

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #120; April, 2008 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830; Ph. (419)435-2836

Fax (419)-435-7571; E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

TO THOSE WHOM THE COVENANT BELONGS

A NON-UNIVERSAL CULTURE AWARENESS INSTRUCTIONAL PUBLICATION

This is a non-copyrighted teaching letter.
Please feel free to make as many copies as you wish, but not to edit.

A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER

This is my one hundred and twentieth monthly teaching letter and completes my tenth year of publication, which I had pointed out in my last lesson that it would. I never dreamed ten years ago that my mailing list would reach 2450 by this time (2318 by E-mail plus 132 by regular mail). And in all of that time, I have not deviated one whit from Two Seedline doctrine, nor have I promoted even a shade of universalism, but hold a very strong non-universal position. Universalism is Satan's agenda, not Yahweh's, and those who fight against Two Seedline doctrine help Satan's cause. Today, I would estimate that 99.999% of the people are following Satan's agenda! That leaves very few who are on Yahweh's side!

In the last lesson (#119), we discussed how in places in the LXX, the translators mistakenly rendered Phoenician as Canaanite, a horrible misinterpretation. While in many cases the Septuagint is a valuable tool, yet in other places it can be quite misleading. The original Phoenicians were Israelites, not Canaanites! Therefore, the object of lesson #'s 119 and 120 is to identify, with the help of Paul's teachings, just who were/are Israelites and who were/are Canaanites. Like the occasions where the Septuagint rendered "Phoenician" as "Canaanite", there appears also to be a problem with Joshua 2:1, where the famous Rahab is said to be a harlot. But again, this may also be a faulty rendering from the Hebrew into the Greek. And again, this may have come about by the Septuagint translators. In the A.V. this passage says at verses 1-3: **"¹ And Joshua the son of Nun sent out of Shittim two men to spy secretly, saying, Go view the land, even Jericho. And they went, and came into an harlot's house, named Rahab, and lodged there. ² And it was told the king of Jericho, saying, Behold, there came men in hither to night of the children of Israel to search out the country. ³ And the king of Jericho sent unto Rahab, saying, Bring forth the men that are come to thee, which are entered into thine house: for they be come to search out all the country."**

Adam Clarke seems to have a better handle on this passage than other commentators. We need to know something of his background to qualify what he has to say: Adam Clarke was born at Mobeg in County Londonderry, Ireland, date not entirely

certain, though his mother reputedly claimed 1760 while his father said 1763. His father was of English extraction, studied at the universities of Edinburgh and Glasgow, and his mother was Scottish. Adam, as a boy, was dull, failing again and again, upon which his teacher told him that he should be a beggar all his life, to jeers from his classmates. This awoke him from his lethargy, and something snapped within him, and saying within himself, “shall I forever be a dunce?” he speedily resumed his task without missing a word. From this he became fond of reading. He then became interested in such works as the Eclogues and Georgics of Virgil, versifying the Psalms of David and other portions of the sacred volume. He soon conquered the whole of the heathen mythology and biography. Of *Littleton’s Classical Dictionary* he made himself complete master. Later he began to study astronomy and philosophy, believing them to be an aid to religion. He then became influenced with the Methodist sect and gradually worked himself into the ministry. In 1782 he preached his first sermon with a favorable impression from John Wesley. During a three-year appointment in the Norman Isles, he devoted all his spare time to the study of the Hebrew of the Old Testament, the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Syrian Scriptures, the Latin Vulgate, and the Septuagint, as found in Walton’s Polyglot, a copy of which he purchased for ten pounds. In 1788, Adam married Mary Cooke, who outlived him one year, and by whom they had six sons and six daughters.

Thus Adam became accomplished in several languages, the Greek Classics, and much history. While he was blind to his Identity as an Israelite, when he declares the meanings of various words one can be quite confident that he has them right. In his *Commentary On The Bible*, Adam Clarke has the following to say about Joshua 2:1-3, volume 2 of 6, pp. 10-12:

“ **NOTES ON CHAP. II**, Verse 1. *Joshua – sent – two men to spy secretly*] It is very likely that these spies had been sent out soon after the death of Moses, and therefore our marginal reading, *had sent*, is to be preferred. *Secretly* – It is very probable also that these were confidential persons, and that the transaction was between them and him alone. As they were to pass over the Jordan opposite to Jericho, it was necessary that they should have possession of this city, that in case of any reverses they might have no enemies in their rear. He sent the men, therefore, to see the state of the city, avenues of approach, fortifications, &c., that he might the better concert his mode of attack.

