

Daniel 05-11-20b

Let's resume our study now in the book of Daniel. We're in chapter 5, looking at Belshazzar, and the great interval of time between the end of chapter 4 and the beginning of chapter 5 contains a great deal of upheaval, and I'm sure that there was a lot of personal upheaval for Daniel. It's likely that Daniel has actually had to attend the funerals for Hananiah and Mishael and Azariah.

They don't seem to be on the scene. They're never mentioned again. The death of Nebuchadnezzar, the huge state funeral that was no doubt made for him, the subsequent turmoil and assassinations right and left and different ones.

You know, it's never just the one guy that gets assassinated. It's all of his little henchpeople and associates, henchpersons, henchmen. Anyway, there are all kinds of murderous... Not a word of that is given in the book of Daniel.

And as we have seen so many times, we've seen it most recently in Revelation with the symbol in heaven of the red fiery dragon and the woman who is with child, and the child is born and then it's caught up to heaven, and how when God has a particular purpose in a passage, he will skip a lot of stuff that might be of great interest to us but does not pertain. And this leads me to point out a principle that we don't think like God does. I know that's probably a new thought for you, but we don't think like God does.

If I were telling this story, I could not help myself. I would have to include the later years of Nebuchadnezzar. What kind of intrigues happened at the palace when he came back and tried to get his first haircut and had his nails trimmed? What happened when he died? What happened to Daniel? What happened as each of the three friends passed away? Who took their place? What sort of undoing of the great work that had been done? How did the faithful cadre of Chaldeans get started? Did Daniel start a nucleus there that he taught the word of God and that became the thread of transmission of the word of God all the way down to the time of Christ when wise men came from the east looking for he who was born king of the Jews based on the words of Daniel from nearly 600 years earlier? I mean, it's astonishing.

There are stunning things that are not in this book. And many times when we look at our lives and we say, well, I see all of these details that are really important to me and God doesn't seem to be paying any attention to those. He's got other priorities, other issues, other things that he's working on.

And it is the objective and one of the tasks of our life to start learning to think the way God thinks and looking at things the way God looks at them and adopt a divine viewpoint of life rather than a human viewpoint. Human beings think a lot of things are important that God dismisses with a wave of his hand. Unimportant, not pertinent.

Does not have any redeeming value. Has no edification value, so not wasting any time on it. And yet other times, it seems as though God's word will belabor a point over and over and over.

You'll notice in chapter 5, just this little section that we read, the gold and silver vessels that Nebuchadnezzar had taken from the temple in verse 2, the temple which, and it says, had been in Jerusalem and had been is in italics in your New King James. Because it basically says the temple which in Jerusalem and you don't have a verb there. And it's like a painful note because it says both things at once.

It had been in Jerusalem and it is not in Jerusalem anymore. It's been torn down, it's been destroyed. And that little absence, it's almost more fitting that those italicized words be crossed out.

Without the temple, you don't have the presence of God. And without that presence of God, the accouterments, the vessels, really are a hollow reminder of what used to be. It's a leftover.

It reminds you of after a death when you have the distribution of things that belong to someone who has died. And it always kind of brings a pain to your mind because you have a little trinket that maybe used to sit in your mother's or your grandmother's kitchen. And you look at that and you say, oh, I remember when there was a house and a life and a whole environment of which this was a part.

And now here's this little thing out of place and out of time. Here's a picture, here's a memento. And it's all that's left of something that used to be very substantial and very real.

And now out of all of the grandeur that David planned and that Solomon built and that God glorified 400 years earlier, you've got cups. That's all that's left. The golden shields, the walls, the curtains, the cherubim woven in, all of the grandeur, all you've got left are some cups.

And this is like the last physical remnant. After this, what do you have? What tangible thing can you find mentioned anywhere in the Word of God that's associated with the temple? This is it. This is the last of it.

You're down to the tableware. You're down to the cups. The gold and silver vessels are brought.

