

Last week raised a number of interesting problems and I hope some of you have worked out the correct answer to all these problems by this time. We noticed that Isaiah 13-14 is entitled "The Burden of Babylon" and then it proceeds to do some very strange things. In the first place it proceeds to discuss Babylon as if it were the great force, enemy of all Israel and of all God's deeds and works, when as a matter of fact, in the days of Isaiah Babylon was a comparatively unimportant city constantly striving to gain freedom from the Assyrian oppression. We noticed in addition to that that some of the characterizations of Babylon didn't seem altogether appropriate. It does not give anything that shows a great deal of local color of Babylon. We have other pictures elsewhere in the Scripture which do. These do not. Later in the latter part of Isaiah he speaks of the two ^{land} gates, he speaks particularly of the gods of Babylon. There are many statements that show our first-hand knowledge about Babylon but this does not have any such special notes in it. Then when it comes to the predictions about the future this predicts about the future that Babylon will become an absolute waste and a desolation as a result of a tremendous overwhelming defeat in war and no such tremendous overwhelming defeat in war took place. Babylon was overcome but then remained a great city and it gradually declined. We know of no one tremendous overwhelming defeat which produced this situation. The picture of desolation has been fulfilled to quite an extent at Babylon although some question it because of there being a village in a portion of it and because of the fact that after the conquest of Babylon no such thing happened. It fell into such a situation as this, most of the city, many centuries after the time of its defeat by the Medes. We have the specific name of Babylon used only three or four times in the ^{scripture} past. Well, of course, that is quite a few but it is, compared to the length of the passage, comparatively few. We have one other specific proper name here, we have the Medes referred to

I 4

in v. 17 as the people who are going to be stirred up against them. It seems very strange to have such a picture given in the time of Isaiah when Babylon was subject to Assyria, trying to get its freedom. It also seems strange in c. 14 to have such a picture of the king of Babylon given as is given here. It doesn't quite seem to describe the attitude of the kings of Babylon at this time. They were might proud and haughty but it hardly seems as if they would come quite in the category given here and their pride was more--at least Nebuchadnezzar's pride was more in building expositions than in warlike conquests, while this pictures a man who is anxious to establish himself as king in all the world and is especially interested in sitting on the mount of the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north. Thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God. Then, of course, the fate of the king of Babylon--cast out of his grave like an abominable branch, thrust through with a sword, not joined with his ancestors in burial. We don't know of anything in particular to fulfill that in the life of Nebuchadnezzar or of the great kings of Babylon at this time, so with all of these problems and difficulties we are faced with the question, "Shall we take the attitude of Fredrich Delitzsch--this is a fraud--predictions were made which were not fulfilled, descriptions are given which are not true. This book is a fraud--cast it out!" Or shall we take the attitude of Driver and the others who are in between, who are not radical but liberal and who say there is beautiful spiritual teaching in it, it is beautiful truth, it may be historically accurate, it may not be true to facts but we get a real blessing from it. It is something that is beneficial to us just like those wonderful stories in the first part of Genesis, no truth to them but they are wonderfully beneficial. They do us good to read them. There is spiritual blessing in it and what difference does it make whether it is true or not. That is the second attitude. The

I

4

third attitude might be to say, "Well, now, it says this is the way the king of Babylon was, he must have been that way, even if there is nothing in history to prove it, he surely was that way. It says here that the city will be destroyed, the king of Babylon cast out, unburied. It must have been that way. Now, of course, your history doesn't show it, but your history must all be wrong. Well, that's right in certain cases. The Bible doubtless preserves us correct facts where our historical are incorrect, but this is rather large, to say that. We can say but is it the correct answer? The fourth attitude, which I think is the right one, is to say, "This is part of God's Word; this is true, but are we interpreting it correctly? Are we taking the right attitude as to what this points to? Now, one of the great principles which I stress in the study of the prophets is that what the prophets say is what they mean, that they are speaking of one specific event, unless there is clear evidence they are including a series of events in what they say, but they are giving us one definite prediction in most of the writings of the prophets. It may seem a little bit contrary to the principles which I advanced in the study of the prophets, the attempt which I make to answer this problem here, but it seems to me that very likely the passage requires that we interpret it in a rather extraordinary way, in a way somewhat different from most passages. One thing, of course, we notice is that the passage ends with the Lord swearing that He will break the Assyrian in His land--v. 24-27, and before ~~the Assyrians a vital force, before that time, I mean before~~ the Babylonians were a vital force, the Assyrian had been broken in all the land, and destroyed. It's a rather strange combination and most critics say v. 24-27 has nothing to do with what precedes. I think that that is hardly the correct attitude to take for it. I think it is better to say it doubtless does have and does it give us some definite light upon it]

I 4

Now in verses 24-27 we are speaking about the Assyrians. I believe it was Prof. Montgomery in the University of Pennsylvania who, I remember, spoke of the description of the kings of Babylon here and he said, "This doesn't describe the king of Babylon at all." He said, "It's a perfect picture of the kings of Assyria." He said, "Surely it must be that this is a picture of the kings of Assyria and the names have simply become confused. They've got the wrong name in it or else perhaps somebody wrote it to describe the king of Assyria and then later on they changed it when the Babylonians were the primary force and they changed the name to the King of Babylon."

I 5

That would, of course, be similar to the situation in Egypt where some of the pharaohs of Egypt who were less powerful than some others and wanted to make out they were just as powerful instead of making new statues would take the name of an old king and would substitute their name on it

. There is a great statue of King III and a later king rubbed it off and put in . You can see such statues in the museums with the name of a later king on the front, probably some times if you look back between the shoulder blades you'll find in small letters the name of the original king whom the statue was made to represent. Now I don't think that is the proper analogy for the Bible. That, of course, fits with the critics attitude toward the Bible. I don't think that is

here, but is there an interpretation of this which is a reasonable interpretation. It is the first of the burden to the nations. It is placed at the very beginning. It describes God's wrath against a great enemy. It speaks of this as the burden of Babylon and it describes God's wrath against a great enemy. It speaks of this as the burden of Babylon

I 5

and this enemy as the king of Babylon and of the town as the city of Babylon and we know that Isaiah later on in his ministry was told by the Lord that Babylon was to be the enemy who would take them into exile. Now is it possible that Babylon then, the one who is actually going to take them into exile even though it is not now a great power, is taken here simply as a symbol to use to represent the great hostile enemy to God, a symbol to represent the forces which are going to oppose the will of God and primarily ~~oppose~~ to indicate the one who is

the great head of all the forces of evil? Can it be that when it speaks of the burden of Babylon it is speaking of the burden of the forces of wickedness and that when it speaks of the king of Babylon that it is speaking of the one who is the great enemy of God, that Satan is here the one who is really in mind and that Satan's doom is described, that Satan's fate is pictured and of course includes in it the idea that somewhat similar fates are to reach many of Satan's instruments and many of Satan's emissaries. I advance that as a suggestion, wondering whether that would be a valid interpretation of the two chapters, as to the meaning of them, an interpretation which would not be out of harmony with the whole situation, which would account for the fact that there are various statements made in them which refer to Babylon and some of which are true about Babylon and some of which are not true. Much of the terminology seems to go far beyond the immediate situation of Babylon. Much of it seems to deal with a time when the whole world is to see the place of combat and God is on the one side and ~~this~~ other great force is on the other side and there is shown the complete victory of God over the forces of evil with Satan at their head and then it ends with the picture of the victory, the wonderful victory which God is going to give within the next few years, within the next few years over the present great world force, the Assyrian force, and so at the end of it we have the Assyrian and this early thing

I 5

that is going to happen as an example of the tremendous victory of God over the forces of which the Assyrian, of course, is God's instrument. God uses the wrath of wicked men to praise Him but God in His destruction of the Assyrian in His land without any human agency entering into it gave one of the examples which Isaiah dwelt upon so frequently of the fact that God's power was supreme and that God could overthrow any great force He chose. The burden of Babylon ends with this and previous to it we have perhaps a picture of God's dealing with Satan and with the forces of wickedness, a picture in which there are occasional glimpses^{that} at Babylon specifically but in which others might deal more with the forces of wickedness in general and with their exemplification in various overthrows but particularly in that great final overthrow of all the forces of wickedness in the battles just prior to the end of this age. Now that is a suggestion which is not usually necessary to make about sections of the Scripture but which is, perhaps, not too far a step. We might note in that connection that we do have instances in the Scripture where we are talking about a certain situation and then we jump forward to a more distant situation. There seems to be no question of that. We have, of course, the serpent addressed in Genesis 3 and then our attention is shifted to Satan, the real force^{back} of the serpent. We have in Daniel 11, the description of Antiochus Epiphanes and we go on for a certain distance dealing with Antiochus Epiphanes and then we jump forward to things that have no relevancy to Antiochus Epiphanes and very evidently there is a jump forward to the anti-Christ. That has been recognized all through Christian history as the interpretation of that chapter. It either jumps forward from Antiochus Epiphanes, the type of the anti-Christ to the Anti-Christ himself, makes that sudden jump clear forward, or else it tells us what is wrong and it is pretty hard to imagine that the book could have described what was absolutely wrong about this man and been accepted as authoritative as the Word of God. It would have been too obvious to people right at the time that it

I 5

a book which had made great predictions and then failed to come true. It is quite evident that they must have understood it in some other way. So that suggestion--now I note in connection with this suggestion about Babylon here you have your title first, "The Burden of Babylon" which Isaiah the son of Amoz did see. Of course over in Revelation we have Babylon often spoken of. Over there you, it is true, in a somewhat different situation than that of the early part of Isaiah because then Babylon had become the great world power and had perished, so its name could very easily be used figuratively as a new world power to come, there, while you do not quite expect such a usage here at the time of Isaiah. It certainly would be utterly inexplicable if it were not for the prediction in Isaiah 39, the definite prediction, that it is to Babylon that the people will go, but you have the title, "The Burden of Babylon" which Isaiah saw and then you have four verses which have nothing specific about them. They have a general description of the gathering together of people for a great battle. Lift up a banner, exalt the voice, shake the hand. I have commanded my sanctified ones, I have also called my mighty ones for mine anger. The noise of a multitude in the mountains, like as of a great people, a tumultuous host. The Lord of hosts mustereth the host of the battle. Is this hardly a picture of the Persian forces, forces which were equally against God with the Babylonians though they did let the people go. This hardly seems like a picture of them. They come from a far country, from the end of heaven, even the Lord, and the weapons of his indignation, to destroy the whole land. Surely that sounds like a picture of a tremendous gathering together of those whom God specifically calls. They come from the end of heaven. ^{Are} these forces here described, forces which come from the end of the heavens, meaning by that that they come from distant lands, or are they actual forces that come from heaven, even the Lord and the weapons

I 5

He brings against them? It is parallel to some extent to our picture in Isaiah 57 and again in 62 where the Lord comes in power to overwhelm the forces of wickedness. Of course he describes it there as coming alone. He here describes it as coming with a great multitude which He gathers but they are very definitely His and His multitude. We have the picture in Revelation 19 of Christ coming. Christ has the sword in His mouth with which He slays the wicked, yet we have the great multitude pictured as coming behind Him. The multitude is pictured and yet Christ's ^{work} /alone, His Word, is sufficient to destroy them.

Now v. 6. Howl ye; for the day of the Lord is at hand: it shall come as a destruction from the Almighty. I question whether we could put too much stress on the phrase, "the day of the Lord" but we have it there in v. 6 and again in v.9. ^{Behold} /the day of the Lord comes. Now, of course, when Babylon has a tremendous catastrophe, things are no longer possible for human beings to control, all this is upon them which they cannot possibly stop, it is a day of the Lord, a day in which the Lord alone can handle things, no man is competent for these things, and so in a way you can call it a day of the Lord when you face any great catastrophe which are unable to cope with. You might say the British at Dunkirk, in a way you might call it, the day of the Lord. Many say if the Lord had not intervened the British army would have been completely wrecked. There was the great fog, there was the unusual calmness of the sea, there was the failure of the, the inexplicable failure of the German planes to make an all-out attack upon them at that point. All these different elements entered in and immediately after it happened it seems to have been recognized by the British in general that the Lord had intervened to save them. A few years later that was largely forgotten and it was the wonderful work of the R. A. F. that saved them. We will not enter into that controversy at present but in the situation as it was you might very well call it a day of the Lord, a day when only the Lord's interposition could give respite. Well, while that is all true and I would not

I 5

want to take this as a technical term and build too much upon it, yet we do notice the day of the Lord here in v. 6 and again in v. 9 and over in 13, I will shake the heavens and the earth shall remove out of her place, in the wrath of the Lord of hosts and in the day of his fierce anger. Here is a picture here which seems to transcend the actual situation of the destruction of Babylon. And then, of course, we have this picture in verses 7 and 8 of the terrific fear. That fits most any time. It doesn't prove one way or the other, but then you have these great cosmic . He's talking about the stars of heaven and the sun is darkened and the moon does not cause her light to shine. All of these can be taken as figurative, of a great earthly war, and yet they hardly can fit the downfall of Babylon . It seems as^{if} there may be more of a literal element in them or at least that they show some tremendous thing going beyond what was actually realized at that time. Now v. 12 is an interesting verse. I will make a man more precious than gold; even a man than the golden wedge of Ophir. Was it King Richard III who said, "My kingdom for a horse"? Who was it who said that for lack of a nail the shoe was lost, for lack of a shoe the horse was lost, for lack of the horse, the rider was lost, for lack of the rider the kingdom was lost. A man, then, might make the difference. They didn't have enough men, for him Man is more precious than fine gold. Oh, for more men to meet the situation. This may be simply an expression of the need of manpower. They're utterly up against it; they're short of them. Oh, they'd give anything to have enough men, and yet I will make a man more precious than fine gold; even a man than the golden wedge of Ophir. It is rather strange language to use simply for the lack of man power. Is there a definite suggestion in it of something more? Is there the man who is more precious than fine gold, the one / through whom these people could have found salvation, the one who whom they could have escaped this whole situation, the one who is more precious than fine gold and they will come to realize it . Is that suggestion involved in it. I hate to be dogmatic about it but it is surely worthy of consideration.

I 6

After that, v. 13, I will shake the heavens and the earth shall remove out of her place, in the wrath of the Lord of hosts, and in the day of his fierce anger. Tremendous language. Tremendous language is sometimes used of small occurrences. The overthrow of Babylon was not a small scurmish and yet it was not, nothing like the catastrophe of the downfall of the Assyrian empire. If this were at all a description of Assyria it would seem more appropriate than of Babylon. Having it designated as Babylon here it may be just to show us that it isn't Assyria, that it is the great that is here referred to. I will shake the heavens and the earth will move out of her place and it shall be as the chased roe and as a sheep that no man taketh up. They shall every man turn to his own people and flee every one to his own land. It is destruction, plunder, terrific damage described, and then, of course, the Medes mentioned specifically here. A local touch. I will stir up the Medes against them. Their bows shall dash the young men to pieces. The Medes, of course, entered in to the destruction of Assyria, as well as the destruction of Babylon. It was the union between the Medes and the Babylonians which overwhelmed Ninevah. The Medes were involved in that though Nebuchadnezzar received most of the booty from it, and it was fifty years that the Persians who had secured supremacy over the Medes in the meantime became the conquerors of Babylon, and then, v. 19, Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. A great picture of terrific devastation, terrific catastrophe, the end of all their great plans and hopes just dashed to nothing, wild wilderness. Well, that is true of a good portion of the city. Babylon has been for many centuries. As we see it we wonder if it finds its full picture there or if this is, while it has a counterpart and actual Babylon, whether it actually is showing the eventual utter destruction of the forces that oppose the Lord, and in that case, of course, it will come right after the great catastrophe strikes, here, and then it goes right on that the Lord is going to have mercy on Jacob,

Ch. 14

I 6

and will choose Israel and set them in their own land and the strangers will be joined with them and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob. Did strangers join with the Israelites when they went back out of exile? The Samaritans tried to; they wanted to work with them, they said, "We believe the same as you do and we want to help you in building these walls and Nehemiah said, "No, you'll have no part nor portion with us," and he tried to cast them out and he tried to keep the blood pure and to keep them specifically Israelites, but here the strangers are joined with them and they cleave to the house of Jacob. Does that show a larger time, greater than anything that happened at the end of the exile, after the fall of Babylon? The people will take them and bring them to their place. The house of Israel will present for servants and handmaids; and they shall take them captives whose captives they were; and they shall rule over their oppressors. They are in general the despised people of the earth. They are despised and looked down upon. That has been true through the ages in general but our Lord says that we shall reign with Him in that time when He shall reign. We shall reign .

In that day the Lord shall give thee rest from thy sorrow, and from thy fear, and from the hard bondage wherein thou wast made to serve. Is this a picture of the victory of the people of God eventually, of the security and leadership of Israel upon the earth and of God's heavenly people over it all in the days after the utter defeat of all that raise themselves up against Him. And it shall come to pass in the day that the Lord shall give thee rest that thou shalt take up this proverb against the king of Babylon, and then the description of the ~~king~~ king of Babylon and his downfall, after the Lord gives this rest from .

Now this description, as Dr. Montgomery says, fit the king of Assyria quite well, many of the kings of Assyria seemed to have had this terrific pride and boastfulness and desire to set themselves up as controller of the whole earth, but this could not be used of Assyria because the Israelites were not

I 6

freed from anything when Assyria fell. The Israelites were simply taken over by Babylon after the Assyrian conquest, after the Assyrians were destroyed, the Babylonians took over. It does not show the attitude of Israel after Assyria went down, after Nineveh fell, that they were able to take up this proverb and say this. Now after the fall of Babylon Nebuchadnezzar would come nearer than any other king of Babylon to fulfilling this true picture and it hardly seems to be a picture of him and he had been dead some time before the end of the exile and many of the terms here that the king of Babylon certainly would seem to refer to some force much greater than any the king of Babylon ever was and much greater than his claims and than his aspirations. How hath the oppressor ceased! the golden city ceased! The Lord hath broken the staff of the wicked. It is God who has done it. He who smote the people in wrath with a continual stroke, he that ruled the nations in anger, is persecuted, and none hindereth. There is no time when this could have been said of . The whole earth is at rest and is quiet; they break into singing. Yes, the fir trees rejoice at thee and the cedars of Lebanon saying, Since thou art laid down, no feller is come up against us. Well, as far as the cedars of Lebanon are concerned, when the Assyrians ceased to fell the trees of Lebanon the Babylonians were ready to do it and when the Babylonians ceased the Persians were ready to do it. The cedars of Lebanon can hardly be thought of as giving this rejoicing at the death of the king of Babylon. Hell from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming. All they that speak, all the great ones of the earth are saying to thee, "Art thou become weak as we? art thou become like unto us? Certainly a very appropriate picture if it is for Satan, great ruler of the world at the end of this age, the one who is the prince of the power of the world now, prince of the power of the air, prince of the world. He's coming down to be as weak as they, for we read in Revelation 20 that he will be cast into the pit, cast there for a thousand years, and we read

I 6

in Isaiah 24 how the high ones on high and the kings of the earth are gathered together and cast into the pit. Thy pomp is brought down to the grave, and the noise of thy viols: the worms cover thee. How art thou fallen from heaven, O light bearer, son of the morning. Just how does that fit Babylon? Light bearer--son of the morning. How art thou cut down to the ground which didst weaken the nations! Thou hast said in thine heart I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God. ~~Certainly a true~~ picture of Satan. Certainly the king of Babylon is taken as a type of Satan, the representative of Satan, ^{if} but this actually is speaking of Satan, it would fit quite appropriately; it would hardly fit the king of Babylon. I will descend above the heights of the clouds; I will sit upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north. The mount of the congregation--it probably refers to Jerusalem--the sides of the north. Jerusalem, builded as a city that is compact together, wishing to go in to God's city and to take it over, and to take possession, but to Nebuchadnezzar, Jerusalem is just one of many cities which he conquered cities, not one of the most important of them by any means and he didn't bother to go there and sit there; it was one of . He went and sat in the gate of the city and directed what should be done with the captives. Surely this is a picture of desiring to go to that which Jerusalem signifies, to stand as ^{the} authority in the throne of God. I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High. The king of Babylon had no helicopter. This certainly--it might be very figurative language but it hardly seems to fit the king of Babylon. It certainly fits Satan. Thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit. We have noticed how that is indeed what is to be Satan's fate. They that see thee shall narrowly look upon thee, and consider thee, saying, Is this the man that made the earth tremble, that did shake kingdoms. We read, of course, at the very end of Isaiah how they shall go out and they shall look upon the bodies of them that have died and have been destroyed of the Lord. The Lord is going

I 6

to leave us examples of the fate that eventually meets hostility against Him. That made the world as a wilderness, and destroyed the cities thereof; that opened not the house of his prisoners. Of course that, to some extent, could be describing the king of Babylon, but certainly even more, Satan. All the kings of the nations even all of them, lie in glory, every one in his own house, but thou art cast out of thy grave. I don't know of evidence that seems to fit the kings of Babylon— as an abominable branch, and as the raiment of those that are slain, thrust through with a sword, that go down to the stones of the pit; as a carcase trodden under feet. It is the fate which God has brought upon some great enemies of God through the ages. It hardly seems specifically to fit the king of Babylon. Thou shalt not be joined with them in burial, because thou hast destroyed thy land, and slain thy people. Thou hast destroyed thy land, and slain thy people. How does that particularly fit Babylon? It would certainly fit many of the emissaries of Satan. It certainly fits Hitler who took thousands of fine German people wishing nothing in the world but to be let alone to live their lives in decency and who, if they would make a light remark of criticism of his treatment of the Jews or something would be seized and thrown into a concentration camp for it. It certainly fits Stalin, with the millions of Russians who have been slaughtered for nothing more than desiring to carry on their own lives and not to give up everything that was dear to them, simply because he desired them to do so. Surely--thou hast destroyed thy land and slain thh people. Whether any king, whether one in the history of the world has caused the slaughter, the death, the bloodshed and the misery which Stalin has in these last twenty years is certainly highly questionable and he, of course, is only one of the instruments of Satan. Prepare slaughter for his children for the iniquity of their fathers, that they do not rise, nor possess the land, nor fill the face of the world with cities. For I will rise up against them, saith the Lord of hosts, and cut off

I 6

from Babylon the name, and remnant, and son, and nephew. A rather vivid description of a complete destruction, a complete end, an end which, as I say, hardly came to Babylon. It was a gradual decline after the conquest, that Babylon may stand here as representative of the eventual fate of the enemies of God. I will make it a possession for the bittern, and pools of water: I will sweep it with the besom of destruction, saith the Lord; and then we have the local, immediate picture. The Lord of hosts hath sworn, saying, Surely as I have thought, so shall it come to pass, that I will break the Assyrian in my land. God is going eventually to destroy the forces of wickedness. Now He gives us the declaration that as an earnest of that which He is eventually going to do He is going to now break the immediate great world powers of force that is threatening Judah; He is going to put an end to their attempt to overthrow Judah. He is going to free the land from the great menace of Sennacherib. I think surely v. 25 had its literal fulfillment in the destruction of the hosts of Sennacherib to which reference is made so many times in the book of Isaiah. This is the purpose that is purposed upon the whole earth and this is the hand that is stretched out upon the nations. What a picture there of the sovereignty of God!

I 7

In fact that is stressed later on in the account of the destruction of the hosts of Sennacherib. As birds flying, as birds hovering, will God defend Jerusalem. He will bring an end to danger entirely by His own force. They will not be destroyed by man, man will not be an instrument. It is God who stretches out His hand and His will is done. For the Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? and his hand is stretch out, ^{who} and shall turn it back? This defeat of the armies of Sennacherib there is given to the people as a time to strengthen their faith in Him. It is a sign for them to know that His great future predictions are bound to come to pass, that He

I 7

promises victory in the end and it will surely come. The Lord has purposed and who shall disannul it, but His purposes are not fulfilled immediately. There is a time of trouble, a time of misery, a time of victories of Satan which are part of God's plan. He permits them, and we do not fully understand it. He permits great disappointments, great confusion, great trouble to come to the forces of God. A great church gets started and then it goes to pieces. A great man, a thoroughly Christian man, has to others, and then it falls into apostasy and into wickedness. Christ said that it is inevitable that trouble shall come but woe to him through whom it comes. They are by no means excusable for it but we recognize the hand of Satan in it all, yet we are not to become discouraged or fearful because we know that God has His purpose and that in the end His purpose will work out. When His hand is stretched out, who shall turn it back? Now in the Bible which I have here there is a new paragraph mark at the beginning of v. 29 and v. 28 goes with what precedes. In the year that king Ahaz died was this burden. In the year that king Ahaz died. Not so long before the Assyrians came. Then was when his burden was given, according to that, if you take it with what precedes. Now why should you mention the year Ahaz died? What is the special reason for mentioning that in connection with the destruction of Babylon? It might be in connection with the destruction of Assyria, which is just before us, because it was Ahaz's clever scheme of bringing relief to his land from a near enemy by an alliance with a wicked distant enemy which has brought the trouble, just as so much of the trouble in the world today is due to the attempt to work with the distant wicked forces of Russia against the nearer wicked forces, instead of recognizing that all wickedness is hostile to God and that an alliance with any of them is contrary to His will. Fighting fire with fire is a very good thing to do if by fire you mean actual physical fire, but fighting fire with fire if by fire you mean wicked moral forces is something that is absolutely wrong and utterly forbidden to the servants of

I 7

God and to the nation which is to be called a Christian nation. Now under those circumstances this verse 28 might go quite nicely with the previous four verses. It hardly seems to have much relevancy, however, to the verses before that, and if you consider it as relating to what follows, it seems to fit perfectly. We have the burden of Babylon and we've had all this passage. Now in the year that Ahaz died was this burden, a new burden, introduced with the time when it was given, the year that Ahaz died. Well, what is the point of mentioning Ahaz's death? Rejoice not, thou, whole Palestina--a very unfortunate translation. The very same word is usually rendered "Philistia," in the Bible. We speak about the Philistines in the Bible and it is this very same word used repeatedly for the Philistines. Why then translate it Palestina here? Well the land of Palestine has taken its name from the Philistines because the first people who came from Europe to the land came to the land of the Philistines first and therefore they gave the whole land that name just as when we go to Asia from Europe we come to the little province called Asia and so we name the whole country Asia, the whole continent Asia, even though Asia is properly just that one province which we now call Asia Minor. It's a common thing to name a whole land after the part of it which we come to first, but to think of it back there as using the term Palestina for the whole land, that is utterly out of place. They didn't call it that there. I think the translators of the Authorized Version made a rather poor rendering here when they in v. 29 and v. 31 referred to Palestina. It's the Philistines he's speaking of. Here is the burden, then, of the Philistines. What about them? Rejoice not, oh all of you Philistines, because the rod of him that smote thee is broken, because king Ahaz has died. King Ahaz whom ye feared. For out of the serpent's root shall come forth a cockatrice, and his fruit shall be a fiery flying serpent. Now does this mean that from the viewpoint of the Philistines Ahaz is gone but Hezekiah is going to be

I 7

stronger--out of a serpent's root shall come a cockatrice. He will be one whom the Philistines will have more reason to fear than they did Ahaz and indeed, of course, it is true that the Philistines had their troubles with Hezekiah, and that is quite important in that which preceded the coming of Sennacherib. Hezekiah was taken captive by Sennacherib and was in Jerusalem and it was at one of Sennacherib's terms that Hezekiah had to be given up when he was. Is Hezekiah the cockatrice? And in his fruit shall be a fierce, flying serpent. Does this refer to further Judaeen victory over the Philistines? Those who take "the year whole that king Ahaz died" with what precedes are apt to this as / Palestina as referring to Judah and Israel and think of the rod of him that smote being broken as the death of Sennacherib. Don't rejoice because Sennacherib is dead because Sennacherib is going to be succeeded by Esar-haddon and he by Assur-banipal. Well, we don't have a great many facts to throw light on what the exact meaning would be but there doesn't seem much reason to take it as, "Here, he's turning away from Babylon to give a rebuke against Judah and Israel, especially when the word is, so far as I know, never used for Judah and Israel elsewhere in the Bible, as in the Old Testament, but is used regularly for Philistines. Of course, you could still take it as Philistia and then take Philistia as not rejoicing because of the death of Sennacherib, because of the death of Sargon, because Sennacherib, and after Sennacherib will be Esar-haddon and Assur-banipal. The first born of the poor shall feed, the needy shall lie down in safety, and I will kill thy root with famine, and he shall slay thy remnant. That certainly sounds like Philistia rather than Palestine. Howl, O gate; cry, O city; thou, whole Philistia, art dissolved: for there shall come from the north a smoke. The Assyrians and the Babylonians, though they actually were from the East and went around the edge of the desert brought them which / into Israel, into Palestine, into Philistia from the north.

I 7

None shall be alone in his appointed times. What shall one then answer the messengers of the nation? That the Lord hath founded Zion, and the poor of his people shall trust in it. It is entirely out of place with Palestina but fits in very well with Philistia, which was the enemy of Zion. /Zion is God's foundation and is going to endure. God's work is going to be done. It is a strange thing, an unfortunate thing that we have this bad rendering here. doubtless

The King James version is a wonderful literary work and it is a work that has very much that is excellent in it but when one takes the King James version as his authority he is apt to be led into all sorts of errors and mistakes. It was a fine version for the day but for the day it was used as a supplement for the Hebrew and for the Greek which are God's true word. Now we have next the burden of Moab, and that has more chapters than any other one of these burdens, because the burden of Babylon doesn't have two full chapters. The burden of Moab has two full chapters and it has more proper names than any other of the burdens and there are ^{and} specific places referred to. It would be interesting to take a month/to try to study just where each of these was, how many of them we know definitely and how many we don't but I don't think we will take time on this particularly in this course as we only have one hour a week to study. Study through just a general idea of Moab but don't spend the same time on it that you do on the chapters 13 and 14. Look ahead to these burdens. Get a general idea of what each of them is about. I think it would be a very fine thing for you to list the verses which are not doom but ^{ing} bless/through the whole thing. It is predominantly doom but there are verses of blessing. List the verses that are blessing for Israel. We have two at the beginning of chapter 14. List the verses that are blessing for others than Israel. Was Isaiah merely opposing all the foreign powers or does he have some blessing for any of them too. List those. Notice whether all of these chapters are dealing with foreign nations or do Israel and Judah come into any of them, as the real subject. We know that they are the subject of this one, Palestina. Are they of any others? Are all these burdens declarations of doom or are there some of them which are not? Look into some of these questions.

I 8

We are now in the part of Isaiah where we have the prophecies against the foreign nations, looking at the different ones and trying to see exactly what is referred to. I asked you for today to look at the different burdens on from the point which we had reached stressed in them, what different nations were referred to and also to note particularly the prophecies of blessing which were contained in them. (This thing isn't sparking. I don't know what's wrong with it. turn it on, and you see nothing happens. What do you think it is? It's connected there. I looked at that. flash and the light's gone out. Oh, you think it's all right except just the light's gone out. (Student) The light is supposed (Students) Yes. Meantime we can use it and have faith that it works. We can't live by sight but only by faith on that matter now.)

Now on these burdens of the nations here which I asked you to look through and get a general idea of, what is the first of all the burdens, Mr.---? (Student) Yes. How long is that? It's how long? How ? What does it say? If the majority of the class feels that the burden of Babylon goes up to 23, that means that you think that 24 on is a different thing, and what would you call that in such a case? would be a matter of definition. Mr. Pote says it forms a part of the burden of Babylon. Yes. Yes. He makes it a part of it in the larger aspect but not in the narrower viewpoint. Mr.---? (Student) Well, now I was making an inference on that key from the translation here in the Authorized Version. I thought I'd better look it up. Do you mean there is no such verse? Let's see, that was verse 25. Well, what does it start with? (Student) How's that? (Student) With " ". Well, that's very good. How about the " "? Does the " " prove a connection with what precedes it? I suggested that the key word, if there is a key there, and from the translation of " " I thought there must be a key there. I wonder how they get out of " "

I 8

the exact translation that they give. Let's see, this is verse 2 . That's plain enough. " " How would you translate " " most literally, Mr. ---? Yes. I think we would agree in view of that that this verse 25 goes with 24 and I think we have agreed from that, then, that 24 on as far as 27 or 28 is a unit, so that if there is a break earlier it is between 23 and 24, and as Mr. Pote has said, it is not simply dealing with Babylon, so in the strictest sense you could say the burden of Babylon does not include it, but yet it is a conclusion to the burden of Babylon, unless you are going to take the critical view that you have a lot of ^{different} things thrown together heterogeneously from different periods. It is a part of the burden of Babylon even though not dealing with Babylon, so our section really run to the end of this and include this, though there is an important paragraph division before it, and in the strictest sense we agree that Mr. Pote is right, but for our division of the whole section, the burden of Babylon runs through this first chapter and the second up to the . Now Mr. Ludlam raised the question about v. 28. Which does 28 go with, what precedes or what follows, and as to that, how many of you have definite ideas? Raise it so I can see it please, all who have definite ideas about it. I only see three--four. Most, I take it, have indefinite ideas. Mr. Shedd, what is your idea, and why? If we did not have this verse 28 here at all it would then be very clear what 29 following meant. You would say, "God has delivered Israel from the hands of the Assyrian and God is going to smite, that is God will deliver and He is going to smite the Assyrians. Now when God has smitten the Assyrians in the land and destroyed the Assyrian power, now don't you rejoice, Philistia, this wasn't done for you. You are not going to be helped by it, because Assyria will send back a stronger power that will hurt you in days to come. This is done simply for Zion. What shall, then, one answer these messengers of the nation? That the Lord has founded Zion, and the poor of His people shall trust in it. You, Philistia, think that you are getting great advantage

I 8

from this. No, this wasn't for your benefit. This was done for Zion. Now, that would be quite a reasonable interpretation of verses 29-32 if verse 28 wasn't here at all, and so you might say, if v. 28 is the end of the previous section and 29 starts, not a new burden, then, but a side talk to Philistia about how Philistia is^{n't} going to profit by this, although as a matter of fact--well, they did profit temporarily in the end, Philistia was overcome but Zion lasted another century and then Zion was overcome too, so that for the time being Philistia didn't profit nearly as much from it as Zion though they might have seemed to at first. That would be a rather reasonable interpretation of this passage if verse 28 were not there or if you consider v. 28 as the end of the previous passage instead of the beginning of this passage. Mr.---? (Student) Now that is a very interesting suggestion: that the Assyrian is followed by another great empire and it by another great empire. The difficulty with that suggestion is that the breaking of the Assyrian in my land was not the end of the Assyrian power. It was a temporary end to it but it was not the permanent end. It ended the present menace to Judah from them but before so many decades had done by the Assyrians came back again and they went all the way down through Philistia and they went into Egypt. That is, from that viewpoint it would be better to think of it not as destruction of the Assyrian empire but that Sennacherib's power is wrecked in this catastrophe here but Sennacherib, after all, is defeated by his son, Asser-haddon, who led a whole force down into Egypt and then he was defeated by Ashurbanipal, who led another force down into Egypt. Some further point? Mr.---? (Student) The text represents the ideas of Mr. , and they are worthy of consideration, but I doubt if he is especially well thought of, to make a judgment on these matters. So far as I recall the only breaks in the Hebrew of the prophets are the breaks between those sections which are designated for use on special Sabbath services. You remember that in the Pentateuch, the is divided into the letters " " and " " into sections to

I 8

be read in the Sabbath service so as to go straight through the Pentateuch in regular order. Now in connection with each section of the Pentateuch, they read a section of the prophets, but these don't go straight through the prophets, they jump all around and they only use a certain portion of the prophets in the Sabbath service and those portions would be indicated in manuscripts, but beyond that it is not my impression that there are any ancient divisions within them. It is a very good question and one that is quite germane to our present question here. Now, the matter then of v. 28 is an interesting matter and commentators differ on the interpretation of v. 29, and what you think of v. 29 will determine what you think of 28. If you think that 29 refers to Sennacherib, his son Asser-haddon, his grandson, Asurbanipal, then 28 is hardly much of an introduction to 29. It seems, rather, to be a conclusion of what precedes, saying that God gave this in the year king Ahaz died. He told that the Assyrian is going to be broken, he had previously told that tremendous trouble was coming to the land on account of Ahaz's terrible deed in making this alliance with Assyria, but now he says, "Though this trouble is coming on account of Ahaz, God is going to deliver us", so in the year that king Ahaz died he gives the burden of Babylon which is promise of temporary deliverance from Assyria. I think from that viewpoint that a reasonable reason can be considered perhaps for "the year that king Ahaz died" ending the previous section rather than beginning the new one, but of course, if you take that viewpoint, what follows would not be a new burden but it would be a continuation of, a different subject closely related to what precedes. Mr. Gustafson? (Student) I am not at all sure that we are in position yet to make a final decision on this present problem. I think it is well for us to see the possibilities, either what goes from 29-32 is closely related to what precedes or else from 28-32 is a separate burden. If 28-32 is a separate burden then you have the introduction to it in this phrase, "in the year that king Ahaz died was this burden". Now that is quite different from the phrase before, "the burden of Philistia" and the phrase in the next verse, "the burden of Moab" and then "the burden of Damascus."

I 8

This doesn't start, "the burden of Philistia". If this started "the burden of Philistia" it certainly would go with what follows, not with what precedes, but it doesn't say that. It says, "in the year that king Ahaz died was this burden." And so we see quite reasonable reason why this verse might be the conclusion to section from 24 to 28. (Student) Yes, it introduces the burden of Babylon and is the final portion of it unless it is something entirely unrelated to it, and that is pretty close to the critical view, I think. (Student) I don't recall any case where one ends with the phrase "This was the burden." They seem to start with it. That seems to be the way of starting and of course if this is the start of the burden of Philistia why doesn't it say the burden of it? Does any other burden start in a similar way to this verse 28? I asked you to look at all the burdens and see what they were about so someone should immediately have an answer "yes" or "no" to this. Is or isn't it?

I 9

Yes, there are a number of them that don't use the word "burden" at all but start in some other way. I shouldn't say a number; perhaps I should say a few that start some other way, but is there any one that starts--after all, "In the year that king Ahaz died was this burden" is very different from chapter 18, "Woe to the land shadowing with wings, which is beyond the rivers of Ethiopia. It is very different from that. Is there any burden that starts in a way that really is quite closely similar to this? How's that? Chapter 20. Any student of archaeology immediately, of course, recalls chapter 20, which starts, "In the year that Tartan came to Ashdod," again referring to Philistia, interestingly enough. When Sargon the king of Assyria--here he is referring to Assyria--sent him, and fought against Ashdod, and took it. At the same time spoke the Lord by Isaiah the son of Amoz, saying. There is an introduction of a burden which is introduced with a time statement, of the time when it came.

I 9

so that would be a close parallel to this. Now would it be correct to say that that is a close parallel to this in that both are burdens against the Philistines? How many would agree to that statement? Raise your hand if you do. How many would disagree with it? One--two--three, I see there are a few who disagree with it. Mr. Lin, why? Why do you disagree?

similarity that we have another verse; there is no doubt, I think that chapter 20 is a unit, is there? It says at that time, God gave a message. It meant that it is related to what precedes in that case but it is a message which He gives introduced with this time, and that is a parallel to this theme in introductory phrase, so that we have two viewpoints; v. 28 introduces a new burden, a burden on Philistia. That is the view which is set forth in the January issue of "The Bible Today," that that is the situation, that there is a burden upon Philistia introduced by v.28, and then we have another possible viewpoint that from 29-32 is still a part of the burden of Babylon though dealing with a related subject, and that what he is saying is that this victory over Assyria is not a reason for you to rejoice, Philistia. The ungodly are often the sharers in the good things that God brings to pass for His own purpose, but they should not rejoice from that because in the end it will not bring good to them. There are too many people who are glad to avail themselves of the blessings that God gives to a land on account of the loyalty of His people to Him and they are ready to avail themselves of the blessings without themselves taking any of the responsibility thereby involved. They are ready to rejoice. "There are people in our churches who are ready to rejoice in the great heritage that the church has for the great heroic constancy and loyalty to the Word of God of their ancestors but who themselves have no share in that attitude or in that and to all such the Lord says, "Do not thou rejoice because you receive blessings which are not meant for you. These blessings are for God's people. These blessings are given as part of God's plan and in connection of the progress of God's

I 9

plan there comes a certain amount of by-product of the good which is done to others which is not part of the main purpose. You have no reason to think that this will continue, because you are simply receiving a blessing to which you are not properly entitled, simply because you are in the way through which this comes. I think there is a very interesting point there and a point which perhaps might be of real value and perhaps that is the lesson of this section for us here. ⁽³²⁾ Verse ~~32~~ says, What shall one answer the messengers of the nation? That the Lord hath founded Zion and the poor of His people shall trust in it. In the light of God's plan, of God's purpose, of God's economy, you can find an answer to all these things, and if you are so fortunate as to get on the right side in some situation, to get on the winning side but yet you are not one of those for whom it was done, you should not let this give you a false security because after all, God's interest is in Zion and it is those who trust in Zion, who trust in God and God's plan who can expect blessing from Him. The more I think of it the more I incline at the moment toward this view that this is a part of the burden of Babylon. Now of course anyone who is a good student of numerics will immediately say that it can't possibly be because we have twelve burdens and if we take this one out we only have eleven and that, of course, I don't think is an argument, but it is an interesting thing to observe. We have twelve as I count them before. Maybe some of you counted differently. Mr. Sit? (Student) Now that is an interesting question. Does the end ? I don't see how, but that doesn't prove it. I haven't been looking for it specifically, but even if he never did, why shouldn't he this time? Why shouldn't he this time, after giving this about Babylon then pointed out the relevancy of this about Assyria to the whole problem? And then give the date in which this particular section was given. It wouldn't necessarily mean that all the burden was given in the year Ahaz died but that from 24-28 was given then perhaps, and then it is included as a part of the larger burden because

I 9

it . (Student) Yes. Yes, he does.

There are occasions when he does. He does in c. 20,—v. 1, of course, covers the whole book. Verse—chapter 7, he does. Chapter 6. There are three or four cases, I mean four to one, if that is the whole number of cases, isn't enough to base a strong argument on. It is an argument worth noticing, but certainly not a conclusive one. Mr.—? (Student) I don't want to say that dogmatically. As I say, I would be contradicting "The Bible Today" for January if I were to say such a thing but it impresses me as a possibility, that the burden of Babylon here as we noticed, doesn't seem to be simply a local, temporary discussion. It seems to be a discussion dealing with great problems in God's economy and dealing with the great force which was in back of Babylon as the great enemy of God's people and then when he comes, after he has dealt with this in a large way, then he refers to a great enemy that came from the region of the two rivers where Babylon was eventually, later to be the great power, the power that came from that earlier, he tells of how they came and of how they would come and of how God would deliver from them. That is side issue connected with Babylon, not specifically dealing with Babylon but dealing with something closely connected with them. Well then it would not be, certainly not unparallel in literature if after having done that then he were to point out another side issue, that this matter of the destruction of Sennacherib's army, while it benefits Philistia as well as benefiting Judah, is not a reason for Philistia to rejoice because Philistia is not the true beneficiary. Philistia is an accidental beneficiary and Philistia, as a matter of fact, is not to receive God's blessing. They are God's enemy. If they wish to receive it there is only one way they can do it and that is by coming to trust in Zion, listening to the God of Zion as their God and finding the mercies that He would give them, but here they are beneficiaries of the great act which God has performed for Zion, but it is performed in Philistia. It is in Philistia that Sennacherib's army is destroyed, and the Philistines are

I 9

liberated as a result of this which was done for Zion, so that, you might say it is like the United States now, if we were to send a great army over to Hungary to rescue Cardinal Mindszenti and then if they were to rescue him there would be a lot of protestant ministers who have been put in prison during the last six months probably and they would probably also be rescued but nobody had started any army to help them, or any such movement. They had not--if there are such, as there usually are in such situations, they have not received the publicity which the other did. Well, now the purpose would be the release of the cardinal but these others would be benefited by the action, and in this case Philistia is the beneficiary, but in this case they are warned that they are not the true beneficiary and that they shouldn't get a false idea that they are now perfectly safe, that God has His wrath against Philistia for their wickedness, Philistia is to suffer truly. That is, in a way it is/a burden against Philistia but it could be thus so closely connected up as to call it a part of the burden against Babylon.

Now that is a theory which seems to me to be worthh of consideration. Mr.---
 (Student) I don't know whether you would call it a separate burden if it is this closely related, or part of the same one. You might say in a way that is a matter of terminology but yet we have our section here divided up into more isolated sections. Now it may be that it can be shown that actually the whole section is very closely related. At least this suggests that 29-32 is much more closely related with what precedes than with what follows.

Mr.---? (Student) Well, now that is a very interesting suggestion. If you are going to reduce this, it may be very awful. It is not a separate burden but a separate message dealing with the same subject and in that case he is talking about Egypt, which he has just been talking about, so that that would fit very nicely together with this theory for the parallel, except that in that case there is a reason, perhaps, why this would be given in the year when Tartan came to Ashdod , while in our previous

I 9

case, if 29-32 is related to the destruction of the _____ in Philistia, there is no particular reason why it should be dated the year king Ahaz died, while there would be reason why the previous _____. We have a very interesting problem here and I think that this may, perhaps, throw light on some future sections. If you are going to follow Mr. Heaney's suggestion and say 20 is a part of 19 you reduce the total number to ten instead of eleven, which is certainly a rounder number than eleven. Mr.----? (Student) Well, I don't think necessarily, because it refers to, it depends on whether you are referring to what follows or what precedes. You could, "In the year that king Ahaz died the following burdens were finished." It could be completed action but that which you think of as completed _____. I doubt if that would be really a forceful argument _____. Well, this section here against Philistia, I think it is too bad that the Authorized Version translated it Palestina. I don't know whether in Old English Philistia meant Palestina or not, but certainly in modern English Palestina means the land which includes Philistia but which also includes the whole region of Israel and Judah and--Oh, I guess that would be all. Perhaps it goes a little beyond the actual borders of Israel and Judah but it would include all of Philistia. (Student) Yes, and the Revised Version has it Philistia and in the Authorized Version the same word is usually translated Philistia so that it seems to me that it is simply an unfortunate translation here in our Authorized Version. I think it is a strong argument against the inspiration of the Authorized Version, that we have this rendered as Palestina here. Well, you all know, of course, where Philistia is. You know that this is the place where the destruction of Sennacherib's hosts took place and you know that in the succeeding years the Assyrian armies would have to go through Philistia on the way to Egypt, and so we know that it suffered from them much after this defeat of Sennacherib, but Judah seems not to have been injured by the Assyrian army ever again after this time. We have no record of any subsequent injury of Judah by Assyria. The subsequent injury all came to Judah from Babylon, not from Assyria, so that, now of course-- There shall come from the north a smoke. Palestina is dissolved. There shall come

I 9

from the north a smoke. That would relate very easily to the matter of the Assyrians coming. They always came down from the north and across the northern part of the desert and then down from the north, but if Judah were to attack them you wouldn't think they would come from the north. You would think Judah would come from the east, so that at least v. 31 does not refer to a conquest by Judah but to a conquest from some section further away than Judah and so that would fit with the idea that it is Assyria that is , and then v. 32. What shall one then answer to the messengers of the nation? That the Lord has founded Zion. This was not done for Philistia, it was done for Zion. These verses fit together very nicely . Perhaps an overall picture could be made on the other interpretation that it refers to Ahas.

- - - - -

Of the general method of interpretation of the prophets to make it possible for those who have not had the prophets course to secure the most of the value of the material which we are now studying. At the same time I will do that in rather brief ¹⁻¹, not go into it very much in detail as after all you will get that next year (those of you who haven't had the prophets) and the bulk of the class, half or two-thirds I guess, have already had that. We will not take a lecture or two of introduction to the study of the prophetic books. We will pick up rather at different points of the introduction along the way as we go. We'll plunge right in to our ~~present~~ present problem.

