

ISAIAH # 1

This course as I believe you all have the assignment. Did everybody get this assignment? You did. I ~~ma~~ meant to say on it. I believe I did say on it that I would appreciate it if ~~you if~~ it could be turned in to me not later ~~æ~~ than Monday noon, and if possible, sooner. It would have been very helpful if it could be turned in previous to Friday night. Now I got one assignment--that is all I have today. How many have it done. Two have it done. That makes three then that we have altogether. That's 50% ~~k~~ that have done it. Well, we are getting off to a start, let's say, but I also ~~could-mention~~<sup>ed</sup> that this course would probably be taken by most of you as an undergraduate course, can be taken by any of you for graduate credit, if desired. You want to take it for graduate ~~credit~~ credit? Oh, fine.

~~Anyboey~~ Anybody who wants to take it for graduate credit, it is necessary ~~for~~ to let me know so I can make special assignments, because ~~x~~ for undergraduate credit ~~this~~ this course should take two hours study for each hour in class, that is, two credit hours--that will be six hours a week, two hours of class and four hours of study, but for graduate credit I will give extra assignments to take two extra hours in class, but because graduate credit study requires four ~~exc~~ hours of study and instead of three. So Mr. Wales is the only one who desires to take it for graduate credit and we will give him something ~~k~~ before long. I think at present he will find enough on the assignment. In this assignment I asked that these questions be written out and turned in and then to keep track of the time and if there was ~~ass~~ additional time to start of the Hebrew. How many got started on the Hebrew? Well, we are getting started. I like to get going early, because many courses are slow. ~~W~~ We can get a little ahead of them and then we can slow down at the end, if possible.

Now, the course, as you know, is ~~inted-intede~~ intended to be a course of very intensive study. I don't think I have ~~every~~ given a course exactly like this one.

This is a new course . It does not conflict with any course previously taken.  
How many of you have had my survey course in ~~Isiah~~ Isaiah 40-55? Two, Three?  
This is a separate course altogether. But if anybody did have notes on that,  
it could be helpful ~~but~~ because ~~w~~ I have pointed out many times that the book  
of Isiah is made ~~up~~ up of certain ~~defin~~- definite units, and these units, while  
they are related, they are well studied as ~~spe~~ separate units. Thus, if you look  
in the ~~book of~~ book of ~~Isiah~~ Isaiah, you look at the end of chapter ~~36~~ 35 rather  
and you find that the wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them; and  
the desert ~~h~~ shall rejoice and blossom as the rose. Verse 10, "And the ransomed of  
the Lord shall return, and come to Zion " --it is a beautiful of ~~xx~~ some wonderful  
things to come, and then ~~38-37-~~ "And it came to pass, ~~when K-~~ 36, "Now it came  
to pass in the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah, that Sennacherib king of Assyria  
came up against all the defenced cities of Juday, and took them." It is a different  
style. It doesn't mean a different man, but Isaiah was giving this prophecy in ~~xx~~  
the sense that it's presentation of God's declarations in chapter 35 and in 36 he  
switches to tell us of an account of certain events. So when we ~~w~~ ~~look~~ look at the  
book of Isaiah, we find that chapters 36 to 39 are a ~~x~~ definite unit, separate from  
everything else in the book. Between ~~36 and~~ 35 and 36 you are in two different world  
from Isaiah, just as you would be if you heard me lecture in ~~Isiah~~ ~~Isah~~ Isaiah one  
hour and in Church History another hour. They would be similar but entirely ~~ly~~ different  
subjects. Well, you have just that feeling when you go from 39 to 40 , you have  
a feeling of a marked difference. so ~~xy~~ the book of Isaiah ~~nea-~~ naturally divides into  
three sections. Within the middle, this section , chapters 36 to 39 is history ~~contina~~  
containing prophecy. It tells you what Isaiah ~~sia~~ said , certain situations, but it  
describes the situations at considerable ~~lenth-~~ length. Now, back in chapter 7 we have

