

God: Deliverer, Not Destroyer

The Flood, the Plagues, the Conquest, and Unanswered Prayer, Read in Full

A study of the Flood, the plagues, the conquest and unanswered prayer, testing whether scripture presents God as their destroyer or as the deliverer within them.

Copyright 2026

Distribution of this study as is in its entirety is permitted & encouraged.

Author: John Lobota

Research Assistant: Claude Cowork

papertiq@bellsouth.net

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
The disconnect between what scripture says about God and what is commonly believed about him, the strongest case on the other side, and what this study does and does not claim.	
Chapter 1 — God Is Good, Always.....	10
Scripture's direct, repeated testimony to God's character, and the name it gives him: Deliverer.	
Chapter 2 — The Adversary.....	13
A real, named enemy who steals, kills and destroys, and Job 1-2 as scripture's own staged demonstration.	
Chapter 3 — The Figure of Speech.....	19
The Hebrew idiom of permission, shown working inside scripture itself, then applied to the hardest verses.	
Chapter 4 — The Flood: Judgment or Rescue?.....	25
Grief before judgment, long patience, a preacher of righteousness, and rescue built into the event — with Sodom as a second witness.	
Chapter 5 — The Plagues: Deliverance Wearing the Face of Disaster.....	30
A rescue announced before the first plague, escape offered along the way, and the destroyer kept from the door.	
Chapter 6 — "If You Don't Obey": Covenant Warnings, Not Caprice.....	35
Terms Israel agreed to, warnings sent for generations, and a curse that arrives when God hides his face.	
Chapter 7 — The Conquest: War Against the Carriers.....	39
The ban's stated reason, four centuries of patience, driving out before destroying, the language of totality, and what the text leaves unexplained.	
Chapter 8 — Amalek and the Long War on the Seed.....	46
From Rephidim to Saul to Haman the Agagite, and the spoil the Jews of Esther's day would not touch.	
Chapter 9 — When God Doesn't Answer.....	50
Job, Paul's thorn, Habakkuk, the present evil age, and a pastoral word against blaming every sufferer.	

Chapter 10 — Closing: The Deliverer, Not the Destroyer.....55

What each chapter found, how firmly, what would change this study's mind, and where it finally resolves.

Appendix A — Who Are the "Sons of God"? (Condensed).....59

The settled reading of Genesis 6:1-4, with the opposing case stated first.

Appendix B — The Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart, Verse by Verse.....60

Every statement in Exodus in order, with who is named as hardening and which Hebrew word is used.

Appendix C — Where Scripture Names the Agent.....63

Parallel accounts in which scripture itself credits one act both to God and to another.

Appendix D — Word Notes.....66

The Hebrew and Greek behind the findings the chapters state in plain English.

Appendix E — The Conquest Record in Full.....69

Drive-out and destroy texts side by side, the peoples still in the land, the peace clause, and ancient war-report language.

Appendix F — Weight of Each Argument.....71

Every load-bearing argument, grouped by claim, with its weight and what the other reading fairly answers — including what this version withdrew.

Appendix G — What Changed from the Previous Edition.....76

A plain list of every correction made in this version, for readers of the earlier one.

Sources Consulted.....78

The reference works behind the study, and the weight each one carries.

Scripture Index.....79

Every scripture quoted in full, in canonical order, with the chapter and section where it appears.

Anchor Passage

1 John 1:5 *This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.*

James 1:13 *Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man:*

Introduction

A. What Scripture Actually Says

Start here, before a single hard passage is examined, because everything that follows has to be tested against it rather than the other way around. Scripture does not hedge on this point, and it does not leave it to be inferred from harder texts read backward. It says it directly, in two different writers' own words: God is light, and in him is no darkness at all (1 John 1:5). God cannot be tempted with evil, and he tempts no man with it (James 1:13). Whatever this study finds in the chapters ahead — the Flood, the plagues, the conquest, the warnings of captivity and defeat — has to be read in a way that leaves these two verses standing, not in a way that quietly overturns them by the back door of an Old Testament narrative.

That is not a preference imposed on the text. It is a sound rule of reading: the plain, direct statement carries more weight than the harder passage read in isolation, and the harder passage is the one that owes an explanation.

Weighing it: Direct statement — sets the standard for the whole study. No one disputes that these verses say what they say. The question every later chapter must answer is what they rule out — and the other side can fairly answer that they rule out evil *in* God, not judgment *by* God. This study agrees, and §D below says so plainly.

B. The Disconnect

Here is the trouble, named plainly. Ask most people — inside the church and outside it — who drowned the world in Noah's day, who struck Egypt's firstborn, who ordered Jericho put to the sword, and the answer comes back the same way every time: God did. And behind that answer, usually unspoken, sits a picture: a God who does these things the way an angry man lashes out, without warning, without grief, without any way of escape offered to anyone. That picture is not confined to skeptics building a case against scripture. Sincere believers carry it too, quietly, and it shapes how they read everything else. A God who drowns children on impulse and orders armies to kill for no clear reason is not obviously the God John describes as light with no darkness in him at all.

This study's conviction is that the disconnect is real, but it is not scripture's fault. It is a reading problem. Scripture regularly describes what God *permits*, what an *adversary* actually does, and what follows as the *consequence* of a people's own warned choice, using the same active grammar it uses for what God does himself. English readers, without the tool to catch it, flatten all three into one thing: God did it, full stop. Hebrew narrative habitually credits an outcome to the sovereign who permits it and stands over it, without claiming he performed every step — much as we say "the judge sent him to prison" without imagining the judge walked the man to his cell.

And there is a further piece of the disconnect this study takes seriously. In case after case, when the narrative is read in full rather than summarized, something surfaces underneath it: opposition to the line through which the promised Seed of Genesis 3:15 was to come. The Flood arrives after corruption and violence have filled the earth and spread even into the family that called on God's name. The plagues fall on the empire enslaving the family that carried the promise. The conquest is fought against nations scripture names as given over to child sacrifice and spirit-worship. Amalek attacks the weakest of Israel on the road out of Egypt, and a man called "the Agagite" tries to finish the job nearly a thousand years later. This study's working thesis, to be tested rather than assumed, is that God is consistently found in these narratives delivering his people and his promise from a real, active threat — and that popular memory has quietly recast the Deliverer as the destroyer.

Weighing it: Narrative — states the problem; carries no weight on any contested claim.

C. The Strongest Case on the Other Side

A study that only quotes the verses it likes has not earned its conclusion. So before any answer is offered, here is the opposing case at its full strength, with its best verses, stated the way its own defenders would state it.

First, God speaks of judgment in the first person, and scripture never apologizes for it. "I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth" (Genesis 6:17). "I will cause it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights" (Genesis 7:4). "At midnight the LORD smote all the firstborn in the land of Egypt" (Exodus 12:29).

Second, God claims authority over death and calamity outright. "I kill, and I make alive; I wound, and I heal: neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand" (Deuteronomy 32:39). "The LORD killeth, and maketh alive" (1 Samuel 2:6). "I make peace, and create evil" (Isaiah 45:7). "Shall there be evil in a city, and the LORD hath not done it?" (Amos 3:6).

Third, the narrator himself — not just a grieving character — credits God with Job's trouble. After the book has shown Satan doing the damage, its closing chapter speaks of "all the evil that the LORD had brought upon him" (Job 42:11).

Fourth, God is said to harden hearts toward destruction. "It was of the LORD to harden their hearts, that they should come against Israel in battle, that he might destroy them utterly" (Joshua 11:20). Paul applies the same to Pharaoh: "whom he will he hardeneth" (Romans 9:18).

Fifth, the covenant curses are in God's own voice. "The LORD shall smite thee" runs through Deuteronomy 28 again and again.

Sixth, God acts in judgment in the New Testament as well. "Immediately the angel of the Lord smote him" (Acts 12:23, of Herod). Ananias and Sapphira fall dead at Peter's word (Acts 5:1-11). "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God" (Hebrews 10:31).

Seventh, a God who only permits is a God who is not really in charge. If every hard thing is the adversary's doing and God merely allowed it, the objector says, then God is either unable or unwilling to stop it — and either answer is worse than simply saying God judged.

That is a serious case. This study does not answer it by pretending these verses are not there. Every one of them is taken up in the chapters ahead, in its own context.

Weighing it: Opposing case, stated — weighs against this study, and is answered chapter by chapter rather than here.

D. What This Study Claims, and What It Does Not

The earlier edition of this study at times said more than scripture allows — that the hardest events were "never actually authored" by God at all. That overstates it, and the verses in §C show why. So here is the claim, stated as carefully as the evidence permits.

This study does **not** claim that God never judges. Scripture says plainly that he does, and says it in his own voice. It claims four things, and they are the four tools every chapter uses.

Permission is not causation, even when the grammar looks the same. Hebrew regularly says God "did" what he allowed to be done. Scripture shows this idiom at work inside its own pages: one account says the LORD moved David to number Israel; the parallel account says Satan did (2 Samuel 24:1; 1 Chronicles 21:1). Where scripture itself names another agent, this study follows it.

A real adversary does much of what is popularly charged to God. Scripture calls him the one who "had the power of death" (Hebrews 2:14), and gives the name Destroyer to another, not to God (Exodus 12:23; Revelation 9:11).

Consequence is not caprice. When a people is warned for generations and chooses its own road, what follows is the stated result of a choice made with the warning in hand — and scripture often describes the mechanism as God withdrawing his protection rather than reaching in to strike (Deuteronomy 31:17).

Where God does judge directly, he judges as a just Judge, not as a destroyer. "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" (Genesis 18:25). His judgments come after grief, after warning, after long delay, and with a way of escape built into them — and he says under oath that he takes no pleasure in the death of the wicked (Ezekiel 33:11).

So the title means what it says, and no more. Destruction is not God's nature, not his aim, and not his pleasure. Deliverance is. The name scripture gives God is Deliverer (Psalm 18:2; Romans 11:26). The name it gives the adversary is Destroyer.

Weighing it: Method, not argument — defines the study's thesis precisely so that it can be tested.

E. Method

This study follows the working method used throughout this library, with one tool used more heavily than in most: E. W. Bullinger's *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible*, the library's standing reference for noticing when scripture is not speaking in its most literal, flat sense. Bullinger names the idiom this study leans on in so many words: "Active verbs were used by the Hebrews to express, not the doing of the thing, but the permission of the thing which the agent is said to do." His own examples include the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, Ezekiel 14:9, Romans 9:18 and 2 Thessalonians 2:11 — several of the very verses in §C.

The King James Version is the base text throughout. Where the Hebrew or Greek underneath changes the meaning, the chapter states the finding in plain English and the working goes to Appendix D, so that the reader is never stopped mid-paragraph by a parsing table.

One question this study does not hold open. Whether "sons of God" in Genesis 6:1-4 names a corrupted angelic bloodline is settled in this library's companion study, *Who Are the "Sons of God"? Settling the Genesis Six Question*, condensed in Appendix A. No such bloodline was ever created. The seed-war thread this study traces rests instead on what scripture states about the conquest's reason (Deuteronomy 9:4-5) and about Haman's lineage (Esther 3:1), and each strand is weighed on its own merits.

Weighing it: Method, not argument — bears no weight either way.

F. Why This Has to Be Made Relevant to the Grace Administration, Throughout

Most of what this study examines is Old Testament material. But this study is not written for Israel under the Law. It is written for the church, living under Grace — the administration that opened at Pentecost, once Christ had died, risen, and ascended to the Father's right hand to pour out the promised gift (Acts 2:32-33), and that governs believers now, "by grace... through faith" (Ephesians 2:8). Every chapter owes its reader more than a correct account of what happened long ago. It owes an answer to the question a believer today actually has standing to ask: what does this mean for how I know God, right now?

First, because correct believing is the whole point of correct doctrine. "As he thinketh in his heart, so is he" (Proverbs 23:7). A renewed mind is what proves God's will "good, and acceptable, and perfect" (Romans 12:2). Faith itself "cometh by hearing" (Romans 10:17) — so what a believer has heard about God's character is part of the foundation of his faith, not a detail beside it. A believer who privately suspects God is capricious will pray, trust and walk differently from one who knows that "every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning" (James 1:17).

Second, because how God is presented to those outside the church matters. "The god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ... should shine unto them" (2 Corinthians 4:4). A God popularly remembered as the gleeful author of

drowned children is a harder God to commend to a skeptical hearer than the God scripture actually describes. Leaving that picture uncorrected leaves a stumbling block standing where the gospel should be.

For that reason, every chapter closes with a section connecting its material directly to the Grace administration: what it means for a believer's confidence in God's character, and what it means for how that same God is presented to someone who does not yet believe. **"I am the LORD, I change not" (Malachi 3:6). "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever" (Hebrews 13:8).**

Weighing it: Method, not argument — sets the study's application, not its conclusions.

G. The Three Questions This Study Answers

First: how does the figure of speech work, and where does the adversary fit? Chapters 1 through 5 build the case — God's stated character first, then the adversary's real agency, then the idiom of permission worked through its hardest verses, then all three applied to the Flood and the plagues.

Second: what about the conquest — the instruction, at times, to leave none alive? Chapters 6 through 8 take this on directly rather than softening it: covenant warning and consequence (Chapter 6), the conquest and the ban (Chapter 7) — including the teaching that the ban was aimed at removing the *carriers* of a spiritual corruption so that it could not travel into Israel, which Chapter 7 tests against the text — and the long case of Amalek, traced to Haman in the book of Esther (Chapter 8).

Third: if God is both willing and able, why do prayers still go unanswered, and why does calamity still come? Chapter 9 takes up the pastoral question on its own terms.

Chapter 10 draws the evidence together, says plainly how firm each part of it is, and names what would change this study's mind.

Weighing it: Narrative — a map of the study; carries no weight.

H. How to Read This Study's Weighing Notes

Every section of this study ends with a short note in bold, headed **Weighing it**. It is there because a study that states a strong argument and a weak one in the same confident tone has not been honest with its reader.

Each note says two things. First, how strong the section's argument is, on a five-step scale used across this library. **Direct statement** means scripture says it in so many words; the only question is what the words mean. **Strong inference** means it follows closely from what scripture says, and the alternative has to strain against the text. **Reasonable inference** means it is the more natural reading, but an honest reader can take it otherwise. **Corroboration only** means it fits this study's position but would fit the opposite roughly as well — it may be stated, not leaned on. **Neutral** means it is commonly cited but settles nothing.

Second, each note says *which way the section points*, and on which claim. Some sections argue nothing contested — they tell a story, or explain a method, or state the other side's case — and they say so plainly rather than being given a manufactured rating.

This study argues eight claims. Here they are in one place:

	The claim	Argued in
G	God is good without exception; no moral evil originates in him	Intro §A; Ch. 1; Ch. 3 §§C-D
A	A real adversary does much of what is popularly charged to God	Ch. 2; Ch. 5 §D; Ch. 9 §B
I	Scripture's idiom credits God with what he permits another to do	Ch. 3; Ch. 5 §D; Appendix C
J	Where God judges directly, the judgment is just, grieved, warned, delayed, and carries a way of escape	Ch. 4; Ch. 5; Ch. 7 §§B-D
C	Covenant curses are the consequence of a warned choice, often arriving as God withdraws protection	Ch. 6
K	The conquest's ban was aimed at a named spiritual corruption, not at a people as such	Ch. 7
S	An adversarial campaign against the promised line runs beneath these narratives	Ch. 4 §D; Ch. 7; Ch. 8; Ch. 10 §B
P	Unanswered prayer and suffering do not disprove God's goodness, and not every sufferer is at fault	Ch. 9

Appendix F collects every argument in one table, with its weight and what the other reading can fairly answer — including the arguments the earlier edition made and this one withdraws. Chapter 10 §D names the findings that would overturn this study's position.

Weighing it: Method, not argument — bears no weight either way.

Chapter 1 — God Is Good, Always

Every chapter after this one walks into difficult territory — water rising over a whole civilization, a nation's firstborn struck in a single night, cities put to the sword. None of that can be read honestly, or safely, without first laying down what this chapter lays down: scripture's own direct, repeated testimony about who God is. Not inferred from the hard passages. Not balanced against them as one consideration among several. Stated first, so that the hard passages are read in its light.

A. Stated Directly, Not Left to Inference

The anchor passage already supplied the clearest of these statements:

1 John 1:5 *This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.*

"No darkness at all" is not hedged language. John does not write that God is mostly light, or light on balance. In the Greek he stacks two negatives on top of each other — "darkness in him is not, none at all" — which in that language does not cancel out, as it would in English, but doubles the denial. It is as complete a "no" as Greek can say. Whatever this study finds in the Flood or the conquest, it cannot involve darkness originating in God, because this verse has closed that door before the question is asked [Appendix D].

James supplies the same claim from another angle — not what God is, but what God does not do:

James 1:13 *Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man:*

1:14 *But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed.*

"Cannot be tempted with evil" translates a single Greek word meaning *untouched by evil, with no experience of it* [Appendix D]. "Neither tempteth he any man" rules out the reading this study exists to correct: that God might engineer someone's ruin by steering him toward evil. The next verse names where that kind of trouble actually starts — a man's own desire. And three verses later James says where everything good comes from:

1:17 *Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.*

Not merely good gifts, but every good gift — from a source that does not shift. "No variableness, neither shadow of turning" describes a God who cannot be the deliverer in one chapter and, on a different reading, the destroyer in the next.

The Old Testament makes the same claim, in case anyone supposes this is a New Testament correction laid over an older, harsher picture:

Deuteronomy 32:4 *He is the Rock, his work is perfect: for all his ways are judgment: a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he.*

Psalm 5:4 *For thou art not a God that hath pleasure in wickedness: neither shall evil dwell with thee.*

Habakkuk 1:13 *Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity...*

A lawgiver, a king and a prophet, writing centuries apart, converge on one claim: evil does not dwell with God, and "without iniquity" describes his nature, not a record he happens to keep.

One detail in Deuteronomy 32:4 is worth noticing because it answers part of the other side's case before it is even raised. "All his ways are *judgment*" — and in the same breath, "without iniquity." Moses sees no tension between a God who judges and a God with no evil in him. Neither should we. The same song, a few verses later, contains "I kill, and I make alive" (32:39). Moses wrote both lines into one song, and meant both.

And Habakkuk 1:13 comes from a man who was himself struggling. The very next words are a complaint: why then do you look on the treacherous and hold your tongue? Habakkuk does not doubt God's purity; it is *because* he is sure of it that the injustice around him troubles him. Chapter 9 returns to him.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim G, that no moral evil originates in God. The other side can fairly answer that these verses say nothing about whether God judges, and it is right; Deuteronomy 32 itself shows the two ideas sitting side by side. That is why this study's claim is about God's character and not about whether he ever acts in judgment.

B. Good, Not Merely Powerful

It is worth being precise about which claim is at stake, because two are easily blurred. Scripture does not merely claim God is powerful enough to have caused the Flood — no one disputes that. It claims something narrower: that whatever God does, he does as an expression of a *good* character, not merely an *able* one.

Psalm 100:5 *For the LORD is good; his mercy is everlasting; and his truth endureth to all generations.*

Psalm 34:8 *O taste and see that the LORD is good: blessed is the man that trusteth in him.*

Nahum 1:7 *The LORD is good, a strong hold in the day of trouble; and he knoweth them that trust in him.*

Nahum is worth pausing on. It is not a gentle book. It is an oracle of judgment against Nineveh, and its first chapter opens with some of the sternest words in the prophets: "God is jealous, and the LORD revengeth" (1:2). Yet it is this book, in this chapter, five verses later, that stops to say the LORD is good, a stronghold in the day of trouble. Nahum does not see judgment and goodness as rival claims to be balanced against each other. He sees them as two facts about one unchanging character — and he sees God's judgment on Nineveh as the deliverance of the people Nineveh had crushed (Nahum 1:15).

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim G. The other side can fairly answer that Nahum shows God judging; this study agrees. What Nahum rules out is a God whose judgment flows from anything other than goodness.

C. The Name Scripture Gives Him: Deliverer

This study's title is not a slogan invented for it. Both of its key words come from scripture, and scripture gives them to two different persons.

"Deliverer" is God's own name in the Psalms and in Paul:

Psalm 18:2 *The LORD is my rock, and my fortress, and my deliverer; my God, my strength, in whom I will trust; my buckler, and the horn of my salvation, and my high tower.*

Romans 11:26 *And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob:*

And what God has done for the church is described in the same word:

Colossians 1:13 *Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son:*

1 Thessalonians 1:10 *And to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come.*

"Destroyer," by contrast, is a title scripture gives to someone else. At the Passover, the LORD passes through Egypt and "will not suffer the destroyer to come in unto your houses to smite you" (Exodus 12:23). Paul warns the Corinthians not to murmur as some of Israel did, who "were destroyed of the destroyer" (1 Corinthians 10:10). And Revelation names the angel of the bottomless pit outright: "whose name in the Hebrew tongue is Abaddon, but in the Greek tongue hath his name Apollyon" (Revelation 9:11) — both names meaning Destroyer [Appendix D].

Chapter 2 takes up who that destroyer is. For now, the point is simpler: when scripture names God, it calls him Deliverer. When it names a destroyer, it names another.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim G, that deliverance is God's character; strong inference for claim A, that the destroyer is another. That scripture calls God "deliverer" and calls another "the destroyer" is stated outright. That these are the same destroyer in each passage is an inference; the other side can fairly answer that in Exodus 12 the destroyer acts under God's own judgment. Chapter 5 §D weighs that.