And they brought those gold vessels. They're mentioned in verse 2. They're mentioned again in verse 3. The gold vessels that had been taken from the temple of the house of God, which, in Jerusalem, king and his lords and his wives and his concubines drank from them. They drank wine and praised the gods of gold and silver, bronze and iron, wood and stone.

Well, we have lots of attention given to these vessels of gold and silver, and yet we have whole years in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar and in the life of Daniel and his three friends that are dismissed without so much as a mention. Why? There is a spiritual point to be made. There is a point of application, a point of doctrine here, which is the things of God outweigh the things of man.

It doesn't ever say what happened to all the household furniture in Daniel's family or any of the other princes of Judah, but it talks about what happens to the furnishings in God's house. And

there is a symbolic disregard for the holiness and the sanctity of the things of God. These vessels have an inscription on them that says, Holy to the Lord, in Hebrew.

Holy to the Lord, Holy to the Lord. And what's interesting about this, if you think about it, we know the story of the handwriting on the wall, I haven't really dwelt on the details yet, but think about it. When does this inscription appear on the wall? It's at the point that they bring in things from the temple that have the writing of God on them.

God's holy name is inscribed on every one of these cups. Every one of them, it says, Holy to the Lord, Holy to the Lord. Kadosh Adonai.

Holy to the Lord. It's on all of these. And so, it is as though Belshazzar has surrounded himself with inscriptions dealing with God, and God says, well, I've got one more for you.

And so he puts it up on the wall. Because you ask yourself, why doesn't Belshazzar get a dream? Why doesn't Daniel come in and make a proclamation? Why is it not like Nathan the prophet or somebody walking in and saying, Woe unto thee, O king, you dissolute, drunken, here's what's going to happen. No.

It is fitting, because he has brought the inscriptions of God into his party, and so God puts another inscription into his party. And instead of inscribing it on every cup, he just puts it up on the wall. And the hand, this disembodied hand is at their writing.

And it's typical of God to be that poetic and that emphatic and that effective in the form of communication that he chooses. Notice the difference. There are similarities and differences, because at the beginning of the Babylonian Empire with Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel associated with him, you have an image of gold and silver and bronze and iron.

And you have a dream that is given to a single man that nobody else knows. The Bible makes a point of saying nobody knows this dream. And nobody can find it out except Daniel.

At the end, that's the first communication from God to the Babylonian royalty. The last communication from God to the Babylonian royalty is written on the wall, and there's a thousand nobles and all of the concubines and their hangers-on and servants and everybody else. Everybody sees that.

It's the most public of communications from God. It's written on the wall with this floating hand, and everybody sees it. And in the same way that Nebuchadnezzar was troubled by the dream that he saw, Belshazzar is troubled by the dream that he sees.

In the same way that Daniel comes and gives the interpretation at the beginning, Daniel comes and gives the interpretation at the end. And it is bracketed by the presence of God and the communication of God through the agency of Daniel. And that's exactly what you have in the history of Israel.

That's exactly what you have with the presence of God coming to Israel in the form of the pillar of cloud and the pillar of fire. And that's what you have with the presence of God coming in the person of Jesus Christ, both at the end of his 69 weeks of prediction that come from Daniel and in that last, that 70th week. God is actively expressing himself, his presence, his power, and his word in and through his people, wherever they are.

If his people are in Babylon, that's where his power is going to be manifested. And the kings over his people, even though they're not of the line of Judah and they're not Jewish, are still accountable and responsible. And that's where this communication comes.

And God is also communicating with his people through Ezekiel, isn't he? And Ezekiel is a much bigger, longer book than Daniel. But the state-level information comes through the state-level prophet, Daniel. And the people-level prophecy comes through the people-level prophet, Ezekiel.

And so this is what we have here. Belshazzar the king is making this great feast, thousands of his lords, and drinking wine in the presence of the thousands. Well, I mentioned before the break that as you look at this from a more symbolic and suggestive angle, Daniel is to the people of Judah and to the kingdom that has those people in its thrall, in its power, as the Lord Jesus was in the days when Rome, the legs of iron, are going to have those people under its sway and in its thrall.

