

When it says God tempted David to do this, it doesn't say Satan did. When it says Satan did, it doesn't say God did.

Question: Wasn't it true that the name of one of the disciples was Cleopas? Wasn't Cleopas at the crucifixion with his wife? Wouldn't it be natural he was going home with his wife rather than with some other disciple?

There is some evidence drawn from some other verses to suggest it was a man and wife rather than two men, and that is altogether proper. God wants us to compare Scripture with Scripture and get all the evidence we can. But in this case, if it had said two men, I still think we would be justified in saying man is used in the generic sense in which man is often referred to. But God led the human writer not to use the word "man" which would give many people the idea they were both males. But using "disciples:" leaves it open and you are perfectly justified to draw evidence from elsewhere, but we can't draw it from this particular verse. Most likely it was his wife but in this case she had to go a little early in order to do the shopping!~~XXXXXXXX~~

Question: Last summer a work came out that was called the Chronology of the Bible and follow the chronology accurately. I'd seen a copy and it was more detailed than I originally thought; it went all the way back to the Garden of Eden and had Adam and Eve created on Friday, the sixth day of creation. I've heard that . . . according to this author creation was 5000 yrs. ago. Others say there is such lapse of undiscernable time that we have no idea how long ago it was. What is the thought today on that?

Different people have different thoughts. I can only give mine. I read a book . . . if you take the dates from Noah's descendants that Noah's son Lamech may very well have been a guest at Abraham's weddingfeast. I don't say that's impossible but it strikes me as tremendously unlikely. When we turn to the NT we read "Jesus the son of David, the son of Abraham." Suppose I told you I was the son of Charlemagne; you'd laugh wouldn't you? But I can trace my genealogy back (to him) as I think everybody else could too if they had all the facts. I think everyone living is a descendant of Charlemagne . . . We today when we use "son" mean the next generation, but in the Bible it is regularly used for a descendant. The word father . . . we would say, your ancestor. The word has a wider extent of meaning than our present word. That's easily shown. It's my personal opinion that when it says, He begat, it means he became an ancestor of. In other words, when he had a son this son was either the man named or it was an ancestor of the man named. Consequently I do not believe it is God's purpose to give us a precise chronology during those years, precise dating. We do not have our modern system of dating as I noted until 500 A.D. there were various types of dating used. I don't think God intended us to have a system of dating. If you took all those generations as strictly continuous you'd have the flood c. 2500 B.C. , and you do have traces that go back at least to 3500, some would say 5000 B.C.