“ *A harlot’s house*] *Harlots* and *inn-keepers* seem to have been called by the same name, as no doubt many who followed this mode of life, from their exposed situation, were not the most correct in their morals. Among the ancients *women* generally kept houses of entertainment, and among the Egyptians and Greeks this was common. I shall subjoin a few proofs. HERODOTUS, speaking concerning the many differences between Egypt and other countries, and the peculiarity of their laws and customs, expressly says: Ἐν τοιοῖσι αἱ μὲν γυναῖκες ἀγοραζοῦσι καὶ καπηλευοῦσι· οἱ δὲ ἀνδρες κατ’ οἴκους εἶντες, ὑφαίνουσι. ‘Among the Egyptians the women carry on all commercial concerns, and *keep taverns*, while the men continue at home and weave.’ Herodotus in Euterp[ê], c. xxxv. DIODORUS SICULUS, lib. i., s. 8, and c. xxvii., asserts that ‘the men were the slaves of the women in Egypt,

and that it is stipulated in the marriage contract that the woman shall be the ruler of her husband, and that he shall obey her in all things.' The same historian supposes that women had these high privileges among the Egyptians, to perpetuate the memory of the beneficent administration of *Isis*, who was afterwards deified among them.

"NYMPHODORUS, quoted by the ancient scholiast on the *Cædipus Coloneus* of Sophocles, accounts for these customs: he says that 'Sesostris, finding the population of Egypt rapidly increasing, fearing that he should not be able to govern the people or keep them united under one head, obliged the *men* to assume the occupations of women, in order that they might be rendered effeminate.'

"Sophocles confirms the account given by Herodotus; speaking of Egypt he says:—

“Ἐκεῖ γὰρ οἱ μὲν ἀρσενες κατὰ στεγὰς
Θακουσὶν ἰστουργοῦντες· αἱ δὲ ξυννομοὶ
Τὰ ἕξω βίου τροφεία προσυνοῦσ' αἰεὶ.

Cædip. Col. v. 352.

“There the men stay in their houses weaving cloth, while the women *transact all business out of doors*, provide food for the family,' &c. It is on this passage that the scholiast cites *Nymphodoros* for the information given above, and which he says is found in the 13th chapter of his work 'On the Customs of Barbarous Nations.'

"That the same custom prevailed among the *Greeks* we have the following proof from APULEIUS: *Ego vero quod primum ingressui stabulum conspicatus sum, accessi, et de QUADAM ANU CAUPONA illico percontor.*—Aletam. lib. i., p. 18, Edit. Bip. 'Having entered into the first *inn* I met with, and there seeing a certain OLD WOMAN, the INN-KEEPER, I inquired of her.'

"It is very likely that women kept the places of public entertainment among the *Philistines*; and that it was with *such a one*, and not with a *harlot*, that Samson lodged; (see Judges xvi. 1, &c. ;) for as this custom certainly did prevail among the *Egyptians*, of which we have the fullest proof above, we may naturally expect it to have prevailed also among the Canaanites and Philistines, as we find from *Apuleius* that it did afterwards among the Greeks. Besides, there is more than presumptive proof that this custom obtained among the Israelites themselves, even in the most polished period of their history; for it is much more reasonable to suppose that the two *women*, who came to Solomon for judgment, relative to the *dead child*, (1 Kings iii. 16, &c. ;) were *inn-keepers*, than that they were harlots. It is well known that common prostitutes, from their abandoned course of life, scarcely ever have children; and the laws were so strict against such in Israel, (Deut. xxiii. 18,) that if these had been of that class it is not at all likely they would have dared to appear before Solomon. All these circumstances considered, I am fully satisfied that the term זֹנָה *zonah* in the text, which we translate *harlot*, [after the LXX translators and the N.T. authors], should be rendered *tavern* or *inn-keeper*, or *hostess*. The *spies* who were sent out on this occasion were undoubtedly the most confidential persons that Joshua had in his host; they went on an errand of the most weighty importance, and which involved the greatest consequences. The risk they ran of losing their lives in this enterprise was extreme. Is it therefore likely that persons who could not escape apprehension and death, without the miraculous interference of

God, should in despite of that law which at this time must have been so well known unto them, go into a place where they might expect, not the blessing, but the curse, of God? Is it not therefore more likely that they went rather to an *inn* to lodge than to a *brothel*? But what completes in my judgment the evidence on this point is that this very Rahab, whom we call a *harlot*, was actually married to *Salmon*, a Jewish [sic Judahite] *prince*, see Matt. i. 5. And is it probable that a *prince of Judah* would have taken to wife such a person as our text represents Rahab to be?