And the role that Daniel fulfills in making the obscure plain is the role that the Lord Jesus himself is going to fulfill both in those days of his first advent and in the days of the second advent, the time of Jacob's trouble. That sobriquet, that name for the tribulation is found, by the way, in Jeremiah chapter 30 and verse 7. Daniel 9.24, Daniel 12.1 is the time of Jacob's trouble. You also have the notation of the succession of Nebuchadnezzar that it's going to extend two generations beyond himself.

You know who said that? Jeremiah. The prophet Jeremiah, before anything could be known about how long Nebuchadnezzar would reign or anything else, in the closing time of Jeremiah's prophetic ministry, he says in Jeremiah 27.7, So all nations shall serve him, that's Nebuchadnezzar, and his son, and his son's son, until the time of his land comes. Then many nations and great kings shall make him serve them.

And Jeremiah in 27.7 says it's going to be Nebuchadnezzar and two generations and then the time of his land will come and they are going to become servants instead of masters and that's exactly what happened 60, 70 years later. That's what we're looking at here. But this symbolic foreshadowing of Daniel as a type of Christ in relationship to the nation of Israel under the sway of a foreign power.

Daniel's day it's Babylon and Jesus' day it's Rome. You also find the interesting role played by the three associates of Daniel. Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah are three associates and sometimes they are in company with Daniel as at the

beginning in the first chapter.

Sometimes they are praying with him as in the second chapter and then sometimes they are seen alone and Daniel is not present as in the third chapter. And this is the same picture we have in the New Testament with the Gospels and Acts of seeing Jesus with his disciples initially. Praying with his disciples and then Jesus absent and the disciples themselves carrying on that witness and that testimony of God while he is away.

The disciples themselves, if you remember the lists in the Word of God in the book of Matthew, in the book of Mark, and in the book of Luke, we have the twelve disciples listed. And you might turn to any one of these. Turn to Mark chapter 3 verse 16.

Mark 3, 16. This is a passage we studied in the course of studying the Gospel of Mark and we took a look at these disciples at that time. This is Mark's description of the sending forth of the disciples.

They are called as Jesus in verse 13 goes up on a mountain and calls to himself those he wanted. They came to him, he appointed twelve that they might be with him and that he might send them out to preach. Two different functions.

They are with him sometimes and they are sent out to preach and not with him other times. And to have power to heal sicknesses and to cast out demons. Then you have the list.

Simon to whom he gave the name Peter. James the son of Zebedee and John the brother of James to whom he gave the name Boanerges. Sons of Thunder.

Andrew, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Thomas, James the son of Alphaeus, Thaddeus, Simon the Canaanite, Judas Iscariot who also betrayed him. They went into a house. Well, I was thinking about this because Jesus has twelve disciples.

Daniel has three friends. And so you would wonder if you don't have a correspondence. Of course if you multiply three by four you get twelve.

And without straining this point too much, it is interesting that the disciples are always named in pairs in the New Testament. They are never singled out. They are always named in pairs.

Probably the disciple teams that Jesus sent out when he sent them out two by two. And those pairs further organize into sets of four. For example, and of course the disciples that everyone has the easiest time remembering are Peter, Andrew, James and John.

Two sets of brothers. And these are associated with one another quite frequently. So that makes the first set like the primary set.

The second set is Philip and Nathaniel. Remember Philip goes and gets Nathaniel. They are close friends evidently.

And then you have Matthew and Thomas. Whether you look at the list in Mark 3.13 or you look at the list in Luke 6.12, you find that Simon Peter and Andrew his brother, James and John are all mentioned together. Then you have Philip and Bartholomew, Matthew and Thomas.

Those four are given in the same order, the same pairings together. Then finally you have James the son of Alphaeus and Simon the Zealot or Simon the Canaanite. And you have Judas the son of James and then Judas Iscariot.

Judas not Iscariot or Judas the son of James and then Judas Iscariot. So that final four you have Judas, James, Simon and Judas. And we've talked before that amongst the twelve disciples you essentially only have six names.

You've got two Jameses, you have two Judases, you have two Simons and so forth. But let's take a look, this is a good time to stop and take a look at the disciples. We know actually more than you might think about most of these disciples.