D. Unchanging, Then and Now

The last piece belongs in this first chapter, because it is the hinge the study's relevance turns on. Scripture does not merely say God was good at certain points in Israel's history and is good now. It says his character is fixed:

Malachi 3:6 *For I am the LORD, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed.*

Hebrews 13:8 *Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever.*

Malachi's own argument is worth noticing: Israel's continued existence is itself the proof — "I change not; *therefore* ye... are not consumed." Their survival, after everything, is evidence of unchanging mercy. And Hebrews applies the same claim directly to Christ, across the very administration boundary the

Introduction named. If the God of Genesis, Exodus and Joshua were not the same God revealed in Christ, nothing in the chapters ahead could settle anything about who God is now. Because he is the same, it can.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim G. The other side does not dispute that God is unchanging. It asks what unchanging goodness looks like when it meets entrenched evil. The rest of the study is the answer.

Relevance for the Grace Administration

This chapter is not background a believer files away before the dramatic material. It is the standard everything ahead is measured against.

For the believer's own confidence: Romans 12:2 ties a renewed mind to proving God's will **"good, and acceptable, and perfect."** A Christian carrying an unexamined suspicion that God is capable of arbitrary cruelty is not merely holding a mistaken historical opinion. That suspicion works against the renewing Paul describes, and it shapes, quietly but really, how that believer prays, suffers, and trusts. The God who **"delivered us from the power of darkness" (Colossians 1:13)** is the God the believer is dealing with every day.

For how God is presented to those who do not yet believe: a distorted picture of God is one of the commonest obstacles a believer meets when speaking to a skeptical hearer. This chapter answers it verse for verse rather than by appeal to sentiment. The chapters ahead take up the hardest cases. This one only establishes that whatever they find, it cannot be a God who was ever anything other than good.

Weighing it: Narrative — application; carries no weight on the contested claims.

In Short

Scripture says outright that God is light with no darkness in him, that he tempts no one to evil, that every good gift comes from him, and that he does not change. It also says, in the same breath, that his ways are judgment — so this study's claim is not that God never judges, but that nothing evil ever comes from him. His name in scripture is Deliverer. The name Destroyer belongs to another.

Chapter 2 — The Adversary

Chapter 1 established what God is. This chapter establishes something scripture treats as equally settled: that a real, active, personal adversary exists in scripture's account of the world, doing real things scripture does not credit to God as their doer. Without this chapter, the difference between causing and permitting would be an abstraction. With it, the difference has a name, a character, and — in Job 1 and 2 — a passage where scripture stages the difference in full view.

A. Named, Not Invented

The adversary is not an explanatory device for getting God off the hook. He is named repeatedly in scripture and given a consistent job description:

1 Peter 5:8 *Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour:*

Hebrews 2:14 *Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil;*

1 John 3:8 *...For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.*

Hebrews 2:14 is the plainest statement in scripture of where the power of death sat: with the devil. And 1 John 3:8 states the whole purpose of Christ's coming as the undoing of that enemy's works. God and the devil are not two names for one power. They are on opposite sides of the same conflict.

Jesus draws the same line in the Good Shepherd discourse:

John 10:10 *The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy: I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.*

A word of care here, because this verse is often pressed further than its own context takes it. In John 10 the "thief" is first of all the false shepherd — those who "climbeth up some other way" (10:1) and who "came before me" (10:8). Jesus is contrasting himself with the religious leaders who fleeced the flock. But the pattern he names — steal, kill, destroy on one side; life more abundantly on the other — is the same pattern scripture assigns to the devil and to Christ everywhere else (Hebrews 2:14; 1 John 3:8), and the false shepherds of John 10 are doing the devil's work (compare John 8:44). What the verse states without any inference is this: Christ does not stand on the side of stealing, killing and destroying. He stands on the other side.

Paul names the same enemy, and gives him a startling title:

2 Corinthians 4:4 *In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.*

Ephesians 6:12 *For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.*

"The god of this world." How did the adversary come to hold such a title? Scripture does not give a single verse saying so, but it gives enough. When the devil showed Jesus the kingdoms of the world, he said, **"All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it" (Luke 4:6)** — and Jesus, who rebuked him on every other point, did not dispute that one. Jesus himself three times calls him **"the prince of this world" (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11)**. John says the whole world lies in the grip of the wicked one (1 John 5:19). The most natural account of how this came about is Genesis 3: the dominion God gave the first man (Genesis 1:26-28) was handed over when he obeyed the serpent instead of God. That authority is not sovereignty over

God — nothing in scripture makes the adversary God's equal — but it is real, it is active, and it is frequently the source of what popular reading puts down to God's own hand.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim A, that a real adversary holds the power of death and works to destroy. That his authority came to him through Adam's fall is a **reasonable inference**, well supported but not stated in one verse. The other side can fairly answer that John 10:10's thief is, in its first context, the false shepherd, not the devil in person; this study grants that and rests the point on Hebrews 2:14 and 1 John 3:8 instead.

B. Job 1-2: Scripture's Own Staged Demonstration

If scripture named the adversary but never showed the difference between his work and God's, this study's argument would rest on inference alone. Job 1-2 removes that gap. It is worth reading slowly, because the narrator's frame — not any character's opinion inside it — is doing the careful work.

Job 1:8 *And the LORD said unto Satan, Hast thou considered my servant Job, that there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil?*

1:9 *Then Satan answered the LORD, and said, Doth Job fear God for nought?*

1:10 *Hast not thou made an hedge about him, and about his house, and about all that he hath on every side? thou hast blessed the work of his hands, and his substance is increased in the land.*

1:11 *But put forth thine hand now, and touch all that he hath, and he will curse thee to thy face.*

1:12 *And the LORD said unto Satan, Behold, all that he hath is in thy power; only upon himself put not forth thine hand. So Satan went forth from the presence of the LORD.*

Satan's accusation is itself an admission against interest: he names God's hedge of protection as the very thing standing between Job and disaster. And notice what Satan asks for — "put forth *thine* hand." God does not do so. He says instead, "all that he hath is in *thy* power," sets a limit, and it is Satan who goes out and acts.

What follows is told in four messengers' reports:

Job 1:15 *And the Sabeans fell upon them, and took them away; yea, they have slain the servants with the edge of the sword...*

1:16 *...The fire of God is fallen from heaven, and hath burned up the sheep, and the servants, and consumed them...*

1:17 *...The Chaldeans made out three bands, and fell upon the camels, and have carried them away...*

1:19 *And, behold, there came a great wind from the wilderness, and smote the four corners of the house, and it fell upon the young men, and they are dead...*

Two of the four disasters come by human raiders. Two come by what looks like weather — lightning and a desert wind. The narrator has already told us who is behind all four: Satan, given leave, working inside a boundary. So when the second messenger calls the lightning "the fire of God," he is speaking the way people speak — crediting the sky's fire to the God of the sky. The reader, who has been shown the

heavenly scene, knows more than the messenger does. Scripture reports the servant's words accurately without endorsing them as the full account, the same way it accurately reports the serpent's words in Genesis 3:4.

The pattern repeats in the second round:

Job 2:3 *And the LORD said unto Satan, Hast thou considered my servant Job, that there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil? and still he holdeth fast his integrity, although thou movedst me against him, to destroy him without cause.*

2:6 *And the LORD said unto Satan, Behold, he is in thine hand; but save his life.*

2:7 *So went Satan forth from the presence of the LORD, and smote Job with sore boils from the sole of his foot unto his crown.*

Here the idiom appears in God's own mouth. God says Satan "movedst me against him, to destroy him" — speaking of the affliction as his own act, because it happened under his permission. Then verse 7 names the one who actually struck: "Satan... smote Job." Not "the LORD smote Job." Two verses apart, the text shows the idiom and its meaning side by side.

And the book does the same thing at its close, in the narrator's own voice. When Job's family comes to comfort him, they "comforted him over all the evil that the LORD had brought upon him" (Job 42:11). This is the verse the other side rightly points to (Introduction §C). But look at what it proves. The same narrator who told us, step by step, that Satan did the damage, now sums it up as "the evil that the LORD had brought." He is not contradicting himself. He is using the ordinary Hebrew way of speaking about a sovereign's permission — the very idiom this study is about — after first showing the reader exactly what lay behind it. Job 42:11 is not a problem for this study. It is the idiom caught in the act, in scripture's own narration [Appendix C].

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim A, that Satan is the actor in Job 1-2; strong inference for claim I, that scripture uses God's name for what he permitted. The narrator names Satan as the one who struck, and then speaks of the same events as "the evil that the LORD had brought." The other side can fairly answer that God is still responsible for the permission — and this study agrees that he is. What the book will not support is the picture of God himself reaching out to wound Job; he declines to "put forth" his hand, and Satan puts forth his.

C. What God Said to Job, and What He Said to the Friends

It is worth being fair to Job's own words, which complicate a version of this argument pressed too hard:

Job 2:10 *But he said unto her, Thou speakest as one of the foolish women speaketh. What? shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil? In all this did not Job sin with his lips.*

Job credits the evil to "the hand of God," and the text says at once that he did not sin in saying it. Two things are true together. Job is using the same ordinary idiom as the messenger and the narrator, and he is not condemned for speaking that way in the depth of grief. "Did not sin with his lips" is a verdict on

Job's integrity under suffering — he did not curse God, as Satan had predicted — not a verdict that his every sentence was the most precise theology available.

The book's later verdicts make this plain, and they need to be read together rather than one at a time. God does correct Job. His first words from the whirlwind are **"Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?"** (Job 38:2), and later, **"Wilt thou also disannul my judgment? wilt thou condemn me, that thou mayest be righteous?"** (Job 40:8). Job accepts the correction: **"therefore have I uttered that I understood not"** (Job 42:3). Job spoke past what he knew.

But the anger falls elsewhere:

Job 42:7 *...the LORD said to Eliphaz the Temanite, My wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy two friends: for ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath.*

The friends had one theory from start to finish: Job's suffering was God's direct punishment for hidden sin. God's wrath falls on that theory. Job had been rash; the friends had been wrong about God. And the story ends not in judgment but in restoration: **"the LORD turned the captivity of Job... also the LORD gave Job twice as much as he had before"** (Job 42:10). James draws the lesson for the church: **"Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord; that the Lord is very pitiful, and of tender mercy"** (James 5:11). The end of the story is what reveals the character of the God behind it.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim P, that suffering is not proof of hidden sin; reasonable inference for claim I. God rebukes the friends' theory in so many words. That Job 2:10 is the idiom of permission rather than a precise claim that God struck Job is a reasonable inference, supported by the narrator having named Satan as the striker. The other side can fairly answer that God never tells Job about Satan and never disowns Job's words; this study answers that God does correct Job for speaking beyond his knowledge, and that James reads the book's end, not its middle, as the revelation of God's heart.

D. Confirmed Elsewhere, Not Unique to Job

Job 1-2 is the clearest single demonstration, but not the only one. The same shape — affliction from the adversary, deliverance from God — recurs across both Testaments:

Zechariah 3:1 *And he shewed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the LORD, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him.*

3:2 *And the LORD said unto Satan, The LORD rebuke thee, O Satan; even the LORD that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee: is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?*

Luke 13:16 *And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the sabbath day?*

Acts 10:38 *How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him.*

Acts 10:38 states the pattern as directly as it can be stated: oppression is the devil's work, and Jesus's healing ministry is God's own presence at work against it. Luke 13:16 names Satan as the one who

bound a crippled woman for eighteen years; Jesus names himself as the one who looses her. Zechariah shows God's rebuke aimed squarely at Satan, and his rescue — "a brand plucked out of the fire" — aimed at the accused. In every one of these texts God's posture toward the adversary is opposition, and his posture toward the afflicted is rescue.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim A. The other side does not dispute these verses; it disputes whether every calamity fits this pattern. This study does not claim every calamity does. It claims this is scripture's normal way of describing sickness and oppression, and that the harder cases should be read with it in view.

Relevance for the Grace Administration

This chapter does not describe a struggle unique to Job's moment. It describes the struggle believers now are told they are engaged in:

Ephesians 6:11 *Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil.*

1 Peter 5:9 *Whom resist stedfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world.*

For the believer's own confidence: recognizing a real adversary is not an interpretive convenience for reading the Old Testament. It is the church's own teaching on spiritual warfare, in the same terms Job 1-2 modeled — a real opponent, real affliction, and a God who sets limits and works deliverance. A believer who understands this can meet hardship the way Ephesians 6 and 1 Peter 5 instruct — standing, resisting — rather than defaulting to the flattened assumption, "God did this to me." And he can stand in the confidence Christ won: the one who had the power of death has been undone by Christ's death, resurrection and ascension to the Father's right hand (Hebrews 2:14; Ephesians 1:20-22).

For how God is presented to those who do not yet believe: **"greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world" (1 John 4:4)**. A gospel that quietly credits God with the adversary's handiwork asks a skeptical hearer to trust a God who looks no different from the thief. A gospel that names the real enemy, and names God as the one who limits him, rebukes him and delivers from him — the way Acts 10:38 describes Jesus's own ministry — offers what scripture actually claims, and is easier, and more honest, to commend.

Weighing it: Narrative — application; carries no weight on the contested claims.

In Short

Scripture names a real enemy who held the power of death and whose works Christ came to destroy. In Job 1-2 it shows that enemy asking for leave, receiving a limit, and doing the damage himself — and then, in the narrator's own summing-up, speaks of that same damage as "the evil that the LORD had brought." That is not a contradiction. It is how Hebrew speaks of what God permits, shown once in full so that the reader can recognize it elsewhere. And the story ends, as James says, with the Lord "very pitiful, and of tender mercy."

Chapter 3 — The Figure of Speech

Chapters 1 and 2 established two fixed points: God is good without exception, and a real adversary exists, doing things scripture does not credit to God as their doer. What remains is the hardest technical work in the study — the individual sentences that, read quickly, seem to say God causes calamity and evil. This chapter takes each on its own terms.

A. Named, Not Invented for This Study

This study is not reaching for a new tool. Bullinger, in his standard reference on biblical figures of speech, lists among the idioms of Hebrew verbs that "active verbs were used by the Hebrews to express, not the doing of the thing, but the permission of the thing which the agent is said to do." His first example is plain: Jacob tells his wives that Laban cheated him repeatedly, "but God suffered him not to hurt me" (Genesis 31:7) — where the Hebrew says, literally, "God did not *give* him to hurt me." The next is the hardening of Pharaoh's heart. His list continues through Ezekiel 14:9, Jeremiah 4:10, Matthew 6:13 ("lead us not into temptation" — that is, do not let us be led), Romans 9:18 and 2 Thessalonians 2:11.

English has a distant cousin of the same habit. We say "the mayor built a new bridge" without imagining the mayor laid concrete; the sentence credits the outcome to the authority who permitted and stood behind it. Hebrew reaches for this construction more often, and more starkly, than English does.

Weighing it: Corroboration only — for claim I, that the idiom exists. Bullinger is a respected witness, not scripture. His list proves that a careful grammarian recognized the idiom; it does not prove that any particular verse is an example. That has to be shown from scripture itself, which is what §B does.

B. Scripture Shows Its Own Work

The strongest evidence that the idiom is real is not any grammarian's say-so. It is that scripture, more than once, tells the same event twice and names a different agent each time.

The clearest case is David's census. Near the end of his reign, David ordered a count of Israel's fighting men, and the count brought a plague. Here is how Samuel tells it, and then how Chronicles tells the same event:

2 Samuel 24:1 *And again the anger of the LORD was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah.*

1 Chronicles 21:1 *And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel.*

One writer says the LORD moved David. The other says Satan provoked him. Both are inspired, and both are describing one event. The simplest way to hold them together is the idiom this chapter is about: Satan did the provoking, and the LORD, in his anger at Israel, permitted it — so that the earlier writer could say "he moved David" in the same way the narrator of Job could say "the evil that the LORD had brought." The later writer, the Chronicler, names the agent outright.

The same story shows something further. When the plague came, it came by "the angel that destroyed the people," and it was God who stopped him: **"the LORD repented him of the evil, and said to the angel that destroyed the people, It is enough: stay now thine hand"** (2 Samuel 24:16). The destroying is done by the destroying angel. The stopping is done by God. And David, offered a choice of judgments, chose this one precisely because of God's character: **"let us fall now into the hand of the LORD; for his mercies are great"** (2 Samuel 24:14).

Other passages show the idiom working inside a single chapter. When the prophet Micaiah describes how Ahab's four hundred prophets came to mislead him, he sees a spirit volunteer to be "a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets," and God permits it: "thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also: go forth, and do so." Micaiah's summary is, **"the LORD hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets"** (1 Kings 22:23) — having just shown that the spirit volunteered and the LORD allowed. And Paul's own statement that "God shall send them strong delusion" (2 Thessalonians 2:11) comes two verses after he has named the source of that deception: the one "whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders" (2:9).

These are not isolated oddities. Appendix C sets out every such pair this study found, side by side.

Weighing it: Strong inference — for claim I, that scripture credits God with what he permits another to do. The two census accounts name two agents for one act; that is a direct statement in each. That the right way to join them is permission is a strong inference; the other side can fairly answer that God might have *used* Satan as an instrument rather than merely allowed him. Even on that reading, though, the agent who actually provoked David is named as Satan — and that is the point this study needs.

C. Isaiah 45:7: Light, Darkness, Peace, and "Evil"

This is the verse most often raised against everything this study has said so far. It deserves to be read in full, in its own context:

Isaiah 45:6 *That they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none beside me. I am the LORD, and there is none else.*

45:7 *I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I the LORD do all these things.*

The word translated "evil" is the ordinary Hebrew word for bad things of every kind, and its most common meaning in the prophets is not wickedness but *calamity* — disaster, trouble, harm. The verse's own pairs show which meaning is in view: light against darkness, and "peace" against this word. "Peace" in Hebrew is *shalom*, well-being, wholeness. Its opposite is not wickedness; it is disaster. Isaiah is contrasting prosperity with calamity, not righteousness with sin.

The same word is used this way throughout the prophets. When Nineveh repented, **"God repented of the evil, that he had said that he would do unto them; and he did it not"** (Jonah 3:10) — that "evil" was the city's destruction, not a sin God planned to commit. And God tells Jeremiah the rule behind it: **"If that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I**

thought to do unto them" (Jeremiah 18:8) — the nation's *evil* is its wickedness; God's *evil* is the judgment that wickedness would bring [Appendix D].

The context confirms it. Isaiah 45:1-7 is about Cyrus, a pagan king God will raise up to free Israel from exile. The point is sovereignty: the rise and fall of empires, the good and bad fortunes of nations, are not in the hands of rival gods. "There is none else." Israel's God is not a tribal deity ruling only where things go well.

Honesty requires saying what this does *not* do. It does not make Isaiah 45:7 say that God has nothing to do with calamity. Read correctly, the verse still says God is sovereign over disaster as well as prosperity, and at times sends disaster in judgment. What it does not say — what it was never saying — is that God is the author of moral wickedness, which James 1:13 and Habakkuk 1:13 rule out.

Weighing it: Strong inference — for claim G, that Isaiah 45:7 does not make God the author of moral evil. The meaning "calamity" is shown by the verse's own pairing and by the same word's use for judgment in Jonah and Jeremiah. The other side can fairly answer that the verse still has God "creating" calamity; this study agrees and does not use this verse for the permission idiom at all. It uses it only to show what the verse does not say.

D. Amos 3:6 and Lamentations 3: The Same Word, and a Look at God's Heart

The same word does the same work in two texts often raised alongside Isaiah 45:7:

Amos 3:6 *Shall a trumpet be blown in the city, and the people not be afraid? shall there be evil in a city, and the LORD hath not done it?*

Lamentations 3:38 *Out of the mouth of the most High proceedeth not evil and good?*

Amos 3 is a covenant lawsuit: God confronting Israel over named violations, warning that national calamity is coming as the announced consequence. The very next verse says so — **"Surely the Lord GOD will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets" (Amos 3:7).** The "evil" in the city is disaster that was warned of first. This is the covenant-consequence pattern Chapter 6 takes up in full.

Lamentations 3:38 was written over Jerusalem's ruins, and it is a statement that the good and the calamitous alike come under God's sovereign word. But that same chapter, only five verses earlier, contains one of the most important sentences in this entire study:

Lamentations 3:31 *For the Lord will not cast off for ever:*

3:32 *But though he cause grief, yet will he have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies.*

3:33 *For he doth not afflict willingly nor grieve the children of men.*

"He doth not afflict willingly." The Hebrew means, literally, *not from his heart*. Even when judgment has fallen — and Jeremiah is sitting among its ashes — scripture insists that affliction is not what God wants.

It is not the expression of his heart. Compassion is. A verse sometimes used to prove that God sends evil sits five verses after a verse stating that he takes no pleasure in doing so.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim J, that God does not afflict from his heart; strong inference for claim G on Amos 3:6. Lamentations 3:33 says it outright. That Amos 3:6's "evil" is announced calamity and not moral evil follows from the word's usage and from verse 7. The other side can fairly answer that Amos still says "the LORD hath done it"; this study agrees that God stands behind covenant judgment, and argues in Chapter 6 how.

E. "The LORD Hardened Pharaoh's Heart" — Read in Its Own Sequence

This is the case most worth slowing down for, and the earlier edition of this study stated it too simply. Here is the sequence as the text actually gives it. [Appendix B lists every statement in order.]