“It is granted that the Septuagint, which are followed by Heb. xi. 31, and James ii. 25, translate the Hebrew זונה *zonah* by πορνη, which generally signifies a *prostitute*; but it is not absolutely evident that the Septuagint used the word in this sense. Every scholar knows that the Greek word πορνη comes from περναω, to *sell*, as this does from περαω, to *pass from one to another*; *transire facio a me ad alterum*: DAMM. But may not this be spoken as well of the woman’s *goods* as of her *person*? In this sense the Chaldee Targum understood the term, and has therefore translated it פונדקיתא אחרא *ittetha pundekitha, a woman, a TAVERN-KEEPER*. That this is the true sense many eminent men are of opinion; and the preceding arguments render it at least very probable. To all this may be added, that as our blessed Lord came through the line of this woman, it cannot be a matter of little consequence to know what moral character she sustained; as an *inn-keeper* she might be *respectable*, if not *honourable*; as a *public prostitute* she could be neither; and it is not very likely that the providence of God would have suffered a person of such a notoriously bad character to enter into the sacred line of his genealogy. It is true that the cases of Tamar and Bathsheba may be thought sufficient to destroy this argument; but whoever considers these two cases maturely will see that they differ totally from that of *Rahab*, if we allow the word *harlot* to be legitimate. As to the objection that her *husband* is nowhere mentioned in the account here given; it appears to me to have little weight. She might have been either a *single woman* or a *widow*; and in either of these cases there could have been no mention of a *husband*; or if she even had a husband it is not likely *he* would have been mentioned on this occasion, as the secret seems to have been kept religiously between *her* and the *spies*. If she were a *married* woman her husband might be included in the general terms, *all that she had*, and *all her kindred*, chap. vi. 23. But it is most likely that she was a *single woman* or a *widow*, who got her bread honestly by *keeping a house of entertainment for strangers*.

“Verse 3. *The king of Jericho sent unto Rahab*] This appears to be a proof of the preceding opinion: had she been a *prostitute* or a person of *ill fame* he could at once have sent officers to have seized the persons lodged with her as vagabonds; but if she kept a house of entertainment, the persons under her roof were *sacred*, according to the universal custom of the *Asiatics*, and could not be molested on any trifling grounds. A *guest* or a *friend* is sacred in whatever house he may be *received*, in every part of the *east* to the present day.”

From Adam Clarke’s research here, we can plainly see that we may very possibly have a mistranslation from the original Hebrew into the Greek. It is not entirely the use of the original root, but a corruption of the sense in which it was originally

written. And as Paul was influenced by the Septuagint at Hebrews 11:31, and James at 2:25, they too, innocently followed a flawed translation not of their own making!

The *Bible Knowledge Commentary* says at Deuteronomy 23:18: “The words for prostitutes here indicate that prostitution in general was in view, not specifically temple prostitution. The word for female prostitute is *zônâh* and the word for male prostitute is *keleb* (lit., ‘dog’). A vow was not to be paid with money obtained from this sinful practice. The payment of a vow allowed an Israelite to express his gratitude for God’s gracious provision in his life. Therefore to use money God did not provide in order to pay a vow was insincere and hypocritical. No wonder it was detestable to the LORD. (Other detestable things included idolatry, offering sacrificial animals with defects, and dishonesty ... Lending and charging interest ...)”

If a male prostitute is a dog, a female prostitute would be a bitch. And had Rahab been a woman of ill-fame (a bitch), the Israelites would not have saved Rahab and her family alive, let alone allowing her to become the lineal ancestor of Yahshua Christ! This is the kind of activity one would expect from Canaanites! Had Rahab been this kind of woman, every Israelite prostitute after that (male or female) could have used Rahab as an excuse for their own ill-behavior! But rather, the Israelites were given instruction by Yahweh to stone all those living such a lifestyle.

From the *Hard Sayings of the Bible*, page 323, we read: “But what about the label put on Gomer? Must we regard her as a soliciting prostitute? No, the term used in the Hebrew text is too restricted to mean that. The Hebrew text does not say *zônâh*, as if it were the intensive form. Instead it uses the plural abstract form of the same word, *z^enûnîm*, thus referring to a personal quality and not to an activity.”