a situation described very briefly, but all of ~~Isiah~~ Isaiah, except chapter 30 is mostly prophecy in the sense that it is God speaking through the prophets. The prophets are ~~g~~ God's spokesmen. He gives messages and ~~we~~ we have ~~the~~ here the messages he gives, and very little is told us of how the people ~~pr~~ received the messages or what the situation was in which he spoke. ~~W~~ We have ~~to~~ to infer that from what he ~~said~~ said, except in chapters 36 to 39. Now, that is very different from the ~~book~~ book of Jeremiah, because in the book of Jeremiah, you have ~~a~~ quite a bit about what happened, certain things happened, and then Jeremiah said them. Jeremiah ~~spe~~ speaks a couple of chapters, and then you are told how something happened. You are told what the king did to Jeremiah, and you are told how Jeremiah was treated, then how Nebuchadnezzar released Jeremiah. You have a great deal personally about Jeremiah --in the ~~book~~ book of Jeremiah scattered through the book. In the book of Isaiah, you have very little of that ~~a~~ outside of 36-39. But Chapter 36-39 of Isaiah are a section that is like Jeremiah in that regard, only much more so, because they are al~~x~~ most like chapters in Kings and ~~Chro~~Chronicles, except they have a good deal more prophecy than those chapters have. They have ~~a~~ quite a bit of what Jeremiah ~~said~~ said ~~in~~ in certain situations, but the situations are described at length. So this naturally divides the book of Isaiah into ~~a~~ two main sections, one-thirt~~y~~-five, and then a historical passage, and then another section after that. And the Higher Critics said that 1-35 often mentions Isaiah, 40 on never mentions Isiah, so they advance ~~the~~ the theory that chapter 40 on was just added on to the same scroll, because they ~~advance~~ the ~~the~~ saw they were somewhat similar and really were about a different author. Well, now in the course of prophets you probably were given the evidence on that quite a bit, we want study that here. ~~It~~ merely state that I believe that 40 on

deals with a later period of Isaiah's ministry and consequently, there is ~~w~~ quite a difference of approach, but ~~a~~ not a difference that is ~~inconseque~~ inconsistent with the same man having written ~~as he~~ it as the one having wrote ~~Isiah~~- Isaiah 1-35. It is a different period of his ministry. I can see how the critics can easily get the idea that it is another man 100 ~~y~~ years later, but I don't think it was I think it was ~~y~~ he himself later than ~~wh~~en he wrote the earlier section. Well, now , we want take time to look at how chapters 1-35 naturally divide itself into ~~certain~~- certain sections. I would say so , yes. I would say that ~~chap~~- chapter 40 on is mostly quite different in subject ~~man~~- matter from 1-35. I would say that in 1-35 he is dealing mostly with the immediate situation of his own ti ~~me~~, and something happened and in that situation he goes and talks to the people, and in the course that I gave a year ago from the Book of Immanuel 7-12;28-35, I brought out that point after point it deals with things like ~~things~~- \_\_\_\_\_, but my personal opinion is that after he ~~a~~ had written 35 that then , later on, he saw the exile as absolutely sure to come, Hezekiah died, and his wicked son Mannasseh took the throne and in that situation with Manasseh , the wicked king ruling , and the country going on and on into wickedness, the people of God who received Isaiah's prophecy ~~and~~- in 1-35 and knew that the terrible predictions that Isaiah made about the ~~cert~~ certainty of the exile which was coming, these people seeing the wickedness around them, and the people growing worse would feel that all that Isaiah said ~~and~~- ~~and~~ concerning the certainty of the exile, God is going to send this terrible judgment on the nation and ~~the~~ they would tend to give way to despair, and therefore, God led Isaiah in chapters 40 on to give something which is meant not for the nation as a whole, but for the godly in the nation . To those in the nation who felt ~~a~~ that ~~everth~~- everything is hopeless, the nation is going into exile and after all, we are trying to stand for

Isaiah # 1, pa. 5

what is right, but the king has gone bad, the nation as a ~~whole~~ whole was going into exile. After all, we ~~are~~ are trying to stand for what is right, the king has gone bad, the nation as a whole is going on ~~in~~ in wickedness, we are going on into terrible exile. What will be the end. The Northern Kingdom had already been taken into exile in Isaiah's lifetime, and these people had doubtless talked with refugees from the Northern Kingdom, and heard how terrible the exile was and the desolation of the Northern Kingdom just a ~~few~~ few miles away, and now they knew that the Southern Kingdom was ~~also~~ also going into sin, and there was no question that exile was coming to the ~~Southern~~ Southern Kingdom, and as Isaiah predicted and so God led Isaiah in chapters 40 on to give the message to these godly that this is not the end, God is not through with Israel--God has great messages of blessing for Israel after the exile. And so from chapter 40 on the critics are right when they say, we have all kinds of ~~evidence~~ evidence in these succeeding chapters that this is written, that the man writing it has in mind Jerusalem is destroyed, the land depopulated, the people in exile, and he is saying "Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people" He is ~~going~~ going to bring you back from exile, he is going to deliver you from exile. He is going to bring you back to your own land, and so that is a great part of the thought in chapters 40 and for a long distance, that ~~he~~ he is talking to the godly in his time, and even more than that, he is ~~writing~~ writing something that 150 years later can be read and ~~one~~ they can say, this is what Isaiah wrote and it just fits our situation today, and ~~tes~~ tells us that God is not through with Israel, but He is going to bring them back from exile, and ~~so~~ so that is the background of chapter 40 on for a long distance. And that I go ~~in~~ into ~~in~~ in the Survey course. And that is a very brief introduction to that section of ~~40-56~~ 40-56. Now, in ~~the~~ this section from 40-56, the Jew looks at this and he finds wonderful prophecy of

