

000788

F

Prophets-15

February 11, 1948

Turn them <sup>in</sup> quickly please because we don't want the gentlemen collecting them to lose part of our study for today. We <sup>are</sup> going on with Micah and yesterday we noticed that Chapter 6 has that great passage from Verses 6-8 with which I hope you will be familiar and recall that which is vital in it. <sup>(in case of later discussion)</sup> I don't <sup>not</sup> think it's necessary we take time on it, but look it over yourselves and get an idea of it and if there is any particular problem raise it in class some time. I think the answer is fairly obvious but you <sup>are</sup> going to find that you are bound to run into it in later times because it is one of the most quoted verses against the conservative view of the Bible, and so it is extremely important you be familiar with Verses 6-8 of Chapter 6 of Micah.

Chapter 7 continues with its terrific war upon the people for their sins and then we have that passage of blessing again which begins with what verse of Chapter 7, Mr. ---? Mr. ---? Yes. You don't. Well, how many Mr. ---? Verse 7? <sup>unclear</sup> Verse 7: "Therefore will I look unto the Lord. I will wait for the God of my salvation: God will hear me." What did you say? Well Verse 18 is <sup>a</sup> blessing but I think <sup>(there is before that quite definitely)</sup> What did you say, Mr. ---? Well, how about verse ---? Yes, but 14-20 is surely all blessing, isn't it? And 8-12 is surely all blessing, isn't it? Yes, 13 has a little touch of rebuke in it, but 8 to, really practically 7 to the end is blessing with this one rebuke verse inserted in the blessing passage, and this passage of blessing is largely subjective rather than quite so objective as are Chapters 4 and 5. It's not so much specific predictions of the future as it is declarations of the trust of the prophet in God, of his joy in God's wonderful promises, of his certainty that God is going to continue His blessing upon His people and to perform His great work. You notice in V. 11 the definite looking forward to the return from exile. Here the walls haven't <sup>not</sup> even been destroyed, the city has not yet been taken, <sup>and</sup> will <sup>be</sup> not <sup>already</sup> for a century, and yet he <sup>already</sup> looks forward to the rebuilding of the walls <sup>already</sup> ready in v. 11. Just as Isaiah in the last part of the book, so here he has put himself into the future situation and is praising the Lord for that which is to come to pass. The 18th verse is very interesting because of the way it starts. Why is the start of v. 18 interesting? Mr. ---? Yes, but there is a particular reason why the very beginning of v. 18 is extremely interesting and how many know that? <sup>This is a</sup> Very specific and unusual reason <sup>would</sup> you raise your hand? Mr. --- does and Mr. ---, who else? Only those two? Mr. ---, what



~~is it? (Student speaks) Well, that's very interesting, but that's not the thing I had in mind. Mr. —? (Student speaks) Yes, that's very interesting, but the thing I had in mind is the very beginning of the verse, and who notices it? Mr. —, you see it surely. Mr. Gordon? (Student speaks) Yes. Mr. —. (Student) Yes, but there's a particular thing I have in mind here. Mr. —? Well, Mr. —, give us the Hebrew of the first couple of words. You don't need to look in the Hebrew Bible if you don't have it open. Translate it into Hebrew. From your English. I'd prefer that you do that rather than to look in the Hebrew. Yes. "Who is a God like thee?" Well, now what is the name of the man who writes it? Yes. Mi ka ya <sup>no space</sup> And what does that mean? Who is like the Lord? Who is like Jehovah? ~~Mi ka ya.~~ You know surely that <sup>in</sup> all the names in the Hebrew ending in ya, the ya stands for the Lord. It's the <sup>is</sup> ~~(someone coughs)~~. Who is like the Lord? <sup>the meaning of</sup> is Micah's name, and <sup>his</sup> towards the end of his book he begins one of <sup>these</sup> verses, "Who is a God like unto thee?" It's <sup>is</sup> very clearly a play on the prophet's name. It's very clearly showing the fitness of his own name for one who takes the attitude that he has taken for God, and it certainly was in the prophet's mind when he said this verse. There's <sup>is</sup> no question of that, because his name, Mi ka ya, was not like <sup>any of our names</sup> ~~the name of one of us that is derived from another language and we have forgotten what it means.~~ Most of <sup>us</sup> you have names that are taken from another language and <sup>we</sup> you have no idea what the name means, but the Hebrew names are mostly Hebrew words with a specific, definite meaning. It's just like a friend of mine who <sup>is</sup> in his family, not usually called by his ordinary name but he's called "brother" by the whole family. He was a younger brother and so they started <sup>calling him that</sup> when he was a child and they still call him that although he's a grown man. Well, now in a case like that if you use his <sup>probably not</sup> ordinary name which means The Lord is Gracious, he wouldn't recognize the meaning <sup>or</sup> ~~probably~~ see a play on names but if you use the word brother he immediately is familiar with the meaning <sup>is</sup>. Now in Hebrew, as in most ancient languages, the names were not derived from some other language but are directly from the language of the people and have a meaning and the meaning is very familiar to them. And so here the book of Micah ends with a great declaration which takes the very name of the prophet and uses it, you might say for a text. Who is like the Lord? He says, "Who is a God like unto thee that can do these things?" It's <sup>is</sup> not a tremendously important thing but it's a very~~



Prophets 415

February 11, 1948

interesting thing, <sup>using this word before he does,</sup> ~~that such a use of the word occurs in Micah here,~~ <sup>this ending</sup> and so he ends ~~up~~ with a great, wonderful declaration of the supremacy and incomparable nature of God. ~~Now and of course,~~ <sup>shows</sup> the last verse <sup>shows</sup> his absolute confidence that God will continue the great blessing which He has promised.

~~Now~~ these last chapters have much in them that would be very interesting to study but our course is one in which we have little time and can just pick out passages that bring out particular principles or key points of interpretation or lay a foundation. You can't <sup>not</sup> study all the prophetic books in the length of time we have or even get the main teaching but just to get a few main principles and so we <sup>will</sup> turn right now to Isaiah. What is the question? (Student) I think it's <sup>is</sup> mostly right that time. Of course, principles are laid down which can be applied <sup>in history.</sup> any time. If Micah rebuked people for an attitude you can be sure that we will be rebuked today if we have that attitude. [(Student again) Well, that's only with specific predictions. With specific predictions, is the only time we worry about the time element. (Student) For predictions, yes; but if he had taken something that is not a prediction we assume the time element is present. It's only if it <sup>indicates</sup> specifically / prediction which is still in the future. Now, of course, there are times where they deal more directly with a future time but I don't think likely in that particular case.]

~~Now let us go back to Isaiah,~~ and the book of Isaiah, as we have noticed, is easily <sup>and</sup> naturally divisible into a number of main sections and <sup>of</sup> these main sections of the book the first one, everyone would agree, is Chapters 1-6. There is no question in anyone's mind. I believe, that Chapter 7 starts a new section. ~~So we have Chapters 1-6 for our first section of the book of Isaiah.~~ There is, of course, no need of our spending time now on the historic background of Isaiah. We discussed it very fully last year in the course in Old Testament history, we were assigned review of it several times last fall and you should have it very thoroughly in mind but in addition to that there is another reason why at this particular point it should not be necessary for us to stop for a review of the historic background of the book of Isaiah, and what is that reason, Mr. ---?

February 11, 1948

That is exactly what I had in mind. If we are going to spend a long time on the background of Isaiah you wouldn't naturally do it between Micah and Isaiah because the background would be very similar to that of Micah, just like the background of the life of Mr. Steinhauser and the historic background of the life of Mr. Ludlam would be in general, specific local details would be different but they have lived in the same period of the world's <sup>history</sup> and consequently--if you're going to study one of them fully you naturally should take up before that the conditions you need for the other as well, because they are in the same time, and Micah was a contemporary of Isaiah. Many writers erroneously say he was a younger contemporary of Isaiah. Personally I think he was an older contemporary, I think he was a few years older instead of a few years younger, but there is no proof either way, but it is clearly a fact that they were contemporary. I've already mentioned yesterday the reason why I think he was older rather than younger. I didn't take special time on it. I touched upon it incidentally in connection with another question. Now it doesn't necessarily prove he was older; the two are so near you can't say which is older or which is younger, but there is an indication looking in that direction which we touched upon yesterday and which I hope you will recall if I ask you for it at some later time.

Now the first section, then, of the book of Isaiah begins with a heading. You look at the book and you find a heading: The Vision of Isaiah the Son of Amos which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah, kings of Judah. It immediately seems likely that this heading is a heading for the whole book, doesn't it? It starts the book, it names all the kings, most of the kings under whom he prophesied, it tells the general subject, concerning Judah and Jerusalem, it seems likely it is a heading for the whole book; however, if you find at the beginning of your second chapter another heading you immediately say, "Is 1:1 a heading for the whole book or is it just a heading for Chapter 1 and then we have another heading there which is perhaps a heading for the whole book or perhaps only a part of the book?" Well, you notice that Chapter 2 begins again with a heading: The word that Isaiah the son of Amos saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem, and how many are there here who think, then, that 1:1 is a heading just for the first chapter and 2:1 heads the rest of the book? How many think that? Well how many think at any rate that 1:1 is a heading just for the first chapter, regard-



less of how far 2:1                   ? Nobody? Well how many then think that 1:1 is the heading for the whole book? A good many. Now can somebody give me one very clear though perhaps not absolutely convincing, but very definite reason which we have already touched upon in this class for not thinking that Chapter 2, Verse 1 is a heading for the rest of the book? Yes. What I mean is if you have Chapter 1, Verse 1 with a heading and then you get another heading in 2:1 why it's immediately appears--well, you say, "Is 1:1 a heading just for one chapter and then you have your new heading as to the rest of the book, Mr.--?" (Student) So you mean that would make it look that 2:1 is not a heading for the rest of the book? And that would equally make it look that 1:1 is not a heading for the whole book, wouldn't it? (Student) You mean 2:1 is more restricted than 1:1? Restricted in what way? But I mean as to time element. Well, mightn't it cover all the time from his time to the end of the history if there is no time element given? Is there anybody here who has a good reason to give us for saying that 2:1 does not cover the whole time from the time of Isaiah to the very end of history but deals with a restricted section of time and to tell us just what that restricted section is, Mr.--?" (Student) Yes. That is, there is history and there sections dealing with Babylon so that neither of them would be an absolutely complete coverage of the whole book and yet it is true that the book as a whole does deal with Isaiah's visions concerning Judah and Jerusalem and he's interested in Babylon principally for its relation to Judah and Jerusalem and the history consists in large part of telling of the visions Isaiah had in the history concerning Judah and Jerusalem so while those show that the heading is not a complete heading yet I don't think they do away with the possibility of it covering the book as a whole; Mr.--?" (Student) Well, there would be that possibility. At least the word word does suggest that it isn't quite as comprehensive a thing as the word vision. I think that would be a very definite point. Mr.--?" (Student) Yes. He was dead a hundred years before                   . Unless you take the higher critical view, of course. And they take the second Isaiah view. (Student) In the 36th chapter of what book?                   just Well now this question which I have/been asking sounded like a question of reasoning. I perhaps should have indicated that I did not mean it for a question of reasoning but a question of memory. Yesterday I stated, you remember, a certain view of my own which I believe is true. Well now if you want to differ with me



you have a perfect right to do so and I would be glad to have you say so if you think I am wrong and bring evidence for it but if you don't differ with me I'd be glad to have you point out how the view I stated yesterday answers the question that I raised today. If you do differ with me I'd be glad to have you show why, but yesterday you may recall that we looked at Isaiah 2:1-5, or was it day before yesterday. It wasn't last week. I wasn't here last week. But I pointed out that in Isaiah 2:1-5 we have a remarkable parallel to Micah 4:1-5 and I pointed out that Micah 4:1-4 ends with the statement: for the word of the Lord hath spoken it; and I pointed out that the parallel is practically complete except for the omission of the verse about the vine and the fig tree and the fact that that phrase is not included at the end of Isaiah's statement but that instead he starts at the beginning with the words, the word that Isaiah the Son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem, suggesting that Isaiah is putting at the beginning of it the statement of divine authority which Micah puts at the end and that Isaiah says at the beginning, "The word that Isaiah saw," as if to say "Micah has had this vision but I also have received from the Lord the statement which is true." Well now if you accept that interpretation which I presented yesterday which I did not reach until I had studied this passage a good many times--it didn't appear to me obvious at all at first but after comparing the two passages I have come to the conclusion, I believe that is the correct interpretation--now if it is, then 2:1 is not an introduction to the rest of the book, nor an introduction to the whole of Chapters 2-6, nor even an introduction to Chapter 2, but merely an introduction to Chapter 2:1-5, and if that is the case, then of course it is not a heading for the whole book and there's no reason in the world why it should interfere with the taking of 1:1 as a heading to the whole book. You see the applications there, and the . I used to, when I first used to teach this, used to raise that question, is 1:1 a heading for the whole book or is it just for Chapter 1, and 2:1 the heading for the rest of the book, and I didn't know. I didn't know what to say because I didn't see how you could tell but since I've come to the conclusion this a parallel and that this applies only to Verses 1-5; otherwise it seems to me to be rather strange to have a new heading like this at the beginning of the second chapter unless there is some particular reason why it applies to a particular section and I don't think that section is the chapter; I think it is only these



Prophets-16 -  
five verses.

so that is the reason why I feel that we can be quite sure that 1:1 is a heading, I won't say necessarily for the whole book but at least going way beyond Chapter 2 and most likely for the whole book. Well now this section then, Chapter 1-6. If you had a brand new heading for the book at the beginning of Chapter 2, it would break up the unity of the section, but if that's only a heading for these five verses as Micah concludes them with the statement: for the word of the Lord hath spoken it; then you would—it doesn't interfere at all with the idea that these six chapters are a unit. Now as you start these six chapters, what is the purpose? What is the purpose in your chart? Rebuke. And how far do you find that the purpose is predominantly rebuke? Now you notice the question is a little different from the usual wording. Usually we see exactly how the rebuke comes there and where blessing starts, but now I'm saying, how far is the general teaching predominantly rebuke, that is even though there be a verse or a few verses, a section of blessing, predominantly rebuke—how far would you say? Mr. ---? (Student) Well the whole six chapters have a tremendous amount of rebuke in them. That's right; but making it a little narrower than that, not quite verse for verse, how far would you say that, except for an occasional verse or couple of verses (Student) Well, would you say 2:2 is rebuke? Chapter 2:1-5 is an outstanding blessing passage, isn't it? But the whole of Chapter 1 is predominantly rebuke, isn't it? Now there are two or three, there is one very wonderful blessing section which is extremely brief, there are one or two other small sections which there's some question whether they may be blessing or not, but Chapter 1 is predominantly blessing and it is followed by rebuke and followed by a wonderful blessing passage, vv.1-5. Then at Chapter 6 again it becomes rebuke and from Chapter 2, verse 6, how far do you continue with rebuke—well, let us say absolutely, how far does rebuke continue from Chapter 2, verse 6. Mr.--- suggests up through 4:1. At least to approximately the beginning of Chapter 4; we have all the rest of Chapter 2 and all of Chapter 3 I believe we can safely say is declaration of punishment for sin and rebuke against wickedness. So here you have a long rebuke passage and then a medium sized but outstanding blessing passage. Then you have a fairly long rebuke, very long rebuke passage and then how about Chapter 4? What is it? Mr.---? Chapter 4, but we leave aside for the moment the question of Verse 1. Whether Verse 1 is rebuke or blessing, leaving that aside for the moment we



February 11, 1948

Prophets-16 -

have no question that the rest of Chapter 4 is blessing, and it is an outstanding and wonderful blessing passage. Then how about Chapter 5, what is it? Rebuke or blessing? Chapter 5 is very largely rebuke. I don't know but we'd say entirely rebuke. Wouldn't you? (Students) The first verses of 5 are, I'm inclined to think they are rebuke. They are introduction to rebuke, but their purpose is to lead up to--in fact even in Verse 2, he looked to it to bring grapes and it brought wild grapes. That's rebuke, isn't it? The end of 2. So I think they would ~~belong~~ quite definitely under your rebuke passages.

(Student)

- - - - -  
Prophets 17 -

Then Chapter 6 is a section which is other--well you might even say it's God's blessing on the prophet. It's the calling--how's that? Well, pretty near it, I guess. It's at least not rebuke, and it is God's calling of the prophet, setting him apart, appointing him to his purpose, and so on, so it seems to me that we have here quite a parallel to Micah in these six chapters, not merely that you have a passage in it like Micah, but as Micah has three sections in it rebuke followed by blessing, rebuke followed by blessing, rebuke followed by a passage which is partly blessing, partly ; here you have rebuke followed by blessing, rebuke followed by blessing, rebuke followed by a passage which is God's blessing and individual care of the prophet so that there is not an exact parallel but something of a parallel between the whole book of Micah, it seems to me, and the structure of these first six chapters of Isaiah which form a unit by themselves. Now I wouldn't want to press that too far but if you think the analogy is not very full, that's your privilege. I don't insist , of course , but I think it's at least interesting, that there is quite a similarity, in general, of them, and of course in your passages you have the first great passage of this section of Isaiah ends with a <sup>blessing</sup> passage which looks at a certain definite future time. Then you have one which looks at a definite time in the future different from the first, and then you have one which looks at the immediate

Prophets-17-

time, so that I think there is an interesting construction there. Well now in Chapter 1, I don't believe we'll take much time this year on Chapter 1. There are many outstanding verses in it again, much that would be certainly well worth our while to .

It's one of the great sections of the Bible, that is, the whole book of Isaiah is, every part of it, and there are many verses in this first chapter that are quoted in the New Testament, such as Verse 9, for instances. Except the Lord of hosts had left unto us a very small remnant, we should have been like as Sodom, and we should have been like unto Gomorrah, except the New Testament says like Sodoma, instead of like Sodom, because you had a different group of translators and they had a different preference, and we do not, as you know, have a unified translation of the Bible. We have different translators doing different sections. I think if you find Noah one part of the New Testament called Noe and another part of the New Testament, Noah, and the Greek is identical. The different groups of translators had a different section of the New Testament. One group of translators said, "If you have the name Elijah taken from the Greek, the Greeks didn't call him Elijah, they called him Elias, therefore we should call him Elias," while another group said, "The Greek is representing the Hebrew <sup>or the</sup> Elijah/ Hebrew word which in English is called Elijah; therefore we'll call it Elijah. So when you get over to James, it's Elijah, while in the gospels it's Elias and it's exactly the same Greek in both cases. It shows the fact that we do not have a unified translation. Someone who doesn't know the original may wonder at the difference and may even try to construct a theological argument on the difference between the two/<sup>there</sup> but actually it simply is a different preference of a different set of translators, or a different individual translator. Actually, of course, if you're going to follow exactly the Greek or the Hebrew you would/<sup>n't</sup> use the word Elijah because they had no jah on it. That is simply an English representation for the man. Mr.---? (Student) Doesn't it say it in James again? Is it? Are you sure? Yes, well I may miss--you remember the passage there then? This is just a side remark and I think if you'll look in your concordance you will find there are passages in the New Testament which have the one form and the other. I know that's true of Noah. It's true of some of the names and I think it is of Elijah. How's that? The revised is Elijah? Well, how does the Revised do in the gospels, do you know? Do they call it Elijah there also or Elias? I don't know.



Prophets-17.

That, of course, is always a difficult question in translating—yes. Now in the King James it has Sodoma, for Verse 9, here, I recall where Paul quotes it. Maybe the Revised goes back to Sodom, I don't know, but here, of course, we have Sodom following the Hebrew in Verse 1. Now the various terrific statements of rebuke in the chapter are interrupted occasionally with promises of blessing. There is one verse in it, Verse 18, which is very commonly quoted as a wonderful evangelical promise which many interpreters think is actually a question. Now you can't prove it is a question, and the interpretation of it as given in the authorized version is one which certainly is in line with wonderful Old Testament and New Testament promises. Therefore I think it would be very foolish for us to go out and when we find somebody preaching on this verse as a great evangelical promise to think we are doing a wonderful thing in telling them they are wrong and showing them that it is not at all, that it is a question. At the same time I think that it is well for us to realize the possibility that it is a question and the fact that the question interpretation which is a possible interpretation does seem to fit the context better. and Therefore there is much to be said for it. I am inclined to think it is right but I do not think that it is enough certain to warrant anybody in thinking that he should feel that he should take it away from someone who thinks of it as a presentation of a great evangelical promise. It fits exactly with that which is elsewhere promised, if you take it that way. It is exactly what God does; if you take it as a question He is saying, "How can you do this?" And you can't. But, of course, a true God can. Now we have a true God, don't we? Well now we have a , in verses 19 and 20 we have a case where we have predictions of the future in, which are conditional predictions, and which are two alternatives in a conditional prediction. We had a great many of those in Jeremiah, you remember. Here is an interesting one very similar to those that so frequently occurred in Jeremiah. Mr.---? (Student) If it is a question, then he says to the people, "Learn to do well: seek judgment: do these good things." He says, "Come, let us reason together about this matter." The Lord says, "Let consider this situation. If your sins are as scarlet, do you think they are going to be as white as snow? If they're red like crimson, do you think they are going to be like wool? Will they be like wool? That is," He says, "If you go out and commit these sins and then you come into the temple and you go through a

## Prophets-17

few oblations and purifications and you say a few mystic words, do you think that is going to make God forget the fact that you are covered with sin and wicked?" And of course it won't. He says, "Let's reason together. Consider what the situation is of your lives. If you are willing and obedient then you can stay in the land and not go into exile, but if you refuse and rebel you will be devoured by the sword." That fits the context excellently; it is a possibility but it depends on the assumption that in speaking He had a questioning tone in His voice which is not indicated by a .

Since there is no indication of a we cannot say that it is that way, and it is true that while man's sins will not be like wool no matter how many mystic words he says or how much pretense he makes, he cannot hypocritically make people think that things are white when they are really scarlet and get anywhere, but, of course, God can do it and God does do it, and it is one of the great teachings of Isaiah that He will do it and whether this particular verse teaches it or not the Bible teaches it clearly and the book of Isaiah teaches it clearly and so, while there is a good possibility that this verse does not teach that particular thing it certainly is found elsewhere and that is a possible interpretation of the verse and no truth hangs upon that interpretation because you are not bringing in anything that isn't elsewhere and therefore I think it would be very foolish to in any way make any objection to anybody's using it in that way. Now there are other cases where I think it is our duty when we find people giving Scripture an interpretation which we think is wrong to point out that fact. . but in this case, as I say, we're not certain that interpretation is wrong and furthermore if, even if, it is wrong it is not importing anything that is not clearly taught in the rest of the Scripture. (Question from student) Well the fact that we have many instances in the Old Testament where a statement which does not have the by it is clearly a question. I don't have one right at the tip of my tongue but any good grammar will give you a number of instances where in the context there is no question you have a--that it is a question and the only way you can tell is by the tone of voice of the speaker which, of course, is not in it; so it is a possible interpretation and then when you look at the teaching here of the passage there is no particular reason for bringing<sup>in</sup>/a great evangelical statement right in the midst of these passages and for that reason all critical scholars and many conservative scholars feel that



## Prophets-17

it is actually a question pointing out the reality of sin and attacking hypocrisy rather than a wonderful promise. But, as I say, that is by no means certain and one would be very foolish to insist upon it. Mr. ---? (Question from student) Verse 16 says that, Verse 15 says when you spread forth your hands to pray and you go through all these and these sacrifices and new moons and feasts, you go to church, you say prayers, you go through forms and ceremonies and all that, and then, he says, you go out and you do wicked things. He says, "I will hide my eyes from you; when you make many prayers, I will not hear." Verse 15 says, "Why? Because your hands are full of blood. Now," he says, "Wash you and make you clean." Quit your wickedness and bring a character that is right before God before you have any right to claim you're entitled to his blessing. He says, "You come with wicked, bloody hands and you expect God to bless you." He says, "Come now and let us reason together. If your sins are scarlet, will they be white as snow? When you've gone through a little ceremony with washing your hands in the temple or bringing a sacrifice, is that going to make you white as snow? If they're red like crimson, will they be as wool? No," he says, "if you're willing and obedient you can stay here but if you refuse and rebel you'll be devoured with the sword." God demands ethical righteousness and no forms of ceremonies or words you express are going to cause God to turn away and ignore the actual wickedness in you." That seems to be the teaching, that is the teaching of the passages before and that interpretation fits in with the passages before. Now, of course, elsewhere in the book we have God's wonderful promise that that which you cannot do to make your sins as wool, He will do and He does do it. That is clearly taught elsewhere in the book. It is possible that in this verse he is interjecting the thought but it doesn't seem to fit the context and therefore ... the other interpretation commends itself to many interpreters and it must be admitted that it is a possible interpretation. That must be admitted and in the light of the context perhaps a probable one but very definitely not a certain one. That is to say it is not certain enough that anyone has a right to object to the taking of this verse out of its context and taking it as the authorized version stands because it does not present anything but what is clearly taught elsewhere, even though the other is the more probable correct interpretation.

(Question from student) It indicates that God insists that we try to do it. We'd have to

## Prophets-17

come with as good a life as possible and a desire to . We have to come--we can't come with a wickedness, a wicked life which we are going to go right on with and thinking that therefore God will bless us if we go through these forms and ceremonies. We have to come desiring a life of righteousness, doing our best to have one, recognizing that we can't get it except as God first washes us in His blood. We have to . It's against hypocrisy. The whole chapter's against hypocrisy, and Verse 16 is very strongly against hypocrisy, and that passage in Micah to which I called your attention at the beginning of the lesson, is very strongly against hypocrisy, too. I desire obedience and not sacrifice. God wants a pure heart and if you don't have at least a desire for a pure heart, all the sacrifice in the world is not going to do you any good. The sacrifice of doesn't do any good. Any at all who simply looks at it as a means of enabling him to go on in sin without fearing God will take the man whatever forms of sacrifice he performs. It is only as he desires and is ready and anxious to receive a new heart , that he can be actually washed and cleansed from his sin.

## Prophets 18 -

I have had to take so much time on this verse. I thought we would just touch on it in passing but of course I can't always tell how much of these particular things you may have had in other classes or other contacts. Now there is, of course another beautiful brief blessing passage in this chapter - Verses 25-27. The Lord says, "I will turn my hand upon thee." There is nothing to suggest his condition. "I will purely purge away the dross, and take away thy tin and restore thy judges as at the first, and the counsellors as at the beginning : Afterward thou shalt be called the city of righteousness, the faithful city, Zion shall be redeemed with judgment, and her converts with righteousness." A very clear promise of eventual blessing for God's chosen city. Eventual blessing, eventual restoration, eventual happiness and joy there. I see nothing in it that suggests that it is



## Prophets-18

conditional in any way. It seems to be simply a declaration of the purpose of God in order to bring comfort to the true believers, to give them the assurance of God's blessing continued with them. Then in Chapter 2 at the beginning of Chapter 2:1-5, certainly ought to be the end of this passage. That is, you have your rebuke passage followed by a blessing passage. There would be two reasonable ways of arrangement. One of them would be to have Chapter 1 run through Verse 5 of Chapter 2. That would be very reasonable because it's a rebuke passage and the blessing passage as a unit. The other way would be to stop Chapter 1 where it does but to have Chapter 2 stop at the end of Verse 5. The revised version as I have it here begins a new paragraph with Verse 5 and is an extremely bad paragraph division. O house of Jacob, come ye, and let us walk in the light of the Lord for thou hast forgotten the people the house of Jacob, because they are filled with customs from the east, and are soothsayers like the Philistines. That is--for one thing the change of pronoun is extremely abrupt. He is talking to the house of Jacob and then he turns and talks to God and then, another thing, it's an exhortation to the people to follow God and exhortation because God has forsaken them, because they are wicked. It seems to me to make much better sense to say, "In view of the wonderful promise God has given of the wonderful things He is going to do, house of Jacob let us walk in the light of the Lord," and then to start, "But, thou hast forsaken thy people because they're so wicked and sinful and filled with all sorts of wrong," and certainly Verse 6 on is a terrific rebuke passage and I don't see how, why it really belongs with the rebuke passage but we have very good evidence it belongs with what went before on the parallel to Micah. So that to my mind the Revised Version paragraph division is quite deceptive there. Mr.---?

(Question from student) No. Simply there is a parallel that each has the seal, and Isaiah put it at the first because he was saying, "I've seen this vision to day, putting his name with it and that to me suggests that Micah's work was already written when Isaiah wrote this, that that's why he put his name to it. In Micah it is a connected part of the context and it flows along smoothly--Jerusalem shall become a heap and the temple of the Lord, the hill of the temple like the high places of the forest, but in the last days it will come to pass that God will lift them up. Now the background of it is left out here. It seems to be lifted out of context and instead of that he says, "This is what

## Prophets-18

Isaiah sees" as if to say, "Micah has given you this, and I want to assure you that God has given it to me, too." In the mouth of two witnesses shall it be established. So it seems more reasonable to me to put your name on a thing that somebody else has already done than to put your name on a particular thing in the first place and then have the other fellow use it without putting his name on it. It's not, of course, plagiarism, that concept was not familiar to them in those days, but it is the presentation of a vision which they both had from the Lord. Isaiah is not saying, "Micah's got this and I think he had a good idea." Isaiah is saying, "The Lord gave me the same vision He gave Micah." So that it impresses me that it indicates Isaiah was later/<sup>rather</sup>than earlier. Now that is not particularly important, I think, but it is worth noting. Now this passage, Chapter 2 here, 1-5, --4, Verses 2-4, I don't need to spend much time on now because it's so parallel to Micah. It's almost identical with Micah. I think we want to note that God thought this passage was important enough to put it twice in His word. God thought it was vital enough to have both Micah and Isaiah say it. Of course, if you want to take a modernistic view and say one of them just copied from the other and therefore ignore it, that, of course, is one thing; but if you take a Christian viewpoint, if you say God gave us the word and God wants us to accept the word as a whole, then when God causes that these three verses should appear twice in the word, He thinks it's important, and He wants us to get it and He doesn't want us to ignore it, and there is absolutely no way of accepting these as the word of God and paying much reasonable attention to them which can come out with any interpretation of the future other than either a premillennial or a postmillennial interpretation. So far as these passages are concerned here I believe they look in the direction of a premillennial rather than a postmillennial passage but I don't think these two passages prove it. I do think that there is a possibility of fitting them into a premillennial or a postmillennial view, but I do not think it is possible to take any amillennial view of the Scripture without utterly ignoring these two passages, and ignoring or disregarding something which God thought was important enough to put in twice in almost the same language, or else trying to interpret it and in so doing using methods of interpretation which can just as well reduce the resurrection of Christ to the great principle of the permanence of personality. If we are going to rebuke the modernists for doing that sort of thing



## Prophets-18

with the great teachings of the gospel we should be careful we don't do the same thing with the great teachings of the prophetic books. We should be careful, sane, scholarly in our interpretation, not read things into the Scripture, not try to draw an awful lot out of a couple of words, but when God thinks a passage is important enough to have two different writers give it, it's important enough that we should pay attention to it and that we should use careful methods of seeing exactly what is taught there, and what is taught here is an external condition, not the peace in the heart which the gospel gives, not the ability to withstand adversity and to have your peace in your mind because it is set upon God. That is not what is taught here; what is taught here is an external condition where the nations do not learn war any more and where we're not afraid because we have nothing of which to be afraid, where there is external peace and safety round about. Now, as I say, I don't think we need to go into the passage more and yet it's true that when God thinks it important enough to repeat this way it's important enough for us to repeat in our attention and consideration and for us to realize that He considers it important. There are people who preach on the second coming of Christ every Sunday night, year on end, it seems like, and people get terribly disgusted with them and say that it is an utter distortion of emphasis and I agree, but I would say that that distortion of emphasis, bad as it is, is nothing like as bad as the distortion of emphasis of those who take a truth so much stressed in the Scripture as the millennial kingdom of Christ is and the return of Christ, to set up His kingdom is and never touch upon it or never devote a whole sermon to it year after year, and for every one who rides it as a hobby there are thirty who ignore it completely, so that I do not feel that we need to be so afraid of overriding it though we shouldn't do that, as to be determined not to fail to give it its proper place in our preaching and in our life and in our thought.

Now we didn't get into Chapter 4 but you have carefully studied it. For today, you know exactly what Chapter 4 means and so I don't know how long you will have to take on it tomorrow afternoon. You've read it in the Hebrew, you've also read Chapter 6 in the Hebrew and 7. I'm not going to assign a new lesson for tomorrow but ask you to review 4 and 7 and know exactly what you think 4 teaches and why you think it teaches it and exactly what there is important about 6 so that we won't have to spend a great deal of time on it.

Now we began our consideration of Isaiah 1-6 which we noticed is a unit and a unit which is divisible roughly into three main heads, perhaps not so roughly because the divisions between these three main sections are very definite. We noticed that the first great section ends with a wonderful section of blessing in the beginning of Chapter 2, a section in which the millenium is so very clearly brought out, Chapter 2:1-4, as it is in the parallel passage in Micah 4:1-5, a passage which renders it in my opinion absolutely clear that God has predicted a millennial reign of righteousness and peace upon this earth. I don't think from these two passages we can conclude with certainty whether this millenium is brought about by the preaching of the gospel and gradual extension of the truth or brought about by the personal return of Christ. I think both passages suggest the latter but I think we have to look to other passages for truth of it. So far as these two are concerned postmillennialism and premillennialism are both possible viewpoints but amillennialism can be held only if these passages are ignored. Now the purpose in this class of course is not to learn what is taught in the Bible concerning the future, but it is to learn what do these particular passages teach and what are sound methods of interpreting them, so at this point we don't want to go any further than that in the relation of this to other passages. We'll wait till we get to those other passages. Now there are two comments I'd like to suggest then in connection with this matter of the millenium which I think are rather important. One is this. The millenium is clearly taught in Scripture. There is much stress on it and it should have its proper place in preaching. It should not be over stressed, it should constantly harped on but it <sup>should</sup> have its proper place. How unfortunate it is that people will either ignore a doctrine or ride it as a hobby, ride it to death. It seems to be people's tendency with one doctrine or another. They either are against it or, if they're convicted to it they just ride it death. Well we want to avoid both extremes. And so <sup>in</sup> this matter of the teaching regarding the millenium it is clear, it's true, it's a vital hope for the Christian; it's something we should stand on, but that doesn't mean that every verse of the Scripture or every wonderful promise regarding the future is dealing with the millenium, and I find that I always have some in the class who think that to something good in the future it must refer to the millenium. Any verse in the Scripture about wonderful blessings in the future, it must refer to the millenium. It must be a millennial prediction.



Prophets-18 -

just as  
Well now that is/unscholarly and unscriptural a method of interpretation as the other is of explaining it away. Let's look at each verse and see what does this verse teach. What is its blessing for us? I remember when I used to have systematic theology as a student I used to sometimes be quite irritated with an attitude which I saw in many professors when a verse was brought up or a passage against the point they were presenting of proceeding to explain away the verse, that is to say to make the verse teach nothing but what you already knew from other passages. That is not a correct way of dealing with the Scripture. We must humbly take each passage and say, "What does it teach," and if you explain it away so that it teaching nothing you are not using the word of God rightly. It may not teach the particular doctrine you are particularly interested in for it may be dealing with a different subject, but it has something of importance for you if you can find it or it wouldn't be in the Scripture. Mr.---?

\* \* \* \* \*

Prophets 19 -

(Question from student) That is a matter in the first place of studying each passage by itself to see what we can gather from it, and then of comparing them to see whether they fit together or belong in different categories. You have to take the whole Scripture into account. (Student) We can't always tell. Sometimes we can be absolutely sure, other times fairly sure, other times we can't tell at all. With Revelation, it seems to be predicting something later than the time of the apostle John. In this case it seems to be predicting the birth of Christ, which was before John, and that is my reason for thinking that the two are speaking of different events. (Student) Well the same figure may be used in different connections. (Student) The same figure may be used in different connections, naturally, but the question is just what is the connection, what is the whole picture. The fact that you have the same language used or a similar expression in Scripture does not prove that the same thing is involved. That's something you must always remember. It's suggested, and it always makes that conclusion worthy of consideration but it doesn't prove it. (Student)

## Prophets-19

Yes. There are those who say every time you find the phrase "that day" it must mean the same day any more in Scripture and every time you find a particular phrase it always refers to the same thing. That does not work out in Scripture. You can't carry that through. If you carry that through you have Paul and John, Paul and James flatly contradicting each other. Paul says we are not saved by faith but by works; no, vice versa, and James says that you are not saved by faith alone. He says Abraham was not saved by faith alone, faith without works is dead, and the fact of the matter is that when you study the teaching of James and the teaching of Paul you find absolutely no contradiction but you find a different use of terminology. When Paul says faith he means something within the heart, relation of trust in God and dependence on what God has done and that, and that alone, is the instrument through which a man is saved and his works can in no way add or contribute anything to his salvation, but when James uses the word faith there he means the claim that ones believes these things, the signing a creed or the saying a phrase and James says that will not do you any good. He says, "Show me thy faith without thy works and I will show my faith by my works." In other words, James says, "By their fruits ye shall know them!" James says, "If it's true faith it will show itself in works and if there are no works you have a pretty good reason to suspect that there no faith there, but James does not in any way suggest that any particular work, or even all the works together have anything to do with your salvation. It's the faith that saves but it's a living faith, and Paul uses the word faith in the sense of a living faith as opposed to trying to win salvation by something you do, and James uses faith in the sense of a mere belief, or a mere intellectual apprehension and says that's insufficient; you have to have a faith which works. And so there is no contradiction but the word faith is used very definitely in two different senses by the two writers. It's the context that proves what they mean by these words. The Bible is not a set of mathematical formulæ in which every time we find the same three words this always means the same thing. The Bible is a book in human language in which God in many different situations has presented different aspects of His truth, so that we can put it together and gain a vision of the totality of the truth of God. I remember being in a class in the University of Pennsylvania in which there was a student who came down from New York, a Jewish student, every week and one day he got up and he said to the professor, he said, "Professor, I think that



in this class, while I've found much of real value, I think you have failed to take into account some of the great discoveries the rabbis have made". He said, "I'd like to present one of them as an example of the method of Scriptural interpretation that you are failing to get here." "Now", he said—he pointed to a place in the beginning of the book of Ruth where it said, "And it came to pass in the days of" and then went on, the judging of the judges that such and such a thing happened, and then the famine came and Ruth and the other--Naomi and her husband went off to sojourn and then he showed another passage where a war began and it began with the words, "And it came to pass in the days of" and then it went on and described something, that this attack came on Israel. "Now", he said, "the rabbis point out that in these two cases where it says, "And it came to pass in the days of", there's trouble for Israel. So that phrase, "And it came to pass in the days of," means there's trouble for Israel ahead. See. Well now that's the sort of argument of taking words and purely from an accidental connection drawing the conclusion that from those words you infer something that the words don't mean and it's a very dangerous method of study, but in the rabbinic literature along with some very fine teaching and some ethical lessons they've drawn there is a tremendous mass of that sort of unprofitable study, but the rabbis are by no means alone in that. You will find that many good fundamentalists, many premillennialists take exactly the same method and they find a phrase like "in that day" used some times in connection with the return of Christ, perhaps used three or four times, and then they say, "Wherever you find 'in that day' used it always refers to the return of Christ." And then the amillennialists use that method and ride it to the ground, terrifically. They, for instance—I know one very splendid student of the Bible who would insist that whenever it says, "the end", that means the time Christ comes back. He he found the words, "the end" used in connection with the time of the judgment of the righteous and he found it also used in connection with the judgment of the wicked so he said there is only one judgment, that they are both used in connection with the phrase "in the end". And when Dr. Buswell pointed out that there were places where it said, "the end of this" or "the end of that" that it didn't prove this at all the professor said, "Yes" but he said, <sup>"It's</sup> /only when it is used without a modifying word, /it means that; and then they found a case where it was used without a modifying word and then he said, "Well, in that case the technical phrase is used non-technically. The method is simply wrong. You must decide from the context and the general

## Prophets-19

teaching of a passage what the passage tells and it isn't a set of mathematical formulae in which every word is like . That's not the nature of human language and a book written over a period of thousands of years could not be that way unless there was a miraculous creation of a special Biblical language for the purpose, which there is not; it uses the language of the time. It is a danger into which all types of interpreters fall and a danger which we must avoid. Now if you find the phrase, "until the travelling woman shall bear" used in one place and the same phrase used in another place in the Bible you are entirely right in saying, "Let us see if these two deal with the same thing", but you are actually wrong if you say, "These two must mean the same . There's a possibility they do; it's always worthy of consideration, but it's by no means certain. It's a great danger in the study of types. Many people have found very splendid Biblical teaching through study of types and seeing how certain things are used in order to impress certain great truths upon our minds and it is a very useful study but it's very easy to run it into the ground by carrying it to an extreme and thinking that everything must have a specific meaning and must always have the same meaning in all places. For instance when the Israelites come out of Egypt, Egypt is the great type of sin there. It is a great type of the control of evil, a great type of that from which God rescued us through the redemption of Christ. That is one of the great outstanding types of the Bible. As the Israelites were delivered from Egypt, so the Christian, so all believers in the Bible, believers in Christ, saved through His blood whether before or after calvary, are delivered through what Christ did on the cross. That is one of the great types in the Bible but then when you turn around and say, "All right, Egypt is always a type of evil, therefore when Joseph took the people down into Egypt he was taking them into evil and they never should have gone down. God only permitted them to go down," that's absolutely contrary to the clear statements of Genesis because the Lord said to Jacob, "Fear not to go down for it is my will you should go down." It was part of God's plan they should go to Egypt and when the brothers of Joseph were there and they felt so bad about having sold Joseph into Egypt, Joseph said, "The Lord sent me down here to prepare a place for you for protection through the famine," and so Egypt was God's appointed place for the people to go for deliverance from the famine and Egypt became later a great symbol of sin and



## Prophets-19

oppression from which God delivers. It has a different meaning in the different situations, and to try to say Egypt must always stand for this is a method which gets us into trouble.

Well now that leads us on to the next great passage of blessing before which, however, we have a very interesting passage of rebuke at which we must briefly look. I wish we had time to look at Chapter 2, Verse 6 through Chapter 4:1 in full detail because there is much in it that is extremely interesting and extremely valuable, in many wonderful verses in the passage. It starts in with a description of the fact that God is going to punish the people, for their sins. God rebuked for their wickedness, for their turning against Him. A declaration that God is going to punish them, ending with, Chapter 2 ending, "Cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils." You can't find salvation from human efforts and human plans and if they couldn't in that day we certainly can't in our day, and such feeble and worthless schemes as this United Nations and other plans of this type to try by human ungodly means to bring peace within the world are doomed to utter failure. It can be produced only through following the way God wants us to go, through belief in His Son and seeking His will and, of course, we know that not enough will seek it that way to find it that way. If all would accept Christ we would have universal peace but they will not in this age but Christ will introduce it in the millennium.

And then Chapter 3 goes on and continues its rebuke of the people for their sins. Verse 8 looks forward to the exile, Jerusalem ruined and Judah fallen, the people gone into exile because of their turning <sup>against</sup> God. And then we come on to Verse 16 and we find a special denunciation of the wickedness of the women of Zion and there is a description here from Verse 16 on of the way in which the women of Zion looking to their human personal adornment for their happiness and joy instead of looking to God. Now that, of course, does not suggest by any means that it is the Lord's will that those who are true to Him should go around looking like scarecrows. There is absolutely no such teaching anywhere in the Scripture. God wants His people to bring honor and not shame to His name; He never wants them in any way to neglect—not only to be clean and to be neat but to do everything they can to be an honor to the name of Christ and that with which they are connected but He is rebuking the women here not for particular practices that they are

Prophets-19

observing , not for particular methods of beautifying which they are using, but for the fact that their heart is set upon these things rather than set upon Him, for the fact that that is where their affection is and where their interest is, rather than in the word of God, and I think it is very interesting and worthwhile to notice that in Verse 16 He says, "Because the daughters of Zion" and then he doesn't go on to say, "Because they were ~~chans~~ and bracelets and mufflers and bonnets and all these things, therefore God is going to punish them." That is all said in the things He is going to take away from them. later, but the thing they are rebuked for is because they are haughty and walk with stretch forth necks and wanton eyes, walking and mincing as they go, and making a tinkling with their feet. In other words, it is the general attitude of these people rather than the type of adornment that they are using that He is here criticizing, and when we put our interest in external things and whether a person has this type of head gear or that type of head gear or this type of clothing or that type of clothing, we are getting away from the teaching of the Scripture. It's not the kind of clothes you wear or the kind of things that you will do that determine whether you are a Christian or not but it's where your interest is, and it is what you are making primary. What is your purpose? Is your purpose so to dress and so to act that you attract people to Christianity instead of driving them away from it, or is your purpose one of human vanity and of human pride? And so it is very clear here that the denunciation is based, not upon the adornment that people wear but upon the attitude that they have toward it and upon the place that they give the adornment of importance far beyond what it deserves, and he says , "Therefore the Lord is going to remove the beauty that they have, He is going to give them sickness and He's going to give them unattractiveness and He's going to give them misery," and then from verse 18 on he describes the things that He's going to take away from them.