Our problem for discussion this year the last thirteen chapters of the book of Isaiah. The reason I have selected the last thirteen chapters is because the Prophet's Course has ^{at} several different times ~~come~~ exactly to Chapter 53. I said a word about Chapter 54 and 55, and that's as far as we have gone in the Prophet's Course. So I thought it was a convenient place to continue for those who have had the Prophet's Course, and at the same time it is not a difficult place to start for those who have not had it. Even though if you have not had it, the relationship of chapter 53 to 40 to 52 may be absolutely obscure to you. You may have no idea why it is that 53 follows those other chapters, or what the relation is or how ~~it~~ ~~what~~ answers the problems that have been raised or why on earth Isaiah there, ~~is~~ talking to people in his day should give us a picture of the sufferings of Christ. These are tremendously important questions. But ~~it~~ even though you know nothing about those, anyone with any Christian background beyond a most rudimentary one, knows that Chapter 53 is a prediction of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus Christ. Anyone, aside altogether from the natural relationship from the background, would agree with us that it is very difficult to find any sensible way of interpreting Chapter 53 except as a prediction of the sufferings of ~~the~~ Christ--very difficult. Suggestions are made, of course, by those who do not believe in the predictions of Christ, who say

that Chapter 53 is a picture of Israel, but how on earth does it describe Israel? There are many statements in it which can't possibly apply to Israel; and some say that the second ~~is xxxxxxx~~ Isaiah describes his contemporary Jeremiah in Palestine. That's pretty hard to see how some of these statements could possibly be applied to Jeremiah. Any interpretation that I know of except that that it is a prediction of the sufferings of Christ runs ~~through~~ on to great numbers of difficulties. That, of course, is not our subject for study in this course. We spend a little time on this ~~xxx~~ chapter in the Prophet's Course and see its precise interpretation and learn a good deal about particular details of it. (Question: What is the Orthodox view?) It is Israel. That is the view that is usually taken, but the attitude of most Orthodox Jews is pretty largely to ignore it. The Orthodox Jew as a rule ~~xxx~~ pays tremendous attention to the Talmut. He is like the Orthodox Roman Catholic in relation to the Scripture. It is the tradition; it is the writings of the fathers; it is the law of the church; that is the thing which is followed. The Orthodox Jew believes, as a rule, in the Old Testament ~~xxx~~ as infallibly inspired, every word of it is true. ~~xxxx~~ He listens to those sacred words read in the synagogue and pays little attention to it, and builds his life upon the tradition which is mostly a matter of interpretation of the precise words of the law and application to his daily life. These passages are very largely neglected except by a few rabbis who study them, and the bulk know very little about them. Just as in the Roman Catholic Church there are a few individuals who study the Scripture ~~right~~ at great length and write some very useful commentaries on parts of it. The rank and file know nothing about it. So that it is not a problem to the average Jew--what does this mean?--they just don't know anything about it. Well, now that then is simply the background of our present study. We are going to start with 54, and as I ~~xxxx~~ said, one reason we start with 54 is because it is a natural, easy place for those who had the Prophet's Course to continue. But another reason is that the problems in my opinion from 54 on are much more

simple, much easier, than many of the problems in earlier portions of the book which we have examined in the past in the Prophet's Course. ~~then~~ ^{and} ~~then~~ the problems in the early portion of the book that we did not examine in the Prophet's Course. They are not so simple, but they are obvious. They take study and working into, but don't perhaps require quite as much knowledge as they would in some other sections. If this course had been limited to those who had already had the Prophets' Course, I think I would have taken the Isaiah Apocalypse, Chapters 24 to 28, which is an extremely interesting and very difficult section of the Bible, but one of the most important, but no important than this, and, I believe, much harder to interpret. So as we take up these thirteen chapters, I think that one ~~xxx~~ who has had the Prophet's Course is in a position to see many things immediately which someone else would take more study to get into, but I think one without the Prophet's Course with occasional presentation of certain of its phases, will be able to work through these chapters and to get the most important features on it.

so we jump right into the middle of the book now, for those of you who have not had the Prophets' Course before, and we say, "Here is Chapter 54 of Isaiah. What are you going to do with the chapter?" Right away you ask the question, "Is Isaiah a book like the book of Psalms in which every chapter is a unit." Of course, the answer is "no". "Then," you say, "does that mean that 54 is necessarily connected with 53?" And again you say, "no". While we believe that the book of Isaiah is a unit, we believe that there is one definite progress of thought in any human book which is a unit with definite progress of thought; there may be sharp breaks in the thought where the author takes up another subject. Of course, we do not have original headings, and we have to infer from the study of the passage where there is such a sharp break in the thought. If I were to write a book about China, I might start in in the northeastern section of China and I might go up and down the country telling a little about the ~~sections~~ different sections of the country, ~~xxxx~~ and you would expect a logical

arrangement in the treatment of the different sections, but I might suddenly finish my discussion of the geography and begin to give something about the history. In that case I would probably start telling about the earliest phases of Chinese history and I might give you something entirely unrelated with the last thing I mentioned in the discussion of the geography. You might, if you were telling about the United States, you might be telling about some state here and you were describing, say New York State, and you told about the large cities and then the smaller ones and different features of it; and then when you finish one of those features, you start out with Pennsylvania, telling about Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, and as you start there that would have no direct relation to the things you had just discussed in connection with New York State. That would end the discussion. It would be a change from one major section to another major section and the book would be a unit as a whole. So the fact that 54 follows 53 does not prove that 54 is closer related to 53; it may be the beginning of a new section which is related to the previous section as a whole rather than to that immediately preceding. That is a possibility. You must not rule out the other possibility; that it is directly related to ~~both parts of~~ if they are both parts of the same section. So as we look at 54 we take a hold of it to see that it is easy to get an idea as to what it is apt to be talking about. I think we can say that it is reasonable to consider the ~~chapter~~ chapter as a unit because the next chapter begins in a tone rather different from that of 54 and what precedes is extremely unified from 52:13 to the end of 53; and this is certainly distinct enough to say that there is at least a paragraph, and maybe a major division. Now we want to find out what shall we do with chapter 54 here? I think it is reasonable to look immediately at the first word. "Sing, oh barren, thou that didst not bare; break forth into singing and cry aloud; thou that didst not travail with child; for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife saith the Lord." You read that first verse and you ask yourself, "What are the

~~possibilities~~~~possible~~~~interpretations~~ possibilities of interpretation of this?"

One, of course, is the most strictly literal interpretation, literal, specific, precise. Isaiah is speaking to a woman before him and telling her to break out into joy, rejoicing; telling her to do so. That is certainly the most natural, obvious interpretation of the book. Now, is that the correct interpretation of the book? Now, of course, if you take it that way--strictly literally (some people say they take every word of the Bible literally; so then they must take this that way) you then have still a question, "Does this refer to one specific woman to whom he is speaking or does it refer to any woman to whom he is speaking ~~a wife~~ who fits the characteristics, but it is specifically a literal woman. The barren woman is to ~~bring forth~~ break forth into rejoicing because the desolate has more children than the married wife. That certainly doesn't seem to ~~fit~~ fit with common sense, with general ideas of general teachings, that it is a general statement addressed to any ^{such} woman and as to its being a particular woman in Isaiah's day, that would be not at all impossible, but we know of no evidence elsewhere to tell us who the woman would be. There is no background for it. Therefore, we can ~~not~~ hardly take the verse literally, either in the immediate, specific sense or in the general sense of referring to any woman of this type at any time. "More are the children of the desolate than ~~of~~ the children of the married wife." In all periods the desolate had more children than the married wife. ~~Th~~ Well, of course, ~~that~~ it is true that sometimes those who are very anxious have children have none, and those who don't want any have burdens with them. Sometimes it seems to be the perversity of life in our age. ~~Amxx~~ A man said to me at the University of Illinois the "cussedness of inanimate objects". Things often go the opposite way to what you think they should or what seems at all reasonable or logical. Well, if it refers to something like that, it is no cause for breaking out into joy; it is no cause for rejoicing; it is a cause for sadness. That is certainly not what is here involved. There is a definite cause for joy, and why should you

rejoice because the "desolate one has more children than the married wife"? Why would that be a cause for joy? It doesn't in itself strictly as a literal thing make sense. It must be somewhat figurative, and it must refer to some elements or some facts which are not stated in the word. We surely can legitimately conceive that. If we reach that conclusion, then either of these facts are something that is ^{not} known ~~from~~ and must be guessed. It hardly seems reasonable for such a statement as this or something that can be gathered from the book of Isaiah as a whole or something that can be gathered immediately from the preceding chapter. As these are the most reasonable by far ^{is} that it is to be gathered from the preceding chapter.

(Question) There may be facts that are absolutely unknown to us that would account for it. That is hardly the case in such a case ~~that~~ as this.

That is occasionally the case with statements in the Scriptures *end of d. 20.1*

And the most ~~xxxxxx~~ reasonable there is that the immediately preceding material, unless the immediately preceding material very clearly has no relevance and there is something evident^{ly} in some other part of the book which clearly has ~~xx~~ a relevance. I don't know of anything in any other part of the book that would seem very clearly to have reference to this verse while the previous chapter is giving us in the first part a statement of sorrow and of misery, but it ends with a great statement of joy. "Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong, because he has poured out his soul~~s~~ unto death, and he was numbered with the transgressors, and he ~~bare~~ bare the sins of many and made intercession ~~with~~ for the transgressor; therefore God will divide ~~him~~ a portion with the great, and he will divide the portion with the strong. Sing, oh barren, thou that didst not bare." It would seem extremely reasonable that the next verse is related to what precedes. One is a statement of a grand thing which is being done; the next is a statement of cause for rejoicing. One divides the spoil with the strong; the other has an increase. There is certainly a similarity of thought,

certainly a relationship. The verse is one of a type which clearly requires something to furnish a reason for it, to show us what the relationship is. So it seems to me that (of course, this has to be checked by looking through the rest of the chapter) ~~but~~ it is reasonable to approach it in this way and to say that verse 1 is a definite result of what has been given just before and is a cry to rejoice in view of that which we have just had. If verse 1 said, "Oh, thou that hast turned against God, repent and come ~~and~~ back to Him," you can say that fits exactly with Isaiah's day to go to the people and say that. It doesn't need a relevance with what precedes, ~~that~~. If it said, "Don't trust Egypt; Egypt will turn against you; only trust the Lord," that fits exactly with the political situation of his day. It fits with the book as a whole, and may be something that would come in anywhere at the beginning of a new section; but "rejoice ~~and~~ thou that didst not bare, break into singing and cry aloud, for more are the children of the desolate", it needs something on which to stand. It is quite definitely a continuance, ~~or~~ rather than a new beginning. And so ~~(Question)~~ it seems ~~or~~ to be just about absolutely certain that fifty-four must follow fifty-three; that it is a new paragraph rather than a new chapter of our book; that it is a new subsection rather than a new main division. Of course, that must be checked with continuing through the chapter. As you look on through the chapter, you find that the tune of the whole chapter is similar to the tune of the first verse. The whole chapter is calling on someone to rejoice, and declaring great blessings that are going to come to the one who is called to rejoice. There is absolutely no call to repentance in the chapter. There is no ~~or~~ call to turn away from ~~the~~ sin or declaration of punishment for sin. The whole chapter is an exhortation to rejoice in view of the wonderful things that God is going to do; and it is reasonable to conclude that the wonderful things are closely related to that which preceded.

Now an interesting thing is that in Chapter 53 we read a number of times about the servant of the Lord. In verse 11, "By his knowledge shall my righteous

servant justify many, for he shall their iniquity^y." Also in ~~xxx~~ 52:13, "Behold my servant shall ~~xxx~~ deal prudently." We have the servant, of the Lord frequently expressed in previous chapters and it reaches its great climax in Chapter 53. The phrase, "the servant of the Lord", or "my servant" used in this way is never used other than in the book of Isaiah. That particular theme has reached its culmination and reached its climax. Are we simply done with it? Lay it aside as many a modern interpreter says, "These servant passages are poems, utterly unrelated to Isaiah, which have been inserted here and there by a late redactor." Well, that makes it rather nonessential to say that we have a book of ~~miscellaneous~~ miscellany here with something put in here from one man and something from another; that's one possibility. But to say that these have been inserted ~~and there~~ here and there with no relation to that which goes with them is a rather absurd ~~suggestion~~ suggestion as to how the book would be put together. Believing as we do in the unity of the book, we believe that there is a great theme there which runs from Chapter 41 right straight through to 53 and reaches its great climax. It seems reasonable that 54 continues that which is to occur ⁱⁿ or that/which ~~is~~ we may rejoice as a result of the sacrifices of ~~his~~ the servant of the Lord described in 53, and it is interesting to find that in the last verse of 54 we read, "this is the heritage of the servants of the Lord and their righteousness is of me, saith the Lord." It's rather difficult to avoid the idea that that ~~relationship~~ relates rather closely to the previous suggestion of the "servant of the Lord." Here are the servants of the Lord. Would not it them be ^a reasonable ~~by~~ hypothesis that the "servants of the Lord" are the followers of the "servant of the Lord." That the servant of the Lord has performed his great work and accomplished His mighty task, and then His followers, the "servants of the Lord," are to receive the benefits of the great work which has been done by the "servant of the Lord." Surely this last sentence in 54 exactly fits with the teaching of 53. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord, and their righteousness is of "me, saith the Lord."

Where do we get our righteousness? Our righteousness is as filthy rags; but ~~that~~ righteousness which we have which is vital and important and which we can glory ⁱⁿ is the righteousness that comes from God, ~~the~~ righteousness which has been earned for us; not through anything we can do, but through the sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ on Calvary's cross.

I remember Dr. Morgan telling us of a campaign, evangelistic campaign, he had once in Wales, I believe it was, ⁱⁿ and he said that he ~~couldn't understand this~~ "I can't understand this. How do you say that I can receive eternal life, that I can receive salvation, forgiveness of my sins, and don't have to do anything to earn it. How can such a tremendous thing as that come without my doing anything to get it? Without my doing anything about it?" Well, Campbell Morgan thought and prayed for an answer to the man, for a way to make the idea clear. Then he said that he said to the man, "Well, you were working down there in the mine during the day, and down there half a mile under the ground you walk along that shaft down there in the mine until you come to the place where there ~~is~~ is a vertical shaft, vertical, or nearly vertical, that goes clear up to the open air, and there there is a skip, sort of a little car that runs very steeply down into ~~the shaft~~ that, and you come to that skip and you sit in it. You step in the skip and you just sit there, and pretty you are up at the top. How do you get up there? What do you have to do to get up?" ~~Oh,~~ "Oh," the man said, "I see. I don't have to do anything. I just sit there, but," he said, "it costs the company a great deal of money to build that skip, and cost them quite a bit to lift the skip up to the surface." There is a tremendous thing done, but he doesn't do it. He receives the benefit of it. So it is with the salvation of the servants of the ~~Lord~~ Lord. Their righteousness is of me; it is of God; it is imputed to them; it is given to them; it is free in the sense that they ~~nothing~~ pay nothing for it and they do nothing to get it. It is not free in the sense that it is just something that is just, "that is all there is to it"—God just says, "no, we won't bother about it; it is all done."

It is not that. The moral argument of the universe would be upset if God would use that sort of a travesty of justice. The justice of the universe has been impaired by sin, and sin must be punished, and God has paid the penalty for sin as described in Chapter 53 when our Lord Jesus Christ, "my righteous servant", bore the iniquities of many and justified them, and they then are the servants of the Lord, and their righteousness is of Him.

Now ~~then~~ it seems to me that we have found then in the beginning and in the end of this ~~chapter~~ chapter, a chapter which separates itself from what precedes and ~~follows~~ what follows as a rather definite unit although closely related to at least what precedes, that we have found evidence at the beginning and the end sufficient to warrant us in saying from the end of it that at least the end of it is dealing with those who ~~are~~ benefit by the death of Christ, those who receive the results of the salvation that He secured by His death on Calvary's cross, those whose righteousness is imputed to them by the Lord. From the beginning of the chapter we find a call to rejoice in view of a situation which is contrary to the normal situation and a situation which under ordinary circumstances, when it occurs is a cause for regret rather than a call for rejoicing; but it is here given as a cause for rejoicing and therefore to understand it properly must be related to what precedes it. In view of what Christ has done, rejoice because "more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, saith the Lord, ~~and~~ Enlarge the place of thy tent; let them stretch forth the curtains of thy habitation." Great extension, great expansion; spare not; lengthen thy courts; strengthen thy stakes, for thou shalt break forth on the right hand and on the left, and thy feet shall inherit the Gentiles and make the desolate cities to be inhabited. I notice that many commentators say that this means "now that Israel is desolate, she has more children than when she was a married wife." More are the children ~~are~~ of the one who is now desolate than the one who was formerly a married wife. I don't see the particular relevance here. It

30

doesn't seem to me that it fits particularly here. It seems to me that it is much more reasonable to take it as a comparison between the married wife, the one who should have been ~~xxxx~~ ~~bearing~~ bearing the children of the Lord, the one who should have been bearing the message of the Lord to all the earth, but has not done so, and the one who seemed to be outside of the covenant of Israel, who seemed to be outside of the covenant of God's grace and God's glory, who is now for a time the center of God's blessing and who enlarges and stretches out to the nations and brings the word of that ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ described in 53. This is a picture here of the salvation going forth to all the world as a result of what Christ did on Calvary's cross. We read

We read in the history of missions, one of the great epics in the history of missions was the time when William ^W Carey, the consecrated cobbler in England sat at his bench and studied his map of the world and longed to bring the gospel to the lands where Christ was not known. He organized a great work to send himself to India and went to India and became one of the great pioneers of missionary work in India. When C---- gave the great sermon which led ~~the~~ people together together and raise the money to send him forth to India. That sermon was based upon for its text, verse 2 of this chapter, "enlarge the place of thy tent, strengthen thy cords and strengthen thy stakes." Was C---- simply dragging the verse out of its context, taking something that sounded like expansion but had nothing to do with a missionary effort that was at stake and using that as his text ^{and} in picking some words such, as you might take the words from a Mother Goose rhyme or from some other source and using the words ~~to~~ to mean ~~something~~ something entirely unrelated to the context, or was he using these words exactly in line with the context in relation to the very things he described? ~~Yes~~ It seems to me that the latter is the true interpretation. That we have here a picture of the missionary work which is the result of Christ's ~~xxx~~ death on Calvary's ~~the~~ cross and that it is to go forth on the right hand and to the left and to go to

all the Gentiles. end of Is. 2

statement to draw a very complete conclusion from it, but certainly if it is a description of a change to take place upon this earth, you might say when is it going to happen. Is it going to happen in the days of the next generation after Isaiah? Is it going to happen in the days of the next generation after Isaiah? Is it going to be on the return from exile? Is it going to be on the return from exile? Is it going to be in the time of Christ? Is ~~it~~ it to be in the present age? As you look through history, you will find that ~~it is~~ except for very brief periods ~~he does not~~ we have not enjoyed such a time when this could be said to be fulfilled. Therefore if it is an earthly condition it would ~~xxx~~ seem to imply a future period upon this earth. ^{when} ~~then~~ it would be fulfilled. Now in itself it would not be ~~xxxx~~ ground on which ~~we~~ to draw a definite conclusion of such a period occurring. If we find clear evidence of such a period elsewhere this certainly would fit in with that. If we did not find further evidence of such a period ~~of~~ that elsewhere, we would find these particular statements very difficult to find a reasonable interpretation on some other basis. So we would have to undertake it because they in themselves would not be enough to establish a teaching regarding the millenium from them. But certainly if you find a millenium prophecy elsewhere these statements in this v rse would certainly fit excellently into that teaching. If you don't find it elsewhere it creates a very definite problem just how you can give a really r easonably interpretation of this particular verse.

58: Now we continue them. You have your passage of blessing now given continuing previous passage of rebuke. Let us ~~xxxx~~ now not immediately look at this ~~next~~ passage of blessing but let us go on to the next passage of rebuke and see what is the general theme in it. In chapter 58 we have in general a passage of rebuke in the early part of the chapter and blessing in the latter part of the chapter. Who in particular is in mind in the early part of it? Who are the people who are particularly addressed? Is this particular of the nation as a whole or is it of whom? (Student answers) A prophet. That is the religious leaders. Yes.

It is the religious leaders who are in mind in the first part of chapter 58. It is those who are leading in seeking the Lord and trying to ~~we~~ carry out His law. They are carrying on the ordinances of religion. They are performing the ceremonies which He has described and they~~xxx~~ say, "We are fasting and the Lord is giving us blessing." These, then, are the religious leaders then. There have been religious leaders in mind for some extent in previous passages but perhaps more particularly political leaders. But now the emphasis is quite definite on religious leaders. They are leading and carrying out ceremonies and forms but there is no ~~interesting~~ inner meaning to the ceremonies and forms. They are doing them for their own benefit instead of doing them in order to carry out the will of the Lord. He says, you fast for strife and debate to smite with the fist of wickedness. This is not the fast that the Lord has commanded. The Lord wants a fast which ~~results~~ results in loosing the bands of wickedness and undoing the heavy burdens, breaking every yoke that ties the righteous and the unrighteous together, letting the oppressed go free, and working out in some real external way the righteousness which He desire. That should be involved in the task and not a mere ceremony which goes through forms that have no meaning to them. And he says, if you will do this, if you will make your religious ceremony to have a real meaning. As Luther said--it isn't the important thing whether you use this ceremony or that one or the other one. The important thing is that you ~~from~~ have a heart of faith toward God. The important thing is whether you believe God, whether you are seeking Him with your whole heart. And, *he says* if you ~~take~~ take this different attitude in your religious ceremonies then your light will break forth as the morning and the glory of the Lord will be your ~~reward~~ reward. So he continues giving the blessings that will come if there is a change in the heart attitude toward God and you have the blessing described in the latter part of this chapter.

Then at the beginning of chapter 59 we have another passage of rebuke.

(Question) ^Social duties show the real attitude. Whether it is purely a

selfish attitude, looking ~~at it~~ ~~from one's own~~ out for one's own good or whether it is an attitude that shows itself in relation for God's people. The social duties are very specifically expressed in Scripture and it is very unfortunate that people get the impression that the social gospel is something that is a fad in itself. ^{He} ~~It~~ emphasizes the social work to the neglect of the relationship to God and is ~~definitely~~ wrong and wicked. But a relationship with God which does result as a byproduct in the amelioration of social conditions is not a true work of God. We do have considerable emphasis on this through the Scripture and the modernists lose the ~~spirit~~ spiritual value of the Scripture and seek something to ~~justify~~ justify his ^{existence} ~~assistance~~ as a religious leader. He places his great emphasis upon these and unfortunately many fundamentalists ²⁹⁻⁶⁻⁴ against the wrong ~~of~~ of the modernists recoil by acting as if ~~they~~ those things were in the Scripture. They are there. They are simply given as ^{disproportion} ~~in proportion~~ by the modernists and that which is secondary is made ~~more~~ prominent. But it is a secondary thing and a real thing and important, but not the primary thing. You can stress the social for years and accomplish practically nothing because it does not get to the root of it, but you stress the spiritual and incidentally touch on the social and the spiritual making the heart desiring to serve God. There has been too much neglect ~~to the~~ to the thought of good works in fundamental circles, a neglect which is being remedied. ~~There is~~ There is more attention to it in recent years to that thought by fundamentalist leaders.

(question) Certainly fits anyone who has personal duties, yes, but I would not think that a true fundamentalist would be described as in verse 4. You fast for strife and for debate and to smite with the fist of wickedness. That is certainly described in their form. Now that is not a seeking of spiritual value and forgetting physical good, but it is seeking unto himself advantage, yes. It is

true that the inner heart attitude is not specifically singled out in this passage here as it is in the previous passage where he speaks of those who trust him. At the same ~~xx~~ time I think it is guarded against taking it that the person who thinks of the religious value and not of the soul value is condemned.

(Question) I think there is a delight to know my way. ~~Itx~~ He takes delight in approaching to God. You ~~find~~ find a real among followers of heathen religions you often find a real delight in ~~spirit~~ spiritual observances. You find a real putting of this in a primary state even though it doesn't effect the things that are vital. A friend of mine was talking with a woman ~~with~~ of a very high branch of the church of England. You know, the high church means the church that places emphasis on ~~the~~ form to a very great extent. She told how in going through the service ~~it~~ there was all this rigormarole, different passing the vestments over and going through these forms and ceremonies and all that sort of thing. She said that she got exquisite delight in every particular symbol of the priests and bowing of his head and all that. If the slightest thing was omitted she missed it. There is a real delight, a real pleasure, that people get from that sort of thing, and there is a delight which we can get in any kind of religious service from that which is incidental rather than which ~~is~~ really expresses the heart feeling of it. One can get it from loud singing and lots of noise and another can get it from quietness and yet they would call it a wonderful devotional atmosphere. Either one of these two can be simply something that satisfies the flesh rather than really meaning something.

(Question) Verse 1? "Cry aloud, lift up thy voice like a trumpet and show my people their transgressions and to the house of Jacob their sins." Would not that be God speaking to the prophet ~~or~~ or the prophet speaking to his fellow prophets? Or perhaps just a general idea with nobody in particular but the theme being that there is need of ~~one of the people~~ showing the people their transgressions? It is pretty much introductory to the next verse. He says that

there is need of showing these people their sins and their wickedness despite the fact that they seek me daily, despite the fact that they are going through ceremonies and forms and all this, it is not sufficient. ~~Show them what it is.~~ There is something wrong. Show them what it is. I don't think it would mean ~~xxxx~~ much by itself. ~~xxxx~~ It could mean, but I think in the context it has to be interpreted as an introduction.

(Question) Oh, I see. He is talking to the ~~priests~~ priest here. Yes. That is an interesting idea and that refers to the second verse instead of ^{? 29-11^{1/2}} third person. It is possible to take verse 1 as sarcastic. I incline toward the other interpretation.

(Question) Verse 3 is parallel to Matthew 7:22. What is that? Yes, that certainly is a good parallel. They are people who think they belong to the Lord. Jeremiah has many words to say about those who are trusting in the temple, who are trusting in the ordinances, trusting in the external forms of ceremony but don't have the heart and root of the matter. So that verse used to get you very much in point here. All this then has the theme of ritual without meaning, form without inner purpose, without the true heart attitude. Then, of course, he has the passage of blessing following it and then we have another passage of rebuke which begins with 59:1 and how far does this passage go? He says it goes to verse 15, middle of the verse. So you think there is a break within the verse rather than at the end of the verse. The Authorized Version which I have here begins a new paragraph with verse 16. It has a ~~px~~ paragraph mark there. I notice that the Revised Version makes a paragraph division right in the middle of verse 15, which shows that the revisers didn't think very much of the verse division that was made there. They have two paragraphs divided right in the middle. How many agree that this is the place, in the middle of verse 15, where the rebuke section ends? Quite a few. What would be the theme of it if you take this as one section from 59:1 to 15a, where would be the most important division within this section? (Student answers) Who did find one? You would think that verse 9 is one. He ceases

talking about sin and starts talking about judgment coming. That is a good point, and another, is that it changes person. They are down there and therefore we are in a situation. It is a confession of sin, a confession of sin with punishment described as already present. Is this passage--is there much in this passage that would seem to be quite specifically leaders or ~~that~~ is the nation quite definitely thought of as a whole without any definite preparation special separation out of leadership? ~~Yes~~ Yes, there seems to be no particular designation of leadership. The people as a whole are thought of here and the ethical imperfection of ~~the~~ the nation is here pointed out. Their iniquities have separated between them and God. It is not that His hand is shortened, that He can't stay but their iniquities have separated and ~~therefore~~ ~~there~~ their sins have hid his face from them so that He will not hear and we have this ~~completely~~ terrible description of sin up to verse 8 and then this awful description of judgment and what follows. showing the people as in this situation and crying out for help. That would be a prediction looking forward to the future and describing in this situation as they look for help. Then in the middle of verse 15 we start a new paragraph with the promise of help that is coming and where is your next verse which is direct rebuke addressed to the people? Where is the next one after this? *end of 29.*

Chapter 63. That is a long passage after all these we have had rebuke, blessing, rebuke, blessing. Does anybody find rebuke before 63? We find a passage of blessing that runs clear through 63. (Student answers) What verse in it would not be? (Student) *(break on 30)*

rebuke and blessing, rebuke and blessing, rebuke and blessing, even though there are certain points at which that general outline might ~~not~~ be subject to certain revision in the ~~light~~ light of certain suggestions that have been made. That is in general the arrangement of this section. We notice that he begins in 56 with a rebuke against the watchman of Israel, a rebuke against the leaders who

who are not protecting the people from evil but who are actually leading them astray. Then we have a passage of blessing. Then we have a passage of rebuke again which again is directed against the leader in general but here it is not so much political leaders who seem to be in mind as it is religious leaders. Here it is the leaders of the religious ceremonies, the others might be the prophets, the leaders of the ideas whether in political things or in religious although it does seem to me that the general moral condition is more stressed than the particularly religious. in the first verse.

In this second one it is very definitely religious ceremonies and their purpose that is in mind.

(Question) Well, it is hard to tell exactly when the prophecy was written. In the early part of Isaiah's life you had King Ahaz's rule and I would say that the leaders of the religious life probably were official leaders but there was a very marked ^{apostasy} a very strong turning away from God, and little interest in such a man as Isaiah. Then after Ahaz's death you have Hezekiah who seems to have welcomed Isaiah's counsel and given Isaiah a very prominent place in the court. ³⁰⁻⁵¹⁺ And in the reign of Hezekiah the religious leaders and the political leaders were to a large extent the same doubtless, and the religious leaders were to a large extent men who were true to the Lord. Then, however, after Hezekiah's death, you have Manasseh, his son, reigning who turned wickedly following the lines of his grandfather, rather than his father and going far beyond what his grandfather had done. In the introduction to Isaiah, it says that what he prophesied in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahab, and Hezekiah, and makes no mention whatever of ~~the days of~~ Manasseh. It is purely a conjecture that he ran into the reign of ^{Manasseh,} ~~Manasseh,~~ but it seems very probable, in fact extremely probable. I consider it as practically certain.

We base it upon, first, ~~the Jewish~~ Jewish tradition is that Isaiah was martyred under Manasseh. Now that tradition may be late, not dependable; on the other hand, it may spring from a valid source. It is a straw; it is not a convincing

evidence.

Then there is no reason why he may not have run into Manassah's reign. We are not told when he died, it would not make too long a life for him, too long a time of prophesying, and it's the background which those who believe that much of Isaiah was written a century and a half or more later, the background of those sections, which they say shows the time of despair of the exile, could equally well show the despair of the righteous in the reign of Manassah. And there being no evidence against its running into this reign, there is every reason to think that he may have done it.

So the situation ~~is~~ was vastly different from the situation of our own time. We have sharp and distinct ~~separation of church and state~~. Such a thing was unknown in those days. Of course Israel was theoretically a theocracy in which God was the King and the human king was representing God on earth. He was the son of David, descendant of the Davidic line, supposed to do what the Lord desired, so that the distinction between/^{them} was nothing like in our time.

(Question) The Roman Catholics, I think, have a tendency to base a great deal of argument on key texts or sections of worship, going a great deal out of the key words and ignoring ~~the~~ contexts or ignoring others, and they draw these indiscriminately wherever you find them, whether in the Old Testament, or in the Apocrapha, or in the New Testament.

Consequently in their books on these subjects they would make much use of these particular~~x~~ verses.

(Question) ~~The method of the~~ The Roman Catholic method is largely ^{30:8 1/2} then a method of defense of that which we have and looking for evidences to support it, rather than starting with what was there and saying this is what comes out. They seem to base more sense upon the point, a lack which lends to the Bible, even though theoretically the Bible.

But it is true that the Biblical ideal is not the ideal of separation of church and state. There's no question of that. The Biblical ideal is a theo-

cracy. It is a government in which God reigns and in which men are God's representatives to perform God's will. The idea of separation of church and state is an expedient for a government in a world which is an ~~un~~ unsanctified world, a world in which the individual is recognized as having right as an individual apart from his relationship to God. It is an expedient for the age in which we live. It is an expedient which would be out of place in a nation or state in which the people were overwhelmingly all obeying God, and consequently there is much to be said on a theoretical viewpoint for the Roman Catholic attitude. In any country in which they are in a minority they talk to you about liberty and power and the right to express their views, but as the state has stated in their papers in recent times, if they are in the majority it would be absurd for them to give any kind of liberty to that which is contrary to them. There is much to be said from the theoretical viewpoint. That is an interesting question but there is more church history in it than this, but in so far as it touches on our passage it is very vital and we are interested in anything which is related to the passage. W

Well now, Isaiah's particular attention to the leaders is very important because the leadership of a nation does determine the nation except that you cannot get a leadership opposite to what the leadership just before had been and then expect the nation to immediately turn around. It takes time. The leadership over a period time determines the nation.

(Question) The stress in 58 on leadership is certainly not nearly as explicit as it is in 57. The stress is on the carrying out of religious ceremonies and it is true that the nation as a whole is in mind there. I think, however, that some of the expressions would suggest at least a certain ~~xxxx~~ attention to the leaders but it is true that in both of them the population as a whole is responsible and in this there is very little of explicitly ^{30-11 1/2}. But I don't think it would be right to say that 57 is leaders and 58 is people as a whole. That might be a partial truth but there is another context that is more pronounced. 57 deals

30-9 1/2

in general with moral attitudes and 58 deals with religious ceremonies specifically.

(Question) Isaiah in the early days of his ministry only had three opportunities to speak without hindrance. It is assumed by most interpreters of Isaiah that he was a man of noble blood and a man of background ~~xxxxxxx~~ which would more or less give him an entrance into all circles of the government. It is probable that in his early messages he was in no sense an official but he had full opportunity to preach. That is purely conjecture but a reasonable conjecture. Now this is definite that in the reign of Ahaz Isaiah did not have free access. In the reign of Ahaz we find that it was necessary for Isaiah to use various expediences to get a hearing. He went out when Ahaz was on a defence inspection tour and Isaiah approached him in front of the mass of the people because evidently he would not get a hearing. He went to seize an opportunity when the people were there and when Ahaz ~~was there~~ wouldn't dare be rude to him. Then we find him in 28 speaking to the nobles and using evidently an expedient of getting a hearing by very tactfully saying things they would agree with for awhile and so they would be ready to listen to him and then turning the attention around to the things they disagreed with. So that in the reign of Ahaz Isaiah hardly had much opportunity except from the mass of the Godly and there probably was a very substantial group. They were following him and were tremendously in what he had to say. In the reign of Hezekiah Isaiah doubtless was listened to with much attention by the whole nation except by those who were opposed to him and who probably didn't say much about him because the whole control was in his favor. Then in the reign of Mennasah if he continued into the reign of Mennasah, he was doubtless giving his messages to a little group which was with him and receiving him with much attention and probably others heard him occasionally but probably in general there was ^d little hesitation.

In chapter 40 to 56:9 it is doubtless this little group which he is prophesying to. He is speaking to them as representing the nation of God. They are people who want to serve the Lord but they are people who as Israelites partake of the sins of

the nation as a whole and realize that the exile is deserved. He addressed to them messages which have a real meaning to them and that which would have even a greater significance for the people in exile who would read the message later on. Then when you get to 56:9 here you reverse to a general attitude which we saw typical in the earlier chapters of Isaiah, a talking to the nation as a whole and then talking to the Godly. Now we have nothing to indicate whether from 56:9 on he is talking in the reign of Uzziah, of Ahaz, of Hezekiah, or of Mennasah. When this was given we don't know. We have no indication. ~~Ex~~ The fact that he does speak to the nation as a whole ~~is~~ in this strong tone of rebuke would suggest that perhaps it was earlier than the chapters from 40 to 56, but we don't know. *end of 30.*

As to the arrangement of the book of Isaiah we know nothing about it. We have absolutely no evidence how it was arranged or who arranged it or when. ~~But~~ ^{whether} it was messages which Isaiah gave which Isaiah wrote down as he gave them one after the other or whether Isaiah had given a great many messages and from them he made a selection and one made a selection and arranged them in an orderly fashion and that was the reason for the order or just how the book was arranged. In the case of Jeremiah we are able to make very good conjectures as to how it was done because in Jeremiah we find the certain general structure of dealing with certain topics in order, chronological order, and then we find other messages inserted which are dated twenty years later and which deal with similar subjects. Quite evidently Jeremiah arranged his messages in the order which he gave them for a certain length of time and then later on when he gave similar messages simply put them in after another message of similar type. Either he did or some other did. It makes it very clear that Jeremiah is not simply a presentation of Jeremiah's messages right straight through in order as given because he will give a message in the reign of Zedekiah and then he will give a message in the fourth year of ³¹⁻² which would be ten years earlier. So in Jeremiah we know that they are not arranged chronologically.

There are generally, however. In Isaiah they would seem in general to be chronological and it is generally assumed among interpreters of Isaiah that 40 to 66 is all laid in the 21-24 (ward)
But when you get here to 56:9 you find in these passages here a tone which is so similar to that in the earlier part of the book that I consider it far from certain that these passages were given at the late time in his ministry at which 40 to 56.

(Question) It appears to me most likely that we have a structure beginning at 56:9 with a passage of rebuke followed by a passage of blessing. Then again rebuke to the mass of the people including the Godly but with special attention to the unGodly rebuking the nation as a whole for its sin and then attention paid to the Godly for a brief period, then the unGodly nation as a whole including the Godly and unGodly but emphasis on the sin up to the early part of 59, and then 16 on up to 63 a continuation of this same general message. So my inclination would be to think that 59 is at the same approximate time as 57 and 58. Now that is pure conjecture. There is no proof. The same ^{attitude} evidences which would suggest ~~the same~~ that 57 and 58 were early in his ministry might suggest 59 also. Of course, they might not be. They might be in the time of Mennassah too. But at least he is looking at the nation as a whole.

(Question) That would fit Mennassah's time or Ahaz's time. My only reason for not thinking of it as probably in Mennassah's time is that the general attitude at his time would appear to be simply the Godly as if he were turning his attention away from them for the time being. It might be Mennassah's time.

(Question--Mr Jerome) Personally I consider the arrangement very definitely inspired. I think that right at that point it is necessary for a moment to stop and think of what we mean by inspiration. Some people think of inspiration that if it says that there 42 children killed by the bears instead of 43 or 41 there is a very definite reason why 42 were killed and that there is a meaning for it. I would say that if it says 42, it means there were 42. The Lord might have a

special meaning to it but there is no reason to assume that he does have. It may be that there just were 42 as we are told. If, however, it said 40 instead of 42 I would say 40 is a round number. It doesn't necessarily mean 40. There might be 45 or there might be 35. It seems to me to be very unlikely that he would say 42 if he meant 41 or 43. Well, if he said 40 I would say it is a round number. The inspiration then to my mind is keeping it from error. It doesn't mean that he gives a complete and detailed picture of everything possible involved. That I do not think is meant by inspiration. The same thing applies to its dealing with all sorts of subjects. The question is just how much the Lord intends to reveal to us. How fully does He intend to give this to us. I do not think that the Bible is like a picture of the earth taken from way up in the sky with such a wonderful camera that the more you use a microscope on it the more truth you get out of it. I think the Bible is a presentation of the great and deep ~~and~~ truths of God and there is far more in it than any human being can get out of it. I believe that there are things in it which are definitely given and other things which are not God's intention to give us. He doesn't give us anything wrong but it is a question as to how far we can go in getting truth in a certain direction. So I think it is entirely wrong as a general thing to make the approach to the Bible just as the Bible tells about a certain subject. What does the Bible tell us? Or rather you might say, does the Bible tell us this about a particular subject? Does it give us definite information or is it one of the things that it does not tell us about. The same thing would apply to arrangement. Personally it seems to me extremely right that the fact that Psalms 22, 23, and 24 come in that order and is a part of God's definite plan and a picture of the crucifixion of Christ mostly described in Psalm 22, the life of the believer in Christ wonderfully described in 23, and the return of Christ wonderfully described in Psalm 24. But the fact that these three are in this order doesn't seem to me to mean necessarily that the order of some other three Psalms ^{has} ~~are~~ is a meaning for it. The relation of 21 to 22 doesn't necessarily have a meaning or 24 to 25. Some things are in a certain order simply

because you have to put one after the other or one before. You can't put them side by side. One has to follow the other in a trend of thought. It may make no difference in the world which came first, and therefore there is no error in the matter which came first. Or it may make a great difference and in that case they are arranged not in the way that would give a wrong teaching, but in the way that would give a right teaching. I think this whole concept, to my mind, is most important in our relationship to the Bible, and I think a great deal of unnecessary controversy and a great deal of misleading of Christian people is due to the assumption that since the Bible is inspired therefore on any particular question I can find the answer to that question in the Bible. You might say as to whether a person should wear glasses or not, well, what does the Bible say about it? Why ~~isn't~~ ^{I don't think} the Bible goes into it. I don't think it does. Will the return of the Lord be on Wednesday or on Thursday. I don't think the Bible tells us. The Bible specifically tells us that we don't know the day or the hour when it is going to be. We are specifically told in that regard. But when it came to the first coming of Christ there were many things about it which were very specifically told in the Scripture and there were other things which very definitely were not told and they ~~may~~ could have hunted through with a fine toothed comb for centuries and they never could have found the answer to these things which were not revealed. I feel that way about the question of the time of the rapture. Will the rapture be before or after the tribulation? The Scripture very clearly teaches that there is going to be a tribulation. It very clearly teaches that there is going to be a rapture. Anyone--pre-, post-, or a-millennial must recognize that the Scripture teaches both these things; both a tribulation and a ~~rapture~~ rapture are clearly taught. But what ~~is~~ is the temporal relationship of these two? Does the rapture come after the tribulation or does it come before the tribulation? There is quite a bit of evidence to look as if the rapture comes before the tribulation. I know of no evidence ~~whatsoever~~ whatever to show that the rapture comes after the tribulation. That is, the arguments I have heard to prove that the rapture comes after the

tribulation have seemed to me to try to show that the evidence of His coming before is not valid. Well, if you prove the evidence is not valid that He comes before, you are left with the conclusion that you don't know ^{when} ~~when~~ He comes. You don't prove a fact. It just leaves you ~~knowing~~ not knowing which it comes. I personally am not at all convinced ~~that~~ as whether the evidence is sufficient that He comes ~~before~~ before or not. But I would say that there is evidence that looks in that direction and I don't know of any evidence looking in the other direction. The arguments that I have heard to prove that evidence is not valid has not convinced me as being sufficient to show that that evidence is ~~still~~ false and I personally think the evidence for the return of Christ being premillennial is many, many times greater in amount than the evidence as to whether the rapture is before or after the tribulation. Well, has the Lord given us ~~enough~~ enough evidence to answer this question or has he not. That is the question. The question isn't that ~~it~~ it must be that we can learn from the Bible whether it is before or after. If you don't find enough evidence for that way then it must be this way. It isn't that at all. It is, has He given us enough evidence for us to know? If He has, we must stand on what He says. He had definite told us that we are not given enough evidence as to when it is. The day or the hour we do not know of the return. The relationship of it to the rapture may be something that is revealed or it may not. I think on the one hand that He wants us to be ready at any time so that if the Lord will come He will find us active and serving Him and separated from that which would hinder our testimony. On the other hand I think the Lord wants us to be ready to go through whatever tribulation may come and to know that He will give us strength to do it whatever it is. Those ~~both~~ both are true I think. As to whether He has chosen to reveal to us the relationship of these two, that is a matter of further study. I think that that is true of a great many points. The question is, let us find out what we can out of it. My psychology professor in college said to me one time. I was taking the course. I guess he was a philosophy professor but he dabbled in psychology and in this course he touched on it a little bit. We had only a very

little. I met him on the street one day and he said, "Well, what do you think of all this?" I said, "Well, ~~sisssc~~ I'm not quite convinced of Freudalism from the arguments that you have presented." He said, "What is wrong with it?" Meaning to say, if you can't prove that it is wrong, it must be right. My position was that I don't know much about it but it has to be ~~xx~~ proven to me that it is right before I'm going to accept it. I don't have to prove it is false. That is true of the conclusion of a great many things in the Scripture. We must get evidence enough to say that it is right and otherwise I think the Lord wants us to reserve judgment until we find sufficient evidence to reach a conclusion about it. I personally feel that way about dicotomy and tricotomy. People get tremendously concerned about whether the human personality is ~~xxxx~~ made up of two parts or three. Personally I don't ~~xxxx~~ feel that this book here is made up of color and thickness and weight. They are three qualities. Well, somebody says that he is a tricotomist and it has three qualities. It has color, thickness and weight. Somebody else says, "No, I'm a dicotomist and it has only two qualities. It has thickness and weight and color is purely incidental. It may be part of one of the other." As a matter of fact here is your book and you can see that it has a dozen qualities. You can say that it has fifty. If you take the color away from it, it might still be a book, but if you take the weight away, it just floats away. It is not a book any more. If you take the thickness away and you have no thickness. There are different things that are needed. The human personality includes a body, a spirit, a soul, strength, all sorts of things. You can't take some of them away and still have a personality. They are all necessary to a full personality. Now you can take away the body and you have an unnatural condition, but that unnatural condition does exist. I don't think you have a body when the spirit goes. It is just a corpse. It is only a body as long as it is united with the spirit. The human personality is both. Now when the body is gone there is an unnatural condition which does survive but which is to be reunited with the body. Now can that be divided into two sharp divisions or should it be three or four or a dozen?

I question whether we can divide that way, but some people have said, it must be ^{two} true and some have said it must be three and I question very much whether you can prove either one to be correct. Here is a human being. God has made him. He has many aspects, but that you can divide into sharp lines and say this is one side and this the other. I question whether there is any Scriptural evidence. Strong disputing over the matter to my mind rests to ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ a large extent ~~xxxx~~ on the assumption that we can get an answer to a particular hypothetical question by investigation that fits on that point. *end of 31*

(Question) I don't know of anybody who holds to a middle-tribulation rapture. Dr. Buswell hold to a mid-week rapture, which means that the tribulation comes in the last half of the week. Well, as a matter of fact, I think everybody thinks the tribulation comes in the last half of the week. But most pre-tribulation rapturists hold that the tribulation comes at the beginning of the 70th week of Daniel. Dr. Buswell holds that it comes in the middle of the 70th week of Daniel but still before the tribulation. So that would be ~~xxxxxx~~ definitely a pre-tribulation rapture view. Personally I'm not sure that we can be so sure of the exact time and all that. It may be that we can, but I think it takes a great deal of investigation and one must go very slowly. His view would be definitely the pre-tribulation viewpoint rather than the post. Of course, that is aside from our present point.

I was dealing with Mr Jerome's question whether the order is inspired and I believe it is. But I don't believe that it always has existed. Whether in one place ~~xxxxxx~~ the Scripture may ~~xxxxxxx~~ say something is lofty and in another place say it is high. It may have no significance. In some case it might have. In other cases it might not. Inspiration means that nothing that has to *32-2 1/2* *meant* has a wrong *few words*. I think very few people have that understanding of what they think inspiration really means. They think it is some sort of magical thing whereby you can draw absolute final answers to every question. That, of course, is what the modernists are shooting at. They have another thought as to what

Christians mean by inspiration. We mean that it is an infallible guide and that it is sufficient for the purpose to which God gave it and is without error for that purpose.

