

Question: What language did Adam and Eve speak?

Answer: Some have speculated that it was a form of Hebrew. It was the original language. We are told in Deuteronomy 32:8 that God separated the sons of Adam.

Question: Does Satan hear our prayers to God? Can he partially answer them and how would we know that he was?

Answer: It gets back to knowing what God's will is. There are ways that God conveys to us in terms of understanding His will. The first way is through what God has revealed in the Scriptures. God reveals things in several different ways. God reveals in a statement of Law—"you shall do this; you shall not do this." "You shall not steal," etc. That is a statement of absolutes of law. It's easy to know God's will in something like that.

There are other ways that God conveys His will. Everything is not completely listed as 'you shall or you shall not.' There are principles of wisdom stated in the Bible.

Proverbs 12:24, "The hand of the diligent will rule," Stop and consider the principle of it. It takes careful, consistent work. It takes that to get ahead. That is an explanation of how God wants us to go about our work, etc. If we want to know God's will, look and see what's pleasing to God. When you are looking for what God wants you to do, is it in harmony with God's laws and the principles brought out in the Bible?

Another principle is seeking the right counsel.

Proverbs 18:1-2, "A man who isolates himself seeks his own desire; he rages against all wise judgment. A fool has no delight in understanding, but in expressing his own heart." Somebody that isolates himself is simply seeking to do what he wants to do. Their mind is made up and they are going to do what they want to do.

Proverbs 12:15, "...he who heeds counsel is wise." Seek wise counsel from those who are tuned in to God.

We have to be very careful of dragging God into anything that happens. How do you know? We have to be careful of reading God's will into circumstances. There are times when God does open doors and things just come together. You first start with the Law. That is a plain statement. The Law is a statement of fact. The Writings are

the application of the Law. The Prophets are examples; they amplify. We look at this as our starting point. If it is good, then it is better when you talk about it. Talk to those who we respect and exude certain wisdom in their life.

It gets back to: How can you know whether it is God's will? Humanly, one of the hardest things we ever have to do and the hardest prayer is, "Not my will, but Your will be done." Too often we spend our prayer time in talking God to our way. We need to see it God's way. Sometimes God gives us what we ask for. If it is our way, then we may come to regret it. What we want to do is to seek God's will. Then we can discern the difference of what is God's answer or the devil's counterfeit.

Question: Where are Enoch and Elijah?

Answer: They are dead and awaiting the resurrection.

Hebrews 11:5 mentions that Enoch was translated, "...Enoch was translated so that he did not see death," Then we have to wonder. What happened? What does it mean to be "translated"?

Hebrews 11:5, "By faith Enoch was translated so that he did not see death, 'and was not found because God had translated him'; for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God."

Verse 6, "But without faith it is impossible to please Him,"

Verses 7-11, it goes on to discuss Noah, Abraham and Sarah.

We are told these all died, including Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, and Sarah.

Verse 13, "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off were assured of them, embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth."

Enoch died and he died in faith. It clearly states that Enoch is dead, "These all died in faith."

What does it mean, "He was translated that he should not see death"?

We are told there are two deaths.

Hebrews 9:27, "And as it is appointed for men to die once, but after this the judgment..."

We are told of the second death.

Revelation 20:14, "Then Death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." There are two deaths. "It is appointed for men to die once." Everyone dies the first death. Even Jesus Christ died the first death.

Colossians 1:18, "...the firstborn from the dead, that in all things He may have the preeminence."

So, the idea that Enoch and Elijah did not die would give them preeminence over Jesus Christ. That would mean that they had an honor that Jesus Christ Himself never had because He died. For that matter, even the doctrine of the assumption of Mary would tie in with the same thing. It would actually give her preeminence over Jesus Christ because it would say that she ascended into heaven in place of dying. That assumption is just that—an assumption—and it is an erroneous assumption. It is erroneous to assume the assumption, if that makes any sense. It is appointed for men to die once, but after that, the resurrection and the judgment.

John 3:13, Jesus said this to Nicodemus, “No one has ascended to heaven but He who came down from heaven [And John adds in a parenthetical statement.], that is, the Son of Man who is in heaven.”

At the time John was writing, it was 60 years after Christ had said it. Jesus Christ was back in heaven, so, “No one has ascended to heaven but He who came down from heaven, that is, the Son of Man, who is in heaven.” We are told that Jesus Christ is the only One who has ascended to heaven, which means Enoch did not ascend to heaven, nor did Elijah.

2 Kings 2:11, “...Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven.”

We must realize that there are three heavens spoken of in the Bible. In some cases, we are told about the birds flying in the midst of heaven. In other cases, we are told about the stars of heaven.

2 Corinthians 12:2, we are also told about what is called the “third heaven.” The term “heaven” can be used to refer to the earth’s atmosphere—the birds in the midst of heaven or the heavens giving forth rain. When we talk about looking up into the heavens, in the sense of outer space or the stars, we are talking about the second heaven. The third heaven is the heaven of God’s abode.

Which heaven was Elijah taken up into by a whirlwind? Well, a whirlwind operates only in the first heaven. When you get above the first heaven, there’s no air. So, the whirlwind Elijah was taken up into simply transported him from one geographical location into another.

2 Kings 2:11, God used ‘horses and chariots of fire.’ Since a jet aircraft wasn’t available and God didn’t choose to make it available at that time, He used a horse and chariot of fire, which would be a very effective means of traveling. It was effective. God wanted Elijah removed and He removed him!

Hebrews 11:5, “By faith Enoch was translated [transferred] so that he did not see death...” Clearly, this is speaking of the second death because all have died.

Verse 13, “These all died in faith,”

Hebrews 9:27, “And as it is appointed for men to die once, but after this the judgment...”

So, Enoch was translated or transferred. His allegiance, his loyalty, his citizenship was translated or transferred from the kingdom of this world to the Kingdom of God, and he died in faith. Evidently he was physically removed, perhaps to a different geographical location.

Question: Did Moses and Aaron suffer the first three plagues along with the rest of the Israelites? (Exodus 7-8)

Answer: The first three plagues were: 1) the Nile turned to blood (Exodus 7:20), 2) the frogs (Exodus 8:5), and 3) the lice (Exodus 8:16). Certainly, everyone who lived in Egypt was affected when the Nile turned to blood and there were frogs and lice all over the place. These were things that everyone had to contend with.

Exodus 8:22, after this third plague, God put a division between the Israelites and the Egyptians. I would take it from this that everyone would certainly have been affected by the Nile turning to blood, in the sense that the whole thing was blood. It didn’t matter who you were; you were impacted by that. There were frogs and lice everywhere—that kind of nuisance.

Question: Exodus 11:2, “Speak now in the hearing of the people, and let every man ask from his neighbor and every woman from her neighbor, articles of silver and articles of gold.” What was the gold and silver used for?

Answer: It was used for a variety of things. Israel carried out some of the physical wealth of Egypt—gold, silver and jewelry. A lot of it was used in the construction of the tabernacle a little bit later on. Probably the bulk of it was used in the building of the tabernacle, the priestly garments and things of that sort.

Question: Exodus 12:34, “So the people took their dough before it was leavened, having their kneading bowls bound up in their clothes on their shoulders.”

Answer: I’m not exactly sure what the question is, except that I might comment that the normal process of leavening was that they let the bread sit out. They used a sourdough process, as I have mentioned before. Since they did not have

commercially prepared yeast, they used the old methods of leavening, which was basically sourdough. You make up a dough, let it sit out, and it will rise. It will begin to ferment and to sour. It will speed up the process if you make what they call a “sponge” and put it in the dough. That will feed it and get it going. But if you just make it up, knead it and let it sit out overnight, you will find that it will begin to sour and rise a little bit.

Unleavened bread was the bread of haste—of urgency—because you didn’t have time to let it sit out and rise. They had everything packed up. Since their kneading troughs were packed up, the bread that they ate was unleavened because it had not been allowed to sit and rise.

The Jews have strict regulations in the preparation of Matzos, as to how long the dough is allowed to sit before it is cooked because if you allow it to sit long enough, it will begin to sour and the sourdough process will begin to set in. So, they have Rabbis spending great lengths of time sitting around, debating how many minutes the dough could be allowed to sit before it could be baked and still be considered unleavened. They tend to go in for all of that.

Question: Exodus 13:2, “Sanctify to Me all the firstborn, whatever opens the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and animal; it is Mine.” Are the firstborn males that open the womb still sanctified?

Answer: It’s interesting that the spiritual application of this is brought out.

Hebrews 12:23, we are called, “...church of the firstborn...” We are!

In Numbers 3, the Levites were established as the priesthood. They took a census of the firstborn males in Israel and they substituted the entire tribe of Levi as the firstborn—instead of the firstborn of each tribe—as the priesthood. The priesthood was concentrated into one tribe. God took that tribe in lieu of the firstborn of each tribe. The Church today, collectively, represents the “church of the firstborn.” So, in that sense, the firstborn are sanctified to God, and we are part of that.

Question: As the Israelites crossed over to the Promised Land, how were they able to communicate with the inhabitants of the land? Weren’t their languages different?

Answer: That’s a good question. Yes, the basic languages were different, though there were probably certain things that they had in common. There were certain languages that

were commonly used, and there were second languages, just as we would have in most areas of the world today. We have languages such as English, French or Spanish as second languages, in many areas of the world, to provide a basis.

The Israelites would have spoken Hebrew as their own native tongue, as well as some of them being fluent in the Egyptian language.

In the land of Canaan, there was contact back and forth, and certainly there would have been at least a limited use of the Egyptian language by some of the people.

Aramaic, akin to Hebrew, was a kind of language of trade and commerce throughout a large part of the Middle Eastern area.

For the most part, I don’t know if there’s any indication of a lot of communication back and forth. There was obviously some. You have the account of Rahab the harlot. She was able to make herself understood to the spies and they were to her. We are not told what language they communicated in. Likely, it was some form of Egyptian.