It is a fine description of the things that meant so much to the daughters of Zion that are going to be taken away from them and it is a detailed enough description to show us that civilization in those days was not a primitive thing of people living in caves or anything like that, that they were a very sophisticated people, the people of Judah; they were a people who had a great many different parts of civilized life and they had all the different sorts of temptations that we have today, even though, perhaps, in different aspects, and he names all these things and he doesn't say that these things are in themselves bad ones, they are not that for which they will be rebuked, but they are put as a of the way God is going to punish them for their vanity and for putting their affection upon earthly things instead of on His will, he names all this long list of the things that the Lord is going to take away from them, and here is, I think, a prime example of proper method for interpreting the Scripture, not to drag a word out of here or a half a verse and try to build a great teaching upon it but it is to see what is the general thought of the context, and the general thought from Verse 16 on is very clearly the fact that the women of Judah in the time of Isaiah had their interest in human adornment and human things rather than in doing God's will and making these things, in their proper place, subsidiary to His service. That is the thing that he is criticising and that is what he is talking about and that is the only thing that he is talking about. Of course his attitude toward the habits of the women of Judah is certainly a proper thing to take by analogy as showing us principles as to His attitude toward similar things today, but what he is talking about directly is the attitude of the women at that time. And it is the attitude of the women about which he is here talking. I remember speaking at a meeting of a--it was the Sierra Club in California a couple of years ago--I was in their outing up in the mountains, there were a couple of hundred people there, all sorts of people drawn from different types of professional life and other types of occupation up there in the mountains, no one knowing anything much about each other but all getting pleasant rest together there, good, solid people but people from many different backgrounds and very definitely a situation in which at their meetings there would be no propoganda for one particular religious viewpoint or anything like that; there were Catholics, there were Jews and there were people with no religion, but I was given the opportunity then to speak to

## Prophets-20

them on archaeology and I utilized the opportunity to show that the Bible is dependable and true, and to drive home the truth of the Bible and it gave me many opportunities to speak individually with people afterwards and was quite an unusual opportunity with a group of this type but I was quite impressed by the fact that after I presented my talk of thirty to forty minutes on archaeological evidences that the Bible is true, when I had finished the chairman thought he would like to add a word to what I had said so he pointed out that just a short time before he had heard that the governor of Texas in a public address had mentioned that there was a verse in Isaiah 3 which was being fulfilled in a remarkable way today, where it says here "in that the Lord will take away the bravery of their tinkling ornaments about their feet, and their cauls, and their round tires like the moon", and he said, "Here's our tire shortage predicted by Isaiah twenty-five hundred years ago and there the governor of Texas had quoted that in a public address." Well, of course it is perfectly absurd to say that the round tires like the moon which the women wore in their adornment at that time had anything whatever to do with rubber automobile tires today. You can find plenty of verses in the Scripture about the desolation and misery which comes in connection with wars which is the result of human wickedness and human sin which would give you a warrant for pointing to tire shortage and such things as showing the evil which is in the world as a result of sin but to take a word here which has an entirely different meaning in its context is certainly handling the word of God deceitfully, and we must beware of that danger. Now the archbishop when he went through his Latin Bible had a very difficult pastoral call that he had just made and his mind was on the call, and therefore when he was putting in his chapter division and he wanted to put one between Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 he found a marked difference between the two chapters, one is a rebuke chapter and one is a blessing chapter and its a good place for a division of verses and he found that after all this discussion of what the Lord was going to do to the women there for their sins he found that we have a statement, "in that day" and then it goes on, certain statements where it seems to him to refer to Christ and he remembered, perhaps, that in his seminary days he had read some medieval commentaries in which they had taken this verse that "in that day seven women shall take hold of one man saying, We will eat our



Prophets-20

own bread and wear our own apparel: only let us be called by thy name, to take away our reproach" and they had said, "Of course, the seven women are the seven virgins, who went for the oil in their lamps, the seven women are the seven virgins and the one man is Christ and this is a prediction of the attitude of the virgins to Christ and of the church coming to Christ and so naturally it belongs in the chapter that tells about Christ rather than in the previous chapter which tells about the trouble that is to come to the haughty women of Zion, and so the archbishop puts this break after Verse 26 and I suppose that, if Chapter 4 is read in a church service they'll start with Verse 1 and read these six verses naturally. Now it should be obvious, I think, to anybody who reads the passage and is not misled by the artificial chapter division that he has been telling previously about the things which will come to the women as a result of war. These women are putting their adornments and those matters first in their affection, first in their interest, first in their life. God is going to take them away from them, described through Verse 24. Then he tells of the depopulation as a result of war, "Thy men shall fall by the sword, and the mighty in the war. And her gates shall lament and mourn; and she being desolate shall sit upon the ground." And what's the result? The men gone, killed in the war, the women who had put their interest in these things instead of the Lord left in a great majority in the land and very few men there and as a result in that day there shall be seven women to one man. The situation here described in Verse 1 is the end of the previous statement and the end of the rebuke to the daughters of Zion and the declaration of the punishment which is to come them as the result of the killing of the men and the depopulation as the result of war. So Verse 1 of Chapter 4 is clearly the end of Chapter 3 and if you're going to have a chapter division here the chapter division should be between Verse 1 and Verse 2. Now I don't want to be dogmatic about that; if some of you feel that the chapter division should be where it is you have, of course, a perfect right to your opinion. If you feel this is the seven virgins taking hold of Christ here, why we won't argue about it. I mean we won't fight about it, but I will be disappointed if that is the view which you hold about that particular verse. Now you say, however, "Surely there's a break there--and in that day"--he's been talking

## Prophets-20

about the women of Zion. Now he looks on to the millennium and in that day, these things are going to happen. "That day" is always the time just before the millennium, the day of the Lord. Well, I certainly do not think that that is a proper interpretation of that phrase. We look back to Verse 17, Verse 16 which told of the punishment the Lord is bringing to the daughters of Zion, Verse 18. There is a day coming when this is going to happen. The Lord will take away these things. In Chapter 4, Verse 1, "And in that day", the day he's just been talking about in this particular case, a day that is coming, this depopulation will reach this situation but in Verse 2 we again have the phrase "in that day" and there it means a different day. It means the day after the previous day. There is a day coming, Verse 2 which begins to describe a day of blessing, a day when the women of Judah have been purged of their sin, a day when those who look to the Lord are truly looking to Him and not finding their pleasure and satisfaction in human strength. That doesn't mean, of course, that they go around looking like scarecrows, as we noticed before it doesn't mean that they become in some way, that they think that if they don't wear buttons on their coats it's proof that they are more spiritual than other people; Christianity is not a matter of buttons or what kind of clothes a person wears but it is a matter of the heart attitude toward God, and here in Verse 2 we find that there is to be a different heart attitude. There is a day coming when they will find that which is beautiful and glorious to be not their personal adornment but the branch of the Lord, when they will find that which excellent and comely, that in which they find their pleasure, to be the fruit of the earth, rather than to be their human, natural pleasures which have their proper place in God's economy for God's people but which are secondary to our relation to Him. And so Verse 2 here makes the transition from the passage of rebuke to the passage of blessing and it begins this new passage which runs through Verse 6 and gives us a key note for the passage—a day of wonderful blessing coming, a day of contrast to the punishment before, in contrast to the purging where comes out that which is clean. Now I think that the stress has been upon the women before. I don't think the stress is simply upon the women thereafter. The principles applied to the women before, of course, will apply to men just as much, and the following passage is dealing with God's people even though



## Prophets-20

it goes from the women and there is still a certain stress on the women, the stress is on God's people as a whole, and so the thought of the women is not particularly stressed in what follows even though there are references back to them again as for instance in Verse 4, "When the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion".

So now we have the passage of blessing after this great passage of rebuke which we've been having, and the passage of blessing starts with a very strange reference--Mr.---

(Student)

/ Yes. Thank you for the mention. That's a very good point. In Exodus He gives us what His will is as to what shall be done. Here He is giving a prediction as to what the situation is going to be, and He is not saying that these women are right in doing this or the man is right in accepting it. He's not giving a new law and making a change. He's simply pointing out the things that happen. Just as if God said that we should love one another and that we should show a kindly, friendly spirit to our companions and we should be helpful to members of our own families and so on, and then in another place He says, "And a persons enemies shall be those of his own household and brother will turn against brother and father against the son". He's not saying they ought to. He's not commanding them to, but He is telling about the terrible things that are ahead as a result of sin in the world and the unnatural things that sin is going to bring, and I think that's what He is doing in this verse. He is saying, "These women here are putting these purely human things absolutely primary in their lives so God is going to punish them, by removing from them even that which they have a right legitimately to expect and by putting them in a position where there will be such a tremendous depopulation in the land that seven women will be taking hold of one man and saying, "If you'll only be the husband for the seven of us, we'll be ready to pay all the expenses and everything". He's showing a condition of depopulation. He's not saying it's right nor commanding it. (Student) There are predictions of wonderful blessing God is going to bring, which is God's responsibility, but there are declarations of the out-working of sin in the world which are the result of sin, and you can't say they're God's responsibility unless you make God the author of sin. They're declarations of how sin will work out: sin will bring forth death. Well, it's not an arbitrary option on the part of God, that causes us to have death as a result of our sin, but it's an inevitable result of the sin in turning away from God.

February 24, 1948

Prophets-29 .

And then we noted the various possible interpretations of Verses 3-6. Now Verses 3-6, if they are a description of the millennium, are an extremely different picture of it than any that we have elsewhere in Scripture. They give an entirely different idea, a different sort of a millennium, or else are so figurative as to make it very difficult to get principles of interpretation that would entitle you to establish the meaning of passages, and to my mind we have in the whole passage a passage of tremendous meaning for us, and tremendous help to us if it is a passage which applies to us in this present age. If Isaiah 2 were to be applied to this age there would be no meaning, to us in that - "Go out and sit under your vine and fig tree and none shall make you afraid" - that's perfectly absurd. Nation shall not fight against nation, they shall not learn war any more, quit learning war, quit preparing, and you make

and that's repeated time and again in history in modern days. There are those who try to develop a pacifistic principle from this that we should simply let everybody have anything they feel like and put up no protection for yourself but that is certainly not the teaching of the Scripture. It is a description of an age far different from the present age, the millennial age. Then in Chapter 4 the message is entirely different from the message in Chapter 2. If it is a message for the present age, then it is a message which has great meaning for us and great value for each one of us. Take that second verse. In that day shall the branch of the Lord be beautiful and glorious, and the fruit of the earth excellent and comely for them that are escaped of Israel. This, of course, would apply equally, this particular verse, whether it is the millennium or to this age. If you apply it to this age surely there is a great challenge to you and a great blessing to you in the verse. Worldly people find their joy in personal adornment and in worldly pleasure but if you are one of those who are escaped of Israel then your great joy is in the Lord Jesus Christ, in Him who is the Son of God, who is the branch of the Lord, in Him who is the most perfect of all humanity, the very ideal of humanity, the fruit of the earth. Do you find in Him that full satisfaction, that full



## Prophets-29

joy of your life which you should find if you truly are one of those who have been purged through His blood? If you do not find that joy in Christ, if you find that your religion is something that is a duty to you rather than a great pleasure, something that you force yourself to as a thing that you must do rather than that your life finds its satisfaction on Christ, stop and ask the question, are you really one of those who have escaped of Israel, do you need to learn the first of salvation, or, if not, what is wrong in your spiritual life? There is something there that needs thinking through. Paul says, "Make your calling and election sure! Make sure that you have it. Find out for certain and make it evident to others that you really have it. It's a thing for every Christian to think about. And then the continuation, "When the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion". Every one that remains in Jerusalem, everyone who has been washed by the Lord shall be called holy. Is there a difference between your life and that of the ungodly? Are you one in whom the world can see a difference; to whom they will apply the term "holy" in a true sense; whom, even if they may revile you and persecute you, they will nevertheless be forced to admit that you are living before them a life of a different quality from that which they can live in the flesh because you have the Spirit of God in your heart? And the Lord will create upon every dwelling place of mount Zion, and upon her assemblies, a cloud of smoke by day and the shining of a flaming fire by night. Do you have the consciousness of the Lord, a cloud of smoke by day and a fire by night, guiding you and leading you? Is He truly leading you into pastures green, into fields of service? In your pilgrim journey as you are between your exodus from Egypt, your deliverance by the power of God, and the entrance into the promised land to which we look forward in the future, do you have the consciousness of His presence and of His leading which is given us in this beautiful picture so parallel to the exodus? And there upon all the glory there's the defence, ~~the~~ tabernacle from the shadow in the day time, the refuge and cover from storm and rain. Are you fearless before the things that may assail you in this life because you know that though you walk through the valley of the shadow of death, Christ is with you and that in the midst of turmoil and trouble and disaster even you know that He is leading and His pillar of cloud and fire is going before you.

## Prophets-29

that He is truly with you at every point and that therefore you need have no fear because nothing can truly hurt you, nothing can injure you in any way except as He has purposed it to bring out of it a lesson for you! To my mind there is here a great passage of lessons for us and blessings for us, in this age, if it is to be applied in that way. Now if somebody prefers to work out a way on which they can apply the passage to the millennium, that is certainly his privilege. If you do, you have to twist the words and ideas around so as to give you nothing but a very figurative expression of the same ideas which are literally expressed elsewhere and clearly expressed elsewhere of the great blessings which we do have in the millennium. As I say, it is entirely optional what view you are to take. I'm not asking anybody to take my view but I am asking that you see the grounds upon which my view is based and that you see the underlying principle which I think is vital in the interpretation of prophecy.

What do we have here? In the millennial passages, freedom from external danger, removal of it, universal peace. In a passage like this, protection from that which is outside which would injure and leadership and guidance through the pilgrim journey. Mr.---? (Student)

Yes, you can take any word other than in a literal sense. The basic principle of interpretation is to see what the principle idea is in any passage and to see what the idea is which is being dealt with and then, in relation to this term, to try the literal interpretation of every term and see if it fits but to recognize the fact that any particular term may be used in a figurative sense, particularly if it is a common term, a term the meaning of which would be well established and easily understood by the reader. It would be very strange indeed to take an uncommon term in a figurative sense because the meaning wouldn't be clear enough to the mind, but any such common term as Israel or Jerusalem is taken in a figurative sense over and over in the New Testament and certainly there is abundant evidence for the possibility of doing it in any particular case in the Old Testament. The thing that we must guard against as to figurative language is an attitude which says of any passage that everything in this passage is symbolic, or which attempts to <sup>take</sup> every word in a passage figuratively. Such methods of interpretation reduce language to utter meaningless. It is only as individual words sprinkled

Prophets-29

through a passage have a figurative sense that the meaning is enriched, clarified and the expression made more beautiful. Now to say that there is any particular word in the Bible that cannot be taken in a figurative sense can be done only if it is an uncommon word; never if it is a common word. You say that Christ is the rose of Sharon and the lily of the valley and that, of course, is perfectly <sup>clear</sup> that He doesn't grow up as a plant, that He is not something that is red colored, that He doesn't have the particular external qualities of the rose of Sharon and the lily of the valley, it can be used because it is a common picture to most of those who originally heard it, and they could therefore easily understand how it could be used figuratively. Now unless someone has some new ideas to contribute to this discussion beyond the matters which we have gone over and over several times already, I don't see any particular point in spending a longer time on it. Of course, as I say it's each one's privilege to interpret it any way you want but I feel that the attitude which says of every passage in the Bible, "It cannot refer to the millennium, it must refer to this age," is an absolutely unscientific and impossible attitude. I feel that equally the attitude which says every passage of blessing must be a picture of the millennium is equally unscientific. The attitude that gives all the curses to Israel and all the blessing to the church is utterly unscientific; equally so is the attitude which says that everything in the Old Testament refers to Israel. Paul very clearly tells us that the Israel of God is God's people regardless of race or background and it is immaterial what the race is, it is a question of what is the belief, what is the connection with God. Mr.---? what is your--? (Student) No. The picture of smoke by day, a cloud of smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night is to my mind a perfectly obvious reference to the exodus condition. It is a description of the condition in the wilderness where over the assemblies of the people there was a cloud of leadership, a smoke by day and fire by night. I see no possible analogy to anything in a millennial condition. It seems to me it is a picture of a pilgrim's journey. I don't see how it could possibly refer to anything else. (Student) Oh, I see. Well, as to that particular question, there is much disagreement among interpreters. Professor the great German exegetist, the greatest German conservative scholar in the last century--



you know. D Introduction to the New Testament, one of the greatest conservative works ever written, Professor believes that Revelation 22 is a picture of the millennium. Now there are many others who follow him in that; there are many others who do not. As to which is true, I don't know. I wouldn't want to enter into decision on that. I am inclined a little bit to view but I wouldn't want to enter into that, but I would say that the picture during the millennium of a cloud standing and a flame of fire by night over every dwelling place of a specific literal picture of it and a very strange condition is going to exist in a material way in the millennium. I don't much think - in the millennium, but it makes a perfect picture of the condition of the followers of Christ in the time of their pilgrim journey and has an exact, and has, I think, a of the conditions of the wilderness journey of Israel, which of course is a picture of our condition in this as the book of Hebrews and other New Testament passages . The--any other question on this? (Student) All right, let's see what it is. (Student)

Prophets-30

(Student) That, of a course, is a way in which one may take<sup>it</sup>/if they desire. I personally don't see the relevance of it, but anyone is privileged to take it that way if they care to. To my mind if you take it that way it is simply a more figurative expression of the pictures we have already of the morning with nothing added, and it's taking this far more figuratively than the way I take it, I believe. I do not think it is a correct interpretation but I don't think it is a harmful interpretation. I don't see any particular objection to it if that impresses you as a better way to take it.

(Student) I don't see that at all, but I think we've discussed that at some length. I think we've spent an hour on it already before. That is a matter for each one to think through and I'm not particularly concerned what results you get. I'm concerned that you see the evidences on the different possible viewpoints and the possible ways of taking it and the basic thing that I am interested in in our study of the prophets is this, that we don't go to the prophets with the idea that we can be sure what every verse in them means because nobody on earth can do that and I think a far worse error than that is the attitude of those who go to it with the viewpoint that we can't know what any of it means. There is a commentary announced for publication this fall on the book of Daniel. I'm always interested when something new comes out on the book of Daniel, but unfortunately the man who was writing this commentary had an article a few years ago in a magazine on Gog and Magog, and when I read his article on Gog and Magog I found that he took up one possible interpretation and gave reasons why that couldn't be true. Gog and Magog couldn't be these nations. Then he took another group. It couldn't be that. Some interpreter said it means this, but it couldn't. He took another and said, "Some say it means that, but it couldn't be," and after he had taken up all the interpretations he could think of of what Gog and Magog were and tried to prove they all didn't work, he said in the end, "What is the answer? The answer is simply that Gog and Magog do not refer to any specific people or any specific nation. It simply indicates that the church is to have many enemies and great difficulties, and we should not be greatly concerned about that because we have a God who is greater than the enemies and the difficulties of the church." The conclusion he gave was excellent. It's true. It's Biblical teaching,

## Prophets 30

but I don't think it's what the Gog and Magog passage means or has anything to do with it. I think when God says Gog and Magog will fight against the people of God I think He has particular people in mind and a particular situation in mind. I think it's a specific prediction of some particular thing. Now perhaps we can show what it means; perhaps we can't, but I think we must say that it means some specific thing, that prophecy has meaning, that of much of prophecy we can tell exactly and definitely what it means and if we take the things that are clear and stand on them, God will enable us to move forward into the things that aren't clear, I believe, and I do not think that the interpretation of Chapter 4 here is anywhere near as clear as the interpretation of Chapter 2 or Chapter 6 or 7. I don't think it is anywhere near as clear. At the same time I feel that there are many passages far less clear than Chapter 4 is. The interpretation which I believe to be the correct one of Chapter 4, I did not wait until I had studied over it for a very long time. I have come to the conclusion that it hits the circumstances better than any other that I know of. Possibly I am wrong. I feel that that is the vital thing in our attitude toward the prophets, to take what's clear and stand on it, go forward into other passages and try to apply the principles you get in the clear passage and then move forward further and as you keep on studying the prophets God will give you light on more and more of it. I may be entirely wrong in my interpretation of Chapter 4 but the more I have thought of it the last ten years the more I have become convinced that it satisfies me far better than any other interpretation I've heard of. I don't think that we advance further in our understanding of it, though, by spending more time upon it at present. I think that if we were to do so the way to do it would be to take each phrase used here and trace it through the Bible and see how it's used in other contexts and what light they might throw on this and take the principles that arise in our minds, questions about different principles, and look for examples in them elsewhere, in the prophets or elsewhere. Now that's not our purpose in this course, to take one particular passage and do that but rather to go on from simpler passages to more difficult ones and to learn principles as we go. only I departed from that a little now because we are going through Isaiah more or less in order and therefore we strike some difficult passages and some that are easier, and so I think the situation regarding



Prophets - 30

Chapter 4 has been laid out pretty well before us. I think we've seen what the problems are and what the possible interpretations are and I hope you have that in mind but as to which one you prefer I hope that you will never say that anyone is an apostate if he doesn't take the one that you take.

But let us move on to Chapter 5. Chapter 5 is a . It begins as a on which the Lord is pointing out that He has had a vineyard and it's not a literal vineyard, it is a figurative expression descriptive of the people of Israel. It is very clear here as in so many other passages that there are figurative expressions but usually the meaning of them is quite clear in the context. This is a picture of the house of Israel, it's made perfectly clear in Verse 7. "For the vineyard of the Lord of hosts is the house of Israel," and if anybody tells you that they take every word in the Bible literally you will tell them that they are not taking Chapter 5, Verse 7 literally here because it says that the vineyard is the house of Israel. You are either throwing that verse out or if you accept that verse you are taking what precedes as a figure, not as a literal expression, but taking it as a figure doesn't mean that you just don't know what it means. It doesn't mean that it reduces us to air. It's perfectly clear what it means. It's explained here: that it is the people of Israel who have not brought forth the fruit that God wants them to bring forth and I think that this passage has a very important application to our present age. I think it is a picture of Israel. It's meaning is Israel. It is talking about Israel, but it has an application to us, and I think it is just as important to apply it to us as for us to understand its direct meaning about Israel; that is, that the principle is true that as the Lord is going to punish Israel for not bringing forth the fruit it should, the Lord will punish us if we don't bring forth the fruit we should, that the Lord wants us to bring forth fruit in our lives by accomplishment, by the development of Christian character also and in our groups, our organizations he wants us to show something worth while in the progress of His kingdom and that's not what He is talking about here but he's talking about Israel, but he lays down a principle that we must apply to ourselves as well, and it is very vital that we should. Now he goes on in this chapter with these woes against the different characteristics of the people at that day and he is here talking about the people in that day. He is giving his

declaration of their sin and his declaration of the punishment that is to come to them for their sin. I think that we must recognize that he is directly specifically talking about that period and declaring the coming of the Babylonian exile, the coming of the Assyrians and of the Babylonians and he describes them in Verse 29 very vividly. "Their roaring shall be like a lion, they shall roar like young lions, they shall take hold of the prey." The Assyrians were very fond of the picture of the lion. They liked to use it as symbolic of their nation, symbolic of their power of destroying other countries and he's here using the Assyrian's own picture to represent the coming of the Assyrian, God's instrument to punish the people for their sins, yet the sins which were here described were sins to which people can very easily fall today. I think that it is a great mistake for us in our studies to simply pass over the rebuke passages and spend our time on the blessing passages. I think we need both but I think the blessing passages, possibly, are harder to understand and for that reason we spend more time on them in class but I think it is very vital that we see what he rebuked the Israelites for and recognize the danger of our falling into it today. Verse 20 here is a very important verse. "Woe unto them that call evil good and good evil, that put darkness for light and light for darkness, that put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter." It is an exact picture of modernism today. It's not modernism he is describing here; he is describing a condition among the Jews, but the thing which he describes which existed there is exactly what we find in modernism today. They use terms with exactly the opposite meaning to that which people understand them to mean. They use them that way, some of them intentionally in order to deceive, others of them having simply taking it over from their leaders and perhaps not realizing the import of what they are doing, but it is an exact picture of modernism today and it tells us of God's great anger against their attitude. Yes? (Student) Yes. Verse 29 is a picture of the coming of the Assyrian invaders. (Student) The Northern Kingdom? The Assyrians attacked the Northern Kingdom and conquered it and destroyed it. They attacked the Southern Kingdom, overran three-fourths of Judah, destroyed all its great cities except one--it looked as if they were going to completely destroy it but God intervened miraculously to deliver. Now this picture of the coming of the Assyrians would apply equally to both. I think the passage

Prophets 30

is almost certainly given before the destruction of the Northern Kingdom and describes both of them, the Northern and the Southern, in this particular chapter. Now I'd like to take time for more details of this chapter but in view of the fact we have only the one year and we want to get the principles as far as possible, I'd like to go on to Chapter 6. This is a chapter that is much quoted, more quoted than probably almost any chapter we have had yet, a chapter on which I trust every one of you will some time preach at least one sermon. Isaiah's great vision of God. It's one of the great lessons for people of any time, by analogy. It is specifically a picture of his vision but the analogy for all of us is very vital. Mr. ---? (Student) Yes. We notice that the structure of the first six chapters of Isaiah is a general three-fold structure, like the book of Micah. We have a passage which is predominantly rebuke followed by a great passage of blessing, that great millennial description in the beginning of Chapter 2. Then, after that, in Chapter 2 we begin another main section. A chapter division really should be there and we have a long section of rebuke, the rest of Chapter 2 and Chapter 3, declaring the sin of the people and showing God's punishment for it, followed/by that great passage of blessing in Isaiah 4 to 6. is a main division at the end of Chapter 4, a main section of this large portion of the book, one which begins with Chapter 5, "Now I will sing\*\*\*a song\*\*\*touching the vineyard!" and that would be turning to the note of description of Israel and rebuke for their sins, and then after he has pictured here in that chapter the sin of the people and the punishment which is to come for it, then the attention of the prophet turns, not to the future blessings particularly, but to the immediate blessing of God upon himself, and the great vision of God which he had. I think we can represent/ these three sections of Isaiah as a passage of rebuke followed by a passage in the very distant future of the great picture of the millennium, then a passage of rebuke followed by the picture in the middle future of and then a passage of rebuke followed by the picture of the immediate situation, God's calling him for service. Now, of course, that is not an argument for the interpretation of this at all. It is simply an illustration of that, if you take it that way then you have this particular passage . I mean I don't think an argument for it.



39

Prophets-30

We must get at a conclusion as to general wide grouping in view of our interpretation of particular sections rather than vice versa but this is the general structure of most of the section, rebuke and blessing, second rebuke and blessing and then the third of rebuke and blessing.

Now Chapter 6 is this great passage

Prophets-35

(Student) Yes. That is a bit unusual. It's a <sup>bit</sup> unusual to use it in the general sense, but not impossible. (Student) Yes. I wouldn't say it's necessarily possible. I'd say it suggests it. I wouldn't say that it was a necessary but it does suggest it. It's a little out of the ordinary, but that is all. I don't think it is at all impossible to use it, as I see it in a general sense, but the fact that it is selected may be vital as the particular one that's been selected. Well, whichever way you take it you have a marked transition here. You do not have here, the Lord talking to two people and saying the same thing about both of them, that the serpent's head is going to be bruised and that Satan is going to fall on the ground. We don't have that. We don't have a double fulfillment in it, you have a single fulfillment, you have certain statements made about the serpent <sup>and serpents</sup> and fulfilled about the serpent and serpents; you have certain statements made about Satan and Christ, and fulfilled about Satan and Christ. You have a single fulfillment of each one and you have a transition from that where you are talking about one to that where you are talking about the other, which is a bit sudden, just as we have had rather sudden transitions from rebuke addressed to the nations as a whole to blessing addressed to the little group of the people of God. We've had sudden transitions sometimes in the middle of a verse, not so often, but occasionally, perhaps more particularly in what we yet have to come to, but we've had very sudden transitions of that type from rebuke to the whole nation to blessing to the little group and here we have a rather sudden transition from the serpent, the apparent instrument in the transaction to Satan, the moving spirit in back of the transaction whether the transition comes as I think, am almost certain, in the middle of Verse 15 or whether it comes at the beginning of Verse 15, but certainly it doesn't come before that. We have, at one or the other of these two places we have a rather sharp, Mr.---? (Question from student). You have a single fulfillment. You are talking about the serpent or you are talking about Satan. You are not talking about both of them. It's one or the other. Some passages are one, some passages are the other. (Student) Yes, it's either the serpent and the woman or the descendants of the serpent and the descendants of the woman, or the, or Satan and one particular descendant of the woman. It's one or the other, of those.

Prophets-35

(Student) I would say that the fulfillment of it is a large thing, that is to say, it's one specific thing. It's Christ's victory over Satan. I would say that Christ's victory over Satan is accomplished on the cross. His victory is there, but that the complete working out of that which is won by the cross is done in various other instances and therefore they all are included in the statement in a general sense. The cross is the specific, immediate thing which it means but the others all come out of the cross and relate to the cross and are included in the general context, so that when he says that God will bruise Satan under His feet shortly he is speaking of the consummation of that which is to the cross and certain of accomplishment because of the cross.

Mr.---? (Question from student) You mean that before He is going to do this, that before that there was no enmity between Christ and the serpent? (student) Yes.

(Student) What do you mean by the woman's seed? Who is the spiritual seed of the woman? There is a spiritual seed of Christ, there is a spiritual seed of Abraham, but I've never heard of the spiritual seed of Eve. Eve is the one who fell and if there is a spiritual seed of Eve (Student) Christ, but it doesn't say Christ, it says the woman. That's the difficulty. I don't see how the woman can be a figure for Christ. (Student) I don't see how it's possible. Christ is the seed of the woman in a specific sense, but to say that the seed of the woman in a general sense is the saved ones. I don't see any warrant for it. Now of course it would be altogether possible to have such a usage but it would be such an unusual thing that I would say you would have to have definite parallels in Scripture before you would say it. You'd have to have somewhere in the New Testament or in the Old where we are told, "You are not the seed of Satan, you are the seed of the woman. You're not Satan's children. You are Eve's children." But Christ didn't say that. Christ said, "You are not Abraham's children. You are Satan's children." He said that, but nowhere is Eve given as a symbol, so far as I know, for the blessing, or nowhere is Eve . If you take the one who does the work to be done, that is Christ, but if you take, if you speak of any before Christ as Eve's seed, because they were good, I don't know that there is any warrant for it anywhere in Scripture. Mr.---?



Prophets-35

(Student) Yes. Children of the promise to Sarah, not to Hagar, but not Eve. We're the children of (Student) That's right. But Sarah is used as a symbol in opposition to Hagar, that's right; but I don't know of anywhere in the Scripture that Eve is used as the symbol of salvation or righteousness as contrasted with someone else. It could be done but I don't know of any warrant for it in Scripture. In the case of Sarah we have these two placed parallel to each other and we have full basis for it, you see. I mean all these things are worth presentation as worthy of consideration but they are enough contrary to what would naturally be expected to require definite Scripture parallels before acceptance of them. But the important thing I'm trying to bring out now, I'd hoped we/could cover this in about five minutes simply to remind you of what we spent an hour or two on last year, the important thing I want to bring out is this; at the end of Verse 15 it is Christ and Satan. The serpent is not there in the end of Verse 15, it is Christ and it is Satan and in Verse 14 it is the serpent, not Satan but the serpent in 14; I don't see how you can possibly get to Satan in the 14th. I don't see how you can possibly get the serpent into the end of 15. Now my inclination is to feel that the first half of belongs with 14, but I don't think for our present purpose that is particularly important. The thing I'm interested now in pointing out is that there is a short transition from a passage where he talks to the serpent to a passage where he talks to Satan and that the fact of the transition must be gathered from the study of the context. Now I think that the transition comes toward the end of 15; if you think it comes at the middle, at the beginning of 15, that doesn't in any affect the principle, which is what I am interested in now, that there is a short transition from talking to talking to the other, and Verse 14 is not quite, is not the serpent and Satan, both spoken of, it's only the serpent and the end of 15 is not the serpent, it's only Christ. There is not--I would say that each of them has a specific reference and there is a definite transition, personally I feel very strongly it's in the middle; if you think it is in the beginning it still doesn't affect the fact of a sudden transition, from one subject to another, and that's the thing that I want to bring out in connection with the here, and that's the reason that I bring that up here before taking up Isaiah 7 which I/had we'd spend fifty

## Prophets-35

minutes on during this present hour, but I fear we won't. Well now, I think perhaps, unless there is some other question this principle, that we can turn back now to Chapter, to the other--oh, one thing though, one other thing I've already mentioned I want to stress. The vital thing here I want to bring out is the transition. I think we must all agree on that even if there will be some difference of opinion where the transition is. Then the other thing that I bring out is the last part of this verse is rebuke to the serpent, or to Satan rather, but it is also blessing to the woman. You have here not a double fulfillment but you have two purposes in one action. You have a purpose of rebuke, you have also a purpose of blessing; they are both involved in <sup>the</sup> one action; ostensibly it's entirely a matter of rebuke; ostensibly He's just rebuking as Isaiah is when he's talking to Ahaz, but actually involved in the rebuke is a blessing to another party. (Student) Yes, yes. There is--now in putting enmity between Satan and the serpent, or between Satan's seed and the serpent's seed is in no way blessing to Eve; that is simply a fact, but putting--as far as she is concerned it's a fact, it's not a punishment to her, it is a punishment to the serpent; but the fact of the serpent's being bruised, it's head's being bruised, it's power being broken--that is Satan's, not the serpent's, that is blessing to Eve, that is the promise of the gospel, the declaration of hope through Christ. Now let's turn back to Isaiah 7 and as we have spent fifty minutes in doing what I thought we would do in five, let's see if we can do in five what I had hoped to spend fifty on.

In Isaiah 7 we have a passage here which we could spend two or three hours presenting the historic background of but I trust you all remember it very well from last year and reviewed it very well last fall. Chapter 7, Verse 1 repeats it in very brief form, but it is also given more fully both in Kings and in Chronicles. As you know Ahaz is king and the king of Syria and the king of Israel are not fighting each other as they usually did before. Quite usually Judah didn't have much to fear from Israel because Israel was so busy fighting Syria beyond, and of course none of you confuse Syria with Assyria, which is still further beyond and a far greater power than Syria. You would confuse it if you hadn't had Old Testament history but I'm sure none of you do now. Now Syria and Israel have combined to fight against Judah and Israel is twice

Prophets-35.

as big, perhaps three times as big. as Judah but not quite as wealthy proportionately, although it's more wealthy in totality but not as wealthy proportionately to its size, and Israel could fight against Judah and it would be a terrific job for Israel to withstand it. Only two kings, three kings before this, Israel came down and attacked Judah, broke a hole in the wall of Jerusalem, overcame the area and left them in a prostrate condition. They didn't try to hold them but did wreck them pretty badly. Israel, you'd think, could do that again; but Israel is no . Israel could do it by itself; Israel is combined with a nation that's fifty per cent larger than Israel, a nation which Israel has been able to fight off most of the time though it's had a pretty tough job doing it and had some pretty terrific defeats from it, from Syria, and now Syria and Israel are combined against Judah and so the attack begins and Ahaz is frightened; you can't blame him for being frightened. We read that "his heart was moved, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind, and then you know what he did. We're not told here but we know from Kings and Chronicles. Ahaz is frightened, and what does Ahaz do? Does he do like his son Hezekiah did? Does he go to the temple and does he pray to God for help? Does he go to the prophet and say, "What shall we do in this situation?" Does he repent of his sin which has brought the situation on? Does he have a national day of thanksgiving, a national day of repentance and of fasting before God? No. He was not a very clever schemer. He says, the "We've got Nazi's Germany to fight; it's a big job, we'll get godless Russia on the other side to go in with us and we'll join with her and in that way we can overcome Germany and we'll be safe from Germany and we'll never have anything more to worry about after that and we'll take godless Russia and with them we'll make peace and democracy all through the world and everybody is going to be happy." He works out a human, man-made scheme, a scheme which is intrinsically wicked. That's exactly what Ahaz did. He wrote to the king of Assyria way across the desert, the other side of Syria and he said to Tiglath-pileser, "You come and help me and I'll be your ally and I'll do what you want", and he reaped the fruit of it later just as we're reaping the fruit now of the wickedness that we've done in the last few years, and so that's the situation in the end of the first verses and we'll have to wait till tomorrow morning



Yesterday we departed from our study of Isaiah for, I thought a few minutes but it turned out to be nearly an hour, to look back at two verses of Genesis 1, verses which have been much discussed through the ages and on which there have been many different theories presented, some being 100 per cent sure that the prediction is contained in them of the death of Christ and others being sure there is nothing there about Christ and I think, myself, that this uncertainty and disagreement is due to failure to get correct principles of interpretation. I do not think that a great many interpreters have observed as they should have the principle of sharp transitional prediction, the fact that you frequently have one theme or one idea or one situation presented and then very sharply and suddenly there is a jump to another which is logically related, as we have had it in rebuke followed immediately by blessing or as we've had it there in dealing with the serpent and spending the time on the snake for quite awhile and then suddenly turning to the one who, after all, is the real source of the trouble and dealing with him.

You might say that all the forces, the spiritual forces of the universe were looking on as interested observers as God declared what was going to happen to the snake, and what was going to happen to the snake, what was going to happen to the snake, what was going to happen to the whole race of snakes in the future and as all this was given them, we think of the spiritual forces of the universe looking on and saying, "Well now, look here, look here, the snake was only an instrument." Yes, the snake deserves punishment for letting itself be used of Satan. The snake deserves lots of punishment, he deserves all the punishment given, but why spend so much time on the snake? What about Satan? There's the real ~~method~~ difficulty. Is he going to pass Satan by altogether? And then all of a sudden you have a sharp transition to, in one little Greek word, pointing the doom of Satan, and doing it in language which does not apply to the snake, but pointing it to Satan. There is that sharp transition. It's as if you build up

You're dealing with one thing and there is another in the minds of the people. It's exactly the same attitude as we had in Micah and we had it frequently in Isaiah where the prophet is describing God's punishment coming to the nation. He points to the sin of the people there because of the doom that is coming to them and all the while he's giving this the righteous are naturally far more interested in what he says

than the wicked, the wicked are trying to shrug it off and say, "Well, I'm not sure there's much to this business anyway and after all he's sort of an old fool and fanatic." They have a tendency to shrug it off but the righteous as they listen are getting more and more disturbed. They realize the sin of the nation; they realize they are implicated in the sin of the nation even though they themselves are following God and true to Him; they're implicated in the sin of the nation and they hear of the terror that is coming and they say, "Oh, is there no hope? Are we utterly doomed in that which is coming?" And then just as, you might say, their feeling of despair reaches the point where it is almost hopeless, the prophet suddenly turns to them and shows them that, though this is coming for the nation, God has His own purposes for the remnant of \_\_\_\_\_ and He has His own blessings which are to come and suddenly you turn from this which has been building up and building up and building up to that other which is also a great need and a need which has been becoming more and more pronounced like water piling up in back of a dam as your attention is turned to other matters. Mr.---, did you have an observation to make? (Question from student) Now, of course, that is a different question, there is a little difficulty in that problem. It is true that the first part of Genesis does give a certain rationality to the serpent. There's no question of that. It says the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field. Just what does that mean? It's presented as if he, in some way, was not so amazed \_\_\_\_\_ as he would be at the person talking. Now the full interpretation, understanding of that is rather difficult, but yet there is something of that sort can hardly be denied. You turn over to the story of Balaam's ass and you find that the angel of the Lord spoke to Balaam and criticized Balaam. Or are these, what I am thinking about the very words that God allowed the ass to use? But the ass said to Balaam, it said, "Here, I've borne the weight of you during the summer and in the winter I've done your duties without complaint and now when I turn aside you start hitting me. Is that the right way to treat me?" There is the assumption in the words which the Lord expressed that the ass is not like a machine here that I can use if I feel like or throw out the window or throw into the fire, that there is something a little different in the animal creation than in the mere vegetable creation. I think we find that assumption suggested on various occasions in the Scripture and it certainly is true in the general attitude

## Prophets-36

which most of us have for the animal creation. If you saw a dog come up and bite a little child you'd say, "Oh, the vicious creature." You wouldn't hesitate for a second to go up and kick him, probably to kill him, but if you saw a dog that seemed to be a friendly creature and somebody came up and was cruel to him you would consider that person morally reprehensible, even if he was the owner of the dog. Now, why? An animal is certainly not in the class of a human being and yet there is the attitude which all human beings have which implies a certain amount of moral accountability in them and there are suggestions of it in the Scripture, and it is a statement which is made by most evangelical commentators who recognize Satan as in back of the serpent that the serpent allowed himself to be used of Satan. Of course, the liberal commentator would simply say, "This is a fable, in which animals talk," and dismiss it as a lot of junk, but the evangelical commentator, unless he takes the position that Satan simply assumed the form, which was only a pretense, unless he takes such a position as that and such a position would render the verse which tells about his going on his belly and eating dust absolutely senseless if it's not a punishment to Satan and why punish the serpent if Satan merely assumed the form? There is--I don't think you can get away from it, that that is implied in the chapter, that the serpent had a moral responsibility there. Now, of course the full background of it, the full situation, we simply cannot understand because we don't know all the facts of it. If we don't deal with all the factors that we do understand because we don't understand all the factors in back of it, we certainly would deal with very little of life. I don't know what advances have been made in electricity since I was in High School but--in fact all I know about electricity is what I learned in a High School course, and probably most of that I've forgotten, but it is my very definite impression that at that time it was thought that what electricity really is wasn't known and there were those who felt that it was like a stream going in one direction, those who felt it was like one going in another direction and those who had an entirely different theory about it and yet they all were agreed that we could utilize it. Now there may be advances since that render that illustration out of date but I rather, even though they may render the form out of date, I doubt if they render its actual purpose out of date. I am sure that it is a mystery to them how it



## Prophets -36

is that you can have a thought in your head and your nerves start working in such a way  
 as to cause your <sup>fingers to move.</sup> / . Science can understand along the way certain of the aspects of it  
 but the actual connection between that thought in your head and that motion of your fin-  
 gers, somewhere in between there is at least some point and perhaps more than one which  
 is a real problem and utterly ununderstood and yet we don't hesitate to reason with the  
 facts which are sure. So that is one great objection to all deductive reasoning or  
 attempt out of philosophy to construct a system that will explain the universe. We sim-  
 ply do not have sufficient data and when we say that something is impossible or absurd  
 or fantastic because we don't fully understand it we could make half the facts of life  
 absurd and fantastic because we don't understand how they happen; we don't know the  
 data, but we know they do happen, and we utilize them. So it seems to me that the  
 animal creation is one on which we cannot be satisfied with superficial conclusions,  
 I mean with hasty conclusions, but that the Scripture does in this passage and also in  
 connection with Balaam's ass definitely teach that which human beings assume, that there  
 is some measure of moral accountability in the brute creation. Well that's an interesting  
 question. It's a little aside from our <sup>main</sup> / present study but it is one that it is very well  
 that we think about a bit because it would be very easy for us to make statements which  
 either fall short of or <sup>go</sup> / beyond the <sup>and situation and which could hinder</sup>  
 the testimony of our ministry. Now that was what I wanted there, was the principle of  
 the transition and also the fact that in the declaration of the doom of Satan there  
 was one fact predicted, a fact which had various, you might say stages in its fulfill-  
 ment, the accomplishment of it through the death of Christ on calvary which wins for us  
 the complete victory over Satan, but the actual performance of that victory including  
 all the accomplishments of Christ, both in this age and previous to <sup>of His</sup>  
 earthly life and including the great suffering and the millennium, all that is included  
 in the victory over Satan but is won at calvary which is the central point of the whole  
 complex of affairs, and then, also, the fact, of course, that <sup>while</sup> / there is one event, with  
 various stages in it, but one event, this event is presented from two viewpoints. It  
 is presented from the viewpoint of Satan directly and addressed to him and from that

Prophets-36

viewpoint it is rebuke, and that alone, it is judgment and rebuke, but it contains something that is far more important to us than the rebuke to Satan. It contains the promise of blessing. From Satan's viewpoint it's rebuke; from Eve's viewpoint it is blessing. From Satan's viewpoint it is rebuke; from our viewpoint it is blessing. And so you have two purposes contained in the same event. I think it is well to recognize that. Not two acts, not two--it's not a double fulfillment. There is no such thing as a double fulfillment in Scripture. You may have a prediction of several events of a similar nature--possibly coming together, as when you say, "This man will make several trips to Chicago." Or you could say, "This man will go to Chicago," you might include several goings, but when you say, "This man will go to Chicago and when he has got there he will buy a new suit," you can't say that that means, even though he has gone to Chicago and bought a new suit that you are sure he is going to go again and buy one because of another fulfillment or that it means both that a man is going to go to Chicago and buy a new suit and that another man is going to go to the National Bible Institute in New York and .as if it might be a figurative expression in the latter and it might be a literal expression in the former . That's the double fulfillment which I believe is unscriptural and harmful. We have a single fulfillment but we have more than one truth in it. (Student) Yes. Yes, now can we use the same pronoun in referring to two different persons? I might say to you, "That's the way it looks to you. How does it look to you?" And thou could refer to anyone--that is, you don't have to look in a figurative sense, but it can be directed to any individual and we frequently find it in the prophetic books and in the Psalms that there is a change of position in that regard. Those pronouns which do not refer to specific individuals but to those who are in a specific position at the time that which

and I think you can find that proven by the fact that

No, we went into that yesterday at a good little length and pointed out that in the New Testament He says that God will bruise Satan under your feet shortly and He refers to that great serpent, the devil; we have various indications that the New Testament writers understood that Satan was a definite party to the transaction but the Old Testament doesn't specifically state it. If you do not imply something, if it is not expressed in it, you just have a fable like Aesop's fables

That isn't reasonable for God's people. . We believe that it must be something other than simply a animal . but we can't prove it. The only thing is that we have to see first exactly what's there and then see in understanding it properly what elements must we assume in order to understand the Scriptures as a whole. Now our purpose now is to understand Isaiah and we have a tremendous amount of Isaiah to cover and I intended to put five minutes on it because I thought I had covered it fully last year. I wanted to resume what I think is clearly proven from it that there is a sharp, sudden transition, there's a sharp, sudden transition from speaking to the serpent to speaking to Satan in the passage and I gave yesterday, I would say fifty different evidences related to it, a great many, and have repeated perhaps twenty of them this morning but there hasn't been a question raised this morning which we haven't dealt with, I think, fully yesterday. I don't think there has been any, I dealt with every one yesterday that has been raised this morning. Now if you have something new I'm glad to look at it but, I mean you can take my idea or not on it, I don't care, but I would like to have everybody get what the evidences are that I present here and then go on and see how they fit into Isaiah, and it is my personal opinion that if we do not take these principles we do not get sense out of the prophetic books. Now I do not prove these principles simply by Genesis 3: I prove them by the fact that they seem to make sense out of Genesis 3 and also they seem to make sense out of the prophetic books; that is, I say that there is evidence from each which hangs together and it is a question which is the best place to start. I don't think we could take either one and start and one hundred per cent prove it just from that alone. I think we have to compare them together and I want to bring the evidence from the different places to see how it fits together. Now if we spend too long on any one of them we simply don't get over the ground, that's the only objection.



## Prophets-37

There was one question raised this morning that we hadn't mentioned yesterday. That was about the animals, and their moral accountability. That, of course, is altogether aside from our present purpose but I thought it was interesting and worth taking time on.