## Isaiah # 1, p. 6

return from exile, and the average Christian pays little attention to this prophecy of return from exile--he looks through this passage and finds wonderful prophecies promises that Jesus Christ is coming, and Jesus Christ is going to bear our ~~w~~ sin, wonderful promises of the coming redeemer, the servant of the Lord, the great future ~~s~~ Saviour. He finds these things, and ~~th~~ he pays ~~lit~~ little attention to the ~~fact that~~ promises of deliverance/, but the Jew looks at the wonderful promises of deliverance from exile and says, "Isn't that wonderful how God fulfilled these promises and pays no attention to the promises of the ~~com~~- coming Messiah, so in ~~the~~- this survey course that I gave a year ago, ~~when~~- I tried to show the movement of thought ~~from~~ from chapter 40 on and how it deals with return from exile, and gradually bringing out the need of dealing with the sin problem, and they went into exile because of sin, even though God is going to bring them back if the sin question isn't dealt with, ~~T~~ there will be another exile. If the sin question ~~isn~~ isn't dealt with there will be another exile. Though He is going to deliver them from exile there is a far greater deliverance ahead, deliverance from sin, which will come through Christ and His death on the cross.

## Isa. # 2

There are some ~~evidences of~~ evidences of idolatry in Israel later ~~that the~~- than the exile, but there are not many. Through the centuries since the exile, with a ~~&~~ very few exceptions, and those very early, Israel had been known <sup>for</sup> ~~for~~ its standing to the one true God and its refusal to bow down to idols. The idolatry which had a great lure ~~is~~ for Israel before the exile and during the exile seems to have been ~~gone~~ gone out of their system by the exile, but now the captivity which ~~was~~ took place under Nebuchadnezzar was not the exile because there was a far worse exile when the Romans conquered Jerusalem in 70 AD and sold thousands of people into slavery and the others were ~~dr~~- driven away from Jerusalem and scattered throughout the

Isaiah # 1, p. 7

known world. And at the present day, the bulk of the Jews are scattered throughout the world, ~~so a good~~ though a good many have come back in recent years. So there was another exile much longer and worse than that one that came later on, \_\_\_\_\_, so that it is true that man inevitably falls into sin and sin is terrible in this world and God never promises ~~that~~ that through human effort ~~the~~ we will get a world ~~for~~ purified from sin, but He does promise that ~~an~~ individuals can be saved through Christ and delivered out of this wicked world and become ~~his~~ His representatives and win other individuals, and so the great message of chapter 40-56 is ~~that~~ that though God is going to carry out His promises to Israel and He is going to bring Israel back from exile, nevertheless, Israel is sinful, and something must be done about the sin question, or just bringing them back from exile is not going to do them any good. They will ~~be~~ be going off into another exile. And, consequently, that is a great emphasis of this chapter, to show the need of something positive with sin, and how God will deal with it. In Chapter 53 He gives a marvelous picture of the Atonement of Christ, the great picture that can't possibly mean anything except the death of Christ and His ~~own~~ bearing of our sins. And that is in brief a summary of the Chapter 40-56, but in this class we are ~~intend~~ intending to take just four chapters, ~~4~~ 52-55, and go into them ~~in~~ in great detail. And in going into them in detail there ~~will~~ will be many points in which we will need to note points of relationship to other chapters, points of relationship, and I will take time to discuss, whenever necessary, such points, but I want you to study this passage, ~~not~~ and we want to study--I hope to study in class every word of the four chapters--every single word--~~the~~ the Hebrew and the English and see ~~what~~ what we can get out ~~of~~ of it. Now the first part of chapter 52 will not be nearly as interesting to us as chapter 53. In chapter we get into the heart of ~~the~~ the matter, but I think we can get some very important principles ~~of~~ of interpretation by careful study of 52, but we want have quite the

