place of judging the people will be the very place God will choose to put his temple. David buys the threshing floor from Araunah, Solomon will build the temple right there. The very place of judgment turns into a place of blessing, where God’s presence is found. This is a kind of cool reversal you find in Scripture.

Student: are the people being judged for David’s sin?

Response: No, God was going to punish the people anyway because they had sinned and he uses the sin David did as the means by which to judge the people. So there are multiple factors here, the people are judged for their sin but the means of judgment comes through these plagues. So it’s kind of tricky there.

Solomon’s installation as king

David has a son named Solomon. Let’s jump over to David’s son Solomon. Under Solomon things are going well in the kingdom. Did you notice I put bubblics around it.

This is Solomon. This is the bubbly time of the kingdom when things are going well. 1 Kings chapters 1-11 is the story of Solomon. His real name is *Shlomo*, but if you say *Shlomo* people think you're doing something bad. Now what Hebrew word do we hear in "Shlomo?" *Shalom*. Solomon's name means *shalom* "peace." Why was David not allowed to build the temple? We didn't read Chronicles, but Chronicles tells us that David was a man of blood. And God says, "David you can't build my temple," but David does store up lots of gold and silver for Solomon. So David bought the threshing floor of Araunah. David set up and saved up and made these great provisions so Solomon could build the temple. Solomon also was wealthy himself. This period of Saul-David-Solomon is called "The United Monarchy." This is when Israel is all united as one under Saul, then David. In this course, there are four dates to learn. David's date is 1000 B.C. Abraham was 2000 B.C. and Solomon comes 40 years after David. Solomon is David's son. Under these three kings Israel was united, it hadn't yet been broken up into Northern Israel and Southern Judah. Once Solomon comes, Solomon does some pretty nasty stuff at the end of his life and the kingdom is going to split north and south. So you'll have Israel in the North and Judah in the South. The kingdom will actually split north and south.

So, let's talk about Solomon and this transition of power. In 1 Kings chapter 1 this is where we begin to see Adonijah's bid for the throne. Adonijah was Solomon's older brother, we actually get this statement about him, "Now Adonijah, whose mother was Haggith, put himself forward and said 'I will be king.' So he got chariots and horses ready and about 50 men to run ahead of him." Then it makes this comment about David, "his father never interfered with him by asking him 'why do you behave as you do.' He was also very handsome and was born next to Absalom." Does it help to be handsome if you're going to be king? Yes. It points out that this guy is really handsome. And it says, "his father never interfered with him." Is one of the roles of a father to discipline his child? David never asked him "why are you doing that?" He never really interferes with or disciplines this child.

Now let me set this up geographically too. You guys are going to be the City of David. This is Jerusalem. You guys over here are the Mount of Olives. Mount of Olives is about 2700 feet high. There is a valley, the Kidron Valley, that goes between the Mount of Olives and the City of David. It goes into the Dead Sea. There is another valley here called the Central Valley and there is one over to the west called the Hinnom Valley. There are two springs, En-Rogel (*en* meaning “spring” of Rogel). So Adonijah comes from Jerusalem, he takes his boys and his chariots and comes down to En-Rogel where he’s going to announce himself as king. David takes Solomon and you guys know where the other spring is. It’s close to the city. It’s the “Gihon” spring. Does anyone remember Hezekiah’s tunnel and the *Get Lost in Jerusalem* program. What happens is David is going to announce Solomon right next to the city, Adonijah is farther away. So the geography works in Solomon’s favor.

But now let’s see what happens. First of all, David doesn’t know what’s going on. In 1 Kings 1 David is out of it. He’s an old man, he’s so old that he can’t get heat. So they find this woman, Abishag, who’s this beautiful, gorgeous young woman. She sleeps with David, not to have sex, but basically to keep him warm. So what happens is Nathan goes to Bathsheba and says, “David is so out of it, didn’t David say that Solomon should be the next king? Well, Adonijah is down here making himself king.” So Bathsheba and Nathan make this plot. David is out of it and Bathsheba goes in to talk to David to secure things for Solomon. So let me read chapter 1 verse 31, it says, “And Bathsheba bowed low, her face to the ground, kneeling before the king and said, ‘may my lord, the king David live forever’ ... and David said, ‘call Zadok and Nathan the prophet and Beniah and Judah and take my own mule.’” Get his royal mule. So he’s going to put Solomon on the royal mule. You ride the royal mule into the city, that means you’re king. Tell me about another king who’s going to ride a mule into the city and be a king: Jesus, in the triumphal entry. When Jesus enters he enters on a donkey and the people are crying “Hosanna, Hosanna.” So Solomon is going to ride this donkey, this royal mule. Solomon is going to be pronounced king. Solomon is Bathsheba’s son.

The Difficulty with Solomon

As I've studied 1 Kings 1-11, I'm really into Solomon. I teach the whole Bible but Solomon actually Proverbs is really my area of expertise. Now I have studied Solomon a lot and it has bothered me over and over again and I'm finally talking about it. In 1 Kings 1-11, Solomon rarely speaks. Solomon himself rarely speaks except when he's speaking officialese, speaking as the king or something like that. It has bothered me for years. When you read about David, do you learn about David's heart? When you read the stories about David and Jonathon, do you learn about David's heart? When you read the Psalms, do you learn about David's heart? You study David for a while and I feel like I know David really well because I've seen his heart. I've seen his ups, his downs, I've seen how he's reacted to things. With Solomon, I've studied him a lot more and I feel like I don't know him. Where's Solomon? He never speaks very much in the narrative; it's always people speaking about him. When he does speak it's always speaking and praying "as the king," not personally. So this bothers me and I want to come back to this later, why Solomon is so far out of the narrative.

As a matter of fact, when Solomon is made king, does Solomon do any of this plotting? Does Solomon plot to become king himself? No. All of the plotting is done by Nathan and Bathsheba and these other guys. Solomon is put on the royal donkey. It's not like he's saying, "Hey, I want to be king, let me ride on the royal donkey." No, other people put him on the donkey. So Solomon is not a "go-getter" kind of character, where he's wearing his heart on his sleeve and that bothers me but we'll come back to that in a little bit.

David's advice to Solomon

Now David gives some advice to Solomon as a father would give to his son in chapter 2 verse 2, this is an interesting passage: "Now the time drew near for David to die. He gave charge to Solomon his son." These are the last words of a father to his son. Do you remember the last words of a father to his son when your father dies? Yes, you remember those words forever. "'I am about to go the way of all the earth' he said, 'so be strong and show yourself a man'" interesting there, "strength." This verse is not

politically correct, “be strong and show yourself a man.” What does it mean to be a man in our culture? This is very politically incorrect. I love it though.

“Observe what the Lord requires of you. [What does the Lord require of you?] Walk in his ways. Keep his decrees and his commands, his laws and his requirements as written in the law of Moses.” So, is David aware of the law of Moses? Now some of your liberal critics will say, “the law of Moses wasn’t written yet for 150 years with that JEDP sources that we looked at earlier. Question: is David aware of the law of Moses? Does David tell Solomon, you better keep your head in the law of Moses--the Torah?

“So that you may prosper in all that you do and wherever you go and that the Lord may keep his promise to me.” What was the promise God made to David? 2 Samuel chapter 7 verse 14, “David, I will build you a house [dynasty] and your house will last forever” meaning that one of David’s sons would rule over Israel forever. We know that to be Jesus who is going to be the Messiah. David comes to Solomon. But notice there’s a shift in the narrative, “the Lord may keep his promise to me” and then he says “if your descendants will watch how they live and if they walk faithfully.” Will some of Solomon’s descendants walk faithfully with the Lord? Hezekiah and Josiah. But will most of them go astray? David is saying that the covenant with David is a conditional covenant in some aspects of it. There’s an “if” part to it. You’ve got to walk in the ways of the Lord otherwise the Lord is not going to put your descendants on the throne the way he would have. So there’s an “if” with David there, and that’s interesting. Now, ultimately will Jesus be on the throne forever and ever? Yes, that’s going to happen because God gave his word, but David’s descendants will participate in that at different levels according to their own obedience.

David’s Hit List

Now David’s an old man and he says, “Okay, Solomon, you’ve got to clean up the kingdom” because there are certain things David didn’t do. David gives Solomon his “hit list” as I call it. Who’s going to be on this hit list? Let’s just talk through these guys. Who has more blood on his hands than anyone else in David’s kingdom? Joab. Joab was David’s general and Joab killed Abner in cold blood. Joab kills everyone in the narrative.

We're told in the narrative Joab kills Absalom. And David says, "Solomon, I am a man of blood. You've got to take care of this problem. Joab has blood on his hands." Now, by the way, you may ask, why doesn't David take care of the problem? Why does he make his son do that? Is it very likely that Joab and David were good friends? They both grew up in Bethlehem together. They both ran from Saul together and fought together. So these guys are life-long fighting buddies. So David is not going to do that to his friend. But Joab has blood all over his hands, so David wants Solomon to take care of that so that his head doesn't go down in peace. So what does Joab do? After Solomon takes over, Joab goes running into the tabernacle area and takes hold of the horns of the altar for asylum. Solomon says, go in and kill him even there, I don't want that blood on my kingdom.

