

More Stuff About Esau's Clan

Genesis, A Teaching Series

By William J. Sturm

sermonaudio.com

Bible Text: Genesis 36
Preached on: Sunday, June 28, 2015

Berean Baptist Church
517 Glensford Drive
Fayetteville, NC 28314

Website: www.bereanbaptistchurch.org
Online Sermons: www.sermonaudio.com/bereanbaptistch

What that will basically mean is that I will probably have to repeat your questions since the microphone probably won't pick them up as well as normal. Genesis 36, remember last week we got started on a discussion of why the genealogy is used in Genesis 36, why do we have these genealogies in Genesis 36 and we talked about a few things. We talked about basically the first 3 ½ of 7 reasons why we might have this genealogy in Genesis 36, "Now these are the generations of Esau, who is Edom." We talked about how that was repeated four times in this chapter that Esau is Edom. We talked about what Edom meant. We talked about who Esau was. We talked about why we probably wouldn't expect the genealogy of Esau and we talked about why it's probably where it is.

Look at verse 35 of this chapter, "And Husham died, and Hadad the son of Bedad, who smote Midian in the field of Moab, reigned in his stead: and the name of his city was Avith." Alright so now we're talking about Midian, alright? Because here he is now, he's being found in the middle of a genealogy in chapter 36 and verse 35. Midian was smitten in the field of Moab and who did it? Hadad, the son of Bedad. Any ideas?

Chapter 25, thank you. Chapter 25. Verse 1, "Then again Abraham took a wife, and her name was Keturah." So this is Abraham's second wife of which we have a name, of whose name we have. So you have Sarah and Keturah. Verse 2, "And she bare him Zimran, and Jokshan, and Medan, and Midian." So here is this Midian character and we find out when he died it was in chapter 36. So now you are getting an idea that some of these people that are related to Esau are killing fellow kinsmen, right?

Now how is Esau related to Abraham again? Anyone remember? Okay, so Abraham had Isaac. Well, he didn't have Isaac, you know. Alright, so Abraham and Sarah had Isaac and Isaac and Rebekah, so grandson, right? Esau is a grandson of Abraham, not a great-grandson, but small problem. So what you have here are the descendants so how would that make Esau and Midian, then? Esau and Midian? What would Midian be to Esau? An uncle. An uncle because remember Esau's father is Isaac and Abraham is Isaac's father and Midian's father, right? So that would make Midian in a very strange and distant sort of half-relation way, an uncle to Esau. So Esau's people in chapter 36 are at least involved with killing the people of his uncle, okay?

So, anyway, I just thought you'd be interested in seeing that, some of you. Some of you are like, "No." Talk to you about chapter 36, let's go back there and talk about another man that might show up later in the biblical account. Verse 32. Thank you very much. Alright, look at verse 32, "And Bela the son of Beor reigned in Edom: and the name of his city was Dinhabah." So verse 32, you have this guy named Bela, the son of Beor. Now I just want us to be aware if we can think through this real quick, we don't know exactly how many years past Moses this genealogy reaches, okay? It could go possibly many many years past the writer, Moses, and again, that should tell you, incidentally, that Moses didn't write the entire genealogy.

So if that's true, then, then this Beor here, since we're talking about Moab and we're talking about Midian, this should probably remind you of another character that's going to come along in Numbers. Who? Think about it. Think Moab because we're talking about people that are from Moab. Yeah, Balaam, son of Beor in the book of Numbers. So we could be very well dealing here with the brother of Balaam, the Moabite prophet in Numbers 24. So a lot of these people are found throughout the other parts of Scripture and that might be why their part of the genealogy was added, okay? Okay.

Then I want you to notice all the possible connections between this genealogy and the book of Job. There are many but let me give you a couple of them. If you'll look in verse 3 of chapter 36, "Bashemath Ishmael's daughter, sister of Nebajoth." Then we get a little further and we find verse 10, "These are the names of Esau's sons; Eliphaz the son of Adah the wife of Esau." Okay, all of a sudden we have this guy named Eliphaz and he is Esau's, really his firstborn son, right? So who is Eliphaz in the book of Job if it's the same Eliphaz? Yeah, one of the three friends of Job.