our Christian religion  
same emotional interest in it that which is in the very heart of ~~Isaiah~~. Therefore  
I want to spend a fair amount of time on 52, more for principles than for matter,  
because then we get into 53 and we will be interested in the matter tremendously,  
~~and-----a-~~ and we want to apply the principles, so we look at ~~eha~~ that chapter 52  
--I asked you to look at ~~50~~ 52 for today, and to notice ~~wh~~ at divisions ~~what~~  
you would make in chapter 52, and don't worry if you didn't get the right answers  
on these questions; that is to say, if there are particular things that you weren't  
away of, this is a working class, rather than a class in which I expect it necessary  
to come up with the correct conclusion--I want to teach you how to go ~~for~~ ~~for~~ ~~for~~  
forward and get a better and better understanding of how ~~tho~~ to interpret these passages.  
But as we look at chapter 52, the answer which as ~~h~~ been turned in divides this  
into ~~x~~ 5 sections--how many did you ~~di~~ divide it in Mr. ~~Wa~~/Wales? Miss Chung?  
That is to say, you divided it into 12 verses in one and three in the other--so then  
you have three ~~xi~~ divisions, and what is your first division. So you would put the  
first six together, and Mr. Wales, how many did you put together again. Miss ~~Pikce~~  
~~Pickett~~—~~there is nothing~~ That would make a big argument for asking the question  
--Is it possible that 13 to 15 is a unit by itself, separate from what precedes, you  
could ask that question very ~~readk~~ readily. You find nothing that is specifically  
about ~~h~~ Him before, so you may think you have a relationship. Now, before that,  
you have a number of imperatives, don't you. You read, "Awake, awake," verse  
one; "Shake thyself from the dust;" verse two; in verse nine, "Break forth into joy,"  
in eleven, "Depart ye, depart ye," You have a ~~leg~~ lot of imperatives. It is the  
same general tone. We are calling ~~k~~ people to do certain things. That is quite a  
bit true, up to verse 12; before verse 12 you have nothing that you can specifically  
say this is talking about that one spoken of in verse 13-15. Now if you are looking  
for relationship with what precedes and what follows, do you notice any relationship

Isaiah # 1, p. 9

between this chapter and the next chapter. The next chapter has, "Behold my servant, in verse 13. We keep on reading about what somebody does, and it ~~see~~-- seems to be describing the same person that precedes and then ~~we we~~ when we get to verse eleven it says, "By His knowledge ~~it~~ shall my righteous servant justify many. They have been called God's servants in verse eleven there, called His servants in verse 13 of the previous chapter, and you find that it is all talking in ~~the~~ third person about what somebody does inverse 13 on and it seems to me the evidence is such that the Archbishop must have been pretty tired that day as he made the chapter division, or he would have ~~it~~ made the division at verse 13 instead of where it is . From verse 13 on to <sup>12 of next chapter</sup> ~~15~~ is clearly a unit, it goes straight along, telling ~~it~~ about somebody--what this person does and what its ~~next~~ results are , from 15 on ~~to~~ to verse 12 of the next chapter, so that is clearly a unit, now , on the other hand, you look at chapter 52 and you ask, ~~it~~ is it related to what precedes. What ~~can~~ you see that show a relation-~~so wh~~ to what precedes, Mr. Wates? The similarity of subject. As a matter of fact, when you ~~look~~ look at the previous chapter, you find that it starts in verse one, "Hearken ~~it~~ to me, " and continues to tell in verse ~~the~~ three how the Lord is going to comfort ~~it~~ Zion, comfort her waste places, and then in verse four, "Hearken unto me," and then goes on, , --God is going to give wonderful ~~it~~ blessing, verse 7 , "Hearken unto me," God is going to ~~give~~ give blessing to them. Three different sections starting Hearken , and then after you have those, then you have three sections starting "Awake, Awake, put on thy strength,-O Zion."--Verse ~~n~~ O arm of the Lord, " Verse nine; verse 17, "Awake, awake, stand up, O ~~Jerua~~ Jerusalem, and 52:1, "Awake, awake;put on thy strength, O Zion." There is such a close connection that you ~~wnd~~ wonder why you~~it~~ should have a chapter division at the beginning of 52 at all. Actually , you have three stanzas

Isaiah # 2, p. 10

of a poem. Verse nine, ~~Awake~~, Awake, verse 17, Awake , awake, verse 52:1, ~~Awake~~, awake, the ~~poem~~ poem begins with these same words. Now, that doesn't necessarily prove that they are stanzas of a poem, and when you suggest that the ~~com~~ content --you find that you are dealing with similar facts. He is dealing with a deliverance from Zion which is in a difficult situation. Then this difficult situation --and he of 51 says in verse three/~~that~~ the Lord is going to comfort all the waste places and make the wilderness like Eden and the desert like the garden of the Lord. That certainly suggests that Israel is definitely like a desert, it is definitely a waste place, and God is going to deliver them, and then you find these Awake , Awake sections, verse nine, "Awake, awake, put on thy, strength, O arm of the Lord " Awake as in the ancient days. Aren't you the one which cut Rahab, which stands for Egypt. Aren't you the one which interefered with Egypt. Aren't you the one which- which dried the sea, the waters of the great deep, that hath made the depths of the sea a way for the ~~ran~~ ransomed to ~~pass~~ pass over? What does that refer~~e~~? ~~The~~ The Red Sea--when He brought them through the Red Sea, so here they were under Egyptian control and God delivered them. Now He said , You delivered us from Egypt , you ~~brough~~ brought us through the Red Sea, Can't you ~~proted~~ protect us now. Each of these sections starts, Calling on God to do it, and then goes on and says, God is going to do it I, even I am he that cometh. God is going to deliver from exile. Just as he delivered from Egyptian bondage, He is going to deliver from exile in Mesopotamia. So that is the thought in chapter 51, and continuing in 52. The ~~backbr~~ background of it is deliverance from exile. ~~Jerusalem~~ Jerusalem , He says , you are not going to be in the state that you are in now when the uncircumcised and the unclean comes in and causes confusion, God is going to deliver you. Thus, he says in verse four, previously you ~~w~~ went to Egypt

to sojourn there. What happened when they went to Egypt to sojourn there.