Does anyone remember who Shimei was? That's a harder one. He's a minor character. Let me just tell you the story of Shimei. Absalom is coming up to kill his father. David flees from Jerusalem across the Valley of Kidron, over the Mount of Olives. As David's running over the Mount of Olives who shows up but Shimei, a descendant of Saul and he says, "see David, you're finally getting what should be coming to you. David, you were a wicked guy with Saul. So now you're getting what you deserve." So Shimei curses David as David's fleeing from his son, in a weak point. Now, could David have killed Shimei? But David is merciful and spares Shimei, but he's telling Solomon now this guy cursed me, take care of business.

How does Solomon do Shimei? It's kind of interesting how he does him. He says, "Shimei, I'm not going to take your life, but if you ever leave Jerusalem, I will kill you." So what does one of Shimei's servants do? Shimei's servant runs away. What does Shimei do? Shimei runs after his servant to bring him back to Jerusalem, Solomon finds out about it and says, "I told you not to leave the city." So Shimei is taken out.

What about Adonijah? Adonijah has a problem. Do you remember when Abner and Ishbosheth were in Jordan? Abner said, "I want Rizpah, the concubine of Saul;" and Ishbosheth freaked out because it was as if it were a play for the kingship? Adonijah, the son of David says, I want Abishag. Remember, that pretty young woman who slept with

David? Adonijah says I want her now for my own. Is that a play for the kingship, so that he can sleep with the same woman who slept with David? So it is believed that when Adonijah says he wants Abishag that he is making a bid for the kingship. So Solomon says, you've got to go Adonijah, that's not right. So Solomon takes Adonijah out. With these three people, Solomon is purging the kingdom and making it purer so that he won't have blood on his hands and avoid backstabbing political intrigue.

Solomon's wisdom

Now what's interesting in this narrative is what I'm going to demonstrate to you is that Solomon was wise before God gave him the wisdom. He's going to have a special dream in chapter 3. He's going to dream at Gibeon and God is going to ask him what he wants. Solomon says that he wants to be wise and discerning. God's going to be impressed with that and makes him the wiser than anybody else in the world. But Solomon was wise before the dream and David recognizes that as his father. It says in verse 6, "Deal with him (that is Joab) according to your wisdom Solomon. Do not let his gray hair go down into the grave in peace." David recognized that his son was wise. This is before the dream. Then if you go over to chapter 2 verse 9 (again, before the dream) David says to Solomon, "but now do not consider him innocent, (This time he's talking about Shimei) you Solomon, are a man of wisdom. [David says to Solomon] You will know what to do to him, bring his gray-haired head down to the grave in blood." So Solomon was wise before the dream. Does God often do that to people, take their gifts and then enhance their gifts? It was not that Solomon was a fool before that.

Now this is where Solomon gets his wisdom, 1 Kings chapter 3 at the sacrificial place at Gibeon. Solomon goes up there offering sacrifices before the Lord and God comes to Solomon in a dream and "the king went to Gibeon to offer sacrifices and at Gibeon the Lord appeared to Solomon in the night during a dream and the Lord asked 'ask what I shall give you.'" Now you know if the genie comes out of the bottle and gives you three wishes. What is your wish for? You have to be smart about this. You do the first two wishes asking for whatever you want and in the third wish you ask for more

wishes. Here he said, “ask whatever you want and I’ll give it to you. Solomon answered (and this shows his wisdom) you have shown great kindness to my father, King David because he was faithful.” Then I’m going to jump down a little bit, “but I am only a child. I do not know how to carry out my duties. Your servant is here among the people you have chosen, a great people, too numerous to count or number (do you get the little dig there about numbering people?) so give your servant a discerning heart [or listening heart] to govern your people to distinguish between right and wrong.” Does the king have to make court cases to distinguish between right and wrong? “For who is able to govern this great people of yours? And the Lord was pleased with what Solomon had asked for.” He says, “Hey, Solomon, you didn’t ask for long life. You didn’t ask for wealth.” God says, “I’ll give you those things as well.” So Solomon’s dream at Gibeon shows his humility. It shows Solomon’s humility when he says that he’s just a little child unable to judge between what is right and wrong. This is true humility in Solomon.

By the way, is there going to be tension between the intellect and this humility? Are most intellectuals you know humble people? Isn’t it usually that when a person is bright, they get arrogant? Usually when a person is bright, they get arrogant. Here you see Solomon with humility which is really very wise.

The problem is Solomon says “I’m only a child,” do you realize at this point he’s already got a kid and a wife? At this point in Solomon’s life it’s not mentioned right there, you have to go back. In fact he’s already got a one year old son and he’s got an Ammonitess wife. The wife is an Ammonite, she’s not Jewish! Do you remember as you read the narrative in chapter 11 it’s going to tell us that Solomon had 700 wives and 300 concubines and they led his heart astray? It tells you at the end of Solomon’s life that he’s got all these wives and concubines. But when Solomon started out before the dream and before he became king or just as he was becoming king he had an Ammonitess wife and a one year old son. When Solomon dies and Rehoboam his son takes over, his son is 41 years old. Solomon ruled for 40 years. This means that his son was one year old and he was born to a wife who was an Ammonitess at the time of the dream, but it doesn’t tell you about the problem with the wives until later on in chapter 11. So you have to work

with the narrative and how it works there.

Marxist interpretations of Solomon and his wealth

Now wealth, what's the problem here? Do Marxists like wealth? By the way, in academia, in colleges across this country, are a many of professors Marxist oriented? The answer is, yes. Now the Marxist comes to the book of 1 Kings and they see Solomon being blessed by God with all of this wealth. Do Marxist people like people with wealth? No, they hate them. So when the Marxist gets in here he has to totally turn this passage on its head. It's interesting to me. Here's how the Marxists and this is how many scholars I've worked with interpret it. I look at it and I say, "God blessed Solomon with wealth." They say that wealth is bad, therefore this narrative needs to be read in an ironic way. Now how do you read the 1 Kings narrative in an ironic way? "O yeah, Solomon had all this gold and silver. O yeah, Solomon was the most wealthy person at the time. Do you know where Solomon got all of this wealth? He must have taxed the daylights out of the people." By the way, later on we do find out that Solomon did tax the people. Where do kings in power get money? They always get it from the same place--they tax the people. Solomon taxed the people, so the Marxist would say Solomon is wealthy, not because God gave him the wealth, but because he taxed the people. So Solomon's wealth show's his cruelty by him dominating the 99% because he was the 1%. Do you get all of the overtones in that, I hope you do.

What does this interpretation do to the narrative? Rather than wisdom and wealth being a blessing from God, the Marxist reads it that wisdom and wealth are not a blessing from God but Solomon taking wealth from other people. So Solomon was "really wise" and taxed the people. So this narrative is not meant to build Solomon up, this narrative is meant to take Solomon down. Now, by the way, is that quite a different reading from how you read it? What I'm suggesting to you is, is this a wrong way to take it? But a lot of people are taking it like that now, which I think is wrong because it's denying that the wealth was a gift from God. Now there would be problems with the wealth later on, but you have to be careful when you say, "all wealth is bad." Long life, again one of the

blessings from God. Solomon will rule for 40 years, and God gives him wealth and long life.

Solomon's wisdom victory

Now, when a new leader takes over, what's the first thing a new leader's got to do? He's got to win a victory. David, 1 Samuel 16 David is anointed king. 1 Samuel chapter 17 is David and Goliath, David's first victory. Saul becomes the first king of Israel, what does Saul do, he defeats the Philistines. Solomon takes over, where is his battle? Do you ever remember reading about Solomon at war? No. Solomon, rather than having a victory of war, Solomon's victory is a wisdom victory.

Why is this story about the two prostitutes put in here? Let me just narrate the story of the two prostitutes. There were these two women, prostitutes, each with a child. One rolls over on her child at night and basically smothers, or kills the kid. So she's killed her own child, during the night she takes her own child, the dead one, and puts it at the breast of the other woman, then she takes the good child. The woman wakes up in the morning and realizes it. Now, do women recognize their children, even from day one? All babies look-a-like? Is that true? All babies don't look alike so she would realize this was not her baby. So now we have a she-said versus she-said. "It's my baby, no it's my baby" etc. When you have two women fighting like that, what are you supposed to do? "Well," Solomon says, "Give me a sword, I'll chop the live baby in two and give a half to each woman." A mother will have what for their children? Solomon is playing on the fact that a mother will have compassion for her children. In my house, can my children do anything wrong? If anyone attacks our children is my wife always on the side of our kids? Even when the kids do bad stuff, she's always on the side of the kids. She is the mother. So cut the child in two. The real mother says, don't cut the baby in two give it to the other woman, just let the baby live. So now Solomon knows who the real mother is, and takes baby from her and gives it to the real mother. It's a victory of wisdom to discern what's right and what's wrong. This is his first victory from these two ladies. It is a wisdom victory.

Now Solomon is the proverbs man. David is the sweet psalmist of Israel. David gives us, almost half of the book of Psalms. Proverbs is written largely by Solomon. 1 Kings 4:30 says this: “he spoke 3000 proverbs.” How many proverbs do we have in our Bible? About 375. He wrote 3000 proverbs, we only have 375 --that’s around 12% of what he wrote. Most of Solomon’s proverbs are gone. “And his songs number 1005.” They had one Song of Solomon and they put it in the Bible and they said, “that’s enough of that’.” No. Solomon has two psalms in the book of Psalms as well. Song of Solomon is dedicated to him, but it’s in actuality “Song of Songs,” not “Song of Solomon.” Anyway, his psalms number 1005. 1 Kings 4.33, “He described plant life, from the cedar of Lebanon to the hyssop that grows out of walls. He also talked about birds, and animals, and reptiles, and fish. And men from all nations came to listen to Solomon’s wisdom sent by the kings of the world who had heard of his wisdom.”