Before any plague falls, God tells Moses what will happen: **"I will harden his heart, that he shall not let the people go" (Exodus 4:21)**, and again, **"I will harden Pharaoh's heart, and multiply my signs and my wonders in the land of Egypt" (Exodus 7:3)**. Those are the other side's strongest verses in this narrative, and they come first.

But then the narrative itself begins, and it tells the story in a particular order. From the first sign before Pharaoh through the fifth plague, the text never once says the LORD hardened Pharaoh's heart. Instead it says five times that Pharaoh's heart "was hardened" or "is hardened," with no one named as doing it, and twice that Pharaoh hardened it himself. (The King James at Exodus 7:13 reads "he hardened," but the Hebrew there names no one; it says Pharaoh's heart grew hard. See Appendix B.) The two statements that name Pharaoh himself are these:

Exodus 8:15 *But when Pharaoh saw that there was respite, he hardened his heart, and hearkened not unto them; as the LORD had said.*

8:32 *And Pharaoh hardened his heart at this time also, neither would he let the people go.*

Only at the sixth plague, the boils, does the narrative for the first time say the LORD hardened Pharaoh's heart:

Exodus 9:12 *And the LORD hardened the heart of Pharaoh, and he hearkened not unto them; as the LORD had spoken unto Moses.*

And even after that, at the seventh plague, the text says again that Pharaoh did it himself: **"he sinned yet more, and hardened his heart, he and his servants" (Exodus 9:34)**. From then on, through the locusts, the darkness and the Red Sea, it is the LORD who is said to harden.

Read in that order, the shape is plain. God foretold what would happen. Pharaoh then set his own heart, repeatedly, by his own choice — and even when relief came he used it to harden himself further ("when Pharaoh saw that there was respite"). Only after that did God confirm him in the course he had chosen. This is a judicial hardening: a man given over to the direction he had already settled.

And that is exactly the pattern Paul describes, in a completely different setting:

Romans 1:24 *Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts...*

1:26 *For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections...*

1:28 *And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind...*

"Gave them up" — three times, each following the people's own rejection just described. God withdraws restraint; he does not manufacture rebellion.

What about Paul's own words on Pharaoh, "**whom he will he hardeneth**" (**Romans 9:18**)? Bullinger lists that very verse as the idiom of permission — "he suffereth to be hardened" — and adds, rightly, that this does not weaken God's sovereignty at all. Paul's point in Romans 9 is that God is free to show mercy or to withhold it, and that no one can hold him to account for it. He is not saying God turned a willing Pharaoh into an unwilling one. Exodus had already told us Pharaoh was unwilling, in his own heart, before God confirmed it.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — for claim I, that Pharaoh's hardening was God confirming Pharaoh's own choice. The order of the statements is a **direct statement** of the text. That the order means what this section says is a reasonable inference, not stronger, because God's announcements in Exodus 4:21 and 7:3 come before everything else. The other side can fairly answer that God announced the outcome in advance and that Romans 9 stresses his freedom. This study answers that foreknowledge of what a man will choose is not the same as making him choose it, and that the narrative takes care to show Pharaoh choosing.

F. 1 Samuel 16:14 and Judges 9:23: "An Evil Spirit from the LORD"

One further case uses language that sounds, in English, like God dispatching an evil spirit as his own agent:

1 Samuel 16:14 *But the Spirit of the LORD departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the LORD troubled him.*

Read in context, this verse follows Saul's repeated, willful disobedience — first his unlawful sacrifice (1 Samuel 13:13-14), then his sparing of Agag and the best of the Amalekite spoil against a direct command (1 Samuel 15:9, 19-23), after which Samuel told him, in the previous chapter, that the kingdom had been torn from him. Verse 14 does not introduce a new divine attack on Saul out of nowhere. It describes the consequence of a withdrawal already earned: the Spirit's presence departs — and, just as in Job 1, where the removal of a hedge opened the door to Satan — what fills the empty place is called "from the LORD" because it came within the space his withdrawal allowed.

The same idiom appears in Judges, with the same shape. Abimelech had murdered his seventy brothers with the backing of the men of Shechem. Then "**God sent an evil spirit between Abimelech and the men of Shechem**" (**Judges 9:23**) — and the next verse gives the reason: "that the cruelty done to the threescore and ten sons of Jerubbaal might come, and their blood be laid upon Abimelech." Evil men,

having done evil together, are left to turn on one another. It is judgment by withdrawal, not by the introduction of evil into innocent hearts.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — for claim I. That the evil spirit followed Saul's disobedience and the Spirit's departure is a direct statement. That "from the LORD" means *within the space God's withdrawal permitted* rather than *commissioned by God* is a reasonable inference, supported by 1 Kings 22 and 2 Thessalonians 2. The other side can fairly answer that "sent" in Judges 9:23 is an active word; this study answers that "sent" is exactly the kind of active verb Bullinger's idiom covers, and that both passages involve judgment on men who had already chosen evil.

Relevance for the Grace Administration

This chapter's method is not a one-time tool for defusing a handful of Old Testament verses. It describes how scripture continues to speak in the present administration.

For the believer's own confidence: 2 Thessalonians 2:11-12 uses the same idiom for events still future — "God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie" — following directly on people who **"received not the love of the truth" (2 Thessalonians 2:10)**, and two verses after naming Satan's working as the source of the lie. A believer who has not learned to read this pattern will either misread that passage as arbitrary divine deception or quietly avoid it. A believer who has read this chapter has the tool in hand. The same holds for the prayer Jesus taught: "lead us not into temptation" is not a fear that God might lead his children into sin; it is a request not to be left to it — the idiom again, and James 1:13 already rules out the other reading.

For how God is presented to those who do not yet believe: Isaiah 45:7 in particular is a favorite proof-text for the objection that scripture makes God the author of evil. A believer who can show, from the verse's own pairing and from Jonah and Jeremiah, what the word means — and who can point to David's census told twice with two agents — removes a real obstacle, not by explaining scripture away but by reading it more carefully than the objection did.

Weighing it: Narrative — application; carries no weight on the contested claims.

In Short

Hebrew regularly says God "did" what he permitted, and scripture shows the idiom at work in its own pages: one account says the LORD moved David to number Israel, the other says Satan did. Isaiah 45:7's "evil" is calamity, not wickedness — and the same Lamentations that says good and evil proceed from God's word says, five verses earlier, that he does not afflict from his heart. Pharaoh hardened his own heart before God confirmed it. God is sovereign over judgment; he is not the author of sin.

Chapter 4 — The Flood: Judgment or Rescue?

No Old Testament narrative carries more popular weight as evidence against God's goodness than this one. This chapter does not soften it — and, unlike the earlier edition of this study, it does not suggest that God did not bring the Flood. The text says he did, in his own voice. What this chapter reads for is how he brought it: with what heart, after how much warning, and with what rescue. On close reading, scripture describes the Flood with rescue language at least as prominently as judgment language.

A. What the Text States Directly

Genesis names the condition before the Flood in the starkest terms scripture uses anywhere for the human race:

Genesis 6:5 *And GOD saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.*

6:6 *And it repented the LORD that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart.*

6:7 *And the LORD said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth...*

Verse 6 is the verse most worth pausing on, and the one most often skipped. Before a single word about judgment, the text states God's own posture toward it: grief. "It grieved him at his heart" is not the language of a deity who enjoys destruction. It is the language of sorrow over a catastrophe already in motion by human choice.

A few verses later Genesis describes that catastrophe more fully:

Genesis 6:11 *The earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence.*

6:12 *And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth.*

6:13 *And God said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them; and, behold, I will destroy them with the earth.*

There is something in these three verses an English reader cannot see. "Corrupt," "corrupted," and "destroy" are all the same Hebrew word [Appendix D]. The earth was *ruined*; all flesh had *ruined* its way; and God says, "I will *ruin* them with the earth." Genesis is telling us that God's judgment was not a new destruction brought against a healthy world. It was the ending of a ruin that man had already made — the earth "filled with violence through them." The destroying had already been going on for a long time. God brought it to its end.

And then, in plain words, the verse the other side rightly presses:

Genesis 6:17 *And, behold, I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven; and every thing that is in the earth shall die.*

6:18 *But with thee will I establish my covenant; and thou shalt come into the ark...*

"I, even I." There is no idiom of permission to appeal to here, and this study does not appeal to one. The Flood is God's act as Judge. But notice what verse 18 does, immediately: "But with thee." In the same breath that announces the judgment, God announces the covenant and the ark. The rescue is part of the announcement.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim J, that the Flood was God's grieved and just judgment, with rescue announced alongside it. The other side is right that God brings the Flood himself; the earlier edition of this study blurred that, and it is corrected here. What the text also states directly is the grief before it, the violence behind it, and the covenant beside it. That the shared Hebrew word means the judgment *ended* a ruin rather than *began* one is a **reasonable inference** from the wordplay; the other side can fairly answer that wordplay alone does not settle intention.

B. Patience Before the Water

The judgment did not arrive without warning. Genesis states an interval:

Genesis 6:3 *And the LORD said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years.*

The most natural reading is that God set a hundred and twenty years of continued striving with man before the judgment of verse 7 was carried out. (Some read the verse as a new limit on the human lifespan instead. That reading has a difficulty: men after the Flood lived far longer than a hundred and twenty years — Shem lived six hundred (Genesis 11:10-11). The countdown reading fits the context better.)

The New Testament removes any doubt that there was a long, patient interval, and tells us what filled it:

1 Peter 3:20 *Which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water.*
2 Peter 2:5 *And spared not the old world, but saved Noah the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly;*

"The longsuffering of God waited" — Peter's own summary of those years is not "God prepared to destroy" but "God waited." And Noah was not building in silence. He was "a preacher of righteousness." The ark itself, rising year by year in plain view, was a sermon. The world that drowned was a world that had been warned, and warned, and waited for.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim J, that the judgment came after long patience and warning. First Peter 3:20 says God's longsuffering waited, and 2 Peter 2:5 calls Noah a preacher of righteousness. That the waiting lasted the full hundred and twenty years is a **reasonable inference** from Genesis 6:3; the other side can fairly answer that the verse may describe lifespan. Either way, Peter's statement of waiting stands.

C. The Same Event, Told as Rescue

The New Testament writers, looking back at the Flood, reach again and again for rescue words:

Hebrews 11:7 *By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith.*

"To the saving of his house" — here the Greek word is the salvation word itself, the same family used for the salvation of the gospel [Appendix D]. And in the verse quoted above, 1 Peter 3:20 says the eight souls "were saved by water," again with the salvation word, and goes on to call the whole event a figure of the salvation that now comes "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ" (3:21). The same water that ended the old world's violence lifted the ark above it.

(A correction from the earlier edition belongs here. It said Peter's "saved Noah" in 2 Peter 2:5 uses the salvation word. It does not. The Greek there means *kept* or *guarded* — God kept Noah safe, the way a watchman keeps a city. The point survives, and is if anything more vivid: God stood guard over Noah while the waters rose. But the salvation word itself is in Hebrews 11:7 and 1 Peter 3:20, and that is where this study now places it.)

Genesis tells the rescue in its own quiet way too. When the family was in the ark, **"the LORD shut him in" (Genesis 7:16)** — God himself closed the door. And when the waters were at their height, **"God remembered Noah" (Genesis 8:1)** — the turning point of the whole narrative, after which the waters begin to fall.

Judgment and deliverance are not two competing accounts of the Flood. They are one event, seen from the side of those who refused the warning and from the side of those who heeded it.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim J, that rescue is built into the event. Hebrews and 1 Peter use the salvation word; Genesis has God shutting Noah in and remembering him. The other side can fairly answer that rescue for eight does not soften death for the rest; this study does not claim it does. It claims only that the rescue is as much a part of scripture's account as the judgment.

D. What Genesis 6:1-4 Adds — the Settled Reading

Immediately before the verdict of verse 5, Genesis gives a harder, compressed passage:

Genesis 6:1 *And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them,*

6:2 *That the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose.*

6:4 *There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown.*

This library's companion study, *Who Are the "Sons of God"? Settling the Genesis Six Question* — condensed in Appendix A — settles what this passage describes. "Sons of God" names the covenant line of Seth, the family that "began... to call upon the name of the LORD" (Genesis 4:26), marrying outside that covenant on nothing more than the ordinary pattern of desire scripture records elsewhere: they

saw that the women were fair, and they took them. It is the same sequence as Eve at the tree ("saw... took," Genesis 3:6), Shechem with Dinah ("saw her, he took her," Genesis 34:2), and David with Bathsheba ("saw a woman... sent and took her," 2 Samuel 11:2-4) — what John calls "the lust of the eyes" (1 John 2:16). "Nephilim," translated "giants," means men who fell upon others — violent strongmen, "men of renown" in the same human sense the phrase carries for Korah's rebel princes (Numbers 16:2) — not a hybrid race.

What this passage adds to the chapter, then, is not a corrupted bloodline. It is something plainer and, for this study's thread, more telling: the one family marked by calling on God's name was drawn into the world's ways by marriage, until even the line of promise was compromised — and immediately afterward, the earth is described as filled with violence. The threat to the promised Seed of Genesis 3:15 was not genetic. It was moral and spiritual, and it came from within.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — for claim S, that the corruption before the Flood threatened the line of promise. That the "sons of God" are Seth's line is argued in full in the companion study and held there as settled; Appendix A states the opposing case first, including its strongest texts. The other side can fairly answer that "sons of God" means angels in Job, and that Jude 6-7 may link the angels' sin to the days of Noah. Appendix A weighs both.

E. Sodom: The Same Shape Again

The Flood is not the only time scripture shows God's judgment on a city or a world, and it is worth setting a second case beside it, because it shows the same shape in sharper detail.

When God tells Abraham that Sodom's judgment is near, Abraham does something remarkable: he argues with God, and God lets him.

Genesis 18:25 *That be far from thee to do after this manner, to slay the righteous with the wicked: and that the righteous should be as the wicked, that be far from thee: Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?*

18:32 *And he said, Oh let not the Lord be angry, and I will speak yet but this once: Peradventure ten shall be found there. And he said, I will not destroy it for ten's sake.*

From fifty down to ten, God agrees every time. He would have spared the whole city for ten righteous people. There were not ten. But the rescue did not wait on the number:

Genesis 19:16 *And while he lingered, the men laid hold upon his hand, and upon the hand of his wife, and upon the hand of his two daughters; the LORD being merciful unto him: and they brought him forth, and set him without the city.*

19:22 *Haste thee, escape thither; for I cannot do any thing till thou be come thither...*

"The LORD being merciful unto him" — the angels physically took Lot by the hand while he lingered. And then: "I cannot do any thing till thou be come thither." The judgment was held back until the rescue was complete. Even Lot's sons-in-law had been invited out; they thought he was joking (19:14).

The judgment itself is stated plainly: "the LORD rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the LORD out of heaven" (19:24). Scripture does not hide God's hand. But Ezekiel tells us what had filled the city first — "pride, fulness of bread, and abundance of idleness... neither did she strengthen the hand of the poor and needy," and they "committed abomination before me" (Ezekiel 16:49-50). And Peter draws the lesson for every reader:

2 Peter 2:9 *The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished:*

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim J, that God's judgment waits on rescue and would have spared many for a few. God's agreement to spare the city for ten, the angels taking Lot by the hand, and "I cannot do any thing till thou be come thither" are all stated outright. The other side can fairly answer that the city was still destroyed by God's own act; this study agrees, and holds that "the Judge of all the earth" did right.

F. Closing: Not Impulsive, Not Gleeful, and Not Without Rescue

Read in full — grief stated before judgment, a ruin already made by man, long patience while a preacher preached and an ark was built, a door shut by God's own hand, and the Flood itself remembered by the New Testament as salvation — Genesis 6-8 is not the account of a God who delighted in destruction or acted without warning. It is the account of a Judge who exhausted patience, provided a way of escape, and then bound himself by covenant never to do it again:

Genesis 8:21 *...I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake; for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth; neither will I again smite any more every thing living, as I have done.*

Notice the reason God gives. The very thing that brought the Flood — "the imagination of man's heart is evil" — is now the reason for *mercy*. God does not say, man is evil, so I will judge again. He says, man is evil from his youth, so I will not. The rainbow that follows (Genesis 9:11-15) is a promise God makes to himself: "I will remember my covenant."

Whatever remains hard about this narrative — and this study does not pretend nothing does — it does not require abandoning Chapter 1. It confirms it.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim J. The covenant of Genesis 8:21 and 9:11 is stated outright. The other side can fairly answer that a covenant not to flood the earth again is not a promise never to judge; 2 Peter 3:7 speaks of a judgment still to come. This study agrees, and notes that the same chapter of Peter explains the delay of that judgment as mercy (below).

Relevance for the Grace Administration

Peter does not leave the Flood in the past. In the same letter where he says God "saved Noah... bringing in the flood," he reaches for the Flood again to explain the present:

2 Peter 3:6 *Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished:*

3:9 *The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.*

For the believer's own confidence: the patience that waited through Noah's years is the same patience that, Peter says, still governs God's dealing with the world. A believer who reads the Flood as impulsive cruelty will struggle to trust that patience now. A believer who reads it as this chapter has — waiting, warning, rescue — has scriptural grounds for confidence that delay is mercy, now as then. And the rescue Peter pointed to in the ark has come in full: the believer is saved "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ: who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God" (1 Peter 3:21-22).

For how God is presented to those who do not yet believe: "saved Noah" and "not willing that any should perish" are Peter's own two halves of one picture, a chapter apart in the same letter. A hearer who has only heard the Flood summarized as God drowning the world has not heard what Peter wrote about it. Supplying the fuller account — patience, warning, a door held open, and rescue built into judgment — is not softening scripture. It is stating it in full.

Weighing it: Narrative — application; carries no weight on the contested claims.

In Short

God brought the Flood — the text says so in his own voice, and this study no longer suggests otherwise. But scripture tells it as the judgment of a grieving Judge on a world that had already ruined itself with violence, after long patience and open warning, with an ark built in plain sight, a door God shut himself, and a covenant afterward never to do it again. Sodom shows the same shape: God would have spared the city for ten, and could do nothing until Lot was safe. The Judge of all the earth does right, and his heart is to rescue.

Chapter 5 — The Plagues: Deliverance Wearing the Face of Disaster

If the Flood is the hardest Old Testament narrative to hear as good news, the plagues of Egypt run a close second — ten disasters, the last fatal to every Egyptian household's firstborn. This chapter reads them the way the text frames them from its first mention of the coming confrontation: as the means of a rescue announced before a single plague fell.

A. The Stated Motive, Before Any Plague Occurs

Before Moses ever stands before Pharaoh, the text states why any of this is about to happen:

Exodus 3:7 *And the LORD said, I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters; for I know their sorrows;*

3:8 *And I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that land unto a good land and a large...*

"I am come down to deliver them" is the purpose of everything that follows, given before Pharaoh has refused a single request. The plagues are not this study's reframing of Exodus as a rescue. Rescue is the reason the text itself gives, in the chapter that introduces the confrontation. And it began with an oppression God did not cause: Egypt's taskmasters, a Pharaoh who ordered Hebrew baby boys thrown into the Nile (Exodus 1:22). The first killing of children in the Exodus story was Pharaoh's.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim J, that the plagues served a rescue already announced. The other side does not dispute the motive; it disputes the means. The sections below take up the means.

B. "That Ye May Know That I Am the LORD"

Across the plagues, one phrase recurs with a regularity that is easy to miss reading them one at a time and impossible to miss reading them together:

Exodus 7:5 *And the Egyptians shall know that I am the LORD, when I stretch forth mine hand upon Egypt, and bring out the children of Israel from among them.*

Exodus 8:10 *...that thou mayest know that there is none like unto the LORD our God.*

Exodus 9:14 *...that thou mayest know that there is none like me in all the earth.*

Exodus 9:29 *...that thou mayest know how that the earth is the LORD'S.*

Exodus 10:2 *...that ye may know how that I am the LORD.*

The phrase, in one form or another, runs through the whole account — about a dozen times from the promise to Israel in chapter 6 to the crossing of the sea in chapter 14 [Appendix B lists them]. It is spoken to Israel, to Pharaoh, and about the Egyptians. The stated purpose is revelation: that everyone involved would know who the LORD is.

Exodus 12:12 names what the plagues were contending against:

Exodus 12:12 *For I will pass through the land of Egypt this night, and will smite all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, both man and beast; and against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgment: I am the LORD.*

Numbers, looking back, says the same: "**upon their gods also the LORD executed judgments**" (Numbers 33:4). Egypt's religious system — claiming divine power over the Nile, over fertility, over the sun, and over Pharaoh himself as a god's son — is the target these verses name. Many commentators have noticed a rough correspondence between several plagues and particular Egyptian deities: the sacred Nile turned to blood, frogs tied to a goddess of fertility and birth, the sun worshipped as the chief of the gods blotted out by three days of darkness. This study holds those correspondences at the weight they deserve. They fit, and they are worth knowing, but the point does not rest on them. Scripture states the target outright: the gods of Egypt.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim J, that the plagues' stated aims were revelation and judgment on Egypt's gods. The correspondences with particular Egyptian deities are **corroboration only**. The other side can fairly answer that judgment on gods still fell on people; this study agrees and turns to what the text says about escape.

C. Escape Offered Along the Way

The plagues are often remembered as ten blows falling on a helpless people. The text records something different: warning before each, and, more than once, a way out offered to anyone — Egyptian or Hebrew — who would take it.