They were made ~~prisoner~~ ~~prison~~ prisoners and captives. God delivered them.

Now, he says, the Assyrian ~~x~~ oppressed them without cause ~~Agan~~ Again they

were ~~oppresw~~ oppressed under the people of Mesopotamia. The people are in

exile God is going to deliver them. And you~~x~~ get to verse nine, Break forth~~e~~

into singing, God is going to deliver and rebuild ~~Jerusalem~~ Jerusalem. The Lord

has ~~mad~~ laid bare His holy arm in the eyes of all the nations, verse 10 says.

Back there in the previous chapter, ~~x~~ He said, Awake, Awake, O Jerusalem.

Now the Lord has laid bare His holy ~~are~~ arm. ~~x~~ ~~All the ends of the earth has seen-~~

It doesn't mean He actually has. ~~The Lord-~~ All the ends of the earth shall see the

salvation of our God. And then what does verse 11 say~~x~~. "Depart ye, depart ye, go~~x~~

ye out with haste, ~~nor~~ touch no unclean thing . . ." What is that talking abo~~u~~t?

Go out from where. They came out of Egypt . God brought them ~~x~~ through the R<sub>e</sub>d

Sea. Now, He says I am going to deliver you from your exile in Mesopotam~~ia~~.

Depart , Go out from hence, leave/<sup>Babylon</sup>~~Mesopotamia~~: Leave the~~x~~ places ~~x~~ where you

in exile. ~~God~~Go out from hence. You that bear the vessels of the L<sub>o</sub>rd. What

does that mean? You that bear the ~~vessles~~ vessels of the Lord. You read the

book of Ezra. It tells ~~x~~ us th~~a~~t King Cyrus said, These cups and figures that were

taken from Jerusalem and carried off into exile by Nebuchadnezzar, he gave them

to the people to take back to Jerusalem. And so you that bear the vessels of the

Lord , you ~~carried the~~ ~~tant~~ that carried the things that belong to the temple and

were taken into exile, you that are carrying them back. He said, Depart , God~~x~~,

God is making it possible for you to take them, and you will go out, not with haste

or flight, for the Lord will go before you, and the God of Israel will be your guard

in back, in ~~x~~ other words, God is going to make it possible for you to do this without

L

Isaiah #3.

W \_\_\_\_\_ What he was asking was that I may be recognized as your prophet, that I may have a double portion of your \_\_\_\_\_, that I may be recognized as the one who is like the elder who is more than anybody else is able to carry forth the wonderful work of Jesus Christ. That is what he means to say here. In this case, I have no doubt that the word "doubt" here means, what it means here is that when you think of the city Jerusalem has been sent \_\_\_\_\_ (1.00) and God has done for her \_\_\_\_\_ for a certain length of time, and now that time has been completed. She has received the city. And now that time has been completed. She has received the city, has received the Lord's \_\_\_\_\_ which the Lord's prophet \_\_\_\_\_ in view of the sin of the ~~city~~ city. When you apply that to individuals, you think of the individual people, and you say these people have received a double ~~portion~~ portion, equivalent to receiving the payment for what they owe for their sin. ~~He says, how~~ He says how can any individual receive the punishment that would be equivalent to \_\_\_\_\_, and yet God says, you have \_\_\_\_\_ (2.00) We have to go on to ch. 53 to find how it is that God ~~say~~ \_\_\_\_\_ that the whole payment for their sins has been paid for every individual. This suggests the idea, and there... this certainly does not mean that he gives the double \_\_\_\_\_ over and over but very \_\_\_\_\_ (2.10) Yes, Miss Chung? (Q) Well, I don't know whether this is true of \_\_\_\_\_ he is talking about a man \_\_\_\_\_ not tell him apart who is so much like him that people would ~~tear him about apart~~. Double is equivalent in our language. (Q) Yes, it is not used in great deal in our day, but means equivalent. \_\_\_\_\_ Yes (Q)  <sup>meant</sup> As far as the city is concerned, God has ~~been through~~ <sup>dealt</sup> with certain punishments for the city, and when that punishment is fulfilled, God will allow that city to be rebuilt.

most of you \_\_\_\_\_ that. But this is a part for Jerusalem. But when it come<sup>s</sup> to an individual, ~~As~~ the primary thing is not the particular sin, but it is the sin,

the sin of rebellion, Here it says, that \_\_\_\_\_ (3.40)  
we find out

Every thing that ~~is done~~ is done from the heart ow wickedness itself. We find it \_\_\_\_\_

Therefore the attitude is so ~~clear that am~~ careful that a man \_\_\_\_\_  
was

to pay the penalty for sin. That of course ~~is~~ not fully understood by any means .