Pharaoh’s Daughter, Solomon and Proverbs

You should know that I’m really into Psalms and Proverbs and I’m really into Solomon. What I’m going to tell you now. You’re here at Gordon College, there isn’t anyone else in the world who is going to say this. This is completely unique you’ll never read it in a commentary. Now as soon as I say that, what should you put behind everything I say? A big question mark. Hildebrandt is making this up. Now I’ve studied this for a long time, but I’m going to make something up. It is tentative and I could be wrong here. I think I’m right, but I could be wrong. Something bothers me in this narrative. As I read this narrative, who keeps popping up in the narrative? This woman, Pharaoh’s daughter. Before Solomon had his dream at Gibeon to get the wisdom, in chapter 3 it says “Solomon made an alliance with Pharaoh, king of Egypt and married his daughter.” That verse is totally out of context, all of a sudden you have Pharaoh’s daughter. Where’d that come from? He is going to have a dream to get wisdom and where’d this verse come from there about Pharaoh’s daughter. If you go to chapter 9

verse 24 you see the same thing, this thrown in verse about this wife that he's got from Egypt. "After Pharaoh's daughter had come up from the city of David to the palace Solomon had built for her." Solomon built this woman a special palace because he didn't want her in the temple area because she wasn't Jewish, she was Egyptian. So Solomon built a special palace for her to keep things kosher. In chapter 11 verse 1 there's a listing of Solomon's wives and this is what it says, "King Solomon however loved many foreign women besides Pharaoh's daughter." Notice how Pharaoh's daughter is privileged. There are all the other wives--but she's special. In this verse there are recorded 700 wives and 300 concubines. Can any man do that? No. A lot of those are political marriages.

Now what I'm suggesting to you is this: in Proverbs, how is wisdom portrayed? Proverbs chapters 1-9 how was wisdom portrayed? Wisdom is portrayed as a woman. It's Woman Wisdom verses Woman Folly. Woman Folly tries to seduce the young man and Solomon is trying to get his son to date Madame Wisdom. Madame Wisdom is a woman. Do you notice also in the book of Proverbs there is no mention of the temple. Now, is the temple one of Solomon's greatest life achievements in his whole life? Solomon built the first temple to God, overlaid it with gold and cedar etc. It's not even mentioned in the book of Proverbs. Who would have a little bit of resentment against the temple? Would Pharaoh's daughter have a little bit of resentment because she's not "good enough" for the temple? Solomon builds her this separate palace away from it.

Here's another thing, when you go to Proverbs chapter 22, it's very, very similar to the proverbs of Amenemope from Egypt. What I'm suggesting here is: is it possible Solomon is interacting with this wife, Pharaoh's daughter, is it very likely that she knows the wisdom of Egypt? And is it very likely that Solomon is collecting proverbs from around the world and he goes to his wife from Egypt and he says, "Hey, what kind of proverbs do you have down there"? She would have been trained in the wisdom of Egypt. Yes, she would have been. So what I'm suggesting is that it's very possible that the book of Proverbs has an influence from Pharaoh's daughter mediated through Solomon. What I'm suggesting is I think there's a pretty strong influence there. Now these are the

proverbs of Solomon and Solomon was the editor of it, but he probably interacted strongly with Pharaoh's daughter. She is highlighted in the 1 Kings narrative.

By the way, how does the book of Proverbs end (chapter 31). It ends with a "VW," a virtuous woman. Is it possible that this virtuous woman was modeled after Pharaoh's daughter? That's a stretch. Put a big question mark by that one. Just some other ideas there.

Solomon and the Temple

The temple construction: chapter 8, Solomon builds the first temple. The Jewish people organize their history around the temples. Christian people organize their history according to Jesus Christ. We have B.C. (before Christ) and A.D. (the year of our Lord). We do things around Christ. The Jewish people have what's called "The First Temple Period." The First Temple Period is from Solomon down to the Babylonian captivity. The Babylonians are going to destroy the temple in 586 B.C. Then remember Ezra and Nehemiah around that time rebuilt the temple and the Second Temple Period goes from the time of Ezra and Nehemiah down to the time of Jesus. Jesus will come into the second temple and the Romans will destroy the second temple in 70 A.D. So the Jews designate time by the First Temple Period and Second Temple Period.

Solomon is going to put up the first temple. How does he do it? He goes up to Lebanon, David actually set this up with a guy named Hiram, and he goes up there to Hiram and he says, "Hiram, I want some cedars of Lebanon." Hiram says, "Man, our truckers are on strike, we can't get the lumber down to you." No. What they'll do is throw the cedars of Lebanon into the ocean and they float them down to what today is Tel-Aviv (or Joppa) and then from Joppa they were hauled up to Jerusalem. They throw these cedars of Lebanon into the Mediterranean Sea and float them down to Israel. It's kind of an interesting way that they built these things, they built ships from the cedars of Lebanon. Solomon then takes the cedar trees, overlays the rocks and then covers them over in gold. It was an incredible thing.

Now Solomon offers a dedicatory prayer here, in chapter 8 verse 27. The temple is

Solomon's biggest achievement. He builds the temple for God that his father always wanted. Solomon actually builds it. This is at the biggest achievement of his life in verse 27, he says, "but will God really dwell on earth? The heavens, even the highest heavens cannot contain you, how much less this temple I have built." This is the biggest achievement of his life. Does Solomon still have things in perspective? Yes. This temple is nothing to God. This is the God of the universe and "how much less this temple." So Solomon seems to have it together. He takes this great achievement and rather than bragging about it, his head doesn't get too big. So Solomon seems to be pretty wise here.

Solomon's fame: Queen of Sheba

The Queen of Sheba comes to see Solomon. She travels up all the way from what you guys would call Yemen, on the south side of the Saudi Arabia peninsula (Sheba). She comes all the way up, probably 1000 miles, to see Solomon. She quizzes him with hard questions. One of the translations says "her breath was taken away at Solomon's wisdom." She raves saying, "Solomon you are wiser than all I was told from my country. You are wiser than I could have imagined." And she brags on Solomon.

But do you notice what's happening here? Does Solomon brag about himself? No. Other people, like the Queen of Sheba and Hiram they brag about Solomon. So rarely in the text does Solomon speak, other people rave about Solomon. Is that a mark of a wise man? He doesn't brag about himself, other people brag about him. This is the mark of a wise man.

Solomon's folly: turning away from the Lord

Now, Solomon's folly, what's the problem here? Chapter 11 saves it up. Solomon marries many foreign wives and basically his heart goes after them. Now a couple things: Solomon has 700 wives and 300 concubines but before he was king he was married to this Ammonitess and before his dream at Gibeon for the wisdom, he had already married the Pharaoh's daughter. So Solomon had already started on this, in other words, they saved up all these women until this point. Rehoboam, his son is 41 when Solomon dies after 40 years of reigning.

This then raises this question and I'd like to end here. Let me just read what the text says. "They were from nations about which the Lord had told the Israelites, 'You must not intermarry with them' ... As Solomon grew old, his wives turned his heart after other gods, and his heart was not fully devoted to the Lord his God, as the heart of his father David had been. He followed Ashtoreth, the goddess of the Sidonians and Molech the detestable god of the Ammonites. So Solomon did evil in the eyes of the Lord, he did not follow the Lord completely as his father David had done." At the east hill he built an altar to Chemosh, where they offered up their children to their gods. They burned their children to their gods. Solomon burned children to Chemosh the god of Moab or Edom or Ammon.

Is it possible for someone to turn away from the Lord? When I was younger I was very much into Calvinism, once saved, always saved or perseverance of the saints. Did Solomon turn away at the end of his life and even serve other gods? Yes.

Now some people suggest that Ecclesiastes tells us Solomon came back to the Lord at the end of his life. In Ecclesiastes 12 Solomon is an old man and he comes back to the Lord. Is that possible? Yes it's possible. Have you seen people go away from the Lord and not come back? I've had a friend who went through a divorce, his wife got the kid, and this guy taught with me at a very, very, very conservative school. All I can remember of our last conversation is that he said f- God, f-God, thirty times at least in five minutes. He was so angry at God for destroying his marriage. Now question: who really destroyed his marriage? He didn't want to face that so he blamed God for it and he turned his back on God. Now is it possible that he might come back to the Lord? Twenty, thirty years later I might say, yes. All I'm doing is raising this question: is it possible for someone to know God, and then turn away? Is that possible. Again, all I want to say to you is: one step. "There but for the grace of God go I." Don't arrogantly say, "I would never deny the Lord," actually who said that? Peter said that and what happened? All I'm saying is: is humility a good thing? Be careful how you think about people who turn away from the Lord, it's possible that they will come back and we need to pray seriously

for those types of people and for ourselves as our hearts are prone to wander.

Okay, see you on Thursday.

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt in his Old Testament History, Literature, and Theology course lecture number 25: David's sin with Bathsheba and transition to Solomon.

Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 26[\[Back to Table of Contents\]](#)

This is Dr. Ted Hildebrandt teaching in his Old Testament History, Literature, and Theology course, the final lecture number 26, from Solomon to Rehoboam, Jeroboam, down to Ahab and then some of the Messianic prophecies.