At the seventh plague, the hail, God tells Pharaoh to bring every man and beast in from the field before it falls. And then:

Exodus 9:20 *He that feared the word of the LORD among the servants of Pharaoh made his servants and his cattle flee into the houses:*

9:21 *And he that regarded not the word of the LORD left his servants and his cattle in the field.*

Egyptians — Pharaoh's own officials — heard the warning, believed it, and were spared. The dividing line was not nationality. It was whether a man "feared the word of the LORD."

At the eighth, God speaks to Pharaoh through Moses with a question that is really an invitation: **"How long wilt thou refuse to humble thyself before me? let my people go" (Exodus 10:3)**. Every plague could have been the last. Pharaoh's own servants begged him to relent: **"knowest thou not yet that Egypt is destroyed?" (Exodus 10:7)**.

And when Israel finally left, they did not leave alone: **"a mixed multitude went up also with them" (Exodus 12:38)**. Non-Israelites who had seen enough went with the people of God — and the law of the Passover given that very night made room for any stranger who wished to keep it (Exodus 12:48).

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim J, that escape was offered along the way, including to Egyptians. Exodus 9:20 says it outright of the hail. That the "mixed multitude" were people who had heeded the warnings is a **reasonable inference**; the text says they went, not why. The other side can fairly answer that most Egyptians were not spared; this study does not claim they were, only that the door was not shut by God.

D. The Passover and the Destroyer

The final plague — the one that troubles readers most — is also the plague scripture describes with the most explicit rescue of any judgment in this study:

Exodus 12:13 *And the blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where ye are: and when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you, when I smite the land of Egypt.*

And ten verses later Moses explains it to the elders, and adds a detail the earlier edition of this study missed entirely:

Exodus 12:23 *For the LORD will pass through to smite the Egyptians; and when he seeth the blood upon the lintel, and on the two side posts, the LORD will pass over the door, and will not suffer the destroyer to come in unto your houses to smite you.*

Read that verse slowly. It names two parties. There is the LORD, and there is "the destroyer." The LORD passes over the marked doors. The destroyer is the one who would "come in unto your houses to smite you" — and the LORD will "not suffer" him to. The LORD's part, at the door, is protection. The destroyer's part is the killing.

And yet verse 29 says plainly, **"at midnight the LORD smote all the firstborn in the land of Egypt."** Here is the idiom of permission once more, in a single chapter: the LORD smites; the destroyer smites; the LORD will not suffer the destroyer to smite where the blood is. The same act is credited to the sovereign who permits and bounds it, and to the agent who carries it out. Hebrews, looking back, speaks only of the agent: Moses kept the Passover **"lest he that destroyed the firstborn should touch them" (Hebrews 11:28)**. And a psalm describes the same night as God **"sending evil angels among them" (Psalm 78:49)** [Appendix C and D].

Who is the destroyer? Scripture does not name him in Exodus, and honesty requires saying so. There are two readings. On one, he is an angel of judgment acting on God's commission, like "the angel that destroyed the people" in David's day, whom God himself restrained (2 Samuel 24:16). On the other, he is the adversary — the one who "had the power of death" (Hebrews 2:14), whose name in Revelation is Destroyer — permitted to act against a house without blood, and held back from every house with it. This study leans to the second, because it is the reading that fits the rest of scripture's language about death and the destroyer; but the first is a fair reading and the point of this section does not depend on choosing. On either reading the text distinguishes the LORD from the destroyer, and on either reading the LORD's recorded act at the doorway is to keep the destroyer out.

And the escape was universal in its terms. The judgment did not pass over a household because of its ancestry. It passed over because of blood on the doorposts — a provided, available means of escape requiring only that it be used. Paul names its fulfillment directly:

■ **1 Corinthians 5:7** *...For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us:*

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim I, that Exodus 12 names both the LORD and a destroyer for one act; reasonable inference for claim A, that the destroyer is the adversary. Verse 23 names the destroyer and says the LORD will not suffer him to enter; Hebrews 11:28 speaks of "he that destroyed." The other side can fairly answer that 12:12 and 12:29 say God "will smite all the firstborn" and that "the LORD smote," and that the destroyer may be God's own angel of judgment. This study grants that reading is possible, and holds that on either reading the chapter shows the idiom at work and shows the LORD standing between the destroyer and the door.

E. Closing: Ten Plagues, One Stated Purpose

Read across all ten, the plague narrative repeats one purpose more than any other: that Egypt and Israel alike would know who the LORD is. The judgment fell on a system of false gods holding God's people in bondage — a system whose king had begun by drowning Hebrew infants. It was announced before each blow. It offered Pharaoh repeated opportunity to relent, and offered his servants a way to shelter. And

in its final and most severe form it came with an explicit, available, non-exclusive means of escape built into its own terms, with the LORD himself standing at the marked door to keep the destroyer out.

Weighing it: Narrative — summary of §§A-D; carries the weight given there.

Relevance for the Grace Administration

Paul does not leave the Exodus in the past. He says why believers now should read it at all:

1 Corinthians 10:1 *Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea;*

10:10 *Neither murmur ye, as some of them also murmured, and were destroyed of the destroyer.*

10:11 *Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.*

For the believer's own confidence: 1 Corinthians 10:11 is not this study's justification for applying Exodus today; it is Paul's own stated reason the narrative was written. And notice what Paul calls the agent of death in the wilderness: "the destroyer." Paul, like Exodus, keeps the destroyer and the Deliverer distinct. A believer who reads the plagues as senseless cruelty misses what they were recorded to teach — that God moves to deliver his people, dismantling what enslaves them, with a stated purpose and a way of escape. That pattern is completed in Christ, who died as our passover, was raised, and ascended to the Father's right hand, from where the promised gift was poured out (Acts 2:32-33). The believer's doorpost is marked, once for all.

For how God is presented to those who do not yet believe: 1 Corinthians 5:7's link between the Passover and Christ gives a believer something better to offer a skeptical hearer than a vague appeal to God's mysterious ways. The God who provided blood on a doorpost as an available, unearned means of escape is, in Paul's words, the God who provided Christ. The plagues, read in full, are not an obstacle to that message. They are its rehearsal.

Weighing it: Narrative — application; carries no weight on the contested claims.

In Short

The plagues began as a rescue — "I am come down to deliver them" — from a Pharaoh who had drowned Hebrew babies. They aimed at Egypt's gods, were announced one by one, and offered shelter even to Egyptians who feared the word of the LORD. At the Passover, Exodus names two parties: the destroyer, who would enter to smite, and the LORD, who passes over the marked door and "will not suffer the destroyer to come in." That same night Paul calls Christ our passover.

Chapter 6 — "If You Don't Obey": Covenant Warnings, Not Caprice

Chapters 4 and 5 examined narratives popularly read as God striking without warning. This chapter takes on a different complaint: the long lists of curses attached to covenant disobedience — captivity, defeat in battle, disease, famine — that read, on a fast pass, like a deity looking for reasons to punish. Read slowly, they are something else: the stated terms of an agreement Israel entered into, with warning given for generations before any of it was carried out, and with a mechanism scripture describes more often as God withdrawing than as God striking.

A. A Covenant, Not a Whim

Israel's obligation under the Law was not imposed on an unconsulted people. It was a vow, given aloud and in full knowledge:

Exodus 24:7 *And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, All that the LORD hath said will we do, and be obedient.*

What follows in Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28 is best read as the terms of that same covenant — blessing for keeping it, curse for breaking it:

Deuteronomy 28:1 *And it shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the LORD thy God, to observe and to do all his commandments which I command thee this day, that the LORD thy God will set thee on high above all nations of the earth:*

28:15 *But it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the LORD thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day; that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee:*

Verses 1 and 15 mirror each other on purpose: the same "if," applied first to blessing, then to curse. This is covenant language — the stated consequences of both sides of a choice. And Moses closes the whole covenant by placing the choice where it belongs:

Deuteronomy 30:19 *I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live:*

"Therefore choose life." God does not merely set out two roads. He tells them which one to take.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim C, that the curses were the agreed terms of a covenant Israel accepted, with the choice placed before them. The other side can fairly answer that the curses are still in God's own voice — "the LORD shall smite thee." §C and §D take that up.

B. Warned Repeatedly, Not Struck Without Notice

The curses were not sprung on Israel centuries later without further comment. Scripture's own record of the Babylonian captivity shows the same pattern Chapter 4 found at the Flood: long patience, repeated warning, and judgment only after both were exhausted.

2 Chronicles 36:15 *And the LORD God of their fathers sent to them by his messengers, rising up betimes, and sending; because he had compassion on his people, and on his dwelling place:*

36:16 *But they mocked the messengers of God, and despised his words, and misused his prophets, until the wrath of the LORD arose against his people, till there was no remedy.*

"Rising up betimes" is the same Hebrew expression Jeremiah uses again and again — rendered in the King James there as "rising up early" (Jeremiah 7:13, 7:25, 25:3-4). It describes a God who, like a man up before dawn to begin his work, sent prophet after prophet, generation after generation. The reason is stated: "because he had compassion." Judgment came only "till there was no remedy."

And even in pronouncing judgment, God states under oath what he wants:

Ezekiel 33:11 *Say unto them, As I live, saith the Lord GOD, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?*

"As I live" is an oath. It matches the grief of Genesis 6:6 and the "doth not afflict willingly" of Lamentations 3:33. The curses are real, and scripture never pretends otherwise. But they are framed, across the Law and the Prophets, as a last resort after long compassion, not a first response.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim J, that judgment came after long compassion and warning. Second Chronicles gives the reason for the warnings as compassion; Ezekiel gives God's oath. The other side can fairly answer with Deuteronomy 28:63, taken up in §D.

C. How the Curse Arrives: God Hides His Face

This is the section the earlier edition of this study lacked, and it may be the most important in the chapter. When Moses, near the end of his life, told Israel in advance how the curses would come upon them, he described the mechanism:

Deuteronomy 31:17 *Then my anger shall be kindled against them in that day, and I will forsake them, and I will hide my face from them, and they shall be devoured, and many evils and troubles shall befall them; so that they will say in that day, Are not these evils come upon us, because our God is not among us?*

31:18 *And I will surely hide my face in that day for all the evils which they shall have wrought, in that they are turned unto other gods.*

Notice what God says he will do: "forsake them... hide my face." Notice what then happens: "they shall be devoured, and many evils and troubles shall befall them." And notice what the people themselves will conclude: these evils came "because our God is not among us." The curse, as God himself describes

it, is his *withdrawal* — the lifting of the hedge Satan complained of in Job 1:10 — and the evils that rush into the space he leaves.

The same pattern appears in the history. When Shishak of Egypt invaded Judah, God's word through the prophet was: **"Ye have forsaken me, and therefore have I also left you in the hand of Shishak" (2 Chronicles 12:5).** "Left you in the hand." And when the king and princes humbled themselves, God limited the judgment at once: **"I will grant them some deliverance; and my wrath shall not be poured out upon Jerusalem by the hand of Shishak" (2 Chronicles 12:7).**

Isaiah states the principle outright, and from the other direction:

Isaiah 59:1 *Behold, the LORD'S hand is not shortened, that it cannot save; neither his ear heavy, that it cannot hear:*

59:2 *But your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you, that he will not hear.*

God's hand is not weak. Their sins had put a wall between them and the hand that would have saved them.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim C, that the covenant curse was described as God withdrawing his protection. Deuteronomy 31:17 names the mechanism in God's own words, and 2 Chronicles 12 shows it in history. The other side can fairly answer that other curse verses say "the LORD shall smite." This study answers with Bullinger's idiom: God's own fuller description, given by Moses in the same book, shows what "smite" means in practice.

D. Consequence Follows a Choice Already Named

Hosea gives the clearest single verse for what this chapter has been building toward:

Hosea 4:6 *My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee...*

"Destroyed for lack of knowledge... because thou hast rejected knowledge." The destruction and the rejection are one continuous line — cause and consequence.

It is only fair to face the strongest verse on the other side here, because it sits in the middle of the curse chapter itself:

Deuteronomy 28:63 *And it shall come to pass, that as the LORD rejoiced over you to do you good, and to multiply you; so the LORD will rejoice over you to destroy you, and to bring you to nought...*

On its face that is the opposite of Ezekiel 33:11. What should a reader do with it? Three things. First, it is part of the Law's own sanction language, set in a deliberate balance with the line before it ("as the LORD rejoiced... to do you good") to say that the covenant's curse would be as certain as its blessing. Second, when the prophets later speak of the moment these curses were actually falling, they describe God's heart in the opposite terms. Hosea hears God say, as judgment on Israel drew near: **"How shall I give thee up, Ephraim?... how shall I make thee as Admah? how shall I set thee as Zeboim? mine heart is**

turned within me, my repentings are kindled together" (Hosea 11:8) — Admah and Zeboim being two of the cities destroyed with Sodom. Jeremiah, sitting in the ruins, says God "doth not afflict willingly" (Lamentations 3:33). Third, even the curse chapters set a limit on the curse: **"when they be in the land of their enemies, I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them, to destroy them utterly" (Leviticus 26:44)**, and Deuteronomy 30:1-3 promises restoration on the far side of captivity. The covenant's harshest line is surrounded by its most tender ones.

Paul states the same principle of consequence centuries later, to a church under a different administration entirely:

Galatians 6:7 *Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.*

Romans 6:23 *For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.*

"Wages" is chosen language: a wage is earned, not imposed at a paymaster's whim. And its opposite is a "gift." This is not an angry Old Testament God and a gentle New Testament one. It is one principle — sowing and reaping — described in both, and one God whose heart, in both, is to give.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — for claim C, that the covenant curse flows from Israel's choice rather than from God's pleasure. Hosea 4:6 and Galatians 6:7 are direct statements of consequence. Deuteronomy 28:63 is the strongest verse on the other side, and this study does not explain it away. It answers it with Hosea 11:8, Lamentations 3:33 and Leviticus 26:44, which describe God's heart when the curse actually fell. An honest reader may weigh 28:63 more heavily than this study does.

Relevance for the Grace Administration

This chapter's material is specific to the covenant of the Law. Deuteronomy 28's curses were the terms of a vow the church never made. Believers are saved **"by grace... through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast" (Ephesians 2:8-9)**, and **"Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us" (Galatians 3:13)**. No believer lives under Deuteronomy 28.

But the underlying principles carry forward. For the believer's own confidence: Paul describes a pattern of consequence inside the church itself — "for this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep" — and then says what it is for: **"when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world" (1 Corinthians 11:30-32)**. Chastening is correction that distinguishes believers from the world, not God turning hostile to his own. And the mechanism of Deuteronomy 31:17 has its own lesson: a believer who drifts from God is not so much struck as uncovered. The remedy is not to fear God's hand but to come back under it.

For how God is presented to those who do not yet believe: "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap" is a principle most people already recognize. Showing that scripture's hardest Old Testament warnings work on that same principle — after long, compassionate warning, by God withdrawing from

those who had withdrawn from him — makes God's judgment coherent with the world's own moral sense, not an arbitrary departure from it.

Weighing it: Narrative — application; carries no weight on the contested claims.

In Short

The curses of the Law were the terms of a vow Israel made with its eyes open, and God urged them to choose life. He sent prophets for generations "because he had compassion." When the curse came, Moses had already said how: God would hide his face, and the evils would rush in. The one verse that says God would "rejoice" to destroy is answered by the prophets who heard his heart when judgment actually came — "How shall I give thee up?"

Chapter 7 — The Conquest: War Against the Carriers

This is the hardest chapter in the study, and it does not soften the texts to make it easier. The instruction to leave none alive in certain conquest-era cities is real and stated plainly. This chapter reads it in full, and examines with equal care what the text itself gives as the reason, how long God waited beforehand, how the conquest was actually meant to proceed, who was spared, and — honestly — what the text does not explain.

A. The Stated Reason: Not Ethnicity, Not Israel's Merit

Scripture is unusually direct in ruling out the reading that treats this as ethnic hostility or national favoritism:

Deuteronomy 9:4 *Speak not thou in thine heart, after that the LORD thy God hath cast them out from before thee, saying, For my righteousness the LORD hath brought me in to possess this land: but for the wickedness of these nations the LORD doth drive them out from before thee.*

9:5 *Not for thy righteousness, or for the uprightness of thine heart, dost thou go to possess their land: but for the wickedness of these nations the LORD thy God doth drive them out from before thee...*

The text anticipates the misreading and closes it: Israel's own righteousness is denied as the basis, and "the wickedness of these nations" is named instead. What that wickedness consisted of is not left vague:

Leviticus 18:21 *And thou shalt not let any of thy seed pass through the fire to Molech, neither shalt thou profane the name of thy God: I am the LORD.*

18:24 *Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things: for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you:*

18:25 *And the land is defiled: therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants.*

Deuteronomy 18:10 *There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch,*

18:11 *Or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer.*

18:12 *For all that do these things are an abomination unto the LORD: and because of these abominations the LORD thy God doth drive them out from before thee.*

Children burned to Molech — **"even their sons and their daughters they have burnt in the fire to their gods" (Deuteronomy 12:31)** — and a whole system of divination, spirit-consultation and necromancy. That is the "wickedness" Deuteronomy 9 names. And the same standard applied to Israel: **"that the land spue not you out also, when ye defile it, as it spued out the nations that were before you" (Leviticus 18:28)**. This was not a standard for Canaanites only. When Israel later did the same things, the same land "spued out" Israel into exile.

Here the teaching this study set out to test comes into view — that the ban was aimed at the *carriers* of a spiritual corruption, so that it could not travel into Israel. Is that the text's own reason, or a later explanation laid over it? The text says it in so many words:

Deuteronomy 20:17 *But thou shalt utterly destroy them; namely, the Hittites, and the Amorites, the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites; as the LORD thy God hath commanded thee:*

20:18 *That they teach you not to do after all their abominations, which they have done unto their gods; so should ye sin against the LORD your God.*

"That they teach you not." The stated purpose of the ban is to stop the transmission of practices — practices scripture elsewhere traces to spiritual powers behind the idols: **"They sacrificed unto devils, not to God" (Deuteronomy 32:17)**.

And scripture records what happened when the ban was not carried out. The psalmist tells it plainly:

Psalms 106:34 *They did not destroy the nations, concerning whom the LORD commanded them:*

106:35 *But were mingled among the heathen, and learned their works.*

106:36 *And they served their idols: which were a snare unto them.*

106:37 *Yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils,*

106:38 *And shed innocent blood, even the blood of their sons and of their daughters, whom they sacrificed unto the idols of Canaan: and the land was polluted with blood.*

That is the danger the ban existed to prevent, and it came to pass exactly as warned. Israel's own children ended on Canaan's altars. The "carriers" teaching, in its textual form, is not a modern softening. It is Deuteronomy 20:18, and Psalm 106 is its sad confirmation.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim K, that the ban's stated purpose was to stop the transmission of a named spiritual corruption. Deuteronomy 9:4-5, 18:12 and 20:18 say so outright, and Psalm 106:34-38 records the result of ignoring it. How far to take "carriers of spirits" beyond this — for instance, that spirits were passed person to person in a physical sense — is **not stated** and is not claimed

here. The other side can fairly answer that stopping a practice does not require killing everyone who practiced it; §§C-G take that up.

B. Four Centuries of Patience

Long before an Israelite army entered Canaan, God told Abraham why the judgment would wait:

Genesis 15:13 *And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years;*

15:16 *But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again: for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full.*

This is the pattern Chapter 4 found in Noah's day and Chapter 6 found in the prophets, on a still longer scale. Some four centuries passed between that word to Abraham and the conquest, and the reason given is restraint: "not yet full." Judgment was withheld until a condition was met, not carried out at the first opportunity. Whatever the hardest conquest texts require a reader to sit with, impulsiveness is not a charge the text allows. And God's people waited as slaves in Egypt through those same centuries so that the Amorites would have them.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim J, that the conquest came only after centuries of withheld judgment. "Not yet full" states restraint outright. The other side can fairly answer that long delay does not by itself justify the final act; this study agrees, and claims only that the act was not hasty.

C. Driven Out Before Destroyed

The popular picture of the conquest is an army marching from city to city killing everyone it finds. The Law's own description of how the land would change hands is quite different, and the earlier edition of this study did not mention it:

Exodus 23:28 *And I will send hornets before thee, which shall drive out the Hivite, the Canaanite, and the Hittite, from before thee.*

23:29 *I will not drive them out from before thee in one year; lest the land become desolate, and the beast of the field multiply against thee.*

23:30 *By little and little I will drive them out from before thee, until thou be increased, and inherit the land.*

The dominant word in the conquest promises is "drive out" — dispossession, not extermination. God would send fear and "hornets" ahead of Israel (Exodus 23:27-28; Deuteronomy 7:20), and the inhabitants would leave, "by little and little." Numbers repeats it: **"ye shall drive out all the inhabitants of the land from before you, and destroy all their pictures, and destroy all their molten images, and quite pluck down all their high places"** (Numbers 33:52) — and notice what is to be *destroyed* in that verse: the images and the high places.

So the conquest texts carry two kinds of command side by side: the land's inhabitants were to be driven out, and the idolatrous cities that stood and fought were to be put under the ban. A people who fled

were not pursued to the ends of the earth; a people who stayed, and stayed armed, and stayed with their altars, were the ones the ban fell on [Appendix E sets the drive-out and destroy texts side by side].