(Question) The great danger is that we take a verse or a few verses or we take a view somebody has given us or an attitude somebody takes and we take that as a starting place and then we go the Scripture in order to find proof texts for our viewpoints. I think we want to go the Scripture and say, What does the Scripture teach? I hear people sometimes say, it is like two trains. They start in here and they go out in different directions and the minute you go three inches that way you are heading for Chicago instead of for London and you have to go back and get on this one. I think that is absolutely wrong. I think the train can go anywhere in the United States. It can't go across the ocean, of course, but it can go in any particular direction. ~~xxx~~ As a matter of fact you can leave New York on a train going south or on a train going north and you will eventually get to Chicago. Or if you take a train going directly in the direction of Chicago you come into ~~xxx~~ the mountains and consequently the trains that go to Chicago that way have very few passengers. You have to go in a different direction to reach your goal. It is not so simple to say, here are ~~xxxxxxx~~ two lines. You are either this way or you are that way. and once you have moved three inches we can tell where you are going. You can't. The thing we want to do is not to come to the Scripture with preconceived ideas and look for evidence of our idea but to come to the Scripture and see what the Scripture has in it. That doesn't mean that you come to the Scripture with an open mind like a sieve and just let everything fly through it. You come to the Scripture and you look at it and you see what it suggests to you and then you form a theory as to what it means. Then you go ahead and examine further to see whether your theory is substantiated as you go on or whether you have to revise it and form a new theory. You must remember that any theory is a fallible, human theory and subject to revision. The Scripture is infallible and is God's Word, and is so far as our theory conform to the Scripture they are true, and only this far. There is great

danger. This morning we discussed in Old Testament History a little the matter of deceit and we could have gone much faster and much further if I had tried to give some general strong conclusions on the matter but I thought instead it was better to develop the general principle. The wrong method of approaching is to say, deceit is wrong. Therefore, what is our problem. Is it true or not? Does it ~~base deceit~~ say deceit is wrong? That is the wrong approach to it. The right approach to it is that whatever the Scripture says is right, is right and whatever the Scripture says is wrong is wrong. Our human word "deceit" is a word which has taken over certain connotations and which has different meanings in the minds of different people who hold it. We want to try to find ~~xxxx~~ what does the scripture say is wrong and what does the Scripture does it permit or what does it say is right and where is its dividing line? What word you call it is entirely a matter of accident. It doesn't matter what you call it. The thing to ~~mix~~ do is to get the right ~~context~~ concept, the concept taught in the Scripture. To do that you have to take the Scripture as a whole. The Scripture says thou shalt not kill. In India we have Hindu sects that go with a broom and sweep in the road and have several servants in front of a Brahman and sweep in the road in front of them to get every insect out of the way because he would commit a mortal sin if he stepped on one of those insects and killed it. Well, that is not the teaching of the Scripture. Of ~~xxx~~ course, the word "kill" doesn't mean ~~kill~~. It means "murder." ⁵ You have to gather ~~ix~~ what is involved. Even if it meant kill, the general idea is presented but exactly what it means you have to examine the rest of the Scripture and see what it teaches and you will find that capital punishment is ordered in Scripture. You find that the eating of meat is definitely provided for in Scripture. You find that war is definitely ordered under certain circumstances in Scripture. You find that God killed Ananias and Saphira as a punishment. You find that the command, thou shalt not kill, even if it was kill instead of murder, must be determined as to its meaning in relationship to the evidence you find in the Scripture as a whole. That is true of all the statements of Scripture. It is

much easier. Somebody said it is the hardest thing for people in the world to do is to think. People hate to think. They ~~would~~ would rather memorize two days than spend ten minutes in thinking! They would rather do any kind of routine work than just go ahead and put out energy and sit down to the hard work of comparing and analyzing things and really thinking them through. It is much easier for us to just build up a general system with words and concepts and say it has to all be right along this line. than it is to go and think it out and see what does the Scripture say on this matter and see how the teaching of the ~~Scripture~~ Scripture fits together on these particular points and when we do we'll find certain great systematic principles that run all the way through it and we'll find many other points on which the decision depends on its relationship to these great principles. But we must draw a principle and then say we must work it into conformity. We must draw a principle and then explain it as we find other passages in Scripture fitting in and enlarging and analyzing it, and if we find it necessary to give up any particular principle and to take another and see how it fits with the Scripture. What is the ~~conclusion~~ conclusion of the Scripture? There are too many people who have one or two points and have a few verses of Scripture on them and just fight over it and forget the great mass of the Scripture.

(Question) Well, that is a good question. In the first part of Isaiah in chapter 1 to 35 in general he is talking to the people of the nations as a whole. He is saying that God is going to punish you for your sins. God is going to give great evidence of His own authority and power by defending Jerusalem against seemingly insuperable objects for quite a time when it seems He is going to defend it. But He is going to punish Jerusalem. He is going to send you into exile. The righteous must not give up hope from the fact that the exile is certain because beyond that time God has great blessing for His people. That in very brief is the thought stressed over and over again in 1 to 35. Then in 36 to 39 we have a section utterly different from 1 to 35, more different from it than 40 on. In that section, 36 to 39, we have the prophet at work. In the days of Hezekiah

we have the great crisis that had been predicted before. We have the crisis actually there. We have the events occurring. We have Isaiah's action in relation to the events, the revelation God gave Isaiah in the midst of the events and the account of how they came out. Then we have told there the account of how in the midst of that situation where God was so wonderfully delivering the people, right in the midst of that Isaiah predicted that the people would go into exile not to Assyria, the great world power, but Babylon, at that time an insignificant country. That was where they were going to exile. Then chapter 39 ends, and with 40 we begin a section which clearly is addressed only to the writer. So that people who see the inevitability of the exile ~~worries~~ and mourn because of what seems to be the end of their nation. They are sentenced there and God is giving them in chapters 40 to 56 the view of His wonderful plan of the future with deliverance of the people from their sins.

Now at 56:8 this seems to end and we have a definite method of approach. There are two interpretations possible at this place of 56:8 to 63. One of these interpretations is that in the days of Mennassah after Isaiah had given his message of consolation ~~xxx~~ and of hope to the people, who are going into exile and the assurance that God is going to deal with the sin question which after all is the cause and foundation of the exile, that then he again turns his attention to the people as a whole and presents God's rebuke upon them and follows it up with messages for the Godly which looks far beyond the immediate deliverance and ~~xxx~~ looks to the wonderful deliverances which are far beyond. Isaiah has thus a change of attitude reverting to the previous attitude in the days of Mennassah. That is entirely possible.

Another possibility ~~xxx~~ which at the moment appears to me somewhat more likely although I have not made up my mind between the two at all. I'm not at all sure we have material on which we can. The other possibility is that in the early days of his ministry Isaiah gave messages addressing the people as a whole and condemning them for their sins and then turning to the Godly and giving them God's

wonderful promise of redemption that is going to come and that in these messages, ~~the~~ the promises of redemption and blessing to come, rather naturally and logically dealt with phases of the blessing which God would give which would logically follow that which was described in chapters 40 to 56:8. Therefore, in the final arrangement of the book, this material which Isaiah gave at an early time, was put in after the other because the account of the blessing which it gives would be more easily understood with that in mind. That might be for that reason, the material actually given to the people earlier, placed in the book later. Now that impresses me as the more likely of the two. We do have it arranged this way and I think there is a purpose in the fact that it comes after.

on the other hand you have in Isaiah 1 to 12 a section in which Isaiah deals with the king of Judah, a wicked king, who is turning away from God and the fact that God is going to replace him with ~~another~~ righteous ruler. That is the essential theme of chapters 7 to 12 although there are other subjects discussed such as God's deliverance for the people from the great Assyrian captain. Then ~~in~~ in chapters 28 to 35 you have this theme discussed: the wickedness of the nobles and the leaders of the people and the fact that God is going to replace them with righteous leaders and is going to turn His ~~favor~~ favor to another people for a time. That is to say, 28 to 35 is very definitely parallel to chapters 7 to 12. Except in 7 to 12 it is the king who is in mind and in 28 to 35 it is the nobility, the leaders of the nation. The general theme is the same. The historical standpoint is the same. The point of departure is the same. — The time of Ahaz in the Israel-Assyrian War. Now under the circumstances the king would more logically come first than the other dealing with the nobles. But the section of foreign nations from 12 to 23 and the Isaiah Apocalypse, 24 to 27, comes in between. Personally I do not know if there is any ~~text~~ significance of its coming in between. It might just as well come after as far as I know. For 13 to 27 to come before or after 28 to 35 as far as I know is without significance. *end 1632.*

We have been looking at a section of Isaiah which seems to be a unified section; at least it is set off from what precedes and what follows. You have a section begins with chapter 40 and runs up to chapter ~~56:8~~, a very long, unified section. Then you have a very sharp break between that and 9. Very evidently a new section of the book begins at 56:9. Now we have noticed a section of rebuke and declaration of punishment followed in general by a section of blessing and declaration of God's goodness to the future blessing that He is going to bring them and another section of rebuke followed by promises of blessing. We have had a section of rebuke followed by promises of blessing. This passage of blessing which began with 59:15a leads into blessings which continue to be presented up to 63:7. And at 63:7 you find a marked change. You have a prayer presented, a long prayer, a prayer which is very different from the material which preceded it. Now we haven't looked into that prayer yet to make this absolutely clear, but I can say without fear of contradiction that at ~~xxx~~ 63:7 is a division point just as marked as that at 56:9. Therefore that this section from 56:9 to 63:7 is separated from what precedes and what follows by sharp division. Now is 56:9 to 63:7 a unit? Does the passage of blessing which begins in 59:15a end at 60 and a new section begin also of blessing? Or does this section of blessing beginning at 59:15a continue right up through 63:6? That is a question which can only be answered after we look at the section as a whole and see whether it seems to have a unified subject matter or a unified structure, something that would suggest that it is a unit rather than a group of different passages, some of which after some point in which you find little relation to the long section that has preceded? You see the problem there that we have before us of structure. We noticed that in 56:9 up to 57:13a we had in general al declaration of the sin of the people and of the punishment which was to come, dealing particularly with the leaders of the people and particularly with their leading the people astray and with their wicked attitude on moral problems. This reached to this point at which we were told in contrast

to the futility of their trusting their own devices. We were told of the blessing of the one who put his trust in the Lord, ~~at~~ the end of 13. And we continue with wonderful blessings up to verse 20, wonderful blessings promised of the Lord, blessings which have been given to the one who puts his trust in Him. It doesn't seem to be "if you turn away from God, you will receive punishment, ~~and~~ ^{and} if you trust in God, you will receive these blessings." It seems rather to be taking people as separated ~~into~~ in one category and ~~presenting~~ presenting the future of the two categories. That is, it does not give the impression of the conditional passage of blessing in which opportunities are offered if you only avail yourself of them, but are not yours if you do not avail yourself of them. The impression given is rather that here are the wicked, here are the dumb watchmen who are not speaking out when they ~~xxxix~~ should, here are the people who are committing these sins. These people are receiving punishment. In contrast to them, here are individuals who put their trust in the Lord. To those great blessing is coming. It seems not to be a conditional promise that if you will do this, you will receive this blessing but an unconditional declaration that that which God is going to perform toward those that belong in this category. Does that make it clear to you? I think it is rather a vital difference and it is quite definite in this context as contrasted with so many other context where you set before you the ways of life and the ways of death and you are left to take your choice. Here he is not setting a choice before you but is setting before you the future of two different types of people who are here described and who are ~~xxx~~ represented as very distinct and separate types of people.

(Question) These people who do trust in the Lord are going to receive His blessing. They are already in that condition. Whether they are imagined as present future or future. That is, I might say, everyone of you who will spend six hours a day studying this course, will receive credit in it. That will ^{be giving} ~~putting~~ a condition before you and if you fulfill the condition you will have the result, and if not, there isn't. Well, I might say everyone of you here who has had ~~a~~ ^{the} course in Prophets will receive a certain sort of credit in this course and

everyone who has not had the course in Prophets will receive a different sort of grade.

I might say that. That would be simply dividing you into two categories. As I say in Old Testament History, those of you who have had beginning Hebrew have a certain assignment and those who have not had, have a different ~~and~~ ~~assignment~~ assignment. It is not a transitional thing but it is a division into categories and a treatment of each one. Now there is a point at which the two viewpoints merge and it is hard to be sure of which of them you are speaking. But in this particular passage we do not have any mode of exhortation. We have no mode of saying, you do this and then you get that and if you don't do that, you get that. It is rather considering that there are to be two classes at least. There are the lost and there are the saved. "Here are the unregenerate and there are the regenerate. There are the wicked and there are the righteous. We are told here what is the fate of the wicked and what is the fate of the righteous. It is not the passage presenting the gospel but a passage declaring the people as two types of people and setting down God's attitude toward them. That which is given at the end of a chapter is an unconditional statement of the blessings which God is giving to His people, to those who are putting their trust in Him. "I have seen his ways and will hear him," he says. "I will lead him and will restore comforts to him and his own." ~~He is not there saying,~~ "If you do what is right, then I will do this." He is saying, "I have seen his works." He is there stating an unconditional situation. So he is promising that there are to be two classes of people. "Here are the wicked whose punishment is described and in contrast to them there are the righteous who are to be blessed who are trusting in their own ~~righteousness~~ righteousness which is only filthy rags and in contrast to them there are those who are the ones trusting in Christ. There are those with them who have received from God and they have not turned to him, but it is not through any goodness on their part but it is His unmerited favor in the grace of God shown to these who are described as those who trust in God. Now here you have the presentation of the future of the two categories.

Here you have the presentation that of the future of the two categories and it ends with a reference back to the other side, those who are not regenerate. ~~The~~ wicked are like the troubled sea. The sovereignty of God is ~~lxxx~~ in the background of this passage. There is a description of the two classes and a description of God as dealing in sovereignty with the one class in accordance with their works and with the other class in accordance with His favor, with His grace, His unmerited favor. It is through no goodness of ours that we are saved but entirely through His favor, the result of His righteous and holy will. But why He should have picked us we cannot say. We know it is not because of some good thing that He foresaw but entirely as a result of His holy will and His righteousness.

When in 58 we have again a description of rebjke ending up with blessing, but here there is much more of a conditional note. Whatever condition there might be in the previous chapter is an inside condition. It is the description of two classes of people and the result that will come to them. "ut in this one we have a problem presented. People are faithfully performing the ordinances ordained of God and they are receiving no blessing. What is the answer?

(Question) Now in 57 he says, "He that puts his trust in me shall ~~xxxx~~ possess the land and shall inherit my holy mountain." Is that spiritual entirely or is that material entirely or is it a ~~xxx~~ combination? He says, "He ~~hxx~~ shall say, cast ye up, cast ye up. Prepare the way. Take the stumbling block out of the way of my people." He is going to--this, of course, 14, you can't say about it. It would fit with either interpretation. 15, "Thus saith the Lord, I dwell in the high and holy place with him also with a contrite and holy spirit." That, of course, is a spiritual blessing. 16 and 17, describing his general relationship. 18, "I will lead him also and restore comfort to him." Are the physical comforts ~~xx~~ or spiritual comforts? It does not say. So the only ~~xxx~~ place where there is a question as to whether it is a spiritual blessing which is considered or whether it is one which is material relationship, is where

it says, "He that puts his trust in me shall possess the land." Does the land mean regeneration? Does the land mean heaven? Is the land a figure for something like that or does it refer specifically to this earth? "The meek shall inherit the earth," Christ said. Is that a prediction simply of spiritual blessing or was it a literal statement of dominion over this earth which they were to have? Whatever your decision is about that statement of Christ will doubtless be your decision in this particular verse here. That is a question then which is laid out before you and refers really ~~xxx~~ only to the one verse. I don't think there is any need of speaking dogmatically.

So we go on then to the next chapter.

(Question) It is true that in the original notes of the King James Version that they go through the prophets with headlines. Everywhere that there is rebuke for sin, they say "rebuke for sinful Israel" or "God's punishment upon Israel." Everywhere that there is blessing they say, "God's blessing upon the church". That that is the way that God is going to deal with His church. Now I was justified in dividing this particular chapter in that way. The name of Israel is not I believe mentioned once in the chapter. Therefore there is nothing in the chapter to say that it is specifically dealing with Israel. There is nothing in the chapter to say that it is specifically dealing with other than Israel or to say that it includes both Israel. There is nothing in the chapter to tell us about that. The first part of the chapter begins doubtless with the people of Isaiah's day or with the people of Israel a certain time later. It is purely a reasonable interpretation that ~~is~~ Israel is in mind in the first part of the chapter. If there is ~~xxx~~ anything in the latter part of the chapter to suggest that he is dealing with different people, I don't see what it is. I don't see until you get to verse 19, "^{peace} ~~preach~~ to him that is far off and to him that is near." That verse would suggest that God who brings these blessings to Israel also brings ^{them} to people ~~xxxx~~ at a distance. So it would seem to me that he is talking probably primarily of Israel. in verses 9 to 13a. Also in verses 13b to 18

primarily of Israel, but the principles that he gives are applicable to the sins of the wicked leaders of the Gentiles, the wicked leaders of professing church, the immorality of members of the professing church that they are applicable in principle but that the first application is Israel who is spoken of. In the last part of the verse it would mean that he is speaking of those ^{who} come out of Israel who put their trust in Christ. That they are the people whom he has in mind. Whether this also includes others outside of Israel there is nothing in the context to say, nothing to suggest that it does. until you get to verse 19 where God says that He who says "peace" says it to the distant and also to the near so that I doubt if you can find much evidence aside from verse 19 of anything ~~xxx~~ apart from Israel in this particular passage. I think *end of 33*

This is another good question raised. I hope you all have definite ideas.

Now if there is no further question ~~of~~ by anyone on this chapter, we proceed then to chapter 58 where we have in the beginning of it God's rebuke and here He says show the house of Jacob their sin. That would seem to refer to Israel. Israel performing the services God has given but not receiving God's blessing. Why? Because they are making the services an end in themselves. Because they are doing the services as if thereby they ~~would~~ won God's favor and not recognizing that the ethical element must be predominant in religion. The modernist talks a great deal about the ethics of religion, about living Jesus' way, following Jesus' way of life, applying Jesus's principles in all sorts of social problems and conditions and situations. It is very easy for the fundamentalists to react against that and say that we are not interested in such matters. We are interested in the church and the proclamation of religion. That is an utterly false and wrong reaction from the modernists' attitude. The Lord does not say that you should accept that. He does not say that you should not perform. He does not say that your relation to him is not the primary and all-important thing, but He says that if this is true in your life, it will result in an attitude towards fellow man.

It will result in kindness and helpfulness. It will result in friendliness. It will result in helpfulness to those who are in need. If these results are not found in you, you can question whether your religion is really true or whether it is a sham or a pretense or is a farse. He nowhere says here that fasting is wrong. He says that fasting if it is done with the thought that you can fast for strife and ~~is~~ debate and smite with the fist of wickedness, that is a sham and a pretense and accomplishes absolutely nothing. So he is speak'ng here about a wrong attitude toward religious ceremonies, a wrong attitude toward religion which fails to let it work itself out as it should in the life and in the actions and the attitudes. The religious ~~xxxx~~ matter is the primary one and the heart's relation to God is that which is the matter and is a thousand times more important than any sort of social improvement which may amount to washing themselves by wallowing in the ~~xxxxxx~~ mire instead of getting a new nature. But that ~~xxxx~~ doesn't say that it shouldn't be. It doesn't say that these things shouldn't have a proper place, and above all it does require sincerity in the heart and in the attitude of the man and helpfulness and kindness for them. The fruits of the spirit involve a righteous kind of ~~xxx~~ ~~xx~~ helpful attitude toward others. That is stressed.

(Question) Where we find commandments in the Scripture we should follow them out as an outworking of Christ's love in our hearts and we should examine our hearts to see whether we are carrying them out, to see whether we are showing true love toward the brethren and to those who are without. If we are not, we should pray God to give it to us and we should request Him very definitely whether we are following the truth. It isn't ~~something~~ signing a creed or declaring your belief in a platform or your apposition to those who disbelieve that makes you a Christian. You are made a Christian through belief in the Lord Jesus Christ for salvation but if you truly believe in Him you are going to show a kindly attitude. You are not going to love your enemies because ~~if~~ you say that you got to love your enemies. I have just got to do this. I am going to love my enemies.

You love your enemies because God gives you a heart of kindness toward them and you pray Him to give ~~xxx~~ it to you.

(Question) Because becoming a Christian doesn't teach you what to do but it gives you a heart that desires to do. Then you have to be told what it is.

(Question) He is making it obvious. We should be able to work it out for ourselves from the effect of sin we are apt not to. ~~Rxxx~~ Somebody has said that the ^{Epistles} officials of Paul with their tremendous emphasis on faith and that their salvation is by faith. Salvation is by faith alone and are just filled with practical admonitions for good Christian living. We'll never reach heaven by good Christian living but we'll never reach heaven without it. It is not the means of salvation but it is the results. If we don't have it, we had better question pretty seriously our relation ~~xx~~ to the Lord. But, I say, that the questioning should be ^{of} ~~by~~ ourselves and not of the other fellow. ~~xxx~~ A person can know for his part whether he is saved but it is often very, very different to be sure about the ~~xxxx~~ other person. In God's sight it isn't where we ~~wxxx~~ are but what direction we are moving in. We can't always see what direction the other fellow is moving in. One of you can pick up any kind of liquor and feel not the slightest desire to touch it. Another one has inherited a terrific appetite for alcohol and has a terrific longing for it and it is very, very ~~difficult fo~~ difficult to keep from falling into the sin. Such a man might fall repeatedly into the vilest of temptations and still in God's sight be a far better man than the man who never touched the thing because he never had any desire for it. We don't ~~txkxwxxx~~ deserve any particular credit from God for not committing the sins that we have no craving to do. That is not particularly wonderful if you avoid a thing which you just ~~xxx~~ don't feel like doing. There is nothing to be commended on for that but the man who does have those ~~e~~ cravings, the man who has the background who makes it very difficult, he is the one ~~xxxx~~ who if he doesn't do it, deserves God's favor and there is real proof that God's spirit is working in his life in giving him victory and strength. It is

that you don't need. You might need it just as much as some other thing, some attitude of unkindness or ~~mistreating~~ by criticism of other people in which in God's sight may be just as bad as the terrific sin into which the other man falls. You cannot judge the other man. You can help the other man, but you can't judge him. You can judge yourself. If we all spend more time judging ourselves and more time in helping the other fellow and less time criticizing, we'll all be better servants of the Lord. 82

Well, now this chapter then gives us this criticism on the Lord's part of a wrong attitude toward ceremony. It doesn't mean that ceremonies are wrong. They have their place. Then it proceeds to tell how if you have the true attitude, if you have the regenerated spirit within your heart, if you do the ceremonies as something that remind you of God's goodness, draws you close to the Lord, and helps you to seek His favor and to commune with Him. Then your light will break forth as the morning and your health will spring forth speedily. Wonderful spiritual blessing. Your righteousness will go before you. We are not spiritualizing these passages. I believe spiritualization is always wrong. I don't believe spiritualization means recognizing the spiritual blessing. I think that it is an unfortunate term used to cover up a very wrong method of exegesis. Here we have spiritual blessings taught. Wonderful spiritual blessings which come to those who use God's ceremonies rightly whether they be Jews or whether they be members of the olive tree after the time that the wild branches have been ~~cut~~ grafted in. You ^{cry out} find the Lord answers. The Lord blesses. The Lord satisfies your soul and drought makes fat your bones. Some of you are going to build the old waste places and lay the foundation of many generations. A ~~restorer~~ restorer of paths to dwell in. Going to build up the wonderful things that have been torn down. Whether it be the Jews' return from exile and rebuilding Jerusalem which has been destroyed or whether it be the person in any land where sin has done its work and it is doing its work exceedingly in land after land. Rebuild that which has been torn down. You will

be called the repairer of the gate, the restorer of ~~paths dwelled~~ past dwellings. If you turn away your foot from doing your pleasure on God's holy day and seek to do God's pleasure on His holy day and on every other day and call the Sabbath a delight and call all of the things which the Lord wants you to do as your light and honor Him, then you will delight in the Lord and ride on the high places of the earth and feed yourself on the heritage of Jacob, your father. These are blessings specifically for the Jew, but blessings which certainly include the entire olive tree.

Then chapter 59 again has rebuke here.

(Question) Everyone's duty to show people their sin, but I don't think it always has to be done in a most personal way, but I think very often of God because it is so easy for us to fail to see the application to ourselves. Like David said when Nathan came and told him about a man who had plenty himself and went out and grabbed the poor man and took away from him. David ~~sa~~ said "who ever did that is going to be killed. We won't stand for that." And Nathan said, "you're the one who has done it." A man told me that he was ~~xd~~ formerly assistant librarian at Princeton Seminary. He told me one day how his son, I think some of you have heard me say this, worked in a store in Princeton and a man there was a man who was supposed to be a Christian and he ground down the people and mistreated them and it was awful the way he treated the employees. This man when the boy came in and told his father about it, he said, "No true Christian should do such things as that. That man is utterly wicked." Then he was invited to preach and he thought that he would really show this man his sin. So he worked up a wonderful sermon on righteousness and business and true treatment with everyone with whom one has business. He preached this sermon with all the power he had and looked straight at the man and when he got through, the man came straight up to see him and he thought, "Oh my, hope he doesn't

hit me." The man got up to him and instead of extending his fist, he reached out his hand and said, "I want to thank you for that sermon and I wish you would do me a favor. I wish you would let me pay to have that sermon printed and to distribute it to my competitors. It would do them good."

Well, I heard Dr. R. A. Torrey tell exactly the same story. He told it of a man who was quite proud and how he was giving sermons dealing with the particular sin of which this man ~~wxxx~~ was guilty and the man after much thanking ~~of~~ how wonderful it was. There were so many people who needed that message. And Dr. Torrey said to that man, "you are the one that needs it the most." He said that he told him right straight from the shoulder and the man said later, "It hurt ~~xxxxxxx~~ like everything but it was good for me." There are times when it is the thing to do--to show the man specifically his sin and it is the duty of every Christian worker to do that at times. But those times are to be selected with care and ~~the~~ tact. The man who goes around constantly rebuking other people soon gets to a place where nobody listens to him. They should be selected with tact and with care and the opportunity watched for to do it. You will find that there are those who are always going around just laying other people out and nobody listens to them and they have no ministry. There are others who never do it and who are so simple and loving in their preaching that nobody ever gets the point. The trouble with an exhortation to people is that if you talk about the need of pointing out people's sins, then the people who are naturally spoiled and troublesome will get out and do it all the more and make their influence less. If you ~~talk~~ talk about the need of ~~con~~ *34-1494 few wds.* then the people who are already so gentle that they wouldn't hurt the wings of a fly are more careful not to hurt anybody's feelings and it is just shows the importance of each one thinking for ourselves and careful of where we are in the scale and which particular thing we need and seeking it out and working it out and also the importance in our pastoral work of the personal help to the individual trying to see what he can't see himself of his particular need and

trying to give the particular help he needs. ~~It is always~~ People are all to willing to be just kindly and grateful. For about fifteen years every time I preached anywhere people say, "What a wonderful sermon." Then they don't even invite me back again. And it took a long, long time for it to dawn how very polite and gracious they were. Then it dawned on me that they were all just very gracious and they said it was a nice sermon and they liked the encouragement, but actually ~~they~~ there were many, many people they would rather hear than me. They probably still are. But I set to work to try to change that balance a little bit and I worked pretty hard on it for a while. I made some very definite ~~improvement~~ improvement on it. I have no doubt about it. *end of 3 4.*

(Question) In 58 we must interpret all this in the background of 40 to 56.
In 58 it isn't a specific matter of you do this and God does that, but he is pointing out exemplifications of the fact that they are not receiving God's favor. They need His grace. He pointing out the conditions which if they are not met you don't receive His favor and you can't prove them. If you turn your foot away from the Sabbath from doing your pleasure on my holy day and call the Sabbath a delight, holy of the Lord, and honor Him, and not do your own things, finding your own pleasure or speaking your own words. Well, now that is like the ~~golden rule~~ Golden Rule. ~~Your~~ You try to do it once. You require God's power to do it. You cannot do it in your own strength. These are rather illustrations of the character of the redeemed as compared with the character of the ungodly than particular conditions if met would be given God's favor. They are descriptions. They are like the Lord's prayer. For give us ~~the~~ our debts as we forgive our debtors. One interpretation of that would be, if I forgive those who sin against me, then God will see what a good man I am and He will forgive me. But that is a false interpretation of the prayer as far as relevant to any group at any time or any period in God's plan is concerned. It does not mean that. It cannot mean that. What it means is that the ones whom God forgives are those who are

forgiving others. We are praying ^{and} that God will forgive us and we are forgiving others. We are carrying out in our character the type of thing that we are expecting God to do for us but we are not giving it as a reason why God must bless us because we are kind to others.

(Question) This passage by itself wouldn't ~~teach~~ teach the other, opposite. It wouldn't teach that. This passage by itself you could look at and try to say, here are the rules. You obey the rules and God gives you the blessing. When you find what the rules are, you find you can't keep them. So this passage by ~~itself~~ itself would not teach salvation by works but it does not explicitly teach salvation by grace. If you take it in connection with Isaiah 40 up to this point you have salvation by grace pretty clearly taught. You don't have to have the New Testament teaching together. It is pretty clearly taught here. It is not so specifically in this one sense here. This one chapter alone would not teach salvation by works. It sounds somewhat in that direction until you examine it further. Then you ~~have~~ find that such salvation by works ^{as} you might think you find here is a hopeless sort of a ~~task~~ task. Something more is definitely needed. Yet God does say that there are those who receive it.

(Question) I personally am inclined to think that when it says "from doing your pleasure on my holy day" he doesn't mean to keep from enjoying the day, but that he means from doing what you want instead of seeking what God wants. It seems to me that what your pleasure here means from doing that which you desire instead of what God ^{desires}. That is, it seems to me, the correct exegesis of that word. I don't think that that particular verse there is a verse dealing with the matter of entertainment. It does not *few wds. 35-5+*
The matter of the Sabbath in this present dispensation is, of course, a rather difficult problem. That is, there are people who take the strongest of views, good Christian people who take the strongest of views quite antithetical to one another. It is a question in which there is considerable difference. I

35-57

think we must say very clearly that the Sabbath, period of rest, a period set apart for God's worship, for rest, is a principle, part of God's moral law taught in the Old Testament, maintained in the New Testament, and to be maintained by all believers. But as to the exact outworking of it, the ceremonial aspect of it has been changed. It is changed from the last stage to the first stage, instead of looking ahead primarily it looks back. It looked ahead then and also back; now it looks back and also ahead. That is, there is a different aspect but in both cases it shows the principle of a plan of God, a progress, and of regularly returning into it. Those are brought out in it. The ceremony of it is somewhat changed but has many points of similarity. The *similaw* of the Sabbath is ~~xxx~~ given in Exodus, a law applicable it seems to me primarily to people who are in an agricultural civilization, who are working hard in physical labor through the week and who are to find rest from their physical labor on the Sabbath day. That is a *similaw* which has application to the particular condition under the circumstance at that time. I do not think that there is a specific law given ^{of} the Sabbath as referring to us today. I used to have a very good friend who was a member of a small group in Scotland which considered to them one of the most important things in life was are you keeping the Sabbath properly which meant not riding on any ^{public} vehicle, on Sunday. This man was put out of his church because of his insistence that though he never rode on a public vehicle on Sunday yet that it was permissible for a person to ride on a street car on Sunday if they couldn't get to church without riding on Sunday. He has a friend who wrote a book called "May Sabbath Keeping Interfere with Church Going". His ~~xxx~~ argument is that if your church is less than ten miles away you should certainly walk there, but if your church is more than ten miles away and you cannot walk to it and get back within the limits of the Sabbath Day, you are justified in taking the street car in order to get there. He and I one day when he was preaching in a church and I was there and we entertained at dinner in the neighborhood and he found that he had left his notes for the evening service a mile away where he lived. It would mean a two-mile walk to get them and come back. But I

got him to lend me his ~~xxxxxxx~~ key to his room because I could get the street car and go and get the notes. So I went and got the notes for him. I feel that it is a case where the thing that we must consider is as Christ said, "The Sabbath is made for man, not man for the Sabbath." Neither in the Old Testament nor in the New Testament is belief in God a matter of the precise ~~of~~ keeping of a detailed set of

regulations but it is a matter of the heart attitude toward God and the seeking to carry out in our lives those principles which God has laid down in the Scripture. Our judgment may differ as to how to carry those principles out. In general I say I have much greater sympathy in every sort of thing with a man who is stricter than the Scripture requires than one who is more lenient than the Scripture requires. But I don't think the Lord wants us to go extremes in either direction. But I think he leaves a great deal for the individual consideration and determination on these matters. I do feel this that as the man who is working at physical labor all the week was commanded in the Old Testament not to walk over a seven-tenth of a mile I believe on the Sabbath Day. He was to rest his body on that day. I feel that as a general principle a man who is dealing with a work of nerve and mind should rest one day a week. I think it is very nice if he can set aside Sunday for the service of God and for the glorification of God. I think that is the proper thing to do. ~~xxxxxxx~~ If his work is mental and Sunday work is the same way, I think it is desirable and proper that he set aside another day in which his mind and his nerves are rested and in which he turns completely aside from these things which are tiring him through the week and also on Sunday and that he take a day of complete rest for his system. I think that in a way the carrying out of the Sabbath principle even though it be done on another day. I would feel that occasionally it might be the Lord's will when it cannot be worked out in another way that a man ~~xxx~~ should do that on a Sunday and devote it for rest for himself from the tiredness which he has received in serving the Lord in the other six days of the week even though it might occasionally interfere with the

religious services which he should normally devote himself to on the day set aside for that purpose. I think in all of this matter the vital thing to get the principle and to try the principle. I don't think that the Lord intends us to ~~get~~ ^{give} ~~the details and~~ us a detailed set of regulations which we can keep right within the letter of and I think that there is a tendency too much of the time among people who are trying to serve the Lord to think that you can put a thing down into precise regulation and that settles the matter. Personally I find it very, very nice when I walk down the street and I see a fellow in the distance and I think for a minute that it is one of our ~~ss~~ students and I rush to catch up with him and have company with him and I find that I am informed that it isn't when he pulls a cigarette out. I know that one of our group does not do that, but I do think that there are many things in God's sight that are far worse than smoking cigarettes and I think that there are Christians who will put a matter of that type into a category which will lead them to neglect weightier matters. I think it is very hard on a great many of these matters to draw a hard and fast line. I know a great many people who wouldn't think of going to a movie picture but who will spend a whole Sunday evening listening to the same people who were acting in the moving ~~picture~~ picture acting on the radio. That certainly is utterly inconsistent. Even if they were different people it still wouldn't be right. ~~You would~~ ^{35-13 1/2 (some cut out here)}

You wouldn't ask ^{that} in sincerity because you know that if I believed ^{it} that I would do it. But the question, of course, is one which I don't think we ought to go into at this point whether in this dispensation we are to observe the day of rest on the first day or on the seventh. The big question is much evident. Personally it is my opinion that the evidence is sufficient for doing it on the first day of the week, but I don't feel that in this particular class we need to take time to go into that and I don't think it enters into this particular point.

(Question) I think it doesn't. I think the renewal of waste places is a specific, literal expression. I don't think it has any reference to something

purely within the heart. I think that the raising up of the old waste places describes the persons returning from exile, coming to the cities which have lain in desolation as the result of the exile which came from men's sins and rebuilding it. But I don't think it refers only to their return from exile. I think it also refers to the case of a nation which has turned away from God and where God has been forgotten and which a little group of Christians begin serving the Lord effectively and are enabled to build ~~it~~ up an effective center of service to God. I think that is restoring waste places but I believe that verse 12 is a specific, literal statement. I don't see any point of a figure.

(Question) Well, I don't think spiritualism is in any sense a ~~xxx~~ antithesis to literal. ~~That~~ I think all ~~the~~ the blessings ~~xxxx~~ of the Scripture are spiritual blessings. They relate to the heart. Otherwise there is no value at all. ~~That xxx~~ God doesn't promise to fill a wicked man with physical pleasure but He promises to give a righteous man the pleasures of this world as well as of the next in many cases.

(Question) There are ^{material &} spiritual blessings as well as in ^{almost end of 35.}
I think the material blessings must also have spiritual blessings accompanying them or God would never give them. I think both are involved. Well, I was thinking we would get through chapter 62 today but we went somewhat more slowly and have covered some interesting and valuable points. ^{end of 35.}

ISAIAH

Aa

- 1/6 Relationship of ch. 53 to chs. 40-52
- 1/5-10 53:
- 2/4 Attitude of Orthodox Jews
Neglected by most; studied by few
- 2/9 54:
3/5 54: Every ch. is Isa. not a unit in itself (like Psalms)
The Book is a unit with definite progress of thought
Sharp breaks but definite progress of thought
- 3/9 Cf. Book about China
4 Suddenly change from geography to history
Or a discussion of features of the U.S.A.
- 4/7 Consider ch. 54 as a unit
4/9 54:1
- 5 54:1 What are the possibilities of interpretation?
5/6 Hardly to be taken literally
- 6/1 54:1 How is this a cause for joy?
6/2 Statement must be somewhat figurative unless the facts be absolutely unknown.
- 6/5 54:1 Reasonable to relate it to the last vs. of preceding chapter.
7 Is a definite result of what has been given just before.
7/5 Is a continuance rather than a new beginning.
- 7/7 54 Whole chapter fits with the tune of vs. 1. An exhortation to rejoice
Reasonable that cause of rejoice is grounded in what preceded.
- 7/10 53:11
8 The servant of the Lord theme
Modern interp. says the servant passages are poems utterly un-
related to Is. which have been inserted by late redactor.
- 8/5-10 Theme running from ch. 41 - 53. "Servants of the Lord" (54:17) are the
followers of the Servant of the Lord (ch. 53)
- 9/1-3 Servants get their righteousness thro the sacrifice of the Servant
9/4-10 G Campbell Morgan's illustration of the ship in the coal mine and the
free gift of eternal life. Cost the company
- 10/1-3 Necessity of satisfying God's justice
- 10/7 54:1-2 Rejoice in view of what Christ has done (in ch. 53)
The children of the desolate
- 11 A picture of salvation going forth to all the world as result of Calvary
11/4-10 Carey's sermon based on this text (54:2) -- a true interpretation thereof.

- 1
1/10 58: General passage of rebuke in early part,; blessing in latter part.
Who is addressed ?
- 2 58: Religious leaders are in mind in first part of the chapter.
- 2/ Emphasis on religious leaders , They carry on ceremonies and forms
but is not inner meaning to them.
- 2/4 58:4 The Lord wants a fast which results in loosing the bands of
wickedness -- breaking every yoke that ties the righteous and
the unrighteous together.
- 2/6 Luther: kind of ceremony not important, but wherether you have
heart faith toward God.
- 2/8 Heart attitude toward God
- 2/10 59 Passage of rebuke.
Social duties show real attitude, whether it is unselfish.
- 3 Social duties given disproportionate emphasiss by modernists.
Stress the spiritual and incidently touch the en the social.
- 3/10 58:4 A seeking unto advantage for oneself.
- 4 One can get delight in a ceremony or religous form , loud singing
or lots of noise, or from a quiet devotional atmosphere. Either
can be that which simply satisfies the flesh rather than meaning
something
- 4/8- 58:1 A need of showing these people their sins despite the fact they
5/2 seek God deaily going through forms and ceremonies.
- 5/3 58:1 Sarcastic?
- 58:3 Parallels Mat. 7:22 Ritual without meaing, form without heart
- 5/7 59:1-15 Paragraph division
16
- 6 No particular designation of leadership. Ethical imperfection of
the nation is pointed out.
- 6/5 59:8 Middle of vs. starts a new paragraph
15
- 6/7 63:
- 6/9 56: Rebuke against the watchmen of Israel
- 7 The Kings contemporary to Isaiah
- 8 Manasseh. Separation of church and state.
8/7 Roman Catholic method one of defense
8/10 Biblical idea is not that of separation of church and state, but
a theocracy.
- 9/6 Leadership over a period of time determines a nation.
9/7 58: Stress on leadership not as explicit as in whp. 57
58: Deals more with questions of religious ceremonies specifically.
57 Deals in general with moral attitudes and

- 10 In early days of ministry, Isa. had only 3 opportunities to speak without hindrance.
Did not have much opportunity in reign of K. Ahaz
Listened to by whole nation in reign of Hezekiah
Little attention given to him in reign of Manasseh.
- 40 - 56:9 Speaking to a little group who realize exile is deserved.
- 11 56:9 Do not know when this was given. Suggestion that it was earlier than ch. 40-56.
- 11/5 Know nothing about how Bk. of Isa. was arranged or who arranged it or when. Contra. Jeremiah
- 11/10 Messages not arranged chronologically
- 12 In general given chronologically in Isaiah.
- 12/3 56:9 Tone similar to earlier part of the book
- 12/6 59: At same time approx. as ch. 57 and 58.
Is looking to the nation as a whole
- 12/8 The arrangement is very definitely inspired. What is meant by inspiration.
- 13-14 Inspiration discussed
- 14/7 Return of Christ - rapture pre- mid -- or post trib.?
15 Rapture question
- 16 Thing must be proven right before I accept it. Get the evidence otherwise reserve judgment.
- 16/4 Dichotomy and trichotomy.
Book has color, thickness, weight & many other qualities.
- 16/8 Body without spirit is not a body but a corpse. Only a body as long as united with spirit. Human personality is both.
- 17/1-3 Not convinced the question can be settled.
- 17/4-7 Buswell's view of a mid-week rapture before the tribulation
7-10 Inspiration, meaning of
18/1-2 -- an infallible guide, sufficient for purpose God gave it, and without error for that purpose.
- 18/2-10 Not to come to Script. with preconceived ideas and look for evidence
Illustration of two trains
- 19 Scripture teaching regarding deceit. Right and wrong approach to subject.
19/1-5 Scripture teaching regarding killing
5-10
- 20/1-7 People hate to think. Easier to memorize two days than think ten minutes.
- 20/8-10 ch.1-35 Jerusalem defended, yet to be punished and go into exile
36-39 totally different section. The prophet is at work
- 21 In the midst of a great deliverance, God predicts that the people will go into exile, not to Assyria, but to Babylon, an insignificant country.
- 21/4 40-66 Gives God's wonderful plan for the future beyond the exile.

- 21/5 56:8 to 63 Two possible interpretations given
- 22/1-4 cont'd
- 22/4 Ch. 28-35 // ch. 7-12
- 22/10 For ch.13-27 to come before or after 28-35 is without significance.
- 23 Chapter divisions
 40 to 56:8
~~56:9 - 59:14~~
~~59:15 - 63:7~~
- 24 Chapter division discussion
 24/6-10 Unconditional promise
- 25 Two classes of people - punishment of wicked
 blessing of the righteous
- 25/10 The presentation of the future of these two categories
- 26/1-4 God's sovereignty
- 26/5 58 Rebuke. Blessing. Conditional note
 26/7-10 57:14-18
 57:13
- 27 57:13 A spiritual blessing or a literal statement about the earth??
- 27/5-10 57 Israel in view tho not mentioned by name
 27/9 57:9-18
- 28 / 57:13b-18 Principles applicable to sins of others, but first to Israel
- 28/38 57:19
- 28/5 58 Service without blessing because performed as end in itself
 Modernist ethics of religion produces wrong reaction by some
 fundamentalists
- 29/1-7 58:3-7 Fasting not said to be wrong, but is speaking of a wrong attitude
 toward religious ceremonies
- 29/8 The outwarking of God's love in our hearts
- 30/2 Becoming a Christian does not teach you what to do but gives you
 a desire to do. Have to be told what it is.
- 30/4 Christian living
 No credit for avoiding sins you have no craving to do
- 31 Must judge ourselves, but help the other fellow
- 31/3 God's criticism of a wrong attitude toward ceremony; not that the
 ceremony is itself wrong
- 31/7 Spiritualization wrong, but is right to recognize spiritual blessings
- 31/8 58:11

- 32/1-4 58:12-13
- 32/4 On showing people their sin. We fail to see application to ourselves. Cf. David and Nathan
- 32/5-10 Assistant librarian at Princeton Seminary's story
- 33/2 R. A. Torrey's sermon to "man who needed it most."
One who goes around constantly rebuking others soon gets to place where nobody listens to him.
- 33/8 Need to find out where we are in the scale of pointing out people's sins or being careful not to offend feelings.
- 34/1-5 Helping others to see what they can't see themselves so they will work on it.
- 34/5 58 Interpret ch. 58 in background of 40-56
Illustrations of character of the redeemed as compared with character of ungodly
- 34/8 The Lord's prayer - The ones whom God forgives are those who are forgiving others. Not a reason why He should forgive us but an expression of our own character.
- 35 This chap. alone does not teach sal. by works tho may sound like it at first
- 35/7 r 58:13 Not from enjoying the day but from doing what you want instead of what God desires
- 35/9 Sabbath day observance
- 36/5 No specific law of Sabbath given as referring to us today
Man who was put out of church in Scotland for riding a public vehicle on Sunday.
- 36/9 Man who left his sermon notes a mile away on Sunday
- 37 Proper use of the Sabbath
- 38 cont'd
- 38/10 58:12 "renewal of waste places" - specific, literal expression
Describes persons returning from exile, and rebuilding waste cities.
- 39 Spiritualize is not antithesis to literal. All the blessings of Scripture are spiritual blessings and relate to the heart.

Material blessings must have spiritual blessings accompanying them.

and then a couple of chapters at least. We'll start with the English part first and I think the first question was: where ~~is~~ the most important division would be that comes ~~at the beginning at our~~ very soon after the beginning of our present section? That is, we noticed that 54 begins a paragraph, perhaps more than a paragraph, a minor section, a subsection begins with 54 and following closely after 53 and between 54 and 55 there is a certain amount of division and between 55 and 56 there seems to be clearly a reasonable place ~~of~~ for some kind of division. Now we asked whether 56 was a unit or whether ^o there was a break in it. I think that was answered last time. Many of you felt that the break came at verse 8. W

Well, then the question that we wanted to decide was, What about verses 1 to 8? Are they a unit? Are the verses 3 to 8 a unit? If so, how can you express in general what 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 words what is stated there? What is the subject of verses 3 to 8? What is the one, complete subject? What would you say, Mr. Stienhouser? Mr. Steinhouser suggests strangers shall be brought in to God's family for verses 3 to 8. What would you say, Mr. ? Those that join themselves would not be left desolate. What would you say Mr. ? That is not as much stressed in the preceding chapters but is it the essential problem here. Of course, it is touched upon here in these verses. What do you think, Mr. ? That is very near of course, what Mr. Steinhouser suggested. Mr. Sit ? That is a little different. Well, Mr. Sit feels that this ties closer with what precedes. Mr. Davidson suggests with what follows. I think that if we look at the section and try to get the main thought of it. If we look at each verse and see what is it that we are stressing. I think the first verse, "Seek ye judgment and do justice for my salvation is near and my righteousness will be revealed" and it is surely a very general verse. He calls upon people to do what is right in view of the fact that He is going to do something. But the stress is surely on what God is going to do in the first ~~verse~~ verse. Then in the second

verse He declares His blessing on those who keep His law. In the third He says that He is going to give blessing to the strangers and to the eunich--3d and 4th and 5th. He is going to give them a better place than the sons ~~of God~~ and daughters. In the 5th, the sons are the strangers. 6 and 7--they will be brought to his holy mountain. Then in the 8th, He is going to gather not only the outcasts of Israel but others too. It seems to me that in the 8th verse that you find a very repeated stress on what God is going to do rather than what man is ordered to do. The stress is on His word rather than on our word. It is possible that the exhortation to us and it is more of an exhortation to sanctify ourselves in view of what he is going to do rather than in order that He may do it. He is not saying, if you will do these things, I will give you a blessing, so much that it is saying, I am going to give a blessing to my own people. Those who are the Lord's need not feel concerned about background, about heredity, about physical defects, about a person that they can't help, matters that in the law seem to be a dividing out those who are outside the covenant and those who are. These here seem to be adjectives and it seems to say that no matter what their condition or where they come from they are to be given a place right in ~~the~~ His kingdom. The outcasts of other nations will be brought in ^{as well}.

(Question) Well, we have to examine the following and see what it says here. We haven't done that in particular as yet. We have examined the preceding verses. In the preceding the stress in chapters 54 and 55 are not on anything man can do. They are on what God is going to do and ~~xxx~~ as a result of what He has done in 53. The stress is on God's work in chapters 53, 54, and 55. It would seem to me that the stress is on God's work thus far in 56. Now does it continue to be on God's work following or is there a difference? We can't tell until we look into what follows. The stress in 53 is on the work of Christ and 54 and 55--the wonderful blessings that God gives to people as a result of the work of Christ. Now in 56:1-8 there is

rebuke. There is a little note of blessing in verse 15 and in the latter part of verse 18, just a touch of it in the midst of the passage which is predominantly a rebuke for sin. While verses 1 to 8 praise the one who is righteous and verses 9 following in 56 and most of what he said is to rebuke the one who is sinful. So that it would seem to me that 1 to 8 would go more natural with what precedes it. It would seem to me that it is not an invitation though or an exhortation except more or less rhetorical. It is a declaration of blessing that He is going to bring. That being the case it would seem at least a reasonable method of interpretation to suggest that verses 54, 55, and 56:1-8 form a complete unit ~~which~~ which relates to the result of the atonement. The result and the blessing going out to the Gentiles, and the blessing on Israel in the great days for them which are to come, the results on the wonderful gospel call going out to all the world, and the breaking down of the wall of partition between those who seem to be in the ~~new~~ covenant family and those who seem to be outside. The sum of all are to be brought into the kingdom. So that that would seem to me to make a definite unit finishing the section that began ~~really~~ really at chapter 40--that whole long section from 40 on ~~which~~ which reaches its climax in 53 has its results described in 54 to 56:8 and at chapter 59 you enter a section which is the first section in the so-called II Isaiah that you could read and imagine you were back in the I Isaiah. That is to say, any section between 40 to 56:8 here is very different from practically anything in 1 to 39. A great part of 1 to 35 consists of rebuke ~~of the people~~ the people for their sin. In this section there is sorrowing over their sin frequently. There are passages where the sin is pointed out and given as a reason for a reason for the suffering which they are enduring. But the direct rebuke for sin such as is quite common in 1 to 35 is not found between chapters 40 and 56:8, but there is very little to separate between 56:9 and what follows through here, and many effects of the earlier ~~portion~~ portion of Isaiah. You seem to be then going back to the type of material starting ~~with~~ a section

which seems to be unrelated. Between 39 and 40 is one of the most obvious and important breaks in the book. Very likely this book here is one that is almost *as* important perhaps less important as the break between 39 and 40. And the archbishop left it right in the middle of a ^{chapter} ~~sentences~~ -- left the first half of ~~chapter~~ took the last half of one great long section of 16 chapters and the first half of another long section and put them together into one chapter, a very deceptive chapter division. Of course, we have occasionally a verse division which is just as bad. Does someone recall that one in the Psalms which is I think the worst verse division I've ever seen anywhere in the Scripture. It is in Psalm 19:4, "there line is gone out into all the earth and their words to the end of the world; in them has he set a tabernacle for the sun." A poem of three stanzas of which we take the last half line of one stanza and the first half line of the next stanza and combine them into one verse. What a ridiculous verse division. We can't blame ~~omax~~ that on the archbishop. This was done many centuries before his time, but it is quite similar to the chapter divisions. You don't often such bad verse division. Only once, however. This is the worst you will find anywhere. *1/8*

Go ahead to day into the section which starts with 58 and see how far you go before you get another division of some importance. Do you think the division between 56:12 and 57:1 is as important a division as between verses 8 and 9, Mr. ? Do you think it is as important ~~max~~ as between chapter 55 and 56? I don't see any excuse for a chapter division there at all--between 12 and 1. It seems that it is just a continuation of very, very similar material. The same general subject--not even a paragraph division. I know that it is interesting that there is a paragraph mark here in this Bible put in at verse 9 and another one at verse 3 ^{in 57.} That would mean they wouldn't think there was one at the beginning of the chapter because I don't think they usually put them at the

beginning of chapters.

