

Dr. Marv Wilson, Prophets, Session 7, Hermeneutical Principles, Part 3, Introduction to Jonah

© 2024 Marv Wilson and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Marv Wilson in his teaching on the prophets. This is session 7, Hermeneutical Principles, Part 3, and Introduction to Jonah.

Let me just say a few things about the test on Friday.

I'll give you the full hour for that. There will be approximately 100 questions, so it's going to cover those books very, very thoroughly. It will be an objective type exam.

Sometimes I will give a verse and ask you which one of those six prophets it came from, so you have to be familiar with the emphases of each of the prophets. It may be a verse that has a unique emphasis. I may give a verse and leave out a word.

That's one of those words that leaps out at you. You'll have to fill that word in. So, you have to study it very specifically.

Hosea, Joel, Amos, Jonah, Micah, Habakkuk. Those six prophets. Some will be multiple choice, some will be true and false, some will be fill-ins, but it will cover all that material.

Either the NIV or the new RSV are probably the two best versions to use. Using a different translation won't be a totally foreign language, but as I indicate in the syllabus when I prepare for exams, I try to be sensitive, particularly to those two versions, so there will be no confusion. There will be no interpretation.

By that I mean what the Bible says and what you can figure out with no notes, no commentary, no helps, just reading the text itself. Now, the method for the madness is in part, so many people only know the Bible today based on secondary sources or reading secondary literature or summaries. They don't read the scriptures for themselves and that exercise itself is very important to be familiar with the scriptures themselves.

That is the focus of the undergraduate emphasis here at Gordon, to know the scriptures, the exposition, to understand the content of scripture. Any of you thinking of seminary, one of the great myths about seminary education that undergrads are not aware of is seminaries don't, for the most part, teach the Bible. They assume you know the Bible when you get there.

Most of the courses you take in seminary relate the Bible to other disciplines, but the assumption is you know it so you can think theologically about it, or you can, courses in preaching or counseling or church history or church administration, but courses that actually deal with what the Bible says, understanding the biblical text itself, knowing the players, knowing the events, knowing who is who, knowing the lay of the land. That's a very important first step in building the pyramid. You can't enter a biblical studies discussion unless you have a frame of reference.

What we're trying to do at Gordon is to give students that foundation, that frame of reference that will be necessary for later theological reflection and drawing out the implications of this for other disciplines. You can't relate the Bible to other disciplines until you know the Bible. So, if you're interested in questions of science and scripture, it's good to know what the Bible has to know about creation and what it has to say about these issues before you get heavily into that discussion.

Alright, so that will be the emphasis, the focus is on the biblical text itself. Do you have any questions on that? I just wanted to give that as an encouragement. Yes? Will we be allowed to use our Bible? No.

No, I'll pray for you and don't bring your Bible. It's a deal. You'll be surprised by this exercise, how it can help you the rest of your life.

I sat in Frost Hall as a 22-year-old, just starting seminary, and I had a teacher who had a course in the Gospels. And literally, in this one-semester course, had to know what was in every chapter of the three Synoptics, Matthew, Mark, and Luke. And if, in the exam, somebody called out a theme, you had to be able to give the chapter's number.

All of that discourse, Matthew 24, Luke 21, Mark 13, like that. What one or two miracles are found in all four Gospels? You had to know what that was and where it was located. And while I don't remember every part of that, obviously, neither would you.

As I look back on that experience, not just in the Gospels, but also for the book of Acts, where we had to do the same thing, it's very definitely helpful in forcing you to sit down with the Bible itself and to begin mastering the text of the English Bible. We talk about the Bible mastering us. Well, we have to master it before those words can begin to master us. And so, that's a good first step, to know where things are found and the respective emphases.

You have a lifetime to work on the interpretation of that. But as we have said, the best commentary in the Bible is the Bible, and that's why when you hear a phrase, lights should start flashing all over the Bible if it's a unique phrase. Or the angel of the Lord shows up here, ah, the angel of the Lord, Malach Yahweh, where does the

angel of the Lord show up elsewhere in Scripture? Angels by name, where do they start getting specific names? Book of Life, is that just a book expression found in Revelation, or does it have an earlier antecedent? And they laid hands on them. Is that just found in the New Testament? Or because you've studied the Old Testament, ah, laying on of hands is not just for ordination to the ministry in the New Testament or for receiving the Holy Spirit as it was in the Book of Acts.