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — for claim K, that the conquest's primary aim was dispossession, with the ban falling on cities that remained and resisted. That "drive out" is the dominant language, and that the images and high places are what Numbers 33:52 says to destroy, are direct statements. That the ban was therefore meant mainly for those who stayed and fought is a reasonable inference; the other side can fairly answer that Deuteronomy 20:16 says "save alive nothing that breatheth" of the cities in the land. That verse stands, and §G faces it.

D. Not Indiscriminate: Rahab and the Gibeonites

The conquest narratives record more than once that the ban was not a blanket rule applied regardless of response.

Rahab, a Canaanite living inside the very first city put under the ban, confessed the God of Israel before any Israelite had lifted a sword:

Joshua 2:11 *And as soon as we had heard these things, our hearts did melt, neither did there remain any more courage in any man, because of you: for the LORD your God, he is God in heaven above, and in earth beneath.*

Joshua 6:25 *And Joshua saved Rahab the harlot alive, and her father's household, and all that she had; and she dwelleth in Israel even unto this day; because she hid the messengers, which Joshua sent to spy out Jericho.*

A correction belongs here. The earlier edition said her confession was the stated reason she was spared. Joshua 6:25 gives the reason as her act — "because she hid the messengers." Hebrews 11:31 then names what lay behind the act: **"By faith the harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not, when she had received the spies with peace."** Her faith showed itself in what she did, which is exactly how James reads her (James 2:25). And notice Rahab's words: the whole city had heard, and every heart had melted. Jericho knew. Rahab was the one who acted on what everyone knew.

Rahab went on to marry into Judah and became an ancestor of David and of Christ (Matthew 1:5). A Canaanite woman from a city under the ban stands in the genealogy of the promised Seed.

The Gibeonites, another Canaanite people, secured a covenant of protection by deceit (Joshua 9:3-15), and Israel honored it anyway (9:18-19). More than that: when five Amorite kings attacked Gibeon for making peace, God fought *for* the Gibeonites — this is the battle in which the sun stood still (Joshua 10:6-14). Centuries later, when Saul broke that covenant and killed Gibeonites, God sent famine on Israel for it (2 Samuel 21:1-2).

It is only fair to set beside these the verse the other side rightly raises:

Joshua 11:19 *There was not a city that made peace with the children of Israel, save the Hivites the inhabitants of Gibeon: all other they took in battle.*

11:20 *For it was of the LORD to harden their hearts, that they should come against Israel in battle, that he might destroy them utterly, and that they might have no favour, but that he might destroy them, as the LORD commanded Moses.*

Two things are true of this passage. First, it is the same hardening language Chapter 3 examined in Pharaoh's case — the confirming of nations who, after four centuries and after hearing (as Rahab said they all had) what God had done in Egypt, chose to fight. Second, and easily missed: verse 19 implies that making peace was possible. "There was not a city that made peace... save" Gibeon. Gibeon did, and was spared and defended. The door that Rahab walked through and Gibeon walked through was not bolted.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim K, that individuals and a whole Canaanite people who turned were spared and even defended by God. Rahab's rescue and Gibeon's covenant are stated outright. That other cities could have made peace is a **reasonable inference** from Joshua 11:19. The other side can fairly answer that Joshua 11:20 says God hardened the rest so that they would fight; this study answers that it is the hardening of Chapter 3 — confirmation of a choice made with full knowledge — and weighs it no higher than that.

E. A Word About the Language of Totality

One further point, held at the lower weight it deserves. Conquest language like "utterly destroyed" and "left none remaining" (Joshua 10:40; 11:14) sits alongside material — in the book of Joshua itself — describing the same peoples still living in the land. "There remaineth yet very much land to be possessed" (Joshua 13:1). "As for the Jebusites the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the children of Judah could not drive them out" (Joshua 15:63). Judges continues the list:

Judges 1:21 *And the children of Benjamin did not drive out the Jebusites that inhabited Jerusalem; but the Jebusites dwell with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem unto this day.*

1:27 *Neither did Manasseh drive out the inhabitants of Bethshean and her towns...*

1:29 *Neither did Ephraim drive out the Canaanites that dwelt in Gezer...*

Careful readers who hold scripture to be fully reliable have long recognized "utterly destroyed... left none remaining" as the ordinary language of ancient war reports: a formula for decisive victory, not a literal count down to the last person. Other nations' royal records from the same era use the same kind of language — one Moabite king's inscription, for instance, boasts that Israel "has utterly perished for ever," at a time when Israel plainly had not [Appendix E]. Scripture's own later chapters show that the conquest summaries were read the same way by the people who wrote them.

This does not remove the difficulty of the hardest commands. But it does mean the popular image of total extermination of every living person in Canaan is not what the conquest record itself supports.

Weighing it: Corroboration only — for claim K, that the totality language is partly conventional. That Joshua and Judges record the same peoples still present is a **direct statement**. That this reflects a known convention of ancient war reporting rests on outside evidence and is held as corroboration. The other

side can fairly answer that Israel's failure to finish the task (Judges 1) is a different thing from the task having been hyperbole; this study grants that both may be true at once.

F. The Giant Clans, Read as Scripture Names Them

The conquest narratives' giant clans belong here as well:

Numbers 13:33 *And there we saw the giants, the sons of Anak, which come of the giants: and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight.*

Deuteronomy 2:10 *The Emims dwelt therein in times past, a people great, and many, and tall, as the Anakims;*

Deuteronomy 3:11 *For only Og king of Bashan remained of the remnant of giants; behold, his bedstead was a bedstead of iron... nine cubits was the length thereof, and four cubits the breadth of it...*

The earlier edition said these clans were tyrants rather than tall people. That was too simple. Scripture calls them "great, and many, and tall" and gives Og's bed as nine cubits — around thirteen feet. They were tall peoples. What the companion study on Genesis 6 settles (Appendix A) is that they were not a surviving hybrid race descended from angels. No such bloodline was ever created, so none survived the Flood to resurface in Canaan. The spies' report that connected Anak's sons to the Nephilim is the very report scripture calls "**an evil report**" (**Numbers 13:32**) — the report that frightened a whole generation out of entering the land.

What these verses add to this chapter needs no bloodline to stand. They were powerful, tall, warlike peoples, and they belong in Deuteronomy 9's own summary: nations driven out "for the wickedness of these nations."

Weighing it: Direct statement — that the giant clans were tall; reasonable inference for claim S, that they were not a hybrid race. Their stature is stated outright. That they were human and not angelic in descent rests on the companion study's reading of Genesis 6, held there as settled. The other side can fairly answer that Numbers 13:33 links them to the Nephilim; this study answers that the link is made in a report scripture itself calls evil.

G. What the Text Does Not Explain

Honesty requires this section, and it is the one this study's earlier edition lacked. The command in Deuteronomy 20:16, "thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth," and its carrying out at Jericho — "both man and woman, young and old" (Joshua 6:21) — included children. Every argument above bears on it: the stated reason (transmission of child sacrifice and spirit-worship), the four centuries of patience, the drive-out that came first, the open door that Rahab and Gibeon walked through, and the conventional language of the summaries. Together they remove the charge of arbitrary ethnic slaughter.

They do not tell us why children were included, and scripture does not say. This study will not invent a reason the text does not give. What scripture does give is a larger frame. The judgment on these cities, like every judgment, sits under Abraham's question: "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?"

(Genesis 18:25). The same God says of himself that he does not afflict willingly, and that he has no pleasure in the death of the wicked — let alone of the young. And scripture's final word on every life cut short is not the battlefield but the resurrection, "both of the just and unjust" (Acts 24:15), before a Judge whose character Chapter 1 established. A believer may trust that Judge with what the text leaves unexplained, without pretending the text has explained it.

Weighing it: Concession — this section grants what the text does not explain. The other side is right that no verse gives a reason for the children's inclusion. This study rests its trust on God's stated character, not on a reason it cannot find.

Relevance for the Grace Administration

This chapter needs the clearest statement of discontinuity anywhere in the study.

The church does not carry this forward as a military pattern. Nothing in this chapter authorizes, models or anticipates physical warfare as a Grace-administration practice. Paul says so directly:

2 Corinthians 10:4 *(For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;)*

"Not carnal" rules out any reading of this chapter as a template for engaging opposition now. The conquest belonged to Israel's unique, administration-specific identity as a landed nation under the Law. The church has no promised territory and fights no physical battles. Reading this chapter as licence for anything like its methods today would be exactly the confusion of administrations this library's framework exists to prevent.

What does carry forward is the underlying concern, met by different means. The corruption this chapter found named — practices scripture calls abomination, and powers behind them it calls devils — is still real, and Ephesians 6:12 names the church's engagement with it: spiritual, not physical. For the believer's own confidence: the danger was never merely military; it was spiritual, and the church now meets it with weapons suited to a spiritual administration — truth, righteousness, faith, the word of God (Ephesians 6:13-17). And the lesson of Psalm 106 applies with full force: what a believer does not deal with does not stay harmless. It teaches.

For how God is presented to those who do not yet believe: this is the one chapter where honesty requires admitting that the plain reading remains hard even after every clarification — as §G says. This study does not claim to have removed every discomfort a modern reader will feel. It claims something narrower and defensible: that the popular image of arbitrary, indiscriminate ethnic slaughter is not what the text's fuller record supports, that a hearer troubled by this chapter deserves the fuller record rather than a defensive silence, and that the same God who fought for Canaanite Gibeon and wrote a Canaanite woman into the line of Christ is the God the gospel offers.

Weighing it: Narrative — application; carries no weight on the contested claims.

In Short

Scripture says the conquest was not for Israel's righteousness but for the nations' wickedness — child sacrifice and spirit-worship — and that the ban's purpose was "that they teach you not." Psalm 106 records what happened when it was ignored: Israel's own children on Canaan's altars. The judgment waited four centuries, was meant to proceed by driving out, spared Rahab and defended Gibeon, and was reported in the conventional language of ancient war. Why children were included, the text does not say, and this study does not pretend it does. The church carries none of this forward as warfare; its weapons are not carnal.

Chapter 8 — Amalek and the Long War on the Seed

Chapters 5 and 7 traced a thread that rests on what scripture states: the plagues' stated purpose, the conquest's stated reason. This chapter follows the thread's most striking strand — a conflict that begins on the road out of Egypt and surfaces again, a thousand years later, in the Persian court. The earlier edition of this study called that link "direct statement, not inference." That was too strong, and this chapter says exactly how strong it is. It is still the most striking strand in the whole study.

A. The First Attack, and God's Stated Response

Amalek's first act against Israel is recorded twice, and the second account gives a detail the first leaves out — who was targeted:

Exodus 17:8 *Then came Amalek, and fought with Israel in Rephidim.*

17:14 *And the LORD said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in a book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua: for I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven.*

17:16 *For he said, Because the LORD hath sworn that the LORD will have war with Amalek from generation to generation.*

Deuteronomy 25:17 *Remember what Amalek did unto thee by the way, when ye were come forth out of Egypt;*

25:18 *How he met thee by the way, and smote the hindmost of thee, even all that were feeble behind thee, when thou wast faint and weary; and he feared not God.*

"Smote the hindmost... all that were feeble behind thee." Amalek did not attack Israel's fighting men. He fell on the stragglers at the back of the column — the exhausted, the weak, those who could not keep up — a people newly freed from slavery, on foot in the desert, with their families. "He feared not God" names the character of the act. And Exodus 17:16 declares at the first encounter that this conflict would run "from generation to generation."

It did. Amalek appears again and again as Israel's enemy: joining the Canaanites to rout Israel at Hormah (Numbers 14:45), allying with Moab under Eglon (Judges 3:13), swarming in with Midian to strip Israel's harvests year after year (Judges 6:3-5). This was not one skirmish remembered with a grudge. It was a people that set itself against Israel across centuries.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim S, that Amalek's hostility to Israel was sustained across generations. Exodus 17:16 declares it and the later books record it. The other side can fairly answer that many nations fought Israel; this study agrees, and claims for Amalek only what scripture singles it out for.

B. Centuries Later: Saul's Commission, and His Failure

The sentence of Exodus 17 was not carried out for centuries — another instance of the long patience this study has traced throughout. When it finally was:

1 Samuel 15:2 *Thus saith the LORD of hosts, I remember that which Amalek did to Israel, how he laid wait for him in the way, when he came up from Egypt.*

15:3 *Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass.*

This is Chapter 7's hardest material in its most concentrated form, and this study does not soften it here either. Chapter 7 §G's concession applies with full force. But two details in the same chapter belong in the account. Before the battle, Saul warned the Kenites, who lived among the Amalekites, to leave: **"Go, depart, get you down from among the Amalekites, lest I destroy you with them: for ye shewed kindness to all the children of Israel, when they came up out of Egypt" (1 Samuel 15:6).** Even here, those who had shown kindness were given a way out. And when Samuel finally executed Agag, he named the king's own record: **"As thy sword hath made women childless, so shall thy mother be childless among women" (1 Samuel 15:33).** Agag was not an innocent. He was a king whose sword had emptied the arms of mothers.

What matters most for this chapter is what Saul did:

1 Samuel 15:8 *And he took Agag the king of the Amalekites alive, and utterly destroyed all the people with the edge of the sword.*

15:9 *But Saul and the people spared Agag, and the best of the sheep, and of the oxen, and of the fatlings, and the lambs, and all that was good, and would not utterly destroy them...*

Saul's disobedience was not mercy applied consistently. He spared the king and the best of the livestock — the valuable things — and destroyed the rest. Chapter 3 examined what this cost Saul personally. And the summary "utterly destroyed all the people" is itself the conventional language Chapter 7 §E described: within a few chapters David is fighting Amalekites again (1 Samuel 27:8; 30:1), four hundred of them escape him on camels (30:17), and in Hezekiah's day there is still a "rest of the Amalekites that were escaped" (1 Chronicles 4:43).

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim S, that Amalek survived Saul's campaign. The later Amalekites are named outright. The other side can fairly answer that survivors from Saul's day do not by themselves connect to Persia; §C weighs that link separately.

C. Haman the Agagite

The book of Esther, set in the Persian court some five centuries after Saul, introduces its villain with a single descriptive word that is easy to read past:

Esther 3:1 *After these things did king Ahasuerus promote Haman the son of Hammedatha the Agagite, and advanced him, and set his seat above all the princes that were with him.*

3:6 *...wherefore Haman sought to destroy all the Jews that were throughout the whole kingdom of Ahasuerus, even the people of Mordecai.*

3:13 *And the letters were sent by posts into all the king's provinces, to destroy, to kill, and to cause to perish, all Jews, both young and old, little children and women, in one day...*

"The Agagite." Here is exactly how far the text takes us, and how far the rest is inference [Appendix D]:

It is a **direct statement** that Haman is called "the Agagite."

It is a **strong inference** that this marks him as of Amalekite royal descent. "Agag" appears in scripture only as the name — perhaps the title — of Amalek's kings (Numbers 24:7; 1 Samuel 15), and the book of Esther repeatedly calls Haman simply "the Jews' enemy" (3:10; 8:1; 9:10, 24). Jewish tradition has read it this way from ancient times.

It is a **reasonable inference** that he descends from the royal house of the very Agag Saul spared. Samuel killed that Agag, and the text does not trace Haman's line back to him by name.

And there is one more piece, which the earlier edition missed and which makes the link far more striking. Look at how Esther introduces the hero of the book:

Esther 2:5 *Now in Shushan the palace there was a certain Jew, whose name was Mordecai, the son of Jair, the son of Shimei, the son of Kish, a Benjamite;*

Saul's father was "Kish... a Benjamite" (1 Samuel 9:1-2). Mordecai is of the house of Kish, of the tribe of Benjamin. Whether the Kish named here is Saul's own father or a later namesake in the same clan, the writer of Esther has set a Benjamite of the house of Kish face to face with an Agagite. It is the unfinished business of 1 Samuel 15, taken up again in Persia. Where Saul, son of Kish, failed against Agag, Mordecai, of the house of Kish, stands against the Agagite and wins.

What Haman attempted is exactly what Amalek began at Rephidim: the destruction of the people carrying the promise of Genesis 3:15 forward, "both young and old, little children and women, in one day." Had he succeeded, there would have been no Jewish people for the Messiah to be born to. Scripture does not comment on the connection; it does not need to. It sets the names side by side and lets the reader see.

Weighing it: Strong inference — for claim S, that Haman was an Amalekite and that Esther deliberately stages a rematch of Saul and Agag. "The Agagite" and "son of Kish, a Benjamite" are direct statements. That they are meant to be read together is a strong inference: the pairing is too exact to be accidental. That Haman descends from the specific Agag of 1 Samuel 15 is only a reasonable inference.

The other side can fairly answer that "Agagite" could be a place-name or family-name with no Amalekite link at all; this study answers that nowhere else in scripture is "Agag" anything but Amalekite.

D. The Spoil They Would Not Touch

The earlier edition missed one more detail, and it seals the connection. When Haman's plot was reversed, the king issued a counter-decree allowing the Jews to defend themselves — and, in words deliberately mirroring Haman's own decree, "to take the spoil of them for a prey" (Esther 8:11; compare 3:13). They were permitted to take the plunder. The book records, three times in one chapter, what they did:

Esther 9:10 *The ten sons of Haman the son of Hammedatha, the enemy of the Jews, slew they; but on the spoil laid they not their hand.*

9:15 *...but on the prey they laid not their hand.*

9:16 *...but they laid not their hands on the prey,*

Three times. Saul's failure had been precisely this — he took the spoil of Amalek, "the best of the sheep, and of the oxen" (1 Samuel 15:9), and Samuel told him that obedience was better than sacrifice (15:22). The Jews of Esther's day, facing the Agagite's house, did what Saul would not: they refused the plunder. The book underlines it three times so that no reader will miss it.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — for claim S, that Esther deliberately answers Saul's failure. The triple refusal is a direct statement. That it is meant to recall 1 Samuel 15 is a reasonable inference, strengthened by the Kish-Agag pairing in §C. The other side can fairly answer that refusing plunder simply showed the Jews fought only in self-defense; this study agrees that it showed that too.

E. Delivered Again, Without God's Name Once Spoken

Esther is distinctive in one further way, and it bears on this study's whole argument: it never once names God. Not in any of its ten chapters. Yet the deliverance it records — Esther's courage, Mordecai's timing, a sleepless king who called for the royal records to be read on exactly the right night (Esther 6:1), a plot turned back on its author — is told so that no careful reader can miss a governing hand, unnamed but unmistakable:

Esther 4:14 *For if thou altogether holdest thy peace at this time, then shall there enlargement and deliverance arise to the Jews from another place; but thou and thy father's house shall be destroyed: and who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this?*

9:1 *...(though it was turned to the contrary, that the Jews had rule over them that hated them;)*

"Deliverance arise... from another place." Mordecai is certain the deliverance will come; he is only uncertain whether Esther will be its instrument. That is this study's title in one sentence. The feast of Purim, instituted at the book's close (Esther 9:20-22), stands as a permanent witness that the long war declared at Rephidim did not end in the Agagite's favor.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim S, that deliverance came; reasonable inference that it was God's providence unnamed. Mordecai's certainty and the reversal are stated outright. That the

unnamed hand is God's is the reading of the whole of scripture and tradition, but Esther itself does not say it; the other side can fairly answer that a book that never names God cannot be quoted as naming his providence. This study answers that the book's structure speaks where its vocabulary is silent.

Relevance for the Grace Administration

For the believer's own confidence: **"in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us" (Romans 8:37)**. The military form of Amalek's war belongs, as Chapter 7 said plainly, to an administration the church does not live under. But the underlying reality — a persistent, recurring opposition to God's people and purposes, met every time by a deliverance that outlasts it — is the same confidence Paul states to the church. The promised Seed that Haman nearly prevented was born, died, rose, and ascended to the right hand of God, and the enemy's long war against that line was lost at the empty tomb.

And there is a lesson in the spoil. The Jews of Esther's day won by refusing what Saul had grabbed. A believer's victory over the adversary is never an occasion for self-enrichment; the weapons, and the motives, are not carnal.

For how God is presented to those who do not yet believe: Esther's unnamed providence is an unusually helpful model for a skeptical hearer who does not expect, and may distrust, dramatic displays of divine intervention. A threat traced across centuries, and a deliverance accomplished through one woman's courage and a sleepless king's reading, show that scripture's claim about God's care does not require spectacle to be real, then or now.

Weighing it: Narrative — application; carries no weight on the contested claims.

In Short

Amalek attacked the weakest of Israel on the road out of Egypt, and God declared a war "from generation to generation." Saul spared Agag and grabbed the spoil. Five centuries later a man called "the Agagite" plotted to destroy every Jew in a single day — and was stopped by a Benjamite of the house of Kish, whose people then refused the spoil three times over. That Haman was an Amalekite is a strong inference, not a direct statement; that Esther stages the rematch on purpose is hard to miss. Deliverance arose, as Mordecai said it would, "from another place."

Chapter 9 — When God Doesn't Answer

Every chapter so far has answered a historical question: what happened, and who did it, in scripture's hardest narratives. This chapter answers a different kind of question, asked in the present tense, usually in the middle of grief: I prayed, and God did not answer. Calamity, or sickness, or death came anyway. If God is both willing and good — everything Chapters 1 through 8 have argued — why does this still happen?