At Joshua 2:1, *The Treasury of Scripture Knowledge* says in part: “... sent. or, had sent. Shittim ... to spy secretly ... even Jericho ... harlot’s house. Though the word {zonah} generally denotes a prostitute, yet many very learned men are of opinion that it should be here rendered an innkeeper or hostess, from {zoon,} to furnish or provide food. In this sense it was understood by the Targumist, who renders it, {ittetha pundekeetha}, ‘a woman, a tavern-keeper,’ and so St. Chrysostome, in his second sermon on Repentance, calls her ... by which the LXX. render it, and which is adopted by the Apostles, is derived from ... to sell, and is also supposed to denote a tavern keeper. Among the ancients, women generally kept houses of entertainment. Herodotus says, ‘Among the Egyptians, the women carry on all commercial concerns, and keep taverns, while the men continue at home and weave.’ The same custom prevailed among the Greeks ...”

Once we understand that the word should have been “zoon” rather than “zonah”, we can begin to see that Rahab either owned or had a concession on a combination hotel and restaurant. The problem is, when we are reading, we sometimes overlook all that is being said. Let’s continue by reading Joshua 2:4-6: “⁴ **And the woman (Rahab) took the two men, and hid them, and said thus, There came men unto me, but I wist not whence they were:** ⁵ **And it came to pass about the time of shutting of the gate, when it was dark, that the men went out: whither the men went I wot not: pursue after them quickly; for ye shall overtake them.** ⁶ **But she**

had brought them up to the roof of the house, and hid them with the stalks of flax, which she had laid in order upon the roof.”

Well, what’s all this business about these “stalks of flax”? Wherever one can find stalks of flax, one will find linen and linseed oil not far away. These stalks of flax should tell us an important story, for it would suggest that Rahab’s family was in the business of manufacturing fine linen which would require growing, reaping by pulling the stalks up, roots and all, rippling or separating the seeds to make other products and obtain the lint, or flaxen fiber, from the boon or core of the stem. To obtain the lint, a steeping in water is required until the boon begins to rot, when it can be separated from the fiber by means of a scutching blade. It is next hackled, or combed, after which it can be spun into threads and woven into cloth. I’ll bet that Rahab had some of the finest bed sheets for her hotel and some of the finest tablecloths for her restaurant! Not only that, but Rahab and her family would have been producing linseed oil used in painting and varnishing. Also an animal food called linseed cake which can be sold in solid cakes or meal. Other products are made such as oilcloth, painter’s ink, soft soap, and linoleum. Why else would there have been stalks of flax around?

In ancient times, sometimes when a woman’s husband died she had no means of making a living, but under the Israelite economy it was decreed that the needs of the widow would be provided for. This provision alone, if abided by, would remove the need of the widow from the necessity of resorting to harlotry. So there are two good reasons why Rahab was not a harlot in that sense of the Hebrew word. It appears from the text that she had a family who could provide for her, and a hotel business to help support her every need. Not only that, but it appears from the text that she was an excellent business manager, for she both helped devise a plan for the spies to get back across the Jordan river, and she was able to divert the king of Jericho from apprehending the spies. If one has ever had the opportunity of managing a business, they are familiar with the odd circumstances that occur occasionally, and how it takes a certain tact to deal with the various situations which come up when one is not prepared. But you will notice that Rahab had no problem, and was able to save both her family and herself.

Let’s now go to W.E. Vine in his *Complete Expository Dictionary Of Old & New Testament Words* under “to lie”: “*Shakab* also signifies ‘lying down asleep.’ The Lord told Jacob: ‘... The land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed’ (Gen. 28:13). In Exod. 22:26-27 the verb denotes the act of sleeping more than the lying down: ‘If thou at all take thy neighbor’s raiment to pledge, thou shalt deliver it unto him by that the sun goeth down ... [In what else] shall he sleep?’

“*Shakab* can also be used to mean ‘lodge’ and thus refers to sleeping and eating. Israel’s spies lodged with Rahab: ‘And they went, and came into a harlot’s house, named Rahab, and lodged there’ (Josh. 2:1; cf. 2 Kings 4:11).” Had Rahab been a harlot, she probably would have been poor – too poor to have afforded a guest room.

And lest we overlook the most important part of Rahab’s story, let’s read Joshua 2:18, which is after Rahab had asked the Israelite spies to spare her and her family when they came to conquer the city: “**Behold, when we come into the land, thou shalt bind this line of scarlet thread in the window which thou didst let us**

down by: and thou shalt bring thy father, and thy mother, and thy brethren, and all thy father's household, home unto thee."