Now if you've been saved a while, it is really time for you to be able to say that you have read most of your Bible. I mean, it's the only book God wrote so if you've been saved about 10 years and you haven't read every word of your Bible, it's time to get on the stick, alright? It just is. You say, "Well, I've never read Job." It's 42 chapters of your Bible, okay? That is not a small chunk. It's like people says, "I've never read Ezekiel." I'll grant you, you probably won't read much of that on a bus but if you've been saved for a decade and you haven't read Ezekiel, I don't want to shame you but you said you believed this book, how can you say with confidence you believe a book you haven't read? So let's quit being hypocritical about this thing, 48 chapters of Ezekiel, 42 chapters of Job, now you're up to 90 chapters. There's only 1,189 chapters in the entire Bible. You may say, "Well, that's, like, a lot." Well, 90 of them are in two books, then you take 150 out for what? Psalms. And we know how many Proverbs has because everyone tells us you read one a day, so there are 31 of those, right? So, really, honestly, if you take all the books that you have read and you put them in, you may be a little shocked at how little of the Bible you've actually read.

So Eliphaz is one of the three friends of Job. Eliphaz, Zophar, and Bildad are the three guys that show up to comfort Job and to some degree they were a comfort. But anyway, that's one connection. Another connection is probably in verse 33, "Bela died, and Jobab

the son of Zerah of Bozrah reigned in his stead. And Jobab died." A lot of people think, I'm one of them, that's Job. The second king of Edom is a guy by the name of Jobab.

(??) You always ask such deep reflective ideas in your thinking, right?

So you have Jobab in here, you have Eliphaz in here, then look at verse 28, you have this guy in this genealogy several generations back, his name is Uz. Where is Job from? He lives in the land of Uz. Uz is in Edom. That's interesting, isn't it? I mean, that's a pretty good connection. You have Job living in Uz which is in Edom. How do I know it's in Edom? I use a concordance and I find all the places where Uz is used and in Lamentations 4, which is a book in your Bible, Lamentations 4 it says that Uz is in Edom.

So here's a genealogy about Edom. There's a guy that lives there, his name is Uz. We don't know how far down the genealogy he is in comparison to this King Jobab, but if it's far enough up toward the top, it could be it's the same Eliphaz, the same Job. You have a lot of the same geographies mentioned. Then, I suppose probably another possibility is in verse 17, "these are the sons of Reuel Esau's son; duke Nahath, duke Zerah," you might have chief, "duke Shammah, duke Mizzah: these are the dukes," or chiefs, "that came of Reuel in the land of Edom." So we have Reuel, this Reuel guy being in the land of Edom. Well, that's significant.

Now think about this if you can help me for just a minute. Let me see if I can just sketch this a little bit. It won't be much. Here's the Mediterranean Sea. Here is the Sea of Galilee. Here is the Dead Sea. Here is the Jordan River in between them. Down here is what you might call Saudi Arabia or Arabia down here. What did that used to be of the geographies we've mentioned so far? Saudi Arabia would be called what? Moses went there 40 years. Midian. So you see there was a guy named Midian in this genealogy. He's killed. Well, apparently he was there long enough to build a family or a family who is named after him. You have a guy up here in Edom, Edom is right about here and part of Edom became known as Moab. So you have all these places that are taking on the names of their settlers. Who do you think settled in Canaan? Yes, very good, Canaan. Again, these places are named that because later on their descendants gave them, or I should say they took on the name of the people that settled there. So Edom, Moab, Ammon is up in here, not up in here but in here. So you have Moab, you have Edom, you have Midian all here southeast of the Dead Sea in what you might call the Jordan Valley.

So if that's true, and it is, then this Reuel guy, who is that other than maybe a figure in a genealogy? It might be a separate figure altogether. Who is it? Does anyone know? He's called about three different things in the Old Testament and that's okay because some of us have different middle names. If you're of the right ethnicity, you've got like seven or eight and they're all hyphenated. What?

("Moses' father-in-law.") Moses' father-in-law, otherwise known as... He has a rope belt. Jethro, right. That's a different Jethro, alright.

So Reuel is another name for Moses' father-in-law, so what am I trying to get you to remember all this? No, I'm just trying to get you to think with me that there is a lot of stuff buried in these genealogies if you care enough to read them, okay? And most of you do. Most of you do, but you probably won't do it if you want to give five minutes to reading your Bible every day. Honestly, you probably just won't. You've got to graduate past the daily bread stuff eventually.

Go ahead? ("When we read the Scriptures, so many times we look at Israel in the Old Testament and the Christian church in the New Testament but this is another example of how interrelated even non-scriptural people were in that area in the history of Israel. I mean, the grandsons of Noah and everybody came from Noah after the flood. So there are a lot of relationships there that don't just go away because you only write about the Israelites.") That's true, and the proximity to the flood is striking when you realize that you're talking about 2300 BC for a flood and maybe 2400 BC for a flood, 2200 BC, I have the numbers in my other Bible, for a Tower of Babel. All of a sudden you are dealing with just a few hundred, 400-500 years maybe between the flood and Abraham's grandchildren's lives. So it's incredibly compressed.