But laying on of hands is found elsewhere in Scripture, and you begin to make those connections in your head thematically, and how one may indeed be very useful in understanding the other. So, these points are cumulative, and they build, and it's a lifeline of a lifetime involved in accumulating knowledge of the Word and drawing on that knowledge for appropriate occasions. I saw work with my father-in-law, and he indicated that, into his 94th year, if a student from Gordon College came with a problem that they wanted him to discuss from Scripture, he didn't need a concordance or anything.

He had studied the Word of God and set out at the age of 20-21 to master Scripture. And for any subject that came up, he knew the appropriate passages of Scripture that he could draw on, just from a lifetime of studying Scripture. That is an ideal that we should all work on, and it's a process.

But it can work, and it can be indeed very, very valuable if you believe in biblical preaching, biblical counseling, and biblical living. I guess that's all of us. Alright, today I want to finish up interpreting prophetic literature and some of those principles, and then I want to go into a few things on the book of Jonah.

Alright, last time we talked about being careful not to read the Bible deterministically. The Word of God says Israel has a right to this land in the modern state of Jordan. Therefore, it justifies an intense military operation to clean that area out because the Bible says this land belongs to Israel. Not so fast.

The principle here is eschatology does not annul justice. That is the principle I want to get across. Eschatology does not annul justice.

We always have to be sensitive, even in doing the will of God, to the potential harm, to the greater harm something might do to others. And so, when the Bible is read too deterministically, and I personally feel this is something Muslims, many of them who take their faith deeply, personally, you often hear that little expression thrown out there, Inshallah, if Allah wills. I had a student in this class a number of years ago; he had come to Gordon as a 14-year-old, and he was strapped on the front of tanks in the war between Iraq and Iran.

And even though he was out there and could have been instantly destroyed, to him, he was taught that there is no way you can avert your fate, Kay sera sera, what will

be, will be. And if you are fated to take that shell or that bullet, you go straight to heaven, and so be it. Well, I think we all acknowledge and recognize God's control of history.

He does not want us to do precarious or reckless things. He wants us to value life. I have a Jewish rabbi friend who tells me, Jesus was the first to uphold the principle which is probably the most important principle by which Jews have lived from Bible times to the present.

It's the principle of pikuach nephesh. If you take my Heschel seminar next term, there's a section in there that Abraham Joshua Heschel has in one of his writings on the saving of life--pikuach nephesh.

In other words, the saving of life takes precedence over any other commandment. And if you have two moral absolutes, if you will, clashing, which one do you choose? It's the one, hopefully, that saves or preserves life. If it's a violation of the Sabbath or plucking grain, what are you going to do? You're going to pluck grain so you can survive rather than worrying about the law of the Sabbath, which you will violate.

Even David's men raided the bread of the presence when they were famished, which is mentioned in the New Testament. Went into the holiest place, just outside of the holy of holies, and grabbed the bread to sustain them. Jesus comes along and He will heal on the Sabbath if there's a violation of two conflicting absolutes.

That's why so many Jewish people historically have gone into the people-helping professions to save lives. Medicine, dentistry, science, things for human progress. Motivated by this idea of saving lives.

The only vehicles permitted in Jerusalem on Yom Kippur. I was in Jerusalem on Yom Kippur during Shabbat when Yom Kippur and Shabbat happened to fall together. The only vehicles permitted on the street were the ambulances to save lives.

I say that because sometimes one can be so intent on the fulfillment of something one perceives as in Scripture, and this is God's will, yet if you dislodge life, uproot life, and destroy life in the process, that can be a very, very horrendous thing. So, eschatology does not annul justice. God wants us to be concerned always about saving life and not justifying the destruction of life on the grounds that God has willed it.

Another principle, watch for multiple progressive fulfillment in some prophecies. I mention this because when you look at Scripture, particularly if you start only with the New Testament, one might take Isaiah 7.14 as a great example. Most Christians that are from the theologically conservative community would argue, yeah, the virgin birth is a good thing to hold to.

And of course, the New Testament is clear on that particular point. It cites Isaiah 7:14: Behold, a young woman or a virgin will conceive, and she will give birth to a son, and he will be called Immanuel. Well, obviously, that prophecy in Isaiah 7:14 was initially to be understood by a child who would be born in Isaiah's own day.