At that time that is not clear to them, but it is clear to us now. The word \_\_\_\_\_

is the idea(4.00) The progressive revelation I would say is that God gives us

many things which we don't fully understand when first get them. We understand

the main tenor of the revelation, we see the primary aspect of the message, but as

times goes on , we see more fully what he meant, and we find that the word

\_\_\_\_\_ adopted to fit the whole situation, not merely the merely part of the \_\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_ that is the case with anything, for instance you take the case of teaching.  
suppose you take an elective in

For instance/~~the~~ Church History. e Of course, you know nothing about it, =until

you Q \_\_\_\_\_ . But if a person ~~an~~ has a lot of knowledge of Roman

history, and the early Christian history, then he would catch a lot of incidental

I make and references and statements and they would bring him understanding  
remarks/~~on AND they can~~ \_\_\_\_\_ (4.55) and they will bring them to

understanding, without just going over head because they forget(?)/<sup>But</sup> A person

has to know a great deal more ~~to get the maximum out of~~ than he is able to  
across to

get/~~the~~ bulk of the class \_\_\_\_\_ (5.00) Yes (Q) \_\_\_\_\_ is certainly

a problem today that we have a ~~ly~~ marvelously accurate trnaslation of the Bible  
ago

into the language of 300 years/ and ~~of~~ the particular \_\_\_\_\_ of spot slike this

all between, for instance, ~~we -- in t-~~ in the New Testament we are told that

we ~~are~~ beware of ...and we are told to beware of philosophy and vain deceit.

If you take the English of 300 years ago when they said science meant ~~es~~ exactly

the ~~w~~ same thing as we mean by philosophy. And philosophy meant the same thing

as we mean today by science. The two words have exactly changed sides in that length of time. ~~Well,~~ We have words in the Old English that have completely changed their meaning, like we say I ... of ~~the~~ the morning ~~with~~ with my prayer. He doesn't mean that he will perform a miracle and make it stay ~~dark~~ dark. He means that He comes before the dark. The word's prevent. In Old English it means to ~~be~~ come before. But we mean today to come before in the sense of stopping. They used it in Old English also a great deal to come in ahead of something. And ~~some~~ it means Before it gets light I am already at my prayer, and it does not mean that I perform a miracle by my early morning prayer. Well, today, that just makes no sense. And so it is easy to see that there is a place where a word has become obsolete. ~~Where~~ Where it is most confusing to have a translation in Old English is where a word will change a little bit. And where today ~~we~~ we understand a word but we are not particularly familiar with the sense that it means in that particular passage, and that is where we get into ~~the~~ real difficulty with the translation. That is where it misleads most is where a word will change a little bit, and where today we understand the word but we are not particularly with the sense of it in that particular passage. And that is where we get into real difficulty with our translation. The RSV make a lot of the fact, where it says, Suffer the little children, that that has led people to child labor and other mistreatment of ~~the~~ children. I think that.... has more sense than ~~that~~ - that. But that is used ~~in~~ in the ~~advertisement~~ advertisement of the RSV constantly that we have to get away from Suffer the little children ~~because~~ because it has done so much harm. But suffer in the sense of permit has just dropped out, and some of these things drop out. Well, there are things that have dropped out within the last ten years. Therefore, if you are going to have a Bible that is going to have an exact understanding, you have... We have a very, very ~~accurate~~ accurate presentation of the Bible into the language of 300 years ago, which, in addition to

#3 @antaly

-4-

that is a very beautiful presentation and all the great facts of salvation are in it, and anybody that has any intelligence can get...but if you are going to get the fine point, you have your choice of two things. One is that you can study Elizabethan literature. Read Shakespeare and all the great dramatists and learn how they use words. It's perfectly amazing to read Shakespeare, written shortly before the King James Version, and see how many words there are that you just don't understand at all. Some of it Hamlet said, To be or not to be... there are words after word that we do not understand. Some of them occur in the Bible and some of them don't. But if you study all the words and learn what it means, then you can come nearer to figuring out what the King James translators meant. But I would say to study the Hebrew and the Greek and find out what the word translation means and instead of trying to worry whether the word...at that time had this exact meaning, you can find out what the...suggested and then you can figure how you can make that statement, it's one thing to find out what the original is, but is a much harder task to put into the language of the people. And that's what made the King James Version so wonderful, not that those men were great geniuses that made the King James Version but that during the previous 80 years there had been a dozen versions of the Bible who struggled to get a way to put it in the language of their day. And these men would hear the expression but there is not corresponding English way to say it. How do we get the idea, and one would say this and one would say this, and when the King James was written, they had all these translations laid out before them, translated comparatively recently into the language of their day. They even took the Douay Version, the RC Version, which is, on the whole, is not a very accurate translation, but there were a few places where it has hit on the exact way to express it. And I personally have great help in the Moffatt