The line I'm trying to draw between Moses and Job is that in the commentary I'm working on for Job, I have already done a little research, who wrote Job? Well, a lot of the parts of it, it's clearly Job couldn't have written it. So I argue for the fact that Moses, because why would you, think about it now, you're a Jew, why would you agree to putting a book about a Gentile in your canon? Job is not a Jew. Job lives in Uz, okay? So it must mean that someone who's a Hebrew was instrumental in bringing that book into a Hebrew canon. They were huge into making sure Hebrews had everything to do with the Hebrew religion. They wouldn't have taken some account of some Gentile over there that's a descendant of Esau and stick him in a Hebrew canon. He doesn't belong in there. So I would say, I've always argued for the fact that Moses wrote the prologue and epilogue of Job and got the record of the conversations between Job and his friends from Elihu or Eliphaz and Reuel, his father-in-law, who is from, it says right here in this genealogy, from Edom. Where did Moses meet his father-in-law? In Midian. So he meets him here where we're told that Reuel, it could be a different guy. I got it, but a guy by the same name came from here, alright? And Moses is here for 40 years, there's no need to not think at least surmise here, why do we need to guess at that? Because I want to. It's fun, alright? I want to see where do I think, why do I think Job is written by someone other than Job? I just gave you a good reason.

That's true and let's remind ourselves how I was talking with someone, I can't remember so if it's you, I'm not trying to tell on you. I don't remember who I was talking to about this but Job as much a descendant of Esau as he was, he sure did have a grand understanding of Genesis 3:15 because it says in Job 19, "I know that my Redeemer lives and that he'll stand at the latter day upon the earth." He had a very very solid understanding of being redeemed, of the last day, of resurrection. He said, "Even if maggots eat this body, yet in this body I will see God." Now that is a pretty advanced understanding for a descendant of Esau and there are 42 chapters of that and you'd better know I'm not going to preach every word of that.

("Reuel and Jethro, he gave very good wisdom or advice to Moses in the time of him leading so there is definitely God's teaching going on in other strings of the descendants of Abraham other than just through the line of Isaac.") Right. That's a major argument. God left everyone else in the dark. No, he didn't. You have Job and he's right here and he knows something about a resurrection and a last day.

So here's basically what you said. Okay, what did you just say in the last five minutes? Here it is. The story of Job happened here. We're told of a guy named Reuel that lived here. We're told that Moses meets a guy here and marries his daughter whose name is Reuel. We're told he came from Edom. So it's a possibility that's how the record of at least the story or the epic or the conversations from Job got to Moses who since he wrote five books of the Bible, was probably pretty weighty in getting Job in there too, in my very humble but correct opinion.

John, do you have anything to add? ("I've never seen that piece of Uz and Lamentations 4:21 says the daughter of Edom dwells in the land of Uz.") Yeah. Yeah, there's a great connection there and I guess it's what I try to do in here, Brother John, everyone, is I try to see what can we get if we don't use anything except the Bible. That's all I'm trying to do here is demonstrate that week after week. If all I have is the Bible, what do I come up with? It's the desert island challenge, okay? I mean, if you want me to pull out someone's great thoughts, you're in the wrong class, okay? I'm not going to make sure everyone in here has books and that we can get some dude's opinion if we can find it in here. If we can find it in here, that's what I want to do.

Alright, so, lastly, what does this genealogy have to do with Jesus? Now we've talked about it a little bit. We've kind of surfaced it a little bit. So do we see Esau or Edom showing up at all in the life of Jesus, which would be really interesting because Jesus is a descendant of Jacob, so if we could find the descendants of Esau somewhere in Jesus' life.

("King Herod.") King Herod is Idumean, which is a New Testament, the New Testament equivalent to the Old Testament Edomite. So the Herods are Edomites. Pretty wild, huh? So you're dealing with, let's see, 1,500 years later, you have Jesus standing in front of Herod and being mistreated. You have John the Baptist being killed by Herod. You have Esau killing John the Baptist. You have Esau having a hand in killing Jesus, okay? So that's the big Jesus picture.

Alright, now I'd like to... Do you have any comments or questions at all? Mike? Okay.