In some of these areas, particularly where there was trade and commerce, you tend to have a language of trade and commerce. Even if people are not fluent in it, they can get by. This was an area that was on the route of what’s called the Fertile Crescent and the caravan route. While not every individual would have had knowledge of other languages, there certainly were people who were in contact with the public and caravans and would have probably tended to have at least a limited knowledge of a dialect and Aramaic as well.

Question: Were there flags in Israel and what did they look like?

Answer: That is an interesting question. When Israel was encamped, as recorded in Numbers 2, there were standards, or flags, that were raised. They were camped three tribes to a side of each of the four sides represented. There were three tribes to each of the four sides. There was a particular ensign or standard, which was just another term for flag, that marked the area of that tribe. There are references to it in Jewish tradition and some things that have been preserved.

Numbers 2:2, we might notice briefly, “Everyone of the children of Israel shall camp by his own standard [flag], beside the emblems of his father’s house;”

Verses 3-9, on the east side—Judah, Issachar and Zebulun.

Verses 10-17, on the south side—Reuben, Simeon and Gad.

Verses 18-24, on the west side—Ephraim, Manasseh and Benjamin.

Verses 25-31, on the north side—Dan, Asher and Naphtali.

Concerning the particular things that pertain to it, there is not a specific description of the flag in the Bible, but there are references in the book of Deuteronomy to things that were described as having relevance to each of these tribes. In Jewish tradition, the pictures of the ensigns of Israel have been preserved.

One of the interesting things to note is that most of the things that made up the ensigns have been preserved in the royal coat of arms of Great Britain. Also, portions of it are preserved in that of the United States, France and some of the other nations of Israel.

Deuteronomy 33:17, the statement describing Joseph, “His glory is like a firstborn bull [KJV, “bullock”], and his horns are like the horns of the wild ox [KJV, “unicorn”]; together with them he shall push the peoples [Gentiles] to the ends of the earth; they are the ten thousands of Ephraim, and they are the thousands of Manasseh.”

It is interesting because if you were to look on the royal coat of arms of Great Britain, you would see the unicorn pictured on there. The bullock also figures in it.

Genesis 49:9, Judah is described as a lion’s whelp. The lion was the symbol of Judah.

Revelation 5:5, Christ was called “the Lion of the tribe of Judah.” The lion, of course, was symbolic of Judah and is descriptive because from Judah was to come the kingly line. That’s why the lion is also in the royal coat of arms of Great Britain.

The Queen (Queen Elizabeth) is a direct descendant of King David. She occupies the throne of David. The very coronation stone over which she was crowned is Jacob’s pillar stone (Genesis 28:18; Genesis 31:13), which the children of Israel carried through the wilderness.

2 Kings 11:14 and 2 Chronicles 23:13 describe it. It was the stone, the pillar, on which the kings of Judah were crowned, coming all the way down.

It was a physical rock that literally followed with them through the wilderness because they took it there. It was taken by Jeremiah to Ireland at the time of Judah’s fall, later transferred to Scotland, and then overturned the third time and brought down to England. It’s there as a physical sign of the covenant that God made. It is preserved there under the chair of the throne of King Edward and

labeled. They recognize what it is. Even the very label that’s there identifies the coronation stone as “Jacob’s pillar stone.”

You have united in the coat of arms the insignias that represent Ephraim and Judah because the royal family in Britain is the descendant of the kingly line of Judah ruling over the tribe of Ephraim, the chief of the tribes of Israel. You find that much of the insignias, the material of the coats of arms, and the flags that are described are identified with the British Isles and actually date back to that particular time that is described here.

Question: Joshua 1:12, “And to the Reubenites, the Gadites, and half the tribe of Manasseh Joshua spoke, saying...” What is the meaning of “the half-tribe of Manasseh” and why were they a half tribe?

Answer: Manasseh was the only tribe that couldn’t get along with itself, and they still can’t! The bloodiest war we ever fought in this country was the war between one half the tribe of Manasseh and the other half of the tribe of Manasseh. Interestingly enough, the major battle at the beginning of that war was known as the “Battle of Manasseh’s Junction” and the “Battle of Bull Run,” but the term that was primarily used in the South was the “Battle of Manasseh’s Junction.” This is an interesting term.

If you trace it back, you will find that Manasseh had a wife and a concubine. Part of his descendants came from the wife and part of them came from the concubine. They never really got along very well between and among themselves. When they came up to the Promised Land, half of the tribe of Manasseh wanted to settle on the east side of the Jordan River. They didn’t want to cross the Jordan River. They were more agricultural, particularly involved in cattle raising and this type of thing. They desired the pastureland on the east side of the Jordan River. So, half of the tribe of Manasseh was given its inheritance on the east side of the Jordan River along with the tribes of Gad and Reuben.

Then the other half of the tribe of Manasseh crossed the Jordan with the other tribes of Israel. The Jordan River, of course, was the dividing line, so half of them were on one side and half on the other side. The half that descended from the wife were on the west side. “Gilead” often refers to the area inhabited by Reuben, as well as the area inhabited by one of the half-tribes of Manasseh. The term “Gilead” goes back to that. Just as we find that distinction in ancient Israel, you find it preserved right on down.

When this country began to be settled, there were basically two fountainheads. One was in Virginia, which was kind of a fountainhead of the South, and the other was in Massachusetts, which was the fountainhead of the North. Those were the two centers.

When you come to the American Revolution, prior to Andrew Jackson (our seventh president), every president of the United States before him was either a Virginian aristocrat or a Massachusetts' Adams. Those two areas dominated the early history of this country, and settlement primarily spread out on an east to west basis, coming from New England or coming across from Virginia and the Carolinas. That was the tendency and the distinction then. You could even track it back to the British Isles and to different areas that they came from, which gets into a different story, but, anyway, it's kind of an interesting subject.

Question: Deuteronomy 16:5, ““You may not sacrifice the Passover within any of your gates...””

Answer: The point of “not in your gates” simply meant that you were to congregate where God said to congregate and not just pick your own spot. You couldn't say, ‘Well, I am not going to go up to the temple in Jerusalem this year; I'll just stay and do it here.’ In terms of the sacrifices, they had to be performed at the place where God had set His name. That was the principle on it. Basically, all the sacrifices were performed in Jerusalem, originally at the tabernacle and later the temple. And that, by the way, is the answer to why the Jews, though they observe the evening, do not sacrifice the Passover lamb at the time of Passover. The reason is that there is not a temple, and they are told here not to do it within their gates but to go to the place where God has set His name. So, that is their reason on it.

Question: 2 Chronicles 7:14, ““...My people who are called by My name...”” is the specific matter that is asked for explanation.

Answer: Notice verse 11, “Thus Solomon finished the house of the Lord and the king's house; ...”

Verses 12-14, we find, “Then the Lord appeared to Solomon by night, and said to him: ‘I have heard your prayer, and have chosen this place for Myself as a house of sacrifice. When I shut up heaven and there is no rain, or command the locusts to devour the land, or send pestilence among My people, if My people who are called

by My name will humble themselves, and pray and seek My face, and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin and heal their land.””

The question relates to “the people who are called by God's name.” I think the simplest way of saying it is that it is a reference to the people of God. In the context of 2 Chronicles 7, we are looking at Old Testament Israel and the time of the dedication of the temple. It was a national reference to Old Testament Israel who were the people of God. The point is that if they departed from their relationship with God and God's punishment came upon them, if they would humble themselves (that is fasting and prayer) and really turn to God with their whole hearts, God would hear. God would listen and God would restore His blessing.

I think the clear implication is that, in principle, this would certainly apply to us today as God's Church, God's people spiritually.

Duality is something that runs throughout the Bible. A basic principle of understanding much of Scripture is God's use of duality. He uses it in prophecy. He uses it in many ways. He uses it with God's people nationally (referring to physical Israel) and also God's people spiritually (the Church of God). Israel was, in that sense, both the Church in the wilderness (Acts 7:38) and God's people nationally.

That's why the Tribulation is two things. The Great Tribulation is the wrath of Satan. We've explained this, of course, when we went through the Bible study on Revelation. The Great Tribulation is the wrath of Satan directed against whom? It's the wrath of Satan directed against physical Israel. Primarily, physical Israel is the United States and British Commonwealth nations.

In Jeremiah 30:7, the Tribulation is called the time of Jacob's trouble. It is directed at physical Israel, but it's also directed at spiritual Israel—at least the portion that Satan can get at.

When you go to Revelation 12, you read of the Church. When you tie it in with Revelation 3, it refers, in that context, to the Philadelphia stage or era of God's Church.

Revelation 12:14, “But the woman was given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness to her place [a place of protection; a place of safety], where she is nourished for a time and times and half a time [the duration of the Tribulation], from the presence of the serpent.”

Verse 17, we find, “And the dragon was enraged with the woman, and he went to make war with

the rest of her offspring, who keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.” The remnants are those that are left behind. They’re in the Church of God; they keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus Christ. It is basically a reference to the Laodiceans.

The point is that Satan’s wrath is directed two-fold: It is directed against God’s people nationally—physical Israel. That’s why it’s called the time of Jacob’s trouble. It’s also directed against God’s people, spiritually. That’s why Satan goes to make war with the remnant of her seed. The remnants are those of the Church that are left behind.

The principle of applying this statement, “My people called by My name,” is certainly that the Church of God is God’s people called by God’s name. In that sense, Israel is called by God’s name because God’s name actually makes up part of the name Israel. When Jacob’s name was changed to Israel, the ending “el” has to do with God. “El” means “God.” It’s a contracted form of “Elohim.” “Israel” means “prince of God” or “prince with God.” So, the name “Israel,” in that sense, reflects God’s name. God gave His people that name nationally. It was a national promise to the people at the time of the dedication of the temple, but the principle would apply all through time.

