

12/4/62 cont'd

because he's buried in a rich man's tomb? Do you think that that is a statement of the effectiveness of his redemption? No, it does not come under humiliation, it doesn't come under exaltation, it doesn't come under redemption. What does it come under?

Question: Answer: The fact he was put....I don't know. ...all the classes of people from the wicked to the rich, does that mean wicked or the rich or the good, the wicked or the bad, or does it mean that the wicked are the poor, All the poor are wicked?

Question: Answer: Yes, it does not make two extremes, Wicked and rich in any category, they don't belong together. There's not humiliation here, there's not exaltation here, there's not redemption. What is it?

Question: ~~Answer:~~ .....there is the humiliation because the kings of Israel let's say Judah were married at a certain place....and claimed....

Answer: Yes, but there's nothing in the context showing he claimed to be a king.

There is no humiliation, there's no exaltation, there's no statement of redemptive prophecy.

work, it is an inorganic problem. That's a term I have coined myself. It's an inorganic problem or prophecy, it does not advance his work. It does not

advance the teaching it does something else.

(Tourville)

Question: Answer: Yes, the purpose of it is entirely different from the main purpose of the prophecy. It is evidential. It is entirely evidential. It is evidential in two ways. It is evidential in the first place because here is a prediction that one who is poor, who's oppressed, who is afflicted, who is killed with wicked malefactors, such a one will be buried in a rich man's tomb. Now that does not