Please notice that the line by which the spies were let down was made up of scarlet thread. Either it was solid scarlet or had a scarlet thread woven in it. Good Bible scholars will always instruct one to find the first mention anytime a new subject is introduced, so let's go back to the first mention of a "scarlet thread". It is found at Genesis 38:28-30: "²⁸ **And it came to pass, when she [*Tamar*] travailed, that *the one* put out *his* hand: and the midwife took and bound upon his hand a scarlet thread, saying, This came out first.** ²⁹ **And it came to pass, as he drew back his hand, that, behold, his brother came out: and she said, How hast thou broken forth? *this* breach *be* upon thee: therefore his name was called Pharez.** ³⁰ **And afterward came out his brother, that had the scarlet thread upon his hand: and his name was called Zarah."** What more evidence do we need to understand that Rahab was of the tribe of Zarah-Judah? Just how she and her family ended up in Jericho would be difficult to conjecture! Inasmuch as Joshua would have picked his best men for this mission to spy out Jericho, they would have immediately been aware of the significance of the scarlet thread, that it was an emblem of Zarah-Judah, and would have realized that Rahab was one of their own people. Had Rahab been a Canaanite whore, we can be quite sure that the spies wouldn't have trusted her for two seconds! If Joshua's spies couldn't tell the difference between a hotel and a whorehouse, they wouldn't have been very competent.

This puts an entirely different perspective on our story than one might imagine. For if Rahab were truly of the tribe of Zarah-Judah, and there can be little question that she was, then Yahshua Christ not only had the royal blood of Pharez-Judah surging through His veins, but also that of Zarah-Judah, and both of the twin brothers were royal. Isn't it simply amazing how many times we can read these passages and not comprehend everything that is being said? Once we understand some of these things, we can determine just how far off base some of the various commentaries can be. For instance, *Nelson's New Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, on page 1065 says this about Rahab, in part: "Thus a Canaanite harlot became part of the lineage of King David out of which the Messiah came ..." Another comment is from *Wiersbe's Expository Outlines on the New Testament* on Matthew 1:1: "Tamar was guilty of whoredom, yet God permitted her to be listed in the ancestry of Christ. Rahab was both a harlot and a foreigner. She was saved by her faith. Ruth was a Moabitess; and according to Deut. 23:3-6, she was excluded from the nation of Israel. Bathsheba was partner to David's awful sin, yet God forgave her and permitted her to be one of Christ's ancestors through Solomon. 'Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound' ..."

It is simply amazing how various commentators just delight in using the least valid reasoning to suggest that Yahshua Christ was somehow racially impure. You have just witnessed two cases in point. It's like in a recent television program, where a liberal minister used the woman of Samaria at John 4:7-14 to support his erroneous theory on race. After reading the passage, he indicated that, with the woman of Samaria, Christ had broken the race barrier. Had he only examined the passage a little closer, he would have discovered that the woman of Samaria was actually an Israelite, for she said at

verse 12, “Art thou greater than our father Jacob ...?” Therefore, Christ didn’t break any kind of a race barrier, but He enforced one, for it is very clear that the woman was an Israelite! That should also give us a clue to the racial background of the good Samaritan at Luke 10:33. These are simply two examples of a couple of Israelites who just happened to reside in Samaria at the time! There are even some in Israel Identity today who claim that race doesn’t really matter, while the truth is, race is everything, and only White Israelites can be Christians!

We can be assuredly certain that Yahshua Christ was 100% racially pure, with absolutely no admixture of any of the tribes of Canaan. That demands that every one of Christ’s ancestors were also racially pure! That means that Ruth was not a Moabite, nor was Rahab a Canaanite! The term “mulatto” means one of mixed-race. Mulatto is derived from the word mule. A mule is half horse and half donkey, therefore a mulatto is a half-assed person. And that is not swearing but stating a scientific fact. And as we travel around the country these days, we are seeing more and more half-assed people! The Mexicans are half-assed people; the Arabs are half-assed people; and the bad-fidjews are half-assed people, but Christ is racially pure!

Getting back to our purpose to show how Paul handled this Canaanite problem in his writing, let’s see what he wrote at Hebrews 11:30-31: “³⁰ **By faith the walls of Jericho fell down, after they were compassed about seven days.** ³¹ **By faith the harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not, when she had received the spies with peace.**” Let’s now compare how William Finck translated this same passage in his *The Letters Of Paul*: “³⁰ **By faith the walls of Jericho fell, having been encircled for seven days.** ³¹ **By faith Rahab the harlot₁₇₂ did not perish with those who were disobedient, greeting the scouts with peace.**” You will notice here that Finck has a note #172 for the term harlot, so let’s see what he says about it: “172. Some contend that the Old Testament Hebrew (Strong’s #2181) allows for Rahab’s having been some sort of ambassador, rather than a harlot. The Greek of the Septuagint, and use of the word πόρνη (4204) there, here, and at Jas. 2:25, allows for no such contention. ἄ has ‘Rahab, who is called a harlot’.”

