

Dr. Ted Hildebrandt, OT History, Lit., and Theology, Lecture 4

© 2012, Dr. Ted Hildebrandt

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.

A. 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. The stories that are listed in the syllabus, those are the ones you are to focus 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 or 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 on 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 turned it in until 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 put it as a MS Word attachment and send it to me as an attachment. Ok, anything else? So that's what we are doing.

One other announcement, Kyle Lincoln will be doing another review session on

Wednesday night here at seven o'clock. Is that correct Kyle? [Yes.] Ok, we are good. So Kyle 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 Dr. 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 turned 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 a signal, a technical time out kind of thing, and give me something like this and then we'll go over the Biblerobics.

Alright, 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 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 and 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.

B. Review [5:58-7:51]

The last time we were talking in the course, and 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 who wrote it down. 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 and sanctioning authoritative books is called **canonization**. So you have the process of canonization which is the collecting 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, Putnam, or Mathewson materials did you make mistakes? Yes, that's why you have an editor. So, yes, scribes make mistakes. Do they make mistakes because they are evil? No, they make mistakes because they are human. They tried to do the best they could.

C. 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 languages? 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 look at this. We're going to focus on translation today—the 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. I want to show you some different translations 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 of going from God to us. I think we talked about that last time. Now what I want to do this time is to work a bit on translation.

D. 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, ok, 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? And 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 off the bad stuff, or dross. So that's silver dross. It's the impurities. So you skim it off 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 we're 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. However, did they know everything about Hebrew? No. The King James translators tell us in the introduction, explicitly, they freely admitted they 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 went to some Jewish people. They said what does this word mean? Some of the 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? The Jewish people 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 about 56-70 miles, there's a place called Ugarit. It's up in Lebanon/Syria--Ugarit. They found this place called Ugarit. There's a language called Ugaritic. Okay, so I've had the unfortunate privilege of having to learn Ugaritic. They found 20,000 of these tablets at 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 “silver 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 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, are like glaze, pretty nice glaze, on a mud pot—like putting lipstick 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? 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 in 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.

E. 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 where it 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? Okay, 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, we should 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. “I do you to wit” is archaic English no longer used today.

F. 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 source language, and you translate it for the word in this

receptor 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." Okay, what's "our ca" mean in Boston? Okay, "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? Anyways, you've got a "car," and then you've got a "train car" like the one I drove in, and then you've got a "car." My grandkid was over and he was playing with a toy car. Is a toy car different from a real automobile car, different than the train car? In other words, can you 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 is this word-for-word literal is a flawed theory, because languages don't work like that.

Now, by the way, do you like word-for-word literal though? It is pretty nice if you can get them one-for-one, that is 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. 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 say, "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" or "kindness." 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 used to translate 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. And 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. It could be love,

covenant love, loyal love, steadfast love, stubborn love, or kindness. Do you know what I'm saying? It has all these ideas, and so the word is a multiplexed 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 when you go meaning-for-meaning. You try to take the meaning for this in the source language and you try to put the meaning over there in the receptor language.

Then lastly, is what I call "**politically corrected views**" of translation. Now what's a politically corrected view? The TNIV by the way, Today's New International Version, 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," you know? 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. They bother 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. Okay, 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.

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

Let's take an example, by looking at Proverbs chapter 10 verse 5. 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. Okay, do you see how beautiful that is? Now listen to it. Listen to it.

'oger baqqayitz ben maskil, nirdam baqqatzir ben mebish. [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," okay? "sh, (ʁ)" "s (ʁ)" 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, right to left. You guys always read backwards. Right?

H. 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 exactly 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 as soon as you see this, is this in archaic form? By the way, do you understand that? Yes, you understand that but 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 now. 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.

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

Now, I'll show you some other translations. 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, okay, 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," and 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?

J. 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. I mean 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 wonder-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 that it obviously what it 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 make it a bit 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. It is short like proverbs although it adds the “crops” here to help with 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.

K. 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, in 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. What I’m saying, is this a father warning his 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”? The “harvest crops” is gone. Why did they take it 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 metaphor of the harvest and the crops beautiful? 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 out 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? 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 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?

L. 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 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 a little bit too 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 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, "Man, 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.

M. 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 and things, 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 it and that there are scribal errors helps you understand how we got our Bible. That's what I'm interested in, so that no one will ever pop anything new on you. We've been through it now. You see how things come to us.

I want you to have a realistic view of transmission, scribes copying, and translation. 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, focus 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. Focus on 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. Do I enjoy reading Plato? *The Republic*, I love reading Plato. If you've never read Plato, Plato's wonderful. Aristotle is more work. Aristotle is a very mathematical logical mind. I enjoy reading Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* and other things. 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 is 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.

N. 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 the flaws. 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. 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? 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? See, 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. All 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.

O. 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. 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? This is the reason why I'm harping on this because this is a really important point. 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] Okay, okay, 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.

Okay, 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.

P. 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 and the prophet writing it down that's perfect. But then what happens is that book gets copied over 1000 or 2000 years. 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're dead meat. When you go out and you try to say every word in this book there's 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.

Q. 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 perfect. 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. 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 and the impact it has on our life because this is God's word. Are we in the best position we've been in for 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. 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 have ever 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. Okay, 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 way? 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 accurate. So you've got to work with that. We're in the best position in 2,000 years and that's comforting.

R. 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 is 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 and 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. Again you know what I'm saying, I mean this is the way it is. This is actual historical fact at this point now.

S. 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, okay? Genesis 1:1.

T. 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 is survey of the whole Old Testament and then we'll jump into Genesis in the first two verses. So there are nine steps to 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, the Flood, and the Tower of Babel, all that in the first eleven chapters of Genesis. They call it primeval history before Abraham.

Abraham's date is what? 2000 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

2000 B.C. Are you okay with that? Abraham's 2000 B.C. I want you to know that date. Okay, after Primeval History then what happens?

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*, okay? 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 while Joseph was in Egypt, the brothers and their 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? God brings them out of Egypt. Yes, he does some plagues and splits the Red Sea. He brings them out by the hand of Moses. On Moses' date 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 in 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 in 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. Okay? 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, 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 write psalms and Proverbs. David does Psalms, Solomon does Proverbs. Solomon does a couple of Psalms as well. 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, 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. Who keeps the kings in line? You're going to say God keeps kings 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 books of the prophets. I'm going to do it in one word. This is the message of the prophets in 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 and my wife doesn't like that, so your head is gone." And so John the Baptist loses. 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 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 exile 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.” 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 has 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. By the way, are there big problems right on the horizon with living in Israel? Are you going to see, and 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? 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 material. 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. Will God let his people be totally destroyed? No. So there may 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 even though 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 done 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. 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 B.C. Who built this temple? Solomon. Solomon builds the temple just after 1000 B.C. In 586 B.C. 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 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.

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.

You ask, "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.

U. Creation [76:09-79:30]

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 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. It was a 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*. Okay, 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." It affects your worldview. Why couldn't the Bible talk about 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 ideas were developed in the 19th and 20th century. 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? 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 because of what 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.

V. 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? Please give me 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 a 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.

W. 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.

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-2