When you study the story of the people of God down through the centuries, you find the ups and downs that reflect the story of the people of God. The principle is always (whether collectively as a Church, individually in our own lives or even nationally as a nation) that if the people of God find themselves in affliction and really turn to God with prayer and fasting and really seek Him, God will hear and God will listen.

Question: 2 Chronicles 21:17, “...so that there was not a son left to him except Jehoahaz, the youngest of his sons.”

2 Chronicles 22:1, “Then the inhabitants of Jerusalem made Ahaziah his youngest son king in his place, ...”

Answer: It is not uncommon for kings to have more than one name and you see at least a couple of names that are used. I think that clearly, in the context, the two names refer to the same person. Perhaps he was known by one name as a prince and another name as king. That is not uncommon. Royal children will have several names and, in certain contexts, use different ones.

Question: Ezra 2:63, “And the governor said to them that they should not eat of the most holy things till a priest could consult with the Urim and Thummin.” What does it mean for a priest to consult the Urim and Thummim?

Answer: We read of that in the Old Testament from time to time. The high priest had a breastplate, and on that breastplate, there were 12 stones. The name of each of the tribes was inscribed in Hebrew on those stones. The consulting of the Urim and Thummim had to do with a way in which God would answer the high priest and would reveal His will by, evidently, causing certain of these stones to light up and the result of it spelled out a message. The Urim and Thummim makes reference to the breastplate and the stones.

According to Josephus, we are told that John Hyrcanus, who was a high priest of approximately 100 or so years prior to Christ, was the last high priest whom God answered through the Urim and Thummim. Basically, he seems to have been the last high priest. Even Jewish tradition acknowledges that God no longer answered the high priest through the Urim and Thummim after that time. I think it was a matter that they simply had gotten far enough away from God that God did not respond to them in that way.

Question: Where does Job come in, in history? Where does his life take place? What country?

Answer: Job 1:1, we are told, “There was a man in the land of Uz, ...” We are not given a lot of details about where this land of Uz was.

Genesis 10:23, it mentions the sons of Aram, who would be the grandsons of Shem, “The sons of Aram were Uz, Hul, Gether and Mash.” Aram was the father of the Arameans or the Aramaic people. They were kindred to the Hebrews. Armenia takes its name from Aram, primarily through the son Hul. Anciently, the area of Uz was in the area kind of between Egypt and Syria. That anciently was the general area of Uz. You might look on a Bible map and get the area if they show the Arameans. If you were to look on there, it would have been the area to the east of what became the land of Israel and north of Egypt and south of Damascus.

There is another reference to a similar word where it refers to the children of Abraham’s brother Nahor.

Genesis 22:20-21, “...it was told Abraham, saying, ‘Indeed Milcah also has borne children to your brother Nahor: Huz his firstborn, Buz his brother, Kemuel the father of Aram...’”

Job's friends are mentioned.

Job 2:11, "Now when Job's three friends heard of all this adversity that had come upon him, each one came from his own place—Eliphaz the Temanite, Bildad the Shuhite, and Zophar the Naamathite." It mentions them coming together.

Job 32:2, "Then the wrath of Elihu, the son of Barachel the Buzite, of the family of Ram,"

In Genesis 22:20-21, we noticed the sons of Abraham's brother Nahor were Huz, Buz and Kemuel the father of Aram or Ram.

Elihu that is mentioned in Job 32:2 was a Buzite. In other words, he was a descendant of Buz. He would be at least a grandson or great grandson of the kindred of Ram, which equates with what is mentioned in Genesis 22:21.

Job 2:11 mentions Eliphaz the Temanite. Teman was a son of Esau (Genesis 36:10-11).

The Bible does not give or clearly define Job's lineage. We have speculated on certain things in times past. The thing that becomes apparent from the book of Job—from the friends that are mentioned and the information that is given about the location being an area that was on the border of Egypt—is that the people that were involved were people that were of the general stock of Abraham and Abraham's family.

We see that Elihu the Buzite would have been a descendent of Abraham's brother Nahor and Buz and down in that line, which would have made them kindred to the descendants of Abraham.

Eliphaz the Temanite was a descendent of Esau. This is several generations after Abraham. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob—Jacob's generation was the generation of the grandchildren of Abraham.

Job's friend, Eliphaz the Temanite, would have been at least the generation of the patriarchs—the 12 sons of Jacob.

What you're looking at is that the general time setting would be prior to the time of the Exodus, but it would have been after the time of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. It is probably contemporary with the time that Jacob and his family were in Egypt. The events described in the book of Job involved some of the people of the general family of Abraham that were nearby, but they were not in the direct lineage. The ones that are specifically mentioned by name, the indication is they were general relatives. They were kindred people and, yet, not necessarily the exact lineage.

We are told the book of Job traces back to Moses. In other words, Moses was responsible for its inclusion with the books. So, it was something that took place prior to Moses. I

think that's clear. When God's great power is described, there is no mention or allusion to the events of the Exodus. It mentions the events of creation and the flood but not the Exodus. It is something that predates the Exodus. It would probably be contemporary with the story of Joseph and his brothers. It would be in that general time setting and that generation.

Question: Psalm 51:5, why did David say, "in sin my mother conceived me"?

Answer: This is not a reference to the Catholic doctrine of original sin and their subsequent doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. Most Protestants don't realize that the Immaculate Conception doesn't refer to Christ but to Mary. Their doctrine is based on their idea that original sin is transmitted through sexual intercourse and that a child is conceived in original sin. This is really what their doctrine is. This is part of it.

Another part of it is that Mary was conceived immaculately. Their story is that she was the only one who did not have original sin because her parents were evidently so righteous. They claim she was the only one not conceived in sin, and since Christ was born of a virgin, He didn't inherit original sin either. Of course, it's a bunch of pagan garbage.

Verse 5 doesn't have any reference to that. It was a poetic expression. It just means, "I was a sinner from the beginning."

Psalm 51:4-5, "Against You, You only, have I sinned, and done this evil in Your sight—.... Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin my mother conceived me."

Verse 7, "Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." He said, 'Wash me thoroughly from my iniquity; purge me. Get out the lye soap and clean me up.' That's really the sense of it. 'I am rotten from stem to stern; I'm a sinner from the beginning.' David is looking at his nature. There is no particular theological implication in the sense that, "in sin my mother conceived me." It is a poetic expression of David expressing the fact that, 'Look, I am a sinner, the son of a sinner. I come from a long line of sinners.'

We all do, by the way. 'I am just a sinner from the beginning. I am rotten through and through.' This is how David saw himself. He said, 'Oh God, please clean me up. Change me, transform me,' which is really the concept of what repentance is all about when we really grasp and see ourselves as David saw himself.

Question: The question involves several different scriptures and involves the matter of judging. When is it appropriate to judge and when is it not?

Answer: We live in a society today that prides itself on tolerance and people don't want to judge anything. If you say something about something, they say, 'Oh no, you shouldn't judge.' Several verses are brought to mind. The question is asked in terms of what's the proper application for us as God's people.

Let's notice some of the verses.

Isaiah 5:20-21, "Woe to those who call evil good, and good evil; who put darkness for light, and light for darkness; who put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! Woe to those who are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight!"

Verse 24, coming down, "Therefore, as the fire devours the stubble, and the flame consumes the chaff, so their root will be as rottenness, and their blossom will ascend like dust; because they have rejected the law of the Lord of hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel."

Jeremiah 23:13-14, "'And I have seen folly in the prophets of Samaria: they prophesied by Baal and caused My people Israel to err. Also I have seen a horrible thing in the prophets of Jerusalem: they commit adultery and walk in lies; they also strengthen the hands of evildoers, so that no one turns back from his wickedness. All of them are like Sodom to Me, and her inhabitants like Gomorrah.'"

Isaiah 59:10, one more verse, "We grope for the wall like the blind, and we grope as if we had no eyes; we stumble at noonday as at twilight; we are as dead men in desolate places."

The point is, as it is brought out in these verses, God's law is a moral compass. To "judge" is to "make a distinction." That's what it means to judge. It means to "make choices, decisions or distinctions." We can distinguish between what is appropriate and what is inappropriate. God's law is a moral compass. If you cast away the law, you cast away the compass and you can't tell which direction you're going.

We live in a society that prides itself on tolerance. In reality, they've sort of thrown away the moral compass and want to treat all behaviors as though they are on the same level. That is certainly not valid from a Biblical standpoint. We can and should judge conduct in terms of what is appropriate and inappropriate. We have the criteria for judging that right here in the Scriptures.

What we cannot judge and what is God's prerogative to judge is the hearts and minds of individuals. God looks on the heart. We can see what someone does and judge the conduct as inappropriate. We don't know how much that person knows and understands and to what extent God is working with them. God looks on the heart. I can't tell you how sincere someone is. God knows. He looks on their heart. Now, sincere or not, I can tell you based on the Bible whether they're wrong or whether they're right in what they're doing.

There is the kind of judging that only God can do. God is the One that has to look in the heart. He is the One that has to evaluate a person's motives and understanding. God evaluates those factors. That's not for us to judge. They ultimately have to give an account to God.

What we are to judge is whether this is right or wrong or whether we should follow this or follow that. We have judging to do as well. Our judging is not the hearts and minds of individuals. Our judging is the appropriateness of various conducts and whether it is something that we should follow or not. We have to make those judgments. God gives us a criterion. God gives us the basis. He gives us His Word; He gives us His law. It is a moral compass.

He puts us in situations where we are confronted with having to make choices. We have to make choices in our daily life. We are pressured from every direction and most of those pressures are in terms of choosing the wrong way. We have to take responsibility. Every time you make a choice, you've judged something.