4 5

Isa. Rec. 3

Version. You know that ~~M~~ James Moffatt has a translation of the O.T. and N.T. It is a thoroughly modernistic version. There are statements after statements that I think are terrible, but the amazing thing is that Moffatt has a marvelous facility in ~~expression~~- expressing ideas. And I have taken a verse in Isaiah and I have struggled out. Here the meaning is perfectly clear but ~~how~~ how are you going to put that into language of today so that people will understand it. And I have ~~stru~~ struggled with that, trying to put ~~it~~ it into English, and then I pick up Moffatt's Version and I find that at this particular verse he exactly had it. He had a way that I couldn't have thought of, but ~~wh~~ when I saw it, it just fit the original. It was ~~α~~ wonderful. But the trouble is that in the very next word, he may throw a side the original away altogether and put ~~it~~ in what he thought it ~~shou~~ should be. So you can't trust Moffatt's Version. He says in Matthew 1 ~~α~~ that Joseph was the father of Jesus. He translates it that way. And then he has a footnote that some of the mss. say it. There is one mss., a Syriac mss. that with the ~~exh~~-exchange of ~~let~~- one letter, doubtless an error in copying, ~~mades~~-makes it say ...And ~~α~~ in another place he doesn't have that much evidence, you can't trust him. ~~Y-But he have k~~ But he has a most marvelous facility. ~~Everything~~ Every now and then, a ...And these men took a few things from the Douay Version where ...though most of it they ~~did~~- didn't. I don't-~~thing~~ think there has ever been a better translation of the Bible anywhere in history than the King James Version, and it's because they had ...~~16~~ years to develop it. And when somebody says to me today, why don't a group of us get together and make a translation. You can't expect one as good as the king James, not to find the original, but to find ~~out~~ how to say it.

Dr. Scofield in 1909 got out a Bible ...It was a one man ~~joy~~ job and, he had advisers but he didn't pay a lot of attention to them. In 1917 he ~~w~~ revised and he called it...and he had a lot of improvements, because ~~and~~ any one man... Well, if he had lived until 1930 he would probably have gotten out another one. But he didn't, so the edition of 1917 is ~~the~~ still the best. It still ~~have n--~~ has many very valuable notes, but in the course of the years people noticed here where he didn't make ...right, here were a few notes of contradiction, here etc. So the Oxford press got nine scholars from different parts of the country to meet together for seven years to examine it to make out a new revision. Well, if Scofield ~~had~~ himself gotten another one in 37 and another one in 45 he would have a much better version ~~x~~ by this time than what we are going to have, because we have to do the whole job at ~~one~~ once. But we ~~hav-3~~ have done the best we can. And the ... (notes on experience with the Scofield Revision Committee--not clear). (Indistinguishable notes on chapter 40; that is, a review from the standpoint of history looking back).

# 5 (completely obscure)

~~k~~ # 6 (starting at 9 1/2)

Talking about the ~~fulfillment~~ fulfillment of the ~~ow~~ work that Israel is to do, but the principle I'm discussing in both these cases...The reason in the first case that I felt quite sure that the Lord wasnt going to let me...ou t there was that I had years of training for a specific work that I felt was very important and had not done . . . But in ~~the e-~~ this case we have the work definitely ~~lea~~ laid out, we know what it is. What is the work that must be done. What is the work on ~~acc~~ account of which Israel is called God's servant. Israel has a responsibility that this work be done. It cannot be done if ~~Israel~~ Israel does not survive. Israel is God's servant.