Now continuing along ~~with~~, Mr. Williamson, how far would you say then before you get a division of some importance? ~~ix~~ 58. That is what is considered by many ~~Bible commentaries~~ Bible dictionaries to be one of the two most divisions of the last portion of the book of Isaiah. That is, many say that you start at ~~Isaiah~~ Isaiah 40 you have a main division there and the main division continues until you have a chapter that ends with a statement similar to this one that ends 57. You recall where that is? Yes, at the end of chapter 58. There is no peace, saith the Lord, to the wicked. At the end of 57 there is no peace saith my God to the wicked. Then at the end of chapter ~~58~~ 66 it tells that they shall go forth and look upon the carcasses of the man that have transgressed that their worm shall not die, neither shall their ~~be~~ fire be abhorred. That is not a repetition of the same phrase but somewhat a similar idea. So the statement is made in many books that this phrase, there is no peace saith my God to ~~the~~ wicked, is the end of each of these two main sections and a similar verse at the end of the third ~~xxx~~ main section and that that divides 40 to 66 into three main sections. To my mind that shows a great danger of attempting to divide passages according to artificial indications. If you have a solid difference of material in a passage, very often you will find that the writer of the passage has indicated the divisions by putting in a new start. Such as in Micah where you have a ~~start~~ start starting with the words, hear ye. Occasionally you will have each section ending with a phrase like this. Such a devise may be used by the writer as an indication, but you should know from other evidences that there is a real reason for ~~ix~~ the division before giving much attention to ~~ix~~ it. The indication alone proves ~~alone~~ absolutely nothing. In this case it is my opinion that those who have been led by this implication have been utterly misled. I do not see any reason for a break here between chapter 48 and 49 that is more than a ~~mere~~ mere chapter division. It seems to me that the

main thought goes directly on from 48 to 49 with a ~~stiff~~ definite chapter division but nothing more. Over here between 57 and 58 it certainly does not seem to me to be one of the two or three main divisions in the book. That is not saying that Mr. Williamson might not be right in saying that it is an important subsidiary division, but certainly not one of the main divisions in the book.

Now as to whether it is a subsidiary division or not. What leads you to think that it is, Mr. Williamson? Yes, but I think it is well to try to put these feelings into words. Sometimes they are just right and sometimes they are not and if we can express it in words, if we can bring it out into consciousness, then we are in a position to judge whether it is a feeling based on evidence or something that maybe based on superficial consideration and all of us may have feelings of the one kind or the other. They may be very helpful to suggest questions to ~~investigate~~ investigate but not to reach a conclusion. So here the subject which is discussed in general in chapter 67 is the sin of the people. In 58 the subject which is discussed in the first few verses certainly would seem to be the sin of the people, wouldn't it. Verse 4, "Behold you fast for strife and debate and to smite with the fist of wickedness." Ye shall not fast as ye do this day to make your ~~voice~~ voice to be heard on high. Wilt thou call this a fast and acceptable day to the Lord?" It is a rebuke to the people for ~~their~~ wrong types of worship. Now of course, there is a difference at the end of 56. They were rebuking the bad leaders of the people. There is in general rebuke in 57 of bad leadership and of wickedness and of various types of the people. Here ~~there~~ there is a rebuke of wrong types of worship. There is a difference in the general though from what precedes. There is also a marked similarity of them. It might be that it would be altogether reasonable at this point to have a subdivision within the rebuke passage. But it would seem to be a rebuke passage. It would seem to me to be still a rebuke passage. We have the little touches of blessing at the end of 57 in verse 18 and ~~there~~ a little before that in verse 13, little touches of it

54:10
but no real blessing passage. Where do we get our first blessing passage after 56:9? Where does it start? Earlier than that? That's right 59 seems to start with a very definite rebuke for sin, doesn't it. But what about the last verse of 58? Is that rebuke ~~xxx~~ for sin? Is it punishment for sin or a blessing? 11 is blessing. How about verse 10, "your light will rise and your darkness be as the noonday?" What would you say? There are two half verses there but I doubt if there is anything longer than that. (Discussion) And in verse 13, but is there any other? In chapter 58. There is not much in 57 about it. Mr. Davis? That is surely rebuke. Back in 57 I think ~~xxxxxxx~~ a very reasonable question has been asked? Is it not true that when you get back there you have rebuke in 10 undoubtedly, rebuke in 11, rebuke in 12, rebuke in the first half of 13. You can't interpret the first half of 13 otherwise than rebuke, can we. The last half of 13 is surely blessing, and 14, what about 14? How do you interpret verse 14? 57:14, "Take up the stumbling block out of the way." Yes, along the line of exhortation but is it a continuation of the last half of 13? It is rather strange that that verses 13 and 14 should be two verses. If you are going to have two verses there, wouldn't it be better to make the break after "vanity shall take them" but he that putteth his trust in me shall possess the land and shall ~~inherit~~ inherit my holy mountain and shall say cast ye up, cast ye up, take up the stumbling block out of the way of my people." That is the declaration of the blessing for the one who puts his trust in God that he is to be able to really accomplish something. The one who is trusting himself ~~and~~ in his own alleged righteousness, vanity will take him, but the one that is trusting God is going to possess the land and inherit the holy mountain and to bring blessing to others. The exhortation of this next verse is an addition to being an exhortation a definite statement that he is to bring blessing to others. So the last half of 13 and 14 should be thought of as blessing. What about 15? Is 15 blessing or rebuke? 15 is a wonderful description of the blessing of God to the humble. So it is blessing. Then 16 is blessing. 17 is referring to God's wrath in the past but leading up to

verse 18 which is blessing with an incidental touch on past rebuke and is an introduction to blessing.

(Question) In other words ~~xxx~~ you would feel that there is a relationship here to the previous material but that it differs in having this rebuke section first. That is that it is a section similar to earlier parts of Isaiah but yet that it has sufficient difference to indicate that it properly comes after 53 rather than before it. That is a very interesting thought. So that it is probably warranted to say that the rebuke passage which begins in verse 9 of 56 continues with rebuke until the middle of verse 13, and then ~~xxxx~~ rather in verse 13 you have a switch from rebuke that comes to the wicked to the contrast ~~xxx~~ of the blessing upon the righteous which is then given in the previous--that is, the blessing on those who believe, those who put their trust in him, those who are His own--from the middle of 13 on through 18, through 19 probably. Then we have just these two verses at the end which are describing the wicked again. So we have then the very common alternation of earlier portions of the book--rebuke from 56:9 to 57:middle of 13 and blessing the last half of 13 through verse 19. That would suggest then, would it not that you have quite a change at the beginning of verse 20 and would raise the question, are these last two verses a sort of an appendix of a different type from the section which we have just been in or do they introduce a new section? That is rather to say about these last two verses, which is the best way to take them. They don't seem strictly to relate to what follows in 58 and yet they have an altogether different viewpoint from the previous five verses. So we have starting in ~~xxx~~ 56:9 we have a rebuke passage proceeding for a long space and then suddenly turning to the contrast of the blessing. Then in 58 we have a rebuke passage through the first seven verses, or if you want to take the two just before with it--nine verses--and then a very sharp change to blessing in verse 8. This blessing passage runs on how far? ~~xxxx~~ Half of 59? The middle of 9? Well, the middle of verse 9 as it is punctuated in the English here, the first half of verse 9 goes with what precedes and the last half goes with what

follows. It has really two sentences with a half of each sentence combined in verse 9. There is quite a division in the middle of verse 9, but the last half of verse 9 begins with pointing out that if one would turn away from sin and then it continues and tells what the results are to be. The result is blessing as one turns away from sin. *end of 9*

So there is, of course, an implied rebuke in the last half of 9 and the first half of 10, an implication that it is not being done as here described, "take away from the ~~midst~~ midst of thee the yoke and put forth the finger that speaketh vanity." An implication that these things have been done in the past but yet the statement is leave these and blessing will be yours. It is really a blessing passage even though there is an implied rebuke. So I think that we have blessing in verse 8 and the first half of 9, and then in the last half of 9 and through 10, surely 11. How far does this blessing passage here extend? To the end of the chapter; that is, previous to the end of the chapter we find no switch to a rebuke passage. Such rebuke as there is is implication rather than statement and is implication leading up to blessing rather than rebuke.

(Question) Yes, there is a very good question. Does verse 1 of 59 go with what precedes or with what follows? As it is punctuated in the King James Version it goes with what follows. Of course, that doesn't prove it, but that does suggest that there were men with a good deal of study who thought that that was the correct answer, that it went with what follows. It certainly cannot be said that it doesn't go with what follows. It fits rather nicely with the thought that follows and it also can be combined with what precedes. It is not extremely easy to decide which way to take it. I am inclined to think that it goes a little better with what follows than with what precedes, but it is pretty hard to be dogmatic about it. I think that there is a very close similarity of ideas with what follows to suggest that it is introduced in the next statement. But though it sounds that though verse 1 sounds like blessing, it may really be a rebuke. It sounds as if God is

strong and entirely dependable ~~that~~ therefore why do you sin so? That is a rebuke. It is pointing out the goodness of God as a reason why it is very strange that you are so sinful. So just as above we had verses with an implication, a strong implication, of rebuke leading on to blessing, here ~~here~~ we have a verse which has a strong implication of the possibility of blessing but which introduces probably a rebuke. So it would seem that there is good reason to suggest that the archbishop did not make a mistake in the chapter division between 58 and 59. Well, if verse 1 of 59 introduces verse 2, then verse 1 is a portion of a rebuke passage. If it is, how far would it go? To 15. Does anyone find a blessing section previous to verse 15? ~~that~~ Well, does anyone find any earlier than 14? a blessing passage? A change from rebuke to blessing? How about verse 10? Is that rebuke or blessing? It would seem to be confession. It is confession of sin and is closely allied but it is a little different type of material. It certainly is not blessing. It is seeking blessing but I think one should notice that between 8 and 9 there is a rather definite change. Up to 8 you are describing the sinful condition of people and in 9 you turn to the first person and describe the suffering condition of the sinner. ~~that~~ Therefore because of the sin described here before, therefore we are suffering. It still continues the rebuke passage because it still is showing the effect of sin and is showing the condition of suffering and misery in which they are whether it is the ~~that~~ statement of people actually in this condition or a prediction in advance of the situation into which people would come expressed thus in a dramatic form. Either of the two ways you take it, it still can very properly be combined with a rebuke passage, but one should note the rather important subdivision between verses 8 and 9. When that goes through verse 12 and through verse 13 certainly. Verse 14 is not blessing is it? Everyone would agree, I think, that verse 14 is continuing the description of the suffering which is the result of sin. How about the first half of verse 15? Is that blessing? ~~that~~ "Yes, truth fails and he that departs from evil makes himself afraid." Is that a blessing? "One that turns away from evil finds the evil

people setting on him and treating him very meanly. That is not a blessing surely. That is a statement of criticism of the wickedness of those who mistreat the one who wishes to turn away from his evil way. So that the first half of 15 as Mr. Lin pointed out is very clearly a continuation of the rebuke idea, the picture of the sin and the suffering and the result of sin. But the last half of verse 15 one must question. Does that properly belong with the first half? It is not a brand new start like a chapter. It is nothing like that. But is it properly connected most closely with what precedes or with what follows? It ~~connects~~ connects with both but with which does it connect most closely? (Student answers) We are describing in previous verses the things that the people have done. Judgment is turned away. Justice stands far off. Truth is fallen away. Equity cannot enter. Truth fails. He that departs from evil makes himself afraid. A long continuing statement of the condition of evil and wickedness. But then, and the Lord saw it and he saw that there was no judgment and he saw that there was no man and wondered that there was no intercessor. Therefore His arm brought salvation. Surely the sentence division ought to be or the verse division ought ~~to be~~ to be in the middle of verse ~~15~~ 15. It is rather an absurd verse division. The two belong together but they belong together as sections of two divisions that belong together. The first half of 15 goes with what precedes and the second half goes with what follows. There is a very sharp division at that point. Now as you have noticed here that beginning with 56:9 we have a passage of rebuke which goes through two-thirds of the chapter of 57 and then we have a blessing passage. Then in 58 we have a passage of rebuke for seven verses and then a blessing passage. Then in 59 we have a rebuke passage for $14\frac{1}{2}$ verses and then we have a blessing passage for $6\frac{1}{2}$ verses. Now as you note the ultimatum, what does it remind you of? Does it remind you of anything in addition to that? In Micah, yes. We notice that in the ~~Prophet's~~ Prophet's Course that in Micah you have rebuke, blessing, rebuke, blessing making

up the book. Three sections each of which has rebuke followed by blessing. And we notice that in the book of Isaiah your first six chapters not so sharply as Micah but nevertheless in general can be divided the same way. Rebuke with a sharp change to blessing, rebuke followed by the description of the blessing of prophet with his pleadings from God. You have a three-fold division, three sections related to one another each of which has two parts--rebuke followed by blessing. You have that again here from 56:8 you have such a section. You have three of these. Well, now, we do not feel that the number three is necessarily a holy number that you must always divide into three parts. ~~But when you have three~~ and therefore when you have three you stop. So we want to see. We have these three. Does a similar alteration continue further or is there a now a change to something else? That is something for you to look forward at and to gain an idea of what follows. But at least we have here after 56 a structure similar to that of Micah and to the first part of Isaiah--rebuke followed by blessing, rebuke followed by blessing, rebuke followed by blessing. Thus a definite unit whether it ends at that point or not, whether we have three or four ~~other variations~~ more such alternations we can look ahead and see or whether it is the start of a new division or the continuation of the last part of that. We can look on and work that out and we can say this much so far that we note that from ~~the~~ chapter ~~40~~ 40 through 56:8 we have ~~the~~ a symphony working forward treating of different themes one after the other bringing them to the ~~the~~ fore and discarding them and taking up others with the one great thought of the servant of the Lord which begins in 41 and runs right through and is climaxed in 53 and finds its great results in 54 and 55 and the first half of 56. Then we have the start of another ~~subject~~ structure, a structure quite different from the general structure of 40 to 46, a structure which is very similar to our structures but some of the content of it seems to require the material of 50 to 56 and a background for it. It would seem to be another section which properly comes after that section but which is a distinct section and has a distinct type of structure.

(Question) Which chapter? Yes, well, that is a very good question to look into and to see what direction the evidence points. Does it point that Isaiah one hundred and fifty, no, two hundred years before the ~~ix~~ return to Jerusalem, or one hundred seventy-five I guess, that he is sitting down and writing something that is meant specifically for people at that time or is he writing something which has an ~~ix~~ immediate and definite interest to the people of his own day and is also vital to the people of his own day., perhaps having a greater reference to the people of that day but yet not exclusively, having a real meaning for the people of his own day and a real purpose at his own time even though part of the purpose is for them to realize the fitness to a future time. That is the question that is worthy of consideration.

(Question) That is a question to examine at a future time. Just how much difference or whether there is a marked difference that one is definitely in one area and one later. Certainly from 40 to ~~53~~ 53 is definitely a unit which belongs as a consideration of that which is to come afterwards. There is no question about that. That addresses the people of Isaiah's day, the Godly people that are convinced that they are to go into exile. Now you can express the Godly people seeing the exile of the northern kingdom and seeing the sin of the people of the southern people and knowing that Isaiah has predicted that the southern kingdom is to go into exile and that the sin of the people for which they refuse to give up must inevitably lead to punishment, punishment such as they have already seen just a few miles north of them. In that situation the Godly people realize that they need comfort and they are in their minds practically as if they were in the exile and it is very reasonable for Isaiah to sit down and give them ~~xxx~~ under the leadership of the Spirit of God an answer of comfort to their fear that all is over and that the exile is certain and there is nothing to hope for. It gives them great consolation and this consolation which he gives the Godly in

his day is very applicable to the Godly when the thing actually comes to pass that these people know are coming to pass. So from 40 to 56 there is a very definite application to Isaiah's own day and also a very definite meaning for the people when those things come to pass in his own day regard as certain--the Godly. But when you get into these rebuke passages here ^{would} ~~with~~ the Godly in Isaiah's day think of, realize, that after the return from exile, people in Jerusalem, there would be such sin as requires this particular type of condemnation. Would there be any particular point in giving this type of rebuke to the people of Isaiah's day to the Godly people. When it comes to the unGodly people of Isaiah's day there would be no point in giving them rebuke that wouldn't apply to them but would apply only to the people of ~~22x~~ two hundred years later? It is rather a different aspect altogether to think of this as *and of it.*

that is very good. That is doubtless included in it--the idea of the urgency of the command expresses the fact ~~that~~ that it is available and also ~~that~~ that perhaps the person may not realize the situation. I was talking with a man out in Arizona who told me of an experience he had had. He said that a man who had been carrying on some engineering ~~work~~, some construction work, down in one of those great valleys in the lower Colorado River region. He said that in that region there where the man was doing this ~~work~~ construction work if he wanted to send a message to another one and so he asked a young man who had been working there a brief time with him there to carry this message. He said that to get to the other place by road you have to drive up and back here and way around and go a hundred miles to go a distance that was only about ten miles across the desert. So he asked this man to walk across the desert here ~~instead~~ and carry his message. And ask them to send some stuff over to him by car that was needed which they would put on a truck and bring. Three days later the stuff hadn't come. So he began to wonder. So he got into the truck and drove around the one hundred miles

and into the other place which was actually ten ~~miles~~ miles of very rough country away. When he got there they had heard nothing of the young man at all. So he began to wonder what had happened to the young man, and they began to hunt. They found that that young man had lost his way and he went there straight forward through that desert country and he couldn't find the place and pretty soon he got desperate for some water and he just kept going forward blindly hunting for that water and just blindly going forward dreaming of streams of water and figuring he would come on to one. He just kept going and when they found him he was walking forward and he walked right straight across a highway which he ~~could~~ could have followed a couple of miles either way and gotten some. He walked straight across that highway, ~~straight~~ straight across a railroad track which would have led him to a place either way, and he was just going forward blindly going for that water which he had no idea where it was. He was just heading there. His mouth was so swollen that he couldn't talk. He couldn't get any words out at all from his mouth as it was utterly swollen. They had to give him just a few drops of water a little at a time and gradually bring him into a condition where he could drink normally. He ~~was~~ was just frantically going forward with no realization of where he was going or how to get there or anything and they had to practically knock him over in order to stop him and tie him up in order to give him a little bit of water and bring him back to a normal condition. Now that perhaps is something of an analogy of the person who is frantically hunting without showing any realization of it. You just have to grab him and bring him in to what he needs, as he has gotten beyond the point of realizing it. He has gone into his disease so far that he doesn't realize what he needs and he is going in the opposite direction to that which he needs. He feels the terrific need and he is heading on trying to seek something that he doesn't realize what he is doing and he is doing that which is the exact opposite to what he should be doing. So there is the urgency of this

command, "Come to the water." Why keep heading that way? Come over here
~~and~~ near to the water. You ~~don't~~ know it is here, but here it is. You don't
realize that it is what you need. You don't realize what you are seeking, what
you are lacking but you have a terrific lack which ~~is~~ ^{has} completely altered your
understanding of life. Come over here. Here is what you need. A tremendous
command with a declaration involved in it. Here is ^{the} water. Not only here is water.
You have no idea you can get these wonderful things. You have no way to pay
for them. You don't realize that you are utterly without means. You have to put
yourself in the position and realize you are utterly without means to reach
it but that there is one who has paid the tremendous price and who has made it
available and that he invites you to come and buy. He urges you. He commands you
to come and buy because he has paid the price. So he says, come and buy and eat.
then you say, how can I eat? I haven't the money to pay for it. I cannot do it.
Well, it continues--come and buy without money. He answers your question. When
he says come, buy and eat, and you say, how can I eat? I have no money. Well, come
and buy without money and without any price. What are you to buy? The water that
you so desperately need. No, not merely water; not merely the satisfying of your
thirst but far beyond that. The vitamins and the nourishment and the solitude that
you need--the wine and the milk. This word wine, of course, ^{isn't yaien?} means the grape juice.
It might be fermented or it might not be, but it is the grape juice. It doesn't
have any thought of intoxication in the verse but it ~~is~~ indicates that which in the
Old Testament represented as especially desirable, especially desirable and
nourishing and pleasant. Wine and milk. So we have this rhetorical structure here.
Come and buy and eat and come. The one "and" ~~expresses~~ in the English expresses
greater division than the other. In English we have more different words to
expression variety and division and so the King James makes one of those ands, "yea"
which of course, is Old English. In modern English you might perhaps say "yes"
come, or you might make it "Oh" come. Or you might just make it 11-6 1/2

come and buy and eat. Come and buy and eat. A new style. The "and" connects two main sections each of which has three sections. So the "and" in Hebrew is much stronger than the English "and". The English "and" is very strong as it is, but this is still broader and often in English you have to get the shade of connection in order to express that "and" correctly. So this first verse here then is not simply a few words to mean an invitation to someone. It is a strong command to those who are in a certain condition and it is perfectly absurd except that there is another factor which is not mentioned here but is ~~assumed~~ assumed. The answer to that assumed factor here must, of course, come in Isaiah 53. It comes right after it and it ~~declares~~ declares that which is possible as a result of 53. It never could have been given earlier in Isaiah until that was presented. Well, we are not getting through this ~~xxx~~ chapter so fast, but there is a great deal in each of these.

Let us look at the next verse, Mr. Meisky. Money is a comparative new thing in the last few centuries well within a couple of thousand years. Before that they did not have coins which had certified how much they were worth. The idea of certification on a coin is to tell you that this coin includes so much metal, its weight is so much. ~~xxxxxxx~~ Prior to that they would weigh out money. They would put so much on the balance and see this amount of metal which they would give over. That was done in the mines in the early days in the western part of the United States, too. They would weigh out gold, such a weight of gold. So the word here "weigh" comes to mean to pay. Why will you pay money for what is not bread? These are people who don't have any money. How can they pay money if they don't have it? Now there is a contradiction, isn't it. There is a paradox. The people are people who don't have money and they are told that they are paying money out for what isn't bread. This is a paradox here. In other words the idea is not strictly the literal idea. These are the people who don't have any money. They are the people who do not have the money with which to purchase the thing

desired. It is as if you might say, "Here is this fine automobile which is available for \$2500 and you don't have anything like that, but you can take it. Here it is yours. Somebody is paying the price so you just take it." Well, the man says, "Why are you working so hard and saving up your money to spend for that kind of an old jalopy which is absolutely useless. Here you can take this which ~~is~~ you never could possibly own. It is yours. Someone else has paid for it. Why do you spend money? You do have ~~money~~ money? This is for him that has no money." It seems to him that has nothing that it is comparable to that which you would expect ^{to be} ~~was~~ needed to secure that which is desired. But the man is making effort. He is pouring out his energy. He is spending his money. He is weighing out that which represents the labors that he has gone through. Your labor for that which is not satisfying. Why do you pour out your money and pour out your effort for that which does not fill your need, when there is available for you that which you couldn't hope to take? That which you could never secure but which has been secured for you at tremendous price by the one who has paid the tremendous price to get it. So there is the question here which is a rhetorical question. Why do you do it? What they are doing is saying they are doing it. It is not asking you a question, why do you do it? Please explain just why you do ~~that~~. It is not a question in that sense at all. It is a rhetorical question. It is a figure asking why you are doing it. It is pointing out the fact that you are doing it. What is the reason for this? Well, I'm not doing it. I never dreamed I was doing it. Well, look here it is exactly what you are doing. It is like when I came up to a man once. I had a friend ~~student~~ American student, and he lived over that way and I lived over this way and one morning he was going to meet ~~some~~ someone at a certain subway--there were three levels to it--and he was going to meet them there. If I happened to get there I would meet them, too, and go on with them. But I wasn't sure whether I would or not. This other person came in on a different line. He came in and converged here. I came in and I went down to

the second level and I didn't see ~~them~~^{him}. I walked down to the third level and there I saw ~~them~~^{him} walking back and forth. He had been there nearly an hour. He was lost in thought and he was walking back and forth along the platform and I said, "Why are you here walking back and forth? Why are waiting where no train comes?" He never dreamed of such a thing. He was ~~not~~ lost in thought walking back and forth there and when he looked down he saw that they had just ~~started~~ hadn't laid any track there. No train had come in there. He had been there a whole hour. He hadn't noticed any. That became a rhetorical question, but it was a means of bringing something to his attention. He was waiting in a place where there was nothing to wait for. He had been walking back and forth there an hour. He hadn't noticed that no trains had come in during that hour. We went upstairs and the next train that came in brought in the person ~~and~~ that he was waiting for so we got there just in time. But he says

But he says here, ~~xxxxxx~~ "Why do you spend your money for that which isn't bread." Well, he says, "I never thought of it. I thought all these things would satisfy me. I put all my effort out to get these things in life and what seemed to me to be worth while." Actually it isn't bread at all. It is not even nourishment. It won't give you anything. It will never satisfy. As Christ said, "The one that drinketh of this water, will thirst again; but the one that drinketh of the water that I give, will never thirst." And so the verse continues then.

(Question) *end of 11.*

but we just want to know who they are so that we won't be shocked if they have something unprepared.

Now let us take a little while looking at the Hebrew a little faster than we did last time and then come back to look at particular points on it. Let us look at chapter 55, verse 13 first. 55:13, Mr. Moffitt., you can read that then.

Now as to the point at which we were looking and continue our discussion of particular features. By the way, before we go on to that, the quarterly meeting of the Presbytery is held next Monday afternoon....^{12-1 $\frac{1}{2}$ -2}

Now we could make up the meeting some Friday for two hours instead of one or I could give you a test. Which should we do?Then we'll make it up then.

(Question)

Now then ~~less~~ let us look at 55 where we were looking last time. We had come along in our discussion to verse 2, I believe. We noticed that in verse 1 the call that is given here to come without money but it is not an implication that the thing is free, simply that someone is paying for it. That which man could not do has been done by another. Wonderful things are available. They are freely paid for by another. Then the rebuke to those who are spending their money with no results and giving their labor hoping to find satisfaction and are not finding it. They are assured that there is something which will give true delight and that this something is something which they can receive. There is no sense in giving their labor and effort for that which they cannot satisfy. It does not mean that you give your labor for that which can, because the previous verse says that the thing that truly satisfies is secure without labor.

(Question) No, that wouldn't be it. You get it without your having to do anything about the price of it. That is the implication. You are invited to come and buy but it is stated that you can buy it without money and without price. In other words someone else pays for it. No. It is worth it. The idea of the verse is that you couldn't possibly buy it. If you ~~tried~~ tried to you wouldn't have sufficient to pay for it. You can secure it without price because someone else paid for it. It rests back on 53 ~~because~~ because Christ paid for it. Of course, that is implication in the verse. The statement to buy without money and without price doesn't mean certainly that it is worthless. It means that you don't have to

pay the price for it. So then unless there is further question on verse 1, we'll look on. We looked at verse 2 last time. I think we need to look a little further at it.

"Why do you weigh out gold for that which is not bread and your labor for that which is not satisfying?" We didn't look at this next word-- 12-5^{1/2}
What is that form, Mr. Ludlar? Yes--an infinitive absolute is a rather peculiar Hebrew construction. It is so far as I know not used in any other language except those which are influenced by the Hebrew and more or less more in common. Sometimes it is translated as if it were a participle. It certainly is not a participle. It is a word that stresses the verb idea apart from all conditions of time or relationship. Ordinarily when it is purely stressing it, it precedes it. It may follow like this or it may stress it, too. Now here^{ar}, really here^{ar} or following it, it may have the idea of continuation--here^{ar} and here^{ar}. The translation "hearken diligently" is not bad. Do really hear. Try hard to hear and hear, listen, listen. Continually keep on listening to me. There is something that is worth more ~~that~~ than casual attention. It is worth constant attention. You are spending your labors. You are laboring hard and not finding satisfaction. You are spending what you can accumulate of this world's ~~instrumental~~ ~~instrumental~~ instruments, negotiable instruments. You are spending them and you are not securing satisfying bread for it. You are not receiving real food for it. But listen continuously. Keep on listening. ~~to the gospel word.~~ Through listening to the gospel word you can find satisfaction. Through listening to the message that God gives you can find that which is the true bread of life and that which is true satisfaction. You have to listen to the word. You have to pay attention. Hearken ~~that~~ diligently to me and eat. The translation "that which is good" is quite a good way to represent the fact that it is a noun. Eat good. Eat something that is really worthwhile. Then the next 12-8 (Hebrew) is of course, a fifth . Is of course a feminine form. It is either 12-8^{1/2} third feminine singular or what else? Whenever you see a word with no set form and

Hebrew

third, feminine singular. ... No, I was speaking about the person. It is either third feminine singular imperfect or second masculine singular imperfect. Speaking of people, you might say "you" would be right. What would a feminine have to do with it? Why would a feminine form be used here? So the soul of life being feminine it is "let the soul be delighted--let the soul find delight" find delight or be delight itself. Let the soul delight itself in that which is luxurious, that which is fat, that which is like cream. Let the soul delight itself in these things. How are you to get that result? By listening and keep on listening. Listen to the Word of God, to the gospel call. The chapter is rather unique in the Scripture. It fits right exactly in. Its thought is contained all through the Old Testament. It is nothing new. It is the truth which is taught to the Israelites by Moses. It is the way of salvation and is known at all periods. It is here made very clear in connection with the 53d of Isaiah. It is similar to the situation which you have in the Psalms where you have the 22d Psalm describing ~~xxx~~ in such exact terms the crucifixion of Christ and implying rather clearly the resurrection immediately followed by the 23d Psalm showing the life of the one who has been saved through His death, and here you have the 53d chapter and here you have the 55th showing the blessings and the pleasures and the satisfactions which can come through listening to the Word of God and receiving that which is made available through what he did as described in the 53d chapter. So hearken diligently and eat good. Consume that which is really satisfying and your soul, let her delight herself with cream.

(Question) ~~xxx~~ _____ is a word which means life or soul. It is not really a metaphysical word. It is a descriptive word. It is rather hard from some of these terms to try to determine the exact constitution of the human personality. God could if he chose have taken the constitution of the human personality and have given a specific technical term to each feature of it and then have informed the people as to what these terms were and instructed as to what they meant. Then have proceeded to use them in that way, as if you were

writing a book of mathematics or a book of law. But that is not what He did. He gave us a book in which he uses the language of the people and uses words in the terms in the way in which the people used them, but used these words in such a way to express His truth. Often no matter what words He uses by the very nature of the human language it would be a difficulty in expressing the exact teaching on many points. Then when you get into matters like this concerning which man did not know and does not now know the full answer to the question of the nature of the human personality with the relation of the different portions of the personality. We cannot express from the Hebrew words ~~those~~ ~~which~~ those people came to use in a popular way and as they were used here to frame exact answers to these problems.

12-12-22 We cannot do that. ~~We~~ I traced the word through the Old Testament ~~one~~ and found that the word is a word ~~which~~ I believe never used of a disembodied spirit. It is always used in connection with a body. I think body would be a better translation than spirit. You have to use one or the other. The word some say describes the whole man with the spirit in the ~~body~~ body. Some interpretate it that way, but it is ~~an embodied~~ an embodied spirit. Sometimes we translate it "life"; sometimes we just say "soul". The nepha is connected with emotion, connected with feeling. The nepha grows strong; it grows weak. It may even be spoken of as God. The rhua which is generally translated "spirit" is something far more ethereal than the nepha. There is a distinct difference between nepha and rhua. They are certainly not the same, but it is a question whether they can be definitely separated. Either the nepha includes the rhua or they are different aspects of the ~~man's~~ man's personality rather than different portions. That is perhaps as far as you can go on that matter regarding it. Comparatively little was known in Old Testament times and not a great deal more is known yet. A great many people with a little knowledge of the few facts which they have observed or ascertained either from the Scripture or from experimental studies. People build great, tremendous theories on them.

Let your nepha be light itself. Let your soul, let your light, let your being be light itself. It is not a term used purely of ~~spirit~~ spirit. Our English

word "soul" has come to mean something very similar to spirit and it is quite different the way the English word "soul" is used to today from the way the word "nepha" is used in the Old Testament.

Then the third verse continues the appeal to the people. It continues this exhortation ~~with~~ which really is not an exhortation but a declaration. It declares that these things are available and calls on the people to take advantage of that which is available. The big features of it really is the pointing out that they are available and then, of course, the ~~exhortation~~ exhortation naturally follows and it is his desire that it should follow. *end of 12.*

So then in verse 3 the exhortation is continued. "Satu". What is the root of satu? (Student answers) You see first your "hey" with a on it, and when you have a word starting with a free form of it with a patha under it, you immediately think of . The hey is a brief form of it. Then what is the first radicle? The first radicle would then be nun wouldn't it assimilated into the tate. So nun would be the first radicle and then you have your second radicle tate and when you have an ending "oo" right after the second radicle it shows that it is so that it would be "nautau" to stretch out. Stretch out your ears. That is an idiom which we are not likely to use in modern English and so it is very beautifully translated "incline your ear"--turn your ear toward me--stretch it out. Literally, put out your ear--stretch out your ear.

Looku is from what root? To go or come. It is motion. It doesn't say whether towards or away from the speaker but the next word shows its source. Come unto me. Then again we have the same word that we had just before. Hear. The emphasis is on the hearing, the gospel call--hear. And again a femine. To heed. Let it live or it shall live. Hear and let your soul live. Hear, and your life and your soul shall live. It brings life not merely to the spiritual portion of you. It brings life to your whole being. The whole man is safe. Certainly you can't save the man without saving his spirit--that is the vital thing. God does not merely

save his spirit. The whole man is effected and there will be a resurrection of the body. Your life and your soul will live.

(Question) Yes. Come to me. That is very definite. Come to me. Now who said to come to him? Yes, and who is the one? Who says to come to him? the one described by It may be God or it may be [^]Isaiah. It is God or it may be specifically the servant of God, the one who has done great things. He says that he will divide the spoil with the mighty. He is giving this gospel call, come unto me, all ye that are weary and I will give you rest. The "unto me" very definitely shows that it is either God who is speaking or it is the second person, the servant of God. Come unto me--hear, listen, and your soul shall live. I will "karah" literally as you know "karah" is to cut. The word "to cut" is used in connection with a covenant regularly. They cut a ~~temporary~~ covenant. It is the way of establishing something that is cut out. It is used very frequently in the Old Testament--to cut a covenant; to establish a covenant. The King James Version translates it just to make a covenant which is probably as near as you could come in modern English. This Hebrew idiom, to cut a covenant. And I will cut to you a covenant of "olam". The covenant of olam. We had in verse ¹³~~12~~ I believe it was--the sign of olam, the sign that stretches on into the indefinite future. It is the covenant of olam. I will cut with you not a temporary agreement but a covenant of long duration. What is this covenant that he will cut with his people? What is the agreement that he makes? It is the 13-6

Take that last word--amonamim, the last word of verse 3. What is its use in the sentence? (Student answers) It modifies . Its masculine plural ending shows that it must be either be a noun in the masculine plural or an adjective

modifying a masculine plural noun. Where it is an adjective, an attributive adjective, because it ~~xxx~~ agrees with its noun in number, gender, and definition. These sure ones, the established ones. The established what? The established 13-6 1/2

is constructive because it would be dative and it must be immediately followed by the word with which it is constructed. And adjective would come later. It is the sure, the established, the amen mercies. Mercy is not a very

good translation.

(Question) A very good question. It would naturally be something ^{13-7 1/2} but you have and what is that "awe" on the end there? (Student answers) How many know? Well, it is a little hard to bring out the whole sometimes. In English we generally represent it, "let me do it". That is an English idiom. You are not going to give me permission to do it. You are not saying, enable me to do it. What you are really saying is that it is my desire to do it. Let us do it. We will encourage one another to go forward and do it. ~~itix~~ In the singular, let me do it, means that it is my desire to do it. I would like to do it. I want to do it. So here, I will cut with you, means I desire to cut with you. That is the result if you come and will listen and hearken and will come to me, then I will cut the covenant, but is expressing my intentional desires for my people. It certainly is not asking for permission. Our English "let" does of course strictly speaking "let" would be permission. Let us go. Give us permission to go. But of course, the way we use it is an idiom in English which means we desire to go. We are encouraging one another.

(Question) I don't think ^{13-9 + 1/2 do)} The "olan" would carry that meaning. The cutting of "olan". (Question) I don't recall ever noticing that. That is a new idea to me. ^{is int} is intention with desire. I don't remember any note of finality in cohote It is not finality so much as suggestion, almost ~~appeal~~ appeal.

(Question) Well, it is not asking permission. I think it sounds a little too ~~much~~ much permission. "Let us do it" doesn't sound like permission; it sounds like we want you to either stand together or fall. But "let me do it" isn't quite the same. It is "I desire to do it." There is a desire here which is sort of carried over to the others. It is not permission but there is a little note--"now you listen and I would like to cut if only you would listen". I don't think there is any finality. I would be interested to know where you got that idea. ¹³⁻¹¹ _{few unit}

(Question) Yes, there is a question what do we mean by the sure ^{13-11 1/2}

of David? What is the ? That translation "mercy" is Old English. I don't think that it would give much idea today. I think it is very unfortunate although we have such a marvelous, usable product. Literary English in the King James Version. When you get to taking it for people today, a tremendous ~~max~~ number of the words just don't have the same meaning today except as they gather them as having heard them in the Bible. Of course, that isn't bad if you get a word that we don't use in English. You take, "behold". It isn't in English today except in hymns or in the Bible. We never use the word "behold" today. Did you behold the B. & O. train this morning? We just don't use the word. Consequently it is quite easy to get your interpretation of it from our human and from our Bible and to form from context an idea as to what the word means. Sometimes we form an idea. Sometimes we don't. Many of the words we read over and over and they are just blank in our minds. I found that very few people have any idea what the word "in thou" means. ^{they} think it is used of God, but it is used many more times of man than of God ^{in the Bible.} The word "ye" to them is absolutely unknown. They think it has something to do with you, but what? There isn't one man in five million who knows. That isn't so bad as those words that people don't know what they mean. When you get a word that is used in English today in a different sense. Then you are just lost. The sense of the word has changed. Mr. Lane was telling me ~~how~~ how the Boy Scouts ~~thought~~ thought the people couldn't get near Jesus because of the press. They asked what the press had to do with it? ~~Did they have~~ Did they have press representatives as early as all that? Now you would never in modern English say that you couldn't get near Him for the press. You would say that because there was such a crowd there or something like that. We just wouldn't use the press in that terminology. So in that case of course, it is quite easy to deduce it from the context what it means. Now this word "mercy" in modern English means to "not give somebody the punishment he deserved." Well, of course, the mercy of God in that sense is a very real thing in the Bible. He did give the punishment to Christ and consequently He freed us from it. But the word "13-14" is used many, many places where that doesn't fit.

The American Revised Standard Version, the Revised Version of 1901, quite generally renders it with the idea of mercy. They translate it loving kindness. Loving kindness, of course, is not a modern English word. We never use it except in connection with the Bible. I think it comes rather near to getting the idea--perhaps

benevolence is a modern English word which is rather near, and yet benevolence is simply desiring good. This has more the idea of doing good rather than desiring good. It is a very hard word to find any ^{modern} English word to represent it. It is sometimes translated "favor". Someone says to someone else--"show me ^{13-14² (see intro. 1-144)}" and it is translated "favor". It is somewhere in that line of favor, loving kindness, general benevolence working itself out in actuality. So here are the ~~sure~~

the sure ~~loving~~ kindnesses or benevolences or determined good actions of David. Of course, of David, the question is what kind of a Genitive is it? Is it a genitive subjective or objective? Is it the good acting that David did or is it the good actions that were done to David? Or is just the possessor of certain actions that are ~~belonging to David~~ connected with David and that belong with David in some way? These are three possibilities to this. As we are near the end of the hour we will not try to speak of which of the three but let you think it over and see what would the meaning be in the case of these three and how would you interpret them? Then as you look at the ~~xxx~~ next verse and you wonder in the next verse who is the speaker. Who is the "him"? Who is the speaker and who is the "him" asking who is speaking? And in the fifth verse--"to whom is he speaking and who is speaking? Those are questions that are worthy of consideration. If you will think of those ~~xxx~~ (Our time is about up) until next Friday.

I think it is worth asking the question about these verses here--who is the speaker? Who is the speaker in verse 1? Is it Isaiah? Is it Israel? "who is it, Mr. Gordon? A very good point. The person who could make such a covenant could hardly be Isaiah. I will make an everlasting covenant with you. It must then be one of two people. Who could the two be? Yes. It must either be God considered as

the ~~trinitie~~ triune God or it must be the servant of the Lord who is God, the second person of the trinity. Now a reader in the days of Isaiah would not have the understanding of the trinity of God or of Christ as being the second person of the trinity. To him he would say, this is God or it is the servant of the Lord. But those are certainly two possibilities. It is either God or the servant of the Lord. We would say it is either the ~~trinitie~~ triune God or it is Christ, the second person of the trinity. That much we can gather from "I will make an everlasting covenant with you." Isaiah couldn't do that. That could not be done by Israel. The speaker is not Israel. The speaker is not Isaiah. The speaker is either God or the servant of the Lord. Now the statement that would apply to verse 3 and it would certainly seem reasonable ~~therefore~~ to think that it applies also to verse 2 and verse 1. The Lord here speaks. The servant of the Lord can be thought of speaking, declaring that which has been won as a result of the great victory of Isaiah 53 or the servants of the Lord may speak on behalf of their Master. The servant of the Lord, the evangelical preacher, could give this message here speaking not in his own name but in the name of his Master that Christ will make, that God will make, an everlasting covenant with those who accept the gospel invitation. So we have a very clear gospel invitation in verses 1 to 3 here in which it is either God who is speaking or it is Christ the servant of the Lord who is speaking here. The everlasting covenant which is to be made is evidently further defined by a phrase in apposition with it. In English the word "even" is emphasized and ~~included~~ in italics. Of course, that means that it doesn't belong there at all. The context shows that it is necessary to make sense out of the passage. Now why would the context show the necessity of putting in the word "even"? I very often find myself when I write an article tempted to use a dash. A dash seems to indicate apposition. In this case surely a dash would seem to convey the same idea. I will make an everlasting covenant with you, the sure mercies of David. Or you could say--namely, the sure mercies of David. The word "even" seems to carry a little special idea, doesn't it. It will be as much as

this. It will amount to this much--even. Or even might mean that this is the fact of what it is. Either one of those ideas may be involved in apposition. It is not necessarily involved. Either of them contains something of an interpretation which would, of course, be based upon the context.

Now the everlasting covenant which is to be made with them is the sure mercies of David. The sure ¹⁴⁻⁵ of David. The sure benevolences or loving kindnesses of David. What kind of a Genitive here is David? What kind of a Genitive do we have? Is it a Genitive of the subjective Genitive? David who provides these mercies? Is it the objective Genitive--the ~~merits~~ mercies given to David? Is it ~~is~~ simply a possessive--the mercies which belong to David? ~~merits~~ Would you think that one of these three would fit the idea or is there one of them which very particularly does not fit the idea? What would you have to suggest on this line? For subjective Genitive you would suggest that it might be the mercies such as David gave. David when he was head of Israel conquered the other nations around and such mercies that he gave them are now offered or such mercies as David, thinking of him as the head of the line, the mercies which are given by his successors, the successors of David, those who represent David. Those are two possibilities in connection with the subjective Genitive. Now how about an objective Genitive? God has wonderfully blessed David. God is going to wonderfully bless you. God gave wonderful blessings to David certainly. Is he going to give the same to those who come and ask for this gift which he here has so freely offered? An objective Genitive--is that what it means? Or a possessive Genitive? Perhaps the ~~merits~~ mercies which belong to David, the mercies which some are some specific mercies, some specific things which were given to David. Are those the ones which are to be yours? Now among these three, which did you think is the least probable one of the three? (Student answers) You think that is the least. Which do you think is the most? You think that the subjective is the most? Either the subjective or the possessive. Which of the two? (Answer: Well, ~~merits~~ seeing that Christ was in the line of David, I would say that the latter, the possessive Genitive, the mercies

that belonged to David.) Not the mercies that Christ gives as being a representative of David, but the mercies which God promises to David in promising him an everlasting house. You think then that this is specifically referring then to the Messianic promises rather than to the mercies which are to be given to David's line or the mercies that are exemplified by the use of David all through his life, ^{treatment} It is rather specific mercies, specific blessings, to him in connection with the Messianic promise. A specific, wonderful thing which God gave to David, the promise of David's greater Son. That is what is here involved. How many think that is the best interpretation? Three. Well, how many think something else is better? Four.

Mr. Moffitt, you have something else you like better or you simply find this one unsatisfactory? You find them both unsatisfactory. You don't know what it is.

Mr. Gordon?

In itself as it stands one has to infer from context. That is, from the exact words you can get the certain realm within which it can be interpreted. Then within these words you see different possibilities and you see which fits the context best. Here it is defining the everlasting covenant which God is going to make. Would it be a reasonable interpretation of it to say that the everlasting covenant that I'm making with you is related to the blessings which I have given David? It is related to the covenant which I have given Him, the promise of one who will not see corruption, the promise of one who will reign upon his throne, the promise of one who will be a light unto the Gentiles. With all of that the result of the promise to David is the everlasting covenant which is made with everyone who accepts the promise. Does that seem to be satisfactory?

(Question or answer) We have to explain it from the light of context and keep our explanations in line with the reasonable interpretation of the particular word. Well, let us take this tentatively now and keep watching for other interpretations which may seem better. We have to do that with interpreting most anything in

language. We have to take an interpretation tentatively and see how many indications we find to strengthen it ~~in~~ in our feeling that that is the correct interpretation; and when we find something which seems to be against it, we examine it carefully to see whether it is something to prove that the interpretation is utterly wrong or whether it is a problem or whether it is something that on close examination proves to be an obstacle. But we take this for the moment then as the best suggestion that we have yet come across. And we have noticed that this verse is either God, the triune God, speaking or it is the servant of the Lord. Verse 3, verse 2, and verse 1.