There is positively no question that the language of the Septuagint is exactly as William Finck states, but did the Septuagint translators take from the Masoretic text a correct sense of the meaning of the word as Adam Clarke points out? I am sure that if William Finck discovers positive evidence of such an error in the future, he will add that to his note #172.

Let’s also compare what Paul wrote to that which James wrote at 2:24-25: “²⁴ **Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.** ²⁵ **Likewise also was not Rahab the harlot justified by works, when she had received the messengers, and had sent *them* out another way?” I checked to see what the Dead Sea Scrolls might have on Rahab at Joshua chapter 2, but they only have portions of verses 11 and 12, not verse 1. So any evidence from that source is presently nil. But let’s see what Josephus has on the matter at *Antiquities* 5.1.2:**

“Now when he had pitched his camp, the spies came to him immediately, well acquainted with the whole state of the Canaanites; for at first, before they were at all discovered, they took a full view of the city of Jericho without disturbance, and saw

which parts of the walls were strong, and which parts were otherwise, and indeed insecure, and which of the gates were so weak as might afford an entrance to their army. Now those that met them took no notice of them when they saw them, and supposed they were only strangers, who used to be very curious in observing everything in the city, and did not take them for enemies; but at even they retired to a certain inn that was near to the wall, whither they went to eat their supper; which supper when they had done, and were considering how to get away, information was given to the king as he was at supper, that there were some persons come from the Hebrews' camp to view the city as spies, and that they were in the inn kept by Rahab, and were very solicitous that they might not be discovered. So he sent immediately some to them, and commanded to catch them, and bring them to him, that he might examine them by torture, and learn what their business was there. As soon as Rahab understood that these messengers were coming, she hid the spies under stalks of flax, which were laid to dry on the top of her house; and said to the messengers that were sent by the king, that certain unknown strangers had supped with her a little before sunsetting, and were gone away, who might easily be taken, if they were any terror to the city, or likely to bring any danger to the king. So these messengers being thus deluded by the woman, and suspecting no imposition, went their ways, without so much as searching the inn; but they immediately pursued them along those roads which they most probably supposed them to have gone, and those particularly which led to the river, but could hear no tidings of them; so they left off the pains of any further pursuit. But when the tumult was over, Rahab brought the men down, and desired them as soon as they should have obtained possession of the land of Canaan, when it would be in their power to make her amends for her preservation of them, to remember what danger she had undergone for their sakes; for that if she had been caught concealing them, she could not have escaped a terrible destruction, she and all her family with her, and so bid them go home; and desired them to swear to her to preserve her and her family when they should take the city and destroy all its inhabitants, as they had decreed to do; for so far she said she had been assured by those divine miracles of which she had been informed. So these spies acknowledged that they owed her thanks for what she had done already, and withal swore to requite her kindness, not only in words, but in deeds; but they gave her this advice: That when she should perceive that the city was about to be taken, she should put her goods, and all her family, by way of security, in her inn, and to hang out scarlet threads before her doors [or windows], that the commander of the Hebrews might know her house, and take care to do her no harm; for, said they, we will inform him of this matter, because of the concern thou hast had to preserve us; but if any one of thy family fall in the battle, do not thou blame us; and we beseech that God, by whom we have sworn, not then to be displeased with us, as though we had broken our oaths. So these men, when they had made this agreement, went away, letting themselves down by a rope from the wall, and escaped, and came and told their own people whatsoever they had done in their journey to this city. Joshua also told Eleazar the high priest, and the senate, what the spies had sworn to Rahab; who confirmed what had been sworn."

From this it would appear that Adam Clarke was on target. That indeed Rahab had an inn and a restaurant, and was well-to-do enough that she didn't need to resort to harlotry! A footnote at *Antiq.* 5.1.2 says in part: "... Nor was Josephus himself of any other opinion or practice, as I shall remark in the note on *Antiq.* 9.4.3. And observe, that I still call this woman Rahab, an *innkeeper*, not a *harlot*; the whole history, both in our copies, and especially in Josephus, implying no more ..." Josephus himself uses the term "harlot" eight times, but not a single occurrence in reference to Rahab.