A. Job Asked Directly, and Was Not Given the Answer He Asked For

Chapter 2 used Job 1-2 to establish the adversary's agency. It is worth returning to Job for a different reason, because Job spends most of the book demanding exactly the explanation this chapter is asking for — and does not receive it in the form he asks:

Job 13:3 *Surely I would speak to the Almighty, and I desire to reason with God.*

23:3 *Oh that I knew where I might find him! that I might come even to his seat!*

23:5 *I would know the words which he would answer me, and understand what he would say unto me.*

When God finally answers, after some thirty-five chapters of Job's questions and his friends' speeches, the answer does not take the form Job requested:

Job 38:1 *Then the LORD answered Job out of the whirlwind, and said,*

38:2 *Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?*

38:4 *Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare, if thou hast understanding.*

God does not explain the scene of chapters 1-2. Job is never told about the exchange with Satan that the reader has seen. He is given instead a long tour of creation's scale and wonder, question after question he cannot answer. And Job's response does not describe a man who finally got the explanation he wanted:

Job 42:5 *I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear: but now mine eye seeth thee.*

42:6 *Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes.*

Job is satisfied not because his question was answered but because he has seen God. That is worth sitting with honestly. Sometimes scripture's answer to unanswered prayer is not a delayed explanation eventually delivered, but a deeper encounter with God himself that makes the demand for an explanation fall away.

But the book does not end at 42:6. It ends with restoration — "the LORD turned the captivity of Job... also the LORD gave Job twice as much as he had before" (42:10) — and James tells the church what that ending reveals: "have seen the end of the Lord; that the Lord is very pitiful, and of tender mercy" (James 5:11). The middle of Job's story looked like abandonment. The end showed the character of the God who had been there all along.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim P, that unanswered questions do not disprove God's goodness, and that the end reveals his heart. The other side can fairly answer that Job's restoration does not happen to every sufferer in this life; this study agrees, and §D takes that up.

B. Paul's Thorn: A Direct "No," With a Stated Reason

Job's case leaves the reader without a stated reason. Scripture also records the opposite — someone who prayed, was refused, and was told why:

2 Corinthians 12:7 *And lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure.*

12:8 *For this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me.*

12:9 *And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me.*

Two things stand out. First, Paul names the thorn's source: "the messenger of Satan." That is the pattern of Chapter 2 — affliction from the adversary. Second, this is not unanswered prayer in the sense of silence. Paul asked three times and received a spoken answer, just not the one he asked for. "My grace is sufficient" does not grant the request; it changes what Paul is asking for. And Paul's response — "most gladly... will I rather glory" — models what this chapter is really after: a settled confidence in God's character that holds even when the specific request is refused.

What was the thorn? Scripture does not say, and readers have long disagreed — some think of a bodily ailment, others of persecutors, since the Old Testament calls hostile people "thorns in your sides" (Numbers 33:55) and the next verse lists "reproaches... persecutions" (12:10). This study does not need to settle it. Who gave it is also debated: "there was given to me" does not name the giver. What the verse names outright is the messenger: Satan's.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim A, that Paul's thorn was Satan's messenger; reasonable inference for claim P. The source is named in so many words. That God permitted it for Paul's protection from pride is the natural reading of "lest I should be exalted," but the giver is not named, and the other side can fairly answer that God himself gave it. On either reading, Paul calls the messenger Satan's, and God's answer is grace.

C. Habakkuk: Complaint Answered With Character, Not Explanation

One further pattern maps almost exactly onto this chapter's question. Habakkuk opens his book with the complaint this chapter exists to address:

Habakkuk 1:2 *O LORD, how long shall I cry, and thou wilt not hear! even cry out unto thee of violence, and thou wilt not save!*

God's answer is not what Habakkuk wanted. The violence he names will be judged — but by a worse violence coming, the Chaldeans (1:6). Habakkuk objects, and waits on his watchtower for a reply (2:1). What he receives is a vision of God's rule over history and a single sentence that became one of the pillars of the gospel:

Habakkuk 2:4 *...but the just shall live by his faith.*

Paul quotes it twice to explain how a man is made righteous before God (Romans 1:17; Galatians 3:11). And the book ends not with the complaint answered but with the complainant changed:

Habakkuk 3:17 *Although the fig tree shall not blossom, neither shall fruit be in the vines; the labour of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no meat; the flock shall be cut off from the fold, and there shall be no herd in the stalls:*

3:18 *Yet I will rejoice in the LORD, I will joy in the God of my salvation.*

"Although... yet" is the whole book in two words. Every circumstance Habakkuk feared remains unresolved — and his trust is settled anyway, on who God is rather than on circumstances improving. This is not resignation. It is faith of the kind 2:4 describes: the just living by trust in a God whose character he knows, while the answer is still on its way.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim P, that trust can rest on God's character when circumstances are unresolved. The other side does not dispute Habakkuk's words; it may ask whether this is only making the best of a hard situation. This study answers that Habakkuk calls God "the God of my salvation" in the same breath, and that 2:4 is not a consolation prize but the foundation Paul built on.

D. Why the Struggle Continues: The Present Evil Age

Scripture gives one more piece, tying back to Chapter 2: why the adversary's activity has not yet been ended.

1 John 5:19 *And we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness.*

Galatians 1:4 *Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father:*

Two notes on the Greek, both of which strengthen the point [Appendix D]. In 1 John 5:19, "lieth in wickedness" is literally "lies in the wicked one" — the world lies in the grip of a person, not just a condition. And in Galatians 1:4, the word the King James renders "world" means *age* — "this present evil age." The believer lives in a period Paul calls evil, under an enemy John names, and Christ gave himself to deliver us out of it.

This does not deny Christ's victory. That was won: God "spoiled principalities and powers... triumphing over them" (Colossians 2:15), and raised Christ and seated him "far above all principality, and power" (Ephesians 1:20-21). But its full, visible outworking has not yet arrived. That is scripture's own reason that unanswered prayer and ongoing calamity are still real, even for those God delivers: victory is secured and its outcome is certain, but its complete arrival is still future.

Romans 8:18 *For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us.*

8:28 *And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose.*

Romans 8:28 is worth reading precisely. It does not say all things *are* good. It says all things *work together* for good — a claim about the outcome of a process still underway, not a claim that every event along the way is pleasant, deserved, or explainable on request.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim P, that the present age is evil and its full deliverance still future. The other side can fairly answer that this explains why suffering continues without explaining any particular case; this study agrees, and SE says so.

E. A Pastoral Word: Not Every Case Is the Same

Honesty requires one more distinction. Scripture does name real conditions that can stand between a person and an answered prayer: sin held onto — **"If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me" (Psalm 66:18)**; wrong motive — **"Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss" (James 4:3)**; persistent doubt (James 1:6-7). Where those are present, they are worth examining honestly, not avoided out of discomfort.

But scripture is just as clear that suffering is not automatically a sign of the sufferer's fault. Job's friends insisted it was, and God's anger fell on them for it (Job 42:7). Jesus rejected the same reflex twice. Of a man born blind, his disciples asked who had sinned, the man or his parents, and he answered, **"Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents" (John 9:3)**. Of eighteen people killed when a tower fell in Siloam, he asked, **"think ye that they were sinners above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem? I tell you, Nay" (Luke 13:4-5)**.

This chapter's governing conviction is Job's and Jesus's, not the friends'. Some suffering has a cause worth examining, and some does not, and wisdom lies in telling the difference rather than assuming one answer fits every case — and never, ever, in adding blame to the grieving.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim P, that not every sufferer is at fault. Jesus says so in so many words, twice. The other side does not dispute it; the risk runs the other way, in readers who forget it.

Relevance for the Grace Administration

This chapter is already about the present — it is the question every believer living now actually asks.

For the believer's own confidence: Jesus stated it directly — **"In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world" (John 16:33)**. Trouble is named as expected, not as evidence against God's goodness; victory is named as already won, not as a promise that trouble will be absent. A believer who has walked through this chapter has grounds for exactly that posture: Habakkuk's "although... yet," and Paul's "my grace is sufficient," not a demand that every prayer be answered as asked before trust is possible.

For how God is presented to those who do not yet believe: **"the God of all comfort; who comforteth us in all our tribulation" (2 Corinthians 1:3-4)** — comfort inside trouble, not only after it. A gospel that promises a hearer freedom from all hardship overpromises, and the disappointment that follows becomes its own obstacle to faith. A gospel that promises what scripture promises — a good and unchanging God, present inside real difficulty, with final deliverance secured though not yet arrived — asks for the kind of trust scripture models, and no more.

Weighing it: Narrative — application; carries no weight on the contested claims.

In Short

Job never learned why, but he saw God, and his story ended in double restoration — "the Lord is very pitiful, and of tender mercy." Paul asked three times to be freed from Satan's messenger and was given grace instead. Habakkuk complained, waited, and learned that "the just shall live by his faith." The world still lies in the grip of the wicked one, in an age Paul calls evil, and Christ's won victory is not yet fully arrived. Some suffering has a cause; much does not — and Jesus forbids blaming the blind man or the tower's victims.

Chapter 10 — Closing: The Deliverer, Not the Destroyer

This study opened with a disconnect: the God most people picture when they read the Flood, the plagues, or the conquest is not obviously the God John describes as light, with no darkness in him at all. Nine chapters later, this closing chapter draws the argument together, says plainly how firm each part is, and asks what it requires of a reader living in the Grace administration now.

A. What Each Chapter Found

Chapter 1 established from direct statement that God is good without exception, that no evil originates in him, and that scripture's name for him is Deliverer — while noticing that the same scriptures say his ways are judgment. Chapter 2 established a real adversary who held the power of death, and showed him in Job 1-2 asking leave, receiving a limit, and doing the damage himself — after which the narrator sums it up as "the evil that the LORD had brought," the idiom caught in the act. Chapter 3 showed that idiom working inside scripture's own pages: one account says the LORD moved David to number Israel, the other says Satan did. It read Isaiah 45:7's "evil" as calamity, found Lamentations saying God "doth not afflict willingly," and traced Pharaoh hardening his own heart before God confirmed him in it.

Chapters 4 and 5 applied these tools to the two narratives most often raised against God's goodness, and — correcting the earlier edition — did not claim that God did not bring the Flood or the final plague. Scripture says he did. What they found was *how*: grief before judgment, a world already ruined by its own violence, long patience while a preacher preached, a door God shut himself, Sodom spared for ten if ten could be found, escape offered even to Egyptians who feared God's word, and the LORD himself standing at the marked door to keep the destroyer out. Chapter 6 showed the covenant curses to be the agreed terms of a vow, preceded by generations of compassionate warning, and described by Moses himself as God hiding his face so that evils could rush in. Chapter 7 faced the conquest directly: a stated reason — "that they teach you not" — confirmed by Psalm 106's record of Israel's children on Canaan's altars; four centuries of restraint; a conquest meant to proceed by driving out; Rahab spared and Gibeon defended; conventional war-report language; and one honest concession, that the text does not explain why children were included. Chapter 8 traced Amalek from Rephidim to Persia, where a Benjamite of the house of Kish stood against "the Agagite" and his people refused the spoil three times. And Chapter

9 turned to the present tense: Job's encounter and restoration, Paul's thorn and God's grace, Habakkuk's "although... yet," the present evil age, and Jesus's own refusal to blame the suffering.

Weighing it: Narrative — summary; each finding carries the weight its own chapter gave it.

B. The Thread Underneath, Weighed Honestly

Beneath Chapters 4 through 8 runs a single thread: an enemy working, across widely separated centuries, against the line through which the promised Seed of Genesis 3:15 was to come, met every time by a God who delivers. Not every strand of it is equally firm, and the earlier edition of this study said too much about some of them. Here they are, weighed.

The corruption before the Flood reached even the family that called on God's name, compromising the line of promise from within (Chapter 4 §D) — a reasonable inference, resting on the companion study's settled reading of Genesis 6.

The plagues fell on an empire that had tried to drown the covenant family's sons at birth (Chapter 5 §A) — a direct statement that Pharaoh did so; that this was part of a wider campaign against the Seed is a reasonable inference.

The conquest was aimed at nations whose practices, left in place, would teach Israel to burn its own children — and did (Chapter 7 §A) — a direct statement of the stated reason and its result.

Amalek set itself against Israel "from generation to generation" (Chapter 8 §A) — a direct statement. That the Agagite of Esther is Amalek's heir, and that the book stages a rematch of Saul and Agag through a Benjamite of the house of Kish, is a strong inference (Chapter 8 §C).

Taken together, these strands give more than coincidence: a coherent account of why scripture's hardest passages keep taking the same shape, book after book. But the thread is an inference from the whole, and it is held as one. The study's case about God's character does not depend on it. It stands on Chapters 1 through 3.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — for claim S, taken as a whole. Individual strands range from direct statement to reasonable inference, as stated. The other side can fairly answer that one can find patterns in any long history; this study answers that Exodus 17:16 declares this one in advance.

C. Why This Was Never Only a History Lesson

The Introduction insisted that none of this could be allowed to sit in the past.

2 Corinthians 5:19 *To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.*

5:20 *Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.*

An ambassador represents the character of the one who sent him. A believer carrying, even unexamined, the caricature this study opened by naming — a capricious God, quick to destroy, indistinguishable in practice from the thief — represents that caricature to everyone he speaks to. God, says Paul, is "not imputing their trespasses unto them"; he is beseeching. This study's purpose has been to close the gap between the caricature and what scripture says, so that the ambassador's message matches the God who sent him.

Weighing it: Narrative — application; carries no weight on the contested claims.

D. What Would Change This Study's Mind

A study that cannot say what would overturn it has not really tested itself. Here are five findings that would, each specific enough that a reader could go looking.

First: a text in which God is said to take pleasure in the death or suffering of the righteous or the repentant. Deuteronomy 28:63 speaks of God rejoicing to destroy a covenant people that has abandoned him, and Chapter 6 §D faced it; but no text this study knows of says God delights in the suffering of those who turn to him. Ezekiel 33:11 and Lamentations 3:33 say the opposite under oath and in grief. A text that said otherwise would overturn claim G.

Second: a text in which God is said to tempt a person toward sin, in the narrator's or God's own voice, with no other agent named and no prior choice by that person described. Every case this study examined — David's census, Ahab's prophets, Saul's evil spirit, Pharaoh's heart, the strong delusion — either names another agent in the same passage or its parallel, or follows a choice the person had already made. A clear counter-example would seriously weaken claim I.

Third: a judgment in scripture that falls without warning on a people who had not already set themselves against God. Every major judgment examined here came after warning and long patience. A case where God's judgment struck the unwarned and innocent as its stated target would overturn claim J.

Fourth: a text in which the ban is given a reason other than the nations' wickedness and the danger of its transmission — for instance, their ethnicity, or Israel's own merit. Deuteronomy 9:4-5 explicitly rules out Israel's merit, and 20:18 gives the transmission reason. A text naming a different basis would overturn claim K.

Fifth: evidence that "Agagite" in Esther means something with no Amalekite connection — a place, a Persian family, anything outside the name of Amalek's kings. That would demote Chapter 8's strongest inference to a curiosity, and weaken claim S considerably, though it would leave the rest of the study standing.

This study knows of no finding of any of these kinds in the text. It names them so that its readers can look.

Weighing it: Method, not argument — states what would overturn the study.

E. Where This Finally Resolves

This study has shown a God who judges as a just Judge and delivers inside judgment, comforts inside tribulation, and remains good throughout — but who has not yet finished the work every chapter has traced. Scripture's last word on that unfinished work belongs here:

Revelation 21:3 *And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God.*

21:4 *And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away.*

Everything this study has traced — the Flood's grief, the plagues' judgment on a false system, the conquest's hardest commands, Amalek's long war, the present age's unanswered prayers — belongs to what Revelation 21:4 calls "the former things." Not excused, and not minimized. Some of it was the adversary's work, which scripture's idiom credits to the God who permitted and bounded it. Some of it was the consequence of choices made with the warning in hand. And some of it was the judgment of the Judge of all the earth, who did right, took no pleasure in it, and built a way of escape into it every time. None of it was darkness in God.

And the destroyer's end is written as surely as God's final act. The one who had the power of death has been undone by Christ's death, resurrection and ascension (Hebrews 2:14; Ephesians 1:20-22), and "the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death" (1 Corinthians 15:26). The same God who set a hedge around Job, stood at the marked door in Egypt, would have spared Sodom for ten, fought for Canaanite Gibeon, and stayed good through Habakkuk's "how long" — this is the God the closing vision names. He is still delivering, until the day nothing is left for him to deliver anyone from.

Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim G, that the end of the story is God wiping away every tear. The other side does not dispute Revelation 21. It is where both readings agree the story ends, and this study rests there.

In Short

God is light, with no darkness in him. Scripture credits him, in its own idiom, with what he permits; names a real adversary as the destroyer; describes covenant curses as the fruit of warned choices and of God hiding his face; and, where God does judge directly, shows a just Judge who grieves, warns, waits, and builds in a way of escape. The hardest conquest text is not fully explained, and this study says so. What scripture says of God from first to last is the name this study took for its title: Deliverer.

Appendix A — Who Are the "Sons of God"? (Condensed)

Chapter 4 §D and Chapter 7 §F rest on a reading this appendix condenses rather than re-argues. The full case is made in this library's companion study, *Who Are the "Sons of God"? Settling the Genesis Six Question*, which any reader wanting the argument rather than its conclusion is urged to read.

The Opposing Case, Stated First

The view that the "sons of God" were angels who took human wives is old and serious, and its best evidence deserves to be set out at full strength.

The phrase itself. The Hebrew phrase in Genesis 6:2, *bene ha-elohim*, is used in Job for angels — "the sons of God came to present themselves before the LORD, and Satan came also among them" (Job 1:6; also 2:1; 38:7). No other Old Testament passage uses this exact phrase for men.

Jude 6-7. Jude speaks of "the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation," and goes on: "Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh." Read one way, "in like manner" compares the sin of Sodom to the sin of those angels — which would make the angels' sin sexual.

2 Peter 2:4-5 and 1 Peter 3:19-20. Peter sets the angels that sinned beside the Flood, and elsewhere speaks of "spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient... in the days of Noah."

Ancient readers. The book of 1 Enoch, some early Jewish interpreters, several early church writers, and — in this library's own standing reference — Bullinger's *Companion Bible* (Appendixes 23, 25, 26) all take the angelic view.

The Answer

The boundary is set before Genesis 6 opens. Genesis 1 repeats "after his kind" ten times in fifteen verses (1:11-25), fencing each created kind to reproduce its own kind. And Jesus says that the angels "neither marry, nor are given in marriage" (Matthew 22:30). A literal angel-human union producing offspring crosses the boundary Genesis 1 sets, whoever "sons of God" names. This is a **reasonable inference** — scripture does not list angels among the "kinds" of Genesis 1, and the other side can fairly answer that Jesus spoke of angels "in heaven," not of angels who had left it.

The identification has its own evidence. Genesis 6:2's sequence — "saw... that they were fair; and they took" — is the sequence scripture uses elsewhere for ordinary human desire: Eve at the tree ("saw... took," Genesis 3:6), Shechem and Dinah ("when Shechem... saw her, he took her," Genesis 34:2), David and Bathsheba ("he saw a woman... and David sent messengers, and took her," 2 Samuel 11:2-4). John gathers the pattern under "the lust of the eyes" (1 John 2:16). Genesis 4 and 5, just before, have described two lines: Seth's, marked by calling "upon the name of the LORD" (4:26), and Cain's, marked

by escalating violence (4:23-24). The simplest reading takes "sons of God" as the first line and "daughters of men" as the second — the danger Deuteronomy 7:3-4 and Malachi 2:11 later name for Israel, the covenant people drawn away by marriage outside the covenant. And scripture does call God's own people his sons (Deuteronomy 14:1; Hosea 1:10), and calls Adam "the son of God" (Luke 3:38). (The earlier edition listed Joseph and Potiphar's wife as a parallel; Genesis 39:7 does not use the "saw... took" pair, and Shechem and Dinah is the better example.)

"Nephilim" and "men of renown." Strong's Hebrew dictionary (H5303) derives *nephilim* from the verb "to fall" (H5307), and glosses it "properly, a feller, i.e. a bully or tyrant," with "giant" as the King James rendering. Genesis 6:4's "men of renown" — literally "men of the name" — is the exact phrase used of Korah's rebel princes (Numbers 16:2), and the builders of Babel sought the same thing: "let us make us a name" (Genesis 11:4). In both, it is human pride. The spies' report that linked Anak's sons to the Nephilim (Numbers 13:33) is the report scripture calls "an evil report" (13:32). Individuals of great stature — Og, Goliath, the tall Anakim — are real, and are not in dispute. A distinct hybrid race is what the text does not require.

Jude and Peter. Jude 6-7 and 2 Peter 2:4-6 list the sinning angels, the Flood (in Peter) and Sodom as a series of historical judgments. Neither writer says the angels' sin and the Flood were one event. Jude 7's "in like manner" is the angelic view's strongest verse, and it is honestly debated: the Greek can compare Sodom's sin to that of the angels, or can compare "the cities about them" to Sodom and Gomorrah themselves. This study holds that Jude does not settle the question either way. Jude does name his sources elsewhere — he quotes Enoch by name in verse 14, eight verses later — and here names no connection with Genesis 6.

Noah "perfect in his generations" (Genesis 6:9) is read, with the Treasury of Scripture Knowledge's cross-references to Job 1:1, Psalm 37:37 and Luke 1:6, as moral uprightness, not purity of bloodline.

Bullinger. This reading departs from Bullinger's own angelic view. His work on figures of speech remains this library's standing reference; his conclusion on this particular question is not adopted.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — for claim S, that no hybrid bloodline was created and the threat before the Flood was moral, not genetic. The companion study holds the reading as settled for this library; this appendix states its strength honestly. The other side's best evidence is the phrase's use in Job and Jude 7's "in like manner." Neither is dismissed; both are answered.