Review of Solomon's apostasy

I want to buzz through some things rather quickly here and so we're just going to kind of hit and run as we go through this material. So let's get this started up. Last time we were talking about Solomon and we were saying Solomon is the wisest man that ever lived. Then we said that at the end of his life he kind of botches up his life. He ends up with all these women, he ends up worshiping other gods, and he has these problems. So it's kind of interesting that it's the smartest man that ever lived turns out to be a very foolish man. The very thing that he warned his kids about is the thing that he botched up himself. So what ends up happening it seems to me, and I wonder if you noticed this, have you ever noticed people that are really smart end up to being really stupid at the same time? So you get this connection on the backside of wisdom, that the wisdom and folly actually crossover sometimes. With Solomon you get this flipping over. The very things that he warned the young man against the adulteress and going after other gods is the very thing that he participates in himself. So Solomon turns his back on God. He's got some big problems there. That brings up Hebrews 6 and a host of things about whether you're saved, you're always saved; but we'll save that for New Testament. But anyways, we've looked at wisdom and folly, and the connections between the two in the narrative.

Dividing of the monarchy

What happen is, because Solomon goes after other gods, God comes in chapter 11 and let me just read this, chapter 11, verse 11: "The Lord said to Solomon: 'since this is your attitude and you have not kept my covenant and my decrees,'" notice "you have not kept my covenant," the covenant was a big thing for God. "You have not kept my

covenant, my decrees which I commanded you. I will most certainly tare the kingdom away from you and give it to one of your subordinates. Nevertheless, for the sake of David your father I will not do it during your lifetime.” So Solomon gets spared why? Because David was his father. He actually says because David was your father I won’t do it to you, because you’re David’s kid. God spares Solomon on David’s behalf, which is really an interesting concept there.

Now what happens is the kingdom is going to split north and south. I call these two guys the Boam-brothers. This is when the kingdom splits. The south is going to be Rehoboam and Rehoboam is Solomon’s son. Rehoboam is going to be in the Davidic line. Rehoboam is going to be the king of Judah. Judah is going to be in the south. So there’s one tribe in the south that stays in the Davidic line--Judah in the south. The ten tribes in the north, they get carried away by this guy Jeroboam. So Jeroboam who actually is an antagonist to Rehoboam and Jeroboam sets up in the north. The north will be called “Israel;” the south will be called “Judah.” So the kingdom is going to split at this point and this is a big thing for Israel. Under Saul, David, and Solomon, the kingdom had been united. Now ten tribes headed by Ephraim are going to get carried to the north. The ten tribes in the north are going to go to Jeroboam, who’s not Davidic. Then the south, one tribe, Judah, is going to go to Rehoboam.

So we’ll look back at that. What we have here is the kingdom’s divided into what they call a “divided monarchy” as oppose to the “united monarchy.” The united monarchy is Saul, David, and Solomon. The divided monarchy is a bunch of kings in the north, Israel, and a bunch of kings in the south, Judah.

Some dates to know: 1000 B.C., 722 B.C., and 586 B.C.

Now, there’s going to be three or four dates that I want you to know. First date that I want you to know is what? David’s what? David is a 1000 B.C. A second date and I want to introduce today is when the kingdom split in 931 B.C. I don’t want you to know the date 931. David’s a 1000 B.C., you figure Solomon is right after that so you get kind of close to this.

This date 722 B.C. is an important date. This is when the northern kingdom of

Israel, the ten tribes in the north, get carried off to Assyria, to Nineveh. Nineveh is the capital of Assyria. The Assyrians were an exceedingly cruel people. Soon as I say Assyria, who's the prophet that comes to mind? Jonah. So Jonah goes to Assyria. The ten tribes get carried off to Assyria. He rips off all the people of wealth, and of means. He leaves the poor people in the land and he scatters the Jews. The ten tribes are scattered throughout Assyria and the region. Have those ten tribes ever been re-gathered? Are the ten tribes really scattered around the world? From 722 B.C., are they scattered among the world to this day? You say no Hildebrandt, they aren't really scattered they're in New York City, most of them. But the Jews are scattered all over the world--Poland, Germany, etc. And now they've gone back to Israel but you know like we said, there are more Jews in New York City than there are in Israel. This is when the northern ten tribes were scattered by Assyria and they have been scattered ever since—722 B.C.

About a 130 years later Judah, Judah lasts about another 130 years. Judah gets exiled in 586 B.C. and this is a really big date. 586 is when the temple of Solomon is destroyed. So this is a really important date, this is when Babylon comes in and destroys the temple of Solomon. So the temple is destroyed and the Jews are hauled off to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar. And by the way, who were some Jews that were hauled off to Babylon that you know? Does anybody remember Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego, those guys and Ezekiel? Does anybody remember the prophet who spoke just before the Babylonians came in and destroyed the temple? Does anybody know what prophet, was a crying prophet, he cried a lot? Jeremiah, that's right. Jeremiah prophesied just before they go to Babylon. Jeremiah tells them, "you guys are going off to Babylon. You're going to go off to Babylon, repent, repent" and they don't repent. Instead, they beat up on Jeremiah. They get hauled off to Babylon. By the way, does God preserve Jeremiah alive? Jeremiah doesn't go to Babylon, he's preserved because he spoke God's word, although he was beat up quite a bit. So that's 586 B.C., it's a big date--the temple is destroyed and Jews are exiled to Babylon.

By the way, how many years did they go to Babylon for? Does anybody remember that? Seventy years. They go for seventy years. Why did God say seventy years? He said,

“you owe me because you have not kept the Sabbath year.” Remember every seventh year they are supposed to let the land rest? The Sabbatical year and the Jews had not done that for 490 years and so God kept track of that. He says you’re out of my land, my land is going to get its rest. You’re in Babylon for seventy years. Now had they gotten away with it for 490 years? Yes. God says, “Okay, now it’s due, you’re out of here, you’re going to Babylon for seventy years” and they go in 586 B.C. which is the date when that actually happens in a big way.

The splitting of the kingdom with Rehoboam (Solomon’s son)

Now, the kingdom is split and we just want to talk about the split and how this happens. Rehoboam is Solomon’s son. He’s going to make some bad mistakes here. One of the mistakes he’s going to make is he’s going to listen to the young versus the old. A young person, when you ask for advice, should the young person listen to an old person or should they listen to their peers? A young person should listen to old people to get wisdom. I’m an old man now. Question, should I listen cross-generationally to my son who’s 23? Yes, I should because that gives you this cross-generational kind of context here. So Rehoboam is, “Okay, so my father is dead now, I’m the king.” What he says is this, he goes to the old men and he says: “hey, elders, what do you recommend?” He consulted with the elders and they said: “if today, you will be a servant to these people and serve them and give them a favorable answer, they will always be your servants.” In other words, if you as the king serve your people, your people will do what to you? They will serve you. So if the king serves the people, then the people will serve the king. Is this talking about leadership? If a new king serves his people, the people will then in turn serve him. That works okay. It’s what Jesus did.

He rejects that and he goes instead to the young men that he had grown up with and here’s what they say: “Hey, Rehoboam, you’re king, you’re the big man now. You tell them, my little finger is thicker than my father’s waist. My father laid on you a heavy yoke; I will make it even heavier. My father scourged you with whips; I will scourge you with scorpions.” In other words, my father made it rough for you, you ain’t seen nothing yet. I’m on the throne now and my little finger’s tougher than my father’s whole power

and being. That's what the young men say. Show them who's boss. Have you ever seen the young leader come in and he's got to take over and show everybody that he's the man? Is that a loser? That's a loser. When you have to prove something like that, that's a loser. The person that comes in and serves people, is that leader a winner?

I just had a talk with my son about that in terms of his experience in the Marines. You have some Marines come in and "I'm going to show them how tough I am." My son was a team leader and you know what he did? His guys marched sixteen miles. Rather than giving them a lecture telling them they were nothing, do you know what he did? He went out and bought pizza for his guys. Question: would those guys have died for him? I'm not talking figuratively, I'm talking literally. The answer is, yes. The problem is they knew that he would go first. If they were going through a bad door, they knew he would go first because he wouldn't let them go first because that's the kind of leader he is. He would go first and that's why I was glad that he was relieved of his duty because I knew he would do that. But that's what a leader does, a leader serves.

This guy, Rehoboam, accepts the advice of the young guys. He comes out: I'm going to whip you. My father whipped you with whips; I'm going to whip you with scorpions. All the people said what? We are taxed enough already. Did you ever see that "Taxed Enough Already"? Has anybody ever seen that? T-e-a, yes, we have had it in our country. "Taxed enough already."

People said we're taxed too much Rehoboam. We are not going to pay you taxes like they paid them. So they said: ten tribes, we're going north. We're not going to come back down here. So, they split the kingdom over this. Now Rehoboam, just to show how dumb this guy was, he used Adoniram who was a minor character. Adoniram was Solomon's tax collector. What does Rehoboam do? He sends Adoniram out to collect taxes. What did the people do to this guy? When he gets out there to collect the taxes, the people stone Adoniram to death. They actually kill him when he's trying to collect taxes for Rehoboam. They said, "sorry it doesn't work here" and they actually stoned this guy to death. Was that a really dumb move on his part? Had this guy already had bad blood because he was a tax collector for Solomon? That's what they were complaining about

too much taxes. So Adoniram was stoned to death. It just shows Rehoboam and his stupidity.