We will study this passage before the end of the term. Isaiah probably has in mind here either Maher-Shalal-Hash-Baz, who is mentioned in the next chapter and is Isaiah's own son. Even the word Immanuel is used twice in the next chapter, chapter 8. But that was the local or immediate reference that God would prove to be present in preserving the Davidic line despite the Assyrian juggernaut on the horizon.

The birth of this child in Isaiah's day would have that kind of prophetic significance, meaning God is with us. But the ultimate expression of God with us would yet await a time hundreds of years after that, when one would walk this earth, and the incarnation would be the greatest expression of God being with us. Obviously, the birth of the child in Isaiah's day was not a virgin birth in the sense of the New Testament.

The child conceived in the womb of Mary was supernatural. Mary and Joseph had no sexual relations. And so that indeed means Mary was still a virgin after the birth of Jesus.

There was no sperm or egg. They came together. In Isaiah's own day, this young woman that would give birth to a child would be obviously in that ordinary sense of the word.

That's why Alma can go either way. And used in Isaiah's own day and that other way in which it is used where a sperm and an egg come together as a young woman conceives and bears a child that would bear that name. So, we have a multiple fulfillment in some prophecies.

It's not Isaiah 7:14 leaps over time and all of a sudden is prophetically fulfilled in Jesus. It had a local meaning and a local reference. There are other prophecies.

You have the only place in the Bible, the Old Testament, where it prophesies about a new covenant. We refer to the New Testament as a new covenant. But Isaiah 31:31-34 says The day is coming when I'll make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah.

Now, very specifically in Jeremiah's own day the immediate context obviously is for his own countrymen. Israel and Judah. But God is going to make a new covenant with the house of Israel.

He's going to put their law in the minds and write it on the hearts and they will be His people. They will all know Him. There will be a permanent forgiveness of sin.

And then right after that He commits Himself to an eternal relationship again with Israel in the flesh. This is what the Lord said: He who appoints the sun to shine by day and the moon and stars by night the Lord Almighty is His name only if these the sun shining daily, the moon and stars at night and the waves of the sea roaring if these things in the natural world disappear from my sight my descendants will disappear. So, in other words, His people, as it puts it in verse 36, the descendants of Israel, will ever continue or will continue to exist or never cease to exist to be a nation before me, verse 36

There seems in this context, then, to be more than purely saying, okay, this is the longest quotation in the New Testament, and it is. And is it fulfilled in the first coming of Jesus? Certainly, its meaning is inaugurated in terms of fulfillment when you look at Hebrews chapter 8 and this longest sustained covenant in Christ's blood.

But it, indeed, in terms of its consummation, may yet also carry significance in terms of the physical seed of Jeremiah's people. The reason I say this is because the election of Israel was a corporate election at Sinai. It involved a people.

And so, Scripture seems also to speak of these people of whom we expand the number spiritually because of our faith, that God will continue to work His work of election love until a time of consummation where that law among an entire people is written internally. Much as Paul probably alludes to in Romans 11. The deliverer comes out of Zion, banishes ungodliness from Jacob.

And so, there's some kind of cumulative consummation of that physical seed of whom Paul the Apostle was a part. And which seed, temporarily at least, had not understood as Paul understood. But yet, what the Old Testament seems to indicate, and even Paul then affirms, has more to come.

So, there may be a progressive fulfillment in some of these things. So, Isaiah 31 applies to you and me as the expanded version of Abraham's family. The expanded version of Israel.

Because we are the people on whom the law has been written on our hearts and minds internally. And we have experienced God's forgiveness through the atonement on the cross. Does this exhaust the meaning of this language? When read contextually, and this is where methodologically again I come back, why do we start with the Old Testament, then go to the New Testament? Many of my Christian friends who are New Testament scholars start with the New Testament and often give the impression the Old Testament doesn't exist or doesn't count or matter anymore.

It's just what the final New Testament word has about things. And I think when you look at the Jeremiah 31 passage, or even the Joel 2 passage, which also implies probably a multiple fulfillment of some sort. God began pouring out the Holy Spirit when Peter gave his sermon in Acts 2. But that Joel 2 passage you've been reading, to get ready for Friday, when the day of the Lord comes, and He pours out His Spirit, He ends that passage by saying everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved.