Appendix B — The Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart, Verse by Verse

Chapter 3 §E states the finding in plain words: God announced the hardening in advance, but in the narrative itself Pharaoh hardened his own heart, or his heart "grew hard" with no one named, through the first five plagues; the LORD is first said to harden it at the sixth. Here is every statement in order.

Three Hebrew words are used. *Chazaq* means to be or make strong, firm — a heart set and resolved. *Kaved* means to be or make heavy — a heart dull and unmoved; the same root, in its good sense, gives the Hebrew word for "glory." *Qashah* means to be or make hard, stubborn.

#	Verse	When	Named as hardening	Hebrew word
1	Exodus 4:21	Before Moses returns to Egypt	God, future: "I will harden his heart"	chazaq
2	Exodus 7:3	Before the first sign	God, future: "I will harden Pharaoh's heart"	qashah
3	Exodus 7:13	After the rod becomes a serpent	No one named — "Pharaoh's heart grew hard" (the King James supplies "he")	chazaq
4	Exodus 7:14	God to Moses, before plague 1	No one named — "Pharaoh's heart is hardened"	kaved
5	Exodus 7:22	Plague 1, blood	No one named	chazaq
6	Exodus 8:15	Plague 2, frogs	Pharaoh himself — "he hardened his heart"	kaved
7	Exodus 8:19	Plague 3, lice	No one named	chazaq
8	Exodus 8:32	Plague 4, flies	Pharaoh himself	kaved
9	Exodus 9:7	Plague 5, murrain	No one named	kaved
10	Exodus 9:12	Plague 6, boils	The LORD — first time in the narrative	chazaq
11	Exodus 9:34	Plague 7, hail	Pharaoh himself — "he, and his servants"	kaved
12	Exodus 9:35	Plague 7, hail	No one named	chazaq
13	Exodus 10:1	Before plague 8	The LORD — "I have hardened his heart"	kaved
14	Exodus 10:20	Plague 8, locusts	The LORD	chazaq
15	Exodus 10:27	Plague 9, darkness	The LORD	chazaq

#	Verse	When	Named as hardening	Hebrew word
16	Exodus 11:10	Summary before plague 10	The LORD	chazaq
17	Exodus 13:15	Looking back	Pharaoh — "would hardly let us go," literally "made it hard"	qashah
18	Exodus 14:4	Before the sea, future	The LORD — "I will harden"	chazaq
19	Exodus 14:8	At the sea	The LORD	chazaq
20	Exodus 14:17	At the sea, future	The LORD — "the hearts of the Egyptians"	chazaq

The tally. God announces the outcome in advance four times (rows 1, 2, 18, 20). Pharaoh is named as hardening his own heart four times (rows 6, 8, 11, 17). The heart is said to be or grow hard with no one named six times (rows 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 12). The LORD is said to harden it, in the narrative, six times (rows 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19) — and none of these comes before the sixth plague.

An outside witness. Centuries later the Philistine priests, advising their own people, spoke of the Exodus this way: "Wherefore then do ye harden your hearts, as the Egyptians and Pharaoh hardened their hearts?" (1 Samuel 6:6).

What the tally does and does not show. It shows that the narrative takes care to present Pharaoh as choosing before God confirmed the choice. It does not remove God's advance announcements, which come first. Bullinger reads all the hardening statements, including the announcements, as the idiom of permission ("I will permit or suffer his heart to be hardened"). This study holds the narrower claim: whatever the announcements mean, the narrative shows Pharaoh's own will at work first.

"That Ye May Know": The Stated Purpose

Chapter 5 §B quotes five of these. The full list, from the promise to Israel through the crossing of the sea:

#	Verse	Spoken to or about	The words
1	Exodus 6:7	Israel	"ye shall know that I am the LORD your God"
2	Exodus 7:5	The Egyptians	"the Egyptians shall know that I am the LORD"

#	Verse	Spoken to or about	The words
3	Exodus 7:17	Pharaoh, plague 1	"In this thou shalt know that I am the LORD"
4	Exodus 8:10	Pharaoh, plague 2	"that thou mayest know that there is none like unto the LORD our God"
5	Exodus 8:22	Pharaoh, plague 4	"to the end thou mayest know that I am the LORD in the midst of the earth"
6	Exodus 9:14	Pharaoh, plague 7	"that thou mayest know that there is none like me in all the earth"
7	Exodus 9:29	Pharaoh, plague 7	"that thou mayest know how that the earth is the LORD'S"
8	Exodus 10:2	Israel, plague 8	"that ye may know how that I am the LORD"
9	Exodus 11:7	Pharaoh, plague 10	"that ye may know how that the LORD doth put a difference between the Egyptians and Israel"
10	Exodus 14:4	The Egyptians, at the sea	"that the Egyptians may know that I am the LORD"
11	Exodus 14:18	The Egyptians, at the sea	"And the Egyptians shall know that I am the LORD"

Appendix C — Where Scripture Names the Agent

Chapter 3 §B argues that the idiom of permission is not a grammarian's theory but something scripture shows at work in its own pages. Here are the cases this study found in which scripture credits one act to God and, in the same passage or a parallel one, names another agent. The first column is what the text says God did; the second is the other agent the text names.

#	Event	Credited to God	Other agent named	Note
1	David's census	"he moved David against them" (2 Samuel 24:1)	"Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David" (1 Chronicles 21:1)	Two inspired accounts of one event

#	Event	Credited to God	Other agent named	Note
2	The census plague	"the LORD sent a pestilence" (2 Samuel 24:15)	"the angel that destroyed the people" (24:16)	God is the one who says "stay now thine hand"
3	Job's afflictions	"thou movedst me against him" (Job 2:3); "the evil that the LORD had brought" (42:11)	"Satan... smote Job" (2:7); "all that he hath is in thy power" (1:12)	Narrator shows the agent, then uses the idiom
4	Lightning on Job's flocks	"The fire of God is fallen from heaven" (Job 1:16)	Satan, permitted (1:12)	A servant's words, reported accurately
5	The Passover	"will smite all the firstborn" (Exodus 12:12); "the LORD smote" (12:29)	"the destroyer" (12:23); "he that destroyed the firstborn" (Hebrews 11:28); "evil angels" (Psalm 78:49)	The LORD will "not suffer the destroyer" to enter
6	Deaths in the wilderness	"the LORD sent fiery serpents" (Numbers 21:6); "wrath gone out from the LORD" (Numbers 16:46)	"destroyed of serpents... destroyed of the destroyer" (1 Corinthians 10:9-10)	Paul names the destroyer

#	Event	Credited to God	Other agent named	Note
7	Ahab's false prophets	"the LORD hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets" (1 Kings 22:23)	A spirit that volunteered, "I will persuade him" (22:21-22)	God permits: "go forth, and do so"
8	False prophets in Judah	"thou hast greatly deceived this people" (Jeremiah 4:10)	"The prophets prophesy lies in my name: I sent them not" (Jeremiah 14:14)	God disowns the prophets he is said to have used
9	The strong delusion	"God shall send them strong delusion" (2 Thessalonians 2:11)	"the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders" (2:9)	Follows "they received not the love of the truth" (2:10)
10	Pharaoh's heart	"the LORD hardened" (Exodus 9:12); "whom he will he hardeneth" (Romans 9:18)	"Pharaoh... hardened his heart" (Exodus 8:15, 8:32, 9:34)	See Appendix B

#	Event	Credited to God	Other agent named	Note
11	Paul's thorn	"there was given to me" (2 Corinthians 12:7) — giver not named	"the messenger of Satan" (12:7)	Passive verb; source named
12	Laban's cheating	"God suffered him not to hurt me" (Genesis 31:7)	Laban	Hebrew "God did not give him"; the King James itself renders it as permission

Two cases with no other agent named, held more loosely. "An evil spirit from the LORD troubled him" (1 Samuel 16:14) and "God sent an evil spirit between Abimelech and the men of Shechem" (Judges 9:23) do not name another agent in the passage. Both follow evil already chosen — Saul's disobedience, Abimelech's murder of seventy brothers — and both are read in this study by analogy with rows 1, 7 and 9. That is a reasonable inference, not a direct statement.

What the table shows. It does not show that every statement crediting God with calamity is the idiom of permission. It shows that scripture uses the idiom often enough, and plainly enough, that a reader must ask the question every time rather than assume the flat reading.

Appendix D — Word Notes

The chapters state each of these as a plain-English finding with a pointer here. This appendix gives the working. Hebrew and Greek words are given in simple English letters; Strong's numbers are given where they help a reader look the word up.

1. "No darkness at all" (1 John 1:5) — Chapter 1 §A

The Greek reads *skotia en auto ouk estin oudemia*: "darkness in him is not — none." Greek, unlike English, strengthens a denial by adding a second negative rather than cancelling it. *Ouk* ("not") followed by *oudemia* ("not even one," "none whatever") is the emphatic form. The earlier edition of this study quoted the phrase as "in no wise" and compared it to John 1:1; both were mistaken and are withdrawn. The finding stands on the double negative.

2. "Cannot be tempted with evil" (James 1:13) — Chapter 1 §A

The Greek is *apeirastos esti kakon*: *apeirastos* (G551) means "untried," "untempted," "without experience of"; *kakon* is "of evils." God is untouched by evil and has no dealings with it as a tempter. The word occurs only here in the New Testament.

3. "The destroyer" — Chapter 1 §C; Chapter 5 §D

Exodus 12:23, "the destroyer," is *ha-mashchit*, from *shachat* (H7843), "to ruin, destroy, corrupt." The same participle names "the angel that destroyed the people" in 2 Samuel 24:16. Paul's "destroyed of the destroyer" (1 Corinthians 10:10) uses *olothreutes* (G3644), found only there; Hebrews 11:28's "he that destroyed the firstborn" uses the related verb *olothreuo* (G3645). Revelation 9:11 names the angel of the bottomless pit "Abaddon" in Hebrew (from *abad*, to perish) and "Apollyon" in Greek (from *apollumi*, to destroy): both mean Destroyer. Whether every one of these names the same being is not stated in any one verse; this study leans to reading them together (Chapter 5 §D) and states the alternative.

Psalms 78:49's "evil angels" is literally "messengers of evils" — *mal'ake ra'im*. Since *ra'* is the word for calamity (note 4), the phrase may mean "angels bringing calamity" rather than "morally evil angels." This study does not lean on the psalm for claim A.

4. "Evil" as calamity: *ra'* and *ra'ah* — Chapter 3 §§C-D

Ra' (H7451) is the broadest Hebrew word for "bad," and its most frequent meaning in the prophets is harm, calamity, disaster. The context decides between "wickedness" and "calamity," and the clearest tests are passages where both senses stand side by side:

Jeremiah 18:8 — "If that nation... turn from their *evil* [wickedness], I will repent of the *evil* [calamity] that I thought to do unto them."

Jonah 3:10 — "they turned from their *evil* way; and God repented of the *evil*, that he had said that he would do unto them" — the second is Nineveh's destruction.

Genesis 50:20 — Joseph to his brothers: "ye thought *evil* against me; but God meant it unto good."

Jeremiah 29:11 — "thoughts of peace, and not of *evil*" — well-being set against harm.

In Isaiah 45:7 the word is paired against *shalom* (H7965), "peace, well-being, wholeness." The opposite of well-being is calamity, not sin. Amos 3:6 and Lamentations 3:38 use the same word in the same sense.

5. "Doth not afflict willingly" (Lamentations 3:33) — Chapter 3 §D

The Hebrew is *lo millibbo*: "not from his heart." Affliction is not what springs from God's heart; compassion is (3:32).

6. "Corrupt" and "destroy" in Genesis 6 — Chapter 4 §A

All five of these words translate the one Hebrew verb *shachat* (H7843):

6:11 — "The earth also was *corrupt* before God."

6:12 — "it was *corrupt*; for all flesh had *corrupted* his way."

6:13 — "I will *destroy* them with the earth."

6:17 — "to *destroy* all flesh."

Genesis uses the same word for what man had done to the earth and for what God would do in judgment. The inference drawn in Chapter 4 — that the judgment brought an existing ruin to its end — is reasonable, not certain.

7. "Saved" and "kept" at the Flood — Chapter 4 §C

2 Peter 2:5, "saved Noah," is *ephulaxen*, from *phulasso* (G5442): to guard, keep watch over, preserve. It is the word for a sentry keeping watch. It is not the salvation word, and the earlier edition was wrong to say it was.

Hebrews 11:7, "to the saving of his house," is *eis soterian*, "unto salvation" (*soteria*, G4991) — the same noun used for the salvation of the gospel.

1 Peter 3:20, "eight souls were saved by water," is *diesothesan*, from *diasozo* (G1295), "brought safely through" — a strengthened form of *sozo*, to save.

8. The three hardening words — Chapter 3 §E; Appendix B

Chazaq (H2388): to be strong, make firm. *Kaved* (H3513): to be heavy, make heavy — the heart as dull and unmoved. *Qashah* (H7185): to be hard, make stubborn. The distribution of these words across the narrative is set out in Appendix B.

9. "Utterly destroy": *charam* — Chapter 7

Charam (H2763) means to devote something wholly — to remove it from ordinary use and give it over, either to God's service or to destruction. The noun *cherem* is used of things devoted to the sanctuary (Leviticus 27:28) as well as of cities placed under the ban. It is a religious word before it is a military one: what was under the ban could not be taken as plunder (Joshua 6:18-19; 7:1), which is why Saul's taking of Amalek's spoil was the heart of his failure (1 Samuel 15:9, 19).

10. "Drive out": *garash* and *yarash* — Chapter 7 §C

Garash (H1644), "to drive out, cast out," is the word in Exodus 23:28-30. *Yarash* (H3423), in its causative form, "to dispossess, drive out," is the word in Numbers 33:52-55 and in most of the conquest promises. Neither word means to kill.

11. "Nephilim" — Chapter 7 §F; Appendix A

Nephilim (H5303), from *naphal* (H5307), "to fall." Strong's gloss: "properly, a feller, i.e. a bully or tyrant." The word appears only in Genesis 6:4 and Numbers 13:33. The other giant names — Anakim, Emim, Zamzummim, Rephaim — are separate words, and Deuteronomy 2:10-11 and 2:20-21 describe those peoples as "great, and many, and tall."

12. "The Agagite" — Chapter 8 §C

Ha-agagi: a gentilic form, "the Agagite," "of Agag." "Agag" appears elsewhere only as the name or title of Amalek's king (Numbers 24:7; 1 Samuel 15:8-33). Josephus, writing in the first century, calls Haman an Amalekite by descent (*Antiquities* 11.6.5). The Greek Old Testament, on the other hand, renders the word differently in different places, once calling Haman a "Bougaean" and elsewhere a Macedonian. The weight of the evidence is for an Amalekite link; it is not unanimous, which is why Chapter 8 calls it a strong inference and not a direct statement.

13. "Lieth in wickedness" and "this present evil world" — Chapter 9 §D

1 John 5:19: *ho kosmos holos en to ponero keitai* — "the whole world lies in the wicked one." The article with *ponero* points to a person, as it does in 1 John 5:18 ("that wicked one toucheth him not") and 2:13-14 ("ye have overcome the wicked one").

Galatians 1:4: *ek tou enestotos aionos ponerou* — "out of the present evil age." *Aion* (G165) is an age or period of time; the King James renders it "world" here.

14. "Rising up betimes" — Chapter 6 §B

Hashkem, from *shakam* (H7925), "to rise early." It is the same expression in 2 Chronicles 36:15 ("rising up betimes") and in Jeremiah 7:13, 7:25, 25:3-4 ("rising up early"). It pictures a man up before dawn to start his work.

15. "Deliverer" — Chapter 1 §C

Psalm 18:2, "my deliverer," is *mephalti*, from *palat* (H6403), "to escape, to bring to safety." Romans 11:26, "the Deliverer," is *ho rhuomenos*, from *rhuomai* (G4506), "to rescue, draw out of danger" — the same verb in Colossians 1:13 ("who hath delivered us from the power of darkness") and 1 Thessalonians 1:10 ("which delivered us from the wrath to come").

Appendix E — The Conquest Record in Full

Chapter 7 states the findings; this appendix gathers the texts.

The two kinds of command, side by side

Drive out (dispossess): Exodus 23:27-31 (fear and hornets sent ahead; "by little and little"); Exodus 33:2; 34:11; Numbers 33:52-55 ("drive out all the inhabitants... destroy all their pictures... images... high places"); Deuteronomy 4:38; 7:1; 7:20-22 ("put out those nations before thee by little and little"); 9:3-5; 11:23; 18:12; Joshua 3:10; 13:6; 23:5, 9, 13.

Utterly destroy (the ban): Numbers 21:2-3 (Arad); Deuteronomy 2:34 (Sihon); 3:6 (Og); 7:2; 20:16-18; Joshua 6:17-21 (Jericho); 8:26 (Ai); 10:28-40 (the southern cities); 11:11-14, 20-21 (the northern cities and the Anakim).

The two stand together throughout. The drive-out texts describe how the land as a whole was to change hands; the ban texts describe what happened to particular cities that stood and fought. Deuteronomy 7 uses both in one chapter (7:1-2, 7:20-22).

The peace clause

Deuteronomy 20:10-15 commands Israel to offer peace to a city before attacking it, and to spare its people if it accepts. Verses 16-18 then exclude "the cities of these people, which the LORD thy God doth give thee for an inheritance" — the Canaanite cities — "that they teach you not to do after all their abominations." Joshua 11:19, however, says "there was not a city that made peace with the children of Israel, save the Hivites the inhabitants of Gibeon," which implies that making peace was possible for Canaanite cities too. Gibeon did so and was spared (Joshua 9), defended by God in battle (Joshua 10:6-14), and protected by God's judgment on Saul when he broke the covenant centuries later (2 Samuel 21:1-2).

The peoples who remained

In the book of Joshua itself: "there remaineth yet very much land to be possessed" (13:1-6); the Geshurites and Maachathites "dwell among the Israelites until this day" (13:13); "the Jebusites dwell with the children of Judah at Jerusalem unto this day" (15:63); the Canaanites in Gezer (16:10); the Canaanites in Manasseh's cities, who "would dwell in that land" (17:12-13).

In Judges: Judah "could not drive out the inhabitants of the valley, because they had chariots of iron" (1:19); then Benjamin (1:21), Manasseh (1:27), Ephraim (1:29), Zebulun (1:30), Asher (1:31-32), Naphtali (1:33) and Dan (1:34) all failed to drive out the peoples in their allotments. God then declares that he will "not henceforth drive out any from before them of the nations which Joshua left when he died: That through them I may prove Israel" (2:21-22; also 3:1-4).

The same peoples, then, are said to have been "utterly destroyed" in Joshua's summaries and to be still living in the land in Joshua's own later chapters and in Judges.

Ancient war-report language

The Mesha Inscription — a stone set up by Mesha, king of Moab, about 840 BC, and now in the Louvre — records Mesha's revolt against Israel (the same revolt told from Israel's side in 2 Kings 3). In it Mesha boasts that Israel "has utterly perished for ever," at a time when the kingdom of Israel plainly continued for more than a century. Other royal inscriptions of the ancient Near East use similar formulas. They are cited here only as **corroboration** that such language was the ordinary idiom of victory; they carry no scriptural weight.

Amalek after Saul

1 Samuel 27:8 (David raids the Amalekites); 30:1-2 (Amalekites burn Ziklag and take captives — "they slew not any"); 30:17 (four hundred young men escape on camels); 2 Samuel 8:12 (spoil of Amalek dedicated by David); 1 Chronicles 4:41-43 (in Hezekiah's day, the Simeonites "smote the rest of the Amalekites that were escaped").

Appendix F — Weight of Each Argument

Every load-bearing argument in the study, grouped by the claim it bears on (Introduction §H). The last group lists arguments the earlier edition made that this version withdraws, demotes or corrects. They are kept in view on purpose, so that a returning reader can see what changed and so that a later edition does not quietly bring a broken argument back.