Mr. --- do you have something that you think is different? (Question from student) I don't think so. I don't think there is whatever. Yes. Thank you. Well then let's look on to Isaiah 7. In Isaiah 7 you have a passage of which if you don't recognize the principles we've been looking at in Genesis 3, in my opinion you have nothing but nonsense in the chapter. You'll find many interpretations of it in different commentaries which I am convinced are errant nonsense. If God spoke and used such principles as many commentaries consider to be involved in ~~Genesis~~ <sup>Isaiah</sup> 7, why just about anything can mean anything and you might as well take the conclusion that the prophetic books are a lot of ecstatic words from which we can gather models that we like, but we can't be sure of anything in their teaching. I believe that if you take principles which fit in and make sense in many, many places in predictive portions of prophecy they make perfect sense in the chapter and that is why I wanted to look at Genesis 3 where I think those particular principles make sense out of the chapter and have them in mind as we look at Isaiah 7. Now of course, we can say they do not apply to Genesis 3. In that case/<sup>it's either</sup> the devil took the form of a serpent and has nothing to do with the serpent at all and this verse about his eating dust and going on his belly has absolutely no meaning whatever or else we can take it that it is just an animal story and there's no Satan there at all in which case it certainly has no meaning for us, or we can take it as a combination of the two with a sharp transition, in which case it seems to me it makes perfect sense. Now we have exactly the same situation in Isaiah 7. In Isaiah 7 we look/<sup>ed</sup> at the background, Verses 1 and 2, and we saw that extremely important thing which is specifically stated in Kings and in Chronicles but which is not specifically mentioned at this point, that Ahaz had decided that he would gain the victory over his immediate enemies by calling in a force at a distance that was even worse than the immediate ones and meeting with them and dividing up the earth with them, forgetting that they would never be satisfied until they had the whole earth in their hands and so he made exactly the same mistake that others have made in modern times. He sent off to Tiglath-pileser across the desert and he gave Tiglath-pileser a lot of lend-lease in order

that he would come and join with him in fighting against Syria and against Israel. So he wrote to Tiglath-pilezer and he said to Tiglath-pilezer, "I'm going to stand with you. We're going to establish democracy in the earth. I'm going to give you a (he called it tribute instead of lend-lease) I'm giving you all this tribute and you come and you attack these forces from the rear." Well now of course in this case it is true that Assyria was stronger than Israel and Syria put together while Judah was not half, much more than half as strong as Israel alone. So that it made it particularly dangerous for him to do that. He couldn't possibly handle Assyria. He simply had to know that the Assyrians were <sup>really</sup> nice folks and if he joked with them like Roosevelt did with Stalin and took a nice, pleasant attitude with them they would stand for democracy after that and everything would be fine, and so he sent this message out to Tiglath-pilezer but he didn't tell his people about it. There is nothing mentioned here about it. It's rather clear that it was a thing which the people did not know. As far as the people of Judah knew, Syria and Israel are attacking Judah. They've made an attack. They've been driven back. The attack was made with small force, and they've been driven back. Now they are expecting another attack with large force, and they're filled with fear. Their heart is moved like the wind, and then the Lord speaks to Isaiah. Now Ahaz didn't speak to Isaiah and say, "Isaiah, inquire of the Lord for me. The Lord speaks to Isaiah, and Verse 3 is tremendously important. The Lord didn't say to Isaiah, "Go to the palace and tell Ahaz you have a message from me, for him." He didn't say that. He said, "Go forth and meet Ahaz, thou, and Shear-jashub thy son, at the end of the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's dield." Why did he tell him to go there? It's very clear that Isaiah had no entrance to the palace. Hezekiah in later years was very glad to have Isaiah come at any time. He wanted to hear the word of the Lord. Nathan, the prophet, could go right in to the private quarters of David and could rebuke him and say, "Thou art the man", but Ahaz didn't want these old fools around. They're all right to keep up the morale of the people. Religion is all right in its place in keeping the people in order and so on but we don't want to be bothered with it. We know how to handle these things; we're going to call in Assyria and send them tribute and make an arrangement and that will solve the problem. We have . . . It's going to fix it up, and we're not interested in this old . . . And so in order

to get access to Ahaz it was necessary that Isaiah go out to the place where Ahaz is on an inspection tour. He is inspecting the defenses of the city and he's out there busy inspecting the defenses at the end of the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field. It's very important to have the water supply in good condition. It's very important to have the walls in good condition, to be ready to protect themselves against the great attack that is expected and more than that Ahab is interested in increasing the morale of the people. In 1940 about four months before the election I came out Sierra Nevada mountains during the summer and I met a man there upon the road with his car and as I rode down with him I asked him what had happened in the world in the two weeks I had been out of touch with it and he said, "Oh, things have gotten bad in the world." He said, "The situation is getting so serious that Roosevelt is finding it necessary to go personally to inspect all the different . . . . The election was about three months off. "Roosevelt is personally going to inspect all the army . . . , because the situation is so vital." Well, I tried to point out to him, as most of the commentators did two or three weeks later that actually the armament factories could do a lot better work if they didn't have to stop work for a day in order to clean everything up and have a parade while the president marched in and glanced around and what did Roosevelt know more than I would know about whether the work was going on well in a particular factory anyway. It was a political trick to impress the country to elect him for a third term and it was a scheme to raise the morale of the people and to convince them of the fact that we ought soon to get busy and enter the war. It was a political scheme but I don't think Ahaz's was here a political scheme. Ahaz was--doubtless in those days the situation was such that the king would know a good bit about these particular defenses and it would be vital that he take a personal direct interest in it but there was the political aspect of it also. He's tremendously interested in raising the morale of the people and showing them the situation was far from hopeless, that if they will fight and fight desperately and fight bravely there is a good chance of holding off the Syrians and the Israelites, and then he wants the morale of the people ready to fight desperately and then he thinks they can hold them off and he feels that the Assyrians will come from the back. He's not worried in the end because the Assyrians will deliver them, he is quite sure. He knows well . . . .



## Prophets 37

at least he is glad enough of an excuse to interfere with conditions in this part of the world and to come to the protection of \_\_\_\_\_, and so Isaiah has to go out and get a hearing from him. He has to go out there just as Moses sometimes had to see Pharaoh as he would go out to the Nile. Moses sometimes had access to him in the \_\_\_\_\_ but very clearly not always. So that God said to Isaiah, "Go out and see him and give him a message and here's the message he gave him. Verse 4 - "Take heed and be quiet: fear not, neither be faint hearted." Well that's very nice. "Don't get worried. Don't fear." Israel and Syria are right at the door, but don't get frightened. It's very nice, isn't it? Reminds me of a time that I took a Turkish bath here in Wilmington, and the man at this place said to me, he was giving me a massage, and I said to him, "Well now", I said, "Up in Philadelphia when I had one up there they used a little wintergreen oil", and he said, "Oh, I can do that for you." Up in Philadelphia they have a big bottle. He took a little bit of a bottle out of his closet and I didn't know much about wintergreen oil at that time so he took the little bottle out and he put a little bit on his hands and started rubbing it over me. About, some seconds later I felt as if I was burning all over, felt as if I was just afire and I jumped off the slab and I began jumping around and he said, "Pay no attention to it. Think nothing of it." And that was very comforting. "Pay no attention to it. Think nothing of it." "Don't bother about it." Well, you can give that sort of comfort. You can comfort a person so it means something and you can give them a comfort that is like Job's comforters. After all, he didn't have to stand it. "Don't bother with it. Don't pay any attention to it." Well here, that, is that all that this message is so far that God has said? "Take heed and be quiet. Don't fear." Ahaz wants the people to fear sufficiently that they will fight hard and work hard and build hard and get ready, but he says, "Don't fear. Don't be fainthearted for the two tails of these smoking firebrands." (That is a figure. I don't think that is a good illustration-- \_\_\_\_\_, but it is a figurative expression which is very clear in the context, to be a sort of a putting down, these Israel and Syria.) What are they? Why do you worry about Israel and Syria? It's just as if somebody today would say to Czecho-Slovakia, "Don't worry about Russia. What can Russia do to you? All they can do is to seize all

Prophets-37

your leading officials and execute them and take his property away from everybody that's got over a hundred dollars in his possession and kill everybody that they would have any reason to think was to control Russia. Don't worry about them. What's Russia?" Well Russia is so much bigger than Czecho-Slovakia that such statements, while they will convince some people, won't convince many. Well, of course that is the situation here. He says, "Don't be afraid of these smoking firebrands, of Syria and ." Well, if you believe in God, that's all right.

first in God - that He controls everything, and, second, if you believe that God is going to protect you from these, then, of course, if you have faith in God you will say, "Yes, there is no reason to be afraid of them. They're nothing in relation to God who is so much more powerful," but if you think this is an old superstition which after all doesn't matter; in fact, <sup>disturbing</sup> in this realistic world, well, it's sort of <sup>and Syria.</sup> hurting morale, a rather /thing, to say, "Aw, don't bother about Israel, What do they amount to? " And he goes on and tells the situation and says, "They said, 'We'll go to Judah and make a breach therein and set a king and put up our puppet king there, even the son of Tabeal. We'll make our own puppet ruler.'" Verse 7, though, the prediction, "Thus saith the Lord, it shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass." Well, there is a good strong declaration from the Lord. "It won't come to pass." Suppose somebody went yesterday to President Benes and said, "Don't fear about Russia. The Lord says it won't, nothing will happen." Well, if Benes is a firm believer in God and if he has reason to think that the man who speaks actually knows the Word of God and actually has a communication from God he might be tremendously interested. As it is I think he is shaking in his boots and wondering whether he'd better see if he can't smuggle himself out of the country or wonder whether he is going to be shot there. He's to make a speech on the radio today and I wonder which of the two tracks he will take, but he's facing a situation. Well, here's a nice thing. Thus says the Lord. It will not stand. Neither shall it come to pass. If you truly believe in God and believe that this man has a right to speak from God and to tell you God's will in this particular situation, then if you

, but that's not Ahaz's attitude. Ahaz wants the people to work hard and build hard and play hard. So Isaiah is to go and say to him, "For the head of Syria is Damascus and the head of Damascus is Rezin; and within sixty-five years Ephraim will be broken, that it be not a people." Somebody might have gone a week ago to the leaders in Czecho-Slovakia and said, "Don't be worried about Russia. Why, within sixty years Stalin will be dead and the whole Russian organization will be ." Well, what would Benes say? "I'm not worried about sixty years from now. I'm worried about next week Monday and Tuesday. That's what I'm worried about." And here he says, "Don't



Prophets-39

worry. Within sixty-five years Ephraim will be broken and won't be a people." And then he says, in Verse 9, "If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established." Well I think Isaiah probably thought as he went along, Well now this is a wonderful word the Lord has given. Within sixty-five years they won't be there any more but what's Ahaz going to do. Ahaz doesn't have much faith anyway and Ahaz certainly is going to say, "Well now that doesn't interest us, what happens sixty-five years from now. They can utterly destroy Judah long before that and we are worried about the present situation." And between Verse 9 and Verse 10 there is a gap. Now that is a statement which may seem striking and strong to somebody.--there is a gap between Verse 9 and Verse 10, but there is absolutely no question about that. That's one of the things of which we can be one hundred per cent sure, in the Scripture, even though it's not stated in the Scripture, that there is a gap there. There are many things we have to infer in the Scripture as in any other book if we are going to make sense out of it. This is one which is 100 hundred per cent sure. In Verse 3 the Lord said to Isaiah, "Go out there and meet Ahaz at the place where he is making his inspection tour." Well we know Isaiah wasn't out there. The Lord wouldn't say "Go out there" if Isaiah was out there. It is a pretty good assumption he was at home in Jerusalem somewhere and not at the place to which he was to go and meet Ahaz and give Ahaz this message, but then we have in Verse 10, "Moreover the Lord spoke again to Ahaz" and then we have Ahaz answering, so it is one hundred per cent certain that <sup>between</sup> Verse 9 and Verse 10 there is a gap and the prophet doesn't bother to say, "When Isaiah heard the word of the Lord he called his wife and said, "Get some good shoes on Shear-jashub because he's got to go with me on this, I want to take him with me now. I have some work to do, and give me my walking staff and get everything ready and we, if the king doesn't throw us in prison we'll be back before the day is over." and then he started out and he went outside the walls of this place and he got there and he got Ahaz's attention so that Ahaz listened and Ahaz stood there and Isaiah came up and started talking: "Oh, king," and Ahaz didn't want to bother with the fellow but there were the people standing around who believed that Isaiah was a true prophet of God, and Ahaz could not just say, "Get out of the way. I haven't got time to bother with you." He couldn't do that because he was out there building morale and it would appear very discourteous and very ungracious to a one whom the

February-38

people respected as highly as they did Isaiah and the only thing that Ahaz could do was let the fellow talk - and let's hope he won't take too long and we can get rid of him soon and get on with our inspection tour, and so Isaiah started and he gave the message given here. Now all that is in the gap. Part of that you may think is inference, but it is clear inference from what follows, but the thing that is absolutely one hundred percent inference is that Isaiah having gotten the message given before here has gone out there and met Ahaz and given Ahaz this much of a message and then, in Verse 10, the Lord spoke again to Ahaz, so here is a further message given Isaiah which is given after that but given to Ahaz doubtless, one after the other one and why is it presented in that way? Well, very clearly from what he says and what Ahaz says we can infer the situation there that after he's given the message Ahaz's attitude has been, "How can I now without seeming/abrupt or impolite to this man that the people think is a true prophet move on with the inspection work and with getting the people stimulated to work hard without seeming to be discourteous or rough with this fellow that I want to get rid of." Now that was Ahaz's thought and it doubtless showed very clearly on his face. Perhaps he started to move on without bothering to answer, and so the Lord spoke again to Ahaz, and when it says here, "The Lord spoke again to Ahaz we can be absolutely it means the Lord spoke again to Isaiah. It means that the Lord at that instant put into Isaiah's mind the words which Isaiah was to give to Ahaz as from the Lord to Ahaz. It's not a voice from heaven, certainly. It's not something in the inner heart of Ahaz. In the circumstances it is in the mind of Isaiah given right to Ahaz as a further message from God to Ahaz. So here's the further message given. "Ask thee a sign of the Lord, thy God." Here he isn't paying any attention. That's all very well to say "Don't be worried; in sixty-five years these people won't even be a nation," but what do we care about sixty-five years? We're not going to argue with this fellow; we're just going to move on and ignore him. That's a mighty good thing to do when a crackpot comes in. It's a mighty good thing to do. Why waste time arguing with them? Just ignore them and move on. You'll find that in your churches; you'll find that in your Christian work. There are times when a sincere inquirer comes with a difficulty and it's worth your taking day after day to talk with him and to help



him but there are times when somebody comes who is just going to cause dissension and trouble and all that you can do in your church is to try in as nice and gracious a way as you can to keep from arousing trouble over this particular thing arising; and you have to make a decision and it's much better to err on the side of graciousness than to err on the side of being too abrupt but if you don't get somewhere near the right point in between you won't accomplish much and so Ahaz is trying to move on and now he has to answer this next question because it is addressed right to him. Isaiah says, "Don't worry. These people won't hurt you." "All right, thank you, thank you. Let's go on. Let's work here." That's all right, but now he says, "Ask a sign of the Lord; ask it either in the depths or in the height above." He says, "You don't think there is anything to this. You think it's a lot of foolishness. You think, it's plain on your face that you think that we're just giving you a message that is just a lot of hot air and the important thing is to get busy and fight hard against Israel and Syria, now," he says, "Let's have a test of this. Ask a sign of the Lord." And, of course, Ahaz remembered that old superstition that Elijah went up on Mount Carmel once and all the people and that fire came down from heaven and--well, now this would be very nice, wouldn't it? If he'd say to Isaiah, "Well, now how do we know that this true?" and Isaiah would say, "Well, I'll tell you. You bring some of your people and we'll go up to Mount Carmel, say, next month some day, and we'll go up there and we'll have a big occasion and we'll prove to you that God really is God and can do these things." Well before that time the Assyrians of course would have come down and would have taken the city of Jerusalem and we'll be wasting this time on a lot of foolishness. Ahaz doesn't want to get involved in anything like that. He wants to move ahead with what's important, with protecting the city from the Syrians and the Israelites and so Ahaz does some quick thinking. He says, "Now if I come out and explain the true situation a lot of these people around here that think this a prophet of God and think that there is a God that interferes in human events, they're going to get excited and bothered and the people will be divided into <sup>two</sup> camps and it will be awfully hard to get the unity of morale that we need in order to move forward." I heard just recently that one of our good friends was asked to serve on a committee for military preparedness for this nation and I heard that he was asked to do that and that he was put in a position of great importance in relation to the president of our country and other leaders in the



## Prophets-38

country in order to do that or at least that he was given to understand he would be and then some people came to him and said, "Look here, in your books you've made statements derogatory to the Roman Catholics. If we put you on this committee that's going to cause disunity in the nation. Now you just repudiate those statements against the Roman Catholics and then we can go ahead and you can be on the committee." He's causing disunity with saying something that some of the people of the land don't agree with. Well, here's the situation. Ahaz wants to avoid disunity and if Ahaz comes out and makes a statement here against this fellow why it's going to cause trouble so Ahaz does some quick thinking and he says, "I will not ask, neither will I tempt the Lord." Very clever statement. Now am I reading a lot into Ahaz's mind in this? Am I assuming a lot here of which we have no proof. I will venture that you will often hear this read around Christmas time or at other times in churches and you'll hear somebody say, "I will not seek, neither will I tempt the Lord. Beautiful, pious statement. Because, the words alone are a pious statement. They're lovely. Christ said, "A wicked and an adulterous generation seeks a sign and no sign will be given to it." Here he says to Ahaz, "Ask for a sign," and Ahaz says, "I won't tempt the Lord. I won't ask for a sign." It's a beautiful statement and it should satisfy the religious people and make them think, "This fellow Ahaz is all right after all." I remember somebody's telling me about the president of Prince/ <sup>ton</sup> University about ten years ago. They said that the president up there used to say, "Well, in this controversy between <sup>Machen?</sup> and Mason, I guess it was twenty years ago, between Mason and the modernist, "I stand right with <sup>Machen?</sup> Mason," and that made all the fundamentalists in the alumni think he was a great person and they supported him, and then every year he had to reappoint the Dean of Religion for the college and he appointed a modernist for that position, so that pleased the modernists, so he pleased everybody. He made some nice statements to please the fundamentalists and he gave the power and control to the modernists and that pleased the modernists. Well, Ahaz has made a nice statement here but the fact that the interpretation always presented on this particular statement is one hundred per cent. certain that it is not a sincere statement but just an evasion to get rid of him is made one hundred per cent certain by the statement which Isaiah made in answer. He didn't say, "Ahaz, that's a beautiful sentiment. I'm glad that - others have had signs and have believed; you are ready to believe

## Prophets-38

without signs. That's wonderful." He didn't say that. He might have. He would have if it was a sincere statement but he said, in Verse 13, "Hear ye now, O house of David: is it a small thing for you to weary men, but will ye weary my God? Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign. God is going to bless you richly and give you everything good that you could possibly want. He's going to give you all the things that your heart desires." Well that doesn't make sense, does it? The first part makes absolute sense. He rebuked Ahaz and he is rebuking him and the purpose is rebuking Ahaz and there is absolutely no question about Verse 13 and the first half of 14, that it is a rebuke and there is absolutely no question that that is demonstrating that Ahaz is insincere in Verse 11 and that almost certainly the tone of his voice showed his insincerity to the extent that Isaiah did not appear to the people standing by to be just a trouble maker in what he said, but it was rather evident to them that this cynicle king was speaking in a tone of voice - "Oh, yes. Let's get on with the work." He was using beautiful words but the tone of his voice and his general attitude was one which showed <sup>his</sup> hostility to religion. And so Isaiah gives him a rebuke and that is one of the most vital things in connection with this chapter to realize that Verse 14 is a rebuke and not a blessing. Now did we read the whole Chapter 7 in the Hebrew? We did, didn't we? We did. Well, you'll have it well in mind <sup>for</sup> tomorrow. That's excellent, and we'll have in mind your ideas on these next three verses. Is 14 rebuke or blessing? Is 15 rebuke or blessing? Is 16 rebuke or blessing? What does Verse 22 mean? That's extremely important. What does 22 mean? I think it wouldn't hurt to look at that first, and what do these three verses here mean? What is their real import and purport? What are they predicting? Is there a double fulfillment here? Is he talking about the fact that Napoleon is going to be sent to Waterloo and that Hitler is going to die in and that some say he is going to come to sometime? Now are there several different things involved? Is there one particular thing involved. Just what is the consideration of these next three verses and I hope you will have some good clear ideas on it for tomorrow.

b2

You will recall that I assigned for today simply a review of Isaiah 7 and some further consideration of the problems in it. I asked you to think a little about the answer to certain questions and in particular about the meaning of certain verses and so now I wish you would, underneath your name, put No. 1 and then under No. 1, I want you to spend not over one or two minutes at most writing an explanation of this: What does Verse 22 mean? What is the general thought of Verse 22? Bibles open, yes. Oh. Verse 22, please. What is the general purport? What is it--is it prediction or a description? If it is a prediction, what is it a prediction of? Is it blessing or is it rebuke? Just what is involved in it? You can do that in one or two minutes, I am sure. Don't use a lots of words to conceal a thought. Question 2. Question 2 is this, looking at your English Bible, or your Hebrew, whichever you want. Isaiah 7, answer this question. What is the purpose of Verse 16 and to what does it refer? No. 3.1s: What is the purpose of Verse 14 and to what does it refer? You know our main purposes just as we expressed purposes of prophetic action in general. What is its purpose and to what precisely does it refer? If there is more than one thing, name the different things. Question 4 is: what about Verse 15. What is the meaning of Verse 15? And to what does it refer? What is its purpose, meaning, and what specifically does it refer to? Is it an ad for a honey company or what is it? We were discussing at the end of the hour this chapter, Isaiah. We didn't get nearly as far as I was hoping to in it but we opened up some very important principles. Before I mention them perhaps I should say a word about church history. I can't seem to find who took down off the board the church history assignments which of course were finished and out of date but no member of the secretarial staff seems to have done and I don't recall having done it myself. I may be wrong in that, of course. But I wanted to put up on it as additional numbers the assignment for next time. Now if anybody took it down I wish you would let me know after class, and if you should have it that would be all the better because I could put it up again with the additional letters on it. Then, another thing. I have found it necessary for me to be in Philadelphia Monday evening and leaving at six will crowd me rather severely so that I'd like to have the class from four to five instead of five to six, in church history. Dr. Harris said he would be



## Prophets-39

willing to have his advanced Hebrew five to six that day so that it wouldn't cause anybody any inconvenience. so that, I'll post a notice and I am sure everybody will see it but I thought I'd give all of you here advance word so you would have that much advance knowledge over the rest of the class. Now, so much for church history. I think that covers all that is vital in that. Now we come back then to Isaiah 7 and we have noticed here that you are justified in assuming that Ahaz's statement in Verse 12 was not what the statement taken by itself would indicate. That is, you are justified in assuming that there was a facial expression and an attitude which Isaiah correctly interpreted. We are altogether justified in that by Isaiah's answer. Otherwise his answer would be rather absurd. Mr. ---? (Student) I don't think so because of the fact that Isaiah is here speaking as God's messenger and as he goes on he gives predictions which would very clearly be beyond a human being's ability; therefore I think we are justified in saying, "Well Isaiah is here speaking as the direct mouthpiece of God. And if that is the case what he says, "Here ye now, O house of David; Is it a small thing for you to weary men, but will ye weary me God also?" If Ahaz had a right idea in mind or anything of a right attitude he would be utterly wrong in speaking to him in that way. If one of you said something to me which I misinterpreted I might come out with a statement like this to you utterly wrongly and then if I found later that you had a thoroughly good reason and a perfectly right attitude I'd be terrible embarrassed about it and feel very apologetic. Well in this case it's not Isaiah, it's not Isaiah, it's God, and God would know Ahaz's thoughts and the intents of his heart very thoroughly. Mr.---? (Student) It seems to me that it is necessary to consider that Isaiah's answer is a rejoinder to what Ahaz has said, and that if he speaks to the house of David which includes Ahaz, not the house of Israel, not the people round about, it's David's line. If he speaks to them he includes Ahaz but he may feel that Ahaz's statement and attitude is representative of the attitude of other kings. (Student) Yes. He may feel that he can rebuke several members of the house at once but Ahaz would certainly be included in the number, I would think. Any further question on this? If anyone feels that there is any valid reason for questioning the interpretation I give that in Verse 12 when Ahaz makes a

Prophets-39

very splendid statement he really doesn't mean a word of it, it's utterly hypocritical and it is perfectly apparent from his face and manner to anyone who watches him closely that it is hypocritical, that I feel to be an absolutely necessary assumption from the previous verse, from the following verse. Now that may not be clear to somebody, and if there is any reason it isn't clear to anybody I would like to go into it and clarify it, because I feel here that our evidence is just as great as the evidence - you see a locomotive down here and you say, "That locomotive is able to pull that train across the bridge over the Brandywine!" Somebody says, "That piece of cold metal there. That locomotive is able to? Why, there is no horse there. There is nothing living. It couldn't do it. " A person would be very justified in saying that a few years ago when locomotives were first invented. In fact, people did say that, at that time. They refused to believe a locomotive could do it. Well, the only answer in that case of course was be just to watch the locomotive, to let it do it. I could sit down in one of those locomotives from now for the next three months and I couldn't tell whether it could do it or not, whether it was in decent shape or not to do it, whether the principles involved were such, until I saw it work. If I saw it go across, then I'd know it but I don't have the mechanical . Well now in this case we can't see the thing happen. We cannot hear Ahaz speak; we can't see his face, but we see the reaction which Isaiah took and it was not a reaction which a man took but it was a reaction which God took, because God was speaking through Isaiah before; in fact, in Verse 10 it doesn't say, "Then Isaiah said", it says, "Moreover the Lord spoke again to Ahaz, and of course we assume there that, and correctly undoubtedly, that the Lord spoke through I saiah, but He wishes to make it abundantly clear to us that this case is one where it is explicitly the Lord who is giving the message, and here we have the Lord's answer spoken through Isaiah and as proof of that we have in our following verses predictions which would be utterly fantastic for any human being to invent. They came from the mind pf God and they were introduced with very strong rebuke in Verse 13. Now if Isaiah in giving this Verse 13 was accusing Ahaz of being insincere and a hypocrite when actually Ahaz was giving beautiful thoughts and meaning every word of it, Isaiah today in heaven would be extremely apologetic and embarrassed about the awful mistake

he made at that time, and it would never have found its way into the sacred Scriptures unless there was an explanation, but it is God speaking through Isaiah. Is that clear to everybody? Does everybody agree on that? (Student) Well Isaiah is talking in the whole thing but the Lord is speaking through Isaiah. (Student) Well the Lord might say it. The Lord - The president of the United States might say in speaking - They say that when Abraham Lincoln one time in his cabinet, I've heard the story, that a certain matter was up for discussion and that he said to the Secretary of State, Secretary Seward "What do you think we should do on this?" and Secretary Seward said, "I think we should take this policy there." Let's say they were A and B. He took Policy B. And then he went to Secretary Chase, Secretary of the Treasury, and he said, "What do you think we should do?" and he said, "I think Seward is right - Policy B is the one to do." and they say he went right down the cabinet and every one of them agreed on B, and

he said, "Well the president of the United States believes that A is the only safe policy in this case." I've heard that story given about him, thus showing that in that case he went against his whole cabinet which of course meant that if it had proven to be a bad policy all the blame would come on him. I suppose it proved that he was right in this particular case and their judgment was bad in that particular case, but that's the way he said it. "The president of the United States believes this," and there are many circumstances under which one will speak of himself in the third person when he wishes to emphasize the reason why or the authority under which he speaks. (Student) Yes. Yes, there are passages in the Prophets where we may say, "Perhaps here Jeremiah, or some other prophet, perhaps made a mistake, but in such a case I feel that we'll have some clear indication in what follows, that the Lord makes it clear that he refuted this particular word of the prophet. I do not expect often, if ever, to have such cases in the prophetic books. Now when you get into the historic books you find that David said to Nathan, "I've thought of a good idea. Why should I live in a beautiful palace and the Lord, the worship of the Lord is in tents. I'm going to build a temple for the Lord," and Nathan said, "That's grand." He said, "Go and do what's in your heart and the Lord will bless you," and that night the Lord appeared to Nathan and He said, "Nathan, you're wrong. I don't



## Prophets-39

want David to build this temple. I want it built by his son and you tell him he's not to do it," and Nathan came to David the next day and said, "The Lord has spoken to me and told me to give you this message: you are not to build the temple. It is your son who is to build it." Now in that case Nathan the prophet spoke as a man and he spoke wrongly. He made his judgment, the best judgment he could, but it did not fit with the mind of the Lord. Now Isaiah could conceivably incorrectly interpret Ahaz but if he did in one of the prophetic books like this where it's mostly straight utterances that the Lord gave the prophets one after another, we would certainly expect it to be ear-marked as such, and so in this case I feel that there is no doubt of the fact that it is the Lord who is speaking; certainly in Verse 13 the Lord is speaking. The Lord is indicating this. The Lord is using Isaiah as His mouthpiece and in Verse 14 it's introduced with Verse 13 and in Verse 13 he gives a very strong rebuke to the house of David which includes Ahaz as its present head and representative, a very strong rebuke. Well now a great many students of the Scripture, I don't know whether you should call them students; at least, people who try to interpret the Scripture, a great many take Verse 14 and they say, "Look here. Here is a promise of relief and blessing - Those nations aren't going to conquer your land, they say. Your land is going to be delivered. How do you know it is going to be delivered? God's wonderful sign is going to be given you, that it is to be delivered. A wonderful sign of blessing. Well is that the purpose of Verse 14? Is the purpose blessing? In the light of conflict, that is not the purpose. Just as in Genesis 3 the condemnation of Satan has as its direct, primary, immediate purpose rebuke, condemnation for Satan, but has a side purpose that the onlooker or the other person can see blessing for them in that which is a curse for this one, similarly in this case there may be wonderful promise of blessing for someone else involved, but the person or group of persons who are addressed are Ahaz and the other members of the house of David and Ahaz and at least some other members of the house of David are given a very strong rebuke. "Is it a small thing for you to weary men, that you must weary my God also? Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign." It is not, "God wants to bless you. Here is a wonderful sign of blessing." It's rebuke to Ahaz. That is the purpose of it in the situation and very few people seem to realize it. I believe it

## Prophets-39

is perfectly clear. I think the reason that they don't is that they grab a verse out of context and look at the verse without trying to see what is it talking about anyway. What's the purpose of the context? The purpose of Verses 13 and 14 is to bring a rebuke to Ahaz who instead of trusting God trusts in Assyria; who, instead of trying to see what will put him right with God in order that God may find it right to bless him

- - - - -

## Prophets-40

very specifically, indefinitely, yes. Thirteen, 14, 15 and 16 are all of them rebuke, rebuke to Ahaz; 17, also. Seventeen is very clearly rebuke. The Lord is rebuking this man here who instead of getting right before God so that it may be right for God to bless him trusts to human schemes and plans to form his United Nations with Assyria and organizing his wicked plan that leaves God out of account altogether and getting Assyria in at the back door and giving them things that he has no right to give them, to give to a godless nation, giving Assyria lend-lease in order to free his land from Israel and from Syria and God says to him: "Don't do any of this foolishness, trust the Lord." The Lord said, "Israel after sixty-five years will not even be a nation." "Well", Ahaz says, "What foolishness! What do I care what happens sixty-five years from now? I'm interested in right now." He says, "Don't worry. Trust God." And then he says, "If you will not believe surely you shall not be established." And Ahaz ~~thinks~~ "Well now he's got this out of his system. We can pass on." And then the Lord says further, "Ask a sign of the Lord. You're not interested in this. You don't think there is anything to this. You think it 's all foolishness and you want to go on with your man-made schemes of building up your protections to your land and your secret schemes that the people don't know about, about your alliance with Assyria. You want to go on with that," but, he says, "The Lord says, if you won't trust God, if you turn that way, prove the Lord, ask for a sign," and Ahaz doesn't want to get mixed up in anything like this!" <sup>like</sup> / when a man said to me, "I'll pay your way over to Palestine. I'll pay your way over there if you will promise to make a statement when you get there that everything in my book is correct if you find that it is." Well the book is full of junk and I had publicly said so and I knew that if I went over to Palestine and looked at conditions and said that, still said the book was junk he'd say no, that he'd proven it to me, he had shown me there the very place where these things happened. Like the man that said, "Why, I caught this big a fish, and if you don't believe it I'll show you the very ocean I caught it in." Well that would be the type of argument that he would use and I wouldn't get mixed up in that sort of a thing. I wanted to stay clear of it. Well, of course, that's the attitude that Ahaz had toward Isaiah. He didn't want to get mixed up in the thing. He wanted to stay out of it, and it's a



Prophets-40

mighty good attitude for you to take in general towards that that is not right but, on the other hand if there is any chance that it's truly of the Lord don't take that attitude. Then we'll investigate. Now Ahaz took that attitude and so the Lord says, "Ask for a sign, any sign, up in the sky, down in the bottom of the ocean, anything that you want. Ask for a sign." Anything at all! What an offer! "What a chance," Ahaz said, "to waste my time, to get me all mixed up in this foolishness." And then he says, "I won't tempt the Lord. I wouldn't tempt the Lord. I don't want to do anything that would be tempting the Lord. Of course, we'll sign all these decrees. Now we all believe in decrees. We unite in this belief. We all believe it. Now let's forget it and go ahead and improve race relations and settle the international problems and forget all this talk about evangelism." That's Ahaz's attitude and the Lord turns to him and gives him a rebuke. "Hear ye now, O house of David. . . The Lord himself will give you a sign." Yes, Mr.---? Yes, surely. The purpose is to expose the insincerity of Ahaz before the people and to bring to the attention of the people the fact that it is God and not Ahaz who was controlling, and that in spite of Ahaz's schemes and plans the whole thing will come out the way God says. Yes. A sign of the fact that God is able to deliver the nation and not dependent on Ahaz's schemes and plans; that is, if Ahaz believed that God would deliver his nation he wouldn't send, as king himself, as he did a representative clear across the desert to the king of Assyria and say, "You come over here and deliver me and everything I have is in your hands. You can take what you want. He wouldn't do that. If we believed that God would stand on the side of the right and that if we were right and Hitler were wrong, God would bless our efforts and would enable us to defeat him, we wouldn't send millions of dollars worth of lend-lease to a godless nation that had leadership that was standing absolutely opposed to everything that we were standing for and say, "Here, you come from the other side and if you attack them and we attack them together, then we will possibly be able to win." We'd say, "No. We must stand for what is true and right and not get mixed up in such things!" And here Ahaz is secretly getting mixed up in these things and openly he's all excited fixing up the fortifications for protection and urging the people to say, "We can't stand against these attackers if we don't fight to the utmost and build these fortifications, here just as strongly as we



## Prophets-40

can, and Isaiah says, "Trust the Lord." God says He's going to deliver you. You can trust Him," and when Ahaz isn't interested, he says, "Well ask a sign. We'll give you proof of it; just like this fellow said to me, "You think my book is a lot of junk. Well, I'll pay your way over to Palestine and show you for yourself what the situation is," and I felt toward him just like Ahaz did toward Isaiah, only I think I was right.

Mr.---? (Student) Well, he practically told him to ask for anything here. Now God doesn't ordinarily give any man that kind of an opportunity. It's very rare. Christ said, "A wicked and adulterous generation asks for a sign and there will no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonah," and on the otherhand Elijah said, "Come up to Mt. Carmel and we'll see who is God. Let Baal show us he's god or let Jehovah show us He's God, and we'll see." and in that instance God chose to give a sign, and God indicated to the whole nation by the sign He gave that He was God and Baal was nothing. God may choose to give a sign and He may not. It varies in different ages and different situations. Ordinarily, when we've got His Word He wants us to take that, and we've got Christian lives around us, He wants us to see the evidences of His work in the world and not to, He doesn't promise us such things, but He said to Ahaz, "Here, let's investigate this thing. I'm ready to prove it to you. I'm so ready to prove it to you that", the Lord says, "I'm ready to give you opportunity to ask any sign you want of the Lord." I don't know when else in history God has given quite as much of a carte blanche to a man to ask for a sign, as that, but, of course, the Lord knew the end from the beginning and He knew when He gave it that He was calling Ahaz's bluff. He was showing, he was indicating to the people the wrongness of Ahaz's attitude and preparing the way to give a wonderful indication of the fact that God was ruling and that His will would be done.

Mr.---, did you have a question? (Student) Yes. In one of the gospels--maybe more than one, where the people asked Christ for a sign and Christ said, "A wicked and adulterous generation asks for a sign and there shall be no sign given it except the sign of the prophet Jonah." (Student) Well, He said He wouldn't give them any sign. Oh, Jonah had lived seven hundred years before that. How would that be a sign to them? Well, I think--the thing I want to get at is, Is it clear to everybody that the purpose of Isaiah's address right now to Ahaz is rebuke.

Prophets-40

Well, we'll say that Verse 17 is clearly rebuke, isn't it? There's no question that 17 is rebuke. (Student) Yes, that certainly would be a good thing to . Yes. Yes, it would be, but \* Verse 17 is rebuke to Ahaz, Verse 13 is rebuke to Ahaz, the first part of 14 is still very clearly rebuke to Ahaz, the last part of 16 sounds like a mighty good thing, can it still be rebuke? (Student) It can still be rebuke because Ahaz is saying, "We've got to go ahead and fight and work if we are going to defend our nation from these people who are attacking and Isaiah says, "Trust God. Don't depend on the arm of flesh for this. God is going to protect the nation and you don't need to do this; and here's proof of it. God Said, 'Within a very brief time those two kings will both be gone . . . In fifty-five years from now the kingdom of Israel will no longer be a kingdom.' If you don't think that's enough promise from God, well here's a closer one. God says, 'Within this length of time these nations will be gone". It's rebuke to Ahaz for not trusting God, even though it is containing very great relief to the people around to know the kings are gone, but no relief to Ahaz because Ahaz says to himself, "Well yes, I know that. I've sent this money to the Assyrian king across the desert. None of these people know anything about it but I've made this plan. I've sent this money to the Assyrian king. I know that before that time comes the Assyrian king will close in from the rear on these people. He'll be only too glad to come and help them in this situation. He'll close in from the rear and he will attack them and he will destroy them and then the two kings will be gone. I've nothing to fear." But he thinks it's from his own clever planning it's going to be done. Assiah says, "God can protect you and this is going to happen." So that a good thing is going to happen but it can be thought of as still rebuke to Ahaz. Mr.---? (Student) Yes. Of course, that's what all the liberals think. The liberals all say that in this passage here that Ahaz is told that he doesn't need to fear these nations round about because a virgin is going to conceive and bring forth a child. Well now they say that if Ahaz in his life there, in the next year or two sees this child, this wonderful birth, he can say, "There's the sign. Now I can believe God. I can believe that God will protect us." But to tell Ahaz that seven hundred years later Christ is going to be born doesn't give him any assurance of safety against these kings , and it's no help to Ahaz in the situation, and my answer is



Prophets-40

that the verse isn't trying to give Ahaz help. The verse is giving Ahaz rebuke. It is saying, "Ahaz, you are a degenerate of the house of David. Here's David who trusted God but you're trusting Assyria and you are one who is holding the position of a son of David but you are actually a very, very reprobate and member of the house hold holding this high position. Now it will not always be this way. O, house of David that wearies God with having members like Ahaz though very few quite as bad as Ahaz. God is going to give you a sign. He's going to put His own son on as a son of David, head of the house of David, taking the place of Ahaz, a righteous one, born of a virgin, one who will represent God with us, not like Ahaz does, look <sup>these</sup> to/human schemes, but He will be a true representative of God, as a scion of the house of David. Do you see what I mean? (Student) Yes. That's right. But it's still rebuke. Yes. It is rebuke to Ahaz, and of course if Ahaz will accept the rebuke and be saved, of course that will be fine and we'd all rejoice in it, but it is rebuke. The purpose of the context is rebuke; the purpose of the verse is leading up to his rebuke. This is a rebuke to Ahaz but just as when God rebuked Satan and said that the seed of the woman was to bruise his head, the woman can take it as for her a blessing and a blessing to mankind that the serpent is to be wrecked; similarly the world at large and the onlookers can take it as a blessing and even Ahaz can if he will become one of the people of God, that the house of David is going to have a representative who truly represents God with us, instead of representing human schemes and with wicked countries against God's plan. Mr.----?

- - - - -

Prophets -41

(Student) Well, as far as Ahaz is concerned the idea of it is to rebuke him for his present godless attitude and to show him that the attitude which he should have is one of trusting in the God who is able to deliver and in the terrible distrust that the House of David falls in to such a point as to have a man like this as its leader there comes the opportunity the point out the promise of rescue and salvation to the whole world but we are not dependent on the individual ones that come in the House of David whether they happen to be good men or bad men, but that God is going to bring One who is the real Son of David, the climax of the whole line of David, the One who <sup>truly</sup> represents God with Us. (Student) Yes. The Hebrew word is "a picture". A participle in Hebrew may be in past, present or future time. It presents a picture of that which occurs in that time. There is no clear indication of what the time is. A virgin is pregnant. That is what it literally means, and there is no "is" in it. It is a participle, and you find the participle used that way in past time, present time or future time. It presents pictures. You have to tell from your context what the time is to be. (Student) You can take it as a perfect or as a participle, and it is usually taken as a participle. If you take it as the perfect, "a virgin has conceived", that again, could refer to any time, something that had been done in the past, that now has been done, or that will have been done in the future, but the participle is the way that the word is used. Mr.--? (Student) It's very near whatever time this word refers to, but that can only be gathered from the context. You cannot infer it from the--as you know, in Hebrew the verbs don't so much show time as the state and the general relationship, and the imperfect may be as the past time, present or future. The same with the perfect and the same with the participle, but particularly so with the participle. The verb does not indicate when it is. Now, of course, you could interpret it that a woman was pregnant many years ago. You could interpret it that one is now. You could say, "This is a situation which is going to develop at some time in the future." There are those who say, "This refers to Isaiah's wife and refers to the child born in the next chapter." There are others who say, "This is Ahaz's wife and refers to Hezekiah, the son who was born." There

are those who say it is an unknown person, but Matthew differs from all of them. Matthew says this refers to the Lord Jesus Christ, and was a prediction of his birth. (Student) There is a later passage which brings that idea out, yes, but as far as this verse here is concerned, Verse 14, it is rebuke to Ahaz that God is going to provide a true son of the House of David. God is going to provide the One who is going to be what Ahaz ought to be, who is going to have an attitude that truly represents the fulfillment of God's promise of the presence of God with His people. God is going to provide a true king. If it is not that it is pretty hard to see how it could have any relation to Christ whatever. If you find a statement in the Bible somewhere supposing that God said to Abraham, "Abraham, you are going to have a child." Well, now, can you take that verse as proving that Christ is going to be born? It was said to Abraham, it was talking about Abraham, it was fulfilled in Abraham's child. There's no reason in the world to refer it to Christ. If you find a statement made down here in this, in Verse 16, "the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings," and here are the people of Czechoslovakia who today are being pillaged and murdered by the representatives of the brutal leaders of the Bolshevik tyranny, and supposing that somebody were to say to the Czechs, "Don't you worry, in a very short time Stalin and Molotov will both be dead. Here's the verse the Scripture that the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings." You'd say, "No, that has nothing to do with that. It is not referring to that. It is referring to something else." I mean there is a great danger of Biblical interpretation to grab a verse anywhere and apply it to anything you want, and we have interpret verses in context, and in the context, correctly understood I believe it refers to Christ. Now if in the context correctly understood it refers to something in the time of Ahaz, then I think you have absolutely no warrant whatever for referring it to Christ and in that case the liberals are right when they say "Matthew just grabbed a verse out of the Old Testament and applied it to Christ with no warrant whatever." Anything that they thought sounded like something in the time of Christ, they says, "This is a prophecy about Christ." Well if they did that, somebody else might as well take other verses out and get an



entirely different viewpoint, unless they've interpreted verses correctly in the light of context to mean that which they do mean in the light of context. Now, for instance, I was asking my wife this morning. She read about how Samson went down and he took a wife out of the Philistines. I said, "Was that a type of Christ?" She was rather shocked, at the idea. "Well," I said, "Samson took a gentile wife. I've heard people say that when Joseph took a Gentile wife it was a type of Christ. Because Joseph took a Gentile wife, what right do you have to say that about Joseph any more than about Samson? I mean if every time anybody takes a Gentile wife it is a type of Christ, because the church is the bride of Christ, why you can just prove anything by anything in the Bible and what's the good of having a Bible, if it doesn't mean any more than that? Mr.---? (Student) Yes. Well, it means one thing or the other, that is, it might cover a space of time, that could easily be. Somebody could say, when Columbus discovered America, somebody could say, "From that land will come armies which will overrun Europe", and you could say, "Yes, the American army went over there in 1918 and again in 1943, and it might do it again in 1950 and again in 1980." That statement might be fulfilled dozens and dozens of times, but if he had said, "From that land will come an army which will overrun Europe, then in 1918 you'd say, "An army came and overran part of France, the prophecy is fulfilled." Someone else would say, "No, that's not enough. The prophecy is a much larger thing than that. I think there is going to be a greater invasion." Somebody would say, "Well, now, there was an army that came over in 1944 and that army overran France and Germany, I think that's the fulfillment of the prediction." Someone else would say, "No, I don't believe that, because they didn't even enter the Balkans. Maybe the prophecy still awaits fulfillment." That would be a reasonable thing for us to consider, "Is it fulfilled yet or does it await fulfillment?" But if it predicts one thing it means one thing and if it predicts a series of things it means a series, but the same prediction doesn't indicate both the birth of Columbus and the founding of the General Electric Company. It indicates one or the other. Do you see what I mean? I mean you can't have two distinct types of thing predicted in one statement. That doesn't make sense. Yes? (Student) No.

Prophets - 41

It predicts one thing or the other. (Student) Yes. (Student) Well, why wouldn't it mean a great deal to Isaiah and to Ahaz? Why wouldn't it mean a great deal to Ahaz? Ahaz was the descendant of David. David had been given promises that God would always have a son to sit on the throne of David there. Ahaz had passed down to him all the tradition of what the true sons of David had done in the past, how Asa and Jehoshaphat had stood true to God, and the great things Solomon had done, and the great things that David had done, and here is Ahaz who is supposed to be carrying these things on and instead of that he's trusting to his own human schemes and utterly ignoring the word of God, and God says, "Oh, House of David," he says, "This condition won't continue forever. God is going to put a man in as Son of David the Head of the House of David, who will be an altogether different stamp from this fellow who is here now. He won't be like this Ahaz, O House of David. This fellow Ahaz is going to be replaced at that time by one who will be an utterly different type, who will truly represent God (Student) Tremendous (Student) It is not addressed to Ahaz. It's addressed to the House of David. (Student) Well, why should it? (Student) Yes. Well, why should it mean anything to Ahaz? Why should it mean something to Ahaz? (Student) No. It's a verse to show the House of David that this wicked Ahaz is not going to continue forever as the typical head of the House of David, that the House of David is going to have a representative who will truly represent God. It seems to me that would mean a tremendous lot to Ahaz, and I don't know of any other thing which it can mean to Ahaz which we find anything in the history or in the book of Isaiah to back up. I mean I'd be interested in any suggestion but so many commentators have made suggestions. It's Hezekiah, the son of Ahaz. It's the son of the prophet. It's all kinds of things, none of which make any sense in the context whatever. I hold that it is a prophecy of Christ, only a prophecy of Christ, has no possible reference to anything else, and I don't see any other suggestion that <sup>it</sup> can have reference to. That is, if you don't think the meaning I have given of it as having meaning for Ahaz shows anything, I don't know of any other meaning which would show half as much as that for Ahaz. (Student) In this particular verse? (Student) Yes. You have to have either a connection or

a transition, one or the other. That's right. Mr.—? (Student) I don't think you could. (Student) I would think so. (Student) I don't think you need to take Matthew at all. I think in the light of the context, I don't think it has any reference to anything in the time then. (Student) That, of course, is a question which might be in this connection. I wanted to take it up as a separate problem. The word used here--the Septuagint translators translated it "virgin". They understood it as something rather miraculous, but as to whether the word necessarily proves that, that is a study that we . Well, I wish we had another hour right now because there is a great deal in this chapter. At the same time, I think perhaps it is worth going slowly because I think these different steps are rather vital, but I feel that to say that this points to something in Ahaz' time and something in the future, this verse 14, is utterly unwarranted. It's one thing or the other. That, I feel, is extremely right. I think it is either Christ or something in Ahaz' time and I know of nothing in Ahaz' time which it might be. Well, we'll continue then next Tuesday afternoon and we will be able then to get time enough to really get somewhere, I hope. Continue on with your review then.