Now, the northern kingdom splits off. The northern kingdom will be called Israel. The names get funny here. So the northern kingdom is called Israel and Judah will be in the south. All the kings of the north are bad. Every one of them are bad starting with Jeroboam, on down. They're all bad. So it's pretty easy for the northern kingdom, they're all bad guys. In the south, the southern kingdom is called Judah and it's through the southern kingdom of Judah that David's descendants will rule. The problem is they have only got one tribe. Simeon actually had immigrated in there, but I don't want to get in to that. But anyway, Judah is where David's son will rule. Most of the kings of the south were bad, some of them were good. Hezekiah was a very good king. Josiah was another real good king. So you've got Hezekiah, Josiah, Asa some of these kings in the south who were good. Not all of them were bad but about four or so were good.

Northern Kingdom kings: a quick overview

Now, the kings of the north, here we go. I don't want you to know this or write this down. I'm just going to float through the northern kingdom. When I took this course many many years ago, my professor had us memorize all the kings of the north and their dates and the kings of the south and their dates. Now I swore if I ever taught this class I would never do that to anyone.

Jeroboam is going to be our first king of the north, he's king when kingdom splits in 931. He's the guy that takes over in the north. He has a son Nadab, but what happens to his line? His line gets cut off. Baasha kills Nadab's son Elah, Elah gets killed. Zimri has no kids, he rules for about three weeks or three months or so. He gets killed immediately. So these guys are getting killed off. Do you see that each of their lines ends?

Now, by the way, in the south are we going to have David's line, father son, father son, father son. David's line is going continue forever. But here you see these guys are cut off, cut off, and cut off. None of their descendants lasts.

Now here's a big one, this guy's got four in a row Omri. You know Omri because

you know his son Ahab. Ahab was famous. He was married to Jezebel. So this is Jezebel's husband. This father Omri is also very important outside the Bible more than inside the Bible. But this is Ahab who was the worst of the worst kings. Ahab is the worst of the north and then he has a couple of sons and then his line gets cut off as well.

Then you have Jehu, Jehu is important for one thing. I'm sorry for simplifying it this much but Jehu takes out Ahab's line. Jehu is the one that finishes off all of Ahab's kids. So Jehu basically ends this bad line in the north. Then Jeroboam II, this guy Jeroboam ends Jehu's dynasty. He's not related to Jeroboam I. But Jeroboam II was the most wealthy of the northern kings. He was the most powerful. This guy was very powerful and wealthy in his day.

These other guys are a bunch of nobodies. I'm sorry but to be honest with you, they're a bunch of nobodies and what happens to them: killed, killed, killed, killed. They each get wiped out after a short period of time.

Finally, because of their idolatry in the north, God sends in Assyria from Nineveh and in 722 B.C., the ten tribes in the north get carried off to Assyria and they take all the wealthy people. They take all the people of intelligence and basically normal people and up. They take them to Nineveh and then they bring in intelligentsia people from other areas and they swap whole populations. Why would they want to swap populations? Because when you're in a foreign country, you're not going to create a revolt because you don't know the people, you're in a foreign country. So they did this thing where they would swap populations so there would be no revolt against them.

The Assyrians were really cruel. In one picture they've got a pyramid of people's heads, just their heads. The point is, if you disobey them what happens? Your head would be added to the pile. Now is that a pretty convincing argument? Would that work in a philosophy class? Yes, it would. Is that pretty convincing? Pile of head, your heads will be there? That's one of the best arguments ever. "Yes sir," you say. So Assyria is cruel.

Jeroboam I and the beginning of the northern kingdom

Now Jeroboam I, I just want to talk about this guy, he's the king of the north Israel. What he does is Jeroboam's got a problem. He's got the ten tribes in the north,

Judah's to the south. But Judah has the capital city of what? Jerusalem. Where are the people supposed to go three times a year and bring all their tithes and offerings? They're supposed to go down to Jerusalem. This means then that all this money from the north is going to go where? It's going to go south and so Jeroboam says: "These people are going to take their sacrifices down there, all this wealth is going down there. They're going to go down there three times a year. These people are going to revolt against me because they've got to keep going to Jerusalem." So he says, "you know we shouldn't do this."

Now let me just do the narration here. This is 1 Kings 12.27: "If these people go up to offer sacrifices at the temple of the Lord in Jerusalem, they will again give their allegiance to their lord, Rehoboam king of Judah. Then they will kill me and return to the King Rehoboam." So what he does is he's going to make these golden calves and set them up at Dan and Bethel in the north so that the people will make pilgrimages and bring their sacrifices to the north, this way he won't lose any revenue, and he won't lose any allegiance from those people.

Have we seen the golden calf thing before? Aaron at Mount Sinai, remember? "These are the gods that brought you out of Egypt." He's reviving this and again he sets up a golden calf in Bethel. He sets up another one at Dan. He says, "these are the gods that brought you out of Egypt." So they're identifying Jehovah with these golden calves. So there will be golden calves at Dan and Bethel. His epithet is that "Jeroboam is the one that taught Israel to sin." This epithet comes up, all the kings of Israel in the north will commit this sin that Jeroboam son of Nebat, "taught Israel to sin." So Jeroboam is the first one and because he set up the golden calves they all do the golden calf thing.

I should say this while I'm thinking about this too. Dan, the one up in Dan in the north, they put up a golden calf up at Dan. Do you know that they have excavated Dan and guess what they found? No, no, somebody said they found the golden calf. Why would you never find the golden calf? Because if somebody as an invader comes in and sees a golden calf, what are they going to do? They're going to rip off the golden calf, they're going to melt it down, they're going to bring it back to their temples. So you're never going to see anything like a golden calf. But would you see a platform where they

had their worship? They have found the high place at Dan. In other words, where he had this thing set up. In other words, they would level the ground there, they found that. So they have actually found this high place of Jeroboam. That's really pretty cool archaeologically up in Dan at the foot of Mount Hermon.

Man of God out of Judah confronts Jeroboam

Now what happens? Jeroboam sets up the two golden calves, the people in the north are worshiping golden calves. The king makes it. Who's going to hold the king in check? The prophet. So in chapter 13 of 1 Kings, there's a man of God comes up out of Judah. Do you remember this guy? The Man of God comes up out of Judah and what does he do? He prophesies against the altars that Jeroboam had just set up. "So by the word of the Lord, a man of God came from Judah to Bethel as Jeroboam was standing by the altar making an offering and he cried out against the altar by the word of the Lord. O altar, altar, this is what the Lord says." By the way, that phrase: "this is what the Lord says." Is that what a prophet says? A prophet speaks for God: "Thus saith the Lord." "This is what the Lord says," and the prophet gives you what God says. "A son named Josiah will be born to the house of David and on you he will sacrifice the priests of the high places who now make offerings here. Human bones, O altar, will be burned on you."

Human bones and the guy's name that he will be called "Josiah." When did Josiah live? 300 years later. There's a prophecy here of Josiah 300 years before the guy lived telling exactly what he would do, that he would burn human bones on this altar that Jeroboam had set up. By the way, 300 years later guess what he does? Josiah is born and Josiah does exactly this. So it's really kind of an interesting fulfilled prophecy.

Now what you're saying is in 1 Kings 13, 300 years before the guy lives, it predicts his name and tells what he would do. Is that a miracle to tell the future and that much, 300 years, in the future? Yes. Question: do critics except miracles in the Bible? No, you can't so you've got to get rid of it and here's how the critics get rid of most of the prophetic miracles foretelling the future. Here's how they get rid of them: they use this thing called *prophecy post-eventu*. What this means is "prophecy after the event." What this means then is that the prophecy, when it says that Josiah will do this 300 years later

that that prophecy was actually made up after the time of Josiah and written back into the text. Do you see what I'm saying? So the prophecy actually comes after the time of Josiah. When Josiah does this, then they put it back in the text--prophecy after the event. That's how critics get rid of a lot of the prophecies in Scripture. They make the prophecy after the event. Now by the way, does the Bible say this? Is there any manuscript evidence for this? The answer is: no. So it's just their way to get rid of those miraculous predictions.

Long term connected to a short term prophecy

Now, another thing that the prophet does, a prophet does a long-term prophecy. Josiah is going to come 300 years later. Are any of those people going to be alive to check him up to see whether he is telling the truth or not? No, they're all going to be dead. So what does a prophet do? A prophet gives a short-term prophecy to confirm the long-term prophecy.

So in this case, the man of God out of Judah, do you remember he was the guy that was supposed to go back to Judah and he didn't and a lion killed him. So this prophet says this: "Josiah is going to offer human bones on this altar," he says. But that's not going to be for 300 hundred years. "So I'll prove to you that that's true. If what I'm saying is true, this altar will split into two right now." What happens? The altar splits in two. By doing that, the people know what? If the altar splits in two at this guy's word, if that's true, do they know this other 300-year prophecy will be true as well? So a short-term prophecy coupled with the long-term prophecy. That's kind of how they did it and this is a case here in 1 Kings 13. So a short-range prophesy confirming a long range.