In John chapter 1, John the Baptist identifies the Lord Jesus Christ. He looks at him and he says, Behold the Lamb of God. This is our first introduction to the Lord Jesus and in Revelation, this same John pictures Jesus standing at the throne of God as the Lamb.

Who is worthy to open the little scroll? It is the Lamb. He's the Lamb at the beginning and He's the Lamb at the end. So these two disciples who are followers of John are intrigued by this identification and they follow Him.

They leave John the Baptist and they follow Jesus. And Jesus says, What are you following me for? What are you looking for? And they say, Where do you dwell? And so He takes them to the house where He's staying and they spend the night there. One of these two men is Andrew.

The other is John the Apostle. John and Andrew were followers of John the Baptist. They were already seeking.

They were looking for the hope of God. And they were evidently long-time followers of John the Baptist. And when John the Baptist said, There He is.

They said, Okay, John. Thanks a lot. And they followed Jesus.

Well, they each have brothers, don't they? John has a brother, James. Andrew has a brother, Peter. So Andrew goes and finds Simon Peter.

This is in the first chapter of John again. Andrew tells Peter, We have found the Messiah. He doesn't say, We think we have found the Messiah or we might have found the Messiah.

Andrew says, We have found Him. And Simon Peter comes and joins the Lord Jesus. It's interesting, by the way, if you read the first part of John, I was reviewing this earlier this week.

There's only about half the disciples that are with Jesus at the wedding feast of Cana. It's

basically, the ones we know for sure are there are this group that first assembles in the first chapter of John. It's Peter and Andrew, John, Philip, and Bartholomew.

Those are the ones that are named and that we know are present. It's likely that James, the brother of John, was also there, although he's not mentioned. But that gives you the first half.

The top six. But Andrew, his name is from the Greek word, Andreas. Andros is the word in Greek that means man, or Andreas means manly.

He's the brother of Simon Peter. They seem to come from pretty robust stock. You always get the idea that Peter was pretty hefty, pretty strong.

So his name probably reflected some physical attributes. We know that their father's name was Jonah. Pretty appropriate for a fisherman to have a father named Jonah.

We know that Simon bar Jonah, Simon son of Jonah, and Andrew is his brother, so their father's name Jonah, or John perhaps. They worked in their father's fishing business. Andrew was born at Bethsaida, North Shore of the Sea of Galilee.

They are present when John identifies him, or shortly thereafter. They go to the wedding feast of Cana, but they do not become full-time followers of the Lord Jesus until somewhat later. In John chapter 6, you have the description of Andrew as a disciple.

John 6, 8, one of his disciples, Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, said to him, there's a lad here who has the five barley loaves and the two small fish. Andrew was the one that knew where the chow was located when they were out there for the feeding of the 5,000. We also know from Matthew chapter 4, verse 18, that after the events of John chapter 1, after the events of chapter 2, and the wedding feast of Cana, there was not yet a full-time ministry and discipleship on the part of these men.

They were associated with Jesus, and they left and went back to their homes. Later, Matthew chapter 4 records their call to full-time followership, if you will. Jesus, in Matthew 4, verse 18, walking by the Sea of Galilee, saw two brothers, Simon called Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea, for they were fishermen.

He said to them, Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men. They immediately left their nets and followed him. People have pointed to this.

The Calvinists say, Look, Jesus called, and they just dropped everything and followed him. Ex nihilo, out of the blue. And that's not true at all.

They knew Jesus, and they knew who he was. They knew he was the Messiah. And when the time came for them to be with him on a full-time basis, he went and said, It's time, let's go.

You don't need to fish anymore. I'll make you fishers of men. They said, OK, fine.

This is not effectual calling. This is not efficacious grace. It's not some sort of whop on the head, where when Jesus calls, you just drop everything and follow like a robot.

And it's been presented that way down through the Christian centuries by people who have not studied their Bible. Andrew and Peter knew the Lord Jesus, had been with him, had seen him turn the water into wine, were familiar with the testimony of John the Baptist. Andrew had heard John the Baptist say, Behold the Lamb of God, a long time before this.