If you say, 'Well, I'm not going to judge,' then, in effect, you've judged that everything is on the same level and that everything is okay. To say that something is a sin is not judging the heart and mind of the individual. God says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery." If somebody commits adultery, that's a sin. I'm not judging them to say that. I'm not judging them as an adulterer or that they've committed adultery if I know that to be a fact. That's not judging them as a person.

God ultimately is the One that is going to judge them in terms of their relationship with Him, to what extent they have repented and to what extent God is working with them. God will consider all these factors. In terms of the ultimate destiny, God is the One who has to judge that, but we can certainly judge and should judge that adultery is wrong and that we are not going to do it. If we can't judge that, then we're in trouble.

That's where the world comes in. The world says, 'Well, who's to decide what pornography is?' It really shouldn't be that hard to figure out. Anybody that wants to open their Bible can pretty well figure out some of these things.

Any judgment you make has to be based on something as a criterion. If you say, 'that's too long' or 'that's too short'—what was your criteria? You had something that you used as your standard.

Maybe someone measures a board and you say, 'You've cut that too long. You're going to have to cut two more inches off of it.' You judged. You used a standard of judgment. You used a tape measure, a yardstick or whatever.

God gives us a spiritual standard of judging. It is the basis by which we are to judge conduct. It is the basis by which we judge the appropriateness or inappropriateness of certain actions. We have to make those judgments. There are a lot of things we're confronted with on a daily basis. God evaluates us on the basis of how well we take and apply His word. God evaluates us on how well we apply His Word in circumstances that we face.

Question: Matthew 2:14, "When he arose, he took the young Child and His mother by night and departed for Egypt..." Can we know by the Bible or history how long Joseph, Mary and Jesus stayed in Egypt?

Answer: There's no specific reference, nor am I aware of a tradition of an exact amount of time.

Matthew 2:19-20, we are told, "But when Herod was dead, behold, an angel of the Lord appeared in a dream to Joseph in Egypt, saying, 'Arise, take the young Child and His mother, and go to the land of Israel, for those who sought the young Child's life are dead.'"

Christ was born in the fall of 4 B.C. and Herod died the following Passover. So, it would have been shortly after the spring Feasts—probably sometime between Passover and Pentecost—that Joseph and Mary returned. Christ would have been less than a year old. They, perhaps, were in Egypt for no more than a matter of months—maybe one, two or three months, something of that sort.

Question: Matthew 5:25, "Agree with your adversary quickly, while you are on the way with him, lest your adversary deliver you to the judge, the judge hand you over to the officer, and you be thrown into prison."

Answer: The basic principle is: don't involve yourself in a bunch of litigation. Try to settle out

of court peaceably. If you get entangled in this world's legal system, there is no telling what kind of trouble you will wind up in before it is all over. It's a principle; don't have this adversarial, 'I am going to hold out and demand that I get everything that's coming to me,' rather than having a peaceable attitude. Be willing to settle. Try to work out a peaceable arrangement. If you have a problem with someone or some type of dispute, seek to work it out in a peaceable way. Realize that even if you have to accept things that aren't exactly right, chances are you are still going to come out better than if you get yourself entangled in this world's legal system. There are problems any way you "slice it." It's an emphasis on trying to settle things peaceably.

Question: Matthew 8:4, "And Jesus said to him [the leper], 'See that you tell no one;'" Mark 5:43, healing of little girl, "But He commanded them strictly that no one should know it," Luke 5:14, "And He charged him [the man with leprosy] to tell no one," Why couldn't anyone tell of their healings?

Answer: It wasn't that they couldn't, but often Christ would tell those that He had miraculously healed not to mention it because He knew that as soon as the notoriety spread, persecution was going to intensify and He would have to leave the area because of the religious leadership being stirred up. Particularly in the earlier part of His ministry, He did not seek to call a lot of public attention to Himself because He knew what the consequences would be. So, in many cases, when He would heal someone, He would simply say, 'Look, keep it quiet. Don't make a public issue of it.' He knew the effect of the notoriety.

Question: Matthew 19:13, "Then little children were brought to Him that He might put His hands on them and pray," This is a question concerning the blessing of little children who are not in the Church but whose grandmother or grandfather is in the Church.

Answer: Basically, the principle would be those who have responsibility for the child. In some cases, the grandparents are raising the child and that's a little different. I think one thing to realize is that with God's blessing comes responsibility. We will probably go through some of this in the sermon on the Sabbath. If we are going to claim God's blessing, we must be prepared to follow through with our responsibility. We can't just lightly claim God's blessing as though it were some magic wand and then not exercise our responsibility.

That would be the problem with children that are perhaps related or friends or whatever. Unless you have responsibility or someone is prepared to exercise the proper responsibility in rearing the child God's way, then for God's blessing to be fulfilled, that blessing must be accompanied by obedience.

There are certain things and certain principles in the Scriptures that you can go through concerning blessings. God desires to bless us, but there are responsibilities that we have. Anytime God offers His blessings, there are other things that are involved with it; there are responsibilities that we have. Perhaps that will clarify, as far as what's involved.

Question: Why, in Matthew's account (Matthew 20:20-21), the mother of James and John asked Jesus to grant her sons' to sit on His right and left hand, and in Mark's account (Mark 10:37), it states that James and John were asking?

Answer: It is just one of the occasions where the two accounts complement each other. James and John were "in" on it; they wanted it. Mark tells it in a more succinct fashion—the fact that they wanted it. Matthew adds in that they had brought their mother into the circumstance. She was the sister of Jesus' mother, Mary. They had brought their mother into it. Matthew simply adds in a detail Mark ignores because the basic fact of it was that James and John were kind of striving for status there.

Question: Matthew 26:41, what did Jesus mean by, "Watch and pray, lest you enter into temptation."?"

Answer: The very fact that if we are not remaining vigilant and not staying close to God through prayer, we will be caught up in various temptations that come along. The key to not being enticed and entangled in some of these temptations is to be vigilant and alert, not simply to world conditions but to ourselves. Be alert to what is going on, what's happening. Be alert, pray and stay close to God.

Question: Explain Mark 7:27-28, "But Jesus said to her, 'Let the children be filled first, for it is not good to take the children's bread and throw it to the little dogs.' And she answered and said to Him, 'Yes, Lord, yet even the little dogs under the table eat from the children's crumbs.'"

Answer: Verse 26, this is a reference to the Canaanite woman who came to Christ.

John 1:11, we are specifically told that Christ came to His own in His first coming—primarily

to the Jews. He was in Judea and Galilee and didn't travel throughout the world. He concentrated His message in the area in Judea and Galilee. This woman came up and Christ, in one sense, was testing her attitude. The English translation is a little harsher than the Greek. The reference is really, let's say, to puppies underfoot.

It was a matter of priorities. Christ was not dealing with everyone at that time. Yet, the woman displayed an attitude of humility when Christ told her that. She said, 'Well, that's true, but even little puppies there under the table eat the crumbs that fall.' Christ was impressed with her attitude and, in a sense, dealt with her ahead of time. It was simply not God's time to deal with everyone. Christ's ministry was directed to the Jews. It was in God's time schedule that they be given that opportunity, and they, of course, rejected the proclamation that was given to them.

But there were individuals among the Gentiles that evidenced outstanding attitudes of faith, and Christ, in a sense, dealt with them ahead of time. It was simply not the time that He was directing His efforts toward a broader spectrum, but there were individuals, as this woman and the Roman Centurion (Acts 10), that evidenced an attitude that Christ took note of. It is a matter of realizing that God may be dealing with certain ones, and, yet, God will take note of an attitude of humility and faith even if that's maybe not where He would primarily be working.

Question: Mark 9:35, "And He sat down, called the twelve, and said to them, 'If anyone desires to be first, he shall be last of all and servant of all.'"

Answer: They were disputing who should be the greatest. He said, 'Look, if you want to know how to get to the top, it is to serve the most. Be willing to lower yourself and be the least. As you look around, the examples you see in the Roman world and your idea of status is that the guy on top does nothing and has everybody else wait on him.' He says, 'I am telling you, the one that really is the greatest is the one that is serving, helping and willing to do whatever needs to be done—the one who is willing to humble himself as a little child, to help and serve others.' Christ showed that God's view of what is important is a little different than man's view.

Question: Mark 9:38-42, "Now John answered Him, saying, 'Teacher, we saw someone who does not follow us casting out demons in Your

name, and we forbade him because he does not follow us.’ But Jesus said, ‘Do not forbid him, for no one who works a miracle in My name can soon afterward speak evil of Me. For he who is not against us is on our side. For whoever gives you a cup of water to drink in My name, because you belong to Christ, assuredly, I say to you, he will by no means lose his reward. And whoever causes one of these little ones who believe in Me to stumble, it would be better for him if a millstone were hung around his neck, and he were thrown into the sea.’”

Answer: Realize that in Jesus’ ministry, He came among the Jews who had been, to various extents, practicing the religion that God had given through Moses. Judaism, as was normally practiced in the New Testament period, really was not the religion of Moses; it was a humanly devised religion that had a lot of human tradition and “dos” and “don’ts” attached to it. But there certainly were many who were sincere to whatever degree, who were observing God’s laws and with whom God was working to one extent or another. Jesus makes the point to the disciples that it was not their job to get out and tell others, ‘No, you can’t do this or that.’ He said, ‘Look, if he is not against us, if he recognizes My authority and is not speaking evil of us, leave him along.’ In effect, He told the disciples to mind their own business and let God take care of His.

Verses 41-42, in terms of offending one of the little ones, Christ says in effect, ‘The way you treat My disciples, I take it personally. If one of My representatives does something in a positive way for My sake for one who follows Me (for one of My disciples), that counts to his credit, and if one causes offense, that counts to his discredit.’ It is a matter that God takes note of. God takes note of the way we treat His children, which ought to give all of us cause to consider and realize that the way we treat one another is a serious matter.