Prophets - 42

We were speaking last time still about Isaiah 7. I hope we can run through Isaiah 7 and get over it so as to get on to other material which is also extremely interesting. At the same time I am anxious that all the principles involved be clear. I don't mean that I am anxious that you accept all the principles involved or agree with me in the interpretation of it. I am extremely anxious that you understand what I mean, that you see on what basis I place my interpretation of it. If you think the evidence is complete and sufficient I hope you will accept it; if you do not think it is, I hope you will not accept it, but place it on the shelf as a matter for further investigation. There's no need of simply repeating over and over various misgivings. Put the misgivings on the shelf beside it and hold it there for further investigation and for observing other matters that enter in in relation to it as we go on. Mr.—, you have a question? I would say there are many passages which have perhaps a dozen fulfillments, exactly as if you were to say, "Next



year for your morning classes you will come up to this building." Now, that would be fulfilled perhaps, let's see, perhaps a hundred and fifty times in the course of the year, every morning when you came there would be a fulfillment, but the fulfillment would end when the year was over, because it said, "Next year". If you had said, "During your seminary course," there would be four hundred and fifty fulfillments and it would end when the course was over. If you said, "That lad is going to make several visits to President Truman at the White House," it would have several fulfillments depending on each of those visits, but now if I were to make a statement, "Mr. Pote here is going to slap President Truman on the back," if I merely made that statement and you saw Mr. Pote slap President Truman on the back you would say, "It is fulfilled". You would have no right to say, "No, that's not the fulfillment. He'll have to do it twice to be fulfilled, or three times." If I made as a specific statement something to happen once, once it happened you would say it was fulfilled. Now, if I said, "One of the students here is going to slap President Truman on the back," and if you saw Mr. Pote go up to him and slap him on the wrist, you'd say, "We misunderstood him; when he said 'back' he really meant 'wrist'. It's fulfilled," but someone else would say, "No, I don't believe it. He didn't say which student. Probably Mr. Riffel will give him a resounding whack on the back one of these days and we must say that it is not fulfilled." Now if Mr. Riffel did so, you would then say, "That's the fulfillment and what Mr. Pope did had nothing to do with it." One or the other would be the fulfillment. Do you see what I mean? It all depends on the nature of the statement. If you state something which covers a series of events then it takes a number of fulfillments to make up the fulfillment of the statement. If you state something which is a specific occurrence, then that specific occurrence is fulfilled once. We find in Leviticus that the Israelites are told, "When you disobey God He will send you into captivity and then if, in your captivity, you turn to God and ask for help and turn away from your sin, He will bring you back and release you from it." Then we find

in Judges that is fulfilled, maybe a dozen times in Judges, and it has been fulfilled other times later. There was a principle given, a principle that recurs over and over with different details, but the same thing occurs on various occasions. It is given as a principle, rather than as a specific event. When Moses said--the people wondered, "What will we do when Moses is dead. How'll we know God's truth?" Moses said, "The Lord will send a prophet like unto me. Him shall you hear. Moses meant, "After I'm dead, why look around for another prophet like me, and after he is dead, look for another one." There is a series of prophets. That has perhaps fifty fulfillments and it reaches its great climactic fulfillment in the one prophet who really was like Moses, because all the rest were inferior to Moses. They were like him in that regard, that they were true spokesmen of God, but this one was superior to them, because He knew God face to face, because He was God, and so there you have a prediction of a series. Now we have to decide in each case, "What is the nature of the thing that is given?" A series of events, if it is a principle that recurs, then of course you look for various fulfillments, but if it is a prediction of a specific event, then you look for a fulfillment of it. When God said to the Israelites, "You are sinning against God and God is going to send you into exile, into Babylon," they went to Babylon, and that was fulfilled, and today no one has any right to take that as a prediction, about the Israelites. You can take it today as showing a principle that God will fulfill, and you can say to America, "If America does not turn back to God, God will bring terrible punishment and misery on this nation." You can't say it because God predicts it. It doesn't--not in any verse I know of, at least, but you can say it because the Bible points out principles of God's dealings which are applicable under certain circumstances. Now, if God says that a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth, and thou shalt call <sup>there</sup> his name Immanuel, ~~were~~ some in the early days of the church who said, perhaps not the earliest days, but fairly early days, who said, "We look for four senses

Prophets - 42

in everything. We look first for the natural, physical, direct sense. There's the historical fact--Jesus Christ was born of a virgin. That's the specific fact, but now," they said, "we look also for an ethical fulfillment of this verse. This verse means that before any great, good thing comes into life there's apt to be sorrow and effort in bringing it. That is the teaching; that's the ethical teaching. And then they said, "We look for the allegorical teaching. Well," they said, "that's the church struggling to bring a new order into existence. That's the allegorical meaning of it, and thus they felt that you could find three or four different in every passage. We protestants reject that sort of interpretation. We say, "It means one thing or the other." It is a prediction of the birth of Christ, or it is a prediction of a new order brought into existence by the church, or it is a prediction of a great principle coming into existence, or it is a prediction of a son born to Hezekiah, but it is not a prediction of all of these things. It is one of them and only one. There is no warrant for taking one statement and applying to diverse and unrelated things or subjects, in the Scripture. I mean that is our general attitude toward the Scriptures. Well, now many people desert that attitude when they get into the prophetic books. The attitude is sort of as if you threw up your hands and said, "This material is too hard for me to understand, therefore I'll simply take the verse and look for something which might be in some way related to it, where I can breed these ideas and thing of something that will give me a blessing. Well, you can do that with Mother Goose rhymes if you<sup>want</sup>/to, of course. You can do it with most anything, but that is not handling the Word of God as God's source of knowledge for us. We should go to it and say, "What does it teach; what does it contain; what sort of thing is given here?" and get our answer and that may be hard. It may involve difficult study, it may in many cases involve reserving judgment on verses or on chapters for long periods while we wait for evidences to come from other sources of Scripture that make them clear, but as you say, I would not say that nothing in Scripture has a double fulfillment. Many a statement had



Prophets -42

fifty fulfillments, but when I use double fulfillment in the sense which I utterly reject, I mean two fulfillments of one specific prediction, or two fulfillments diverse in nature involving unrelated types of interpretation. In such instances there is one type or the other which is to be used in the particular thing. If they say that the lion of the tribe of Judah is going to overrun the land of Assyria, that may mean the lion of the tribe of Judah is a figurative representation of the people, or it may mean an actual wilderness lion coming out of Judah, but it doesn't mean both. It's one or the other.

Mr.---? (Student) Well now Joel, we could take up the week of Joel and spend a week on it and get much of value from it, but it is—I don't think there is any question we could take on Joel unless we took a week on it, for this reason, that the book of Joel is a closely integrated book with very definite teaching and I think quite easy to understand, but I don't think that in a minute or two it could be discussed, particularly for people here who didn't have my somewhat brief discussion of it last year, in Minor Prophets. Yes? (Student)

It depends on the type of the prophecy. (Student) It depends on exact examination of the verse and seeing what it says. If I were to make the statement in the time of Columbus that on this land there is going to be a great and powerful nation which will exert world-wide influence, the world-wide influence might be exerted in the Spanish American war, it might be exerted when Roosevelt went to Yalta and divided the world up with Stalin, it might be exerted in something that would be done now. It might be any one of various things. It's a general statement, but if I said, "There is a land which will have a ruler who will be a true man," well, that would be a description of one particular ruler. If I said, "That land will have rulers who will be true men," that would be description of many. You have to find exactly what is contained in it. If I say, "On that land a great deal of rain will fall," the rain might all fall in one day or it might be spread over ten years, or it might fall, half of it this year and half of it three years from now, so the particular prediction we refer

to is one of the types which we would have to study very carefully before drawing a conclusion. You can't simply use it as a source for a rule. It is a thing to be studied in itself to see what the type is. (Student) I would say it depends entirely on the nature of the prediction, but I would say that if there are a dozen fulfillments or if there is one fulfillment, or what it is, they must be similar in type. If it describes a series, it must be a similar series. (Student) Yes, because it would be clearly stated that in the prediction then, /there were two men . If you would say, "There will be two men who will do great work, there will be /fulfillments, because there are two men mentioned, but if I would say, "When you come to this class you will see a man there with his left hand stuck into the edge of his belt," why, you look and see that Mr. Heaney's exactly that way, the prediction is fulfilled. Somebody says, "Yes, but Mr. Bennet is doing the same thing. I can't see ", but I mean that has nothing whatever to do with the case. If I said, "You will see one," that would be it. If I said, "In this class today there will be two men with bright yellow neckties," will that would be double fulfillment. It takes two to fulfill it. But if I said, "You will find students in that class who will be half asleep," well that would be a plural thing. It would take more than one to fulfill it, but it might be two or it might be ten, or it might be the whole class. You couldn't tell from the statement, could you? The idea of double fulfillment is the means of escape from thinking, on the part of both liberals and conservatives who, instead of getting down to careful study on a prediction to see what it really means simply say, "Oh, it looks like this. It's that. It looks like this, it's that." These are two unrelated things, each of which is a fulfillment. I say, "Study it and see which is the fulfillment." If it is a specific prediction, it is one or the other, unless there is a series of related things, which sometimes doesn't take a plural form but shows that it is a succession of events. That you have to study out from the nature of the particular case. Mr.---? (Student)

This prediction here is given to Ahaz in order to assure Ahaz that God is going to protect the nation and to deliver the nation. What

comfort would Ahaz get out of the fact Christ is going to be born seven hundred years from now? And therefore they say Matthew was simply drawing a theological inference that had nothing to do with it; actually it refers to someone born in this time and then they begin trying to guess who the person might be and they don't find anybody that fits the conditions and so they say, "It must be somebody we don't know anything about." Well, that is your modernist attitude toward this verse, which denies that seven hundred years from then is any comfort to Ahaz. Well, the answer to that is that in the first place it says nothing in the verse about its being a comfort to Ahaz. It gives a fact which is something which will happen. And in the second place the verse before makes it very clear that it is not a comfort to Ahaz at all, but a rebuke to Ahaz that is being given. He is being rebuked by being assured that God will bring His own Son into the world, a true Son of David, instead of this sort of a degenerate, false son of David, such as Ahaz was, a son of David only in the flesh and in no other way. There is no theory here. There is a thought, but no theory. There's no condition which whenever it is met a certain result comes. There is nothing of that kind, and it is no comfort to Ahaz suggested. There is sharp rebuke to him but no comfort. (Student)

- - - - -

(Student) Well that is an English word--sign. You want to look and see what the Hebrew word is here and trace that Hebrew word through all its uses and see if you find a definition of it which fits all of the cases where it is used, and then you will have something worthy of drawing a conclusion from in that relation. Now this particular word, "Oh" is used several hundred times in the Old Testament. (Student) Well sign is simply our English means of representing it. There is a question, what I've gone into that rather thoroughly and I don't think we will find any help from it in this particular section, but if you do hunt through it and find something I'd be very interested in finding it, and tell you but



I think for our present purpose that it is worth while for us to look on now. We have seen that 7:14 rebukes Ahaz and tells Ahaz that God is going to give him, is going to show God's own will in the matter. Ahaz is wearying men and wearying God. The House of David is wearying men and wearying God. Well, God is going to give a true scion of the House of David, a true representative who will be born of a virgin and who will be truly Immanuel, who will represent the fact of God's presence with His people. Ahaz thinks these are his people whom he can use as pawns in the international game of chess in order to accomplish the things that he enjoys in working out his deals with the king of Assyria and all that, but God is going to show that these are God's people and God's Son will be Immanuel, God with us, and Ahaz' idea of it is entirely false, and so we jump on to verse 16 now.

In Verse 14 we have a clearly, we can clearly type it down. It is the virgin birth of Christ here described. Matthew says that the virgin birth of Christ is a fulfillment of Verse 14. There is nothing else anywhere else in the Scripture which can possibly be related to Verse 16 and said to be a fulfillment of it. Some say it is Hezekiah. Hezekiah was born before this time. Some say it was son of the prophet. Certainly the son of the prophet would not fit into this particular category here. He wouldn't be a sign to Ahaz of this type and besides, the sons of Isaiah had different names with different meanings altogether from this. There is nobody known to us to fulfill it except Christ and Christ fulfills it perfectly. So we can put a peg down and say, "Verse 14 describes Christ". Now what does Verse 16 talk about? (Student) Yes. We'll look this problem squarely in the face and then we'll pass it by. Well, now, we're going in this case to do what I think is the proper thing to do in the study of any subject. Pick out that which is clear and explained, and then in the light of what is clear, look again at what is obscure. In any chapter, in any book, in any subject, go over it as fast as you can and see what <sup>is</sup> absolutely clear and definite and stand on that, and then look at the things that aren't clear, explain them in the light of what is clear. If you

that it is inexplicable in that light, then it may be that you have in the light of them to go back and revise some that you thought were clear and explain them in another way, but stand on what is clear. Don't just take the didactic courses of the New Testament. Take any part of the Bible that is clear and stand on it and then that will lead you on into other things, until you get them so you understand them. Well, now we have Verse 14, then--a prediction of the birth of Christ. It fits perfectly into the context, is the rebuke to Aha<sub>z</sub> that is needed in the situation, fits exactly into the requirements of the situation, and Matthew tells us that that is the fulfillment of this verse. Now then, we have the fulfillment of this. We go on to Verse 16.

Verse 16, you look at. You find a fact given. You think, "What can be the bearing of this fact? What can it have to do with the purpose of the prophet here? What does Verse 16 say?" It is talking about some child, and it says, "Before this child will know to refuse the evil and choose the good", before this child has received the Ph. D. in the field of ethics. Surely that is not what it means. Before this child knows enough to reach for the warm milk instead of reaching out and putting its hand on the hot stove, before it knows enough to make simple judgments of what is good and what is bad. I think that word "evil" is a very unfortunate translation there. Of course, it's old English. It was perfectly all right three hundred years ago. God said for the wickedness of this people, "I will bring great evil upon their land." That doesn't mean God is the author of evil. It means God is going to bring misery and destruction. The word "evil" in old English simply means something that is bad. Of course, it isn't particularly important to us what the old English says. The question is, "What does the original say?" The original has the word " " , which is used where Pharaoh saw good cows, very fine cows came out, and then he saw very wicked cows, very morally degenerate cows. Of course not at all. They were evil cows in the sense that they were cows that were thin and unattractive and not much good for meat or for milk. Jeremiah came out and he got two baskets of figs and one basket was good luscious figs.

You just felt like eating them, and the other, the old English says the other basket had naughty figs in it, the good old English word "naughty" figs, and it's this same word " " and it means figs that were not good to eat. They were bad figs but not in a moral or ethical sense. The Bible doesn't teach ethics about figs. It teaches that they were bad figs, they were figs which were decayed and so on. They were not healthful, useful. In other words the Hebrew word " " is physical evil rather than moral evil, and if you question that you will find a footnote in the Scofield Bible that states the fact. I forget what page it is in, or if that is not sufficient evidence you can look at the Hebrew concordance and trace it through and you will find that it means physical evil, not moral evil. Well, now in this case here, then, before the child knows to refuse that which is bad, to make simple choices between something helpful and something harmful, and to choose the good, before that simple effect is reached, before the child has reached a comparatively young age, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings. Well, Ahaz said up above, he said, "What's the difference? If Israel in sixty-five years is no longer a people. Long before that time they can have utterly wrecked us." Now there is a new measure given. Before the land, a child shall reach this particular age--let's say the age of five, if you want to, I don't know just what age it would<sup>be</sup>, perhaps three would be better. Somebody who has raised some children will have better judgment on that than I do, but before a child reaches an age of ability to make simple choices between that which is helpful and that which is harmful, all of these kings who are now such a menace will be gone, within this brief period of time. Now does that mean before Christ reaches the age of four, both King Rezin of Damascus and King Pekah of Israel will be dead? In less than seven hundred and four years after Isaiah speaks that will happen. That wouldn't be any help in the situation whatever. It would have absolutely no meaning. The purpose of the verse is to tell the people there that God is on the throne and God has determined to rescue the people from the attack of these two kings. He has



already said not to fear, He's already said that His purposes are against those two kings. Now He makes this even more definite saying that within this very short time both kings will be gone. It is a specific prediction about an event to happen in the near future. Now is it very important in connection with that who the particular child is who is meant here in this verse? In this verse there is a measure of time given. We don't know when this child is coming. Nobody knows it will be seven hundred years from now, nobody knows whether it will be fifty years from now, nobody knows whether it is today. Supposing that this virgin has already conceived. Supposing that this child will be born within the next few months. Before that child reaches this age both of these kings will be gone. Here is an assurance to the people <sup>there</sup> that/they can trust God and a rebuke to Ahaz for his wicked plans in making an alliance with that wicked power of Assyria, that wicked aggressor that is just seeking an excuse to destroy everything that gets in his way, and bringing them in to this by giving the invitation to come and deliver him from the two kings. It is a rebuke to Ahaz and it is a promise of blessing to the true people of God and to all of them it is an assurance that God is <sup>on</sup> His throne and is performing His will and His purpose. So we have a good, definite purpose in the situation, Verse 16, and it is an immediate purpose, and we have a definite purpose of this rebuke to Ahaz in Verse 14 and it is a description of the birth of Christ seven hundred years from now. Now the question is, where is the transition between these two ideas. We have one idea definitely in 14 and we have another idea in 16. We can put a peg on each of them. Where is the transition between the two? Where does Verse 15 go? Does it belong with Verse 14 or does it belong with Verse 16? Well that, of course, is not an extremely vital question any more than the first half of our verse in Genesis is about the enmity. It is not extremely vital but I think it is quite clear when we look at the evidence, bearing on it, but the vital thing is that we have Verse 14, which I have depicted here, in the time of Christ; we have

Verse 16 which I've depicted in the time of Isaiah, and there is absolutely no way you can take Verse 15 and apply it to the time of Christ and get any sense out of it at all, because it is, there is no reason why to say, "Before Christ is four years old both these kings will be gone." Before Christ is born they will be gone, and six hundred and ninety-eight years earlier than that they will be gone. It has nothing to do with Christ, and the other one is a definite specific prediction of Christ and has nothing to do with anything at the time of Ahaz and the only way you can get anything there is to say / we'll imagine there is something there which is not mentioned anywhere in the Scripture. There is nothing mentioned in the Scripture that has anything whatever to do with it. Mr. ---? (Student) Exactly. (Student) Yes. That's right. Verse 16 is a specific statement of the immediate time, but Verse 14 has no relation to anything except to Christ. It could have no particular relevancy to the immediate situation because there is no individual born at that time who is in any way similar to the description in Verse 14, and there is nothing connected with the life of Christ, no detail of it which has anything to do with Verse 16. We have two distinct things here given and the only way you could get any double fulfillment of it is to imagine two others that are found nowhere in Scripture or in history and to put them in in order to make a completedouble. We have two specific things given and there must be a complete transition between them, and you have the problem of trying to decide "just how is the transition, what is the reasonableness of it?" Now it seems to me that it can be considered as very reasonable on the assumption that first you are giving the facts of the coming of the true Son of the House of David, the one who is truly Immanuel, but that then you are going on using the life of a child simply as a measuring stick and saying, "Now supposing that this child were to be born right now, that that is the imagination, if he were born right now, then certain results would follow." You are now not dealing with him as a person but merely with a life as a measurement, merely indicating a lengthy of time and so you have a transition somewhere between

Prophets - 43

Verse 14 and Verse 16, between the finished fact predicted which nobody knew then when it would be fulfilled, and the specific measure of time lifted which begins immediately, regardless of whether there is any child born then or not. Imagine a child born now and before he would reach age certain things would happen. Now, we turn to Verse 15. What does 15 mean? Well, in the first place the translation is not particularly good. "Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good." "That he may know." If you want to know how to do what is right and to avoid that that would be injurious, eat lots of butter and lots of honey. That verse would make a wonderful advertisement for a dairy, wouldn't it? But I don't think that that is the purpose of the verse, and the Hebrew, as a matter of fact, as you know, says, "Butter and honey shall he eat in his knowing to refuse the evil and choose the good."

- - - - -  
Prophets - 44

and that phrase in Hebrew, "in his knowing" while it might have a purpose of meaning "in order that he may know" would not be the usual way of expressing a purpose. That would be more apt to say, "In order that he may know," or "for his knowing". This is "in his knowing". It relates to his knowing.

"The to know" would be the usual purpose,

but it would not be the usual way of expressing the purpose. Usually you have  
Now the usual expression of time is . is a little exceptional  
for time but it is not at all impossible for time. That is both are possible renderings. "Butter and honey shall he eat" in relation to his knowing. Is it a purpose or is it the time when it occurs. Now the Revised Version, it's interesting, gives several different possibilities. You'll notice in there in the footnote in Verse 7 here that, Chapter 7, (thank you) Verse ~~14~~ 15, it says "when he knoweth", and then the footnote under that says, "Or that he may know or till he know". You notice they give you three possibilities. "That he may know", "till he know", ("to his knowing" which would be more apt to be and yet would be possible for) or "when he knoweth" they put up in the text, in



the Revised Version. Now you have a pretty wide possibility then of interpretation as to the relationship between his knowing this and what he eats. I don't think the "till" is the correct, in view of the general context. I don't think it is "till". I certainly don't think it is purpose. I think that it refers to the time when he does this. I think the, at the time of his gives the better sense in the context but the other two would also be possible. But if you want to know what this means, to eat butter and honey, what does it mean? What is the best way to find out? (Student) Yes. Very good. Read the rest of the chapter. A very good rule. When you want to know what anything means, compare Scripture with Scripture and see if there is elsewhere in the Scripture that which throws light upon the thing that is bothering you, and so in this case, I asked you the other day in a little written lesson first of all to explain what is meant by Verse 22, "And it shall come to pass, for the abundance of milk that they shall give he shall eat butter: for butter and honey shall everyone eat that is left in the land." There's great prosperity ahead. Is that what it means? It is not an indication of great prosperity, but it is an indication of depopulation. You read the verses before and after and you find that it describes a time when so many of the people are gone that there aren't enough left to work the crops, and so in Verse 25, And on all hills that ordinarily are digged with a mattock, you can't even get into them because of the briars and thorns. All they could use them for was to send out oxen and lesser cattle, sheep and goats. There aren't the people to cultivate them. There aren't the people to grow the products of the soil, so all you can do is to let most of the land run wild and you have plenty of pasture land and for the few people that are left in the land you'll find that there is plenty of the product of the cattle and of the sheep and the goats for them because there are so few people and there is so much land that is just lying idle, not good for anything except to let animals run on, and so the--Verse 22 tells us that everyone that is left in the land will have plenty of the products of the cow and of the bee because there is no use for the land except for cows

and bees. There aren't enough people to cultivate it. That is clearly taught in these latter verses of the chapter, and so the result is that they eat these products of butter and the honey that you can just go out and get from the animals that you don't have to cultivate with careful cultivation of the soil, and so very clearly that is what this verse also means. At the time when the child has reached this age, at that time you will find that the people will be predominantly eating in the land, not the products of long, careful cultivation of the soil, which would require a lot of man power, but the products that come from the animals which have lots of land, and don't require so much cultivation. It is a picture of depopulation, and of course, we know that that is what happened. We know that the Assyrian king came. We know that he overran the land of Israel, that he took away thousands of them into captivity. He left the land desolate, so desolate that the lions which had been out in the wilderness began to come right in to the cities and cause devastation, because there weren't enough people out around working and toiling to keep the wild life down, and that, of course, is just north of Jerusalem, a very few miles north, and we know that not so long after that of course there was Sennacherib's attack in the time of Hezekiah when all of Judah was overrun and in the land of Judah only Jerusalem remained and the rest of the three years there could be no cultivation done. They just had to pick that which grew of itself, and so this "Butter and honey shall he eat" is not a picture of the simple life of our Lord as some commentators have said, but it is a picture of the condition of depopulation which is coming into the land as a result of that which Ahaz has done. Ahaz has invited the King of Assyria to come. The king of Assyria is going to overrun the land. You're going to have this misery. Well, now of course Ahaz, as he hears this, "Before a child shall reach this age, if a child were to be born right within the next few months, before it would reach a comparatively youthful age, both these kings will be gone," and Ahaz says to himself, "Well, let the old prophet rave," he says, "Let him talk on just so

Prophets - 44

he'll quit soon and let me get on with my defense inspection here. I want to keep the morale of the people up so they will fight valiantly to hold back those people until the Assyrian king comes. I know he is coming, but the people don't know it. I haven't told the people about it, but that is the plan I am working for deliverance and that will deliver us and I know that within a few years our land will be perfectly safe from this invasion and this attack. I know it. The people don't know it. Well, this prediction the prophet makes fits in with it. It's going to be true because I'm working it that way. That's perfectly all right." But then the next verse brings him an awful shock. Verse 17. "The Lord shall bring upon thee, and upon thy people, and upon thy father's house, days that have not come, from the day that Ephraim departed from Judah; even the king of Assyria." And Ahaz gives a start. He says, "What on earth does this old fool know about the King of Assyria? How does he bring him in? What makes him think that he is going to enter in to the situation? Has he in some way--has somebody tipped him off that I have sent word to the King of Assyria that I will pay him tribute if only he will come and deliver me from Israel and Judah? Ahaz is beginning to feel more interested. The prophet has got information that he didn't think that this prophet could possibly have, and the prophet is predicting that Ahaz' clever scheme is going to backfire. It's exactly as if someone were to have said to Roosevelt a few years ago when he went to Yalta and divided up the world with Stalin and they didn't tell any of us what he'd done, but we were all supposed to stand back of him, to stand by to secret agreements that he made there with Stalin, somebody had said, "A few years from now you will find that America will not longer be worried about Hitler or about the Emperor of Japan, but that Stalin will be the one that you will fear," and according to Secretary Stimson, I understand in the last few months of his life Roosevelt was greatly perturbed because he saw the tremendous cataclysm that he had brought upon the nation by his foolishness in thinking he could kid Stalin along into being democratic by giving him everything he wanted, and so the



situation, I think, is exactly parallel. Ahaz had his clever scheme of bringing in the King of Assyria to rescue them from these two lands, Isaiah says, "In order to save yourself from the wind you're reaping the whirl. You're getting rid of the immediate thing and bringing in something far worse. You had two bumper states between you and Assyria. You were fairly safe from Assyria because they had to go through these two countries first. Now they're out of the way." It's like England. Never had anything to fear from Russia for many centuries because there was the big power of Germany in between and for centuries they never had anything to fear from Russia. Now Germany is reduced to utter weakness and Russia could walk across it in three days, at any time, and the British are shivering in their boots as a result of the present situation which is facing them. They had good strong bumper states in between. All they had to do was to keep those bumper states fairly friendly and they didn't have to fear the tremendous power that was in back of them, and now they're gone. There's nothing now to stop the army of Russia, of the godless forces of Stalin. And so that's what came to Judah. Israel gone, Syria gone. You've got a far greater power, a far worse power, a far more brutal power, a far more aggressive power, one with which you had no business having any dealings whatever, and so the prophet is rebuking Ahaz for the work which Ahaz has done but has probably not yet announced at all, so the prophet goes on and points out what is going to happen. It will come to pass in that day, in this day that is just shortly ahead of us, the Lord will hiss for the fly that is in the uttermost part of the rivers of Egypt, and for the bee in the land of Assyria. They're going to come from all directions and they are going to rest in the desolate valleys and the holes in the rocks and upon all the thorns and bushes, and in that day will the Lord shave with a razor that is hired--what's a razor that is hired? Well to shave with a razor is of course a figure. He doesn't mean that God is going to take an actual razor and shave off the beard of kingship off of Ahaz's face. You could take it figuratively that way, that is, you

could take it as a literal thing representing a figurative meaning, but that is not what is meant here. He goes right on and explains the figure; namely by them beyond the river, the king of Assyria. The king of Assyria is the razor and he is the razor that is hired, he has been told by Ahaz, "You come and do this and I will give you all this tribute." He has hired him to do it, but, as Roosevelt said to Stalin, "You enter the war against Japan and we will give you the northern half of Korea and Manchuria and most anything else you want," and after we had won the war Russia entered in and took the weapons away from them and gave them to the Chinese consul, and that is exactly what we have here in Isaiah. You notice I am not saying any of this is a prediction of events today. I'm merely saying that the situation is parallel and the principle applies, but the specific situation described in Verse 20 is the king of Assyria, and nothing else. It has no specific relevance to anything today, except as we find it an example and illustration of God's methods of dealing. and consequently you have here this specific prediction of something that happened then, the king of Assyria came and he shaved<sup>off</sup> the head and the hair of the feet and consumed the beard. In other words, he's going to get mighty close. It's going to do damage mighty near, and of course the Northern kingdom went into exile and the southern kingdom was soon reduced to large parts of it being overrun by the king of Assyria - and so it will come to pass in that day that a man shall nourish a young cow and two sheep, and butter and honey will everyone eat that is left in the land. A man will have plenty of land to send out the sheep and the cows in because there is no land being cultivated. Grass is growing in the streets, the land is devastated because so many people are gone, and in Verse 23, it will come to pass in that day that every place shall be, where there were a thousand vines, a thousand silverlings, where there were all these wonderful vineyards with people cultivating them and producing a fine crop, there will be briars and thorns. They'll hardly even be able to enter into the place because of all the briars and thorns. All that they can use it for is to send out these animals to pasture and but it will be very hard

Prophets - 44

even to walk through sections of it because so much of these wild weeks will spring up in the lack of cultivation. A description of the condition of depopulation which is going to come upon the land as result of Ahaz' sin. The primary thought of Chapter 7 is throughout rebuke to Ahaz for lack of trust in God, for depending on the arm of flesh and substituting for that which is God's will a human man-made scheme and a scheme which will not work but which will backfire and will do more harm than good. Mr.—? (Student) Yes. There will not come the fear—the person who is afraid of briars and thorns won't come there.

- - - - -

Prophets - 45

(Student) Oh, yes, of course. (Student) The country contains many desert sections and many sections good only for pasturage, always has, but it also contained a great deal that was well populated then, as now. Well now, next time look on into Chapter 8 and try to get the principal ideas of 8 well in mind. There's a child mentioned in Chapter 8. Is this the same child in Chapter 7? Try to get arguments pro and con about it, and between 8 and 9. You've done that in the Hebrew, I believe, all of eight and the first of 9. Go over carefully in the Hebrew Verses 21 and the next three verses of 8 and be prepared to say, "Is there a transition between 8 and 9 and if so, where is it? Where does the Hebrew Bible make a chapter division? Is that a better place than ours or a worse place? Has the beginning of 9, the first two verses, anything to do with Christ, and if not, why does Matthew quote it, in connection with it? We'll look at that, tomorrow morning. Oh, no, we'll look at that. We won't have time. so you won't have time to prepare that. Maybe you can

- - - - -

Prophets - 45 - Second part (beginning at 2)

As a result of the action of Ahaz there is going to be a great depopulation in the land. Now of course that comes to Israel within the next three or four years. To Judah it comes within the next twenty years, but we don't know whether



Prophets - 45

it came to some slight extent, I don't mean slight, I mean considerable but not tremendous extent, to Judah within the next/<sup>very</sup> few years. (Student) From the Assyrians, yes. (Student) II Chronicles 32. Would you read us the verse you have in mind please? The situation in Israel was that within, say four years after this happened Pekah was killed and the Assyrians overran most of the land, but they set up a puppet king, Hoshea, and Israel still had a nominal independence and they had perhaps perhaps two-thirds of their people still there. There was great depopulation but not complete. That lasted nine years. After five or six years Hoshea revolted, the Assyrians came, finally completely put an end to Hoshea, and led nearly all the people away captive, and so Israel was left utterly desolate, which is just a step from Judah, near enough that this could be describing the situation within twenty miles north of Jerusalem. However, the southern kingdom may have been overrun to some extent on either one of those conquests, we don't know, but the, twenty years later, the Assyrian king we are told came and he took the fenced cities of the southern kingdom and carried a great many people captive from them. Now, at that time there was of course a great depopulation in the southern kingdom, but that depopulation then would not necessarily have lasted a great number of years. Hezekiah may have done great building before the Assyrian came then or he may have done it some time after. I don't think we have any contradiction in the Bible there in fitting those two statements together. (Student) Well it certainly was plenty noticeable to Judah what happened twenty miles from Jerusalem. Yes. Well, he wanted to get rid of the king. As to the whole land being thus devastated, whether that pleased him or not, I don't know as we can say. Certainly the depopulation which came to Israel was a constant menace to Judah from the instant when it came. It was a constant menace to Judah and certainly the reduction of Israel twenty miles north to this pastoral situation and a very, very small Assyrian garrison there, meant that all the people of Judah had access to this great increased amount of the products of the animals, immediately. That was immediately noticeable in Judah, immediately affected

Jerusalem and all the parts of Judah, and whether they rejoiced as some people in America have in the past and said, "All the crops of the rest of the world have failed, therefore we can sell ours for better prices," or whether they said, "The Assyrian has overwhelmed them and he'll probably do it to us the next time he comes," and therefore ate it with a good bit of sorrow mixed with their joy is a matter that would probably vary with different individuals.

(Student) And then, of course, there's the big difference that Europe is three thousand miles away and this is twenty miles away. That makes a big difference.

too. When you can look right out your window and see it, and when you have refugees coming to you with a very little distance to come, and when you don't have to bring the crops that are a result of it three thousand miles but can bring them a few steps—(Student) Yes. Egypt is much in very little, just that one—(Student) Assyria is mentioned in Verse 17, isn't it, and then

again later on. Assyria is mentioned five or six times, I believe, in the passage. Egypt once. (Student) It doesn't say that, though. It says Assyria.

(Student) After 21? No, the last reference to Assyria is in Verse 20. I don't think there is any reference to any nation after that. It would suggest that what is described after is the result of what the king of Assyria did. (Student)

Yes. It happened both times. (Student) Well, suppose, for the sake of argument that we admitted that, what seems to be unlikely, but we did admit that the Babylonians were in view particularly in the end of the chapter, what would that

prove? (Student) Yes. Well, there might be something similar, then. There might be something similar today. I don't see anything to connect it with

though. How's that? (Student) Yes, and what was the razor that is hired?

Even if you took Assyria as a figure of something else, what would a razor that is hired have to do with anything except Ahaz' hiring Assyria to come in at this time. I mean, that's the whole situation of the chapter. It's rebuke to Ahaz for his hiring the Assyrians to come in, and that we find in Verse 20, and the

(Student) Yes. There is a suggestion then, you have, that there is a transition

Prophets - 145

between 20 and 21. Well, I won't have any objection if you want to put a transition there. I am inclined to feel that there is no need of one because it fits in with the same argument, but if you want to put one, why we have no objection. (Student) Sixteen? No. Sixteen is three or four years later, if not more. I don't think 22 has anything to do with 16. (Student) Well he could do that by the time he was four years old, five at least. (Student) The import of Verse 16 is that Ahaz is out trying to gather the people to a desperate plight to hold off Israel and Syria and he feels that the only way of doing it is to get the people tremendously excited about protecting themselves and to do this secret, underhanded maneuver, this wicked alliance with a hostile power, a godless power, which is contrary to God's commands all through the Scripture, and Isaiah is here saying to Ahaz, "God is going to see that within the next five years/ <sup>both</sup> ~~the~~ king will be gone," Verse 16 says. "The land thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings," and as a matter of fact it did happen. Both Pekah and Rezin disappeared from/ <sup>the scene of</sup> history within four years after the time when he said this to Ahaz, and then he continues in Verse 17 and says, "The Lord is going to bring the king of Assyria upon the land of Israel and the land of Judah and there is going to come only misery from this clever scheme you've presented," and here we have a definite situation. We have a discussion of the results of the situation. We have presentation to Ahaz of that which is going to come as a result of his sin. Now we can take isolated verses from it and apply to some other period and there is no objection to so doing if there is a reason which/ <sup>fits</sup> in with a part of the passage but if it's just jumping off into the air why it makes the passage just a series of disconnected pictures. There's no meaning to it. (Student) No. Now I determined in 15 the fact that the reference to butter and honey was a reference to a depopulated condition. Moreover, the fact that in Verse 22 the same phrase was used in connection with a depopulated condition. That does not by any means suggest that the particular depopulated condition described in Verse 15 is identical in every way with that one described in Verse 22.



2899

Prophets - 45

It would seem that the one in Verse 15 is specifically the situation which he says is going to be within four or five years, while in 22 it is picturing in general the result of the bringing in of the Assyrians and it includes what happens within a few years but it may stretch on just as far as the results of that wicked action spreads on. There is no reason to stop it short of the end of the result of that wicked action. It is as if you were to say to Columbus, should say to the king of Spain, "Isabella has pawned her jewelry in order to let Columbus go to America. Well, as a result of this there shall be gold coming to Spain and wealth coming to Europe in great amount." Well, as a matter of fact in three years after that they had great amounts of gold which came to Spain. Spain became the richest land on earth because of the gold that came from America, but also during this last twenty years tremendous wealth in the form of lend-lease or any other form you want to name it has gone to Europe from America. Wealth has been going to Europe from America ever since that time. The first reference to the wealth going to Spain would be the immediate thing but the result of Columbus' discovery of America is still active and it brought a tremendous amount of treasure to both sides in the Spanish war a few years ago and it is still bringing help to Europe. You have a situation which is a result of this action which continues on. I doubt if the result of Ahaa' bringing in the Assyrians would be considered would be considered as extending in any sense as far as the birth of Christ. It might be thought of as considering a couple of hundred years.

Mr.—?

- - - - -

Prophets - 45

(Student) No, I don't think the 21st means any particular man. I think that is just one. Just anybody—any particular man you want to speak of. (Student) In Verse 15? That is a matter which we have to decide with careful investigation of the whole situation. We find in the beginning of it that it is speaking of

Christ. In 14. We find in 16 that this child of whom it has not been told when he is to come but on the assumption that he comes immediately his age is used as a measure of time. Now we ask, then, with which of the two does 15 belong. Is it describing something about Christ or something about the time referred to in 16. Now there would be nothing to prove which of the two it refers to except to see what it says and which it would naturally connect with and when we find in Verse 22 that the condition of depopulation which results from the act of Ahaz is described as reducing the land to that condition which it was before the Israelites came, a condition in which it was a land simply flowing with milk and honey without many people there to consume the milk, a condition in which every one of the few who are left in the land will have all the butter and honey they want, because there are comparatively few people there and no use for the land for other purposes. When you find that that butter and honey is used in that way, eating of it, in Verse 22, it doesn't prove that Verse 15 is using it in the same way but it suggests that that is at least a possible meaning of Verse 15. I would go further, I would say that it shows that. I would say that it <sup>shows that it is</sup> the probable meaning of it. You take that meaning and see if it fits in with Verse 16 and it certainly does. You try to fit it with Verse 14 and if you feel it fits better with 14 than with 15 there's absolutely no objection to your putting it with 14 instead with 15. Personally it doesn't impress me, but that doesn't mean but what I might be wrong. I'm simply trying to show the facts as I see them and anyone is free to evaluate it differently from I do. (Student) Surely. Yes, I'm glad that you raised the question. I want to be sure that everyone has clearly in mind the way that I take these different complicated factors and put them together. Now some one here may work out another method that will revolutionize our understanding of Isaiah some time and if you do I'll be very glad for it, but I think it extremely unlikely as far as this particular chapter is concerned, because I've never seen another interpretation of this particular chapter that seemed to me

to have nearly as many strong points or as few weak points as this interpretation. Now some other chapters we get into I don't feel nearly as certain of my interpretation. This one, I've never seen an interpretation that seemed to me to make much sense out of it except this one, and this one seems to make perfect sense. Now, of course, you have a perfect right to differ on it. All I ask is that you get in mind what I present. Yes? (Student) I would say Verse 14 is an explicit, direct, specific and exclusive prediction of Christ and nothing else whatever. Yes. (Student) The child is imagining, if this child were to be born right now, then in this length of time they'd be gone. It is using the child, the date of whose birth has not been revealed, as a measuring stick on the assumption, supposing he were to be born today. Now that is an explanation which is not the most obvious explanation. There have been many others suggested. Some of the others may appeal to some of you more. They don't seem to me to make much sense, but they may appeal to some of you as much better. Mr.---? (Student) You get that principally from the historical situation. Student) Oh, definitely. Very definitely. The Hebrew does not require it but specifically allows it. Mr.---? (Student) Well, probably for breakfast, at noon and for supper. (Student) I would think so, yes. I would think so, and now, Mr. Manross gave me a very good reference. What was that again? Do you recall it? In Genesis 24:63 we have this identical usage of with an , and in that case, if you translate it the way the Authorized Version translated this one here, you would say, "And Isaac went out to meditate in the field," and what is the next, "To the?" (Student) "Yes, he went out to meditate in the field in order that the evening might come." That's not an impossible rendering of " ", but the way it is rendered in our English is "at the time of evening" and it is absolute proof that that is a possible rendering of " " with the . It is not proof that it is a necessary rendering. There are other possible uses , as there are of English prepositions, but that is one which fits perfectly in this case as



39. 102

you fit it into the historic background. The question is, "Is the Bible a series of disconnected verses of which we grab one out here and one out there, and another out another place and ignore everything that lies between?" Is it a book in which we have people dealing with the social ills of their own day and knowing nothing of the future in those great distances and caring nothing about it, or is it a book in which God has dealt with the situations of the particular time but has in the course of so doing pointed out important matters relative to the distant future? Those are the three possible views. One, you might say is the ignorant fundamentalist view, the other is the ignorant/modernist view, the other is the reasonable view. That's the way I would apportion— I don't mean that the only reasonable view is the interpretation I give of 7. I think it is but I may be wrong, but I mean that of the three attitudes towards the prophets as a whole I would definitely say that is the only reasonable view, the view that the whole thing is a connected discourse, not a series of different verses of which we pick a verse here and pick a verse there and say, "This sounds like Christ. Therefore it is." But if we find a reference to Christ it must make sense in relation to the immediate situation, and not be something simply dragged in without any relation to the immediate situation. Mr. —?

(Student) Yes. 16 is before. 16 gives the reason for 15. (Student) What do you mean, "It does away with Israel?" (Student) They'll be forsaken. Yes.

(Student) No. About that particular king of Israel. He was replaced by another. The king of Assyria led away large numbers of people into captivity and put a puppet king on the throne who reigned over the people that remained but who after a short time revolted against ~~the king of Israel~~, the king of Assyria, and then nine years later was himself taken captive by the king of Assyria and then Israel was completely taken over by Assyria. Verse 16 refers to the two kings who are now attacking Judah. It refers to Pekah, King of Israel, and Rezin, King of Syria. Rezin, King of Syria, was killed by the Assyrians and his land was incorporated in the Assyrian empire. Pekah, King

of Israel, was killed by the Assyrians but a puppet king placed on the throne and allowed to continue as an independent king but with a terrifically depopulated land, and particularly the part away from his capital and just twenty miles from the capital of Judah, would be so overflowing with pastoral products that it would make a tremendous difference in the general situation of anybody living in Jerusalem, as far as the food they would have to eat would be concerned. (Student) I'd say he's speaking about both of them. (Student) Egypt is referred to very slightly in these passages. Egypt's whole attitude in these years is a thing that is not fully known to us. We know that Egypt interfered every now and then. We have a little later a great many pictures of the relations of Judah with Egypt, but we don't have full accounts of them. (Student) He means that the land of Judah and the land of Ephraim which were living in comparative security without getting mixed up in the great affairs of the big world powers are now plunged right into the maelstrom of world events as a result of the attitude of Ahaz in inviting the Assyrians in. That means that the Assyrians are now plunged into the situation, the Egyptians become tremendously interested, their armies a little bit and Israel with Judah, instead of being/outside the sphere of trouble between the great powers, is now right in the very middle of it. You might say it is like when the people on the edge of Czechoslovakia, ten years ago, invited Hitler to come to their protection against the mass of the people of Czechoslovakia, the result was that their nation became the point of argument and discussion between Germany and Russia and Britain and France and got right into the midst of everything and was involved in all the turmoil that has come since and especially in the events of the past week. You can't say all that was only the result of the appeal of these men but it certainly entered into it. (Student) That is a thing you can't divide up into quite as one-two-three an order as that. I would say that the picture from Verse 21 to 25 is a picture of depopulation, and we are told that this depopulation is to come to the land of Palestine as a result of Ahaz' wicked action. Now how much of it refers to the Northern Kingdom and how much to the Southern Kingdom, how much refers to Transjordan, how much refers to one tribe, how much to another. I

don't think he says, and I don't think we can read it in when we don't have specific information. It is as if you would say, as if I would say, "The foolish action of the United States in allowing dictatorships to continue in Russia and to hold half the world in brutal subjection means that unless we put a stop to it atomic bombs will drop on our own cities within the next ten years." Now if I make a statement like that, you might say, "Are you talking about California or are you talking about New York? Are you talking about Chicago or are you talking about St. Louis? Is it the South you refer to, or the West?" I would say, "I have no idea where there will drop. I don't know as even Stalin knows that yet, but it/ <sup>would be</sup> a matter which is a danger placed on the whole land and he will decide when the opportunity comes where the best place is to drop them." (Student) They are no secret. As I understand, there are thousands of particular engineering discoveries that go into the making of it. The main principles aren't secret. Those, as I understand, were all patented between 1941 and '43 and the Russians asked our patent office for a thousand copies of all the patents and have been given them. I'm not sure that is true but I have been told it. Now, that is a little aside from Isaiah, -Mr.---? (Student) Yes, that's very good. Now I'd like to get on into Chapter 8 because we do have some interesting things in Chapter 8. I am beginning to think the assignment I gave for tomorrow will be perfectly good for tomorrow, but I think it would be a very good idea if we would get on into Chapter 8 now. We have seen, I think, the main situations in Chapter 7.

- - - - -



Prophets.47 .

interpreters of Isaiah, there were two hundred years ago interpreters who took certain chapters in Isaiah and found in them the account of the wars between Bavaria and northern Germany and the interference of the pope and the attitude of the king of France and they found the whole history of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries contained in certain chapters in Isaiah. Well if you can find an absolute connection between the events described in some particular time you have a right to suggest that but it needs careful examination. In most cases you will find that most of it refers to the immediate situation, that is the situation within a few decades or centuries after the speaker and events directly arising out of what happened there.