He links it to Mount Zion and Jerusalem, where there will be a great deliverance. Then he goes on that these chapters and verses weren't put there until hundreds of years after the biblical period. In those days, I will restore the fortunes of Judah and Jerusalem.

And though people are scattered among the nations, and though my land is divided, He talks about blessings that are coming on God's people. Those that dwell in Zion and Jerusalem become holy, and never again will foreigners invade her. Now the language is poetic, but it certainly speaks, as my Jewish friends remind me when they open their Bible, and it's amazing the insights Christians can get from letting Jews tell them what their Bible has to say.

We often hijack the Jewish Bible, take it, reinterpret it, and tell Jews what it means. I'm saying it can indeed sometimes be instructional to ask Jewish people how they read their own texts, rather than us hijacking their Bible and then coming back and telling them what their text doesn't mean, and disenfranchising them sometimes. As Joseph Klausner, a great Jewish scholar who wrote in the last century, said, the problem with Christianity is it has removed the worldly, physical, and sometimes even political dimensions of the Bible.

And that's why we at Gordon like students to get to Jerusalem, to study in that land, to make a connection with the physical geography. We can sing in our hymnals. We're marching to Zion, that beautiful city above.

But we can certainly learn a lot from the Jerusalem of this world, the only Jerusalem the Jewish community has ever known and the only concrete Jerusalem the Bible speaks of that people have known, at least to this point. So that connection is very important. We should all Get Lost in Jerusalem. A plug for my good colleague, Dr. Hildebrand, who would say amen to that.

Alright, so some of these have multiple fulfillment. Then, another brief principle, the principle of correspondence or equivalency, may apply to certain texts.

One of the areas where I could quickly illustrate this from Isaiah would be Chapter 2. When God, in poetic language, wants to reveal to the prophet what peace is all

about, in the ultimate outworking of the messianic program, he says in Isaiah 2.4, they will beat their swords in the plowshares and their spears in the pruning hooks. A nation will not take up a sword against a nation or train for war anymore. Swords and spears, I think, are the kind of peace and, actually, loss of the knowledge of warfare itself, about which this text speaks, is not something this world has yet to realize.

So, in terms of equivalency, would it be tanks, would it be missiles, would it be fighter jets in terms of removing the implements of war, the spears, and the swords? And the picture here is converting these into agricultural implements, implements of peace. Plowshares and pruning hooks, not a people at war, but a people in peace.

Would this be threshers and combines and John Deers and farmhalls. What is meant by these other words? The idea of equivalency, or perhaps we want to think this way about the vision that Isaiah has way out there eventually about peace on this earth. When you have that expression by Yom Ha'Hu in that day, which is repetitious many, many times in the Prophets.

In Isaiah 19, you have one of those. In that day, there will be a highway from Egypt to Assyria. Now, again, this is the ultimate outworking of God's shalom and God's messianic reign on this earth.

In the modern world, would you say Iraq instead of Assyria? It says, well, that's what the Living Bible does with it, projecting that idea and modernizing it. The Hebrew text says the Assyrians. And we'll be getting into that Assyrian context as soon as we talk about Jonah.

But it says the Assyrians will go to Egypt and the Egyptians to Assyria. The Egyptians and Assyrians will worship together, and in that day, Israel will be the third along with Egypt and Assyria. A blessing on the earth.

So, the Iraqis, the Egyptians, and Israel are all linked together as being a blessing on the earth. And the last verse in Isaiah 19 says, the Lord Almighty will bless them, the age-long enemy of Israel, the Assyrians, will bless the Egyptians, dominated today by Muslims with some struggling Coptic Christians remaining. The Lord will bless them, saying, Blessed be Egypt, my people.

Assyria, my handiwork. And Israel, my inheritance. This is a universal vision for peace.

Not three gods, Allah, Adonai, and the Christ. That's not alluded to here. But it seems to be that they are all worshipping together, a description of peace and unity brought about by worshipping the one true God.

Nations change names. 1935, Persia became Iran. And a lot of the names you read in the Bible, particularly in Scriptures, it's the prophets of Israel that take that long look with the telescope down the highways of time.

That's why one word never is found in the vocabulary of a Jewish person. And that word is discouragement. That word is one that says depression.

Depression. It won't happen. Judaism has always had to be a religion of hope because it introduced to you, me, and the rest of the world the notion of a golden age.