Question: Mark 10:25, “‘It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God.’”

Answer: It’s explained in the context. Verses 23-24, “‘Then Jesus looked around and said to His disciples, ‘How hard it is for those who have riches to enter the kingdom of God!’ And the disciples were astonished at His words. But Jesus answered again and said to them, ‘Children, how hard it is for those who trust in riches to enter the kingdom of God!’”

That really is the problem—those who put their trust and confidence in physical wealth. It’s very difficult. Through a comparison, He is using a statement that’s obviously an extreme statement. It’s an attention-getting statement.

Verses 26-27, “‘And they were astonished beyond measure, saying among themselves, ‘Who then can be saved?’ But looking at them, Jesus said, ‘With men it is impossible, but not with God; for with God all things are possible.’” It’s not that anyone who has any wealth will not be in the kingdom, but there is a problem. The human tendency is to put our trust and confidence in what we can see, taste, touch and feel. The more we put our trust and confidence in what we have and what we can see, the less we put our trust and confidence in Whom we can’t see and the more we open ourselves up to trouble. Certainly, God can work with those who have wealth or those who don’t.

Question: In John 16:7-8, 13, why is “Him” and “He” used instead of “It” in referring to the Holy Spirit?

Answer: I think the simplest explanation is the fact that in the Greek language and in most languages other than English, you don’t have the neuter in the same way. For instance, in the French language, it is masculine or feminine. If you were talking about the table, it’s spoken of in the feminine or if you were translating it literally and you were referring to something, it would be either “he” or “she”—even though in English we would refer to it as an “it.”

Other scriptures show that the Holy Spirit is not a person. Matthew 1:18, one of the simplest ways to prove that is that we are told that Mary was with child of the Holy Spirit. If she conceived by the Holy Spirit and the Holy Spirit were a person, then that would make the Holy Spirit the Father, right?

John 14:16, yet, Christ prayed to the Father to send the Spirit. Mary was with child of the Holy Spirit. Obviously, the Holy Spirit was not a person, else that would have been the Father. Think that one through.

There are various other places where it talks about the Spirit being “poured out” from on high (Acts 10:45). You don’t pour out a person. The Holy Spirit is a power that emanates out from God (Luke 1:35; 24:49; Acts 1:8).

Many times when the masculine or feminine pronouns are used, they are rendered into English as the neuter “it” in many contexts. Here, the translators didn’t do that because they did not understand the fact that the Holy Spirit

was not an individual. Since the translators themselves believed in the doctrine of the trinity, they simply rendered it this way. If you were reading this section of Scripture in the French Bible, the question would not arise because everything would be rendered as masculine or feminine. If you were reading it in the Greek, the same would be the case. In English, we make a distinction between “he,” “she” and “it.” It creates a little problem or causes a misunderstanding.

Question: Acts 7:25, “For he supposed that his brethren would have understood that God would deliver them by his hand, but they did not understand.” Did Moses know before leaving Egypt that he was to deliver Israel?

Answer: Moses had come to understand that God was going to use him to deliver Israel. He thought God had put him in the position as prince of Egypt and God would use him to help the people. The people were unwilling to accept him in that role. He thought he knew how God was going to do it. Then during the 40 years in the land of Midian, he probably thought God was not going to use him. God did it a totally different way. We try to second-guess God. God delivers us from our problems. Very, very rarely does He do it the way we anticipate it. We have to walk by faith.

Question: Why does it say in Acts 9:7 that the men heard the voice and then in Acts 22:9, it says the men did not hear the voice?

Answer: Acts 9:7, “And the men who journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice but seeing no one.”

Acts 22:9, “Now those who were with me indeed saw the light and were afraid, but they did not hear the voice of Him who spoke to me.”

They did not understand what was said. They heard a noise, but they did not comprehend the message that was spoken. That is the sense of it.

Question: Acts 16:4, “And as they went through the cities, they delivered to them the decrees to keep, which were determined by the apostles and elders at Jerusalem.” Are the “decrees” of this verse referring to Acts 15:29? Can decrees be imposed on us? Were the decrees nailed to the cross?

Answer: They felt to be baptized you had to become a Jew. The sign of the covenant of Abraham was circumcision. It was an issue. It was difficult for many Jews to accept the fact that Gentiles didn’t have to be circumcised. The

issue had gone to Jerusalem. When an issue arises and it cannot be resolved on a local level, it goes to headquarters—specific matters of Church government.

In Acts 15, a decision was made. The decree was written up and sent out. One of these decrees had to do with circumcision.

Were the decrees nailed to the cross?

Colossians 2:14, “having wiped out [KJV, “blotted out”] the handwriting of requirements [KJV, “ordinances”] that was against us, which was contrary to us. And He has taken it out of the way, having nailed it to the cross.” The decrees are not what it is referring to. What is blotted out?

Acts 3:19, “Repent therefore and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, ...” Our *sins* are blotted out. What does that have to do with the handwriting of requirements? If you were to look up the phrase “handwriting of ordinances” (Greek, “*cheirographon*”), it means “something handwritten.” This is a manuscript, specifically, a legal document or bond, a handwritten bill. It is a written record, like a signed handwritten bond of indebtedness. It was a term often used in the Greek world referring to a debt. Our handwritten bill of debt was blotted out. Christ paid our debt in full. The catalog of our sins—our personalized debt—was paid in full. We owed our life and Christ paid the penalty. It was against us, contrary to us and He took it away. Our sins were nailed to the cross. He took all of our sins. As a result, our sins were nailed to the cross.

Can decrees be imposed on us? Yes.

Matthew 16:19, the authority for that is where the Apostles were told, “And I will give you the keys of the Kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven.” Binding and loosing had to do with official judicial decisions. The judgment was to be made based on the law. The law doesn’t change; circumstances change. That comes on down today.

The Scribes and Pharisees were in that office, but they weren’t doing what they were supposed to do.

Matthew 23:2, “... ‘The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat.’” “Sit in Moses’ seat” is to make judgments.

Matthew 21:43, “Therefore I say to you, the kingdom of God will be taken from you and given to a nation bearing the fruits of it.” It will be taken from the Pharisees and given to the Church.

How do you know which days to celebrate as Holy Days? We know from the Hebrew calendar. Who made that determination? God revealed it, but the Jews have preserved it.

Question: Why do Protestants most often quote the Apostle Paul as their authority? Peter was the chief apostle (the leader of the Twelve), John had a very special relationship with Jesus and James was the brother of Jesus. Why is it that almost all scripture references used are from Paul instead of these three?

Answer: Paul wrote more of the New Testament than any other one person, so there is a lot to quote from Paul. He wrote 14 books.

2 Peter 3:15-16, the reason the Protestants like to quote from Paul the most—one factor is the fact that Peter says, “...as also our beloved brother Paul, according to the wisdom given to him, has written to you, as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things, in which are some things hard to understand, which those who are untaught and unstable twist to their own destruction, as they do also the rest of the Scriptures.”

Peter said centuries ago that Paul wrote some things that are a little hard to be understood. Paul was a deep thinker. He frequently dealt with philosophical concepts. He wrote some things that are a little more difficult to understand. Peter made reference to that. It was hard to be understood at the time that it was written. Peter said Paul wrote some things that are a little more difficult to understand and those that are unstable and unlearned twist them, just like they do the other scriptures—but they particularly like to twist what Paul wrote.

They take certain things out of context. This was the case centuries ago at the time of the New Testament (Peter himself warned about it), and it is certainly our case today. We find that there is an emphasis given to what the Protestant world terms “Pauline theology.” That is simply based on what Peter expressed.

God used Paul in a very remarkable way. He was deeply educated and grounded in the Old Testament Scriptures, and God used him to write more of the New Testament than any other one person. God also included the writings from James, Peter, John and Jude, as well as the four gospels. That’s why, when we started going through the New Testament in the order in which God inspired the Greeks to preserve it (the manuscripts are inevitably preserved throughout the Greek world and the so-called Byzantine texts), the General Epistles of James, Peter, John

and Jude preceded Paul’s epistles. They set the stage. That’s why, when we went through them, we went through them in that order. When you go through James, Peter, John and Jude, you go through faith, hope, love and warnings against apostasy. By the time you come to Paul, you are a little more grounded to understand some of the things Paul wrote. You understand Paul in the light of James, Peter and John. In that sense, that’s why they need to be understood first because they deal with more basic subject matter.

Question: 1 Corinthians 15:29, the question is concerning the phrase, “baptized for the dead.”

Answer: The whole context deals with the resurrection. If there isn’t a resurrection, what is going to happen to those who are dead?

1 Corinthians 15:29, “Otherwise, what will they do who are baptized for the dead [“baptized for the hope of the dead” is the sense of it], if the dead do not rise at all? Why then are they baptized for the [hope of] the dead?” This is a gross misunderstanding.

Question: 1 Timothy 3:1, “This is a faithful saying: If a man desires the position of a bishop, he desires a good work.” Why don’t we have bishops?

Answer: We do. We don’t normally use that term in English; bishop is a Middle/Old English term. The term in the Greek language is “*episcopos*.” It’s the Greek word from which the Episcopal Church takes its name. “*Episcopos*” simply means “overseer.” It is one of several terms that is used to refer to the ministry. Certain churches—the Catholic Church, Episcopal Church and others—use “bishop” as a title to refer to an individual in a church hierarchy. In reality, all elders are bishops. They are overseers, individuals responsible for the oversight of the congregation. We don’t generally use the term simply because it is a term that has been misused by the world and carries the connotation that is not scriptural. We more commonly use the term “elder.”