As Jesus walks on along the shore to the next fishing area, he saw two other brothers, James, the son of Zebedee, and John, his brother, in the boat with Zebedee, their father, mending their nets. He called to them, and immediately they left the boat and their father, and followed him. Why? They know him.

This is time. They are not surprised by this at all. Later on, we find that Andrew and Philip introduce a group of Greek men to Jesus.

This is John chapter 12, verse 20. Certain Greeks among those who came to worship at the feast came to Philip, who was from Bethsaida of Galilee, and asked him, saying, Sir, we wish to see Jesus. So Philip came and told Andrew, and Andrew and Philip told Jesus.

They are from the same town. They know each other. They evidently had good Greek skills, and so the Greeks talked to them, and they bring them to Jesus.

The second disciple we take a look at is, in no particular order here, Bartholomew. Bartholomew is also, in fact, I guess we'll do them alphabetically. I guess what my list is in is alphabetical.

Bartholomew is Nathaniel. Depending on which list you read, Bartholomew equals Nathaniel. Now, if you think about that name, Bartholomew, what does Bar mean? Son of? His full name is probably Nathaniel Bartholomew.

T-H-A-L-M-A-I Nathaniel Bartholomew, or Bartholomew. So sometimes they call him by his last name, sometimes they call him by his first name. Evidently, the reason he's called Bartholomew is because early church fathers indicate that Bartholomew was a noble.

He's the only one of the disciples that seems to have been from the upper class. And it would be natural for his family name to be sort of his, it's kind of like Ben-Hur. If the family of Hur is notable in Judah and in Jerusalem, why you call him Ben-Hur? And so Nathaniel seems to have been maybe a middle to upper class individual.

He is the one, of course, that Philip goes and gets. There was a King Thalmi in the Old Testament, 2 Samuel chapter 3. When you look at the family of King David, talking about his sons in 2 Samuel 3. His second son, Chiliab, was by Abigail the widow of Nabal the Carmelite. His third son, Absalom, was the son of Maachah, the daughter of Thalmi, King of Gesher.

So Thalmi is an old, old Davidic family name as far as Absalom goes. Jesus says Nathaniel is an Israelite in whom there is no guile in John 1, 47. Philip goes and gets him and brings him back.

And when Jesus sees him coming, he says, Behold, an Israelite in whom is no deceit, no guile. And that was a rare thing among the nobility in almost any generation. But it is a feather in the cap of Nathaniel that Jesus says this about him.

We also have James, the son of Alphaeus. He is one of the least mentioned of the disciples in the list in Matthew chapter 10. He is called James of Alphaeus, James the son of Alphaeus.

It is probable that he was a brother of Matthew because in Mark 2, 14, we are told that Matthew, or Levi, is the son of Alphaeus, the tax collecting disciple. And so this would be another set of brothers, Peter and Andrew are brothers, James and John are brothers, and then you have Matthew and James would be yet another set of brothers. There is another man referred to in Scripture as James the less, standing at the foot of the cross in Matthew 27, 56.

People standing around among whom are Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Joseph, and the mother of Zebedee's sons. And you compare this with John 19, 25, they are stood by the cross of Jesus. His mother and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene.

And it is possible that Mary, the mother of James and Joseph, there are three Mary's there, actually four Mary's, you have Mary the mother of the Lord, Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joseph, and along with the mother of Zebedee's sons. So there is a theory that this James, if he was a cousin of the Lord Jesus, as the sons of Zebedee appear to have been, that one or more of these disciples, because they are cousins, may have borne a family resemblance to Jesus. James and John are cousins.

If this James and Levi the tax collector, remember there is a connection between the family of Jesus and the Levites, Elizabeth and Zacharias are Levites, and so this Levi or Matthew being a brother of James, and those two being another set of cousins, and it sounds strange, but if true, one thing this would explain, you remember in the garden, when Judas Iscariot brings all the troops in, and he says, I'll let you know which one it is, because I'll go up and identify him with a kiss. Well, this would make sense if several of the men involved looked alike. If Jesus bore a family resemblance to some of his cousins, and didn't look that different from them, especially in the dark at night by torchlight, only somebody who knew them well, might have been able, what happens if you drag James the Less off to the trials, you've made a big mistake.