Now Chapter 8 I think is a good chapter division. I believe that when he says, "And the Lord said to me, Take a great roll and write in it with a man's pen concerning Maher-shalal-hash-baz", I do not believe that he is there continuing to talk to Isaiah outside the wall as he is talking to Ahaz. I do not believe that to be the case. I think that Chapter 7 is a definite unit here. I think we must praise the archbishop for this or say that his horse was unusually good that day. He made a very good division, I think, of Chapter 7, between that and 8. It would seem--the reason I would suggest that is that 8 begins with him taking faithful witnesses and taking these people and going to the prophetess and she conceives and bears a son and then the Lord says, "Call his name." Well now all that seems to suggest quite a period of time. I would say that between most of Chapter 8 and Chapter 7 perhaps a couple of years had passed by. That would appear to be very likely. At least there is a reasonable interval between 7 and 8. In Chapter 7 there are two things we haven't looked at but we perhaps should have looked at, perhaps ought now to take a second at; one of these is the matter of the place where most of Chapter 7 was given, in Verse 3. He says, "Go forth to meet Ahab, you and Shear-jashub your son, at the end of the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field," and they went out there and they talked to Ahaz there and rebuked Ahaz for his sin in secretly making this wicked agreement with a godless power. I think the reason why we are told so explicitly just where he went is because of the fact that in Chapter 36, Verse 2 we find exactly the same place referred to. "The king of Assyria sent Rabshakeh from Lachish to Jerusalem unto king Hezekiah with a great army. And he stood by the conduit of

Prophets\_47.

of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field." It's exactly the same place, and so I think the reason we're told in both places exactly where it happened is to bring out the little point which would suggest a big idea, that at exactly that same place where Isaiah stood and said to Ahaz, "You're wicked. You're turning against God in making this wicked alliance with this Assyrian power. That's going to bring Assyria next to you and do away with a bumper state in between and it's going to mean that the Assyrian will be coming right into your land," about twenty years later, more or less, we find that the Assyrians have overrun all of Judah, the people of Israel are shut up in the city in terrific danger of their, of the Assyrians coming and making an attack and destroying Judah, and in that situation the representative of the Assyrian king comes and taunts them and says, "You're absolutely helpless," and calls on them to surrender to him at the very place at which Isaiah had predicted what was going to happen a few years before, and the very place that it happened is not, of course, a vital thing in the carrying out of the prophecy, there's no great principle involved there but there is the thing that it would remind you of. You'd say, "Here's the place where Isaiah warned Ahaz what was going to happen and on the very place where it happened you see the Assyrian king whom Ahaz thought he was bringing in as a help is now there threatening to destroy Jerusalem just as he has destroyed all of Judah by this time." So I think that similarity of that place is extremely important. Now the other thing that we should mention before we leave it altogether is the statement, "Behold a virgin shall conceive." Is our English translation correct there--Behold a virgin shall conceive? Well the word which is there used is not the ordinary word for virgin. The regular technical term for virgin is parthenos. It is the passive participle of partheno, to withhold, a withhold one, a parthenos. That is the technical word to indicate the technical virginity of a woman. Now in English, in Old English, in English of the time of the King James version the word virgin was used in two senses, closely related; was used in the specific sense that a woman is a virgin, the specific physical condition, and it also was used very commonly in the general sense of just a young woman. This young woman was a virgin, but the stress isn't on the fact of her being a virgin; the stress is on the fact that she's a young woman, that is the stress on it, for instance in the parable



Prophets\_47

of the ten virgins in the New Testament. The word was very commonly used in English at that time to indicate a young woman, a young, unmarried woman was virgin. It was an ordinary English term. We don't use it that way any more today, just as words are constantly changing their meanings and one that has one meaning one century changes quite a little in its general stress a century or two later. Now in this case the word is not the technical, specific word for one who is in the physical condition of virginity; that's not the word here used. The word is not, also, the ordinary word for young woman, the feminine of , a boy, a girl. That is not the specific word here used. The word here used is a word which is used comparatively seldom in the Old Testament--the word , and this word probably is rather near to the English word "maiden". Maiden is a word which in English is used to mean ordinarily a young woman, a young girl. It does not seem to me it would be usual in English to a maiden, of a young married woman. We wouldn't think of her as a maiden, ordinarily. We do speak, sometimes, of a maiden lady, as a term for a virgin who is somewhat older than a young woman. We speak of her as a maiden lady. That's an idiom which has developed in recent years. I don't know how far back that goes, but specifically maiden doesn't mean virgin in English, and yet ordinarily when you think of a maiden you think of one who is a virgin and this word , I think is rather close to maiden. It is so translated in Proverbs, the way of a man with a maid. That is the word translated. Maid there for here and for the same word, , which is here translated virgin. It's not ordinarily translated virgin, it seems to me it is nine times, it's very few times, that the word occurs at all in the Old Testament. If you go through those times you will find no one of them in which the woman is evidently a married woman. It always seems to refer to an unmarried woman. We have no convincing proof that the woman was not a virgin in any case although some think there is a strong presumption in that case in Proverbs where it speaks of the way of a man with a maid that it there . That is the interpretation some people give to that verse. I don't think it is a necessary interpretation; something could be said for it. But it certainly is not a word which is ordinarily used for a married woman; in fact, I don't know of any instances where it is used for that. People often say, "This word means a young woman of marriageable age.



Prophets-47

whether married or not." I do not think that we have proof that that is the case and yet it's pretty hard to prove what it is because it's only used nine times in the Old Testament and that's a mighty small number of times. You could speak of meeting a young woman and you could refer to it fifty times dealing with unmarried women and then the next ten times might be young married women. Nine times is pretty few to get a proof from on a thing like that so that I would hesitate very much if I had this Hebrew in front of me and was asked to translate this verse, I would hesitate to translate it by the word virgin using our specific physical sense which the word virgin has come to mean in modern English. I would hesitate very much about that. I wouldn't hesitate so much about using it in the sense in which it was used three hundred years ago when the King James version was translated when you'd speak of any young woman as a virgin in a common way just as we would say a maiden today. Well the thing that causes us to translate it virgin here is not simply the fact that Matthew so renders it in the Greek in the New Testament, it is the fact that in the Septuagint it is so rendered. The Septuagint translation made perhaps two hundred years or more before the time of Christ, made by Jews who had never heard of the virgin birth and who had no thought of trying to find here a prediction of something which they found fulfilled in connection with Christ, they translated it by the ordinary specific Greek word for virgin, the word parthenos, which is the regular Greek word for virgin which ordinarily would correspond to almah, rather than almah. Now why did they translate it that way? It impressed those translators of the Septuagint in the light of the context as being the proper way to translate it. They did not think of it as simply meaning young women. They thought of it as meaning some very special type of young woman, something very much out of the ordinary. It's almah here. Now, of course, when you come to know what Hebrew words mean, nobody today speaks ancient Hebrew. It's a language that's been dead for a long time. Attempts were made to resurrect it today but that doesn't prove what the words actually meant then. If we want to know what the words meant we have to see how they were used or how they were translated at different times. And so the fact that the Septuagint translators rendered it virgin is a very vital evidence that that would probably be within the range of thought considered within the word almah, and

## Proverbs-47

commentators, liberal commentators, of course, a few years ago were trying to make it all just an ordinary young woman. It's interesting, though, to notice Plummer's commentary on Matthew, in which he quotes from the German as pointing out that the attitude of the Septuagint translators toward this verse shows that it was generally felt by those who write as not merely describing an ordinary verse but pointing to something very strange, very much out of the ordinary, something so strange that it did not seem to them an incorrect way to tender it to say a virgin shall conceive. This verse would not be a proof of the virgin birth. To my mind it is like so often occurs in the Old Testament where we have a suggestion of something that's going to happen later, a suggestion given in such a way that you are not altogether sure in the light of the context what it is in the Old Testament. You can get it down to a rather narrow limit of what it probably is and when you get it into that limit it seems rather strange and perhaps / <sup>hardly</sup> reasonable to you and so you're apt to reject that possibility and say, "Let's take another!" and you don't find any other that fits quite as well as that but you'd be apt to select one that fits quite a bit less well rather than that which seems so strange and yet you'll find it fulfilled in exactly that way. So it seems to me that that is the fact here, that the virgin birth here is not explicitly stated but that an unusual and yet we find that that unusual method of expression corresponds exactly to the fact which occurs in the virgin birth, of the Lord Jesus Christ. Now we could spend a long time on this almah and the various discussions that have been written about it and so on but that covers the main material in connection with it. So I think we could go on to Chapter 8 which, I believe, occurs, the main part of Chapter 8 occurs some time later than Chapter 7. We have the Lord speaking, "Write concerning Maher-shalal-hash-baz". There is a son—is that Immanuel? The oldest son is Shear-jashub. A remnant shall return, the Lord says. Now we're told Write concerning Maher-shalal-hash-baz. Hasten the booty; hurry the spoil, the word says. What a name for a poor innocent little boy! Hasten the booty! Hurry the spoil! I don't recommend that any of you should use this name for your son in these days. It would be cruel today to have a little child have to have such a name but in those days God

Prophets-47

was utilizing it as a means of bringing a lesson to the people so that every time they called Isaiah's son they called attention to the fact that God was predicting gloom and destruction and upheaval. Hasten the booty; hurry the spoil. Now he writes that and then he takes faithful witnesses, a priest, two priests, Uriah and, I believe Zechariah was also a priest. At least he takes these two men, Uriah and Zechariah, and the Lord said to me, "Call his name Maher-shalal-hash-baz. Don't call his name Immanuel, God with us, but call his name Hasten the Booty; hurry the spoil. For before the child shall have knowledge to cry, , which is to say "Daddy and Mommy", the very simplest beginning of talking, the words which a child ordinarily says first, a much cho~~ose~~<sup>to</sup> the good and/rejects the evil. So there is, instead of five years, perhaps two years involved in that; two or three years, perhaps. There is a shorter interval implied and this child with a shorter interval comes to approximately the same ; before the child can say this the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria

Prophets 48 -

the same event. The two lines, the lines forsaken of both her kings predicted/<sup>from</sup>a shorter interval; the longer interval in Chapter 7 , until the child reaches a certain age, now until a child reaches a lesser age. Two different children, one of them is simply used as a measuring stick, ~~not~~ actually living in that period at all but using it as a measure of a length of life , the other a specific physical son of Isaiah and born somewhat later than the time of the prediction, given in Chapter 7 and before he reaches this stage of barely saying the simplest words the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria will be taken away before the king of Assyria and then the Lord continues to speak to him and gives further rebuke upon the people for their wicked alliance with the king of Assyria, for trusting the arm of flesh instead of trusting God. He says Forasmuch as this people refuseth the waters of Shiloah that flow softly, a figure of speech, doubtless, for the little stream that comes down through the Kidron there right by the edge of Jerusalem that flows softly near the temple as a symbol of God's word, trust and confidence and



quiet patience, following the Lord; instead of turning to that they refused that and they rejoice in Rezin and Remaliah's son. They look to Pekah and to Rezin as the vital forces and feel that they have to meet them rather than to trust God. Therefore behold the Lord brings up upon them the waters of the river, strong and many--they're going to have a flood, taken literally it is. Someone will probably say next year that I said always take the Bible literally as they have in past years some times, but he goes on to explain the figure. Even the king of Assyria and all his glory. The king of Assyria is often pictured as a river as Mesopotamia was characterized by the two great rivers, and here under the figure of a flood comes the king of Assyria in all his glory and he goes up over all his channels, and we're told about the spoil Samaria's taken away, here we read he's going to go over all his banks and he's even going to pass through Judah, not to stop with Israel. He's going to pass through Judah. He will overflow and go over and he'll reach even to the neck, and the stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land. Whose land? God with us. Now the word God with us is here translated, transliterated, instead of saying God with us, it says Immanuel. It takes it as a personal name. It seems to fit better. The king of Assyria is going to overwhelm the land, God's with us. That doesn't make much sense. The king of Assyria is going to overwhelm thy land, O Immanuel. He is already thinking of this land as not the land of the wicked king Ahaz, the man who is the representative of the house of David, now, the temporary one, the false one, the degenerate one, but it is the land, truly the land of the real representative of the house of David, the one who is already living but who has not yet assumed a human form and a human personality, the one who is yet to be incarnate in the distant time but who is already effective in the history of Israel as He has been from the very beginning. Immanuel, the true son of David; even Ahaz rules the land and looks on it as his it is really Immanuel's land but as a result of Ahaz' mismanagement Immanuel's land is overflowed by the forces of the king of Assyria. So he will overwhelm thy land, O Immanuel and then he turns to the people who are coming against the land and he says, "Associate yourselves, O ye people, and ye shall be broken in pieces. Give ear, all ye of far countries: gird yourselves, and ye shall be broken in pieces: gird yourselves, and ye shall be broken in pieces." What a tremendous thing

## Prophets-48

to say! The Assyrians are coming, the Egyptians are coming. They're going to attack the land. Ahaz has brought this terrific evil on the land but God says though Ahaz has brought the evil God is going to give deliverance from the evil. Take counsel together and it shall come to nought; speak the word, and it shall not stand: for Immanuel. Why transliterate it in one case as Immanuel and translate it in another case as God with us the other time? It's Immanuel both times. Well, the fact of the matter is that the translation is not bad here, because it is both a proper name and a meaning. That's not double interpretation or a double fulfillment. It is just a fact that the name has a meaning, and that when you speak the name you think of the meaning and in this case the name is given because of the meaning. He is an individual, Immanuel, the true son of David, the true owner of the land, the one whose land it is, and his name indicates the presence of God with His people and they can make their plans but this is Immanuel's land and Immanuel is going to show that they cannot do anything which He does not wish them to do and the Assyrians may come, all this terrific result comes as a result of the sin of Ahaz but God is not at this time going to allow the complete working out, the complete victory of Assyria to go to the extent of taking Jerusalem. It's Immanuel's land: God is with them, God is going to continue His mercy with them for the present time. For the Lord spake thus to me with a strong hand and instructed me that I should not walk in the way of this people, saying, Say ye not, a confederacy, confederacy between Israel and Assyria, a united nation between those who are godly and those who are godless. How utterly ridiculous and fantastic; how contrary to all the plans and purposes of God. Say ye not a confederacy; neither fear ye their fear nor be afraid. Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself, and let Him be your fear and let Him be your dread, and He shall be for a sanctuary. He is one whom you can trust if you will, and He is going to deliver Jerusalem from the attack of the king of Assyria but He will be a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel, not just to Ephraim, not just to Judah, to both of them, for a gin and a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. All of Israel is part of God's plan. God has not rejected Israel and chosen Judah but all of them are part of God's kingdom, part of God's plan, God is bringing His punishment upon both, even though Israel gets it first and God is for the time being protecting Jerusalem,

X 113

even as bird's houses and He is protecting it by His power and not by the power of the people there in order to show that it is He who rules and He who can perform His will as He chooses. And so we have these chapters dealing right with the immediate situation in the time of Ahaz and dealing directly with that situation and yet in Verse 14 of Chapter 7 giving us a glimpse of the coming of Christ which is not simply dragged in out of relation to the context but which has a true relation to the purpose of it, the rebuke of Ahaz and pointing out that Ahaz is not the true son of David but the true son of David is yet to come and it is referred back to in these two verses.

Now you have already read Chapter 8 and the beginning of Chapter 9. I hope you'll have it in good, well in mind tomorrow and particularly tell me this--at the end of Chapter 8 you have misery, at the early chapter 9 you have rejoicing, where should the chapter division be, as the Hebrew Bible has it, or as the English Bible has it, or should there be no chapter division there? Where does the misery stop and where does the rejoicing begin? Where is the transition, or is there no transition? Is it all misery or is it all rejoicing? And Matthew <sup>quotes</sup> Verses 1 and 2 here in connection with the life of Christ. What on earth have they got to do with the life of Christ? Was Matthew simply dragging something here and just grabbing a verse out of context or is there a real significance? Or is the whole thing just talking about the time of Christ and having nothing to do with Ahaz? I'll be interested in what you think about that tomorrow.



175/114

Prophets-48 (second part, beginning with 10)

and in class and giving some idea on the material that was just ahead since we've going rather directly through, chapter by chapter and verse by verse right now it's not so necessary to indicate exactly what you should prepare for each lesson. As you know, I always figure that for undergraduate work two hours/should be sufficient and I try to arrange it so that it won't pile up. I know that it is very difficult to keep from working along and there isn't so much to assign and then you have a good stiff problem and there is a lot all at once, so that I try to assign it ahead when we come to such a place, but ordinarily if there is nothing specific mentioned if you put in your two hours having the next ahead pretty well in mind, it covers our needs. Now this Wednesday, isn't it? We meet again Thursday; I'll assign lessons for next Tuesday and Wednesday but we will have the meeting at some other time, instead. Oh! Now I was thinking of not assigning any lesson for Thursday but having a written lesson instead. Well now, the thing is, if we have it in church history and in this Thursday--but one is in the morning and the other in the afternoon; that wouldn't crowd you so much, would it? Would you rather have this on a different day? Suppose we have it next Wednesday, of you prefer, and I'll assign a lesson for Thursday, have this test Wednesday instead of having a lesson for Wednesday and having the test Thursday. The test then will be next week Wednesday and I'll assign lessons for Tuesday and Thursday of next week, and then we'll have those two hours to make up, of which one was made up yesterday afternoon, and the other one we'll make up two weeks from yesterday afternoon. That will, I think, keep us pretty well abreast of the time we should need to cover this material and to have a pretty good idea what is involved in it. Now any time that any of you have any questions, or anything that isn't clear, please bring it up, any time you have an alternative suggestion to make, please don't hesitate to make it. We may not be able to spend a lot of time discussing particular alternate views because we have a good deal of ground to go over, but I wish you always would present them. Don't ever . We're glad to have--several of you have suggested other views, I wish all the rest of you would have your minds equally active as those who have been making suggestions. Maybe you can make some worthwhile contributions to the progress of our study here, because there is far more in these passages than I have yet

Prophets\_48

figured out. There is a great deal in them. There is a depth in them, there is meaning. The Christian church is suffering tremendously through just grabbing a verse here and there and being satisfied instead of getting into the depths of these books and learning what the Lord has there for us.

Now we were looking last time here at the 8th chapter and we noticed how the 8th chapter like the 7th is dealing with the unfaithfulness of Ahaz. Like the seventh, it is dealing with the matter that Ahaz is trusting Assyria instead of trusting God. He is working a clever human scheme instead of trusting to divine revelation, is going contrary to the commandments of God all through the Scripture in binding themselves together with those who are unbelievers and who are definite enemies to the will of God and the same punishment and the same condemnation comes upon him for it here as will undoubtedly come on our nation for its part in the United Nations, as long as the vital leader in that organization, the other of the two most important powers is one which is avowedly, not simply indifferent but definitely antagonistic to Christianity in its statements, its declarations and its attitude, and antagonistic to all the Christian virtues. There is hardly a Christian virtue but what is avowedly denied by the declarations and of the which means anything because Marx and Lenin state over and over in their books that the purpose of words is to accomplish effects, not to tell truth; that if they want to soften up somebody who is not with them to the point where they can destroy them they can make all kinds of promises and that is the right thing for them to do because it is forwarding the proper cause of communism



their statement. Indeed, as the Scripture says, when they are unwilling to believe the Word of Truth God gives them over that they should believe a lie. Well now Ahaz had exactly the same situation, not as much developed as today, he didn't have as much light as we have today, <sup>full</sup> the/circumstances were not as evident as today, and yet the situation is very similar. Anybody in those days who knew anything about Assyria would know of its wickedness and of its aggressive tactics and its determination to conquer everything else and to subdue everything that came in its path and yet Ahaz thought he could use fire to fight fire, thought he could make an alliance with wickedness in order to overcome other wickedness, thought he could bring in the greater enemy and danger which was far in order to protect himself from the lesser danger which was near at hand, and God said, "the plan is not going to work, the scheme is going to fail." He said, "I'm going to bring the waters of the river, strong on many, even the king of Assyria," and He said He's not going to stop them, Israel is going to go on into Judah.

And then in Verses 9 and 10 we notice a marked change; that just before this the great scene which has been stressed has been Ahaz's wicked and his plan is going to back-fire and Judah is going to be in terrific danger and have a great deal of suffering come to it from the coming of the king of Assyria whom he brings in but in 9 and 10, as in certain sections of the previous chapter, the prophet brings out the fact that though Ahaz is bringing terrific suffering on the nations through his wickedness, that God is not at this time going to hand over the whole nation to destruction but God is going to show His mighty power by, for the present, protecting Judah and causing the plans of the enemies to come to nought, for this is Immanuel's land and it is going to be made evident for the present that Immanuel can protect His land when He chooses so to do as He is choosing now. Mr. ---? (Question from student). The significance of a definite article is a very difficult thing to determine in any language. You have to-- the child means not just any child whatever, the child that we're now going to speak about, the child who is now before us. If you would say, for instance, "He brought a child into the room; now the child was young," that would mean the child that he had just brought in but it might be used of the one we're just going to. We say "The man went walking in the woods." What woods? Why, the one he just went walking in. We



put the "the" in indiscriminately. Quite clearly in English it very rarely has any particular meaning. Now in Hebrew there may be cases where it does and there are cases where it doesn't and there may be points where it would have a very definite importance but it's pretty hard to prove. You have to bring a great many instances and compare because the use of the definite article is so very flexible in most languages and when you get over into/Syriac from the <sup>the</sup> Aramaic into the <sup>the</sup> Syriac, /dialect of the Aramaic, you will find that the article is just about , it is practically never that they use the article. It becomes practically a part of the word, as it has become in English. Our English would be just as clear, I think, if we dropped all these articles. Now Hebrew is perhaps not quite as bad as that but it's pretty far in that direction. (Question from student) Well, it's a specific child that we are now going to describe, that we now have in mind but it doesn't necessarily mean when we say, "The" that it is the one which is specifically outstanding or extremely important or necessarily the one which we have just been talking about, yet-(Question from student). Twelve and 13 of Chapter 8 - I'm not at all sure that they would have, because in Verse 12 he's speaking of the confederacy coming against them, isn't he? I think he's speaking there in that verse of the confederacy of Israel and Syria coming against them. Now, of course, Israel had no business uniting with Syria against Judah but in Verse 13 "sanctify the Lord of hosts and let Him be your fear and let Him be your dread," certainly Verse 13 <sup>with</sup> ~~is~~ specifically dealing /the situation then, has the principle in it that we should not trust the arm of flesh of flesh but trust the Lord and in it, too, that when you find people entering into unholy alliances with those who oppose the power of God ordinarily there is an unworthy motive entering in, so that I wouldn't say this directly dealt with such a subject but indirectly it would be related to it, and, of course, the principle involved here of a nation which was supposed to be God's allying itself with an ungodly nation that is opposed to God for its own protection, that principle would apply to a church or a denomination or an organization, also, but not directly. It would be by implication and by inference. It would be a valid inference but not a direct inference. Now in Verse 14, as we noticed, there is a statement that ~~the~~ it's two views of God, that He is a sanctuary but He is a stone of stumbling. They say that whenever Paul went there was either a revival or a riot. People went along and



Prophets\_49 -

they were complacent and everything was going very nicely and then Paul came along and began to preach and the people got lined up on both sides and as Christ said, He divided the father against the son and the brother against the brother. A division comes when the Word of God is presented and people have to take their sides for or against it and so He's a sanctuary for those who trust Him but He's a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence to those who are against Him. As the Scripture says, "Beware when all men speak well of you," although it says in other places, don't have people speak ill of you as a busybody or an interferer in men's matters or as one who breaks the morale of the land or anything like that. There are people who pretend that it's on account of their loyalty to the Lord that they are persecuted when it's on account of their own unpleasant peculiarities or their selfishness or their attempt to advance their own interests. There are plenty of people of whom that is true but there are plenty of others who are unjustly spoken of and if you stand absolutely true to the Lord you may be quite sure people are going to speak of you unjustly and say all sorts of things that aren't true about you and the sensible thing to do in most such cases is probably just to ignore it, and to overlook it and to go straight on in the direction that you feel to be the teaching of the word and even if people call you names and criticize you or make all sorts of statements about you that are absolutely unfounded, it is well, in many cases, to let God vindicate it and not worry about it yourself, / particularly

Here we have then the two aspects, in 14 and 15. He is a sanctuary to those who are true, while He is a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel. We have both Ephraim and Judah in mind--both houses, but particularly the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Now Jerusalem wasn't taken for 150 years after that but we're shown that already Jerusalem was going to suffer from the Assyrian attack and the Assyrian oppression, even though the city itself wasn't hurt, and that which begins now continues. This is not a statement, "The Lord is going to be a sanctuary next Thursday for those who are true and a stone of stumbling on next Thursday to both the houses of Israel and after that this is over." This is a statement showing a situation of relationship of God to the house of Israel which begins now and stretches on indefinitely into the future. It is a continuous thing for quite a distance, the verse doesn't tell us how



4/26/19

Prophets\_49

far, how long into the future this reaches, but ordinarily you wouldn't say, "This describes God's relation to the people of Israel then and it also describes His relation to the church at the present time and it also describes His relation to Israel and to Palestine at the present time. It is probably one of those three, but it's not a thing which must be restricted to a minute or an hour or a day. It can stretch over a period, but the principle in it can be inferred and applied to these other matters, but not the direct teaching. Yes? (Student) I don't think it means much the same people. I think He's a sanctuary for those who trust Him and He is a rock of offense to the ungodly in both the houses of Israel and the fact that he says to both the houses of Israel recognizes the fact that both of them have become ungodly and to some extent. that the righteous are implicated in the sin of the wicked./ Just as the people of America are all implicated in the terrible things being done in Korea today, that when one of our representatives turned over the northern half of Korea to the Russians with absolutely no excuse for it whatever and no right to do so, no action on the part of our senators or Congress, the Russians weren't even in the war until/a week before the end of the Japanese war and had nothing to do with the bombing of Japan that ended the war, then we could turn over the northern half of Korea. "Well," you say, "Our government did that. What have we got to do with it?" We have a lot to do with it, and every one of us who did not keep aware of what was happening and protest vigorously and object and let our government know that we didn't approve of such wickedness is to some extent implicated in the fact that thousands of Christians are being martyred and massacred and that the Christians as a whole are being much worse treated in Korea today than they were under the worst of the Japanese oppression. We are implicated in it. You may say it's indifference; we didn't know about it, we were careless, we didn't investigate these things. That is all true and the Lord takes them into account; nevertheless we are implicated and we are involved in the sin of our nation and so were the righteous here involved in the sin of the nation and yet they are not the ones who are primarily in mind in the statement that He is a rock of offence here. He is a rock of offence to all the nation but particularly to the wicked portion of the nation and He is in addition a sanctuary to the righteous in the nation. Now in Verse - yes? (Student)



Prophets\_49

I would say that was the primary thing--the alliance, that is, God had His people work with unbelievers for purposes, for good purposes for a time. There was nothing wrong with the Israelite at times having relations with the Syrians or the Moabites or the Egyptians or different for a specific purposes but God's purposes were always definitely finite. It was not selfish individual purposes involved in the attempt to promote oneself or to secure one's safety by an ungodly alliance, but a cooperation is often found in Scripture with such forces. Paul didn't hesitate to declare that he was a Roman citizen and to appeal to Rome. He used the arm of flesh on occasion but he didn't put his primary reliance on it. (Student) Mr.---? (Student)

- - - - -

(Student) Yes. If Paul quotes a verse from the Old Testament to prove something, we shall say this, that Paul is not simply grabbing a verse regardless of context. He has the context in mind. He is presenting the teaching of the Old Testament and in addition to that there is a very important thing I'd like to point out, that there are many cases in the New Testament where we find a statement, this is true because--and we have maybe five words or maybe a whole verse quoted from the Old Testament and as you read the quotation you say, "What on earth has this Old Testament statement got to do with the thing he is proving? It doesn't fit." And then you go on and say, very often, "Well, he just takes these words and he gives them an inspired interpretation which we would never dream of originally" or we say, "He's proving it all on one particular--the fact you have a plural instead of a singular or the fact that you have a masculine instead of a feminine; he's building his argument on one letter in the Old Testament!" The New Testament never builds an argument on one letter or one word of the Old Testament, but the trouble is that people reading the New Testament so often take a quotation where you have a few words from the Old Testament and they say, "How do these words prove this?" and they think that these words must prove it and that isn't the apostle's idea at all. The apostle knows as the Lord Jesus Christ knew that the Old Testament is not a succession of mottos simply in which you can pick a few words out of context and have the teaching; it is a succession of teaching in context presenting great truths and specific matters with vital importance to the immediate situation sometimes relating it to something for which it jumps forward into the future and points out something in the future as related to this, sometimes pointing a trend or something that starts now and runs on very far into the future, and the apostles as a rule are referring, not to merely what these two or three words say but to the thought of the Old Testament passage as a whole, and a New Testament truth will, in most cases, if you study into the Old Testament passage be clearly seen to be the application of the truth as a whole, rather than simply building on one or two words. There is too much of that sort of misunderstanding of the New Testament attitude toward the old. People say, "Well now what about our doctrine of verbal inspiration when the New Testament takes an Old Testament verse and quotes three or four words from it and quotes them differently than the Old Testament has it. Well the fact of the matter is the same. He said "seed" and not "seeds". Therefore you have the whole thing proven because it is singular and not plural. That's not the New Testament method of arguing.

## Prophets-50

The New Testament refers to the passage and then gives you the explanation of the passage, that that passage indicates this, fits in with this interpretation, means to teach us this fact. He's interpreting the Old, applying the Old as a whole, not simply a few words, and so that the New Testament interpretation of Old Testament quotations has, for one thing, suffered tremendously from failure to study the Old Testament through in its context and, second, it has led to false understandings of what we mean by verbal inspiration. I think it is very important to realize that what we mean by verbal inspiration is not that you take three or four words anywhere, take those words and get every letter in them and see exactly what it says and you can squeeze this thing until you get everything possible out of these four words and it will give you a tremendous amount of truth you never would have gotten otherwise, and you must be sure and pick the right four words, because nine-tenths of it they never pick for that purpose. I mean modern expositors who use that method, never pick nine-tenths of it for that purpose but take a few words here and there and try to squeeze the content out of those few words. That's not what we mean by verbal inspiration. What we mean is that it is a book dealing with arguments and viewpoints and presentation of ideas and that these ideas are presented in human words in such a way that no error of fact, of doctrine or of judgment is allowed to be included in the teaching, carefully interpreted, of the passage. It is not a matter of a word or two or a verse or two, and so right along here in these next few verses here we have a number of New Testament quotations which, studied in the light of context, fit perfectly into the understanding of this context here but since there are certain problems which are of secondary importance rather than primary importance in them, it would be very interesting and worth going into but there are many very vital problems of primary importance we haven't yet worked into right in these sections ahead. I think I'd like to skip a little rapidly over these next few verses, not but what it's very valuable and we might come back to it later if you'd like some time, but I think that I'd rather spend the time on some more important things until a little later on but I think it's worth stopping to at least glance at each particular matter in this particular few verses here. Mr. ---? (Student)

Well, of course, in this particular case the Lord of Hosts is the one who is to be the sanctuary and the stone of stumbling and just above we've been referring to Immanuel.



## Prophets-50

This is Immanuel's land. This land cannot be destroyed because it's Immanuel's land and the enemy can't take it unless Immanuel chooses to give it over to him. The very Messianic teaching is here brought in connection in the whole passage. Now you can, you do not find explicit teaching of the deity of Christ here but you find that which fits right in directly into it and it is altogether valid that the New Testament which clearly teaches the deity of Christ should quote these verses as applying to Him., who is God and who furthermore is mentioned right in the previous passage, in this passage, as a man. Well now the situation here described is one which does not continue for only two or three years. There is a situation described here as a result of the sin and apostasy of the Israelites which may be thought of as going on for a long time. The Lord is going to be a sanctuary to those who truly trust Him but a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence to to both the houses of Israel, and think of all the misery the Israelites have gone through since that time. The Lord gave them up in a sense, as we found in Micah, and they went through<sup>in</sup> the exile and they went through<sup>in</sup> the time of the Maccabees and the time of the Roman oppression and even in the recent Hitlerite persecution all through the ages the Jews have undergone a persecution such as no other race as a race has undergone. The Armenians had just as bad, perhaps even worse, for a brief period just before the last war, but it was for a comparatively brief period, while this is something which has gone on with intermittent changes off and on for the centuries that God has been indeed a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense to both the houses of Israel, "and many among them shall stumble and fall and be broken and be snared and be taken," and, of course, the Lord here is specifically the Lord, it is God and God the second person of the trinity, is very specifically involved. We have teaching about Him just before, the true Son of the house of David, Immanuel. He is very definitely involved in the picture but not exclusively brought out here, and then a command is given. Well, what is Isaiah to do? What are the people of God to do? What are they to do who want to follow God in the face of this situation where the overwhelming tempest is coming, where the Assyrian rushes over the land, where the terrific dangers and troubles come to the land. What are you to do in such a situation--verse 16. Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples, among my disciples. Who says that? Does Isaiah tell the

Prophets-50

people to seal up the law among his disciples or does Immanuel tell Isaiah to seal up the law among His disciples? Which is the interpretation in that verse, is that Immanuel speaking of His disciples or is it Isaiah who is speaking of his disciples? Well, they are to bind up the testimony, seal the law, keep the truth alive, preserve the testimony, preserve the statements, give the witness but do not allow it to be overcome by tremendous sweeping forces of God's vengeance and destruction. "And I will wait upon the Lord". Is that Isaiah now responding? The Lord, you might say Immanuel says to Isaiah, "Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples." Isaiah says, "And I will wait upon the Lord, that hideth His face from the house of Jacob and I will look for Him." Isaiah responds that to the Lord in the face of the situation and then Immanuel answers, "Behold I and the children whom the Lord hath given me are for signs and for wonders in Israel from the Lord of hosts, who dwells in Zion." Immanuel and those who are specifically His, those who are His own children, they are for signs and for wonders; that doesn't mean they are miraculous, that doesn't mean they are something that is supernatural necessarily, but it means they are something that is a distinctive evidence. It's an evidence, it's a testimony. They are signs and wonders in Israel, the true people of God have been preserved all through, all the situations that come; there always are a group of the true people of God, they are signs and wonders in Israel--not only in Israel but in the whole world. Mr.--- (Question from student) Yes. The salvation of Jehovah here? A genitive can be objective or subjective in almost any tongue. As far as the name of Isaiah is concerned one would hesitate about deriving anything from the meaning of his name for this reason, that Isaiah was a man, as far as our evidence goes, born in an entirely natural way, brought up by his parents but called of God. Now God might have given him a particular name with a particular meaning but we have no evidence that He did so, and therefore in Isaiah's case we have no reason to assume there is any particular importance in connection with his message with the name which he happened to bear any more than the name of David or the name of Saul or the name of any one of the many others, unless we have specific evidence that the Lord ordered the name to be given for a certain purpose.

---

interpretations. Now that's what I had in mind when I said that there was a little in here worth noticing, to go back.

## Prophets-51

(Student) Yes. As a specific personal name it was not given to Him, but it is a name which certainly describes Him. He was Immanuel. He was God with us. He was God in human flesh; God and man together. The name fits Him most perfectly but it is not specifically used of Him in the New Testament except where Matthew applies the prediction to Him. That's a very interesting fact. (Student) I don't know what--It may be but I don't know what the evidence is for it. I don't know what the evidence would be for it. His character of Immanuel, God with us, may be the most clearly exemplified in His second coming but I should think it was very definitely His first coming. I don't/see how you could separate that to one coming more than the other. Now this verse then--we see that the author of Hebrews does not simply grab it out of context but he took the more probable of two possible interpretations here. Then verse 19. He reverts very specifically to the present situation. And when they say to you "Now the people aren't trusting God. They're not looking to the testimony. the law that is to be bound up among the disciples. the true word of God which is to be kept and treasured and studied and searched out and applied to their lives; when they say to you, instead of seeking God's law, "Seek to them that have familiar spirits and to wizards that peep and mutter", when they say that should not a people seek unto their God? Should they seek for the living to the dead? This verse makes very good sense if you put the right intonation in it, and if you don't it makes no sense at all. (Student) I don't believe so. I think it is spiritism that is involved. Should they ask the dead for help in the affairs of the living. I believe that is the idea that is involved here. It is against spiritism, against going to familiar spirits and wizards and trying to seek that sort of means and the thing is that should not a people seek to their God for the living to the dead means, should not they seek to their God should they seek for the living to the dead. There's an there which you can easily bring out with your voice but--you can bring it out with your voice but if you read it straight along in a monotonous tone it doesn't bring it out. I don't think there's a time element, I think there is a personal element involved.

Then the next verse--to the law and to the testimony. Here's the answer. Should not a people speak unto their God? You'll find it right in America here. People of good Christian background. People who should be studying the Word and trying to find



## Prophets -51

its teaching and apply it to their lives and they say, "Aw, we don't want any of that old-fashioned nonsense. We're not interested in that sort of thing. We'll use our brains and modern science and figure out things ourselves," and so on, and that's the attitude they take and in instance after instance you'll find they're getting astrology, what the stars say, going to astrologers to tell them when they should plant or whether they should buy their stock or what they should do for the future or going to spiritist meetings and going to all kinds of involved secret sorts of business that have absolutely no scientific foundation whatever, showing that they do not stay permanently satisfied with the idea that their brain is sufficient to work out the answer to the problems of life and if they fail to go to the law and to the testimony and to study God's word to find the answer, almost inevitably you will find that they are-- when a little trouble or, perhaps not necessarily trouble, when a situation comes up in life in which they have to really try to figure things out and the evidence is not right at hand they resort to all sorts of absurd methods, that is, they're ready to trust and believe all sorts of things when they turn aside from the teaching of the Word. There is a--everyone has in his heart the realization there is a power beyond us, there is a force beyond us, there is something we can't reach to ourselves that we need to have to help us and to guide us and to lead us and if they fail to accept that in God's Word you'll find that most of them will some time turn to other alleged forces for help for which there is not a tenth of the evidence for dependability that there is for God's Word. for His own. But the/<sup>last</sup> great bulk of people in this pagan land do not realize that there is a reasonable apologetic for God's Word. They don't realize that it is something for which a reasonable evidence can be presented showing that it is dependable and reliable. They don't realize that. The simple, plain evidences of the Scriptures which have been repeated over and over by Christian leaders through the past several centuries and even ever since the time of Christ are simply not known to ninety-nine per cent of our people in America. They've never heard of them, and it's not half so important as far as apologetics is concerned that we delve into extremely and wild philosophical arguments in order to try to bring a new approach for our generation as it is that we get the simple, plain clear arguments and evidences that have been repeated over and over

## Prophets -51

by Christian leaders, and it's simply forgotten as far as our present generation is concerned; they just have never had them presented to them. They just don't know they exist, even. They need to be presented and presented in a sane, reasonable scholarly way. (Question from student) Mr.---?/ It isn't doubt. It's trust. It's Immanuel. (Student) What else do you think it could refer to? It doesn't seem likely, though. That would be very unlikely in Hebrews 2:13. It's very unlikely in that instance. I'd rather not take too much time on this particular problem here because we have so much more important ones just ahead but you notice in Hebrews 2 that we find that Hebrews 2:11--For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee--How's that? (Student) Yes. What is the source of that quotation? Psalm 22, yes, which is a Messianic psalm describing the crucifixion of Christ and His resurrection and glorification--And again, I will put my trust in Him. That is Psalm 18, And again, Behold I and the children whom God has given me. Forasmuch, then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same. That is, there are three statements given and He says He is not ashamed to call them brothers because He says, and the first two of them are quotation from the psalms and the third one is word for word like a statement in Isaiah, and I believe most--I think all interpreters have considered it to be that he is quoting from this passage in Isaiah. Now is he just taking some words out of Isaiah and applying them to Christ where they have nothing to do with Christ, or do the words here actually refer to Immanuel of whom we have been speaking in just a few verses before? That is a question which is worth consideration and I pointed out a way in which these can be taken in context as applying to Immanuel. I don't think it would be obvious in first reading but I think that it certainly is a possible interpretation of the passage even apart from any New Testament consideration whatever. We are for signs and wonders is a little stronger, speaking of the prophet and his son, and of course, Verse 16, Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples, sounds much more like Immanuel talking to Isaiah than about talking to somebody else. (Student) How do you mean? Yes, there is usually--God, Elohim is usually translated . is usually

translated in the New Testament. Lord, because the word is a very broad word. It's used of a human being who was the head over a large establishment. It is used for God, as the Lord, and it is a translation of this specific name of God, and it was used by the Christians as of the Lord Jesus Christ very specifically. That, of course, is a New Testament study and a very interesting one, the usage of those terms in the New Testament. (Student) Which place do you mean now? (Student) Yes, in Verse 18 they're used--What was it in Hebrew there, I forget. (Student) I and the children which God hath given me. That's right. It's translated as if it were rather than as if it were the name of God. I don't think you'd call that a discrepancy though. The Lord certainly in the Old Testament context clearly means God, and (Student) follows the exactly the Septuagint which, I wouldn't say made an erroneous translation here but not perhaps a strictly exact translation. It simply quotes the Septuagint calling attention to the passage which the Septuagint translates in that way. Either one would give the idea. God or Jehovah. Well now this section that we have noticed here then goes on to point out that they should follow the testimony, this law which is held among the little group of disciples, the followers of Immanuel. Immanuel and His children, the group of true believers who, through the ages from that time on are to witness to God in the heathen and pagan world and to continue so and will continue so until the return of our Lord. They are the signs and wonders both to Israel and to all the nations. They are for indications. It is the greatest argument for Christianity, is the presence and the character of individual Christians or groups of Christians scattered through the world. The greatest argument for Christianity, the greatest evidence for it. More people are won to Christianity by Christian lives than by Christian argument. Christian argument is necessary and vital but if it is not backed up by Christian lives it may accomplish a great deal but it may not. It may accomplish very little. More people will be affected by the other, by the lives connected with the arguments than will be affected in any other particular way. Somebody said, "God is not looking for lawyers; He's looking for witnesses." and of course it's true we need both, but every Christian can be a witness, and we must never-- never allow activity as a witness to what God has done for us to be interfered with by our desire to be a lawyer. We should



## Prophets-51

fulfill both functions but above all that of witnessing by our life and by our testimony, to the truth of God.

Now we didn't find out where you think the transition is, between this chapter and the next and I think if you go on studying this and the next few verses of 9 as far as you've read in the Hebrew and have it very thoroughly in mind for tomorrow we'll try to make some progress through it. There are some very interesting and vital material there. Further about Immanuel.