In reality, there are four basic terms that are used in the New Testament. One is the Greek term “*presbyteros*,” which means “elder.” A second term is “*episcopos*,” which means “overseer.” It is translated “bishop” in the King James. A third term is “*poimaino*,” which means “shepherd.” It’s the word that’s translated “pastor.” Any time you see the word “pastor” in the New Testament, it is translated from the exact same word that is also translated “shepherd.” Then, also

the term “*diakonos*,” which means “minister.” Those four terms—bishop, elder, overseer and minister—would be pretty much interchangeable, used in the sense of referring to anyone, whether a local elder or another rank. The term pastor (or shepherd) would refer basically to the one who had the oversight of the flock or the congregation.

Question: 1 Peter 5:13, “She who is in Babylon, elect together with you, greets you; and so does Mark my son.” Is this physical or spiritual Babylon?

Answer: The book of 1 Peter is a straightforward letter or book.

1 Peter 1:1, KJV, it is addressed, “to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia...”

1 Peter 5:13, “She [the Church] who is in Babylon, elect together with you, greets you; and so does Mark my son.” It is written from Babylon. Babylon was the capital of the Parthenon Empire. This was one of the major areas where the ten tribes of Israel were. Babylon had a large Jewish community. There’s no reason to take that he was in Babylon, other than in a literal fashion. If it is not symbolic, then it is to be taken literally.

Another aspect of demonstrating that it was the literal city of Babylon, the Catholic Church wants to claim that it was Rome. They should go back to Revelation 17. When it comes to 1 Peter, they claim Peter was in Rome being the pope. They want to leave out Revelation.

Also, if the letter is coming from Rome, it would be coming from the west, and there’s no way you would start a letter from up in the northeast corner of Pontus. You would have to start it probably in Asia and come through another way. We would take the expression, “Babylon,” literally. To whom were they sent? They were sent to the lost sheep of the House of Israel.

Question: 1 John 5:7-8 appears to support the trinity.

Answer: 1 John 5:7-8, “For there are three who bear witness in heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness on earth: the Spirit, the water, and the blood; and these three agree as one.” “In heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness on earth” is not a part of any of the original Greek texts. Basically, any commentary will bring that out. Most modern translations simply show the verse

with a footnote. Verse 7 does not appear in any Greek manuscripts; it only appeared in the Latin Vulgate.

It’s an interesting story as to how it came to be a part of the King James translation. The King James translation (1611 A.D.) was primarily made from the *Greek Textus Receptus* (as it is called), as published by Erasmus of Rotterdam (in the late 1400s), who was a scholar a couple of hundred years earlier. He was responsible for and helped to compile an authoritative Greek text that was utilized in the western world. When he came out with his Greek text, it, of course, did not have this verse because it was not in any of the Greek texts. It stirred up quite a bit of controversy. Basically, it came to be put in under threat of his life by the local Catholic bishop. It’s a story that will be brought out in any of the commentaries. So, from that standpoint, it can’t be utilized as a proof of the trinity because it really has no authority in the Scriptures. It is not actually a part of inspired Scripture. It is not in any of the Greek manuscripts that we have or that there is any record of.

Question: Is the Laodicean Church era to come after the Philadelphia Church era?

Answer: Yes. In Revelation 2 and 3, we have the Church addressed.

Revelation 1:20, John sees seven lampstands and this is explained. Christ is pictured as standing in the midst (v. 13). The entire Church is being pictured by seven lampstands. It was to be a light to the world. These are not the only Church congregations in Asia Minor. They were to typify the Church of all times.

Revelation 1: 1, “The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave Him to show His servants—things which must shortly take place,” John was given this vision to be revealed, to reveal “things which must shortly take place.” It was a prophecy. It was something that had implication way beyond the seven little congregations which were addressed here in chapters 2 and 3. These seven were selected out. They were stops on a Roman mail route. There was this particular order in which they were addressed. We have something that was typical and representative of the Church of all time. It typified the entire Church because God’s number of completion is seven. Each of these congregations had characteristics selected out.

From a standpoint of prophecy, we begin in Revelation 2 with the Church at Ephesus. This is a particular time period of the Church. There are seven distinct eras. It was successive, as in the

nature of the mail deliveries. They also have an application to individual Christians of all time, but these messages are primarily a prophecy. It begins with the time of the Apostle John and projects itself out to the time of the Lord. The Laodicean era is the final or seventh one mentioned; Philadelphia is the sixth.

It became plain in the early 1950s (about 1951-1953) that an understanding of some of this had opened up. Mr. Herbert Armstrong had been puzzled. Those in Oregon clearly were the Church of God, yet, they were so small and totally lacking in vitality, life and power. It was a paradox and he could not understand. If it was the Church of God, why was it was lacking in power? He puzzled over that through the years. In the time around 1951-1953, those coming out of college began intensive study in certain sections of Scripture. It became plain that this was the revelation in chapters 2 and 3. Sardis was told that it was at the point of death, and then Philadelphia, which had little strength and, yet, had kept God's Word, had set before it an open door. It was plain that God had raised up Mr. Herbert Armstrong for the Philadelphia era. Revelation 3:10, this was the era that was prophesied to be kept from the Great Tribulation. It became apparent that the scriptural description of these people (Sardis) was identified here in Revelation. They were pictured as lacking power and they did. The understanding of the history of the Church from the apostles to our time became clear.

Yet, there remains one final era characterized as the Church of the Laodiceans. Some of the specifics remain to be seen. The distinction between Philadelphia and Laodicea will be apparent prior to the Tribulation and is something that we will simply have to wait and see. It should serve as a warning for each of us, as to what God says is going to occur to some. We find an attitude, described in chapter 3, characteristic of the Laodicean Church and characteristic of this age. We live in a permissive society. We live in a society that tends to have a very watered-down, lukewarm, type of approach to life. We would all do well to be warned of that. Perhaps at a later time we will go through an entire Bible study on Revelation 2 and 3.

Question: Revelation 6:6, "And I heard a voice in the midst of the four living creatures saying, 'A quart of wheat for a denarius, and three quarts of barley for a denarius; and do not harm the oil and the wine.'" What is the oil and the wine that is not to be hurt?

Answer: That is a reference to the horse of famine. It describes the four horses of the Apocalypse. The third horse is the horse of famine. It describes, in symbolic terms, that he has a balance scale, a type of scale that was used in time past.

Revelation 6:6, "... 'A quart of wheat for a denarius [KJV, "penny"], and three quarts of barley for a denarius; and do not harm the oil and the wine.'" It describes rationing, where they are rationing out this small increment of grain. There is severe famine, and it describes grain, the very staff of life, being rationed out.

The term that is translated "penny" in the King James is a reference to the sum of money that was a day's wage for a common laborer—not exactly a penny as we think of it, though some of you can probably remember when you worked for a few cents a day. Our concept of money today is vastly different than the concept of money simply 40 or 50 years ago and much more so back then.

"Do not harm the oil and the wine" is simply describing commodities that are in short supply. They are told, 'Be very careful, we are rationing grain and some of the luxury items like oil and wine.' They are being very, very carefully rationed out because of severe shortage.

Question: Who are the two witnesses?

Answer: Would you like for me to name names? No, I won't name names. The reason I won't name names is because I don't know names. There was a time, a number of years ago, when several of us thought we had them figured out, and it's very apparent that we didn't. So, I don't think I am going to nominate anyone new to the job.

Revelation 11:3-4, the two witnesses are mentioned, "'And I will give power to my two witnesses, and they will prophesy one thousand two hundred and sixty days, clothed in sackcloth. These are the two olive trees and the two lampstands [KJV, "candlesticks"] standing before the God of the earth.'"

You find reference to them in Zechariah 3 and 4. You find symbolism of God's two representatives. You can find parallels to the two witnesses in the person of Moses and Aaron, God's representatives who went in before Pharaoh. The plagues that Moses and Aaron called down are very similar to what the two witnesses will be calling down.

The two lampstands mentioned are representative of two Churches. Some have speculated on this that they are Philadelphia and

Laodicea. I don't think that is necessarily the case. Understand that candlesticks, as we know them, did not exist back then. A more accurate translation would be lampstand because wax candles simply did not exist at this time in history.

What was utilized at that time resembled a pottery bowl. In some cases, it was a bowl that was set on a stem that came down and you filled up the whole thing with oil. You would have, maybe, a high stem and then you would have stems that would come out. You would fill up the main stem with oil, and the oil would keep the lamp lit. You would fill up the main stem that came up higher with oil, and the oil came up to a little bowl on each side. So, it was the oil that was burning.

Generally in the Middle East, they used olive oil because that was the most readily available source. God uses olive oil as a type of His Holy Spirit. Many analogies are drawn from the Bible from the use of olive oil. The fuel source that was used in the tabernacle and later in the temple was olive oil. Olive trees would be, of course, the source of olive oil. The two lampstands that are filled with olive oil represent a type of God's Spirit. In other words, the two individuals are filled with the Spirit of God.

At that time, God's representatives serve as a contrast to the two other individuals in Revelation 11 who are Satan's representative—the Beast and the false prophet. Who does God have? He has two witnesses, two individuals who are undoubtedly alive on the face of the earth right now, and we, in terms of knowing exactly who they are, cannot lock in on that right now. The point is that when the time comes, God selects whom He will and places those individuals in that office. The individuals may very well be around.

We look on the horizon and we try to figure things out, but we are doing so on the basis of things as they are now. But if we're talking about 10, 15 or 20 years in the future, then there's no telling. Things can change drastically. Things can change drastically in five years or even in one year. You see, that is the problem in trying to zero in on a specific individual.

There will be two men that God will utilize in that capacity as His direct representatives to serve as witnesses to the world and, in effect, call the hand of the Beast and the false prophet. This is in much the same way that Moses and Aaron went in before Pharaoh as God's representatives and contended with Pharaoh's magicians, Jannes

and Jambres, and there was the contest back and forth.