So, it's a pure hypothesis, but it sort of makes sense when you think about it. If there's a strong family resemblance here, that would explain why Judas has to identify them, and it would tell us that Jesus did not stand out in a crowd, didn't stand out in the crowd of his own disciples, had to be identified by a physical gesture on the part of Judas, so that there wasn't a case of mistaken identity. He has no form or comeliness that we should desire him.

He didn't glow, he didn't have a golden dish behind his head, he just looked like everybody else. Judas didn't say, well, go for the guy with the glow behind his head. That would have been an easy identification.

But, James is the son of Alphaeus, Levi is the son of Alphaeus, so there's another set of brothers. So, half the disciples are sets of brothers, and two of these four sets appear to be, or are possibly, if we're reading Scripture correctly, physical relations, cousins, to the Lord Jesus. You have, in addition to James, another James, James the son of Zebedee, John's brother.

The episode we saw in Matthew and again in Mark, where Jesus goes along the shore and gets Simon Peter and Andrew, and then he goes a little farther and sees James and John, his brother, in the boats mending their nets, and calls them and they immediately respond. Again, this makes sense. If they've known Jesus all their life because they're his cousins, and they were there when John the Baptist identified him, isn't it interesting that even knowing him as family, they are not surprised when John the Baptist identifies him as the Messiah.

The familiarity, in this case, did not breed contempt. In fact, they probably had suspected for a long time that there was something unique about Yeshua, the son of Joseph. James, the brother of John, is of course the first one to suffer death at the hands of Herod Agrippa I. He is executed with the sword, Acts 12.

James, the son of Zebedee, is never mentioned by himself. He's always mentioned along with John. Even in the record of his death in Acts 12, it says James the brother of John.

He very much seems to be in the wake of John. We've talked a lot about James and John in our Revelation study, so I won't dwell on him too much. But he is one of the favored trio of disciples that are in those most intimate scenes where Jesus raises the daughter in the upper room, the transfiguration, and so forth.

Both James and John are called the sons of thunder, Mark 3.17. We've reviewed this in Revelation in connection with the two witnesses, who I think are James and John, drinking the cup of the Lord Jesus and being baptized with his baptism, as he told their mother they would be. But James' death early on, this is circa 44, 45 A.D., sparks a lot of intense activity and faith amongst the early church. Herod probably hoped that he was going to throw water on the church by executing James, but it had the opposite effect.

The word of God grew and multiplied, it says in Acts 12.24. John's entire gospel, from beginning to end, never mentions James, not once. John barely mentions his own name. He refers to himself as the disciple that Jesus loved.

We find this as another hint and clue in the book of Revelation, which John also wrote. He doesn't name himself or James in connection with the two witnesses, and yet we've seen the strong evidence to suggest that they are those two. John refers to himself and James indirectly, one time in John 21.2, as the sons of Zebedee, and that's it.

You have John himself, about whom we have a considerable amount of information. Again, as I mentioned, there's evidence to indicate that James and John's mother was Salome, who was at the foot of the cross, Mark 15.40. Salome appears to be the sister of Jesus' mother, as John 19.25 suggests, and so James and John would also be cousins of the Lord Jesus, just as Matthew and James bar Alphaeus. The humility of John, the status as beloved disciple is well known.

Paul, when he mentions the apostles at Jerusalem, mentions John last, in Galatians 2.9. He talks about James, Cephas, or Simon Peter, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that had been given to me. They gave me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go to the Gentiles, and they to the circumcised. John is mentioned behind Simon Peter, and behind James, the head of the Jerusalem church.

Whether that order is significant or not, we don't really know. But you remember the angst expressed by James and John at the Samaritan village that didn't want to receive Jesus, and they say, let us call down fire out of heaven, and incinerate these people. It's also when somebody is following behind Jesus and the disciples, casting out demons in Jesus' name, and so John speaks up in Mark 9.38, and says there's somebody doing this, but we forbade him because he does not follow with us.