-----

## Prophets-52

March 4, 1948

Practically everything from Verse 2, then, of our English and 1 of the Hebrew on describes great joy while in the previous verse there was reason for considerable question whether it described joy or not. wasn't there? Whether the people got their--the people who had been light--their afflictions were light, their afflictions were made heavy, or the people who had been humiliated, they now were exalted. It's rather difficult to be certain, about it, the change in Verse 23. Now if you look back you will find that in Verse 21 there probably is little question about the beginning of Verse 21 as to whether it is gloom or joy. I think you might look at your English Bibles now. I'd like to run through these six or eight verses in Hebrew but the length of time it took us on one verse, we'd be here till midnight and I think probably it's better to leave that for you/ <sup>to</sup> work on it yourselves. I think that we'd better get on into the principle of interpretation here which is vital but a principle which cannot be properly applied unless you work it through in the Hebrew, but the thing that there can be no doubt about is that in the beginning of Verse 21 you have people in misery. Verses 19 and 20 have described a people who have turned away from God and who have sought help from wizards. They have sought from all kinds of other means. They've sought their help from the arm of flesh or from the imagined supernatural beings, from false religions and false cults and false comforts of every sort; they have sought in those (who are described in Verse 19) they have sought in those their comfort and their guidance and Isaiah says in 20, "to the law and to the

## Prophets-52

testimony. If they speak according to this word it is because there is no light in them. And what is the result when you have no light? Twenty-one tells . . . They pass through it. Verse 21 tells us, sore distressed and hungry. Surely that is misery. There is no question about it. It is punishment upon the people for their wickedness. Upon what people? Well, we've been told above that the houses of Israel and Judah, both houses are in mind. Is one in particular in this verse or are both under consideration? It does not tell us here, does it? We'll say the land of Palestine then, is in mind here, the people in the land of Palestine. They shall pass through it. The result of their sin is that they have misery to go through. It shall come to pass when they shall be hungry they shall fret themselves and curse/their king and their God. So far, it is misery, anguish, trouble. There's no question about that. But then, they look upward. They turn their faces upward. What's that got to do with it? Does that mean they repent? Does that mean they turn back or does it mean they simply look up to see if there is any help to be found there? Well they look upward and they look to the earth to so it makes you wonder whether there is any sense in the verse division there. They look up and they look down. They look in every way to find help and they don't find it. Somebody may take Verse 21 as a transition in it. They're thirsty, they are in misery; they are hungry, but they look up, there's repentance. But you start in with 22 and they look down, look to the earth, or maybe they're just looking in every direction, trying to find some help and they're not finding it. They look to the earth and what do they see? They look up and they look down. What do they see? They see trouble and darkness, distress and anguish and then the Authorized Version ends Verse 22 with a translation "And they shall be driven into thick darkness." They shall be driven into darkness. That fits in certainly with the thought of the verse, they looking, they are in gloom, anguish. That's all they find and they're driven into thick darkness, but the Revised Version renders it, "And thick darkness shall be driven away." / <sup>And</sup> into thick darkness, the Revised Version, / <sup>they</sup> shall be driven away, but there is no into. (Question from student). Yes. The Revised Version I have here says "and into thick darkness they shall be driven away", but it has a foot note which says, "And thick darkness shall be driven away." Well now it makes a big difference whether they are driven away into thick



darkness or whether thick darkness is driven away. If you are out driving at night and it is foggy and miserable and the thick fog is driven away or you drive in a thicker fog, it makes a big difference, and yet the Hebrew is here very brief and it's hard to tell which to take it. The thick darkness is driven away and they're driven into thick darkness. Which is the correct interpretation? Well, if you say thick darkness, they're driven into thick darkness, as the Authorized Version did, then both these verses express gloom and misery but if you want to take it that the thick darkness is driven away, that would be like the Revised Version's margin while the Revised Version main text says, "In a thick darkness they shall be driven away." <sup>then</sup> And/the Revised Version margin says, "Thick darkness shall be driven away for" and then the next verse giving the reason, while both the Authorized and the Revised translate in their main text, "Nevertheless" or "But". They make the transition further. Now you see we start in and we have misery and in the end of Verse 21 they look up. Is that a suggestion of hope? They're looking up, the light's beginning to dawn—or isn't it? Well you go right on, "They look down to the earth". Does that mean they look all around and find nothing? Or they <sup>?</sup> No, they don't. They look down to the earth and they keep on. They're looking at the earth and everything is misery. Gloom, darkness, and they're cursing, and then, <sup>in</sup> they're driven away into thick darkness or thick darkness is driven away because there's a great change coming. Has your change come yet, or not? Well in the light of the previous clause or verse you're apt to say, "No, there is no transition. It continues. It's still dark." Your Authorized takes it that way. They shall be driven into darkness; nevertheless, the dimness shall not be such as was in her vexation, when at the first he lightly afflicted the land of Naphtali, and afterward did more grievously afflict her by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, in Galilee of the nations. The Revised says, "But there shall be no gloom to her that was in <sup>for</sup> in the former time he brought into contempt the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali but in the latter time hath he made it glorious." You see in one case he afflicts it more grievously, <sup>in</sup> the other case he makes it glorious. /the latter time he has made it glorious by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the nations. Well now here we have a specific



geographical statement. There is a place named. Where is that place? Is that within the kingdom of Judah? Is it actually within the tribe of Judah? Where is this place, Mr.---? (Student) Yes, are they south of Judah? (Student) They're fairly near Judah. That is, they are still in the land of Palestine. They're not in the southern kingdom. They are way up in the northern kingdom. They're north of the main part of the northern kingdom. The southern kingdom is only Judah and Benjamin. Zebulun and Naphtali are north of the center of the northern kingdom. Zebulun and Naphtali, the way of the Gentiles, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the nations. The region up around the Sea of Galilee. Zebulun and Naphtali, Zebulun comes right next to the Sea of Galilee, touches on it. The way of the Jordan up there, across the Jordan, the way of the nations, where the invaders come in, and end it. That is the section here described. Which kingdom is he talking about in this verse, Israel or Judah, Mr. ---? Israel, the northern kingdom, is here under consideration. So it is not the tribe of Judah at all. We've been talking about the two houses of Israel but now it is the northern house that is under conversation, and we read that at the first He afflicted them. Finally He afflicted them, or at the first He afflicted them, later on it was changed. Why are these singled out? Why are these places singled out? What do they mean by, what do we mean by the reference to Galilee of the nations? How did the nations get into this? (Student). Well Syria is quite a bit north of us yet, there are two or three other tribes between this and Syria. It is the area in which an army coming from the east enters in across Trans-Jordan, crosses the Jordan just south of the Sea of Galilee and enters into this area. Galilee of the nations. It's the section where the armies come marching through when an attack is made. It's the first place the attack comes, is in from that side entrance there. Now of course here it is Syria north, directly north, but the main part of Syria is further east and from the main part of Syria they are more apt to come this way. Yes? (Student) They would come in north, past the Sea of Galilee and then cross over the

and go south along the coast from there. Now they might come down the coast above that if they were coming from Syria or from the Hittite land but hardly if they were coming from Assyria or from the main part of Syria around Damascus because by the coast there at the border of Palestine Assyria is extremely narrow and very easy to guard and

## Prophets-52

difficult to get through. They are much more apt to come in by this more open section a little further inland. Well now here is a section where an army from Assyria will naturally enter the land. Ahaz is bringing the army from Assyria by his wicked plan. He is bringing the army from Assyria into the land, the army from Assyria is going to attack the Northern kingdom because of the perfidy of the king of the Southern kingdom who would bring in an outsider for help against the Northern kingdom and appeal to the wicked nation of Assyria against those who should be closest to him, the Northern kingdom. How often we find that, we find people who have a certain view or a certain stand will make alliance and friendship more readily with people who are very far away from them than with those who are near to them but not exactly with them, who differ a little bit, who are a short distance away from them. Those who are a short distance away they come in conflict with more perhaps because they are actually nearer to them, and therefore the points of conflict come more into sharp relief and sometimes you'll hear a person say that a man who compromises is worse than a modernist. Such a statement is utterly unchristian. There are two classes of people in the world, there are believers and unbelievers. A believer may be a man who is grossly mistaken; he may be a man whom we have to oppose; he may be a man whom we have to do every-thing we can to lead to take a different view of things but if he is a child of God who believes in the Lord Jesus Christ and is saved through Him, he is far closer to us than any unbeliever or modernist that denies the Word can possibly be. He is actually our brother as Dr. Shepperson said in chapel the other day. He may be a brother with whom we cannot work, but he is a brother whom it is our duty to love as a brother and to pray for and to have an entirely different attitude toward than we can have toward any unbeliever, but oh, how easy it is to think of a person who is way over there in an entirely different area and make friendship with him against those who are nearer to us. Now Israel was a great source of danger to Judah, a great source of danger, and Judah had to seek for help from Israel. They should have sought it from the Lord. They had to resist Israel; they had to oppose that which was wrong in Israel, but they had absolutely no business calling in the wicked Assyrian power against them, absolutely none. They are rebuked of God for it repeatedly and told that God's curse will be upon the individuals who were involved in doing this



## Prophets 52

wicked thing, but as I said, it's a natural, it's an easy thing to do, a thing which all of us at some time in our lives will fall into if we're not awfully careful, because it's a natural, human tendency. The flesh is very weak in this regard and many people fall into it. But the people of Israel here are the ones who meet the Assyrian attack first. Isaiah had told Ahaz, "The Assyrians are going to sweep over Israel and on into Judah. Judah is going to suffer greatly from the Assyrians. Judah is going to have great depopulation as well as Israel on account of the Assyrians. There's going to be great misery there on account of them but Israel gets the misery first. They are the ones who are

## Prophets - 53

and they

deserved the affliction which came to them, but the occasion of the affliction was the wicked act of Ahaz who as a scion of the House of David should have been doing that which would bless them instead of that which would bring the overwhelming force of wicked powers against them, and so now the wicked power of the Assyrian has flooded over the country in this area. Galilee of the nations. The tribes of Zebulun and of Naphtali are the tribes which first feel the force of the terrific attack of the Assyrian oppressor. They are the ones which first feel the coming of them. It is described in Verse 5, the armour of the armed, the man in the tumult and the garments rolled in blood, the misery of the attack and of the suffering and of the chaos and of the trouble and of the enslavement which come from the coming of the Assyrians against the land both of Israel and Judah hits Israel first in this place. And so now Isaiah has given us the rebuke. The people of the northern kingdom went into terrific misery, and the southern kingdom, also, but first the northern kingdom--terrific misery, driven to darkness, trouble and anguish, leading out of this act of Ahaz but a result of the sin of the people of both nations. Now they go into this



misery which hits them first in a specific area which is named, and yet, he says, in Verse 2, the people that walked in darkness have seen a great light: they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined. Now <sup>you</sup> do/want to start a new chapter with Verse 2, and say there's a complete break, Verse 2 starts a new section, all previous has been God's rebuke and a declaration of punishment coming to the people; it ends here at the end of Verse, as the Hebrew has it, Verse 23? It describes the misery of the coming of the Assyrian which enters Israel in this place, Naphtali and Zebulun, Galilee of the nations, or the land beyond Jordan. That's where the misery begins and as He afflicted this place more lightly with the former attacks of the Assyrians, now with the coming of the Assyrians, He afflicts it more grievously, that area--and then/<sup>we</sup>stop. And then we start a new chapter and we say "the people that walked in darkness have seen a great light." The people that dwelt in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined. Or do we say that this is describing those very people and saying that those people (I don't mean those very individuals, but I mean the people of that very area), that in that area where the darkness first came, where the results of Ahaz' act were first apparent, in that area the light first begins to break. That seems a reasonable interpretation, doesn't it? That you do not have a complete break but that you have a continuation of thought, as we find in most of our cases in our study in Micah and Isaiah. You all recall, while I hope, that/frequently we deal with a great promise of blessing and then we and rebuke with punishment/for sin, and there is a clean break between; that almost invariably when we have a change the other way, from rebuke to blessing, there is a definite relationship between the rebuke and the blessing. The rebuke is given in the immediate situation and then he goes on to show ultimate blessing beyond the punishment, in some way related to the immediate blessing. That is something we noticed in Micah three times, something we've noticed in Isaiah already repeatedly and we will notice it many, many more times before the end of the

semester if we make the progress we should, and so that is a thing that— rebuke and blessing is a natural sequence in the prophets. Blessing followed by rebuke is apt to be the starting of a new cycle and may mean a complete break. Well, now we have this rebuke and then we have this section of blessing. There is a good suggestion, the two are related. We say, "the people that walked in darkness," and are those the people we've just been speaking about? The people who went through this misery? And then in the previous two verses we find suggestions of a change. We find little suggestions. They look upward--or is it that they are looking all around? The darkness is driven away, or is it they are driven into darkness? Is it that He lightly afflicted them before and then He afflicts them more grievously, or is it that before He humiliated them but later He makes this area glorious? As the Revised Version has it? Which is it? Well, you can't tell. The Hebrew may have either sense, just like very often in our English there are different senses and it is hard to tell which is involved. In such a case we have to take what is there and see how it fits into the context in the total picture, and what we have here is a picture of misery and gloom followed by a picture of wonderful joy, joy like they joy in harvest, we are told in what follows, and it leads on up to the great verse, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given." It leads on up to that in a few verses. There is a passage of sorrow; there is a passage of joy. There is a transition which comes, you might say like at the end of a storm the light begins to break through the cloud here and then all the rest is cloudy and here is another little break through here and another little break through here, and you get glimpses of light coming and you are not quite sure whether it is really coming or whether the storm is still continuing, and then all of a sudden it bursts on you in all its glory, "the people that walked in darkness have seen a great light. They that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined," and the Archbishop when he made his division here made it like our English Bible, but the

rabbis, when they made it, they said, "That is silly. This verse is rebuke and goes with what precedes. There is a new section, and they start it. So they changed it there. Do you think that the fact that the rabbis changed it is partly connected with the fact that the New Testament quotes the two verses together? The rabbis said, "The New Testament is misquoting. The two verses don't belong together. One is in a section there, the other is in a section here, unrelated." They probably thought so, and--how's that? (Student) I don't know just when. I doubt if anybody knows, but some time after Stephen Lancaster. He was thirteenth century, so they would be after that time. They took his divisions, but they occasionally changed them. Well, now the situation then is that in the book of Matthew you have the two verses quoted but you don't have all the first verse quoted. You just have the place quoted, of the first verse. Matthew quotes the place and then goes on and says, "the people that walked in darkness have seen a great light." Is Matthew simply taking something out without a context? You find a few places named here. These places occur in history. Therefore put them in there. There is a relationship," or what did Matthew say? What is the exact reference in Matthew? Does one recall instantly./ <sup>Good.</sup> Matthew 4: 15 and 16. I didn't have it marked. I opened right to it. He says that Jesus, leaving Nazareth, came and dwelt in Capernaum, which is on the sea coast, in the borders of Zebulun and Naphtali, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying, "The land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, by the way of the sea, beyond Galilee of the Gentiles, the people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up." And so Jesus goes and lives in this place here which is mentioned back there, and therefore you say the same place is mentioned there and Jesus lives in it now, and therefore this is a fulfillment of that. Is there any sense to that? Is there any sense to it, that Matthew just picked something/<sup>out</sup> without any relation to context whatever? If I wasn't going to be away next week, I'd probably stop



here and tell you to think it over, but I think probably we'd better rush on rapidly because I won't see you next week and simply point out the fact that Matthew is not grabbing a couple of words and saying, "These apply to Christ because it happens to name the same places," but he is telling us that which was predicted by the Prophet Isaiah. He is saying, "Isaiah predicted the fact that that region where the Assyrians came, first came with their armies, that region where the misery began, that region where the gloom and the darkness first entered the land of Israel as a result of the wickedness of King Ahaz, is the very place where a light is going to break upon the land, the very place where first they will see the great light because Immanuel, the true scion of the House of David, the One who is going to undo the great harm that has been done by King Ahaz is going to begin giving the light of His glorious preaching in this very place, in this very section, and that is where Jesus began His preaching and where the people began to see the glorious light that came from the One who was, the child who was born, the Son who was given, who is indeed the wonderful Counselor. In that very place He began His preaching, in that very place the light of the gospel broke, in the very place where the misery of the Assyrian attack had first come, and so Isaiah predicts this specific thing. Now if you want a double prediction you can say that in the days of the Assyrian kings there was a great deliverance which came into this particular part of the land of Palestine and delivered them while none of the rest were delivered, but we know nothing about it. There is no historical reference to it anywhere, but we can imagine such a thing may have taken place perhaps, and that's what Isaiah was speaking of and then there is another fulfillment of it later on when Jesus begins preaching. But/<sup>that</sup> is entirely drawing upon your imagination because there is no historical evidence of any such thing, and also it is interpreting words in such a way that the same words mean two entirely different and diverse matters. Either this is a prediction of some unknown thing in the time of the Assyrians of which we have no historical evidence, or it is

as fits perfectly with the context, a specific, exact prediction of the fact that light of the preaching of the Lord Jesus Christ would first begin in that section of the northern kingdom which was the very section where the Assyrian army came, and so you have Isaiah predicting and the Lord fulfilling, and it fits perfectly with the context and there is one fulfillment of it and only one and it is the fulfillment which exactly fits that which is predicted. Now, I think that, instead of assigning a new lesson here, I'll ask you to review the Hebrew of Chapters 8 and 9 for next Tuesday and then our test comes as announced on Wednesday and covers only matters which have been either assigned this semester or discussed in class. It comes next Wednesday, and then I will post a notice of the assignment for Thursday and for the following Tuesday when we will again meet. Yet? (Student) This coming Tuesday there is no meeting. The assignment is simply the review of this. No meeting next Tuesday but two hours the following Tuesday.

- - - - -

March 16, 1948

When we left we were studying the ninth chapter of Isaiah. We had just started the study of that chapter and had noticed the transition between the eighth and the ninth. I think that it is perfectly clear in the English and even clearer when you look into the Hebrew that the transition is rather sharp but not exactly definite. That is to say that there are phrases in this of which you are not sure whether they go with what precedes or what follows, but that you have God's punishment, judgment upon wickedness before, you have God's blessing upon the people afterwards, and the transition between the two is little glimpses of light, rather than a transition that you are absolutely certain of, where it is, but you are certain, while you are uncertain of a great many phrases, which way they go, there are other phrases you are absolutely sure of and you begin to get a glimpse of the light and then another glimpse and then another glimpse, and then you have the light before you. So that I

feel that's a very important element of the interpretation of this passage here. Now we noticed the interpretation of Chapter 9, Verses 1 and 2, according to the English enumeration, 8:23 and 9:1 according to the Hebrew enumeration, and which of these two enumerations did we decide was the best, Mr. ---? The Hebrew or the English? (Student) How many think the English is the best? Raise your hands. How many think the Hebrew is the best? Raise your hands. Personally I don't think you can choose between the two. I think they are equally bad. I think they are both very, very poor. The question is, "Where does the transition go between the judgment and, between the rebuke and blessing?" Well you can't say where it goes. The English has the great advantage to it that it combines together two verses that are combined in the New Testament. That, of course, is an advantage, but as a matter of fact there is no reason to separate Verse 1 of 9 from 22, preceding. If you had a long passage of rebuke followed by a long passage of blessing, it would be perhaps reasonable to put a chapter division in between, but certainly far more reasonable is it to put a chapter division at the end of the short period of blessing which ends the long passage. Therefore, I would say very definitely that there is far more reason to have a chapter division at the end of Verse 7 than at either of these places. I would say at the end of Verse 7 is where there ought to be a chapter division according to any sensible arrangement, and then before that the next chapter division of comparable importance to that would certainly come somewhere in the latter part of Chapter, if you are going to have one there. I don't think it would be nearly as important as the one at the beginning of 8 which is a transition from to a second scene, but the chapter division here is, if you are not going to have one at the end of 7, it is rather absurd to have one here, and whether you are going to have one here, like the English, or like the Hebrew, it's pretty hard to say. It's pretty hard to decide between them. I would say they are both pretty bad. They both confuse us. They separate that which belongs together.

Well, now the reference of this chapter to the Lord Jesus Christ, Verse 2,



1 and 2, I think is clear. We discussed that last time. I do not think that the New Testament is grabbing at mention of a place and saying, "Well, here is the place Christ preached, let's apply this to Him." I don't think the New Testament ever does that. I think the New Testament is taking a direct, specific prediction of what He was to do there and calling attention to it, and I believe that this verse is fulfilled exactly in that thing, that it was fulfilled in the coming of the light through the preaching of the Lord Jesus Christ, that that was the fulfillment of it, that it has been fulfilled and that no one has a right to say now, if we find the Jews driving back the Arabs from Galilee in the next year or two that that is the fulfillment of this particular verse about the light shining upon the people in Galilee, nor do we have any reason to look for any fulfillment of it toward the end of this age or in the millennium. It was fulfilled in the time of Christ, it fits the situation completely and there is no more reason to apply it to that than there would be if we were to say, "The people that walk in darkness have seen a great light. That is the people in America, in some particular section, and that section the time when the gospel comes." It is true that the Lord sends the light, the light comes to people in the shadow of death, it comes as a result of what Christ has done. We can by analogy and by inference apply the teaching here to any time when the light of Christ comes, but that which is specifically predicted here is the preaching of Christ in Galilee, in His ministry. It is exactly that. It is nothing else but that. Of that I am 100% convinced. Again, that doesn't mean you have to accept my opinion on it, but I would like you to know what it is and I'd like you to know what I base it on, and if you have a good argument against it I would be very much interested in hearing you mention it here. I don't see any necessity of our spending a lot of time discussing it unless you have a good many arguments that have considerable validity in the case, and then I think it would be nice to have them presented. But the rest of this passage is one that contains a good deal of material not widely understood

and it certainly is worth our taking a little time to look at it, though I do not feel, in view of other similar problems to this first part—this first part I consider a major problem. I think it is something that is very little understood in the Christian world, when you take the number of times that people quote these verses from Matthew in connection with . and then think of the few of them that I think really understand their import in Isaiah. I think it is a major problem, but I don't think it is a difficult one. I think the rest of the passage here has some minor problems in it that are worth a little time, to us, but perhaps not in a course of this length worth a great deal of time. Verse 2 has the light coming to the people. Verse 3, "Thou hast multiplied the nation, and not increased the joy," the Authorized Version says. The Revised Version says, "Thou hast multiplied the nation; thou hast increased her joy." Here you have a contradiction in the Bible, the Authorized Version saying one thing, the Revised Version saying the exact opposite to it, and which of the two is correct, Mr.—? Which has translated the Hebrew correctly—the Authorized Version or the Revised Version? You, of course, have all translated this. This is one of the passages we have assigned, up through Verse 7, and I'd be interested to know what conclusion you came to on it. What is the correct translation of Verse 2 there? Mr.—, what is your conclusion? (Student) Well, what is the evidence then. If you haven't come to a conclusion, suppose you state to us the evidence upon each side. I think that was a very fine attitude you formed, not jumping to a conclusion but gathering the evidence and weighing it carefully and reserving judgment until you are sure which direction it . Now what is the evidence that you would present on one side and what is the evidence on the other side? (Student) There doesn't seem to be? You mean that the Authorized Version has just deliberately inserted the word "not" with no warrant whatever? (Student) I see. Well, then it is a . You mean the Revised Version, then, is wrong? They have made another false translation? (Student) Yes. And what does the footnote say? I see. And so that settles the matter, does it? (Student) It doesn't.

You mean if you have a footnote in the Bible, that doesn't always settle the matter? No. Now, a footnote in the Bible may be a very useful suggestion showing you what some man thinks is the interpretation. It may be very helpful. Some people say we should never use a Bible with notes in it. Just use God's Word. I think that's an excellent idea, but of course when you cut out the footnotes you must also cut out the headings at the top of the page. They are man's interpretation, and you must also cut out the chapter divisions, which are human interpretations. You must also cut out the verse divisions, which are human interpretations. The names of the books are often human interpretations. The translation involves a great deal of human interpretation, and even the vowel / <sup>points</sup> involve a certain amount. So if we would have no human interpretation in our Bible let's have merely the Hebrew consonants and nothing else, and that will be strictly having that which is God's Word and that alone. Now, of course, we cannot do that. So the best thing to do is to recognize that, what is God's Word. It is the consonants of the Hebrew text, and recognize that anything beyond that is human interpretation but very few of us know enough to just throw aside all human interpretation and just / <sup>simply</sup> start with the Bible and work on it. We must start with the human interpretation available recognizing it as human interpretation, considering it as such and taking it for its value, not casting it aside lightly nor hanging to it, but recognizing that the Hebrew consonants are what count. Now in this case what are the consonants of the Hebrew? (Student) Yes. Well, what is it of the original? (Student) Well, how do you speak and read (Student) Both exactly the same. The fact of the matter is that the agrees upon a text, and that text they have preserved to us are written texts, it is a text on which there is very little textual evidence of variation, very little, that has come down to us. It is a unified text. But there are places where the have put a footnote, and given us another set of consonants. Are they in this case saying that Christ says this but we think it means that? We're sure there's a mistake. If so, why didn't they put



28/144

the other text up in the top? Or is it perhaps that of the manuscripts they had available to them the majority had that which they have in the top but there also were manuscripts which which had the reading they have in the body, and therefore they felt that this was the preferred reading and that there was manuscript evidence for it but the other one was the one which had more manuscript evidence and therefore they felt required to it in the text. I think most scholars feel the latter is the case, that the \_\_\_\_\_ gives us in most cases evidence of actual manuscript evidence available, less manuscript evidence than that in the top but evidence which the \_\_\_\_\_ thought was the preferred reading though not the one best evidenced. Now there is a certain amount of theory in that but it is rather generally accepted by most interpreters, I believe. So that when you have \_\_\_\_\_ out in the written text that is what the majority of ancient manuscripts have, but when you have \_\_\_\_\_ in the text at the bottom, that is either the interpretation which the \_\_\_\_\_ thought was the correct one, or in a case like this, more likely it is not only that which they thought was the correct one but one which they had a certain amount of manuscript evidence for but not sufficient to make them feel justified in \_\_\_\_\_ it in \_\_\_\_\_, so we are justified in saying that there is evidence for \_\_\_\_\_ and evidence for \_\_\_\_\_ and in that case which one will you build your great doctrine on? Which of the two? You are very sensible in such a case not to build a doctrine upon it's being one or the other but to see what the import is of the two possibilities. It is exactly as if you said in English that they raised the city, and that could mean that they raised it up from the ground, building it up, a great city, or that they razed it to the ground, as they destroyed it. Our English word "raise" is used in both senses. There are many English words which have two senses like that. In this case the Hebrew pronounced word \_\_\_\_\_ has the two senses, and which is meant by it is not certain in the text, any more than if you find, "I" followed by "r e a d" in English you know whether it is "I read" or "I read". You have a right of private interpretation on that point. Now here, as you know, it is not "to them" or "to me", it is either "to him" or it is not, but which of the two it is we

Prophets - 54

do not have proof. And so, as you see, a person without his knowledge of Hebrew

- - - - -

Prophets - 55

a person in a case like this finds the Revised and Authorized versions flatly contradicting each other and wonders what kind of a text we have anyway, but with a knowledge of Hebrew you see that it is just the same as "r e a d" in English, whether it is rē~~ad~~ or re~~ad~~, or perhaps rather it is like an English word which with the same pronunciation may be spelled two ways with a different meaning, like the word "raise", He raised the city up or he razed it down. Well, now in either case then, "Thou hast multiplied the nation and not increased the joy." The nation is multiplying but there is not yet joy. Then it follows with the joy--the transition. It's a comparison between the joyless multiplication and then the joyful condition which has come. A transition within the verse. The verse describing the condition of misery before and a condition of joy which follows. Our whole situation here is one of a description of transition from misery to joy and therefore that is a perfectly reasonable interpretation, not at all out of harmony with the context, to take the as it stands. On the other hand the rest of the verse, being a description of joy, "Thou hast multiplied the nation; thou hast increased joy to him," is equally possible, and there the whole verse is just to show us the joy that comes as a result of, in connection with the coming of this light. There is light then. Those who dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them the light shined. This very place where the Assyrians first entered with its career of misery for the people, in this place has come the wonderful preaching of the Word of God, the wonderful preaching of God's Kingdom, the wonderful preaching of salvation through Christ. Now the people joy, like the joy in harvest, and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil. A tremendous joy. There's joy when things work out right, joy when something is successful, joy when there is accomplishment and when people receive that which they tremendously need. Now why does this great joy come? Why does

Prophets - 55

it come? Well, because light comes. Light and happiness, yes. But here is a specific thing in connection with the joy. Verse 4. Four in the Hebrew. "For the yoke of his burden thou hast broken and the staff of his shoulder, the rod of his oppressor." An end of oppression, an end of burden, and an end of misery. What kind of burden, what kind of misery, what kind of oppression is involved here? Is it necessarily simply the oppression of a foreign aggressor who was holding them, or does it include also that which is at the basis and background of all oppression by human means? The oppression of sin, which causes all our misery in this world? Are both types of oppression involved for after all they are closely related? Oppression is broken and how is it broken? What is the end of the verse? What are the last three words, two words? (Student) Yes. Day of Midian. Well, what the day of Midian have to do with this. Mr.---what does that mean, the day of Midian? As the day of Midian? What does that mean? (Student) Yes. That is a very good suggestion. That it is a comparison to a previous deliverance. Here they are rejoicing because of a great deliverance, a deliverance like the day of Midian, a reference to a previous deliverance. What other suggestion would you have to make for an interpretation of this verse? Mr.--- You can't think of any other. Mr.---. can you think of another? Mr.---, what do you think? You all agree with me. I don't think of any other. The only one I can think of that seems to me to throw any light on it is to compare it to Gideon's conquest. Like the day of Midian. Like that day when Gideon conquered Midian, so is there a deliverance from oppression here. Well, what was important about that day? What was the vital thing? Surely the suddenness is the thing that is vital, isn't it? It's the suddenness and it is the fact that God gave the victory. Perhaps those two entered into it. A little band of three hundred men overthrew the tremendous hosts of Midian. Well those three hundred men couldn't defeat the great hosts of Midian. God gave the victory and God gave it suddenly. God acts, by God's appointed leaders God



delivers them from the hosts of wickedness and sin, and so here is it not valid to say the people are rejoicing because/ <sup>of</sup> a sudden, overwhelming victory over sin and oppression which comes through an intervention of God. Would not that be what "as the day of Midian" here means? Mr.---? It--my personal opinion is that military oppression is very much in mind but that the background of military oppression has been present all through the previous but it is military oppression which is the result of sin, which has come because God sent this. There's no light in them; they've turned away from the law and the testimony and there's no light in them and so they pass through and hungry and misery. It is military oppression resulting from the oppression of sin, and the deliverance--are you going to restrict it to one or the other or are you going to say that both are involved? That is, it isn't saying two things but it is one complex including the two phases. (Student) When Christ came He on the cross secured the victory over Satan, which brings us deliverance from both. Deliverance from the oppression of sin and deliverance from military oppression, which is the result of sin. It all is the result of . (Student) Yes. It's very strongly stressed there. It was due to the sin of the people and the deliverance from it began when Gideon stood up and destroyed the idols, and overcame Baal and the Midianites said, "Turn Gideon over to us. We'll punish him. We'll kill him for this," and his father said, "Well if Baal is a god, let Baal . Why should we intervene on Baal's behalf?" There was a recognition that Baal wasn't a god. There was idolatry, there was sin, the cause and the accompanying situation, and in the Bible we have the teaching that physical oppression is the result of sin. It is caused by sin, can never be fully cured until the sin problem is cured. The two go along parallel. One follows after the other; one may result from the other; you cannot permanently solve one without solving the other. I think that is taught consistently through the Scripture, and so in this case I think that there is a very strong emphasis on military oppression, which is the outward sign of the effects of sin, and while there is that emphasis, I think there is

also an emphasis all through on that which causes the oppression, and that is the worst oppression, the worst thing, is the oppression of sin, and so then we find that this verse stresses the deliverance, a sharp, sudden deliverance, a deliverance by God's power, a deliverance which I think finds its actual accomplishment through Christ at Calvary, but a deliverance which finds its full outworking later on, in an outworking, when He comes to any heart and gives him salvation, an outworking for the whole world when He brings to the whole world victory over military oppression and suffering of every kind which is accomplished as a result of atonement, through the work of Christ.

Well, then Verse 5 describes the coming of the Assyrian host. It describes the coming of the Assyrian host, the armor of the armed men and the tumult, the boots of the booted warriors, the battle of the warrior with confused noise, garments rolled in blood, all that is going to be for burning and fuel of fire. The vivid description of the bloody aspects of the war, of the conquest, of the destruction which comes with the Assyrian attack but which continues all through history; as long as there is sin in the world we are going to have war, oppression and misery, but all this is going to be brought to an end. All the weapons of war will simply be turned over to the fuel of fire. There will be a complete disarmament because they will no longer be necessary. Now that doesn't say that this is going to come when Christ preaches at Galilee, but it says that this is a result of the light which Christ gives. It is a result of that which is presented to them in Galilee, Jesus Christ, God's Son, who has come to give the victory. When they see Him they see the light, the light beginning suddenly to shine brightly in an area, the light which eventually will lighten the whole earth, and then you have the most remarkable thing, that this Light which is going to cause a complete end of military oppression and which is going to bring peace upon earth so that all the garments rolled in blood and the boots of the warriors and all that can be utterly wrecked and destroyed and an end brought to them, and they learn war no more, that this comes, we are told, because "Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the government shall be upon His shoulder."



Prophets - 55

Does that mean that the day He is born the government is placed on His shoulder? Surely not. There are little sons who have been born just about the time their fathers have died and they've been acclaimed as the King of a region, the great ruler, but actually the government has not been on their shoulder. He has merely been a figure head for someone else to rule. The government will be upon His shoulder, going forward to a time when He Himself will rule, which cannot be when He is born. There is joy because of His birth, but the joy is because of what He is going to do later, that He is going to have the government upon His shoulder. Now this bringing in of a wonderful verse in connection with the end of war and destruction fits right in, of course, with our prediction back in Chapter 7. Ahaz is the son of the House of David, who is wearying men and wearying God also with his clever human schemes to play off human forces one against another and thus to relieve them from war and oppression and from the danger of the terrific attack which is coming from the north. Ahaz is not using God's method. God says God is going to send a substitute for Ahaz. He is going to send One who will be God's true representative, God with us, the true scion of the House of David, and now again we back to that idea of the birth of Immanuel. "Unto us a child is born." We will rejoice because of that fact, that one is born, except that now we are looking forward very definitely to the time of His birth and seeing the coming of joy, joy to those who knew what it meant when He was born, joy to those in Galilee who heard His first preaching and first began to see the light shining forth, joy to those who look forward to the time when the government will indeed be upon His shoulder, joy to those who know that all war and oppression is indeed going to come to an end because He is going to reign and righteousness and peace upon this earth. The government will be upon His shoulder and who is this one who is born? Well a child is born. Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given. Parallelism and poetry. No particular meaning. Simply two statements that are next to each other that mean the same thing in different words. That's the possible interpretation, but it is very interesting that we have these two statements, a child is born and a Son



Prophets - 55

is given, and they remind us how back in Chapter 4 we were told that the branch of the Lord will be beautiful and glorious, and the fruit of the earth shall be excellent and comely. At that time the parallelism was not nearly as natural. We had to find a way in which both of those could properly be used together. Now in this case they seem natural, it's a natural parallelism that we have no other evidence anywhere to throw light on the suggestion that there is more to it than a natural parallelism. We might say, "That's all there is to it." And yet in view of the fact we have statements elsewhere which suggest there is more to it we are justified in saying, "Here again is a hint of the fact that this one who is born as a child is also given as a Son, that there are two aspects to it, not proven by this verse, but suggested by it

Prophets - 56

And so the two-fold nature of our Lord Jesus Christ is not proven here but is suggested here, very definitely suggested. He is Immanuel, God with us. He is One born as a human child, He is One who is given as indeed the Son of God. Not proven but very definitely suggested and fitting into its other indications you can take it as evidence of the teaching of this in Isaiah. And this one is eventually to have the government upon His shoulder. We are not told when He takes the government upon His shoulder. Actually in the light of subsequent knowledge of Christ we can say there are three aspects of His taking the government upon His shoulder. One of them is, of course, that He is going to reign from sea to sea. He is going, indeed, to be the One who will control all the world. He will rule the nations with a rod of iron; His Word will go out from Jerusalem; peace and happiness will be everywhere because He will be in control. A wonderful prediction of the millennium. That is the time when truly the government is upon His shoulder, but that doesn't mean that the government is not upon His shoulder at all before that time. He is now ruling in the hearts of those who believe on Him. You cannot take Him as Saviour

without also taking Him as Lord. We do not make a bargaining arrangement with Him. He will save us if we do something for Him. Not at all. He saves us with a complete change in our character, in our life, a complete taking over from the kingdom of darkness to the kingdom of light, and we, if we are truly saved, are looking to Him as Saviour and Lord. The government is upon His shoulder over every Christian, and so, while the kingdom of Christ receives its full expression at the time when He reigns over this earth and has complete power over the whole world and the world today lies in the evil one and Satan is today the prince of this world, nevertheless, we, today, are, we who believe on His name, are members, not of Satan's kingdom, but of His kingdom. We are living in Satan's kingdom. We have to deal with Satan's kingdom, but in it we are to be witnesses to His kingdom of which we are a part, actually now, so the government is upon His shoulder in that He is the true Lord of all those who believe on His name though it will in the fullest sense not be on His shoulder until the whole world is subject in actuality to the decree which He sends forth from Jerusalem, but then there is a third note in it which is very important for each of us. The government shall be upon His shoulder. He wants the government to be upon His shoulder. It is vital that it be upon His shoulder. It is vital that if we are truly His we are constantly asking this question, "Is the government over me, more and more coming upon His shoulder. Am I more and more becoming subject/to His will and His desire. I think that is a very important aspect of the statement. The government shall be upon His shoulder. Mr.---? (Student) All three are included in that which is to be . It is predicting this fact about Him, that the government will be upon His shoulder There is a certainty of the government's being upon His shoulder eventually over the whole world. There is an actuality of the government's being upon His shoulder to a greater or less extent over every one who is His submissive disciple and if you are not that I question seriously whether you are one whom He has saved, and there is a progressive increase in the government being upon His shoulder over every one who is truly His. All three are aspects of that which is taught

here, that He is the one who is to rule in this age in the hearts of His people in the millennium over all of the world. They are not three different things. They are three aspects of one thing, a continuous manifestation from the time of Christ right on through the present and right on to the millennium. Now—yes! (Student)

I don't see how Verse 7 limits it. I would say that Verse 7 stresses the physical aspect, but it doesn't deny the most aspect of the Spiritual aspect. The doing away of the handling of the sin problem is primary to the handling of the military problem, and the military problem is the one which is more evident, more obvious, and therefore stressed, but as you start clear back in Chapter 8 you find that it is the sin attitude where they refuse to look to God for their guidance, they do not listen to this Word, therefore there is no light in them, that the result comes with the physical aspect, and you have the redemption, including both the physical aspect and the military. (Student) Well, they're just as great. It's rather hard to say. I would say that the physical is that which is more in the external sphere and more obvious but the Spiritual is that which is back of the physical and the cause of it and in some ways greater, because God is not interested so much in just setting up a physical realm in which there is outward obedience as He is in setting up a Spiritual realm in which there is inward obedience working itself out in outward obedience. They both are involved. In one sense the physical is greater because it is the outward, physical manifestation, and in another sense the Spiritual is greater because it is that which is the cause and foundation of all the physical. So I don't quite like to make a comparison. There is a difference in quality as well as in degree, but I think they are involved in the one thing. These people in are rejoicing because of the birth of Christ. They are rejoicing because they see before them the One who is their Messiah, the One who is God and who is man. They are seeing this One upon whose shoulder the government is going to be. They are rejoicing because they can, the light has sprung up upon them and they can look forward to the time when the government will be entirely upon the shoulder of this One who is already born, that is in Galilee, and so now we can look forward and we



can say, "We praise the Lord that He is born, but why do we praise the Lord at Christmas time simply because there was a birth, simply because the Methodist quarterly one time--I picked it up and at Christmas time the lesson was on the Prince of Peace and the whole lesson was, "How will we secure disarmament and persuade the nations to adopt universal peace?" We rejoice because universal peace is coming. We rejoice because the One has been born through whom it is going to be brought about. We rejoice because He who has been born brings peace in our hearts and gives us victory over sin and deliverance from it and is going to give this whole world victory and deliverance over sin. Again, this particular passage here does not specifically teach premillennialism. It can fit in with the premillennial interpretation, it can fit in with a post-millennial interpretation, but it leaves no room whatever for an amillennial interpretation. It shows a universal ruling of Christ upon this earth as coming but it doesn't say whether it is coming simply by the progressive spread of the gospel until the hearts of all are subject to Him or whether there is going to be a great physical intervention which is going to establish it after the body of Christ is complete. This passage does not decide between those views but it does say it is coming. It leaves no room for the idea that righteousness and wickedness go along side by side and then come to the end and that's all. Mr.---? (Student) There is a variation of, which is sometimes called an amillennial view although very few amillennialists hold it, because it really is a form of premillennialism rather than amillennialism, a form which makes the millennium an endless period rather than a limited period. It is, I think, an incorrect form of premillennialism but it has more in common with premillennialism than with amillennialism. It is making a millennial period after the return of Christ. Most amillennialists put these passages completely during the present age. There is that view which some would say they hold leads logically right into the premillennial view and is really nearer to it than to any true amillennial view. Mr.---? (Student). Yes. Every time you see anything about peace or righteousness or anything it is simply a description

Prophets - 56

of the hearts of the people during this age, and of course that is involved in this present and many passages, but they go far beyond that. There is a ruling over the whole earth clearly taught ~~and~~ a period of freedom from external suffering, clearly taught in the prophets of the Old Testament, which if you can get rid of you can just as well get rid of the resurrection, of Christ and make it the great principles and permanence of personality, simply a beautiful parable which shows you a spiritual truth. So-called spiritualization is in my opinion not spiritual at all. So-called spiritualization is really taking a thing as figurative to the sense that everything about it is figurative, to the extent that you make things figures for something entirely different from what they actually mean. If you say, "He is a lion in the fight", there is a figure, and the figure is one fighting with courage, but if you say that he is a lion in the fight and you spiritualize it that is making the "he" stand not for an individual but perhaps for the whole Christian race and making the fight stand simply for perhaps the ordinary conduct of life and then the fact that he was a lion would mean, not that he was brave but that he was king and that he used his mouth in preaching the gospel as the lion roars sometimes. That is, it is apart from the natural figurative sense and introduces all sorts of figurative interpretations. It is a course which is used by those who go with a certain amount of truth to the Scripture and simply try to make everything a further illustration of that which they already know instead of a method of going to the Scripture and saying, "Let us humbly see what is here." Let us admit there is a great deal that isn't clear, let us try to see what the interpretation is, take that which is clear, stand upon it and move forward to that which is not clear and gradually God will give us understanding of more and more of it but let us humbly say whatever we understand we accept, whatever we don't understand we keep studying and praying God to make clear to us, rather than twisting it around in some way to fit into what we already know, and simply be a further statement of something we already know, and not add anything else. I don't like the term spiritualization. It is a misnomer but it is a term rather widely

Prophets - 56

used. What they mean by it is raising the Old Testament to a higher level, so-called. The Old Testament talks about fighting, it talks about a kingdom, it talks about ruling. By doing away with war we raise it to the higher level that is a description of the church in which God reigns in the hearts of His people, and in which there is Spiritual blessing and progress. Well, all that is true, all that is taught in the Old Testament which is extremely important but there are many passages in the Old Testament which are dealing with other things or with that in connection with other things, and it is wrong to twist them to mean that and only that. Yes? (Student) The first part? (Student) Oh! Well we haven't come to the end yet. The end goes on that His name shall be called, and what do we mean--His name shall be called? We've already been told His name is going to be Immanuel and when Christ came they didn't call Him Immanuel. The name is used in the Bible in a sense quite different from our modern sense. To us a name is merely a handle and you might use any name you want just so you stick to the same one and people know what you are talking about. Now in modern China as I understand it they give a person a descriptive name and then if they think he is a little different they give him a different name. Chian-kai-shek has had five or six different names that different people call him and the missionaries--sometimes you have one name and then they change it to another. The name is more or less a descriptive thing and in some ways truly represents the person. In our modern usage the name is merely a handle, just an indication, and that being the case I don't see why we don't use more of a variety of them instead of just using the same common ones over and over, but we do, because they don't have any meaning and at the same time it decreases their effectiveness as handles. Now in the Bible the person's name is often used in the sense of designation of its meaning, something that truly indicates the character of something, rather than merely an indication, merely a handle to point, and so here we are shown certain characteristics about Him. I don't say that's the only interpretation which is possible. If you want to take it this is the actual name of the One who



Prophets - 56

is coming, that is also a possible interpretation, but the other is equally possible, and unless His name was Immanuel and also was this, why one or both of them are descriptions rather than merely designations.

Prophets - 57

Now what is this name? What is He called? What are these characterizations? Our Authorized Version translates it "Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." The Revised translates it exactly the same except that it leaves out the article, leaves out the "the", and then it has a footnote, "Wonderful, Counsellor or Wonderful counsellor." Well now from the Hebrew which do you prefer? Wonderful? Counsellor? or Wonderful-Counsellor? Which would you say was the preferable translation of the Hebrew here, Mr.---? You don't know? Well now, what does--look at it. Read it. " " What does that mean? (Student) Yes. "And His name--

--and His name has been called, His named was called "

It's a tense of the Hebrew. It expresses a relationship rather than a . What is the next word after " "? (Student) " " Yes. Well now why not say, "And His wonderful name shall be called?" Why not translate it that way? Have you any objection to that, Mr.---? "And His wonderful name shall be called." (Student) Yes. It would have to have the article. In other words " " is not an adjective going with " " because " " is definite and an adjective agreeing with a definite noun must be definite. Therefore " " cannot go with " " because " " is definite and " " is indefinite and they do not go together, so that is not a possible interpretation here. All right then, if we do not take it that way in this case, if you don't take " " as an adjective going with " " why not take it as an adjective going with " ". " a wonderful counsellor?" (Student) I don't expect it. I think it would be (Student) Yes. We have adjectives preceding nouns with which they go in the Hebrew quite frequently. I might say, "red book", in Hebrew. You have the

Prophets - 57

word "red" followed by the word "book". How would you translate it? You would say "red is the book", wouldn't you, and a adjective in Hebrew may precede , an attributive adjective in Hebrew follows. "A red book" would be "a book a red one", so if you have " " it is not "a wonderful counsellor". That would be " ", but the word " " can be taken as a noun, " a wonderful thing, a wonderful one, or thing," and if " " is the , what would the be? (Student) Yes. So that this can be or . It can be "a wonderful one, a counsellor, or a wonder of a counsellor", so "a wonder of a counsellor" is perfectly all right here and "a wonder of a counsellor" isn't very far from "a wonderful counsellor", is it, so that "wonderful counsellor" is not an impossible rendering, taking it as an adjective, "a wonderful counsellor" and there is this in its favor, that all of your subsequent descriptions are, consist of two words, and that would make it parallel, "a wonder of a counsellor, a mighty God, an everlasting Father, a Prince of Peace." That's His name. All these different things. A wonder of a counsellor, or wonderful counsellor. Both are possible, and it is pretty hard to decide if one would necessarily be the right one rather than the other in that particular case. Well now His name having all these things connected with it, it seems quite natural to think of it that they are descriptive , and who can be described by all these wonderful names? Is that a proper name for David? Is it a name for Hezekiah? Is it a name for any earthly man? I add here the Jewish word, and the Jewish word here says , "And His name is called , that the government may be increased and of peace there will be no end." So you know His name, in the Jewish version, but it is a good deal longer than most Jewish names, and it is rather hard for some of us to escape the opinion that they, by transliterating instead of translating, are trying to escape the implication that it is a description of Him and shows Him to be actually deity. Now we will not continue our discussion until one hour from now--an hour and five minutes.





"Father of booty " hardly seems to make much--no, that's the next phrase, "the mighty God", a God of a hero, some people try to tell you, as if the God of a hero is certainly a very unusual phrase. Mighty God, a hero who is to be the God is certainly a more natural rendering of it, and then "Father of eternity", "Eternal Father" certainly seems to fit the context better than "Father of booty", and the Prince of Peace, the One who brings peace, who establishes peace. All these different phrases as translated this way fit in very well with the character of the Lord Jesus Christ. Translating them, getting the idea of the Father of booty, and God of a hero, consists more of the idea of one who simply conquers and destroys, ravages, and that doesn't fit particularly well with all this theme about the light coming and the Prince of Peace and the doing an end with the weapons of war. I read to you the text of the Jewish version, which is a very excellent translation on the whole, but in this one place it simply transliterates instead of translating; this, of course, is what we do when we say "His name shall be called 'Immanuel'". We could just as well say, "His name shall be called 'God with us'". It is always a question to the translators, "Shall we translate or transliterate?", and especially in the case of a name, and judgments vary, but to transliterate a long statement like this simply doesn't fit the meaning unless the reader is familiar with Hebrew. did not leave the reader in that condition of ignorance the meaning of phrases. He has a footnote. He says, "That is wonderful in counsel, is God, the mighty everlasting Father, the Ruler of Peace." You see that gets rid of the significance that the Messiah is Deity. His name is Wonderful in counsel is God the Mighty, the Everlasting Father, the Ruler of Peace," and you'll find some commentators take it a little differently and say, "The Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Ruler of Peace, the Counselling, a wonderful thing." here, takes them just like the Authorized Version, the last part, the Ruler of Peace "The mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace/" He doesn't

Prophets - 57

adopt any of those other interpretations as some have tried to , but he agrees with those who say "His counselling are wonderful", instead of saying "Wonderful in Counsel", in making it a long name which simply is giving praise to God. Theoretically such a name is not at all impossible. In actual practice you have cases where, in Babylonian names, where you say, "Certain gods, the god is king of the earth, or some such thing as that. You have many names . In the Bible many of our names are, "God has done a certain thing." Eliashim, "God establishes" - different names like that, in the Hebrew. Joshua, Jehoshua, Jehovah saves. Many a name like that has a meaning, but yet you have a long description of the subject followed by a very brief predicate like this, is something that I have never come across anywhere in ancient names. It certainly would be utterly contrary to useage in names and there doesn't seem to be much point in it here in the context to simply bring in a long name like that. "His name will be", and all this long name of praise to God. It doesn't seem to make so much sense. It seems to make far better sense if it is, having a long and unusual sort of a combination like this, that it is descriptive of Him. It seems a much more natural method of interpretation.

- - - - -

Prophets - 58

and of course that method of interpretation does fit in with the other teaching which we find in Isaiah elsewhere, that a wonderful child is coming, a child who represents God with us, the idea of God's presence and the idea that wonderful this/child is indeed not only a child but also a , a Son of God. Here is another case where you wouldn't want to prove so much in advance that these wonderful promises for the future but you get wonderful glimpses of what is coming and when you put the different glimpses together your idea and understanding of that which is coming in the future becomes clearer and clearer. Now in Verse 7." Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end." But the "shall be" is inserted. "Of the increase" or "the increase of the

government and peace not an end." It's not "His government," really, it's just "the government," and peace is not an end. Nothing is able to destroy His government and His peace. None is able to overwhelm His rule and His justice, and we find--someone asks, "How does that fit with premillennial teaching? Well, the increase--does this mean that it is just going constantly keep increasing forever? I don't think anybody quite believes that. It's the increase which there is no end to. "Of the increase of His government and peace there is no end." It certainly would mean, not a temporal thing--there is no end, but that there is no destruction of it, there is no putting an end to it. There is no overthrowing of the government and of the peace, which He establishes. No one overthrows it. It fits entirely with the possibility that He Himself turns over the government to His Father in this that God may be all in all. There is nothing contradictory/at all in the idea that of the period in which He reigns as king in Jerusalem there should be an end to that period or a change in its general form and substance, a voluntary change which He brings about. There is no one able to destroy it at the end of the millennium. There is an uprising, an attempt to destroy/<sup>it</sup> an uprising which fails. There is no end to the increase of His government and peace and this again, of course, the way it is expressed, could fit perfectly with a postmillennial interpretation, that things go on increasing, multiplying constantly until you have the whole world covered as a result of the spread of the gospel. took the postmillennial interpretation of this passage and the passages in Revelation 20. He said, "The emphasis is upon the completeness of the victory." There is a complete victory, a complete establishment of God's control upon earth. Does that come about as a result of the gradual spread of the gospel? Does that come about as a result of Christ's divine interposition. Some of these passages don't make clear which way it comes about but it is perfectly clear that it does come about and amillennial interpretation that evil and good just go on together until the end and then there is the last judgment is definitely ruled out by many events in the Scripture. I don't like to speak of an amillennial interpretation because there are



about as many interpretations as there are amillennialists. The reason is they don't stop to interpret, as a rule. Amillennialism is a denial. Post-millennialism is a position, premillennialism is a position. Amillennialism simply lumps together those who get rid of the millennium out of the Scripture and have any particular other interpretation, but the millennium is so clearly taught in the Scripture that it seems that we have to fit it in somewhere, either before or after the return of Christ. Now this is going to, His government and His peace upon the throne of David, and upon His kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. Now that word forever, of course, is one from which eternity cannot be gathered. I think I have mentioned in this class the very fine article which was sent to me for criticism some years ago, for suggestions, rather, as to how to judge whether any little point would need correction before it could be published, but the whole article was upon the basis that the eternal punishment of the wicked is proven by the word " " , and it said, "The word ' ' means eternity, it must mean eternity because there is no other word to mean eternity." Well, of course we have our word " " which means eternity just as much as " " and both of them are used, not only of the future but of the past and not only of the past back in the very counsels of God but of the past within the light span of this earth and long after creation. We read, "These were men of " , men of a name, and it doesn't mean that the great heroes who were born when the sons of God went in to the daughters of men were eternal creatures. It doesn't mean that at all. It means they go way, way back into " . So " " means way, way off, forward or back. It is a term to express a long distance. It is not the term to mean that there is no end to it. That is a philosophic concept, a concept which we may arrive at by a study of the different passages but we have no right to assume that that must be the conception involved in a particular word which is used. You take the rank and file of people in ordinary daily life, take all the words that they would use over a long period of time, and see how many times one of these words

would express a concept of eternity. Unless you are discussing a definite teaching of the Scripture it is not a concept which would necessarily arise and develop and consequently there wouldn't necessarily be a word which carried that precise concept. The concept would have to be expressed with the use of the word and the fact that this word alone " " does not mean eternity is shown by the fact that sometimes it's made stronger, forever and ever, not just forever. " " and the same in the New Testament

The word in itself  
 " " does not mean alone "eternity", but the word is used in contexts in which the idea of eternity is clearly brought out. I think that is rather vital that we get a clear understanding of it. We are sure to come into contact with people who will build great arguments against eternal punishment on the fact that these words do not in themselves carry the idea of eternity. There's no use fighting them over the meaning of the word and making a big argument about it because they are right, the word itself does not convey that concept, but it conveys the concept of a very, very long time and then when you say "an of " or an of " you get the idea of a tremendous long stretch, and then you have various expressions used, "where their worm dieth not", the various expressions used to signify the idea of a long, continuous but it is not a concept you would necessarily look for in one individual word. And so when you say that it continues from now on and even to , there is a long period but not necessarily a period that goes on everlastingly. Now, of course, in a sense, of course, Christ's kingdom goes on everlastingly. There is at the end of the millennium an attempt to destroy it which fails. Just how vital is the break at the end of the millennium? Does He give over the kingdom to the Father that God may be all in all and in<sup>a</sup> sense make a complete break or is there simply /a change in administration for after all He is indeed God. He has controlled the world from the beginning. All the creation was done through Him, and surely His kingdom is to endure in a very real sense through all time, even though there be a limited period, a period after the resurrection of the righteous dead, a period previous to the resurrection of the wicked dead and the judgment of the wicked

Prophets - 58

dead, and then just what is after that we have not been told a great deal about it, and I don't think we get very far by letting our imaginations run where the Scripture doesn't clearly show it. You say, "It's got to be this way because there is no other way it could be." That doesn't prove anything. Personally I think one of the weakest arguments that can be presented for any view is, "Here is the view which makes completeness and explains all the facts and therefore it must be the final and complete view. Everything fits in to this. It makes a complete whole." Nobody on earth has the mind to know what makes a complete whole. If you say, "Here is an explanation which all the factors of our life experience fit into," that is a strong argument for it as against the interpretation into which they do not all fit, which we believe certainly do not fit into it, but the experience which we have or the whole human race has together is only a fraction of all the factors in the universe. All that science has learned is not a thousandth part of all that is vital in the universe. All that God has revealed in the Bible is not a millionth part of that which is vital in the universe. He has revealed to us that which is vital for our knowledge in this life and what He has revealed is clear and definite, but when we come to try to make it all actually complete and have the answer to every problem, we have to realize that the great bulk of problems we don't even know about. We haven't got the contact to know about them, the means to know they exist, the mind to interpret them correctly if we did. There is no indication that that was God's intention, to give us that kind of knowledge. So that is the sort of an argument which may be a useful argument some time in trying to win somebody but I think you could have your tongue in your cheek and realize that it is not a very satisfactory sort of argument because it is, after all, a rather fallacious form of argument.

Now then, "the zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." What is that word "zeal"? The zeal of the Lord of hosts? " ", the very word used in "The Lord thy God is a jealous God." The zeal of the Lord. The jealousy of the Lord. It is a word which indicates the Lord's determination



that His power is to be triumphant. He will tolerate no other gods before Him. He will not share His throne in the world or in your life with any other. He demands absolute sway. The jealousy of the Lord in a proper, true sense, the zeal of the Lord. The word zeal is rather . All zeal means to us is just determination. Determination, great interest. Well certainly this word means much more than that. It is the same word used, "The Lord thy God is a jealous God." This is a part of God's plan of tearing down every idol throne and everything that would share control with Him, and it is all very fine for us to believe in the premillennial return of Christ and to believe in the great accomplishment over complete control of the universe which He is going to have in the future when His justice reigns from poll to poll and when there is peace everywhere, but there is this very practical teaching in it, that it is His will that His government increase in our lives and that He has his jealousy about any opposing force in our lives, our desire to satisfy a particular desire of our own or our particular happiness or joy. It should all be in Him, and in trying to serve Him and to live lives that will glorify Him and anything, even a good thing, which becomes another aim alongside of His glory becomes an instrument of evil to us. Mr.---? (Student) No. I believe that in Verse 7 He is specifically speaking about the reign which He is going to establish on this earth after His return. (Student) No. I drew a lesson from it, the lesson that that which He is going to establish over the whole earth He wants established in our hearts now. I don't think that it will be established in our hearts now, but I think He wants us to strive for its establishment. We will not be like Him until we see Him but we will grow toward (student) Verse 6 is giving the Christmas lesson. It is not a picture of people in the millennium rejoicing over the birth of Christ. It is a picture of people at Bethany or at Galilee rejoicing over the fact that Christ is born and that this man who is born is the one upon whose shoulder the government will be, and that putting of the government upon His shoulder refers to all the future sway which He comes to exercise, which includes His sway over the lives of all individuals who are saved through Him and also

His universal sway over the world later, and then he goes on, having mentioned that, then he returns to His name which is vital already at His birth but some of the qualities of which are brought out fully only at the time of His complete reign throughout the whole world. (Student) No, it's not a transition, it's a looking forward over a long period. It is as if you--a transition is between two different things, while this is a continuous thing which is but with a great step forward at the time of His return which great step forward is not here particularly stressed, but it is one continuous thing, and this passage here can be fit in with a postmillennial interpretation with comparatively little or it fits in well with the premillennial but one must understand then that certain aspects are not explained here. They are not denied but they are not brought out here, but it cannot fit with an amillennial view any more than most of the rest of . Mr.---

- - - - -

The increase, the enlargement of His government. It really means that as He extends His government and His control, there is no force which can put an end to His expanding of it. That's what it means, that the increase of the extension of His government and control, there is no force which puts a stop to it. That doesn't mean that the world is an expanding universe that just shoots out and out and out and out, there's no limit to it. It doesn't necessarily mean that, but it means there is no force to stop it, at any time, except as He chooses. He chooses to carry it to a certain point (Student) No. This verse refers to the whole future control of this One who is born there at Bethlehem. He is to exercise sway over His disciples. He is to choose one of them who is not going, who is going to appear subject to Him but not actually to be. His sway is going to increase over the others. Peter will seem to turn away from Him but he will not actually do so. Then as they go out into the world He extends His sway over all those who come to believe on His name and eventually He extends His

sway in a material, physical way over the entire world. He extends it now in a material, physical way through those who are His body over those parts of the life of the world which He touches and He could, if He chose, to make a thoroughly Christian civilization throughout the world in this age, but that was not His will. His will is to exert a large influence upon the material civilization of the world wherever His people are but not to make the world a Christian world in this age but to make that come true at His return, but that isn't brought out in this passage. Mr.---? (Student) The last part of Verse 7? No. No, the last part of Verse 7, "The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this," I think refers to the whole process previous to this time, that this One born here in Bethlehem is going to reign over all the universe, and the zeal of the Lord of hosts will establish it. He will , in other words every eye will . Everything that opposes it will. (Student) It's a general statement. It's not a specific statement of one particular element in the progressive . Mr. ---? (Student) Well the / doesn't say that. That is an evasion, attempted/hold an amillennialist view, to escape from the implications of various facts, in the Old Testament. Amillennialism is not a position but it is a denial and those who attempt such a position after they think it through, give it up. Those who hold an amillennial position try to make practically all the prophecies refer to the light of the church during this period and they think of the new heaven and the new earth as simply a static condition, an everlasting now, a situation/<sup>in</sup> which there is no progression, there is no going out of the Word in Jerusalem to all the world, there is no establishing of peace and beating of swords into ploughshares, there is just nothing. That is, it is a complete static situation. That is the usual view. Now I don't mean that is necessarily to be held if somebody wants to make a view that combines certain features of premillennialism and certain of anti-premillennialism, that would be, of course, possible for someone to try such a thing, but there are very few amillennialists who would in any consistent way take such an attitude. I've come in contact with some who have, who have



under pressure completely given it up, under pressure of examining the passages. The teaching is that there is a millennium. Now if one believes there is a millennium, that is a period in which Christ reigns from pole to pole, there is peace and happiness everywhere, why call himself an amillennialist? Why not call himself a premillennialist and accept the fact, as stated in the Scripture, that before such a period the righteous dead are raised and at the end of such a period the wicked dead are raised. It is <sup>to</sup> escape from the whole idea of a reign of Christ on this earth that the usual amillennialist opposes the view. Otherwise, one might as well take the Scriptures just as they stand. Well now in this particular passage we do not find a clear, premillennial teaching as opposed to postmillennial. three important elements of premillennialism are not mentioned here. They are not denied. They are simply not mentioned. Postmillennial emphases may be suggested here. There is a certain amount of taking things figuratively required in taking this passage postmillennially, but not a great deal, but it does point to a definite victory over this earth of Christ, a definite establishment over this entire earth, which is entirely different from an amillennial view that this earth simply comes to an end without any such establishment of a kingdom over this earth, of the throne of David over this earth. Practically everyone who has thought things through from an amillennial view will say, "The throne of David means Christ's reign in the hearts of His people today." A very few would think of trying to apply that to a new heaven or a new earth. Well now, of course, our present purpose is not to compare views so much as it is to see what passages teach and look at views as we come to them. I'd like to try to compare some views more later on but first I'd like to look at more passages and gather more data. Yes? (Student) Yes. No. Some people could say that, yes, but I think there are very few who do actually say it, who have tried to work out a definite system in which these passages would fit with such a view. There are very few who have. I've known people who have who have given up that

approach, upon further consideration. That is a sort of a halfway view, trying to get half way between premillennialism and amillennialism, and one has to go in one of the two directions, but of course, and just simply taking this passage by itself to say that there would be the possibility that when it says that this One upon whose shoulder the government is going to be is going to extend His kingdom and establish His righteousness after a complete end of this earth instead of after the raising of the righteous dead but before the raising of the wicked dead, it would bring a theory someone might present if he wanted to. I don't know of any Scriptural evidences of its truth. It isn't usually taken as . Well now I think we'd better proceed and see what other light we have on the teaching of these passages, but there, of course, is a question which perhaps <sup>well</sup> could/be thought be thought through, could be investigated, just how much we can find in writings of people who deny a premillennial reign of Christ, of taking such passages as these as referring to a reign of Christ after His return but yet which they can't call premillennial. Premillennial means that He returns and establishes His millennium, His reign of righteousness over the whole earth. Well if a person believes that he might as well call himself a premillennialist. Why should he call himself something else if he accepts that which is two-thirds of premillennialism? Is it because he thinks it would be terrible to take the word of Revelation 20 that the wicked dead are not raised until later than the righteous dead are? Is that the point? Or what is the point ? It is a thing which I think it would be good to look into some evidences on because there is a lot of shifty thinking which has been brought out by different individuals, a lot of hazy thinking, and I haven't forced the truth so much myself, because <sup>is</sup> my opinion/that the way to get at the truth is not to see what different people say or how they try to work up a schism, but it is to see what the Scripture says and gather data, and then see what is clear regarding those Scriptures, how they fit together and whether or not.

Now I would say thus far that we have recognized that Christ is going to have a reign of righteousness and peace and joy, a reign which will be spread over the whole earth. That is clear. Now if you want to say, when it says the whole earth, and some of these passages of that particular phase are not very clear, it means a new earth, instead of the present one. That perhaps is not such a tremendous change. Like John, I think, felt that when we speak of a new heaven and earth we mean the heaven and earth which exists in the millennial period. That was his interpretation of that particular thing. Yes? (Student) I would say that in these passages apart from anything else anywhere you have definitely the teaching that there is a period of freedom from external dangers, a period when the rule of Christ is complete and no external danger because everything is subject to His control. That is the clear teaching, apart from any comparison with anything anywhere else. That is they are definite enough to make

(Student) Yes. (Student) As to that particular matter of a transition a thousand years after the beginning of this period we haven't in the New Testament. The Old Testament teaches that there is going to be such a period. It doesn't say how long it will be. If anyone wants to say that it is going to last for eternity, I can't see that there is much to their view. The premillennial view which would say the millennium lasts forever, come after the return of Christ and last forever, would be different from the usual view. I think probably a misinterpretation but nearer to the standard premillennialism than any true amillennial view. (Student) Well there are not many passages in the Old Testament that throw much light on that, nor in the New. There are many who consider there is none in it. Others think that there is

Professor , the most German conservative scholar of the last hundred years, one whose learning was very highly praised by , the greatest liberal scholar . Professor held that Chapter 21 of Revelation, the description of new heaven and new earth, is a description of the situation at the time of the millennium. He held that that was what was



42/11

described in those passages. and I think there is much to be said for this view though I haven't made up my mind as to what I think is the most . (Student) Well, you don't, many times. You may think you have a few indications, but you have very little , very little. Is the millennium the first thousand years of internal which is similar, almost identical with those thousand years? Or is there quite a change in God's economy? He has not revealed. The purpose of the Bible is not simply to satisfy curiosity, regarding the future, but to give us those things we need for our leading and guidance today, and to give us the great hope when He comes back. He has not given us one thousandth of the amount that we need to--I mean that we need if we if we will know everything . He has given us all that we need, but not all that. It would be interesting to people who simply want to satisfy their curiosity. At the end of Verse 7 in the English or 6 of the Hebrew, there is a break, a great break in the chapter. The interest of Isaiah is always in his own situation, in his own day and he is looking forward to the future and bringing great blessing upon the people in showing wonderful lessons that can be learned about it. Now in this passage, which should start a new chapter, a new section of the book of Immanuel, the Lord sent a word to Jacob, it's lighted on Israel. Now he is going to talk about the northern kingdom. The people shall know, even Ephraim and the inhabitant of Samaria, that say in the pride and stoutness of heart, the bricks are fallen down, but we will build with hewn stones; the sycamones are cut down, but we will change them into cedars. Doesn't that remind you of the great war when the Germans were bombing London and they said, "Isn't that wonderful--all our slums are being cleared out. Now it will be much easier to build much finer buildings on . It was an attitude which was taken by them at that time, and which we all considered as a wonderful example of resiliency under war and of courage and nobility. The word " " taken by itself does express that idea. There is surely nothing reprehensible in Verse 10 by itself.

Nevertheless, it is something which is condemned of God. Well, what is condemned here? It is dependence on themselves rather than on Him. There is the attitude of human progress. God has sent judgment upon them. The judgment has fallen, but their heart is not touched by the judgment. They are proceeding to go ahead and they are going to build bigger and better in the future despite the disaster they have had in the past without any turning to God in the face of the situation. That is the meaning of the passage here, that which is altogether praiseworthy, it is blameworthy because it represents an attitude of absolute pride and dependence on self instead of dependence on God. There the Lord will set up the adversaries of Rezin against him, and join his enemies together; the Syrians before, and the Philistines behind; they will devour Israel with open mouth. For all this his anger is not turned away but His hand is stretched out still. You notice that phrase. Look down to 17. For all this His anger is not turned away but His hand is stretch out still. Look down at the end of Verse 21, "For all this His anger is not turned away, but His hand is stretched out still". Look down at the end of Verse 4 of Chapter 10. "For all this His anger is not turned away but His hand is stretched out still." What meaning, if any, is there to the fact that this phrase is repeated four times? About four verses apart? What meaning would you think, Mr. ---? (Student) What would be the purpose of it? Why on earth should He do such a thing? (Student) Yes, but why does he repeat the same long sentence and something four times in a row with about four verses in between? His anger is not turned away and His hand is stretched out still to destroy them? There is no in that. That's God's judgment, God's wrath, God's overwhelming power that is going to bring misery and gloom upon them. But why repeat the same sentence four times? Mr. ---? (Student) What verse? (Student) Chapter 14, verse 27. We'll see what that says. 14, Verse 27. The Lord of hosts hath purposed it, who shall disannul it? and his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back? Very good comparison. There the statement is made that that which God intends to be He will carry out and nobody can stop it, but that is not the thought here. The thought here is, the



people are wicked; therefore, God's anger continues. That is the thought here. You see there is a relationship but not . (Student) The thing I have in mind right now is not so much a matter of teaching but a matter of mechanics. to have the answer to that at once. What is the point in having a sentence repeated four times with about four verses in between, each time? (Student) Yes. A poem, exactly. It is the structure of a poem. You have four verses and it ends with something. Then you have four verses and again the thing repeated, again four verses and again the thing repeated. Some would call it a refrain. Some would call it a chorus. This is a recurring phrase--more than a phrase, it is a whole sentence--recurring as a chorus, as a refrain at the end of each verse of the poem, and the verses are approximately of equal length. We start in Verse 8. Here are the people who are optimists and in the pride of their hearts they are determined to build up regardless of God's will. Well, that is their attitude, but God's anger is not turned away; His hand is stretched out still in punishment against their wickedness. All right. Verse 13. The people don't turn to God. They don't seek the Lord of hosts. Therefore, in one day the Lord will cut off head and tail, branch and rush. The ancient and honorable is the head; the prophet that teacheth lies is the tail. The leaders of the people cause them to err. For all this God's anger is not turned away. His hand is stretched <sup>out</sup> / still. Wickedness burns as the fire. The wrath of the Lord, through the wrath of the Lord the land is darkened. There's hunger; there's misery. Manasseh against Ephraim, Ephraim against Manasseh. Both of them against Judah, but for all this His anger is not turned away. His hand is stretched out still. Woe to them that decree unrighteous decrees. There's injustice in the land--robbing the fatherless. What will ye do in the day of visitation? For all this His anger is not turned away but His hand is stretched out still. Four stanzas of a poem, approximately equal length, each ending with the refrain. Now what does that tell you about the Archbishop, Mr.---? (Student) Exactly. Exactly. Here is a poem of four stanzas. The last stanza starts with "Woe unto them", and that sounded like a good start for a chapter, so he started



50/74

the chapter there. (Student) Yes. Very good. But he didn't realize that you have a poem which you are cutting up in this way simply because the verse starts at this point. You cut up, as Mr. --- says, the poem after three-fourths of it. Now that's a very poor division, very unfortunate division. You should have a chapter division at the end of Verse 7 of Chapter 9 and another one, very clearly, at the end of Verse 4 of Chapter 10. Here is a unified passage, a poem in four stanzas, each of them having a conclusion, one refrain at the end of each of the four stanzas, and it should one poem and is broken up in the middle of it. It's very, very poor chapter division. Some people say, "Never use a Bible that has human notes in it." Well, certainly if you are going to do that you should certainly do away with any chapter division at that point, because not only is that a human note here, it is an extremely misleading leading note, putting a chapter division at this point. Well this chapter, then, which has the four parts to the poem, has some very good ethical teaching on the wickedness of the people, the punishment that is coming, the certainty of God's judgment against wickedness, the future misery that is ahead for the nation. The teaching would be well worth your study and consideration. It is vital to us today by analogy. It is by no means unimportant at all, but it is comparatively simple and I don't think it is necessary that we take time on it, I think we can go on into matters of more difficulty in interpretation. Mr.---? Oh, yes. The whole book of Isaiah except the four historical chapters, it is pretty hard to say whether it is poetry or prose because of a free poetry, but there is a great deal of it that has a very definite poetic structure. Mr.---? He doesn't stop. He doesn't stop his punishment. He comes with His wrath and He destroys them for their wickedness and they don't turn to Him. They say, "We're going to build up and we're going to make something better than what we had before, and He doesn't say, "Well, it's enough." He just keeps on, because they still are in obstinate rebellion against Him. And then He points out another phase of their wickedness, another phase of their general opposition to Him and He shows the terrible nature of the punishment that's coming, but that's not the end. The

punishment continues on for a long distance in the future. (Student) Yes. The phrase, "His hand is stretched out," may mean stretched out for mercy or it may mean stretched out for punishment, but in these passages it is very clearly punishment. Just as God says to the Israelites, "I've brought you out of Egypt with a mighty hand and outstretched arm." It was outstretched for good to the Israelites but punishment for Pharaoh, and for opening the way for them to come and in this chapter the whole thought is rebuke. There is, so far as I recall, not a word of blessing, in those four stanzas. It is entirely God's rebuke for the wickedness of the people and Verse 5 starts a brand new section, a brand new section of the book of Immanuel. We are still in the book of Immanuel which runs from Chapter 7 to Chapter 12, but between Verse 5 and the previous four verses there is the very slightest of connection. That is to say it is a new section. A new part of the book, a new theme is taken, and it should begin a new chapter, Verse 5. Very definitely. And Verse 5 begins the discussion of a vital problem, and it is a different problem from any we have discussed before. It is a very different one, a very vital one, a very interesting one, and one which it should not be too difficult to decide from, even from the English words just what the problem is which is in the mind of the prophet. Unless we have the problem in mind we can't appreciate the answer which he gives to the problem and so before tomorrow morning I hope that you will at least glance over Verses 5 to 34 and tell us, "What is the problem there under consideration?"

What is the problem? Be ready tomorrow morning to state in brief words, "What is the problem which is considered between Verses 5 and 34 of this chapter. It is altogether different from the previous one. What is he perplexed about?"

What is the problem? And as you look through you will find several verses fit together giving a picture. How does the picture relate to the general theme, or what is the general theme to which the picture relates? So we have a problem here and this chapter and Chapter 11 run along together. Eleven grows naturally out of this chapter here. Now if you will turn to Isaiah 29 you will find that in Chapter 29 you have 24 verses and they are very difficult verses and so we

will say that if you take--we will suppose that those twenty-four verses would represent about three hours' work this week, three hours and a half work, this week, only about seven verses to an hour and you surely/ can do 20 in an hour, so we will--but these are hard ones, so you probably couldn't do over a dozen of them, so we will say that this is three and one-half hours of the four hours work for the next two days. The other half hour is the--what is the problem, the ? That part I wish you would be sure to do for tomorrow. That half hour of tomorrow's two hour lesson. What is the problem in Isaiah 10, from Verse 5? Get a definite idea exactly what the problem is, and then the other hour and a half for tomorrow I will not press you on tomorrow, but that, combines with the two hours for Thursday, the assignment of Chapter 29 from the Hebrew. Chapter, yes. Just the first twenty-four verses of Chapter 29.

- - - - -



We find that in most of our chapters up to this point our theme has been God's punishment of His people for their sin, His rebuke for their wickedness, or it has been God's blessing to the people after the punishment. God's favor still remains with the people and He will give them a blessing later on. Now which of those two is the thought of this chapter? How many say it is punishment upon God's people for their sin, that that is the primary thought of this chapter? Raise your hands. Nobody. How many say it is blessing upon God's people, after their punishment. Nobody. Yet I think a number of you said something like that on one of your papers. Surely this chapter would be expected to fit in to one of those two categories. If it does not fit into one of them there must be a definite reason for it. What would the reason be? What is the problem that is now before the prophet? <sup>(Student answers)</sup> Mr.---?/ Yes. Supposing now that the United States here, we have great churches, we have wonderful places where the Word of God is proclaimed and yet the people as a whole are indifferent to the Lord, although the moral standards are much higher than in many other countries, there's far more of real fineness and decency here. For instance, take in this war, when we would, when someone was killed in this war they would receive a letter from the Secretary of War to the family, they would have a memorial thing sent to them, they'd have a flag sent to them, the army would do everything possible to show the people of this country individually the great sympathy and interest with them in the loss of a member of the family in the war. In Russia they didn't bother with hardly any of that--after all, what's an extra million people dead. We've got a hundred and fifty million more; they don't really matter. It's the leaders that matter and what their plan is, the state is the important thing and the individual is subordinate, and so there is a callousness to human suffering which is far beyond anything you'll find here. There is not merely an indifference to God but a defiance of God, an attempt to definitely go against that which is in accordance with the word of God. Now under those circumstances supposing that the Russian army were to march through this country and that they were to take over this nation as they have taken over ten other nations in the last few years and to make it just a football for them to kick around and treat the people as their leaders felt inclined. You would say, "Where is the justice in this?" Many people would say, "How

can there be a God. How can He allow a wicked, God-denying nation to treat a nation that is so much better in such a terrible way?" Well that is **exactly** the thing that occurred to the people of Israel. They said, "We know there's sin in this nation. We know there's wickedness here; we know there's denial of God, but," they said, "The standards of the morality of Israel are far ahead of those of any nation round about us," and they said, "The people of Israel do not have the cruelty, the brutality and the, anything like the licentiousness that they have in Assyria." You can tell that even from the excavations. You can see how much higher is the general standard of morality, of Israel, than in those nations. Well now, under those circumstances how can a nation which is an aggressor, a wicked power that destroys other nations and that is brutal and callous in its whole attitude, how can it come and destroy Israel? What kind of a just God have you got there? See the question? That is the problem which he is discussing here. How can this be that Assyria, a very wicked nation, can come and can injure a nation which <sup>is</sup> God's own people and in which, while it's not perfect, its standards ~~are~~ <sup>are</sup> above those of any other nation on the earth, both in loyalty to God and in morality

. How can such a thing be? It is a tremendous problem, a problem which many people have found very difficult to answer, a problem which many have given as the reason for giving up all faith in God when such things happen in the world. I remember when the European war came, 1914-18, many persons said, "How can a real God permit that?" They didn't believe it possible. Well now here— that's slightly different but related to the same problem. Now here is this problem. What answer can you get? And so Verse 5 here has a complete change from the subject of the previous four verses. They are rebuke for sin and declaration of punishment, quite the normal approach of the book of Isaiah. (Student) He doesn't state but he answers it. And you infer from the answer what . That is, he is dealing in this chapter with a specific thing. (Student) Yes. Well the problem is answered immediately in the very first verse, No. 5. The first verse of the second . He says, "O Assyrian," not "Assyrian, you wicked nation, you are going to succeed." Not, "Assyrian, you are better than Israel; therefore you can take Israel over," but "Assyria, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in the hand of the Assyrians is my indignation." He says, "Assyria is not a great power which is able to beat another power because it's better, but because



Prophets 61 +

it is God's instrument to accomplish His purpose. The answer is given in this verse, and the question must be in the lines in order to be a reason for the answer. Yes, Mr.---? Yes. Well as far as Isaiah's own mind is concerned, what would be a problem to him and what wouldn't would be hard to say but what he says would be to reach people. It's to give them an answer. Not so much to give him an answer-- (Student) Yes. Isaiah is here speaking to the people and trying to give them a message and the message he is trying to give them is this message which Isaiah himself may have just learned. It may have been a tremendous problem in Isaiah's mind. I would think it very possible that it could have been a tremendous problem to Isaiah. How can a nation so much more wicked than the Israelites defeat the Israelites? That's a complete overthrow of justice. That is the wicked overcoming the good. That is not right from any viewpoint. That may have been the problem in Isaiah's mind which God answered. Or it may be that in the long years of Isaiah's close intimacy with the Lord in representing Him in many ways that God had caused him to have such an understanding of this extremely difficult problem that to him it would be by this time no problem. I think that we can safely say that either it was a tremendous problem to Isaiah now or it had been at some earlier time, but this is an answer given to those/<sup>to</sup>whom it is a tremendous problem. Mr.---? (Student) It occurs once I think. Yes. Of course, there are those who say there is another stanza to this poem that is out of place, that got in a different chapter. I would think rather that the Israelites, a stanza of a poem with its refrain, wrote one and then later on he wrote a whole poem with the same key note. (Student) Where is that, in Isaiah 5? Yes. That is a parallel to the last part of Isaiah 9 and the first four verses of Isaiah 10, to God's rebuke upon His people for their sin and the punishment he threatened. But with Isaiah 10:5 we start a new section which is related to that problem; it grows out of it but it's a different problem. It's easy enough to see how Israel for its sin can be smitten yes, and the prophets write it over and over and over; it's very vital but how can a wicked nation overcome a righteous nation? How can a nation which is far worse than Israel overcome Israel even if Israel isn't perfect. How can there be a just God who permits a thing like that? And of course the answer is, God doesn't permit; he uses the wicked nation for His purpose. Yes? (Student) Yes, but that's a little



Prophets—1 +  
(Student)

later./ Well even if they went down to Egypt to sojourn there and had the blessing of Egypt and then Egypt went against them. They weren't conquered by Egypt. They were already there as friends, and then they got a new king. In the case of Babylon, it comes later than this and it is the same problem as the first. The only places where the problem would have occurred would be in the book of Judges, in the relationship with the Philistines and the other peoples there and of course in those days we had constant fighting with one of these foreign tribes and another of these foreign tribes and they were not great powerful world states and you would be under them twenty years and then you would be free from twenty years and you were back and forth, but now for a long time Israel and Judah had been free, for three hundred years, about. They've had their great empire under David and Solomon and they've had a divided kingdom in which they've never been subject to any foreign power and so then the situation comes with the force of something new and vivid. The other experiences there were far more brief experiences and experiences which were far back in history. In America only two hundred years ago the people in America in any town would have had a blackout and a little hole to watch for the Indians, and places where they could put their rifles to protect themselves not knowing when it was coming. It was a common, ordinary, every-day thing for them; they didn't think much about it but today if somebody were to find it necessary to put up a block house around one of our cities as a means of protecting it from the Indians it would cause tremendous excitement because it would be highly new and different. If we had guerrilla forces going through our country here it would cause five times the stir among our people that it would among the peoples of most nations of Europe because they've had these wars back and forth and we in the United States have been safe from any external invasions now for a hundred and thirty years and as far as internal strife on any large scale is concerned, it's seventy-five years since we've had any, so it is something that would be quite a new thing to us. And here is an attack with the threat of overrunning a large part of the land, not by a small tribe that is to hold them awhile and then it's natural to think they'll be free from, but by the great powerful nation, many times as powerful as they are, it seems to be the end of all their national history and people are tremendously excited about such as has been happening

Prophets-61 +

and they can't see how, if there is a just God in the universe, He can permit a nation, a wicked nation to overcome a Godly nation, and so the answer to that problem, well, of course the whole problem in the chapter here is, what about Assyria? What is God's attitude toward Assyria? Hitherto the question has been, "What is His attitude toward Israel? Is it an attitude of blessing? Is it an attitude of punishment?" Now the question is, "What is His attitude toward Assyria? How can He permit Assyria to conquer them and, if He does, well is that, is Assyria then the one to receive God's blessing?" They are the ones whom He is going to give everything to, despite the fact that they are a wicked nation, who don't even recognize Him. And so, right away in Verse 5 we have a most startling statement: "Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their hand is mine indignation." I remember hearing a minister say five years ago that, he said that he thought that probably Hitler was like Nebuchadnezzar, that he was God's instrument to punish the so-called Christian nations of the world for their sin and their forgetfulness of God. Now of course that proved to be utterly false in that case because the nations of the world which were more democratic succeeded in putting in

Prophets-62 +

but at present the attitude of most of the nations that fought against them, especially the United States is, we had such a powerful force of, we had such strong armaments and wise leadership that we were able to put a complete end to this menace which had come to the world and now we would go ahead and form a United Nations and carry out our wisdom a little further, leaving God out of account just as much, or even more than we had before the attack of Hitler, that we would proceed to establish peace and goodness on a nongodly level in the world. Well that is the attitude which our people as a whole have taken. Now this minister's statement about Hitler was proven utterly wrong as far as Hitler's being God's instrument against them was concerned but it may well be that his view is right but he simply had the wrong instance in mind. It's not at all impossible that Stalin might be the instrument. Mr. ---? (Student) Yes. You mean then Judah should have sent armaments to Assyria to help them against Israel? (Student) Well, that's not the question we're entering into. The question we are entering into is, is one of these nations God's instrument to punish us. Well Hitler wasn't. Hitler didn't punish us. He just puffed up our pride more than it had been before. (Student) Not very much. They're comparatively very little. Well how about this . . . (Student) Yes. Well now that is, I think, a little aside from our present discussion. Maybe we can go into it a little more in another connection, but right in our present connection I'd like to get over this main point here that the Assyrians are not going to overcome Israel because Assyria is good and Israel is bad. That's not true. The opposite is true. Israel is good. The northern kingdom is good, comparatively. The standard of morality and ethics were probably a lot higher in the northern kingdom of Israel than in our United States today, and the northern kingdom was worse than the southern kingdom of Judah, but the standard was probably much higher than it is here today and as far as the claim to be true to God is concerned, you didn't find atheism and blatant denial of God in either Judah or Israel as you find it today. You had a country the contrast between which and Assyria was so great that you'd almost say that Israel was a perfect nation compared to the utter wickedness of the Assyrians and yet the Assyrian is conquering Israel. Is there a God of justice in the world who can permit such a thing as that to happen? Well now that problem Isaiah answers in one statement



Prophets-62 \*

here. There are other places where it is discussed more at length. He answers it here in one statement and then he touches upon it in addition in other places, but the answer is given in this very striking first verse. O, Assyrians, the rod of my anger. What does the Assyrian think of being told that he is not a great power that is trying to do what he wants to do, that he is merely the instrument of God's anger, he's merely God's force. Here's Henry Wallace and he is telling us what we should do in order to establish peace in the earth and what policies the United States should take in everything, what would he think if Stalin were to say, "Henry Wallace is merely one of my instruments. I'll use him as long as I want to and then I'll throw him aside," as he has done with many others. Wallace would say, "Perfectly silly. I'm a free agent and I'm doing what I think is right and if it happens to fit with what Stalin would like", he'd say, "that's Stalin's good fortune rather than anything intentional on my part." That's what he would probably say. That's certainly what the Assyrian would say in this case and that is brought out beyond it. O Assyrian, the rod of my anger. I will send him against an hypocritical nation, and against the people of my wrath. God has wrath against Israel and Judah more than against Assyria? No. He's not talking about Assyria now, as far as that is concerned. Is Assyria wicked? Does Assyria deserve punishment? He is speaking of one specific thing now, that Israel deserves punishment. When Christ said to Peter, "Feed my sheep," Peter turned toward John and said, "What is this man to thee?" And Christ said, "What is that to thee? Follow thou me." "What is it to thee if I will that he carry the . Follow thou me." In other words we are each of us separately responsible to God and if you say, "Well, you think I am not such a true servant of the Lord, but look at the fellow over here. I'm an awful lot better than he is. Look at this one over here. I'm certainly a much truer servant than he is, and I've found that if you try to give to anybody nearly a suggestion as to improve himself or mention a way in which they can make themselves a more effective servant of the Lord, they'll say, "Well I'm not so bad. All these other people are a lot worse than I am." That's the immediate reaction of a sinful mind, is to try to find an excuse by comparing with someone else and saying we're better than they but that's not what God is interested in. God is interested in how we compare with His

Prophets-62 \*

standard for us, not how we compare with what someone else has done and here is Israel which is far superior to Assyria according to every standard of comparison between the two of them as to morality, ethics or loyalty to the Lord but God is saying "You are the people of my wrath. You have fallen down on doing the thing I wanted you to do and I am punishing you, and I'm using the Assyrian for my instrument. My dealings with Assyria are a separate thing. They don't particularly concern you. The question is, so far as you are concerned, "What is my purpose for you and I will use what instruments I choose for that purpose." And so it is not a strife between Israel and Assyria to see which is the better nation and therefore is entitled to have God's favor. It is not that at all. It is a question of what is God's attitude toward Israel and what instrument is he going to use for it, and this great powerful aggressive Assyrian force is merely an instrument on God's hands; therefore Israel has no right to give the excuse and say, "Oh, well, we can't be her, with all our faults we are a lot better than they (machine hangs up and then skips). He may use them against them. And so he says here, "I'm going to use the Assyrians as my instrument to accomplish my purpose. I will send him against the people of my wrath and give him a charge to take the spoil and take the prey and tread them down like the mire of the streets." It's a terrific thing that God is going to use the Assyrian to do. He just can't believe it, that that would be His will, but He declares it here, it's going to be His will. They are His instruments and so having given us the answer to that problem in Verses 5 and 6 He then proceeds to deal further with another very vital aspect of the problem. You say, "Well, Assyria is just God's instrument but Assyria doesn't think of itself that way, Assyria thinks they are the great powerful force that's going to do what they want in the world. Isaiah says, "Yes, you're right." Howbeit he meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so; but it is in his heart to destroy and cut off nations not a few. And then he spoke the viewpoint of the Assyrians, and how far does the viewpoint of the Assyrians continue, the quotation of it, Mr.---, how far? How far does it continue? (Student) Mr.---, how far? (Student) Yes, but through Verse 11 it is a direct quotation of the attitude which the Assyrian takes. Here's a lovely verse to pick out for a sermon. Shall I not as I have done to Samaria and her idols so do to Jerusalem and her idols? The Lord has punished Samaria; the Lord

Prophets 62 \*

is going to punish Jerusalem. God's plans are going to be carried out against one nation after another and He is--we needn't think we are safe, the way He treats another He may treat us if we're untrue to Him. Wouldn't Verse 11 be a fine text for that sort of a sermon? Perfect, for that sermon. Would that be a proper way to use Verse 11? It would be an

improper way. It would be using the Word of God deceitfully because it would be taking a verse out of its context and using it to express something entirely different from what the verse means. The verse means that Assyria said, "I've conquered Samaria and I am going to conquer Jerusalem," and that's altogether different from expressing God's purpose. It's another instance of how wrong it is to take a verse out of context and say "This is what God says." Verse 11 here is what God says that Assyria says. It isn't what God says; it's what God says Assyria says. And so Assyria here in these verses from Verses 8-11, in those four verses is a great presentation of the attitude of the Assyrian.

WE've conquered all these great powerful nations; we've conquered Damascus, Samaria is a puppet state under us. They have to do what we say. We've overrun all of Israel. You see this is a little later in time. The child has already reached the age of choosing the good and rejecting the evil. It's already come to that point now and the Northern kingdom has been overrun and is a puppet state now and in that situation the Assyrian says, "I've done all this. He says, "I've conquered all these nations and their idols weren't able to protect them. He says, "Will not the, I treat the idols of Jerusalem the way I've treated the idols of Samaria?"

Of course, he includes God as an idol, because the Assyrian knows nothing about God at all. He thinks of the people as people who are following idols. They are following their own gods and his gods of Assyria have conquered all of them. And so Verse 12 is the end of the quotation, that is 11 finishes the quotation and 12 begins the words of the Lord in answer to the quotation. We don't have quotation marks in the Hebrew and the English Bible has followed the Hebrew in not inserting quotation marks but you have to realize that there are quotation marks at the end of Verse 11 in actuality or you have no conception whatever of the meaning of the chapter. The Lord says, in view of what the Assyrian says, "Therefore it shall come to pass that when the Lord has performed His full work on Mount Zion and on Jerusalem I will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the King of Assyria and the glory of his high looks. He says to the people, "You





Prophets-63 \*

Verse 13 he continues quotation from the King of Assyria. God is punishing the King of Assyria because the King of Assyria states what our people today could just as well say and many of them have said. Verse 13, "By the strength of my hand I have done it and by my wisdom; for I am prudent: I have removed the bounds of the people, and I have robbed their treasures, and I have put down the inhabitants like a valiant man." We conquered Germany and we took everything that any German individual owned that didn't happen to be in Germany at the time. If a German had sent some money over to this country to his friends here seeing that war was coming and thinking that it would be safer in the United States, our Government has simply seized it and taken it away from him. Thousands of dollars of property in this country which was owned by German citizens, people who had no connection with Hitler, perhaps opposed to everything Hitler had ever done, have been seized by our Government and taken away from their owners. We even forced Switzerland to give up the money that had been deposited in its banks by German citizens. We have conquered Germany and everything that belongs to them is rightful plunder for us to take and use as we choose and he says here, "I have robbed their treasures and have put down the inhabitants like a valiant man." That is what the Assyrian says, "It is I who have done it." Of course Assyria is far larger, far more powerful, far more able than the people of Israel. They have been able to do these great things. They are boasting. It is exactly the attitude which you'll find at most patriotic rallies in the United States. It's our greatness, it's our wisdom, it's our power that has succeeded. We're the most powerful nation on the face of the earth now. You'll hear that said repeatedly and that is what Assyria says here, "My hand has found as a nest the riches of the people; and as one gathereth eggs that are left, have I gathered all the earth; and there was none that moved the wing, or opened the mouth, or peeped." This 14th verse, of course, is not quite the same as the 13th. It is carrying it on to the attitude of willful aggression which <sup>our</sup> nation does not openly follow, which we have not followed as a policy for other nations, save that after we did conquer a nation like Germany we carried out the same policy <sup>toward</sup> the individuals who were citizens of the nation but we didn't set out to do that and we haven't done it toward other countries.

So the Assyrian has this attitude which is characteristic of most nations of the world and would doubtless be of ours were it not for the leavening effect of Christianity which has affected a great deal of at the outward talk of our politicians and of our leaders. And so here you have God quoting the Assyrians from Verse 13 through how far, Mr.---? Oh, my! Mr.---, how far does it go? Through 14. Now 13 and 14 here are what the Assyrians said. 14 you might take and preach a great sermon on the power of the Lord. He gathers all the earth and there is none that can against Him, but that would be another misuse of Scripture, because he's quoting Assyria there. Then in verse 15 the Lord gives His answer to the Assyrians, which after all doesn't affect Israel so much; it simply is an assurance to them that God is righteous and God's righteous will will be done. Verse 15--Shall the axe boast itself against him that heweth therewith? Shall the saw magnify itself against him that shaketh it? as if the rod should shake itself against them that lift it up, or as if the staff should lift up itself, as if it were no wood. He says the Assyrian couldn't even lift his hand if God didn't give them the power and use them for His purpose. I've heard people say, "The breath that a man uses to curse God, he couldn't use if God didn't permit it for him." Yes? (Student) Yes. Chapter 29 which you had for today and tomorrow has some very striking parallels/ to it. The whole section from 28 on is a remarkable parallel to this section, from 7 on, and you'll find very interesting parallels. I hope you'll notice them all as much as you can as you come to them. I think though, instead of our looking ahead and comparing them in class, when we get there we'll look back and get them in context with our/ here. Now in Verse 15 then the Lord makes it more specific. Here is God's instrument and what right has God's instrument to boast against God? Here is America which was founded by a people who wished to have a nation where they could obey God implicitly, a nation where the will of God could be carried out in every aspect of our national life and God has greatly blessed the nation. What right have we now to say: "We are powerful; we are wise. We are , and you take the average American for the last thirty years, anywhere in Europe would recognize the average American by his attitude of looking down on everything that the European did and thinking how superior we were to them in every way, and how much wiser and more prudent in every single way we were than they were when, of course it is a fact that we are



Prophets-63 H

tremendously advanced beyond them in the material aspect of civilization but it is because God has blessed our nation, not because we are any better than those people and we are a lot worse than a great many of them. Well, now the 16th verse, the Lord goes on after speaking the statement of His attitude toward the Assyrians, in 15, the staff can't lift itself up as if it was not wood but as if it was really something with independent power, therefore the Lord is going to punish the Assyrians. Verse 16, the Lord will send among his fat ones leanness; and under His glory He'll kindle a burning like the burning of a fire. The light of Israel shall be for a fire, and his Holy One for a flame; and it shall burn and devour his thorns and his briers in one day; and shall consume the glory of his forest, and of his fruitful field, both soul and body; and they shall be as when a standardbearer fainteth, and the rest of the trees of his forest shall be few, that a child may write them. What is predicted here in Verses 16-19? Is it a general principle stated? Is it a series of recurrent events, or is it just a prediction of some definite thing? What would you say about that, Mr.---? (Student) You don't? Well, what do you do then with this phrase, <sup>in</sup> /one day? He says that he, he says in Verse 17, we'll burn and devour his thorns and his briers in one day. (Student) With which it will be accomplished? Wouldn't that be a definite thing? (Student) I mean you don't ordinarily think of general principle accomplished, do you? Its general principle extends over a long period. Whenever this happens which result comes from it? (Student) Yes. Well what do the thorns and the briers mean in Verse 17? Are they literal or figurative? How many think they are literal? We read back in Chapter 7 that the land will be covered with briers and thorns. Is this a reference back to that? How many think that it is not? Then it is not a reference then to the briers and thorns in the land of Israel. It's not talking about Israel here at all, is it? What briers and thorns is he talking about? Assyria. It is as if we say, "There's going to come a great, a great air armada is going to come from Russia to California and they're going to destroy all the sun flowers out there." What would the sun flowers indicate? They would indicate the beauty, wouldn't they, of the land? The sun flower. You wouldn't mean just that the flowers were going to be destroyed. You'd mean the beauty of the land. It would be a figure. Well now here you say the thorns and the

Prophets-63 #

briers of Assyria are going to be destroyed. Does that mean Assyria is going to lose its beauty? Does it mean that just the weeds are going to be destroyed in the land? What does it mean? (Student) Yes. I would think so. The thorns and the briers are that that make you hard to get at. You try to walk through a where there are a lot of these sharp, thorny things and it's pretty hard at times. It's a very adequate protection against they're getting through, and the thorns and the briers figure back in Verse-7 for depopulation of the land and yet even there it says, "You will not come near it for the thorns and the briers. There's the difficulty of getting through because the thorns and the briers are to rise up. Here it is a picture of the armament and the strength of Assyria and he will burn and devour his thorns and briers in one day. Is not that a reference to the armament and the force, the military power of Assyria? And if so, there is, of course, a general principle that when any power in defiance of God raises itself up to accomplish its own purposes God is going to bring it to an end when and as He chooses but in this case is he giving a general principle or is he talking about one specific power? (Student) Mr.---? (Student) Then Sennacherib's army was destroyed. Yes. /that is what he is referring to, that would be a specific occurrence which happened in one day, wouldn't it? In one night, rather. I guess one day would not be an erroneous way of speaking of what happened in one night. Yes. It shows the suddenness of a great destruction. Now there are two possibilities, it seems to me, for this particular passage here. The Assyrian power is going to be destroyed suddenly. The Assyrians, the City of Ninevah was destroyed suddenly in 612 B. C., that great power, the mistress of the world, the capital city, was overwhelmed by its enemies and wrecked, and that was the actual end of the power of Assyria. A small group carried it on for a time afterwards but it disappeared and you couldn't say, "There will always be an Assyria because, though for two or three times as long as England has been a great power Assyria had been a great power, but now it was just wiped off from the face of the earth and in one day that happened. It might be referring to that. Or it might be referring to the <sup>great</sup> army of Sennacherib which came and was going to overwhelm Judah and God in one night destroyed such a great multitude of that army that it melted away, those that were left were so

Prophets-63 #

few that a child could write them, and the few went back to Assyria and didn't molest Judah any more, for a good many years. It could be a description of either one of those two great events. As far as that which it is said here will happen is concerned it could fit either one, but three of the four would stand for the power, either of the individuals in the nation, which were spoken of as a forest or the . (Student)

So few that a child could count them. It wouldn't take an adding machine, to figure them out. Mr.—? (Student) That would suggest very strongly that it is the destruction of Sennacherib's hosts. If you take that in the sense of the direct agency of God, it's the destruction of Sennacherib's hosts; if you take it as God working through human forces as He worked through the Assyrians, but it is God who does it, then it could refer to the destruction by the Medes and the Babylonians.