Alright well, I want to show you something I would like to fix from a last lesson, not the last lesson. Look at chapter 31 and without telling you what verse I want to go to, I want to ask you if you can remember with me, please, how far did we say it was from Paddan-aram or Haran, which is in present-day Turkey, how far is it from there to Beersheba or Bethel, whichever you want to go with? There's about 50 miles between those two places but if you get the ballpark figure, we'll go with either one. I don't particularly care. But

how far did we say it was between Haran and the Promised Land? Does anyone remember? About 400 miles. In fact, I think the lesson you taught or maybe it was John who talked about how probably it took the camel train that would have gone to get Rebekah would have taken more than a month to travel there. So I have to admit, when I read this verse and I taught it, I was like, "I don't feel comfortable with what I just said." So I've been doing some thinking on it for about two months, alright?

So look at chapter 31 because, remember, the test is not, "Will you buy what I'm saying?" The test is, "Am I correct?" So I'm trying to make sure that when I tell you something, that not only is it believable but is it correct. That's really important to me. So please notice in verse 17 of Genesis 31, "Jacob rose up, and set his sons and his wives upon camels; And he carried away all his cattle, and all his goods which he had gotten, the cattle of his getting," wow, he got what he gets, or something, "which he had gotten in Padanaram," so he got the cattle that he had gotten, "for to go to Isaac his father in the land of Canaan." So he is traveling – listen now – about 300 miles at the very most minimum suggestion, okay? Let's see if you see the problem.

"And Laban went to shear his sheep: and Rachel had stolen the images that were her father's. And Jacob stole away unawares to Laban the Syrian, in that he told him not that he fled. So he fled with all that he had; and he rose up, and passed over the river, and set his face toward the mount Gilead." Which if I had pictures, which I don't, I'm sorry, I had them ready. But whoa, okay, I guess we'll get to that and see here. I have one of them. Let's see. Oh well, who even knows. Who even knows. Does anyone know how to operate that clicker back there? If not, just never mind. You act like you don't see it and I'll be okay, alright?

So in verse 20, "Jacob stole away unawares to Laban the Syrian, in that he told him not that he fled. So he fled," verse 21, got toward mount Gilead. "And it was told Laban on the third day that Jacob was fled." Okay, on the third day. Is everyone with me? Okay. Thank you. So, I appreciate it, sir.

So verse 22, "And it was told Laban on the third day that Jacob was fled." Is everyone with me? Okay. "And he took his brethren with him, and pursued after him seven days' journey; and they overtook him in the mount Gilead." Okay, okay, so let's just forget about... I don't know where he got those. Those are not it. Alright, so, how far are they traveling and how far according to the text did they travel? How long did they travel and how far did they travel?

("Ten days.") Thank you. Let's just... Ten days to travel how far according to what we've said?

("That's 30 miles a day with herds, the family.") Yeah. Either that or there's an acceptable Hebraic figure of speech going on here. We have two choices, either Jacob was able to travel at about four times the normal speed with camels full of, now four wives, children and tons of herds. We've said and we gave all the statistics that it would have taken them 30 days to travel on camels and there were only 10 camels and it was only the entourage,

Genesis 24, of Abraham's servant, right? Traveling 30 days. Now we're saying that with probably 100 times that, they traveled almost the same distance in 10 days. So this is why some have said that it's an error. Yes, some have said that. That's one of your choices. When you see something that doesn't make sense in the Bible, you can say it's an error. You sure can, but you're in the wrong room for that, alright?

The next question is: well, then what could it mean? What could it mean? Well, here's a commentator named Kenneth Matthews that says 3 and 7 are formulaic expressions for relatively shorter and longer durations, not to be taken as 10 actual days. So from Haran to Gilead, which is 400 miles, this is what the man says, "It far exceeds what a caravan would be expected to travel in such time, moving only about," listen to this, "six miles a day because of the size of the herd." So if you do the math, you know, you talk about six miles a day, you're talking about almost 70 days, thereabout. Sixty days would get you 360 miles if you're only traveling six miles a day with that huge herd.

Alright, so what are the possibilities? The possibilities of that 3 is symbolic of a very few and 7 is symbolic of many more. That's a possibility. The usage here is another, this is the Faith Life Study Bible says, "The usage here of 3 and 7 suggests that this combination does not require that a day be interpreted as a 24 hour day. Even when combined with a numeral, it's unlikely that Laban pursued Jacob for 7 consecutive 24 hour periods in the desert without sleeping or resting his animals." So again, you can get upset with me for even bringing this up if you'd like, you can to that, but just know that this is a problem if you're going to read it like a 2015 American, traveling 400 miles in 7 days without the huge herds for Laban, 400 miles in 10 days total for Jacob with the huge herd.