That history is moving to that age of climax, of peace, of justice, righteousness on this earth. And so the language here in the prophets does have to be updated. As nations, by label, come and go.

But territories can have many, many different names, even during the biblical period. Think of just the Sea of Galilee. It can be the Sea of Tiberias, the Sea of Gennesaret, or Galilee. But in the Hebrew Bible, none of those words occur.

It's Kinneret. The harp-shaped sea. It can have many different names.

Next principle. Prophecy is, first and foremost, a message for the original hearers. I just again want to reassert that when we study the prophets of Israel, the message had to primarily have something to say for the people of that time.

And again, dismissing that popular notion that prophecy always has to do with the future. The current generation needed correction, needed rebuke. The prophets were heralds of moral righteousness.

But they also needed hope for a better time to come. And so that one word, despair, is not part of a Jew's vocabulary. It just can't be done.

That's why the Jewish people have probably been the most resilient people in history. Sometimes, it is thought to simply be a dead civilization. But Israel continues to live.

Where do we study the Egyptians today? Huntington Avenue in Boston. Or in the British Museum. Or in New York City, where classical Egyptian civilization is found.

Where do we study the Canaanites? We go to the Rhode Island School of Design for some wonderful pieces taken from Canaanite culture. We go to the Israel Museum. We go to the Bible Lands Museum outside the Israel Museum in Jerusalem.

These ancient civilizations. But Israel continues to live. And that's one reason why Christians need Israel.

We need the work of the archaeologists, the historians, the linguists, the biblical scholars. Some of the best collaborative work taking place in the world today between evangelicals and Jews is in Jerusalem, studying Scripture together. Another, just warning hermeneutically, you and I are influenced much more by Western thinking, which tends to be far more logical, far more harmonious, far more arguing from a premise to a conclusion, and wanting to put into a carefully worked out systematic approach to this matter of what is the future for Israel? It's very complex.

I would beware of somebody who knows too much about that future. The Bible qualifies things on a number of fronts, so we have to be cautious.

We do not seek to make an elaborate system out of particularly understanding the end times. It's very easy to want to absolutize the relative. The next point I want to make is much more important.

In the New Testament, particularly Matthew's Gospel, but you also have it elsewhere, we meet that word fulfill. This is to fulfill. And usually, that does not mean a one-for-one connection.

A prophet spoke of something to come, and in the New Testament, you have the fulfillment of that prediction. Fulfill often carries with it more the sense of filling full a particular idea. That is what scholars call the *sensus plenior* of Scripture.

The fullest or deepest meaning of Scripture. The *sensus plenior*. I'll give you one example that you are familiar with from Matthew 2.15 He got up and he took the child and his mother during the night and left for Egypt.

The only time we know Jesus was in Egypt, at least according to the biblical text. He was a little tyke and could just about walk. And they escaped to Egypt and stay there until I tell you, for Herod is going to search for the child to kill him.

So, he got up and took the child and his mother during the night and they left for Egypt. They went down Route 95 and took the *Via Maris*, as the Romans later called it. Probably came down into the Delta area somewhere.

He stayed there until the death of Herod. Now the dates of Herod the Great, 37 B.C. to 4 B.C. He stayed there until the death of Herod. Of course, you know the problem with the calendar in terms of the dates of the birth of Christ.

But Herod dies, and then it says in verse 15, He stayed there until the death of Herod and so was fulfilled what the Lord had said through the prophet, out of Egypt I called

my son. So, he quotes what you've been reading for Friday's exam. Out of Egypt have I called my son.

Hosea 11.1 This is to fulfill that. It fulfills it in that *sensus plenior* way. Now God has two sons.

Actually, more than two. We're sons of God. We're the *teknia theu*, the children of God.

Sons of God. God's original son was Israel. In the Exodus, out of Egypt, I called my son.

Brought him out of Egypt. Israel was Yahweh's firstborn son. But he would have a second son, and the significance of that second son would be far greater and far more impacting than his earlier son.

So, to fulfill that meaning of out of Egypt I have called my son, in the Christ event, everything wrapped up in him, who is the ideal Israelite, if you will. He is the one who epitomizes in the ultimate whatever it means to come out of Egypt. God's unique son.