Then here is another one, Jeroboam's son is sick so his wife goes in to talk to the prophet. The prophet was blind he said: "but I knew you're his wife and when you enter into your house, when you go cross the threshold of your house, your son's going to die." Guess what happened? She goes back home, she goes through the threshold of her house and her son dies. So again the prophet's speaking so you get prophecy-fulfillment. The prophet prophecies and then later on in the chapter its fulfilled or later 300 years its

fulfilled. So that connection, we see it several times here with these prophets. The prophets rebuke the kings. The prophets were checks on the power of the king and the prophet said “thus saith the Lord and king you’ve done wrong, repent.” The king usually beat up on the prophet. That’s usually what happened.

King Ahab and Jezebel of Israel

Now Ahab is one of the big bad guys in the Old Testament as far as kings. But his father, was named Omri and Omri is actually more famous outside the Bible than Ahab is. You know when we talked about Alexandra the Great, is Phillip of Macedon really important? Yes, Alexander is a great leader but his father Phillip set him up. This kind of in an evil way, this is what’s going on here. Ahab is a big bad guy but his father Omri, moves the capital. Now if you guys are Israel, the capital of Israel was where William is here and then over where Zack is, is more where Samaria is. Now why would you move the capital from where William is over to where Zack is? Where’s the major road? If you guys are the Mediterranean Sea, is there a major Route 95 coming up right here called the Coastal Highway? So if you move the capital over here, you can now control the what? The major highway, the Coastal Highway, that runs out by the coast by the Philistines. You can control that if you’re here. If you’re back up in the mountains where William is, you can’t control that route. So, was that a brilliant move by Omri to move the capital up by overlooking the coastal plain? It’s a brilliant move. So they move it to Samaria and now Samaria will be the capital of Israel in the north. That was a brilliant move by Omri.

The Mesha Stone and the Moabite Stone are two ancient stones that archaeologists have dug up and they have the name “Omri” on them. So he was actually carved into stone, his name “Omri” dating from about 830 B.C. So we have confirmation of some of this information archaeologically. By the way, nobody argues with this. You can’t argue with it, this is like chiseled in stone, so they’ve got it?

It’s interesting to this guy Tiglath-Pilezer and I don’t care if you know his name, call him Tiggy for short. But anyways, Tiglath-Pilezer, in his annals in Assyria, about a hundred years later mentions Israel as the “house of Omri.” So even a hundred years later, Israel was known as the house of Omri by Assyria. Omri was a big guy, Ahab was

his son. So Omri is internationally known, I guess that's what I'm trying to say. Ahab is going to be more significant in the Bible.

Now, Omri's son Ahab marries this wonderful woman named Jezebel. Even to say her name Jezebel today, if you call a woman "Jezebel" is that derogatory? If I ever called my wife Jezebel that would be like the worst. There are other politicians that I've heard called that too but we'll get out of there. Ahab marries Jezebel. Jezebel was from Lebanon. She was from Phoenicia, she was from north of Israel, Lebanon, just north. Therefore, just because she was from out there, what kind of god did she worship? She was a Baal worshiper. Lebanon, that's where Baal was from, Lebanon, the area of Phoenicia. So what Jezebel does then is Jezebel brings Baal worship into Israel.

Baal Worship

Now Baal, there's some things you should probably know about Baal. But I had the unfortunate privilege of reading Ugaritic and I had to read all these Baal myths. The Bible doesn't tell us too much about Baal, that's the truth. But they found a place in Ugarit with about 12,000 tablets just north, actually just north of her home up in Syria in Ugarit and they found 12,000 tablets that have got these tales, these myths of Baal.

So here's Baal's myth basically, Baal was a storm god and Baal was considered a "rider of the clouds." By the way, it's kind of interesting, the Bible in Psalms 68 says, Baal is not the rider of the clouds. Psalm 68 says Jehovah is the rider of the clouds. So there's apparently even in the Psalms there's some back and forth between the two cultures. So Baal is the rider of the clouds, Baal then rains on the earth, mother earth. When Baal rains on the earth, he's really fertilizing mother earth. Do you get the imagery? Yes, it is that imagery. It is gross. Now, question, when you went into Baal worship, what happened? When you went into Baal worship, they had the priestess there and you as a male would go in there and if she conceived and had a child, that meant, if she was fertile, that meant your land would be fertile. Do you see what part of their worship was? Part of their worship was to go into these temple prostitutes and get them pregnant because that meant your land would be fertile. If she was fertile, your land would be fertile.

Now by the way, is this really corrupt? This is really majorly corrupt. It was part of their worship and God hated it. It was really wicked, and Jezebel is promoting this kind of worship and we know a whole lot about it now. To be honest with you, we know too much about it.

Elijah and Ahab

Now, king Ahab is a really wicked man, he's going to be the most wicked king in the north. What's going to happen, is there going to be a prophet that has to stand up against him? He's a wicked king, who's the prophet? Guy's name is Elijah. This is where Elijah goes against Ahab and this is why Elijah's so famous because he's the most wicked king. Elijah announces God's judgment on Ahab. It's interesting the prophets, the good prophets get blamed, killed and beat up. The false prophets, did Israel love the false prophets? What was the message of the true prophet? The major message was what? Repent. What was the message of the false prophets? Peace, shalom, peace. The message of the false prophet was largely one of peace. Everybody loved the false prophets because they always proclaiming peace, peace when there was no peace. The true prophet says, "repent," and they hated them. So it's very interesting. By the way, do we have true and false prophets today? It's interesting.

Elijah and the Prophets of Baal on Mount Carmel (1 Kgs 18)

So there's no desire on his part to repent or to face judgment and so he calls Elijah and we're over in 1 Kings chapter 18, Ahab calls Elijah the troubler of Israel. Who is the real troubler of Israel? Ahab is the troubler of Israel, but notice how he projects his evil on to another person? Ahab is the one who's troubling Israel but yet he projects it and calls Elijah the one who's troubling Israel. Now, what happens? 1 Kings 18, there is a really interesting story here, we have Elijah and the prophets of Baal. They're going to duke it out. There's going to be 450 false prophets. How many good prophets do you have? One, 450 against one, you always go with the majority right? You should take a vote. 450 to one, Elijah versus the prophets of Baal, what's going to happen here?

This is a map of it. Where does moisture come from in Israel? It always comes from the same place; it comes from the Mediterranean Sea. The moisture blows in off the

Mediterranean Sea and where does it rain? When it hits the mountains, the water goes up and when it hits the mountains it rains right here because the water, the clouds go up and when the clouds go up, things cool off and it rains. So it comes off the Mediterranean, hits the mountains, and rains on the front side of this mountain. But where is Mount Carmel where is Elijah's going to be? Do see this mountain right here? This is called Mount Carmel, do you see the antelope's nose here? This is a port city called Haifa today, but this is Mount Carmel. When the waters come off the ocean, what's the first mountain that gets hit? Carmel. Will Carmel be verdant and green because it gets rain? Yes, it's right by the ocean so this is where the rain comes, this is where it rains the hardest.

Elijah's going to duke it out with the prophets of Baal right here. If you ever get to Israel, make sure you get up there and see it. They've have a statue of Elijah, that's really cool. Anyway, its right here.

Now, Elijah says "let's duke it out." The prophets of Baal, they go up on mount Carmel, it's a place where storms usually hit. Elijah calls the people to a decision in chapter 18, verse 21. There is a beautiful statement there: "Elijah went before the people and said, How long will you waver between two opinions? If the Lord is God, follow him; but if Baal is God, follow him." So he says don't waver between two opinions, if Jehovah is God follow him, if Baal is God follow him. Then Elijah said to them, "I am the only one prophet of the Lord's prophets left and Baal has 450 prophets."

So they go up there, now the problem, Elijah says we're going to have the gods shoot a lightning bolt on these altars. Now, by the way, did Baal specialize in lightning bolt chucking? Baal was a lightning bolt chucker god. He was the one who brought in the rains, and he was the one who brought in the thunderstorms. So Baal specialized in rains. So Elijah is saying, I'm going to fight Baal on whose turf? We're going to fight Baal on Baal's turf.

Now, Jehovah's got a problem. Jehovah's problem is that Jehovah, what does he specialize in? Baal specializes in lightning bolt chucking and rain coming down. Jehovah doesn't specialize in anything does he? So Baal's got this specialization, Jehovah just

kind of does everything. So they go out.

Now they get this altar up and they start crying out to their gods. I'm going to ask this question: is sarcasm ever appropriate? Now if you've taken this class, I ask you, is sarcasm ever appropriate? Yes. I use it in class regularly and where did I get it from? Well, here it's on the Bible, here's Elijah talking to the prophets of Baal at noon. This is chapter 18, verse 27: "At noon Elijah began to taunt them. Shout louder! He said. Surely he is a god!" "Surely he is a god," did Elijah believe that? No, is he mocking them out? He's mocking them out. "Surely he is a god! Scream louder maybe he can't hear you. Perhaps he is in deep thought, or busy, or traveling or maybe he's on the pot. Maybe he is sleeping and must be awakened. So yell louder so he can hear you, in case he's sleeping, you need to wake up your god." "So they shouted louder and slashed themselves with swords and spears, as the custom was until the blood flowed." Why did they cut themselves? It is believed that if you cut yourselves, that it would get the attention of god. Kind of this idea of shedding blood, if you make blood to flow, maybe the water would flow from the heavens or something like that. So they cut themselves. There's nothing, nothing happens.