Claim G — God is good without exception; no moral evil originates in him

#	Argument	Where	Weight	What the other reading fairly answers
1	God is light with no darkness at all; he tempts no one to evil	Intro §A; Ch. 1 §A	Direct statement	These verses rule out evil in God, not judgment by God — agreed
2	Every good gift is from God, who does not change	Ch. 1 §§A, D	Direct statement	Not disputed
3	Deuteronomy 32:4 joins "all his ways are judgment" with "without iniquity"	Ch. 1 §A	Direct statement	The same song says "I kill"; agreed, and both lines stand
4	Scripture's name for God is Deliverer	Ch. 1 §C	Direct statement	A title does not settle every act; agreed
5	Isaiah 45:7's "evil" is calamity, not wickedness	Ch. 3 §C; App. D	Strong inference	God still "creates" calamity; agreed — the verse is not used for the permission idiom
6	Revelation 21's end: God wipes away every tear	Ch. 10 §E	Direct statement	Not disputed

Claim A — A real adversary does much of what is popularly charged to God

#	Argument	Where	Weight	What the other reading fairly answers
7	The devil "had the power of death"; Christ came to destroy his works	Ch. 2 §A	Direct statement	Not disputed
8	"The god of this world" / "prince of this world"	Ch. 2 §A	Direct statement	His authority is derivative; agreed
9	His authority came through Adam's fall	Ch. 2 §A	Reasonable inference	No single verse states the transfer
10	In Job 1-2 Satan is the one who acts	Ch. 2 §B	Direct statement	God still permits; agreed
11	Oppression and sickness are named as the devil's work (Luke 13:16; Acts 10:38)	Ch. 2 §D	Direct statement	Not every calamity fits; agreed
12	Scripture gives the name Destroyer to another, not to God	Ch. 1 §C; Ch. 5 §D	Direct statement (names); reasonable inference (same being)	The Exodus destroyer may be God's own angel of judgment
13	Paul's thorn was "the messenger of Satan"	Ch. 9 §B	Direct statement	The giver is not named and may be God

Claim I — Scripture's idiom credits God with what he permits another to do

#	Argument	Where	Weight	What the other reading fairly answers
14	Bullinger names the idiom and lists these verses	Ch. 3 §A	Corroboration only	A grammarian's list is not scripture
15	David's census: the LORD moved him / Satan provoked him	Ch. 3 §B; App. C	Strong inference	God may have used Satan as an instrument — but Satan is still the named agent
16	Job 42:11's "evil that the LORD had brought" after Satan is shown acting	Ch. 2 §B	Strong inference	God remains responsible for the permission; agreed
17	Exodus 12: the LORD smites; the destroyer smites; the LORD will not suffer the destroyer	Ch. 5 §D	Direct statement (both named)	The destroyer may be God's own agent
18	Micaiah's lying spirit; the strong delusion after Satan's working	Ch. 3 §B	Strong inference	"Put" and "send" are active verbs
19	Pharaoh hardened his own heart before God is said to	Ch. 3 §E; App. B	Reasonable inference	God announced it first (Ex. 4:21; 7:3); Romans 9:18
20	"Gave them up" in Romans 1 follows their own rejection	Ch. 3 §E	Direct statement	Not disputed

#	Argument	Where	Weight	What the other reading fairly answers
21	Saul's evil spirit and Abimelech's: judgment by withdrawal	Ch. 3 §F	Reasonable inference	"Sent" is active; no other agent is named

Claim J — Where God judges directly, the judgment is just, grieved, warned, delayed, and carries a way of escape

#	Argument	Where	Weight	What the other reading fairly answers
22	God grieved before the Flood	Ch. 4 §A	Direct statement	Grief does not remove the act; agreed
23	The Flood ended a ruin man had already made (one word for "corrupt" and "destroy")	Ch. 4 §A; App. D	Reasonable inference	Wordplay alone does not prove intent
24	God's longsuffering waited; Noah preached	Ch. 4 §B	Direct statement	—
25	A hundred and twenty years of warning	Ch. 4 §B	Reasonable inference	Genesis 6:3 may set a lifespan
26	Rescue is part of the Flood account (Hebrews 11:7; 1 Peter 3:20; Genesis 7:16; 8:1)	Ch. 4 §C	Direct statement	Rescue for eight does not soften death for the rest
27	Sodom: spared for ten; nothing done until Lot was out	Ch. 4 §E	Direct statement	The city was still destroyed by God
28	God covenanted never to flood the earth again, citing man's evil as the reason for mercy	Ch. 4 §F	Direct statement	Future judgment remains (2 Peter 3:7)
29	The plagues served a rescue announced first	Ch. 5 §A	Direct statement	Not disputed
30	Egyptians who feared God's word were spared from the hail	Ch. 5 §C	Direct statement	Most Egyptians were not
31	"Doth not afflict willingly" — God does not afflict from his heart	Ch. 3 §D; Ch. 6 §D	Direct statement	Deuteronomy 28:63
32	"As I live... no pleasure in the death of the wicked"	Ch. 6 §B	Direct statement	Deuteronomy 28:63
33	Four centuries of withheld judgment on Canaan	Ch. 7 §B	Direct statement	Delay does not justify the act; agreed

Claim C — Covenant curses are the consequence of a warned choice, often arriving as God withdraws protection

#	Argument	Where	Weight	What the other reading fairly answers
34	The curses were terms of a vow Israel made	Ch. 6 §A	Direct statement	They are still in God's voice
35	Prophets sent for generations "because he had compassion"	Ch. 6 §B	Direct statement	Not disputed
36	God "hides his face" and evils rush in (Deut. 31:17; 2 Chr. 12:5)	Ch. 6 §C	Direct statement	Other verses say "the LORD shall smite"
37	Deuteronomy 28:63 answered by Hosea 11:8, Lamentations 3:33, Leviticus 26:44	Ch. 6 §D	Reasonable inference	28:63 may be weighed more heavily

Claim K — The conquest's ban was aimed at a named spiritual corruption, not at a people as such

#	Argument	Where	Weight	What the other reading fairly answers
38	Not for Israel's righteousness but the nations' wickedness	Ch. 7 §A	Direct statement	Not disputed
39	"That they teach you not" — the ban's stated purpose	Ch. 7 §A	Direct statement	Stopping a practice need not mean killing all
40	Psalm 106: Israel learned the practices and sacrificed its own children	Ch. 7 §A	Direct statement	—
41	The same standard applied to Israel (the land "spued out" both)	Ch. 7 §A	Direct statement	—
42	"Drive out" is the dominant command; the ban fell on cities that fought	Ch. 7 §C; App. E	Reasonable inference	Deuteronomy 20:16
43	Rahab and Gibeon spared; God fought for Gibeon	Ch. 7 §D	Direct statement	—
44	Peace was possible for other cities (Joshua 11:19)	Ch. 7 §D	Reasonable inference	Joshua 11:20 says God hardened them
45	Totality language is conventional	Ch. 7 §E; App. E	Corroboration only	Failure to finish is not the same as hyperbole
46	Why children were included	Ch. 7 §G	Concession	The text gives no reason

Claim S — An adversarial campaign against the promised line runs beneath these narratives

#	Argument	Where	Weight	What the other reading fairly answers
47	Before the Flood the line of promise was compromised from within	Ch. 4 §D; App. A	Reasonable inference	"Sons of God" may be angels (Job 1:6; Jude 7)
48	Pharaoh drowned the covenant family's sons	Ch. 5 §A	Direct statement (the act); reasonable inference (the campaign)	Pharaoh feared Israel's numbers, not the Seed
49	Amalek's war "from generation to generation"	Ch. 8 §A	Direct statement	Many nations fought Israel
50	Haman "the Agagite" was an Amalekite	Ch. 8 §C; App. D	Strong inference	"Agagite" might be a place or family name
51	Esther stages a rematch: Kish's line against the Agagite	Ch. 8 §C	Strong inference	Kish may be a later namesake
52	The triple refusal of spoil answers Saul's failure	Ch. 8 §D	Reasonable inference	It may simply show self-defense
53	The thread taken as a whole	Ch. 10 §B	Reasonable inference	Patterns can be found in any long history

Claim P — Unanswered prayer and suffering do not disprove God's goodness; not every sufferer is at fault

#	Argument	Where	Weight	What the other reading fairly answers
54	God's wrath fell on Job's friends' theory	Ch. 2 §C; Ch. 9 §E	Direct statement	God also corrected Job; agreed
55	Job's end reveals "the Lord is very pitiful"	Ch. 2 §C; Ch. 9 §A	Direct statement	Restoration does not come to all in this life
56	"My grace is sufficient" — refusal with a reason	Ch. 9 §B	Direct statement	—
57	"The just shall live by his faith"	Ch. 9 §C	Direct statement	—
58	The world lies in the wicked one, in a present evil age	Ch. 9 §D	Direct statement	Explains suffering in general, not each case
59	Jesus: neither the blind man nor the tower's victims were worse sinners	Ch. 9 §E	Direct statement	Not disputed

Withdrawn, Demoted or Corrected from the Earlier Edition

#	Earlier argument	Where it was	Now	Why
60	The hardest events were "never actually authored" by God	Ch. 10 §D	Withdrawn	Genesis 6:17, Exodus 12:29 and others say God acted; replaced by claim J
61	2 Peter 2:5's "saved Noah" uses the salvation word	Ch. 4 §B	Withdrawn	The word means "kept, guarded"; the salvation word is in Hebrews 11:7 and 1 Peter 3:20
62	Haman's lineage is "direct statement, not inference"	Ch. 8; Ch. 10 §B	Demoted	Only "Agagite" is stated; the Amalekite link is a strong inference
63	Rahab was spared because of her confession	Ch. 7 §C	Corrected	Joshua 6:25 says "because she hid the messengers"; Hebrews 11:31 names the faith behind it
64	Pharaoh hardened himself three times "across the first six plagues" before God is said to	Ch. 3 §D	Corrected	God announced it first; 9:34 is at the seventh plague; the heart also "grew hard" with no agent
65	The giant clans were tyrants, not tall	Ch. 7 §E	Withdrawn	Scripture calls them "great, and many, and tall"
66	John 10:10's thief is the devil, as a direct statement	Ch. 2 §A	Demoted	In context the thief is first the false shepherd; the point now rests on Hebrews 2:14 and 1 John 3:8
67	God's rebuke fell on the friends "not on Job"	Ch. 2 §B	Corrected	God corrected Job (38:2; 40:8); his wrath fell on the friends
68	"Genesis 3 establishes" Satan's authority	Ch. 2 §A	Demoted	A reasonable inference, supported by Luke 4:6 and John 12:31
69	1 John 1:5 "in no wise," compared to John 1:1	Ch. 1 §A	Withdrawn	Misquoted; the finding now rests on the double negative
70	Amalek targeted the young and old "by every ancient account"	Ch. 8 §A	Withdrawn	The text says the feeble and weary; the rest was unsupported
71	Esther is "the only book" never mentioning God	Ch. 8 §D	Softened	Stated now simply as: Esther never names God
72	The Nephilim/giant-clan material as inferential "seed-line" evidence	Project notes; Ch. 7	Withdrawn	Settled by the companion study: no hybrid line existed

Appendix G — What Changed from the Previous Edition

For readers of the earlier edition (pod-V6), here is every change of substance, in the order it appears. Style changes, new "Weighing it" notes and new "In Short" summaries are not listed one by one.

Introduction. New §C states the opposing case at full strength, with its best verses. New §D states precisely what the study claims and what it does not — above all, that it does not claim God never judges. New §H teaches the reader how to read the weighing notes and names the study's eight claims. The "carriers" teaching, which the earlier Chapter 7 referred back to but the Introduction never mentioned, is now introduced in §G. The method section now quotes Bullinger's own statement of the idiom.

Chapter 1. The Greek note on 1 John 1:5 corrected. Deuteronomy 32:4's "all his ways are judgment" and Habakkuk's following complaint noted honestly. Nahum 1:2 and 1:15 added. New §C, "The Name Scripture Gives Him: Deliverer."

Chapter 2. Hebrews 2:14, 1 John 3:8, Luke 4:6 and John 12:31 added. John 10:10's context stated. The wind verse corrected from Job 1:13 to Job 1:19; the Sabean and Chaldean raids added. Job 2:3 and 42:11 now treated as the idiom in God's and the narrator's own voice. New §C harmonizes God's correction of Job with his wrath on the friends, adds Job 42:10 and James 5:11, and removes a contradiction with Chapter 9.

Chapter 3. New §B: David's census told twice (2 Samuel 24:1; 1 Chronicles 21:1), Micaiah's lying spirit, and 2 Thessalonians 2:9. Isaiah 45:7 section adds Jonah 3:10 and Jeremiah 18:8, and says plainly what the verse still claims. Lamentations 3:31-33 added. The Pharaoh sequence corrected in full (Appendix B). Romans 9:18 addressed. Judges 9:23 added. "In the same chapter" corrected to "in the previous chapter."

Chapter 4. No longer suggests God did not bring the Flood; Genesis 6:17 faced. Genesis 6:11-13 and the shared Hebrew word added. 1 Peter 3:20's "longsuffering... waited" added. The Greek of 2 Peter 2:5 corrected. Genesis 7:16, 8:1, 8:21 and 9:11-15 added. New §E on Sodom. "Separated by one letter" corrected to "a chapter apart in the same letter."

Chapter 5. Exodus 1:22 added. The "that ye may know" count corrected (Appendix B). Numbers 33:4 added. New §C: escape offered during the plagues (Exodus 9:20-21; 10:3; 10:7; 12:48). New §D: Exodus 12:23's destroyer, with Hebrews 11:28 and Psalm 78:49, and both readings of the destroyer's identity stated. 1 Corinthians 10:10 added. The Ascension added where the redemptive work is summarized.

Chapter 6. New §C: Deuteronomy 31:17-18, 2 Chronicles 12:5-8 and Isaiah 59:1-2 — the curse arriving as God hides his face. Deuteronomy 28:63 faced, with Hosea 11:8 and Leviticus 26:44. "Rising up betimes" note corrected. Galatians 3:13 added.

Chapter 7. Deuteronomy 20:17-18 ("that they teach you not"), Deuteronomy 12:31, Deuteronomy 32:17, Leviticus 18:28 and Psalm 106:34-38 added. New §C: "Driven Out Before Destroyed" (Exodus 23:28-30; Numbers 33:52). Rahab's stated reason corrected; Hebrews 11:31, James 2:25 and Matthew 1:5 added. Gibeon's defense (Joshua 10) and 2 Samuel 21 added. Joshua 11:19-20 faced. Joshua 13:1 and 15:63 added. The giant clans' stature corrected. New §G: an honest concession on the children.

Chapter 8. The unsupported claim about the rear of the column removed. Amalek's later attacks added. 1 Samuel 15:6 (the Kenites) and 15:33 (Agag's own record) added. Amalek's survivors listed. The Haman link re-weighted as strong inference. Esther 2:5 (Mordecai, of Kish, a Benjamite) added. New §D: the triple refusal of spoil (Esther 9:10, 15, 16).

Chapter 9. Job 42:10 and James 5:11 added. The thorn's identity and giver stated as open. Habakkuk 2:4 added. The Greek of 1 John 5:19 and Galatians 1:4 noted. John 9:3 and Luke 13:4-5 added.

Chapter 10. Summary rewritten to match. The thread re-weighted strand by strand. New §D: "What Would Change This Study's Mind." The closing no longer says God never authored any judgment; it says none of it was darkness in God.

Appendices. Appendix A corrected (Jude 14 is eight verses after Jude 6, not three; Genesis 34:2 replaces Genesis 39:7; "men of renown" parallel stated exactly; Matthew 22:30 added; the opposing case now stated first). Appendices B through G are new.

Sources Consulted

This study is built from scripture. The King James Version is the base text throughout, and every quotation has been checked against it. The works below were consulted for language, cross-references and background. None carries scriptural weight.

E. W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible* (1898). This library's standing reference on figures of speech. The idiom of permission is quoted from his section on the idiomatic use of verbs ("Active verbs were used by the Hebrews to express, not the doing of the thing, but the permission of the thing which the agent is said to do"), with his list of examples.

E. W. Bullinger, *The Companion Bible*, Appendixes 23, 25 and 26. Consulted for the angelic reading of Genesis 6, which this study does not adopt (Appendix A).

James Strong, *Exhaustive Concordance*, Hebrew and Greek dictionaries. Word meanings and numbers in Appendix D.

Brown, Driver and Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Hebrew word meanings, as used in the companion study on Genesis 6.

The Treasury of Scripture Knowledge. Cross-references, especially for Genesis 6:2 and 6:9.

Flavius Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, Book 11. Cited once, as corroboration, for the ancient reading of Haman as an Amalekite.

The Mesha Inscription (the Moabite Stone), about 840 BC. Cited once, as corroboration, for ancient war-report language.

This library's companion study, ***Who Are the "Sons of God"? Settling the Genesis Six Question***.
Condensed in Appendix A; see its own Sources Consulted for full sourcing.

Copyright © 2026 John Lobota. Distribution of this study as is, in its entirety, is permitted and encouraged. Scripture quotations are from the King James Version, which is in the public domain.

Scripture Index

Genesis 6:1-2, 4 Chapter 4 §D

Genesis 6:3 Chapter 4 §B

Genesis 6:5-7 Chapter 4 §A

Genesis 6:11-13 Chapter 4 §A

Genesis 6:17-18 Chapter 4 §A

Genesis 8:21 Chapter 4 §F

Genesis 15:13, 16 Chapter 7 §B

Genesis 18:25, 32 Chapter 4 §E

Genesis 19:16, 22 Chapter 4 §E

Exodus 3:7-8 Chapter 5 §A

Exodus 7:5 Chapter 5 §B

Exodus 8:10 Chapter 5 §B

Exodus 8:15, 32 Chapter 3 §E

Exodus 9:12 Chapter 3 §E

Exodus 9:14, 29 Chapter 5 §B

Exodus 9:20-21 Chapter 5 §C

Exodus 10:2 Chapter 5 §B

Exodus 12:12 Chapter 5 §B

Exodus 12:13 Chapter 5 §D

Exodus 12:23 Chapter 5 §D

Exodus 17:8, 14, 16 Chapter 8 §A

Exodus 23:28-30 Chapter 7 §C

Exodus 24:7 Chapter 6 §A

Leviticus 18:21, 24-25 Chapter 7 §A

Numbers 13:33 Chapter 7 §F

Deuteronomy 2:10 Chapter 7 §F

Deuteronomy 3:11 Chapter 7 §F

Deuteronomy 9:4-5 Chapter 7 §A

Deuteronomy 18:10-12 Chapter 7 §A

Job 38:1-2, 4 Chapter 9 §A

Job 42:5-6 Chapter 9 §A

Job 42:7 Chapter 2 §C

Psalms 5:4 Chapter 1 §A

Psalms 18:2 Chapter 1 §C

Psalms 34:8 Chapter 1 §B

Psalms 100:5 Chapter 1 §B

Psalms 106:34-38 Chapter 7 §A

Isaiah 45:6-7 Chapter 3 §C

Isaiah 59:1-2 Chapter 6 §C

Lamentations 3:31-33 Chapter 3 §D

Lamentations 3:38 Chapter 3 §D

Ezekiel 33:11 Chapter 6 §B

Hosea 4:6 Chapter 6 §D

Amos 3:6 Chapter 3 §D

Nahum 1:7 Chapter 1 §B

Habakkuk 1:2 Chapter 9 §C

Habakkuk 1:13 Chapter 1 §A

Habakkuk 2:4 Chapter 9 §C

Habakkuk 3:17-18 Chapter 9 §C

Zechariah 3:1-2 Chapter 2 §D

Malachi 3:6 Chapter 1 §D

Luke 13:16 Chapter 2 §D

John 10:10 Chapter 2 §A

Acts 10:38 Chapter 2 §D

Romans 1:24, 26, 28 Chapter 3 §E

Romans 6:23 Chapter 6 §D

Romans 8:18, 28 Chapter 9 §D

Romans 11:26 Chapter 1 §C

Deuteronomy 20:17-18 Chapter 7 §A
Deuteronomy 25:17-18 Chapter 8 §A
Deuteronomy 28:1, 15 Chapter 6 §A
Deuteronomy 28:63 Chapter 6 §D
Deuteronomy 30:19 Chapter 6 §A
Deuteronomy 31:17-18 Chapter 6 §C
Deuteronomy 32:4 Chapter 1 §A
Joshua 2:11 Chapter 7 §D
Joshua 6:25 Chapter 7 §D
Joshua 11:19-20 Chapter 7 §D
Judges 1:21, 27, 29 Chapter 7 §E
1 Samuel 15:2-3 Chapter 8 §B
1 Samuel 15:8-9 Chapter 8 §B
1 Samuel 16:14 Chapter 3 §F
2 Samuel 24:1 Chapter 3 §B
1 Chronicles 21:1 Chapter 3 §B
2 Chronicles 36:15-16 Chapter 6 §B
Esther 2:5 Chapter 8 §C
Esther 3:1, 6, 13 Chapter 8 §C
Esther 4:14 Chapter 8 §E
Esther 9:1 Chapter 8 §E
Esther 9:10, 15-16 Chapter 8 §D
Job 1:8-12 Chapter 2 §B
Job 1:15-17, 19 Chapter 2 §B
Job 2:3, 6-7 Chapter 2 §B
Job 2:10 Chapter 2 §C
Job 13:3 Chapter 9 §A
Job 23:3, 5 Chapter 9 §A

1 Corinthians 5:7 Chapter 5 §D
1 Corinthians 10:1, 10-11 Chapter 5, Relevance
2 Corinthians 4:4 Chapter 2 §A
2 Corinthians 5:19-20 Chapter 10 §C
2 Corinthians 10:4 Chapter 7, Relevance
2 Corinthians 12:7-9 Chapter 9 §B
Galatians 1:4 Chapter 9 §D
Galatians 6:7 Chapter 6 §D
Ephesians 6:11 Chapter 2, Relevance
Ephesians 6:12 Chapter 2 §A
Colossians 1:13 Chapter 1 §C
1 Thessalonians 1:10 Chapter 1 §C
Hebrews 2:14 Chapter 2 §A
Hebrews 11:7 Chapter 4 §C
Hebrews 13:8 Chapter 1 §D
James 1:13 Anchor Passage
James 1:13-14 Chapter 1 §A
James 1:17 Chapter 1 §A
1 Peter 3:20 Chapter 4 §B
1 Peter 5:8 Chapter 2 §A
1 Peter 5:9 Chapter 2, Relevance
2 Peter 2:5 Chapter 4 §B
2 Peter 2:9 Chapter 4 §E
2 Peter 3:6, 9 Chapter 4, Relevance
1 John 1:5 Anchor Passage; Chapter 1 §A
1 John 3:8 Chapter 2 §A
1 John 5:19 Chapter 9 §D
Revelation 21:3-4 Chapter 10 §E