Jesus had to kind of chew him out and say, look, he who is not against us is for us, and so on. Of course, they are party to this suggestion that they get to sit on the right and left hand, instigated by their mother in Mark 10.35 and following. So, John appears to have had connections with the religious leadership.

We know during the crucifixion events, crucifixion week, John 18.15, John was known to the high priest and went with Jesus into the courtyard of the high priest. So, he evidently was on that side of the family that was more closely connected with the Levites. Remember, there's a strong Levitical connection in the family of the Lord Jesus with Elizabeth and Zacharias, and Mary being a relative of Elizabeth's, and so on.

And there seems to have been a coming together of the tribe of Levi and the tribe of Judah in the immediate family of the Lord Jesus. And this would explain why John is on good terms with the high priest. And as a cousin, he might have had some family connections there that even Jesus himself did not have.

Otherwise, there might have been some sort of intervention on Jesus' behalf on the part of some of the priests at the temple. Instead, there's great opposition. And so, it seems as though maybe this family connection was not well known.

The Judas, next on the list, who is not Iscariot, is what the man that Jerome called Trionius, the man with three names. Because Judas, not Iscariot, is also called Thaddeus, and he's also called Lebeus. Judas slash Thaddeus slash Lebeus.

His actual given name was probably Judas, but Matthew, in chapter 10, verse 3, says his

surname was Thaddeus. Well, T-A-D in Aramaic means breast. It's similar to the Hebrew Shad.

El Shaddai, in the literal sense, has the idea of the many-breasted one, but it means the great provider. Well, Thad or Tad in Aramaic has the same idea of the chest or the breast. And so, he is the man of the chest or of the breast, the dear one, the one close to the chest.

And this is the same thing that Lebeus means in Hebrew. Lev in Hebrew means heart. And so, Thaddeus and Lebeus are Aramaic and Hebrew synonyms that mean the one of the breast or of the chest or of the heart.

But this Judas, of course, the name Judas is common. Judas, the brother of Jesus. Judas of Galilee, who led an insurrection around the time that Jesus was born.

And, of course, Judas Iscariot. And then this Judas, Judas not Iscariot. If you had a King James, it will, in Luke 6.16, say that this man was the brother of James, but he's not.

He is the son of James. We don't know who that James was. Some people think it's James, the brother of Jesus, which would make Judas a nephew of Jesus and yet another family member.

But it's not likely because early church history says that James, the leader of the Jerusalem church, was never married. Others think that he was a son of James, the son of Zebedee, a grandson of Zebedee, but there's no way to be certain of that. Well, Matthew, Levi, we've talked about him as a son of Alphaeus and so on.

Philip, only the Gospel of John tells us much about Philip. He's not the same as Philip the Evangelist in Acts. But while most of the other disciples were called to full-time followership in pairs, Philip was called individually.

And he is the one that brings Nathanael to Jesus. And he is the one that says there's not enough bread to feed the five thousand. He's the one that talks to the Greeks.

And when the disciples are in the upper room, it is Philip who says, Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us. John 14.8, Jesus told him that they had already seen the Father in him. Well, these disciples fulfilled a role.

Simon Peter goes without saying, I think we all know the case with him. Simon the Zealot or Simon the Canaanite, we know very little about him. And then finally, Doubting Thomas, we're pretty familiar with him.

But these disciples, when you compare their role in coming out from under the shadow of the Lord Jesus and bearing witness and bearing testimony because they had been with him, is very similar to the role that these three friends of Daniel play in the book of Daniel. Well, that's what we're going to have to stop for this morning. We'll come back to the writing on the wall and this very dramatic scene in the feasting hall of Belshazzar next time.

Father, thank you for the privilege of studying your word. We pray that God the Holy Spirit will

minister it to our hearts. We ask it in Jesus' name, Amen.

Jacob. They're all Jacob. Yeah, right.

Yeah, I should have mentioned that again there like I did in Revelation.