Now how about verse 4? "Behold, I have given him." Who is the "I" and who is the "him"? That is a question. ~~which~~ What is the answer? First, well, you can't answer ^{it} perhaps the I unless you answer the "him". Who is the "him"? It would seem that there are only two possibilities; one is David and one is Christ. That would seem absolutely necessary. Now, of the two the one which at first sight would seem obvious is David. You just said the pure mercies of David I have given him. I have given David. But when you think of that, it would seem to refer to something in the past, something that did happen. What relevance would it have to the present or the future situation unless David is to be resurrected and given a new position of importance? Were that to be the case then surely it might refer to something which is related to the sure mercies of David but which is not specifically stated as such. In such a case it might be the one who is the fulfillment of the promises of David. The sure and determined and established loving kindnesses which have been promised to David, which are the great covenants with David. They are what is involved in the covenant which is here being offered to those who will come to the water. God makes the covenant with those who appear who will keep that which is good. God gives them the covenant and he says that this covenant, ~~the~~ ~~xxx~~ one who is involved in this covenant, the one who is promising it, the one who David is told is coming, David's greater son, God has given him, not simply an order that David may be happy because he has someone to sit on his throne, not simply because God has promised Israel a place of importance in the world, but because he is to be a

witness to the peoples, a leader and a commander to the peoples, to the nations. One whose leadership is to go far beyond the bounds of Israel, one who is to give many nations the leadership which they need. It reminds us, of course, very strikingly of those promises between Isaiah 41 and 53 about the servant of the Lord--that He is to be a light to the Gentiles, that the isles shall wait for his rod, that the commands are to go out through the whole earth. He is to bring peace and righteousness to all the world. God has established ^{him} ~~them~~ to be a witness to the people, one who brings the ~~light~~ light to them, to be a leader and a commander to the people, one who brings law and leadership and knowledge and guidance to them. *end of 14.*

Then if that is the one who is given, who then is the speaker? Is David ~~that~~ speaking? Is Isaiah speaking? "Who is speaking? In this verse, then, God is speaking. So in this verse if God is the speaker, one of two things is true as far as these four verses are concerned. God is the speaker in all of the four verses or in the first three the servant of the Lord is speaking and in the fourth verse God is speaking about the servant who has just been speaking. Which of these two do you like the best? Do you see any difficulty with the servant speaking in three verses and then the Lord speaking for a verse. There is certainly no objection to having different speakers in a different verse. It is very often in the prophets and in the Psalms that there is a change of speaker. It is very evident in the prophets and in the Psalms. So in this case there is this possibility and it is interesting to think through which is the more likely possibility of the two. Perhaps that can be decided by a study of the four verses. Perhaps it is necessary to go further.

(Question) Yes, except that so far as he is speaking here not so much as what the person is as to what the person does. He is speaking of the wonderful blessings they have received through the person and consequently I don't think he speaks ^{ob} much himself but he is tying it up with the promise. He isn't speaking of himself but he is speaking of what he does for them rather than what he is. So

I think that suggestion is a very good one to think about. I doubt if it is a particular objection to the person speaking. (Answer) Yes, Christ offers Himself. That which the Triune God gave to David, Christ offers. In chapter 53 it varies--who has believed our report. It is the Lord speaking mostly, speaking about the church. Oh, yes. Before this ~~xxx~~ chapter 49 is very clearly the servant speaking--"listen, oh isles, to me and hearken ye people. The Lord has called me. He hath made my mouth like a sharp sword and has said to me, thou art my servant, oh Israel, in whom I will be glorified. Now saith the Lord that formed me from the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob again to him. He said ~~ix~~ it is a light thing. Thou shalt be my servant to raise up the tribe of Jacob. I will also give thee to be a light to the Gentiles." There are a few passages, but this one rather ~~long~~ lengthy where the servant speaks.

Now if we look on to verse 5. Who is the speaker in verse 5? (Student answers) Yes. Now ~~ix~~ is it somebody talking to God? "Thou shalt call a nation thou knowest not." That would hardly be ~~xxx~~ God, would it? God knows all the nations. (Question) No. You could interpret the word "know" in that sense or whether it is to be in that sense. (Question) Yes, in one sense. But then you go on--"because of the Lord, thy God and for the holy one of Israel, for he hath glorified thee." That would seem to suggest that it is not God who is here addressed, but someone else is here addressed. Is the one who is here addressed Israel? Is it David? Or is it the servant of the Lord? I do not think that it could hardly be David. The question is between its being Israel or the servant. While that might be hard to decide on the basis of simply the one verse, I would think that the probability would incline towards its being the servant rather than toward its being Israel as a nation. The fifth verse then would seem to be the Lord speaking which is the same doubtless as the fourth.

(Question) Yes, the holy one of Israel, the one whom Israel is to sanctify.

(Question) No, I think it refers to the Lord. I don't recall in this case

whether it is used specifically of the ~~servant~~ servant. (Question) I don't

that would quite be the case. The holy one of Israel (Question) I rather doubt it. The idea of a holy one is a rather common thing. But the holy one of Israel I think refers to God. It is an interesting phrase. I don't think it is very common. (Question) How do they say it? Holy One. I see. Well, then, that is a very interesting parallel but I doubt if it this particular word here would be parallel to that passage. He says, "for he hath glorified thee" and we haven't had much in this context of Israel being glorified. Israel has been gathered and Israel has been redeemed. Israel has been freed from its prison, but the term glorified seems rather to refer to the servant rather than to Israel.

(Question) Well, of course, there are not a great many passages specifically speaking of the servant of the Lord. I would only be God who would make the covenant. So the phrase, to make a covenant, would suggest ~~it~~ to me that it was God who was ~~speaking~~ speaking unless it is so clearly the servant that it carries the idea of the church. That is a very good point. Now verse 6 refers to a previous line of thought. Verse 6 is very similar to verse 1, 2, and 3. 4 and 5 make something of an interlude. The tone of 6 and 7 are very close to the tone of the first three. The only ~~it~~ difference being that the note of repentance and forgiveness is brought in in verse 7 ^{which} as we had not found in verses 1 and 2 and 3. One, two, and three were the free and unmerited, unearned satisfaction of me. Seven is the unearned and unmerited granting of pardon. The two are very close. They belong together but there is a different emphasis. "Seek the Lord while he may be found. Call upon him while he is near." We have already been given the impression that He is near in the wonderful promises ~~that have been given~~ given in the previous verses. Here we are told to buy up the time and utilize the opportunity. "Now is the day of salvation. Seek the Lord while he is near." Let the wicked forsake his way and the unrighteous man his thought and let him return unto the Lord and he will have mercy upon him and to our God for he will abundantly pardon." Does that sound like God speaking? Those two verses? Those two verses

seems to be the servant speaking. They are either the servant speaking or Isaiah speaking. It would seem to be more likely that it is the servant speaking, giving the author of salvation as a result of what he has done and that that would fit in with the suggestion that the servant is speaking in the first three verses. That the first three and these two would seem very likely to be spoken by the same one. It would hardly seem to be quite the natural thing to have these two spoken by a different one ~~than~~ ^{from} the one who spoke the first three. So it would seem a very reasonable suggestion, although by no means a certainty, that the servant speaks in the first three, that the Lord speaks about the servant in the next two and then that the servant speaks again in the sixth and the seventh. That is by no means a certainty but it seems highly probably. If that is not it you have the Lord speaking in the first five and then someone else is speaking--either the servant or Isaiah. It seems unnatural that it would not be the same one.

Then, of course, in verse 8 you have the Lord speaking but quoted. Is it quoted or is it introduced? This is what the Lord says, "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are my ways your ways." You would think that these blessings would require that they be earned at terrific effort on your part. They cannot be earned by effort on your part. That would be insufficient to earn them. There is no way in which you can possibly earn them. God has provided a way of salvation that you could never have dreamed of were it not for His wonderful revelation of the fact. Were it not for the wonderful thing which He has done in making this available through the sacrifice described in Isaiah 53, it never could possibly have been so. "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are my ways your ways, saith the Lord; for as the heavens are higher than the earth so are my ways higher than your ways and my thoughts than your thoughts." How much higher are the heavens than the earth? The distance is infinity. So infinite are the ways of God to the inferior ways of man and the thoughts of God superior to the thoughts of man.

Then we have another thought expressed in verses 10 and 11. It would ~~seem~~ seem to me that there is perhaps more of a break between verses 9 and 10 than there is between 7 and 8. Because 7 and 8 have still the idea of the utterly unimaginable, unsearchable riches of Christ. The wonder of that which He has done is far beyond what we could have done. In verse 7 our relationship is to something different. Verses 8 and 9 seem very tightly combined with what precedes--with the wonder of God's mercy, the remarkable offer, the free gift, of these wonderful things which God is ready to bestow. But that is not ~~exactly~~ exactly the thought in verses 10 and 11. What is the thought? Could you give in one word the thought of verses 10 and 11? *end of 15,*

Pardon. Is that the word? (Student answers) Well, what about the word? We have been talking about the word right along but what about it? What is he saying about it here? Yes, well, then what one word? No, ~~what~~ ^{not} what the purpose is --that he has told ~~before~~ before. It will accomplish his purpose. What one word would cover all that? (Student answers) Yes, "certainly" or "surely" would I think. I should think the very word Mr. Bennet used would be especially good, accomplishment. Its effectiveness, success, achievement. The thought of verses 10 and 11 is not what is going to happen, is not the free grace of God which he is giving. There is no stress on that in these two verses. That has been stressed all the way up to here. It is not the unsearchableness of God's wisdom. That is not the problem in these two verses. The thought in these two verses is the fact that what he purchased will be accomplished. The thought is that it will work. That success will come to his work. This is not an ~~empty and vain~~ empty and vain invitation. You could go out on the street and you could go up to Market Street and you could go along and say, ~~for~~ "Everybody who is dissatisfied with life or finds that you don't have anything that you like. Come and follow me and I will lead you off to a land where you will be happy and prosperous." ~~for~~ If you walked up and down Market Street and yelled that out for a couple of hours and the police didn't bother you, you might get a couple of drunks following you. I don't know. You

might get children following you, but it is very unlikely that anyone of us who went up there and did that would get many people to follow off to the land where all these things would be given to us. There ordinarily before such promises are accepted there has to be something that leads people to have some confidence in the one who makes the promises to know that he is not just a person out of his mind or a person who is making wild offers but a person who ~~xxx~~ has something substantial to get. The Lord has given here a wonderful offer. Now he tells us that the offer is not going to fall on empty air; that it is not going to do something that is just no attention paid to it. People may say that that sounds pretty but after all why should we bother with that? We have no reason to think that it will amount to anything.

A man came to my wife not so long ago and told her that she could have health and happiness and joy--everything she wants. All we have to do is to pay him twelve dollars a piece every month--just she and I. Then we'll have all this. Well, we may have it. The thing that he would give us may bring almost every advantage, but we ~~xxxxxx~~ hesitate a little about giving him the twelve dollars.

Well, the Lord says here that ^{the} word is not going to be something that is given out and nothing happen. He says that His word is going to ~~xxxxx~~ accomplish what He pleases, that His purpose will be performed. We don't need to worry and say, "well, what can we do? We go out and nobody listens to us. Everyone is turning against us. Nobody is interested in the Lord." He says here that His word will not return void to him but it will accomplish that which He ~~xxxxx~~ chooses. He says that this is just as the rain comes down and the snow from heaven and accomplishes his purpose to water the earth and it produces on the earth. There are changes that come upon the earth because the rain and the snow come down. You look at the earth ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ with nothing growing ~~and~~ dry and parched and dead through the winter and the rain comes down and the sun shines and flowers begin to come up and to bloom and something is accomplished. He says that

Chp
35

just as you see the rain come down you will see the flowers grow up but you look at the desert in southern California where nine-tenths of the year it is absolutely parched and barren and desolate, just dry sand. Then you get a big rain in the spring and you see it just a carpet of wild flowers. you can hardly step without stepping on a dozen of them. This wonderful display produced by the rain when it comes down. It says here that so ~~it~~ is it going to be when his word goes forth. Not that everyone is going to come, not that the whole world is going to be one immediately as soon as they hear the preaching of the gospel, but his purposes will be fulfilled. It will succeed in the thing that he has sent it to. There is a definite declaration here in ten and eleven of something that is a new and distinct idea, ~~say~~ separate from anything that has been declared previously in the chapter. We have been before told unless it would be implied in verses 4 and 5. Verses 4 and 5 do fit in with it. I spoke too strongly when I said different from anything else. The offer was in verses 1 to 3 and 6 and 7. 4 and 5 declared that it was going to be fulfilled--that he would call a nation he knew not and they would run after him, nations that he knew not, and here he says that His word is going to accomplish and do what He intends it to do. God's plan is not a haphazard sort of thing that is simply given out and it is up to you. You can do nothing about it. God has his definite purpose, his definite plan, his definite program ; his word will accomplish its part. We have a part in it. Woe unto us if we fail to fulfill our part, but that which God will be fulfilled. We cannot say that the work of God is held up by the ignorance or indifference of one of us.

(Question) Yes, well, now in this case the ~~word~~ word "word" *Ref. - 16-24* is also often translated "thing" or "^{matter} ~~mass~~". So shall the word be, so shall the thing be, so shall the matter be. But it is here explained by the statement of what happens to this word. The word that goes forth out of my mouth. That, of course, if you want , so shall the matter be, so shall the thing be that goes forth out of my mouth. It is not a group of sounds. Some people seem to think that if you say certain Scripture words in good Old English, people will hear those words

and it will have an effect upon them. That there is something about these sounds. God never says that there is anything sacred about the certain combinations of sounds. They say that when Whitfield preached, they say, that when he would say Mesopotamia, everybody would weep to hear the word, the way he would say it. His word, the combination of sounds had a tremendous affect on them. That is sometimes true.

I attended a conference in Los Angeles once which was supposed to bring together religion, science, and education. At this conference at which they tried to get people--everybody was interested in religion, science, or education. A man was there from ~~there~~ a branch of the University of Chicago who spoke about Christ and he used the most pious tone and he told how Jesus never knew ~~any~~ anything but that he was pious. They told us how when he died, it was the end of his life just the same as it would be anyone else. When he died and was buried he remembered and that was the end. But he told it in such a pious tone that I could see lovely old Christian women in front of me and every time he would mention Jesus one would turn to the other and say, "Isn't that beautiful?" They were just so impressed with the power of his tones that they were paying no attention to the things that he was saying which were denying everything in the gospel. W

Well, that is not what the Lord means about the word of God being effective. It is not the combination of sound. It is the ideal. It is the matter. It is the thing involved. It is the thing that goes forth out of His mouth. It is certain ideas which He has sent forth into the world and these are not new ideas. It is the word which went forth when He said, "Let there be light" and there was light. It is a command. ~~It is~~ This invitation is also a command. It is not simply something that is thrown out onto the open air. It is something which will accomplish His purposes. We are to be His instruments in the fulfillment of His purpose. If we are unsuccessful there are two possibilities. One is that we are not doing it right. We are accomplishing what He wants us to accomplish because we are not doing it in the right way and the other is that we are not accomplishing what we would

like to see accomplished because that particular thing is not the thing which is His purpose. to be accomplished. The first of these being true means that whenever we have any right to sit back and say, "All right I've ~~done~~ done my part. This task is simply impossible." We have to find the best way to do it. We have to study to show ourselves approved unto God. We have to study to seek the way to do it. We have to study to find a way of reaching men with the gospel. Not simply doing a thing as if it were form or ceremony or doing it one particular way because that is the way people used to do it. We have to find how to do it and until we find the effect of it we cannot say that we have truly declared the message of God. On the other hand the fact that God declares that His Word will accomplish His purpose and His purpose will be done means that we have no right to have any anxiety or to have uneasiness or to have dissatisfaction or discouragement. We have the duty of doing the very best both in energy and in method that we possibly can. But we have the assurance that if we do the ~~thing~~ best we possibly can and really do it that God will utilize us for his purposes. And if we don't His purposes will be accomplished through some other channel rather than through us.

(Question) The word "prosper" means to be effective. It means to succeed.

(Question) Yes. It is used I believe in the first Psalm. "Whatsoever he doeth shall prosper." It doesn't say that the man shall prosper but that his efforts are to be effective. (Question) No. It is the idea of carrying out and accomplishing something.

(Question)-how does this protect our view of inspiration.....?)

That of course is a little apart from ~~Isaiah~~ Isaiah here but it is an extremely important matter. What do we mean by inspiration? Inspiration does not mean that these words are magical. The thing that expresses the mind of God is not the words. It is the ideas behind the words. Inspiration means that these words are free from error as they present the ideas. The idea is the thing. But it is the words which are inspired and not the ideas. The ideas

may be revealed but the words are inspired. When we say that the words are inspired we mean that they express the ideas that God wants them to express and that they ~~express~~ it without giving in addition erroneous ideas. That does not mean that these words are a perfect meaning for the expression of the idea. Words by their nature are very poor and useless and the Scripture is made up of human words. It has the weakness ~~as~~ which human words have. But these words are words which ~~are~~ express the truth without an addition. It is an idea which is not so extremely simple but it is extremely vital. When people talk about ideas being inspired they are not talking about inspiration. Ideas are not inspired. Words are inspired. The words give us a true picture of the ideas. The ideas are the truth. But what we have from God are not some vague ideas floating around in the air somewhere. It is certain words from which we can gather vital ideas, and which we study into to learn what these ideas are. In so far as we grasp the ideas out of these words we are getting the true Word of God. But if we merely repeat the words without an attempt to discover ^{course} what the ideas are we are not truly honoring God's Word. Now, of course, it is possible for us to take certain words of the more obvious teaching of the Word of God and simply repeat those words through those obvious teachings and accomplish a great deal of good from that meaning. But that is not getting into the fullness of the Word of God. That is not declaring the whole ~~counsel~~ counsel of God but simply ~~declaring~~ declaring some of the outstanding features of the Word of God. *o. d. b. 16.*

I think this is a little hearer, "So shall my command be." The command or invitation. I think it is a little bit nearer to that. I don't think it really means the Bible as a book except as the Bible is a part of God's commands. or God's means of fulfilling His words. God's Word will not return to Him void. That doesn't mean that every time that if you would cut your Bible up into a thousand sections and throw up a section on every street corner that everyone of those would bring some fruit. That isn't true at all. Although it is true that

God has sometimes in most remarkable ways ~~to use~~ small portions of His word to ~~perform~~ ~~per form~~ most unexpected purposes. But it doesn't mean that every bit of wording which you find here will accomplish a purpose. If that were it, we would have to use the Hebrew words. This is God's word--the Hebrew. The English is only a ~~translation~~ translation. Whether you translate it into the sacred language that King James used or into the ordinary language that people talk today. It still is only a translation and is not the original. The words are not magic. It is the ideas which are included and the words are an inspired meaning of what is meant by the ideas.

(Question) The prophet does not receive a dictation from God with specific words to put down except where it saith "Thus saith the Lord" and God reveals certain words to the prophet for him to put down. In that case you have revelation. God revealing a certain message either by a vision or by something which He causes them to see or ~~something~~ some words which He causes them to hear. ~~But~~ That is revelation. But inspiration is ~~keeping the words written~~ the action of the Holy Spirit keeping the words written in the Scripture from error in the presentation either of that which God has revealed or that which the man has heard and which God desires to put into part of the Book.

A man tells of experiences, observations, historical events. God keeps the writing of it from error. That is what I would say is what we mean by inspiration.

Now there was a second part of your question that slips my mind. What was it?

(Question) The revelation the prophet wouldn't necessarily have to understand. In inspiration there is the possibility that God directed him generally in the selection of subject and kept him from error that the result might be the inclusion of truth which is unknown. We are told in I Peter that the prophet searched what manner of time the Spirit of Christ did signify when he testified beforehand the suffering of Christ ~~and~~ and the glory which should follow. There was much which was not ~~known~~ known to the prophets, but also, of course,

there was a great deal that was known.

(Question) Oh, good. ...I think is quite definitely the name David. As to a common noun, there is, of course, the word "beloved" from which David may be very well be derived. There wouldn't be this form. Then there is a word found in the Morrey Tablet that 17-42 seems to be a leader. That seems to be entirely distinct. I don't think there is any possibility of taking it as a common noun. What is your second question?

I would think that those could be...no. "To sanctify" would be That would be It wouldn't have the vowel on it. See the "be holy" is "behold") to make holy. To sanctify is to feel it. This would be the Holy One. This is not "to make holy" or "sanctify". This is the one who is already holy and sanctified. That would have to be If you didn't have the vowel in it you could say that it was pointed wrong, that they should have pointed it That would be all right, but you have your vowel in it. I don't think that would quite fit. Maybe we had better leave the third question until Tuesday because our time is rather gone and I think you have already studied chapter 54 rather carefully in Hebrew. Suppose for Tuesday then you just take the first eight verses of ~~thux~~ 56 and get them ready in the Hebrew.

Just at the end of the hour we had ~~thux~~ some interesting questions raised. That is the thing I like about a class ~~thux~~ that you get questions raised. It makes you feel that the thing is worthwhile. So last time this question that was particularly interesting about the Word of God. So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth. Just what do we mean by that? "So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth" We had a little discussion about it last time and the whole subject--perhaps more than was necessary for this one word here because the context here makes it rather clear. It shall accomplish that which I please. Very evidently then it is a command--that which I please.

"And prosper in the thing where I send it." The word that He sends out, the command that hHe sends is going to be fulfilled. "For ye shall go out with joy and be led forth with peace." Who is he talking to here? Who is going out with joy? Is th t the word or is it the rain? Is it theheavens or the thought goigg back four verses? Who is he talking to who is going out with peace and with joy? (Student) Oh, you say not those whom he was speaking to in verses 6 and 8 but those whom he was effectively speaking to. Yes. Not the people who are called but the people who are effectively called. If you take it that way it can be those to whom he speaks in verses 6 to 8. Certainly the people who are blessed in verses 6 to 8 are in the ~~first~~ ^{first} instance unsaved people--"let the wicked forsake his way. Seek ye the Lord while He may be found. Our God will abundantly pardon." They are unsaved people. ~~They are going~~ Therefore the people who are addressed in 6 to 8 could not be the people who are described in verse 12 except if something has happened in between. Only on that condition. You might say, Is verse 12 a conditional promise? Is verse 12 saying to the people in 6 and in 8, If you forsake your way, if you turn to the Lord, if you come ~~xxxxxx~~ while ~~His~~ ^{He} is nigh, if you come to the waters, then you will go out with joy and be led forth with peace. Is verse 12 conditional? How many would say, yes, verse 12 is conditional? How many would say, no, it is not conditional? Quite a few think it is not conditional. Why, Mr. Steinhouer? Yes, there is nothing right~~xxxxxx~~ near it that seems to suggest a condition. Yet we sometimes hav conditional predictions without something suggesting it right there. If this verse 12 came immediately after verse 7 or 8, you would almost have to think it is conditional wouldn't you. But what is its immediate consequence? It seems to me that we must take it in connection with the immediate preceding statement of God's effective call. That God's word will accomplish the purpose to which he sends it and then with that in mind you can take it as was said as unconditional. It is to those whom he effectually calls. It is to those to whom the Word goes. "let the wicked forsake his way" but not

necessarily to all. You must not say, maybe none will accept. It is for those who do accept and it is declared the will of God. The Lord's perfect will be accomplished. So to those who do accept, those who are the ones that He pleases shall be brought into the kingdom by His word, to them he says this succeeding word--you shall go forth with joy. I think then that we can fully understand who the "you" are in verse 12 and the "you" in verse 12 is a different "you" from the "you" in verse 6. It is an overlapping "you".

(Question) Chapter 52:12 to 53:12 is giving the basis. That is what God does ~~with~~ which secures these results. 54 is the declaration of what the results are going to be, and then 55 is the means of securing them. Chronologically 55 comes before 54. 54 declares what will happen. 55 shows how it will happen. 53 shows what makes it happen. 55 then gives the invitation on the basis of which 53--we could just as well have 55 ahead of 54 as far as our judgment is concerned. Either one of them could come after 53. 53 leads to both of them. One is the result and the other is the means. 55 is then you might say the chapter of faith as the instrument. 53 is the chapter of God's work on the Cross. 54 is the declaration of these results and the salvation for the Gentiles bringing in again of Israel.

Then the last part of verse 12, "the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing and all the trees of the fields ~~shall~~ shall clap their hands." I've heard people say that "You say that the Bible predicts that Christ is going to return in bodily form and that He is going to reign in righteousness on this earth. Well, that is a literalist. You must not take Bible predictions literally. It is symbolical. Listen to this statement-- 'all the trees of the field clap their hand.' You don't take that literally. Why should you take these others literally." Well, of course, that is going at the problem from the wrong end ~~altogether~~ altogether. "All the trees of the field shall clap their hands" does show that there are ~~figurative~~ figurative elements in it but it doesn't show that everything is figurative nor does it mean

that you just have the right to take anything figurative that you feel like.

(Question) It is altogether possible that there are sounds; in fact, we know that there are sounds here, the sounds which we can ~~hear~~ hear now. But is that what this verse means? (Question) But trees do not have hands. You might say the hands are a figure for the leaves but the leaves do clap together but I don't think that is what it means. I think it means that all nature will rejoice. All nature will be pleasant. Everything seems to sing. Everything seems happy. As to whether there actually is a spirit in nature which can feel happy and indicate singing. If there ~~was~~ was singing in the mountains and clapping of the hands in the trees, there would be a reflection of a rational being. (Discussion) Yes, it might very well be. (Discussion)

(Question) ~~---that~~ ^{end of 17} passage in Romans, "all creation groaneth and travaileth")

If I recall correctly the word there translated "creation" is the same word which is translated "creature" a few verses above and below. So you could say the whole creature ~~xxx~~ if you want, meaning the whole of the body. Is it the body or the whole of the animals or the whole of the creation in general? It could mean any one of them, but it certainly included the human body and it certainly includes the animal creation. The plant⁺ creation is involved certainly in the curse, but let the plant creation actually groan. I think the animal creation actually does. A cat or a dog groan even though it is a different creation from we are I think we think of it as having feeling, as having a certain measure of thought, certainly ^{of} having emotion. We recognize that much of it as emotion, but we aren't apt to think of ~~xxx~~ the trees as having emotion. We think of the creation as groaning--you might say suffering under the hardship. All creation is involved.

(Question) I would be inclined to think that verse 12 --"you will go out and be led forth" It shows the come-outers. It shows... It would hardly be ~~expected~~ a ~~pleasant~~ ~~picture~~ picture of entering into the kingdom

of God, entering into the millenial reign or of coming up to Jerusalem to worship. It is certainly not a picture of going ~~out~~ forth from Jerusalem after the worship. Either it is just a general idea of happiness which seems to me to be taking it too generally. There must be something a bit more specific at least in it or else that there is an idea of a progressional movement. Of course, it is true that the word ~~Go~~ go out can just as well mean let's go out or come out. There is an outward direction. But it would seem to me to perhaps ~~not~~ tie up to a ~~not~~ pilgrim journey rather than of a position in an enduring kingdom. Therefore I would be inclined to feel that verse ~~12~~

12 would apply to this age rather than 18-3 *don't = words*

~~It would seem to me perhaps to tie up with~~ It would show the joy and gladness of the one who is following the Lord. If he has to go out and give up the things that meant so much to him before he entered the kingdom of Christ he goes out not with a feeling that he can bear this, he can endure this, for Christ, but with a feeling of rejoicing as he goes forward in his pilgrim journey even as the Israelites left Egypt and came out as God was leading ~~him~~ them in their pilgrim journey through the wilderness. They purely are a type of the Christian who is coming out from sin and coming out from wickedness and going forth on the pilgrim journey as God is leading him, leaving in tents as Abraham did realizing that this is not his home but that he seeks an enduring city whose maker and builder is God which will be the establishment which God will establish in the next age. I don't think he is waiting for a disembodied spirit for the condition of being a disembodied spirit which we call heaven. He is waiting for the future age toward which he moves forward and ^{for} ~~toward~~ which he is being fitted.

(Question) The pilgrim journey? Yes.

Well, now verse 13 seems to--"instead of the thorn will come up the fir

32:13

tree and instead of the briar will ~~xxxx~~ come up the myrtle tree. It is rather hard to pin that down specifically, because it could fit either condition. It could describe the man sitting under his vine under his fig tree ~~xxx~~ and none can make him afraid. The world with the curse removed. It could be looking on to the end of the pilgrim journey as he is going forth in joy bearing his sheaves and serving the Lord and he is going forward toward that land. The thorn and the briar are removed and the results of the curse are gone and ~~that~~ ^{possible} instead of that all is beauty and everlasting happiness. That is the principle interpretation of it as the state following after God. At the same time when you speak of a journey, you speak of the trees clapping their hands, ~~you~~ there is the possibility that this is describing the trees. That along in his journey the thorn is replaced by the fir tree. I am inclined, rather, to think the other is true because while all ^{nature} ~~creatures~~ rejoice with the Christian, ~~the~~ ~~Lord~~ and he is serving the Lord. Yet he is beset with thorns in his pilgrimage--thorns and briars to pass through. God gives him joy in it all. But he cannot expect the life in this world to be without tribulation.

Consequently 13 doesn't seem to refer to ~~thxxx~~ this life. Is the note of the going out being led forth in 12 to suggest a pilgrim journey? But in 13 the note of the removal ~~xxxxxx~~ of the ~~xxx~~ curse seems rather to suggest the time after this present age. I would incline that from the sense that 13 ~~xxxxxx~~ shows the goal toward which he goes. It is a little hard ~~off~~ for me to see quite how 12 points to the future and to the millenium or ~~thexxxxxx~~ of Christ.

(Question) Well, of course, the verb is simply 18-7! If it is a ^{perfect} conjunctive with ~~the~~ perfect and it has been--you might say--the Lord looking back on His work at the end of the ages and seeing all of this which is a wonderful thing which He has done and has brought everlasting song. Or if you want to take it with the "wow" conversive or consecutive with whether you use

the conservative name or the modernistic term for it. In that case with the perfect it is a rather infrequent construction. The "wow" with the imperfect is very common but with the perfect it is far less common. If you take it that way it could be either "and it should, shall be" or "let it be". It could be either the coercive idea or the simple futurity. This process, this work of God, this leading the people out from their sin whose salvation through Christ, this establishment of the great company of the redeemed who are to glorify God forever. This is to the Lord a name and an everlasting sign. It can be that way or it can be "and let it be for the Lord"--a prayer that it may go forth in a marvelous way, this wonderful thing which God is doing through the great offer in the beginning of the verse and the assurance of it. There will be many whom ~~he~~ will lead to take advantage of ~~ix~~ the offer. You cannot speak dogmatically as to whether it should be "and it has been" and "it shall be" or "let it be". I incline to have "let it shall be", the way our English version takes it but one cannot be dogmatic.

Now somebody says, what are you going to do? How are you going to follow the Bible when you can't be dogmatic whether it is "shall be" or "has been" or "let it be". All these possibilities. That is a very good question and one which a person should be prepared to answer. It is very vital. It is vital for us to realize that there is ^{in any language} hardly a sentence which taken alone without context is not ^{as much} susceptible of ~~a large~~ variations of interpretations as that. Perhaps not that particular variation kind but other sorts of variation. You have to have a great deal of help from context in order to know exactly what is the meaning of one isolated passage in any language ^{age}. Therefore when you have material in context in any language most inevitably there are individual statements and sentences of which in the context you are absolutely sure what they mean and there are many others of which there is a wide range, perhaps a little range in

every case as to exactly what it means. Our language is not a mathematical language. We do not talk in precise points. Our words express areas and our syntactical constructions express areas. That is just as true in English as it is in Hebrew or any other language. They are more precise in Greek by far than in ~~any~~ English or Hebrew but there ~~are~~ there is a considerable range of possibilities. So in this case your range of interpretation here is, of course, as to what the "if" is which I don't think is difficult. I don't think the removal of the curse is the thing that ~~is~~ is the main thing, the everlasting sign. I don't think it is the coming up of the fir and the myrtle tree. I think it is the whole process of salvation which God performs or the product of the process, the great company of the redeemed. It is one of the two. Which of the two it is I don't feel for sure. I don't know as it makes such a great difference which it is. It is either the work of salvation which it does or the saved group, the saved people. Whether we look back on the process and see that it has been or look forward on it and see that it is going to be, he says "let it be so". The meaning is quite clear I think. To me the great secret of exegesis is to ask question and then hunt for the answer. The asking of them is just as important as the answer--to get the right questions to ask.

I have found it very useful lately in studying chapters in Isaiah, trying to take a hold of a chapter ~~and~~ to ~~use~~ use this method. I take a verse and I look at the verse and I say, what is in this verse? Is there blessing? Is there rebuke in it? Is there something about Israel in it? Is there something about the church in it? Is there something of punishment? Is there something dealing with business specifically? Whatever there is you can get anywhere from 4 to 8 elements that strongly stand out in one verse which you think may be repeated in subsequent verses. List them at the top of a page and then put the number of the verse under each of those which are involved in the verse.

Then as you look at the second verse and see how many of these elements are repeated and how many new elements there are. As you go through a chapter that way, pretty soon you find that there are certain elements which only appear sporadically or perhaps very little and there are other elements which you will trace right through for a certain number of verses. It ~~gives~~ gives you a sort of pattern of the chapter and that gives you an idea of the general scope and content of the chapter and pretty soon its main divisions ~~begin~~ begin to stand out. It is ^(a) far more scientific method than to look for the words "~~xxxx~~" "hear ye" or some other indication which you will mark off sections by. You may use such indications or you may not, but the indication is that it is like a sign on a box. This box contains. ~~I said~~ I said to my wife this morning. I said, "I would like some 18-104" which is a disinfectant we use a good deal. "I don't see anywhere in the medicine cabinet." "Oh," she said, "there is some right there." Well, I looked and there was a little bottle that said on it--Dr. ~~xxxx~~ so and so. Take one pill after each meal. She had used them up six months ago and the bottle was handy so she put the disinfectant into it. Well, the sign may indicate or it may not. The important thing is what is inside of it. It is the same way with the verses of Scripture. It is not the headings on the chapter or at the top of the page or even the words ~~xxxx~~ with which it may begin but it is what is the context of the verse. That is what is vital. She said, ~~take a little and see~~ "Shake it a little and see if it gets soapy on the top, smell it, see if it 18-104". By that method of diagnosis I decided that it was the thing to use. I could tell it wasn't pills anyway very readily.

We have a pretty good idea of the content of this 55th chapter. There, are, of course, many further points we could get and a more extended investigation of it and the meaning of particular words and ~~x~~ syntactical construction. But

I imagine we would get more value now to go on to another chapter probably to look back at 54 in more detail now that we have gotten general structure from 54 up to 59 I think and a detailed study of 55. *end of 18.*

Now in 54 we have this chapter which could just as well, I believe, have come after 55. I don't see that there is much necessity of one or the other being the first one of the two. They both follow and one has to be first. Of course, that is one thing about writing. You have to take an order. You have to follow a certain order. You may be divided as to which of the two is the best one to take but you have to select what you are going to say first, what order you are going to take. It may be tremendously important. It may not be very important which comes first.

In this case I think there is much to be said in the order as it ~~stands~~ stands. There are certain logical reasons why the other in some viewpoints might be better. Now 54 began immediately after 53 with a statement in the first verse here which is in the form of a command. What is the real teaching of verse 1? ~~Is it~~ Is it a command? Is it an exhortation? What is it? What would you say? I don't mean just the form but the real meaning of it--verse 1. What kind of a statement would express what is taught here? Would it be a command, exhortation? I don't think it is a command. But I don't think exhortation fits very well. I think declaration is as good as any. I ~~think~~ think he is declaring a fact. He is declaring it under the rhetorical form of exhorting people to rejoice in the fact. But the declaration I think is what is involved here. It is to make them aware of this wonderful thing. We are told what the wonderful thing is in the last half of the verse. The first half of the verse simply introduces it with this rhetorical form by saying, here is something for you to be happy about. That would be a declaration. But

He says you the

he says, sing and rejoice. You say ~~why~~ why? It ~~is~~ a declaration and he goes on and says, "for more are the children of the desolate than are the children of the married wife." Of course, the one who is ~~to~~ to rejoice is again not the real subject of it. It sounds as if it is talking to one person. It really is not talking so much to that person as it is telling us all what the situation is. The ~~purpose~~ person who is addressed in the form of it is the one who is addressed by this adjective here. Of course, this is Old English. Sing O barren. We do not use adjectives that way in modern English. That is rarely. I have known a man who speaks to a woman and says, ~~hello~~ "Hello beautiful." That, of course, is using an adjective in place of a noun. But it is a stereotype form. It is not common English. You wouldn't go up to a person and say, "Hello tall" or "Hello short". "Hello fat." If you said in English the ---If I said, "Who is coming in the door there?" And you said, "Oh, the fat". That is a usage which has disappeared from modern English but which is common in most other languages and which is very common in German for instance. In German they say, Who gave it to you? Oh, the blond. They will mean a man who has light hair. That is the regular use of it. In English it has been lost because our English doesn't have distinctive marks to indicate it. --the difference between an adjective and a noun and particularly the difference in numbers and genders. So we keep it only for the ~~plural~~ plural. If you say the living and the dead are there, and you went to the place and found one living and one dead one, you would say that you had been told wrong. In modern English the adjective used as a subject has to be in the plural. So for modern English you would have to say, "Sing, O barren woman" You would have to indicate that it is a singular which the modern English would never do in this case. You would also have to have a noun to modify it. Now who is the person who is addressed? We discussed ~~that~~ that

to some extent before. We might go a little more in detail now. "Who is the person addressed here? ~~Who would?~~ Is ~~it~~ Israel? It would seem impossible for it to be Israel. "Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear." That seems to be a definite statement that this is one who has seemed to be not accomplishing. What is the form of "thou that didst not bear"? What is the exact form in Hebrew? Feminine, perfect, singular 19-6^{1/2}. Third, singular, feminine. I wasn't sure if I understood or not. Third, feminine, singular, perfect of of the verb . Is there anything ~~else~~ else which this form could be? Is there any other possible interpretation of the verse? A feminine participle? Active or passive? What would be the 17-7 active participle, feminine, singular of 17-7 ?

But you should indicate that you are doing so because their pointing has been passed on for a long time. It is a good tradition and you will find in most cases it is correct but it is not necessarily correct. It is like the verse division in the chapter. It is quite a help, well, it is better than the chapter divisions. It is probably about the same as the verse divisions. It is a help but not to be slavishly followed. So in this case unless you are going to change the pointing, it seems to be definitely a perfect and not a participle. Would you say that this translation, "thou that didst not bear" is

an exact translation? Shall we say is it slavishly literal translation? There are two questions. How many would say it is an exact translation? Raise your hands.

There is a point there that half of it perhaps is a little more exact than it is. I'm not sure whether a great point because I think this is pretty noticeable that you have up to this time. It might mean that you didn't mean 17-8^{1/2}. What I had in mind was ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ another matter. How many leaving this point aside that Mr. Stienhouser has mentioned now, how many from some other ground would say that it is an exact translation? Mr. Gordon, give us an exact translation. That is not exactly what it says. It

gives the exact meaning with a different form. Somewhat ^{like} ~~like~~ the case when I was in Germany, we read ^{Egyptian} a story about a snake on an island and somebody was cast on the island and came up to this snake and the snake was very sorrowful because he had been left there alone. He ^{would have been} ~~was~~ very much interested in a female. Then there had been an earthquake on the island and all the other snakes had been killed and the one that this one had been so much interested in and he was left all alone on the island and he tells his story to the mariner. The Egyptian speaks of the snake as "he" throughout. But in Germany our professor required us in the class of mythology ~~to translate it as~~ in translating it that the mariner spoke to the snake and she answered and she said "I have been left alone and t is female snake whom .. and she said and she went on" And the reason was that in German ~~ixix~~ snake is feminine . So you always have to call snake she in German even if it is masculine. There is a case that in

order to represent it properly in German you had to use a different tense or it wouldn't make sense. Just like in German if you speak of "the girl" you say , because "girl" is neuter. unless she is a ^{9-10 1/2} in which case ~~she~~ takes the masculine form. ~~Thax~~ In translating from one language to another you have to follow the usage of the other language. In ^{9-10 3/4} an English you can't say, "thou that heedeth", you have to say "thou that

So in this case our translation is not taken literally but I think it is exact. As far as this particular point is concerned. I wouldn't ~~call~~ call it inexact. ~~Wxxxx~~ Well, there is one who is addressed, ^{is} the one who has not born. It would seem to indicate. It is a participle--you who are now in this state. Some people say this is Israel and Israel has been cast off. Israel has been cast aside. She no longer has God's favor. She is though of as barren. But she is called on to rejoice because she is to receive God's favor again. More are the children of this one who has been desolate than were her children when she was a married wife, when she was in God's favor before.

There is the interpretation that you find a great many of the commentators give

to this word. Of course, it doesn't fit with the New Testament quotation of it which I think should be decisive but it seems to me that it doesn't fit with

19-11³/₄

either. Unless you are going to change that to a participle the would seem to indicate that she has not born at all, not that she just hasn't been in the immediate situation, You are talking here of two women rather than speaking of one woman in different times in her life. Certainly this figure of being with child here is certainly a spiritual concept. It is not a physical matter that is here involved. It is a ~~physical~~ ^{figure}. I don't know as you necessarily have to say that it is a figure except ~~that~~ as the new ~~ix~~ birth is a figure. It is a figure of bringing children into the family of God. It is a figure of the spiritual birth. From that viewpoint Israel had not been barren in the past. She certainly had brought forth a very great contribution to the spiritual kingdom of God in past. So the contrast here seems to require that there are two different women involved. Each woman is, of course, a figure. They are not real women. They are figures for groups of people, groups of people, for institutions, for nations, whatever you think is the best way to say this. "Thou that didst not travail with child." The definite idea that this was not done. It is one that was previously thought of as unfruitful.

5.4:1

So we have this idea of the spiritual birth in this instance. I don't see any other reasonable interpretation other than spiritual birth. I do not see any reasonable way except that we have two women involved and, of course, there is little of the idea of the Jews involved from some time to explain. You would wonder who they were and what they were. Surely the prophet understood. It is hard to say. But it certainly in the context seems to make the best sense. ~~that~~ There are grave difficulties with any other interpretation. It is the view which the apostle quotes it as definitely teaching. Th

Then what about verse 2? Is verse 2 an exhortation, a command, a declaration?

What would you say verse 2 is not in its form but in its actual meaning?

Yes, an extension and an increase. Now it is gone. It is rather ~~it~~ hard to say whether to call it an exhortation, a command, or a declaration. The declaration I think is in verse 3. Declaration is telling what is going to happen so I would incline to think that this is either an exhortation or a command and is probably some of both. The Lord exhorts us but He also commands us. He addresses us as children with His request but He certainly is entitled to address us with His commands and His requests which we should consider as a command. So we have the command here to reach out and enlarge the place of thy tent. Lengthen thy cords and strengthen thy stakes. We sometimes forget about the stakes. We think of strengthen thy stakes. We think of ~~strengthening~~ going out on a shoestring basis in every direction and just going out here and there, but he doesn't merely say stretch out. He says strengthen the stakes. Make it secure. Make it so that you can stand up.

~~xxxx~~ He doesn't mean for us to do like St. Francis Xavier did when he did to the Orient and he say the thousands around him who were lost and he ~~fix~~ felt so bad about it that he just got some holy water and he sprinkled it in every direction and called out "I baptize you in the name of the Lord" and made thousands of converts every day. He felt that he was truly doing a great work. I think the great old man was in his dotage probably at the time but people speak of it as a great thing ~~ix~~ to realize how important. There are times when someone goes out on a shoestring and God wonderfully blesses. I don't think that that is implied by I *20-2 1/2 - few words*

I think because if one is to strengthen the stakes and to establish the tent ~~xxxx~~ ~~ix~~ ~~ix~~ Our tent or abode in this life is like a tent. It is not a permanent habitation. But to make it ~~xxxx~~ strong so that it can weather the storm so that it will not get so extended so that it will just disappear. I

I think that is a very important thing to remember for our testimony. It is so easy to spread ourselves in so ~~many~~ wide a way and try to do so many things that you don't do any of them well. The Lord wants us not only to extend the force but He wants us also to strengthen the stakes.

(Question) Yes. To whom is it? ~~hazz~~ Mr. Moffitt answered that question with another one but we'll give him credit for answering this one. He said to the Gentiles. (Student speaks) It is certainly not all the Gentiles. Certainly not that. Is the message here addressed in ~~xxxx~~ terms of the figures. Is it addressed to the married wife or to the desolate, the barren one. It would seem that if you are going to make the sharp division between the two, you would have to say the desolate. If you say the children, then, of course, you would have children of both. I think that as a matter of fact that it is addressed to the true~~xxxx~~ people of God regardless of background rather than specifically to the Gentiles. It is the church. It is the people of God. In the age when the first church was put forth. Consequently the preponderance

see note - 20 - 4/14

(Question) Yes. It was unless you follow the figure the closely it certainly does. The barren woman. And that would make it Gentile. But if you take it in the light of a full context I would think that the body of true believers it would be--which involves the bulk in this age but also includes the other. That is in the light of the whole context and something that one could very easily rule out if one insisted on a more closer following. That is, it is an interpretation that involves drawing from a larger context which is always dangerous unless we check at every point. We must do without putting precautions and we must at the same time the closer interpretation is always kept in check by the further context and see what is the wider interpretation and prove it.

Now verse 3 of course, is the declaration, the reason for the command and for the exhortation. That you will break forth on the right hand and on the left. That would seem to have deserted the figure of *OTW word - 20-6 1/2*

To break forth on the right hand and on the left is a figure of enlarging, a figure of extension. Of course, the increase of children, you might say, and breaking out of tent flaps as they become too ~~numerous~~ numerous. But I don't think it is quite as close to the figure as that. I think the figure is more or less left here and the idea is of enlargement and extending. You will break forth on the right hand and on the left. Your seed will inherit the nation and make desolate that to be inhabited. Those, of course, who make it the married wife now as compared to the desolate. The married wife before ~~we~~ *and* ~~discussed~~ *desolate* but now they take the desolate city to referring definitely to the *few words - 20-7*

Now we had better stop now. You have had quite a bit of assignment in the Hebrew. I think for the next time just for an exercise suppose you take chapter 66 for an exercise. Just for this question: divide chapter 66 very closely into paragraphs. I think in two hours you can do that. Decide exactly where you would make paragraphs--not over six or less than two--real paragraph divisions. For a matter of method of now. We'll spend about fifteen minutes next time on it.

ISAIAH

y.

#1

ch	1/3 1/9	56:1	<u>Division reasonable</u> between ch. 55 & 56
wh	2	56:2-7 56:8	What God is going to do rather than what man is ordered to do. Stress is on His Word rather than what man is ordered to do.
ow	2/5-7		The <u>outcasts</u>
ll	2/10	56:1-8	<u>Blessing</u> stressed
re	3/4	56:9-12	<u>Rebuke</u> . The <u>sin</u> of those who should be serving the Lord.
si	3/7	57:12	
	3/10	57:16	
re	4	56:1-8	belong with what precedes relate to the <u>result of the atonement</u>
so			In 40 to 56:8 there is <u>sorrow over sin</u> , but not the direct <u>rebuke</u> for sin such as is common in ch. 1-35
br	5/1-3		Imp. break between ch. 39 & 40
re	5/1		Bad vs. division in Ps. 19:4 A poem of 3 stanzas of which we take the last half line of one stanza and the first half line of the next stanza and combine them into one verse. Is <u>ridiculous vs. division</u> .
ch	5/8		Bad <u>ch. division</u> between 56:12 and 57:1
ch	6		<u>Danger of attempting to divide passages according to artificial</u> <i>division</i> <u>indications</u> .
	6/10		No reason for more than a chapter division between 48 & 49
fe	7		<u>Feelings are helpful</u> to suggest questions to investigate but <u>not to reach conclusions</u> . <i>conclusion</i>
si	7/5-7	58:1-4	Subj. discussed is the <u>sin of the people</u> ch. 57 - <u>bad leadership</u> rebuked ch. 58 - <u>wrong types of worship</u> rebuked
ba			
wr			
	8	ch. 57, 58	Which passages rebuke? Which blessing?
	9/6		Rebuke from 56:9 to 57:13a Blessing from 57:13b - 19
bl	10	58:9,10	<u>Blessing with implied rebuke</u>
	10/6-10	59:1	Seems to go with what follows. Sounds like blessing.
si	11/5	59:1-8 59:9	<u>Sinful condition of the people</u> <u>Suffering condition of the sinner</u> . Break between vs. 8 and 9.
su			
	11/9-10	59:13-14	
	12	59:15	Division in middle of vs. 15 Rebuke for 14½ vs and blessing for 6½ vs. in ch. 15
	13/3		Three fold division : 3 sections related to one another each of which has two parts -- rebuke followed by blessing.

- mic 13/5 ch.56 Structure similar to that of Micah -- rebuke followed by blessing
 re
- my 13/7 40 -56:8 Symphony
- me 14/8 Mental state of the godly similar to as if already in exile.
 co 14/10 Consolation given the godly is applicable to the godly when
 15/1 exile actually comes to pass
- il 15/5-10 Illustration of man in Arizona who had gotten lost in desert
 16/1-10 and blindly walked for water with no idea of where he was going.
 Analogy of the person who is frantically hunting without showing any realization of it. Does exact opposite of what he should be doing.
- wi 17/1-7 55:1 Come ye to the water. Don't realize what you're seeking. CLEAR
"Wine" means grape juice, not have to be intoxicated.
- 17/8-10 Come and buy and eat
 18/1 "and" connects two main sections each of which has three sections
 55:1 A strong command
- we 18/5 Money, coins. To weigh means to pay
 Paradox
- 19 55:1- Illustration of (HELPFUL MATERIAL)
 rh 19/8-10 American student in Berlin. Why you waiting where no train comes?
 20/1-5 Rhetorical question a means of bringing something to one's attention.
 (cont'd)
- 20/10 55:13
- 21/3 55:2 Can buy it without money because someone else paid for it (going back to ch. 53)
- me 22 Why do you weigh out gold . . . ?
Meaning of "hear diligently" -- listen continuously. **Infin. absel.**
- 23 Soul delight itself in that which is luxurious
 cf. with Ps. 22 followed by Ps. 23 -- Isa. 53 followed by 55
- me 23/8-10 Discussion on meaning of "soul", "life" (nephesh?)
 So 24/1-4 Word is never used of a disembodied spirit; always in connection with a body.
- di 7 A distinct difference between nephesh and ruach
- 25 55:3 A declaration rather than an exhortation
 Idiom - stretch out your ~~head~~ ears
 Soul shall live i.e. it brings life not merely to the spiritual portion of you, but to your whole being. The whole man is safe.
- wh 26/1 Whole man is affected. Will be a resurrection of the body.
 by redemption

of 26/2 55:3
su 26/7
tr 26/9

cut a covenant of olam
Olam, the sign that stretches on into the indefinite future
The sure mercies are the established, the amen cercies
Mercy is not a very good trans. *poor*

27/1-5 55:2

"let" -- not permission, but encouragement

co 27/7

cohortative -- intention with desire (?)

me 28

sure mercies of David
Remarks on the word "behold"
Meaning of "thou" and "ye"

me 29

"mercy" rendered "loving-kindness" in RSV
Has more the idea of benevolence, but more of doing good than desiring good.

me

Is sure mercies of David subj. gen. or objective gen.?
Or is it possession?

Sp 29/7 55:3

Who is the speaker, and who is the "him"

Sp 30/
tr 30/8

Speaker must be trine God, or must be the Servant of the Lord. Speaker is not Israel, nor Isaiah
Necessity of putting in the word "even"

Ki 31
ge

Kind of genitive -
David who provides the mercies - Subjective
Mercies given to David - Objective
Mercies which belong to David - Possessive
Preferable

32

cont'd

Ac 33 55:4

"Behold I have given him". Is the "him" David or Christ?

34

The One who is to be a witness to the people, a light, and a leader. He brings law, leadership,

Sp 34/4 55:4

Who is speaking? Various possibilities.

35 55:5

The Lord is speaking which is the same doubtless as the 4th vs.

gl 36
36/4 55:5
36/5 55:6

Holy One of Israel
"Glorified" seems to refer to the servant rather than to Israel
Refers to a previous line of thought - similar to vs. 1-3 (with vs. 4,5 as an interlude)
Close to the tone of vs 1-3, except for additional tone of repentance and forgiveness.
Unmerited, unearned satisfaction
Unmerited granting of pardon

7

1-3

7

re 36/5-10 55:6-7

The Servant speaking.
Spoken by the same Person.
The Lord speaks about the Servant
The Lord speaks

37/1 55:1-3;6-7

55:4,5

37/6-10 55:8

y4

4

ISAIAH

- br38 55:9-10 have more of a break than between vs. 7-8
- ac 38/4 55:10,11 The thought here in one word is accomplishment
38/8 This is no empty, vain invitation
- no 39 God's offer is no wild proposition that nobody will pay attention to
- 39/7 His word is not going to be something that is given out and nothing happen. It will accomplish what He pleases.
- pe 40 55:10 The performance of God's purposes
wo 40/8 Meaning of the "word" - the thing. Not a group of sounds.
- so 41 Nothing sacred about a combination of sounds. ^{not sacred} Whitefield saying
wh Mesopotamia made people weep.
- me 41/3-7 Women who were impressed with the power of a speaker's tones yet
po and he was denying everything in the gospel they believed
- la 41/9 Two possibilities for lack of success
42 Need to do our very best, and need to depend on God's purpose.
- me 42/6 55:11 Meaning of "prosper" -- to be effective, succeed
me 42/8 Meaning of inspiration - the words are free from error as they
pr present the ideas. The words are inspired, not the ideas, but
in it is the ideas that are important
- in 43/1-8 Words are inspired, not ideas. Inspiration cont'd
in 44 Discussion on inspiration cont'd
di 44/4-6 Diff. between revelation and inspiration
- re 44/7-10 Understanding of the revelation imperfect
- 45/7-10 55:11
- ad 46 55:12 To whom addressed? Saved or unsaved? Is vs. 12 conditional?
47 Said to those who do accept His word. "You" in vs. 12 is diff. from the "you" in vs. 6.
- 47/5 Chronologically ch. 55 comes before ch. 54
54 declares what will happen
55 shows how it will happen
53 shows what makes it happen
- fi 47/7 55:12 On taking the Bible literally. Are figurative elements in language, but not everything is figurative, nor do you have the right to take anything figurative that you feel like.
no
- 48 Rom. 8 - "all creation groans". Suffers under hardship.
48/9-
- 49 55:12 To go out -- geographical movement? Pilgrim journey in this age.
pi Joy of following the Lord in our pilgrim journey.

50 55:13
pi

Describes the state of one following after God. Refers to this life? Vs. 12 suggests present pilgrim journey; vs. 13, the goal toward which the pilgrim goes, or time after this present age.

50/10 -
wa 51/1

Waw(conjunctive)with imperf. is very common; less common with perf. Waw conversive or consecutive -- conservative or modernist term?

51/4 55:13

Can't say dogmatically whether it should be "and it has been"; or "and it shall be" or "let it be." Prefers, "Let it shall be." Good discussion on how to decide which is correct. Need to understand context.

52
wa
wo

Lang. is not a mathematical thing. We can't talk in precise points. Words and syntactical constructions express areas. Are a range of possibilities

52/4
ma

Main thing is not removal of the curse, or the coming up of the fir and myrtle tree, but the whole process ofsalvation which God performs, or else the product of that process which is the great company of the redeemed.

52/6-10
re
of
he

To me the grt. secret of exegesis is to ask questions and then to hunt for the answer. IMPORTANT discussion.

53
me

Method of studying a passage. Far more scientific than looking for "key words"

53/4
il
co

Sign may or may not indicate contents. Illustration re disinfectant What is in the context that is vital, not the "sign"

54 54
de 54/6 54:1
nd

Could just as well come after ch. 55
Is it command? Exhortation? Declaration is good -- declaring a fact, under rhetorical form of exhortation.

55 54:1
il

Use of adj. as noun in most other languages than English, except in the plural. Good illustrations.

56 54:1
ad

Who is addressed?
"Thou that didst not bear" - a perf. and not a participle.

57
tr
eg

Problem of exact translation here.
Egyptian tale of the snake which was a "he" in Egy. but when trans. into German was made "she" since in German snake is fem. even if it is masculine.

57/6
us

In trans. from one lang. to another, you have to use the usage of the other lang.

56/8 54:1
in 58/1

Common interp.
Does not fit with N.T quotation, not with the Heb. Are talking here of two women rather than of one woman at diff. times in her life. Each woman is a figure,

58/7 54:1
58/10 54:2
me
two
fe

Spiritual birth spoken of here

59/1
59/5
st
xu

An exhortation or a command or both.
Sometimes forget about the stakes: are not merely to extend but to strengthen and make it secure. Cf. F. Xavier baptising thousands IMPORTANCE OF THIS FOR OUR TESTIMONY: DO great many things but not do them well.

60/1
ch 60/5
61 54:3

Addressed to people of God whether Israel or Gentiles. Is the church A declaration, the reason for the command and exhortation

Isaiah 54-7 - Second part

discussed in Isaiah, as I think you gathered from our meeting last week, is not intended as a class in which I am going to tell you what I think Isaiah means and that's that. I'm not here to expound to you the meaning of these passages so that you may know what I think it means and you could go on the rest of your life telling people what I say it means if you want, but that's all you have out of it. Anything like that might as well be put in a book and you can read the book and that is the end of it. I don't see the particular value of a course that simply has that as its purpose. I feel it is very important to learn what these passages mean but my purpose in this class is something far more important than that. It is not to learn what these particular passages mean but it is to learn how to find out what passages mean. It is training in interpreting passages which can be used later in other passages and which I hope will be used by each of you in many other passages. You cannot possibly learn enough of Bible interpretation in three years of seminary to go out as creditable servants of the Lord for the rest of your life. What you must do is to learn how to interpret the Bible in seminary and learn the meaning of a good many passages and then go out and keep on interpreting other passages, and learning more and more of what the Bible means, and right there there is a very important point on my belief as to the proper attitude for Bible interpretation. I do not think you can take a passage and say, "Now we know what this verse means. We know what this second means. We know what the third means!" and so on and then take another and go on through. I don't think you can do that any more than you can take a science, take chemistry and start in with oxygen and learn everything there is ever to know about oxygen and then everything there is to know about hydrogen, and so on. You cannot take a subject that way. It is interrelated. You can't understand this part thoroughly until you understand this part. You can't understand this part until you understand this part. It is all interrelated, some of it is extremely difficult, other parts of it are very obvious, and the difficult is not all put over here in certain books and the obvious over here in other books. I believe that the only way of making progress in Bible interpretation is to take the material and look at it and

Isaiah 54

get what is very obvious and "Here's something that's clear. We stand on it." Here's something that is fairly. We are quite convinced of this. Here is a question which you may not get the answer to for many years. We have made a great step forward when we become aware of the , and we see the proposition is there, the need that is there. I've heard the statement made that the more a person knows the less he knows, and that is, of course, entirely true. The illustration is given of a circle. You take the whole field of knowledge and let us suppose that it is this whole blackboard and here's a person's knowledge. He knows everything in that circle. What he doesn't know is the blackness which he touches here. The amount that he knows is the inside of the circle and the amount that he doesn't know is the circumference. He doesn't even know these things exist over here. He's not ignorant of them; he just doesn't know anything about them. Now this man knows this much. That is he doesn't know anything. This man has this much knowledge, many times as much as this fellow but he touches this many more . This many more areas of matter are in the field of which he is aware and consequently he feels many times as ignorant as this fellow does, even though his knowledge is many times as great, as this fellow's knowledge. He is aware of a far larger number of things which he knows he does not understand and which he knows he will have to work into if he is to understand them and get a larger area of knowledge and also a larger area of ignorance, a larger area of things that he knows he is ignorant of and knows are problems to him. That is true in any science. It is true in the field of knowledge in general; it is true in the Bible. The more you learn, the more you become aware of problems, the more that you recognize that you know need further investigation, and so with Isaiah it is a big thing to become aware of problems and then as we reach an answer which seems to satisfactory to certain problems we may be sure that we will become aware of twice as many more, and we should. Thus does our knowledge grow and our understanding grow in any field whatever. So I am not interested in doing, as a man can very easily in a class, taking a subject and giving you what I know and concealing from you the things of which I am ignorant

Isaiah 54

so that you don't realize those problems exist and decide that I have the last word on everything in the subject, and never attempting to bring out many of the problems before you of which I am aware but of which I do not have the answer in order that you may learn more about how to learn that which is apparent and thus learn of the existence of problems with which you were not previously familiar and then as you learn of the existence of a problem in one passage of the Scripture and later on studying another passage you find the answer to this problem here which you never would have seen if you hadn't been aware that the problem existed. You would have looked, have passed over the matter and not have seen the important factor in it. To become aware of problems is, in a way, as important as the learning answers to problems, and so that is a big part of our . Consequently you will not see that I have the answer to everything. You will probably have an idea of your far more ignorance than you would have if I took the other approach.

Isaiah 54

follows a passage that the whole Christian world agrees is a description--the Christian world, I say, not the world of nominal Christians, but the Christian world agrees certainly is a picture--of the death of Christ, and we have the question, "Is our next chapter related to it or is it distinct from it, and we notice there is a strong presumption that it is related to it and then as among the various interpretations which are possible of the next chapter, the question of which relates us to what precedes, can be a very important factor, so I became aware at the end of the hour, which I had not previously been, of a problem, and a vital problem. "What is the meaning of the statement 'more are the children of the desolate'?" I had previously thought of the problem, "What is the desolate?" "What is the married wife?" and had not thought of the problem, "What does it mean 'more are the children'?" But that is a very important problem to face. It was brought up at the end of our last hour. Does that mean they have a larger family? Is it a promise of physical increase which is here given?

Isaiah 54

I think that it quite evidently is not simply that, that it is a promise of a 'Spiritual increase rather than a physical increase, but it is a promise that more are those who are members of the family of God, from the desolate, the one who seem to be desert, wilderness, than the one from whom one would normally expect the bringing of children into the family of God. We notice that from v. 1 through v. 3 it seems very reasonable to consider that it probably is a description of the extension of the gospel to the Gentiles, that that is a very reasonable suggestion of an interpretation of those three verses with much less difficulty to it, it seems to me, than any other interpretation. However, from v. 4 on there is a strong probability that it is Israel who is being addressed, that he turns his attention from the barren to whom he has been speaking to the one who has been the married wife and is in danger of becoming a widow, so it would seem, and that he tells Israel from v. 4 on that God's mercy which goes to the Gentiles as a result of the sacrifice of Christ on calvary who was first predicted to us in c. 41 and 2 as the one who would be a light to the Gentiles, that He is not a light only to the Gentiles but Israel also is ultimately to receive full and complete blessing through Him, and then from v. 13 on it would probably refer to both, perhaps the particular emphasis still on Israel but re-

54:1

54:1-3

ferring to both and certainly the last sentence, the heritage of the servants of the Lord refers to those who are followers of the Servant of the Lord, those who are born into the kingdom of God through what He did on Calvary's cross. Yes? (Student) Yes. That is to say that the statement, the last statement seems to rather require the . at the end. The question is, "How far back does that extend? And you can say that it probably extends back to where you find 'a statement that cannot , and when you find such a statement at you see how far forward and see/what point the most likely transition occurs.

Now there is much more that we could do in delving into the exact teaching of this chapter here. I would like to just mention to you an incident which is an experience I had not so very long ago when someone told me about a man who was doing a very worthy thing. He was studying psychiatry, studying medicine

Isaiah 54

in relation to mental problems in order to help people and this man was going out to counsel people and to help people and I was told of him he was a very fine Christian, a man raised in a Christian home, who had attended Christian churches and now he had gone into this field in order to get material which he could use in order to help people, and I was told how ideally fitted he would be. He already has the Christian material, the Christian viewpoint; now he gets this material of the discoveries in psychiatry and in mental study which will be useful in counseling people with difficulties. Well, it just struck me that that could be very excellent. There is much that is unChristian in the theories of scientists in many fields and of course whatever is truly unChristian is untrue, but there is much that has been discovered by them that can be very, very helpful in dealing with people, but the thing that disquieted me about the statement was, "He already knows the Christian part; now he is getting the other." as if going to a Sunday School class a few times and hearing a few sermons gave one what he needed to know about Christianity. Now he has to spend years of discovery what has been laboriously worked out about the constitution of the human mind and its activities in order to get what is necessary from that aspect for dealing with the problems of people. It impressed me that to know the Christian side of it is the thing that could never be said. You never know. God doesn't give us three or four chapters which was all we need to know. He didn't present His truth to us in a few pages. God has given us a large book and in this book He has the secret of salvation so clearly written that a man with comparatively little knowledge of it can seek the Lord and can find Him and be saved, but the one who is truly saved desires to know far more than is necessary for salvation. He desires to go on in the things of God and God has given us a textbook here which goes on and gives us a tremendous amount that is useful in the problem of dealing with human needs and human problems and helping people and one can never learn too much of the Scripture for this purpose. Well now it may be that with a certain amount of study of interpretation of the Scripture one is

Isaiah 5

would
 at the point where he/be better able to help the people with now having a certain knowledge of psychiatry and of what has been observed from observation of the activity of the human mind. That may very well be, but to say that a little bit of this is sufficient and then a great deal of that is an absolutely wrong, absolute failure to recognize the depth and the importance of that which God has given. To my mind it is one of the great weaknesses in the Christian church today. People think, "We've got John 3:16 and what more do we need?" If that were all that we needed, that is all that God would have given us. God has given us a large and extensive book in which John 3:16 and certain other matters are stressed and are tremendously important and probably it is better to have them without the rest than it would be to have the rest without them, because you couldn't have the rest without them. It would be meaningless, but the, I believe one reason for the weakness and powerlessness of the Christian church today is that we are satisfied with a little bit of truth in stead of feeling the need of getting into that book and learning all we can of the secrets that God has there for His church and for His people. I believe that all the methods we can use of advancing the gospel, reaching people with it, rousing their interest are valuable, but in the end I think the secret of the progress of Christianity will be the knowledge the Word on the part of those who are serving the Lord, and the depth of their study of it, and so we are interested in this class in learning all we can from this passage but if we worked on it five years we wouldn't learn everything that there is in these thirteen chapters, but I wouldn't think it wise to work straight ahead for five years on it. I think you work on this awhile, you work on something else, and this helps with the other thing and then you come back to this and the other thing helps with this. Mr.---? Do you have a question? (Student) Yes. In the context there he says, "Tell me, do you desire to be under the law or do you not hear the law? For it is written that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free maid, but he who is of the bond woman was born after the flesh but he of the free woman was by promise." These things are an allegory for these are the

Isaiah 5

two covenants, the one from Mt. Sinai which gendereth the bondage which is Hagar. For this Hagar is Mt. Sinai in Arabia, an answer to Jerusalem which now is and is in bondage with her children, but Jerusalem, which is above is free, which is the mother of the Gentiles. Do you get what he says? (Student) No. Which is the mother of all. Just that mean just to the Jews? That means of all who are truly God's people. The heavenly Jerusalem and the earthly Jerusalem overlap. They cannot be completely separated. Everyone in any age who has been saved has been a member of this heavenly Jerusalem which is free. Every one who ever was saved is a member of this Jerusalem which is the mother of us all, but the law has its true purpose which Paul gives us clearly in other passages. It is meant for a blessing for God's people and it, the law itself is not accursed, the Old Testament is never a curse but a blessing, but misunderstanding the law and misapplication of the law becomes a curse and genders to bondage, and that is the Jerusalem below apart from the heavenly Jerusalem, and so the heavenly Jerusalem is the mother of us all and it is written, "Rejoice thou barren that beareth not. Break forth and cry, thou that travaileth not, for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband. The earthly Jerusalem which would be expected to bring the children into the kingdom of God has failed of her task because of failing to seek it according to the faith which was the way in which she was supposed to seek it from the beginning and on account of this she has failed and the married woman doesn't have the children whom she would be expected to have, but the desolate, the one who seems to be outside of the family is the one which has brought forth more children into the kingdom than the other. Now we brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise, we who are by virtue of this promise which is based upon the chapter which immediately follows, through the death of Christ, we are brought into the kingdom of God whether we be Jews or Gentiles. More are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife but there are many from both. Yes? (Student) Excuse me. He doesn't say there are no children from the married wife,

Isaiah 5

but only from the desolate there are more children from the desolate because the married wife has been seeking, you see, in the wrong way. Yes? (Student) No. I do not believe so. No. I don't think that is a precise parallel. I think that Jerusalem which is above is the true family of God but I don't see how you can possibly call it the desolate. I think the ~~desolate~~ is the Gentiles.
 are
 There/more from the Gentiles than from the Jews, but there are from both and from above those from either one, he says, "Jerusalem/is the mother of both, of those from either one. (Student) I would think so, yes. It isn't, you see, an exact parallel, but it is a comparison with . That's a very interesting question to raise. Let's think about it more and study the passage more. Some of you may have a suggestion on it which will amend this one somewhat and will improve the interpretation. I haven't studied the passage in Galatians very carefully by trying to compare it with this one. I think there is one thing right there to mention about New Testament quotations. I read the statement once the proof of the inspiration of the Scripture is that the New Testament proves a point by a single reference to the Old Testament. It proves a point by the fact that a singular instead of a plural is used, by the fact that the present tense is used, and so on. I saw a whole string of these whereby one word, by one tense, by one number of a phrase in the Old Testament, a great doctrine is proved in the New Testament, and I believe the statement is one hundred per cent wrong. I do not think that God ever wants us to prove a great doctrine by one number, by one tense, by one word of any portion of the Bible. The words of the Bible are not something magical that you can grab three words here or five words there, and here you have something which solves all problems. You study the Bible and see what the truths of it are, see what its teaching is, and then you select verses which give you a picture in brief of the teaching of large passages, and you have no right to build on a verse taken out of context, but to build on the teaching of a passage which is summarized in a verse, or which is brought out clearly in a particular verse; is the way to build up our truth. I examined those very cases once when a

all of which I think grow out of c. 53 and are based upon it and it is calling on the people to rejoice in that which He is giving them. There is no call to the people in Isaiah, in c. 54 to do anything. They say, "Fear not. Rejoice." That's not calling on them to do anything. That's simply pointing out the relevancy to them of the statement. It is showing them what God is going to do for them. There's no call, there's no summoning the people, no exhortation to them, nothing like that in c. 54. It is simply a declaration of the great blessings which are theirs by virtue of c. 53, but when we start 55 we have a little different note. We have definite ^{exhortation} ~~exaltation~~ in 55. We have the individual note in fifty-five. People are lumped together in 54. They are grouped in great masses of people and these masses of people are told of the wonderful blessings which are theirs but there is an individual note in 55. The note is here stressed in 55 that here are blessings which rest upon the attitude of the individual, blessings which are available for the individual, blessings which the individual may take to himself and so there is an exhortation, there is a call to acceptance of the blessing given, there is a declaration that these blessings are available and that they are sure and it seems to me that whatever one may think about 54, a Christian cannot question that 55 is the direct out-
^{warding} ~~warding~~ of 53, and that 55 is calling, is the gospel call to the individual to come and avail himself of the blessing which God has provided through Christ's act in 53. I don't think any Christian can question that. I don't know of any other interpretation of 55 which can be advanced other than on the type of interpretation which just divides it up into fragments unrelated to one another. The connection is so close and the relationship so definite between it and 53. Hence there is no meaning in 53 at all if 53 is not the basis out of which 55 comes, and it seems to me that that is tremendously important in interpreting 54. Fifty-four is right in between 53 and 55 and I think closely related to both. It seems to me that the archbishop's horse must have been unusually well behaved the day when he divided up this passage into chapters because you have such a good chapter division at the beginning of 54 and such a good chapter division at the beginning of 55. They are minor divisions, they are

they are paragraph divisions, it is closely integrated, but if you are to make a division in here, they are certainly the right places to make the division. Fifty-three telling of the work of Christ, 54 applying the work of Christ in general to large groups of people, 55 showing the individual and specific application of it to those who come to God through Him, and of course the note with which 55 begins is the great blessings which are available without money and without price, and then in v. 7 there is a specific call to turn away from sin but so different from the call in the rebuke passages in the early portion of Isaiah, or in later portions. You cannot certainly call v. 7 a rebuke verse. It is not a rebuke verse. It is a blessing verse. He is not saying, "Oh you wicked sinner; turn away from your wickedness or God is going to punish you." Not at all. He is saying the wicked has a wonderful opportunity. Let him forsake his way, his wicked ways, because God is ready to have mercy upon him. It is a blessing passage, exhorting the sinner to come and receive the gospel offer of salvation. Very clearly, I think. Fifty-five is a gospel chapter. It is a presentation of the gospel of Christ which is available to all individuals since the time of Christ and before, and before the time when Isaiah wrote, available to all to come to God by virtue of the shed blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. And so we have these wonderful individual promises in c. 55, these exhortations to turn away from wickedness because God has provided a way of escape and return and He will have mercy upon him and to honor God for He will abundantly pardon, and then an emphasis on the inscrutable goodness of God, the inscrutable will of God, that God's ways are higher than our ways and His thoughts higher than our thoughts, so much so that we could never have worked out the plan of salvation, we could never have imagined it except as He has revealed it to us. We could never have found the way in which God could be both just and also the justifier of them that believe on Christ. It is only He who could do it and it is by virtue of the fact that His ways are as much superior to ours as the heaven is higher than the earth, and then, of

Isaiah 6

course, the certainty of it, v. 10 and 11. God's Word is going to accomplish that which He pleases. There you have your contrast, the free agency of man, the free offer of salvation, "Come if you will. Turn away from your sins; come to God for He will abundantly pardon. The offer is before you. It is up to you now. Take it, and accept the wonderful offer that God gives, but God's Word will accomplish the things which He pleases and will prosper in the thing to which He has sent it. God has elected those who will come, God has ordained it this way and at the same time you have a responsibility and an opportunity, and you have before you a greater condemnation if you fail to accept the opportunity which God, in all sincerity and truth lays before you. We cannot fully understand just how these aspects fit together and we don't improve it any by taking one aspect or the other and trying to forget the opposite one. By saying, "Yes, it's all up to man. Man can do as he wants. You can do and God can't help yourself." Well that is not the teaching of the Scripture anywhere. God has ordained, God's Word goeth forth and it will accomplish that which He pleases. He will draw to Him everyone whom the Father has given Him. That is clearly taught in the Scripture. And on the other hand I have known people who have said, "Well you can't say, 'Whosoever will, let him come', you can't say that because they can only come if God draws them." God has given us no right to say that anybody cannot come. God has given us the order to go forth and the offer is a sincere offer of salvation to all the world. It is the sincere offer presented and made available to all people. We can't understand just how it fits together. God's ways are higher than our ways and His thoughts higher than our thoughts and you cannot expect to work out a human explanation of it, but so many try and when they go forward in doing it, what they do is to take one side and to leave the other out and they get the two unbalanced. I remember hearing a man say once some years ago when I was speaking in another seminary-- this man had been a very fine evangelist and a fine minister and was doing a splendid work and he was taking a graduate course in doctrinal preaching, and

I was sitting next to him at the Senior faculty dinner at the end of the year and he made this statement to me that the year had a tremendous effect, the course in doctrinal preaching, a tremendous effect upon his preaching, because, he said that he sued to say, "What shall we do to be saved? Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved," but he said he found out you can't say that any more, a man can't believe unless God gives him the faith and therefore you cannot say that, "What shall I do to be saved?" There is nothing you can do to be saved. Well, that's not the Scriptural teaching. Paul said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ." The Scripture clearly teaches that we can tell every man, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and if you do not you are responsible for your failure to do so!" and that is just as true as the other aspect that God has ordained who is going to believe. They are both true, they are both clearly taught here in this passage. And then, of course, the last two verses of c. 55, the wonderful blessing which God is giving to all His children, to all those who believe through Christ. He says, ye shall go forth with joy and be led forth with peace. The mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, surely a figurative passage, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands. I've heard people say, "You don't believe the trees actually clap? This is figurative, therefore you can take anything in the Bible you want figuratively." Well, of course that is absurd. The Bible contains a great deal of figurative language but we have no right to take something figuratively if

- - - - -
Isaiah 7

as a book where anything can mean anything, but as a book which has a solid undergirding of clear literal statements, clear literal teaching and has beautiful figures interspersed here and many a teaching drawn out in certain places in figurative language much more clearly, perhaps, than a literal statement would have brought out that particular thing, and so in v. 13, instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree. Perhaps that very thing is going to happen. The time is going to come

Isaiah 7

when we won't have the thorns and the briars to contend with, instead of them we will have the fir tree and the myrtle tree, perhaps this is here a specific prediction of a literal thing that is going to take place, but that certainly is not all that is included in the verse. It expresses a change in the condition of God's people, a change in the circumstances round about them, and even if you were to make v. 13 to refer exclusively to a great time of wonderful blessing ahead in the material and physical sphere for God's people, even if you make it refer exclusively to that, it still cannot just mean the fir tree and the myrtle tree, but they will be examples of a general change in the physical creation which will take place and which in addition would be symptomatic of a change in the Spiritual realm which would take place then for all of God's people and which takes place to some extent for God's people in the age preceding that time of blessing. Well now we come to a much more difficult problem. Between c. 55 and c. 56 I think that anyone will feel that there is a break, that the archbishop's horse was in pretty good condition at the beginning of chapter 56 but I wonder if he got colic or something before it was over. I defy anybody to interpret c. 56 as a unit. If there should be a break between c. 53 and 54, and I believe there should, and there should be a break between 54 and 55 and I believe there should, and a break between 55 and 56, and it seems reasonable to make a break there, certainly there is one hundred times more reason to have a break somewhere in the course of 56 than there is to have a break between 56 and 57. In fact, it is highly questionable whether there is any reason whatever for a break after v. 12 of c. 56, highly questionable whether there is any reason whatever to make a break there, and certainly there is a place somewhat earlier in this chapter where there is far more reason to make a break than there is between v. 12 of 56 and v. 1 of 57. Where would you suggest such a break might be made, Mr.---? I trust that everyone will have your Bibles before you as we make these discussions because as you see I am not simply giving you stuff to write down and memorize but I am trying to go into the problems with you and

Isaiah 7

you can't follow them very well without the Scripture before you. Of course, this I ran over very rapidly and I wouldn't necessarily expect anyone here to have an immediate answer to the question I asked. I was not saying that in any way personal, Mr.—, but simply for exhortation to others, that I would be interested to know how many there are here who think that you have a place to suggest which you think is a more important place within 56 than any reason to make a break after v. 12. How many feel that you have an answer to that question. Raise your hands. One--two--three--only three, / ^{so far.} How many more? I think if you look at the chapter that it should not be difficult to reach a conclusion. It is quite clear if you read the chapter, and surely most can run their eyes over it quite quickly and can see a change in atmosphere in the chapter. It is not a change such as takes place between day and night and that gradually gets dark like this. We have such changes in the Scripture but this is not that kind of a change. This is the kind of a change that takes place when the bell rings and everybody rushes to the door. Mr.---? (Student) After v. 8. How many would agree with that? How many think it should be after v. 9 instead? After v. 9. I went over this in a class a couple of years ago and there were quite a number who thought it should be after v. 9 while a good many of you seem to feel that it should be after v. 8. Personally, I think that v. 8 is much the better place of the two, but I think we must agree that either after v. 8 or after v. 9, in one or the other of these places there is a break of tremendous importance. What is the great difference? Mr.---? (Student) Yes, but it is a figure, isn't it? Don't you think? It's a figure for people, isn't it. There is a suggestion, I think, in what you say but I think there is a stronger reason. Did somebody have---? (Student) That would be one way of putting it, I should think. We have in c. 53 God's wonderful blessing in sending Christ, in c. 54 there is not the slightest rebuke to these people. It is all blessing. In chapter 55, it is wonderful opportunity of blessing and reality of blessing, realization of blessing to God's people. In c. 56, it is far less well known that either

Isaiah 7

53 or 55 and as you look at it you may not be so sure, but certainly the predominant tone is strongly one of blessing in v. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 and 8, very strongly blessing, but now in v. 11 - they are greedy dogs which can never have enough. Come ye, they say, I will fetch wine and we will fill ourselves with strong drink. That's very different in anything in 54 or 55 or the first eight verses in 56. Eleven and 12 are very clearly a rebuke of those who are evil and without any visible relationship to chapters 53, 54 and 55. It is a complete and total change from the whole atmosphere of 54 and 55 to the atmosphere of verses 11 and 12 of 56, and how about 10 of 56? His watchmen are blind. Whose? Whose watchmen are blind? They are all ignorant, they are dumb dogs, they can't bark; sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber. Now it seems to me that 10 is related to 9. All you beasts of the field come and devour. Isn't that terrible, the beasts to come and devour. The beasts should be kept out so they can't devour. Well, why can they come? Because the watchmen are gone, in ignorance. They are dumb dogs. They keep quiet when the forces of evil come to devour. He isn't wanting the beasts of the field to devour. Nine is a figure of speech. It doesn't mean he wants them to do this. It is a prediction that they will do it.

They will be able to do it. Therefore, come and do it. There is nothing to stop you. That is what he is saying. He's not rejoicing they're doing it. He is grieving, that they can do it, that there is nothing to stop them from doing it, that the way is perfectly open for the beasts of the field to come and devour because the watchmen aren't on the job. Well now that has no relation whatever to 53, 54 or 55. I don't mean no relation whatever in the sense that they do not have . . . do not have a reasonable place as portions of the book of Isaiah. I don't mean that at all, certainly. They do fit together in the book, but it is, 54 and 55 belong to one large section of the book telling us the results of the sacrifice on Calvary to which c. 40 to 52 have been leading up, and then reach the great climax and 54 and 55 tell of the wonderful results of it and then everything previous to 56 from c. 40

Isaiah 7

on, all that section forms a unit together which is not immediately related, at least I know of no way to immediately relate it, to v. 9 to 12. V. 9 is the beginning then of a new large section of the book. There are those who divide the book into sections, one of which begins with chapter 58. I think it is a rather foolish division. I think that the division between 57 and 58 is not one-tenth as important nor one-fiftieth as important as the division between verses 8 and 9 here. It is the ending of a volume, let us say, of the book of Isaiah, and the beginning of a new volume which starts with a different section. It is as if you have been reading D'Aubigney's history of the reformation and you have been reading about the reformation in Germany and you come to the end of the life of Luther and then you start over again with the reformation in England in another book, and the first chapter of that has no relation to the last chapter of the other, although the whole book there has a definite relation to the whole book which precedes, and surely there is that difference after v. 9 of 56 but what are you going to do with the first part of 56? Is the first part of 56 closely related to the last part of 56? and to c. 57? Or is the first part of 56 related to what precedes? Or is it a volume by itself with only these eight verses in it? What do you think about that? That would be a matter to think through, very important in the organization of the book. What is the teaching of c. 56, vs. 1-8? Is it a teaching regarding the importance of the sabbath? Is that the purpose of it? Is that the primary thought of it? Just at a glance we might say, "This is a passage on sabbath keeping. Sabbath keeping is mentioned a number of times there, but is that the primary thought? If you have these eight verses and you want to discuss, "What is the thought of these eight verses?", can you express in six words, say, in a few words a very simple, brief idea which will give a unity to the passage as a whole? Well, if you don't think you can to the passage as a whole supposing you skip the first two verses and ask this question, "Is there anything which would give a unity to verses 3-8 and around

which everything in those six verses could gather, and if so, could you perhaps subsume one or two under the same head? Do you see the question? It is a problem which I think it would be wise for you to study. Now as I have mentioned before, anyone who is taking this course as an elective to be applied for undergraduate credit, we expect to average two hours study for each hour of class, but if you want graduate credit for it, toward an S. T. M. degree, then, of course, it would be three hours study outside in relation to the hour in class, and so if anyone is thinking of taking this for graduate credit I wish you would let me know so that I can give you the additional assignment and let you take that extra time.

Now for our next lesson, one portion of the assignment--last time somebody asked some questions just at the end of the hour and I completely forgot to give you something to which to put your two hours for today but I suppose most of you read these first two chapters in the Hebrew during that two hours, but the--for next time the first portion of the assignment is the study of that first section of 56 and a reasonable answer to the problem. What thought gives a unity to these passages? Is it, like Proverbs, a lot of isolated verses, or is there a unity to it? Here you find v. 3-8 having a definite unity that can be stressed in a few words, or if you do, can that possibly include verses 1 and 2 also of c. 56, and if so, does it relate to what follows--the last part of 56 and 57, or does it relate to what precedes? Then the second part of the assignment would be--run ahead rapidly and tell me where do you think there is the next rather major division in the book. You have a general line of thought starting in v. 9. How far does this general line of thought run before you get a marked change? Where would the next important division be in the book? That's the second part of it, and then I think it would be well for you to start reading in the Hebrew for the next time 55. We'll come back to 54 later, but suppose you do 55 first in the Hebrew and read as far as you get to in the two hours for next time. Friday's assignment. As I mentioned to you, I have to have my eyes examined at two o'clock next Friday and I think I can be back by four but I am not sure, so someone suggested that we begin at 4:30 since there is no five o'clock class.

21

Record 20 apparently did not record as I cannot hear it at all from the break on to the end. I'm starting then with number 21.

Look on at the point at which we had been looking at the questions of conflicts. What was the last verse at which we were looking? Were we still on "3". Yes, then on "4" we had "Fear for thoushalt not...neither be thou confounded for thou shalt not be put to the test." Here is an exhortation to an emotional attitude in view of the fact in the physical realm. The promise in the physical realm, the material realm, ~~the spiritual realm~~, or the actual realm, therefore emotional circumstances are called upon. This is the sort of a sentence which is really not so much a command as a declaration of fact. It is fact. It isn't that you take a hold of yourself and don't be afraid. There is no need for that. There is no need for you to be hurt of danger because you are going to forget the misery which you have gone to through. You are going to get this misery. Now the other question is: who is he ~~talking~~ talking to here? Is he talking to the desolate or to the married wife? 21—2

What does he mean? Does it mean the cities that are desolate?

This would fit in perfectly with the interpretation ^{that} ~~and~~ he is here speaking of the Israelites in Babylon under captivity. Palestine is in ruins. Her cities are in desolation. Come back and the cities will be built up. That will be strictly literal interpretation of the passage and entirely possible as the interpretation of the passage. However, that is not the only possible interpretation of it. The question is: He is then talking here of an increase. What kind of an increase is he ^{is} talking about? Are they going to have more people. Are there more physical people involved? Are there more children borned? Will there be more people come into the world? Or when he speaks of "more" are the children of the desolate, is he speaking spiritual persons? Both are possible but we notice that in the context spiritual persons seems to fit rather than large numbers of human beings. If we take that interpretation for verse 1, we have the right to ask the question whether that interpretation fits also in verse 3.

If it will fit in verse 3, then this definite city to be inhabited would mean a city which previously did not have in them this kind of people, people who are spiritually born people. You might say, here is a city which is a city of strife and of turmoil, a city of low morality, a city of wickedness, a city of which it is said there is no fear of God left in it. In that ~~six~~ city there occurred a number of spiritual births. There come into the life of that city from outside or through a change of people in the city there come into it children of God, people who are spiritually born, people who are of a different culture. They cause the city which was desolate, as far as that type of person is concerned, to be inhabited. That is to say, if you can have the figure of the children being the spiritual birth. You can apply it to this. Speaking literally, the other would be the meaning of it. The other meaning I don't think carries through logically. I think this is the meaning that carries through logically and consequently I don't believe we have any great difficulty in interpreting this particular thought in line with the figure of that statement. if you decide that is the figure in verse 1. Certainly it is the one that apostle Paul (21-5 *four words*) Then if we are to take that interpretation of verse 1, I think that the phrase, cause the desolate to be inhabited. Then the next verse there is the question, who is he talking to in verse 4? Is it the same person as in verses 2 and 3, or is it a different person? Well, in the very first half of verse 1, he talked to one person, one who did not travail with child. Then he continues in the third ~~verse~~ ^{person} in comparing the children of the desolate with the children of the married wife. We notice the interpretation as the same one who was the married wife is now the desolate and the one who is now the desolate has more children ~~more than her married wife~~ than she when she was the married wife. A figure which I don't think carries out very logically because if she ^{is} ~~was~~ desolate and has previously been a married wife, we would expect her again to become a married wife before we expect her to have children. Paul certainly states it as being two different women. If you take it as two different women, then you

will have two women here presented in the third person. In line of the teaching of the whole verse, you expect the statements of 2 and 3 to refer to the one he has spoken of in as the desolate one. But when you come to verse 4, you ask the question, "Is he speaking to the same one to whom he spoke in verse 1, 2, and 3; or is he speaking to the other one? There are two persons and there is absolutely no difficulty in speaking of the attention of the speaker as passing from the one to the other when you have two present. That is a very common thing. I may be talking to two people. I may be talking to one of them a while. I may be speaking to the other with a slight turn of head. It is a very common thing. Therefore, there would be no reason why he shouldn't switch over. So that doesn't say that he does turn his attention to ~~the~~ a different person. in verse 4 from the previous verses. It does say that there is no difficulty in presenting that other possibility. It leaves it open to us as to whom he is speaking. That is a question. we often raise. To whom is he speaking relative to what was said? We have to interpret relative to whom it is said. I'm sure you as well as I have had these ~~things~~ experiences in life of having someone ask you the question and finding out that he was talking to a person right behind you or right next to you. He asked you something that you just didn't know how to answer. It didn't make sense.

Well, now how about verse 4. Does verse 4 continue with the previous verses, or does it deal with a different person? How many think it is still possible that it is the same person as in verses 2 and 3? I see most of us thought so. How many think it is a different one? Most of the back row. Well, now we have quite a division between the back row and the front. Let's get some argument.

Student speaks 87 to 9.

Yes, well, the argument Mr. S _____ has advanced is that in verse 7 there is a definite change but there hardly seems to be

You would say that there is one verse 7 or earlier. Reasonably so. You would say verse 7 is different from verse 3 so that the question would be, does the change come at the beginning at the verse 7, 6, 5, or 4. But that it comes, we would agree. How many would agree that verse 7 is different from verses 2 and 3. The back row seems to agree with that. How about the front row? They seem to be silent on that. Is there someone else from the front who thinks as Mr. S_____ did. He ~~taught~~ thought verse 4 was the same as verse 3. You have the additional argument ^{21-10.}

Mr. S_____ ^{good} ~~gave~~ gave us the ~~additional~~ argument that there is a change at least by chapters whether at verse 4 and he is inclined that we were against it. Naturally we don't say there is until we have reason to think so.

(Discussion) Mr. S_____, what makes you think there is a change in verse 7? (Answer) "I have forsaken thee previously, but now I give you mercy. I hid my face from you for a moment, but I will have mercy on you. If he hid his face before from him, has he previously hid his face from the Gentiles or forsaken them? You might say that He has not given the Gentiles His plan. That is an indication that He previously ~~has~~ been blessing them. That seems to fit more with the idea of the Jew being addressed in verse 7.

^{21-11 (few words)} rather than the Gentile. It seems to be the married wife who is now seeing that the desolate has more children than herself. in verse 7. That is the argument Mr. S_____ presents. I take it that the back row who thought that there was a change ~~xxxx~~ as early as verse 5, agree that there is a change in verse 7. We all agree that the change ~~is~~ is in verse 7. We have got together the two ends of the class. The front row has admitted that by verse 7 there is a change and the back ~~row~~ row ~~has~~ already held that the change was in 7. The question is, does the change come earlier than 7 or does it first come at 7? That question we will not be able to consider further this week on account of ~~xxxx~~ the American Council meetings. We shall postpone its consideration next week. You might go on with your problem study of the Hebrew in the passage. *end of 21.*

We were still discussing Isaiah 54 last time. We haven't covered much ground. Yet we have spent a good bit of time on Isaiah 55. So we are a little further along than it would appear at first sight. In chapter 54 we have noticed evidence from the New Testament that the first verse is ~~xxxxxxxx~~ comparing two different women in one moment at two different times. And that these women are figures, and that one of them is the figure of the Gentiles, and the other is the figure of Israel. So we have these two different women, according to Paul's interpretation, one of whom has done her part and has presented the Word of the Lord, but the other has done far more by her watching. ~~222~~

Natural olive ~~xxx~~ trees are grafted off and wild olive trees are grafted on for a season. Now, of course, a question which is of great interest to us, is just what part of the verses ~~xxxx~~ in the chapter refer to one of these women and which parts refer to the other one? So it would be interesting to look through these verses and to ask about each one. Are you sure that this refers to the Gentiles? Are you sure that it refers to the married wife, Israel? Are you fairly certain that it is one particular one or the other or are you absolutely ^{un-}certain? Before being able to make a definite judgment upon particular verses, it would be well to ~~not~~ go through and get a general picture of how the evidence appears.

So as we look at verse 1, we of course, would all immediately see that in verse 1 both are mentioned. Both are explicitly mentioned and are there compared so there is no question that both are here in mind; that is, if you have two women. Not as so many commentators take it--one women at two different periods in her life. We noted the difficulty of that view. We noticed how it doesn't fit in the context particularly well. How it has little relationship to Isaiah 53 which precedes it and how it is just ~~a~~ contrary to the interpretation which the Apostle Paul gives it. So I think at present we do not ^{need to} go further into the question unless someone wants to raise some other point as to whether there are two women or one and one is the Gentiles. Then if that is so, what about verse 2?

To whom does verse 2 then refer? How many would say verse 2 is definitely referring to Israel? Nobody. How many would say that it is definitely referring to the Gentiles? Nobody. We have about nine-tenths or ninety percent saying that. So I'll put down 2 with three marks under it. Now how many are there who say it refers to Israel, but I'm not sure. I think maybe it does. How many say that? So we have three who think that number 2 might refer to Israel. It is only 3 against the field. We might put a 2 with a question mark after it. Now take verse number 3. To whom does verse 3 refer? How many say absolutely Gentile? Only about 4, about 6. In other words for verse 3 we'll put a 3 with ~~xxxxx~~ one underline instead of 3. How many say definitely Israel? Three. So we'll put over there a 3 with a question mark. How many say perhaps Israel? Nobody. Oh, two. All right ~~xxxxx~~ maybe we should make another question. How many say perhaps the Gentiles? Everyone thinks that the Gentiles is sure. We won't need a question mark after it. All right.

Now verse number 4. How many say verse 4 is definitely Israel? Up to this point we have been considering which one speaks of both explicitly. Verse 2 and 3 I have asked how many thought it was this one and how many thought it was that one and how many it might be that or it might be this. I did not ask the question, were there some who thought verse 2 might refer to both? That is both in one picture. Will you raise your hand? One thinks that they both are included in one picture in verse 2. However, in verse 3, how many? Again. ~~For both~~. One votes for both. He would have Truman for president and Dewey for vice president. How about verse 4 now. How many would say that 4 is definitely inclusive of Israel? Five. Well, I'll have to underline that then. How many say 4 is definitely Gentile? ~~3~~ Three. Well, that is only enough for a question mark. How many say 4 is probably Israel? One. How many say it is probably Gentile? Four. Well, that is enough for an underline. How many say verse 4 is both? Two. Well, that is still a question mark. H

How about verse 5? Definitely Israel? Five. Underline that. How many say

verse 5 is definitely Gentile? Only one. How many say 5 is probably Gentile? Three. How many say it is probably Israel? I think there are a good many who didn't vote on that. How many say both? Three. Well, the vote is very small. Then how many think number 6 is Israel? Eight. Well, number 6 then is definitely Israel. How many say it is Gentile? None. What about the rest of you? How many say it is probably the Gentiles? How many say probably Israel? Quite a few. Better underline that one. How many say both? Nobody. Some would say both for 2, 3, 4, and 5, but not 6. How could 5 be both and 6 not? 22-9¹/₄ - few words

Verse 7. Israel? None. Verse 7 Gentile? ~~Nobody~~ Nobody. Probably Gentile? ~~None~~ None. Probably Israel? 22-9¹/₂

Well, everyone seems to think then

You don't think then that the descendants came from Jacob. The others sons of Noah were for a small moment forsaken and now are to be gathered for a great ~~xxxixxxxxxx~~ blessing after. Now what do you think 22-9³/₄ to 22-10.

Then number 8. How many would say that 8 refers to whoever 7 refers? Most of us would agree to that. So we'll put 8 also underlined.

Verse 9. How many think 9 goes again like these previous verses? Quite a few. How many say 9 is different? We can only get 2 on that.

How about 10. How many say 10 is the same as 9? Several. How many say it is different? Then we'll have to ~~sxxx~~ ask exactly what ~~ixxdiffxxxxix~~ it is. How many say 10 is definitely Israel? There are more who thought 10 was the same as 9 which they thought was Israel than there are who think 10 is Israel. That is a logical contradiction. They have to decide that it is Israel. How many think 10 is Gentile? How many think 10 is both? Two, three. Well, 10 will be both with a question mark. Israel with two underlines. Most of you are rather neutral.

Verse 11? How many say it is Gentile? Nobody. How many say Israel? Some say it ~~is~~ both but most say it is Israel.

How about 12? Twelve is the same as eleven.

How about 13? How many say 13 is Israel? How many say Gentile? Nobody. How many say both? All right for 13. It is ~~22-12~~

Verse 14. How many say Israel? Four? How many say Gentile? How many say both? Five.

Verse 15? How many ~~xxxxxxx~~ say against ~~22-12 1/4~~ To ~~22-12 1/2~~

Verse 16. ~~12 1/2 - 13 1/4 - includes verse 19 2 think~~

So as we look through this Scripture here we find that the Gentiles do not seem to have been taken ~~alone~~ anywhere after verse 6. Not positively ~~xxxx~~ anywhere after verse 2. ~~xxxx~~ Israel seems to be considered and definitely in mind through most of the passage.

(Question) The class seems to feel very positive that 3 was Gentile. A few had a little question that it was both or Israel. On 3 some suggested Israel. Some think both. ~~14 - 14 1/4~~

So we seem to have that it is the consensus of opinion that it is Israel that is spoken to from verse 7 on. That seems to be pretty well agreed that from 7 to ~~14 1/2 to end of 22~~
~~22-11 to 23-2~~

Do they say let ~~every~~ everyone who is in trouble rejoice? ~~26 3 1/2~~
Do they say let all the people of the earth prepare themselves because ^dthe atomic bomb?

Does it say, Let all the people of the United States rejoice?

It couldn't say rejoice because of the atomic bomb —

Now in this case you could say this refers to God's people including both.

Here it is Israel and the Gentiles —

You could hardly say ~~22-3 to 23-4~~

If I were to write a magazine article and say, Rejoice on account of the atomic bomb. Well this would mean that all the Americans should rejoice because they have the bomb and all the Russians should rejoice because they will soon have the atomic bomb. 23-6 1/2

In that case my words ~~might be~~

And also means that the Jews who for a time

Doesn't it have to mean one or the other? Isn't it pretty difficult to make the verse apply to them both? 7-7 3/4

Calling on Israel which was formerly the children of the desolation. It is one or the other. I don't know how you can distinguish which one. ~~xxx~~

If one can interpret it in such a way so that the word "barren" ~~xxxx~~ means specific to Israel at one time and the other way means specific of Gentiles.

You have to watch out. You have to find out what the specific meaning is and then

To my mind it is always possible to take an area of meaning and find that you can send it out to cover a larger area.

Unless we say that such an interpretation refers to verse 1 we would say that verse 2 refers to whoever is called the barren woman.

What was your idea Mr. Gustafson? 23-9 - 23-10

Does it refer to a spiritual birth? That is to say ~~xxxxxx~~ receiving children into the kingdom or does it refer to a physical --receiving more area. Is it

a physical issue over a larger area here or is it a spiritual issue? 10-10 1/2

You could take verse 3 or verse 2 as indicating the spirit of Israel which may be predominant, but not exclusively as including those who would become Christians.

That would be different from saying that it means the physical race of ^{Israel} people. ~~41~~

The physical race of Israel. You might say that this verse might be very easily quoted at the present time when the United Nations gave Israel a territory which occupied about a third of Palestine and the Israelites made an advancement. ~~aa~~

couple weeks ago to the south and seized the southern area and this week they have advanced to the north and seized the northern area. They are breaking forth on the right hand and on the left and seizing the territory of the Gentiles north and south of them and driving ~~xxxxxxx~~ out the Arabs who are going as refugees up to Lebanon and down to Egypt and other areas and there are probably as many Arabs driven out of Israel as there are now Jews in Palestine. They have been driven out as refugees. Thus they are extending their territory. Now that is *11 3/4 - to end of 23.*

24-C - 24-3/4

However, when you come on to 4 there is not the same close relationship in 4 as in 3. *few words here*

There is a change of person that he is now looking at. *not a new person here*
So we could ~~xxx~~ have a transition. *how we do*

What is there in verse 4 which suggests that verse 4 is speaking of Israel rather than of the Gentiles? *4-1/2*

Now there you always have this problem to determine the use of the word. You see how many times a rebuke

It is pretty hard to say this cannot truthfully happen.

He gives you a whole chapter and says this chapter is definitely a part of *5-1/2*
in context of course - introduction

It could fit very nicely with verse 4 whatever. The only thing in 4 is that would suggest is the word *7 1/2 to 8 3/4*

its use is often quite a comparative matter. You can use the term in quite a comparative and relative sense. *9-11 - some discussion we looked at think*

You who are outside the covenant who didn't have the presence of God. You rejoice. God is going to give you a wonderful period in a great future and great happiness. Then *11 1/2 - few sentences*

It's true you are going to pass through the reproach . You are going to pass through a long period of dis-tain, but the Maker is your husband. God is your Redeemer. God has _____ for you which he is not going to cast aside ~~which~~ even though for a time it appears to be out of reach. Therefore, you should not appear on account of this

124 - 13

discuss - ion

and without bringing into account anything else--just taking it for what it says there . my theory has two women there and they are antithesis of each other so you can't merge one into the other. When he says something he speaks to one and not the other. _____ this is ^{said} by a student

I don't think that up to this point in the chapter at least you have to bring _____ involved. Paul clearly teaches regardless of any relation to the millenium he teaches a going out of the gospel to the Jews as being received into the Olive tree of the entire Jewish race. I don't think that carries with it any. Conversion of the Jews as a nation born again. It seems to me that that is rather taught in the New Testament--that there is great glory and great happiness regardless of just what all is included in that. There is a period when as a nation they receive great blessing whether it is for a brief period or for a longer period. Whether in this case he is coming to that or still referring to the Jews is the question on which evidence could sway you either way. I don't think you have to report a ~~xxxxx~~ millennial consequence here in order to pick one or the other. I think that is not necessary to do here. This is a guess.

(Discussion) I don't think it means antagonism so much as indifference. Is there a difference or is one thought of exactly the other? *end of 24*

Saying that we want the Lord to declare our righteousness and our works. ~~We~~ They would like the Lord to give us our just desserts and ~~we~~ ^{they} are satisfied. They are as good as the next fellow. They will ~~take~~ take their chance. They are perfectly

all right. Let the Lord declare their righteousness and their works and they are all right. That is what they said. It comes from superficial saying. It ~~isxxx~~ does not come from a real understanding of the nature of the heart. Jeremiah said the heart is deceitful above all things and desparately wicked, not ~~merly~~ merely that it is desparately wicked but that it is deceitful and desparately wicked. I remember when one of the ~~Nxx~~ Nazi leaders ten years ago from Neumberg ~~xxxxxxx~~ was being accused of being a very blood thirsty man because of the terrible treatment which he was giving Jews. He told the reporters that this was utterly false. He said, "I just love little canaries and I do everything I can to keep the canaries from suffering in any way. I take care of them and I'm so kind to them." He felt that he was a very kind-hearted fellow. Others felt that his treatment of the Jews was more important than his treatment of the birds. Yet it is simply typical of the way in which people fail to see the wickedness of their hearts and they turn their attention upon something that is good and think that that is fine and they deserve credit for it. Of course, it is true of us as well as for them. We have the same tendency to judge ourselves wrongly ~~xxx~~ before God. So here is a wonderful text for a sermon. It is a wonderful answer to that attitude of the human heart. God gives them what they are after. I will declare thy righteousness and their works. But He said that they will not profit thee. The ~~xxxxxx~~ first half might leave us in doubt. The last half I think makes it ~~hat~~ clear. God is saying the declaration of your righteousness and your works results in seeing that they are ~~filthy~~ filthy rags. They are nothing good in God's hands. It is a rebuke.

So Mr. Haney seems to be all alone taking verse 12 as blessing. Well, now who would finish with verse 12, the end of verse 12. Well, then we'll ask it another way. Mr. Haney's first suggestion was 15a. how many agree that 15a was the place where the rebuke passage ends? Nobody agrees with that. What he said was 15a but he ~~retrack~~ ^{retract} that. so we won't hold that against him. But nobody else seems to agree with that either. Mr. Harrington suggest 13 a. How

many would agree with Mr. Harrington? We seem to have a rather large vote so we'll let the majority rule on this, and say that it is 13a. "When thou criest, let thy company deliver thee, but the wind shall carry them all away. Vanity shall take them." That is certainly ~~xxxxxx~~ rebuke, but the last half of that, "He that puts his trust in me shall possess the land and shall inherit my holy mountain." That is pretty hard to get away from the feeling that that is blessing, isn't it. Now the verse is one of those of which we have a good many of in Jeremiah where we have two alternatives, one that does this--rebuke--and one that does this--blessing--two alternatives. And hence there might be a good argument to put in the two halves in one verse here. But the two halves are hardly exactly parallel, are they. "When thou criest let thy company ~~xxx~~ deliver thee, but he that putteth his trust in me shall possess the land." There is the idea that the one is trusting in his company to let them deliver him and the other is trusting in the Lord and the Lord will deliver him. There is certainly a parallel but it is not an exact parallel. In order to get an exact parallel you have to confer a certain idea ~~xxx~~ from 13 which are definitely there but not clearly expressed. It surely seems to me that it would be a much better verse division to make your verse division here between the end of the present rebuke passage and the beginning of the blessing passage. I would think it much ~~xxx~~ better to make the first verse division right after 13 a there, especially as verse 14 does not seem to be a complete verse does it. Surely there will be something to be said for making 14 a part of 13. Taking one verse as a whole and if you are going to make two it would seem rather reasonable to make the division between the two verses come at the end of 13a instead of the place where it does as arranged here.

Now 14 is surely not rebuke is it. 14 would surely be blessing. 15a is the introduction to 15b. You have blessing then I think we'll all agree beginning with 13a. How far does the said blessing passage continue? How far does blessing continue after 13a? How many say through 19? About half. How many say

somewhere short of 19? Mr. Davis, where do you say? That is a reasonable way to take it. 17 is a ~~rebuke~~ sub-rebuke passage but part of a blessing passage because of its relation to what precedes and what follows. I will not contend forever nor will I always be wrought. I have contended in the past and he did not turn to righteousness but I am going to heal him nevertheless. The sovereignty of God in salvation. God's plan is going to be fulfilled. So that I think we can pretty well agree that ~~through 19 through 19~~ 13b through 19 is a blessing passage. Then we have two verses of rebuke, very definitely rebuke.

In contrast to what precedes. Are these two verses then properly a part of the next section? They are rather peculiar here. Or does the new rebuke passage start with them? Or are they a little postscript to this section? That is an unusual arrangement but one which is not unparalleled in Isaiah.

(Question--Mr. Moffitt) Your suggestion is as I take it that verse ~~19~~ 20 and 21 are not dealing with a type of rebuke. He is not saying you are wicked and you are going to be punished. He talking to the writer in a comparison with the other situation from which they have come out and with which they are not connected. ~~They~~ but putting this into strong relief. That ~~words~~ would be something which is perhaps not unparalleled but certainly not common. But it does seem to have an affinity of general idea of what precedes than to what follows in the next chapter. So that although at first one would say the chapter division should be at the end of 19. rebukes begin here and these two verses of rebuke seem to be a different type of rebuke from that which follows. It very likely to be again a rebuke section which is a subsection under a blessing title given by way of contrast to show God is going to bring peace to him that is far off and peace to ^{him} that is near and God will heal him but there is no peace to the wicked. But in contrast it shows the ~~blessing~~ blessing of the righteous rather than as a specific definite rebuke. I would incline very much to think that that is the correct ~~19~~ ^{of these two verses} interpretation. since they do seem to be more

connected in general tone with this chapter than with what follows. If we do that, we would say that we have a main subsection. We have a section, I would say, that begins at 56:9 and runs to the end of 57. We have a section. Is this a great section by itself like 40 to 56:8? Or is it a portion of a great section? It seems hardly long enough to be paralleled with 40 to 56:8. We would have to say that if it is as definite a section by itself as that is, then we must have very marked change from what follows. It would be quite reasonable to expect that the section of the book that begins in 56:9 will run further than a chapter and a half.

So we look on at the next chapter and see if we can find similarities to the previous chapter if we think it is part of a main division even though there is a section under the main section. ~~58:1-2~~ Does 58 begin with rebuke or with blessing? With rebuke Mr. _____ says. How many agree with Mr. _____ How many disagree with him? Perfectly neutral, but most agree. He said, "Show Jacob their sin." And yet in contrast ~~xxxx~~ comparison with the sin it says the people here are not people who are indifferent. They are not people who are turned away from God. Show them their sins but they are seeking God. They are trying to know the Lord's will. They want His ordinances. They take delight in a ~~xxxxxx~~ personal God. ~~xxxx~~ Verse 2 could be blessing or rebuke. We could not be sure which is what. ~~xxxx~~ when alone. Its combination with verse 1 would suggest it is rebuke because 1 is a declaration and a command that is rebuke. This one shows the good things about them and seems to be subservant to one ~~than~~ rather than to be a declaration of blessings. Then what is the relationship of verse 3 to verse 2, Mr. Hill? As Mr. Hill points out verse 2 says that the people had been seeking the Lord. Verse 3 this seeking has not been in the right way. Verse 2 says that they take delight in a ~~personal~~ ^{approaching} personal God. Verse 3 shows the people saying that they have fasted but God doesn't pay any attention to them. We have afflicted our soul but God doesn't give us any

58:3-4

knowledge of it. Here is the question. Why have we fasted and thou hast not seen? We have afflicted our soul and thou takest no knowledge of it. To say "they" is an assumption; it is not a statement of the Scripture. This becomes quite clear to become the meaning of it. This is quoting their situation. You seek the Lord and they don't find Him. They try to follow Him and He does not reward them. Then we have the answer to that given in the last half of 3 and in 4. Here it is again. Would it not be a better division simply to put the question in verse 3 up to the word "knowledge" ~~than~~ to put the last part of verse 3 and all of verse 4 in either ~~xxx~~ one or two verses because they are quite distinct, are they not. They say, "We have afflicted our soul and God taketh no knowledge," and He says, "Behold in the day of your fast, you find pleasure. Exact all your labor. Behold you fast for strife and debate and to smite with the fist of wickedness. Ye shall not fast in the day and make your voice to be heard on high." He says, "You are doing lots of ceremonies. You are very religious. You do not miss out on any forms of religion, but what good is it going to do with you? The heart is wrong and the forms are worthless if the heart is wrong." Luther said such things and they almost burned him at the stake when he said it is not enough to go through the form. You have to have a penitent heart along with it. That is what Isaiah wrote. You can do all the form. It does you no good if the heart is not right. Then he continues discussing form. He says, "Is this a fast? To go through all these forms-- bow down your head like a bulrush, spread sackcloth and ashes? Is that acceptable to the Lord? It says in verse 5--he is rebuking them. end of 58.

It is a little hard to put verse 6 very definitely under the category of ~~xxx~~ rebuke or blessing because the form that it is seems to be not so much a matter of telling the people you are wrong because you don't do this or you are right because you do this as to give the explanation and solve the problem to tell what kind of a fast is desired. You might say he is rebuking them for not

fasting in this way. So to that extent it is a continuation of the rebuke. These are the things you don't do and therefore you are cursed. On the other hand as he continues he shows that blessing will come to you if you do these things. So it is a little hard to place 6 or 7 definitely under rebuke or blessing. It would seem to be though a continuation of the passage telling what is wrong with the people. Why are the people not receiving God's blessing? Because though they have plenty of form for ceremonies, their heart is not right with it. It doesn't mean they shouldn't fast. It doesn't mean you shouldn't go through ceremony. It does mean that they are absolutely useless if the ~~xxx~~ right heart attitude is not with them. If they are not a help to get the right heart with them in ~~itx~~ itself. So he says this is the kind of fast I want to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, to let the oppressed go free, to break every wicked yoke, to ~~give~~ deal your bread to the hungry, to bring the poor who are cast out to your house, to cover the nation and hide not thyself from thy ~~xxxx~~ own flesh. These are the things that are a right fast and they are not doing it, so the rebuke. They are the things that should be done ~~xxx~~ if fasting is done right. What will the result be if we do these things? The blessing passage might be conceivably thought of as starting at verse 6. It certainly does not start later than verse 8. So we have here again definite rebuke passing to words of blessing. The people are shown their wickedness and the reason for their wickedness. What they are doing is wrong and how they would do it if they were doing it right. Then if it is done in this right way, then comes blessing. So whether you would make the exact dividing line between 6 or between 8, is hard to say. The whole thing is a unit. There is a paragraph division, it seems to begin at 8. The contrast has been presented and a part of rebuke perhaps. Now he says if you would do the thing that is right instead of the wrong, here is the blessing that would come. What is the blessing that would come? Verse 8. The blessing then is given from verse 8 how far, Mr. Gordon? Yes, verse 8 to 14 is blessing. God's blessing upon the people.

Now comes a very interesting question. Is this blessing prediction a prediction of unconditional blessing, something that is bound to take place? Or is it a prediction of conditional blessing--if you do so, such and such will happen? ~~in chapter~~ What about 57? We had blessing there from 13:8 to 19. Was that unconditional blessing or conditional blessing? How many conditional blessing in 57? Raise your hand. Several. How many say it is unconditional? A much larger number. What does the minority have to say for itself? (Students)

Predictions which are--God has a plan ~~He~~ is going to carry out, the plan to make people happy. God is going to bless. You may ask, which are you? Are you among those who are going to receive the punishment? Are you among those who are going to receive the blessing? It is definite that the blessing is coming and there are those who will receive it. There are others which are given if you will do such and such, God will send this terrible punishment; if you do the opposite, God will send a wonderful blessing. The two can pass over instances, to the point where there is no sharp division. But there are those which clearly belong on one side and those which clearly belong on the other side of this division. This one is not clearly on the one side but is fairly definitely there, but is not extremely on this side. It is fairly definite. It is only these words of condition here, these words of description rather, of those who receive ~~it~~ the blessing rather than a statement, if you will do this, you will get that; if you do the other, you will get that. Of course, all of that is implied.

(Question--Mr. Jerome) Yes, there is on one occasion, but the implication is given rather than there are two categories. The one category gives this and the other gives that. Rather than saying, here you are, which are you going to do? There is always that in the background.

57:17 (Question) He says, "I hid me and was wrought and he went on forward, and the way of his heart I seen a ways." Doesn't it sound like sovereign grace there? That's overruling and turning the man around who is going on forward in the way of his heart, and God entering in and just taking a hold of him by the back

of the neck and turning him around and pushing him in the direction of God's desire. He ~~is~~ has seen his ways and the ways just described are pretty bad ways. He is going to restore him. Now you don't want to draw a lot, of course, from a connection of two verses, but it is at least a possible interpretation between the two verses, ~~tha~~ and to draw the opposite certainly required reading into it. It is not a thing on which the doctrine can be settled on this particular verse here, but I think that it must be agreed that verse 18 fits this very well with the idea of the sovereignty of God in grace--that God is saying that Israel has gone ~~is~~ on in wicked ways ~~that~~ but that God is going to heal Israel, not because there are some in Israel who are so good and so fine that they turn away from their wickedness and turn to God, but because God in sovereign grace is going to overrule and He is going to produce a rank. That would certainly seem to be something that is not at all far fetched to get at the possible interpretation of this verse.

57:18

(Question) That would be the Calvinistic interpretation. (Question) The infinite wisdom of God that the fact that any of us are not wicked is not because we are so good that we decide to turn to God but because He in His marvelous grace ~~turns~~ turns to us. It is marvelous love that makes us to be righteous.

(Question) A very interesting suggestion here. To divide up into six sections the section from chapter 56:9 to the end of 59 omitting the last ~~two~~ three verses of 59 which he would put over with the next chapter. That is a very interesting suggestion. The first place in it where it differs from the suggestion we had made was where he considered 57:1-2 to be blessing. Well, 57:2, "He shall enter into peace. They shall rest in their beds, each one ~~walking~~ walking in his uprightness." Does he walk in his sleep? Walking in his uprightness. That certain verse is a very peculiar verse. At first sight it certainly sounds like blessing, but verse 1 doesn't seem to me be blessing. "The righteous perish and no man lays it to heart and merciful men are taken away. None considering that the righteous is taken away from the evil." (Discussion)-few sentences) 26-10

It is very questionable whether one is any blessing at all. Certainly 2 might be blessing. It is a very peculiar verse. I think that we must say that if 1 and 2 are blessing, I'm not ready to categorically deny, but which appears to me rather improbable. Then Mr. Lin's suggestion to have two divisions here 56:9 to 57:2 and then 57:3 to 14 is a good one. But I am rather skeptical about this, although I must confess I don't know quite what verse 2--verse 1 seems to me to be rebuking people for their wickedness. "The righteous perisheth and no one lays it to heart; merciful men are taken away and nobody realizes that the righteous after all are in God's hand." The tone of ~~it~~^{one} ~~at once~~ seems to be quite clearly rebuke, but 2 I just don't really know, whether 2 is simply an ~~apix~~ exclamation of the righteous going into peace as showing the rebuke to the wicked who sends him or what it ~~is~~ is. I don't think it is an extremely vital question right here whether we would take what seems to be the probably thing that 56:9 to 57 is one section or divide here at 2 on that particular basis.

Now the next place where Mr. Lin raised an interesting question is when you come to 13a. 57:3 to 13a we all agreed was rebuke. Whether you start with 57:3 or with 56:9. Certainly it is rebuke. Then Mr. Lin suggests 13b to 14 to be a section of blessing ending that ~~xxx~~ paragraph and then starting a new one with another blessing section followed by rebuke. As against that we wonder about the fact of verse 15 starts with ~~xxxxxx~~ "for". "For thus saith the high and lofty one". The "for" doesn't necessarily mean that it connects with ~~what~~ what precedes. It might be in connection with what follows. It certainly suggests it. That is a certain suggestion against it. It is an interesting suggestion to have this one be blessing and rebuke rather than to have a long rebuke passage followed by a fairly long blessing passage and then two verses sort of hanging in the air as an ~~apix~~ appendix as you spoke of, which is quite unusual. This is an interesting suggestion to get around that. It is new to me and I at first sight am inclined to hold to the previous idea, but it is worth thinking through more. It is a very interesting idea.

Now then the next point where he. That takes you through 57 so that the arrangement he suggests is a very interesting one and the basic points of division is the same. The main thing is to make more divisions here than we did, but the general basic approach is ~~the~~ much the same. Now the next one he made 58:1-7 as a rebuke passage which I think we would probably all agree with unless we put 6 and 7 with a blessing passage following. Then 8 to 9a he makes one division and then 9b to 14 a section all by itself of blessing. Now that is true that 9b starts with condition, and so it is either condition given before, conditions and results, conditions and results repeating, or a new section in which conditions are given. It is an alternative rather than interpretation here and very interesting indeed. I doubt if it effects our general main conclusion. It is a very interesting suggestion. At any rate from 8 on to the end of the chapter is blessing whether it is simply one section or two sections. I think on that we would all agree.

Now we notice that while the end of 57 is not thoroughly or decisively unconditional yet there is much to be said for taking it as an unconditional blessing. There is much which suggests the implication that this is God's sovereign grace here giving the conditions which will be there in connection with His showing it rather than to offer the man, "you fulfill these conditions; you be contrite; if you are I'll do this and if you are not these blessings won't be fulfilled." There is a *do - 15 (same word)* that says they are going to be fulfilled and they are going to be there for those who will receive them.

- 1/4 Learning how to find out what passages mean.
- 1/7 Proper attitude for Bible interpretation NB
The Bible is all interrelated
- 2/3 The more one knows, the less he knows.
Illustration of the circle - knows what's inside, ignorant of what
is beyond the circumference -- more than that he does not know
they exist.
- 2/8 Important to become aware of problems
- 3/4 Becoming aware of problems is, in a way, as important as learning the
answers to problems
- 3/6- 54:1 Explanation of "children of the desolate" Meaning of "more are the
children"?
- 4 54:1-3 Promise of spiritual increase rather than physical
Description of extension of the gospel.
- 4/4 54:4 God addressing Israel
17 "heritage of servants of the Lord"
- 4/8 Man who was studying psychiatry
5 "He already knows the Christian part, now he's getting the other."
5/7 Never know all there is to know of the Christian side of things
- 6 Great weakness in the Christian church today: "We're got John 3:16,
what more do we need?"
- 6/7 Secret of progress of Christianity found in knowledge of Word on part
of those serving the Lord.
- 6/8 Question relating to Gal. 4:21-28
7/3 "Mother of us all" - can't completely separate the heavenly people and
the earthly people; they overlap
- 7/5 The law itself is not accursed. Misunderstanding and misapplication of
it becomes a curse and genders bondage.
- 7/6 54:1 Not "no children" from married wife, but "more children" from desolate
7/10
- 8/3 The "desolate" is the Gentiles - are more from Gentiles than from Jews
- 8/5 NT quotations and verbal inspiration. Not to try to prove doctrines
by a single word and its use.
- 9/1 NT quotations. Abuse and misunderstandings regarding them.
9/7 Stephen's speech - knew his facts about Abraham and Jacob.
Mistake on his part unlikely
- 10 Scribal error less likely probability than that this is a
telescopic account of two into one. NB
- 10/7 Possibility of scribal error extremely small.
- 10/9 Relation of ch. 54 to ch. 55

- 11 54: No call, exhortation, summons to the people to do anything
- 11/3 55: Different note. Definite exhortation to individuals.
Contrasts noted between ch. 54 and 55
- 11/6 ch. 55 a direct outworking of ch. 53. Gospel invitation to avail
self of blessings provided by Christ's work in ch. 53
- 11/8-10 Example of good chapter division
- 12 Ch. 53 tells of the work of Christ
Ch. 54 applies it in general to a large group of people
Ch. 55 shows individual specific application of it to individuals
- 12/4 55:7 Not a rebuke, but a blessing verse
12/6-10 Ch. 55 is a Gospel chapter
- 13 55:10,11 Free agency and sovereign election both
God gives a sincere offer of salvation to all the world.
- 13/9 Evangelist who took graduate course in doctrinal preaching and
lost truth of man's responsibility to Gospel invitation
- 14/7 55:12-13 Figurative change expressed beyond any literal fulfillment.
15/1-4 Fir and myrtle are examples of general change in physical creation
and symptomatic of change in spiritual realm
- 15/5 Between ch. 55 and ch. 56 comes a break, at least a break occurs
in course of ch. 56, but not after vs. 12 of ch. 56
- 16/5 Not a gradual change, but the kind that takes place when the bell
rings and everybody rushes to the door!
- 16/6-10 Reasons for putting the break at 56:8
17 cont'd
- 18/3 The division between ch. 57 and 58 not a tenth as important as the
division between vs. 8 and 9
- 18/5 Illustration from reading D'Aubigny's history of reformation.
- 18/7 56:1-8 The teaching of 56:1-8
- 19 Assignment
- 20 54:1 "the children of the desolate"
- 21 Interp. of 54:1 fits 54:3 - children of desolate, desolate cities --
city which was desolate as far as that type of person is concerned.
- 21/7 54:4 Who is speaking to?
he
- 21/10 Two different women
- 22 Shifts from one to the other NB
22/8 54:4
23 Class discussion and argument

R

- 24 54:1 Compares two different women in one moment at two different times. These women are figures - one of Gentiles, the other of Israel
- 24/4 54:1 How determine which woman is referred to in which verse? mentions both
- 25 54:2-4 Votes of class on to whom these verses refer.
- 26 54:5-10 -- voting continued
- 27/1-4 11-16 Gentiles do not seem to be taken alone anywhere after vs. 6 (unintelligible discussion)
- 27/5-10
- 28/1 illustration: rejoice on account of the atomic bomb
- 28/3-10 not clear
- 29 " "
- 30/3 The two women are antithetical & cannot be merged into one
- 31/3-5 illustration of Nazi leader who when accused of atrocities to Jews denied it and pled his love for little canaries and kindness to them. Tendency to judge ourselves wrongly before God
- 31/7 57:12 I will declare thy righteousness -- declaration of it results in seeing they are filthy rags. A rebuke
- 32 57:13 Discussion over whether it contains a clear division or parallel thought. 14 blessing
- 33 57:13b-19 Blessing 20-21 Rebuke
- 34/4 58 Discussion over what is rebuke and what is blessing
- 35 58:3-4 Form not enough; must have penitent heart also
- 35/9 58:6 Describes the kind of fast desired rather than rebuke.
- 36 58:6-7 Rebuke passing into blessing
- 36/10 8-14 Blessing
- 37 Is the blessing conditional or unconditional?
- 37/9 57:17 Sovereign grace
- 38/1- 7 18 " "
- 38/7-10 Interesting suggestion on 56:6 - 59:
- 39/3-5 57:1-2 The "for" of vs. 15 does not necessarily mean it connects with what precedes
- 5-10 13a-15
- 40/1-6 58: Verse division
- 40/5-8 57: End of ch. - unconditional blessing?

Today we are taking up the last three and a half of Isaiah, and particularly the first two and a half of those three and a half. That is to say, it is chapters 63, 64 and 65 that we are particularly interested in now, although we may glance also to some extent at 66. I asked you to look over these chapters, and I haven't yet had a chance to look over your papers and find out how many of you have done it, to look over 63, 64 and 65 particularly, and find out what ~~out-what-~~ the man is talking about. I think this is a vital thing in connection with the prophets. We should recognize that these men are talking about something; they are presenting something. It is not a series of magical words, that you can pick out a few words and get a blessing from it. It is a discussion, and the discussion may be summed up in a few words, and those few words have great value by themselves, but in general words have to be taken in context, and we see what the subject matter is of the whole section of the book, what is under consideration. You can't make a rule that everything is going to be literal. You certainly can make a rule that the great bulk in any section is literal, or it makes no sense at all. But there are figures of speech interspersed in any section of the Scripture that you want to look at, more in some/xx/ less in others, but you have to know by your context, what is it talking about? What is the subject under consideration. Now I would like to ask, how many of you have studied 63 sufficiently to give me an answer to this, What is the most important dividing point in the chapter? Would you raise your hand. Not manyDidn't I assign 63 also? Then it is understandable why you do not have the division. I stated at 64 ~~64~~ then? Mr. O, you had 63. What do you say about it? (St: I think the primary division is between verse 6 and verse 7.) Yes. Verse 6 and 7. Let's look at that. And if I didn't include 63 in the assignment, we must look at the latter part of 63, because it and 64 form a unit, and while you could probably get the idea from 64, to fully understand it, you need 63. 63:1-6 is a picture of God coming in wrath, a tremendous picture ~~of~~ of God coming sometime at the end of the age in wrath. There is no question that that is what is here described. And it is closely related to previous sections

of the book, previous chapters, but at verse 7 we begin a new section, a section which probably runs to the end of the book. It changes to the first person. You have the first person in verse 3, but here it is either the prophet or some person other than God speaking in verse 7, and you begin a unified section which runs perhaps to the end of the book, but at least to the end of chapter 64. It is easy to see with just a glance with at the first few verses of 64 and the last few of 63 that it is a prayer which is in 64 and in the previous verses of 63, and that they go together. It is one continuous section. It is highly questionable whether there should be any division where chapter 64 begins, but there is no question that one of the major divisions of the book comes between verses 6 and 7 of chapter 63, far more important than the division at the beginning of chapter 63. And so we will begin with verse 7 there: "I will mention the loving ~~of~~ kindnesses of the LORD, and the ~~prais~~ praises of the LORD, according to all to all that the LORD hath bestowed on us, and the great goodness toward the house of Israel, which he hath bestowed on them according to his mercies, and according to the multitude of his lovingkindnesses." ~~Not~~

Now here is a section then, and you immediately ask yourself, What is the purpose of verse 7? Is the ~~of~~ purpose of verse 7 to begin a section of praise to God? Or what is the basic idea of the section from verse 7 here to the end of chapter 64. Is it a section which has as its primary purpose praise to God? Or is its primary purpose the revelation of future things to come? Is it God's message to us what is being presented primarily, or what is it that ~~is~~ is the basic thought of this section? What would you say, Mr. L, that is the basic thought of the section as a whole? (St: That the Lord will remember in future days what He has not done or brought to them in the past.) It is a prayer that God will do something for the people. It relates to the future. I-~~dea~~¹ Is it necessarily distant future? I don't think in chapter 64 the people are saying, "God, we want this. Do it for us in the distant future." I think they are hoping it will be soon, aren't they? It is future, definitely. It is something they don't have as yet. But they want something. They are praying /God to do

something for them. Chapter 64 begins, "Oh that thou wouldst rend the ~~heaven~~ heavens, that thou wouldst come down--" Chapter 64 ends, "Wilt thou refrain thyself for these things, O LORD? wilt thou hold thy peace, and afflict us very sore?" They are asking for an end of affliction. They are asking for something to be done by the Lord. And what is it that they want done? Do they want Him to release them from Babylon? Is that stressed in chapter 64, release from B_abylon? What verse in 64 refers to release from Babylon. There is no ~~meta~~ mention of any such thing in the chapter, is there? What is it that is mentioned in 64? (St: It seems mostly to be the breaking down of the temple and (7) the land.)

Yes. The end of the chapter: "Thy holy cities are a wilderness. Our holy and beautiful house, where our fathers praised thee, is burned with fire. Wilt thou refrain thyself for these things, O LORD, wilt thou hold thy peace--?" If you come to me and you say, "It is time for chapel and there are no hymn books there." Are you going to sit quiet and do ~~nothing~~ nothing? What is the idea? What are you coming to me about? You are coming to see if something can't be done to provide the hymn books. And here it is perfectly clear that it is not a rhetorical statement; it is not the description of a condition; it is not an utterance of praise to God. All these may ~~end-~~ enter in, but the primary thing is, O Lord, rebuild our temple; O Lord, rebuild our cities; O Lord, change our area from a devastation and a wilderness to a place which again is blessed as it has been in the past. Chapter 64 is a prayer that God will return His blessing to His land. There is no mention of exile. Therefore the critics divide the book into three main sections, say that the first part of Isaiah is discussing conditions in the time of Isaiah when there was danger of attack by a foreign army. The second part, from chapter 40 on, is discussing the condition when the people are in Babylon, in exile, and asking for ~~del~~ deliverance from Babylon, ~~that-therefe--~~ The third part, this section, is asking God, after the people have come back to Palestine, for help in

rebuilding the land. And so, they say, you have three different stages and three different Isaiahs. Now, of course, we do not accept those conclusions. But those conclusions rest upon a recognition of the basic theme of these sections, and the fact ~~it~~ is true about the basic theme. The basic approach in the first section of Isaiah is to the people in Isaiah's day. The basic approach in the second section of ~~Isaiah~~ Isaiah is to the people in exile, giving them assurance of God's deliverance. And, of course, he is addressing it to people in his own day who have seen the wickedness of the land becoming so great that they know ~~that~~ his predictions of exile are bound to be fulfilled. They envision the exile as already present, and he talks to those people to ~~em~~ comfort them, and also talks directly then, to the people a century and a half later who will be in exile. But now, here, he has gone on past the return from exile. That has been dealt with. That is taken for granted, and now he is looking forward to a more distant time. And he is appealing to people in that time, and he appealing to people in his own day who realize the certainty of this situation that is going to come. And he is not necessarily stressing three stages--return from exile, and then be settled in the land, and what it rebuilt, but what he stresses here is that-relation- desolation of the land and need of rebuilding. And the question is, What is going to be done in this situation? The land is in distress; the land is desolate. ~~The~~ holy cities are a wilderness; Zion is a wilderness. The holy and beautiful house where our fathers praisied thee is burned with fire. Wilt thou refrain thyself, O Lord. Wilt thou hold thy peace and afflict us very sore. Now then, if that is the key passage here, if that is the thing that is under consideration here, a prayer to God for help in this situation, what does verse 7 have to do with it? What is the purpose of verse 7 of chapter 63? (St: It seems to be a calling to mind the things that the Lord has done in times past to His people, and uses that as a basis for hoping that He will do that sort of thing.) Yes. Exactly. Verse 7 is remembering past goodness, and as a ground on which to hope for future

goodness. They are saying, "God, you did so much for us in the past. Why won't you do something similarly now?" They are saying, "We remember how good God was in the past, and therefore we ~~sh~~ have reason ~~to~~ to hope that He will now again be good to us." And so verse 7 here is introducing a prayer for help in the face of desolation and misery in the land, in view of the fact that God has done good to them in the past. That is the thought of verse 7. It is remembering God's kindness in the past to Israel for a certain ~~purpose~~ purpose, for the purpose of being the ground of a prayer for present and future help. And so we continue with verse 8, "God was so good to our ancestors. Why? Because He said, They are my people, children who will not lie. So He was their Saviour; in all their affliction He was afflicted, and the angel of ~~of~~ His presence saved them: In his love and pity he redeemed them; and he ~~bare~~ ^{carried} them, and carried them all the days of ~~of~~ old." God did all ^{these} things for the Israelites: bringing them out of Egypt into the Promised Land, and blessing them in all these ways. That is wonderful, those things God has done in the past. Now we see-- say, O Lord, you have done these things in the past, now do something similar. But you can't quite make that jump immediately from the past/ goodness. You remember the past goodness, and then it is necessary to remember a little bit of what is happening between. Is it just because God is arbitrary and changes His mind that now we are in such suffering, or is there a reason for it? And so they naturally, having mentioned His goodness in His past, have to mention how it came about that the ~~change~~ change occurred. So we see in verse 10 that they rebelled and vexed His Holy Spirit, and so He was turned to be their enemy. That is how we are in this situation. They ~~regarded-it--~~ rebelled and so God has done this to them. And He ~~is~~ ^{fought} ~~against~~ against them. And then He remembered the days of old, Moses and His people. And they say, Where is He that brought them up out of the sea with the shepherd of His flock? Where is the One who did these wonderful things coming out of Egypt? Where is the One who brought us through the Red Sea and protected us? That led us by the right

hand of Moses with His glorious arm, dividing the water before them to
~~am~~ek make Himself an everlasting name, He-~~am~~- that led them through the
deep, as an horse in the wilderness? They are looking back to God's
goodness again. They mention/ that "We have fallen into a bad situation
because the people have rebelled against God, and so He became ~~en~~ our
enemy." But," they say, "think of what God did for us in the past. May not
He, who did all this in the past, again do wonderful things in the future?"
"As a beast goes ~~de~~
~~And-as-these-ge~~ down into the valley, the Spirit of the Lord caused him to
rest; so didst thou--" Now they address God personally--"--So didst thou
lead thy people to make thyself a glorious name." They say, God, you did
all these wonderful things in the past, and the implication is, ~~I//o//~~
^{we}
O, ~~I~~ wish you'd do something like it now, do something in the future like
the wonderful things in the past. And so they continue, addressing them-
selves directly to God, "Look down from heaven, and behold from the habitation
of thy holiness and of thy glory: where is thy zeal and thy strength, the
sounding of thy bowels and of thy mercies toward me? are they restrained?"
They say, God, you have done all this in the past. Won't you do similar
things now? Where is your love toward us? Where is your ~~h~~ holiness?
Where is your strength? Why don't you do something, Lord, like you used
to? What are they basing it upon then, their hope that God will do such
things for them? They are basing it upon the fact that He did such
things in the ~~pat~~ past, aren't they? They are basing it upon that. And
they recognize that the reason that He brought ill to them was because they
had rebelled. Up to this point, how much expression do we have of
repentance for having rebelled? (end of record)

that we no longer have that attitude. 1/4 statement, O God, we have done wickedly in the past, we deserve what you brought upon us but now we want a change. Give us a right spirit within us. Change our hearts. Make us truly yours. Help us to do your will in all things. There has been no such statement up to here, has there? Up to this point it has all been based upon this. We are your people. You did these things for us in the past, now can you cast aside the ones you have done such wonderful things for in the past? Aren't you going to continue similar wonderful things in the future? Just think of these wonderful things. ^{You} ~~He~~ did all these things in the past, O why, aren't you ^d going such things for us now. The ground is a recollection of what God has done in the ~~past~~ and a claim that they are his people. And now, they say in vs. 16; "Doubtless thou art our father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not: thou, O Lord, art our father, our redeemer; thy name is from everlasting". It is based here upon God being their God, they being His people, therefore they have a right to expect that He will do wonderful things for ~~them~~. And then they say; "O LORD° why hast thou made us to wander from thy ways, and hardened our heart from thy fear? Return for thy servants' sake, the tribes of thine inheritance". You might say that is Calvinism carried to the extreme of hyper-calvinism, is it not? O God, why did you cause us to go into sin and wickedness? Why have you done it? Why don't you make us righteous? Why do you ~~s~~end us into wickedness? Make us righteous instead of wicked. (question 2)

Read the revised version then. Yes, Go, Abraham, that is.....
Yes, well the people who have been speaking just above are the people whose ancestors had been lead by the hand of Moses, aren't they? And in vs. 17, "Return for thy servants' sake, the tribes of thine inheritance." In vs. 17 and vs. 11, and the other earlier verses, it is quite clear that it is Israel that is talking and so here Israel would seem to say even if Abraham doesn't do anything for us. Even if Israel were to turn against

us, yet, you God, are the one who did so much for them, for our ancestors, then surely, even if they were to turn against us, then surely ~~you~~ you wouldn't turn against us. (question 3 1/2) Well, we haven't as yet reached a conclusion on that point..... vs 16? Well, Israel here is Jacob. I don't think it means the nation. No, it is using the word Abraham just about, who is the first, It would impress me that it is referring to the founder of the , rather than to the nation, Abraham, Isaac, and Israel..... I don't think so. I think you would say even if 4

yet we all are descendents of God's people, we are His people. Yes, it is a little bit difficult, the verse unquestionably, a little bit obscure. It is a little obscure, undoubtedly, but it in the light of the context that that is the best way to interpret it. That Abraham is an individual here and doubtless Israel is also. If they meant the people of Israel, I don't think they would ~~put~~ put Abraham in parallel even if we had nothing to 4 1/2 human beings who are our ancestors who were great men while they were living, yet God was their God and we are His people, and surely He will not forget us. (question 5) It may be, I don't know. It is difficult to decide positively how it is means, but negatively ^{at least} ~~it/it/never~~ even this not for the people to say, they wouldn't. To definitely say that, it would seem to require something in the context and there is nothing in the context to suggest , but even if now, whether there is a little recognition that they couldn't look upon the sin of the people , I don't know. At least, even if they were to reject us, why God is our God, He is our Father, He is our Redeemer, for our nation, and surely He will continue . It would seem to me that at least that is the big start of the here and that particular phrase is different. I just don't see any, I mean it fits in with this sentence, I think, fairly well, but to draw further implications from it, it is pretty difficult and I don't know of any other sense to suggest that ^{will} ~~might~~ work out in the light

of the whole context. Well, then, in vs. 17 there is this prayer; "Why have you made us err from your ways?" Now, you might say it just means 'not cause us' but 'permit us', "Why did you permit us? But why did you harden~~ed~~ our heart from your fear"? At least it seems to be attributing their sin to God, doesn't it? It seems to be making him the author of evil, doesn't it? It seems to be saying: "Well, we can't help ourselves, and God made us this way. What can we do about it? God has done this and here we are. Now won't He help us and give us some help?" It seems to have that idea, doesn't it? Well, now, they say then, "Return for thy servantz' sake, the tribes of thine inheritance. The people of thy holiness have possessed it but a little while;" 'It' is in italics, but 'possessed' requires some kind of an object. "It possessed something but a little while." What have they possessed a little while? What is it talking about? The sanctuary is specifically mentioned in the next verse. It would seem at least to include the sanctuary whether it includes more or not. At least the sanctuary and "tribes of thine inheritance". That would seem to refer to the land that pe~~o~~ple had inherited. Perhaps, just the sanctuary, but probably a lot larger area. "The people of thy holiness", thy Holy people, "have possessed it but a little while: our adversaries have trodden down thy sanctuary." Does that mean just the temple? Does it mean the whole of the Holy Land? The whole of the sacred land that God gave to A~~r~~raham. At least it means the sanctuary and if it just means the sanctuary, it would surely seem to s~~t~~and for an area rather than just the building. "We are thine: thou never barest rule over them; they were not called by thy name." Who are the 'they' who are not called by thy name. The adversaries. The people who had trodden down the sanctuary. CHrist said that the Holy Place will be trodden down of the Gentiles ^{til} ~~that~~ the time of the Gentiles be fulfilled. Here they say, "Our adversaries have trodden down thy sanctuary. Thou never barest rule over them. We are your people. They were not called

by thy name". What is the big argument now? God should restore to Israel the land. God should restore Israel its sanctuary, Why? What is the reason? Well, they only possess a short time, they say, but of course, that is 9 .

They had it for a few centuries, certainly, but just a little while in the light of eternity. The adversaries ~~of~~ have trodden down , but the reason is that they are God's people and the other people aren't God's people. The other people haven't been called by God's name and they have been. Well, He ought to do it for His own rather than for someone else, shouldn't he? He ought to do it for His rather than for the other people. Is that at all similar to the attitude that I must say irritates me when I hear somebody talk about, we must do something we have got 100,000 boys in Korea and think what will happen to them if we don't do something. Well, I agree with them 100%. I agree with every word of it. But, yet, when I think of 15,000,000 Koreans subject to slaughter and torture and terrific treatment at the hands of those who would like to make the whole world a slave state. It seems to me that terrible as it is to think of 100,000 boys suffering that the slaughter of 15,000,000 Koreans is even more important, even worse, and they ^{be} ought to at least given an equal position when we discuss the matter. It impresses me. They are ours and we are interested in ours, but are we not interested in any human beings who are in danger of terrific suffering and torture and misery at the hands of the thugs who control about half of the world today. They are ours. We are interested in our own. I know a lot of people have that attitude, but I don't think that it is a Christian attitude, especially, I feel that a Christian is interested more in any other Christian in any part of the world, tremendously in any other Christian regardless of his race and of his and of his nation and I think that any human decent being should be interested in the suffering of anybody anywhere and the fact that he happens to be of

his ~~own~~ home nation, while it gives him a special reason to be interested in him, should not be so important as to make him forget the other altogether, certainly. Well, now, do you think that there is anything of that ~~type~~ spirit here? "We are yours. You never bore rule over them. They weren't called by your name. They are just the heathen, they are just the outsiders. We are your people. We should get these blessings. Well of course, God's people should get His blessing, and God's people will get His blessing, but what is the vital thing in getting the blessing? Is it the fact that God has shown you mercy in the past? That is vital. But is that the most vital thing? Is not a more vital thing, what is your relationship to Him, and what is your relationship to the sin that has put you in this present situation. (St: ...Malachi...the people were looking for God's blessing, and they weren't receiving it, and God was blessing the Jew's enemies above them.) And they were crying for the day of the Lord to come. But wasn't it Malachi who said, "The day of the Lord will ^{be a} day of misery for you, not a day of blessing. The day of the Lord is a day of darkness, not a day of light," by which he meant to say, you can't simply say, "Once God does things, everything will be fine for us." God is interested in righteousness and justice, and not merely in the treatment of His own people, although that is a real factor, enters in, and has its place very definitely. But it is not the exclusive place, and if it becomes the primary thing, it loses its true significance. And I am just wondering, do we ~~ah~~ have perhaps not too much stress in this thought here, as perhaps an unbalance here, with a lack of the other side. Now, of course, you don't want to say that just on the basis of one chapter, or one passage. It may be ~~g~~ balanced with other passages elsewhere, but we do have ^{13 1/3} at least a very strong stress here in this passage on this (brought?). And we have this, "Where are your people? You never bore rule over them. They aren't called by your name." That seems to be the big stress here: "We are the people who belong to God, and He must bless us." At least in

this verse. Well now, the next chapter ^(Isaiah 64:1 AV) continues right straight on, and you have this wonderful prayer: "Oh that thou wouldest rend the heavens, that thou wouldest come down, that the mountains might flow down at thy presence, as when the melting fire burns, the fire causeth the waters to boil, to make thy name known to thine adversaries, that the nations may tremble at thy ~~presene~~ presence! When thou didst terrible things which we looked not for, thou camest down--" What is verse 3 doing again? It is referring to facts again, isn't it? It is ~~rewa-~~ showing the wonderful mercies of God in the past, what He has done. Whereas v. 1 is looking to the future, praying that God would do wonderful things, v. 2 is saying God is a God who does do such things. Verse 3 is saying God is a god who has done such things. They are ~~re~~ referring to the power of God, and to the powerful acts God has done in the past, and saying, Why ~~can't~~ can't such things happen now? (V. 4 read.) The wonderful things that God can do a vital element of prayer. Praise to God, recognition of His power, of His ~~ged~~ goodness, of what He has done in the past, and what He can do. (Read v. 5a,b) You would almost think the verse ought to end right there. (" v. 5c) "Behold, thou art wroth; for we have sinned/: in those is continuance, and we shall be saved." You are wroth, we have sinned, but your mercy is from everlasting, and surely there will be salvation.

(end of record)

e 87

...terrible condition. (v. 7) "And there is none that calleth upon thy name, that stirreth up himself to take hold of thee." Why? Because we are such awful sinners, that we don't turn to God ~~right-away~~ as we should and ~~try~~ to seek His will, --and now let's do it right away? No, "for thou hast hid thy face from us, and hast consumed us, because of our iniquities." God has turned away from us, ~~and-has-consumed-~~ there is iniquity on us, and God has turned from us, but now, after all, God is our *father*, even if we have been sinners. Even if we have been wicked, God is our father. We are the work of your hands. You sent us into sin. You brought upon us to do

this wickedness; you made us err from your way; now turn around and take us back again. We are all the work of your hand. After all, God controls all things, so He should turn us around. "Be not wroth very sore, O LORD, neither remember iniquity forever." We are going to change our attitude, and we are going to follow God and ask Him for power to do His will. "Neither remember iniquity forever: behold, see, we beseech thee, we are all thy people. Thy holy cities are a wilderness, Zion is a wilderness, Jerusalem a desolation. Our holy and our beautiful house, where our fathers praised thee, is burned up with fire: and all our pleasant things are laid waste. Wilt thou refrain thyself for these things, O Lord? wilt thou hold thy peace, and afflict us very sore?" Delitzsche says something like this: "After this tremendously moving prayer, God can do nothing but give immediate answer. He just cannot wait until He grants the things that are desired and gives immediate answer after this wonderful moving prayer." Just can't wait because of this poignant moving prayer. However, before we have God's answer, we first have a passage of rebuke. " That is what he says approximately. Now, if God just can't wait this wonderful prayer, why then does He interject a passage of rebuke first? Why, did some editor get it mixed up and get it in the wrong order? And between the prayer and the answer, put in some other thing? You come to me and you say, "Oh, we've got to sing. We want to sing the praises of God, and we need some hymn books. Won't you give us some hymn books." And I give you a good scolding for something you did last year. It doesn't seem reasonable, does it? It seems as if chapter 65, unless there is a sharp break in the passage, chapter 65 must come right after 64 and relate to it, and it must show us God's reaction to the prayer which we have in 64. Oh yes, He could start and say, "This wonderful prayer moves me; I am going to grant your request. Before we discuss details of it, I have a few things to discuss wherein you have been wrong, and I want to point them out." He could start in that way, but that is not the way He starts it. What

does he say? ~~They~~ "They say, 'We are thine. Thou never barest rule over them. They are not called by thy name.'" He says, "I am sought of them that asked not for me; I am found of them that sought me not: I said, Behold me, behold me, unto a nation that was not called by my name. I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people, which walketh in a way that was not good, after their own thoughts." Now how can you interpret the beginning of 63 in relation to 63^{and 64}/except as to say, "Here is a prayer presented to God, and God rejects it." Does He reject it altogether? Or does He reject certain aspects of it? Well, we are not ready, until we have gone quite a ways, to say with certainty that He rejects it altogether. A person can reject certain aspects, and then turn around and grant certain things. I can say, "Look here, do you think I ~~will~~ ^{ought to} give you any hymn books after the way you wasted those we had last time? The way you were so careless with them, and you tore pages out of them? I think you ought to at least pay for throwing around the ones that you had." I can go on that way for a while, and then I can say, "However, I see the great need you have of them; I think it is a wonderful desire; I am going to provide you with them." If I do, the rebuke is at least important enough to be placed first, and relate itself directly to the petition, and in this case we have a petition and we have an answer which relates itself to some extent to the words of the petition. But we are not ready as yet to say whether there is a favorable answer to the petition. But we are ready at least to say this: "There is a sufficient element that is unworthy in the petition that a rebuke must come first, and then if we have nothing but rebuke, we must say the petition is entirely unworthy." Now it is a little hard for us to say right off hand that the petition is entirely unworthy, because the petition stresses the fact they are God's people and that is stressed in the Scripture. They are God's people, and God's mercy to His own. And He shows His lovingkindness to those that follow Him to thousands of generations. And we have so much that may (be, lead to) a positive answer

to the prayer. That may be. We can not say until we go on further and see. But at least, before that can come up, there is something else that is immediately vital. There is something about the prayer that is not like, and my inclination is to feel that in the prayer nine-tenths of it is good, but it is unbalanced, because it needs at least half as much more of abject penitence, of confession of sin, of declaration of great remorse for sin and desire to turn from it, and asking /God to show a way, and promising that never, by His grace, to fall into any such situation again. It needs to be balanced with that, with at least half as much space devoted to that. And then there is an occasional note in it which while even they have an element of truth, do not seem to be quite the proper approach, like this: "We are thine. Thou never barest rule over them. They were never called by thy name." Are Israel God's pets that He wants to do everything for them because He loves them, or are Israel God's instruments, God's pattern, God's means of bringing the gospel into the world, His means of giving the oracles of God, His means of preparing the way for the coming of His Son, His servant through whom it is His will that His message shall go forth to all the world? They have a special blessing and a special place as His people, yes, but not that they can compare themselves with others and say, "We are better than these others, and we ~~do~~ deserve the ~~best~~ blessing, because we are not they and they are not we." It seems to me as if there is a wrong attitude, and a wrong approach shown in a few of these verses which perhaps colors the whole to some extent, and ~~that~~ that there is, more than that, a very definite unbalance, because something is stressed which is, after all, not the primary thing, though it is a real thing, but that which is the primary thing is omitted completely. If anything, there are one or two verses where you may think you can gather from them a little remorse, but it is not certain you can, and it looks more as if they are blaming God for their sin, and saying, "God put us in this situation. It is up to Him to get us out of it." And so I can't get away from the idea that chapter 65 is beginning with a rebuke of the prayer and of the spirit which

is back of the prayer. And that doesn't mean the prayer is denied or turned down, but it means that at least there is that in it which deserves rebuke, and so that you have a close organic relationship between chapter 64 and chapter 65, and if that is the case, this/^{prayer}is not the prayer of a godly remnant, but is the prayer of Israel. Now is there any question up to this point? Or is that fairly clear, and does it seem fairly reasonable? (St: Concerning the quotation that Paul makes...) That is what is going on to what follows. We want to go into that. (St: 64:4 Would that be an element of truth that Paul would take from that?) Yes, definitely. V. 4 is very very true. Doesn't Paul say that there is nothing but what God is has prepared for them that love Him. Doesn't Paul say, "For them that love Thee?" This says, "For them which wait~~eth~~ for Him," which is good, but not as good as the way Paul gives it here, "for them that love Him." But the expression here is wonderful. No one has heard or perceived by the ear or seen by the eye what God has prepared. That is, God's mercy has power; ~~God-is-great-~~ God's grace is beyond anything we can imagine, and there is a very good expression here, and there are good expressions for a lot of things in the prayer, but there is a basic approach that is wrong in the prayer, and it is rebuked immediately thereafter. Unless you are going to say, "There is a sharp break. This prayer is given. Then you stop, and then you start again, and then after a while you go back and deal with the prayer," which doesn't seem reasonable or logical, unless you are going to say that, the rebuke is in relation to the prayer that we have just had. Well, then, if he is going on here, and God is answering, so the break between 63 and 64 is a sort of semicolon; it is a break in the midst of a prayer, it seems to me it would be better if it were one chapter between 63:7 and the end of 64. But at the end of 64, you have not a main division of the book by any means, but you have a definite paragraph division. You have the end of the prayer of the nation, and the beginning of God's answer. And so it is a proper place for a chapter division, although not for a main chapter of the book here. And so ~~he~~ answers, "And they say, we are yours;

you never bore rule over those people. They were never called by your name. Do something for us. " And He says, "I am sought of them that asked not; I am found of them that sought me not: I said, Behold me, behold me, unto a nation that were not called by my name," taking up the very words they used. They say, those people have oppressed us; why do you do anything for them? Why not for us; we are your people. He says, "I have said, Behold me, to a nation that was not called by my name." He says, "I have mercy and blessing for these people that you think are outside, for the ~~peopl~~ people that were not called by my name. But in contrast to that," He says, "I have spread out my hands all day to a rebellious people which walked in a way which was not good, after their own thoughts." He doesn't deny that they are His people; He doesn't deny that He has done wonderful things in the past; He doesn't even say He won't do wonderful things in the future, but He says they are a people who are walking after their own thoughts in a way that isn't good. And this is surely a rebuke of Israel; not of some people outside of Israel, and it is pretty hard to ~~keep~~ keep from tying it up with the prayer we have just had. "A people that provokes me to anger continually to my face; that sacrifices in gardens, and burns incense upon alters of brick; which remains among the graves, and lodges in the monuments and eats swine's flesh." Well, what is wrong with eating swine's flesh? It is against God's law given to Israel. It is very definitely dealing with Israel, isn't it? "The broth of abominable things is in their vessels; that says, Stand by thyself, come not near to me; for I am holier than thou." He is rebuking spiritual pride, isn't He? He is rebuking the Pharisaical attitude. He is rebuking the attitude that says, I am better than the other fellow; I am God's people and they aren't. And it is an attitude that Christians have to be careful that they don't fall into, too. It is easy to fall into it if we forget the fact that it is only by the grace of God that we have anything, and there is no goodness in us. Our righteousnesses are indeed filthy rags. It is only God's mercy that makes us worth anything, and for the wonderful things He's done for us, we should be His

instruments to make available to others, and to bring Him to their knowledge, and it is only as we keep that thought constantly in mind, that we can altogether escape the danger of looking down on those others who are outside, and thinking of them as inferior to us or different than us in some way that gives us a right to look down on them, A terrible danger. But here we see what God thinks of our spiritual pride. He rebukes it. He says, "They say, Stand by thyself; come not near to me; I am holier than thou." He says, "These are a smoke in my nose, a fire that burns all the day." And can you imagine a Pharisee in the days of Christ, as He looked down on this publican, and looked down on these people; who didn't fast twice in the week as he did, and pray as often as he did, and all this; can you imagine him reading this verse in Isaiah? It is a direct rebuke of spiritual pride, and it is not saying that it is a characteristic of all the Jews by any means- means, but it certainly seems to suggest that there something of such an attitude in the previous chapter, in the prayer. They say, "We are thine; thou never barest rule over them; they were not called by thy name. Thou, Lord, art our father." And he says, "They say- say, Stand by thyself, come not near to me, I am holier than thou. These are a smoke in my nose, a fire that burneth all the day." He certainly seems to be rebuking certain elements- elements of the prayer, certain aspects of the prayer. Rather than being so moved by this "moving prayer" that He "just cannot wait" to say yes, and- and I am going to do everything you want, but first I am going to take a little time out for a rebuke." It surely shows seems that He is dealing directly with it, immediately, as the only logical way to do. And, of course, Delitzsche is a very excellent commentator, and has got a great deal of very material, but at this particular point, I think he missed the organic unity union of the passages and the connection which logically must be recognized. And so, as He goes on and says, "Behold...." (end of record)

your iniquities and the iniquities of your father together, saith the Lord,
 which have burned incense upon the mountains, and blasphemed Me upon the
 hills, therefore will I measure their former work into their bosom." So
 the Lord says, "I am going to continue to bring suffering and misery to
 you because of your sin, your idolatry, and your spiritual ~~10/10~~ ^{3/4}
 , and surely that is a large element of the prayer that has just been
 upraised. ~~Thus says the Lord--~~ But He is not through yet; He continues;
 "Thus saith the Lord, As the new wine is found in the cluster (read through
 v. 10)." "And so," he says, "I am not simply forgetting this earth. I am not
 turning my back on it. I am not turning my back on Palestine." He says,
 there is a blessing in it. He says, the great bulk of this people has
 turned away, but for my servants sake, I will not destroy all; I will
 bring a seed out of Jacob, and out of Judah, an inheritor of my mountains,
 and my elect shall inherit it and my servants shall dwell. So there is
 the promise that out of Judah is going to come great blessing, great blessing
 for the people that have sought God. And then, after this assurance that
 He is not through, that He has blessing to bring, blessings in accordance
 with His purposes, then He continues with the rebuke and with a contrast.
 And now, "But ye are they--" ^{the} who are/"ye"? The people who have said, "Oh
 Lord, we are your people." He says, "If you are my people, why don't you
 live as if you are?" They say, You never bore rule over them; they weren't
 called by your name. "Well," he says, "if you are the only ones called
 by my name, why don't you show it in your loyalty to me? Why don't you
 show it in your life? Why don't you show it in your abhorance of Heathen
 customs and your staying away from them ~~all?~~ ^{altogether,} instead of the
 way you've been doing?" ~~He says, "But ye are they that~~ ^{He says,} "But ye are they that
~~He would rather~~ forsake the Lord, I forget my holy
 mountain, that prepare a table for that troop, and that furnish~~h~~ the
 drink-offering to that number." Complicity in idolatrous worship; connec-
 tion with heathen practices. "Therefore will I number you to the sword,
 and ye shall all bow down to the slaughter: because when I called, ye did
 not answer--" They are saying, give us your mercy, do all these things for
 us. He says, when I called you didn't answer, when I spoke you did not hear.

You looked the other way when I had something I wanted you to do. Why should I pay attention now when you have something you want me to do?

You did evil before my eyes, and ^{chose} ~~esse~~ that in which I did not delight."

And now we get the contrast: "Therefore, thus saith the Lord GOD, Behold my servants shall eat, but ye shall be hungry: behold, my servants shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty: behold, my servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed." Now, who is the "Ye" about whom ^{He} is talking? to all

this time? Is not the "you" the people who have given the prayer? The people to whom He has addressed this rebuke in the early verses of this chapter. Is He not rebuking them, and comparing them with some other people He calls His servants? And His servants are going to be ~~ah~~ happy, and they are going to be ~~in~~ in misery. (Read v. 14) And it certainly is

a fact. You take our last ^{few} centuries, and you will find that there has been among true Christians a great joy in the Lord, a great happiness in Him and what he has done for them, and

~~God-had-given-them,-and-to-their-peculiar-institutions,~~ and though you would on the whole find that Israel has in these last two millenia been characterized by a wonderful loyalty to the law that God has given them, and to their peculiar institutions as separate from other nations, that nevertheless there has been a general sorrow and oppression, a feeling of being inferior and mistreated, and rejected all through, and comparatively little time when there was a feeling of singing for joy of heart.

(St) It would be very good to bring out at this point that it would seem that the "my servants" here would refer back to the note He has already introduced, "I am sought of them that asked not, I have said, Behold me, to a nation that was not called by my name." Of course, v. 1 and 2 here are quoted by Paul as showing God's turning to the Gentiles, and he is not quoting out of context; he never does that. (St: Explain the figure in v. 8,

"So will I do for my servants sakes.") Do you mean the figure, "Destroy it not, for a blessing is in it"? It would seem to be a figure of a vine about to be burned. It would seem to say, there is good grape juice in it; don't destroy the whole business. He says, there is to be something

good comes out of it; His blessing, His servants, they come out of Judah, they come out of Jacob, and for His servants sake He is not simply going to cast Israel off and destroy them now, oh no. Christ comes out of Israel. The early Christians are Israelites; the whole Christian movement comes out of the Jews, but speedily becomes largely a Gentile movement. (St: I thought the passage referred largely to the return from captivity.)

V. 8-16? That might very well be said of v. 8-10. I don't incline to that view, but it is not at all impossible. I am inclined to the view that v. 8-10 is looking forward to the spiritual seed coming ~~fe~~ out of Jacob, but it is not at all impossible that it might be return from exile. (St:.. spiritual...⁷) It could be. It could be used as a figure, although I wouldn't think an extended passage of that type could be a figure, and possibly it is better to take that specifically as a return from captivity, these three verses. Possibly. I am uncertain as between those two interpretations right there. But whichever you take it, v. 11 ff. is rebuke, isn't it V. 11 to 16 is surely very strong rebuke. (St: Could that possibly be looking forward to the time when the remnant of Israel will inherit the mountains during the millenium?) You mean v. 8-10 just briefly look way forward/? Not impossible. There are three possibilities for these verses, and in view of these three possibilities, I think we should not build anything upon the three verses, but should recognize that they look slightly aside from the main thought at present under consideration. In 11-16 you certainly have rebuke; He is looking directly to these people, and it would seem to be those who are pictured as giving the prayer above. That prayer is representative of their general attitude and thought. They have a longing for God's blessing, but not a disposition to follow Him fully. And it is dealing with those people in 11-16, and again it is very strong language in v. 14 where "my servants" are contrasted with "you", and then in v. 15, "and you shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen, for the Lord Jehovah will slay you and call His servants by another name."

Now that is tremendously strong, isn't it? What does it mean, "you will leave your name for a curse unto my chosen"? Doesn't it connect up with the thought back in Leviticus, that if the people turn away from God their name will become a curse and a byword among the nations?

I don't think the true Christian ever speak of the Jew in a term of curse, but certainly great numbers of professing Christians do, probably some even of real Christians. (St) Yes, terrific. And, of course, even a man like Martin Luther, in the middle of his career, he felt now that he had the truth he would simply present it to the Jews and they would all accept it. And he presented it, and they- most of them just turned them down cold, and then he went into the most virulent attacks. Some have tried to picture Martin Luther as anti-Semitic; I don't think he was, but I do think he took over the general attitude of the Christians of his day far more than he should in his dealing with them in the latter part of his life. It has been a characteristic. I don't think God is saying here that it is right. "You will leave your name for a curse to my chosen, and the Lord God will call His servants by another name." That is a strong statement, and how can you interpret that particular statement in any sensible way other than that for a time, at least, the mercy of the Lord is going to turn to the Gentiles, and instead of being called by the previous name, even though they are they are the Israel of God, they are to be called by a distinct name. It makes perfect sense of a picture in that way of this element of God's dealing with His people through the ages, and it is pretty difficult to make any sense out of it any other way that I know of. (St) Christians. Of course, the word "Christians" means "Messianic", followers of Christ, which is a name which certainly could have been applied to the Jews. They were looking for the Messiah, but never was, but is applied to the Christians.

V. 16 is not very sure in mind whether it should go with what precedes or with what follows. What is that first word in v. 16? (ASHER) Yes. And how do you translate ASHER ordinarily? "Which", yes. Now what is the difference between "which" and "that"? "The book that is on the table," "The

book which is on the table." What is the difference? (St) There is a possibly entirely different meaning in the word "that". The word "which" has two possible meanings. "Here are two books. /Which do you want?" "Here are two books. That thee want." You see, "which" has a very different meaning from "that". It has an interrogative meaning which "that" does not have. But if I say, "The book which I want," or "The book that I want," it is absolutely immaterial. They can both be ~~relatives~~, or "which" ~~can~~ be an interrogative. It is a clear language, this English. But that is the ~~possibility~~- possibility in the "which", while on the other hand, "that" which is exactly the same as "which" is a relative, can also be used in an entirely different sense: "He spoke that I might know he was there." You wouldn't say, "He spoke which I might know he was there." If we only had three different English words, how much better it might be: one for purpose, ^{one} for a relative, and one for an interrogative, but instead of that we have an interrogative and a purpose which are entirely distinct, and we use either one of them as a relative. It is a crazy language, really. I often wish we could abandon it. It would take us a long time to learn any other, so we had better stick to it. But we had better recognize its peculiarities. Many people think the only thing queer is the Hebrew language. Actually, the English language is a dozen times queerer, once you think into it. And the fact that we don't think into ~~it~~ the meaning and the peculiarity of English, we just don't understand our English Bible nearly as well ~~as~~ as we should. People talk a great deal about study of the English Bible (and we should study our English Bible), but even an English Bible, I doubt if you understand your English Bible ^{half as well} /if you just study English Bible, as you do if you also study Hebrew Bible, because you begin to see more of what the possibilities are in English words. Now, as this stands in our English ~~of~~ here, the AV, he says, "--and shall call His servants by another name, that he who blesses himself in the earth shall bless himself in the God of truth," and that, in context, sounds definitely purposive. But ~~Ashir~~- ASHIR is not commonly used purposively. There are

two ~~tehere~~ other expressions commonly used for purpose in the Hebrew; but now, it is possible to use ASHUR in the purposive, but it is not the usual thing, it is rather uncommon, while the relative is much the more common usage. "The ~~y~~ one who," "the one," and go right on with the relative, "that he who blesses himself," "the one who blesses himself," "the one who is the blessing himself one." And so, the most rational way to take- take the ASHUR here is as a relative expression, rather than purpose. Now I don't say the purposive is impossible, but it may be that he will call His servants by another name in order that ~~He-will-bl-~~ he who blesses himself in the earth will bless himself in the God of truth. I don't say it is impossible, but it doesn't seem to me to make a lot of sense. I don't see a lot of connection. And when we look at the Hebrew word/ that is used there, while ASHUR can mean "that" perfectly well, it is rarely a purposive thing,-- "that", and ~~also~~ almost always a relative "that",--(end of record)

e 89

with what follows, while, since we are uncertain whether v. 16 goes with what precedes or what follows, ~~an~~ unless you think a good deal needs to be derived from 16 in our interpretation, let us for the moment leave 16 to the side and go on to 17. (St; KV "so that") To get the "that" out of ASHUR is pretty difficult; to get "so that" is still more, but yet I think it is wise to make specific what you mean: "that he who blesses himself" is definitely purposive, it couldn't be relative, and so if you put the "so" in, you make it even clearer that's what you mean. But that is not what ASHUR ORDINARILY-MEAN- ordinarily means in Hebrew. ASHUR ordinarily means relative. I don't say/ it isn't purposive; it may be, but if it is, I don't quite see how this purpose immediately follows, though you may be able to figure out a way. But at least, up to this point, it would seem/ we had a rebuke to the makers of the prayer. We have rebuke given for the attitude which says, "We are your people; you have got to bless us." God says, "No. ~~My~~ My people are the ones who are doing my will. My people are the ones who are loyal to me. My people are the people who are not characterized by spiritual pride. I am going out to the highways and byways and

bringin in a people for my name, and I am going to have a ~~prep~~ group of servants ~~as~~ who are not taken from you, a great group of servants, and I am bringing terrific suffering and ~~me~~ misery upon you in response to your wrong attitude." But it does seem to me that when you look at the passage from verse 17 on, to v. 25, there is a marked difference from the passage from 11-16, a very marked difference from most of the passage ^{from 1} to 16. There is there a great stress on things being rebuilt and being built up; a great stress. And there is a great stress upon God's blessing, a stress that would seem to be an answer such as Delitzsch says, it's the answer to the prayer before. ~~Delt-~~ Delitzsche says, "God gives His wonderful affirmative answer to the prayer before; He cannot refrain in the face of this great moving prayer; but before He does it, He has to give a rebuke." Well, it seems to me that his division is correct there, and his understanding of the last part is correct, but we need to integrate the first part with it, and we need to recognize that God is first rebuking the wrong elements of the prayer, and then He is giving His affirmative answer to the correct elements here. He is saying, "Those who claim my blessing simply because of ancestry, or simply because they think they are superior to others, they are going to have a very sorry awakening. They are going to find that I turn my mercy to another people, and they are going to find rebuke and misery and slaughter for them." But ~~that~~ nevertheless, He would not have given us so much space to a prayer like this, if there was not along with the wrong attitude much that is right and true in it, and there is much in the ground upon which it is made that is true if only you balance it with a proper repentance and turning away from sin, and conversion to ~~Christ~~ God and doing His will, and that the thing that they ask, that His mercy return, as His mercy has been in the past, is the thing that He says, "Yes, I am going to do." And it is the last part of the chapter here that is giving the affirmative answer to the question. And He is saying, "I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy. I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people." They won't build and another inhabit; plant and

V. 22

another eat. They will live a long time. "As the days of a tree will be the days of my people. They will long enjoy the work of their hands. They will not labour in vain, nor bring ~~fre~~- forth for trouble." A wonderful picture of great blessing to come to Jerusalem. That God says, "Yes, I am going to." In v. 16, "The former troubles are forgotten, and they are hid from ~~in~~- mine eyes." Now this last half of 16 certainly wouldn't seem to have much connection with the immediately preceding context. "You are going to be sorrowful, and my servants will be happy. My servants will rejoice, and you will be ashamed. The former troubles are forgotten and hid from mine ~~y~~ eyes." Well, that has no connection. The ~~former~~- former troubles are forgotten; therefore you are going to be punished and somebody else is going to receive. That has no connection; this last half, at least, of v. 16, with what preceded. Now if you want to take it as purposive, it seems to me then that you should make a break after "truth" and start your new division there. If you want, you can say, "God will slay thee and call His servants by another name in order that the one blessing himself in the earth will bless himself by the God of truth, and the one swearing in the earth will swear by the God of truth. Period. Start the new division, "Because the former troubles will be forgotten and because they will be hid my eyes, behold, I will create new heavens and a new/ earth, and the former will not be remembered nor come to mind, but be ye glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create: for behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy." It seems to me there is a sharp break which comes either at the beginning of v. 16 or at the middle of v. 16. I don't see how ~~y~~ you can connect the last half of 16 with what precedes, but it seems to me that it connects very tightly with what follows. "The former troubles shall be forgotten and hid from my eyes." Well, you are going to have a lot of suffering on account of these former troubles; on account of this attitude, you are going to be ashamed, you are going to be thirsty, you are going to be in misery, you are going to be hungry, the Lord will slay you, and He will call His servants by

another name, yes, but that doesn't last forever. The former troubles will eventually be forgotten. They will be hid from my eyes because I am going to create new heavens and a new earth, I am going to create Jerusalem a rejoicing and her people a ~~joy~~ joy; I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people." And so He is saying, it seems to me, "Yes, there is mercy for Israel. Yes, you are God's people, and you are going to have your place, but first there is going to be a change." There is going to be a great change, which is not ~~definite~~ definite in this particular section, but is implied. "There is going to be a change, but before there is going to be a change, there is going to be a long period of misery for you." There is going to be a period in God's economy in which He has turned His favor to another people that you are looking down upon and saying, "They are not God's people; God never bore rule over them." God is going to turn to this other people, and He is going to bring great blessing to them and He is going to bring great blessing to the earth through them. And they are going to be His servants, called by another name. There is that long period, but there is eventually the answer to the thing that you are asking. There is the blessing for Jerusalem; there is the blessing for God's land; there is the blessing for those who are God's people; after they have been purged from their sin and from their iniquity, there is a wonderful time ahead of remarkable blessing. And so you have a picture-- now some people will say this picture begins with v. 18 and runs through v. 25. I incline to think it begins in the ~~mid~~ middle of v. 16, or else at? (8) and runs to --(8?) ~~the-beginning/~~ of v. 25. But at any rate, what are the elements of this ~~picture~~- picture. What is he describing in v. 18 to v. 25? Is it a picture of heaven? Is heaven the place where the child shall die, being a hundred years old, and the sinner being a hundred years old shall be accursed? Is the heaven the place where it will come to pass that "before they ~~call~~ call, I will answer," the place where "they will not labour in vain, or bring forth for trouble"? This does not seem to be a ~~descrip-t-~~ description

of heaven; it seems to be a description of earth. It seems to be a description of a rejuvenated earth, a question of a transformed earth; a picture of something which is not yet made perfect, but which is made tremendously better and different from anything that the world has experienced before. Not anything, let us say, from anything since, let us say, since ^{8 3/4} (beginning?) days, or since the days shortly after Eden. A world in which the curse has been removed, but its effects are not yet entirely gone, but in which tremendous changes have taken place. A place where Jerusalem is going to be a rejoicing, and her people a joy, and God will rejoice in Jerusalem, and there will be wonderful blessing there: no more weeping, no more voice of crying, no child/who dies a few days old. Nor ~~aneth~~ an old man who hasn't filled his days. If one ~~da~~ dies at a hundred years of age, they say, O, he died as a child. He didn't live out his years. He was just a child when he died. It is ^a tremendous increase in ~~length~~ longevity, but not yet a complete abolition of death. "The sinner being a hundred years old shall be accursed." There is very little of visible sin, but yet something of it is present. "The sinner being a hundred years old shall be accursed." (St: Do you think there will be death for the righteous....) I would think that it would imply that there were those ^{there} ~~sinners~~ who would have death, not necessarily sinners. That among the people there, there were sinners who would die, and that there were also people there who would die who were not specifically sinners. That is, they would be sinners, but they wouldn't die specifically on account of a sin. That is to say, it would~~not~~ suggest the possibility that there were redeemed individuals there who would die. (St) Perhaps we will discuss it after looking a little further. It does raise a problem when one first comes to it, but in relation to the whole question, I don't think it raises a problem. There is a satisfactory answer to it. (St: What about the new heaven and earth?) Yes. That is why I said, I personally believe that the passage starts at the beginning of 16 or at the middle of 16. Some would say that it begins at the beginning of 18. I think that

is the view of the Scofield Bible. ~~X~~ I think it has a ~~h~~ heading at the beginning of 18. 17? What is the heading of the beginning of 17?

(St: "The eternal blessing of Israel in the new earth.") What about the footnote? (See ft-nt) Yes. In other words, it takes 18-25 as being the passage, and 17 as being distinct from it. Well now, you can take it that way if you want to, I think this is clear, what 18-25 is; I think that is our vital thing. Now what are you going to do with 17. My own inclination is to think that it starts with 16 or the middle of 16. In that case, 17 is a part of the passage, and if it is a passage, ~~h~~ God is saying, you have had all this misery, all this trouble, but the former troubles are forgotten and hid from my eyes, for I create new heavens and a new hearth, and the former shall not be remembered nor come to mind. Now to my mind, that is a description of the kingdom, that is, ~~fe~~ of what follows. You don't have to take it that way; I don't think it is vital to our consideration. But if you do take it that way, there are under that two possibilities: one of the is this, that this is saying there is the rejuvenation of the heaven and earth, which we call "the new heaven and the earth", takes place at the beginning of the period following. That is one way to take it, but not necessarily. Even if this phrase is used elsewhere of a far greater rejuvenation, at the end of the period described in 18-25, it is possible here to use it in a somewhat figurative sense. That is to say, so great is the change in the earth with the curse removed from the present condition, that I call it a creation of new heavens and new ~~h~~ earth. So you see, there are three possibilities with v. 17. One is to say, at the beginning of the period from 16-25 comes what we call the new heaven and the new earth. That, I believe, is Zann's view. Now the second possibility is to say, This is a figurative statement; so different is the condition after the curse is removed that you can speak of it as creation of a new heaven and a new earth, without in any way jeopardizing the belief that there is a far greater change which we call "the new heaven and new earth, coming out of heaven," at the end of the period. And the third possibility is to say, as the

Scofield Bible does, This verse looks way off to something. But then in 18 we come back and look at that which is more directly the answer (14). It is, in any one of these three interpretations, v. 18-25 have exactly the same significance, and I don't know how you can get any other suggestions out of 18-25, no matter what you do with 17. It fits in with any one of these three. (St:...II. Peter....) Zahn takes II Peter as referring to the rejuvenation of the earth, the purging of the earth, at the beginning of the kingdom age. Dr. Buswell definitely does not take it that way. I don't know enough about it to be dogmatic. (laughter) but my inclination ~~is~~ (not conviction) ^{as} great/is my regard for Dr. B. and for his knowledge of the NT, which is far greater than mine, and I may come to change it, but I have not, up to the present. At the present my inclination is to follow Zahn in this regard.) But if you take the other view, it does not necessarily mean that this expression here is the same used of this particular term. Peter could use it/~~of~~ ^{according to} God's promise of a far greater change coming at the end of the period here described, and it could be used here in a figurative sense of that which is practically a new heaven and a new earth: removal of the curse. (end of record)

e 90

... that is Zahn's interpretation of it, and I incline to that view, but Dr. B tells me--I read Zahn fifteen years ago. I was much impressed with it. Dr. B about two months ago went to the public library and got ahold of Zahn and read it through, and he is impressed that Zahn does not follow the Scripture literally, and plays rather fast and loose with it in some places, and he doesn't feel inclined to take Zahn as an authority at this place. That was not my impression. That was not my impression of Zahn's reading here ~~of~~ fifteen years ago. That is a long time/ back; I may disremember, and Dr. B knows the Greek NT much better than I do, but I know German somewhat better than he does; so while he may be correct on this, I am reserving judgment until I get time to look at Zahn's reading, because I know that the German language is a very difficult language, and I had the

experience with a man who had studied in Germany, and had know German long before I ever had known it, of having him base a view--this is a matter entirely unrelated to the Bible; it is related to archeology-- upon the statement of a great German scholar, and gave his record as evidence, and I went to it, and read it carefully, and found that the German writer said exactly the opposite of what he said. As a result, the statement in the volume was changed. That is, he had read it rapidly, and had gotten the wrong impression. The German language is a wonderful medium language for the expression of exact thought, but it piles so much exactness and so much nice distinctions in, that often you have to read it with very great care, not only to get the exact thought, but to get the big overall picture, whereas in English, we are apt to speak in such a way as to get the big overall picture, more ~~clearly~~ clearly and quickly than the German perhaps, and not make the details quite so $2 \frac{1}{4}$, so that I am ~~not~~ going to read Zahn more fully, but I han't felt in a great rush about it, because I don't ~~feel~~ think that is a particularly important thing. I think it is an interesting question, one which I want to look into, but I think the big main question ~~of-what~~ is not what comes a thousand years ~~fe-~~ from now, but what comes immediately after the return of Christ is a more vital thing for us. And therefore, I am more particularly interested with that point. And whichever way of the three that you take verse 17, I don't see that there is any ^{question} ~~connection~~ with what to do with 18-25. There may be ^{of its} several/details which you are uncertain as to how you are going to interpret, ~~re~~ or how you are going to apply them, but as to the big question of what it is talking about, v. 18-25 is surely talking about a time when the curse has been removed, about a time when we return to conditions which, to some extent at least, approximate those of the Garden of Eden, a return to a time of great longevity, a return to a time when there is a tremendous change in the animal and vegetable creation, a time of great blessing upon this earth. I don't see any other way to take it, as figures of heaven or figures of an eternal state; they just don't seem to fit. And they certainly not pictures of our present age; they don't fit at

all. They seem to picture an a e which has aspects/ like the present,
 and aspects ^{3 1/2}. I don't see any other way to
 interpret this 18-25. Now, of course, it is one way to take a passage of
 Scripture and say, Here is a passage; it can't mean this, it is ridiculous
 if you take ^{it} to mean this; it is ridiculous if you take it to mean this;
 the result is, ~~you~~ we don't know what it ~~means~~ means, let's forget about
 it. Well, there may be passages where we have to do that, but we must
 keep them to an extreme minimum. If we can get sense out of a passage of
 Scripture, it is the Lord's will we should get sense out of it. And if
 we find something that is clearly taught in a certain passage, ^{if} it sounds
 strange to us, and out of harmony ^{with} our idea of what ought to be in the future,
 let us not build up an idea on one passage. Let's say, I don't understand
 it, but let's not throw it out of consideration. Let us say, I am going
 to keep it on the shelf until I look a little further, and then, if you
 find ~~ante~~ another passage that seems to fit with it, tie ~~to~~ the two
 together and see if they really force one. And the teaching that I find
 very clearly taught in the Scripture aside from this passage, in other
 points, seems to me to be greatly reinforced by this passage. And further
 details given about it in this passage, some ~~detail~~ details not given in
 other passages. And you notice how technically it is tied up with Isaiah
 11 by the last verse. The last verse is the very same figure as in Isaiah
 11: "The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat
 straw like the bullock." Exactly what we have in the picture of the
 millenium in Isaiah 11. And then, an added touch that I don't believe was
 given in Isaiah 11: "And dust shall be the serpent's meat." The serpent,
 we are told in Isaiah 11, is to be robbed of his harmful qualities, and is
 no longer dangerous, but he is not removed from the curse in the sense of
 the ~~mis-~~ misery [?] accomplished by him. "Dust shall be the serpen't meat."
 The serpent is not forgiven. It is the answer to universalism. It is
 the removal of the curse, but not a forgiveness at all. Dust shall be
 the serpent's meat, but he shall be harmless to injure anybody. "They shall

not hurt or destroy in all my holy mountain," saith the Lord. (St: What is the "holy mountain" here?) Well, "all my holy mountain." It is a somewhat figurative expression, certainly. It doesn't mean ~~see-~~ some little hill somewhere. There isn't any point in that. There may be lots of robberies and chaos in Wilmington, but they won't hurt and destroy in all of this block--it is nothing small like that. There is surely something bigger, and whether He is referring to Jerusalem as His holy mountain, or whether He is referring to Palestine as His holy mountain, His "holy hill"⁶, or whether He is referring specifically to them, but giving the picture of / conditions that relate to the whole world. Perhaps the whole world then is to be indeed, / His "holy mountain." It would be a region in which destruction and the ragages of sin in its external form will be completely held down by the righteous power of Christ as He reigns and sends out His commands to the nations, and they beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks, and there is free opportunity for the preaching / of the gospel; there will no / longer be the possibility of such situations as happens so frequently in modern times, when ~~so~~ everything seems just right for a great advance of the gospel, everything is open and ready for it, and then the door is ~~due-~~ suddenly snut, is suddenly slammed in our faces. All through the war people were saying, if the western nations win this war, there will be the greatest opportunity in China for Christian work than there has ever been in history. Everything will be wide open. And so it was; when the war was over, the people in China were more responsive to the gospel than they / have ever been before, and when the government was welcoming missionaries more than ever before; everything was ~~si-~~ wide-open. And just as it seemed as if the greatest advance of Christianity in history was about to take place, in as far as China was concerned, the door was slammed shut, and a group of anti-Christian ~~thugs~~ thugs seized control of it, and pulled out the gospel from the area, and made it impossible for us to advance in that region. And it is the sort of thing which will not occur in the millenium. There will be oppor-
tunity

for everyone to hear the gospel, with no \int external circumstance interfering and preventing. And there will be opportunity for people to receive it, and we may hope that the great bulk of those upon this earth then will receive it. But there will be no compulsion about it; there will be a vindication, a clear revelation of the failure of mankind, that even under ideal conditions, with the external effects of sin completely removed, that nevertheless, even then there will be those who will stick to their wickedness, and will only profess a lip service, will be like the emperor Julian, who was a leader in the church, but in his heart was a pagan, and when he had the opportunity, turned violently against God; ^{as} and ~~the~~ opportunity was given to Julian for a little season to become emperor of Rome and to give the people who were with him the opportunity to speak out and \int show their colors, so there will be that little season at the end of the millenium to make clear the situation of the heart of man, and to show that apart from the grace of God, all have sinned, all are wicked, and even under ideal conditions, even given the kingdom of God in the finest sense ~~that~~ that any modernist could ever ask for, there will still be evidence that that is not enough; that it requires the grace of God in the heart, and that grace will be shown in tremendous numbers in that period, but not universally. (St: Is that thought brought out in this passage?) ^{9 1/2} Which aspect? (St) The sinner, being a hundred (v. 20) will be accursed. (St) The passage here seems to indicate people who are still to some extent on earth, the pressure of the possibility of death within that age. Well now, we are told that the saints are going to reign with Christ, that they are going to judge the earth. Who are they going to reign over? Who are they going to judge? It would imply in this passage here that there are those over who \int they will reign, and the statement that Christ will rule with a rod of iron, and establish righteousness among the nations implies that there are people to judge still. Now \int who are these people? Where do they come from? It is not fully explained in \int the Scripture. There are different theories regarding it, and I certainly

don't think we can be dogmatic about it. There are those who say, The nations which have not been strong and definite in their opposition to you in the period just before the millenium, that had been, you might say, more or less on the side of it, that they will be permitted to enter into the millenium. Not to enter into eternal life; nothing ~~fe~~ of the kind, Well, it that a second chance? No. If I hadn't ~~o~~ accepted Christ today and I lived tomorrow, if I hadn't this year and I lived next year, it is no second chance except in the ~~o~~ way that any man who lives in this world ten thousand days, you might say, had ten thousand chances. It simply means that the chance does not stop yet. Well now, is that the situation? Is a division of living nation who have not been in the ~~fore~~ ^{ll 1/4} of the upheaval before? Is that where they come from? ~~it~~ ^{it} Is/at least where some of them come from? Can there be a comparatively small number then, and among these, a tremendous increase in population? Of ~~o~~ course, a tremendous increase in population can very rapidly take place. Some people have estimated that with that little group of a few hundred people who came to Plymouth, and the little group of people in New England in the early days in this country, three hundred years ago, that if those ~~ewep-~~ people had kept on increasing by natural generation during the three hundred years since that time in the three hundred years after at the rate that they did the first s venty years after, they came there, we would have just as many people as we have in the United States today if there had been no immigration whatever. That is to say--of course, they had big families in those days; they had fifteen or twenty children. Today we have on an average about one and a ~~quate~~ quarter. A tremendous change has taken place. But under ~~new~~ normal conditions, you do have such large families. Even without the large families, somebody ~~o~~ said, "How could the whole human ~~o~~ race come from Adam and Eve? It is impossible. How would we get all the million we have upon the earth today from just one couple? It is impossible/." And so, a man made this figure ~~mathematic-~~ cally, and it astounded me when I read it last week. And then I figured

up myself and found he was correct. He said, Here they had an average of two and a half children per family. That is to say, if each adult couple had an average of two and a half children (under normal conditions in America, families are always much larger than that) you could start even as recently as 4000 B.C. with one ~~couple~~ couple and have two or three times as many people in the world today as we have ~~eg-~~ got. And so where all these people come from, what the situation is, is one of the thousands of things--I wouldn't say God hasn't revealed; maybe it hasn't been carefully studied; as far as I know there may be clear revelation of it--it is unfamiliar to me. It is one of the thousands of things I don't know but that there will be people there for the saints to rule over, and people whom Christ subjugates, people who are not the saints, resurrected people, people who have believed in this age and have been resurrected and are those who reign with Christ in that age, that seems to be rather clearly the teaching of this passage, and implied by those other passages. I didn't refer to this passage at all in my little booklet, "The Millennial Kingdom"; I think you have it abundantly proven in the other one, the ~~te~~ other passage, but this passage, it seems to me, reinforces it, and adds certain details about it, and fits in with the development of the context. I don't know any other way to take it that would make much sense, and it does fit in with other teachings of Scripture. (end of record)

e 91

Chapters _____

to meet the immediate situation, and I think he is still dealing with the prayer in the beginning of 66. We have in 64 a holy and beautiful

with fire when you refrain yourself from these things, O Lord, and in chapter 66; the Lord says "The heaven ^{my throne and the earth is} is/my footstool." Where is the house you built for me and where is the place ~~of my rest~~ of my rest? He is not ~~saying~~ saying it isn't ^{3/4}. He is not saying that there shouldn't be a great center of his worship, but he is saying that there are other things that are more important. After all, he says, why is it necessary that God have a temple in Jerusalem. The necessary thing is that you believe in Him and do His will and then He will add these things unto you. "For all those things hath mine hand made, and all those things have been, saith the Lord: but to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word." We are back in the area again of turning away from Israel and turning to the despised Gentile, the man who is outside the fold, the man over whom God never bared rule, the publican who stands ^{3/4}, we are turning to the other. He said, "He that kills an ox and makes a sacrifice, ^{3/4}" and his indifference to God is as if he slew a lamb. "He that sacrifices a lamb, is as if he cut off a dog's neck." He is saying that all of your sacrifice to God ~~is~~ if not from a poor and a contrite spirit, it is utterly worthless. It might as well be a lot of filth. It might even be ^{3/4} for all

. "They have chosen their own ways, and their soul delighteth in their abominations. I will choose their delusions, and will bring their fears upon them:" We have the same note there as in the first part of ch. 65, "because when I called ^{none did} ~~hear~~ answer, when I spake they did not hear. They did evil before my eyes and chose that in which I delighted not. Hear ^{tremble} the word of the Lord, ye that ~~come~~ at his word. Your brethren that hated ~~ye~~, that cast you out for my name's sake, said, Let the Lord be glorified: but ~~ye~~ shall appear to your joy, and they shall be ashamed. A voice of noise from the city, a voice from the temple, a voice of the Lord that rendereth recompence to his enemies." And now an interesting passage, 7 and 8. God

is here looking forward, you might say, to the end of the age. He will appear to your joy. "They will be ashamed", what does that mean they will be ashamed? Does it mean that they are ruined, wrecked? But He says; "A voice of noise from the city, a voice of the Lord the rendereth recompence to his enemies. Before she travailed, she brought forth; before her pain came, she was delivered of a man child," What does this mean? It sounds like a sudden change, doesn't it? Something suddenly coming into existence. "Before she travailed, she brought forth." Suddenly something happens. vs. 8' "Who hath heard such a thing? who hath seen such things? Shall the earth be made to bring forth in one day? or shall a nation be born at once? for as soon as Zion travailed, she brought forth her children." A nation born in a day! An interesting thought. God is going to come and appear with great disturbance and recompense to his enemies, but Zion is going to be a nation born in a day. Now, that is not the Christian nation. They were not born in a day. A little group of disciples gradually spreading and the power of God from Jerusalem over Palestine, over Asia Minor, little by little. There was nearly a century they were hardly noticed in the Roman Empire. Gradually spreading 300 years they had perhaps a third of the Roman Empire and it becomes prominent enough that it became 4 . That was a slow gradual coming into being of this new great people of God. (question 4)

coming to the Holy Spirit for power, 3000 people, but I would hardly call it a nation. It was a big step, but this seems to be something far greater than that. 4/3

- 1 words must be taken in their context. Not everything literal-
Break between vs. 6 and 7
63:1-6 gives picture of God coming in wrath
- 2 "I" in v.6 different from "I" in v. 3. No ch. division at 64:1
Purpose of v.7. Prayer to God to do something
- 3 Asking for an end to affliction. Prayer for God to rebuild temple and return His blessing to the land. Critical division of Isaiah into 3 parts: before exile, in exile, after exile.
- 4 Stressing the desolation in land and need to rebuild.
64:10-11 key verses.
Bearing of 63:7 on this theme. Recalling past goodness as ground for hope of future goodness.
- 5 Reason for change from past blessing to present suffering given in v. 10
- 6 63:14. No expression yet of repentance for rebellion
- 7 ~~Cla~~ming God's blessing because they are His people and asking God why He made them wander from His ways. Hyper-Calvinism!
- 8 63:16 Abraham an individual here, not the nation
- 9 63:17 Seems to be making God the author of their sin.
Sanctuary = the land, not just the bldg.
63:19 "They" = adversaries who have trodden down the sanctuary
- 10 Similar attitude taken toward our troops in Korea
- 11 Wrong attitude of 63:19
More vital than their past relation is their present condition. Too much stress on "we are your people," so you must bless us.
- 12 64:1-4
- 13 ch. 65 gives God's reaction to this prayer of ch. 64
- 14 Isa. 65:1-2 all rebuke
- 15 The prayer of ch.s 63-64 is 9/10th good but unbalanced. Lacks confession of sin. Israel not God's pets but His pattern and instrument to bring gospel to world. God first rebukes Israel's prayer and spirit in which it is given
- 16 Not the prayer of the godly remnant.
64:4 has element of truth Paul uses
Good expressions but basic approach wrong
64:12 end of prayer of the nation
- 17 65:1 God has mercy for the people who were Israel's oppressors. He has rebuke for His own people who walk in a way that is not good.
65:5 rebukes spiritual pride
- 18 Attitude of Pharisee against Publican
- 19 65:11 God's attitude toward those who boast they are His people but don't live like it.

- 20 Rebukes those who prayed in chs. 63-4. Paul does not quote 65:1-2 out of context
- 21 65:11-16 strong rebuke
- 22 God's people to be given a distinct new name: Christians = followers of Christ (Messianic)
Difference between "which" and "that"
- 23 Which has an interrogative meaning "that" does not have. Both can be relative pronouns, but only "which" can be interrogative.
That -- relative, and purpose
Which - relative, and interrogative
- 24 ASHER not usually purposive but relative.
- 25 God rebukes the wrong elements in the prayer and then gives his affirmative answer in 65:17-25 to the correct things in it.
- 26 Sharp break at beginning of 65:16 or in middle of v. 16.
Last part of v. 16 connects with what follows
- 27 Will be misery before change takes place and then you will get the answer to the thing you ask for.
Is. 65:18-25 a picture of heaven? or earth?
- 28 Increase in longevity but not abolition of death
- 29 Three possible interp. of 65:17 as to the time
- 30 Agrees with Zahn in taking 2 Peter 3 to refer to re-creation of the EARTH
- 31 65:18-25 fits the millennial scene
- 32 65:25 dust to be serpent's meat
- 33 65:25 meaning of "all my holy mountain." Post-war China and the Gospel
- 35 ~~Millennial conditions~~ Millennial conditions
Size of New England settler's families
- 37 Is. 66:1-6
- 38 Is. 66:7