What does Elijah do? Elijah says: "there's an old altar for the Lord here. Let's set it up twelve rocks for the twelve tribes of Israel. Let's set the twelve stones up and let's put a little water on this. If Jehovah's going to shoot some lightning bolts on it, why don't we douse it with water just to make sure the wood really burns." They put water on it and then all of a sudden you remember this little hand comes over, a little cloud hand, and all of a sudden what? God does this kind of drone thing with the laser guided lightning shoots right down on the altar and hits it right up. The thing smokes and the people are terrified and start screaming. Then Elijah goes after the 450 prophets and they are killed.

But it's kind of interesting too. The people are frightened when the lightning bolt strikes. Have you ever been close to a lightning bolt strike? Will that scare the daylight out of you? Now you can train yourself as much as possible I'm not going to be scared. But when it comes close and its close, I've not been real, real close but I've been pretty close and I'll tell you it scares the daylight out of you because you're totally out of

control when the thing hits. By the way, have some people been hit by lightning bolts and survived? Yes, it's really kind of interesting when you see the power of the things and I've always wondered what it would be like to get hit by a lightning bolt and survive. But I never really wanted to set up the test because I wouldn't trust my sneakers. It would probably burn them off or something. But I just thought that would be really interesting.

Who wins the day, one against 450 prophets of Baal, Elijah wins the day. This is the greatest day of his life. He defeats the prophets of Baal, 450 of them. He takes on Jezebel, Ahab and the 450 and he wins. This is the greatest day of his life, he's the hero, he's the one that wins.

Elijah flees from Jezebel

What's the problem? Jezebel in the next chapter and this is kind of incredible actually. "Now Ahab told Jezebel everything that Elijah had done and how he had killed all the prophets with the sword. So Jezebel sent a messenger to Elijah to say, 'may the gods deal with me be it ever so severely if by this time tomorrow I do not make your life like one of them.' Elijah was afraid and ran for his life." Where did he run? He's up you saw where Mount Carmel was, he ran not only through the land of Israel, he ran through Judah and the next thing we know is he's down in Beersheba. Where's Beersheba? Beersheba's out the bottom of Judah. Beersheba is like Key West? It's out the bottom to the south.

So he runs down to Beersheba and he gets down there and he was afraid. Then he came under a broom tree, he sat down and prayed. He said, "'I've had enough Lord,' he said, 'take my life. I've had enough, take my life.'" By the way, have we ever seen another prophet ask for something similar? I think his experience was like Moses. Elijah, "Lord take my life." Is it possible for a Christian person or one of the greatest prophets that ever lived, Elijah, to pray for death? And he says, "take my life."

The angel comes and gives him some food. Then the angel comes and gives him some more food. Elijah eats the food and the next thing Elijah does is he runs from Beersheba which is way out the south of Judah, he runs all the way down to Mount Sinai. By the way, who's at Mount Sinai? God's down there and "the word of the Lord came to

him, ‘what are you doing here Elijah?’” It’s God saying, well I’m down in Mount Sinai, what are you doing down here. It’s hundreds of miles south. I’m not sure on the exact mileage. I think it’s only about 75 though miles. But 75 miles is a long way to go on foot.

“He replied, I have been very zealous for the Lord God Almighty. The Israelites have rejected your covenant, broken down your altars, and put your prophets to death, and I am the only one left and now they are trying to kill me too.” So, Elijah basically is flat down. Is Elijah really depressed? What I’m trying to suggest to you is, here Elijah has won one of the greatest victories of his life defeating the 450 prophets of Baal. A few days later, he’s fleeing all the way down and he’s totally depressed because of this woman, he’s scared to death that he’s going to lose his life.

Do highs and lows ever come together? The person gets high one day and everything is great and wonderful and the next day they’re down in the dumps. Have you ever seen a pastor on Monday? Have you ever seen a pastor preaches his heart out on Sunday, on Monday he’s down and depressed. By the way, do a lot of pastors take Monday off? Do you know why they do that? A rush of adrenaline on Sunday, Monday is crash day.

I want to call this “existential aloneness.” Elijah says, “I am the only one left and now they’re seeking to take my life.” One of the worst feelings in life that I’ve ever felt has been feeling like you’re absolutely alone. My son just got back from Afghanistan. He was in the Marines for four years and he did a deployment in Iraq which wasn’t too bad. When he got on to Afghanistan, Afghanistan was brutal. He gets back here, can he relate to the kids that he went to high school with? Now he’s 22-23 years old, he goes back to his high school buddies, can he hangout with his high school buddies now? Are they very different then he is? Yes, he goes out to a place and one of his girls who was in his high school class comes up and says, “how many people did you kill?” He says, does she have a clue? She has no clue, absolutely no clue. He’s totally “You don’t even know what that question means to ask it.” Can he talk to his peers? And the answer is, No. He’s had a dickens of a time talking to his peers. So all of a sudden he starts feeling what? Totally and absolutely alone. You can’t talk to anybody; nobody understands what’s going on. So

all I'm saying is be careful, there can come real down times. Being totally absolutely alone, I'll tell you it's really, really depressing. Elijah experienced this and so he's done.

Elijah's threefold final mission

Now what God does is God comes and says, "Okay, Elijah, you've got to finish up three things. There are three things for you Elijah that you need to do yet. You aren't the only one, there's 7000 of my prophets that haven't bowed their knee to Baal. You need to get your tail back up there and help those guys."

So he tells him you need to do three things: you have to anoint Hazael, who's to be the king of Syria. Anoint the king of Syria. Secondly, you have to anoint Jehu. Now who is Jehu? Jehu's going to be a king. He's going to take down Ahab and his descendants. Jehu is going to be the king that takes out Ahab's descendants. And the lastly, you've got to anoint the next prophet. The next prophet is going to be Elisha. So Elijah is going to anoint Elisha. It's almost like a prophetic baton that's going to get passed from one prophet to the next. Have we seen that before? Moses passes the baton to whom? Joshua. What you have here is Elijah passing it along to Elisha. Elisha's an understudy and Elijah passes it on. So God says you have to go up and anoint these guys and so Elijah had to back up.

Naboth's vineyard

Now, Naboth's vineyard, and I want to hit this quickly. It's in 1 Kings chapter 21. This is a powerful story. Ahab goes out and looks at his palace and who's got a beautiful vineyard right next to his palace? A guy named Naboth. Ahab goes up to this guy Naboth and he says, "Hey, Naboth, I want your vineyard. I will pay you well for your vineyard; just sell it to the king. I want your vineyard, sell it to the king." Naboth says what? "I can't sell it to you, it's an inheritance from my parents from our family. So I can't sell it to you."

What's the king going to do? Well, in this case the king didn't kill him. It says here: Ahab went home sullen and angry because Naboth the Jezreelite had said, "I will not sell it to you." He laid on his bed sulking and refused to eat. His wife Jezebel came in

and said, "why are you sullen why won't you eat?" Jezebel comes and says, "how come you're so down? Ahab, you're the king, how are you down in your bed sullen?" She says, "don't worry about it Ahab, I will take care of it. What do you want for Christmas Ahab? You want his vineyard? I'll give it to you; I'll get it for you. I'll take care of it," Jezebel says. Now when Jezebel says that, is that going to be bad news?

Jezebel says this and I want to introduce a concept that I call "religious evil." Could Jezebel have just ordered her men to go out and kill him? She could have just ordered her men to go out and kill him. Is that what she does? No, she doesn't. Here's how Jezebel kills this guy Naboth. "She says, proclaim a day of fasting and seat Naboth in a prominent place." So it's a day of fasting, it's a religious ceremony. Naboth is put in a prominent place among the people. "But seat two scoundrels opposite him," notice two scoundrels. She would need two witnesses to convict a person. "and have them testify that he has cursed both God and the king. And then take him out and stone him to death."

Naboth was killed. Was he killed using the law of blasphemy? She used the law of blasphemy to kill him. This was Jehovah's law, she uses Jehovah's law to kill this guy. Is that wicked? Is it doubly wicked? It's kind of like cheating in a Bible class, you know what I'm saying? I mean, you're going to cheat in class, you cheat in a Bible class, is that like really bad? What I'm saying she's using religion to destroy Naboth. She uses religion and rather than just killing the guy, so this is what I want to call "religious evil." Do people hide behind religion to do evil? Yes, they do. Often they coat it with all this religious stuff. It's incredible Jezebel does that.

God comes, by the way, there is a God. He sees what happens and so guess who shows up? Who's the prophet? Elijah shows up, he goes after Ahab and he says, "Ahab you're a dead man. Dogs, will the dogs lick up your blood. The dogs are going to lick up your blood Ahab." And then he comes to Jezebel, he says "Jezebel you set that up, dogs are going to eat you. You're going to be eaten by dogs, you're done."

Ahab and God's grace

Now what happens, listen to what the Bible says, "there was never," this is chapter 21 verse 25: "There was never a man like Ahab who sold himself to do evil in the eyes of

the Lord urged on by his wife Jezebel.” Is Ahab the worst of the worst? But what happens here? Next verse: “When Ahab heard these words, he tore his clothes and put on sackcloth and fasted. He lay in sackcloth and went around meekly.” What’s this guy doing? Yes, Ahab repents. I mean this is the wickedest guy that lived in the northern kingdom, this guy repents. Check this out: “When the word of the Lord came to Elijah the Tishbite, he said, ‘have you noticed how Ahab has humbled himself before me? Because he has humbled himself, I will not bring disaster in his day. But I will bring it on the days of his son.’” Is Ahab spared? Ahab is spared, he repented. This guy is the worst, the wickedest person in the Old Testament. This guy repents and God’s spares him.