I fear I'll have to stop here for this morning and we'll continue with it tomorrow. The lesson is assigned for tomorrow.

- - - - -



Prophets-65 4

We seem to have less than usual here today. I hope it doesn't mean that someone vacation time. We always get triple cuts, you know, for the day or two before vacation and the day or two after, and so that—I'm glad to see that we've had a large influx since the prayer. I hope that doesn't mean that these gentlemen don't believe in prayer, that came in afterwards. At least they are more interested in the Word, perhaps, than they are in prayer, and that is right. It's God's Word that speaks to us. He wants us also to speak to Him but even as to how to speak to Him we learn from His Word. The Word is primary, though prayer is also essential. So even though some of you come too late for the prayer we are glad you get here in time to get the Word anyway. Well now, we are in this book of Isaiah and the tenth chapter of the book and we have a good deal of ground there to cover. I am torn constantly in this class between the desire to go thoroughly into the material we have and the desire to go rapidly and cover more ground, and it is always very hard for me to decide which to do. There is so much in the Word, so much that is important, so much that is vital, but yey, of course, I keep realizing that after all I am merely giving you sound methods and introduction to do it and my hope is that you will keep it up yourselves afterward. Don't just try to go on preaching what we give you here; above all, don't preach that anything is true because I say it. Get the principles and then find what you find in the Word and stand on that. It is not what looks reasonable to us that matters. It is not the philosophy we try to build that matters. It's not the emphasis we get from the Word that matters. It's--what does the Word say. Mr.---

I think

(Student) I don't quite see how you can. in this as in all the principles of interpretation you learn as you study different passages, you notice principles that apply and then it is good to try to get things into a hard and fast rule as you can, but when you do it's only a hypothesis; that is, it's a statement of the cases you've investigated and you can't be sure whether it will fit all of these or not. (Student) I would say that. Yes. I would say that very definitely. The major care should be in the sense that it is a vital factor to recognize it very definitely. It's not a thing that occurs hundreds of times--nothing like that, but it is something that occurs many times and I don't thing you can properly interpret the prophets without recognizing it, that there is a

Prophets-65 H

sudden transition often from one phase to another or from one action to another. Now of course there is also--I wouldn't call it a sudden transition between 10:4 and 10:5. I'd call it rather the beginning of another sentence. The transition, I mean more in the midst of a verse of a sentence where he is dealing with a matter and then suddenly his attention turns to another phase of it. I think, in view of Mr. Casner's question right at this moment it would be worth our taking five minutes to call your attention to something which Dr. Harris will discuss with you probably in the Prophets 4th class next year. He may even interpret quite differently than I do, but the particular point here that I'm going to mention, I don't see how he could interpret very differently, because I don't see any other very reasonable interpretation. Let's all turn for a minute to the 22d psalm. When I say turn to the 22d psalm am I leaving prophetic books and entering an entirely different type of literature? (Students) I'm sure that every Christian who is at all informed realizes that the 22d psalm is an important part of the prophetic portion of the Scripture. It is included in the book of poetry but much of the psalm material is predictive. Much of it is real prophecy, too, and this is a predictive psalm. There are very few Christians who would question that Psalm 22 is a picture of the crucifixion of the Lord Jesus Christ a thousand years in advance. Well now, if you will take this psalm, doubtless all of you are somewhat familiar with it,-- I used to when I taught the fourth course take perhaps a month on this psalm. There is a tremendous amount of extremely valuable insight to be gained from this psalm. But I would like to ask you to look at the 21st verse and to tell me what the 21st verse means. "Save me from the lion's mouth: for thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorns." Now what do you think that means? How many here think they know what that verse mean? Raise your hand. Mr.--- is the only one. Mr.---, what does it mean? (Student) Yes. The order is somewhat different from the English, and Mr.--- has followed a very good principle. When in doubt as to what an English passage means look at the Hebrew, and see if you gain more light there on the subject and there is a very valuable thing to know, that the order of the words is somewhat different there than it is in the English. Now this is--I don't recall what the Revised Version does with it. It's always interesting to see if those translators had an interesting viewpoint on it.

Prophets-65 #

They say, "Save me from the lion's mouth, yea from the horns of the wild oxen thou hast answered me." What is the difference between that and the Authorized Version? (Student) Well, one difference is that one says unicorn and one says wild oxen. Is that the most important difference? It's not the most important difference. Well, what is a more important difference than that? The translation of the verb--one has "Thou hast answered me" and the other has "Thou hast heard me" and the Hebrew word on that is a word which is regularly translated "answer". I would say it was a much more accurate translation of this particular verse in the Revised Version than in the Authorized, but that is not the most important difference between the two. (Student) The Authorized says, "Save me from the lion's mouth: for thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorns." The Revised says, "Save me from the lion's mouth: yea, from the horns of the wild oxen thou hast answered me." What is the most important difference between the Authorized and the Revised? Mr.---? Yes. The word order in the Revised follows the word order of the Hebrew. Now that doesn't mean to say you must always follow the Hebrew in a word order of the/translation because word order often has a meaning and the meaning of word order in one language may be altogether different from the meaning of a certain word order in another, and it may be necessary to change the word order in order to get the meaning across. If I were to say, to you, "I heard that you yesterday this to your friend told half", if I were to say that here you would wonder what on earth I was talking about. That would be pretty near a literal translation of a German sentence but it wouldn't make any sense to a person in English. We have a different order, word order. And so it is not at all wrong to change the original word order, but in this case the Revised Version follows the word order of the Hebrew and it at least makes possible certain interpretations which the Authorized rather excludes. Now did you notice that one of the translations says, "For thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorn" and the other says, "Yea, from the horns of the wild oxen thou hast answered me." Now you, of course, all have your Hebrew Bibles open in front of you and so we'll ask Mr.--- what is the Hebrew word which is translated in one case "for" and in the other "yea". He didn't have his Bible with him last class and so I know he has it today of course. What is the Hebrew word there? Now this verse, which is Verse 21 in the English is



Verse 22 in the Hebrew because the introduction to the psalm which is just given in small type in the English is counted as Verse 1 in the Hebrew. Which is the correct translation, the Authorized says "For thou hast heard me", and the Revised Version says "Yea, from the horns of the wild oxen thou hast answered me," and what is the Hebrew word which is translated "For" in one case and "Yea" in the other and which is the correct translation of this Hebrew word? Now would those of you—everybody is looking at it—those of you who think that the Hebrew word there is most correctly translated "for" in the Authorized Version, just raise your hand. Nobody raised it. Those who think that it is most correctly translated "Yea", as the Revised Version has it raise your hand. Nobody does. Do you mean to say you all disagree with both the Authorized and the Revised versions? Those who have no opinion on the subject raise your hands. That is, alas, quite a few. Mr.---, what is the word? (Student) Yes, and how do you translate ordinarily? (Student) Yes. Well now "and". Would "and" be translated "for"? in our English . If I say "He went and got the book," it would be more accurate to say "He went to get the book, wouldn't it?" Your "and" there really expresses a purpose. Our English "and" is sometimes rather broad. He went and he departed. "And" is like the "Yes". He went; yea he departed. So perhaps it may cover the "yea" there, to show a repetition or further emphasis upon it, but a simple, the "and" to translated/"for" or "yea" is certainly not strictly , is it? It shows that the translator thought there was something of a difference between the first and last part of this verse which required to have them separate. You take Verse 18, "They part my garments among them, and upon my vesture do they cast lots," the Revised Version says: the Authorized says, "They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture." Why didn't one of them say, "For they cast lots"; or "Yea, they cast lots"? Well "Yea" wouldn't be bad there, would it? But "for" certainly would be out of place there. Now there is then evidence that where you have just here, this is one of the few cases, I don't know whether there is any other case, where is translated "for" in the Authorized Version. There are cases where it is translated "Yes" in either version, but not a great many of them. And so the question is, as you look at your Authorized and

Prophets-65 \*

your Revised and you compare--is "for" correct or is "yea" correct, well the Hebrew says just "And" so there are other possibilities; let's not be misled by the fact that the translators tried to get across the idea the best they could. What was the idea they had? Now the Revised Version here--well, take the Authorized for a minute. "Save me from the lion's mouth: for thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorns." What on earth could that mean? Do you see any sense to it? Maybe there is sense but I am sure I don't see it. "Save me from the lion's mouth: for thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorns." (Students) Well what does it mean; he knows the Lord has heard him from the horns of the unicorns? Does he mean that the Lord dwells on the horns of the unicorns? And that's / <sup>where</sup> He's heard him? You might say, "Save me from this calamity for you have heard me from your place in the heavens." But, "You have heard me from the horns of the unicorn", what on earth does that mean? Mr.---

(Student) Yes. That's a very interesting suggestion. Very interesting. Mr.---

(Student)

Prophets-66 \*

"Save me from the lion's mouth: for thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorn." What does it mean--"heard you from the horn"? If he's said, "For you have saved me from the horns" there would be good--do that, because you've done this. You've saved me from this disaster, save me from that one." But there is no disaster--the horns of the unicorn--from which he has been saved nor

Mr.---? (Student) To call the wild ox the golden altar, I would require pretty definite proof of Scripture before I would accept it, that it is so used in some other place.

Yes, I must admit that as a young fellow I used to read this, "For thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorn." Well, the only thing I could ever picture was that God, in some way, as He sitteth upon the cherubim, His place is above the mercy seat. Someway you think of Him as upon the horns of the wild unicorn and there He hears you, from there.

But

for that interpretation. The Re-

Prophets-66

vised Version follows the order of the Hebrew and if you follow the order of the Hebrew then Mr.---'s suggestion becomes a possibility that there is a pause between the two, but you'd never dream that from the Authorized version; never in the world. Well now as you read--yes? (Student) In the text it says, "Save me from the mouth of the lion,". Then there's your , you see in the first section of this verse. Then, "and from the horns of the wild oxen thou hast heard me." (Student) No. Those were put in by the . They indicate their interpretation. They have not indicated any pause, any breaks, but this is the order of it. The "thou hast answered" or "thou hast heard" comes at the end. "Thou hast heard me from the horns of the wild oxen or "thou hast answered me from the horns of the wild oxen" doesn't make any sense at all. "Thou hast heard me and answered me, delivered me from the horns of the wild oxen, that might make some sense if you have some reason to think he hasn't been saved from the lion. he has been from the wild oxen, let's hope he'll be saved from the lion too, but there is nothing that I know of in connection with the life of Christ that leads you to say He was saved from the wild oxen, or will be saved from the lion. Mr.---? (Student) Yes, but I don't know what . I think everyone will agree that it is the life of Christ, the description. In fact, it's Christ hanging on the cross and there's verse after verse recorded which literally and specifically describes him hanging on the cross, poured out like water, His bones out of joint His strength dried up like a potsherd, they've pierced His hands and feet, I may count all my bones, they part His garments and cast lots on His vesture--it's Christ on the cross and He on the cross, you might say, He says, "Oh, I was saved from something else, from the wild oxen, and now save me from the lion, but I don't know what in His life would have this verse. I don't know what there is in the New Testament--if the cross is the lion, something else is the/wild unicorn . Mr. ---? (Student) Yes. It is true that you find in--that this is the animal song. It is set to the hind of the morning, we read first in the/introduction. As you go on you find that bulls have compassed Him, strong bulls of Gashan have "gaped upon me with their mouths, as a ravening and a roaring lion" and in Verse 20 He wants His darling delivered from the power of the dog. Save me from the lion's mouth, yea from the wild horns of the wild oxen thou hast answered me. You might



Prophets-66 \*

think of a man in terrific pain, suffering and thinking of the boring the holes through the hands and the feet and the anguish; He imagines it in all sorts of animal figures; the lion and the bull and the wild oxen, the gorers and all these things are descriptive of the suffering which He is going through in the situation which He is in, but any reason to separate the wild oxen as one thing that is distinct from the bull and the lion and all the rest of them/<sup>there</sup> is absolutely no evidence either in the song or anywhere else. I see, personally, absolutely no way of making any sense whatever out of Verse 21 except along the line of Mr. ---'s suggestion. To say that here is one who from verse 1 on—"My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me", the very verse Christ used on the cross, is describing His anguish and misery on the cross and calling for help and in the midst of His call He says, "Deliver my soul from the sword; my darling from the power of the dog. Save me from the lion's mouth and from the horns of the wild oxen" and right there "and from the horns of the wild oxen, give me deliverance", He's going to say, and He pauses there and instead of going any further with His cry for deliverance, He says, "Thou hast answered." There's a sharp transition in the middle of the verse there from the cry of anguish and the appeal for help which had continued through every verse right up to this point and the rest of the song, all of which is praising God for what He has done. "Thou hast answered me. I will declare thy name unto my brethren." It goes on with the next verse. "In the midst of the assembly will I praise thee." It shows the sharpness and suddenness of the deliverance. Christ died on the cross. He is put in the grave. His apostles are scattered, distraught, full of disappointment--they think everything is at an end, and suddenly they realize He's raised from the dead, He's truly proven to be God in human flesh who has actually borne the sin of many in His death on the cross but the rest of the song from Verse 22 on is the resurrection joy. "All ye that fear the Lord, praise Him: all the seed of Jacob, glorify Him; that all the ends of the earth shall remember and turn to the Lord." Well now some unknown Jew who is in misery and being pursued by animals and having all this suffering, all the ends of the earth are going to turn to the Lord because He is delivered. That doesn't make sense. It doesn't make sense. It's only in connection with Christ that it makes sense.

Prophets 66 4

Professor \_\_\_\_\_, of Hebrew Union College in his commentary on the psalm says we have two distinct psalms here. One is a psalm of suffering and misery written by some sufferer in Maccabean times, the other is a psalm of praise to God, and the two are combined here. There's no connection between the two. We have this sharp transition between the suffering of Christ up to the middle of Verse 21 and then in the middle of the last clause where the parallelism of the poetry--you have one line complete, two-thirds of the next line and then you suddenly break off. There is a sharp transition, the sharpest you can ever imagine as he gives his answer, "Save me from the lion's mouth; from the horns of the wild oxen!" and then He breaks forth into joy, "Thou hast answered me. I will declare thy name unto my brethren", right in the midst of this verse. A sudden, sharp transition from misery to joy, from gloom to happiness, from crucifixion to resurrection, and He continues and tells how all the fat ones of the earth shall eat and worship and they that go down to the dust shall bow before Him. Even he that cannot keep his soul alive, a seed shall serve Him. It shall be told of the Lord unto the next generation and they shall come and declare His righteousness unto a people that is to be born, a new people that comes into existence, not previously existent, those who believe on the name of Christ, a new people gathered out of every tongue and nation and tribe. Those people that shall be born, that He hath done this, that He hath done it, that it is finished, the last words that Christ spoke on the cross, "It is finished." Spurgeon taught that this clause represents in advance the very words that Christ expressed on the cross, and there you have the sudden break from the theme of agony and misery and suffering to the theme of joy in the sight of what God has done as He has accepted the suffering and performed the resurrection of Christ \_\_\_\_\_, and so there is, I think, one of the sharpest of transitions in the whole Scripture. I don't think the verse can possibly make sense without recognizing this transition. It's interesting that Prof. Moulton of the University of Chicago in his MODERN READERS BIBLE interprets it exactly this way simply as a poem, that there is a sharp transition here, he puts "Thou hast answered me" in big capital letters at the end of the line there and says, "Here is the moment at which He suddenly is delivered and turns His attention to the

9/20/71  
Prophets-66+

Joy." Yes? (Student) Well, it's simply a term for the soul. It's parallel with "My soul from the sword, my life, or that which is dear to me.

Mr.---? (Student) That's my only hope of life.

Well, now we could take a month with great interest on this psalm; there are so many interesting features right up with Christ's definite resurrection. I incidentally brought out two or three of them here in my discussion of the resurrection passage here, the pointing of it to the new seed that is to come into existence, the new nation that is to be born as a result of what He has done, but I was only doing it in answer to Mr.---'s question about the matter of transition because it seems to me that it is one of the most striking instances in the Scripture, one which I see no other possible way of interpreting which makes sense but which does make sense in a most startling way--a sharp transition from the one phase to the other of the psalm. Now you are not justified in just going through the Bible and any verse you want finding a sharp transition in the middle of it. The thing is, you find a passage which has one thing in it, you'll find a section which has another thing in it, you'll find a break between them often is not a new heading put up or a statement, "Now, we've discussed this, we're going to discuss this" but just sharply jumps from one to the other and of course I mean not a new section like but another phase of the same idea, a related, perhaps contrasting, phase of the same idea, as you have in Psalm 22 and as we've had in various places in Isaiah. (Student) Oh, yes. I would say it's a transition. It is a sharp, sudden transition from the anguish of the cross to the joy of the resurrection. Two closely related but contrasting ideas, dependent one upon another. It isn't as if he's discussing the trinity now and then he turns to discuss methods of salvation. That I wouldn't call a transition. A transition is when you're discussing one subject and then you suddenly go to another phase of it or a related aspect or something which is possibly the answer to a question that's been welling up in the mind of the reader as he's been thinking about this all the time more and more it comes to him, "What about that? What about that?" and then suddenly he's given the answer,



Prophets-664

as when they give rebuke and judgment and the righteous are thanking, "Oh, what shall we do? What shall we do? Every thing's hopeless. The nation is sinful; they're wicked; there's no hope ahead. What shall we do?" The answer is, "There's great hope ahead. God is not through with Israel. He has wonderful blessings." Well, now to get back to chapter--Mr.--, did you raise your hand? Now to get back to Chapter 10 of Isaiah here. You have in it the matter of the chapters starting with Verse 5 and running on to 34. It's difficult for me to know how much time we ought to take on it because it is an interesting section in between two high points. Chapter 9 is one of the high points in the Scriptures; chapter 11 is one of the high points, and compared with them this seems like a low point and yet it has a tremendous that is really very interesting and we notice that the first problem is, "How can the wicked Assyrian conquer righteous Israel?" The answer is, God is dealing with Israel; the Assyrian is God's instrument, but, furthermore, the answer is, there is perfect justice in God's economy. You may not see it; you may not understand it but it is there and He is going to requite wickedness even though He uses the wicked for the performance of His purposes. Their turn will come in His economy, and the Assyrian is not simply obeying God and being used as his instrument. The Assyrian thinks that he in his great wisdom and his great learning is accomplishing a great thing and God is going to show him that this is not true. The

will be dealt with and God will punish him for it. Mr.--?

(Student) Because of his . It is because of their wickedness in general and because of their boastfulness against God. (Student) They did the right thing there but they deserve no credit for it because they didn't do it for a right motive. They didn't do it thinking they were serving God; they did it thinking that they were doing something quite different.

Prophets - 67

like the case in San Francisco when the Russian dictatorship was standing for totalitarianism and the United States was standing for democracy and then the United States said, "We want Argentina . . . .", and the Russians opposed letting Argentina in because Argentina was a dictatorship in which you have a little group ruling but that group was against Russia, the Russians thought, and therefore they opposed it, but the United States forced it through. Well the United States forced the thing through which was to Russia's interest rather than ours because the Argentinan dictatorship has far more in common with communistic dictatorship than it has with American democracy and very soon after they made a . . . . between Argentina and the Soviet but at that time the Americans did that which was for the interest of the Russians but they didn't do it for the motive of helping them and they gave us no credit. They consider that while the billions of dollars of lend lease we gave them, they consider was just to save our own . . . . ; they don't give us any credit for it, and Assyrian was God's instrument doing what God wanted done but it was doing it for its own purpose and it deserves no credit in God's hand for doing that which was not done in order to please God. But he says in Verse 12, "when the Lord has performed His whole work on mount Zion and in Jerusalem, I will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria." The Lord is dealing first with His own. Zion deserves and will get its punishment and then you may be assured that God will perform His righteous works but those are in God's hands. God says, "vengeance is mine; I will repay"--saith the Lord. if your heart is right before the Lord and you are serving Him you can look to Him to keep you in the way that is fair and there is no need of your rushing around and worrying about someone else who injures you personally. God will take care of that in His own time. There's no reason for you to get excited about it. Yes, Mr.--? (Student) Yes. (Student) The word here rendered "punish" is really "visit". "I will visit". It is the word which means to oversee and to cause a sharp change and I doubt if you could draw a great deal from the

Prophets — 67 †

word . Mr.—? (Student) Yes. Absolutely literal in this sense. Yes. They took all the fenced cities of Judah; they destroyed Lachish , the second most important city of Judah; they closed in Jerusalem like a bird in a cage for three years so people couldn't get anything to eat except what they could rush out in between forays and grab from the fields, that which grew of itself. He doesn't say, "After I destroy mount Zion," but after he performed this work which He has before Him, this particular work for which the Assyrian was called into the land. It is true that you cannot here take His whole work here as meaning everything that God is ever going to do against Jerusalem but it means the work for which He is using the Assyrian. That's what he means. (Student) That would seem mostly—. Now the, further on in the chapter then we have, verse 15 through 19, the actions of God against the Assyrians, the Lord is going to overcome them. The Lord is going to, verse 18, consume the glory of his forest, and of his fruitful field, both soul and body. It's His force, used as a figure for the Assyrian power. Great force; great center of power and strength. The Lord will consume the glory of his forest and of his fruitful field, both soul and body; and it shall be as when a standardbearer faints, and the remnant of the trees of his forest shall be few, that a child could number them. How high can a child count? Certainly not up to 26,954,000,000 or whatever it was that is the amount of energy in a pound. Certainly not that high. A child says, "Oh, there was lots of people." "How many?" Oh, there thirty—twenty-five or thirty people there." He can't count in these terrifically high figures. He's not reached that point yet. The Assyrian power is so small that a little child can indicate the weakness of it. That is the way that the Assyrians are going to be devastated by the Lord's own power. Now does the destruction here of the Assyrians refer to the destruction of Sennacherib's army or to the destruction of Assyria as a nation? Certainly both are in view; <sup>you might say</sup> both are parts of the picture. God's punishment upon Assyria includes the end of the Assyrian attack upon Jerusalem; it includes



Prophets -674

the utter destruction of Assyria when the Medes and the Babylonians conquer it. Whether one or the other of these two phases is primarily in view here or whether they are both involved in --they're both phases of one thing; that is, it's not a double fulfillment but it is a, possibly a large thing which includes several different phases of it. Which of the two right here is a matter I wouldn't want to be dogmatic about, but, in verse 20--it will come to pass, there is a day when it will come to pass, the remnant of Israel and those who escape of the house of Jacob shall no more again lean upon him that smote them but shall lean upon Jehovah, the Holy One of Israel, in truth. They will not look for their health and deliverance to human means as Ahaz is doing in going to Assyria for help against Syria but they will lean upon the Lord as Isaiah was exhorting Ahaz to do. A remnant shall return, even a remnant of Jacob, to the mighty God, for though thy people Israel be as the sand of the sea only a remnant of them shall return. A destruction is determined overflowing with righteousness for the full end of that determined for the Lord God of hosts made in the midst of all the land. There is to be a remnant left but the nation as a whole is desolate; though they are a tremendous nation, they are to suffer because of their sin against God. (Student) I would think that that probably would refer to the time of the .

It's a little hard to be sure, if you're looking forward to the future, to that time (Student). 33! Yes. We haven't got up to 33 quite. I would say it refers to the Assyrians. Well let's move on rapidly and get up to 33 and we'll look at 24. The Lord said, "O ye people that dwell in Zion, do not be afraid of the Assyrian. The Assyrian is the one to be afraid of. To be afraid is disobeying God. Be afraid of displeasing Him. / if someone were to say today, "The great danger for American isn't the communist, it isn't Stalin; it's the sin of the people. It's the forgetfulness of God of our nation and it is from God the danger is coming to us. God may use the Russian as an instrument to punish us or He may deliver us from them. It's all in God's

Prophets 67 -

hands. If we are right before God, God is able to work out His own plan in relation to His own. He says, "O my people, don't be afraid of the Assyrian, though he smite thee with the rod and lift up his staff against thee, after the manner of Egypt." He goes on to say there is something very special He's going to reveal, yet a very little while and the indignation shall be accomplished and my anger shall be directed to his destruction, and the Lord of hosts shall stir up against him a scourge as in the slaughter of Midian at the rock of Oreb. His rod will be over the sea and he will lift it up after the manner of Egypt. You remember Moses lifted his rod in God's command and the sea was turned into blood and it will come to pass in that day that his burden shall be poured off thy shoulder and his yoke from off thy neck and his yoke shall be destroyed by reason . It's very clearly here a picture then of a sudden deliverance from the Assyrians. God had said that Ahaz has brought the Assyrian into the land by the wicked alliance with an ungodly power instead of trusting God. He has brought them unto the land, just as the alliance at Yalta and has now given half the world into the hands of Russia. It has been brought by man's wickedness that we have come to this pass in which we now find ourselves. It is the result of man's disobedience to God but in this particular case dealing with the Assyrian God said, "That indignation which is to be performed through the Assyrian will soon be accomplished and there's going to be a sudden, tremendous overwhelming deliverance by the hand of God, just like the lifting of the rod in Egypt. It's God's hand that is going to bring deliverance. It's a wonderful prophecy of a deliverance which God is going to perform in a supernatural and unbelievable way. Mr.---?

(Student) Yes. (Student) I would think so, yes. I would think that is looking forward to the time of the captivity and saying, "There's going to be purification. There's a remnant that will turn to God." I don't think we turn any and come back to, figuratively, I think it means turn back to their loyalty to God.

(Student) Yes. I think he's giving that principle of the coming of the remnant

Prophets-67 \*

which is a principle that applies all through Israelite history and saying particularly it's going to apply in that , though it also applies before and after that, but now he's describing in 24-27 though Ahaz by his wickedness has put Judah in the place where it is in danger of complete destruction by the Assyrians God is going to deliver them from the Assyrians. The Assyrian is not going to bring an end to the land of Judah. He will bring terrific scourge, terrific suffering upon them. There will be great devastation in the midst of the land but there will not be a complete destruction. God is going to give a wonderful deliverance and a whole century of before the actual exile comes, and so in verse 28-33 we have a very beautiful but unhistoric picture of that which happened when the Assyrians came. We have the picture there in 28-32 --it says here in Verse 28, "Here is Jerusalem--and below Jerusalem you have a vast stretch here of partly easy to defend from the south, and from the east and from the west and north of this is the hill country to Jerusalem, and north of it are all these places. Here are the Assyrians from way over there. They've come across and they've come down from the North; they come to Aiath, they pass through Migron; at Michmash he lays up his , they've gone over the pass, they've taken up their lodging in Geba; Ramah trembles, Gibeah of Saul, just three miles from Jerusalem is fled, "Cry out with thy voice, O Daughter of Gallim, hearken oh, Laish, O poor Anathoth." It's getting very near to Jerusalem now. Madmenah is a fugitive, the inhabitants of Gebim flee for safety, he stops at Nob, he shakes his hand at the mount of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerusalem. It is as if you were to say that the German fleet had landed at Boston Harbor, the soldiers, the great tank division had landed in Boston, you say, "They've come down as far as New Haven, now they're approaching New York, now they've come to Elizabeth, New Jersey, they've come through Newark, they're getting on down near Trenton. Here they are at Philadelphia, the people of Chester are already fleeing in great fear, is being deserted, they are/entering Holyoke

and Arden over here and that's the situation described here. It's describing the places north of Jerusalem as the Assyrian army is imagined coming down and attacking the city and



Prophets 68

It gives a wonderful picture of the Assyrians coming but the Assyrians fooled the prophet. They came around from the South. They came down the Philistine plane and came up from the South and they never attacked from that direction. So this does not describe that which actually happened. It gives a picture of the terror of the people as they imagine the approach of the Assyrians. They think of them as coming down that hill country from the North and they didn't actually come that way. It's not a mistake in the Scripture. It's not a specific description of something that's going to happen. It is a picture, rather, of the <sup>as</sup> terror of the people when they're imagining their coming and thinking of them/coming down this way and they're getting nearer and nearer and nearer and they are at Nob, they shake their hand against the mount of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerusalem. How close they're getting, how tremendous is the danger, what can we do to stop them? The Assyrian will come right up and take Jerusalem. There's nothing we can do, but in Verse 33 right when you're in this terrific situation, the people are closed up in Jerusalem fearing the coming of the Assyrians, they think they'll come down from the North even though they find that the great mass of the army is over in the Philistine plane, and then they come up from the South instead, but they're filled with terror and then—here's a sharp transition—Behold the Lord God of hosts will lop the boughs with terror. It's the figure of a forest again describing the Assyrian attack—and the high of stature shall be hewn down, and the lofty shall be brought low and he shall cut down the thickets of the forest with iron and Lebanon shall fall by a mighty one. A tremendous description here of the great Assyrian marching forward on Jerusalem seemingly about to take it and God lops it off and puts an end to it so that the trees of the forest are but few, Sennacherib's army here melts away. killed by the angels of the Lord, the pestilence in the night, very few left the next day, Sennacherib had to take the small number left and go back to his land and a century later the same thing is re-enacted in a different way upon the Assyrian . God here gave an example in advance of what he was going to do to the Assyrian empire as a whole. A hundred

17 208

years later the Medes and the Babylonians attacked the city of Ninevah, <sup>they</sup> destroyed the city, they reduced it to a ruin which it remains until this very day and never again was rebuilt. It remains just an utter ruin there in the desert, across the Tigris river from most of the heaps, the mounds there in the desert and so the great Assyrian empire, the greatest force that ancient Rome had ever seen up to that time, the Lord caused to be cut down and just lopped off and reduced to nothing, the end of a great forest represented by the Assyrian empire and then, since we have only two or three minutes if you wouldn't mind I'd like to show what continues immediately thereafter. He says, "Here is the great Assyrian empire--what is God going to do? He's going to lop it over and destroy it and it lies in a ruin." Well, the next verse says, "There shall come a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, a Branch out of his root shall bear fruit. Here is the Assyrian forest lopped over, destroyed, well here's another force. Here's the forest of Jesse. Here's the force of Judah, and out of that there comes a shoot out of the stock, a Branch out of his root. This other force is also lopped up, is also destroyed and reduced to practically nothing but though the force of the Assyrian comes to an end and it's finished and there's never again been an Assyrian power in the world, it was completely ended. The objective seemed to be ended also, the House of David is reduced to absolute nothingness. Zedekiah is taken by the Babylonians and killed, the people taken into exile, the House of David never again has a king to sit on the throne, finally Joseph doesn't even have a place to live and they have to be out in the inn, out in the stable and there out of the roots of the House of Jesse, reduced to this state of poverty and humiliation, a little Branch shoots out of its roots and bears fruit and this one is the One who is going to be the Emperor to reign over the whole world with an empire far greater than that which the Assyrians ever had. So you see how there is no break between Chapter 10 and Chapter 11. There is a turning of attention from the great Assyrian world power which is destroyed by the hand of God to the comparison with the root which comes out of the stock of Jesse and which springs up and which is going to fill the whole world and establish righteousness and peace over the world. I wanted to bring that transition before Easter.

Prophets - 68

It would be inappropriate to have Easter without having this in mind. Now, Mr. ---, did you have a question? (Student) Yes. Well a forest is perhaps a rather nice figure for something strong and powerful, especially so perhaps in Palestine there because wood was rather scarce. They'd go up to the great forest of Libanon in order to get their timbers. It seems to be a good representation of strength and power and it's used that way quite a good many times in the Book of Isaiah in different sections. You may have noticed it in Chapter 29. It occurs in the same way there. Well, we continue here a week from Tuesday. I won't assign any lesson for Tuesday but I will for Wednesday and Thursday.



- 1 Micah 7:7-18  
 2 The name Mi ka ya. Prophets name used as a text  
 3 Isa.1-6  
 4 Micah a contemporary of Isaiah  
 5 Heading of Isaiah 1:1 and 2:1  
 6 Isa.2:1f// Mic.4:1f Reason for saying 2:1 is heading for 2:1-5 only  
 7 Isa.1-6 a unit Cycles of rebuke, blessing, rebuke  
 8 Isa. 6 Cf. structure of Isa. and of Micah  
 9 Isa. 1
- 20 9 Not a unified translation viz Elijah/Elias  
 10 Isa 1:18 Possibly a question but not make an issue of it  
 1:19,20 Conditional predictions  
 If your sins be as scarlet, do you think they are  
 Only tell from tone of voice whether it is a question
- 11 1:15  
 12 1:25-27  
 13 2:5 RSV paragraph division deceptive  
 Micah written before Isaiah  
 15 Isa 2 and Mic 4 Impossible to fit with amil view  
 16 Preaching on the second coming
- 17 Millennium clearly taught in Scripture  
 Avoiding extremes
- 18/1-4 Wrong method of interpretation  
 18/8 Same figure may be used in different connections  
 19 'In that day' not always refer to same thing  
 Same terminology may be used differently  
 James' terminology and Paul's  
 Jewish student thought  
 20 'And it came to pass' meant trouble ahead  
 20 'In the end' example of technical phrase used  
 non-technically'''
- 21 Danger of study of types Have different meanings  
 in different situations, viz Egypt
- 22 Isa 2:6-4:1 Folly of seeking peace through UN  
 22/7-12 3:16 Looking to personal adornment for happiness
- 23 Basis for rebuke: haughty hearts, wrong attitudes  
 Not the adornment but the attitude of those  
 wearing it is rebuked
- 24/7-10 Seeking to Calif Sierra Club on archaeology  
 Gov of Texas used v 13 of tire shortage
- 26 3:26-4:1ff chapter division wrong here  
 27 The important heart attitude
- 28 4:1 Condition of depopulation  
 29/1-5 4:3-6 Description of the millennium  
 29/6-10 Ch 4 diff message from ch 2
- 30 Isa 4 Good sermonic material  
 Satisfaction in Christ, holy living, fearlessness  
 and guidance Lessons for us in this age
- 31 Principles of interpretation

- 32 Isa 4 Principles of interpretation  
Description of present rather than millennial  
33 conditions
- 34/7  
36 Isa 5 Gog and Magog  
Figurative description of Israel cf v 7  
Application for us
- 37 5:29 Mistake of neglecting rebuke passages  
5:20 Picture of modernism
- 38 6 Threefold structure of chs 1-6  
40 Sudden transitions but not double fulfillment
- 41 Seed of the Woman not saved ones in general  
42 Gen 3:14-15 Transition from serpent v 14, to Satan, v 15  
43 Rebuke to ~~serpent~~ Satan and blessing to the woman  
Not double fulfillment but two purposes in one  
action
- 43/7 Isa 7
- 44 Ahaz showed no spirit of repentance. Just schemes.=  
Joining with Russia to fight Germany
- 45 Gen3:13 Principle of sharp transitional prediction  
Snake deserves punishment for letting itself be used
- 46 Attitude of the righteous toward message of coming  
doom on the wicked  
Serpent and Balaam's ass  
47 Animal moral responsibility  
Electrical theory as taught in high school
- 48 One event(victory over Satan) presented from two  
viewpoints Not double fulfillment But single  
fulfillment with more than one truth in it
- 50 Sudden transition from speaking to ~~Satan~~ serpent  
to speaking to Satan
- 51 Isa 7 Apply principles used in interpreting Gen 3  
Ahaz' scheme
- 52 Why Isa. went to meet Ahaz at fuller's field  
53 Roosevelt's political trick of inspecting the  
armament factories
- 54 Isa 7:4 Don't be worried or fear Cf man giving a  
massage who said 'Pay no attention to it' after  
rubbing on wintergreen oil
- 56 7:7-8 Isaiah's message to Ahaz  
57 7:9-10 Gap between vv 9 and 10 Reasons for saying this  
59 7:11  
60 7:12 Ahaz attempts to avoid disunity so makes this  
pious sounding statement  
Pres of Princeton U who made statements that  
pleased the fundamentalists and did things to  
please the modernists
- 61 7:13-14 V 14 is a rebuke not a blessing  
63 7:12-13  
64 Illustration of the locomotive which someone  
says can't pull the train because there is  
no horse or anything living attached to it

- 66 Pres Lincoln went against ~~what~~ his whole cabinet  
Nathan the prophet was wrong once
- 68 Isa 7:13 God is speaking Strong rebuke Cf Gen 3:15  
7:14-17 All rebuke  
Man who offered to pay AAM's expenses to Palestine  
if he would endorse his book Only junk
- 70 Nowhere else has God given such a carte blanche  
to a man to ask for a sign
- 71 7:17 Rebuke for not trusting God
- 73 7:14 Heb. participle presents a picture and must tell  
from context what the time is to be
- 74 Matthew refers this to Christ  
Danger of taking a Bible verse and applying it  
to whatever you want to
- 75 Samson taking a Gentile wife did not make him  
a type of Christ Or Joseph marrying a Gentile  
Is the prophecy predicting one thing or a  
series of things? But the same prediction does not  
indicate both the birth of Columbus and the  
founding of the Gen Electric Company/  
Can't have two distinct types of thing predicted  
in one statement
- 76 What does the prophecy mean to Ahaz?
- 78 Good illustrations of single fulfillment as  
over against a series of fulfillments
- 79 Principles have recurrent fulfillments  
Predictions of a series of events or persons  
Those who looked for four senses of everything  
Historical, ethical, alegorical, etc
- 81 Not two fulfillments of one specific prediction
- 82 A fulfillment must be similar in character and  
not involve unrelated types of interpretation  
In the class you will see two men with bright  
yellow neckties that would be double fulfillment
- 83 Isa 7:14 Modernist attitude toward  
Hebrew word 'sign'
- 84 7:16
- 85 Meaning of 'evil' -- misery, unattractive  
evil cows, naughty figs Physical evil
- 87 7:16 What child is meant?  
7:14 refers to time of Christ, 7:16 refers to  
time of Isaiah and likewise v 15 Have to  
decide how is the transition and the reason-  
ableness of it
- 89 7:15 Butter and honey he shall eat in his knowing  
Possible translations of the phrase



(4) Prophets, Spring 1948

- 90 Isa 7:15 'till he know' incorrect cf v 22-25  
91 picture of depopulation
- 92 Ahaz's scheme to backfire Cf Roosevelt's  
pact with Stalin  
93 England's fear of Russia now that Germany's  
power is broken  
94 Parallels between Ahaz and Roosevelt  
Parallel principles without being a prediction of  
events today
- 96 Depopulation of the land  
97 7:20 Rebuke to Ahaz for hiring Assyria to come help  
98 Verse 22 has nothing to do with v. 16  
Depopulation in v 15 not identical with the  
one described in v 22
- 99 7:15,22 v 15 more immediate and v 22 stretches on out  
Cf Columbus coming to America and its results
- 100 Certainty expressed regarding this interpretation
- 101 7:16 cf/ Gen 24:63 for parallel Heb usage: at the  
102 time of evening '  
Three views of the Bible  
103 Verse 16 gives the reason for v 15  
Israel and Judah brought into the midst of  
struggles between the great powers  
Not given the specific regions of depopulation
- 105 Good ch division between ch 7 and 8  
Relation between ch. 7 and ch 36:2
- 106 Assyrian representative calls on Judah to surrender  
at the very place where 20 yrs earlier Isa had  
predicted what would happen  
The word for 'virgin' in Heb  
Not the technical term, or  
the ordinary word for firgin  
Maiden -- unmarried woman
- 108 LXX translation of almah
- 109 8:1  
110 Two different children: one not yet living as a  
measuring stick. The other the son of Isa born  
somewhat later than the prediction given in ch 7
- 111 8:6-9  
113 8:9,12 Ch 8 ends with misery Ch 9 has rejoicing  
Where is the transition?
- 115 Ch 8 dealing with same subj as ch 7  
116 Ahaz thought he could make an alliance with  
wickedness in order to overcome wickedness  
8:9-10 Use of the article in Hebrew 'The child'
- 117 8:12-13  
118 The Word of God causes division  
On criticism--just and unjust

- 119 Isa 8:14 Our government turning over N Korea to Russia
- 121 Quotations from OT in NT  
NT never builds arguments on one letter or one particular Refer to thought as a whole
- 122 NT method of interpreting the OT
- 123 Isa 8:8 Immanuel's land Israel's apostasy and dispersion  
8:16-18
- 124
- 125 8:17-18 Immanuel speak(v 16) Isa answers(v 17)  
Immanuel speaks again (v 18) which is applied in Hebrews Epist to Immanuel
- 126 8:19 The name Immanuel applicable to which coming  
Spiritism denounced
- 127 Need for reasonable apologetic
- 128 Heb 2:11
- 129 Isa 8:18 Immanuel and his children--the greatest argument  
for Christianity is the character of individual  
Christians scattered throughout the world
- 130 8:22-9:1 God wants witnesses, not lawyers  
Transition between ch 8 and ch 9
- 131 8:21 misery of people of Palestine  
Look up to )repent 2) for help Look down
- 132 Driven into thick darkness (KJV)  
Thick darkness driven away (RV)
- 133 A place named: Galilee of the nations
- 134 First section thro which marching armies pass  
Principle: people make alliances with people  
far from them more readily than those who are  
near to them but not exactly with them Points  
of conflict sharper with man who compromises  
than with a man who is a modernist
- 135 Isa 9:5
- 136 9:2 begins a new section
- 137 9:2
- Is the darkness driven away, or are they driven  
into darkness? Is a picture of misery followed  
by one of wonderful joy
- 137 9:6  
Mat 4:15,16
- 139 Matthew's use of Isaiah's prophecy
- 140 Transition between Isa 8 and 9
- 141 9:7-8 Ought to be a ch division between vv 7 and 8
- 141a Reasons for saying 9:1,2 were fulfilled by Christ  
at his first coming
- 142 9:3 Is AV or RV correct trans here?
- 143 Value of footnotes in the Bible  
To exclude all human interp from the Bible one  
would have to have a Bible with only the =  
consonants of the Hebrew text alone
- 144 Case of having two possibilities in the same  
word Viz the English word 'raise' has two  
senses

(6) Prophets, Spring 1948

- 145 Isa 9:3 A comparison between the joyless multiplication and then the joyful condition which has come  
Joy follows the coming in of the light
- 146 144 9:4 Oppression broken Like the day of Midian  
147 Is military oppression resulting from the oppression of sin
- 148 9:5 The coming of the Assyrian host  
149 9:6 When is the government placed on his shoulder?  
150 Christ's two fold nature suggested here  
151 We are member's of Christ's kingdom but we live now in Satan's kingdom  
Vital to have the government of my life upon His shoulder Progressive increase
- 152 9:7 Stresses the physical aspect but suggests the spiritual aspect also  
153 Passage permits no amil interpretation which puts these things completely during the present age  
154 Spiritualization is not spiritual at all Dislike the term=
- 155 9:6 His Name  
Chinese practice of changing the name to fit the person's description  
158 College friend's name: Green Kirby White McGee, Jr
- 160 9:7 How fit premil interp?
- 162 Amillennialism is a denial rather than an INTERPRETATION  
Meaning of 'forever' and 'eternal'
- 164 Weakness of the argument which tries to fit everythingx in the universe into it so as to make a complete whole  
The zeal of the Lord of hosts means his determination to us but the word means a great deal more Same as 'jealous'
- 166 The increase of his government No force can stop it  
167 Statement of the amil position
- 171 9:7-8 Break here  
9:10 Illustration of London's slums being cleaned out by the German's bombing
- 172 10:4 refrain Four stanza poem each starting with 'Woe unto them'? or ending with refrain in 9:12,17,21 and 10:4 A ~~unit~~ unit from 9:8-10:4
- 175 Hand stretched out in punishment, not mercy  
Consider the problem presented in 10:5-34



(7) Prophets, Spring 1948

- 177 Isa 10:5ff Proplem of God's using a sinful nation to punish a nation with a generally higher standard of morality Cf/ Russia overrunning the United States
- 178 Assyria God's Instrument
- 179 5:25 Refrain found in chs 9 and 10
- 180 Conditions of safety in United States
- 181 Minister who said Hätler was like Nebuchadnezzar in being God's instrument
- 182 Hitler didn't punish us but only puffed up our pride
- 183 The reaction of of sinful minds in finding an excuse by comparing with someone else and saying we're better
- 184/7 10:7 Assyria's viewpoint
- 185 10:11 Example of wrong use of a text to teach something entirely different from that which the text means
- 187 10:13 The way our government seized property of Germans during World War II robbing her Sinful pride
- 188 10:14-15 American's proud attitude
- 189 10:16-19 Thorns and briars figures of the armaments of Assyria that he will burn up in one day
- Principle: or a particular instance of Assyrian power being destroyed, viz Sennacherib
- 192 Remarks on being late for opening prayer
- 193 10:4,5 Psalm 22 Meaning of v 21 Word order different in Heb than in English Word order in RV follows that of the H brew 'For''KJV), 'yea'(RV) Which is correct The Heb is just 'and'
- 195 'For''KJV), 'yea'(RV) Which is correct The
- 196 Heb is just 'and'
- 198 Ps 22:21 How does God hear from the horns of the unicorn? Sharp transition in the middle of the verse. Shows the suddenness of deliverance
- 199 Prof. who says we have two distinct psalms here and they are combined but have no connection
- 200/8 Nature of a transition
- 201 Isa 10
- 202 U:S: getting Argentina into the UN
- 203 10:12 10:18-19 Assyrian power so small a child can indicate its weakness
- 204 10:24 picture of sudden deliverance from Assyrians
- 206 10:28-32 Immaginary picture of the Assyrian invasion
- 207 10:33 People's terror as they imagine the approach God's sudden destruction of them
- 208 10-11 No break 11:1 takes up where 10:34 leaves off