You find various analogies. You can draw an analogy to Joshua and Zerubbabel and their function in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. In the book of Zechariah, they are the two olive trees and a lampstand with seven lamps. Zechariah 3 and 4 are the chapters that refer to that. It's clear in Zechariah 4 that's the analogy of the two lampstands and the two olive trees of Revelation 11:4 clearly typify Zerubbabel and Joshua in the book of Zechariah. They were the two individuals who were leaders in God's work. They were doing God's work at that time and were representing God to the people in dealing with foreign rulers. They were dealing with the enemies of the faith. Some of that ties in with the way we got the Bible.

But to try and zero in on two specific individuals is not possible at this time. The point is that at certain times in history, God has utilized a team, as in the case of Moses and Aaron or as in the case of Zerubbabel and Joshua. God has not always chosen to utilize a team in quite the same way. You will find in the New Testament at the beginning, Peter and John stood out in a special way. They were kind of a team. You would find them as a team being brought before various ruling groups. There are other times when you find an individual mentioned in the singular fashion and you don't find any mention of someone else. God has sometimes done it a little differently. The two witnesses are simply going to be God's chosen representatives at the time of the very end. During the time of the Tribulation, there will be those two individuals whom God will use to hold out as His witnesses and warning to the world in much the way that Moses and Aaron did.

Question: Revelation 20:7-10, "Now when the thousand years have expired, Satan will be released from his prison and will go out to deceive the nations which are in the four corners of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle, whose number is as the sand of the sea. They went up on the breadth of the earth and surrounded the camp of the saints and the beloved city. And fire came down from God out of heaven and devoured them. And the devil, who deceived them, was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone where the beast and the false prophet are [were cast]. And they will be tormented day and night forever and ever." Are those that perish lost forever? Is there hope for them?

Answer: The Millennium is a time of judgment. God is not judging the world right now, but He is going to be judging during the Millennium. The scripture does not teach a second chance; it teaches a chance of salvation—an opportunity for an individual to have his mind opened by God to understand God’s calling and purpose. But realize that when we know and don’t act on what we know, that’s our chance. It’s not a matter of second chances and third and fourth chances, over and over. It’s a matter that once we really know and understand, God has dealt with us. We understand and we are having our opportunity. We have to make a commitment. There will be those who make the wrong choice, those who simply choose the wrong fate.

From the time setting, it would appear, here in Revelation, that we’re looking at a period at the end of the Millennium. Here are individuals who have had an opportunity to fully know God’s way. God has been working with them. They have had an opportunity and they simply have not availed themselves of that opportunity. They have allowed themselves to be deceived because they did not believe the warnings. Don’t you think there will be sermon after sermon after sermon preached on these scriptures, particularly as we get toward the end of the Millennium? Don’t you think we will warn people of what’s going to happen and to be aware lest it happen to them? There are going to be individuals who sit there and think, ‘That could never happen to me.’

I had a point very vividly impressed upon my mind. We were at the Feast of Tabernacles and Mr. Herbert Armstrong called a meeting for the ministry. He addressed the assembled ministry. He opened the Bible to the section in Acts where Paul talked to the Ephesians elders (Acts 20:17-38).

Acts 20:28, he went through the section of scripture where it says, “take heed.”

Verse 30, “Also from among yourselves men will arise up, speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after themselves.” ‘Some of you will depart and will seek to lead away a following.’ This was a charge to the Ephesians elders.

Verses 28-30, “Therefore take heed to yourselves and to all the flock, among which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers, to shepherd the church of God which He purchased with His own blood. For I know this, that after my departure savage wolves will come in among you, not sparing the flock. Also from among yourselves men will rise up, speaking perverse

things, to draw away the disciples after themselves.”

Mr. Herbert Armstrong read this to us and he said, ‘Fellows, this is not a statement of what has happened in the past; it’s a prophecy of what’s going to happen in the future. This is going to happen again. Don’t let it happen to you.’ I remember that very emphatically and the point emphatically made as only Mr. Herbert Armstrong could make it. I had never heard Mr. Armstrong go through this scripture in that way either before or after. But that Feast, for some reason, he was inspired and I think I know why he was.

He was inspired of God to go through that section in his address to the ministry and to really drive it home. ‘This is going to happen! Don’t let it happen to you!’ What really impressed me was that just a matter of weeks later, there were a number of those in the room who heard those words, who did allow it to happen to them—some within a matter of weeks, some within a matter of months, some over the course of the next few years. The point is that people can be warned and they don’t always heed the warning.

There are going to be those in the Millennium who are going to be warned, ‘Look, Satan is chained up right now. The time is going to come when he is going to be turned loose and he’s going to try to deceive you—and this is the way he’s going to do it. Don’t let it happen to you.’ There are going to be those who ignore that, and it will ultimately lead to their destruction. The whole world ultimately has a choice set before it—good and evil, right and wrong. Israel of old had that choice (Deuteronomy 30:15, 19). We have that choice today. The people who live in the Millennium ultimately are going to have to be given a chance to choose.

For a period of time, they will have the right way instilled in them. Satan won’t be around to “muddy the waters.” We will be able to create a society without Satan’s influence, but they are going to have to make a decision to reject that influence. God has to know that if they had a choice, they would choose the right. If they never had that choice, it would be a little different.

Question: In the book of Revelation, it talks about the various tribes and it talks about the 12 tribes. The question relates to the fact that most people, even in the Israelite tribes, have some level of mixture in terms of a tribal mixture. If they are going to be separated out, there are

many who would not be totally of one specific tribe and the same would be for ethnic groups as well.

Answer: I think the principle is the fact that God is ultimately the One who will tend to that. In cases like that, people normally take after one side of the family or the other, and there is a sense of identity that is there. Many things are obviously clear. Some things or some issues may not be as clear. That's why some of those things will have to be resolved when Christ comes because He is the only One that knows how to sort out the details in the appropriate way. Perhaps much of it would not be unclear, but some would be in terms of how God would allocate things and assign individuals as He reallocates the earth as recorded there in Revelation.

Question: Is it permissible for a baptized member to date a non-baptized individual under any conditions?

Answer: The basic principle of dating, of course, goes back to marriage. For one who has made a commitment to God—who has been baptized and is converted—to become involved with someone who is not, is not appropriate.

In the context of the Church and young people who have grown up in the Church and who are here as a part of the congregation, we sometimes have situations where there are some who are baptized and some who are not—basically, that young adult age spread. In terms of single dating and in terms of anything that would involve romantic involvement, something of that sort really shouldn't go that far. There needs to be a common bond in terms of commitment to God's way.

It may be partially on what you mean as a "date." In the context of Church socials or participating in young adults group activities, something of that sort, it is a little bit different. It would be best that if someone has a specific question on that, it is the kind of thing that's best handled on an individual basis. If someone has a specific question, they can check with me on it personally.

Question: The question involves the fact that the Catholic Church has issued a new catechism. The Catholic Church, in issuing the new catechism, states, "doctrines and scriptures should be understood to reflect more accurately the current mood and consciousness of society." This is stated in the introduction of the Catholic Bible Course. The question relating to that is:

Would that be accurate from a Biblical standpoint?

Answer: The scripture is very clear that Jesus Christ came preaching the gospel or the good news of the kingdom of God. God's message is not designed to reflect the current mood and standards of society. Society has cut itself off from God and chosen to go its own way. Jesus Christ came with God's message.

Malachi 3:1, you might notice, "Behold, I send My messenger, and he will prepare the way before Me. And the Lord, whom you seek, will suddenly come to His temple, even the Messenger of the covenant, in whom you delight. 'Behold, He is coming,' says the Lord of hosts."

What do we find here? We find that Jesus Christ was to come as the Messenger of the covenant. He came proclaiming the message of the New Covenant. It was a prophesy that a messenger would be sent to prepare the way before the One who was coming as the Messenger of the covenant.

Acts 10:36-37, you might notice, "The word which God sent to the children of Israel, preaching peace through Jesus Christ—He is Lord of all—that word you know, which was proclaimed throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee after the baptism which John preached..."

You want to know about the gospel or the origin of the gospel that Jesus preached?

Mark 1:14-15, we're told, "Now after John was put in prison, Jesus came to Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, 'The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand. Repent, and believe in the gospel.'"

Peter said in Acts 10 that this message was "the word which God sent." So, who's the origin? Where did the message originate? It originated with God. It was "sent to the children of Israel." Jesus Christ was the Messenger and the message had to do with peace. It began to be published, starting in "Galilee, after the baptism which John preached."

Mark 1:14, when we come back, we see, "after John was put in prison, Jesus came to Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God..." That's the only way to peace. The good news of the Kingdom of God is the way that peace is coming, and that is the only way. That is the good news that holds the key to peace.

This was a message about the New Covenant. What is the New Covenant? The New Covenant has to do with God writing His laws in our hearts and in our minds (Jeremiah 31:31-33; Hebrews

8:10). Jesus did not come with a message that was going to do away with the law. He came with a message that had to do with putting the law in our hearts and in our minds.

The gospel was the message of the Kingdom of God. What does a kingdom have? First and foremost, a kingdom has a king, doesn't it? It has laws, it has subjects, and it has territories. Jesus Christ came with a message that made all of those things plain.

You remember Daniel 2:32-35. We've gone through this numerous times. You remember the great image that Nebuchadnezzar saw: the head of gold, the breast and arms of silver, the thighs of brass, the legs of iron, the feet of iron and clay and the ten toes. The stone cut out without hands comes down and smashes the image on its feet, and the image turns to dust and blows away. The stone becomes a great mountain that fills the earth.

Daniel 2:44, we're told, "'And in the days of those kings [the final ten] the God of heaven will set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people; it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever.'"

The God of heaven is going to set up a kingdom. Where is it going to be set up? It's going to be set up on the earth. It's going to rule over all the kingdoms of this world.

Revelation 11:15, we read, "... 'The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ, and He shall reign forever and ever!'"