His son that He sent into the world. And so, if you think you know what it means to be a son called out of Egypt, you haven't seen anything yet until you've seen the very Son of God. Anything related to Jesus is greater in the very nature of the case.

Read the book of Hebrews. We have a better high priest. We have a new Moses here.

Everything is better because the types and shadows have now passed away and the real has come. That's why it's better. So, what is the fullest meaning? The sense is *plenior*.

Whatever that means, it's the filling full of meaning to come out of Egypt. And in Jesus, the sense is *plenior*. So, look for this full meaning often in the coming of Jesus, where that broadens the idea and fills it full with meaning.

Expect also some surprise moments in reading the Old Testament prophets. Sometimes there's an unexpected fulfillment in New Testament times of Old Testament texts. Some of that pertains to the Kingdom of God.

Jesus may have been the King of the Jews, but not in the sense the masses expected. His was not a power play. But yet, the reign of God is seen in His life.

If I cast out demons, if I perform miracles, the Kingdom of God has come to you. That dynamic power, reign, and rule of God. What is the Kingdom of God? Wherever God takes charge.

The Kingdom of God is in this room because somebody is reigning and ruling in our hearts whose will we seek to obey. Somebody else's king. Now, He mediates that reign through Christ and the Holy Spirit in our lives today.

Nobody's there with His crown, sitting on a throne. But we know the reign and rule of God. This spiritual reign, the Scriptures seem to imply, is going to eventually lead to a physical, concrete reign and rule over this earth where righteousness, justice, and peace will be realized.

Where the enemies will be indeed destroyed, and His lordship and His reign and His victory will be experienced. That's more the image of the Old Testament concept of divine kingship.

There were kings in Jerusalem, and the Messiah was to be a king. But ultimately, God was king. There was a heavenly counterpart to what was understood in the physical.

There was a heavenly temple, but there was an earthly temple. The Messiah's surprise was that He came as a suffering servant to die. There weren't a lot of people who could put that thing together.

He didn't come as a political figure. And so, the bringing together of the *Abed-Yahweh*, the servant of the Lord concept from, say, Isaiah 53, along with some other strands in the Old Testament, not always that clear. Okay.

Do you have any questions on anything I've said in this section? Let me just make a couple final comments on the book of Jonah, which I will particularly pick up on next week. The little book of Jonah tends to be remembered by a lot of people, sadly, because they trip all over the big fish. The book is far more a story about a big God than it is about a big fish.

And a lot of the theologizing or understanding of theology itself is who is this God of Israel and what are His concerns in the world. We learn some things. Very, very important in this book.

And one of the things we learn is that there's an international love of Yahweh going on during Old Testament times. There were a lot within Israel that had a very parochial understanding of the love of God. If it weren't for the book of Jonah, you and I wouldn't be here today.

God has sheep outside His own fold. And to go to a pagan, non-Israelite community that was the superpower of the day patrolling the ancient Near East. God has people in that land who need to know His love and His compassion.

The word dove, d-o-v-e, is really what Jonah means. You have several versions of that. J-o-n-a-h is found in the book of Hosea.

It's a Hebrew word. Israel is like a silly Jonah. Dove.

You see it in the New Testament. It's a Grecianized form. Jonas, J-o-n-a-s.

Same word. Traditionally, the book has been ascribed to Jonah. He's called the son of Amittai in 1.1. And the last thing I want to say is the Bible does identify a town that Jonah is from.

And it's this town up here in the Galilee called Gath-Hepher. And you can see that it was located in the same territory Jesus grew up in. Jesus grew up in the big Z. Zebulun.

Zebulun. On the sons of Jacob. In the territory of Zebulun.

Zebulun is about five miles from Nazareth. Gath-Hepher. So, this prophet's from Galilee.

Hundreds of years later, another prophet would come from Galilee. So, this is the area where we'll be talking about prophets from the northern kingdom. Jonah will be the first foreign missionary from the northern kingdom.

We'll talk then about Hosea who will be from the northern kingdom speaking to the people of the northern kingdom. And then one other prophet that ministered in the northern kingdom. That was Amos.

He came from Tekoa from the southern kingdom and had to deliver his message in the northern kingdom. Okay, that will be it for today. We'll see you on Friday.

This is Dr. Marv Wilson in his teaching on the prophets. This is session number 7, Hermeneutical Principles, Part 3 and Introduction to Jonah.