That brings me back, some people say there isn’t much grace in the Old Testament. Question, is this grace? This is grace, this guy just butchered Naboth and had done all these bad things and yet God spares him. Is the Old Testament full of grace as well? The answer is: yes. God is gracious in both testaments, it’s the same God and God spares Ahab here.

My other point is this: is it possible that in your life, you will do something that’s so bad that you’ll say: God can’t forgive me for this? Question: if a person repents, does God forgive? Even if it’s an Ahab, it’s absolutely incredible. So Ahab is like the worst of the worst, he repents, God says, “I won’t bring disaster in your day.”

Dates to know

Now, here’s some dates to know. These are just some quick things and then I want to hit something else. David’s a 1000 B.C., that’s easy. Here’s a new one, the northern kingdom is deported to Assyria, what’s the capital of Assyria? Nineveh, that’s Jonah’s territory, that’s 722 B.C.

I forgot to talk to you guys about the Samaritans. Do you guys know who the Samaritans are? Remember Jesus and the woman of Samaria? The northern kingdom, when Assyria took those ten tribes away, they left the poor people in the land. The Assyrians then brought in other peoples and had them intermarry with these poor Jews. So the Samaritans are half-breeds set up by the Assyrians who took most of the middle class and up, they didn’t really have a middle class, but they took the wealthy and

intelligent away and left only the poor people. Then they brought other groups in that intermarried with the Jews and those people became the Samaritans. That's why the Samaritans are so despised in the New Testament, they're half-breeds. They're the lowest class Jews who intermarried with these people. So Jesus will run into that prejudice in his day.

Now, Judah got deported to Babylon in 586 B.C., what else will happen in 586 B.C.? What's the most important event? The temple is destroyed 586 B.C. Judah gets exiled to Babylon in 586, and the temple's destroyed. Then here is the last date. These are the four big dates that I want you to know for this semester. The end of the Old Testament, as we are in Nehemiah, and I call this guy Malachi, the last of the Italian prophets. But he's the last prophet. Keep thinking Malachi now. Malachi ends at 400 B.C. So after 400 B.C., prophecy is over after 400 B.C. Prophecy ends with Malachi and until the time of Jesus, you got what? About 400 years, they call the silent years that is when the Apocrypha is written. So from Malachi 400 B.C. until the time of Christ, that's basically when the Apocrypha is written. Jesus comes around zero. Wrong, but anyway, we'll talk about that in the New Testament.

Babylon was capital of the Neo-Babylonian empire. There was the Old Babylonian Empire, you know Hammurabi (ca. 1750 B.C.). Hammurabi is the Old Babylonian king, they went down the tubes. Assyria came up, Assyria was the big one and in 612 B.C., Babylon destroyed Nineveh. Then Babylon was on a role. Nebuchadnezzar and all those guys and then Babylon became big for the Neo-Babylon Empire (612-539 B.C.).

Then who took over after the Babylonians? Do you remember that? Cyrus the Persian. Do you guys remember the Persians? The Persians came in and wiped out Babylon, now that was about 539 B.C. Seventy years after the Jews were exiled the Persians come in. Who comes after the Persians? Yes, the Greeks, the 300, the Greeks under Alexander wipe the Persians out. After the Persians then the Greeks are what? And who's after the Greeks? No one. The Romans stole all the stuff from the Greeks. Sorry, I have a bad view of the Romans.

Messianic Prophecies

Now, let me jump down to some prophecies here. I want to go through some Messianic prophecies. The Old Testament points forward to Christ and I just want to spend this last little bit thinking about some of these prophecies. What is the first look forward to Christ in the Bible? The proto-evangelium. The one who will come from the seed of the woman who would crush the serpent's head. Right from the beginning, after Adam and Eve fell into sin there is the expectation that from the seed of the woman would come one that would crush the serpent's head, proto-evangelium.

The covenant with Abraham was what? The land, the seed, a blessing that Abraham's descendants would be a blessing to all the world. That is us. Jesus would come and the gospel would spread throughout all the world and we, as Gentiles, would be grafted in to the stock of Israel, to the olive tree of Israel. So the blessings of Abraham to all the world looked forward again to Christ. The thing narrows in even more with David, now with David it is said that the Messiah would be the what? The Son of David. God would build David a house [dynasty], and that his descendant would sit on the throne of his father David and would rule forever and forever looking down to Jesus as the *ben* David. *Ben* David means what? *Ben* means "son" of David, *ben* David. Now there's going to be another. Let's run through this.

Malachi at the end of the Bible, in the very end here it mentions. Let me just read this to you. It's interesting, the last verses of the Old Testament end this way: "See," says chapter 4, verse 5 of Malachi: "See, I will send you the prophet Elijah before the great and dreadful day of the Lord comes." When Jesus shows up, did they ask John the Baptist if he's Elijah? They asked him if he's Elijah who is to come. The Old Testament told them that Elijah was coming before the great and dreadful day of the Lord. That was how the Old Testament ended. Now let me just run through some others.

(student question) Yes and no, Jesus said, "John the Baptist is Elijah if you will hear it" but Elijah was on the Mount of Transfiguration Mathew 17.2, but I think it refers more to John the Baptist. It gets complicated and we'll talk about that in the New Testament.

“For onto us a Child is born, onto us a Son is given” (Isa. 9.6) what does that sound like? “and his name should be called,” yes, let me just read this: “For onto us a Child is given is born, onto us a Son is given and the government should be upon his shoulder. And he should be called Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of peace.” Okay, it’s really bad when you got to go through it like this. How do you guys know this because you know Handel’s Messiah. Handel’s Messiah, I swear half of it is out of Isaiah. Seriously, Handel’s Messiah is incredible. A child will be born and he will be called Wonderful, he will be called Mighty God, Mighty God, so it’s not just a regular child, he will be called Mighty God.

How about this one, turn back a page in Isaiah, Isaiah chapter 7 verse 14. It says this: “Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign. A virgin will be with child and will give birth to a son and you will call him” what? “Emmanuel.” What does “Emmanuel” mean? God with us. A child, who is the virgin who will conceive and give birth to a son? Mary, quoted in the New Testament.

Micah 5:2, I won’t look this one up, it’s that Jesus will be born in Bethlehem of Judea. Who was born in Bethlehem before Jesus was? David.

Zechariah 9 says that the king will come to you riding on a donkey. When does Jesus do that? He rides a donkey in the city of Jerusalem, what do all the people say? “Hosanna, Hosanna, the son of David, Hosanna to the son of David.” The triumphant entry, Jesus fulfills Zechariah chapter 9.

Here’s one that you all know: “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?” Who said that? David. David knowing the heart of God. “My God, my God, he writes a psalm. Jesus, when he’s on the cross quotes from David: “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?” David possibly seeing Jesus in the future and that kind of thing.

Now there is one passage I want to finish up with and that’s Isaiah 53 and this is beautiful. When I was young person, my father had me memorize this. “Who has believed our report and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed? He grew up before him like a tender shoot, like a root out of dry ground. He had no beauty or majesty to attract us to him, nothing in his appearance that we should desire him. He was despised and

rejected by men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief.” The Jews were looking for the Messiah ben David who would come and throw off the Roman yoke, who would sit on the throne of David. When Jesus came did he come as the Messiah who would throw off and would rule? He didn’t come like that and the Jews noticed this passage and others and they said, the Bible tells us about another Messiah and they called this Messiah, the Messiah ben Joseph--the Messiah ben David versus the Messiah ben Joseph. The Messiah ben Joseph is the what? What happened to Joseph? He got put in prison. The Messiah ben Joseph is a suffering one and so the Jews had this idea of this Messiah ben Joseph and this Messiah ben David. Here he’s described, “he was despised and rejected.” “Surely he took up our infirmities and carried our sorrows yet we considered him stricken by God and smitten. He was pierced.” Do you noticed the pierced thing references the cross? “He was pierced for our transgressions, he was crushed for our iniquities; the punishment that brought us peace was upon him and by his wounds we are healed. All we, like sheep, have gone astray”, sound familiar? “each one to his own way and the Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed and afflicted”

Now check this out down in verse 9: “He was assigned a grave with the wicked” plural, with the wicked (plural), were there more than one in his death that were wicked on the both sides of him? Would the plural wicked and "the rich (singular) in his death." Is that exactly what happened with Jesus? The wicked plural on both sides and in his death the rich, who was the rich in his death? Joseph of Arimathea do you remember he gave Jesus his tomb? He was a rich man that provided for Jesus. So there’s a play on the rich (singular) and with the wicked (plural) there it’s absolutely incredible.

So this passage of Isaiah 53 is absolutely gorgeous telling us about what? He bore our iniquities. We call it the “substitutionary atonement” that Jesus substituted himself for us. “He bore our sins and by his stripes we are healed.”

This is my last slide. Check this song out, “Joy to the world.” I was going to sing it, but I can’t do it today. “Joy to the world the Lord has come, let earth receive her King.” The whole Old Testament moving up to this, “the earth receiving her King. Let every heart prepare him room” and then “let heaven and nature sing, let heaven and

nature sing and heaven and heaven and nature sing.” That’s where we need to end this course, that’s where we’re going to end it. “Joy to the world, the Lord has come.”

Transcribed by Allana Notaro
Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt