

you were to make that statement and when you said Washington the second time you were talking about Peking instead of Washington it would be rather silly . The word Washington has to be used, when used in a sentence that way with two parallel things it has to have a similar meaning, refer to the same thing unless there is some clear evidence that there is a difference of meaning. A word can be Babylon. We can use Babylon today for New York, Peking or Washington or for most anything if we think that it has similarity to the ancient Babylon . We can use ~~B~~ the word Babylon as a figurative expression but for somebody to say Babylon is going to be destroyed and become heaped but the time will come when people will go out from Babylon and lead great armies and when you are speaking of the latter times instead of speaking of the ancient Babylon you mean New York or San Francisco or something it just would not make sense. You would have to say from a city similar to Babylon, something like that to show a change of meaning . The word can be used figuratively but you don't expect two parallel expressions one to be figurative and one to be literal, and so I believe this has much to do with the meaning of the passage. As we noticed last time you look at Micah 4:1 clearly there are figurative elements in t he verse there is no question about that but the verse says that sometime after the exile (1½) is going to be gloried at these places at which he has been humiliated, describing the previous verse by being destroyed by the Babylonians there . He is going to be glorified and there will be people from all over the world not just from other parts of Palestine but from all over the world who will be interested in the message that will go forth from this place and so verses 1 and 2 could be a description of a return of the jews to Jerusalem and an establishment of Jerusalem, the place which politically and culturally which will have an influence throughout the world or it could be a description of this place which was so humiliated and was destroyed in the exile becoming a place which is the center to which the Gospel will go out to the whole world and the world ~~is~~ will be interested in the message from Jerusalem . Verses 1 and 2 alone could be interpreted in either of these two ways.

I don't know of any other possibility of interpreting verses 1 and 2 except these two . It is one of the two that sometime after exile there is a political power and a cultural center which exerts (14 3/4)

Sometime after the exile and has an influence on the nations all over the world .
14 3/4)

For when you come to verse 3 then you get into something that is more specific. Verse 3 does not speak of a situation where people are going to stop being aggressive and injure others. It speaks of a situation where people don't have to fear that those around them are going to be aggressive and try to injure them. It speaks of a time when nation will have to not learn war because there is no need of it. They can feel perfectly safe . That was the situation here . at the end of the 1914-1918 War. President Wilson said the war had made the world safe for democracy . Now that we had destroyed the power of the Kaiser the world was safe for democracy . ~~Yxxxxxx~~ We didn't need any more armament we could just scrap our armament because the world was safe for democracy. That was the situation at the end of 1945 at the end of the war . Hitler was wrecked, Mussolini was ended the power of the Japanese Empire was humbled and the United States immediately began to tear up (13½) and began to disband its forces . The world is safe. We did not think it was necessary to learn war any more. I was at college when the 1914=1918 war ended I was just too young to be in that war . The men came back that had been in the camps training to be officers and the kgovernment had started an R.O.T.C. in the college and we were supposed to get military training and those fellows had too much military training already and they didn't want it and you just couldn't get them to take it . Then they gave up trying to give military training in the college. The war was over. The German power was ended , the world was safe why bother to learn war anymore . Well, in 1945 we did away with our ~~xxxxxxx~~ armaments. We sold all kinds of military equipment (12½)

(B9 very scratchy and inaudible in most places)

Micah4:5 says "For all people will walk every one in the name of his god, and we will walk in

the name of the Lord our God for ever and ever." Now Mr. Abbott thinks there is a little

similarity . How much similarity do you find there Mr. ? The latter part of

the verse in ⁵ ~~Isaiah~~ ^{Micah}Isaiah says Let us walk in the light of the Lord while Micah says

We will walk in the name of th~~s~~ of the Lord our God for ever and ever . Now here

is a walking ~~n~~ ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ relation to God. One says a ~~walking~~ ^{the} light of

and the other says the name which may be vital and which may not be vital It could

be either way whether there is a great deal of difference between walking in his light

and walking in h s name Let us look at the Micah passage for a minute Mr Abbot

(13 3/4)

Here is a sentence Here is six words here together and here is another six. Do

they express the same ideas / They are they approximately the same or are they

exactly the same (13 1/2)

Besure and ask about any of these points about any of these points if what I give

you (15 to 10 very confusing)

Beginning with (10)

~~Nowxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ Now Mr. Abbott would you just explain to me you said the other

one was an exhortation and this is merely a statement. Now would you explain to us

just ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ what it states. What does it say? Let me ask . Micah

says now I'm going to give you a ^{glimpse} ~~look~~ into the future. Is it true there is going

to be a period of universal peace and safety on this earth but that is not a time

when everybody believes in God. No, because at that time you are going to find a lot

of people walking in the name of Jupiter, Allah and Confucius, Buddah and others .

~~There~~ They are going to be walking in their names and we are going to be walking in

our name but Micah predicts that we will always for ever and ever be true to our God.

Now this is a marvelous prediction . If somebody in the early days of the Pilgrim Fathers

had said I'm going to make a prediction to you. We, the pilgrims and our descendants

forever and ever are always going to walk in the name of our God. xW I would say

what a poor prophet that man is . I know some of the descendants of the pilgrims who are ~~some~~ among some of the worse atheists in the world. Every nation that I know has had its ups and downs . They have times when they are loyal to the Lord and they have times when they turn away from Him and this is a marvelous thing that Micah is able to predict the jews are never going to be disloyal to the Lord but they are going to walk in the name of the Lord forever and ever. It is a marvelous thing to have that assurance but I don't have that assurance . I don't find that in the history of the jew that they have always been loyal to the Lord, so, therefore, I tend to question whether it is a prediction or whether it is a statement of fact. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ I tend very strongly to feel that it is more reasonable to interpret it not as a statement of fact but as an exhortation .

Now, of course if we are simply dealing (8 3/4)

We must admit that the translators of the Authorized Version translated it as a statement of fact a prediction but does the Hebrew require it to be a statement of fact Is it not possible in the Hebrew to have (7½)

be an exhortation rather than a statement of fact. Yes, All right if verses 1 - 4 are in the future, a picture of something in the future we will say there is a definite reason for considering seriously the possibility ~~of~~ that verse 5 continues the picture of the future . If I know nothing about verse 5 except that verses 1 -4 are a picture of the future I'll say let's make a guess that it is a picture of the future but it won't decide the question it merely makes a suggestion . It doesn't have to be a picture of the future because in Isaiah verses 2-4 which are a picture of the future but in verse 5 you come back to the present and in verse 5 we say "O house of Jacob God has given us this marvelous promise of what is going to be the future . Now let us walk in the light of the Lord. Let us be true to the God that can give us marvelous picture as this as to what is going to happen in the future. That is what we have in Isaiah . Now having that in Isaiah (6½)

It doesn't prove it is an exhortation but it does establish a certain presumption in that direction . Mr. ? When I first studied these passages verse 5 bothered me tremendously and I came to a certain conclusion on it but I didn't come to it hastily

It took me quite a bit of studying but I want to bring before you the different trend that lead me to the conclusion I came to and if someone has a different suggestion when we get through I'll be interested in seeing the evidence. It may be better than mine. I never found ~~the~~ any other that satisfied me except the one which I'm going to mention to you and I'm trying to bring to your attention threads the different ~~threads~~ that have lead to it. One of them is Isaiah has an exhortation after the beautiful picture . Now in Micah you have the picture and then you have an exhortation following. The picture in Micah is a little long you have an extra verse but that extra verse which you have in Micah ends with sort of a signature . After you talk about "none will make them afraid" then you say "for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken. This is like a signature . God says this is true . You may find it difficult to believe this but it is true . The picture of the future is interrupted by the insertion of a guarantee of divine ~~Providence~~ promise. Well that having been done , you can return to face the future if you want or you can give an exhortation and we cannot be sure which ~~we~~ we are going to have but I think a little presumption that it might be an exhortation from having an exhortation in Isaiah but we look at it and we assume (4½)

and you want to know which of them is the right one. It is always good to take the one that impresses you as the least likely ~~best~~ and do your best to follow it out and see if you can't prove that it works . It is very ? in approaching scripture to let your prejudice lead you to a conclusion. ~~which is something you have just gotten from somewhere else~~ which is just a repetition of something you have gotten from some other part of the scripture . May be one passage of Scripture ~~is~~ just repeats what you find out (4)

But there is a good possibility that God is giving you some new information and you may lose that information if you simply try to find over again what you have already found out. I used to be just digusted when I was in Seminary ~~she way~~ at some of the interpretations that would take a passage which seemed at first that it ~~contradicted~~ other things

seemed at first sight to contradict other things in Scripture and they would explain it away so that it would say nothing at all. I always feel that there is a meaning in a passage and try to find what the meaning is. Well now on the assumption that this is a future prophecy, what ~~xxxx~~ is it a future prophecy of . A future prophecy that the unbelievers will ~~all~~ always continue to walk in the name of their God. All people will walk everyone in the name of His God. There is never going to be a time when everybody on earth will believe in God because people will always be walking in the name of Jupiter, Venus or Mars, Buddah or someone else other than God. Well, that is not what I find out elsewhere in Scripture. I find that all the unbelievers will be done away with. That all of the false religions are going to come to an end and, therefore, I find it very difficult to think that the first part of verse 5 is a promise for the indefinite future. Well, the second part has the forever and ever on it. It doesn't have it on the first part but if the first is a contrast and they are going to follow (2 3/4)

When you don't have a statement the implication is forever and ever applies to both. If they are statements of the future . Well, now I find that the imperfect in Hebrew may express the future but it doesn't necessarily. The imperfect expresses an action It shows something happened sometimes it is used of ~~an~~ a happening in the past and sometimes in the present or in the future. But it shows something happening, an event rather than a condition. Well, now you can then just as well interpret this as a (2)

that is a statemtn of something that you observe as happened . You say well, now look at the people of Israel who are going off and following ? and Baal and these ~~xxx~~ other gods . Look at the other nations round about and see how loyal they are to their god and they don't have a god who can make wonderful promises like your God can make. Their gods can't promise to bring you the condition, universal peace and safety . A condition that when the word of the Lord will go out and rebuke nations afar off and establish peace throughout the whole world. They can't ~~make~~ make a promise like this. Their god doesn't compare with yours and yet look at their loyalty to their god.

B10

Look at the ~~wayst~~ way they stand by their god, people that don't have a God like you have . Well, when all of these people follow their gods with the loyalty they have should not we who have a God who can make such marvelous promises should not we walk in His Name forever and ever? That is to say it is perfectly possible to interpret the tense in such a way that the first is a (1) ?

and the second is an exhortation and if you interpret it that way you get meaning which does not contradict anything else in Scripture which does not guarantee a continuance of heathenism forever but merely observes the loyalty of the heathen to their god and, therefore, shouldn't we who have a God such as we have

B11

It reminded me of an experience I had in Constantinople when I got to Constantinople there were a couple of people of the sort of secular Americans not interested in religion . They thought it was a lot (15½)

I joined the cruise at Constantinople went on from there down to Palestine and somebody told me how they knew a couple of men, I don't think I actually met them myself who had this queer ~~sess~~ secular attitude religion was all superstition and they said that these two men in Constantinople (14)

Well, it just struck me they were seeing the loyalty of the heathen to their god . When I was in the train in Egypt and it came the hour of prayer, the men in all of their strength got up, bowed in the aisle and bowed toward Mecca and never hesitated about anybody seeing them . And in this country how many in a public restaurant bow their heads (13)

Now, of course, I think one difference is that the Christian (12 3/4 inaudible)

But the fact is the heathen are not embarrassed .

It seems to me that Micah's statement is a very true exhortation for us today. When the heathen ? in the name of their god and their various heathen gods and go through ceremonies and sacrifices and gifts and suffering for the name of their god the way they do (11½) inaudible

~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ Now having examined (10)

you see the reasons why I have come to this conclusion . There are a good many different aspects to be entered into . (9 3/4)

They don't add anything they merely make more explicit what is in verse 3 ~~an~~
(9 3/4 to 7½) confusing and inaudible

Isaiah said here is something that God has given me and there is a parallel it seems to me a very marked parallel between Isaiah 2:1 and Micah 4:4 the last third of the verse . Micah says "for the mouth of the Lord of hosts hath spoken it." You may not wish to believe that such a wonderful thing could happen. You have seen nation rise against nation, kingdom against kingdom. You have seen nations destroyed; you've seen them taken off into exile . You have seen all of these terrible things happen and Jesus Christ said they would continue to happen . We have seen them happen in our own day . We have seen millions of chinese having to flee from the communists and untold millions killed by the communists . We have seen these ~~xxxx~~ terrible things happen in our own day just as they happened then. But God said there is going to be a time of ^{external} peace and safety when the word that goes out from Jerusalem. He is going to establish external peace and safety so nobody need fear and Micah says this is not a dream I have or an idea I have this is what the mouth of the Lord hath spoken . Isaiah says this is the vision that Isaiah hath seen about Judah and Jerusalem . God has given it to them so there are two different places saying this is on God's authority not on the authority of a mere man ~~but~~ ^{SD} we have a remarkable parallel between the last third of verse ~~of~~ 4 in Micah and

all of verse 1 in Isaiah, remarkable parallel. In addition to which Isaiah 1 repeats the thought of Micah 3:12 that it is Judah and Jerusalem he is talking about, tying it up with this very ~~thought~~ spot on earth and then in addition to that there is another verse in Isaiah 2:1 which is not in Micah. Does ~~he~~ anybody have an idea what that additional thought is? It is in Isaiah ~~bas~~ 2:1 but not in Micah.

Mr. Abbott says the other thought is that this is a vision that Isaiah had. The words of Isaiah the son of Amos concerning Judah and Jerusalem. Now this leads to my theory of the relationship between these two passages. Commentaries argue about it. ~~This is the verse in Isaiah~~ Which is first Isaiah or Micah? Now, it is possible that God could simply dictate these words to both of them, say almost equivalent words to both of them but it doesn't seem to me that is likely way God did it. I think God probably gave them a vision. They saw a marvelous situation and then God lead them to describe their vision and God kept them from error in describing it so that their words correctly pictured the idea that God wanted to give them but they are giving a picture vision that God enabled them to have about the future. Now in the case of Micah I find strong evidence that this is original in Micah. I find strong evidence of that in the way it fits into the contents. It goes right straight along from verse 12. Verse 12 names these places. Verse 1 names the same places and tells about this. They fit right together in the context. It doesn't seem to me that it is likely that somebody would lift a few verses out of something else and fit right into the context in quite that way. It seems to me that that is an argument for its originality in Micah. Then it seems to me Micah has the longer picture. He has this addition to verse 12x 4 (?) which makes it a little clearer and a little (2½) but when people already had Micah they didn't need to have the picture given quite as full. And so Isaiah gives all the ideals that are in Micah. He simplifies verse 5 he gives the idea a little more clearly, a little more briefly than the idea of verse 5 and when it comes to verse 4 you have got something there which ~~is~~ the first two-thirds of it is just an enlargement of the idea of external peace and safety in verse 3 and Isaiah

does not give it and then there is that used to puzzle me when I first studied Isaiah . Why on earth does Isaiah give us a title at the beginning of ^{Ch.}verse 1 and give us a ~~title~~ a new title at the beginning of ^{Ch.}verse 2. Does he give a title for the book and then after one chapter he thinks he has to give us a brand new title to the book. In the beginning of Chapter 1 is it a title just for one chapter? Chapter 2 have a title that covers the remaining sixty-five chapters of the book. Why does he have a new title so soon at the beginning of the book. Well, I don't believe it is the title for the book at all. I believe that God enabled Isaiah to see this marvelous vision and that having seen the marvelous vision , Isaiah who was familiar with Micah which I believe had been written already at the time though probably not much before that Isaiah said this vision that God has given me is the same vision that He gave Micah and so Isaiah said I want to put my ~~(1)~~ ^{authority} behind the vision that Micah saw. God gave it to Micah, God has also given it to me so this is the vision that Isaiah son of Amos saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem . God has led me to see what Micah saw . I am repeating it in much the same words he did giving you the same vision we are giving you a double prophetic authority for the one thing. I am putting the authority of Isaiah in back of it.

/B12

(14 3/4)

If we are going to have such a time when is it going to be? Well, he doesn't say. It is in the last days . We will have to make a study of what that phrase means. In the last days. Would you like to do that now or should we move on? May we will for next time. Supposing that you , I gave you my little sermon you can read that and see what light (14)

Let's take two aspects in studying for this time. Let's ~~take~~ give you three aspects Let's see what you can do before the next meeting. Number one, let's take the phrase "in the last days" and let us look up , now it is the Hebrew ~~phrase~~ phrase that we are interested in (13 3/4) you can look it up in any commentary , concordance

Young's Concordance is about the easiest . (13½)

See what Hebrew word is used here for "last days" and then all of the passages in the Old Testament in which the phrase is used "the last days" or "the latter days" and (13) inaudible

Now the second thing is , this marvelous time of peace and safety when is it going to come ? What Scriptural evidence do we have . Spend a little time thinking about that . When is it going to be? This prophecy when will it be fulfilled What is the evidence and there you will find (12)

The third thing I would suggest is (12)

Verses 2, 3 and 4 look forward (11 3/4)

Look through and make an outline see where the divisions come and see what are the subjects talked about . Let me know how many hours you put into it .this lesson. I would appreciate it if you would spend a little extra time these first couple weeks before these other classes get well under way and then may be we could spend a little less later on . But please return these papers again that I gave out to you today. I would like to look at them a bit . If you will return them to me now please and get this paper for next time and any of you that ~~is~~ didn't state on your paper ~~is~~ (10 3/4)

The last time at the end of the hour we were talking about that wonderful passage beginning at the ~~end~~ of Chapter 2 in Isaiah which occurs ~~at~~ in the beginning of Chapter 4 in Micah and we noticed certain reasons why it seemed to be much more reasonable to think that this was originally written by Micah and then repeated by Isaiah than to feel the other way about it . We also notice what I think is a certain support of this , the heading that Isaiah gives to it which parallels the last phrase of verse 4 in Micah. We notice the extra verse in Micah which makes more explicit what seems to me is already contained in here in Isaiah. What would you say is the basic thought of the latter part of this passage , Mr. Abbott . Being thrown to the lions in the coliseum and he has perfect peace in his heart because his mind is stayed on the Lord

and he knows that He is following the Lord in what he is doing. That would be peace wouldn't it? Would that be what is described here. Well, can you spiritualize so that would be . It doesn't seem to me it is possible. Yes, I think you have to put in the word external . It seems to me that we have here a picture of freedom from external danger. It is not a situation where there is peace in the heart. We have wonderful promises in the Scripture of peace in the heart but it doesn't seem to me that one can properly interpret this as a description of peace in the heart . It does not seem to me that one can properly interpret this as one which says that there will be some people who will cease to be cruel and become peaceful. If it refers to people as becoming peaceful it must be all people becoming peaceful because the emphasis in the passage is on the individual who need not fear others because there is nothing else to fear. It is a situation of complete external peace and safety. Now that is made very clear in Micah in sitting every man under his vine and his fig tree and none shall make them afraid. It is a lack of anything you need to fear but in Isaiah I believe you have in the fourth verse the same thought brought out , they don't learn war anymore,. Why don't they learn war anymore? Because they are foolish and don't bother to protect themselves? No, because there is no need of it . There is nothing from which to protect themselves. It seems to me a picture of external safety, peace in the sense that we don't need to fear aggression from any one else. That is the thing certainly that is emphasized in Micah and I believe that is the thing that is emphasized in Isaiah . That is Micah goes a little further makes it a little clearer . I think it is already here in Isaiah. That then is the thought and we have the concluding exhortation in both . Let us walk in the light of the Lord. Other nations which do not have a God who can make a promise like that are faithful to their gods. Let us ^{be} faithful to our God. No nation has ever been as unfaithful to their god as Israel was to its God and as christian nations as a whole have been to their God . No other nation has shown so much unfaithfulness and the reason for it is simple . With other nations their

god has been simply someone or some group of ones to look to for help or they have been some who they have terrible fear of and must be proficient but they have not been these who have laid down before them such a moral bond as the god of the jews, God of the christians lays down and makes such requirements on the lives of their followers and that is the reason why there is more falling away, unbelief, apostasy in Christian nations perhaps than in any other religion . As we said, other nations they walk every man in the name of their god should not we who have a God who can make such wonderful promises should not we walk in the name of our God forever and ever. It parallels in the exhortation of the two . Now is there any further questions that occurs about these two passages in Micah and in Isaiah? Anything you would like to bring up about the parallel between them about the thought of them. Anything that occurs to you for further discussion . Mr. ? (4)

The passage it would seem to me must be taken as a unit. If you take it as a unit I do not know of anytime previous to the millenium when it could be ~~said~~ said to be fulfilled. Now the first sentence here of it verse one of it could have conceivably occurred in several different times. The second passage could possibly be thought with comparatively (3½)

as applying to simply the going out of the Gospel but it could also apply to the situation in the millenium and the two of them are sufficiently different that it would seem that verse 3 must apply to one or the other . Perhaps it would seem at first sight to fit slightly better with the going out of the Gospel than with the millenium . But it does fit either one but it doesn't seem reasonable to say that verse 3 is a picture of both. It seems reasonable that it could be a picture of a situation which continues over a long period of ~~time~~ and then at the end you learn of the climax of that period . That would be entirely possible . If one for instance holds the post=millenial view that you could say that verse 3 describes a process which began with the going out of the Gospel ~~to~~ from Jerusalem in the time of the apostles and which continued as nation after nation is won

to the Gospel, section after section of the world becomes truly christian until
in verse 4
the result of verse three is the situation/where the whole world has been converted
and, therefore, no one need any longer fear aggression or violence because everyone
has the spirit of peace in their heart as a result of the Gospel. This passage
✓ in other words could fit with a post-millennial view . A view that the Gospel is
going to bring in a condition of universal peace and safety because all people will
~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ be converted. (1 3/4)

Or, it can be a description entirely of something that is going to happen after
(1½)

that is a pre-millennial view . I don't see any possibility of interpreting this as
such in line with a A Millennial . It seems to me if you are going to take an
✓ a-millennial view you have to take this passage and throw it out of the Bible .

You have to do that with this passage and the passage in Micah and the passage in
Isaiah . They can fit exactly with a pre-millennial view . When it comes to
a post-millennial view Micah and Isaiah 2 can fit exactly . Isaiah 11 if you take
the picture of the animals not as literal but figurative representing people then
it can fit with the post-millennial view . It can fit with the pre-millennial view
if you take it literally but even so it also includes the picture of human beings.

B13

Isaiah 2 and Micah 4 can fit with either pre-millennial or post-millennial . Isaiah 11
is a little better with pre but can be ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ interpreted to fit with post-millennial
but I see no possibility of taking (14½)

On the other hand when you look at the New Testament there is no post-millennialists
in the New Testament. The New Testament you find many passages that fit with the
pre-millennial view of the return of Christ to establish His Kingdom but some of those
passages also be interpreted in the New Testament as a picture of ~~sa~~ the return of
Christ followed by a last judgement and the complete end of this world but you cannot
interpret the ~~New Testament~~ ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ New Testament in post-millennial view and you cannot

interpret the Old Testament in an AMillennial view. You can interpret either one in a pre-millennial view . Yes, (13 3/4)

That as a result of the message of salvation going forth the nations are judged in character and in their attitude so they ~~seek~~^{cease} to be warlike . Now that particular phrase seems to me fits much better than with the pre-millennial view than with the post-millennial view but the previous verse fits with the post-millennial view than with the pre-millennial view. Yes, (13 1/4)

No, Yes, but Isaiah 11 describes (13)

and then it goes on describes his kingdom and his kingdom is one ~~w~~ in which war and aggression is done away with and Isaiah 11 we could say this talks about animals but it is not animals he is talking about but the human world . I think the emphasis is primarily on the human world. I would be ready to consider interpreting Isaiah 11 as a figurative picture describing the human world were it not for the fact that I find ~~isn't~~ in the New Testament definite statements of the removal of the curse from the world which fit in with taking Isaiah 11 literally as a picture of the end of war and fighting in both the human world and the animal. So for that reason I feel that the pre-millennial view is definitely the better . There is no possibility of fitting it in with the A Millennial ~~view~~. Yes, verse 4 in Chapter 11 "But with righteousness shall he judge the poor and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth; " It is going a little far from the direct ~~is~~ literal to say that this shows the result of the spread of the gospel with the activity of Christ's people resulting in the doing away of inequality and oppression everything of that kind. It is going away a little from the literal but not so tremendously and then, of course, that last part that with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. That, of course, fits exactly with the idea of Christ coming back and destroying Satan with the breath of his mouth but there are those who say shows the Gospel speaking the message comes from Christ which makes the change. I think the pre-millennial is definitely the best view. I think that A-Millennial view is absolutely impossible .

I think you just have to tear these passages out of the Scriptures kto take an

A-Millennial View but it does seem to me that they can (11)

✓ According to the pre-millennial view Christ comes back and sets up a kingdom of righteousness and peace upon earth . According to the post-millennial view there is a kingdom of peace established on earth and then Christ comes back and brings an end to this kingdom . Neither of these passages mentions this , states whether it will be at the beginning or end . Well, it would be equally strange from the viewpoint of post-millennial . It would be equally strange from either . The Old Testament has these various passages in which the prophet looks forward to the coming of a golden age in which there will be peace and happiness and joy and freedom from external danger upon the earth. That he sees before his eyes something that is going to come . He sees it at a time when a righteous king is going to reign and establish this but he sees the period that is the glorious thing that many of the prophets looked to. Now in the New Testament the people knew Christ. They knew him personally and the thing they looked forward to was His return so the return of Christ as something to look forward to is greatly stressed in the New Testament and the New Testament does say a little about what He will do after He comes but not so much so that is why a post-millennial view which puts off the return of Christ until the end of the millenium is pretty hard to fit with the New Testament but an A-Millennial view which does away with it all together ~~can~~ ^{can't} be fit with the Old Testament which gives us clear pictures of this period. Of course, no one passage is going to give all of the truth . They take the ~~whole~~ Bible to give all of the truth. But one passage stresses one aspect and another passage stresses another aspect and so on and then we fit them together and we get our picture of the situation as a whole . I hope you all read my little sermon . The material is very important for this second chapter and there is quite a bit I've given in that sermon that I wouldn't want to take time to repeat . Well, any further questions about this . Yes, (8½)

Verse 4 ~~is not repeated~~ in Micah is not repeated in Isaiah . Yes, that is given in only the one and so either Isaiah wrote it first and Micah wrote it and enlarged this way to show what is already included in Isaiah but to make it clearer or else Micah gave the picture as a whole and then Isaiah abbreviated some of it when he described how God had given him the same vision he gave Micah . We have everything else repeated but I don't think you will many people who know ~~everything~~ that everything else is repeated. I pointed out in class I don't think any of you realize it is that last phrase for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken does have this parallel in the beginning of ~~the~~ ^{his} Isaiah and I don't think that many readers realize that verse 5 . That verse 5 in Micah use to puzzle me, it took me a long time to find what it really meant . But we do find this that it is not repeated . It does not really add to the thought. It simply strengthens the thought and if people were already familiar with what Isaiah says I have seen the same vision. This is the vision God gave me . He quotes most of it, the sitting under the vine and the fig tree is the further stressing on the idea of external peace and safety already brought out by the statement they don't learn war any more and he simply reminded them of the picture without necessarily giving the whole picture . Incidentally, that suggests a (6½) which I think is tremendously important. People have great difficulty with New Testament quotations of the Old Testament because the New Testament will say well the Old Testament says so and so or such and such . You look at it and say how does that prove that. It doesn't prove it all. There are people who say Paul was simply taking a couple of words out of context and interpreting in a very, very queer way so to build on these particular words a whole teaching . He never does anything of the kind. The New Testament very often quotes two words or a sentence of the Old Testament not to say these words prove what I'm going to say now but to say the passage that I'm reminding you of proves what I'm going to say and it gives a little bit to remind you of a passage and ~~the~~ is the passage that is vital not just a word or two that is quoted . I think that is a very important

point about it. Yes, They remind people of a passage by quoting a little bit of it.

If you will examine what the New Testament is bringing out and examine what the
 Old Testament teaches / You will also find that it is exactly the same (5)
 in that passage .

Just look at the couple of words and you say how does this . I saw an article
 one time that said verbal inspiration , I thoroughly believe in verbal inspiration ,
 that the words are divinely guided so as to contain the true thought
 But this article said verbal inspiration is proved by the fact that the New
 Testament builds a whole ~~argu~~ argument on the fact that word in the Old Testament
 is singular instead of plural . On the fact that a word in the Old Testament
 is in the present instead of in the past or future and so on it builds on a
 and I don't believe it and then it proceeds to give illustrations / Like it says I don't believe any one of
 them.
 in the New Testament Jesus said to Moses "I Am the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob
 and he built his whole argument on the fact that the word "am" is in the present in
 the Old Testament. Well, I wrote him and I said in the first place if you will look
 in your New Testament passage the word "Am" is in ~~xxxx~~ italics. There is no such
 verb there at all and I said there is no such verb in the Old Testament passage of
 that verse, there is no verb at all and furthermore there is no present in the Hebrew
 anyway so how could you be building an argument on the fact that the Old Testament
 uses the present when no such thing exists in Hebrew . Well, he was sort of skeptical
 but anyway that is the fact of the matter . He is building on the idea not on a word
 and another illustration he gave was he said verbal inspiration is proved by the fact
 that Paul builds a whole argument on the fact that seed in the Old Testament is
 singular not plural. He said to ~~thxy~~ thy "seed" not "seeds" . The seed is Christ.
 Well, if you look into the Old Testament and it says to thy seed will I give this
 kingdom and it says thy seed shall be like the stars of the heavens, they'll multiply
 You are able to count the stars you are able to count your seed. Well, that is
 singular . The seed is like the stars in other words the word seed is a collection
 which may refer to one seed or may refer to millions and he is not building an

argument on the fact it is singular. He is explaining the meaning^{of it} that in this particular case he does not mean one seed . Seeds as many and seed as one.

The strange thing was that I found that many of the very best writers gave that that as an illustration for verbal inspiration . They have just taken it from others and have not bothered (2)

Here we have this passage in the two places and it starts with the word going out from Jerusalem . It could be the Gospel going out or could be the command going from the king but in any event the result^{of that word}/is the establishment of the situation of external peace and safety where there is nothing around of which to be afraid. In Isaiah 11 that is made even more explicit because the animal which normally we need to fear one no longer needs to fear. You all read the sermon that I gave you a copy of the story of the man and the snake in the desert which I told there, which showed where the little child had no fear of the snake at all but that is not the point . The child won't have any fear. The point of it is that the child doesn't need to have any fear , that's the point. It isn't peace within the heart it's freedom from danger outside , freedom from external danger .

B14

Look into this phrase "in the last days" and, of course, you immediately look at the Hebrew to see what the phrase is that means "last days" . Because if you take an english word and trace it through it may be very interesting but it doesn't prove anything . To prove anything you have to get the original and so you get the original of this word "last days" and you find that it is the Hebrew word (14½?)

And the question is what does the word ?? mean? Well, at this point a person who knows very little about Hebrew can still get a great deal of benefit from Hebrew . A person who even had no Hebrew at all if he has Young's Concordance can get a great deal of benefit from it and even a person who knows a great deal of Hebrew can often shorten his work by using Young's Concordance . I wonder just how well you people are familiar with this fact. You look in here in Young's Concordance and you look up the word "last" and you find here that it says "last"

or "latter end" (13½)

Then under ?? it gives five usages of ?? and every one of these five it gives here is the last days. No, four of the five given here is the "last days". No, three are last. But look in the back of Young's Concordance. All of the recent ones have the extra section in the back. I can just explain it and look at it tomorrow but all of the Young's Concordances that have been issued in the last sixty years have another section in the back in which all of the Hebrew words are repeated in the back in alphabetical order and they are given in english letters also in Hebrew so that even if a person didn't know Hebrew they could look up. Find a word here in the front and look it up in the back and there they would find that this word ???? is translated "last" in these four cases or five, is also translated latter several times and then you look up latter you will find that in quite a few it is "latter days" and so you find that the word (12??) means "latter days" or may mean "last days". It is used for both but a quicker way to do it is to use this book. The Englishman's Hebrew Concordance. This is a tremendously valuable book in the study of Hebrew because here you just look up (11½//) and then you find all of the cases where (11½??) occurs. It is easy to pick out one that gives with the english translation and it is very easy to pick out the ones where it is translated "latter days" or "last days" from it. This phrase (11½??) we find used in the Scripture a fair number of times and there are two ways of finding out what it means. The only decisive way is to examine the *context* contents. That is the only decisive way but there is the helpful way of studying the etymology of the words and seeing what light that throws upon it. Well, now I would like to do both because both are helpful but the decisive way always must be used. Words go contrary to etymology often in any language there is. Words often change in such a way that etymology does not prove what they mean. You can't prove a word by etymology. Etymology suggests very interesting things and is well worth looking into. Now I believe all of you have listed on your paper all of the cases of "last day" or "latter day". Well what is the last one that you have Mr. ?

Daniel 2 :28 and if you look at Daniel 2:28 you will find that he says " there is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets, and maketh known to the king Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter days . And as far as context is concerned what does this prove about this. (9½)

He shows Nebuchadnezzar four kingdoms, four parts of the statue and then he shows the whole statue going down . The whole statue hit by a stone cut from the mountains without hands which the Roman Catholics say is the Virgin Birth and then they say that stone hit the statue and destroyed it and it fills the whole earth. Well, now when the stone cut from the mountain without hands destroys the image and fills the whole earth. That is the end of the present age and the beginning of a new age . Well the a-millennialists say that is the first coming of Christ . He destroys the Roman Empire and establishes Christianity throughout the whole world. I don't see how that can fit the idea that it is completely Christ's statue because there are many ~~remain~~ remainders of secular ungodly power in this world to this day. Yes, (8½)

In this passage we have two ways of considering is Daniel saying to Nebuchadnezzar I am going to show you what is going to happen in the latter days . The head of gold is you Nebuchadnezzar. I am going to tell you what is going to happen to you and what is going to happen to your descendants straight through to the end. Is all of this included in the phrase "in the latter days"? Or, does the phrase "in the latter days" merely refer to the hitting of the stone which comes at the end of the age. He is going to show you what is going to happen in the latter days but in showing you he is going to give you a big introduction first with nearer things . You see what I mean? In other words this passage does not prove whether the phrase "latter days" covers everything subsequent to Nebuchadnezzar or whether it covers only the very end of the vision which he saw. You can't prove it. I would feel there is a little bit of preponderance in favor of thinking what Nebuchadnezzar is shown starts right soon because there is all of this detail about this image and the different parts of it and all that . I would imply that probably when he says I'll show you what will

happen in the latter days he means the Babylon Empire and the Persian Empire and the Greek and all that which came pretty quick that is came in a few decades, a few centuries but I don't think you could possibly take it any other way so I don't think that this passage proves it. Does the "last days" or the "latter days" mean a specific time when the image is struck and this age comes to end and a new age is ushered in or does it include a great deal of space before that . Well, this passage doesn't prove it. What is the next one prior to that Mr.?

Micah 4:1 and that, of course, is the thing we are talking about so from that we can't prove it and what is the one before that ? Hosea 3:5 we read in verse 4 "For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince , and without a sacrifice, and without an image and without an ephod, and without teraphim; Afterward shall the children of Israel return and seek the Lord their God and David their king and shall fear the Lord and His goodness in the "latter days" . Is this describing the return of the people after the exile which will be fairly soon , looking clear forward to the end of the present age . So that it would look forward to a long distance in the future. It would prove that the long distance future might be included/^{under it}but doesn't necessarily prove that all of it. What is the next one before that Mr. Abbot . Ezekiel 38:16

"Thou shalt come up against my people of Israel, as a cloud to cover the land; it shall be in the latter days and I will bring thee against my land, " Now, this, of course, just when is this going to happen but it certainly is probably during the very end of the age and consequently would fit "the latter days" seems very distant . What is the one in Daniel but doesn't prove it.? Daniel 10:14
(4)

"Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days: " Does he mean I am here to tell you Daniel what is going to happen to you in the future , what is going to happen to you after a time or what is going to happen to you at the very end of the age ? Well, he goes on "for yet the ~~vision~~ vision is for many days." It is quite a ways off but does it mean he is necessarily talking about the very end of the age . Chapter 11 starts right in with the time

of Daniel. Just like Daniel 2 starts in with the three kings of Persia , Alexander the Great and the Kings of Greece, etc. It starts in with the immediate but it does go to the distant so it could conceivably cover every thing from fairly soon along to the end or it could just refer to the very end. What is the next verse? Jeremiah 49:39 "But it shall come to pass in the latter days, that I will bring again the captivity of Elam saith the Lord." Well, we don't know when that is going to happen we can't tell whether that is something that has already happened or whether that is the very end of the age. What is next Jeremiah 48:47 " Yet will I bring again the captivity of Moab in the latter days, " Is that referring to the very end of the present age. It might be what is the next ~~afterwards~~ (2½)

None from Isaiah back to Deuteronomy . Deuteronomy ? None in Joshua? Did anybody find any in Joshua . Deuteronomy 31:29 "Gather unto me all the elders of your tribes, and your officers, that I may speak these words in their ears, and call heaven and earth to record against them. For I know that after my death ye will utterly corrupt yourselves, and turn aside from the way which I have commanded you; and evil will befall you ^{4000 years later at the end of the age} in/the latter days; because ye will do evil in the sight of the Lord, to provoke him to anger through the work of your hands. "

Does that sound reasonable? No, well if it means the end of the age that is what it must mean. Well, what I mean to say is Moses says to these people I know you are going to corrupt yourselves and turn away from the way I have commanded .

B15

In this one here Moses says After my death you are going to utterly corrupt yourselves, turn away from the way I have commanded you. He said God is going to punish you evil is going to befall when is that evil going to befall you. What I'm asking is does the phrase "last days" , "in the latter days" always mean at the very end of the age. Well, does this passage look as if it does or does this look as if it means something nearer. Yes, it is not immediately . This passage looks very strongly in the direction of the phrase meaning afterwards rather than the end of the

age. Which wouldn't be until 4000 years after Moses. (13½)

Suppose I would say to you, you better study pretty hard now because if you don't study, you'll get behind and you'll fall into difficulty at the time when the Lord comes back. Well, of course, if He is going to come back next month, of course, that would fit but if it is going to be jthree or four thousand years away it just wouldn't seem very appropriate to make reference to that specific time in connection with it. When we read on into Judges we find that is what happened that the people turned away from the Lord and the Lord sent them into captivity and we find the punishment coming soon after the turning away. We don't find all of the punishment waiting several thousand years until the end of the age. This passage seems one of the strongest to suggest that phrase may mean after a time rather than in the period of the end of the age. Yes (12½)

It seems to me that the strong (1 3/4)

One the context is speaking, it would not be natural of him saying if you turn away from the Lord away off at the end of the age God will punish you, your nation for it. It seems more reasonable that he would suggest something that is going to happen nearer. In the second place the very important thing that Mr. Curry has mentioned the fact that we do find ~~a~~ the whole book of Judges given to a succession of turnings away from the Lord. God bringing evil upon them, putting them into captivity and then their praying to God and repenting and God delivering them and their turning from the Lord and God bringing a punishment very soon after. We find that to be the succession that occurs that Moses predicts in various passages in Deuteronomy and that is fulfilled in Judges and so on those two grounds. First, 1) the reasonable interpretation, that seems more likely, but that doesn't prove. Second 2) in the fulfillment this is the way it was fulfilled and that would be as suggested that is what Moses actually meant so this seems to me a very strong argument against the phrase being a specific technical phrase for the period at the very end of the age. Now Miss? (10½) did you have a question in ^{Job} ~~Joel~~? What was that? In Job 19:25 ~~that would prove that that is at the very end~~ (9 3/4)

It means afterwards in the sense of that one specific period or does it mean afterwards whether beginning soon (9½)

Then what is your next one before Deuteronomy . Deuteronomy 4:30 we read ~~When~~
~~the tribulation, and all these things shall come upon thee, when thou art in the latter~~
~~days~~

Here is a succession you see he says that here that when they turn away from God verse 26 " I call heaven and earth to witness against you that you will utterly perish from the land when you turn away from God, the Lord will scatter you among the peoples, other nations, there you will serve false gods and from thence if you will seek the Lord your God you will find Him if you seek Him with all of your heart. When you are in tribulation all of these things are come upon you in the latter days, if you turn to the Lord your God and are obedient to His voice He won't forsake you but will bring you back. We find in Judges several times where they turn to the Lord in the tribulation God sent them and He brought them back and so the question is does this mean "in the latter days" here in the time of the very end of the age? Or, does this mean you turn when this tribulation comes upon you, then afterward you turn to God then and are obedient to His voice He won't forsake you but He will bring you back, which happened repeatedly. It seems to me this ~~is~~ is pretty strong evidence here for the phrase meaning afterwards , after a time, rather than a phrase meaning a specific time . Now what is the next one before this? Numbers 24:14 He says, Now I will tell you, advertise is the translation which is not real advertising what this people will do to your people in the latter days . It is Baal telling Balak what is going to happen to the people of ~~Edom~~ Moab at the very end of the age . Or, is he telling them what is going to happen after a time and he goes on and describes the coming of David who conquered Edom and also conquered Moab . It seems to me it is a clear picture of the coming of David which was fairly near rather than that which is going to come at the very end of the age . If the "latter days" means the end of the age then this couldn't be a picture of David's conquest of Edom . It would have to be something that ^{is yet going to} happen at the end of the age .

but then Edom and Moab both have to be restored, reestablished for that to happen at the end of the age. It could happen but it seems to me what he is telling them is David is going to conquer both of these. What is the next one before that? Gen. 49:1 Yes, now that is a very interesting one Jacob called his sons together and said "Gather yourselves together so I can tell you what is going to happen to your tribes at the very end of the age " and then you go on and read all of these verses and you think are all of these things going to happen at the very end of the age ? You find one of them is the prediction of the coming of Christ and you find various predictions about the situation of the tribe in the land of Palestine and my personal guess is that most of what is predicted here did occur in the time when the Israelites were in Palestine . I have one friend says the "latter days" means when Israel (5½) It seems just means after a time . Yes (5½)

Well, that is I think the prediction of the coming of Christ . Of course, He did come and He is going to come back again but most of the events there, it would seem to me we would know what they were if we knew the whole history of the tribes in Palestine. Well, this word (4½) ?

I think it is translated four hundred and fifty times after (4½)

It is a noun derived from the (4½) To me it seems more logical that the

derivation (4) that which is after rather than that which is at the end . It is looking from the speaker forward saying afterday rather than looking at all of the days and saying the last of the days . These two or three passages seem to me to definitely required. We will look a little bit at the etymology next time .

B16

This phrase (15)? noticing the way that it is used in the different places in the Old Testament and we notice that many of these, of course, all of these mean something in the future at the time the person writes and they are usually a little while after at least not immediately but are they all referring to the end of the age.

Does in the (14½)? mean the last days that there are before the return of Christ

or the last days before the end of the world or the last days of something. Is that what it means . Well, we start at the end because the most revealing ones were toward the beginning . I thought we would look at the ones that didn't deal so much and most of those ~~was~~ toward the end could refer to the very end of the age but that doesn't prove it . If you find some that can't that will be what will prove it and ~~toward~~ toward the beginning there we found two or three in Deuteronomy and Numbers that would seem to refer to a time ~~xxxxxxyearsxxafterxxthe~~ ~~speaker~~ a lot of time before the very end of the present age and then we look at Genesis 49:1 at the very end and there are a number of things in that chapter which seem to be specifically fulfilled in the Israelites in Canaan. Like when he says to the tribes of Simeon and Levi I will scatter them in Jacob and we know that the Leyites were scattered abroad as representatives of the work of God here (13)

We know that Simeon lost his identity of the tribe and became scattered abroad through the nation. This was fulfilled literally at that time. The time of the Old Testament history and that was on in the future from the time that Jacob but it is a long time back from the present . It is not the end of the age. So these three uses seem to me to be pretty strong ~~cases~~ indications that the phrase actually is not literally translated "the last days " (13½)

What does [?]akereth mean ? Well, it means something in the future there is no question about that . Well you take the word akereth(?) which is the first word of the phrase and just would that mean? Yes, Mr. Curry (12½)

Well, when you find a phrase that means the beginning it is natural to look for the one that means the end and when you find something that means the start, the head most important it is natural to look for something that is least important or the lesser ones or which means the very last point but that does not necessarily mean you will find one that means that. I think a common fallacy in thought is to think that because a certain arrangement would be logical, therefore, that arrangement is

of paraphrasing
 what we want . Any such logical connections ~~however~~ are worth looking at as
 suggesting to check on and see if what we find. Actually , of course (11)
 Yes, because there is a head there should be a footbut would akareth(?) mean
 a foot ? It doesn't mean a foot. Akareth(?) always means completion . Well,
 there is a great deal of that sort of thing done in commentaries . (10½)

~~Now~~

Now, of course, you take something like the United States . The United States
 is very logically put together . You've got San Diego on the West Coast
 You've got Sandy Hook on the East Coast see how logically they fit together. You
 try to show the relationship between them there is nothing. I happened one day
 to be noticing that I was just for fun on a walking trip and I just trying to do
 something to occupy my mind
~~figuring something out and I thought how many States start with~~ started alphabetically
 well, how many states start with A , how many with B, how many with C, how many D
 and so on . The next thing I noticed which (9 3/4)

divide it
 I noticed this and I was amazed that if you take the alphabet from A to Z/in two
 halves one will be A to M and the other N to Z and if you take the 48 states and
 arrange them alphabetically . The first twenty-four cover letters A to M and
 the last 24 cover letters from N to Z. In addition to that you take the 24 states
 and divide them in three parts , the middle part will be sixteen states and if
 you take the two middle letters of the alphabet M and N you find that sixteen
 states begin with M or N . They go right in the middle ~~axxxxxxxxxxxx~~ it's the most beautiful symmetrical
 arrangement argument
 you ever saw in your life and if you want to make a numerical ~~alphabet~~ here you see
 the divine inspiration ~~for~~ of the 48 states of the United States . It is
 (8 3/4)

amazing how frequently you will find . I notice sometimes when I make out my income
 tax if they have a simple thing for you to do they always give you a way that involves
 endless figuring, arranging and you will find a whole series of figures in order
 and this parallels this and all kinds of stuff it just happens that way. But life
 is full of that sort of happenstance to a point and then you find it just doesn't
 work at all. Somebody tried to learn the names of the kings of England once and

said there are four Georges followed by the fourth William . ~~Life is filled with that sort of~~ and they worked out all kinds of arrangements like that well somebody else said try it with the kings of France . It doesn't work there. Life is full of that sort of apparently systematic arrangement and yet there are thousands of things that just don't work out that way and it is very, very easy when you get into interpretation to say . Well, now here is the head there ought to be a foot and you have this phrase which is translated the "last days" occurring very frequently ~~which~~ that should be completion . Well, it could be but you have to examine the facts to see what it is and to find the proof. Our second and third president of the United States ~~(75)~~ they both died on the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence exactly fifty years after, both on the same day. Well, that is a sort of coincidence like we saw. We have no right to assume (7)

And when we examine this phrase we find out of these occurrences the phrase akareth (7)? we find there are about ~~3/4~~ three-fourths of which would very probably be very far off in the future so you can think of it as the last part of this age if you want . Very likely (6 3/4)

But we find three of them which would seem to refer to something within a century after or two of the time of the writer so any such logical ideas seems to me to simply fall by the wayside and exactly what does this phrase mean . They translate it "last days" or "latter days" in the Greek and in the Hebrew but is that what the phrase really means akareth? I looked up the phrase akareth? and looking up in the back of Young's Concordance you find that akareth? is translated end twenty-one times , last twice, last end , four times, latter end eight times, latter time, once, etc. The translations have taken the idea of end or of last What is the meaning of Akareth? what is that what is the correct meaning for it. Well, it is derived akareth from the word Aka? and the word aka? means after in 408 occurrences. It is translated after. In 23 it is following in 26 it is after that and in 29 afterwards and a few others. All of these figures are in the back of

Young's Concordance. There is no point in my giving them to you take down. ~~You~~
 Once you get the general idea that aka? ~~means~~ means after. Now aka ? does not
 mean the end . It means that which comes next that which comes further on, that
 which comes after , that is what the preposition regularly means . That is very
 easy to (5 1/2)

Now if what the preposition means following or after then the
 akareth? you might say in literal english would mean afterness. The after thing,
 the after that which would be following rather than that which would be at the end.
 That would be the logical development from a preposition (4 3/4)

That would be most reasonable that is which follows rather than that which comes
 at the end . Now, of course, the end naturally follows but is the central idea
 that which follows or that which is at the end? Well, according to (4 1/2)

Greek Lexicon this word ~~akax~~ akareth? is used only once of place and in all
 other cases refers to time . If it means end in regard to place you would sort
 of expect it to be used for the end of the building. It is never used but once
 of place and it is used in all the other cases refers to time . ~~if it is used~~

~~in regard to place you would expect it to be used for the end of the building.~~ Now is the emphasis
 on the end of time or on that which follows . Now here in the Englishmen's
 Concordance all the cases of Akareth? are listed together and you will notice in

Deuteronomy 8:16 "to do thee good at thy latter end:" The latter end is the translation
 of akareth(?) Now does it mean to do you good when you come to your end or to do
 you good in what follows in the after world ? Which is more likely logic?

Certainly they are both equally possible. The word akareth(?) in Psalm 119 :13
 is translated posterity Let his posterity be cut off. Well, does the posterity
 mean the end or that which comes afterward? The after idea rather than the final

idea is the definite idea of the preposition and of the noun founded on the preposition.

It seems to me it fits as least as well in all of the cases as far as I have seen.
 It fits equally well, of course, the end comes after so that the after might be the
 end but is it just the end? Now the only case where akareth(?) is used as place
 is in the Psalms 139 where he says I dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea . You

know he says you can't escape from God in the light or in the darkness . If I ascend to the heavens thou art there, though I dwell in the uttermost parts of ~~shesea~~ the sea, behold thou art there. Well, this "uttermost part" is a translation of akareth(?) . It is the only time akareth? is used as place. Well, if you think of someone in ancient times looking at this Hebrew and learning to translate it into Greek and if this person in ancient times has the idea of the world as Europe with a great sea mass round about it and ending up in sea it would perhaps be a natural translation though I dwell in the akareth of the sea, though I dwell in the most furtherest part of the sea but, of course, if it is going to be a reasonable idea a person doesn't dwell in the sea . You don't say you are going to dwell in the sea . Most certainly to anybody in the present day the much more natural idea would be though I dwell way over across the sea. In the afterness, in the beyond , though I go to the other side of the great sea even there shall thy hand uphold me and there is the derivation of akareth from akar which means after or beyond . It is not the last part of ~~sshesse~~ it seems to me but that which comes afterward , that which comes beyond so it is once used as place, though I dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea. It doesn't seem to me to mean though I build a houseboat way off in the other extremity of the ocean but though I go to the other side of the ocean or I am as far away from other people as it would seem like (I could get yet even there God is there.

B17

If that is the correct idea of what akareth means . Then the akareth of the (15)

He says I know that you will sin and turn away from God but I know that evil will befall you in the "~~later~~ days" No, not in the last time but evil will befall you after sometime after you have turned away from God . It is the result that proceeds later on , not immediately but after while and when Jacob says to his sons come to me I am going tell you what is going to happen at the very end of ~~shesag~~ the age. I don't think that is what he is saying. I am going to tell you what is going to happen to your descendants after a while . What is going to happen along in the future.

That would be the thing they would be interested in and would be the natural interpretation of that word. So to take a phrase which is translated in the "last days" to prove that this tells us just what the time is that it applies to .

It is a logical jump without any foundation , of course, we figure that this millenium has not yet come . It is still future it must be talking about the very end of the age . (13½)

Mr. Curry you have a question? (13½)

That is what the early translators doubtless (13½) inaudible.

Well, I wanted you to check into this particular phrase and see what light you can get from it . My feeling is we won't get much light from this particular phrase. This particular phrase just means later on . Yes, 12½)

In Ezekiel 38:6 "Gomer and all his bands; the house of Togarmah of the north quarters and all his bands: and many people with thee. Be thou prepared, and prepare for thyself, thou and all thy company that are assembled unto thee, and be thou a guard unto them. After many days thou shalt be visited; in the latter years thou shalt come into the land that is brought back from the sword, and is gathered out of many people, against the mountains of Israel, which have been always waste; " In the akareth years that is the after years . There are some years first it doesn't come in Edom but it does come later on. I don't think the uttermost means the last but the later , after some years. It is the same chapter where you have it in verse 16 "And thou shalt come up against my people of Israel, as a cloud to cover the land; it shall be in the latter days , (akareth of the days) that is ^{This is not coming now, this is later on} after all time/. Of course, this prophecy of Gog and Magog in Chapter 38 and 39

[^{may}many things] describe something that comes at the end of the present age just before the millenium. There are others that ^{think} are a fter the millenium because you have them mentioned in Chapter 20 of Revelation . Gog and Magog rising up after the millenium and in addition to that. in Chapter 37 you have a picture of the millenium and 38 comes after 37 so there are many who think that this morelikely comes after the

millenium. In either case I do not think (11)

Any further question on this? Well, if not, we might well look back at our chapter and see what you did with the outlining of these next three chapters . I asked you to outline them . Yes, Mr. Abbott (10½)

Of course, in interpreting the Bible it seems to me that it is very important that we (9 3/4)

What is there upon which this passage does not touch because nothing is complete nothing tells about everything and all too many mistakes have been made from reading into the passages something that the passage does not tell us about one way or the other . If the people say there is a contradiction in the story of the Resurrection because one account tells how somebody looked in and saw an angel at the head of the place where the Lord lay , another account says somebody looked in and they saw two angels one at the head and one at the foot. Well, one says there was one and one says there was two. Is that not a contradiction (8 3/4)

When you say they saw an angel you do not say there were other angels there whom they did not notice . You did not say there were other angels there whom they did notice but the one is what they fastened their attention upon. He saw an angel . He might see two angels. There might two or three or four in other parts of the place. When you say there are two there you don't mean there ten there. You mean at least two if there is only one you can 't say there is two so if somebody saw two it rules out the idea that there was only one but it does not rule out the idea that there was considerably more than two. If he said he saw only two that would make it definite. Oh so many errors have come into Biblical interpretation to read into a passage . I have heard the synoptic gospels contradict each other because one says when the cock crew Peter recognized the Lord 's prediction was fulfilled he had denied His Lord.

Others said the cock crew again or the cock crew the second time . Did the cock crow once, did the cock ~~crow~~ twice , did the cock crow three times you can get a contradiction among these if you insist . These words express exactly and only what happened. The fact of the matter is there were doubtless hundreds of roosters around Jerusalem and there is a certain time in the morning when it begins to get light that they crow and he is referring to the time of cock crowing which was a regular way at that time of expressing the early morning time and he says before the cock crows you will deny me. Does that mean before any rooster in Jerusalem crows or does it mean before a particular one crows . No before this time of cock crowing . When you try to read into it more specific information than is in it you can get into contradiction. If there is specific information let us get it but let's not read into it specific information that is not there so that with this phrase I think our principle^{al} value of our study is to decide that it is not a technical phrase which will enable us to take two different occurrences and say they occurred right in that same period but it is a general expression showing that something happened. After a while sometime in the future which might conceivably be twenty years from now which might conceivably be ~~XXXX~~ ten thousand years but it is after a space . Well now we can turn to Isaiah again and I ask you to look into the rest of Chapter 2 . I think that we agree that the new Chapter should begin at verse 6 . Yes, ? In the two references in ~~Jeremiah~~ Jeremiah there 23 and 30. Is he saying "Here is something that is going to happen but you won't understand it until the very end of the age "or is he saying this is going to happen and afterward it will become perfectly clear to you what has occurred. ~~After this~~ happens you will see that it is just what I said. It seems to me a pretty good argument (4½)

After these things occur. After the Lord does it you will see the truth of what I have been pointing out to you . You will understand. Mr. Abbott? (4½)

There is another very interesting thing . The Isaiah passage ~~is verses~~ is very similar

to the Micah passage and the Micah passage has in the immediate context that Zion will be plowed into fields. Jerusalem will become heaps. There will be this ruination but after a time, later on a complete reversal is going to occur. Now in Isaiah, Isaiah begins with the saying "Here is the vision that Isaiah hath seen God has given me this vision. The same vision as the word shows that Micah has given and he begins "And it will come to pass after a time " after a time from what? I think we are justified in turning back to the end of Chapter one. The end of Chapter one the destruction of the transgressors and of the sinners shall be together, and they that forsake the Lord shall be consumed. For they shall be ashamed of the oaks which ye have desired. There will be all of this misery that comes from going into the exile which would parallel Micah's description of the downfall of Jerusalem and then instead of going right on. Later on is going to be a reversal he now gives you now they'll think I'm just copying Micah and I'm not. ~~It's giving~~ I'm giving what God gives me so he says the word that Isaiah saw concerning Jerusalem after a time it is going to happen. But if you skip the little reference to the fact that it is Isaiah's vision the after a time connects ~~with~~ right on with the preceding whereas if as it can easily do the new heading makes you think you are starting a brand new section.

(2½)

I told you how it would puzzle me how Isaiah would start with a big heading in Chapter one and another heading in Chapter two. Did he give a title to his book and after one chapter have to give a brand new title to the whole book? It didn't seem logical. Of course, he is giving a title for these two verses. He paralleled what might have said "For the mouth of the Lord hath spoken and he has spoken to me so that you have my witness as well as Micah's for the true situation. ~~Ass~~ I don't want to go to go on into the rest of it until I'm sure there isn't some other points that you want to raise. Every time I get started someone comes up with something very interesting and worthwhile but if not we will proceed to look what follows and we see there is a sharp break between verses five and six and it is unfortunate the translation in verse six "Therefore thou hast forsaken thy people the house of Jacob, why because God gives

this wonderful promise for the future . Therefore he has forsaken his people? Very strange thing to say. Well the therefore represents the Hebrew word Kee and I don't remember any other case where Kee is ~~sskan~~ translated // ^{therefore} Certainly out of a few hundred cases where it occurs there wouldn't be over five at the very most where it is translated therefore. I don't think therefore is what Kee means. Kee means because or when . It means if something like that and this is the reason for what follows ~~kfxx~~ for the destruction that is coming is because God has forsaken the people because of their sin . It does not look back (1)

B18

So we start a new section with this therefore is a poor translation because you have forsaken that the destruction)(14½)

Because God hath forsaken his people the house of Jacob and the reason he has they are replenished from the east and soothsayers like the Philistines and please themselves from the children of strangers. They are putting their joy in the earthly things instead of God . They are described as (14)

Not to say that wealth is wrong but the wealth has to some extent contributed to their forgetfulness to God . What division did you make for this what would be your first section of any size here? Mr. Ogden did you have a ^{division} ~~reason~~ there? You have rebuke and ~~(12 3/4)~~ judgement and that, of course, under the big heading of Rebuke ~~Under the big heading~~ I have included judgement but it is true rebuke is definitely different because you are pointing out sin and judgement you are showing the punishment that has come because of sin but you don't have blessing here . It is rebuke and judgement . As you say you have a section pointing out the sin and then you have a section pointing out the punishment . How far does this go ? (12 3/4)

The rest of chapter two and all of three is either rebuke or punishment . All of the rest of these two chapters. It is a beautiful section but it is a gloomy section. It is all rebuke or punishment and it describes time when people are going to find that

there idols are useless. Times when the lofty^{ness} of man will be brought down low. The idols God will utterly abolish . He will prove the ~~what~~ absolute folly of this sort of life and show the evil results of it and all of that is stressed in general language but very beautifully and very vividly until you come to verse 16 of Chapter 3 and you are still in the same general sort of thing but what is he talking about in verse 16. Mr.? What is he talking about there? Is he talking about blessing or about rebuke or judgement? Yes, now who are they. Who are the daughters of Zion Are those the very seas of Palestine? Are they the seven foolish virgins or the seven wise ones ? Who are the daughters of Zion? I don't recall one right now there are many in relation in Isaiah. But who do you think is meant in Chapter 3 vs. 16 by the daughters of Zion. (10 3/4)

Well, when you speak of the daughters of Zion that is speaking of Babylon personified. It is the singular daughter of Babylon that is Babylon personified as a beautiful woman enjoying all kinds of riches . She is going to be brought low. It represents the whole of the people of Babylon . It represents Babylon as a nation. Babylon as a power with great glory that is going to be humiliated. It does not refer particularly to the sex of the person in that case but in this case the daughters not the daughter but the plural daughters of Zion . What do you think it refers to? Mr. Ogden . (9 3/4)

A

I would not want to interpret verse 16 of Chapter 3 from one of four by that because I think 4:1 is the more difficult. I want to interpret the more difficult from the easy. It seems to me that from 3:16 on at least to the end of the chapter he is talking about the Israelite women that were in Jerusalem. The daughters of Zion. It seems to me here he means the woman of the land. He has been telling about God's punishment upon the nation as a whole for its sin, its idolatry, for its wickedness and the things that are going to come to it now he speaks of one segment of the population, the women., and he describes the women's sin and then points to the punishment in the latter part

of Chapter 3. Mr. Abbott (8½)

If I recall correctly I was told twenty years ago that the Governor of Texas in a speech had declared that the/Bible is wonderful for use of our own day because , you remember at that time you could not get tires for your car unless you had special permission and there was a great tire shortage because all of the tires went to the armed forces and the Governor of Texas if I am correctly informed in his speech quoted Isaiah 3:18 "In that day the Lord will take away the bravery of their tinkling ornaments about their feet, and their cauls, and their round tires like the moon." Prophecy of tire shortage. Well, I don't think myself the Governor of Texas was a very good exegesis in that particular ^{case} ~~day~~ . I don't think it has anything to do with tire shortage. I think the word tire here is like attire . It refers to ornament rather than to anything made of rubber but if you read verse 16 "they walk with stretched forth necks and wanton eyes, walking and mincing as they go , and making a tinkling with their feet:" A good description of the worldliness of the women of Jerusalem. And you read on in this chapter "In that day the Lord will take away the bravery of their tinkling ornaments about their feet, and their cauls, and their round tires like the moon, the chains, and the bracelets, and the mufflers, the bonnets, and the ornaments of the legs and the headbands, and the tablets and the earrings, the rings and nose jewels, the changeable suits of apparel, and the mantles, and the wimples, and the crisping pins . " I don't think we want to look for specific spiritual meanings in each one of these terms or for a specific designation of certain particular sins or anything . This is a description of general worldliness and so he is talking about the women of Jerusalem and he is saying that these women are going to have , these women who are so interested in human adornment and in physical matters which are not harmful in themselves become harmful when they become a major objective. That these women are going to find that in this very feature they are going to be punished. It is rebuke followed by judgement . We have in verse 23 the glasses and the fine linen, and the hoods, and the veils. Then he tells of the judgement upon the women . And he says " It shall come to pass, that instead of sweet smell there shall

shall be stink; and instead of a girdle a rent; and instead of well set hair baldness; and instead of a stomacher, a girding of sackcloth; and burning instead of beauty!"

He is speaking to the women. Now he is speaking about ~~God's punishment~~ God's punishment upon the women here. Then all of a sudden in verse 25 he turns to the men. Well, immediately you say does he deal with women for an area and then with the men for area. Well, we have been dealing with the people as a whole ~~xx~~ through chapters 2 and 3 The people as a whole but perhaps with more emphasis on the men. Now we have a passage dealing with the women . Are we all of a sudden going to turn back and again deal with the men? Or, is he in verse 25 dealing with the men in relation to the women? In other words he is telling them what the women are going to suffer as a result of the coming of the exile, the coming of God's judgement upon the people. That these women are going to find not only that they are going to lose their beautiful adornments but they also lose their menfolk and so the loss of the men which is referred to in many other places as part of God's judgement upon the nation is here given as God's part of his punishment for the women, upon the women for their worldliness and so that verse 25 could be a part of the judgement to the women. It could be a separate subject and have a whole chapter for it but it is brought in under this other head. The other heading with which he is particularly dealing . Well, then you ask the question

And her gates shall lament and mourn; and she being desolate shall sit upon the ground. and in that day seven woman shall take hold of one man, saying, We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel; only let us be called by thy name, to take away our reproach. " Now the Archbishop evidently thought the rebuke finishes in verse 29 so he must have thought these were the seven virgins taking hold of Christ with a wonderful gospel picture beginning with verse 1 but to do so you are certainly taking it very figuratively and the thing may be figurative but you have to have (4)

Suppose you try taking it literally ? Could this taken literally have any relationship with what precedes it. The ~~key population~~ ^{de-population} of the land is what is spoken of in verse 25 and 26 . The women are to be punished part of their punishment of worldliness is the loss of the men and the ~~depop~~ de-population of the land. The loss of the land

has the effect upon the women of leaving a tremendous overpopulation of women as described in Chapter 4 verse 1. So this verse can be interpreted as being simply the end of the passage dealing with God's punishment upon the women and showing the result which will come to them. I saw exactly that situation in Germany after the first World War when tremendous numbers of the men had been taken away and there was a tremendous over-population of the women in the land. There was a great unbalance in the general population and there were many results that proceeded from it which were very unpleasant, the destruction of the natural balance through war. Well, that seems to me a very natural interpretation of verse 1 and other interpretations one which many have taken and certainly was taken or this position would have never come here. This phrase "in that day" there are commentaries state that "in that day" is a specific (2) term which refers to just before the time of the return of Christ. Well, I question very much if the description here is talking about the time just before the return of Christ. It seems to me that Chapter 2 and 3 after verse six are talking about the downfall of the land of Isaiah's own day coming during the next two centuries as a result of the sin of the people and resulting in the misery of the exile. And then he is describing the circumstances which are going to come and he says in Chapter 4 verse 1 seven women shall take a hold of one man saying saying. Now does that mean in the days that we have just been speaking that is one possible interpretation of "in that day" but the next verse says in that day shall the branch of the Lord be beautiful and glorious and certainly verse one is talking about a miserable day and in verse 2 about a happy day. I have a list here of quite a few places where "in that day" occur and is used often in successive verses without referring to the same period. We had a student here several years ago who had come from Czechoslovakia and had learned English here and he used the word that in a way that I wasn't accustomed to and yet I noticed my wife using it in a similar way quite a bit since so may be it is used more that way more where she was brought up in Maryland but he would say "Now its that way" and go on to say what way it was. It didn't mean just the way he was talking about but the way he was going to tell you and I have heard Bob White use it the same way. I guess we would all use "this" that way and then we

go on to tell you what the way is. We don't mean the way we have just been talking but the way we are going to talk and in Hebrew you know there is no difference between this and that . The same word is translated this or that so in that day could be the day we are going to talk about and I believe if you will look at a number of cases where "in that day" occurs you will say there are many of them where it could be the day we have just been talking about but there good many were a dozen and I am inclined to think that what it means is in the day I am now going to tell you about which may be the day we have just been talking about but it doesn't have to be. In other words "in that day" means there is going to be a day when this is going to be the situation. He tells about this punishment of the women and then he says in that day he means there is going to be a day which will be like it , the result of their sin and then he says in that day and he means now I'm going to tell you about it the day that is somewhat different. He uses the same phrase to ~~introduce~~ introduce two different days in the two successive verses . Now I suggest that you can look into different occurrences of it I think you will find ~~(12)~~ evidence of fairly easily to lead you ~~That doesn't~~ to feel what I have said is justifiable. That doesn't mean that "in that day" does not mean the day we have just been talking about but it doesn't have to mean that . That it may mean the day I am just going to talk about. It is not something to tie things together ~~just~~ but to emphasize (12½)

There is going to be a day when that is going to happen. Now look at this second verse "In that day shall the branch of the Lord be beautiful and glorious"; ~~and~~

What is the branch of the Lord? I want you to look up the Hebrew word for it and see what word is used . Do we find this word used in earlier ~~places~~ places of the Bible in a way to suggest that it means a man for instance. Do we find it in Isaiah that it means a man or does it mean a literal branch ? Or does it mean a literal branch and then to be used figuratively for a man? What exactly does this phrase "branch" mean what does the "branch of the Lord" mean and then he says the "fruit of the earth" what does he mean by the "fruit of the earth"? In that day Christ is going to be beautiful and glorious and the growing of onions and ~~potatoes~~ potatoes is actually going to be uncommon. That doesn't sound sensible does it. That is to say there seems to me there ought to be a balance to this verse . What does verse 1 mean?

What does verse 2 mean and after that we have a description of the situation described in verses 3 to 6 what does that description mean. What is talking about there ? I will not be able to be with you next week on either Monday or Tuesday. I have to speak up at Cleveland those two days and so that I will have to suggest you do a little studying yourselves for those two days. Then prepare for next week and the week after and we will have our meeting a week from next Monday so I would like to suggest for what for you to do during that time. Look over your summaries of Chapters 2 and three again particularly though look in some commentaries and hand me in a report. Look in the same commentaries you have looked at for this last time. There were 34 different commentaries ~~is~~ looked at by members of the class . Look in the same commentaries you looked at . I noticed one person used Daleys . I think Daleys is one of the best and worth one or two more than used it before . Four used Alexander and Alexander is a very excellent commentary. Four that used ? (10) Most of these commentaries there was only one or two persons that used it. We had quite a wide range so I think it would be good to bring in a report on the same commentaries again as you did except I suggest that a few more could look at Daleys than did the last time / But see what these commentaries say bring me a report on what they say about what is Chapter 4:1 talking about and what do they say about 4:2 . What is meant by the "branch of the Lord" and "the fruit of the earth" and then what do they say about the passage which runs 3 to 6 ? I am not so interested in specific details of 3 to 6 but I am tremendously interested in verse 2 but in 3 to 6 it is one ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ continuous picture and what is it a picture of? What does this commentary say is here pictured? Is this a picture return from (9i) Is this a picture of the first coming of Christ ? Is this a picture of the Church ? Is this a picture of Israel? Is this a picture of the Millenium? What do they say it is a picture of ? Many commentaries unfortunately only deal with a few words and don't deal with the picture or the passage/^{or the idea}. Try to get it if you can from the commentaries, what answer they give to these questions I have asked. Now that would be enough assignment for one week . You have two weeks time to get ready two weeks to be assigned for but I

won't ask you to go further into other passages but read Chapter 4 those six verses in the Hebrew . Get them in the Hebrew and study particular ly this second verse. Also in the latter part of the verse what do you find the reminiscences to be . What does it suggest to you in Old Testament History . Do you have here a picture of a time when there is an end of external danger? Is the central thought here the same as it was in Chapter 2 and Chapter 11. Is it the same or is it different? A time when all external danger has been removed. What is the situation here. Exactly what will you do with verse 2. That is a very interesting verse and a ~~striking~~ ^{striking} verse. How will you get a sensible interpretation . Is it just agriculture? Is it just Christ? Is it a combination of Christ and agriculture? You see agriculture can fit in very well here . They are going to have de-population, they are going to have lack of food, They are going to have famine, they are going to have results of exile. (7)

Just what is it that is here in mind. I think perhaps in two weeks assignment you can really get a lot out of this chapter. It will be very much worthwhile and bring me a report on the commentaries and then we will look at that together a week from next Monday . We have really only glanced at the first chapter of Isaiah and then we looked rather in detail at the beginning of the Second Chapter and saw the tremendous teachings of that chapter with the parallel in Micah . Then I gave you my little booklet on the "Millennial Kingdom of Christ" which deals with these and related passages I don't think there is any point in my repeating in class anything that is in that booklet but I hope you will master the contents of the booklet because it is very important in connection with our whole study. Then we have not looked to any great extent into the material after Chapter 2:1 -5 . The material from there up to ^{the end of} Chapter 3 is much that is interesting and worthwhile in these chapters and also in Chapter 1 but I think that perhaps your interest will be whetted in working into it properly if we move more rapidly for the ~~moment~~ moment and look from our viewpoint what are the outstanding passages first and come back to the others that have more of an immediate local significance and so we look at the latter part of Chapter 3 and in that part as

you remember starting with verse 16 we have a denunciation of the women of Jerusalem for their worldliness, for their putting of human pleasures and human adornments in a place of supreme importance in their lives. This passage ends with the declaration of God's judgement upon them. He is going to remove the means of their worldliness, to remove the physical materials which they own and ~~human pleasures and human adornments~~ to put an end to their prosperity. Then we have verse 25 and verse 25 here must be interpreted as part of the whole passage rather than by itself. If you say to Israel, Israel your men will fall by the sword that is a terrible future, a terrible judgement upon Israel. They are going to have many men fall by the sword in the war but this is not Israel this is speaking about the women and so the women here are presented as putting human adornments, human pleasure as primary in their lives forgetting God altogether and they are told they are going to lose these things and that the men whom they are seeking to please and attract and to enjoy themselves with that these men are going to fall in the war. This is part of the judgement upon the women rather than the judgement upon the men or the judgement upon Jerusalem as verse 25 in the context.

"And her gates shall lament and mourn: and she being desolate shall sit upon the ground."

The "she" there means the city rather than an individual verse 26 but it is thinking of the women. Now we start Chapter 4 with their wonderful promise of the seven virgins taking hold of Christ in verse 1. which is evidently what the Archbishop thought it was or he would not have started the chapter at that place. I trust that you have ready to turn into me today the reports on all of the commentaries that are in the library and not any one of you on all of them but between you covering all of them showing how many of them agree with the Archbishop. That verse 1 of Chapter 4 is the promise of the coming of Christ and the seven virgins taking hold of Christ and saying we will eat our own bread and wear our own apparel; only let us be called by thy name, to take away our reproach. How many found any commentary that thought that was what verse 1 means? Nobody, found any? Don't we have any medieval commentaries in the library or are they all modern commentaries? Mr. Ogden what did you find in the commentaries you consulted. Did they agree or disagree among themselves as to what verse one means.

Every commentary then that any of you looked at disagreed with the Archbishop and felt that the new chapter should start with verse 2 instead of verse one . They not have expressed it that way but if they say that Chapter 4 verse 1 is a part of the preceding rather than a part of the succeeding passage that is what it amounts to isn't it? Nobody disagrees? Well does it go with the previous passage Mr. Ogden. And so that is the interpretation that most commentaries today would hold that 4:1 is simply a part of 3:25 and 26 that is a part of a longer passage beginning with 3:16 that the women are not going to be killed in war but the women are going to suffer the results of the war in their losses of material things and even more in the loss of the men out of the nation and thus the establishment of a great artificial situation . We have not experienced that to any great extent in this country. I was in Germany six years after World War I it was very obvious there, unnatural situation you had. A great preponderance of women. I think the verse ~~assumed~~ ^{throughout} the world ran pretty nearly the same . There are 103 women born to about 100 men something like that but it is very close but in Germany in the first World War thousands of men, many, many times the proportion of the losses our country suffered were gone and there was this whole generation of women, very, very acute in this age bracket so this verse 4 here is expressing the condition, the situation to come as a result of the de-population of the war and the exile . This chapter should begin at 4:1 if you are going to have a new chapter . Now whether you need to ~~have~~ have a new chapter might be questioned that is to say the common usage in Isaiah is to have rebuke followed by blessing and the two form a unit common usage / and from that viewpoint Chapter 2 verses 1-5 should have gone with Chapter 1 rather than with the rest of Chapter 2 . The break of Chapter ~~at~~ ^{break} 2 at verse 6 is a more important ~~chapter~~ than the break of Chapter 2:1 . Of course, in that case a person could easily be confused by the heading given there in Isaiah which might make them think it is a chapter actually I think it is only the heading for this little section at the end of the first vision . But now we have then this rebuke and declaration of punishment which comes upon Judah described in Chapter 2 and 3 and ending with Chapter 4 :1 and then it is very interesting the use

of the phrase "in that day" .. If you say what about Chapter 4:1 in what day will that take place. Now there are three possible means of interpreting this phrase .

- 1) One is what some say is a technical phrase (11½) means "in the day of the Lord". means the period at the end of the present age. That is what it is described as .
- 2) The second interpretation is to say it is referring to that of which we have just been speaking of, ³⁾ another is to say it is that of which I am just about to speak . Now there are those three interpretations and there may be many cases where all three would fit so that you couldn't tell which of the three it would really mean but if you find certain of them in which one of those will not fit that rules out the possibility of saying that must be what it always means . What about it meaning the end of the age? Do you think here it means the end of our whole present age? Just before the return of Christ. Do you think that is what he is talking about here. Yes, why? The preceding chapter seems to refer to the exile within a century after Isaiahs time. It does not seem to be looking forward to something that is going to happen at the very end of the age . It wouldn't seem to have a great deal of point in Isaiah's message to those people there about their sin and the punishment God is going to bring to say you women are paying all of this attention to human adornment and forgetting God therefore, three thousand years from now there is going to be a great de-population. That wouldn't seem to have much sense and for Isaiah to be rebuking people for an answer that is going to come three thousand years from now it certainly would be an unreasonable interpretation of that. He is talking about the women of his day. He may not be ~~sia~~ talking about something that is going to happen in the lifetime of those women he is talking to but it would seem it wouldn't look a tremendous distance in the future . So that it would seem more reasonable to say the latter part of Chapter 3 is dealing with a period within a century after Isaiah's time and Chapter 4:1 is ^{dealing} also/with that. So that "in that day" ~~and~~ in this case does not seem very reasonable to think that either in 4:1 or 3:18 that "in that day" means at the end of the present age. Now how about the interpretation that says "in that day" means the day we have just been talking about . Would that fit in 3:18? Would you think that in 3:18 it might say the day we have just been talking about . It would seem that it could fit

that wouldn't. Well would it seem it could fit in 4:1 ? It would wouldn't it. ~~Wet~~
 Would it seem it could fit in 4:2 ? You think 4:1 and 4:2 are the same day. I would
 be inclined to say this. If you want to say that "in that day" refers to the seven
 virgin statement taking hold of Christ then 4:1 and 4:2 may refer to the same day
 but in that case 4:1 does not refer to the day that precedes but if you say that 4:1
 is the end of the previous chapter then I would be inclined to say 4:1 can mean the
 day we have just been talking about 4:2 must be different, later on so it does not
 seem to me that both refer to the day immediate to the day that has just been spoken
 of. One or the other of them must indicate a new day. Yes, Well what do we mean
 by double reference ? You mean the judgement here might be a picture of the judgement
 after the exile and also of another judgement to come later on. Yes, I would tend to
 question that very much. I would tend to feel this way that if they say there will
 be times (6½)

but if he says this is going to happen a virgin will bring forth a child. He is
 referring to what virgin and what child. Now if he gives a prediction in connection
 as a certain cause is going to bring a certain result . He might be giving a principle
 that whenever you find this cause you will find this result . It might have many
 results but I think it is very unlikely that there would be two unrelated fulfillments
 of one prediction that I would think is (6) Mr. Ogden (5 3/4)

Well, exactly that way. I feel if a statement may give a general principle which can
 be fulfilled many times or a statement can be given in the plural (5½)

But that if a specific statement is made in the singular like "behold a virgin shall
 bring forth and thou shalt call his name Immanuel" ~~Th~~ I would feel that is a specific
 description of one of them and if it is fulfilled , it is fulfilled and there is no
 reason to look for another one . If we find that it is not yet fulfilled then you
 say the fulfillment is future. (5½)

of one event

If the statement was in its nature a specific prediction/rather than a general principle which could be fulfilled any time . Yes (5)

I am inclined to think that in most cases it would be one or the other that it would point ~~immediately~~ to an immediate thing or to a distant thing unless it is clearly a general principle . A general principle might be whenever this happened this is going to happen. Well, you could have that happening several times but I would think it very unlikely that he says that you are going to go into exile for your sin and that is fulfilled then and also years later. Unless he describes a certain sin and says that whenever this happens God will bring punishment you can apply that anytime. I would be inclined to think that the idea of double fulfillment is an attempt to find a way out of a problem and I don't think it is usually a helpful way . It is usually to be found on some other line and one line that I think often occurs is that there is a transition . That a certain amount is said about one thing and then another thing is spoken of . Like in Daniel 11 he talks about Antiochus Ephiphanes and then he talks about the anti-christ and he does not clearly indicate where he turns from Antiochus Ephiphanes to the anti-christ . Now I would say up to this point he talks about Antiochus Ephiphanes from there on he talks about the anti-christ . It is as if I talked to you and I turned and talked to you a shift but I don't think you should say that both are talking about Antiochus Ephiphanes and the anti-christ, one or the other. There may be a shift may be a transition . Yes, Miss Pickett (3)

We could find they were mistaken, it isn't that its this like exactly where Peter says. Peter said that it says in the 16th Psalm Thou wilt not leave my body in the grave . Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell nor shall my body see corruption. I forget the exact words, they are approximately that. Now Peter says now let me speak to you clearly about the ~~xxxx~~ patriarch David. He is dead and buried and we know where his tomb is to this day, so David was not speaking about himself but being a prophet he looked forward to Christ. He said that the grave could not hold Christ now in that case people might have thought that David was talking about himself but Peter says no David wasn't talking about himself he was talking about Christ. I think

that would be a mistake to say that was about David and about Christ. I would say it is one or the other. Unless David said I and my Greater Son there would be two referred to. ~~4:2~~ (1)

The so-called double fulfillment in my opinion is very dangerous. It is more apt to bring confusion than clarification.

B21

(15)

We would have to examine it to see if it is. For instance if somebody said during the reign of Franklin D. Roosevelt there will be a great extension of the New Deal and there will be rationing of ~~gasoline~~ gasoline because of a war. Now those are not the same days but they are the same reign, the same administration. So they could be put together in the same period. In that day this will happen, in that day that will happen that could be and if the de-population is followed immediately by whatever ~~he~~^{4:2} talks about then I think that would be entirely possible. But if there is considerable interval between I would not think it possible and in this particular case of course we have not yet discussed what 4:2 is but my own interpretation, of ~~4:2~~, 4:2 puts a big space between it and what precedes. Now if you take the interpretation that it refers to immediately after the exile. Well during the exile "in that day" there is going to be this terrible de-population but "in that day" there is going to be prosperity in the later part of the period we are now talking about which includes exile and ~~restoration~~^{restoration} ~~(13)~~ I am a little afraid it is a little long. A little bit of too much difference. (13)
of 4:2

If you ~~take~~ take that interpretation/that refers to immediately after this but I am not sure. I would be inclined to think that these uses here and some other uses make it pretty definite that "in that day" means the day I am now going to talk about. The day I am now going to talk about may be the day at the end of the age or may be some other day. The day I am now going to talk about may be the day I have just been talking about or may be a new day. I feel the force "in that day" is usually best expressed in English Bible something like "there will be a day" I tell you there

will be a day (12½)

Well, if everyone is pretty well agreed to what 4:1 means what about 4:2 . In the most obvious interpretation of Chapter 4:2 is this . The most natural except for certain problems would be to say that the women have been told you are ^{not} going to have your beautiful adornments to get all excited about to be so happy about all of these fine clothing you are going to wear and all of that sort of thing and all of these courtings you are going to have, all of that will be gone with the war and de-population etc. You are going to have this terrible de-population. But there will be a day when the women and the others who survive the war will no longer get their pleasure out of personal adornment, worldliness , pleasures of this life but they will get it out of agriculture out of the good solid, substantial joys, pastoral country life , raising crops, raising apples and ~~or~~ oranges, getting honey from the bees. All of these the things of agriculture , the produce that the Lord supplies will be wonderful and the fruit and the vegetables that grow in the earth they will be the thing that those that survive the war will get their joy out of. Now that is the most natural way to take verse 2 except for certain things that don't quite fit with that interpretation. Do you see anything that doesn't fit that interpretation. Not looking to any other passage to any New Testament passage . Do you see anything that doesn't fit. Miss Pickett (10)

I don't know if the women helped a great deal in tilling or not then, of course, Ruth went out and gleaned after the harvesters. Whether other women participated I don't know. I have often seen them in Europe. Women working in the fields, Norway, Czechoslovakia and other countries I have seen the men and women working out there together but whether they did at that time I just don't know . Yes Mr. (9½)

Yes, The Cambridge Bible Schools and Colleges, John Skinner writer of it . Professor John Skinner said that this word "branch" really means the produce that which shoots up . That which the Lord supplies . That which is provided by the Lord because apart

from Him we certainly would have no agriculture. You can't have a crop except as the Lord provides and so while it may be a rather unusual way to speak of the agriculture of the Lord yet it is not impossible. I was at a Methodist Church one time and I heard somebody tell how, this was at a Young People's Meeting, they asked me to come and speak and it was an opportunity to give a good witness and was glad to do it. Before I did it the young man who was in charge of the class gave a little talk first and I didn't know after his talk what I would say would appear relevant or not but in his talk he told about a man who went out and saw one of his parishoners who had taken a broken down farm, it was in terrible shape . This fellow had gone out there and had worked and fixed everything up and planted good produce , everything and had a wonderful crop there . The minister went and said My this is wonderful what you and the Lord are producing . The man answered and said "You ought to see what it looked like when it was only the Lord doing it and I wasn't doing it." That was a strange thing to tell in church anyway regardless of the viewpoint of the church. Of course, the fact of the matter is that while the Lord might let the place go to utter decay and terrible situation when there is no man to till the ground yet no matter how hard the man works if the Lord doesn't provide the rain, the air/^{sunshine}and the other necessities the man would produce nothing. We should in everything ~~inxiixxiife~~ we do in life we should be conscious of the fact that we don't produce it without the Lord's help we can't and so to say this is what the Lord has provided is not out of place at all and the "branch of the Lord" he says is the produce the Lord has provided. So at first sight "the branch of the Lord"/^{doesn't}seems like it sounded like agricultural production but I don't think it is too impossible to take "the branch of the Lord" as agriculture. Let us say that phrase looks a little bit against it being but not completely and now of course, somebody says immediately yes look at Isaiah 11 where it says "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots" and goes on and describes Christ and Branch is capitalized there in the King James version . Here it is small but they are two distinct Hebrew words , two different Hebrew words . Isaiah 11:1 the fact that it speaks of a branch growing out of the roots of Jesse

meaning Christ does not prove that this means Christ. In fact it doesn't prove anything about it one way or the other. It is a different word altogether. You might bring some ~~the~~ other references. If you studied the Commentaries you doubtless found some but the most common references to Christ as the Branch of the Lord such as that one Isaiah 11 are entirely different and it is not impossible even if this works should later be used to refer to Christ it would not be impossible to use it this time for agriculture. Now do you find any other thing in the verse that illustrates against this being a statement that the women who were so interested in the sophisticated and worldly things of life when they have gone through this terrible exile they are going to put their attention on the more wholesome solid things of life like the good potatoes, corn and vegetables. You see anything else in the verse? Yes (4½)

You read in Jeremiah and quite a few people were in. I mean a tiny fraction but yet quite a few. To my notion that is one of the biggest arguments against it. Beautiful and glorious and then equally excellent and comely later in the verse. It seems to me that all four of those words are pretty strong keys for potatoes and onions. They are going to find their joy not in those artificial things, not in these worldly things but they are going to find their joy in agriculture, in vegetables, fruits and etc. Yes, the fruits, the apples, the oranges are going to be beautiful and glorious the onions and tomatoes are going to be excellent and comely for them that are escaped in Israel. The phrases, the wording seems to be strong for that. They don't quite seem to fit. It seems to me that there is a rather strong suggestion in the use of these words to suggest that it is a figurative rather than a literal that the Branch of the Lord and the fruit of the earth means something different than simply agriculture. Yes, I would be inclined to think if you look on to the next verse It shall come to pass that the ones left in Zion and the ones ~~left~~ that remain in Jerusalem shall be called Holy even everyone that is written among the living in Jerusalem. I would be inclined to think that doesn't mean (2)

Of course, the 4th verse "When the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion" Here we get back to the idea of women. There would seem to be

a suggestion in the preceding verses the whole people is taken into consideration not just women. I don't know (1½)

In German it is very strict if you speak of the spoon it is masculine and if you speak of the fork you say she . Fork is feminine. If you speak ~~of a knife~~ of a knife you must say It . In German the genders are very, very strict but in Hebrew there are comparatively (1)

I would think that "they" masculine could be used to cover all or a group that was predominant . In Hebrew (½)

B22

I am not saying it isn't the Messiah. I am simply trying to see what the different possibilities and what are the arguments for each possibility and if you look at the natural, literal sense, is its agriculture but now the language seems to me hardly to fit agriculture , the adjectives . Therefore, it is suggested that it should be something else than agriculture . In which case it is figurative. I am not trying to tell you what I think Isaiah means I am trying to lead your thinking in order that we see the different possibilities that is my purpose in this course. I am simply saying that the immediate natural approach is agriculture but it seems pretty strange/~~to speak~~ ^{to speak} the agriculture is beautiful and glorious, excellent and comely . It seems to me that those phrases are pretty strong, particularly beautiful and glorious and, therefore, one has a perfect right to ask the question can this be a figure of speech and stand for something other than agriculture . If you ask that question then you say . Well is this phrase a Branch of the Lord used for the Messiah, immediately you will find in Isaiah 11 you will find a phrase "Branch of the Lord" used of the Messiah or "Branch of Jesse" used for the Messiah but that is a different word so that doesn't prove anything but there are two cases later on where this word is used . They are referring to the Messiah but they are later and, therefore, they wouldn't prove much about what this means . If somebody uses a phrase in a certain way in the ~~past~~ ^{past}

I am familiar with that is a basis for saying maybe I am using it in the same way but if somebody uses it in the future in the literal in a figurative sense that doesn't throw much light on how I used it in an earlier way, so that I don't think that from the word itself we can get much help . The word is something that springs up something that grows up and its natural meaning is agriculture. It could be used as a figure for a person. Now there are three ways of attacking a verse. One is to say it is all literal, it is all agriculture. Second is it is all figurative it is the Messiah, He is the Branch of the Lord, He is the fruit of earth . Then there is a third way which is half and half . He is speaking about when the Messiah is beautiful and glorious and when the product of the earth is excellent and comely. You have the Messiah and you have prosperity, and that seems to me to be the poorest one of the whole group . It seems to me that it is much more likely that they both ~~refer~~ refer to a man or they both refer to agriculture . That seems to me much more reasonable and I am sure that this verse ~~was~~ must be in Isaiah's day have puzzled people a great deal to know exactly what it means . Well, it seems to me another argument against thinking that this is a description of agriculture would be to look on a little bit and to see what is said in the next few verses which would surely seem to be connected with it. "And it shall come to pass, that he is left in Zion when the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion the Lord will create upon all of this a smoking fire and a cloud by night a tabernacle for a shadow , a ~~storm~~ storm of rain, etc. Well, of course, if you have agriculture you don't want protection from the rain . You want rain to make the things grow but the general succession doesn't seem to particularly fit , they are turning to the simpler things of life , agriculture instead of personal adornment . It suggests that they will turn away from personal selfish adornment to something that is higher and greater but that it is something of a different nature and I feel that we are justified in disagreeing with Skinner who says it is definitely agriculture and saying it is definitely the Messiah. If you say it is the Messiah, then the Branch of the Lord and the Fruit of the Earth will both refer to Him. That would be a strange thing wouldn't it to call a person

a Branch of the Lord and the Fruit of the Earth ~~would be both~~ wouldn't it. Did you find any commentators that referred to both of them to the Messiah or did you find that all of them referred first to the Messiah and the second to agriculture. Mr. (9 3/4)

In that day people will be beautiful and glorious. Yes, Miss C

It seems to me that it is either agriculture which it seems to me the adjectives will fit in the whole situation or that it is the Messiah and if it is the Messiah it seems to me it shows two aspects of His nature. He is the fruit of the Lord, He is the produce from the Lord. The Lord gives us our agriculture but this is one who in a very unique way, a special way ~~has~~ ^{is} given us by the Lord. Also, He is the fruit of the earth because He is one who definitely has his roots there in the people there in Palestine. In chapter 11 speaks in different words He is a branch out of the stem of Jesse. He is a man and a divine promise -- he is born. It points to the divine character and to the human character of the Lord. Now (8 1/2) holds that and Skinner laughs at it thinks it is ridiculous but I don't see why it is at all. It seems to me that we have two logical views. Agriculture or the Messiah and that half and half doesn't seem to me to make much sense but my impression is that the majority of the commentators will take it half and half. They will say the branch of the Lord is the Messiah but the fruit of the earth would have to be agriculture. They find their joy in the Messiah and in renewed prosperity, the fruit of the land. It/doesn't seem to me that the fruit of the earth is not a Messianic phrase. It is not taken up later and used as a Messianic phrase but ~~in~~ the Branch of the Lord ~~is the Mess~~ using this Hebrew word is not either at this time a Messianic phrase but he uses it in a figurative language and it becomes a Messianic phrase. The fact that the other one is taken off in that sense doesn't prove that it did not mean it here. It would be like the Son of God and the Son of Man. He was the Son of God. He was divine. He was the Son of Man, he was truly man and it seems to me we have here a suggestion a strong suggestion of his two-fold nature. Yes Mr. (7)

If it is Christ then, of course, then there is a big gap. If this is Christ He looks at the women now, He sees their condition, their worldliness and their selfishness

and their sophistication and He says all of this is going to end in nothing but misery but then He says that is not the end God is not through with His people there is going to be a day when God's people are going to find their joy in the Messiah whom He will send. Their joy will be in the one who is the Branch of the Lord and who is also the Fruit of the Earth and He will be the one upon whom all who are escaped of Israel will put their love and their trust. He is looking forward and then there will be a big gap between verses 1 and 2 just as there is a gap between the end of Chapter 1 and the beginning of Chapter 2 . Yes (5 3/4)

In English we put in a however or something like that but in the Hebrew just a simple (5½) very often is used where there is a sharp (5½)

They very often translate the (5½) like they did back in Chapter 2:6 "Therefore, thou hast forsaken thy people , no that is not the one. I guess I am thinking of Chapter 29 or 30 where there is a very sharp change. Yes in chapter 29:5 we read of something in verses 1,2,3,4 and then we read "moreover " "moreover" doesn't give the idea at all . It should be "however" but the Hebrew is Just (?)

✓ It is just an "and" but the "and" is used in Hebrew often where there is a sharp change . In this case where we are now it seems to me that it is just "in that day" we talk about one day and then we say now there is going to be a day when such and such is going to happen. Yes verse 4. So that we have then a section from verses 3 to 6 . Now is verses 3-6 a description of the return from exile or is it a description of the situation after they return? Or is it a description of the situation a few centuries after or is it a description of many centuries after. What is described in verse 3 - 6? This is surely a promise of blessing wouldn't you say? Is this literal is He going to wash the filth of the daughters of Zion, purge the blood of Jerusalem by the spirit of burning? Is that literal or is it a picture , it is a figurative picture of tremendous change that God is going to make in these people . These people are going to be washed from their filth , these people who are spoken of as those who are the escaped from Israel . In verse 3 they are spoken of as the ones written among the living that is those whose names are written in the Book of Life . Who are written among the living in Jerusalem . They are the ones whom the Lord washes away

their filth, whom he purges with the spirit of judgement and the spirit of burning. Now this is a description of a select group of people and what is the time he is describing that is going to happen that is described in this latter part. I rather of course deal with verse 2 pretty much before we deal a lot with verses 3-6 but 3-6 might throw a light . It doesn't seem to me that verses 3-6 very logically follows a discussion of agriculture but if it is the Messiah in verse 2 why 3-6 we are dealing with the cleansing from sin, the removal of filth, the ones written in the book of life , the ones who are purged by the spirit of judgement . It would seem to represent the ones who are cleansed by the one described in verse 2. It would seem to me to be quite reasonable .

B23

We were last time looking at Isaiah 4 there and, of course, Isiah 4 immediately reminds us of the section in Isaiah 2 because most of them are sections that look forward to the future and deal with the matter of the wonderful blessings that God is going to give in the future. Now in connection with Isaiah 2 we noticed that in order to understand it right we have a great additional help given to us in the parallel in Micah 4 and that parallel in Micah 4 suggests that the places in Micah 4 are literal places because of the close relationship to the last verse in Isaiah 3 . where it says these places Jerusalem, the Zion, the hill where the temple is, these places are going to be desolate , going to be burned, going to be cast down and become heaps Then we go on to tell how these places are going to be blessed of God and be the center from which the Word of God is to go out . That is one definite thing we have in Isaiah 2 there although it is made more explicit in the parallel Micah4. A second thing that we notice in Isaiah 2 is shows from Jerusalem there going out to other nations the Word of the Lord going out and having great effect there. Thirdly we notice that Isaiah 2 was a universal picture . Isaiah 2 and Micah 4 one of them says many nations and the other all nations. The parallel , if you put them together you certainly have a universal picture . It is a picture of something effecting the whole world . Then in third place we notice that the essential feature in Isaiah 2

And Micah 4 is stress of freedom from external danger . There is nothing that is outside that they need to be afraid of. They sit under their vines and their fig trees no one makes them afraid . There is freedom from external danger. That is clearly brought out in both of these passages . Then if you have studied, I trust, by this time my pamphlet on the Millennial Kingdom of Christ you will notice a close parallel in these passages in Isaiah 11 . and Isaiah 11 in addition to all of these features has the removal of the curse from the world and that removal of the curse found in Isaiah 11 in the change in the animals something which might be taken figuratively or literally but since we have the same thing taught in Romans 8 we are justified in saying it is a literal picture here so that is element which we find in these passages. Now when we turn to Isaiah 4 our second great passage of future blessing here in Isaiah we find that it really starts with verse 2 and not with verse 1 but in verse 2 we find that there is going to be a day when the Branch of the Lord will be beautiful and glorious and the fruit of the earth will be excellent and comely and we did not speak dogmatically on the question of whether this is agriculture . They are going to turn away from the human adornment and all of that was important to them and they are going to turn to agriculture and the wholesome and solid things of life or as seems more likely that it is a figure of someone coming who will replace these men who are killed in the de-population with something higher and finer and greater than any earthly relationship, relationship to the Lord the one who is the Branch of the Lord and who is also the fruit of the earth . Now we may say more about this verse before we get through but I think that we might go on and look at the passage in verses 4-6 . This passage in 4-6 if it is connected with the verse just before dealing with agriculture surely doesn't seem to be any great connection but if it is connected with the passage telling how the one whom the Lord will give the wonderful Immanuel is to be the one who is the center of love and adoration of His people then what follows relates directly and immediately to that Immanuel to that wonderful one in whom alone blessing and redemption is to be found but we have a continuous passage in verses 3 - 6 and in this continuous passage it is interesting to immediately see just how close is the parallel to Isaiah 2 . Well, I just mentioned to you five features

those was that
 about Isaiah with their related passages but first of ~~all~~ Micah 4 connects right
 up with a specific reference to the destruction of these specific places with the
 three places named right before giving strong ground for saying these places are used
 literally and not figuratively in Isaiah 2 . How about Isaiah 4 is there any such
 strong evidence here that it is specific, literal places he is speaking of and the
 places involved are a figure for something else . Do you find such evidence ?

Do you notice the difference? In Micah he talks about Jerusalem, the hills of the
 temple of the Lord become the place of ruin . He is speaking about a place and
 what desolation of the place and now how the place becomes a place of glory. Here
 (8½)

It is not Zion speaking of but the daughters of Zion . It is the people rather than
 the place. The emphasis is on the people here rather than on the place and so we have
 a definite relationship between the people mentioned before and the people mentioned
 afterwards but the emphasis is on people rather than on place so we do not have the
 same definite ground for saying the places are literal that we do in the other. That
 is not to say they are not literal but that particular evidence of the place being
 literal which was in the other passage is not here. The emphasis here is on people
 rather than on place. Now the second feature we notice in Isaiah 2 and parallel
 passages was that it showed a center from which the ~~word~~ Word of God went out into
 all of the world that was stressed in the first two verses of the Isaiah 2 passage and
 the Micah 4 passage . Do you find that Isaiah here that the word from Jerusalem is
 going out to the world. The command of the Lord having effect throughout the world.
 Is that in this particular passage? Mr. (7)

I don't think it is necessary to take the verse that way because he is speaking not
 of a city but of a people in the city . He speaks that everyone of the individuals
 will be called holy . That could mean that they seek each other to be holy instead as
 every group in the world today that there everyone will see the grace of God shown in
 some extent in the life of everyone. I do not believe that we can say with any (6½)

Now the third feature we find in Isaiah 2 was that it is universal . It deals with all of the nations. It goes out and stops nations from fighting against nations . It establishes peace throughout the whole world , The word of Lord causes nations everywhere to say let's go up to Jerusalem and hear the Word of God . Do you find that note of universality here in Isaiah 4:3-6? Mr. Abbott? Do you find it there? You don't? Does anyone find any trace of it here? I have not seen yet. Now, then the fourth feature we noticed was that the stress in Isaiah 2 is You can sit right down under your vine and your fig tree. There is nothing you can be afraid of . Nations don't take up sword against nation. There is nothing to be afraid of. The wolves and the lambs feed together . The lamb doesn't have to be afraid of the wolf . There is nothing to be afraid of . There is complete removal of all external dangers in the picture of Isaiah 2 and Micah 4 and of Isaiah 11 . Is that the picture here ? Take it negatively and positively . First, positively do you find any stress here on removal of external danger. You do not. Take it negatively do you find any evidence that there is still any kind of external danger? You do. What Mr. Abbott. Yes, even the word defense . There is to be a defense. There is protection from storm cover from rain, shadows from heat. There are pictured here all kinds of external dangers and unpleasantness existing but those who are redeemed, those who are (4½) those are given a protection from these things so that in this fourth feature it is more unlikely than in any of the previous ones to the passage in Isaiah 2.

Then the fifth feature that we have noticed only in Isaiah 11 the removal of the curse . Are there any suggestions here of a removal of a curse? There is no suggestion , of course, there isn't any suggestion in Isaiah 2 either. Isaiah 2 is closely related to Isaiah 11 . It is involved in it . Here there isn't any reason to say it isn't (3½)

Now we have noticed here the five outstanding features of those millennial passages and we have noticed that those features are not present here. That being the case if somebody wants to say this is a picture of exactly the same thing as Isaiah 2 pictures the burden of proof is upon him to prove it. (3)

The burden of proof is on any one to say they are different. You find many places in prophecy may fit together (2 3/4) (inaudible)

In addition to that there is a strong (inaudible)

B24

The first time I taught this course I was teaching in a Seminary in which most of the teaching was A Millenium ~~xx~~ therefore the emphasis the students had from other classes was strong against Isaiah 2 being a picture of the millenium and so it was necessary to try to give definite proof this is a picture of the millenium Isaiah 2, Isaiah 11 and Micah 4 . In recent years I have always ~~taught~~ taught where the whole teaching is pre-millennial and, therefore, that has not been a problem but I have found that every time I have taught this ~~portion~~ portion of the book of Isaiah there is usually been quite a number ~~with~~ who have taken the attitude now Micah 4 is usually a picture of blessing in the future so this must be another picture of the millenium and that is usually taken for granted . ~~Isaiah~~ Isaiah 2 is the millenium Isaiah 11 is the millenium and, of course, Isaiah 4 is the millenium also but now when we compare it with Isaiah 2 we find more points of difference than we do of similarity 1 (13 3/4)

You can have a picture of the United States looking at the eastern seaboard and another picture looking at the western seaboard and you can find some physical difference and yet they are both pictures of the United States . Or you can have a picture of it in two different phases of history . You can have a picture of it in winter and you can have a picture of it in summer . They will be quite different. You can have the same thing viewed from different aspects. When you have so many different things there is certainly it is only right (13)

To start with the question what is this talking about ? What is it a picture of ? We should not start with the millenium (13)

B24

Does it fit a little later? (12 3/4)

You are certainly right that the restoration of spiritually)12½)

If verse 2 is a prophecy of Christ then it makes it quite difficult to think that 3-6 happened to Israel before the coming of Christ. Now there is one other question I would like go on with before we go on to ask when it is and we notice the stress is on the redeemed.

(record inaudible)

In Isaiah 2 with its parallel in Micah 4 I feel that the close connection with the previous verse where it speaks of the Temple and of Zion all three of these ruins these places of ruin (14½)

It makes it clear that there is nothing figurative there. Now in this passage I feel that it is worthy of consideration whether daughters of Zion, his daughters of Jerusalem, ~~his~~ is to be taken in a literal sense as meaning that particular place or whether it is to be taken in a somewhat figurative sense meaning the place of God's (13 3/4)

The people whom God has redeemed as the New Testament speaks of the redeemed ones as the Israel of God. Now which way it is to be taken I don't think we can just assume (13½)

It is also possible that this is a picture at the end of the tribulation period of a group of Israel who are serving the Lord truly and are given special blessing by Him at that time prior to the millenium. I don't think that can be ruled out as a possible but I think it is equally possible that it is a picture of two people during the entire period between the first coming of Christ and the Rapture those who are finding their joy in Him and who have been purged and cleansed from sin by the spirit of burning who had their filth purged away that they are here given the assurance of the blessing of divine leadership and of divine protection. That is to say this is peace in the heart and divine protection whether it is pictured as that for Israel for those who are redeemed of Israel or whether it was a picture of that for those who are the redeemed of God's people. Regardless of whether they of Israel or not.. Now as between the two they are inclined to think that is people in general it isn't the people of Israel (12)

So the only time I can think of when this would be a picture of Israel would be the possibility that it would be those who come through the tribulation and stand true to the Lord, in which case it would refer to a very brief ~~xxx~~ period toward the end of the tribulation. But since the other is a much longer period and could be given here as whether they are God's true people, Israel or not, those who are redeemed

by the blood of the Lamb and are finding in Christ their joy and rejoicing. That seems to me to be somewhat the more likely of the two interpretations. But it definitely seems to me to be a different picture ~~than the~~ ^{than the} millennial picture (11)

So my feeling is that the picture in Isaiah 2 is a picture that we all can read and look at as the divine promise . We can look forward and get encouragement today from knowing God is going to bring to pass in the future what is described in Isaiah 2 and Isaiah 11 and, therefore, that increases our trust in Him and our certainty as we go forward as to what He has in store eventually. But this one is a picture of blessings that He gives us now and that we have a right to claim now, if we are those who have been purged by the blood of the Lamb who have been cleansed from our sins and who are finding our joy in the one who is the Branch of the Lord and at the same time the fruit of the land. So the two of them seem to have blessings in them for all of God's people at all times. A little different type of it.

(10)

Let us look at Micah 4 . Micah 4 comes right after Micah 3 and Micah 3 ends with verse 12. in which he says "Therefore shall Zion for your sake be plowed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the house as the high places of the forest. There is nothing figurative about that, that is not == Zion doesn't stand for anything there but a particular place on this earth and this particular place which is the center of David's palace is going to be just a plowed field as it is today . Then he says Jerusalem shall become heaps. The Babylonian king burned the city and knocked over the buildings and left the city just a heap of ruins . That is very literal no question . And the mountain of the house the hill where the temple becomes just like a high place in a fort. In other words the temple is burned there is just ruin left there not a habitation of man any more. It just becomes like a place out in the wilds, a little higher. Well, of course, that was the condition it was in during the exile but it has never been since because at the end of the exile they rebuilt the temple and there were temples rebuilt until Hadrian after the second conquest of Jerusalem by the Romans built a heathen temple there and then the Mohammedans built the mosque of Omar which has remained until this day. So that is

not literally fulfilled today. It was literally fulfilled for at least seventy years that the temple was just like a high place of the forest and Jerusalem became heaps and stayed heaps for quite a long time and was rebuilt again and Zion was plowed as a field and has been ever since because it is outside the present walls of Jerusalem. Well, he goes right on in the next verse Chapter 4:1 and, of course, the chapter divisions were not put in until the 13th century A.D. and verse 1 here is tying up with verse 12 jhe says later on it will come to pass that the mountains of the house of the Lord which we have just been told would like the high place of the forest. It will be established in the top of the mountains and the second verse many people will say Come let us go up to the mountain of the Lord and the law will go forthout of Zion . Zion will become plowed as a field and Jerusalem becomes heaps . Here you have three literal places in an account of destruction followed by the same three places being mentioned as being greatly exalted. Here the emphasis is on the place and the place is specifically designated in a literal destruction which we know occurred . It would seem to me that that rules out any possibility in Micah, 4:1, 2 which is exactly the same as Isaiah 2: almost identical -- of taking them in/a literal way, of these specific places. Now it does not seem to me we have that same sort of a situation here . Here we are talking about people rather than about places and we are talking about people who should be God's people but instead are finding their joy in human adornment, in worldliness and then we are told how those people who were people in Jerusalem there those people are going to suffer and be punished by God for sin but we look forward beyond that to the coming of Christ and be assured that in a future day the people who cling to Him will have very great blessing. Now there is a parallel between the people in sin and the people who are redeemed from their sin but there is a big interval in between and the emphasis is on people rather than on place and it would seem to me that this could very possibly be a description of blessing that God is going to give to saved Israelites finding their joy in the Messiah in the time of the tribulation just before the y come to Christ. I can't rule that out But whether that is included in it and it also includes all of them that find their

joy in Christ who are purged from their sins through Him, through the interval in between or whether the major emphasis is on those two who are saved in Christ . I can't be dogmatic between the two but I incline toward that. Mischung? (5)

That is a point that inclines me toward thinking that people between the two ? rather than the tribulation. I don't know how many during the tribulation there would be who ~~be~~ who be finding their joy in Christ. I don't know. They certainly wouldn't be finding it in agriculture . It doesn't seem to me that agriculture fits with either ~~any~~ interpretation. It seems to me as if verse 2 had to be Christ it doesn't seem to me that it could possibly be agriculture . There might be a great group of Israelites who during the time of tribulation would turn to the reading of the Scripture and see that Jesus was the Messiah and turn to Him and be redeemed through Him then and follow Him and ^{receive} ~~get~~ blessing (3½)

That is possible but I don't think we can prove from Scripture that that is a fact. We can't say that it is possible. It might be Yes? (2 3/4)

I think it is definitely Christ but if it is Christ during the earthly life or Christ (2½)

I think they are connected. I think verse 2 describes Christ as being the center of those individuals who it then goes on to tell us more about . I would think it would refer to Christ as the one who has lived , now in he a ven but is known to live, even though we don't see Him physically He is really known to live. Yes, Mr. Abbott? (1 3/4)

Yes, if I understand you correctly it is a general question relating to the structure of great parts of the Book of Isaiah. That is Isaiah usually points out peoples sin so does Jeremiah . They point out people's sin and they call on them to forsake them but they know they are not going to forsake their sin and they proceed to tell what punishment God is going to bring them . Well, here you are sinning this way and God is going to punish you this way . It hardly looks likely you say, look at your sin, look at the wickedness you are in 3000 years from now God is going to bring a terrible

catastrophe . That hardly seems to fit that situation . It may be that it will deal with something 100 or 200 years from now because he points out the sin of the nation and as the sin of the nation gets worse in a century or two then God sends the punishment but it is in the comparatively near future the punishment for the sin. But then, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekial and Micah and some of the others have great passages dealing/^{immediately} with the sin of the people and the judgement of God and then after doing that the way it appears to me is that as if the prophet turns his attention away from the mass of the people who are continuing in sin and unwilling to

(½)

turns his attention away from them to the godless to the group among the people ~~where~~ who realize the prophet is right and who are trying to do right.

B26

And to those who say, well they tend to give away in despair they say oh well, Jerusalem is going to be destroyed, people are going to exile all of these men are going to be killed. It is just hopeless . It is just hopeless. What is there we can do . We are implicated we are part of the nation we are implicated in sin . We can see what our nation is doing we know judgement is ahead. They tend to give way to despair and the Lord leads His prophets to turn their attention away from the mass of the people to the godly, those who accept his message or those who are willing and to give them assurance that God is not through with them that though judgement must come and though punishment is theirs yet God has a marvelous purpose of grace and God is going to bring them wonderful things beyond the judgement of which he gives them glimpses as encouragement to them as they go forward. Therefore, when these people see in Micah 4:3 that the nation is going to be destroyed, the temple destroyed, Jerusalem heaps (13)

God has a marvelous purpose and on beyond that there is going to be blessing and he doesn't say how soon and sometimes he gives them a glimpse of return from exile 50, 60 70 years . Other times he gives them a glimpse of the second coming , other times he gives them a glimpse of the glories of the millenium. But he gives them glimpses that show how God has marvelous ~~blesse~~^{blesse} ahead which he is going to bring to his people.

To encourage the godly although in the immediate future for them is the terrible judgement upon the nation for its sin and that interpretation seems to me to fit case after case of these various prophets where you have a picture of sin and coming judgement and then ~~you have a picture of~~ a glimpse of some portion of God's marvelous blessing in the more distant future. You get the same thing over in Isaiah 8 where you see the terrible sin of the people, you see where they are turning away from God and you see the Assyrian Armies come marching in by the Sea of Galilee, they come in through Galilee of the nations through the area up there in the northeastern portion of the land. That is where the Assyrian Armies come marching in and the misery begins to come. He says in that very place the people that dwelt in darkness have seen a great light. These people that were in the shadow of death on them has the light shined. In other words this place where the Assyrian Army first came in that is where Christ will begin his preaching, seven hundred years later and Matthew quotes the passage and says this is fulfillment. Light shined in the very place where seven hundred years ago the dense darkness first was because of the Assyrian Invasion. (11)

In Isaiah 2 he jumps ahead twenty-five hundred years to the millenium and here he jumps ahead, is it 700 years or is it 2500 years or something else but you ~~are~~ may have a little jump, you may have a big jump between punishment and the vision of God's promise of glory but between the sin and the coming judgement the space seems to be much shorter. It would not be reasonable to say it is a 30,000 year jump between the declaration of the sin/^{of the people} and the judgement that is going to take place but the assurance of blessing that may be long. That is a very good question. 9 3/4)

I have puzzled over it and this is the conclusion I have come to that I think fits the situation. (9½)

God said to Hezekiah. He said your descendants are going to be taken off as eunuchs to the King of Babylon. Hezekiah said at least we are glad there is going to be peace and safety in our day and when they told Louis XV of France. Look at the people of France how they are getting all upset about the conditions in the land there is going

to be blood flow, difficulty, it won't come for a while. Well, Louis said after us the deluge .m The ones who were living were all right. There is the tendency of the sinner to say oh well. Where was it I was reading somebody said that there is more young people smoking than ever before . People say today why should I worry today whether I might get some disease sixty years from now how does that affect me. The ungodly person, the person who is forgetting God and turning away from Him , the threat of something way off in the future doesn't mean very much to him and, of course, many of the judgements are in the distance but the further off they are the more they lose their effectiveness but for the godly he has his eye on ^{eternity} ~~Jesus~~ and he is following and the Lord the Lord /gives him views of the distant future as an encouragement so I think there is a difference there. (7 3/4)

preparation

I was going to speak about ~~separation~~ next week may be we can speak hurriedly I think rather than go on now it would be good to go back and look over Chapters 1,2, 3 a bit . I would suggest this that you leave your papers while I go away. Next time could you for next Monday put in what time you can between now and then (7)

Start in with Chapter 1 and run through Chapters 1,2,3 and note regarding each verse. Is this verse a description of sin. Is it God's wrath against sin. If so what sin? Or, is this verse a declaration of coming judgement? If so what is predicted? Try to see what verses are a description of present sin and what verses are a description or prediction of a definite event in the future. If it is a prediction is it a conditional or unconditional prediction. In any event is the verse strictly literal? Or, does it contain some figurative language and if it is a prediction when has it been fulfilled or when will it be fulfilled? I thought I would have a little time to develop this . (5½)

If that is clear then please have it ready for next Monday for 1,2,3 if you can. If you get into some interesting problems and want to spend sometime on them and don't get over the whole business well that is all right. The ~~ones~~ 1,2, and 3, if you can. Do you all have your work done for today. These papers I asked you to get ?

Chapter 1 of Isaiah. I asked you to look for certain definite things there and one of them was to notice how much was figurative and how much was literal. How many of you would say that everything in Chapter 1 is definitely literal. Would you raise your hand? Nobody? Well, everybody then thinks they find something figurative in the chapter. What would be the last thing you would find in the chapter that you would say is figurative? Surely this is figurative. It is a figure of speech. It is a simile. The strong shall be as tow and the maker of it -- what is the maker of it. Probably the thing made, probably what the strong one makes, his great accomplishment his great what he thinks is going to be so much is like the spark that goes up and is gone and they shall burn together, the strong man and his work burn up actually in a fire or do they compare. Is this part of the verse figurative or literal? And none shall quench them. Does this describe. Is this a picture of hell, of actual fire here? Or, is it a picture of the destruction of the works of those who are opposing God no matter how strong they are. They go up as if a fire. I am not ready to be dogmatic as to the answer to these various possibilities of the verse but we must agree (2 3/4)

This rock is as big as a house he actually means something in size *2½)

What is your next thing before that that is figurative. What is figurative in verse 21 How about verse 30 what is figurative about verse 30 You are not like a tree you don't have leaves, you don't have roots, you are not stuck in the ground it is not a comparison (inaudible to the end of the record.)

I would think that any specific statement in the Scripture could be taken as an illustration to ? a principle . That can be done with any statement like where you say The Lord put Jacob ahead of Esau. It can show that God isn't bound by ~~laws~~ rules of the eldest having preference in matters like that. You can rob principles from it but what the verse specifically said is only with Esau and ~~Jacob~~

I wouldn't think it would be right to say Esau stands for the Greek Orthodox Church and Jacob for the Roman Catholic Church . You might draw a principle from it but that is only an application rather than what the verse is talking about. I would ordinarily think that the verse had one meaning or the other . There may be cases where we are not sure which but ordinarily we should try to determine which but ordinarily there would be one definite possibility in most cases. Sometimes, of course, words are deliberately chosen as to describe both possible meanings when both are in the line of right but I think that is rather uncommon. Well that is

< verse 29 ~~abe~~ how about verse 28 Mr. ? You have anything figurative in verse 28? I am inclined to think that there is nothing figurative in verse 28 I haven't noticed it there . Now about 27? Well, yes, there, of course, is a big question. Does Zion here refer to a particular place ? If it does and is strictly literal. If it strictly literal it could refer to that place as a settlement. Like we could give Philadelphia will grow to be a great city. Philadelphia will lose its importance in relation to other cities. We are not speaking of a piece of dirt we are speaking of a location but it is a location which has ~~some~~ ^{physical} certain/geographical features it would be quite literal . That is to say I think you could be speaking here of a definite place -- Zion. However, it could be possible Zion stands ^{for something} /which would be legitimately right. I don't automatically say it has got to be literal or automatically say it isn't literal I think we have to ~~says~~ study the matter and there might be some questions (12)

If you take Zion literally as a place, a ground then it could be returned geographically

to the peo ple who come **back** from exile

Beginning at 10

But the previous verse what do you find that is figurative in verse 29? verse 26.

To that extent if it is not figurative, it is not Jerusalem

Most record B27 is inaudible.

And this is a case where the literal interpretation makes absolutely good sense and yet I find that the figurative meaning is the correct one. Although the literal one makes absolute good sense and the reason for that would be the analogy of the first half of the verse. Thy silver has become dry it does not impress me as a literal statement. I don't think it means the ~~money~~^{metal} in their money has deteriorated. I think it means that they should be the highest quality, the people who have God's line who are supposed to represent true righteousness that they have become polluted. So there silver has become dry and if that is the case in the first part it would seem quite reasonable to think that the last part instead of being a description of one of their theivous practices is another way of saying the same thing that they have become adulterers. I would be inclined to think that the end of verse 22 is a good indication where something makes perfect sense taken literally and yet it can be more likely to be figurative. (13)

What about verse 21 did you find any figure of speech there Mr. ? (12 3/4)

Verse 21 all makes excellent sense literally except speaking of the city as being a harlot. It doesn't say the city is full of harlots it describes it as itself a harlot. Therefore, it is not a reference to actual harlotry but the reference in relation to the Lord to a relation of turning away from God and giving their love to others that are not entitled to it consequently the first part of it would definitely seem a figure of speech. The last part of it a very literal description of the same thing. How about verse 20 do you find anything figurative in that? (11 3/4)

How about verse 19 Mr. Bryant did you find anything literal ~~xxxxxx~~ or figurative in verse 19? You don't find anything figurative in verse 19?

How about verse 18 Mr. Kim do you find anything figurative in verse 18?

How is scarlet sin and how is snow pure?

They shall be as wool. First look at the other part . Though your sins be as scarlet, the color is surely figurative. Sins are not colored not as a whole but a color which suggests blood perhaps . It is a figurative of speech. They shall be white as snow. ~~SNOW THE SNOW IS EXACTLY~~ Now snow is not a figure of speech . Snow is a literal comparison to the whiteness. So it is the white that is a figure of speech and the snow is a literal picture/and then again red is a figure of speech since the red color suggests and red like crimson. Crimson would probably be like snow a comparison to show the color so the color being figurative but the crimson not. Then they shall be as wool we have been speaking of scarlet contrast turning to white , red changing to wool would it be ^{suggestion} ~~an~~ of the whiteness of wool. It would seem to be an analogy of that verse . It is suggested that that is a strong possibility . There are black sheep. I guess it is either black or white and probably white is much the commoner . I don't know if I have ever seen black sheep.

(7½)

But with the sheep the great bulk of them are white at least the wool is white but the black sheep is the rare one , the uncommon. So if the black sheep is the uncommon

(7)

Beginning at 3

Anything verse 17 , any figurative in verse 17

Well that is another phase. We were at present dealing with what is literal and what is figurative. Now a very interesting question is how does verse 18 fit into the context and that is a very interesting question . I think we should go through the chapter more. I have been going in a backward direction here taking the matter of figurative and literal but I wouldn't want to get into the relation of 18 to the context without looking first and it is a very good question . Just how do you relate 18 to the context and of course you raise the question, could it be a question. Aside altogether from relation to context or meaning there is a question to be asked . Is it possible to take such a verse as 18 as a question. I don't want to look at it as to context and go through it but apart from all that altogether we could look into

grammatically. Can a sentence rightfully taken as a question is that a possibility? In order to examine that question it would seem to me a very logical thing to do to turn to ? Grammar of which when I was at seminary ~~was~~ the standard of ? Hebrew Grammar was the 28th division of which the 26th was translated into english and then the 28th was used to revise the 26th and this was the second/english edition revised in accordance ? in 1909 I haven't heard of any later edition. In this book which has a splendid facts of Hebrew Grammar and I don't think anything it says is taken (1)

Why there is a section on Page 473, 476 which is called interrogative sentences and under this one No. 1 is the only one that relates to this present question .

B29

He said a question need not necessarily be introduced by a special interrogative pronoun or adverb. Frequently, and then under frequently he has a footnote and he continues frequently the natural emphasis upon the words is a result sufficient to indicate an interrogative sentence as such compare Genesis 27:24 where it says "Thou this my son Esau" The question is it when Jacob came in to see his father . Did his father say thou art my son Esau? or did he Thou art my son Esau? Was it a question or was it a definite statement? Which is it? Now how does our english translate it? Our english said he said "Art thou my very son Esau? And he said, "I am." But they have the art in italics so if you leave out the art he said "Thou my very son Esau" "Thou my very son Esau" See in english you can indicate a question without using the normal sign of a question., which is in english inversion of the order of the subjects and verse. We say I'm satisfied, but we make a question "Am I satisfied?" You can't do that in Hebrew order of words does not determine meaning in Hebrew. as it does in English. In Most ancient questions you can't simply by inverting order indicate. So that in Hebrew unless a question is introduced with "who", "which", "what" like it is in English unless it is so used in Hebrew the ordinary indication of a question is to put a ? at the beginning of the first word of the sentence . But in this instance

there is no such ? And in english we don't have to have a question. I don't have to say "Am I satisfied?" m I say "I'm satisfied" I can make a question by the tone of my voice and the tone of the voice does not have any mark to indicate it unless we put a question mark after it and they do not have question marks in Hebrew. So he says frequently the natural emphasis upon the word itself is sufficient to indicate an interrogative question as such compare Genesis 27:24, Genesis 18 :12, Exodus 33:14. He gives in addition to that ten instances and then he says so especially when the interrogative ~~וְ~~ is connected to the preceding sentence by clause ? Jonah 4:11. There is a good instance in Jonah 4:11 In Jonah 4:11 he says thou hast had pity on the gourd and should not I spare Ninevah? It is I shall not spare Ninevah but with the ? they take it with a question although there is no ? . They don't have it in italics there . So he says especially when the interrogative is connected with the preceding sentence by a ? and then he gives 16 instances of that and then he says or when as in some of the examples given it is negative and gives two instances and what he has at the heading of this article. He says , he refers to an article published in/1907 by H. G. Mitchell, on the omission of the interrogative ~~וְ~~ particle. He has a footnote in which he says that Mitchell in this book restricts the number of instances to thirty-nine and which he attributes twelve to corruption of the text. He thinks that in twelve of them because has a question there fore there should be a question in the Hebrew. the samaritan/ But if the samaritan was translating they might find a question So I'm not so sure that is such a good argument but suppose there are thirty-nine and even seventeen are due to corruption of text suppose there are twenty-two . Suppose there are twenty-two clear cases there is a question without an indication of the ?hey Here is one instance I notice here in I Samuel 11:12 tells how there were people who did not want Saul to be king and then Saul won a great victory . Then in I Samuel 11: 12 the people said to Samuel "Who is he that said Saul shall reign over us? Bring the men that we may put them to death. And Saul said, There shall not a man be put to death this day: for today the Lord hath wrought salvation in Israel. Now in the english translation of verse 12 the people said to Samuel Who is he that said, Shall Saul reign over us? They put in a question. There is no question mark in the Hebrew.

The people said Saul shall reign over us. You see that makes it a question. Saul shall reign over us . You don't have to have the question mark but you have to have the tone of voice. Now I think if you take thirty-nine cases or even if you cut it down to twenty-two and have twenty-two clear cases where there is a question indicated by the tone of voice not by any mark then that means you have the right to consider when you have a set of words, is there a possibility these words are expressed in such a tone to show them to be a question. Now in the case we looked at the ? makes it quite clear . When poor, blind Isaac says You're my son, he wanted to be sure. He wasn't giving a statement. He was asking for assurance and in this case they were not going to kill the people that said Saul will rule. They were going to kill the people that said Saul won't rule . The way they indicated they put a question "Saul going to rule over us?" (7)

So that if you even twenty-two cases it seems to make it a possibility to be considered in interpretation. Does a taking of a verse as a question make a better sense in the context. Understand one just doesn't go through sentence after sentence and do that that would be ridiculous. ~~xBut if xan xsekabian xarrnax xwhn xkx hnx xbn xkn xlx xkx~~

~~xkxkxkx~~

But in an occasional case where the sentence is much clearer to understand it is justifiable to do that. Now that does not decide anything about this verse 18 whether it is a question or not but it does say that grammatically there is warrant for the possibility of interpreting it as a question, if you find that it makes far better sense in the context (6) so it comes down to a question of taking it in the light of context. Of course, that is one thing about interpretation of anything. Anything you interpret has to be interpreted in context you can get a sentence that is absolutely clear or almost absolutely clear. You get several such sentences in the light you interpret (5 3/4)

And there is a matter of interpretation (5 1/2)

You say two and two makes four. You mean that ~~wxxhx~~ two horses and two rocks makes four. Four what? You have to interpret

B29

The question of verse 18 is a very vital and interesting question but I think we need to look at the context more before and I didn't realize it would take quite so long looking at what is figurative and what is literal . Verse 18 we are speaking of. Verse 17 is hardly figurative. Did anybody find anything figurative ~~in~~ in verse 16 wash if probably figurative. It means removal of that (4½)

"Put away the evil of your doings from before mine ~~ye~~ eyes is a literal statement . Wash is a figurative description of the same thing, and then verse 15 . Is there any thing figurative in 15 . Most of the verse ~~is~~ clearly literal but is there something figurative. Yes, Yes, it doesn't mean that the hands have actual blood . It is a designation for sin . There hands are related to bloody deeds . Miss Chung. In verse 15 it is has to be God. " When Ye make many prayers, I will not hear" That is not Isaiah talking , It is not the devil talking . It is God. Yes. (3½)

Verse 14? Anything figurative in 14 . I think we agree that ~~ve~~se 14 is literal don't we? ~~How~~ about verse 13 ? There is no agreement as to what we mean by soul (2½)to the end of the record.

B30

We are now about to continue with what we were looking at last time and will go a little faster but I think last time we got into general methods of procedure that were more clouded so it should go a little faster now . I would like to continue as we were going until we get to the beginning and then take another approach. We were looking at the question of figurative language and what was the last verse we looked at? Verse 17 clearly has no figures in it doesn't it? Verse 16 I think somebody mentioned that "wash you" might be figurative language . It is not speaking of physical washing it is speaking of spiritual cleansing so there is a figure perhaps in verse 16 . Now in verse 15 "your hands are full of blood" was mentioned that that might be a figure . Your hands are not literally full of blood. It is a figure of speech but the meaning of it is perfectly clear and then one very important thing to understand. Many people seem to think that they will show their loyalty to the ~~world~~ word of God that they take everything in it literally . Of course, you don't . Other people carry figurative language to such an extreme that they reduce the Bible to just a book from which you can get proof text for anything at all that you want to present, and, of course that is absolutely wrong . So called spiritualization . Nothing spiritual about it. It is carrying figurative language to the point where you can make anything mean anything. It is not a source for knowledge. ~~The fact~~ The Bible is an objective source/for which we go to get what is there. But that doesn't mean that it is such a simple thing that we can grab three words out of context or that we can take any sentence in the most obvious meaning and that that is necessarily the correct one but it is an objective source. What it says we must accept because it is God's Word to us but it does include a certain number of figures of speech a very considerable . But these figures of speech, this figurative language does not make it obscure or vague . Figurative language adds beauty but in addition to that it often makes things clearer rather than less clear. When you say your hands are full of blood there is no question on the world as to what he means here. No question at all. But it is a figure of speech. Then verse 14 the question was raised last time "My soul hateth" That would be a (11 3/4)/ It would be the Lord as he speaks of his hands and of his eyes . That would be using human terms.

What it represents is the personality of God . What exactly it is metaphysically explained as "My soul" as God speaks of Himself is something that we simply do not know enough about. The internal constitution of the Divine Nature but it ^{is} perfectly clear what it means . Then verse 13 is there anything figurative in verse 13. Verse 13 is quite plain and clear isn't it? I don't think there is anything figurative in verse 13. Now in verse 12 though I am inclined to think there is a figure . "When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand, to tread my courts?" You take that literally as a question and who required it. Why Moses required it. Just a question asking for information but very clearly it is not a question asking for information . It is a rhetorical question so that is in a way a figure of speech . The rhetorical question which implies a specific answer. When I was in the Presbytery of Philadelphia , the Presbyterian Church of the U.S.A. many years ago. One time I made a speech about the Laymens Foreign Mission ? I wanted to point out the modernistic aspect of the whole business so I said this was supported by a committee of the General Assembly who approved of this and there was nothing wrong. Who was on this committee ? Who werethese men and it is a rhetorical question. I would go on to point out the modernistic complexion of the committee. When I said who are these men one of the members of the Presbytery who is on the modernist side really jumped up on his feet and said You want to know who they are . Here they are and he starts in and gives the names. Well, it was perfectly obvious that I was not asking for the information but I was giving a rhetorical question meaning I am going to discuss who they are and so here it is the rhetorical usage which we have in english a great deal and also in Hebrew. The rhetorical usage to express the idea that this means nothing for you to come to my courts . You whose hands are full of blood, you who are not obeying God's law what gain by going through religious forms? What full meaning is not in the sentence as it stands. "Who hath required this at your hand to tread my courts?" Why all of the Israelites were required to come to God's temple. It was part of the law. They were to be cast out, to be stoned if they did not obey the law. Here was the law they were ob^eying it so it is a rhetorical question which has an

implication but it is not obvious in the immediate sentence you have to gather from the context the implication is, If you are not doing God's will and seeking to make His Law primary in your moral life then there is no point in going through ceremony even though these ceremonies are prescribed and required. They are required but they presuppose something else/so you might say there is a figurative element at least that you cannot take ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ the verse simply by itself and ^{which you have not done} ~~say~~ what it implies and consider that as correct. Now verse 11 "I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, " that is specific thing, perhaps something of a figure "I am full of them" I am satiated with them and yet it is simply another (8)

I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of goats. There is no real figure of speech other than (7 3/4)

Now how about Verse 10 is there any figure of speech in verse 10 ~~Miss~~ ?

I think you probably call that a (7 1/2) He is speaking to the people of Israel. He is speaking to the jews and the jewish leaders. He is not speaking to the people of Sodom and Gomorrah. Sodom and Gomorrah had been destroyed 1500 years before well, then what is the sense of talking to the rulers of Sodom. There aren't any such rulers Well, it is perfectly obvious here it is a figure of speech. He is using Sodom and Gomorrah as figures for a land that is reprobate before God. A land that has fallen into iniquity and is doing the opposite of what God wants it to do. He is using it as a figure of speech and so here is a figure of speech that he is using here about Sodom and Gomorrah by calling these peoples rulers of Sodom people of Gomorrah. This is perfectly obvious what he means in the context it is utterly clear the figure of speech does not introduce obscurity or uncertainty into the text., but makes it clearer

1:9 Now the verse before that . Is there any figure of speech in that verse Mr. Abbott.

I am not sure that you could call that the same. I question very seriously whether there is any figure of speech in verse 9 . Verse 10 has a figure of speech. He calls these people rulers of Sodom and Gomorrah which they are not. When we say he was as fresh as a daisy that is a figure of speech because a daisy is necessarily fresh.

It is a figure of speech. You say he was a lion in the fight or he fought like a lion.

But when you say we would have been like Sodom and Gomorrah . How were Sodom and Gomorrah?

They were desolate. They were destroyed . The people were gone . It is simply a statement of fact. It is the comparison of faith which would have come to them if God had not shown mercy but merely shown justice. There ^{FATE}faith would have been exactly the same as the ^{FATE}faith that had come to Sodom and Gomorrah . That was not a figure of speech , it was a great literal fact. If I ~~would have said~~ to say if the Russians would loose their bombs upon us our condition would become exactly the same as that of Germany was at the end of the war. That is not a figure of speech. I was in Germany in 1947 and saw acre after acre of ? just lying in ruins , wreckage just the result of the bombing . Well, the atom bomb would make a different sort of ruin in a way . The result ~~was~~ would be practically identical . It would be just heaps of ruin. This is a physical, accurate, matter of fact statement (4½)

It is not a literal comparison and so I would say that Sodom and Gomorrah in verse 10 is a figure of speech and verse 9 they are used to refer to the literal Sodom and the real Gomorrah and the real thing that has happened and that the same thing is going to happen to us . Now how about verse 8? Any figures of speech in verse 8? Verse 8 I think you would probably call that simile. There might be a question again that there is comparison. There is a cottage in the middle, no human people around, agricultural land around. Here is Jerusalem which is the daughter of Zion , no other towns around. You might say that it is a straight comparison. Perhaps beyond a little comparison. Something of a simile ~~symbolized in the garden~~ a lodge in the garden , vineyard, cucumbers in the garden, here they were more or less (3)

Now verse 7 "Your country is desolate, your cities are burned with fire, your land strangers devour it in your presence, and it is desolate, as overthrown by strangers." Surely that is just a literal statement . How about verse 6 . Does verse 6 have figurative anything/in it or is it strictly literal? What do you think Mr. ?

Verse 6 describes their spiritual condition. They are in this terrible condition ~~1~~

misery and suffering, a spiritual condition but also a literal condition . Probably, there were some people in the land, people who had sores all over them. Do you think it is a double fulfillment . (2)

There may have been people who were exactly like this but this is not talking about them . This is talking about the spiritual condition or about the devastation of the land (2) to end difficult to understand.

B31

Verse 6 here in those days they did not have the medical things that we have. If you go to Arabia today, if you go to the heart of Africa today you will find many individuals who are in just this condition. You take any missionary doctor when he comes back he shows you pictures, he shows people with terrible sores . They are just in agony from these sores which they have no means of treating . Certainly with their medical knowledge so far inferior then to what it is now there must have been many individuals in all of those countries. Physical condition would be described exactly like this and you could take this as a literal description of some such individual if you had an individual in the context to whom to attribute . But I think it is quite evident that what he is saying is You see that poor beggar over there that has never had any medical care that has had these awful diseases and there he is with his putrifying sores and everything . You wouldn't think of touching him when you go by you look the other way you drop a coin in his plate hoping it will make it a little more comfortable but you don't want to get near him he looks so terrible . Well that is the condition your nation was in before God in spite of your wealthy people and your fine nobility and all that they have got . The nation before God is actually as bad as that poor beggar. That's what he says . I would say this about it that he is ~~not~~ not describing the condition of a nation under the figure of something didn't exist. He is not doing that . He is using a figure of a situation that they knew existed whether he saw it or not they knew there were such things so he uses it as an illustration but it is a figure of speech because he is using a physical situation of which they were aware even if they couldn't put their finger on one particular case, as an example of what

the nation has become in spiritual place. The verse before is similar to this one "Why should ye be stricken any more? ye will revolt more and more:" ~~the whole head is sick and the whole heart faint~~ That is simply a literal statement. But then the whole head is sick and the whole heart faint is not referring to anybody's head or anybody's heart. Here he is using figurative language speaking of the nation as a whole. Now how about verse 4 Mr. ? did you find anything that is figurative in verse 4? I think that the verse is just about entirely literal. A people laden with iniquity. That is a physical statement about being weighted down. Iniquity does not weight you down a figure for the effect upon something which just pulls you down. It doesn't physically do that although it may have physical factors but if the figure of speech (11 ½)

It means they have made spiritual progress or material progress in a downward instead of an upward direction backwards instead of forwards. Yes, Mr. Ogden? Well, the word seed of course. Now there is a case where a word comes to be used, it was originally a figure and then it becomes to be used as a literal indication of a particular thing. Like you take the word manufacture. The word manufacture is the latin ? means to make. Manufacture is to make something by hand and when people took their hands and proceeded to put things together that was called manufacture. Today, we have reached the point where the greater part of our manufacturing is done by machinery and not by hand at all. We still call it manufacture so in a way that is a figure of speech. Manufacture. Yet, it is not actually a figure of speech because the word has come to adopt that precise meaning today. Manufacture means to produce something usually by means of machinery. Now the one you spoke of was seed. Originally, of course, a seed is something which comes out of a fruit which you drop into the ground, and it grows. But the seed is used of that and also of its counter part in the human life in the production of new human life. The original seed. (9)

And the word seed in the Bible is used a great many times specifically for posterity and that being the case (8 ¾)

Now then that is verse 4 now verse 3 . There is nothing figurative in verse 3 . It is literal. "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib; but Israel is different. It is a physical fact a comparison . A precise fact. In verse 2 "I have nourished and brought up children, That nourished has the Lord actually brought them into existence as children is He here speaking of the origin . In a way it is a figure of speech there . The Lord is calling you and developing a nation he is comparing it to the upbringing of children . It is not literally bringing up children but it is God bringing up a nation, developing a nation . That I would say has something of the figurative element . So it is amazing to see how much the figurative there is in/Chapter. Yet I think of the meaning of this chapter, of these sentences is that most of it is very clear. ~~ixixix~~ ¶6 3/4)

Now starting at the beginning of the passage we begin at the title which is given to the whole book in verse 1. Now in verse 2 "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth!" He is not expecting the heaven to listen, he is not expecting the earth to listen. It is a phrase of introduction (6)

He is not saying that the Israelites are worse than the Babylonians . They were morally better much better they had a far higher standard than the Babylonians or any of the other people . He is not saying these are the worse people on earth . He is not saying these are bad people and I have to punish them because of their wickedness. That is not what he is saying. He is saying these are people who have had unusual opportunities and who have failed to take advantage of them . These are people whom God has remarkably blessed and who have failed to give God the gratitude they should. They have turned against the one who has done so much for them . So the start of Isaiah rebukes . It is rebuke against the people for their turning away from God and failing to show proper gratitude for all that He has done for them. That is initial sin for which he begins his rebuke of the people.

B31

That sin is described in verses 2,3, and 4 . It is a specific thing for which they are rebuked. "Why should ye be stricken any more? " What is the meaning of that? Why should we? We don't want to be stricken. What does it mean? (3) to end of the record.

B32

At first sight we all say I believe, I did . Verse 7 and verse 9 are a prediction. You are in all of this sin . The result is going to be that you are going to be punished. He is going to make your country desolate. He is going to burn your cities with fire, your land, strangers devour in your presence , He is going to make it desolate. It is overthrown by strangers . He is going to leave Jerusalem like a cottage in a vineyard , like a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, as a besieged city. Now may be this is a prediction . I don't think verse 9 sounds as if verse 7 is a part of a prediction . It also impresses me as a rather strange kind of a prediction to make. Your country is going to be burned up and ~~you~~ ^{Jerusalem} is going to be left isolated . That is a strange prediction . ~~You would rather expect it to predict that Jerusalem will be destroyed~~ (13½)

towards thinking

So that at the moment I am inclined ~~that~~ in verses 7, 8, and 9 he is referring to the condition which exists and if he is referring to the condition which exists then these three verses must have been written at a time when that condition did exist. And ~~did~~ do you know of any time in Isaiah's life when verses 7 and 8 were literally fulfilled?

Mr.? It was the most dramatic time in the time of Isaiah that was described in chapters 37 and 38 where it tells how the Assyrian King Sennachrib and it says he took all of the ? cities of Judah and it looked as if he would take Jerusalem too and he sent his messengers to the people of Jerusalem and he said to them you surrender. You can't hold out against us then Hezekiah took the message to Isaiah and Isaiah said No, God will deliver Jerusalem and this is a sign to you and he said Jerusalem will be . He said This year you will only get what ^{glows} ~~is~~ of itself and

next year the same but the third year you will be able to plant. In other words they were shut in in Jerusalem in such a condition expecting a besiege any time which never actually happened. Then they could leave Jerusalem and go out and pick anything they could find but they could not go far enough to do any ploughing, or harrowing or planting because there were bands going through all of the time and there was always the expectation any minute that they were going to get an attack and that is what is described in Isaiah 37 and 38 and this seems to fit that exactly. Their land devoured by strangers . The Assyrian Army was in all of the rest of the land of Israel except in the land of Jerusalem and they thought that any minute they were going to come there and Jerusalem, the daughter of Zion, was left like a cottage in a garden of cucumbers, like a cottage in a vineyard . It was left there and all around was ravaged. It is exactly the situation which occurred. At this time toward the end of Isaiah (about the middle) (11)

Is it possible that this first chapter was written at that time and describes the situation there and then when he put the book together he put the description of that situation right in the very first chapter of the book as summarizing the general teaching of rebuke of the nation. I don't know. Now Mr. Kim has a recent commentary on this and I think has some interesting suggestions. What are they? It is because of a historical fact. If I were to say the Russian Headquarters will be established in Pittsburgh and Philadelphia will be left with great difficulty of defending it. If I were to say that everybody would know that it is not a description of anything that exists today. If I were giving that statement which was inspired of the Lord. It would be definite it must be a prediction but if that statement were found written in a book which was written sometime now and the next fifty years for all we can tell now that situation might exist sometime during the next fifty years ~~forxxxxxxx~~ ~~thatxxxxxxx~~ until somebody looking back upon it later on, would say is that a prediction made at this time, is that going to happen or that a statement of fact made then. Of course, in english our tense would usually show but in the Hebrew the tense does not show the same way. You can't tell from the tense whether

1332

it is a prediction that is going to happen or a description of something that is there present and anyway it is given in the present so the present it is given in doesn't say this is going to happen in the future. He describes a situation. Well, he may describe a future situation by painting a picture as if now present so it can be a prediction as far as the syntax is concerned even though it sounds like a present description but when you come to ask which it is I incline toward thinking it is a ^{description} present ~~XXXXXXXX~~ rather than a prediction for two reasons. 1) First, because it doesn't seem a natural thing to predict that Jerusalem is going to be left like a cottage in a vineyard. It seems more natural to predict the whole land is going to be desolate. Then to pick out one city and say this city is going to be left surrounded by devastation that is what did happen. For somebody to give a general description prediction the Lord might lead him to do. It might be a prediction of what happened in ^{Ch 37} verses 37 and 38 given years before, it might be. The specific nature leads me to wonder if it is not that it was written at that time rather than a prediction.

2) The second joined with this that looks in that direction to me is the statement in verse 9 "Except the Lord of hosts had left unto us a very small remnant, we should have been as Sodom, and we should have been like unto Gomorrah." Now that statement would fit the situation at the time of Sennachrib's invasion. People say oh isn't this terrible. Look at all ~~parts~~ ^{of} our land in the hands of these wicked Assyrians and all we got is just Jerusalem. We are shut in here in Jerusalem. Isaiah says "Yes" look at our sins as a nation. What can we expect why it is only the mercy of God that we have Jerusalem left. Except the Lord had left us a very small remnant we would be like Sodom and Gomorrah. We would have nothing. It would be a very effective thing to say at the time when that happened. Now to say it years before as a prediction that God is going to pour out devastation and destruction on the land for our sin except the Lord elected a small remnant we would be like Sodom and Gomorrah. He hasn't left us a small remnant now we have a big remnant. We got the whole land now and in the future if it is going to be devastated but we haven't any introduction of any idea that there is going to be remnant left except in the previous (7)

These two points seems to me to look in the direction of being an actual statement of Isaiah's at that time rather than a prediction . Now I'm not ready to be dogmatic but I am inclining in that direction. Now Mr. Kim what else do you have?

That is to say in the Hebrew the tenses do not agree . There are two tenses in Hebrew actually the imperfect describe s an event occurring . It may be here is the event it begins to occur like in Genesis 2 God caused a mist to come up out of the ground. Now that is something out of the past when Moses writes described in the imperfect It shows an event occurring , beginning to occur. The imperfect shows an event beginning or happening repeatedly or something that will happen in the future lbut it shows an event occurring. The perfect shows a situation which may be the result of condition or the result of event in the past. Like when you say "he has come" that is the perfect. That means he is here but he is here because in the past he came. He has past. In english we have a lot of tense in Hebrew we only have two. Two in a way aren't really tenses. They are types of action . One is an event occurring and the other is a condition which may be the result of (5)

And so in the Hebrew it is very common in prediction to look forward and describe a situation. We have it in II Kings where (4 3/4) said to Ahab I see all Israel scattered upon the hills and someone says let these people go to their homes . They are sheep without a shepherd. Well, he describes it as something he sees but he is predicting the fact that Ahab is going to be killed and the people left without a king, Ahab said put this man in prison, on bread and water until I come back. It is a lie, untrue, and what he says is false . He didn't say this is going to happen . It will be this way. He said, I see this situation, he looks forward into the future . He sees a condition and a great many of the prophets are exactly alike, so that the tense doesn't tell us what (4)

We have to gather it from the nature of the statement and what is present. But if we are going to understand the facts we have to learn to distinguish where we can . Where

~~134~~
B32

can't distinguish to indicate it as a problem which may be cleared up with further information gathered from other parts of scripture . It is not one of the things the Hebrew tells us whether it is future actually or present condition .

Mr. ? (3½)

Verse 5 seems to fit exactly with it. Here you have had all (3½)

why are you ~~voxxxx~~ (3½)

It fits exactly . This may be ~~the~~ very sermon that Isaiah gives to the people when Sennachrib Army (3)

It may be the sermon he gave then as he went over that material and edited it in order to put it in proper shape. ~~It~~ may be that he said this will be excellent (2 3/4)

Yes, I would say that verse 7 and 8 if a prediction was specifically, literally fulfilled of the coming of Sennachrib and is not a description of something that is going to take place in the last days or at the destruction of Jerusalem after the life of Christ or any other future time. If it is a prediction ~~thatxxxxxxx~~ it is a specific prediction of that which came then . Doubtless, the same thing happened again when the Romans came in 66 A.D. the Romans came and conquered all of the land for years except Jerusalem. Jerusalem held out for two or three years besieged. Everything else was taken but in the end . (2)

You might say again also in the time of Nebuchednezzar . He is another king that took all of the land except Jerusalem and the city resisted the besiege for three years (1½)

So that you might say it fits all of these but it fits best the time when Jerusalem got into this condition (1½)

So whether it is a prediction given at the beginning of the century which may be or whether it is a description of a situation given at a later time it just seems that verse 5 and verse 9 fit very well with the description at the actual time but it may be a prediction .

B33

Well, now we have then this rebuke to the people for alienation from God from turning away from Him and ending up with this verse 9 with Sodom and Gomorrah . There would be nothing left . It would like Sodom and Gomorrah. Well, that is the way it was after Nebuchednezzar took it and that was the way it was after the Romans took it . It was like Sodom and Gomorrah. In the time of Isaiah it didn't look like Sodom and Gomorrah . It would have looked like it except that God intervened and delivered the land from Sennachrib so it did not. That fits with this idea . We would have been like them except the Lord intervened and delivered. Then in verse 10 he takes the words Sodom and Gomorrah which have been given as literal fact and uses them for figures of speech and he says Here the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom ; give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah . He goes on to rebuke another aspect of sin and what is the aspect of sin that he now rebukes. ¹ The first was alienation of God . What is the next aspect? Yes, but I think you can express it more specifically . Well that is involved but I think you can make it more specific . Or, perhaps putting trust (13)

2 ¹ Thinking that the ceremony in itself is going to do you any good . It is a rebuke of the (13) idea of religion. The idea that if you through with certain hocus-pocus you get God's blessing . The forms of ~~religion~~ ceremony of religion are commanded in the Old Testament . They are commanded, they are part of God's will but the ceremonies are simply a helpful indication to those whose hearts are right before God and in life itself it is absolutely nothing and that is the point here. The foolishness of a ceremony which does not correspond to a heart situation (12 $\frac{1}{2}$) He says don't bother with the ceremonies what is the value of them , if your hands are full of blood . If you haven't got the reality in your heart there is no value in the ceremonies whatever. It is not an attack on ceremonies , it is an attack on ceremonies that don't correspond to a heart attitude. It is like the idea of just taking any child and baptizing them thinking that the child is saved. Like they say many a kindhearted Roman Catholic nurse in a catholic hospital will take a protestant child

that looks as if it were going to die and will baptize him in the hospital without his parents knowing anything about him thinking that she saved the child in that way from eternal suffering . Well, it is a good attitude on the nurse's part to want to save the child but it is a complete misunderstanding of the meaning of baptism. If the parents don't have faith in God and a determination to bring up their child in the knowledge of the Lord and a belief that God's promise is given to christian parents will be fulfilled in their child. The baptism is just an empty, foolish form and the same is true of adult or infant baptism. I was just a little shocked for a minute but I recovered quickly from it up in Cleveland after I had spoken , I spoke two nights and two afternoons. Dr. Ketcham spoke three afternoons and two nights and one night he was speaking there about the necessity of belief in Christ and personal relation and he said "What are you putting your trust in for salvation? Do you think that because you were baptized in infancy you are going to be saved? The way he said it I thought now why does he say that with me here when we are holding the conference together and I thought that is not in particularly good taste to do is it. I was baffled when he went on . He said, "Do you think you are going to be saved because you are baptized by a camelite (?) preachers . Is that what you are putting your trust in? That won't do you any good. Then he said "Do you think you are going to be saved because you have been baptized by a Baptist preacher? If you are putting your trust in that, that won't do you any good you have to have faith in Christ that is the only thing that will save you. I told him the next day you shocked me a little for a minute but I said when I got your full statement I agreed a hundred per cent . That is what he is trying to bring out here -- ceremony . Our works, unless they correspond to a heart attitude and if the ceremony shows the attitude from the heart then it is something that the Lord rejoices in . If we trust in a ceremony then it becomes an incumbent (9½)

And so we have this strong viewpoints on ceremonies which is one of those passages which the critics get together and put everything against ceremonies . They take everything that the prophets say against ceremonies and say that you had a big disagreement in Israel . The prophets and the priests. The priests thought what matters is ceremony

adulation. The prophets say no do away with that we don't sacrifice it is a pure heart and a conscience that is right before God that is what matters and they make a contradiction where there isn't any because the prophets do not attack sacrifice . The prophets attack ceremony as some of the people trust in instead of the symbol of a heart attitude and it is a misunderstanding of scriptures . I hoped to get over Chapters 1 and 2 today but we got over the fine principles and do you have your papers through 3 . You might leave those papers today and look on into Chapters 5 and 6 . We will have to a little bit faster but if we get the principles we can go a little faster toward the end if necessary but leave the papers today. Then go on and look into 5 and 6 carefully for next time . We are at the beginning of Isaiah here having looked at the passages which have been dealing with the blessings to look forward to , most of them. Now we are looking in general here and we notice the title in verse 1 and then the discussion of the condition of the nation, their alienation from God, their ingratitude , their failure to show proper response

(6)

Then he says "Your country is desolate , cities are burned, the daughter of Zion is left as a cottage in a vineyard and the question is - is this a description of ^{the situation} or does he predict this is what is going to happen (5½)

You are going to get into this condition when only the daughter of Zion is left like a besieged city which it is, I don't know . I don't think we have any way to prove it. If it is a prediction, it is a prediction of God's (5 ½)

Then his second argument was there is no point in religious ceremony in the careful and extensive carrying out of religious ceremony unless there is a spiritual heart attitude involved unless there is reality and sincerity , outward form can accomplish nothing . That is a very great lesson and a very vital one which we will need. (4½)

This is particularly true when you have a very involved service but it is possible in any sort and we find that God had them put the brazen serpent up on a pole in the wilderness . It was God's provision to save people from being bitten by that serpent and later on they worshipped that serpent and God commanded Hezekiah to destroy it.

So what was God's provision for good God commanded to destroy later. The provision
became an end in itself / ^{instead of a means.} I think that is true of any kind of ^{picture} ~~(2)~~ religion.

Because the Romans still worship pictures or idols and we should have no pictures .
Anything that becomes an idol is wicked and wrong should be destroyed . That does
not mean you should take the Mohammedan attitude that all pictures are bad (3)

If it is something that becomes an object in itself and takes the place of God it
becomes a (3)

That is true of any kind of organization or institution itself . It can be a means
of drawing you to God or (3) to the end -- rather inaudible.

Let's just look at this he says from a common sense viewpoint if you are a sinner and you put on a white gown and you march in a beautiful form and you say some pretty words is that going to make you as white as snow. No, you have to get some reality to your life. When you talk so beautiful and then I see the rotten kind of a life you are living. I know it is just insincere talk and that is all there is too it . He says come, let us reason together , let us look at it and then he goes right on if you are willing and obedient, if you really try to do something worthwhile you shall eat the good of the land. If you ~~dig~~^{get} down and try to do something worthwhile God will bless this country but if you refuse and rebel you will be devoured with the sword; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken . Now if you had a presentation you folks are sinners (13½)

God is able to do it and if you are going to do it you got to get it by coming to him and then verse 18 would be the big climax , the conclusion . Look at what God is going to do but here is not the end it has the two verses after it . It seemed to be the end which say if you get down and be sincere and really look at things as to what they really are then you are in the direction where God can begin to bless you but if you keep on with your insincere attitude and claim that you belong to God and has to bless you , and yet your hands are full of blood and you are disobeying Him and living a wicked life do you think God is going to look at your scarlet sins and say they are as white as snow . We read in Proverbs "He that covereth his sins we read "Blessed is the man that covers sins " We also read that "He that covereth sins shall not prosper " that God will punish him because we use two sentences. There is covering your sins in the sense of bringing them under the blood of Christ and there is covering your sins and pretending they don't exist and He wants the sins right out in the open and revealed, confessed and turned away from and ~~if~~ you have to have that step before we can receive His free grace. The free grace is free in the sense that we get it for nothing we don't have to do anything to get it but it is not free in the sense that it is cheap because it cost God a tremendous lot and Isaiah 40 to 55 he develops how the sin is so terrible that it was necessary that Christ should go to Calvary and undergo all that in order to make it possible for us to be saved. You

don't find any of that in this chapter. There is a different idea altogether and do we have a right to read into this chapter taking it in ~~context~~ this context that way impresses me as being somewhat like the fellow we had at the seminary here, a very fine chap who was a wonderful personal worker but his idea of personal work as far as I could see was mainly to go up to somebody in the street and say "Here is a dollar would you like to have it and then the fellow laughs at him and he says go ahead take it . He finally persuades the fellow to take it . Now he says is it yours does it belong to you? Yes. You've got it? Yes. Now he says don't you want to be saved. Take it it is yours. What does that mean to anybody . A person has to have some realization of what sin is and that they need to turn away from it and they can . That it isn't just a matter of here is a gift let's take it , your whole life has to be changed because you have turned from darkness to light. You realize that you are deserving hell and that it is only God's grace which cost him a tremendous lot that you can be delivered and if a man has terrible conviction of sin and he can't believe God to forgive him then the illustration about the dollar is a wonderfully, helpful illustration, to bring a person who has a conviction of sin to realization of the free grace of God . ~~Just~~ But you need the conviction of sin before the illustration means anything whatever . Well, in this case here I certainly would not be dogmatic about it. I am looking for light on it and the Authorized Version contains some very intelligent men and they translate exactly word for word as it stands in the Hebrew . Now if you can show the phrase "Let us reason together" is used in the Scriptures always in connection with pointing out the free grace of God or something like that that would be a foundation but you can't get that out of the air. You have to find comparisons and use them . You have to find some ~~scripture~~ linguistic evidence or some evidence from scriptural passages that this phrase necessarily means that . Let's look at this thing sensibly . Do you think that you can pull the wool over God's eyes by saying that you haven't got any sin? When actually you are covered with them. You see what I mean? There is a natural, obvious interpretation. Now that natural, obvious interpretation would not occur to you as you read it in cold print if you did not know that the tone of voice may enter into it. The tone of voice makes a tremendous difference.

Just as in English we can say I'm going to get the prize for being the best student in the school. I say Oh you are going to get the prize for being the best student in the school. You can say Dr. MacRae said I'm going to get the prize. Well, everybody would know I didn't mean it from my tone. It is perfectly obvious. You say that I'm going to take the bus down to South Philadelphia. The bus comes by here at 5, I say the bus comes at 5? Well, you can't go and say Dr. MacRae says the bus comes at 5. My tone would mean, I'm surprised, are you sure that is true? Ordinarily, in English we reverse our order of verbs and nouns but that they don't do in Hebrew. It is a different kind of a language but we don't (8)

Ordinarily in Hebrew you put a Heh(?) before it which is like our English the. You don't always do it. You can find quite a number of places in the Scriptures where it makes no sense except on the assumption that it is given in a tone of voice which clearly implies it is a question and in this case if you take it as a question it fits in with the idea of the context being a demand for sincerity and not pretending to simply go through some folderol of a ceremony to do away with the fact that you are truly a sinner. So that I say I cannot be dogmatic on it. My present feeling is that the obvious way to take it is as a question and as a question it ~~is~~ reinforces the plot which is developing for and driven home in the two verses which includes the third. However, there are very intelligent people who take this that this particular verse is a presentation of (7)? If you take the words alone they certainly can't be but words should be taken in context and in the context here there may be some commentary here that brings out a clearer explanation of the way (6½)

It may be (6½)

But the important thing is that we are not building on the gospel on this verse anyway we get it from elsewhere so it doesn't effect our belief whether this verse has it. It is clearly taught in the Bible, it is clearly taught in Isaiah so there is no question of that marvelous truth of the gospel at all of God's willingness and ability to cleanse.

There is no question about that it is clearly taught in the Scripture . Our only question is , is that what this particular verse is teaching or is this particular verse presenting something else . I would be much interested in an explanation which I could see how it shows in the context a development here that is what it is. I haven't time . Verse 19 and 20 would seem to me then to fit with the whole previous section . That is it would seem to me I am not saying this is necessarily on that interpretation that I suggested verse 10 says you rulers of Sodom and Gomorrah. They say what nonsense we are the rulers of Jerusalem, the people of Judah. Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed for their wickedness long ago why do you call us that . Well, he said what I mean is you are not really rulers of Jerusalem, God's holy city you are pretending to be but you are really rulers of wickedness. He goes on and says what is the point of your sacrifice I am full of them. Does that mean God does not want any sacrifice . No, further on in Isaiah and Jeremiah he declares the wonderful blessing coming that they are going to have their sacrifice. He has ordered the sacrifice . When you come to (4 3/4)) who has required this of your hands . It is in God's hands. He has ordered them but what he is saying is you have been ordered to do these things not as a being to receive God's favor but they are the things that the sincere seekers after God do not which are done by themselves as a form are going to bring anything to insincere hearts that are not seeking God . So he says in verse 16 Wash yourselves quit this business of being such hypocrites and pretending that external things are going to hide the fact that it says that your hands are full of blood. Cease to do evil, learn to do well and then he comes to verse 19 and he says If year willing and obedient, if you try to get what God wants you to have , seek to do his will . He is going to leave you here in the country he is not going to send you into exile. You shall eat the good of the land but if you refuse and rebel if you keep on the way you are now in your wickedness you will be devoured by the sword. The whole thing is on sincerity and insincerity . Try to get rid of your sin or be satisfied to go on in your sin and verse 18 goes on to the gospel and comes back. It is sort of out of place like giving the conclusion of the book in the first chapter . A similarity

of precise words . Do precise words used successively always mean the same thing. Well, verse 9 we would have been like Sodom and Gomorrah. Well, he says you are like Sodom and Gomorrah . But in verse 9 we would have been destroyed like Sodom . (2½)

On e case for destruction, one case for wickedness and then in ve#se 11, if you are willing , if you fulfill this situation this result will come . Verse 20 but if you refuse and rebel, if you fulfill this condition then this result will come you will be destroyed with the sword . All right if you take verse 18 that way If your sins be as scarlet then the result is then they will be as white as snow but if your sins aren't as red as scarlet then they won't be as white as snow . You see what I mean. As verse 18 (I ½)

And, of course, if you translate verse 19 as though it would not make sense. Though you be willing and obedient you shall eat the good of the land or if you refuse you will be devoured with the sword . The word would make no sense so if the (1¼ ?)

B36

In that connection let us look at I Kings 22 . Now I wouldn't want to take much time with this but I think you are all familiar with the story . This is where Ahab and Jehoshaphat are there and you remember in the beginning of it they want to know about going up to Ramoth Gilead and Jehoshaphat said in verse 5 "Inquire, I pray thee, at the word of the Lord today. Then the king of Israel gathered the prophets together, about four hundred men, and said unto them Shall I go against Ramoth gilead to battle or shall I forbear? And they said Go up; for the Lord shall deliver it into the hand of the king." Jehoshaphat said ~~is~~ "Is there not here a prophet of the Lord besides, that we might inquire of him? And the king of Israel said unto Jehoshaphat, There is yet one man Micaiah the son of Imlah, by whom we may inquire of the Lord; but hate him; for he doth not prophesy good concerning me, but evil. Then the king of Israel called an officer and said, Hasten hither Micaiah the son of Imlah.

These other prophets were saying how they wanted to destroy Ramoth Gilead)13½)

Go up to Ramoth Gilead and prophecy for the Lord shall deliver it into thy hand. And the messenger verse 13 says that was gone to Micaiah spake unto saying, Behold now, the words of the prophets declare good unto the king with one mouth: let thy word, I pray thee, be like the word of one of them, and speak that which is good. And Micaiah said, As the Lord liveth, what the Lord saith unto me, that will I speak. So he came to the king, And the king said unto Micaiah shall we go against Ramoth gilead to battle or shall we forbear? And he answered him, Go, and prosper: for the Lord shall deliver it into the hand of the king. He said just what the messenger told him to. He said just what the other prophet said so, of course, Ahab immediately turns to Jehoshaphat and said look it here this prophet agrees with all of the others (12 3/4)

The King said

~~He said~~ Look at what Ahab said/How many times times do I adjure thee that thou tell me nothing but that which is true in the name of the Lord . Why on earth did Ahab say that . What sense is it? It makes absolutely no sense unless we assume that what he did was what the king said Because we go up against Ramoth-Gilead to battle shall we forbear any of them? Go on and prosper . ~~God will~~ For the Lord will deliver it into your hands. He said it in tone of voice that made it perfectly obvious . You ask me to repeat what the others say and I'll repeat it but I don't believe it. If he hadn't done that you would have been sure that Ahab wouldn't have said (12)

His tone of voice is the secret of it (11 3/4)

And so I am not saying that verse 18 here is not a statement of the Gospel)11 ½)

in which

but I am ready to state that I don't see the way/the introduction of the gospel in verse 18 just confusing the whole context instead of carrying forward the discussion.

and therefore, it seems to me that since it can so easily be interpreted in wh

that that is the more reasonable thing to say that this particular verse in this particular context

Record 36 inaudible

If Isaiah 40 to 56 were inserted between verse 17 and 18 so that after you get verse 17 the call to do well that you have 40 to 56 showing you that something more is needed than for you to try to do well you need the atonement of Christ in order to make it possible and then that all of 40 to 56 ends with this marvelous completion of verse 18 God says you cannot do it but I provide complete atonement for you and then verse 18 would make a marvelous climatic finish to the whole pattern with 40 to 56 inserted between 17 and 18 . Then when you got that you would want to stop you say it is marvelous this is what God is going to do and then go back and say well now you won't go into exile if you are obedient. It is very much of an anti-climax . I don't see then what more unless you read 40 to 56 into it or the New Testament we have for interpreting this particular verse in that way . Now there may be some more that I haven't seen . There are so many people translate it that way that they have either copied words and taken them down as they are or they have a real reason but I would like to see that reason put into simple ABC language so I could understand it. I haven't seen it yet and you can say anything if you say it strong enough and people will believe it . Believe in anything at all. I don't care how foolish it is. If a spellbinding orator tells people if President Kennedy tells people that ~~the government spends money that~~ if they spend money that government doesn't have and go into debt so they don't have money to pay the government's debt that will balance the budget eventually. Now there are people foolish enough to believe it but it is utter nonsense but it hasn't originated with Kennedy it has been taught in our colleges for a long time but it is utter nonsense/ But you will find that nine-tenths of the people of the world will hear what is said over and over and they accept it and swallow it and believe it . People will believe anything if they hear it said often enough but that is one thing that is very sad in commentaries. You will pick up some of the latest commentaries and you will read and you will find the explanation of a verse or a statement which just doesn't make any sense. You wonder where did this fellow get that idea you will go back and you will find somebody else had it , somebody else had it and they just copied it and copied it until you get back to some great mind who did some excellent work dashed off a certain section

without much attention and ~~bb~~ his great name got attached to the section that he dashed off in a hurry and everybody copies and says it must be true because he said it. I have come across that repeatedly/ I picked up an article by a man in which a statement was made it was utterly silly. Anybody who knew anything about Hebrew would not say it but he said it and he not knowing much about it. I thought I was doing him a kindness in writing to him and pointing out the error. He wrote back and said I appreciate very much what I had pointed out to him but in defense of himself he pointed out that James M. Gray , ? and Hodge and many other men of the highest said this very same thing and they had just taken it over from some great person who had said it in a section he didn't (10 3/4)

It just didn't make any sense at all. You will find that in any science not just in theology in ~~everything~~ line of thinking. People copy uncritically if they have a good name in back of it . Well, I believe that which is true can usually can speak in clear simple language that you can understand what it means and when you get to chapters 40 to 56 you have the gospel developed in the most marvelous way and of ten the teaching at first sight is not obvious at all but as you ^{compare} ~~compare~~ and put passages together to see the meaning of them and the development you can exactly how it is brought up and (10)

But if this is an anticipation I just don't see how it fits but somebody may be will in a commentary somewhere else I'll find a statement that seems to me to make sense. But if it is it should be possible to express it with simple clear language. The true things usually are not so complicated. It may take an awful lot of complicated study before you find them. When you do find then you you can usually can put ~~them~~ them in fairly clear sense. Well, this section then aside altogether from the question of verse 18 , 10 to 20 are attack upon ceremonial religion without the heart in back of it. That certainly is very appropriate for our day . Dr. MacIntire twenty years ago published a pamphlet on the Sin of going to church. It sounds crazy the "sin of going to church" just as crazy as this sounds what Isaiah says "Whe ye come to appear before me , who hath required this at your hand, to tread my courts?" Well, you say the Bible says don't forsake the assembling of yourselves together . The Old Testament said that God commands them to appear . / Yet he says who hath required this .
It is a definite command of God

B37

What He is pointing out is if the heart is not right the forms and ceremony are absolutely ridiculous. There are thousands of people today who think by going to church on Sunday and ~~listening~~ ^{sleeping} to a sermon they are winning the Lord's favor and Dr. MacIntire put it in a very, very catchy way to get the truth across that unless the church is in a place where people are gathered to honor the Lord and to present His Word. If it is a place that is simply lulling you to sleep or ~~worse~~ worse than that giving you denial of the Scripture/you are not doing a good thing by going but you are actually committing sin by associating yourself with such ungodly ~~ways~~ work.

(7 ½)

2 So that is the second great truth of this chapter and then in the third section of it, starting with verse 21 he refers again to the sin of the nation. "How is the faithful city become an harlot! " Well again there the thought is unfaithfulness, that is the main thing that we have had through the whole chapter so far. He is not simply looking at the ungodly ~~world~~ world. He is looking at his own people. He is looking at those who he has brought up as children. He has brought them out of Egypt and he has cared for them and he has done all this and given great blessings to them and then they have turned against Him . It is his own people he is dealing with. "How is the faithful city , the city that was devoted to the Lord, the city that always should be devoted to the Lord because God Himself had brought it into existence and given it to His people. How is this one that is given its affection to false gods that which is the enemy of the true God. "How is the faithful city become a harlot! " It was full of judgement. Righteousness lodged in it but now murderers. It is apostasy he is speaking of here not simply the ungodliness, not simply the wickedness of those who have never known him but the turning away of those who have known what the truth was and should have carried on the line of faithfulness to them. "Thy silver is become dross, thy wine mixed with water : " are the same thing again. This is not something going to the ungodly world, this is going to those who have silver, those who know the Word of God and have changed it . It is going to places like Harvard University. It was not formed as Cornell was with the idea of simply a place to train people in technical knowledge and the first

president of Cornell was ~~wne~~ who wrote a book on the word that Science was Theology. Attacking Biblical teaching. Most of our universities are not like that they are like Harvard which was formed to train men to preach the truth of the Scriptures . Most of our great universities were founded with that as their definite purpose and those are the ones he speaks of . Those who had silver and it became dross; your wine mixed with water; Your princes are rebellious and companions of thieves; every one loveth gifts, and followeth after rewards; they judge not the fatherless, neither doth the cause of the widow come unto them. Therefore, saith the Lord now we get the prediction of what God is going to do about it. Therefore, saith the Lord, the Lord of hosts, the mighty One of Israel , I will ease me of mine adversaries, and avenge of mine enemies: And here you have a parallel with what he says in verse 7 ~~or~~ 8 . It might be a description that Jerusalem is going to be left alone ~~atxthexxx~~ after the rest of the land has been overrun or that you have in verses 19 and 20 . If you refuse and rebel you are going to be devoured , you will not eat the good of the land, exile is coming . Here again a parallel with a difference . I ease you of my adversaries and avenge me mine enemies ; And I will turn my hand upon thee . It doesn't say devour you with the sword . He says I will turn my hand upon thee, and purely purge away thy dross, and take away all thy tin, Is this a conditional prediction or an unconditional ? We have back in verse 7, 8, 9 we have more unconditional prediction . In verses 19 and 20 we definitely have a conditional prediction . If you do this, this result will be and if you do that, that result will be (3½)

But when you come to this place he says this is your condition I am going to do this and what I am going to do is not to destroy but to purge away your dross ~~and~~ and take away your tin. In other words God declares that he is going to cleanse them .

(2½) inaudible to the end of the record.

What were the judges of ? in the beginning.

There of course, when you look back you find men like Joshua and Gideon and David and others who were true to the Lord (14½)

They weren't perfect and no one of them but had wicked people with them . When Joshua came near the end of his life he turned to the people and said , I don't know whether you are going to follow the Lord or not but as for me and my family we will follow the Lord. Well that implies that he wasn't at all sure they were all wholeheartedly following God . So that if it simply stops with that , I will restore thy Judges and thy counsellors at the beginning . Well, you could say now in Isaiah's day things have declined a little but look at the way they were a hundred years before they will get like that again and may be they were after the return from (13 3/4) just as good as they have been in the time of David as far as the righteousness of the people as a whole is concerned. I don't know . We are not in a position to make a fair judgement. But if it stopped there I wouldn't have much more to say this requires a fulfillment that is still future/ ^{in our day} We have no proof of what they have been restored to as good a condition as they ever have been before the time of Isaiah at various periods after Isaiah's time. Well, even take Isaiah spoke in the time of Hezekiah . Well, they had a great deal of wickedness under Manassah for fifty years but then Josiah came and Josiah had a tremendous revival , a re-establishment of righteousness in the land that might be restoring your judges and counsellors as in the beginning. In Josiah's day people would say Look this is the city of righteousness, this is the faithful city but after Josiah's day they sank very rapidly down to a lower point than they had been in the days of his grandfather Manassas and it doesn't seem as if you take the whole three verses together, 25, 26, 27 purely purge away our dross, take away all my sin ^{as if} and that doesn't seem/that could merely represent Josiah (14

It is very easy to be ? when things are going right . You can say look what I have done but then trouble comes and you are in the hands of the Lord because it is beyond anything you can ? The day of the Lord is upon you . You have forces stronger than you can understand. It may come through a physical condition something in your body and you have no way of knowing what to do about it . You cannot predict it may come in external circumstances but he says everyone that is proud and lifted up is going to have a day of the Lord upon him. God declares his wrath against ungodliness Here he says in verse 13 All the cedars of Lebanon and all the oaks of Bashan and all the high mountains and the hills are lifted up and every high tower and every fenced wall. Do you think those are literal or figurative statements ? It seems to me those are probably figurative statements . They are referring to the features of nature which appear to them to be great and to tower above them in that day . He is using them for figures for everything that is human that seems to tower above you. He says no matter how great it seems to you God is the one who works His will in relation to it sometime . Verse 16 And all the ships of Tarshish and all of the pleasant pictures. What are the ships of Tarshish. Do you know? Tarshish is a port in Spain and it is thought that the ships of Tarshish was the ships that made it clear across the mediterranean to Spain. As far as you can go . ~~(12)~~ in the Mediterranean. In other words they are the biggest ships, the most powerful ships they had in those days and it is thought probable, we ~~and the loftiness of man shall be bowed down, and the haughtiness of man shall be made low and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day~~ haven't much evidence but it is most probable that the term came to be used for any great ship . The ship of Tarshish. A ship that was capable of making the trip. Anything that is great and strong and seems to be attractive if it is contrary to God's will is going to be brought into judgement . And the loftiness of men shall be bowed down and the haughtiness of man shall be made low and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day. There is coming a time when the Lord alone will be exalted and the idols shall be utterly abolished and that, of course, has been marvelously fulfilled. The ancient world without idolatry is just unthinkable. Everywhere you go it is filled

with idols and today in most of our western world idolatry in that form has disappeared. We have the same emotion, the same attitude but that particular thing has disappeared in our western world. God has removed it and eventually He will remove it from the whole world . And they will go into the holes in the rocks and the caves of the earth for fear of the lprd.and^d for the glory of his majesty , when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth. Of course, that is what people have had to do time after time when circumstances in their life became such that the forces were completely beyond their control but it may find a very vivid fulfillment if the Lord yet arises to shake terror (10½)

in allowing an atomic war to break out then surely people then will go into the rocks and the caves of the earth to try to hide away there for two or three weeks to get away from rocks falling. It is a picture which would find a fulfillment in most any (10½) and somebody would have said ten years ago that is a description of ancient times. It fit then but no longer has (10)

Today you find all over they are making holes in the rocks in order to be protected. What seemed to have gotten out of date

Today I asked you to write out a hasty study of eight chapters after the latter part of the book. We want to go on looking at the second chapter, the third and the ~~fish~~ = ~~xxxx~~ fifth and the sixth. Had we finished looking at the second and third? We better look on to three now. Probably we better look at some of the written work you have fortoday. Make some headway on it. First we might continue on with Chapter 3 then. Chapter 2:6 began a section of rebuke and the rebuke we notice usually starts a section and we have rebuke and then we have a conclusion with blessing so that the end of verse 12 would have been the right place to start a new chapter 2:6. Then we have the picture of the way in which the Lord is going to put man in a position where they would see very clearly where it was the day of the Lord. A time when human strength was at an end, and only in God could they find deliverance. Of course, actually we are always in such a time because we never can control things or predict what is going to happen. The smallest things can happen in a way to completely upset everything we plan on and the Lord controls all but it is in a time of great emergency that people come to that realization. It is amazing that in this country the progress that these blatant atheists make. We see it in this effort to get rid of everything Christian out of the schools and out of public life. It is amazing the way this attitude is being widely inculcated that man is the master of his fate. All of this ~~xxxxxxx~~ supernatural business is all foolishness. Yet everyone in his life comes to the time when he realizes that you cannot control.

Things are way beyond his control so here he predicts. Isaiah says there is going to come a time when people find they are absolutely unable to find their satisfaction to find safety in themselves . Cease ye from man whose breath is in his nostrils: for wherein is he to be accounted of? And then we have in chapter 3 continuing verses 1 - 8 the picture of a time when nobody wants to take over the control because Jerusalem is ruined and Judah is fallen . It certainly sounds like a prediction doesn't it ? Is this a prediction of something that came before the exile or does it look forward to something that is going to be much later on. Surely it is Judah he is talking about. It is specifically a prediction of the fate of the people of that land. I will give children to be their princes and babes shall rule over them. And the people shall be oppressed every one by another, and every one by his neighbour: It certainly fits with the description that Jeremiah gives of the situation for the downfall of the land and it would seem to me that the most reasonable interpretation of it is that he is predicting general confusion previous to the exile when the better part of the people had been taken away into exile. I don't know whether any of you have a different idea or a different hypotheses to suggest for examination regarding this section but that would seem to me to be the most likely interpretation of it. If in verses 1 - 8 he is giving a prediction of the future which would be you might say the continuation of the punishment at the end of this section verse 6 on . First you have a condition then you have a punishment. Then in verse 9 he comes back to condition again . "To shew of their countenance doth witness against them; and they declare their sin as Sodom they hide it not. Woe unto their soul! for they have rewarded evil unto themselves" "Say ye to the righteous, that it shall be well with him : for they shall eat the fruit of their doings. Woe unto the wicked! it shall be ill with him; for the reward of his hands shall be given him. " Here is a prediction in verses 10 and 11 Is this a specific prediction or is it a general statement of a truth. Don't you think it is a general statement of a truth ? He is not saying in this particular situation something is going to happen but he is saying that God has made the world in such a way that over a period of time righteousness is rewarded and wickedness is punished and even

if it does not find its reward, in this life that it will in eternity. It seems to me it is not a prediction but a general principle and a general principle which certainly is true in the light of eternity, in every case but is true in this life as a general principle even though there are striking exceptions. The wicked prosper and the righteous suffer but that is not the usual rule there is occasional (6 ½)

but that is not the usual rule. Then in verse 12 he is continuing with the condition he is not predicting the future. He is describing the condition in the land. "As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them." That would seem to suggest a period when the power was controlled by the royal family particularly in a polygamist family. You often have this situation in the history of the eastern empire, very common that you would have a weak king and it was the members of his household that ruled the land (7½)

Whether that was the condition in Judah right at that time I don't know but I would be inclined to think that is what he is picturing. "O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths." I don't quite see why verse 12 as two sentences. You look at verse 9, it has two longer sentences than verse 12 but they are closely, intimately related. They fit right together. The meaning is very different between the two sentences. Children are their oppressors and women rule over them that suggests a condition where the control is weak and probably/irresponsible hands. Children are their oppressors and women rule over them would not mean women who are properly entitled to but women virtually by their family relationship like ? in the time of King Ahab. We read elsewhere, I think it is in Proverbs "Woe to the nation whose king is a child" and it is a situation where you have responsibility in the hand of one who doesn't have ability to carry out the responsibility. You have a difficult situation and in ways it is a matter of luck who is going to be under control in such a case particularly, theoretically (6)

In England after the death of King Henry VIII, his son Edward VI who was ten years old became king and Edward was a very well-meaning boy greatly interested in theology and anxious to have just what was right in the land but his uncles became regents

and they began fighting between themselves. One of them had the other one beheaded , then the first one was beheaded. Six years he reigned . It was one of the most chaotic periods in English History . If Edward had been fifteen years older he might have made a good ruler. He had the name and the authority but other people were exercising it . It wasn't a satisfactory situation . You ~~can't~~^{can} have a satisfactory situation under such circumstances but it is not likely . Mr. Abbott you had a question. I would not think so because I would think that was the beginning of the first part that I just expressed but the last part says . "They which ~~leave~~^{lead} thee cause thee to err and destroy the way of thy paths." It would seem to me that would rather show a ^{evil} strong/rule rather than a weak and capricious rule. That is the impression I get. The first part is a weak and capricious rule and the second part is strong and evil. I don't particularly know that the children that were the oppressors and the women that were ruling over them would be causing them to be going in the wrong direction causing thee to err. That sounds more like Jezebel for she was woman and she was a strong ruler. She was wicked through her rule . She was not a weak, capricious ruler . The Lord stands up to plead and judge the people . It seems to me that is intervening

(3)

The new section of the review starts with verse 16 and I do not feel that though verse 16 speaks of the daughters of Zion it connects particularly with verse 12 where it speaks of women ruling over them because the reference to women is an entirely different type. That was dealing with government, here he is dealing with the worldliness of the women. Their worldliness, their human pride their putting other things ahead of God's will, God's purpose. This section we did look at already as introductory to that section in Chapter 4 . We have this detailed account of various worldly adornments of these women and we start with the prediction here with the condition in verse 6 and the punishment in verse 7 and then the punishment continues in verse 18 and the detail of the punishment he involves a further description of the different types of their worldliness and their interest in purely human things rather than in the Lord's will. He tells how the Lord is going to take all of these things away from them. Then speaks of the de-population of the land through war and exile. Dealing with it not in itself but its effect upon the women reaching its climax in Chapter 4:1 which is really the end of the prediction so Chapter 4 ought to start with verse 2 but the Archbishop certainly did the right thing in starting Chapter 5 where he did. It is very clear there is a difference between Chapter 5 and Chapter 4 . Chapter 5 starts a new part of our first main part here but Chapter 4 from 2 - 6 is the conclusion of the rebuke of the women. The conclusion of it here is after telling of their punishment then to look for the blessing beyond for the people whom the Lord shall have washed away their sins of the daughters of Zion and purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof and we already looked at that and saw he is not looking to a time of freedom from external danger but he is looking to a time of protection in the midst of danger which would seem to be a pilgrimage journey whether it is specifically Israel or whether it is the people of God in general even though that people of God may at the time of which we see here involve only a comparatively small part of it being Israel but I don't think you can be dogmatic about it but it seems to me that the future picture in Chapter 4 is very definitely earlier in its fulfillment than the future picture in the beginning of Chapter 2 . Then we have the third main part of our section from 1 - 6. It goes from rebuke in Chapter 5 to the marvelous picture of blessing on Isaiah in

Chapter 6 and ~~their~~ there is much we can say about those two chapters, particularly 6. Before we do it I would like to jump forward to your assignment for a bit and see how you made out. I asked you to look at eight chapters and in a way this is not a fair assignment (11)

What did you feel was the first important dividing point after the beginning of (10½

There is absolutely no reason for chapter division beginning with 57 . It continues right straight on from the four verses preceding it and it is a period of denunciation of sin and Mr. Abbott how far did you find this denunciation of sin continued?

Then we noticed last time at the end of the section that I asked you to look at which I hope that all of the time you didn't put in yesterday can be combined with the time for the next assignment so that before our next class you can have a very thorough study made of this . You will notice that in Chapter 63 . The first six verses are of the future prediction/and the last thirteen verses of it is entirely different in nature and we have an important break in the book at ~~56~~ at the end of 63:6 not nearly as important as the one in the middle of 56 but yet quite an important division, so that we have a definite section of the book of Isaiah which runs from 56:8 through 63 :6 and in both cases the beginning and end of this important section of the book . The chapter division is in the wrong place and we will want to take up that section of the book as a unit next after we finish Chapters 1 - 6 and that will be our second Chapters 56:8 through 63:6 . That will be the second section we look at and the third section we look at will be 63:7 to the end of the book . I will not ask you to look for anything beyond 63:7 . In these chapters I pointed out you have the ordinary progress that Isaiah and Jeremiah make in their prophecy. Ordinary procedure is to start in with rebuke, pointing out sin and its punishment and that starts in this section 56:9 and goes on to 57 until you nearly to the end of the chapter and in the end of the chapter 57 ~~(12)~~ is pretty much in the right place . It is sort of an appendix to it with the last two verses with the contrast of the wicked to the righteous but ~~the~~ from verse 15 on to at least through verse 18 and 19 . There is a little section of blessing at the end of this long section of rebuke. We will look at this section after the vacation. I am not assigning anything particular about it now. I hoped for today that everyone would have that in mind. You have this section from 56:9 to the end of 57 with rebuke followed by a brief passage of blessing . I am not asking for that at present. Then for 58 you have the first seven verses is rebuke, pointing out their sin and rebuking them for their sin and then in verse 8 to 14 you have the wonderful section of blessing so you then have again the progression rebuke and blessing but with a longer section here. That we will look at after the vacation but I am not asking you to study that in any great amount now. Then we have a section of rebuke at the beginning of Chapter 59 running through verse 14 I am not saying exactly where now that is a matter

you have to study. Here I would like you to study. I ~~would~~ would like you before the next time to glance through and read, don't fail to do this, glance through 59 one on and see how far rebuke goes and where does blessing begin in 59. When you decide the point at which blessing begins and don't let ~~any~~ ^{any} paragraph marks or anything like that decide for you. They may be right or they may be wrong. They differ in different Bibles but when you have made that decision then from there clear on to 63:6 it is all prediction. It is God looking forward to the future to His dealings with His people in the future. It is a long section called blessing certainly it is prediction, mostly blessing, a long section here one of the longest we have beside, of course, from our big section 40 to 56. And so, that is what I would like you to look at very particular before next time. I would like you as I mentioned yesterday look at Chapter 63 verses 1 - 6. In Chapter 63 verses 1 - 6 you see a picture of one who comes and treads the winepress alone, the day of vengeance is in my heart, verse 4, verse 5 I looked and there was none to help; and I wondered that there was none to uphold: therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me; and my fury, it upheld me. Chapter 63:1 - 6 is a picture of someone coming to judgement, coming alone. That is very definite. You look back at the beginning of this section that is to say in Chapter 59 starting in the middle of the chapter you read in verse 16 "He saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no intercessor: therefore, his arm brought salvation unto him; and his righteousness, it sustained him." Verse 18 "According to their deeds, accordingly he will repay, fury to his adversaries, recompence to his enemies," Here you have a parallel picture so you have a certain picture in 63 : 1-6 and back here in the middle of Chapter 59 you have a parallel picture so there are two units which parallel each other. Now after you look at those two units continue on from 59 to 60, 61, 62 see how many units you can find, be they small, be they large units of thought just like these two are units. What is he talking about. What is the general subject and see if you find any of them that parallel each other as I pointed out these two parallels. You see you can put a bit of time in that and get into it and get the problems opened up in your mind and I am sure you will find some very interesting things. I hope that every one will have that well done prior to our

meeting after vacation, so that we can discuss it then. I have been looking ahead this way because I want to have you ready to discuss these things when we deal with them together. Now we return then to the part we are actually on now which is the early part of the book. Yesterday we looked on into Chapters 2 and 3 and Chapter 4 we have already looked at and have seen the picture of blessing predicting future time which is not the millenium described in Chapter 2 but is something earlier. A time of a pilgrimage journey of God's people with figures borrowed from the march through the wilderness and figures it is not a situation when there is no ~~axis~~ external danger but one when they are protected from external danger, one when God's mercy is around His people watching over them very, very closely and they who have been purged from their filth by the spirit of judgement are putting their joy in the branch of the Lord and the fruit of the earth and we examined what those things meant before. Now Chapter 5 which follows that is a chapter which is largely a chapter of rebuke. I will sing a song to my wellbeloved a song of my beloved touching his vineyard. He describes here a picture which seems very familiar to any one who has read the gospels. Here is a vineyard which he makes and he orders it to bring forth good grapes and it brings wildgrapes and he calls on the people to judge between him and his vineyard and in the New Testament our Lord Jesus Christ gives the parable about the man who lets out vineyard to growers and how they keep back the produce of it and then he sends his own son and then they kill him and there certainly is a close relationship between those two. He is dealing with the Lord's vineyard which is not providing the fruit that it should. Verses 1 to 7 are a declaration of God to the House of Israel that God is not getting the fruit from it that he should be getting and that his wrath is going to be upon His own people for their failure to bring forth what they should have done. That is Chapters 5: 1-7 / Then he follows that with a series of woes. This is continuing rebuke which you see but leaving the figure of the vineyard speaking of the nation as a whole now he is speaking of individuals who are sinning against Him. In verse 8 we have an interesting picture. A picture of those who are disregarding the commands of the law of Moses that Israel in the land was to be holding the land as a region of small ~~farm~~ farms and on these farms individual, independent people were to

be developed who would show for the glory of God in their lives and instead of that we have ~~many~~ people together in great amounts of land into large holdings and grinding down the others. "Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth! "

Big areas round about with just a few people controlling great amounts of land . It is not to say, of course, that there is anything wrong in big farms being run particularly with modern scientific methods where they can be efficiently run as large organizations . This was a specific plan that God had given for the land of Judah, the land of Israel, that this land where the place where the knowledge of God would be kept alive, oracles of God given, a way prepared for the coming of His Son. This vineyard here was not a production of agriculture or of wealth but it was production of men who were true to God and he wanted to have the people have their small farms and so the law would lay down every particular how the land would go on be kept in the same family and be passed from father to son . Laid down in the Pentateuch and they have deserted all that and here he rebukes them for not seeking ? (3) of his purposes and declares that actually there is going to be desolation instead of great prosperity when they are forgetting him. Then in verse 11 he rebukes those who are giving up their time to wasteful, riotous drink. Verse 11 and 12. They rise up early in the morning that they may follow strong drink; that continue until night, till wine inflame them! and do not regard the work of the Lord and those are these two specific rebukes. One against the disregard of His specific law for His people. Not a law He laid down for all lands but a law for Israel with the specific purpose he had for it and then the second one, of course, 11 and 12 would apply to any people at any time who are putting their own pleasure ahead of the Lord's will and the Lord's purpose . Verse 13, "Therefore, my people are gone into captivity, " Now the way it is expressed here you would think they were ~~already~~ already in captivity . The way it is expressed in the english but I would be inclined to think here it is rather a prediction of what is coming in the future unless, of course, this is when Sennachrib is taken . Therefore they are gone into captivity because they have no knowledge; " They are ignorant of God's word . They are not studying His Word as they should. Therefore ~~he~~ hath enlarged herself,

Slave

B45

and opened her mouth without measure; And the mean man shall be brought down, and the mighty man shall be humbled, . It is showing God's judgement upon the nation which is going to strike all groups within the nation. They all have to suffer as a result of their turning away from God .

B46

And he continues in verse 17 "Then shall the lambs feed after their manner , and the waste places of the fat ones shall strangers eat. " It shows the lambs uncared for . The Hebrew word is Sheol and if you take it as the grave in the sense of a hole in the ground that is not what it is . You never dig a Sheol . Sheol is the abode of departed/^{spirits}and is ordinarily used for the abode of the departed lost , not always. Jacob speaks of bringing my gray hairs down to Sheol and so it ~~s~~ is used in the Old Testament to cover the whole of existence after death. There was a certain emphasis on the condition . I am inclined to think that in this case he is speaking here of the end of the physical existence of this earth rather than specifically bringing out the doctrine of Hell in this verse. There are other cases where he describes in Isaiah where he describes the continuing conscience/^{existence}of the lost which are definitely pictured. I question in this verse that is what he means. I don't think the grave gives the idea exactly yet I think it comes a little nearer to it than hell does , in this particular case . In the New Testament the word which specifically is a picture of eternal suffering is Gehenna /and Gehenna which was a valley in which the refuse was burned as a figure for the continuous conscious misery through all eternity . There have been those who have tried to prove that Hades means only the abode of the lost but there are a few places where they have a little twisting together and it seems perhaps safer to say that Hades means the condition of individuals after death. Perhaps more of the lost than the saved. It isn't so much a matter of a word as a description

We have a (11 3/4)

Well, we have verse 17 showing the land going into idleness and waste and verse 18 has another "Woe" "Woe unto them that are giving great time to doing what is evil, iniquity and then verse 20 is a very interesting woe . Woe unto them that call evil good

B46

and good evil ; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter! That certainly is a verse for the present day. Of course, it is true if you take the world many things that are black today. Is this book big or little? Little. There are many things which are relevant. They are not black or white . Is today a warm day or a cold day? Well, ~~at~~ the middle of next summer you will say I wish I could have a lovely cool day like last April 19th. Three weeks ago you might have said My I would like a lovely warm day like today. It is relevant. Many things in life that are absolute no matter how much a person may be deformed, may be injured . He is a human being or he is not a human being it is absolute . There is a difference between a human being and between an animal. There is an absolute difference between a living thing and an inanimate object . There are matters which are absolute. There are matters which are relevant and when you try to make everything absolute you get into all kinds of confusion and when you try to make all kinds of things relevant you get into all kinds of confusion. ~~Some~~ Some things fall into one category and other things fall into the other category and we get ~~hopeless confusion~~ ^{hopeless confusion} when some people want it in one or the other. Once you recognize how much there is that is relative it is very easy to go on from there . Then there is the utterly wrong attitude that can make things so relative that anything can mean anything at all and that is what he is pointing out here in this twentieth verse. "that call evil good, and good evil" darkness for light, and light for darkness , bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter! I read an article, I guess ten years ago, maybe not quite that long. I picked up a book put out by the Internation Council of Churches by the World Council of Churches It was a book on peace and how we should have co-existence how we should treat all men as our brothers and all that and it described going into communist satellite countries trying to understand these people proper relationship and all of that and told of some people who had done it . It was very encouraging the progress they made but it did mention the difficulty they had because of the use of words . These men were advocating peace and they found the people they were talking to were advocating peace too but pretty soon they found they were using the word peace in a different sense and soon they found what those people meant by peace was a condition in which every capitalist was

dead. That was what they meant by peace . Peace to them did not mean letting a capitalist continue to live, did not mean a person who did not believe in communism be uninjured. No that wasn't peace. A condition of peace is a condition in which all who are ~~capitalist~~ ~~non~~capitalists have been destroyed . This was put in a book by people who were advocating co-existence and it simply was a little semantic ~~differeance~~ difficulty that some of their people had had but it ~~shows~~ exactly the situation. That is the primary activity of the communists is making black white, making sweet, bitter. They call it the Peoples Republic of China. Everyone of their countries is the Peoples Republic . What do they mean by the Peoples Republic . Do you mean a republic in which the people have ~~the say~~? Actually it means the people are forced to do what you say. Exact opposite of the way it means before. You talk about democracy and democracy to us means a place where people have some chance of self-determination . To them democracy means a place where the people are ordered to do by the big boss. The exact opposite is the way they use terminology. That is true of the modernists. That is true of the neo-orthodox particula rly. Like the neo-orthodox who said I believe in the bodily resurrection of Christ. It used to be the modernist believed in a spiritual resurrection of Christ but it took a fundamentalist to believe in the bodily resurrection of Christ but now the neo-orthodox believes in the bodily resurrection of Christ. Only what b ecame of those chemical elements which were put in the grave. Of course, nobody knows that. Well, if nobody knows that there is no bodily resurrection. You are twisting the word around to mean the opposite of what is always understood to mean. I got Episcopal magazine ~~Episcopal magazine~~ just yesterday on my desk. There is an article on it on "Jesus Saves" and he says at the start people may be confused by the title "Jesus Saves" because they may think of someplace of brimstone, ^{eternal} ~~infernal~~ fire and such an idea is entirely repugnant to the modern age. Of course, we don't mean anything of that . Well, it is repugnant or not doesn't prove whether it is true or not but they want to say I don't believe in Salvation I am not interested they can say it but when they say when they use the terminology and mean the opposite . Well, it seems like a new development all this modernism. But here is Isaiah right here is pointing it out and saying "Woe to them that call evil good and good evil ; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put

bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter! And very appropriately it is followed in verse 21 "Woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes and prudent in their own sight! Here you see all of the conceit and egotism of our present century and people think they have the explanations of all the mysteries of the universe and any such divine revelation is pure (4) ? and they explain away great dogmas that have been vital in the foundation of everything that is good in our present age. Well, they are wise in their ~~own~~ ^{eyes} ~~yes~~ and prudent in their own sight! They think they know everything and how very inconsistent or illogical Isaiah is, isn't he? After he has given these two which just fit together, here he speaks of these great wise prudent people who know the answers to all of the problems in the universe and don't need any divine revelation in verse 21. He goes on to verse 22 "Woe unto them that are mighty to drink wine, and men of strength to mingle strong drink; which justify the wicked for reward, and take away the righteousness of the righteous from him! How would anybody who is wise and prudent in his own ~~yes~~ eyes and prudent in his own sight be going on to be mighty to drink wine and all that. Well, he wouldn't be if he really was wise but you talk with the people who have been active in the development of our atomic progress in science today. I talked with some one who was out at Los Alamos and very active in that work and they said that the people most of them were drunk half of the time. The liquor used is just unbelievable. The people who are wise in their own eyes are the very people who are doing what anybody with an sense would say is utterly unwise in ruining their bodies and ruining their health but that is what you find. People are wise in their own eyes instead of seeking the wisdom which is from above. So in verse 22 we find them ruining themselves and verse 23 we find them unscrupulously using their wisdom to injure others which justify the wicked for reward and take away the righteousness of the ~~righteous~~ ^{righteous} from him! And there we have people of great gifts who are trying to make the worse appear the better making their gifts available to justify the wicked for reward or in order to blacken the character of the righteous for their own purpose. Politics today is shot through with that sort of thing that sort of misrepresentation. I was amazed even to find it among professing christians. When I was at Princeton Seminary it was just in the last few years there before the

institution was taken over by the modernists and the evangelicals were still in definite control though there was a strong modernist group that included the faculty and a group of strong liberals in the student body and the directors were thoroughly sound at the time but the movement was on which eventually changed the directors and changed the nature of the institution . I remember one day we were told that the vice-president of the Board of Directors was going to preach in the little seminary chapel on Sunday B47 This announcement was made and when this announcement was made all through the group where it was made you heard some of these liberal fellows whisper "If you go you better sit up near the front so you can hear him and so those who did not know the man said I think we will go down to the church downtown on Sunday instead of coming to the chapel service because it wasn't compulsory attendance there (14)

But who wants to go and have to try to hear someone who can hardly speak and has nothing interesting to give but I stood for the cause and I knew ~~this man~~ what this man represented and I went to the chapel and here was this man with a bellowing voice that you could hear him in that place and a half a block away. These fellows were deliberately trying to prevent people from coming they knew that was a complete falsehood. Whatever they thought would keep people away. There is no question that was their purpose and that is the attitude described here by ~~the wicked for reward~~ which justify the wicked for reward and take away the righteousness of the righteous from him. The communists explicitly say in their book that words and sentences are an ~~accomplishment~~ instrument to be used to accomplish and affect denial. Not a means of presenting truth by affecting what is so but you have your objective which is world domination and then you say what will help that domination. We get pretty close to this when President Kennedy ~~used~~ said news is a weapon and the attempt is made to give the people such part of the news that will give them the morale that you want them to have in order to accomplish what is your idea of what is desirous in international relationships. (12½)

(9 3/4)

"Therefore as the fire devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the chaff, so their root shall be as rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as dust: because they have cast away the law of the Lord of hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel. And, of course, Jesus said, they have made the Word of God of no effect (9)

The jews today use theTalmud and forget the Bible and the Roman Catholics study the doctrine of the church and forget the Bible. They both give lip service to the Bible but they don't, in any great number, go to the Bible for the message that is in it . The Word of God which is our source. They have cast away the law of the Lord of hosts. They cast it away by definitely saying we don't want to take it out of the book, away with it, we won't have it or we put it up on our shelf and say it is wonderful but we don't want to study it. (8½)

B48

As though Isaiah said, In the year King Uzziah that's when God gave me this message
Isaiah then reflected on the smallness of man compared with the greatness of God. The
importance of not only starting out for the Lord but in keeping on. He said in that
year I saw the Lord, high and lifted up and his train filled the temple. The commentators
asked, What temple? Some say Isaiah was transported to heave into the heavenly temple.
Others say he was in the earthly temple and he had a vision that he saw and we don't know.
We know that what Isaiah saw was the Lord on a throne high and lifted up with his train.
Whatever temple it was Isaiah declared himself it was a vision. He had this vision
"Above it stood the seraphims:

Beginning at (6)

We were looking at the end of the last hour the sixth chapter of Isaiah. There in that
sixth chapter we have that inaugural vision that Isaiah had somewhere the beginning of
His ministry. It is rather strange that it isn't Chapter I as it is in the Book of
Jeremiah. Here it is in Chapter 6 and that makes one wonder whether he had already had
a fair amount of ministry first before God gave him this special vision or whether perhaps
the first six chapters were sort of a summary out of ~~xx~~ his early ministry and not
necessarily arranged in chronological order. It would seem in a way rather natural that
when he volunteered to serve the Lord. When the Lord asked who would serve Him that
tha t would be the beginning of his ministry rather than ^{after} giving all of those tremendous
messages that we have in the previous five chapters. We saw there the vision that Isaiah
had of God, first and then the vision of himself, sinner, then the vision of atonement
of salvation through the closing off the altar, the iniquity taken away and the sin purged.
Atonement is necessary for one who has sinned and how could he serve ~~Go~~ God effectively

B48

unless his iniquity is taken away and his sin purged. I got a letter this morning from a fellow who is serving a three year term in prison and has only fourteen months left of it and he is, I couldn't read the word whether it is determined or destined, for the ministry and wanted to have a catalogue of the Seminary and he wanted to know about our requirements for entrance, etc. Well, you have to have more information than that about him before you would know if he would be one who would ever be in the Christian Ministry or not . I would say nine chances out of ten he would never be in the Christian Ministry. There would be one chance in ten but that would be an unusual situation. He might be very definitely called of the Lord. It is so unusual that you would have to have evidence before. One thing I liked about it he asked if we had any correspondence courses and I think we can get him in touch with a good correspondence Bible Course or something why at least would give a person a chance to find out if he is serious or not as to his character and so on. Perhaps, more than any other inquiry might but people don't realize that our iniquity has to be taken away and our sin purged before we can be used effectively for the Lord and if after we are used of him we fall into sin it is possible that he may restore us (2½)

Well, Isaiah had this vision and the vision of God lead to the vision of himself , seeing of the need for the cleansing of his sin , the atonement typicized by the burning coals from off the altar and bringing it to his lips and then he hears the voice saying "Whom shall I send, Who will go for us? and he said, I, Here I am send me (1½) to end

It is very interesting the contrast between Isaiah and Jeremiah. We think of Jeremiah as the weeping prophet. The one who predicted that Jerusalem would be destroyed, the one who had to see it destroyed and wrote that terrible ~~lamentations~~ book of Lamentations terrible expression over the awful situation that he saw. We think that Isaiah is a great prophet of comfort, a prophet of atonement, the one who declared Christ, the evangelical prophet of all prophets. Yet, when you have Jeremiah's call to the ministry ⁱⁿ and Jeremiah 1. The Lord tells him that he is going to set him over the nation that he is going to give him the power that he will be defended by the Lord and they will fight against Jeremiah and they will not prevail; for I am with thee to deliver thee, the Lord saith. He sets him over the nations, etc. so that you have this picture as if Jeremiah had power and tremendous leading and actually he goes on to be the prophet of the misery, sorrow that came to going into exile. With Isaiah you have the call saying "Hear indeed but understand not, make the heart of this people fat and make their ears heavy, lest they should turn and be healed and he said ho long? And he answered Until the cities be wasted without inhabitant, and the houses without man, In neither case does Isaiah or Jeremiah does the vision give a summary of the message, in neither case. In both cases the vision, the call seems to fit the other man better than this man and I think that the answer to it is very clearly that God was not here giving him a summary of His ministry. A picture of just how he was to serve the Lord. He was giving him an emphasis that he would need. He was giving him something that would be vital in his ministry and so he gives Jeremiah a great ~~xxxx~~ motive of encouragement. Jeremiah has the disagreeable time and task to go through with it. Isaiah with his wonderful, marvelous promises of blessing that he has God puts the emphasis more on the fact. For the time being the people are not going to hear it, not going to understand. So the message here is to be introduction. It is not a summary of the prophets work. It is a word of encouragement to the prophet to go ahead as the Lord leads him. I saw an article once written by a man thirty years ago by the man who was president of the Santa Fe Railroad and in some magazine he wrote this article called "Don't hitch your wagon to a star" and he said that people had lost out more in life by hitching their wagon to a star; than anything else. He said they would worry ahead to something that was

far, far ~~way~~ away and set out to try and reach that and didn't think of the intermediate steps. He felt the person should think of the thing that was before it and do a first class job of that and then look to the next step. It is true that there are some people

(?)

like that Dr. Robert ~~McPherson~~ that the Lord gave a vision to in his early life

(12½)

and Dr. Wilson said he deliberately divided his life into three periods, fifteen years each and for fifteen years learning all of the ancient languages, dialects that I can then I'm going to put fifteen years studying through the Old Testament. Each word by word in the Hebrew in relation to the language in order to see what the facts are about the higher criticism and then I am going to devote the last fifteen years to writing my material and getting it in shape in order to bring out the evidence on this matter and the Lord enabled him to finish out his forty-five years and I guess go on teaching another four years. There aren't many people who can plan their lives the way that Dr. Wilson did and in his case I felt/he planned a little more on effective ways of writing it. If it was effective it would have a far greater hearing. There is a mine of this material that he has left and I think about up to date he has written more people would get value out of it. It is comparatively rare that the Lord enables you to see way ahead. Things happen in ways you never dream of and he wanted us to step into the doors that He opens, which our particular abilities will fit so we can accomplish for him. So with Isaiah and Jeremiah he gave them an emphasis in the beginning of their ministry which was of great value to them but then He lead them step by step in the changing circumstance of their life. Doing the things that He wanted them to do and to accomplish the purpose that He had for them. Comparatively seldom that it is given to any of us to see very far in the future. In Isaiah here we have this marvelous picture through the first verses, the first eight verses. I doubt if there are many sections in the Old Testament aside from ~~the~~ some of the well-known stories are more read and loved than these first ~~three~~ ^{eight} verses, a marvelous picture but when you get into the ninth verse it is so different than what you might expect and particularly when you think of Isaiah marvelous messages of God's wonderful grace which must be a stunning blow

God said I got a marvelous work for you who is going to go. He said, Here am I send me . He said Go tell this people "Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not . Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy and shut their eyes lest they see with their eyes and hear with their ears and understand with their heart and convert, and be healed." My what a ~~difference~~ difference in the picture (8 3/4)

Then he continues "Then said I, Lord, how long? And he answered, Until the cities be wasted without inhabitant, and the houses without man, and the land be utterly desolate. And the Lord have removed men far away, and there be a great forsaking in the midst of the land." Then he gives him one more verse out of the little bit of a glimpse (8½)

But that 13th verse is a rather obscure verse but a very unpleasant one but before it we have these four verses looking at the gloomy side of the picture . It is interesting that verses 6 and 7 are quoted in the New Testament just about as much as any verse in the Old Testament is quoted in the New Testament. Off hand I don't think there is any verse in the Old Testament that is quoted more frequently than this particular verse is in the New Testament. I think it would be good to look at where the verses are quoted in the New Testament. Now the first of these is Matthew 13:14

How many of you could immediately tell me without looking at the content of Matthew 13? Will you raise your hand if you can tell me if you know what is the general content of Matthew 13? Well Matthew 13 is a great chapter. A chapter that handles ~~parables~~ ^{parables} of the kingdom where we have this series of very interesting and striking parables and where we have the picture in this chapter of the Lord explaining the certain things in a form that the average person would not understand at all and he tells them first of the parable of the sower and the disciples come to him and in verse ten. They say, "Why speakest thou unto them in parables? And he answered and said unto them, Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given . For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not from him shall be taken away even that he hath." There are many people who like to think that God is absolutely just and fair to every individual in the sense that

everybody has equal opportunity, and it is entirely up to us and we get treated according to our deserts and that is that. Well that is the exact opposite of the extreme

(5½)

The thing is when a person doesn't think much the opposite of extreme Calvinism seems to them to be the natural thing. Sure everybody should get his just deserts that all there is to it but there is no such thing because we do not have equal opportunity. Some of great opportunities and some have little opportunities. There is an inequality in life and you can't get around it. It just is a fact and so here we find the Lord Himself definitely said "It is given to you to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven but unto them it is not given. For whosoever hath to him it shall be given and he shall have more abundance and to whosoever hath not to him shall be taken away even that which he hath. Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not neither do they understand, And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see and shall not perceive: For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted and I should heal them. But blessed are your eyes, for they see: and your ears for they hear." =Now in this passage there are two rather variant notes. There is the note that says that is given to them. It is not given to them God has chosen to give certain privileges to certain people and there is no question of that. There are inequalities in life and we cannot get around it. We believe in a Just God and a Holy God and in a Loving God and we know that He has a purpose in all that He does. Purposes which are right but they are not necessarily what we would think would be the natural right thing. If we knew everything He knows we would know they were right. They are purposes that are part of His great, marvelous plan and that is one thing that is definitely in it. There is a divine judgement. There is a divine activity

Many another people comes to an end because of their sin. It's happened in secular history. Other nations have fallen into sin and just disappeared.

Most of the peoples of ancient times have just gone -- there's nothing left.

We don't know where they are or ^{We know they just simply disappeared.} nothing about them, And many a nation has turned away from God, and they have disappeared (14.27) But in the case

of Israel it is not the end because God has called Israel for a special purpose and God is going to fulfill His special purpose, and the nation ~~has turned away~~

even though they turn into terrible habits then, ~~it~~ into a terrible exile, it is in addition to that in iniquity-a destruction has a judgment of sin, but it involves his chastisement, ~~them~~

in bringing/back _____ (13.78) continues to fulfill his Himself

purposes and accomplish them, so he is going to leave ~~us~~ a remnant, **** just

And yet There will be a portion of people that will return. I ~~just~~ don't know/what to do ~~to~~ know

with this @shall be eaten or shall be consumed." I don't/whether it's dge

judgment or whether ~~it~~ it merely shows ~~it~~ that one generation disappears, ~~it~~ from that

but another goes on. But ~~the~~ last part, it seems to me, we can get a definite idea that _____ @@@@

****(And even though man fails, God's purpose will be accomplished. Even though

~~the~~ man _____, God is going to carry ~~it~~ out his purpose, and so we are told that _____ (13.48))

@@@

a tree in you see/woods, ~~that grows green~~ with no green leaf, look dead. A dead tree, an

absolutely dead tree, that will rot in fall (?) (12.53) Then you see another

tree which at first sight ~~is~~ very difficult to tell whether ~~it~~ is dead or not.

as if it were
 But actually it simply _____ (12.50) it ~~see~~ simply looks/dead through the
 winter, and _____ (12.40) and the tree that has got its substance
 in it even though its leaves appear dead, it ~~is still~~ there is still a living center
 there, that substance, _____ God will continue to

So even though we are in a ~~particular~~ particular period

God will fulfill his purposes

We have looked at these first two chapters, and we ~~can~~ come back to this... Yes, Mr.

... (Q) Yes, ~~Miss Chung~~ (Q) Well, that is an interesting question. One which
 Miss Chung?
 deserves to be brought out. Why does he, there is a tense ~~which~~ - he shall return.
 that
 The only thing ~~which~~ occurs to me in relation to that is the tithe that they were taught
 to give one tenth ~~of~~ to the Lord. He says even though it goes into the destruction

(10) Some of you may think of _____. I am inclined to think that, how's
 just an Old English for tenth
 that? Oh, yes, yes, yes, the tithe ~~in the Old English text is no difference~~
~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ As far as I know there is no difference between tithe and

B 51 contd.

tenth, simply we have taken an old English word for tenth and we have used it to men the tenth that belongs to the Lord. It certainly is not a specific denotation. ~~There~~ there must be a reason for it. I haven't checked the commentaries at all to see whether they suggest that idea, Well, now , then we will come back to this N. T. expression of this. In ~~v=~~ fact, I think a little fat on verses nine and ten would be worthwhile anyway, because they are tremendously ~~impro~~ important. The teaching in those two verses and Its relation to the Old and New Testament is a tremendously important thing. We could spend years. (Question) Yes, in commentaries one might find that's there's some particular significance the ~~tree~~ tree. It is not easy though because after all, there's been a great deal of destruction in the ancient times. The Bible was written in one country and carried to another. And the other land changed, and to determine exactly what trees are meant and exactly what plants , animals is often very difficult. You take the twelve stones in the high priests garment. There have been all kinds of interpretations. It's very difficult to be sure just what stones they were. Those are things which ~~disappera~~ ar unless you have pictures of it. There have been studies of the Bible and there might be some particular reason or significance to the trees--they're not ever-
(Something about the ~~oak~~ oak missing here)
greens . The evergreens looks living as long as the evergreen tree is living it's apparently living. When the _____tree _____its needles so there're no needles left on it. Then the pine is dead. But the oak tree, when it _____ all its leaves, then it looks dead but it isn't. I think he's using the _____ tree. Well, this then finishes the six chapters as far as our purposes this semester is concerned. They are a tremendous group of chapters. They have

B 51 contd

They are general in nature, giving us a marvelous vision of Isaiah's statement of judgment, punishment in more or less general terms, looking forward to exile _____ . (Quite a bit missing here).

Then in chapter ²⁸⁻³⁵ twenty eight he begins a new section which runs through thirty-five and this section parallels the Book of _____

Then ~~the~~ ³⁶⁻³⁹ thirty-six through thirty-nine is an historical section telling about Isaiah's dealings with Hezekiah, Ahaz, and the other kings at these crucial

times. Then in chapter ⁴⁰⁻⁵⁶ forty-~~fi~~ to fifty=⁶ six we have the section in which he promises return from exile, and in this section he shows how God is going to deliver the people from exile, but He ~~p~~ brings out how deliverance from exile is not enough. They will go back into another exile if they continue in sin as they were before. God is going to do something about the exile.

That is very important, but it is necessary --more necessary to do something about the sin problem, and so in forty to fifty six He starts with deliverance from exile and ends with deliverance from sin and gives the marvelous picture of the atonement of Christ in Isaiah 53--that marvelous picture of the atonement of Christ and the glory that shall follow (54 to middle of 56). Then after that I ~~feel~~ feel that there's no question that we have one of the basic divisions of the book--comes at 56:8, completing the section which begins with chapter 40.

It deals with the return from exile and with atonement. And~~x~~ then at 56:9 we have a tone of rebuke , a specific tone which is not followed in this way in 40-56--it's different; it is ~~a~~ separate from that. And, as I expect most of you know, the H. C. which began a little over 100 years ago , dealing with the book of Isaiah , the claim was made that Isaiah 40 to 66 does not deal with the same thing as 1-39. One to thirty-nine often talks about Israelitish

Kings. They're not mentioned in 40-~~56~~. 1-39 deals with Isaiah's day in the main, and 40-66 you are looking to the exile. Isa 1-39 most of it is dealing with Palestine; 40-66 is mostly dealing with Babylonia and deliverance from Babylonian exile. Well, then, we had great controversy with the liberals. 40-66 has a Babylonian background--look at this verse, look at this chapter. And the conservatives said, "No, 40-66 is like 1-39 as the Palestinian _____ Look at this verse, look at this verse, etc. And then one of the ~~liberals~~ conservatives noticed that the liberals were drawing most of their illustrations

B. 52

... Liberals seized the bull by the horns and said, "No, they're not two Isaiahs; they are three of them. ~~He said~~ We don't think they're hardly any liberal scholars today who believe in two Isaiahs any more, they believe in about 40 actually, but three main ones but the original Isaiah includes a fair portion of 1-39. And the second Isaiah a considerable portion of 40-66 deals with the return from exile. Then they say from ~~50~~⁶-66 is largely dealing with events from a hundred years after the return from exile. And therefore, there's a third Isaiah a hundred years later than the second Isaiah. That's the view that most of the critics hold today.

Well, now we look at it and we noticed last semester that 40-56 is dealing with the return from exile. I believe Isaiah wrote ~~the~~ but I believe the Isaiah was looking forward to a time, and then he wrote that for his own day... Does the passage from 56 on now come back to Isaiah's own day, or does he continue to look forward... Does he continue to deal with matters after the exile... Ahaz' punishment is definitely connected with Isaiah's own time. What do you find that is definitely related to Isaiah's own time in this passage? What do you find that definitely does not relate to it, but deals with a ~~xx~~ later time? I'd like ~~xx~~ you to have those evidences in

B. 52 contd.

mind. Now you don't need to concern yourself with the other vital question, as the background, ~~with~~ whether it's Palestinian or ~~is~~ Babylonian, because I think everyone agrees pretty well that from 56 on it' is Palestinian ~~is~~ rather than Babylonian....

Next class hr.

The Lord says to Isaiah , Go and produce this effect. Those who have turned away from God, who are not willing to follow Him, that their eyes shall be darkened so that they wont see the truth. It's like in the New Testament where ~~we believe~~ ~~they ref~~ they rejected the truth, God gave them over that they should believe a lie. Those A world that you only believe that the facts that you see, that you reason, that you understand. It sounds very beautiful, but you find when you take this attitude, they sat the early New England Unitarians ~~is~~ had a great attractiveness, because they seemed to ~~is~~ be turning away from superstition , mysticism, everything like that, and simply accepting these attitudes. We find that these who take these attitudes do not find it satisfactory. And it is amazing how regularly you find that such groups drop into some kind of ~~we~~ wild mysticism , as some kind of spiriticism, some kind of fantastic acceptance of ~~untruthy untrug-~~ untruths that is much harder to accept.... Here we have in Isaiah's time ~~these~~ people who had a chance to know God and who refused to.... ~~Tye-~~ They simply ~~is~~ ~~ud~~ used their religion to rather than something they really accepted ~~R~~ from God. So God said, Go and make the heart of this people heavy and their eyes blind those who are hardened, hardened them further.... Now this is the command that God gave to Isaiah. To those who believe it is the savour of ^{life} like , to those who don't believe the savour of death. Now Paul says here, here you see the outworking

B-5v2-

B. 52 contd.

which has been commanded. Here we see who have a chance to believe, but

but now you bring up the realization of these they refused to accept.

He quotes half of what Isaiah said; not half in the sense of half the ~~x~~ words,

but half in the sense of half the meaning. The meaning of Isaiah is , "You

go and produce this ~~reus~~ result. Now if you produce this result. Then after

that the result has been produced. So Paul quotes . . ."See, what Isaiah

says is fulfilled. Is that clear, everybody? If nobody comes to bring the

light, the sin of those in darkness is not as heinous as it would be if they

knew the light and rejected it. YOu might say that those who go into ~~dark-~~

darkness are better off if they never hear the truth, than those who hear

the ~~trug~~ truth and reject it. It ~~does~~n't mean that that was the ~~x~~ full

ministry of Isaiah by any means. ~~It~~ He had a tremendous ministry. . .

The wonderful ~~opp~~portunity means that there was one of two results. Either

there was acceptance with the wonderful joy in the Lord or else there is

the ~~hardening~~--you get the _____ rather than the ~~vala~~ eless, -_____

that is slowly going to hell. In Isaiah ~~is~~ it seemed to be a command to do

something; whereas here it sounds as if God said to Isaiah , Here is

a ~~coman~~d. They are presented in some what different tones. But dealing

with a later stage of the same situation. That of course brings out a ~~h~~ vital

part about quotations of scripture. The Bible is verbally inspired; that means,

it is not some ~~di~~ ideas hanging in the air that are inspired. The ideas are

~~re~~ revealed to us, but inspiration -- the ideas are expressed in a way that is

free from error. Inspiration is a matter of words , not a matter of ideas. But

the thing that is important is not the words but the ideas. And the word is

the means of ~~expression~~ expressing the idea. You ~~can~~ can't have the idea

without the word, but you may have the idea in different words. Consequently, in a quotation from the ~~the~~ New Testament, they simply allude to the idea to that the ~~truth~~ truth portion of the idea ~~wh~~ which is vital in connection to their discussion. You can't translate exactly from any language--there is no such thing. Language is different and is expressed in approximations, not exactly. And so, very often, they do not say here are these words: A B C D for ~~this~~ this. No. They say, the Old Testament teaches this and they remind you of a passage and they ~~draw~~ draw from that passage an idea which is definitely in the passage or ~~else~~ else they merely quote a few words to ~~rem~~ remind you of the passage, but it is the idea that is the vital part, but the words are ~~what~~ what contain and protect the idea. You can check your interpretation of the idea by going to the words to see if you are going beyond ~~ore~~ reading something into it ~~k~~ that isn't there. But the words per se have no value. ~~It's~~ It's just ~~like~~ like the woman who said she wept every ~~time~~ time ~~she~~ she heard the preacher say those wonder ful words, "Mesopotamia." There's nothing sacred in the word; the sacredness is in the idea which is ~~possessed~~ ^{expressed} in the word.

N^o. 53

That's a very important thing about it. The New Testament cannot ~~quote~~ quote ~~exactly~~ exactly, because it's not giving Hebrew-it's giving Greek. Well, then what are we to do. If you ~~can~~ cannot quote it exactly, what should you do. Well, what they do is ~~is~~ this. Ordinarily, if they want to quote a passage ~~as~~ as at ~~length~~ length. Sometimes they merely refer to it in a few words. But if they wish to quote it at length, the common version, which is ~~more~~ familiar to people they quote, ~~the~~ if that version brings out clearly the particular thought they wish to convey. In that case they quote the common version. But if the thought in the original is not brought out in the common version, ~~then~~ then they will give a translation directly from the original which might not be as good a

No. 53 contd.

translation as the _____ but which will bring out the particular idea which
of quotations
they have in mind. I have rarely seen a discussion of this matter which is
seems to get to the heart . Usually, it's a matter of words. Do they say these
words or these words. Which is it. Well, it's neither . You've ~~re~~ quoting
Hebrew ~~you~~ Greek , you're quoting Hebrew. . . It's like you might ask, "
What did Paul say when he spoke of Elias?" He said, "Eliah" Elias is coming.
Other ~~re~~ places it speaks of Elijah. Which did the apostle say, did it say
Elijah or Elias. It didn't say either ~~re~~ one. Those are two English words. One
of them is an English word ~~re~~ which is ~~re~~ representation of ~~re~~ the Hebrew.
The other is a representation of the Greek. . . . And it seems to me if we're going
to call him Elijah in English, we should call him that everywhere, but evidently
when they prepared the New Testament, the committee that had a portion to
handle, when they came to the gospels, they came to the reference to Elijah,
they said the word in the Greek is _____, so they give Elias. And then the
others who had the book of James they said well, ~~re~~ they say Elias in the Greek,
they are referring to Elijah. So they translated it Elijah. So in the New Testament
~~re~~ you have Elijah and Eliah. And they're exactly the same in the Greek, but
it's the Greek approximation of the Hebrew. Why shouldn't we give it to our
translation--try to get the form to represent the _____. We should be consistent.
committees
The King James gives considerable freedom to the _____ on the different sections.
I think this discussion has brought out some principles which are rather ~~vital~~ vital.
This is a matter in which you find people's faith upset. Somebody comes along
and says , "Look here, you ~~re~~ say the Bible is verbally inspired . Well, the
New Testament doesn't quote the Old Testament exactly . They ~~re~~ don't believe
in verbal inspiration. ~~re~~ Well, if the New. Testament quoted the Old Testament
~~exactly you would b~~

K. No. 53 contd.

they would ~~have~~ have to give the Hebrew words.
exactly ~~you would~~ ... There's no other way you can quote it exactly.

_____ didn't quote the King James version. They didn't have the King James version in his day. He couldn't quote it correctly unless he just wanted to give the Hebrew words. Of course that's a very nice thing to do, if you have an audience that knows Hebrew. But if you don't.....

~~You-are-~~ (WS (German lady experience)). Why, he spoke to you in the familiar form. I said _____ which is the familiar form. Now, I should have said _____ which is the polite form. You never use the familiar form to a stranger, and she was shocked that that stranger would address me in the familiar form. Well, suppose she said, Did he say _____ or _____. What could I say... That's the problem when you are translating from one language to another. We had a very fine, godly man who took an interest in the students, and one time ~~x~~ he thought he had a thing to show us--how we ~~er-~~ we were not careful about the Bible like we should. He asked ~~me~~, read me the ~~w~~ verse where it says all scripture is inspired of God, etc. And so we read it, about five ~~us~~ of us. ~~And he said, thro~~ And we said, ~~the~~ thoroughly furnished unto all good works. He said, "not one of you read it right. Look at it, it's throughly furnished unto all good works." Well, sure enough, in Old English, it's throughly furnished unto all good ~~g~~ works and that's much more sense than thoroughly furnished. But in present day English we have lost the word throughly. We don't say we go thoroughly through the door; we say we go through the door. But on the other hand, when we make an adverb of it, we say thoroughly not throughly. But what does the Greek say, throughly or thoroughly. Of course it's a translation, and here it's Old English. And ~~no~~ I think personally it is very silly to try to talk in Old

English, ~~best~~ let's talk in English of today. Let's say thoroughly so people will understand. And when the N.T. writers, they would quote the common version, but if that ~~bring~~ bring out the thought of the original, then they would give a free rendering of the original. (Question). ... But you look back to the ~~passage~~^{ss} from which he quotes and see what the idea is in that ~~passage~~^{ss} and I found in case after ~~a~~ case where the N. T. Quotation doesn't seem to prove the thing at all but where you look at the ~~passage~~^{ss} and see what it means ~~and~~ in the O. T. and it means exactly the thing that the N. T. is bringing out. So he is talking to people who know the O. T. and he doesn't have to ~~x~~ stop and tell the whole story or quote the whole chapter. He gives something to remind them of the passage and then proceeds to give what is logically deduced from that ~~passage~~^{ss}. When you take it that way, with a careful study of what the O.T. is really talking about, you find that his arguments are excellent. I've seen a number of not only Bible teachers but theologians who say that proof of verbal inspiration is the fact that Paul said in ~~they~~ seed, ~~singular~~ singular not plural, fulfilled in Christ. Verbal inspiration built on one word--utter nonsense. Two sentences later, God said to Abraham ~~if you~~ your seed will be like the stars of the heaven, if you can count the stars the heaven..... I am the God of Abraham--he doesn't go on to point out that am is in italics--it's not based on the present. There's no present in the Hebrew. And there's no verb there in the Hebrew or in the Greek. And verbal inspiration is proved.... It's very important to ~~w~~ know ~~x~~ what verbal inspiration is--the words are ~~remenduously~~ immensely important, but words are not exact. Words are areas not points. And you put the words together and you can get an area within which the word must be and you can prove it from that. And verbal inspiration is important because God has give us the words to use which narrow it down to an area

No. 53 Contd.

correctly
 WHICH ~~presnets~~ presents ... But that reasonably interpreted ~~will~~ will be
 and will include that thought, and that's what verbal inspiration....they have
 a mechanical idea which does not fit with the.... words are in ~~x~~ any language
 something which changes and ~~ix~~ it has an area. You ask ~~wxx~~ somebody what
 is the word in ancient Hebrew for a jet plane. Well, what is it? I heard a
 man give a big argument on the eternity in the , which is certainly taught
 in the scriptures. But his big argument was that this particular Heb. word
 must mean eternity because there's no other ~~x~~ word that can mean eternity.
 The average person ~~liff~~ liveing an average ~~likf~~ life , not dealing with philo-
 sophical concepts, and how ~~offter~~ often he expresses the idea of eternity.
 The idea does not enter in to ordinary usage any more ~~that~~ than the idea of
 a jet air-craft entered into usage before the jet planes were known~~x~~. And,
 therefore, you cannot expect that there will ~~be~~ necessarily be a word to
 express that idea. But there are statements that express that idea unmistakably
 in the Old Testament. And the idea is that the words would be used to express
 the idea. ~~X~~ What is the Old Hebe~~re~~w word ~~α~~ for a ^{bus} ~~but~~. What does the word
 bus
~~but~~ mean anyway. Bus is the end, ~~ablat~~ ablative ending of Latin . Omnibus in
 Latin. Omni means all , Omnibus means ~~is~~ for all. When they got coaches , the
 word meant not only for owners but for everybody , they called them coaches
 for everybody, and we shortened them to bus.

No. 54

But ~~x~~ perhaps we have covered this aspect sufficiently
 for now unless some one has a question--further statement.
 I think it's vital ~~w~~ right here [^] (Question) In Isaiah 6 ~~is~~ it's very clear. But
 I rather question that it is brought out in this particu~~lar~~ lar passage. I think
 Divis~~is~~e election is very , very clear in Isaiah 6. And I think it is very clear in
 Matthew . But in Acts 28 it doesn't seem to be there unless there is a sugges~~tion~~tion

No. 54 contd.

at the end of verse 27. And even there , I'm not sure it's there at all. Isaiah 6 has divine election very, very clearly and Matt. 13 has it very clearly, but in Acts it doesn't seem. . . . (Question) That's ~~is~~ a matter of expression, but what we say is that God has judged all as guilty of sin --all are guilty and deserve eternal death. We deserve eternal death because we have sinned. We sinned in Adam--he is our representative; he brought ~~on~~ death upon the whole race and we have sinned ourselves . And we all deserve death. Then we ~~we~~ say that God out of the mass of lost humanity has elected certain ones to accept Christ . Some say yes, He has elected some to salvation and some to damnation. Others say, No, He has elected only unto salvation; He has not elected any unto damnation. Well, it's a matter of phraseology. That's the ~~only~~ only difference. Because if we all deserve death for our sins. God is not the author of evil. God cannot be blamed for anybody being lost. But God does elect some to salvation. He can be praised for electing them. ~~Where~~ . . . In the end it amounts to the same thing. If you can say it in a softer way that doesn't offend people, like a stronger ~~way~~ way might, ~~but~~ certainly there's no point in offending people unnecessarily, but the fact of it is that nobody has any right to blame God for their being lost, because we are lost on account of our sin. It's our own fault that we are lost. But those who are saved have only God to thank for their being saved, because it is no goodness of us that we are saved--it's His goodness entirely. . . . So this big argument over ~~whether~~ ~~whether~~ whether God elected the lost ~~to~~ to be lost or not seems to me to be an argument of words. The fact is that the reason that we are lost is because of their sin. They have brought it on themselves. It is not God's Fault that they are lost. In a way you might say ~~they are~~ it's

like as if I were to take 50 dollars and go down to Philadelphia and walk along the street and give a dollar bill to each of 50 people, out of the million I might pass on the ~~x~~ street. Somebody might say, "Wasn't he good to give a dollar to each of 50 people." Somebody ~~ask~~ else would say, "Wasn't he terrible to pass by 999,999 people without giving them a dollar." Well, there would be more people who would think you were mean because you didn't give them a dollar than there would be that thought you were good to give them a dollar. But there was no reason why you needed to give a dollar to anybody. So that It's a thing which we can twist around. Like a boy who comes home from school. He proves that $\frac{9999}{10}$ is equal to one. He can prove that absolutely and when you get through --you can in words make it look as . . . It's just like today, the U.S. is giving away arms to other nations, and are they grateful. What's the result of all the arms the U.S. is giving away to all the other nations.? Nobody is a bit grateful, but the nations that they haven't given arms to are very indignant, because they haven't been given arms, and so they have aroused hatred, because those that don't have them hate us for not giving them to us. They even make an argument that God has no responsibility to save anybody. It's entirely the result of our sin that we are lost. But ~~H-~~ it's His marvelous ~~grave~~ goodness that we are saved. And He has given the free offer of salvation to all people and whosoever will can be saved and no body has any way to say that a person is elected unto damnation because you may work with a person and present ~~x~~ the word . . . It's the silliest thing I ever heard to say, "Nobody has the right to ~~x~~ hear the gospel twice until everybody has heard it once." There can be somebody that you can speak to 5,000 times and he pay no attention ~~x~~ and then accept the Lord and

someone else will accept the first time they hear. Our duty is to reach many with the Word... Now we can get to the second portion of this course; that is, Isaiah 56 following. Now ~~ex~~ we don't begin with Isaiah 56:1 because that is a part of the previous section, which we dealt with last semester, but it is very unfortunate I think that the ~~ax~~ Archbishop's horse was getting rather rather _____ when he got to this section of Isaiah and that consequently he made ~~see~~ some of his chapter divisions are in very very poor places. Perhaps one of the poorest chapter divisions that ever was made anywhere is ~~the~~ this one in chapter 56, because ~~of~~ at the end of verse eight there is a ~~complete~~ complete change in verse/nine, ten, eleven, and twelve are ~~different from everything~~ different from everything before in any two sections of the Bible _____

_____ (6.00) For there is an entirely new section for the book of Isaiah which starts with verse nine. And this section of ~~g~~ the book is/entirely different situation, and _____ is looking at _____ the people shortly before the end of the exile, promising/deliverance from the exile, ~~promising~~ God's saying that there will be/a greater _____ ~~of~~ of sin through the atonement of Christ. end of the last(?) And that of course is the big emphasis in ~~the~~ this section of the _____ chapter.

~~The~~ But then at the end of the verse eight he finishes that ~~with the~~ ~~xi~~ verse of eight/reaching out the Gentiles, the Lord gathereth the outcasts of Israel

~~ax~~, and he will gather others ~~to~~ to Him, beside those that are gathered unto Him.-

the reaching out the Gentiles, the people of every nation, and tongues

are to be saved/ through the atonement described in the Isaiah (5/25) _____ as he said, first _____ in verse eight

Then I suppose ~~that~~ it might be that/there will be a gathering of others/, and then

in verse nine ~~there will be a gathering of~~ "All ye beasts of the field, come to devour,

yea - there is a gathering in each _____, ^{for} Maybe ~~that~~ that misled the argument

archbishop, and let him think that _____
we the
_____ the section which deal/wi/ begins with verse nine, and in verse nine here
_____ ? (4.65)

x he starts to call for repentance upon a sinner, and we ask a question, "Is he
calling for _____ upon sinners in his own day or is he looking forward
beyond the exile, to say that in the later dayⁿ after the exile, as in his day

there will be ~~no~~ need ~~of~~ again of the message of rebuke of sinners, and calling
people to turn from their sin and turn to God. At this point, we could't be

sure, but as we go on ~~we will~~ you will find no reference to Israelites' change
day ~~the~~. But ~~to~~ references to the
or specific situations of Isaiah's ~~article~~. /A number of/cities that have lain

waste for a long period of time we find I think conclusively that from here to the

Near the end of the book

/He is speaking about a situation which ~~would~~ will come two or three hundred

years after his day, after the return from exile. He^s is looking forward to that.

Well, now, that I do not want you to take on my dogmatic statement, but I want
you to be alert to the fact that and be watching for _____ (3.65) indi-

cations, so that at the end of the semester I would like you to be able to say, I believe
in

that/Isaiah 56:9 through the end of 66 Isaiah is dealing with^e the problems of
it

his own day, because I find/ in this reference and this reference, and in this reference,

or I would like ~~you~~ to have you say, I believe that in Isaiah 56:9 ~~through~~ to the end

of the book he is looking forward to the three hundred years and dealing with the

preparing for the prob~~le~~ms that will be to the people of that time, because of

what I find in this verse, this verse, and this verse. I would like you to find

~~the~~ specific verses to prove whicheverⁿ one of these two/ suggestions,

the suggestion you think is correct, and I told you which I think is correct. If

you can find the verses to prove _____ (3.00) I ~~think~~ don't think

they can nullify the verses I find to prove this one. I don't think you can, but

I know you can find verses for this. I want you to find it for yourself. There is
need of my just finding it.

~~No use of my find it~~ _____ (2.72) But now he has here verse nine,

and what does he teach in verse nine? What would you say is the meaning of

and
verse nine here, Mr. Gratton? In poetry/literature the words _____
the

just what they say in the most simple literal interpretation of/words. _____

the of the Presbyterian
time I spoke before the presbytery of/Philadelphia/Church of U.S.A., and I said

that ~~he follows that~~ they tell/ us that the committee of the General ~~of~~
has ~~had~~

Assembly of U.S A ~~pronounced had~~ made a pronouncement, ~~that~~ Who was in

this committee? _____ (2.00) somebody ~~ok~~ calls up ~~and said~~ from the

iles(?) ~~Who~~ Do you want to know who was in it? Here they are. Here are

the names, and he started to reading them. I hadn't asked for anybody to tell,

I had it right in ~~x~~ my hands. What I meant to say was , the nature of this

committee affects what it says; and therefore its words are not worthy to be

~~x~~ taken at face value, and I'm going to go on to prove it. That's what I meant,

but what I said was a rhetorical statement which would convey that mean ing

to anybody, and I'm ~~ds~~ sure did to the person who tried to heckle me. But

he saw a chance to upset me by it, answering the question which was a rhetorical

question. Now, here we have a statement, "All ye beasts of the forest come

to devour." Is this saying 2500 ~~x~~ years from now there are going to be national

parks established in the U.S. and in these national parks they are going to ~~x~~ put

food out for the wild animals to eat and so these wild animals are invited to come

B. 54 contd.

~~xxx~~ and eat. Is that what it is saying,. Well, what is it saying? What is the ~~mean~~ ~~ma~~ meaning of the passage.

B. 55

...This would be a very , very appropriate verse to use today. .. What is he saying? Is it nation ~~he~~ here or is it people? We want to find an ~~x~~ answer to that question, and in order to find an answer, we have to look ahead, and ~~when~~ we look ahead , what do we find/? What is the real meaning of verse nine; by itself, it ~~doens~~ doesn't mean anything. It may be a prediction of the national parks. It could fit any one of a hundred situations. But the next verse shows the situation to which it referes. I'm not sure whether _____ here means the nations or means God. It might mean those who are _____ Supposing I were to say, "Communists, come in and take over the country. Nobody is going to stop you. The National Council is opening its doors to communist-minded clergymen. The government is letting secret agents come into the country freely --~~there's~~ nothing to stop you. Come ~~me~~ ahead, and take over the country." You wouldn't know that I didn't mean ~~for~~ that I wanted them to come . Not at all, but I would be saying , if there is a situation in which there's nothing to stop you, and I would be saying it in a dramatic form, by presenting it in a form of an invitation. And so here this verse nine should mean , these people are going to be devoured. There's God's judgment ahead. It could mean that. But when you take it in context with the next verse, it's ~~lx~~ seems to say, "There's ~~x~~ is nothing to protect this nation come ye, beasts of the field, devour them, there's nothing to protect them from you. Not that I ~~x~~ want you to devour them, not that I'm making you devour them. No, but ~~that~~ , naturally , the beasts will devour them, if there is nothing to stop them. And here there is nothing to stop them. They are people looking for their own

B. 55 contd.

objectives--their own gain. They say, "Come, I'll fetch wine, and we'll fill ourselves with strong drink. Tomorrow will be just like this day and there will be more tomorrow. So why should we bother about preparing to protect our economy, so that it will continue good. Tomorrow will be just as good as today is, let's not worry about it. Watchmen are not on their job. The righteous perish and no man lays it to heart. There's nobody noticing the ~~x~~ terrible situation of the country. It's just open for the ~~week~~ wicked forces to come in and take it, because those who should be the leaders of the nation--the shepherds who are protecting them from the evil, are lying down on the job and looking out for their ~~wx~~ own interest. So it is a denunciation of the failure of the leaders of the nations to ~~wx~~ do the work they should be doing in protecting their nation from the forces that can ~~destroy~~ ^{it.} That is ~~that~~ what these verses put together mean. And verse nine alone could mean any one of a hundred things, but in ^{introduction to such a} ~~his~~ this context it is a vivid/denunciation of the leaders of the nations. It's not an invitation actually to the animals; it's only rhetorical, but it is saying there is nothing to protect the nation, because those who should be the watchmen have fallen down on the job. It's just like I say when some of our leaders today just show such perfect inhumanity in their dealings with such situations and such ridiculous ~~x~~ attitudes. ~~H~~ You ^o say, "How on earth can they have such attitudes?" I say in the universities and colleges for the last 40 years they have been indoctrinated with the doctrines of non - resistance, with passivism, with subjection to socialism--that sort of thing. When I was in college, in many of the classes, that was being propagandized. And today the leaders of America have mostly been ~~subjective~~ subjected to that. Kennedy at Harvard was subjected to that for four years; perhaps the meeting place or ~~the source of~~

that very teaching. They say , "Come ye ~~æ~~ beasts of the field , come and devour." We don't them to come and devour. What we're saying is , there is nothing to ~~ð~~stop you, because the watchman who should have been guarding them and ~~æ~~ keeping them out has been lying down on the job, and devoting themselves to their own pleasures . And so we have ~~æ~~ here in these three verses a picture of the sin of the nation, but specifically the leaders of the nation. W^u_p have a picture of the sin--we do not have here a statement of judgment except as it can be inferred from verse nine. They are exposed and open--there is nothing to protect them because their leaders have fallen down on the job . They've ~~wæ~~ become selfish and indifferent. They've ~~wæ~~ greedy , dumb-dogs . They never get enough. They've looking out for their own gain . They are greedy, dumb dogs that can't bark, lying down, loving to slumber. The righteous perishes and no one takes it to heart. .. So verse one of chapter ~~of~~ 57 is a logical continuance that is far more connected with the verse that precedes ~~æ~~ it than the ones following. They are a ~~æ~~ separate section. But verse one of fifty-seven goes right on and there should be no break here at all. The righteous perishes and no man takes it to heart. Merciful men are taken away and people don't realize that the condition is so bad that there's bound to be ~~æ~~ judgment and the righteous are actually better off in being taken away.

B.55 contd.

Take up the stumbling block out of the way of my people. Here we have a great bulk of the nations sunk in sin, and yet he says, "Those that put their trust in Him are going to have an effect--they are going to be able to accomplish something....They are going to be able to go ahead and to really have some accomplishments, for thus says the high and lofty one that inhabits eternity, whose name is Holy. I dwell in the high and holy place with him also that is of contrite and humble spirit to revive the hearts of the contrite ones. ...Here are these watchmen who are not paying any attention to their watching, who are not doing what ~~w~~ they should be doing at all, but he says, God says I'm still here, and the one ~~fx~~ who follows me is going to receive my blessing and is going to accomplish something. He says, I will be with him that is of a contrite ~~k~~ and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the ~~x~~ humble, to revive the heart of the contrite ones. I will not contend forever, neither will I ~~axk~~ be always wroth. God says, I am pouring out my punishment upon the nations and the godly are implicated in the nations--they suffer with the rest, but He says I will not contend forever. There's blessing ahead for the godly. For the iniquity of his covetousness I was wroth and smote him: I hid me, and was wroth, and he went on forwardly in the way of his

B. 55 contd.

heart. I have seen his ways, and will heal him: I will lead him also, and restore comforts unto him and to his mourners." God promises that in spite of the sin of the nation, & God is going to bring blessing. Just as he promises to a world that is turned away from Him, that He is going to save individuals out of it. His word ~~is~~ will not return to him void but will produce results. "I create the fruit of the lips; Peace, & peace to him that is far off, and to him that is near, saith the Lord, and I will heal him." God says, He will make peace for those who are really his. "But the wicked (in contrast) are like the troubled sea, when ~~x~~ it cannot rest There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." For next week, please look on into these next chapters very carefully: 58, 59 noticing which verses describe the sin of the people. which ~~x~~ verses describe the punishment coming . and which verses describe blessedness that He is going to give to His own. Which verses are predictions and what do they predict. Do you find definite evidence that ~~God is going~~ Isaiah is a speaking particular for people at a time distant in the future. Or, can this just as well have Isaiah's immediate situation in mind. Look on for a few ~~x~~ chapters and try to have it well in mind.

B. 58

And so we have this marvelous statement of God's charity,

B. 58 contd.

wf-ccj which is in back of these blessings. "Thus says the high and lofty one that inhabits eternity, whose name is Holy;" a stress on God's charity, ^{God's greatness,} /the certainty of the fulfillment of His promises. "I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is ~~α~~ of a contrite and humble spirit, to ~~rx~~ revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones." Is there rebuke in this verse, Miss Luke? This verse is not a verse of rebuke, it is a verse of blessing, and it is a ~~a~~verse of blessing which he gives to those who have a certain characteristic so one could call it conditional blessing for those who have this characteristic, one could call it unconditional ~~γ-ε-~~ in speaking of these individuals, saying it is limited to them.

It is limited to them and therefore, ~~und-- con-~~ unconditional. It is not just a blessing given to /the whole world. But you may be speaking of a certain group of people, the contrite and humble ones, they have Or you may be ~~α~~ thinking of the whole people--^{there} ~~they~~ may be those among them who will become contrite and Humble. Now doesn't speak like the previous one. Anyone who trusts in the Lord --you think immediately of a But here the contrite and humble may be a ~~descrip~~ description of what they ~~ar-~~ already are. In that sense it would be so much conditional. So that here he says that he guarantees that the contrite and humble ones can have their spirit revived, like _____ ~~α~~ who seems to be nothing, seems to amount to

nothing at all, but he's one who truly trusts the Lord. God is so great; it's not the man who is great--it is God's greatness that insures the fulfillment of the blessing .

And what about verse sixteen? What would you have to say about verse sixteen? Rebuke in verse sixteen? Who is he rebuking? You might say there is a transition ~~kt~~ in it, but ~~it~~ is it a transition to rebuke? But the verse itself, verse sixteen, is promising that God's contention with the nation is not going to be carried on forever. You take the ordinary nation and the nation turns into sin, and God destroys the nation. God brings it to an end. God punishes sin. He contends with the wicked , until the wicked nation is gone. There is nothing left to it. But here he is speaking to Israel, and says He is not going to contend forever with Israel, nor is He always wroth with Israel. God has called Israel for a specific purpose. They are called apart in order that His' words --that the knowledge of God shall be kept alive, in order that the way shall ~~p~~ be prepared ~~f~~ for the coming of Christ. And therefore when the nation of Israel falls into sin , God rebukes them, He chastises them rather than to destroy them. He brings a punishment to them, but there is an end to the punishment. He does not contend forever. Individuals are punished forever. But the nation as a whole does not permanently suffer under God's wrath, because the spirit would fail before Him ... The ~~x~~ purpose which He has in ~~bringing the nations i~~

.... would never be fulfilled ~~that~~ it's His marvelous
 grace that gives them what they do not deserve. There ~~wel~~
 will be a giving of His spirit to a remnant who are of a
 contrite and humble spirit, for the ~~dx~~ carrying on of His
 work. So verse sixteen itself is a verse of blessing. And
 it is a ~~x~~ verse of unconditional blessing. It is not saying
 if you do this, ~~ktx~~ if you turn to God, God will stop being
 angry at you. If you repent, God will not contend with you.
 He is saying that in order to accomplish His purpose it is
 necessary that there be a limit to His contention. Hew will
 not always be wroth, for the spirit would fail and the soul
 ... There would be nothing left to carry on H^I's work if it
 were not for this ~~und~~ unconditional favour, this great, ~~Und~~
 underserved, unmerited favour. And so verse sixteen is a
 verse of unmerited and unconditional blessing. Now what
 about verse seventeen. Is there any sin in verse seventeen.
 But first, is there any rebuke in verse seventeen? Is there
 any blessing in verse seventeen? Yes, that's right. There
 is no blessing in verse seventeen. There is rebuke, and
 the rebuke is not for present sing but for past sins. It is
 an explanation of ~~why~~ punishment has come in the past.
 He is pointing to past sins. And he is pointing to past
 punishment. He says for the iniquity ~~andx~~ of his covetousness
 I was angry and I smote him. And he hid me and was wroth
 and he went on frowardly in the way of his heart. He says
 I sent Israel into exile for their sin, I punished them, I was

B. 5F contd.

angry and they went right on in their sin. He says they did not repent. I saw this and I punished them for their sin, so verse seventeen has past sins and past punishment in mind.

✓ It is not a description of present punishment. And then He says, that He has punished them in the past for their sins, and they have failed to repent. But what does He say in verse eighteen. IN verse ~~eighteen~~ eighteen in the context is a great Am- Armenian verse, saying if man is good enough to turn to God, then God will ~~be~~ bless that man. If man deserves God's goodness ~~but~~ because he repents and turns to God God is going then to bless that man. Is that what verse eighteen says?

Mr. Abbott? Would you read us the fourth ~~verse~~ word in verse eighteen? Read/ us the fourth word in English, please.

Whom do you think he is referring to? (Ans.) Yes, it is/ It ^{reasonable} seems to me to interpret that ~~his~~ his in/ the verse eighteen refers to the man that is coming in verse seven, not ~~to~~ to the discussed in verse thirteen. There is no ^{warrant} ____ (6.10) for ~~is~~ jumping way back. It is saying that this is the condition that I have seen the ways of ~~the~~ the man who repents, but that this is referring to the man just described, the man who has not repented. For that reason it refers to the first, unless you are going someway to give warrant for the complete phrase between ~~verse~~ verse seventeen and eighteen. The verse eighteen is referring to the unrepentant sinner of verse seventeen, the man of whom he said in verse ~~of~~ sixteen that he is not going

/o

B. 50 cont'd.

to contend for ever. They are gone on in sin, but God is not going to contend forever. Despite their sin he ~~says~~ is going to bring, but he says, I have seen his ways, and I am^{go} going to heal him. He says, I have seen his repentance, I have seen his turning away from sin, I have seen his great good/ness.

No, I have seen his evil, and nevertheless, I am going to bring him faith and I am going to lead him, and ~~I~~ I am going to restore comforts ~~to~~ to him and to the ones who with him are in sorrow because of what they have suffered. Here is

surely if taken in(4.65) the context a strongly Calvinistic verse, a ~~✓~~ verse which is strong in the matter of election that God for His purpose is going to heal those who~~are~~ are

going to accomplish His ~~work~~ purposes even though they have not ~~been~~ repented, even though in the^{em} ~~text~~ there is no good thing, there is nothing that he should _____(4.30).

And say, look at these/peoples, why _____ must be good

to them. No, look at these people who are sinners, but ^{wants to use them for His glory, and so He converts them} God ~~is~~ ~~not~~ ~~going~~ ~~to~~ ~~use~~ ~~them~~ ~~for~~ ~~His~~ ~~glory~~ ~~and~~ ~~so~~ ~~He~~ ~~converts~~ ~~them~~ in His own marvellous

goodness grace without any ~~merits~~ ^{goodness} on their part, whatever, even the

goodness of their turning ~~✓~~ away from their sin and putting trust in the Lord. He will enable them to turn away from

sin and _____. Yes, He will compel them to ^{the irresistible grace} recline (4.0)

but it is not because, this is not a conditional verse at all ~~xxx~~ it is ^{surely strong} an unconditional verse ~~of~~ of what God is going to bring, and it will not predict an unconditional/ blessing - how what good thing would any of us be entitled God's marvellous grace which ^{is} described in verse eighteen. If you take a verse eighteen in context, ^{with} the verses sixteen and seventeen, if you take it ~~with verses sixteen~~ with fifteen you might say he is a humble one, a contrite one. Those are the ones He is talking about. But you have two verses in between which make it refer to the ~~of~~ unrepentant one. He is the ^{who} one ^{who} by His irresistible grace ^{in him} compelled ~~xxx~~ goodness and the _____ (3.00) the knowledge of Christ, even though man turns away from God. And so we have two strands. I've heard many ~~people~~ of you were very excellent. And once in our chapel in which ~~wz have~~ an evangelist ~~who~~ ~~said~~ said that God by His marvellous grace converts those whom He delights, whom He chooses _____ ^{so} (2.50), and then he said, who~~ev~~er turns away from~~s~~ sin and turns to the Lord, he will be saved/. And all the Arminians. And he said ~~A~~ actually Calvin should have _____ because Cal~~v~~inism is not a doctrine which _____ ignoes or rejects half of the teaching of ~~of~~ God's marvellous grace and all the _____ / ^{not at all} but Calvin had the attitude of the marvellous unreserved faith. So ^{that} Calvin should ~~have~~

58:14

B 58 contd.

in

REJOICE/both ~~in~~ , ~~and~~ and we should ~~not~~ be just as much

interested in preventing(?) the message that ~~whosoever~~ will
is as any body else _____ .(1.50) God by

His incredible wealth has turned whomsoever he wills.

Both of them are the Scriptural teaching, and both of them are
Calvinism properly understood. And so here we have ~~a~~

that unconditional blessing in verse eighteen, and then in

verse nineteen we have a continuation of God's unconditional

blessing,"I create the fruit of the lips; ..." God says that
unto Him

His word will not return/in ~~void~~ void. The ~~evangelist~~

can preach the message, but it is God that gives the increase.,

it is

Paul plants and Apollos waters, but/God who gives the

increase. I create the fruit of the lips, the lips give the

message, but the fruit/~~is~~ is what God creates. It is a ~~marvellous~~
marvellous

God's ~~creation~~ creation.

58

and
 And so if he says, here is the message. Peace, peace, to him that is far off, to him that is near, saith the Lord, and I will hear. So, it is not limited to any ~~individual~~ race. It is not limited to any group, It is not limited to any background. It is not limited to any type of education. It is the one that is far off and the one that is near. God has meant that it is to all, and God has chosen from every nation, ~~and from~~ every _____, from every class of society, from every type of background, but has chosen those whom He is going to choose. ~~Y~~ God creates the fruit of the lips, peace to him that is far off and to him that is near, and God heals him but the verse twenty, But the unrepentant, the unregenerate those who reject God, the wicked are like the troubled sea, and cannot rest. Verse nineteen, ~~xx~~ and if unconditional blessing, verse twenty, is twenty(?) blessing or rebuke? Mr. Grafton, which ~~do you say~~ it is, blessing or rebuke? Which do you say is verse twenty, Mr. _____?

_____ (13.10)

Verse twenty is strictly and entirely, and completely rebuke. Now rebuke is mostly ~~w~~ither description of sin or declaration of punishment. Which one is verse twenty, Mr. Grafton? Is it description of sin or declaration of punishment? Which ~~is~~ is it? Exactly, it is description of sin it tells what they are like. It does not tell what's going to happen. It is not a punishment, but a description of sin. So, we have four verses in this chapter, which this is one ~~on which it is~~

B. 59

_____ (12.50) verse eleven and twenty-one, which
the is ~~made~~
this is one in which ~~is~~ stressed ~~is~~ not on punishment,
but on description of sin. Yes? (Q) Yes, it ~~describes~~
the unsatisfactory conditions which of course is a punishment.

_____ (12.07)

That the wicked have no peace, They are like the troubled
sea., ~~like the troubled sea~~ whose waters cast up mire and dirt.
There is no satisfaction, there is no continued happiness.

They may have _____ but not happy _____ (11.75)

It is amazing how often you find the statements made by
these people who have what someone may think ~~that~~ is the
greatest pleasures in life, who just indulge in all kinds
of pleasures of life, and people ~~do~~ look at them, and think
that they are on top of the world, and then they come to the
end of their life, and then they ~~are~~ never happy again. They
are just _____. Everything is ashes, and nothing
_____, and they are like the ~~troubled~~ troubled sea,
always looking for something different, ~~get~~
no rest. _____ (11.00)

Sin never satisfies. It is its own punishment, ~~even~~ when
it does not occur. I was just reading Beacon this week
_____ (10.75) ~~it~~ tells in it ~~about~~ about a
man who trained his son to always look out for prophecy,
~~when~~ whatever happens, he was to think of

of everything as a means ~~to~~ getting something for himself, and as a means of getting ~~XXXXX~~ _____ (10,50) And

_____ said ~~there~~ there is only onething unfortunately about this. That as a boy's ^{group} he carried out his father's instructions so faithfully that he had to look out for his father _____

Y:z z(z z)z (10.00)

Well, we didn't get / very far today. ~~xxx~~ We've got / today where we got through last time. What did you say? What did you say? You mean everything we said today is _____ ?

Well, ~~we~~ maybe we had a rapid survey, but I think we probably had a few things today, didn't we? Is that so, yes, yes, Well, the Scripture is inexhaustible. Certainly ^a/tremendous work.....

We looking last time at the fifty-seventh chapter and quite noticing the verses/specifically. Maybe Miss Chung, you could move slight to the right hand, and then you could be the Queen of the _____ Mr. (??????) instead of right front of it. No, not too far. Mr. Curry, that's right....

Yes, that's much better. Now, we were looking at chapter fifty-seven, and we noticed that in chapter fifty-seven we had ~~xxxx~~ several verses ~~which stress~~ stressing the sin of the people, then we had several in which God's punishment for sin is / stressed. We had a quite number / in which ~~and it is~~ there were conditional blessing given, ~~and it is~~

and then three in which unconditional blessings were listed, while at the ~~of~~ very end we got ~~xxx~~ back to the _____ (7.75)

verse twenty

of the sin, and twenty of the Lord's punishment for the sin.

58:1

Then in chapter fifty-eight what do we start with? What is the theme in the first verse? Is it the rebuke or blessing? It is rebuke. And is this the declaration of punishment or description of sin? (A) Yes, ~~it~~ ~~points~~ ~~out~~ ~~the~~ ~~sin~~, it is the condition of sin rather than the punishment God is going to send for you/ in this

58:2

verse. Fine. And then in the second verse of, does the second verse fall under one of these ~~of~~ categories? Mr. Eurajian,

Does it fall under rebuke or does it fall under belssing?

(A) Well, you would'nt get that out of the verse alone, ~~of~~ would you? Never out of that verse. Yes, in ~~relation~~ ~~to~~ ~~what's~~ ~~to~~ ~~follow~~, if it is an introduction to a passage, of rebuke, then it of course becomes a rebuke.

If is is an introductiional passage of blessing it per se

becomes blessing. But as taken just by itself, you have nothing in this verse ~~which~~ ~~shows~~ that ~~it~~ ~~is~~ either blessing or

rebuke. In fact ~~by~~ taking the verse alone you would be more apt to think that it is ~~a~~ blessing rather rebuke, because

he tells what is good about him, and that is the _____ thing (6.08)

whenever you are having a faithful people, and you having an argument with them to discuss something. Find the points

where you can agree with him ~~on~~. Find the points you can praise them on

No. 59 contd.

and start with that and it makes a much better atmosphere in which to
p
point out the points of difference and in this case he calls to show~~n~~ them
their sin but yet he points out the good things about them. They are a
nation that is actually seeking God. (Question) Irony? You meant they
weren't seeking ~~them~~ Him? ~~At~~ The question might be asked How deep~~x~~
their sins... but it does seem to me that he is pointing out their great
emptiness on religious practices--their constant talk~~s~~ about the seeking
the ordinances of justice and about their delight in approaching God,
and their going through the forms that He wanted. Surely that was all
true and He says , "Show them their sin, even though they are a people
who are daily doing the things God has command~~ed~~: offering the sacrifices,
listening to the reading of the Word of God, declaring that they are ~~but~~
God's people, seeming to take delight in approaching to God, even though
all that's true, it is necessary to show them their sins. It would seem to
me that in verse two He's pointing out what's good about them. I don't
want to be dogmatic, but I ~~just~~ just don't quite see the argument. Maybe
you'll have further suggestions later. I'll be much interested to ~~x~~ hear
them. In verse three continue and in verse three let us take the first
half of the verses . What did he say about the first half of the verse?
What would you say about the ~~s~~ first half of verse three? Would you
say the first half of verse three would either rebuke or blessing, not
taking it as an introduction to something but what it is, in itself. Is
~~it~~ it rebuke or blessing, Mr. Grafton? Well, it's more than describing?
Wouldn't you say it's a presentation of a ~~big~~ problem ? A problem is
raised. These people say , "We've fasted . We've performed ...all
the ordinances of religion. We've gone through all these forms. We've

No. 59 contd.

done all these things from our youth up and yet we don't find God's blessings on us. Why should we fast and afflict our souls and then we find that God does not reward us for it. God is not doing anything about it." A problem is presented--a people that are very religious and are carrying out the commands of God and yet are not getting God's blessing. That doubtless was the way they felt after they had come back from their exile and they were back their in the land, and they were doing their best to re-establish their nation, and honouring their God, trying to perform every command in the Pentateuch, and yet they find that they were not getting God's blessing. They are having a little of a people out there on the outskirts of the Persian Empire and they just struggle to keep afloat. And why is this? What is the answer to it? The question of the first half of verse three presents a problem of this matter of fasting? What is the good of fasting if you don't get any reward for it other than this? It's funny that Henry Adams' ~~sp~~ book on _____ and _____, which he just wrote for his friends, but which has been reprinted by the American Institute of Architects (?), that that book is advertised by R. Catholics, because it presents that Adams really believed that the Medieval times was the best time in the history of the world--that was the Golden Age, the time that he described. He discusses all the life ~~for~~ of it and when ~~he discusses it~~, I don't get that impression at all. But here is one thing that interests me. He ~~kept~~ told about back in the 13th century there were the tremendous long lines of wagons with the ~~px~~ French peasants carrying thousands of great stones to build these tremendous cathedrals that you find all over France today. And he tells how the peasants just poured out their energy

No. 59 contd.

and their efforts and their money in building these cathedrals , but he says that the French peasants were very, very practical minded, and he says that they found that in their lives , in their happiness ~~the~~ir was no improvement after the building of these cathedrals. And he said , after all they had done they didn't ~~see~~ get much result in their lives, in their happiness and that they always had a question about the church ever after. They didn't feel that it really had been worthwhile. Now he says that in the first of his book.

No. 60

We do all this for God and what are we getting out of it. You got great, big beautiful cathedrals over there the people from all over the world go to see, but ~~x~~ are the peasants any happier than they were before they built ~~that~~ they built them. Is their lives any better . Now they say, ~~which~~ "We afflict our souls. We fast , but God shows no sign that He is pleased or that He is doing any thing for us. Verse three really is two parts. It seems to me to be much better to put two verses: the first half presents a problem, the second verse gives the answer. The answer which is given is given in the end of verse three is continued into verse four, The answer is , "Behold in the day of your fast you find pleasure and exact all your labour." You go through the form of fasting. You go ^{without} without eating. You ~~k~~ injure your ~~pe~~ pleasure, but ^{on} your ~~x~~ heart is ~~not~~ --your own pleasures, and your own activity, and your own purpose, rather than on God's will. It is lip service to God rather than heart service. And he continues, "Behold you fast for strife and debate

No. 60 contd.

58, 5

and to smite with the fists of wickedness." You should not fast if- as you do this day to make your voice to be heard on high. This is not the way that you are going to reach the Lord. You have a fast and you're just going through a form, and ~~k~~ in the course of the form you have just as much wickedness and hatred as you ever had before. Your heart is no different than it was before. He says, "Is this the fast that I have chosen?" Is it a day that a man afflict his soul, bows down his head as a bulrush and spreads sackcloth and ashes? He goes through certain forms. Is this the thing? Will you call this a fast ~~and~~ - an acceptable day to the Lord. He says, "is ~~the~~ this a fast? He says, "No, if there's not reality to it, it doesn't mean anything. So he is discussing --you might say his big subject is rebuke but still he is discussing the meaning of fasting and what is necessary in fasting to be worthwhile. You can go through national days of prayer and you can have special days when all the stores are closed and everybody remembering the Lord, but it's just a ~~ye~~ form and a time when people continue with the same wickedness, the same fighting, hostility and unChristian ~~attitud-~~ attitude as before. What good does it do.

58, 6

He says ~~there's-~~ is not this a ^{fast} ~~fact-~~ in verse six, this is the fast that I have chosen, to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the ~~oppres~~ oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? when thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh? " Is it does not show ~~its~~ itself in real, decent ~~kind-~~ kindness to other people and the carrying of principles in your activity ~~and~~ as well as in your thought, it means absolutely nothing. He's

60
No. ~~50~~ contd.

not interested in the forms of ~~religi-~~ religion if they don't result in practical improvement ~~and-~~ in your life and in your relation to other ~~peo-~~ peo ple.

(Question) Yes, he is here in these two chapters speaking to the nation as a whole , and the nation as a whole includes many different kinds of people. He speaks about those people who ~~w~~ are Idolaters ~~+~~-who are openly idolaters, but then he speaks more ~~px~~ particularly to those people who are idolaters in their conscience--those people who are going through the form of worship to ~~g~~ God but actually are seeking their own advancement, their own ~~pe-~~ pleasure, their own purposes. The nation ~~k~~ as a whole is a very religious nation. And a nation which is declaring its loyalty to God, and it seems that the sorcery and the idolatry is a comparatively small part, and yet when it is big enough, it deserves a definite rebuke. But the ~~wicked~~ wickedness and the thought-
and
lessness of others/~~seeking one's own advancement~~ all that is verbatim, im-
portant. That is from the _____(9.75). (Q) Yes, yes, yes, the one with the outward show of righteousness if they don't have the inner meaning of it, it's no better ~~th~~. In fact it often seems in our day/~~it's easy~~ to reach
that ~~ier~~ and knows that he is a terrible sinner,
the man who is drunken, to reach the man who is in gross sin, ~~to reach the~~ and
~~know~~ know that there is no hope for him than it is to reach the man who is self-righteous, and who thinks that he is a mighty good fellow, and he thinks that he is very loyal to the Lord, and yet actually not thinking of the welfare of others, and really does not care for others. They are harder to reach. But there are, I believe that we ~~have~~ have here a unified section beginning of the fifty-six which is dealing with the people, probably with the ^{main} emphasis on the

7 1

No. 6- Contd/

PEOPLE after return from the exile, but pointing out the sin of the people, and

at the same time encouraging the righteous, and know that God is not through
with his people, ~~and so there is~~ ^{so} though there is sin among his people, that

God has his own among them, and ~~if~~ God has purchased ^{them} it, ~~if~~, and God is not

going to cast ~~them~~ his people away. Yes? (Q) Yes, that is my impression, too,

that there is a very little of it, after the exile. And if you look ~~at~~ at the two

chapters, you will find no reference in chapter fifty-seven to the people of

Israel in ~~and~~ idolatry, in fifty-eight, I mean. In chapter ~~sixty~~ ^{fifty} six, you

don't find any, and of course that's only four verses, but in ~~fifty~~ ^{be} seven how

much do you find? It seems to me ~~that there is~~ ^{very} in verse five a definite re-

ference to it. And verses five and six ^{we} have a very definite reference to

idolatry. And now if you continue after that, there is a little question ~~and~~ ^{he}

whether ~~it~~ is speaking of ~~the~~ wickedness ~~of~~ in general or whether he is

implying ~~that~~ idolatry, but ~~it~~ there is no specific ~~and~~ mention about it.

Only the two verses seem to be _____ (7.55). And it is generally

> said that after the exile the Israelites never again fell into idolatry. Well,

maybe that's too strong a general statement, but we can certainly say that it

was rare, rare. But the fifth verse does seem to refer to that ^a as/sin which

some of us will _____ (7.10). Enflaming yourselves with idols under

every green tree, Well, every ~~green~~ green tree, does that mean that every

person? or does it mean the person/who ^s ^{are} is guilty of ~~it~~ doing it? _____ (6.75)?

It is only these two verses which really have been SPecifically referred to.

(Q) Yes, compared to that, there is quite a _____. Yes. Now,

that

I am not ready to be dogmatic/ from fifty-seven on he is talking especially to the people after the exile, but I must ~~it~~ say that there is a quite bit of _____

58. (6.45). Now, the ^{eight} ~~fifty-seven~~ then we have this discussion of a fact, and the discussion of the fact involves the rebuke, ~~A~~ so we can say that the first half of the chapter is rebuke, but it is also a discussion of the problems and answers to the problems. It is their sin, and the lack of sincerity in their religious practice^s that results in the not getting the result ~~that~~ they should get from him in God's blessing upon him. But after he finishes this, the last few verses of the section describes what the fasts really ought to be. If they really serve God, they will be interested in the welfare of others and be interested in carrying God's message and carrying God's blessing to others, and then in verse ~~eight~~ ^{eight} he turns to blessing, and ~~for~~ for the rest of this chapter I don't recall that we have any rebuke. The rest of the chapter, in chapter 57, we have mostly rebuke, a brief ~~secto~~ section of blessing toward the end of the chapter, then in 58 we have half of it rebuke and the last half of it is the specific promise of blessing, and the ~~blessig~~ blessing would seem to be introduced in a conditional way. If you ~~trespass~~ fast in concern. If you really put God at the center of your life, then, he said, great blessings are going to come to you, and so probably those ~~is~~ last ~~k~~ seven verses must be ~~ens~~ considered conditional. And what are the conditional blessings he is going to give them? In verse eight, "Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, and thine health shall spring forth speedily; and thy righteousness shall go before thee; the glory of the Lord shall be thy rearguard." This word I'm sure is very confusing to people in America; it occurs quite a ~~g~~ few times in Isaiah. I've heard people read it, thy reward. This is the second reward. Of course it has nothing in the world to do with reward.

No. 60 contd.

It's rear-~~ward~~ward. And ward is the same word as guard. The wa and the gu in the Old English confuse, so we have today the warden and the guardian which both are the same original English words. The protector: the warden or the protector, exactly the same words. Here the rear-ward is the rear guard. The Lord is protecting you from the back, and your righteousness is protecting you from the front, so that here is blessing declared in rather figurative language upon the one who is ~~is~~ really sincerely devoted to the Lord. And verse nine, "Thens~~shalt~~ shalt ~~sho~~thou call, and the Lord shall answer; thou shalt cry, and he shall say, Here I am." He said above in verse three "we fast and thou takest no knowledge. We fast and you don't see." Now he says, if you are sincere in your religious life, he says, you will call and the Lord will answer; you will cry, and He shall say, Here I am. "If you will take away from the midst of thee the yoke, the putting forth of the finger, and speaking vanity;" If you'll do away with these evil practices, "If thou draw out thy soul to the hungry, and satisfy the afflicted soul; then shall thy light rise in obscurity, and thy darkness change to the noon day." Now this coming of light, verse 8 to verse 10, of course is a figure. Definitely they were in figurative ~~dark~~ darkness in figurative light. A ~~good~~ figurative expression. "And the Lord shall guide thee continually," That's a tremendous promise. ~~We can't~~ We can't look for the Lord's guidance if ~~we~~ we don't sincerely follow Him. And the first step in guidance is to make sure we really want to follow the Lord. Don't say, "Lord, which of these shall I do, but let it be this one." Pray that the Lord will show you and be sure before you start, ~~be~~ that you absolutely willing whichever way he leads. It's good to think of different possibilities and think of the ones that are most

No. 60 contd.

advantageous to you; then, make sure you ~~wx~~ are willing to go that way and that's the way the Lord wants you to go. Don't think the Lord necessarily wants you to go ~~to~~ the way that you _____ (2.45) that may not be the way . But the vital thing is to make sure that you yourself ~~is~~ ~~are~~ are willing to go or not go, which ever the Lord wants. And that's the most important thing of guidance, is to get that attitude of mind, you can't expect the Lord to show you if ~~yet~~ you don't get that attitude of mind. And so the "Lord shall guide thee continually, and satisfy your soul in drought, and make fat your bones; and you shalt be like a watered garden, and like a spring of water, whose waters fail not." But now look at this verse twelve, "And they that shall be of thee shall build ~~x~~ the old waste places: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called, the repairer of ~~the~~ the breach, the restorer of paths to dwell in." Does not that α sound ... There is an area (?) of where they are, where there are old waste places, where there are foundations that haven't been used for generations. Does not that fit with the people who have returned from exile and are back in the land , the little group trying to restore to ~~fix~~ it in _____. Now I don't say that it is impossible/with something before the exile. But it certainly α sounds more like the condition after it, than before. I don't think it was written after the exile. I think that Isaiah wrote it before the exile ever came, but I am quite certain that he is thinking particularly of the people who will after that.

B. 61

This verse alone wouldn't prove it ~~ax~~ at all, but I think that this verse looks very definitely in that direction, that other verses, which along with it

B. 61 contd.

seem to me to make it rather definite that Isaiah has in the people after the time of the exile by now when he writes. Well, then, this is the promise He is giving. It is a conditional promise on sincerely following Him. And then verse 13 goes on to another aspect. ~~We have~~ He has spoken about fasting, fasting being done in the right way or in the wrong way. Now he speaks of a related aspect, "If thou turn away thy foot from the sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day." I was--a young fellow ~~x~~ up in Montana, friends up there, and when it came harvest season, they worked just as hard on Sunday as ~~x~~ any other day. And I said, "You work on Sunday, on the Lord's day?" You go out and harvest?" Well he said, "It says in the Bible if your ass fall into the ditch on the sabbath day, pull it out." And if we don't harvest our grain on the sabbath day, we ~~don't~~ wont get enough harvest and the oxen will be starving in the winter, it will be just the same as if they fell in the pit, so we have to work on Sunday. And you can _____ (13) to do away with all observance of the Lord's day, but the Lord meant that for an emergency, if ~~x~~ your ox fall into a ~~x~~ pit on the sabbath day pull him out. You are not to let your animals die because you don't go and take care of them, when emergency comes, but if you can't harvest enough ~~x~~ grant to take care of your cattle through the winter, unless you work on Sunday, then He wants you to get a smaller amount of cattle. Get an amount of cattle that you can take care of with working in the time that will not interfere with your doing the Lord's work. ~~x~~ I heard a story 30 years ago that impressed me very much. We had a student ~~7-a-~~ who had a pastorate in Wildwood, N. ~~x~~ J. He had been there 3-4 years and he told me that in his church there there was a man who had a garage. This man said that he would not open his garage on

B. 61 contd.

Sunday. I go to church Sunday. I spend my Sunday in obeying the Lord, there's no reason I should have my garage open on Sunday. People said to him, what a fool you are. Sunday is when all the people from N. J. and Penna. come crowding down ~~x~~ here to the shore, and you'll get more business on Sunday than you will all the rest of ~~the~~ the week put together. And they said, if you close it up Sunday, the ~~gar~~ other garages will get all your business, and you'll starve. Well, he said, I can't help it, I don't believe that I should have my garage open on Sunday. I'm going to church Sunday. I'm going to devote Sunday to the Lord's work. Business cut down, and it looked as if he was going to fail. And they said, that's ~~was~~ what you can expect. And then a strange thing happened. Then he began to have people coming to him, coming from all over N. J. and bringing their cars for repairs, and pretty soon he was working ten hours a day through ~~6~~ 6 days of the week he had all the business he could possibly do and he was making money way beyond any other garage in town, and he couldn't understand why all these people brought their cars down to him during the week. And so he began asking some of them, "How did you come to come to me?" Well, he said, we were down here on Sunday, when all the garages in the town were open except yours, and they were doing a big business, and they said, "What on earth is this garage closed for?" And the people said, "~~P~~ Oh, he believes he shouldn't have his garage open on Sunday, so he closes it; He's probably going bankrupt." These people said, "If he is so interested in his religion, that he is willing to loose all that money, rather than open his garage on Sunday, that's probably an honest man that we could trust to do the work that he says that he will and do it right. So they began crowding

B. 61 contd.

down there during the week. And in that case, the Lord gave him much more money as a result of his loyalty to Him ~~that~~ than he ever would have done otherwise. Now, of course the Lord wont always do that. And if we do that with that purpose in mind, we certainly can't count on Him doing it. It's not a way to make money to carry out the Lord's will, but the Lord does call upon us to put His will first, and if we put His will first, most people wont suffer for it. Some cases He wasn't us to glorify Him and show Him ~~wx~~ how willing we are to suffer for His cause. So here He says, "If you turn away your foot from doing your pleasure on my holy day and call the sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable;" Oh my, here comes that sabbath again; ~~you~~ we can't do anything but sit around and mope. Call it a delight--the day when you are enjoying the service of the Lord, and ~~hou-~~ "honour Him, not doing your own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking your own words; then you shall delight yourself in the Lord; and I will cause you you to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed you with the heritage of Jacob your father ; for the mouth of the Lord ~~has~~ ~~hathx~~ spoken it." Here he felt that this ~~w~~ould seem so illogical that He's got to put in a special word ~~seal~~ that God puts his ~~shield~~ upon him. You must believe that God has declared it. All of it is what God has declared. He especially put this here that you may understand ~~tht~~ that God is going to ~~bel-~~ ~~bles~~ you if you will follow ~~Hw~~ His will in relation to those things that He wants set aside for Him. . I'm not at all sure that in the beginning of chapter ~~of~~ 59 is in the right place; I am sure that in the middle of 59 there is a far more important division ~~than~~ the there is either at the ~~g~~ beginning or ending of chapter, ~~thx~~ but I wouldn't be at all surprised if the passage of blessing in 58 that ends in v. 12 should ~~it~~ be the end of the chapter, ~~but I wouldn't be at all surprised~~ and then the 59 starts

B. 61 contd.

two verses earlier. It would seem much more reasonable to me, because you have ~~h~~ you have your rebuke and then your blessing, in 57, and then your rebuke and then your blessing in 58, and then you have these two verses starting a new subject, you might say, though it is a continuation of the blessing, in relation to the sabbath. So maybe if it is a continuation of the blessing, the division isn't so bad. ~~But~~ But now you start your third section of rebuke with the beginning of 59, and here we have this rebuke ~~ata-~~ again at the beginning of 59. Well, the first verse actually isn't rebuke or blessing, it fits in; it's an introduction, which is one or the other, and it couldn't be either one. Behold the Lord's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save; neither his ear ~~h~~avy, that it cannot hear:" you just wait for the time of the Lord and you will find that He gives you great blessing. Verse one could be introduction to a passage ~~k~~ of blessing, very easily, but here it is an introduction to a passage of rebuke. The Lord's hand is not shortened that it cannot save, neither his ear heavy, that it ~~ca~~nnnot hear. It's not on account of ~~the~~ something wrong with the Lord, but of you that you don't get the blessing. It's rebuke~~k~~ parallel to rebuke in verse three of chapter 58. Wherefore, we fasted and the Lord doesn't see. The ~~Lord's~~ Lord's hand is not shortened that it cannot save; it's your iniquities, verse two says, that have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you, that he will not hear. The answer to the problem is given, "here we are--why isn't God blessing us; why aren't we making further head way." Well, it isn't ~~tax~~ that God isn't strong. It isn't that God can't do it. People say, "What's the point of this. It isn't bringing us anything. We aren't

59:2

B. 6 contd.

getting any good out of it. Well, he says, it isn't that God is any less able to bring you good ~~an~~ than he was before. But it's because you are the cause of the lack of His blessing. Your iniquities have separated you from Him;

59:3 "your hands are defiled with blood, and your fingers with iniquity; your lips have spoken lies, your tongue hath muttered perverseness." The hands defiled with ~~th~~ blood certainly doesn't mean that everyone was a murderer there, by any means, but it ^{may} ~~does~~ mean that there was bloodiness among them, and the others ~~s~~ were not doing anything about it--they were putting up with it; they were allowing it to go on. We have the silly attitude that is taking now-- a days that if a murder is committed, that we have more sympathy for the murderer than for the one who is murdered. After all, the ~~mf~~ murdered one is dead, what could you do about them? But here's the one who did the deed; and probably it was the result of his upbringing or due to some psychological complex, and we want to find out what it is and feel ~~k~~ sorrow for him and make over him and never think of punishing him for it, but ~~he~~ the Lord says that our hands are bloody when we tolerate bloodiness without cleaning it out from among us; your hands ~~ax~~ are defiled with blood and your fingers with iniquity. Your lips have spoken lies and your tongue hath muttered perverseness." None

59:4 calls for justice, nor any pleads for truth." Now, of course, this is rhetorical language. There were certainly some who ~~pe~~ plead for truth, but they were in the minority. They were very few among the people. Maybe when someone spoke up strongly others would fall in line, but there weren't many ~~ax~~ who would take the ~~initia~~ initiative. "They trust in vanity, and speak lies; they conceive mischief and bring forth iniquity." This is all description of sin. He is not here describing the current punishment. He is describing the sin. Verse six

B. 61 contd.

59:6

goes on to punishment. "Their webs shall not become garments, neither shall they cover themselves with their works:" But then there's punishment at the

beginning of six but at the end of it is further description of the sin. "their works are works of iniquity, and the act of violence is in their hands, their feet run to evil, and they make haste to shed innocent blood, their thoughts are thoughts of iniquity; wasting and destruction are in their paths. The way

59:8

of peace they do not know; there is no judgment in their goings: they have made them crooked paths: " up to here is sin again, then punishment, "whosoever goeth therein shall not know peace." So all this up to here is the description of sin and the punishment--occasional touches on the punishment are _____.

59:9

then in verse nine, it turns into a first person, and when you change a first person to a third person, you want to stop and think, "Is this a division? Is this a different section? But here you find that the same subject is involved exactly, so that it is not a different section--simply a different way of saying exactly the same thing. "Therefore is judgment far from us, neither doth justice overtake us: we wait for light, but behold obscurity; for brightness, but

we walk in darkness. " The punishment is here as a result of sin, and it is described in the first person by those who are suffering; the whole nation is

59:10

suffering, including the godly. We grope for the wall like the blind, we grope like we had no eyes: we stumble at noon day as in the night; we are in desolate places as dead men. We roar all like bears, and mourn sore like doves: we look for judgment, but there is none; for salvation, but it is far from us." The

description of the punishment of the situation --there just isn't anyone in the land ~~deery~~ describe their condition and then point out ~~te~~ the result

59:12

of their sin." For our transgressions are multiplied against us" Here's the

B. 61 contd.

sin that caused it. "And our sins testify against us: for our transgressions are with us ; and as for our iniquities , we know them," in transgressing and lying against the ~~Lord~~ Lord and ~~lying~~ departing away from our God, speaking oppression and revolt, conceiving and uttering from the heart words of falsehood. And judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off: for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter. Yea, truth faileth; and he that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey."period. There should be the end of the verse, the end of a section, and I don't know how it came ~~about~~ - about that verse 15 was made in one verse. Certainly it is completely ~~erroneous~~ erroneous. Verse 15 is certainly the last verse of one paragraph and the ~~first~~ first ~~of~~ verse of another combined into one verse. . . . the ~~of~~ verse divisions are put in such a way as to leave them together in one verse.

62
B. 62

di

And so here we ~~are~~ have a very important/vision. We have the divisions here between first we have the rebuke and then blessing, verses, chapter fifty-seven. Fifty-eight, rebuke, first half of the question/^{is} just like that. Fifty-nine ~~is~~ rebuke up to the middle of verse 15. And then we go on to show the marvellous ^{that} acts ~~of~~ the Lord is going to do including the great blessings he is going to bring, and this passage which is also a prediction of God's marvellous acts of blessing ~~to~~ come runs through the end of fifty-nine all through sixty/ sixty-one, and sixty-two and ~~of~~ parts of the the sixty-three, all that is blessing. ~~And that is blessing.~~

We have set three sections, rebuke all by a little bit, rebuke all but seven verses, rebuke all by three chapters. And this makes ~~a~~ one unit, which ~~is~~ ends in the ^{section} course of chapter sixty-three. Now where does this ~~chapter~~ end in ch sixty-three?

⁶²
B. 52 cont*d.

Well, we begin chapter sixty=three, Who ~~s/~~ is this that cometh from Edom,
with dyed garments from Bozrah? ... Wherefore art thou red ~~in thine apparel~~...

I have trodden the winepress ~~alone, and of the people there~~ This is a
picture of description of something God does / through verse six, and then
says,

verse seven, I will mention the lovingkindnesses of the Lord... Certainly
that is not the same I in verse six where the Lord says, I will tread down the people

~~of the world~~ in mine anger... There is a sharp break between ~~verse~~ six and
seven of chapter sixty-three. In fact it is the most important break between

chapter fifty-seven and sixty-six. It is the major break in this section.
~~From~~ running

We have a main section of the ~~L~~ book. From fifty-six nine to sixty-three
six, one major section. Then we have another major section from sixty-three
to
seven ~~through~~ the end of the book. And it is very unfortunate that the chapter
divisions have been placed as it is, because it obscures that, and makes it
difficult for people to realize the fact that you have a unity ~~of~~ here to study together
from chapter fifty-six nine to sixty-three six, and then you have another unit
to study together, sixty-three seven to the end of the sixty-six. And so we
of these three
want to study each ~~unit~~ as a separate unit. And the first of these units ~~is~~

has ~~rebuks~~ as we have noticed rebuke followed by a _____ ~~is~~ (12.00)
fifty-six seven to the end of sixty-six, then rebuke followed by seven verses

_____, and then rebuke follows by a long passage, describing the marvellous
things that God is going to ~~do~~ do in relation to His people which runs from the
middle of the verse sixteen in chapter fifty-nine up until the end of the verse
~~teen~~
six of chapter ~~fi~~ sixty-three. When you look at this section then, naturally

our methods of interpretation are going to be quite different from what they have
for
been ~~from~~ in what we have been looking, and they will be quite different again

63:1-6
63:7
7

when we get through the later sections of the chapter sixty-three. Your methods ~~methods~~ are going to be quite different, because ^{we} now ~~we~~ are dealing entirely with the blessings that third ~~passage/of~~ the blessing, that long passage of the blessing in which God looks forward to the future, and tells what he is

And going to do. / Here we have started in the middle of verse fifteen, / and the Lord saw it, and it displeased him 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 unto him; and his righteousness, it sustained him. For he put on righteousness as a breastplate, and an helmet of salvation upon his head; and he put on the garments of vengeance for clothing, and was clad with zeal as a cloke. According to their deeds, accordingly he will repay, fury to his adversaries, recompence to his enemies; to the islands he will repay ~~recomp~~ recompence. So shall they fear the ~~name~~ name of the Lord from the west, and his glory from the rising of the sun.

There is the end of that particular section. Verse fifteen middle of the verse to the middle of ~~the~~ nineteen, there is a section which describes the intervention of the Lord. Yes, Miss Chung? (Q) Fifty-nine. Yes, how many of you have in mind? We are now in fifty-nine. I am ~~taking~~ taking this part from the middle of the fifty-nine to the middle of the sixty-three, and starting to look into the first portion, and the first portion of it which I've just read was fifty-nine fifteen the last half ~~of~~ nineteen the first half, and that section you ~~noticed~~ noticed describes the marvellous intervention of God which is coming, but it is an ~~intervention~~ intervention which is to be on His power alone. He saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no intercessor: therefore his arm brought salvation ~~unto him~~ this alone. And s of He did ~~act~~ ~~the~~ / What did he do? He did act ~~the~~ / ~~vengeance~~ vengeance, he brought vengeance, according to their deeds, accordingly he will repay, fury to his adversaries recompence to his enemies; to the islands he will repay re=

59:15b

14

the
 compence. He had on/garments of vengeance for clothing, and , and was clad
 with zeal as a cloke. Well, we have this section then from fifty-nine to middle
 of fifteen to the middle of nineteen, and you notice what the main theme of this
 section is. Now we have noticed that the large section here runs from ~~fifty~~
 fifty-nine fifteen to sixty-three six. Let's look at the very end of the section,
 at sixty-three now, chapter sixty-three verse one, and see if you find any thing
 similar to the passage we've just a minute looked at. What do you find? Who
 is this that comes from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah? this that is
 glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength? I that speak in
 righteousness, mighty to save. Now we look back to fifty-nine sixteen, it says,
 And he saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no intercessor:

Therefore his arm brought salvation unto him; and his righteousness, it sustained
 him. ~~What a remarkable parallel!~~ with
 him. Is not there a parallel? This one coming from Edom is/dyed with/ garments
 ... I that speak in righteousness, might^y/to save. Now that one we read back
 there was clothed with/garments of vengeance, clad with zeal as a cloke.

What do we read in sixty-three? Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and
 thy garments like him that treadeth in the winefat? I have trodden the winepress
 alone; and of the people there was none with me/ ~~He is coming alone - para so.~~
 - He is coming for vengeance-
 anger, and trample them in my fury;/and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my
 garments, and I will stain all my raiment. For the day of vengeance is in mine
 heart, and the year of my redeemed is come. He is coming alone for vengeance,
 a
 _____ (7.03) clad with the garments of vengeance, ~~And~~ And I looked,
 and there was none to help; and I wondered that there was none to uphold: there-
 fore mine own arm brought salvation unto me; and my fury, it upheld me.

Verse five, look at the close parallel to verse fifty-nine verse sixteen, And

he saw that there was no man, and wondered ~~about~~ that there was no intercessor; therefore his arm brought salvation unto him; and his righteousness, it sustained him.

What a remarkable parallel! I will tread down the people in mine anger, and will make them drunken in my fury, and ~~wildly~~ make them in my fury, and I will bring down their strength to the earth. Then you go right on out to mention

(?)
the loving kindness of the Lord without a ~~sharp~~ sharp break. This is the main break in our last part of the verse is right there. And the last part of this you will have to look at before the end of the semester, but for the present let us confine ~~us~~ ourselves to the section through chapter ^{verse} six. Now you notice how this section, from 59:15 through chapter 63:6 begins with a ~~describe~~ description of the coming of the Lord for judgment, clad with the garments of vengeance,

coming alone, because there is ~~no~~ no one else to do this that must be done. This act of vengeance He does. Well, that is a picture ~~of~~ ^{at} the beginning of the passage; it is the picture at the end of our passage. It's good to look at these two comparatively together ~~to~~ to see what further light you can get on the ^{similarities} ~~similarities~~ of these two passages. ~~And it would be good to look at~~

~~at these two~~ Certainly it's striking. I doubt if you take either one of these passages, I doubt if you would find any other passage in the whole Bible that is half as close a parallel as ~~to~~ you find in the other one of the two. ^{There's} ~~They~~ are a remarkable parallel between those two passages. Now I ask this question, If we have a section here ~~in chapter~~ --this makes part of two; this is 59 here to 63--and this section here starts with a section here and has an ending which is very similar, do you think it likely that he have, what I call it envelope; in other words, as you go on and if you would have your first part last and make ~~your~~ your next to the last and then worm (?) a little which you might say is all deductive (?) That is what impressed me as I studied the

Σ

B. 62 contd.

passage some years ago, to leave a structure of this passage; I called it an envelope structure, because the two ^{ms} are the same and then two next are the same and then the two next and then one in the middle. Well, now, I just told that as a suggestion for your consideration, but I don't think that anyone can doubt that the first and the last part are remarkably parallel. Well then, let's look at the second part and the part that is next before the last.

What is the second one here--start with verse nineteen. "When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against ~~h~~ him. And the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord. As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord; My spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's ~~and~~ seed, ~~nor out-~~ saith the Lord, from henceforth and forever." There is a passage in ~~it~~ which we are told that the Redeemer is going to come to Zion and turn away; and unto to them that turn ~~for~~ from transgression and Jacob, the Spirit of the Lord is going to lift up a standard and going to make a covenant with God's own people. Well, we've looked at the beginning of 63 ~~with~~ that's parallel to the first part of this. Now we've looked at the second. Let's look at what's

59:19b-21

just before ~~this in 63~~ the beginning of 63. Look at verse 10 of ~~63~~ 62.

"Go throught, go through the gates; prepare ye the way of the people; cast up, cast up the highway; gather out the stones; ~~He~~ lift up a standard for the ~~per-~~ people. Behold, the Lord hath proclaimed unto the end of the world, Say ye to the ~~daughter~~ daughter of Zion, Behold, ~~they~~ thy salvation cometh; behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him. And they shall call the m, The holy people, the redeemed of the Lord; and thou shalt be called, Sought out, a City not forsaken.

62:10, 12

B. 62 contd.

God is going to return to His people. He's going to ~~bring~~ bring great blessing to His people. He's going to raise up a standard among them. ~~They are~~ God wants His marvelous blessing coming to His own specific people. Now I wish you would compare these two and also look at the section between and see if the figure of the envelope that I gave works out. And I would like you to first make a very careful study in the Hebrew of the ~~the~~ last half of verse nineteen of chapter 59. Chapter 59, verse 19, "When the enemy ~~the~~ shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard ~~agaemst-~~ against him." & Very simple, isn't it; you could put it right back into Hebrew perhaps. You get the American Standard Version which Cr. _____, president of Moody Bible Institute, and many other Bible teachers, think is greatly precedent (?) over King James. You get that version and read ~~what~~ what it does with that ~~the~~ verse. Now if you don't know ~~the~~ where to get a hold of that, get most any _____ and see what it does, and see if it does what the King James does to it. I'd like you to look in at least one other translation ~~the~~ of the last half of verse nineteen, and see how different ~~the~~ it is from what you have here. Then, look at the Hebrew and study the Hebrew and see what you think ~~the~~ is right. Try to ~~the~~ get a determination of what is the correct interpretation of this Hebrew, and there you may look at the commentaries, what ever you feel is important or apt to be most important.

B. 63 contd.

Ye Do you find anything parallel to that later on? Miss Luke? Of course it speaks here about the garments being sprinkled with blood and stained, whereas the other ~~place~~ place speaks of the garments of vengeance, and that ~~even~~ certainly seems somewhat parallel. And then of course over here it does speak a lot of vengeance, "I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury;" the idea of vengeance ~~of ve~~ is there and also the idea of righteousness, as Miss Luke points out. So you have ~~every-~~ thing that we ~~have~~ have looked at so far has had a parallel over in 63, and there's a little bit here that wasn't specifically mentioned, specific reference to breast-plate and helmet, and over there was a little more detail about the blood and so on, but certainly very close similarity, and

59:18 also about coming from Edom and Bozrah, etc. Now, you continue in 59:18 "According to their deeds, accordingly he will repay, fury to his adversaries, recompence to his enemies; to the islands he will repay recompense." Any-

63:6 thing parallel to that over that; anything parallel to verse 18? Did you find that, Miss Luke? Yes, 63:6 very specifically. 63:6 "I will tread the people in mine anger, and make them drunk in my fury, and I will bring down their strength to the earth." Speaking of the peoples. It would seem to be rather parallel to this. Then, of course, in 59:18 you had refer-
Palestine
ence to the islands, which seem to go beyond ~~the time~~. You don't have anything specific in 63 . . . by going beyond Palestine, but you ~~ea~~ certainly have the idea of fury and recompense to his enemies. Well, then you continue

59:19 in 59 and you read in verse 19. "So shall they fear the name of the Lord from the west, and His glory from the rising of the sun. " We find the parallel to verse 18 in verse ~~18~~ 6 of 63. Do we find the ~~part~~ parallel in verse 19 in

B. 63 contd.

verse 7. How many think we do? I think that's very ~~import~~ important to notice, that in 63:7 we seem to be starting an entirely new section. "I will mention the loving kindnesses of the Lord, and the praises of the Lord, according to all that the Lord hath bestowed on us." It's a new section altogether. It's the major break in our last part of the book. The most important ~~k~~ division. So we have found that our section then which started with 59:15b came along and ~~α~~ paralleled 63:1ff until verse 18 paralleled verse ~~16~~ 6 which is the last verse of that section. So we have the section from 59:15b to 18 paralleling what follows what is in 63:1-6, very striking. And this section you might say is an envelope structure then. This section ~~wh~~ which is the general ~~bx~~ rebuke section is ended for the present. There's no rebuke in our ordinary sense here. No pointing out of sin and declaring God's punishment for it. It's a new type of thing altogether, more like ~~v~~ blessing, but not strictly blessing~~px~~ blessing and prediction of the future. This section running from the middle of 59 to the middle of 63, and in this section it starts and ends with very similar parallel passages. So I say it's like an envelope. There's this at the beginning; this at the end, and then a lot of stuff in the middle. Now, what's at the beginning?: I want to know how far this section at the beginning goes that's parallel with the 63:1-6. Does it exclude verse 19. My Bible, for instance, has a ~~pra~~ paragraph marked at verse 20. Here you'll think that 15--it has a paragraph marked also at verse 16, which is clearly wrong, the paragraph should be in the middle of 15, not at 16. ~~W bxx~~ But what about this one at the beginning of 20. Should it be there? If so, then verse 19 goes with what precedes it. And if verse 19 goes with what precedes, then

B. 63 contd.

that means that verse 18--verse 18 and 19 , if they go with what precedes , then it should have a parallel over here in this section. Well, of course it might not. The ~~w~~ two sections might overlap and yet it might ~~be~~ ^{go beyond.} -----

So if it has no parallel here, it doesn't prove it must go beyond necessarily,

but if it has a parallel, it would seem to ~~x~~ prove it, and do you find a parallel?

59:19

The idea here of 59:19, "So shall they ~~w~~ fear the name of the Lord from the west, and his glory from the rising of the sun." That is a tremendous state-

ment, which could very well be the conclusion of our statement previously about these tremendous things He is going to do. ~~But~~ But is ~~it~~ it a part

of the same paragraph? Well, if it is , you will have added proof of it if you find the same sort of statement in 63:1-6. Do you find any parallel

to it? I don't see any, I would be interested if any of you see any? But of course then , if you have a ~~pre~~ parallel in the --what follows is a new

section. You don't look for a parallel in what follows. You look but you don't find any, because it's a different section. How about what precedes.

Is there any parallel to it in that? "So shall they fear the name of the Lord from the west, and His glory from the rising of the sun." Is there any

parallel to that ~~?~~ in the verses immediately preceding chapter 63? I doubt if there's in 12 but I wonder about 11, "Behold , the Lord hath proclaimed

62:11

unto the end of the world." That shows the Lord's message going out , doesn't it, to the west and the east. I'm not sure whether that's a parallel

or not, but it strikes me that it might be. Yes, Well, one thing we want to guard against is letting the word ^{"so"} ~~sow~~ be disregarded. The ordinary

usage of the word ^{so} sow is , as a result of this , something is going to happen.

Sow ..will reap. But I don't think we have in the Hebrew a proof that it

B. 63 contd.

necessarily is , it might ~~k~~ be so ~~be-se be-se~~ because of what I'm now going to ~~ge~~ tell you. Now it ~~eu~~ could ~~k~~ very well come after that , but I'm not 100% sure it will. It's difficult to pass a judgment on verse 19, because we ~~w~~ have ~~n~~'t looked at the last part of it yet and examined its translation.

59:19
w.
But now look at the first part of nineteen. Mr. Abbott questions that it is parallel to what precedes and indeed we don't seem ~~k~~ ~~k~~ to find any very close parallels to it, but how about the last part. Do you find any parallels

62:1
w.
Other with ~~what~~ anything in 63 or in the latter part of 62. Verse 10. In verse 10 we say "lift up a standard for the people." ~~na~~ and in 59:19 it says the "Spirit of the Lo d shall lift up a standard against him." That suggests perhaps a certain parallel there. Now, that of course is if that is if you take it as it is in the KI^Ng James and there is no other translation that I can reason (?) that takes it that way. They all seem to take it in a

59:20
w.
different way. Well, before ~~x~~ looking at 19, lets look at 20 for a minute. What about the beginning of 20? "And the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord~~x~~."

Do you find anything ~~x~~ parallel to that in 63 or in the last part of 62?

62:11
w.
Don't you think that verse 11 has an even closer parallel. "Say to the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy salvation cometh...and they will call them the redeemed of the Lord." Verse 20 here "the Redeemer ~~so~~ shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob." Surely this is a very close parallel between verse 20 and the last part of ~~62~~- 62. Then

59:21
w.
look at verse ~~20~~ 21. "As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord: My spirit that is upon thee~~n~~, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, ~~nor~~... from henceforth and for ever." Well, that seems to parallel, doesn't it? They will call them the holy people, the redeemed of the Lord, sought~~,~~ out,

a city not forsaken. ¶ Surely that quite parallels to "The Lord's word will not depart from them forever." So we have two verses, twenty and twenty one--we have a very striking parallel to 20 and 21 in verses 11 and 12. Now verse 19, if you take it as the King James has it, the lifting up of a standard would be an interesting parallel to verse 10 before, wouldn't it? It would be an interesting parallel, if you take that. More than that, see how it starts, "When the enemy comes in like a flood, the Spirit of the lifts up a standard against him, and the Redeemer comes to Zion."

62:11-12
 Look at "Go through, go through the gates; prepare ¶ ye the way of the people; cast up, cast up the high-way; gather out the stones; lift up a standard for the people. ¶ Behold, the Lord hath proclaimed unto the end of the world." Surely there is a remarkable parallel, so that ~~if~~ we have an

envelope structure in having the section with which this whole part begins, closely paralleled to the beginning of 62, but then you look at verses

59:20-21
 62:11-12
 20 and 21 and they are closely ~~paralleled~~ ^{paralleled} to the last two verses of 62. But

we're not so dogmatic ~~about~~ that verse 19 parallels verse 10 over there, but the two following verses raises a question, ~~and each raises a question~~

and each mentioning a standard as ¶ it stands in the King James seems to carry that on a bit further. I suggested that you have in 59:15b ff God's sovereign in a position to overthrow His adversaries, and you have again in 63:1-6 God's sovereign ¶ in a position to overthrow His adversaries.

Then possibly you have in 59 after that a banner is raised and a Redeemer comes to Zion, and then at the end of 62 the banner is raised and the Redeemer comes to Zion. There's the possibility then of a parallel. A, B, then a long passage, and then B, A.

B. 64

I suggest then the possibility that the very ~~α~~ last part of 59 and the end of 62 might be called a "banner is raised, and the Redeemer comes to Zion." Now the matter of the banner being ~~questi~~ raised might be questioned, but the Redeemer coming to Zion which is in both of them, there is certainly no question about it at all. So you have the ^{SAND TIMER} envelope. You have at the beginning of it, God sovereign interposition to overthrow His enemies. Next you have a Redeemer comes to Zion, possibly introduced by a banner is raised. It's very interesting structure of ~~lx~~ this passage. Now we ~~know~~ notice then the similarities. God's sovereign inter-position with power to destroy them begins this section, ends the section of blessing. Then right after ~~k~~ He tells about it, He tells about the Redeemer coming to Zion and just before He again tells us about his interposition to -- ~~power~~ ~~power~~ against His adversaries, He then tells about the great blessing of the Redeemer coming to Zion. Well then, we have a question about verse 19. Is verse 19 part of the first section or is it a part of the second section, or do you divide it in the middle, half going with the first and half going with the second. And, is the last half of nineteen to be translated the way the King James Version translates it or is it ~~α~~ to be translated the way all the modern versions translates. What modern versions do you have available, today. I didn't bring one with me. You see how the R.S.V. is almost identical with the American Standard, for He will come, they will say, and the other says, "When the enemy shall come in." Now there's a difference. Well, first, it just says, He will come, the other says, the enemy will come. There's a vital difference. But they both say Come, don't they. Only one says, come in and the other says Come. Which is correct? Come, or Come in? I ordinarily think...our English Come means motion in our direction, The Hebrew doesn't tell the direction. 127 is come or go, so Come, since

B. 64 contd.

it means our direction, perhaps it isn't really inaccurate, but come in is a little better, Come in or enter. Now, the King James says it is ~~He~~ he, it is ~~an~~ the enemy, it tells us who is going to come. Now the other, He will ~~not~~ come. Who is He?

— There's nothing in the verse to suggest that He is talking about an enemy, as it ~~says~~ stands in the American Standard--the first part of the verse is just about identical with the King James. This first part of the verse has nothing about an enemy in it. So that the He would have to represent either the Lord or the glory of the Lord, wouldn't it? ~~Because~~ Because the verse says that they shall fear the name of the Lord--it can't be the they. The ~~name~~ name of the Lord, from the west, and his glory from the rising of the ~~sun~~ sun. When he shall come, that might be ~~the~~ the name of the Lord; it might ~~not~~ be the glory of the Lord, it might be the Lord, but certainly it's the same thing, whether it's the Lord ~~or~~ or the Lord's glory.

— For He will come as a rushing stream which the breath of the Lord driveth. Now that is, according to the interpretation of the ASV, simply a continuation of the first part of the verse; in fact, a continuation of the whole section. (Question) Yes, I don't see what else it could be, except the Lord or the glory of the Lord or the name of the Lord. I see no other possibility in the context. Well now to say the name of the Lord or the Lord comes like a ~~rushing~~ rushing stream which the breath of the Lord drives would be rather strange to say the Lord comes like the breath of the Lord drives. Don't you think? (Q) This is perhaps methodologically bad to ask, which makes the best sense, because what we're interested ~~in~~ in, is what are the possible interpretations of the word, what can ... But just from the viewpoint of sin, I must say the ASV and the RSV seem to me to raise problems. They don't seem to sound extremely sensible to me. (Q) It seems rather ~~strange~~ strange that the Lord is like something the Lord drives. (Q) The Lord comes in like a stream that the Lord's breath drives. Maybe it's sensible but it does

B. 64 contd.

seem rather peculiar to compare the great God to merely something that God
compare Him to as an instrument.
makes new. / something that He uses / You might say that this stream came with
all the force as if it were the Lord coming ; it was such a tremendous thing, you
would almost think God ~~would~~ was attacking you. But to say God attacks, ~~just~~
just as if a stream was coming that God would make Him come. It seems to ~~be~~
me a pretty _____ kind of thinking. Now, I don't say it's impossible. (Q)
Yes, He came in like a flood. That would seem very sensible, but God coming
like a flood that God drives, it seems as if you are trying to illustrate God by
merely something God produces as an instrument. If you left out the last part
it wouldn't be so bad. He comes in like a rushing flood. God comes in like
a flood, which the breath of God makes . It seems a crazy thing ~~to~~ to put that
in. Now, that's not saying it couldn't happen. But when we cannot tell what
the Bible means, by what seems to us to make sense, but if what we read
~~doesn't~~ doesn't make sense, then we have a special ~~real~~ reason to examine
carefully and make sure that that is what _____ before we _____ And here we
have this tremendous whole context about God sees there's no intercessor and
God --His arm brings salvation for Him and He puts on righteousness and he
brings fury to his adversaries and recompense to his enemies, so shall they
fear the name of the Lord from the West and His glory from the rising of the
~~sun~~ sun, because He comes like a rushing stream which His own breath drives.
It seems like a anti-climax ~~to~~ to me. You have such a vivid ~~pic~~ picture of
Him coming before , a picture of a man-an ~~arm~~ armed man ~~to~~ God is compared
to that. Then to compare Him to a stream which the breath of the Lord drives.
Well of course they say, which the wind of the Lord drives. It seems like an
anti-climax to the passage rather than really enlarging , extending of the passage.

B. 64 contd.

Well, now, the vital thing now isn't what sense it seems to make, but what is there solid that you ~~a~~ can stand on/. Well that Come is there, there's no question of come. We might underline come. Then as a rushing stream or like a flood, we agree on that, don't we. Like a stream, or as a flood, Is there any problem on that? (Q) Yes, but the as a stream or as a flood, that seems to be quite definite --there's no disagreement between _____.

ççç _____ like a river. The word river of course is -can be a flood.

IN modern English it isn't quite the same. River is perhaps a little better.

(Q) Yes, it's ~~xv~~ often used in King James English for a river. But it doesn't mean like in Noah's time. The enemy comes in just like a river rushing down.

The ~~px~~ picture before like this about the Lord putting on righteousness ~~and~~ and-- as helmet and _____, it comes like a river.

It doesn't seem to be a natural figure. For that is supposed to be a comparison, the figures like an army man. But the life is definitely to be _____ as words(4.53) and like a stream, or a little _____ river _____ exactly the same thing in _____ as a stream of flood. Now we have the difference/ ASV says,

when the enemy shall come in/ like a flood, while the Revised version, the Aermican and RSV Standard ~~Version/and/~~ say, that, he will come as a rushing stream. Now, does the, ~~And~~ where ~~do~~ do the others get the enemy? where ~~the~~ do they get the enemy? They both get it from the same word, don't they?

And the word, רש (Heb. Now, which word ~~w~~ does רש mean? Does this What did you say? narrow, yes, well, mean rushing? Now, the adversary, ~~is~~ plural. ~~is~~ It is the ~~the~~ definite meaning

for the ~~plurak~~ word, isn't it? Yes, that is the very common meaning. Here I have the Englishmen/s Hebrew Chaldee Concordance, and here we have רש as enemy, we've got a column in two thirds, and ~~we~~ we have ^{maybe} hundred cases for this word,

is

is used for enemy, or adversary, so there is no question ~~as to what~~ ^{but} what the word can mean enemy or adversary. That certainly is a possible meaning for the word. And so that the word enemy is perfectly all right, either enemy or adversary, the only ~~thing~~ thing is that the King James says the enemy. The enemy is all right, but it would be more literal to say an enemy for there is no article. When an enemy shall come ~~like~~ like flood, there is now, do you see any reason why that part of the p verse ~~cannot~~

may not be translated as the King James has. How about the ~~word~~ ^{with} order of the word?

What do you mean the נחש? But is there any thing wrong ⁱⁿ when he shall come ~~like~~ like flood an enemy in Hebrew? As far as Hebrew is concerned, you can

have your subject ~~after~~ after your verb. The verb is usually after the word. When shall come in an adversary. It comes after the verb. Now between the subject and ~~verb~~ verb, you can put in a comparison like this. There is nothing wrong with that.

As far as the Hebrew is concerned, the order does not prove against it. Now, of course,

the way the others take it, ~~the~~ ^a rushing stream, they take נחש as modifying נחל

(nahhaar) as ~~an~~ adjective. ~~Subha~~ Subh an adjective is perfectly possible to follow. If we you had an article with it, it couldn't, because it must agree

in definiteness, it must agree in number, ~~and agree in gender~~, they both agree

IN gender, they are both masculine, indefiniteness adjective ~~and~~ modifying _____.

It can agree, so that it can be a נחש (~~ssadmi~~) stream, or it can be a נחש

(~~ssadmi~~) shall come in. Either one of these is perfectly possible. Now the meaning

of נחש (~~ssadmi~~) ^{if} you take it as an enemy, that is a well ~~est~~ established meaning

for the word. We have many, mahy cases, where נחש (~~ssadmi~~) means.

Now you say, you have found three meanings, Miss Chung, one right after the other, here.

The meaning given there is narrow, or tight. How does that mean there? Yes, But neither of them take that way, do they? Yes, yes, that's exactly what the B.D.B. says, B.D.B. here says, Isaiah 59:19, like a (contracted (hence with) powerful river. So that, according to B.D.B. this means a narrow stream.

And a narrow stream, therefore, would be a rushing stream. I ~~don't~~ think ~~if~~ there are ^s ^{that} lot/of narrow streams ~~rushing~~ didn't rush. If you have a big stream, and if it is compressed into a space, then it will make it rush. But the thing that would be going down hill. ^{whether it's is} would make it rush ~~is a down hill~~. And ~~whether~~ ^{it} ^{Now} it/s wide or/narrow, it ~~it~~/when it goes down hill, that/goes down fast. /If it is contracted into a small space, ^{more} and going down hill, ~~if~~ it may have/force, it may be hard to stop, and then if it's spread out, _____ (13.00) put into a

narrow space, all that force that is there presents strength through a narrow stream. If it's already going down hill, but the stream has to be going down ^{which} hill, it is the level ~~to~~/at ^{which} it is ~~going~~, going ~~it~~/makes its speed, not the narrowness of the stream or river. Just think of it, spreading flat, and just meandering along, _____ (12.80) pushed into a narrow space. But a narrow

space won't make it go fast. it is going down hill that makes it go fast. And if what the Hebrew says is narrow, if you are going to translate it literally, you ^{shouldn't} you.

ought to say like a narrow stream, But if you say he will come like a narrow ^{breath of} stream, well, which the / the Lord drives. The breath of the Lord drives

a narrow stream. ^eWell, the breath of the Lord drives a wide stream. There would be just as hard to drive a narrow stream. So, what does the narrow stream have to do with it. It's quite ~~if~~ a jump in thought to translate the word narrow, and then in English say rushing, isn't it? it's quite a jump in thought. ~~It~~ is not exactly what the Hebrew says. It is an inte~~r~~pretation. WE do not have

other cases where it is used that the stream is fast. Mr. A^Bbott, do you have any further ~~of~~ question? (Q) All right, thank you for calling attention to that.

That verse is a matter of Masoretic point. It could be pointed, קוון קאיה (~~KOON KAHIA~~)

And it is always possible to consider that the pointing might be incorrect, but we should do with the for doing that we should see what/the pointing as what it is. Now if it is definite whether קוון

like the river, like the river, now does that prove ~~like the river?~~ (ssaah) is a whether

stream or/it is rushing, whehter it is ~~narrow, wide~~ an enemy or it's rushing.

What does it prove? So that, the RSV, the A~~m~~erican Standard translation

contradict the Masoretic pointing. ~~The Masoretic~~ The Masoretic pointing is the

river, and then there is no article in it with the sream, if it is agreed with it

should be קוון קאיה, like the narrow sream, so that that is a definite

obstacle to their interpretation. They have to, in order to get their interpreta~~ti~~on,

ignore the pointing, and change it to like a river, and of course, one of their they

rules was that they didn't , they disregarded the pointing if/thought. They did

not. The pointing, ~~was~~ of course, was put in the fifth century A.D. We feel

that there may be cases where ~~they~~/ the pointing, the vocalization was passed even

on by the word of mouth, and were maybe/passed on wrong. We feel it possible

but I wouldn't find to think that if you are going to think so, you should put

a footnote, you ~~should~~ have always as advanced today.

Yes? (Q) Oh, yes, what is that? The Qere and kathieve are the evidence

of ~~the Masoretic~~ manuscript (9.50) - Then the line

~~below that~~ below that is simply their opinion as to what it ought to be . And

here they say, or say, here reads wth the Greek and various ancient versions,

they say, read as some manuscripts a few of the great - many~~x~~ uscripts

~~no~~ don't have article . So they say, read קוון קאיה . They are not

evidence,

saying that there isn't any manuscript/ but they are saying that there is some evidence of ancient translation which didn't have any article. And of course,

we don't want too much on the pointing, but as they/ pointing stands it doesn't

fit the RSV. I am not objecting that they are saying a rushing stream

when it says the, though I do think that it would be more accurate if they/ it

says the translation. But / I am objecting to making rushing modify the stream

when _____ (8.25) That is definitely changing

from the pointing. Well, you can't change the pointing, but I think you ought

to _____ floor (8.10) So that is an argument in favour of the King James

the

to take as an enemy, and an enemy of/ common _____ (8.00) If you take

the meaning they take, it's a narrow stream. ~~it's a rushing stream~~ is certainly

phrase

a para/ not a translation. It would be more literal to say when an/ enemy

shall come in like a river, and/ enemy comes, when an enemy comes, if you

want @like the river," the word "the river" is very frequently used in the

Asia

Prophets for the river Euphrates. The great, tremendous river of ~~the Nile~~, the

biggest river in that part of ~~the Nile~~. /q Asia. They call it the river. Now,

the river doesn't have to be that, but that is the usual word standing for the river.

Now if you want to say the Nile/ in a different /a way, _____ (HAIYOOR)

The (_____ (Our) / is the river Nile. But now it is very common ~~to say~~ meaning

either you say _____ (7.25)

that comes down

So it could like the Euphrates, the tremendous river/ from ~~the mountain~~ a mountain, river

a great, wide river with tremendous force. Like the/ Euphrates/ the enemy comes,

or the enemy comes like the river Euphrates. In other words, ~~he~~ it can be ~~before~~ for

or when. Either one is all right, but for he will come, he will come, ~~he is just~~

~~talking about~~

he has just talked about what he has done, how he saw this and that, and so he came , then you say, he came like an army man. For he will come like a narrow stream. The narrow ~~stream~~ doesn't give the sense of _____ (6.50)

Now how about the last part? "Which the breath of the Lord drives.@ " Where is the "which" in ~~the~~ Hebrew? As Miss Chung suggests here the, uh, it is possible in

the Heb. as ~~an~~ English to have a relative clause without a relative pronoun, the word, which . it's

It is less common, I mean, /comparatively . . . ~~man~~ in En/English you say, the man, that is ~~by~~ the man I saw yesterday. This is without any relative pronoun.

~~That is the man~~ You mean that is the man whom I saw yesterday. In English I believe you can only do it when it is an object, when ~~when~~ which is an object.

Of course, ~~it's~~ here it is an object. _____ which the breath of the Lord drives.

Yes, Mr. _____? The breath of the Lord drives it/a ~~As~~ they can take it/ but the common way in the Hebrew would be put an 7:45.

I would say that in many more cases, ~~the~~ where the 7:45 are used, and then/it's not. But there/enough where it's not, that we can admit

the possibility ~~to take it~~ of taking it as a relative. So, you can take, for he will come like a river, or a stream which the breath of the Lord drive/with, or when the flood enemy shall come in like a ~~river~~, but the spirit of the Lord shall lift up a

~~standard against Him~~ standard against Him. Well, that would depend on the verse. There are some ~~son-~~ verses ~~where~~ which introduce their object

by a _____, like , he struck , well , I can't think right at the moment of ore , But there are many ~~or~~ English words which have their objects introduc4d = by prepositions and usually you have some verbs can't , some can, so if you had

a common verb used in Hebrew, ~~it~~ it would be very easy to say, this is a verb regularly used with ~~Beth~~ Beth or this is a verb which is never used with Beth.

You'd have your answer. But what about the ~~the~~ verse. They say, which the

B. § 65 contd.

breath of the Lord drives and the ~~κ~~ other says the Spirit of the Lord will raise up a stand~~ard~~ard against him. Well, first, what about the Spirit of the Lord or the breath of the Lord? What's the situation there. Π. 7 can be breath or wind or spirit. Either one is perfectly all right. It's just like in Greek. We read in John that the wind bloweth and thou knowest not whence it cometh or whiter~~er~~ it goeth, so is every man that is born of the Π. 7. It's the same word ~~κ~~ exactly. Every man is born of the Spirit. It seems to me to be more logical in that verse in John to either say the wind bloweth where it listeth, so is every man that is born of wind. Or to say the spirit blows where He chooses, so is every man that is born of Spirit. I have felt for a long time that it would be more logical to take it the same way in both cases. I question anyway whether it is the wind. Why, certainly we can tell where the wind comes from. ~~κ~~ If you get up on high enough place, you can certainly see where the wind comes from, and certainly with out present observatories, it's very simple to tell. They tell you on the radio every night where the wind is coming from. You think people in Christ's day said, "You don't know where the wind comes from." Maybe, but it doesn't fit with our _____ today, and I would question whether it did then. But the spirit of God works where it chooses, and every one that is born of the Spirit is similar, is going to be used of God in ways you can't see or expect. To me that makes much ~~better~~ better sense. ~~κ~~ But that's getting into the N. T. In this case whether you say the breath or whether you say the Spirit is a matter of interpretation. But the big thing is Drive and Lift up a standard --which does the verb mean: drive or life up a standard. The answer is of course, you can't prove which it means, because it's a very rare word.

B. 65 contd.

But in order to get it to mean drive , you have to take it from _____
to ~~fly~~ flee, The Lord causes the river to flee it seems to me to get a
better word for word for drive ~~ax~~ ~~x~~ than that according to _____. Anyway
there are so many ideas of drive in the Bible, it seems strange to take an
entirely new word so as to get that idea. And, of course, the same thing is
true of banner. We don't have Lift up a banner in this ~~point~~ form, but we do
have ~~ax~~ the word for banner quite commonly. And to get a verb derived from
it should ~~be~~ n't be difficult, like we read today. "So and so authors a book."
Well, that's not English verb. Author's a noun. But they make a noun into
verbs often. And to take banner and make it--it would just ~~x~~ seem to me
that the King James is fully as reasonable as the other. The difference between
the indefiniteness looks in favour of the King James, and the parallel with the
~~anber~~- banner in the other part looks to me like the direction of _____, the
fact that you have _____ to a banner, and to me it makes much more sense,
for it's introducing a new idea. While on the other, it's continuing the idea,
but it doesn't seem to me to be a very reasonable solution. (Q)

No. 66

W~~w~~ were looking last time at this verse in Isa. 59, and we ~~was~~ ~~w~~ saw that
there were real difficulties, ~~bes~~ ~~x~~ because it uses some words that ~~ax~~ are
~~x~~ rather unusual, and there is the great advantage of studying the Hebrew.
It is not that you take some difficult verse that people have not been able
to figure out, and you immediately know what it means, but it is ~~x~~ that you
can see ~~that~~- what it is that perfectly clear and what there is that isn't
perfectly clear, and you ~~x~~ can tell at a glance what the things are that there
are no question about or what is in God's world, and you can tell also what

N B. 66 contd.

the things are that are varied possibilities of interpretation, And so looking at this last half of verse 19 and again in the Hebrew. The first word is ___ which ~~is~~ can be either ~~that~~ or if or for, or when. It has a quite a variety of meanings; as ~~such~~ some of our English prepositions and conjunctions have.

Preparation Prepositions are the hardest thing to get in any language, because there is no simple group of ~~pre~~ prepositions that can express just a few simple ideas. There's a great variety of ideas in a every language which a few prepositions have to express. And these prepositions vary as to ~~have~~ what they include in every language, and so ~~the~~ prepositions and conjunctions are ~~difficult~~ difficult in any language, and we see what the various possibilities are in one, and as we learn to know the language better, you see also certain possibilities can be immediately excluded. But here then we find ~~the~~ that first word ~~that~~ ___ can be used in direct discourse, or it can be used for, ~~or it can be used for~~ Very often there is a reason involved in it. And this reason may be connected with the ~~temporal~~ temporal ~~situation~~ situation. And so that ~~the~~ we know what the ___ means but as to the variety among the possibilities of its meaning there may be uncertainty. Then, the next word, He shall enter. And He shall come, is not necessarily bad because the word come in English expresses motion toward the speaker, which after all is related to ~~enter~~ enter, but perhaps come in is a little more exactly what the Hebrew says. When He shall come in and thus far we don't know what the noun is. So the noun must be either something that precedes it and ~~if it is~~ ~~is~~ something that precedes it in the context it has to be either the Lord, or the name of the Lord, or the glory. I think I gave them in reverse order. The nearest to it is the ~~glory~~ glory of the Lord. So that would be perhaps the most probable, ~~if there is~~ ~~if~~ if it's something that precedes it. However, it can be the ~~a~~ Lord, for the ~~glory~~ glory of the Lord

B. 66 contd.

is another way of saying the Lord. Or it could be perhaps be the name of the Lord. That's the least likely ~~xxx~~ of the three , but still is a possibility. But at any rate , it is either the Lord or one of these attributes of the Lord that is the subject of it, if the _____ has as its subject what precedes, but there's always the possibilities that the subject follows it ~~x~~ if you have a 3ms, and so in this case it may be that the subject follows it, and then as the Hebrew stands here , When He shall come in like a river, and of course , if one wants to say , "Well, that vocalization has been corrupted in the course of centuries by passing on by word of mouth because a dot in the nun was ~~wx~~ not written until the 5th century AD, but it would be pronounced and while the ^{tradition} ~~position~~ has been on the whole very ~~weel~~ well preserved through these many centuries of the correct pronunciation of the vowels and the ~~dx~~ doubling, ~~xyex~~ yet there is much more possibility of error in that than there is in one of the consonants, which were preserved through writing, and , consequently, ~~ix~~ we don't rule out the possibility that it is like or as a river. We don't rule out the possibility but we say it is more probably is like the river, and I would think that like the river , and I would think that like the river is probably like the ~~river~~- river Euphrates--the great, wide, tremendous river that was such a force there in Western ~~Euger~~ Europe, and it's sometimes used in the scripture as a figure for a great, invading army or a great enemy , like a tremendous , mighty river. Like the river, and then we ~~have~~ have this word _____, which is ~~certisx~~ certainly not definite, consequently, ~~the~~ if the vocalization is correct, can _____ then _____ can not modify. It cannot be like the _____ a river. If you're going to have _____ go with _____, then you have to change the vocalization to _____, instead of _____. ~~if~~ YOU have to do away with the vowel, you

11-10

B. 66 contd.

ok have to do away with the doubling. Now, we don't say that's impossible, but it is not exactly what _____. I would say that if the enemy came to be used of one specific enemy, so that it became almost like a proper noun, then it could become definite. Well, if it ~~is~~ is a specific, definitely ~~is~~ collective group. I would think that ~~is~~ it is not likely but certainly not to be ruled out. The possibility that this could be a rather definite reference to it-~~is~~ a specific group of enemies but if it were, that would not make it possible for it to modify ~~is~~ river. As far as river is concerned here, you cannot say that _____ modifies river, unless river is to be changed from the vocalization that you have ~~her3~~ here, and we admit the possibility of changing the vocalization --~~is~~ we admit that possibility but we say that it is uncommon. The translators of the RSV took the position that if they think they can get a better ~~position~~ sense by changing the vocalization any more, they'd do it. The vocalization isn't inspired--that's simply vowels put in by the Masoretes. Well, what is inspired? It isn't the consonants that are inspired; ~~is~~ it isn't the vowels that are inspired. It's the words that are inspired. And the words are something that were giving vocally, and that's ~~was~~ what was inspired, so I would say that, as originally written by the prophet, and that's what inspiration means, the original writings--the vowels are just as much inspired as the consonants, ~~wheter~~ whether he wrote them down or not. ~~is~~ What he meant was what people would understand him to mean when ~~is~~ they read it. It's just as much inspired as the consonants. But when it comes to transmission, it is easy to transmit the consonants, then transmit the vowel, because the consonants were written down.

When you would read over you would see ~~the~~ if you had made mistakes in consonants.
 vowels/ it were
 Whereas the ~~the~~ people read many times, they ~~are~~ accustomed to it, and of
 very often
 course/if you see vowel concentrates you know ~~the~~ right away what the vowel
 then
 is. You would ~~right~~ write in English a book that had no vowels/you wouldn't have
 a great deal of difficulty, would you? You would get the slam ~~effect~~ of it, and
 most of it you wouldn't have much difficulty to read. It would be easier to read
 without vowels
~~the~~ Hebrew than English, because in Hebrew the consonants represent the idea
 as a rule, and the vowels mostly simply indicates the time or something like
 that. The consonants are more important in Hebrew proportionately than in English.
 But even in English, you wouldn't have too bad a difficulty to read something with
 just consonants written. And _____ (7.00) brought the consonants, but
 they didn't, the thing there, you take a ~~the~~ there, That is here. That's
~~her~~ not her. That's not higher. It's not _____ (6.75). It's here. And
 read the You wouldn't say,
 did you/sentences here?/Can you read what is written first? You can't say can
 you read what is written ~~here~~ higher? You would read it as here. And ~~they~~
 when they read this, they read this, ~~they read~~ they read this as were(?).
 s were
 They didn't read _____ (6.50) And the consonant ~~the~~ written but the whole
 word/ ~~that is concerned~~ is what is concerned. And there are more consonants in
 Hebrew proportionately/ than in English. ~~The whole~~ And so, the Bible as written
 s
 is words, not consonants, and thousand years after it was written the Masorets
 these
 put in signs to indicate vowels, but they didn't make ~~the~~ vowels up, they
 put in vowels to represent the way their parents and their teachers had told them/
 what it was. And so the vowels represent the tradition, and ~~add~~ it is easier
 for the traditions of the vowel/e to get _____ in content. And so we as

a means of possibility if you want to change a vowel, you would say , that makes a better sense, and we don't judge what you~~r~~ are doing. But we say that probably in the great ~~g/y/~~ bulk of cases that the vowels have been corrected. From time to time you just can't just throw away the vowel away. But we do not object to

_____ (5.50) if you ~~w~~ feel that occasionally a different vowels makes a better sense. But RSV committee simply said that if ~~w/y/~~ we want to change the vowels any time, we can do it. We don't have to make any footnote ~~saying~~ because, they say, vowels are not inspired. But we don't ~~w~~ accept that.

We... I don't object to the fact that there are changes in vowels, but I think they should put in footnotes ~~that~~ and let us know it when they do it. / They don't, / do it. But in this case, all the modern scholars in fact says that this means a

narrow stream', and as it is written it cannot ~~be~~ mean a narrow stream. You have to ^{either} have a before ~~the~~ narrow to make the article agree or else you would have to do away with the ~~passage~~ ^{pathah} and double it in ^{דפדפ}. Well, we don't say that you~~r~~ can't do it, but we do think that if it is ~~changed~~ ^{difficult,}, you cannot just

_____ (4.650) So that I say that this is a difficulty, is a hindrance to interpreting this as a narrow stream, the difference of definiteness, but then I find a greater difficulty in the meaning of it, that He comes in like a narrow stream does not make a great deal of sense, because a narrow stream is not necessarily a strong stream, a narrow stream isn't necessarily a strong stream--a narrow stream isn't necessarily a strong stream ; it might be a slow stream and a wide stream; and a wide stream may be a slightly slow stream ; or either of them may be fast. The thing that would make a stream rapid would be a speedy stream--a stream that goes down hill rapidly , and anybody who lives where there are any number of streams ought to catch on to that, and to not feel that its the narrowness that make s it. Anybody who

B. 66 contd.

did just a little bit of work in hydrolics would soon find out that the narrow~~x~~ stream up doesn't make it go fast, doesn't make its course any greater. It ~~m~~ may mean that less water comes through, but what comes through amounts to the same rate--narrowing it doesn't make a stream faster. There's some things, if you narrow them up you make them ~~k~~ more forceful, but that's not true of a stream. It'~~s~~ makes the stream hit one place, rather than hit a lot of places, but it doesn't make it faster. (Q) One gets the idea of rushing; well, you can't get it by simply saying it's narrowing, so if you take the narrow and say well, narrow means its ~~ke~~ pent up, well there again, pent up stream, does that make it a strong stream. ~~Tha~~ That doesn't increase the force of the stream--to pend it up; it means that either it goes or it doesn't go. But the thing that makes the stream have force is the angle of descent. It's the weight of ~~k~~ water that's back of it; not whether its pent up or not; that doesn't particularly apply as to its strength. It ~~man~~ may apply to ~~speed~~. You close steam in and ~~v~~ as the steam gets stronger and stronger, and can't escape in all directions, it will break a way out some way. ~~Tha't- Tah-~~ That's not true of a stream. It's not a ~~particular~~ particularly good figure to mean a rushing~~ing-~~ stream to ~~x~~ say to narrow it. I don't say it's impossible but it's a rather poor figure --they have plenty of ways they could say a ~~ugh~~ rushing stream--plenty of ways they could say a strong stream--a ~~pes-~~ powerful stream, but to say that the spirit of God is like a pent up stream. How is the spirit of God pent up? How is the glory of God pent up? It's not a ~~particular-~~ particularly good ~~figure~~. I don't say it's impossible, but it is against it; its unnatural. And then, whereas if you take _____ as a very common --we have this common adjective _____, and we have this common noun _____, an enemy, an adversary. And you take it that way, it gives you a natural subject for your verb, When it shall come in, When the enemy

B. 66 contd.

shall come in, like the Euphrates in flood season an enemy comes, just pours.

It's a very good figure for the strength of an enemy. (Q) The fact that a word

is used twice a ~~va~~ few verses apart doesn't prove that it has the same meaning

but seriously suggests that meaning would be in the mind when you come to it.

I know we will often use the same words. I use the same word three sentences

apart with an entirely different meaning. ~~Sometimes~~ Sometimes I am rather

surprised that I do, but I think there is a tendency to have the same meaning

if you see that it is the same word and if you want to express a different meaning

to use a different word ~~than~~ from the word that you have just used in a different

text. (?)

B. 67

Perhaps the fact that it was just used recently in the plural would make there

be objection to using the same word in an entirely different sense like narrow,

than if it were singular, but I don't think ~~it~~ it would disprove it being used in

the ~~singular~~- singular; it might take a little bit of the edge off the objection

by using it again in a ~~a fi~~- different sense. But now we have two possible

meanings here. As it stands, When an enemy shall come in like the Euphrates.

If you change it to the river, or like a river, you could say when he , that is

when the Lord, For the Lord shall come in like a narrow stream, but then you

have your latter part of the verse , and there you read , if you take the ~~first~~ last

part as a whole sentence you expect then a conclusion of the ~~a~~ sentence introduced

by when or if. Something happened, then something else is going to happen. But

it is not at all impossible to take it as a relative clause. It is much more common

in the relative clauses to put in the shureq. So that the lack of the shureq is not

proof against it ~~being~~ being a relative clause, but it is a little objectionable, and

taking it either way, the first word, the רוח as an _____, the spirit of the Lord, or if you want, the breath of the Lord. I don't think the ~~wind~~ wind of the Lord is particularly good--what is the wind of the Lord, anybody. The RSV takes it the wind of the Lord, and the wind of the Lord --what is the wind of the Lord? It may be a way to say a mighty wind, but do they say it that way. ~~k~~ Do we find elsewhere in the scripture when they tell about a big wind, that they call it the wind of the Lord. The liberals say in Genesis 1 where ~~it~~ we say the Spirit of God was hovering over the waters, they say a mighty wind was rushing over the waters; that's the way they ~~we- th-~~ translated it in the RSV. No, they don't in the RSV, but they do in most of the liberal interpretations. I remember in this particular case; ~~k~~ I heard Dr. Linkskey speaking, who was the Jewish member of the RSV committee, and he told in this group right ~~α~~ up here in Jenkintown where ~~it~~ he discussed translation with them, he said that in ~~X~~ the RSV in ~~α~~ Genesis 1 there that the question was, will this be the Spirit of the Lord ~~α~~ hovering over the waters or would it be a mighty wind, and He said that the committee there had a vote on it, which will we take: wind or spirit. And he said that ~~the~~ one man did vote; and the rest of them--four voted for spirit and four voted for wind. So they said to the other one, you have to vote. And he said, I don't want to vote. Well, they, said, You've got to vote. You've got to decide it. They're four who say wind, and four say spirit, and we can't put both--we have to put one or the other. And he said, all right, I'll vote ~~k~~ for spirit. So they got spirit instead of wind, well then, the question~~x~~ now was, shall we call it Spirit with a ~~α~~ capital S which is the Christian idea of the ~~Tra-~~ Trinity which he said was never heard of until the ~~thri-~~ third or fourth~~x~~ century AD, or shall we put in Spirit with a small s, which is the Jewish idea of the Divine Spirit; simply God's spirit. Then~~k~~, he said, we had a discussion for an hour or so

B. 67 contd.

about that. They put ~~x~~ it to a vote. Four voted for Spirit with a capitol S, and four voted for spirit with a small s, and the same man who didn't vote before, didn't vote at all. They ~~said~~ said, "You have got to vote." And he said, I don't know what to vote. and they said, well, you've got to vote. ~~KX~~ And he said, o k I'll vote for big S. And he said he saw the man later, and asked the man, "What did you vote for that ~~x~~ for." You know they didn't believe in the ~~Tri~~ Trinity that early. You know they didn't believe in spirit like that. It should have been wind, of course. Or if spirit, it should have been small s. And he said, Harry, I voted as a Christian. And that was the only case~~x~~ where he knew of where religious bigotry had decided a matter. Then when they say the RSV is ~~the~~ the authorized Bible for today, and when you think that one man ~~wh~~o couldn't make up his mind ~~did~~ decided whether it would be wind or spirit on how little hangs an authorized translation for the church to be told it must accept the authoritative word. The one that half of them were ready to vote for ~~the~~ the wind of God, they just mean a wind~~d~~, a ~~max~~ mighty wind, and that's the way the liberals translate it, a mighty wind was rushing over the waters, but I don't think you'll find that a mighty wind ~~is~~ is usually called the wind of God. That's not a common way of saying a mighty wind. (Q) I think it says mighty wind. ~~The~~ We don't have that much in scripture to call it a wind of the Lord. Now it wouldn't be quite so hard in Genesis--it's harder here than it is in Genesis, because in Genesis a wind of God is a way to say a mighty wind, but a wind of the Lord ~~could~~---that's a pretty big jump, bigger ~~on~~ even than to say a wind of God. Of course, the RSV takes it as the breath of the Lord, and as Addison points out in his commentary

B. 67 contd.

on ~~Isa~~ Isaiah, he says the incongruity of making the comparison, comparing God to a river that the spirit of God is pushing, to compare God to something that God himself is contained in the comparison--it's quite an incongruous sort of an expression. ~~It~~ But the spirit of the Lord, what is the spirit doing? What is the spirit doing? Here is your biggest difficulty in the whole verse by far.

⁶⁷⁴⁵ This word _____. This word has no parallel in the scripture. We have nothing equal to it. And so what is the word _____? ~~But~~ Well, we don't have some things ~~equal~~ that are somewhat similar to it. The nearest thing that we have to it, according to what we have in Brown, Driver, and Briggs here is where it ~~give~~ ^v gives an example of. It says _____, be ~~gh~~ high or conspicuous, perhaps is the root of _____. It gives a hithpoel from Ps 66, "God has given a banner that it may be displayed, possibly, he says, a denominative from _____, that it may be displayed, that it may be raised high, that it may be made a banner. And that would be a hithpoel derived from _____ the noun, a banner. That's a pretty good comparison. That's a pretty good analogy. He doesn't call it an analogy. It certainly is a pretty good analogy. It may be displayed. And then there is a possibility of a participle of the hithpoel in Zech. (9:16 in which he says, "Perhaps raised or _____. That is much more dogmatic, ~~that~~ than this case where in Ps 63 (?) where ~~he~~ he is giving him a banner to be displayed because of the truth. But the one possibility is then is to take that it is a denominative ~~of~~ taken from the word _____ in a hithpoel. And that certainly is a possibility.

^h Now another possibility, the one which liberals all take, is to take it from _____. Now the word _____ means to flee, it doesn't mean to run, it doesn't mean to attack. It doesn't mean to drive against something. It means to flee. That is a very common word--the idea of flee or escape, take flight

B. 67 contd.

depart, disappear. There the question is, does this case in Ps. 66, in order to take flight before the bow, as many think it means, taking that as a highpole from _____. Now, Alexander points out, that the difficulty with doing that is that you have a ~~hith~~ hiphil used quite a number of times to put someone to flight--in quite a few cases, to put someone to flight, to drive hastily to a safe place, to cause to disappear or hide. Well, when you have a ~~hith~~ hiphil doing that, what right do you have to assume that there is a polel to do the same thing: to cause to take place, ~~the~~ to cause to flee, when you have no proof of it. The only proof of the polel having such a meaning would be our present case here, Isaiah 59:19, the only occurrence in the scripture, ~~ix~~ if it is. And if it is, what it means is that the glory of the Lord is like a narrow river, which the spirit of the Lord causes to flee. Well, when you speak of someone fleeing, you are not taking ~~x~~ of their driving with force. If you're thinking of their fleeing, you're thinking of their trying to get away from something, trying to disappear, and the jump from causing to flee to making it come ~~ix~~ with force, is a pretty big jump, and there are plenty of other ~~ix~~ ~~wxx~~ words that could be used to express the idea. I knew a young fellow who was ~~wxx~~ with his uncle and aunt in China. They were inland in China on a river bed where it was very steep, and it was a narrow river bed where it was only two or ~~ix~~ three feet deep, and they were out in the middle of this stream with ten or fifteen feet each side of them and all of a sudden they heard a noise and it ~~rained~~ rained way up somewhere where they didn't know where and all of a ~~sudden~~ sudden this great--like a tidal wave, came rushing down, and this water came rushing down and raised ~~ix~~ it up 20 feet and one of them was drowned and another was dashed against the rocks, so he had all

kinds of bones broken, and it took him months in the hospital & before he recovered. Well, all of a sudden that water came rushing down that narrow ~~ox~~ channel. It would be _____ that made it come before, but it came suddenly and with this rain there, and all ~~the~~ this force comes, and- but you wouldn't say that water is fleeing, ~~noth-~~ nothing is causing that water to disappear, causing it come with force, coming with attack, ~~rather~~ rather than fleeing or disappearing. It's a very poor figure to express the idea of a rushing. That the spirit of God is like unto a narrow ~~w~~stream which the spirit of God is driving --it's quite an incongruous idea. Well, if & you take the word in an ~~equial~~ equally, a natural way, exactly the way the King James Version has it, when an enemy will come in like a flood. We've spoken & just about how God is going to give recompense to his enemies, but that, you might say, is a final picture. He looks & way ahead to God's intervention, to a putting an end to the difficulties of this world; He's going to intervene and bring recompense to ~~ben~~ them, but now we look at this time a little before that, the word of God has gone out so that it is feared to some extent, from the west and from the east, and in that situation ~~what~~ when an enemy comes in, like a river, the spirit of the Lord lifts up a standard against him, raises a warding against Him, calls on God's people to assemble against Him.. Well, we have this first part which parallels with the last (63:1-6) and this which comes right after has a very close parallel to 62:10-12, and 62 definitely says, "Lift up a standard for the & people and ~~set~~ the standard ~~lx~~ there is this very word nation (?). So in a passage that is parallel in ~~son~~ many other ways, you have the listing up ~~s~~ of the standard specifically mentioned with the word nation, whose interpretation ~~w~~ there is no question about. And so, it seems ~~x~~ to me that from the viewpoint of a parallel, from the & viewpoint of a clear analogy, from the viewpoint of the most sensible translation of the words as they ~~set~~ stand, the

B. 67 contd.

most sensible ~~explanati~~ explanation of the syntax as it ~~tax~~ stands, and from the viewpoint of keeping the vocalization exactly as it is and avoiding the incongruity of having the glory of the Lord be like a narrow stream that the spirit of the Lord is causing to flee, the King James here is much the best.

B. 68

IN the Brown, Driver and Briggs they say _____/or escape, and then they give a great many ~~instances~~ ^{flee} instances in Qal. Or it means flee or it means escape. Then they give polal, ~~of cases the xxx~~ ^{one} case where they say it means drive at it or drives on, and then one case is our present verb. It is in the verse where we are looking at now. And what basis do you have to get that meaning in the verse for it? If they get it from this verse, ~~it~~ ^{that} doesn't give a basis to come back ~~to~~ to this verse, and they say what the verse means. If they find three other verses, ~~it~~ ^{where the meaning} fits the context well, they have a good basis on which to apply to this verse. But ~~in all instances~~ ^{if} the implications it means flee, disappear, to escape, why they are making ~~it~~ ^{a big jump} a big jump ~~to say~~ in thoughts to say in this particular case alone it means to guide or force. Yes? (Q) Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, But ~~say~~ ^I the same root. That is to say that it may be a same root. That, uh, yes, they say lift up, and then they have the word make. Now, in this case they have ~~to~~ ^{a form} which may be ~~the right one for xxx~~ ^{derived from _____ (13.25)} or it may be root- (13.25) ~~the right one for xxx~~ ^{be derived from _____ (Heb.)} We don't have this form occur ~~it~~ ^{that} ring anywhere else, and plainly derived from either one of the two. There is ~~a~~ ^{case} case in the Psalm ~~it~~ ^(13.00) which ~~case~~ seems to me that this case fits ~~to~~ ^{escape} more than flee. But you have the two cases, one of which has a _____ (Neissin), the other ones has one which may ~~be~~ ^{mean} mean _____ (meiss) or _____ (noouse). If you take it neissin _____ you ~~may~~ ^{may} make a better

B. 68 Cont'd.

_____*(12.75)
sense in the context, and you preserve the parallel. I don't say that the two
together go, but I say that they make a strong presumption and statement,
and it fits in the structure that I find here of having the beginning and end
dealing with the coming of the Lord's vengeance, and the the next passage dealing
~~being~~ with the coming with the spirit of the Lord lifting and raising up the standard
and redeemer coming to Zion. And these two or three words which go together
in parallel, so that I feel that the King James' rendering here is much simpler
against
in the context, and that it is philologically not provable over/the other, but
~~the~~ the presumption is much better in its _____ than the other. (12.00)

Well, we have the sixty-six one to six which is certainly a striking similarity
to the beginning of the sixty-three, and then we have the sixty-two ten fits
is what you
well which/surely a remarkable similarity to/get when you continue in fifty-nine
with
where you go on ~~and~~ the redeemer shall come, and then the enemy shall come
in like a flood, like a river the spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against ✓
him, and the redeemer shall come to Zion, to them that turn from transgression
of Jacob, says the Lord, as for me this is my covenant with them, says the Lord,
my Spirit which is upon thee, and my word which I have put in thy mouth shall
not depart out of thy mouth and out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth
of ~~thy seed of~~ of thy seed's seed, says the Lord, from hence forth and forever
more. And the other one at the end of fiftytwo ~~verses~~ said, They shall ~~be~~ call
them the holy people, the redeemed of the Lord, and thou shalt be called
the sought out city not forsaken. You might say, one of them looks at the
internal, and the other at the external of the something. One looks at the
people in whom the Spirit of God lives, and He plants His word in their hearts.

The other looks at the external situation that they shall be called the redeemed of the Lord, the city sought out, the city not forsaken. Well, then you have the material which runs through verse nine of chapter sixty-two, and which starts with the beginning of chapter sixty, and so you have from the beginning of sixty up through verse nine of the chapter ^{sixty} ~~forty~~-two. Now ~~is it~~ if this is a continuous ^{ous} ~~ed~~ passage, if it is a continuous passage with no important breaks in it, or is there an important break in the midst of this section of two, three and four of this chapter, Mr. _____, would have a judgment? There is a difference in the beginning of ^{sixty} ~~forty~~-one from anything in sixty. The Spirit of the Lord ^{God} is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach ~~the~~ good tidings, unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, ~~and the opening of the prison to them that are bound;~~
 ¶- Do you find anybody in chapter sixty who was sent to proclaim liberty to the captives, to bind up the brokenhearted? You don't find that anywhere in the sixty. Anybody who was sent immediately from the Lord to fulfill ~~that~~ a certain ^{And} special purpose. You don't find that in the sixty. /You don't find that in sixty-two. But when you compare ~~them~~ sixty and sixty-two, they are both describing the time of remarkable blessing with a great deal of ~~urgent thought~~. earthly prosperity and earthly blessing. And this time which they describe is a very similar in the contents. So it seems to me that we can carry on our envelop structure at this further. ~~What that we have~~ We have the beginning and end, the coming of the Lord ⁱⁿ in vengeance, and then we have the three verses/each near the middle where the banner is raised, especially where the redeemer comes to Zion. That's very ^{these} clear in three chapters/in three verses. At the after the first part ~~of~~ before the second, so you have AB and something ~~in~~ in the middle, and then BA. ~~A~~ A for same thing for A, and then B again. And then you have next to that ~~it~~ a section

C which is a picture of the worldly prosperity and happiness, a condition where they have a tremendous blessing from the Lord. That comes after the first and before the last, and then in the middle you have the beginning of the sixty-one, and there the Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me, sent me to ~~to~~ bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim ~~to~~ liberty to the captives.

~~Now, what does this talking about?~~ Now what is this talking about?

Talking about somebody ~~whom~~ whom the Lord hath sent. Is this Isaiah? Is Isaiah sent to proclaim liberty to the captives? Yes, to ~~some~~ some extent. Has ~~Isaiah~~ Isaiah been sent to bind up the brokenhearted/? Is Isaiah sent to proclaim the

opening of the opening of the prison to them that are bound to comfort ~~them~~ them all that mourn? Surely ~~it~~ it goes beyond Isaiah. And in the New Testament we find that our Lord Jesus Christ read this passage, and said that it applied to Himself.

Surely we are justified in saying that we have here in our third of these alternations of rebuke followed by blessing, rebuke by blessing, third our passage of blessing, or perhaps, ~~you~~ you might say a ~~prediction~~ prediction of this future in-to more than a long passage running through ~~three~~ three chapters. It is arranged like an envelop.

A. B C D C B A. Two A's at both ends are God's intervention with tremendous upon His adversaries power, to proclaim ~~His~~ His, to bring His vengeance ~~with tremendous power~~ - and then

the next one is the short passage of the redeemer coming to Zion, and ~~being~~ brings tremendous blessings to God's people, and then you have about a chapter describing these marvellous blessings in turn which is ~~hard~~ hard to be know/just how ~~much~~ much of it is literal and how much of it is figurative. But certainly it is

describing the time which is at least is ~~in truth~~ true and earthly, but I think

the millennial blessing is certainly not in this moment _____ (6.25)
of climax

And Then in the middle ~~of~~ the ~~climax~~ climax of it, in the middle ~~of~~ of it he is the one through whom all these blessings come. It is the servant ~~of~~ of the Lord, the one through

He

whom all these blessings come, ~~who~~ is the redeemer who comes to Zion. He
is the one ~~through~~ ^{from} whom and for whom all these glorious things occur. But

you have the ~~interpo-~~ interposition whose ~~wrath~~ _____ (5.76)

And then next to it is the marvellous redemption for Zion, then the great period of millennial glory, and then in the middle the climax pointed in the middle you have this description of Him. Now you ~~certain-~~ sometimes hear it said that here is a picture in which it first tells about the first coming of Christ, and then about the second coming of Christ, and that the Lord very definitely ~~has shown~~ ^{showed} the distinction by quoting in the New Testament just ~~the~~ up to the point where it dealt with the first coming and and stopping it, but I don't think that works that way.

I think that where he stops the next thing stated ~~being~~ = would seem to go

~~with~~ the second coming more than with the first. But then you go on to other

_____ (5.03) fifteen to go equally well with the first and with the second,

~~perhaps~~ perhaps with even more, ~~so~~ so it seems to me that ~~it would not go~~ -- we

do not have here ~~with~~ the description of the events of the first and second coming

of Christ, but rather a description of him in his _____ (5.00) in gathering

upon his _____ matters which apply to him whether it's first coming or

second coming, to either or both, and, of course, in reading the New Testament

it is quite ~~not~~ natural for him to stop at a particular part dealing with his person,

_____ (4.50) or for the Spirit of God to lead the writer

to quote ~~it~~ it up to that point, even if he in the synagogue perhaps read first,

simply to quote that much, because he quoted ~~it~~ everything he said, John

~~said, the whole~~ says the whole Bible as ~~the all the world~~ -- world might

contain all the books of opinion he had had quoted ~~it~~ everything he said.

But it is a picture of Christ in the middle, and then all that which quotes from

Him in the two directions. So it seems to me that ^{that is} the general structure of this

s

section of three and half chapter/we have here, and the section then has these descriptions

physical ~~things~~ but also the figurative ~~things of the~~ descriptions of the glory good

which are to come to Jerusalem in the millennial day. Surely there is a great deal

of that is literal in it. Look at the latter part of sixty-two. Verse six, " I have

set watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, which shall never hold their peace

day nor night: ye that make mention of the Lord, keep not silence." This "make n't a

mention of the Lord" is/particularly good translation. It is 'cause the Lord to

remember it _____ (3.25) ye that cause the Lord to remember, hold not silence,

keep not silence, give him no rest, until he makes Jerusalem a praise in the

earth. It is calling upon those who remind the Lord , ^t whose who praise the Lord,

~~whose who~~ those who call upon them to the formal (2.25) blessing, to get give

=fill God establish, and till he make Jerusalem a praise in the earth

no rest for you. God _____ unless you repent, praising the Lord,

six and seven

Yes, Miss Chung? (Q) Sure, chapter sixty-two verse six,/yes. The Lord has- hath

His

warned by/right hand , by the arm of His strength, Surely I will no more give thy corn ~~to~~

~~be meat for thine enemies, and the sons of the stranger shall not drink thy~~ thy meat.

Now this word we today

~~The~~ old English ~~for~~ corn means what ~~they~~ call/ wheat. Like the corn to be meat, there we mean when

is an old English word meat. It is what/we today say food. The word has changed

and in

their meaning, wherever/the King James Version you read meat, it is the word that we would something to eat.

~~we~~ today/call food. It is the Hebrew word for food/ And like it says that the tree, well, children

the fruit of the tree would be your meat for the nations. That means they are going in

to get the meat from the tree. It means food. And we read about the corn of/Egypt,

they didn't have corn in Egypt as _____ in _____ American friends. Some way

we have taken out that old English word which means wheat, and we apply it to

~~the~~ Indian form, but in England I guess it is still ~~in~~ in use. But here you have to

change the word to get what the Hebrew word means, it/ is not corn, ~~no~~ ^{its} it wheat .

B. 68 Cont'd.

It's not meat. It's food. I will no more give yours than _____ - _____ (1.50)
country.

in Europe/instead of (?) food for your enemies; and the sons of ~~the~~ Australia shall
not drink your wine, for the whi h hou have laboured: But they that have gathered it
shall eat, and praise the Lord; and they have brought it together shall dr nk it

in the courts of my holiness. @ " So we have the description of the details of the
millenial blessing in chapter sixteen, and ~~sixty-two~~ . Just how much of ~~a lot of~~
the latter
part of ~~fifty-one~~ belong with ~~the~~ sixty-two might be considered, whehter it's

verse four on/ or verse seven on, or ~~verse~~ _____ (1.00) perhaps verse
"And

four on. You notice ~~verse four~~ chapter sixty-one four they shall build the
old ~~ways~~ wastes, they shall ~~re~~ raise up the former desolations, and they shall
repair the waste cities, the desolations of many geenrations. " And now that

certainly sounds as if that area had been laid desolate. That verse with some
we

verses ~~with~~ had before, fifteen(?) _____ with the possibility tht Isaiah was
ing

looked forward to a time after the land had been wasted for a long time, desolate
in his day the more natural thing would be that you aren't
and _____ / ~~are going to be - you aren't~~ going to right side, When

you are continuing a land _____ you wouldn't be able to keep on _____.

2.8

61.4

B. 69

Say in His day, but ~~the head~~ I believe Isaiah writes it, but he's looking forward, speaking particularly of the needs of a future time, when the land has lain waste for a ~~x~~ long time. There are certain verses that fit in very definitely with that. Now, I am not to be able to ~~x~~ meet with you next week, so you will have opportunity to do some extra study before I'm with you two weeks from today, but I would like you to look over these sections and see what you can get specifically about the millennial glory. What are we taught about the millennial glory, and what are we taught about Christ. What are we taught about Christ in this middle section, what are we taught about the millennial glory ...get a rather definite idea of that, but then I would like you ~~go~~ to go ahead and look at chapter 63 and notice that in chapter 63 at verse 7 there's a big break. the biggest break in the last part of the book. "I will mention the lovingkindness of the Lord." Who will?
.. is the Lord coming in vengeance. This is not the Lord. This is somebody talking about the Lord. What is ~~x~~ he starting in verse 7. Is he starting a term (?) -- is he starting a discourse? Is he starting a prayer? Now, look on from ~~x~~ verse 7 in 63 and answer this question. How far does this go? Look at the beginning of 65, "I am sought of them that asked not for me." Is that the same I in 63:7, or is it a different I. How ~~x~~ far does the section that begins with 63:7 go. Now decide how far it goes and then decide what ~~if~~ it is trying to do. What is the purpose of this section? Is it a prayer? Is it a sermon? Is it trying to have an effect on men or is it trying to have an effect on God? And if it is trying to have an effect on God, what kind of effect is it going to have? If it is trying to have an effect on men, what kind of effect is it going to have? And, what are the arguments that are given to produce that effect. What are the reasons given in this section? Why, if it's addressed to God, should God do what the petitioner asks--if it's a prayer to God. If it's a ~~prayer~~ a statement to man--a sermon to

63:7

65:1

✓

B. 69 contd.

men, what are the arguments given to ~~pe-~~ s persuade these men to do what he wants them to do. Now we look at chapter 65, and Davis (?) says in his commentary on chapter 65. After this _____ in prayer until _____, God cannot but grant the request. He does it here in this chapter--he grants the prayer, but first before he grants, he has to give ~~g~~ rebuke. That's a funny way to get a tremendous prayer addressed to you and then start in rebuking before He grants the request. That doesn't seem to me a very natural way. Is the first part of 65 related to ~~x~~ what precedes or does He avail Himself before He deals with what precedes... go off and talk about something else. What is the answer? This is, I think, a very important question to which I have never seen the answer anywhere, but I think I've found the answer and I don't think it takes an awful lot of hunting to find it, if ~~k~~ you look ~~an~~ at it and find the answer to the questions I've asked. First, is it a ~~pa~~ prayer or is it a sermon (if it's a sermon, it's addressed to man), if it's a prayer, it's addressed to God). A sermon tries to get man to do something. A prayer tries to ~~b~~ get God to do something. Now if it's trying ~~k~~ to ~~gee~~ get-- whichever it's trying to get to do something. What is the thing that he's trying to get him to do, and what are the arguments given, ~~and are they inductive~~ in order to induce him to do it? And notice the arguments that are given and particularly any arguments that are repeated, that occur more than once. For instance, at the end of Chapter 63, we read "We are thine: thou never barest rule over the m: they are not called by thy name." and then in 64 :~~6~~-8 we read, " But now, O Lord, thou are our father; we are the clay, and ~~tox~~ thou ~~are~~ our potter." There's an argument that occurs in both of these verses, and what is the argument? If you get a correct understanding of 63 and 64 , then I think you can correctly understand 65, and if you don't , you'll be like Davis, who says here is this tremendous prayer that God is going to answer, but before He answers , He has to deal with something

65:19

64:8

B. 69 contd.

63:7
else first. That doesn't sound very logical to me. I think 64 and 65 deals specifically with ~~64~~ 63 and 64, ~~I~~ I'd like to find out what you think. So please find ~~out~~ opportunity between now and two weeks from yesterday to get some definite ideas. (Question). The first ~~k~~ part of 63, verses 1-6 belongs with the section we have been discussing, but in verse 7 he starts a new section, and I want you to ~~think~~ think how far that new section goes, what it is, and what its purpose ~~it~~ is, and what its relation is to Chapter 65.

We have noticed that this last part at which we are now looking--this part which the critics would call the third Isaiah and there is a measure of truth ~~in~~ in those terms, in this sense that from Isaiah 56:9 on it's quite distinct from what precedes, just as the part from 40-56 is quite distinct from what precedes, and this part, which seems to look quite a distance into the future divides into two main sections, and this is a very sharp division between the two, at Isaiah 62 63:7, so you have a unified section before that and a unified section after that, but the structure between the two sections is very different. The structure of the section before that consists of ~~rebut~~ rebuke and a little blessing, (half a chapter of rebuke and half a chapter of blessing), 3/4 a chapter of rebuke and then three chapters of looking forward into the future, mainly blessing, but all of it the great works of God. And so this large part of this first portion of our present section which begins at 59:15b and runs through the first part of 63 in turn has a structure of its own, and here we notice there's an envelope ~~str~~ structure: it starts and ends with two parallel passages, which describe a forceful, divine intervention to establish justice, and then, next, after the first, and before the last, ~~is~~ comes the section which describes the raising of a banner and the coming of a Redeemer to Zion, and that has that wonderful

B. 69 contd.

verse in it in 59:21, "As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord;

54:21

My spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in ^{thy} ~~their~~ mouth shall not depart out of thy ^{mouth} ~~mouth~~ of thy seed, nor out of the ~~mouth~~ mouth

//

of thy seed's seed, saith the ~~Lo~~ Lord. from henceforth and for ever." This

63:10

wonderful verse of the Redeemer's work ~~is~~ within~~g~~ the heart of His people, and parallel with it, just before the beginning of 63 we have a section, where-

in verse 10 they are called to "prepare ~~x~~ ye the way of the people; cast , ~~x~~ cast up the highway , ... lift up a standard for the people." "The Lord hath ~~pre-~~ claimed unto the end of the world. Say ye to the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy salvation cometh; His reward is with Him, and His work before Him, and they ~~sa~~ shall call them, The holy people, the redeemed of the Lord: and thou shalt be called, ~~Sought~~ sought out, a city not forsaken." So we have these two parallels

and then we have the third in from the beginning and the third back from the end are two very long sections, and those two long sections which include on the one hand all of chapter 60 and on the ~~ox~~ other hand from ~~63~~ 61:4 on to almost the end of 62--those two long sections put their stress on the regathering of Israel and this would seem to imply that he is looking ~~for~~- forward beyond the



exile; there are a number of verses that stress the regathering, and many verses which stress the Gentiles, being either subservient or being helpful, many verses stress that and there is much ~~stress~~ stress on material blessing, and ~~may~~ many statements about the glory of the Lord resting upon the people. Now ^{then} this section ~~them~~ from chapter 60: verse one to 22 and ~~63~~ 62:5 or 4 -9; that's 61 through verse 9 of 62--these two long sections look ~~for~~ward to a time of very special blessing from the Lord upon His people, and ~~the~~ way they are introduced would seem to suggest that this is something that ~~x~~ occurs after

B. § 69 contd.

God's marvelous intervention with power to establish ~~an~~ justice on the earth and to bring an end to wickedness, and after the coming of the Redeemer to Zion so that all ~~Israel~~ Israel shall be saved and she shall be called a city not forsaken. After those events, it would seem to be Thus we have ~~three~~ two events , and a condition which are pretty hard to point to as having taken place by this time, the first of them the ~~divine~~ divine intervention when the Lord is ~~not~~ sprinkled with the ~~ix~~ Blood of those when He has trampled out the wine-press alone; that is pretty ~~had~~ hard to ~~say~~ say has occurred yet; there have been incidents ~~w~~ somewhat like that on a small way, but hardly big enough to be the fulfillment of that passage--those two passages. The second of them, the one about the Redeemer coming to Zion some can spiritualize and say this shows the ~~person~~ first coming of ~~Christ~~ Christ, and it refers here not to Israel but to ~~the~~ all of God's people, whether from Israel or from Gentile background--pretty hard to do that with the passage of the Lord's intervention and it doesn't very well fit with these either. But ~~then~~ then we have these two long passages of God's material blessings and His re-gathering of Israel and those would certainly seem to be future pictures. -~~Surely~~ Surely these two passages are a picture of the millenium--a picture of that which God is going to establish, as a result of these two great acts which are to occur. But right in the middle of that we have this passage (~~61:1-3~~) (61:1-3), and that is a passage which differs from what precedes or follows, because it is one speaking and declaring a great call that has come to him--a great position which he occupies, a great task which he should do, and so we look at chapter 61, and we immediately say , "Who is speaking?" "Well, the spirit of the Lord is upon me." Would Ahaz say that? Would Hezekiah say that? Well, certainly Isaiah could say it, couldn't he?

B 69 contd.

Well, is this Isaiah speaking in 61:1-3? You have , looking simply at the passage, any evidence that this is or is not Isaiah speaking, with out bringing in other passages of scripture? ~~fx~~ The Lord speaking, "I ~~walk~~ the Lord will hasten it in His time, but no~~wy~~ couldn't you switch from I the Lord. You think it is still the Lord speak~~ing~~ . But he says the spirit of the Lord is upon me. How ~~thax~~ would the Lord say the spirit of the Lord is ~~px~~ upon me?

B. 70

Well, a prophecy might ~~bx~~ help a great deal--to proclaim liberty to the captives . It doesn't say to give liberty here, it's to proclaim liberty. A prophet couldn't make a prodamation--proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord. When you get to comfort all that ~~moun- moun-moun-~~ mourn, that's pretty strong for a ~~ax~~ prophet to do. I think when you get to three it gets still stronger, "to appoint to them that mourn, to give unto them beauty for ashes." The prophet surely could not give them beauty for ashes. It seems to get stronger as it goes on. It seems that it starts just with talking, as you or I could ~~do-~~ do. We could bring people joy by telling them what God's message is , but them it seems to get to actually doing it , not merely telling about it, and more and more you find that he implies a power beyond what would you would expect a mere prophet to have . (Question).

Well, Mr. Curry asked that we should confine ourselves to this passage, in other words, he has~~l~~ some parallel or something to bring in connection. What did you have in mind? Luke 4, and what do we find in Luke 4? So the Lord quotted these words in the synagogue, and He said, "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He has ~~annou-~~ anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor, He has sent me to heal the broken - hearted , to preach deliverance to the captives, the recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them ~~ther~~ that are bruised, to preach the

⁷⁰
B. ~~69~~ contd.

acceptable year of the Lord. And then he says, this day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears. Just what would that mean? ~~Would~~ Would that mean this is the acceptable year of the Lord? Does that ~~je~~ mean that all that are bruised are going to be set at liberty, or would it mean that now this proclamation is being ~~given~~ that these things are coming. Which ~~α~~ would it be, "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." One commentater has said that ~~κ~~ since this was to preach the acceptable year of the Lord, that proves that our Lord's earthly ministry was only one year; that's the acceptable year, and it ~~κκ~~ couldn't be more. Now if that interpretation is valid, then when he says this day is this ~~scit~~ scripture ~~4~~ fulfilled in your ears, it would mean that all has happened in one day. In other words, day and year simply indicate time in general. It surely doesn't indicate a specific length of time, but he says now you see this scripture fulfilled. Either with the situation happening which ^{else} is the situation described in the verse or ~~este~~ the ~~†~~ verse was looking forward to a ~~α~~ proclamation which proclamation was now being made, and he was ~~decahri~~- declaring the carrying out of that. Well that certainly suggests that this ties up with our ~~α~~ passage in Isaiah 40-56 where it speaks of the Servant of the Lord and gives ~~and~~ individual ~~picut~~ picture of Him. This is Him speaking again, and He is right in the center in the climatic part of this section from 59-63. So here then we have the whole millenial glory , some of the verses which could be applied rather recently to our present period, but surely many of them go way beyond this present period. They seem to look forward to something far beyond anything that has yet been realized , and this all hinges upon these verses here. These verses describe the thing ~~whih~~ which is back~~g~~round and necessary to them. They are the out-working

B. §70contd.

of Christ's work. And so His work here begins with the preaching good tidings to the meek and surely that was a very marked ~~feath~~ feature of our Lord's ministry. You think of the Beatitudes and of His preaching in general, Binding up the broken-
certainly He was doing that,
hearted/proclaiming liberty to the captives. Is this literal? Does this mean people who are prisoners of war, or does it mean people who are prisoners of Satan? Well, if it applies to Christ's earthly ministry, it would be more likely prisoners of Satan than prisoners of War." And the opening of the prison to the bound." That again is probably not a literal description, unless it be looking forward to the beginning of the Millenium, probably it is more natural that He is freeing people who are held in blindness and deafness, or prisoners of Satan. And then "to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord"; that's a peculiar phrase--the year of acceptation perhaps, the year of favour of the Lord. To proclaim~~x~~ the time when the Lord^{to going} wanted to show His mercy to His people. That probably would refer to Calvary. "And the day of vengeance of our God." Does that refer to like the end of 59 and beginning 63, God's destruction of His enemies--is that what He is now proclaiming, or is He here proclaiming His vengeance against sin? His punishment of sin through Christ on Calvary. "To comfort all that mourn." Jesus said ~~Be~~ Be Blessed are those that mourn, for they shall be comforted. Jesus by His healing work brought comfort to many, of course, and by His forgiveness of sins. "To appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness." How great an extent is that a description ~~of~~ in a w somewhat figurative way of what He did at His first coming. To how great an extent does this refer to literal blessing to be in connection with His second coming. The ~~&~~ last part

B. 70 contd.

seems more like it refers to His first coming, doesn't it, that they might be
~~x~~ called trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord, and yet we do have
the second coming back in Ezekiel where he sees the vision of the river and
he sees the trees by the side of it, and we of course Psalm 1 the man who is
like a tree planted by the rivers of water, the planting of the Lord, that He
might be glorified. It's rather hard to confine it to the second coming, at any
rate. (Question) Yes, if you take just that one verse, "To proclaim the
acceptable year of the Lord and the day of vengeance of our God." And you
say the acceptable year of the Lord is Christ's first coming and the day of
vengeance of our God is His second coming, and He stops in between,
you might say that, Does that mean that everything before that ~~&~~ refers to
His first coming, and everything after that refers to His ~~sox~~ second coming.
I find it rather hard to see that. It seems to me that if some of the things
before might refer at least as well to the second coming as the first, and some
of the things after seem to refer better to the first coming ~~than~~ than to the
second, and do we know that that is all the Lord said. Of course it says
you don't ordinarily be so specific as "He closed the book.
He closed the book/that sort of gives the impression here that He stopped.
be
It may/that this is just giving you a part. So I wouldn't want to be dogmatic
on this. Now if it were very clear that what preceded referred to the ~~second~~
first coming and very clear that what followed was the second coming, that
then would be a good suggestion, but I'm rather skeptical of it. I am inclined
to think that quite a bit description after this seems to refer to the first coming,
and it isn't so much what he does as what he says, but of course it is what
you say, proclaim, declare about what He is going to do, but even that

B. 70 contd.

what He declared of what He is going to do seems to fit the ~~personality~~ first coming more than the second. So it seems to me that it is very definitely looks forward to the second coming and very definitely includes the first, but whether you can separate the two ~~sharp~~ sharply, I'm rather skeptical. It seems to me more that ~~is~~ it is a picture of the Q Lord Himself, rather than a picture of one or other--it simply refers to things typical of the second and the-- first and

It is rather a description of His work, which applies to both. ✓
typical of Him in both. / This then is the structure of this section, and we have looked in some detail at the a part, the b part beginning at and x then this d in the middle--the long section in between has some beautiful verses in them; it's a very lovely section, but we haven't looked at them in ~~now~~ ~~much~~ much detail. Maybe we will come back to them ~~at~~ later. Now I think it would be good - (Question) It would seem to me that the passage here is probably not a ~~describe~~ description of His first coming or not a description of the Second Coming, but a description of ~~He~~ Christ and His work. And His work applies to both coming. For instance, the great purpose of His first coming was to die on the cross for our sins. Well, He won the victory over Satan. He destroyed the power of the devil. He set us free from the curse of sin by His death on the cross, but that was done there in principle, ~~now~~ not in complete out-working, and the complete out-working awaits the second coming. That which was won at the cross. We have many of the blessings now, but many we will not have until the second coming, and, consequently, there is a very close relation between the two. The first ~~be~~ being the defeat of Satan, ^{in principle} and the second the out-working of ~~it~~ ~~we~~ ~~awa~~ that which has been done. And so, the followers of Christ in this age enjoy in their hearts and their relation to Him ⁱⁿ a very real way the many of the blessings which will be enjoyed in a more

B. 63

For today I ask you to write out two different things : one was a comparison of the material in Chapter 59 and 60 ~~x~~ with that in 63 and 62 ; the other was a study in the Hebrew of each verse. We might look at a part of _____ first.As we ~~wx~~ look there at the end of 59 we find that the new section starts right at the middle of verse 15, where it says , "And the Lord saw it, and it displeased him that there was no judgment. And He saw that there was no man , and wondered that there was no~~k~~ intercessor:" ~~therefore~~ Did you find anything that was ~~ax~~ parallel to this in chapters 63. Anybody? I'm looking at particular verses now. I think you'll find many point of similarity to the section beginning at 53. Looking at the particular verses I read the last half of verse 15 and the first half of verse 16. ~~x~~ "The Lord saw it, and it displeased him ~~hx~~ that there was no judgment, and He ~~x~~ saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no intercessor." Verse 5 of chapter 63 is an exact parallel. "I looked and there was none to help; and I wondered that there was none to uphold:" Whereas back there at the beginning of the passage in 59:15, 16 "The Lord saw it, and it displeased him that there was no judgment. And he saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no intercessor:" Then we continue , "therefore his arm brought salvation unto him; and his righteousness, it sustained him." Do you find anything parallel to that. Yes, " Mine own ~~ox~~ arm brought salvation unto me; and~~x~~ my fury, it upheld me." And similar back in verse three, "I have trodden the winepress alone; and of the people there was none with me." We have these two verses which are exact parallels to that idea which is the second idea in 59:15b ff. Then we continue ~~x~~ in 59:17, "He put on righteousness as a breastplate, and an helmet of salvation upon His head; and he put on the garments of vengeance for clothing, and was clad with zeal for a cloke."

59:15b

59:15-16

63:5

63:3

59:17

B. 70 contd.

externalway after the second coming. And it would seem to ~~me~~ that some of these phrases would seem to have more of an emphasis on the ~~present-~~ later situation ~~than~~ present, but that all of them are really applicable to both. Surely, it was a day of vengeance of God by Jesus, when He destroyed the power of sin by Christ's death on the ~~ox~~ cross, but the out-working of it was in the ~~cup~~ outpouring of His wrath at the end of the age. And surely when it comes to His comforting all those that mourn. The greatest comfort is in what He did on the cross. And surely the opening of the prison of those that are bound is accomplished by what He did on the cross, ~~so~~ though finally worked out through the second coming. So it seems to me rather difficult to differentiate in this particular passage. It is Christ rather than one or the other of the comings in view; it is not a ~~picutre~~ picture of events but a picture of a person who worked through these _____. (Question) We enjoy them now in a spiritual sense ; we will later enjoy them in a spiritual sense and also in a physical sense. Of course we enjoy them now in a physical sense, but later they will be more a universal enjoyment. Is there a further question on this, or shall we go on to a further section. Now I asked you to look ahead during these last two weeks when I have not been with you, at the second main section~~ef~~ of this last portion of Isaiah, and this section, you'll notice starts with Isaiah 63:7, and we really ought to have a chapter division there rather than where it is . It's a very good place for a division between ~~62;12-~~ 62:12 and 63:1, but when ~~ix~~ it comes to making a start at verse one here and a start at verse 7 , 7 is still more an important _____ than verse one, for verse one is a carrying out of this whole passage and finishing it, with a parallel to the start of ~~it~~ it. Now in 7 we start on something entirely different. Now

B. 70 contd.

who is speaking in verse 7? Mr. Grafton, would you give us an explanation of who you think is speaking in verse 7 and why you think it?

B. 71

You can narrow the possibilities if we can cut Ahab out at least. Well, how much can you narrow it down. Is it the Lord God speaking in verse 7. Can you narrow it down in that regard? It would seem to be a godly person, wouldn't it? It's a person who professes to be a follower of the Lord. It is a person who is interested in the house of Israel, who is interested in the welfare of Israel, one who professes to believe in God, it is not God speaking. It could conceivably be the Lord of course, be Christ speaking, though it doesn't seem likely --we don't rule that out, but we do rule out it being God the Father. And we rule out it being any person who is vocally antagonistic to the Lord. So then we narrow it down to those who claim to be God's people. S+ Now, is it some one individual among such, or is it those people considered as a whole, or is it some group of them. Well, we maybe can't decide on that from this one verse, but certainly the speaker involved in verse 7 would be very different from the speaker in verse 6, wouldn't it? Verse 6, "And I will tread down the people in mine anger," That is the Lord God speaking, this is entirely different. Well now we don't tell a great deal then from verse seven, but as you go on there would seem to be a continuity in verse 7 that continues for a long distance. We have the start of a passage where somebody wants to call attention to God's goodness to people. Well, why does he want to call attention to God's goodness? Do you just all of a sudden have a little passage like praise God

B. 71, Cont'd.

for His goodness? Or is it tied w up with the conclusion of something, or is it an introduction to something? Is it an introduction? Introduction to what?

(A) Yes, yes, as Mr. Kim points out ~~it~~ verses one to three to seven to nine,

the wonderful things that God has ~~g~~ done in the past, but verse 10 says, in
wonderful

spite of the ~~things~~ God has done in the past, he will turn against us, so that
an

it is ~~interesting~~ survey of God's relationship with his people, but now then
is

verse 10, still continues ~~to~~ ing to deal with the past, telling about the people

~~concerning~~ turning against God, and what ~~about~~ about verse 11? What does ~~the~~

verse 11 deal with, Miss Chung? (A) Mr. Kim says, when we look at ~~the~~
midst of

verse 11, we find that we are in the ~~middle~~ of a sort of lamentation, ~~he reckoned~~

regretting God who did wonderful things for the people in the past doesn't

seem to be ~~along~~ the same ~~swonderful~~ things now. Well, that surely gives us

the key to the passage as a whole. We start then with verse seven, and we

find the descriptions of the ~~god~~ good things that God had done in the past.

Admission that the people had turned away from God, and deserved punishment

which they have ~~never~~ ~~received~~ received, but lamenting that God is not now giving

them the deliverance from the punishment. And so desiring that God do something

for the people. We have then a prayer, don't we. It is a prayer, but read verse

seven. It is a prayer, a ~~prayer~~ prayer to God expressed first with praise to God,

summary of God's goodness in the past, lamentation over present misery and
relief

prayer that God will give ~~deliverance~~ from present misery. Now when, what is
which

the time in ~~this~~ prayer ~~it~~ is placed? Or we might ask, first we might ask.

How far does the prayer go? How long do we have to ~~wait~~
read

the prayer ~~7~~, and get through the answer to the prayer or to something else? Did ,

B. 71. Cont'd.

you tell us something again? (A) Mr. Kims says, until the end of ~~✓~~ chapter sixty-four, does everybody feel that way? You have a continuous passage, then it would be much better. If you want to have a new chapter, ^{start with} sixty-three, let it finish chapter with sixty-three, and start a new chapter, but you have a continuous passage, why have a break at ~~✓~~ sixty-four one? Why not have a continuous passage? Because here is a declaration of a human being from verse one through verse seven to the end of sixty-four. Wilt thou refrain thyself from these things, oh, Lord? Wilt thou hold thy peace, and afflict us very sore? There is a prayer extending through the twenty-four ~~✓~~ verses, the prayers to God for help, a prayer that he will give an assistance in a dire situation. What is ~~the situation? that they want~~ is it that they want God to do? What are they concerned about? Is it... There is another verse, there has been damage done to the land.. Now ^{do they} you may pray God to bring them back to God from exile? Is there ~~any~~ any verse here that suggests that these people are in Babylon asking Him to bring them back to their own land? ^{do} ~~✓~~ you find any suggestion here? Anybody? It seems to me that they are ~~not in~~ interested ~~✓~~ not in returning to their land, but in having their land rebuilt. And the land is destroyed, listen to what he says. Verse 10 of sixty-four, ^d Thy holy cities are 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? " (7/25) ,

64:12

You see why the critics say the first of Isaiah is the time~~ly~~ of Isaiah before the exile, second Isaiah is in Babylon, wanting to come back, the third is after they come back, wanting the land rebuilt. Now I don't say that that is true at all.

I believe Isaiah wrote the whole thing, but it seems to me a strong argument can be made that ⁱⁿ Isaiah one to thirty-nine ^{he is} it's mostly dealing with the situations of his own day, that in forty to fifty-six ^{he is} it's looking forward to the exile with the people in Babylon, and declaring that God is going to bring them back, and that in fifty-six following he is looking ~~forward to the exile~~ beyond the exile to what ~~is~~ God is going to do later on/ and through the misery that they are going ^{ir} to have after the exile is over, and the ~~need~~ and further help _____) 6/85)

And certainly ~~h~~ you have a background in this passage of a situation where the land is in bad shape. Look at sixty-three verse eighteen. @ "The people of thy holiness have ~~p~~ossessed it (land) but a little while: our adversaries ~~h~~ave trodden down thy sanctuary." Look back. It was only a short time as we look back as we ~~have-~~ had the land. Now it is trodden down by ~~the enemy~~ ^{re} our enemies. This is the condition in which they want ~~building~~, they want restoration, they want the land, again have God's blessing. And so they pray to God to give them ~~rebuilding~~, restoration of prosperity, return of his blessing upon the land. They pray for them. Now, I hope ^{was} during the week while I ~~am~~ away, you took time to go through this prayer, and to see what (are) the grounds on which they make this plea. They say, we say, God do this. That's a question, but then after we are given some reasons why He should do, why (He should) give his blessing? what is the argument for it? There must be some argument. There must some ~~argument~~. There must be some purpose. ~~When we ask God to give us blessing-~~ ^{god's} We, when we ask for God's blessing ~~to do~~ it on the arguments that Christ has died for us on the cross, and by virtue *of*

what he has done, we are now turning away from our sin, and asking God to- for ~~forgive-~~ His mercy and for His blessing. What is the ground in this prayer of

request? Well, the very first ground of it comes in verse seven. What ground do you find there? (A) He is going to mention the thing that had happened

in the past, isn't it/? So, it is the past _____ (4.30) It's what God has done

done in the past. If God had ~~done~~ in the past these wonderful things, surely we

~~ought to be~~ we ought to see ^s ~~some~~ more wonderful things like it in the future. which comes in

63:7, From now, does this argument ~~in~~ verse seven, is it repeated in anywhere? It is

repeated in verse nine. It's repeated in verse nine. It's repeated in verse eleven.

9, It's repeated in verse twelve/ and thirteen. It's repeated in verse fourteen. ^{In} /All

11 those verses we ~~have~~ have the plea that God has done wonderful things for

His people in the past. Isn't it reasonable to think that He is going to keep on

doing it? That's the first ground of it, God's lovingkindness in the past. Yes,

Miss Chung. Sixty-three and sixty-four. Then in verse you have then the plea then

in all these ~~the~~ verses . God has been good to them in the past, will he not

continue? The prayer that He will continue. Well, now do you find another

ground on which they ask that He shall give them His blessing, and shall restore

What is the next one then, ~~them~~ their land? / Mr. Kim? (A) Yes, where does he do that? Where do you

63:16 find it? Verse sixteen Lord, thou art our father, our redeemer; thy name is from

everlasting." They say, God, you have a relation to us. We are your children, and

you are our father. Therefore we have a right to expect blessings, do you find

this argument given any more? Verse nineteen, "We are thine: thou never barest rule

over them; they were not called by thy name." Why should these people have

64:8 the land? They are not your people, but we are your people. Do you find that

argument any more? (A) In verse eight, "But now, O Lord, thou art our father; we are the

clay, and thou our potter; and we/ all are the work of thy hand." The same argument.

God, we are your people, why don't you bless us? Because we are your people.

Do you find

/Any more after verse eight? Verse nine, "...O Lord, ... we beseech you, we are all your

people. You never bore them, and they are not your people. We are your people.

Why do you let them take our land? Why don't you bless us? Well, that's a

_____ repetition of _____ for this reason . Now do you see any other

reason? What other reasons do they have? Do you see the statements, O God,

We have turned from our sins, We have turned ~~from~~ away from it, we have sought

for your forgiveness, and therefore we want you to do good things for us, the sign

your

of forgiveness, do you find that any more? There is a certain recognition of the

sinful condition. You find that in/ verse 10 of sixty-three, "But they rebelled, and

vexed his holy Spirit: therefore he was turned to be their enemy, and he fought

against them. " Verse six of sixty-four:"But we are all as an unclean thing, and

all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags; and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities,

like the wind, have taken us away. " @ "And there is none that calleth upon thy

name that stirreth up himself to take hold of thee: for thou hast hid thy face from us,

and hast hid thy face from us, - and hast consumed us, - because of our iniquities: "

Do you find any expression of a real repentance?, And call on God to change them.

in their hearts, or is it entirely a physical blessing and external blessing that they

are asking? B. 72

Verse six might be taken as confession of sins, but is it an expression of repentance? and

of turning away from sin ?/ They say in verse six, " You treat the righteous well,

we have sined, we are like an unclean thing we fade as a leaf ~~xxx~~ our iniquities

have taken us away there is none that calls on your name you have hid your face

but now Lord , verse 8 says, we have turned away from our sin and we are looking

to you to forgive us our sin, provide an atonement for us, make us worthy . Now

Lord you are our Father we are the clay, you are the potter. I don't find any

64:6

64:8

expression of real repentance from sin real desire to be transformed into the image of God, ~~reads~~ real request for spiritual blessings in this chapter at all.

Now if you read ? wonderful commentary on the book of Isaiah you will find he starts Chapter 65 something like this . After this poignant prayer for God's help this wonderful outpouring of a person's heart and desire that God will help them there is nothing that He can do but answer and grant their prayers. However, before he does that it is necessary to express certain rebukes for sin so you get the impression then from ? here is a prayer and the answer to the prayer comes over in verse say verse 17 of the next chapter or where the Lord says I am going to give you wonderful blessings ~~there~~ is marvelous blessings ahead for my people but first you have a big passage of rebuke to the people condemnation of sin coming before the answer to the prayer just received . Well, that surely is highly illogical if you are going to have a prayer and it is answered you ought to have one right next to the other but then have the rebuke for sin that has no special relationship to the prayer it ought to be somewhere else so I have come to the conclusion myself that the correct interpretation that this prayer in 63: 7-12 is not the outpouring of the heart of Isaiah or the godly in Israel but that it is an ~~expression of the nation~~ ~~and~~ as a whole with a large portion of the people who are looking for God's blessing on altogether false grounds that it is similar to the spirit of the Pharisseees who say we are Abraham's children God has to bless us because we are ~~His~~ chosen we are the ones whom He has elected we are the descendents of Abraham . Why on earth does ~~the~~ God who has chosen us and called ~~the~~ Abraham and is going to give His blessing to Abraham why does He wait to leave us in this awful condition with ~~our~~ our land destroyed why doesn't He give us a blessing and consequently the answer of God is in two parts. The first part of the answer being a condemnation of the spirit of the prayer . A pointing out that this prayer represents the attitude of the insincere and ungodly who are looking for God's blessing when not seeking to be

God's instruments and to really turn away from sin that therefore the answer to the prayer, the direct answer to the prayer is in the first place a rebuke rather than a blessing but, nevertheless, that God has called Israel in order to be His instruments in the accomplishment of His purpose and that His purpose is going to be fulfilled and, therefore, that the prayer is to be answered God is going to give them what they ask but He is giving it not on the ground of the prayer that they make but because it is a definite part of His plan for which He has called Israel from the beginning . A plan that is not going to be thwarted even by the sin of ~~Man~~. Thus, you have two different basic ideas in this prayer, ideas ~~in~~ ^{with} which God must be dealt in the full.

65:1-16
 He must first rebuke them and He has the strongest rebukes anywhere in the Scripture in this first part of 65 and this rebuke too is a rebuke that deals with people that are having a spirit that is contrary to God's will . Look at what He says in verse 5 A people which say stand by thyself come not near to me; for I am holier than thou, These are a smoke in my nose, a fire that burneth all the day . These exclusive ~~spirit~~ spirit, this claiming that you are God's and that you have to have His blessing no matter what you do or how you live this is a spirit which I am going to punish rather than to bless and then after going on for about sixteen verses on that then He goes ahead and says yes the land is going to be rebuilt , Jerusalem is going to have marvelous blessing so that the thing they ask for is to be given but not on the ground of the prayer but of the plan. First, there is a rebuke yet more than a rebuke they are told that this exclusive spirit of thinking that they have a right to demand things from God is going to be so punished by God that we read in verse 13 Behold, my servants shall eat, but ye shall be hungry: my servants shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty: my servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed: and verse 15 ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen: for the Lord God shall slay thee, and call His servants by another name: Now that is pretty strong language but this suggestion that I have made makes a fine unity in the passage from 63:7 to the end 66 and

if it is a correct ~~explanation~~ explanation then 63:7-12 is not an expression of God's will but is a divinely correct picture of a wrong attitude which is being taken by His earthly people. Perhaps a rather a ? no more so than to say that the book of Ecclesiastes is a picture of man under the sun, the natural thought because he is not as much but it is an interpretation in the light of context that is showing a wrong attitude rather than a picture. You have an interesting problem when He speaks of Israel he ~~does not mean~~ can mean the ¹⁾ godly Israel or he can mean by Israel ²⁾ the nation as whole being both godly and ungodly or he can mean the nation as a ³⁾ whole with the emphasis on the ungodly. I was inclined to think it was the third one. This prayer is showing the attitude of not all of the nation but a great ~~part~~ portion of the nation ~~is~~ which is picking God's blessing because it is their right because they are God's people. You are never going to rule over them we are your people instead of those who are looking in humility to the God who had saved them through no merit of their own the one they should serve and desire to follow. Now think over that because that is the interpretation in the light of it you see unity in the whole meaning of and get a tremendous amount of light on the ~~individual~~ individual verses which you would not have otherwise and sometimes look at 65:1 and 2 in the RSV and see how they compare with the Hebrew.

We were looking at 63-64 at the end of the hour, and we noticed what I think is good grounds to suggest that this is not a presentation of the word of God in the sense that this is God's message to the people. But that it is presentation of the word of God in the sense that it is God's quotation of the attitude of a certain group of people in order that He may proceed then to give His answer to this attitude. Now that is an approach which I readily admit must be used with great caution. I presented a couple of problems in the Book of Jeremiah to a man, and I said, "What do we do with these problems?" And he said, Well, Jeremiah was mistaken. Look here, ^{where} if the Lord says to Jeremiah, If thou

wilt take the precious from the vial, thou shalt be blessed, but if not, then God will ~~do~~ deal badly with thee.*^h ~~Jes-~~ Jeremiah has both the precious and the ~~vial-~~ vile, and we must take ~~the-~~ the precious from the vile, and leave aside the vile." Well, the place where he pointed out that statement in ~~Jereme~~ Jeremiah was a whole chapter earlier than the place where this verse came that presented the problem, and I feel in a case like that we must take what Jeremiah said as God's message to ~~5h~~ the people, and we must say if there is a problem, study the words, see exactly what they mean, see ~~k~~ ~~ix~~ if they possibly have been mistranslated, misinterpreted, ~~k~~ see if context throws light on it, and when we get ~~the~~ through with all that, and what we have left we must ~~sk~~ say is God's Word and if it does not fit our pre-conceived ideas, we must change our ideas to fit God's Word. But ~~the~~ what the prophets simply ~~is~~ God's Word. ✓

What we do have--the quotations in the prophets that such and such a thing is said, then came the people with a question, then came the King of Assyria with a statement, ~~in~~ God gave an answer. We have this statement in the Psalms that the fool has ~~he~~ said in his heart, "There is no God." Then God goes on and deals with him. We have the whole book of Ecclesiastes, which we take as being the wisdom of man under the sun, a divine picture of the wisdom of man under the ~~ix~~ sun, showing its futility apart from God and ~~k~~ with the final answer that in the face of death the only answer is to put God first. And I feel that in this particular case we have a right to consider ~~to~~ the thing in relation to its context, and to reach the conclusion that there is here a prayer given and God gives the answer. And from the nature of the prayer and still more, the nature of the answer, we are justified in saying, this is not Isaiah's prayer, this is not the prayer of the godly, this is the prayer of the nation, as a nation, having attitudes which are right and attitude attitudes which are

B.73 contd.

wrong. And this presents that attitude of the nation, and God gives His answer to it. Now, I've never come across this in the commentaries, but I have found commentaries on the whole, very unsatisfactory, because while they often take a verse and throw a lot of meaning on the ~~verse~~ verse or the meaning of certain words, few of them grapple with the problem of the meaning of the passage α as a whole, and its inter-relation. And, in this ~~case~~ case, it seems to me, we must study the precise words and see exactly what they say and what they mean, but you have to interpret words in the light of context. And when you interpret in the light of context, ~~or~~ you find that people here rightly point out that God has blessed them in the past. They truly recognize that it was the result of their past sin that they have fallen into their present situation. They recognize that they have deserved nothing at God's hand, that they recognize. But then they go ahead to pray God to give them deliverance, which is right, but they base their deliverance ~~on~~ purely on the matter that they are God's people. They are his people. He never bore rule over these other people. They are not called by His name (63:19). We are God's people. You have to do it for us. Remember, we are God's people--we are the ones that ~~is~~ it should be done for. God's attitude is ~~is~~, "No, I am not simply doing something because these are my people. These people should be those that are turning away from ~~sin~~ sin, turning to God in absolute sincerity and with their whole hearts, and that is necessary, but it ~~is~~ is also true that they are God's people, and God is going to work His wonderful blessing for His people.

B. 73

Let's say it this way. I'm saying that this is not the prayer which the godly ~~ought~~ ought to be praying, but there are many portions which they should be praying. I would not so much ~~be~~ say that the godly should not pray what is

in this prayer as that they should ~~α~~ include a great deal in their prayer that
isn't ~~α~~ in this one, and a few things that should not be included, not that those
things are wrong so much as that, taken by themselves, they become wrong,
unless they are grounded on something more. (Q) Well, you can't always distinguish

quite as sharply in the Old Testament between the godly and the ungodly as we
feel that we can do between those ~~who~~ who are saved and those who ~~are~~ are lost.

a little
I think perhaps we distinguish/more sharply than we can. In God's sight
they ~~they~~ are
people are saved or/lost. ~~There~~ There are two definite categories, but we can't
always tell who is saved and who is lost. God knows we can't tell always.

But the difference there is a difference of possession, a difference of justification.

When ~~w~~ it comes to sanctification, some of the lost are more godly ~~than~~ in their
s and attitude have from
action/than some of the ~~was~~ saved, because they/started a higher level, and they
from
are going backward, while ~~e~~ some of the saved started a lower level, and reached
THEY ARE improving, yet they haven't reached yet that which some of the ungodly had/
while some of them are improving (12.80) So, we have the mixture

of ideas and motives and attitudes. This we ~~for~~ find all true. And ~~in~~ in this case,
The ungodly in the sense of those who reject God, and ~~was~~ want to do nothing with Him,
They ~~are the people who have named~~
believe either in materialism or/idolatry. They will never be afraid of _____ (12.50)

Certainly these are the people who name the name of God, and calm that they
ahead to
are/~~heads~~, but they ~~are/did/ing/~~ may be more like some of the people/~~whom/they/did/~~
in ly The
in Jeremiah to whom the Lord says, "Trust not ~~the/~~ lying words. Temple of the Lord, the
temple of the Lord are these." Jeremiah could have _____ these people (12.25)
therefore good
very strongly who feel that they belong to God, and/God must do everything/for them.

Jeremiah said, you've got to cleanse your heart, and _____ not your God,
You've got to have your spiritual life in line with God first. You've got to turn
from ~~s~~ your sin/ before you have a right to expect ~~yes/ing/~~ God to bless you.

B. 73 cont'd.

And so we'll say that there is an element of hypocrisy on the part of ^{some of us} ~~those~~ who

say that. We may not always be consciously ~~of~~ of it. There is an element of heresy. There is an element of hypocrisy. We are not born in fornication.

We are Abraham's seed. ~~A~~ Jesus said, God is able out of this rock to make

descendants to Abraham. There is an attitude our Christians can get into very

easily, where they think God has to bless them because they belong to this Christian Church, because they belong to this Christian family, and to this ^{Christian} nation,

~~and~~ because they have this Christian background, and there is much ~~fe~~

more to get God's blessing. Yes? (Q) A very good question. Uh, what is

Isaiah doing when he gives it? ~~Is~~ he ~~is~~ presenting the attitude of a certain

people in his day, and giving them an answer, or is he presenting prophetically

an attitude that ^{will} ~~would~~ be characteristic of the Christian people two hundred

years later? an attitude which perhaps is felt by some in his day, but

not expressly, definitely _____ (10 50) which comes to become a

definite expression by the time of Jeremiah a century or so later, I guess.

But that he is expressing ^{this} ~~the~~ attitude, and then is ~~he~~ showing God's answer and

to it/in the course of showing God's answer to ~~it~~ this attitude, he shows ^{his people}

What God's purpose is in ~~it~~ relation to this, which is vital to ~~him~~ in _____ (10.

25). I would be inclined to think that along such a line there is an answer to it.

Yes? (Q) That is ~~the~~ my interpretation of the expression is that it is not an ^{which is presented} ideal prayer, ~~it is not~~ as what God's people ought to say, but ^{that} it is a picture

of the attitude ^{deal} ~~of the people~~ that Israelites as a whole will take after the return

from the exile. As Miss Chung has brought out, this prayer is not a wicked

prayer, it is not an expression of an attitude of those who ~~have~~ have no claim

on God, it is not an attitude which any heathen persons will take ^{it is} ^{triple} , not an attitude

which those ~~who~~ who are openly ungodly will take, it is a prayer which contains much truths, and much that is good, but it is a prayer which I would not say was wrong or wicked, but was deficient, and the prayer does bring out lead the fact that God has a covenant relationship with his people, but ^{it} bases itself only on that. God says, I feel that this not a model prayer, because, in the first place, there is no confession of sin~~s~~ in it, and there is no turning away from sin, there is no evidence of trying to bring hearts, desiring to bring hearts in line with God's desire. I feel that this ~~is~~ is a deficient prayer, because it has , it is basing ¹⁾ solely upon the covenant, upon their being God's people, not upon their seeking him to make their hearts worthy of the blessing of the covenant, and I feel that it's a deficient prayer, ²⁾ because it has an attitude towards other people that God never rule over other people _____ thought, we have not simply (8.10) because we ~~have~~ claim on God, but that we have claim on God ~~at~~ as against these other people, that they have no claim on God's blessing to them, and these three grounds impress me as feeling that the prayer is deficient, but I would not reach such a conclusion simply on these three grounds. If I found these three grounds and no other reasons, I would say no , I will not say that, I will say that it is a true, godly prayer, and an expression of the mind of God, but the thing that leads me to ~~think~~ ^{think} that these three grounds are a true indication the deficient prayer is ~~that~~, that is, that ~~it is wrong~~ ~~or~~ wrong, but it is the fact that when the Lord the Lord prayer ends, ~~of~~ answer to it, it is not to say, yes, you are my people, you are suffering these things, but I am going to bless you and to give you what your prayer asks, but that he says, I am going to bless~~s~~ the people that you ^{don't} ~~don't~~ think deserve a blessing, I am going to bring punishment upon you who says, Stand by thyself, and come not near me, for I am holier than thou.

These are a smoke in my nose, a fire ~~at~~ that burneth all the day. So he proceeds with a rebuke against the erroneous attitude or prayer, and then follows that rebuke with a recognition of the true elements in the prayer in declaring that the covenant is going to be fulfilled, and the people are going to ~~to~~ receive the very blessings for which they ~~have~~ asked in the prayer. Now, it is on those grounds that I feel that we are justified to take this prayer ~~that~~ way. In fact, we must take it ~~that~~ way. Now, the only other way I see is approaching which I do not think is valid is the approach which Francis Delitzsch makes in wonderful his/commentary where after giving the prayer he says, this poignant, _____ and moving prayer must be answered, God must grant what is asked, but before he does so he must give a _____ well-deserved rebuke, and then that is to say, he ~~makes~~, he does not bring out the relationship ~~of~~ rebuke ^{with} then he proceeds in ~~prayer~~ the prayer, but ~~he foresees~~ to have nearly a chapter of rebuke, and then God answer the prayer, Yes, I will give you what you have asked for. Now, if that was the case, the answer to the prayer would come immediately after the prayer. And the rebuke would be given in somewhere else. But the rebuke being between the affirmative answer to the prayer and the prayer itself. It seems to me to mean that the prayer deserves two things: they deserve the rebuke for that which ~~is~~ ~~w-~~ is wrong in it, ~~and it--~~ and it deserves a favourable answer for that which is right. And God gives both. Mr. Curry? I should not have said there is no confession of sin. I shouldn't ~~have-~~ have said ~~that~~ there is no evidence of repentance, and of turning away from sin. There is an admistie- sion of sin as having put them in the position, and the admission of not deserving ~~God's~~ any good at God's hand. That is in it. And that made me hesitate very strongly about adopting this _____ clause(5.00) That is definitely in two places,

B 73 Cont;d.

IN CHAPTER sixty-three verse 10, @But they rebelled, and vexed his holy

Spirit: therefore he was turned to be their enemy, and he fought against them." That

~~They~~ recognize that there was sin/~~and~~ which put them in this condition, and then

in verse six of the next chapter: "...we are all as an unclean thing, and all our

righteousnesses are as filthy rags; and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities,

like the wind, have taken us away. And there is none that calleth upon thy name, that

surreth up himself to take hold of thee: for thou hast hid thy face from us, and

hast consumed us, because of our iniquities." Verses six and seven are

tremendous confession of sin. What's the answer? We've got this terrible sin

in verses six and seven. God has turned away from us because of our sin and

iniquities. Now, O Lord, turn us back to yourself, and cleanse us from our

iniquities." But, now O Lord, you are our father; we are the clay, and thou

our potter; and we all are the work of thy hand." We are in this awful, sinful-

condition, ~~now--and we--can~~ but we can't help ourselves. We are just a

potter. ~~We~~ are just the clay. We are the work of your hand. Don't ~~be~~ keep on being

angry with ~~us~~. Look at the ~~terrible~~ situation ^{it} we are in, and help__ (3.75

~~refr~~ refrain ~~yourself~~ from yourself ~~with~~ these things. Well, you might say that

he should ~~take~~ us, and cleanse us from sin. But they don't say it. They don't

look at it, but it goes far enough/ to make you hesitate, but ~~it~~ definitely

stop short of ~~it as far as~~ ^{going} _____ far off. (3.50) I am glad that you have

called attention to it. I did not speak very clearly on it. (Q)

Yes, there is no real representation of repentance of turning away from sin, and

desiring God's cleansing. That I think is the first one, and the second one is

that there is an attitude of feeling that just because they are God's people he has

63:10
69:6

therefore
7

got to give these things to them. And the third ~~one~~^a is very closely related to the
 in fact that there is an attitude of saying that he shouldn't do good things for the
 others~~/~~ people, for they are not guilty people like we are. We are, he ~~say~~^s says,
 verse 19, "We are thine: thou never barest rule over them; they were not called
 by thy name." The reason~~s~~ to give this to us is because we are your people,
 and the Babylonians aren't your people, In fact God has created both of
 them. And God has called them to be not _____)2/25_

He has called them for purpose. He will fulfill His purpose, and He will
 carry out what He has promised.
 carry out His purpose He has done it for a purpose, not just because you
 therefore
 are His and ~~so~~ you are entitled for blessing. I think that that is brought out
 chapter?
 in the answer in verse 65 where He reproves spiritual pride so strong in verse five.

~~"Which~~ - "Which say, Stand by thyself, come not near to me; for I am
 These
 holier than thou. There are a smoke in my nose, fire that burneth all the day."

Doesn't that remind you of the statement in verse 19, "We are thine: thou never
 barest rule over them; they were not called by thy name" He says, these
 people say, "Come not near to me; for I am holier than thou." He says, They
 are _____, are smoke in my nose, fire that burneth all the day."

So that, to me the whole passage fits together very closely from sixty-three to
 with much desert?

sixty-six. The error of the prayer mixed up pretty much with _____ (1.10)
 Then

/The answer consists of first the rebuke for the error, and for the attitude of a part
 which the error is ~~simply~~- synchronized, and secondly the assurance of the
 blessing, the covenant blessing which ~~he~~ has promised, which He is going to
 fulfill, not because they deserve this, but for the glory of God. To me, this
 sees the unity in the whole passage. I believe the Lord has this. Do you have
 any question? I am very anxious to see questions and problems be brought out.

B. 74

There is a good question. How do we fit together, the verse seven, the "I will...." with the continuation where there is no further an "I", is there? As it goes on, it's more _____ (14.15). Is it we or thine? Thou never barest rule over them. It starts with "I am going to remember the Lord's ~~god~~- goodness, all that He has done for His people. Then he goes on to describe how God has done ~~god~~ good for His people, but the people had sinned, and God has turned ~~them~~ away His mercy from them, and then ~~it fits more with~~ it speaks of more of the group rather than with- of ~~this that God / I will /~~ who represent the ~~group~~ group. "W~~i~~ I will mention this that we say, God will look down from heaven, God, thou knowest thou art our Father. Abraham being our Father, the Israel acknowledges, thou ~~o~~ Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer, thy name is from everlasting to everlasting. Why hast thou made us to err from thy way? Why have you put ~~i~~ us in this situation? Why don't you make us good followers ~~of~~ instead of- of yours in stead of bad follower of yours? He godt _____ (13.25) Why ~~caused~~ have you caused thou us to wander in this misery? The people of your holiness has possessed a little while. We are yours. To our notion, it is a little strange to start with the "I", and then go into the "W'e". But it could easily be thought of/a group with an individual starting a prayer and a group joining together. Further questions? In verse 10/^s look/^{to} back to their sin. ~~There they are~~ losing God's ~~grace~~ favour. They rebelled, and therefore He turned them away to their enemy, then the "he" I think should be taken as meaning the nation, the nation, then, the people ~~the~~ remembered that the days of the Lord _____ (12.45) and His _____

And they say, where is he who brought them out of Egypt? Where is the ^{did} God who ~~has~~ the wonderful things in taking them through the Red Sea ~~and~~ leading them through the wilderness, bringing them into the Promised land?

63:10

All these ~~the~~ wonderful things God did for His people in those days. Where is ~~the~~ that God now? We don't see him here now are in suffering, and in misery. We don't see ~~anything~~ ^{anything} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~now~~. Here we are now in the little city of Jerus~~alem~~ with ~~enemies~~ all around, and a little _____ (12.00) city with a few small husbandmen. We don't see any real up-building, or re-building, or re-establishment ~~of~~ that would amount to anything. Where is the God who did these things in the past? that ~~who~~ showed the wonderful kindness described in verse seven and in verse nine? Where is ~~any way~~ ^{any way} he now? And so they pray that that God will manifest Himself, and do these ~~next~~ ^{next} things for us. And over in verse nine of the chapter, " Be not wroth very sore, O Lord, neither remember iniquity for ever: behold, see, we beseech thee, we are all thy people." He says, _____ (11.50) Don't remember the ~~iniquity~~ ^{away} ~~forever~~ ^{to}. Help us ~~from~~ ^{from} getting ~~from~~ ^{from} the iniquity. Help us ~~turn~~ ^{will} from the sin. Put a right spirit ~~in~~ within us, so that we ~~deserve~~ ^{deserve} some better ~~chance~~ ^{chance}. No, don't remember our ~~in~~ iniquity forever, recognized that we are your people. This is not entirely on the covenant relationship at all. He desires ~~an~~ ^{for} improvement in the character that produces _____ (11.00) Yes, Mr. _____ They are remembering all these things which God did for them, saying that he ~~will~~ would come and do it again. They don't say anything about hearing _____ ^{His} but they say, because we are His people. ~~Never has never~~ ^{He never was among these people, He is} ~~th~~ These people never were His people. -- this is our people among our people. (?) He never was everybody's their god, He is our God. They never was His people. We are His ~~them~~ ^{them} He did these things ~~to~~ ^{to} for us for our ancestors, and ~~now~~ ^{now} he should do ~~for~~ ^{for} us now.

104.9

And

B. 74 contd.

And in the days of Moses, he says, He led them through the Red Sea, while why isn't He doing anything for us now. We are His people just as much as they are. They don't mention the fact that those people were left to die in the wilderness, except for just two or three of them, who were brought through it. (Q) I don't find anywhere in this passage, "Do it for your name," I find, "Do it for us, because we are your people. They never were called by your name. We are the ones that are called by your name." Do it for our sake rather than your sake. (Q) Yes, those are very good. In the past God made Himself a great name by doing these wonderful things for Israel. Now He should do similar things for us because we are His people. The Babylonians are not His people. Why should He do anything good for them? We are His people. He should do it for us. He doesn't say, "Do it so now He will make a name like He made then." He does not say that. You might think that that is implied, but it isn't expressed. It is expressed that He made a name in the past by what He did for them. Now they say, Do something for us similar: We are His people. Those aren't His people. We are His people. Well, that's not all, of course, God does not look merely at the prayer but to the people who are making the prayer. But in these elements of the prayer, they bring out the fact that to quite an extent the selfish person--it is the prayer simply, we are his people, so He should do this for us as He did in the past. And He says Yes, I'm going to do it for you, as I did in the past, but before He says that He first rebukes the errors in their attitude and not only rebukes sends the people into punishment, and how is He going to punish them. Well, we find in Isaiah 63:1,2 where He says, "I am sought of them that asked not for me." You say, "We are your people." Those others are not your people. You never ruled over them. We are your people. Now, He says, "I am sought of them that ask

B. 74 contd.

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 ~~an~~ name. " They say in verse nineteen, "we are thine: thou never barest rule over them; they were not called by thy name." Now He says, I am going to be found by people who ~~are-n~~ were not called by my name. And Paul quotes this in Romans, and Paul says, when people say, "Well, How can this happen. This is the message of salvation through Christ going ~~geu~~ out and there are more Gentiles accepting in than Jews. How can this be, and Paul's answer is, "This was foreseen by the prophet, "God declared in advance that the time was to come when He would graft out some of the natural branches of the olive tree and graft in the wild branches. And ~~Paul~~ Paul says this was God's plan from the beginning, because of the unbelief of Israel, and so we find it over there in Romans 9 where He says how he ~~he~~ has great ~~g~~ sorrow for his own people because they are not coming to the Lord and he discusses this in chapters ~~ix~~ 9, 10, 11, 12, and in ~~ix~~ chapter 10:19, "First Moses saith, I will provoke you to jealousy by them that are no people, and by a foolish nation I will anger you." "But Isaiah is very bold," says Ro.10:20, "and saith, I was found of them that sought me not; I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me." God has turned to those who are not called after His name, and made Himself manifest to them, but Paul continues, ~~he says~~ "But ~~k~~ to Israel he saith, All day long I have stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people," which is to some extent reminiscent of 65:2, "I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people, which walketh in a way that was not good, after their ~~wa~~ own thoughts." So we have Paul's quoting these two verses, saying these ~~v~~ two verses, quoted here, along with other quotations that Paul ~~g~~ gave from the Old Testament, show that God predicted in advance the unbelief of Israel and the fact ~~ix~~ that as a

B. 74 contd.

result, because they sought it, but not by faith, but by works , they started to earn God's favour and to claim ~~ix~~ they deserved it simply because they were God's people , instead of seeking to find that justification by ~~works-~~ faith, which they should have done. Therefore, God says, I will turn to the Gentiles, to a people ~~that~~ were not called by my name. They say , we are thine. ~~Thi-~~ Thy never barest ~~x~~ rule over them. They were not called by thy name. He says , I am sought of those that ask not. I am found of those that sought me not." I said , Behold me, behold me, unto a nation that was not called by my name." So Paul here says that

verse one reads is a presentation , a prediction of the calling of the Gentiles, the turning to the Gentiles, and if you take it that way, as Paul takes it, its either stuck in all of a sudden in the midst of a passage which has nothing in the world to do with it--stuck in ~~there~~ all of a sudden a discussion of the turning to the Gentiles or else it is a logical answer to the prayer . You shouldn't bless those people. They weren't called by your name. You should ~~be~~ bless us. We are your people. The answer is, Yes, you are my people, but you are not following me as you should, so I am going for a time ~~k~~ to turn to a nation that is not called by my name. And so that is the interpretation that Paul gives to this verse, you see, and fits in with the interpretation that I am suggesting for the previous chapter. Well, that's the way Paul interpretes verse one here and verse two. Does anybody happen to have the Revised Standard Version? Mr. Curry, if you have it, would you read to us Roman~~s~~ 10:20,21, please. You notice that the RSV translates these three verses very closely to the King James. The meaning of them as given ~~k~~ in the RSV is identical with the meaning of the KJ, and expresses Paul's argument just as well as the KJ. Paul says, these two verses ~~br-~~ predict ~~that-~~ the turning to the Gentiles, but now under verse 20, you have have a foot note in the RSV, and what

B. 74 contd.

~~B. 75 con-~~

does that footnote say. It refers to Isaiah 65:1, in ~~xxx~~ other words, you RSV N.T. where Paul builds his argument upon quotations from Isaiah has a footnote which says, the verse he's building on is Isaiah 65:1. That is part of the RSV. Now our similar footnotes in the KJ are not part of the ~~jk~~ KJ; that is to say, they are put in some Bibles, not in others, ~~and~~ mine here has no such ~~x~~ footnote. They are not part of the KJ, they've simply the reference to the O.T. that some editor puts in a particular publication, but the RSV N.T. includes footnotes which refer to the passages in the O.T. quotation. So it is definitely a part of the RSV teaching that Paul is here quoting 65:1, so that being the case we should ~~bx~~ turn to 65:1 and see how ~~they~~ translate that verse. Now in the RSV O.T. the verse 65:1 is translated very differently from the ~~α~~ way Paul renders it in the N.T. The way Paul renders it in the N.T. is to present the argument that the O.T. predicts to calling to the Gentiles, but the way its quoted in the O.T, ~~is~~ it couldn't possibly ~~ly~~ refer to calling to the Gentiles--it simply is going with rebuke of Israel and has ~~not~~ reference whatever to the Gentiles, ~~xxx~~ as they make it by making it I was _____ instead of I was. And so your RSV O.T. ~~⊗~~ contradicts the N.T. at this point, and makes Paul a stumbling mis-interpreter who didn't have sense enough to realize that the verse he's quoting to show the ^{calling} ~~coming~~ of the Gentiles has nothing in the world to do with any such thing, and Paul deliberately misquotes it. Of course he quotes it from the LXX. ~~x~~ You might say it's the LXX's ~~ere~~ error rather than Paul's, but at any rate, as far as Paul is concerned, he quotes the O.T. to prove something ~~th~~at it doesn't prove at all and ~~ax~~ has nothing to do with it. ~~Th~~at That's ~~wy~~ why I say that its a misnomer to put on the cover of the RSV, the Holy Bible. A Bible is not

B. 74 contd.

a Holy Bible but an unholy Bible that imports a contradiction into the two testaments and makes the one testament at place after place misquote the other testament and draw from it conclusions that could never possibly be drawn from the Old Testament as~~x~~ the RSV translation. Well, now, that is then , of course, presents to us a problem , was Paul right, was Paul a very ~~ix-foolish~~ foolish man who utterly misinterpreted , or was Paul a lying scoundrel who knew the O.T. had nothing to do with it but yet picked to try to fool us into thinking that he did. Which of the interpretations will you take? Well, what is this fact about the translations, is it a correct translations~~x~~?

B. 75

And so you ask the RSV, you say, when it says, I was sought , I was found, why do you translate it , I was ready to be sought, I was ready to be found. Oh, you say that was a ~~Nipah~~ Niphal , can't have the meaning of being ready, not just the passive but of being ready, just like the Greek middle. You know of cases ~~the~~ where the Greek middle has that sense--I never saw that. Maybe there are , I don't know. I never struck one, but I've had a great scholar say that to me. Why, he said, the Hebrew Niphal, just like the Greek Middle. I'd never come across the Greek middle having such a sense . That's not to say it may not be , in a few rare uses it might sometime occur. I've never come ~~a~~cross a Niphal having that sers e. That's not to say there might be a obscure , rare use that might sometime occur, but I ~~hve~~ have never come across a case where I know that it occurs. I don't know of any case in the RSV where it occurs. I think ~~they~~ now have a concordance of the RSV. It would be very good to get a hold of that and look up the word

B. 75contd.

ready and see if you can find any other case, or how many cases you can find where they have translated the ~~Na~~- Niphal that way. And out of all the Niphals in the O.T. what proportion of them ~~th~~ do they translate that way. Is this the only case, or do they do it one case in 100 or what. If it is a possible interpretation which I am not at all convinced of, but so many great scholars say it is, I'm not ready to deny the possibility. But if it is a possible case, what kind of translators are they who in one case where Paul specifically quotes this verse as proving something. In that particular case, & even if it is a possibility, choose the possibility that would be an obscure and unusual way which will contradict the way that the N.T. quotes the same verse. (Q) Isn't that strange. ~~x~~ You would ~~think~~ think at least he would ^{keep quiet} ~~inquire~~ about the fact, wouldn't you, but you put it down, that is the same as saying in Isaiah, Look here, see what this verse is, but if you look at Romans, you'll find out how Paul is completely misinterpreting and misunderstood this verse. In Romans they say, look up in the O.T. to find the verse that Paul is using and utterly misinterpreting. That's what it amounts to. So, that certainly doesn't show ~~xx~~ any faith in the Bible, but quite the opposite. The New English Bible is I think a little more ~~safe~~ safe than the RSV -- they don't ~~xx~~ put footnotes to refer to the.... Well, this is one of the first instances that I noticed that they show how wicked the RSV is, and then when the Berkeley version ^{came out,} /I immediately looked at the instances that I had found to ~~xx~~ be so bad in the RSV, of the changing of the Messianic passages ~~xx~~ in the O.T. and case after case I found they were translated in the truly Messianic ~~x~~ sense. It is a version which was made by believing men ~~xx~~ on the whole. The editors ~~xx~~ were believing men and most of the translators he got are believing men, and

he got the various ~~to~~ translators to translate and he went over their work and made the changes he wanted to and in the beginning he named who the translators and doesn't tell which portion any of them have done, so you can't tell who did any section of it, but incidentally, when my review came out, he wrote and thanked me for the review. He says that I talked about it. He said anything was better than not mentioning it, and he said the main thing he wanted was ~~to~~ that it be talked about. ~~xxxx~~ He says, I freely admit it's not a version as it might be but he says, if you'll help me, I'll get a better version. He wrote several letters trying to get me to help him, but I said as long as he had some of the men he had in it, I couldn't cooperate with him. And in the end, when he doesn't say who translated anything, suppose I made a very fine translation of a ~~section~~ section and my ~~name~~ name gets _____ and there's some terrible sections of it, who knows which I've done. When I saw that he didn't say who did any part I was all the more glad that I ~~didn't~~ didn't agree to _____, but this one piece here he followed the RSV, and I pointed out and he wrote me and he says that he believed in his next printing he would change that. And I hope he did, but to get in line with his policy elsewhere, I think ~~that~~ it is a thing that slipped in. Incidentally, the man who of all men ~~men~~ ^{him,} I would not have incorporated with was one who had promised to do Isaiah for ~~me~~, and I heard later that this man's translation when he turned it in to him was so bad that he couldn't use, he got another man to do it, but of course he had already asked him and he didn't drop him in order to get me. But I'm glad that I didn't because of some others who may not have been as bad as he was but bad enough that I'd rather not. .But on the whole, it's a good translation, though not as smooth as the RSV, there is much value in the Berkeley ~~Translation~~,
Translation,

and this ~~th~~ is the worst thing in it , and I do hope that they correct it.

~~But if the case~~ But it's a case where I believe a godly man translated

Isaiah but in this case was misled by the liberal scholars of the day, and perhaps

followed that, ~~wh~~ without even realizing the relation to it, but he should

have realized that he was at least translating the Niphal in a way you

wouldn't know that _____ . But now then, as it stands here in 65 and

is called translated as you see, we have this prayer followed they say-

"these people were never called by your name, we 're your people. You

ought to give us blessing. God said, "I am going to be found by people

that haven't been called by my name. I going to say, Behold me, behold

me, to these people that wereh't called by my name. So the answer is

in the ~~v~~ first place to say, "~~This~~- This ~~being~~- business of saying we were

God's people, therefore you must bless us. That' is not conclusive thing,

I am turning to the Gentiles. And then in contrast with that, then in verse

two he goes on to look at the Jewish people as a whole, He says, "I spread

out my ~~had~~ hands all day unto a rebellious people, which walketh in a way

that was not good, after their own thoughts; A people that provoketh me to

anger continually to my face, ~~that~~" Three and four point out the

idolatry and sin which was among part of the Jewish people. Now can you

say that the people referred to in three and four are the same people as

the people in five? I don't know. It seems to me that almost it must

mean a different group of people. It's hard to think that those who are
be

sacrificing to ~~the~~ idols would ~~do~~ the one who would say, Come not near
for as if it is

to me, /I am holier than thou. It seems to me that ~~it~~ probably that he is

referring to the nation as a whole, and say, among these there are those

65:1-2

65:3-4

falsely

who are provoking me continually to face; that sacrificeth this wickedness.

Then he says, there are also among them those who have spiritual pride, say,

Come not near to me, for I am holier than thou; . . . These are a smoke in my

nose, a fire that burneth all the day." So, we find what the Lord thinks the

spiritual pride is, whether there is any reason to be proud of or not. Of course,

some of the people that are most spiritually proud~~d~~ of are _____ (6.70)

But those who have a reason have a tremendous temptation for spiritual

pride, and therefore they must resist, they must oppose and stand against

it. They must watch, ~~and~~ lest he should be got hold of. He says, Behold,

it is written before me: I will not keep silence, but will recompense, even

recompense into their bosom. Your iniquities, and the iniquities of your

fathers together, . . . will I measure their former work into their bosom. "

God is answering the prayer first with the declaration of punishment for

n

sin, and the/secondly, with the promise that, nevertheless, the covenant

promises will be fulfilled, and He will give the marvellous blessing to the

people. That's in the latter part of the chapter. The marvellous~~s~~ belssing

_____ (6.00), but first in the first place he is ~~ere~~ going to

he says, in

create Jerusalem a rejoicing in verse eighteen, and the people ~~is~~ a joy,

. . . I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people; and the voice of

covenant

weeping shall be no more heard. . . . God's/promises are to be fulfilled.

That I think is ^a the/picture of the millenium, a wonderful picture of

this

the last half of ~~the~~ chapter, but the first half is God's chastisement or

God's punishment? ~~Y~~ Israel first.. This punishment involves turning

to the Gentiles, and that is brought out very strongly, when you get over

"therefore saith

to verse thirteen. He says, /thus ~~says~~ 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:

65:6

65:18

B. 75 Cont'd.

65:14-15

"Behold, my servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for vexation of spirit. And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto ~~me~~ my chosen: for the Lord God shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name: " What a remarkable presentation of the turning to the Gentiles. God Who is the ^{od} G~~ps~~ of Israel after the coming of the Messiah became the God of the Christian, and the followers of the God, ~~he~~ the people of God, those who are in the continuous line of blessing with the Israel before as ^{tree} shown in the figure of the olive (4.50) nevertheless that they are called by a different name in the _____ (4.45) and they are yet Israel

→ the Israel of God, and the name is really a little use. The people of today says, You shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen: so that it is most striking not ~~only~~ merely the one verse brings out the turning to the Gentiles but these three verses later on there is a full section ^{with} deals with God's punishment upon the hypocrisy of the nation as a whole not every individual by any means. Great numbers of them call upon God but the nation as a whole a punishment upon their hypocrisy. A period in which his servants will be called by another name. A period in which great tribulation, difficulty and trouble will come to Israel but then to be followed in the latter part of the chapter to be followed by the great blessing that He will give to His own people. so now we only have two more meetings ~~is~~ in this class and please study very carefully Chapters 65 and 66 and see what you find about the millenium in these two chapter and relate it to the sections in Chapters 60 and 61 and 62 that we skimmed over hurriedly. See what you can learn about the millenium answer this question specifically. Is the millenium ~~at~~ a time when there is no death? What is the nature of the millenial period exactly. The wolf and the lamb shall

✓

↓

feed together. Here you have a definite reference to Isaiah 11. What is the situation of the millenium? What are the features of it contained in these chapters? What does ~~hes~~ he say about Israel? What is Israel going to be brought to know the Lord? But how does he tell us anything about that in these chapters. What does he tell about his (2:50)

I think we understand them better when we bring them better when we bring them in relation to others.

§766

B76

Now we are in the verylast section of the Book of Isaiah. The section which begins at Chapter 63:7 and ~~63:7~~ to 64:12 as we notice there is first a mention of the goodness of God in the past, a recital of the fact that on account of their sin they have fallen into a sad plight and a prayer to God that He will do ~~somethig~~ something about it. What is it they ask God to do? Mr. Abbott can you tell us?

(14)

I think it would help to get as specific as we can. Now let us look hurriedly through the prayer. Let us look for two things. The thing prayed for and the basis on which they are praying. Now, of course, we start with verse 7 God's mercies ~~mercies~~ in the past & God has blessed them in the past, however, they have sinned in verse 10 and God turned against them but ~~ix~~ then they had remembered what God had done in the past again so that the motive thus far, the basis of the request of God for help is what God has done in the past, the past blessings to them is the ground on which they ask future blessings. That would be true of verse 7 and 8 and 9 and 11 and 12 and 13 and 14. Now in 15 ~~he~~ ^{they} asks ~~them~~ ^{Him} to do something. What do they ask the Lord to do? They ask Him for awareness of their situation

That, of course, is again rather vague but that is the way the verse is . They ask Him to be aware of their situation in verse 15 . That is the first part. Look down from heaven and behold. Then the next part of the verse what do they ask Him to do ? The implication is do something about it , it doesn't say what. Where is thy zeal and thy strength, the sounding of thy mercies toward Me? Are they restrained? The awareness of the situation and do something about it is really all that they ask. They have not yet said but in this same fifteenth verse we have a ground on which to do it haven't we . Where is thy zeal and thy strength , the soundness of ~~thy~~ thy mercies toward me . Are they restrained perhaps that is the past blessings have been but where are they now ? Again a reminder of past blessings . Now how about verse 16? Does verse 16 ask for something? Or does it give a ground on which the asking is done . The ground is relationship . Thou art our Father. They are God's people . On that ground they ask it and twice they say it in the verse. Thou O Lord art our Father. Then in verse 17 . O Lord, why hast thou done this? Return and ~~do~~ do something about it. That is about all you can get out of it is do something about it. It doesn't say what. The tribes I have inherited. That would be relationship again. The same way. It has the ground but it is generally what to do . Give us blessing do something about it . Give us blessing and help us out of the situation that we are in . Not so much new blessing as return of old . Then verse 18 . Does verse 18 have a statement of what they want or does it have a statement of the ground? Surely the last part, "our adversaries have trodden down thy sanctuary? It would be an implication that they want the sanctuary rebuilt, wouldn't it? That is getting rather specific after the situation. That the sanctuary should be rebuilt and the ground we are your holy people and we have only have it a little while . Relationship again perhaps. Relationship not so much (9)

It is His Sanctuary. Then how about verse 19 . What is the plea there?

Does that tell what they want? Or does it give the ground ? It is entirely ground.

What is the ground? Again they are His people . They are His people . Paul Said called by His Name . His people called by His Name and there, of course, it brings in the negative. "Thou never barest rule over them" Why should they have this blessing they are not your people, we are your people. There is the negative aspect of it there. The implication is that the promises have not yet been fulfilled . They are only partly fulfilled. Then in 64 what is the first verse

of 64? Is that the statement of what to pray for or is the ground . It is the statement but it is very general ? So again you have to say do something about

it . That is about all you can get out of it. Verse 2 expresses "that the nations may tremble at thy presence." Perhaps there is the implication there not only do something about it but overcome enemies . Do you think that is in it or not? It doesn't go quite that far does it? But it does go in that direction .

Then verse 3. What is verse 3 Is that the thing requested or the ground ?

What is the ground? Past blessing or what has gone before? They go together some of it is the past blessing and some of it is the past showing of ~~power~~ power.

But the two are combined. You could separate them . Here the emphasis is on the power shown before. Verse 4. What is verse 4 what they are asking for or

is it ground ? What is the ground? Would that be the promises of God that would perhaps go along with verse 18 the promises of God. Then verse 5. What is verse 5 . Is verse 5 the thing they are asking for or is it the ground ? What

is the first part of it. Then the ground would be that they are liking it. No,

The ground that we can expect the answer from the prayer because God meets with those with those that worketh ritheousness . From that implication we are the ones that work righteousness. The end of the verse says in the past we have sinned

in those is continuance, and we shall be saved. " "Behold thou art wroth for we have sinned" It is not said that God is wrong to be angry. We have sinned and it is proper that He should be angry, nevertheless, in His continuous blessing upon those that rejoice and work righteousness there is assurance that we shall be saved from the wrath. You don't find any repentance in it. You find an admission that the past punishment was proper and an expression that ~~we~~ we can expect a continuance of past blessing. Although we have sinned nevertheless (3)

64:6-7
 May be that ~~the~~ verse needs a little more consideration but in ~~general~~ that would seem to me that would be the thought of it that is the ground on which they should be. Verse 6 and 7 . Verse 6 and 7 comes the nearest to anything yet to being a real confession of sin. But is there any expression of real repentance in it

Is it an expression of repentance in it or is it an ~~expression~~ expression of misery for the condition that they are in . The end is "for thou hast hid thy face from us, and hast consumed us, because of our iniquities." Here is our situation we are like an unclean thing all of our righteousness is like filthy rags , we fade like a leaf , our iniquities have taken away , and there is none that calls on thy name , there is none that takes hold of thee because thou hast hid thy face from us and hast consumed us, because of our ~~iniquities~~ iniquities . Is it really saying that we are so wicked we don't deserve anything else . surely that isn't it.

The opposite of that is (1:50)

Is it not saying you do not have a temple which is in operation with people carrying on ceremonies , calling on your name and stirring up the multitudes to take hold of you because you have consumed us because a result of past sins

(1:25)

as a whole

In the chapter ~~before~~ is not this particular two verses mean ? If you just take

by themselves there might be an inclination to think there is real repentance but you don't find it and you may find an implication but you don't actually find it . What implication you are going to take out of it in the light of follows and what precedes . The implication is here is a bad situation (end of record not clear)

B77

A very interesting question indeed. Mr. Abbott suggests are they confessing for their parents and assuming they are better . That would seem quite likely, wouldn't it . In the light of the context the implication is either in the past we were sinners now we deserve something better and after all you have been good to us in the past why couldn't you be now and perhaps we, "we" can best be explained with ~~our~~ our parents before we are confessing their sins but we deserve something better k. Yes, but the question is whether the one that calls on his name (13:75 is a statement that How can you expect God to do anything when there is all this sin or is it a statement the result of the sanctuary being torn down is that there is no divine services being held or nobody calling on God's Name in a proper established ceremonial way . Those are two possibilities. I admit that at first sight the one being an ^{more} abject confession of sin seems a natural interpretation just on the words alone than of it being a statement that God's services are not being carried on that God is suffering. He is losing out by not having any sanctuary but the second seems to me to fit the context much better because He doesn't go on and say , well how can somebody call on God and say nobody is calling on your name. Aren't you calling on His name when you pray? Are they saying none of us are calling on your name? Or are they saying none of the rest are we are the only ones that are. Now if we are the only ones that are and none of the rest are and there are few individuals that are making the prayer it is not much of a basis

to ask to have the whole area rebuilt. You would expect to ask for a revival first but the others would be brought in line with God's will to where you could expect it but there is ^{no} suggestion of that here at all. So it seems to me that the context seems to require that this is a bad situation rather than this is our confession . Well, in verse 8 this is a bad situation whether the bad situation is that all of the people have gone off into sin and nobody is looking to God or anything if that is so what right to do they have (12)

~~There~~

Whereas here is a bad situation has come because the sanctuary is closed torn down, destroyed and no services going on and verse 8 goes on and makes a prayer "But now, O Lord, thou art our father; ~~we are the clay~~ again on the relationship the ground is relationship . Now O Lord you are our father we are the clay and you are the father we are all the work in your hand . You can't blame us if we don't look for repentance we are just the clay and ~~we are the~~ you are the Father. How can you expect us to do anything why you put us in this situation . I don't think it goes quite that far but it certainly doesn't present anything to keep it from meaning ~~that~~ that . While the specific thing, the ground of the relationship is surely the main ground here but verse 9 goes on with the thing they want . Don't keep on being angry , don't remember iniquity . Why not because we are your people. Verse 9 is relationship again. Very clear. Why not remember ~~our~~ iniquity because there is no sign of repentance. There ~~ought~~ ought to be repentance. No, they don't say anything about repentance . They say after all we are your people why should you keep on remembering ~~our iniquity~~ our iniquity . Your 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. Now these two verses 10 and 11 how do you reconcile those two verses with ~~this~~ this being written by Isaiah ? Were they laid waste in

Isaiah's day? So that you have to either say somebody other than Isaiah wrote this or Isaiah is looking forward to a later situation and is writing with that particularly in mind . Now it seems to me he may be writing for the people of his own day , the godly of his day who see what is bound to come and showing them what is going to come thus giving them a picture of the future . That he may be doing but unless he is doing that and also the same time writing for the knowledge of the people in the future time when these things come to pass . Unless he is doing that then you have to say somebody other than Isaiah is writing it . It is pretty hard to say that he is simply dealing with the situation of his own day when he writes this . He might have said, our cities are destroyed and refer to the cities in the northern kingdom or refer to the cities of the southern kingdom which were devastated when Sennachrib came and took all of the ~~walled~~ walled cities except Jerusalem but this specifically refers to Jerusalem which was not devastated in the time of Isaiah at all . I don't believe it ever was in the time of Isaiah . This specifically refers to that . Surely it is looking forward to the future . It is Isaiah dealing with the future age which seems to me not at all unusual . It is either that or another writer but to say that it is Isaiah and not recognize it as the future age is hardly reasonable . The difficulty of that is that the general tone of that is asking for physical blessing rather than spiritual blessing . I don't think they are asking for spiritual blessing ↓ I think they are asking for physical blessing . I would think so I would be inclined to think so . They are asking for a rebuilding of that that they know is going to be destroyed . He is looking forward to a time when some of them will be destroyed . There is quite a literary device there of presenting to the people the attitude that they can expect their own people to take in the future judging by the attitude they can take now . It is either that or some one else writing it . A man asked me the other night at dinner up at Cornell how many Isaiahs

I thought there were. He was quite shocked when I said I thought there was one. He wanted to know on what grounds .

Verses 10 and 11 are a description of the situation with the implication that this situation be remedied . All these general things about return and remedy would seem to relate to restore the cities which are devastated. That is what the prayer is for. The prayer is for the re-establishment of the nation . On verse 12 refers back to the specific things just said "Wilt thou refrain thyself for these things, O Lord? Wilt thou hold thy peace, and afflict us very sore?" How can you keep on punishing us „ we are terrible sinners but how can you keep on punishing us when it means your holy city is destroyed and no ceremonies are being carried on in the name of God. Those who are your people are in suffering and misery. The implication is that it is the relationship and the past deeds of God is the basis on which the prayer is made and the prayer is for restoration and material blessing. Then we come to the answer and Daly? says something like this -- after the poignant, touching, moving God can do nothing but say yes and pour out His blessing but before He does it though He has some rebuke to give them and it seems much more reasonable to say rebuke is related to the prayer and when he starts the very first verse we find a nation that was not called by my name. When they have said they were not called by my name. You should do your good things for those who have been called by Thy Name rather than those that haven't been. He says--"Behold me unto a nation that was not called by my name" So 65:1 is a statement of a turning to the Gentiles or it is pretty hard to get much sense out of it. Unless , of course, (4:50)

He says why are you asking for these things I was ready to give you blessing but your attitude was such that you couldn't receive them. So there is still in the RSV interpretation is something of the statement of strong dissatisfaction with the attitude but it seems to me that it is justified in taking it in its natural, literal interpretation not assuming such a sense of ? More than that (3:75)

of the turning to the

Paul says this is the declaration ~~concerning~~ the Gentiles. Paul says in Romans 10 This is what God says about the turning to the Gentiles and then Paul says the next verse is what He says about Israel. I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people who walk in the way that was not given after their own flesh. What does he mean I have spread out my hands all the day . Does that mean I have been punishing them? Surely the phrase I have spread out my hands all the day doesn't mean it. Surely the spreading of the hands means the opposite it means come back . Means I have asked them to repent . I have looked to them with hope that they would repent and turn again to me but they were a rebellious people and did not do so. Surely that is the meaning of I have spread out my hands all the day. It is not God's fault that you are in this situation . You admit you got ~~into~~ into it through your own fault . Why don't you admit the reason that you stay in it , is your own fault. Why do you still continue to be rebellious . That is a very interesting comparison. We had that phrase repeated in Isaiah that His hand is stretched out . The implication is stretched out for punishment. Now in this case if spread out means spread out for punishment or does it mean spread out in appeal to return. Which does it mean. It might mean it is necessary to take the precise Hebrew words and examine their usage elsewhere . I am inclined to think though that the general context gives a pretty good suggestion that it is a plea for return rather than a threat of punishment . In the ~~verse~~ first verse I ~~spread out~~ am calling the Gentiles . I said "Behold me, behold me, unto a nation that was not called by my name" Why? I have been punishing all the day or getting ready to punish a rebellious people doesn't quite seem to fit the context. It might be good to look into it and see if there is a possible interpretation along that line . Verse 3 goes on to show how they are rebellious doesn't it? As we go on we find their rebellion described and the rebellion seems to be described under two heads and the two heads that are shown one wonders if the two heads can be descriptive of the same people. Whether it doesn't mean that some of the people go in the one direction . Some ~~are~~ are guilty of the one sin and some of

the other. It is a little difficult to think that the two are both descriptions of the same person. May be they are but I am inclined to think that he is pointing out the sin of the people and doing it by saying there are two categories. Or at least among them some are guilty of one sin and some are guilty of quite a different one .

B78

Well one of the ~~things that showed~~ reasons why things that showed their rebellion is shown in verse three and four . They provoke Him to anger continually to His face. They sacrifice in gardens and burneth incense upon altars of brick; which remain among the graves and lodge in the monuments, which eat swine's flesh, and broth of abominable things is in their vessels; . Now all of these would seem to be a summary of unholy ~~practices~~ practices in which they engaged. Surely it would indicate impurity either moral or religious . Probably religious , turning away from his commandment and doing what is contrary to them. Doing what is abominable in his sight and that is brought out in these two verses but then to get to the next verse and you seem to have another group of people included in the condemnation. It hardly seems reasonable to think it is the same which you might say people are hypocrites. They lead wicked lives and then they pretend to be very holy but the types of wickedness described here are not the hidden wickedness they are things that provoke him to anger continually to his face and so it does not seem as if they are hidden wickedness with a hypocritical attitude described in verse 5 rather that they are overt wickednesses apart from the people and another part showing an attitude which is also very unsatisfactory . Which say "Stand by thyself , come not near to me; for I am holier than thou." Not the attitude of weeping over the sin ✓ of the people trying to bring them into a confession of their sin but an ~~attitude~~ attitude of boasting of one's own holiness and making himself out to be much better than the others-- a Pharisaic act. A common idea among people seems to be that the Pharisees were all hypocrites, and I am ~~a~~ not at all sure that that was the true idea. There were doubtless hypocrites among them; that ~~is~~ there were a great many among the ~~hypocrites~~ Pharisees

5.18 contd

who were quite sincere in what they were doing and who thought of themselves as having a superior holiness. When the Pharisee boasted that, "I am not like other people, He thanks God that he is not like other people, he tithes, he does all this good." I don't think that's a picture of a man who is very a really wicked man. ~~His picture~~ He is picturing a man who is a wicked man as we are all, who doesn't realize his sin. So I don't think its one who recognizes his sin and hypocritically hides it, but refuses to face it, and thinks that he's so good that he just omits to notice the fact that he's like others. That's my inclination in that particular parable --they doubtless were many hypocrites among them. But to say that they were as a whole seems to me to be a reading into the N.T. At any rate these people here described in verse 5 would seem to me to be people who were ~~du-adeb~~ adopting an arrogant attitude of exaggerated claims of personal holiness, and is not to say that they are more sinful than others, not to say they are necessarily hypocritical, but certainly to say they are wrong in their judgment, wrong in the claims that they make of themselves. (Q) Yes, very interesting to compare this to the previous chapter, and the people who are making the ~~pa~~ prayer that perhaps would be more the one to say, "I'm holier than thou rather than the ones rather than the ones who were guilty of the idolatry." (Q) Your iniquities and the iniquities of your fathers together. (Q) Mr. Enrejian's suggestion is that the people in verses three and four are not people who are following idolatrous practices, clearly recognized to be forbidden by God, by people who are claiming to follow God but doing it in a way that is displeasing to Him. That's an interesting suggestion. I think it's hard to fit that with ~~wx~~ swine's flesh because the command against swine~~e~~ is so very clear in the scripture in the O.T. and then ...of abominable things ~~k~~ in their vessels. How can anyone think of abominable things which were glorifying to God. The word contains the idea that ~~ix~~ it is . (Q) People who are pretending to worship God but are ignoring His law, but then would such people say , "I'm holier than thou.

Conceivably. That is of course a vital problem with these two verses to decide.

Are there two groups of people here described, or do they in some way discard the same teaching? It's interesting to think that's true and to see what is the most likely conclusion. I think that will be ~~w~~ well worth --if we had another three weeks. We have only an hour and a quarter, maybe we ~~m~~ better leave it sort of open at the moment. (Q) I would incline to think that three and ~~for~~ four describes one set of people, but four describes another group of the ~~e~~ people. It doesn't say so, and it may be wrong. It may that they are all describing the one, or it might be three groups--the three verses. (Q) That's right, verse one speaks of a people, a nation not called by my name to which He's turned. Verse two speaks about the ~~h~~ rebellious people from which he's turned, and this rebellious people ~~is~~ described in verse two is in verse three four and five is shown how they are rebellious, how they are walking in a way that is not good after their own thoughts. So he is very clearly in verse ~~s~~ three, four, and ~~v~~ ~~xxx~~ five talking about that people, the rebellious people. And to talk about how they are rebellious. The only question is whether ~~is~~ each of the descriptive terms ~~apply~~ applies to the whole people or whether it may be that these terms all are showing how this people is rebellious, but some of them are rebellious in one way and some another. That's the question. (Q) Yes, And I wish we had a couple of hours reconciling but I'm afraid we had better move along ~~now~~ now and maybe you can do that this summer and write me a good statement of it, some of you, I would be much interested. I wish we had a little more time on it, but I'd like to go on now to see that what He says further in regard to prayer. He says, Behold, it is written. These are a smoke in my nose, a fire that burns all the day. Behold, it is written before me, I will not keep silent but will recompense into your bosom your iniquities and the iniquities

Q516

of your fathers together. This is rather ~~v~~ confusing in the English, isn't it.

6517
 How verse 7 starts with a capital letter and yet ~~is~~ it is the ~~obj~~ object of the word right before it. I will recompense into your bosom your iniquities . and the iniquities of your fathers together , says the Lord. Now, the iniquities of your together who have burned incense on the mountains and blasphemed me upon the hills. Therefore, will I measure their former works into their bosom. There must be referring to the whole people, the third person instead of the second person, because he can't be saying now he will be recompensing into the father's bosom, I wouldn't think. But here God says I'm going to continue punishment. You say you've punished enough, why ~~have~~ not quit. We are your people. He says , There is still that ^{evil} ~~that~~ requires punishment. There's still a rebellious nation that's got to be punished. But now is the whole nation going to be destroyed as a result. Verse eight, "Thus saith the Lord, as the new wine ~~is~~ found in the cluster and one says, destroy it not for a blessing is in it. So will I do for my servant's sake , that I ~~am~~ may not destroy them all." Does not that sound as if God says, "I have brought up this nation for great purposes. I have called them out and done great things to them and through them and with them, but they have fallen into rebellion and it might look as if I ought to destroy them, but No, there is still a blessing in store for them. There still with them that which is ~~or~~ truly loyal to the Lord. And I am going to preserve them for my servant's sake that I may not destroy them all. I am not going to just wipe the ~~whole~~ thing out. I will bring forth ~~a~~ a seed out of Jacob and out of Judah ~~and~~ an inheriter of my ~~mountain~~ mountains. And my elect shall inherit it, and my servants shall dwell in it. So that they say , We are your people , you should give us back the land and restore it. He, says, No, you're wicked , you're rebellious, but He says I'm not going to completely ~~am~~ destroy you. I'm going to ~~be~~ bring out a seed ~~for~~ out of

Jacob. There will be those left who will receive this wonderful blessing that you've been asking and Sharon shall be a fold of flock and the valley of Achor a place for the herds to lie down in for my people who ~~are~~ have sought me. Surely, verses nine and ten suggest that material blessings are coming. Material blessings are coming to a remnant of the people who are true to God. Surely that's ~~the~~ ^{he} what's here _____. Material blessings are ahead for this land, but ~~we~~ continue ~~with~~ that you ~~are~~ are the ones who forsake the Lord. These people who have made this prayer, they haven't forsaken the sin that brought them into this situation. They have forsaken the Lord. They are preparing a table for Gath, this heathen god. They are ~~turning~~ furnishing a drink offering to another heathen god _____. Therefore, He says, There is slaughter and punishment ahead for the rebellion

65:9-10

against God. I will number you to the sword. You will bow down to the slaughter. Because you've failed to turn to the Lord and ^{showed} ~~show~~ that which He did not delight. So that they are not now to receive wonderful prosperity for the whole nation.

65:12

They is this misery still ahead. But then verses thirteen to sixteen are most remarkable verses. I don't think you can quite ~~or~~ understand thirteen to sixteen, unless ^{P.K.} you look back to one and two. Verse one had a very strange, new idea, a turning to a nation that did not know Him before, that He is going to bring His ⁺ blessing to. Now up in _____ surely you ~~are~~ have the remnant speaking--there's going to be a remnant out of Israel that is going to get His blessing. The remnant out of Israel ~~that is~~ -there's a whole outside ~~a~~ nation that's going to get it.

65:13-16

So what's going to happen. Behold, thus saith the Lord God, Behold, My servant shall eat but ye shall be hungry. Whose the ye? Those among those who made the prayer, the ones who are not deserving of having their prayer rightly answered. Not all those who are involved in the prayer. Surely, the prayer represents the nation as a whole, but those who are responsible for the fullness of prayer, for its claiming of a right of relationship ~~over~~ what should only come as a result of

65113

turning to God, as it is made very clear in the Books of Leviticus and Numbers where He tells them they are to ~~the~~ turn to God and away from their sins, if they are to be blessed. Therefore, thus saith the Lord God, Behold My Servant shall eat, but ye shall be hungry. And here He differentiates those whom He is talking to from His servants, and His servants surely include the remnant ~~of~~ out ~~of~~ of Jacob who ~~is~~ has been described above, and also would ~~include~~ the people of that other nation who knew Him not, was not called by His name, which He has called. These two together are His servants. Behold my servants shall eat but you shall be hungry. My servants shall drink. You shall be thirsty. My servants shall rejoice. You shall be ashamed. My servants shall sing with joy at heart, but you shall cry for sorrow of heart. Ye shall howl from vexation of spirit. You shall leave your name for an ~~oath~~ ~~oath~~ oath to my children, for the Lord God shall slay thee and call His servants by another name. Surely these verses are carrying of the idea of the turning to the Gentiles. If they are not what are they. But that one turns to includes surely a remnant out of Israel, but as we look forward to this, we see the misery and the suffering that Israel has gone through through the ages. And we sorrow for that, for what they've gone through but we recognize that the cause is their rebellion against God. **They** Their failure to have followed Him as they should.

B. 78 B. 79

This is an interesting break. "You shall leave your ~~an~~ name for a curse ~~xx~~ under my children. I'm not sure that is such a good translation. ~~There were re-~~ The word Leave here I'm not all sure it means leave. It is placed. You shall cause it to rest there. Now that perhaps is to leave it. And you put ~~it~~ it somewhere and go away from it. Perhaps leave is all right, but it's a little more to ~~be~~ place. And for a curse, the word is always translated oath, I believe except here. At

least, if it's ever translated curse, beside this instance, I have noticed the case. I've noticed many cases where it is translated oath, Ye shall leave your name for an oath ~~u~~ unto my chosen.. In other words, ~~the~~ the name but cursed probably expressed the idea which oath would mean, particularly in view of the last part, for the Lord God shall ~~say~~ ^{kslay} thee, and call His servant by another name. Does this point to the fact that in the providence of the Divine economy that the time is coming when the people of God would be called by a different name than it is, Even though they are the Israel of God, they are the continuation of the Olive tree, that witness of God. There is a unity between the people of God ~~and~~ the old covenant and the new covenant. Nevertheless, there has been a ~~ch~~- change in the name, and the name of Israel has been a name which was not normally used by those who were the ~~descents~~ ^{center} of God's blessing through this age. But instead a different name has been used. You will leave your name for ~~the~~ ^{a curse unto ~~my chosen~~ ^{slay}} my chosen; for the Lord God will ~~say~~ thee, and call His servant by another name: That he who blesseth himself in the earth shall bless himself in the God of truth; and he that sweareth in the earth shall swear by the God of truth, because the former troubles are forgotten, and because they are hid from mine eyes. For, behold, I create ~~new~~ new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind."

~~This~~ Does this indicate the gospel dispensation? is ~~it~~ so different from what preceded that it can be spoken of as if it were a new heaven and ~~a~~ a new earth? Or does it look forward to a literal time when the earth will so altered changed physically that it can be called a new heaven and new earth? Well, it seems to me that if you are going to make it figurative here you've got a lot of ^{Things} ~~verses~~ in

the next few verses to make figurative, and some of them are figures which have been used in other context, but it seems that we have a strong evidence to take it literally, and this would connect _____ with others(12.00) So my ~~inclination~~ inclination is to think that either starting with verse sixteen or seventeen, I am not altogether sure which, he changes from the rebuke of what is wrong to the blessing given in the affirmative ~~an~~ answer to what kind of prayer it is, to what the prayer asked for, that the prayer is granted that first ~~is~~ given ~~in~~ rebuke for the wrong ground in the spirit of the prayer, and the ~~is~~ declaration that the words of the prayer will not be participated in by those who share/his wrong attitude, but then the assurance that what the prayer has ~~is~~ asked for is going to be granted, there is going to be a restoration, there is going to be a restored ~~at-~~land, and the condition of prosperity such as the world has never seen before.

So starting with verse sixteen, if you want to start with seventeen, if you want, would say, start but some, with verse eighteen, /start with one of ~~those~~ those, and go through to verse twenty-five. And this is one of ~~the~~ most interesting discussion _____ tomorrow fifteen.... But I feel we have one more hour to discuss that, and the next chapter. So please do all you can tomorrow, so that we can discuss it very intelligently.

GS: 16-17

16, 17 ✓

Now, we were looking yesterday at the... we summarized again in the prayer which seems to me to be the background for this answer ~~which~~ that the Lord gives in two chapters, in sixty-five and sixty-six. And in these two p chapters he deals with the whole situation, but it is the situation related to the prayer. He is not giving the future ~~picture~~ picture of the world. He is not giving the future picture of the church. The future picture of God's dealing with the Gentiles, nor the future picture of God's method of salvation. He is giving a future of his actions in relation to Israel, and that aspect is really revealed in this

prayer. The prayer seems to represent Israel after it has been delivered from
 exile, because there is nothing said of being delivered from captivity, ~~and~~^{or} brought
 such a devastation
 back. At the same time there is ~~no demonstration~~ in Jerusalem. That seems to
 imply that the exile has already taken place, and this prayer here express^{es} the
 attitude of the nation as a whole, and an attitude which has in it that which is
 much true, in that it represents that they are God's people, God has ~~ek~~ called
 them specifically, and promised blessing to Abraham. He is going to fulfill
 those blessings, because He will carry out His promises. ~~Now~~ Now it looks
 as if the promise weren't being carried out. The holy cities are devastated,
 Jerusalem is a pile of ruin, temple is gone, God is going to ~~ek~~ carry out His
 the
 promises to restore this. So that that which is right in/prayer is dealt with.
 God's determination~~to~~ to carry through his marvellous plan, and fulfill his
 marvellous promises, specifically his marvellous promise as related to the Israel,
 but that which is flase in the prayer is also dealt with. The assumption that
 though they have sinned in the past they ~~can~~^{can} simply go ahead, and
 claim God's blessings, because they are God's people, the assumption that
 bring great
 it is sufficient to ~~obtain~~ these/promises, ~~that~~ that there is no necessity of
 real thorough going repentance, and turning away from sin, the assumption that
 they are better than others, and deserve blessings that others cannot possibly
 have, these assump~~ptions~~ are dealt with in the course of these two chapters.
 And in the course of these two chapters, we have approximatd y half of the
 verses engaged in the rebuke, approximately half of them engaged in blessing.(7.25)
 then all
 We don't have all the rebuke ~~at~~/first, and/the blessing. We have in fact start
 with rebuke, and then we end with a sort of rebuke, but in general we have
^{the} a longer passage of rebuke first, and the we have ^{the} a longer passage of blessing later.

~~z~~ and all related to the _____ (6.75) I don't think from this passage
 could a
 alone we ~~can~~ get the picture of God's plan for the future, His marvellous plan
 clearly brought out elsewhere in Isaiah,
 for the redemption which is ~~developed-~~ particularly between
~~in~~ chapters ~~fity~~ fifty and fifty-five . That is not directly dealt with in this
 passage/~~at~~ all, but His plans for His people, His plans for millenial blessing,
 and certain other things are very clearly brought out in this chapter. The first
 verse specifically brings out, I believe, the calling of the Gentiles, and this is
 to
 gone into a considerable detail in verses eight ~~and~~ ten . So in these four verses,
 we have something tht is rather unique here, something that marvellous fits with
 things that happen in connection with the establishment of the ^{by} Christian Church that
 was fully
 certain was revealed, but/a mystery surely not/understood in the Old Testament
 time. And we noticed that at the end of the hour those very clear expressions
 verse verse
 we noticed from/thirteen through fifteen, ending with, "ye shall leave your name
 for a curse unto my chosen: for the Lord God shall slay thee, and ~~et~~ call his servants
 the
 by another name: " And w then whether/verse sixteen seems to have ~~a~~/ no note
 of re _____ such as the previous three have at all. There is only blessing
 in sixteen. It would seem to me to ~~b~~ deal with blessing relating to His own
 servant. His own people, partly from Israel, and partly from the Gentiles.
 That he who blesseth himself in the earth shall bless himself in the God of
 in the name of Christ
 truth; and he that sweareth in the earth shall swear by the God of truth; because e the former th
 troubles are forgotten, and because they are hid from mine eyes." Is verse
~~His~~ ~~sixte~~ sixteen looking at the same period as the period of thirteen through
 fifteen or does it look beyond them? to a time when ~~w~~ the re w ll be a universal
 g the true den
 reconition of God when the former troubles shall be forgotten ~~and~~ and hid from
 his eyes. I wonder the division isn't perhaps between fifteen and sixteen rather
 than between sixteen and seventeen. Verse 17 starts "Behold, I create new

13-14

B 79 Continued

heavens and a new earth: Surely sixteen seems to fit with what you find in ~~there~~ in the new heaven and the new earth . Of course, what does this mean new heaven and new earth? There are various interpretations given us in this chapter. In verse ~~7~~ 17 there are those who say he simply means there is going to be a new condition. A great change so we call it a new heaven and new earth. Then there are those who say it means that the present earth is ~~completely~~ removed and an entirely new planet substituted completely. Then there are those who say it means that the present earth is to be regenerated to be cleansed and have the curse removed. You have such a great change taking place that it can be called a new heaven and a new earth. Now if we just had this verse 17 alone it might be very difficult to know which of these three to select . When you look on into the rest of the passage here into the next six verses you find such changes described in the ~~x(3)~~ habitable earth such a great increase of longevity that doing away with the curse that the first interpretation hardly seems reasonable ^{merely} that it means a general change that changes moral and spiritual condition. Seems to imply all of this a change of physical condition unless a great many things further on in the verse are all to be taken as strictly figures of speech and so that this seems very reasonable to say that this expressed either the second or the third and then in addition to that we get the statement in Revelation at the end of the book there He saw a new heaven and a new earth because the old ones had passed away and the description there is rather lengthy it conveys the idea of a great positive change that the Lord is to bring to pass ~~on~~ upon this earth . Now we will clearly find some in Revelation 19 and 20 and also in Isaiah 2 and 11 and Micah 4 that there is to be a millennial period . A period when the Lord Jesus Christ shall reign in power and glory and everything that is evil will be destroyed and removed from this earth. We will find that we have no difficulty in taking this new heaven and earth and it is not strictly being a change a general moral and spiritual change but a physical change as well but I think the

natural tendency is to think that as the statement about the new heaven and new earth in Revelation 21 follows chapter 20 with a long description of the millenium and of the uprising at the end of the millenium and the great white throne judgement at the end of the millenium ~~and~~ that this pictures an entirely new state which follows the millenium and in the Schofield Bible if I recall correctly there is a note at

Chapter 65 verse 17 which says the new heaven and the new earth and it is verse 18

I believe which says the millenium and suggests that he look forward to the end of the millenium in verse 17 and to what precedes it in the following verse. You might have a correct interpretation of this and also what follows in Revelation 21

However, ^ZJahn(?) the great german commentator whose book on introduction to the ^{New} ~~Old~~ Testament which is called by (?) the most ~~scholar~~ scholarly work of the nineteenth century. Professor ^ZJahn in his commentary on Revelation very strongly takes the view that Revelation 21 which is a description of the new heaven and the new earth is the description of the millenium. After describing the course of the millenium and telling about the great white throne judgement at the end of it then he goes back and discusses the condition in the millenium then this earth has been purified and the curse removed and it is called a new heaven and a new earth.

Some years ago I read this in ^ZJahn's commentary in German. Very difficult german to read he never is contented with a sentence with less than thirty words if he can make one of fifty or more. I think one sentence ran for a page and a half and had the verb at the very end. Very difficult german. A very great scholar and it is very clear when you see exactly what he said. Dr. Buswell nearly twenty years ago wrote a little book on prophecy and I translated it for him as Jahn's specific statement about the millenium and I broke up one sentence of Jahn's into three. To make it ~~intelligant~~ intelligible in english and also I gave him the quotation from Alfred? on this and a quotation from Charles and he put them into what you call the appendix notes by me at the end of the book.

It was some years after that that I when I came across this discussion of Jahn on Chapter 21 and I must say that it appeals to me very much . So I had the whole faculty at the time meet and discuss the matter . And I expressed Jahn's view and I found some very, very much upset by it and they presented what they thought were very strong arguments against it and may be they all were ~~right~~ arguments sufficient to prove that he was wrong but they did not impress me that way.

I imply , I would not be dogmatic, I feel very strongly of this that the millenium is definitely taught in the Scripture and Christ's return is before this and I feel very strongly that the rapture is to occur before the great outpouring of God's punishment upon the earth and before the revelation of ~~antichrist~~ anti-christ. ✓

As to whether the Scripture in Revelation 21 is a description of a new situation after the end of the millenium or whether we just don't know a great deal about what is going to happen after the millenium and that is a description of the millenium

I would not be dogmatic but I am inclined to Jahn's view . Certainly, if one should take Jahn's view on it I think it would make this chapter appear a bit more logical and ~~xxx~~ to say that 17 is introducing the discussion of the millenium rather than to say it looks way beyond it for one verse and then comes back . I don't think that is a conclusive argument but it does have weight to it . At any rate

verse 17 is definite ly either a statement of what is going to happen after the millenium or a statement of the millenium if in either event it describes a great ~~event~~ change in this earth which involves a great thorough going removal of the ~~curse~~ curse which came as a result of sin and the change will effect all moral and spiritual life

as well as the physical situation . Well then as we continue at any rate in verses 18 and 19 you might say that they could fit a time after the millenium or they could fit the millenium , the wonderful promises at Jerusalem is going to be a place of joy and happiness and the voice of weeping no more heard in her.

It could be used of either time I think most interpreters would think it is the millenium rather than what follows it but in verse 20 I don't think there is anybody who think that verse 20 is a description of the period after the millenium. I think that everyone would either say verse 20 is a very figurative description of the condition of the christian church. That would be a-millennial approach to it or that one would say that verse 20 is a description of the millenium and it is rather hard to see how it is a description of the christian church I must say. If it is purely a figurative thing just what is it a figure of but if it is literal it is surely a picture of the millenium in which he says longevity shall be so great in the millenium that when someone dies at the age of one hundred he will say oh the poor fellow he was only a child when he died. That is a picture of great increase in longevity and when he says a sinner being a hundred years old shall be accursed it surely suggests that there is still to be a certain amount of death in the case of sinners in the millenium but a small amount so small amount that it would come before the person is a hundred years old. Most people would not die at all in the course of the millenium. When I was at Princeton Seminary the professor was very strongly post-millennial and it came in the very last week or two of the whole three year course of discussion of the millenium. ^{remember} A ~~number~~ one student, he was a graduate of Wheaton and was a strong pre-millennialist when he came there and I saw him just a day or two before commencement he said that he had given up pre-millennialism because of the professor's stress on the verse "the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death" that proves that pre-millennialism is impossible because that the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. Now if this is a picture of the millenium it shows death as not having been destroyed at the time of the millenium and in fact in Revelation 20 it says death and hell are cast into the lake of fire at the end of the millenium rather than at the beginning and so while the

followers of Christ who are reigning with him are in the resurrection body during the millenium who are in the millenium this seems to show that there are those who are in the physical bodies and who are subject to death though longevity is tremendously improved. Now I found when I dealt with a-millennialists to them one of the most conclusive arguments against pre-millennialism seems to be that they cannot see how there could be people in resurrection bodies and people not in them on the earth at the same time. An age where there are both seems to them utterly inconceivable. I never have been able to see why it is inconceivable. If the Bible teaches it it seems to me that settles it and I don't see how you can get away from it in connection with this passage right here. This is a passage describing the millenium it shows death as still present in the millenium though to a very, very limited degree and certainly if we take for any reasonable interpretation for pre-millennialism we have in Revelation 20 the account of the reign of the saints for a thousand years but at the end of it there is a great uprising. How would there be a great uprising at the end of it if there were not people in their natural bodies upon this earth. People who were still subject to sin but had been so afraid during the thousand years of the reign of Christ to show their true hearts although they had every opportunity to accept Christ and believe on Him in their wicked hearts they conformed outwardly the righteousness of the age that they were ready for the chance to revolt. Perhaps that is the part of the Lord showing that even under ideal conditions that the heart of man is deceitful and desperately wicked and ~~is~~ it is only through the salvation of Christ are any are saved. Yes? There are many people, I don't know if there is so many today as there used to be. There were a great many people in the last century who were pretty earnest, sincere christian people who did not believe in the millenium. They did not pay much attention to the doctrine of the return of Christ and their tendency was to ignore these teachings or to make them a figure of presentation of the doctrine

of Salvation. Now in our day with the oncoming of modernism those views were largely disappearing and more and more people were either modernists, unbelievers like Taylor Matthews dean of the University of Chicago who used to attack pre-millennialism saying that he didn't believe in this idea of a man coming down from the sky and that sort of thing. Well, when he talked that way he was not talking pre-millennialism he was attacking all supernatural christianity but the people more and more were either going toward pre-millennialism or toward modernism but then largely through the influence of Westminster Seminary there has been a great attack against pre-millennialism and Dr. Oswald T. Allis who used to speak there some years ago wrote a book on the Old Testament and the prophets in which he very strongly attacked the pre-millennialist although he does not take any very positive view. You cannot tell very clearly from the book whether he is a-millennial or post-millennial but he very strongly attacks pre-millennialism. There is a man in Grand Rapids who twenty years ago wrote a book called "Why a thousand years" in which he attacks pre-millennialism. Five lines of his book saying post-millennialism was absurd and could not be true and all of the rest of the time attacking pre-millennialism. He was taking the stand of the a-millennialist. Now Dr. Warfield held and Dr. Machen held a post-millennial view that all of the world would be converted before Jesus Christ came. That is a much easier view to fit with the Scripture than a a-millennial view but there is very little post-millennialist now mostly a-millennialism. The idea that the world will continue as it is with wickedness and righteousness going on both going together until the harvest until suddenly the Lord intervenes and no great victory of righteousness either now or at a later age. Now there are certain ~~circumstances~~ (4:50)

Here is Alexander's commentary on the prophecies of Isaiah which was written a hundred years ago and which has been reprinted by Zondervan and it is ~~an~~ an

excellent commentary has very fine german interpreter who quotes up to that time various views and so on and he is a very godly man but is very definitely anti-pre-millennialist or I guess I shouldn't say anti because he wasn't very much aware of it something he opposed. He definitely considered that every prophecy is fulfilled in the church and so when you get into these points you are apt to find him quite unsatisfactory and he mentions for instance in connection with verse 25 where it speaks of the wolf and the lamb together . He says that and refers to Calvin and Tringa? who definitely take it as meaning the curse is to be removed from the earth but he says they both go on to put their big stress upon the results of conversion and that is indeed what Calvin does when he speaks of Isaiah 11 . He says that this shows the curse is to be removed and the earth to be brought back to its Adamic condition where there is no fighting or violence or animals eating other animals but then Calvin goes, however, more particularly we find that in the teaching that wicked men are to be turned into good men so in other words ~~xxxx~~ Calvin applies (2:50)

The direct implication of the passage is pointing to a time which must be the millenium because no one has suggested any other time which would fit that but you are speaking about verse 20 specifically. I will see exactly what Alexander says about that . ~~xxxx~~ and give you a sample of that type of exegesis . He says the whole end of it . He says, ~~th~~ perhaps the true view of the passage ^{that} resumes the contrast between the verses thirteen and fifteen, between the servant of ~~the Lord~~ and- Jehovah and the sinners there addressed. The verses sixteen ~~n~~ to nineteen may then be regarded a parenthetical amplification, as if he said, 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 mourn: ... my servants shall ^{be just beginning} ~~just begin~~ life(?) _____ 9(1.20)
 but ye shall be driven out of it. Among the _____ ^{he} ~~s/who have died~~ ^{dies} hundred
 years old, shall ~~die~~ die as child. Among you he who dies at the same age shall
 die a curse. On ~~the~~ the whole, however, the most natural meaning is the one
 that is already mentioned is preferred by the modern reader. The premature
 death, even the death of ~~moderately~~ ^{moderately old age} ~~old~~ shall be unknown. He who dies a hundred
 years old shall be considered ~~as~~ ^{either} dying at childhood or cut off by a special
 malediction. The whole is a highly poetical ~~description~~ description of longevity to be
 explained precisely like the promi se of the ~~h~~ new heavens and new earth in
 verse 17. Well, it's rather vague, but they have to be very ~~ba~~ vague

on this passage, if you don't take it as millenium.

B 81 and B 82 are not put to recording.

B. 83.

A year ago ~~Isaiah~~ when this class discussed Isaiah 7 to 11, Just this last fall,
 we discussed it, didn't we. ~~I gave you that~~ Did I give you that this semester?
 Didn't I give you ~~this~~ ~~old~~ the copy of my little sermon? Well, in that little
 sermon ^{se} ~~on~~ I pointed out how those who interprete the passage in a figurative
 sense go beyond ~~the~~ those who say that the resurrection of Christ is ~~t~~
 simply the great principle of the sermon of the _____. It goes beyond
 this. I don't think that the most important thing is whether ~~b~~ we believe in the
 millenium or not, whether we correctly understand the areas of God's future
 plans. But ~~eh~~ the important thing is whether we are doing now what He wants us
 to do, but I ~~don't~~ think that in taking a method of interpretation ~~it's~~ gets the
 millenium out of the Bible, we introduce in both ~~b~~ passages the method of
 interpretation which will do away with all the doctrines. ^{if it was here} It ~~will~~ apply universally.
 And I am grateful, and ^{I am} ~~think~~ thankful that there ~~are~~ people ^{do it in-} ~~who are~~ consistently.

as they do not apply to the resurrection of Christ, and to those great Christian doctrines, but I think the Lord wants us to be consistent. I consider the ~~Chris-~~ Christian ~~brothers~~ brothers who are in error in these points, and stand on the great fundamental but I think that we should make known the true interpretation, and one which has a ~~qualification~~ qualitatively consistent method that can be applied also to those passages that deal with the resurrection/ of Christ. I think that all millenium is not in itself so bad as what it may lead ~~to~~ ^{to} in its introduction of the figurative method of interpretation which you can get anything out of it if you ^{it} if you call/ (12.80) That's what Dean Alford says. Dean Alford said that in ~~re~~ Revelation twenty when it speaks of the first resurrection ~~of Christ/~~ ^{and of the second resurrection}, if you take one of them, ~~literally one, and figurative one~~ ^{one of them figuratively and one literal,}, he says, there is ~~an~~ the end of all certainty in the interpretations. He deals with that. You remove the foundation of the solid exegesis when you say that, but the thing I am thankful for it is that those who confine it to ~~a~~ certain sections of the Scriptures, but they do not do that to the great central doctrines of ~~Christian~~ and the passage.

And now, _____ said that all that matters in the Bible is such a doctrinal ~~passage~~ ~~of~~ - chapters as Romans and Galatians. That's all that matters. Of course, ^{and} you don't have to _____ in them. If you will be literal/consistent, ~~and~~ -- you will naturally get _____ you ~~in the matters~~ like salvation, but I think ~~to~~ get enough real, solid service for God. We need to get a song that is _____ (12.00) quite universal, not _____

So, our purposes in this course is not so much to deal with the errors of those methods as ~~trying to~~ to try to find what we can actually learn from these passages about God 's future plans, and I do think that this shows a great increase in longevity in which ordinarily people will live ~~during the~~ a very, very long time/, but I don't think that death is entirely removed during the millenium. ^{of course,} The believer ^{be with} who has been raptured to/Christ at His coming ~~will-li~~ and then with Christ will return

to the earth, and then set up the Kingdom, ~~He~~ he will naturally subject to death.

65:21 / And the verse 21 goes on, @ "And they shall build houses, and inhabit; they shall not plant, and another eat: for as the days of a tree are the days of my people, and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands." They shall not build, and another inhabit; they ~~and~~ shall not plant, and another eat: for as the days of a tree are the days of my people," ~~and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their and hands.~~" This is a beautiful figure of speech, and then, of course, = _____

we don't think trees will live only a few years, but it is a picture of something continuing going on and on, "and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands. They shall not labour in vain, nor bring forth ~~of~~ forth for trouble; for they are the seed ~~the~~ of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them.

And it shall come to pass, that before they call, I will answer, and while they are yet speaking, I will hear. " Then here we have the verse which is a reminiscent of Isaiah eleven and as Alexander points out here, very clearly

against the critics, he says, the language of this verse is so ~~very~~ similar to that of the eleven ~~that it / that / whether / that~~ verse eleven were a post, a passage written

long after the exile. That would give us the proof that ~~if~~ this ~~must~~ must be after the admit that

exile, but here they ~~miss~~ the eleven was written by the original Isaiah, then

But

he says ~~why~~ aren't they willing to admit that this is also by Isaiah? /They say, no.

This is a late imitation of Isaiah at length. ~~Ww - Wel~~ Well, I think Isaiah in

uses a very similar language to refer to the very same thing, and ~~he uses~~ a much he is briefer form, /simply reminding us of the wonderful promises he has given before.

And that's a sort of tie this up very closely /// with the millennial teachings.

"The wolf and the lamb shall feed together," ~~and the a~~ Now, that together is not

an exact translation here. They shall feed as one which is of course, even more than together.

When you do something together/ in the sense of being next to each other, this shows something in which there is a real unity and fellowship." They shall feed as one ~~together~~, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock: and dust shall be the serpent's meat: ~~They shall not hurt nor-destroy in all-my holy mountain, saith the Lord.~~"-

The continuation of the curse upon the serpent. Certainly the denial of the Origen and others idea of ~~the origin~~ that even the devil would be saved in the end, that all would be saved. Curse/will remain upon the serpent. He still is subject to the curse upon the serpent that dust shalt be the ~~serpent's~~ ^{his} meat. He eats dust, of course. But his head would be in the dust(?) _____ (8.75) ~~Thus~~ "They shall ~~not-not--~~" then the repetition of his statement on Isaiah eleven"shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, sath the Lord. " Now Alexander says that the holy mountain is the Church, and ~~hit-~~ if this means that they don't hurt nor destroy the church, ^{all} why, it certainly doesn't fit present age, kThere has been plenty of it/throughout the ages, even in ~~hur--~~ our present age. It certainly means in all the world ~~in~~ which we _____ before our eyes (8.50) Yes? Mr. Eurajiean, do you have a ^{the} question? (Q) I cannot say that we can prove that/lion does not eat meat/ in the garden of Eden, but it would seem to be a reasonable conjecture from the fact that even people were not given meat for food at that ~~the~~ time. It would seem to be a reasonable conjecture that all animals were vegetarian, that there at that time there was no killing _____ animals(7.75) We can't prove it, but it seems rather/ reasonable. And that in ~~ex~~ chapter eleven, we certainly have a clear ^{about} statement ~~that~~/animals being able to live together with no fear at all. We have ^{ox} there in/ verse seven the same thing here." The lion shall eat straw like the ~~bullock:~~" They are showing that the ox has nothing to h fear from the lion. He is not _____ (7.25) Of course, the a-millennialist says, oh, this is a figure for ^v ~~unt~~

human beings are not hurting other human beings does show change in animal creation. Well, if it is, I do not deny the ~~possibility~~ possibility of taking a figure, but I would say that if you take a figure, it still does not ~~impress~~ ^{express} the present age. It would mean a time when the whole world will be converted, ^{has} or when Christ ~~will~~ establish His kingdom on the earth _____*(6.80)

So it will show ~~that~~-millenium in either case. And then since we ~~have~~ ^{it in} the statements about ~~the~~ Romans about the curse being ~~it~~ removed, the whole creation now waiting for the redemption of our body, since we have this ^{it} statement, it seems to me to be reasonable to take ~~that~~ literally/ that there is _____, and that there is no more ~~animal~~ animal eating. I am not nearly as positive, because I am not definitely a-millenialist of the _____presbyterian church. ^{but I do} I feel quite strongly, but not so dogmatically. Yes?

(Q) Yes, yes, well, it ~~is~~ ^{is} true that in Revelation twenty, ~~it is said~~ it ~~says~~ ^{says} that at the end of the morning there will be a great _____ against the _____. Now people didn't ~~just~~ ^{just} suddenly turn into wickedness there were _____(5.90) That seems to be ~~applied to~~ -- imply that ~~those that were~~ those /there, who were only outwardly righteous because of the condition (_____(5.70)

Well, then we have this fifty-fifth chapter. This is the chapter we have just looked at. This has the ^{great} two/emphases. The emphasis on the condemnation ^{of} against sin, and against the feeling that we can trust in our background, in our ^{to} history, and in our ancestry, to our, God's people, and that is a rebuke definitely. Unless we bring forth the fruit of righteousness, we have no right to expect ~~of~~ any of the f _____. (5.00) And then chapter sixty-six continues, and ^{has} has a passage of rebuke, a passage of/another rebuke, and another blessing ~~to~~ ^{so}

~~that I would think~~

B. 83 Cont'd.

THAT I would think that sixty-six is still continuing to answer the prayer.

But it starts in as the prayer says, "Your sanctuary is torn down, your cities are destroyed, ruined, how can you be quite ^{etc} in this sort of situation? Why don't you ~~rebuild~~ rebuild _____ (4.50) as we rebuilt the temple in Jerusalem?

66:1 Well, God wanted the temple to be rebuilt like Jerusalem, but He says, that is not the primary thing. So, he says in verse one, Thus saith the Lord, the heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool: where is the house that ye build unto me? and where is the place of my rest? He says the temple is good, but that is not the main thing. The main thing is your relation relation to the Lord in your heart. 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~~ my word." They built a great temple for the Lord's dwelling, but to have the temple of your heart is the most important thing." He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, as if he cut off a dog's neck; he that offereth an oblation, as if he offered swine's blood; he that burneth incense, as if he blessed an idol." ~~They/they~~ ~~have/chose~~ ~~their/~~ You can do the finest forms, you can go through all the forms and ceremonies you want, but if your heart is not right with God, you are just as bad as he that offers to has fallen into idolatry. "Yes, they have chosen their own ways. ~~So they delight in~~ and their soul delighteth in their abominations. I will choose their delusions, and will bring their fears upon them; because when I called, none did answer; when I spake, they did not hear: but they did evil before mine eyes, and chose that in which I delighted not." God here declares that no amount of orthodoxy will bring his approval. We can hold the doctrines as

66:5
doctrines, but unless our hearts ~~are in~~ relation with Christ, it is worthless, it means nothing. And so he says, he is going to bring punishment upon all those who do not from their hearts accept him, and obey him, "Hear the word of the Lord, ye that tremble at his word; your brethren that hated you, that cast you out for my name's sake, said, Let the Lord be glorified: but he shall appear to your joy, and they shall be ashamed." That thing that appears over and over. I don't know how our time is going. May be I can take a second to tell a story about the ? (2:25) Dr. Chisholm How in 1940 , 1941 was it when he was in Korea he stood adamant and forceful against the worshippers of the heathen shrines but the Japanese said this is only a matter of patriotism and it is not religious yet it was religious ^{it was obvious that it was relig.} And it was a bowing to heathen shrines and he stood four square against it and there was another missionary who said Oh this is just a matter of patriotism , this is just a nationalist thing and this other missionary went and bowed at the shrine (2) Dr. Chisholm and others said let us close the schools rather than continue them and had heathen ceremony connected with them (1:50) Well he went , I think he came back from this country and I think ~~Dr. Chisholm~~ Dr Chisholm went to Japan for a brief time and then he took a boat to come here and on this boat was this other missionary and he said the Japanese official came on to investigate the property that was taken off by these men as they left and he said they came to him and said William Chisholm and looked at his list glanced at his stuff and passed him along then he came to this other missionary who had been conciliatory and compromising and he said he made him, there on the deck, open up everything he had , all his properties as if he was searching for something hidden spy document or something . He said the man was so embarrassed and ashamed it just humiliated him in front of everybody and the way that Dr. Chisholm explained it was they could understand a man who could stand for something and stood four-square

for it they might be against him , they might oppose him but they understood him but the man who was a missionary and yet would agree to the bowing to the shrines they couldn't understand him and the result was that they were suspicious that there was something hidden or underhand about ~~xxx~~ and they humiliated him in front of everybody .

B84

here

And so we have the assurance that may be fulfilled in this life and may not be until in the next life but it will be fulfilled somewhere. Verse 5 "Your brethren that hated you, that cast you out for my name's sake, said, we are glorifying the Lord by doing this , He shall appear to your joy, and they shall be ashamed" It happens over and over in this life but in some things it doesn't but it certainly will eventually that all of those who truly stand for the Lord will be exonerated , vindicated and those who compromise with the Word of the Lord will find that in ~~the~~ the end it does not pay Now in verse 6 we have a very interesting thing "A voice of noise from the city, a voice from the temple , a voice of the Lord that rendereth recompence to his enemies. Before she travailed, she brought forth, before her pain came, she was delivered of a man child. 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." Is this a picture of the beginning of the Christian Church . I don't think it began quite as sharply as that . It was a little small beginning that flows fresh, it doesn't sound like this . It seems to me that here he is answering the prayer of Israel and he is dealing particularly with Israel and he is saying . He is not through with Israel . ~~That's all xxx It seems to me he is answering~~ The time is coming as he said earlier in the book so as Paul says later on in Romans and so all Israel shall be saved . It is a great marvelous conversion of Israel as a nation which is to come at the end

of this age. Sudden, marvelous conversion of Israel as a nation ~~will~~ a nation as born in a day. Surely he is referring to this promise there and we have a deliverance. We have a nation born in a day before the end of the tribulation period after Israel has in many ways ~~gone~~ undergone terrible suffering. There will be a recognition of ~~Him~~ Him who they have pierced and a nation born in a day. So he says shall I bring to the birth, and not ~~cause~~ to bring forth? saith the Lord: Rejoice ye with Jerusalem, and be glad with here, all ye that love her: and He goes on and now speaks of the blessings that are going to come to Jerusalem. Now these blessings are sort of indefinite 10 -- 14. They have no question of their being promised God is going to comfort Jerusalem, He is going to bring wonderful peace and blessing to her. Surely this is looking forward to the millenium after the conversion of Israel as a nation and then in verses 14 and 15 " His indignation toward his enemies. For the Lord will come with fire, and with his chariots like a whirlwind, to render his angry with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire. For by fire and by his sword will the Lord plead with all flesh: and the slain of the Lord shall be many. "

✓ Surely this is the outpouring of God's wrath at the end of this age. Then again he shows that those who are secretly unworthy it will be revealed. They that sanctify themselves and purify themselves in the gardens behind one tree in the midst, eating swine's flesh, and the abomination and the mouse, shall be consumed together, saith the Lord. " Every secret sin will be brought to light, every hypocrite will be made manifest those who pretend to be his but are not really that will be made clear. "For I know their works and their thoughts: it shall come, that I will gather all nations and tongues; and they shall come, and see my glory. Then he tells how he is going to regather the Israelites. He will send them that escape of them unto the nations, to the isles afar off they shall declare my glory among the Gentiles. Some feel that this pictures a great missionary work of Israel during the tribulation period. ~~May~~ be it is. I am not sure just whether it does

66:17

show but it does show somehow a great missionary work. May be it is during the millenium that they are to be God's instruments in making Christ known to all of the world. May be it covers both and they shall bring all of your brethren for an offering unto the Lord out of all nations upon horses, and in chariots and in litters, and upon mules and upon swift beasts. ~~It~~ It pictures all kinds of methods ~~of travel today~~ of ~~transportation~~ transportation. Chances are ~~today~~ today that they won't use any of those kind but at least ~~giving~~ the figure giving a lot of kind suggests many kinds of transportation whereby they will come to my holy mountain Jerusalem ~~as~~ says the Lord. Today you find jews in Philadelphia here who will ~~go~~ go over to ~~spend~~ have the Passover in Jerusalem thousands of them It is the money but it is small compared to what we will see during the millenium and I will also take of them for priests and for Levites, saith the Lord, For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. How can anybody read this and say as some of them do that God used Israel to bring Christ to the world and when that was done He was through and Israel shall have no further place in prophecy. Surely this is very, very explicit and clear here and it shall come to pass from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me saith the Lord. And look at this 24th verse. This is rather typical of Isaiah he deals with a great subject and then he wants to be sure he gives you a full balanced ~~picture~~ picture so very often one verse giving the other side. I have known writers and speakers when they are dealing with one thing you think that is all there is. I remember a student at the Bible Institute of Los Angeles who attended Dr. Torrey's wonderful lectures on what the Bible teaches. I heard the last half of it, the second year of his course in which he dealt with the gospel

Q. 22

of justification and sanctification . In the first part he deals with God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Spirit . This man said I found this confusing because we would take up the Father and we would see the wonderful blessings and we would just feel the fellowship with God the Father . His presence in your life, union with Him until it just thoroughly satisfied you and then you get a little further and he is talking about Christ , communion with Him , ~~and it just how thoroughly satisfied you and then you get a little further and he is talking about Christ~~

and His presence in your life and you just thought that was everything and then you get the Holy Spirit , the leading of the Holy Spirit and his direction is plan in your life is everything . Now, of course, they are tremendously true all of them but, of course, they all balance together . If you take the whole book, it all balances but in one lecture he might seem to exalt one to such an extent that there would seem to be no room for the others. I remember when Campbell Morgan was in ~~Los~~ Los Angeles speaking on a tour in 1920 and he was very ? but I heard Campbell speaking on the Virgin Birth and oh the evidence he gave for the Virgin Birth . He would just give evidence after evidence when he got through with his talk you knew the Bible taught the Virgin Birth . You had no question about it but he has come to something that touched on the Resurrection he would say now I am not talking about the Resurrection . When he got through you didn't know whether he believed in the deity of Christ or the Incarnation or the Crucifixion or the Resurrection . You knew he believed in the Virgin Birth and when he talked about the Resurrection you knew he believed in the Resurrection but you weren't sure he believed in the Virgin Birth you might even think he didn't . He would take each one and drive it to that extent ~~ky~~ you have to drive ~~its~~ a point to get it across to people to get it clear you have to do it and some places in the Bible some times you read Paul and you think Salvation by Faith is so vile you almost think let us sin in order that grace may abound though of course Paul definitely denies that. If you think that Salvation by

Faith is the only thing that matters and then you read James and James says you people that think that just by saying a few words they are saved there is nothing to that if you don't have works your faith is dead that is equally true but you read in James and you would think if you weren't careful that he didn't believe in Salvation by faith . You read carefully and he hasn't denied it he hasn't said anything that contradicts it all but he has put his emphasis in a different place but Isaiah is the ~~typical~~ type that tries to balance and make sure that though we stress this truth now we touch on it and so here we have this wonderful expression here of the marvelous blessings of God to the end of the age and all of His outpouring of His goodness and all that and he doesn't want you to forget that there is another side and so verse 24 ends on a somber note. " And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither ~~shall~~ shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." You have the doctrine of hell, the last verse . Isaiah with his wonderful promises of Christ coming of the Atonement of Christ , the deliverance, the millenium , Israel as a nation born, they (5) yet his last verse comes back to this truth that must not be forgotten that to those who reject the Lord , or turn against Him that there is a terrible fate in store. That hell is a reality and that now is the day of judgement , now is the day of Salvation, now is the time of decision and I know people who say well , a fellow was just telling me in Los Angeles recently, what about this word Ion (?) what does it mean exactly Does that mean forever? I said No. Because it says ion of ions, translated means forever, and ever. Forever alone without ion . then how does "forever and ever mean"? The fact of the matter is that there is no ~~w~~ one ~~o~~ word that carries the idea of eternity, but the word means on~~e~~ and on and on and on as far as you can see, and then when you say ion of ions, that thing ^{is} just ~~o~~

u

B. 84. Continued.

multiplied over and over. Well, _____ (4.00), but it is not
 expressed that way. But the idea of eternity ~~is~~ expressed in this verse where
 the worm shall not die neither shall ~~the~~ the fire ^{be} extinguished, the continuing
 on going punishment of final rejecting. (?) Yes? (Q) Yes. Oh, you mean that
 they ... at the end of ~~sixty-five~~ ^{chapter} we have millenium. Now in sixty-six
~~apart fr-~~ a part of it deals with ~~the~~ the period before the millenium, and the
 part of it ~~deals with~~ ^{the} is dealing with ^{the} millenium. I don't think sixty-six ~~quite-~~ ^{quite}
~~deals with~~ quite chronologically ~~with---~~ ^{at sixty-five.} (3.10). Sixty-five first looks
 ✓ at the punishment of the attitude , second at the millenium, then sixty-six
 looks forward to dealing with aspects of the prayer, and for ~~instanc~~ ^{the} e the
 conversion of Israel the day before the the millenium. Yes? Yes, over
 five) _____ before the millenium. And when you get to verse nineteen,
 I don't know whether nineteen is ~~is~~ ^{is} before the millenium or during the
 millenium. I just don't know it could be either one. I don't think that ~~his~~
 this specific time element is in this chapter nearly as explicit as it is in the
 of the previous chapter.
 latter part/. Is that one ~~thing~~ ^{thing} that we have to remember. Many people have
 the idea that ~~that~~ things are going to be _____ (2.50) A., B, C. D. 1, 2, s,
 3 from one aspect, but it isn't that way. There are times for chronological order,
 times for chrohological _____, fimes for _____. Yes? (2.10)
 Yes, that's the end of the millenium. not during the millenium, but at the end of the
 millenium. (Q) I don't think there would be _____, but I think that would be
 at the end of the millenium. There would be the heart of the individual that
 _____ wrong, but at the end they will be given oppprtnnity to show the _____

B. 84, Continued.

I doubt if there would be actual troubles within the millenium, but still the saints all over the world are doing that. Well, _____(1.50)
~~just~~ everything just goes together . You've got to have . Things ~~we~~ have to be _____ problems and all that, but no really vital trouble, because Christ will be controlling _____. So ~~ti~~- I think we made a fair coverage
noticed
of ~~the~~ two passages here, and have ~~noted~~ the outstanding sections. We could ~~talk~~ take another semester on that , and get that much further into it.
opened
But we have ~~taken~~ up these main emphases, and then we will get a few samples ~~if~~ of what you've got from the _____. Yes, yes,