Revelations 19:16, the kingdom of God is going to hold sway over all the earth. Jesus Christ is going to rule as "KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS."

Isaiah 2:3, the law will go forth from Zion.

Jesus Christ came with a message of the good news about how peace is going to come and how we can have a part in that.

Matthew 25:34, the kingdom of God is something that we can inherit.

John 3:5, it is something that we can enter. That gets into a whole different subject. I've gone into that in some of the outlying Bible studies.

Jesus Christ did not come with a message that simply reflected the spirit of the age. He came with a message that reflected the Spirit of God. The spirit of the age has been different things at different times. The spirit of the age has never been in tune with the Spirit of God. It's not in our time and it wasn't in the time of Christ.

1 Corinthians 9:22, Paul brings out the statement, "...I have become all things to all

men, that I might by all means save some." Paul used psychology, in a right way, to help them to understand.

In terms of the way Paul approached the subject, let's notice a couple of examples in the book of Acts. Let's notice the different approach with a different audience.

Acts 17:22, notice, "Then Paul stood in the midst of the Areopagus and said, 'Men of Athens, I perceive that in all things you are very religious...'" - 'You're exceedingly religious.'

Verses 23-26, "'for as I was passing through and considering the objects of your worship, I even found an altar with this inscription: TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Therefore, the One whom you worship without knowing, Him I proclaim to you: God, who made the world and everything in it, since He is Lord of heaven and earth, does not dwell in temples made with hands. Nor is He worshiped with men's hands, as though He needed anything, since He gives to all life, breath, and all things. And He has made from one blood every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, and has determined their pre-appointed times and the boundaries of their habitation...'"

Verse 28, "'for in Him we live and move and have our being, as also some of your own poets have said, 'For we are also His offspring.''" Here he quotes from one of the Greek poets.

Verse 29, "'Therefore, since we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Divine Nature is like gold or silver or stone, something shaped by art and man's devising.'"

Verse 31, coming down, "'because He has appointed a day on which He will judge the world in righteousness by the Man whom He has ordained. He has given assurance of this to all by raising Him from the dead.'"

You can go through this whole section of Acts 17 and you'll find that Paul did not start out by quoting scripture. There aren't any verses that he quoted. In fact, the name Jesus Christ is not mentioned in this specific section. Paul was speaking to people who were not familiar with the Bible. He was talking to people who were unaware of Jesus Christ or any of the controversy that had surrounded Him. Paul introduced the subject starting from where they were to bring them to the fact and reality that there is a Creator God who is going to intervene and judge the creation, and there is One that He has borne testimony of through the resurrection as being the instrument of that judgment. It was an introduction. It was not everything there was to say, but it was the way Paul approached the

subject, dealing with people who didn't have any knowledge of the Bible.

Go to Acts 22 where he's speaking to Jews (people who were familiar with the Scriptures).

Acts 22:1-2, he said, "Men, brethren, and fathers, hear my defense before you now.' And when they heard that he spoke to them in the Hebrew language, they kept all the more silent." He spoke in Hebrew to really get their attention. He certainly didn't speak in Hebrew on Mars Hill; on Mars Hill he spoke in Greek. He approached the people from that standpoint. He started out by introducing himself.

Verse 3, he said, "I am indeed a Jew, born in Tarsus of Cilicia, but brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel, taught according to the strictness of our fathers' law, and was zealous toward God as you all are today."

He starts out emphasizing his relationship with the Jewish community—acknowledging and pointing out his study of the law.

Verses 4-14, he recounts the story of his conversion and goes on through.

You could notice other accounts that are directed toward the Jewish community. You could notice Peter's sermon in Acts 2 or you could notice Stephen's sermon in Acts 7, where Stephen started out with God appearing to Abraham (vv. 2-8), then gives sort of a synopsis of the Old Testament (vv. 9-53). Stephen was addressing Jews in Jerusalem who were familiar with the Scriptures.

If you're speaking to people who don't even know what a Bible is and you start quoting

verses of Scripture, that's not an effective starting point. You have to first lead them to the realization that the Bible is the Word of God and then prove to them what it says.

It doesn't do any good to prove to a Buddhist what the Bible says when you haven't even proven to him that the Bible is the Word of God. You have to start with people based on where they are. The message is the same; the standards of God don't change, but their technique and approaches are different. You can go through the book of Acts and find that there were different approaches used with different audiences, but they weren't coming to different conclusions and they weren't preaching different gospels. They simply used a different introduction to capture their attention and help them relate to the message they were conveying.

We have traditionally done that over the years. Years ago, when Mr. Herbert Armstrong was traveling in some of the foreign countries (particularly in non-Christian areas), he used an approach modeled much more after Acts 17. When he was speaking to audiences that had a general familiarity with the Bible, his approach was different. We have, I think, an appropriate way of approaching the subject, but it does not allow for different gospels. The one gospel that Jesus Christ brought from God—the message that He came proclaiming—is the good news of the Kingdom of God which He bore witness. That is God's message.

CONTENT CORRECTIONS

[Editorial Comment: Last revision was completed in June, 2017. The posted lessons on the website reflect these corrections.]

CORRECTION – Bible Study #1,
page 7, L, par. 2, line 2—"there has (add "not") arisen in Israel a prophet...

CORRECTION – Bible Study # 2,
Page 1, R, par. 5, line 3—"This next period was at the time of David and Samuel."
Move sentence to end of paragraph.
page 9, chart, line 15, should be Joshua-Judges not Joshua-James.

CORRECTION – Bible Study #3,
page 4, L, par. 5, line 4—"...that was built (not "build") many years ago....

CORRECTION – Bible Study #8 & 9,
Page 7, L, par. 1—"If we go through Genesis 10, the European stock primarily comes from Shem (not "Ham"), the African stock comes from Ham and the oriental and certain eastern European stock comes from Japheth. Ham's wife was Naamah, a descendant of Cain." (Check the whole paragraph; there are several corrections.)

CORRECTION – Bible Study #14,
Page 2, L, par. 3—look that up on the website. We changed a good portion of the paragraph and you'll see and can correct your copy.

CORRECTION – Bible Study #17,
Page 11, R, par. 5, line 1-2—"The Roman Emperors had the title going back through the Pontifex Maximus of Pergamum (not "Rome").

CORRECTION – Bible Study #20,
page 13, L, par. 8—Joshua 17-21 should be Judges 17-21; par. 9, Joshua 17 should be Judges 17; par. 11, Joshua 17:10 should be Judges 17:10; R, par. 1, Joshua 18:1 should be Judges 18:1.

CORRECTION – Bible Study #20 Question sheet,
Question #14, "What was the ancestry of the "preacher for hire" (not "preacher on fire").

CORRECTION – Bible Study # 24,
Page 8, L, par. 4, line 2—"articles of silver (not "sliver").

CORRECTION – Bible Study #26,
page 13, R, last par., lines 4, 7, 10, 14—the month is "Ab" NOT "Ob"...

CORRECTION – Bible Study #27,
page 1, L, 7 lines from the bottom—"to the time Ezra came" NOT "to the time Zerubbabel came"—
page 1, L, par. 1, line 6—"...was a subsequent invasion a few years later in 596 B.C. (not "592 B.C").

CORRECTION – Bible Study #28,
page 2, R, last par., line 2—"You see, the Persian Empire had not gone that far east (not "west")." We made several correction and suggest you reprint your copy.

CORRECTION – Bible Study #41,
Page 8, L, par. 5, line 4 and 11—"...went to Cyprus (not Cypress)..."
Page 12, R, par. 7, line 1—"what Paul and Silas (not Barnabas) were doing."
page 13, L, par. 5, line 1—"Paul went from there to Athens (not "Rome")."

CORRECTION – Bible Study #47,
page 4, L, par. 5, line 2—"...Isaiah's life, but according to Jewish tradition he was sawn in two by the order of the wicked king Manasseh during the first year of his (Manasseh's) reign."
page 6, R, par. 5, line 1—"Jeremiah began his ministry, as I mentioned, a couple of decades prior to the time that Judah began to go into captivity. Jeremiah began his ministry 100 years or more later than Isaiah. Jeremiah 1:1-2, he began his ministry during the 13th year of King Josiah, which would date it to 625 BC and about 60 years after the death of Isaiah."
page 8, R, par. 4, lines 7-8—"Manasseh, evidently, put Isaiah to death at the beginning of his reign (not "at the beginning of Jeremiah's ministry"), and there wasn't an active, prophetic ministry that was done openly."

CORRECTION – Bible Study #54
page 1, R, last line—"and setting up camp outside (not "inside") the walls of..."
page 10, L, 2nd to last par. line 3—"Revelation 17:2, John (not "Jeremiah") describes the Beast power...
page 13, L, par. 1, line 4—"...king of Babylon), Nebuzaradan (not "Nebuchadnezzar"), the captain of the guards....

CORRECTION – Bible Study #55
page 5, L, par. 4, line 9—"...and it shall be besieged (not "besiege"), and you shall lay...."

CORRECTION – Bible Study # 56

page 9, R, par. 8, line 4—“...a number of decades after (not “before”) Ezekiel wrote.”

CORRECTION – Bible Study #70

page 8, R, under "Third", line 2—"One of the great roles (not "rolls") ...

page 9, L, par. 1, line 3—"...weekly news (not "new")....

CORRECTION – Bible Study # 91

Page 23, L, 2nd to last par., line 8—“anniversary of the establishment of Christianity in Russia (not Rome).

CORRECTION – Bible Study # 92

Page 7, R, par. 1, last 3 lines—“Then God raised up the prophets Haggai and Zechariah (not “a prophet”), and Zerubbabel (not “and he”) finished the temple.”

CORRECTION – Bible Study # 106

Page 5, R, par. 2, line 10—"The Queen of the South, who flourished nine centuries after (not "before") the people of Sodom and Gomorrah—...."