Now you say, "Well, that doesn't make any sense. Why would they say 3 for just a few and 7 for several?" Well, we do that. The actual definition of a few is..... Right. But if you want someone to think that they're about to be right there when they're really not, what would you say? I'll be there in a few minutes, and "few" does not mean 3. So anymore than a couple means 2, but that is the definition of a couple.

Yes? I need 2 or 3 people out with me. I don't mean 2 or 3, I mean lots. So I'm just saying that you need to leave the door open that even though you don't have a perfect example, a perfect explanation for how 3 and 7 are symbolic here, you probably should assume that sometimes when those numbers are used, they're used symbolically.

I would like to give you an example of what I'm talking about, New Testament example. I can't give you an internal biblical example of how 7 means many and 3 means few, but I can give you a few reminders of how numbers in the book of Genesis are used symbolically. Let me give you a couple. How many times did Jacob say Laban changed his wages? Ten. Do you think it was 10 exactly? Well, was 10 probably an exaggeration for it?

("He changed it all the time.") All the time, yeah. Many. Okay, so there's an example. That's shaky ground. I'm not asking you to apply this as a strict hermeneutic throughout.

Okay, I used a big word, sorry. I'm not asking you to use this as a strict standard for how to interpret all numbers in the Bible, alright?

Let's see if you can quote this verse with me, or at least think along with me. 1 Corinthians 15:1, "Moreover, I declare unto you the gospel which you have received which I preached unto you wherein you stand. If you would keep in mind the things which I have preached unto you, unless you have believed in vain, for I preach unto you that which also I have received, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures." Is everyone paying attention here? Make sure we're getting this. "That he was buried and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." Now look here, you're going to have a pretty difficult time looking through the Old Testament and finding a very explicit reference to Jesus getting up on the third day. It's going to be very hard to find that.

So one of two things: Paul is wrong or there are several ways to take one verse in the Old Testament. I mean, don't you think that they would have expected Jesus to get up the third day if it was that explicit in the Old Testament? So let me show you what they had in the Old Testament. Look at Hosea, that's in your Bible, Hosea 6. Hosea is the husband of who? This is even funnier. Gomer. Yeah. So next week, we'll get on with Genesis 37 and Joseph and it will be a little bit lighter. I understand this is kind of heavy and kind of deep and I'm sorry, sort of.

("Is that like a few?") Sort of. Sorry, sort of. That means I feel bad that you feel bad about it.

So chapter 6, look at verse 1. If you haven't found it yet, I think you can probably reap some benefit by simply listening, alright? Here we go, "Come, and let us return unto the LORD: for he hath torn, and he will heal us; he hath smitten, and he will bind us up. After two days will he revive us: in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight." Does everyone know exactly what that's talking about? Well, of course you don't. I just dropped into the middle of a context. It would take us a while to determine what does that mean, but if I were to tell you that that's the only reference in the Old Testament to something happening on the third day was someone rising up, you'd be like, "What?" It's the only reference in the Old Testament for anyone rising on the third day and yet we're told that Jesus, the Gospel of Christ, was that he rose again the third day after dying for our sins, he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures. By the time 1 Corinthians 15 was written, which Gospels were already written? Zero. None of them. None of them were written. So the Scriptures are not talking about New Testament Scriptures. 1 Corinthians 15, Christ died for our sins, was buried, rose again on the third day according to the Scriptures is talking about Old Testament Scripture otherwise what's the point if he's not fulfilling prophecy? Right?

So here we have this and so what gives us the license now to say that Hosea is talking about Jesus? Can anyone think of it?

("Hosea means salvation.") That's true and I like that. What are some other ideas that can tell us internally within Hosea, if you have read Matthew. I might be giving it away here. What are some ideas in Hosea that tell you that we could probably use, talk about the people of Israel and apply it to Jesus?

Alright, are you still in Hosea 6? Okay. Why are we here? I'm trying to show you that this is the Scripture Paul was talking about that Jesus would rise again the third day. What gives me license to say that? I'm about to show you. Here we're talking about the people of Israel, they will be raised again the third day. I'm telling you that Paul was saying that that was talking about Christ rising from the dead on the third day. Is there any internal evidence that anyone else in Scripture thought this way? Alright, you've got to hold your place here, turn over to chapter 11. Look at verse 1, "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." Alright, that's pretty simple. Alright, that's cool. If all I have is the Old Testament, I'm like, okay, the people of Israel, what are they called? The son of God, right? Pretty simple. Alright, you just read it.

Don't move your hand from Hosea 6, let's look at Matthew 2. Use one hand for Hosea 6, another one for Hosea 11, use your third hand for Matthew 2. Alright, so Joseph is sleeping after Jesus is born and an angel appears to him in a dream and tells him to do what with Mary and Jesus? Go to Egypt, right? Look, please, at verse 13 of Matthew 2, "And when they were departed, behold, the angel of the Lord appeareth to Joseph in a dream, saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and flee into Egypt, and be thou there until I bring thee word: for Herod will seek the young child to destroy him." That was kind of a neat, closed circle. I didn't intend on, there's Herod. Anyway, verse 14, "When he arose, he took the young child and his mother by night, and departed into Egypt: And was there until the death of Herod: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my son." Matthew said that Hosea's talk about Israel was really about Jesus.

Alright, let's use that same principle, look at chapter 6 of Hosea again. Hosea 6:1-2, we now see a proof text in the Old Testament for Jesus rising from the dead on the third day. Does everyone see that? What gives me the right to do that? Matthew did it. Matthew told us that when you see Israel in Hosea, you should probably think in terms of prophecy, you should probably think of Jesus. Matthew said it. Why did he say it? I'm not going that deep. We don't know. I'm just saying that here we have a proof text for Jesus rising again on the third day from the dead, Hosea 6:2.

Now the question I have for you, my dear friends, is do you think that it was that clear to the people in AD 50ish reading 1 Corinthians?

("No, probably not.") Probably not. So if the use of numbers in the Old Testament can be a little foggy, the use of numbers in the Old Testament by New Testament authors can be a little foggy, then I think we should leave the door open that in Genesis 31, 3 days was sometimes thought of as something less or something more. Seven days was sometimes thought of as something less or something more but definitely more than 3.

You sure have. And by 100, you don't mean anything close to it. If you mean 9 or 10 or 11 but you got sick of counting, what do you call it? 100.

[unintelligible] ("300 to 400 miles separate these two locations and it cannot be done in 10 days. They would have known it better than us because, quite frankly, they lived in the same methodology of lifestyle that we don't really understand.") You're exactly right and there were a ton of Hebrew people that believed Moses' record in Genesis 31 who did not discredit it because of the numbers Moses used. They believed what Moses said and the spirit in which he said them.

So this is what I want you walking out the door with. I need everyone to make sure they're paying really good attention here. When we say is the Bible inerrant, we mean is it without error? We would say absolutely it is without error within the intent of the original author. If inerrant means that it really only would take 10 days for Jacob and his entourage to travel from Haran to Bethel, we would say, "Absolutely not." "Well, it says that." We believe it's 10 days within the intent of the author. Seven is much more than 3 if you're using them both symbolically. Do you see how that works?

So now I think everyone in this room, if you weren't already, maybe you're going to be better equipped when someone, a skeptic, do you know that there's a thing known as a Skeptics' Study Bible? I'm talking about footnotes like your King James Study Bible, like your John MacArthur New King James, like your Life Application NASB. I'm talking about a Skeptics' Study Bible so that when you pull out your Bible at their front door, they can pull out theirs and say, "Look at this nitwit. It says it took them 7 days to travel 400 miles. That's not possible." I've just prepared you for that. By God's grace, we are better prepared now to know that when those Old Testament authors used numbers, it's not as static as 2015 America is. It's just not.

Any comments or questions?

("We've used the same examples.") Right, you're exactly right and I guess, thank you for bringing that back up because I guess what I'm trying to say is we don't cut the same slack to the Bible that we do for ourselves and so, again, when the world out there says you're against homosexuality, your Bible doesn't even make sense, we say it makes great sense if you understand it as it's written by the author. It makes fine sense. "Well, it has errors in it." No, it doesn't if you understand it as it's written by the author. So this is pretty simple stuff.

Yes, Mary? ("I just have to say probably if anybody says there are errors in the Bible if you asked them which one, they couldn't even tell you.") Oh right. Yes, yes, they've got a list. They know Matthew 7:1, "Judge not that ye be not judged." They've got the one in Deuteronomy 22 on mixed fabrics. They've got that one figured out. So they've got a list of about 11 or 12 verses they have committed to partial memory and even the really smart ones, they've read the Bible once. So I hope you're getting the idea that this Bible is an amazing book.