God can raise up another group, yes, but in God's providence, that was God's plan, so the work is to be done through Israel. Now, what is the work. Now we have a picture, Behold, my church. And we read the picture and you ask yourself right away. Who is the servant? Well, he ~~as~~ has already said, ~~Is~~ Israel is the servant. Israel is to do the work, and we have no grounds in the context to say, No, he is not talking about Israel. He is talking about Israel. in ~~x real~~ relation to the whole background. But, what does it mean that he is talking about Israel. ~~He is~~ Is he talking about the entire nation of Israel. Is he talking about Ahaz? Is he talking about the wicked members of Israel, when he says all these things are to be done by Israel. Well, ~~g~~ God can convert the whole nation. ~~He is the God~~ Every man, woman, and child that descended ~~k~~ from Jacob of course would be ...actively engaged in fulfilling the work of God. He could do that but that would not seem the natural thing or way to fulfill it. It would seem much more natural to think that when he says that Israel is going to do this...Israel the nation is to ~~x~~ provide the doing of this job. You might say America beat ~~He~~ Hitler in the ~~way~~ war. That's an oversimplification, but ~~s~~ certainly America figured a great part for the ~~k~~ the defeat of Hitler. Well, you say America beat Hitler. Did I beat Hitler, did somebody beat Hitler in ~~k~~ a theological seminary. Did ~~come~~ some body beat Hitler who was occupied in doing something that was not at all a part of the war. ~~Act-~~ Actually, we were a part of the ~~an~~ nation that provided the army. But it was the army that...But did everybody in the army beat Hitler. How about the men who were busy picking up scraps of paper around the camp? Were they beating Hitler? Well, they were all contributing to it. It was a contribution that ~~was~~ was tremendously ~~impor-~~ ~~importan~~ important.. The primary thing that was done was to provide a group of soldiers, to equip them, and to send them...

To how great an extent the nation as a whole... In this case God is raising up Israel to be His servant to do a work. Well, that doesn't mean everybody is going to do the work. It may be that the work will be done by half of a million/ it may be 3/4s ; it may be 1/4. It is ~~k~~ not impossible that Israel ~~ma~~ might ~~perform~~ ~~perform~~- perform the work by providing one man who is provided by Israel , who ~~xxx~~ represents Israel. Who does the work for which Israel was brought into existence. And on account of which Israel has been upheld by God all through the ages. You cannot say ~~x~~ at ~~the~~ this place. You may wonder if it is not ~~x~~ the whole nation. Some of the nation is so that the part of Israel which will perform this work may be a very great part and it may be a very small part , and also, you say, America provided the ~~pa-r~~ army.

The army represented them, and America provided the means ... Now, Israel provides the one or ones who are actually to fulfill this task for which Israel is called to serve.

Does Israel provide this individual or group of individuals representative in carrying on the ~~task-task~~ task in that they are fulfilling their responsibility that Israel has

in the task. Does it also provide the means to do it. Well, it all depends upon

what kind of means to do it, gives the equipment. Well, it all depends upon what

kind of means ~~xx~~ or equipment. Because, after all, at this rate, God ~~x~~ has raised

up Israel that the ~~task~~ task may ~~be~~ performed. God is certifying that the task will

be performed. Whether the ~~x~~ means and the equipment has been provided by Israel

or by the Lord-~~god~~ does not affect the question that if the task is done and done

by an individual or a group who comes from Israel that will ~~re~~ represent Israel, then

the responsibility has been fulfilled, and the purpose for which ~~x~~ God brought Israel

into existence has been fulfilled. And so we have for the first time a clear picture

provided here at the beginning of 41 of what the work of- is to do, and it is constantly

in individual terms; well, it is perfectly possible to think of ~~x~~ Israel as he or she.

You can personify ~~x~~ a portion of a nation, but as you read, it is not the ... of the

individual ; if it said they, and ~~a~~ talked about the plural you know it couldn't refer to an individual. But when it uses the individual ~~ters~~ terms , you don't know that it doesn't refer~~a~~ to the nation as a whole. But the possibility of it perhaps ~~referee~~ ...which one represents Israel in ~~perferm~~ performing. -(Q- And so you read it and you see that ...and you see whether ...I don't think the ~~terma~~ terminology proves, but I think the terminology suggests rather strongly that it is not ...and even that may be a single ~~a~~ individual who fulfills the work of the ~~wk~~ servant, the work for which Israel has called and ...By the way, I gave you an assignment two or three weeks ago to study Isa. 41:2 in ~~ixx~~ the Hebrew.

41:2

I ask~~a~~ you to take that verse and study the words of it , particularly~~ly~~ the first ..and do you very best, knowing exactly what these words are, and more particularly studying the order of the words in~~a~~ order to see the possible way to translate them, for after all, if you say the mouse, (?) Israel is a mouse, ...has no neuter, is the man. You can interpret it as the Man killed the mouse or the mouse ~~kin- i-~~ killed the man. Order is not the ...If in Hebrew you have the word And, it sep artes what after the and and what is before. If we say , He did it in order that they might go, you can't translate it that they may go in order that he might do it. Order does have ...but order doesn't enter into Hebrew a fraction ~~a~~ of as much... so that on many possibilities~~ies~~ of interpreting, the order in different ways. In most cases these possibilities can be ruled out, ...~~Espeae~~ Especially the first half of verse two I asked you to arrange ...see what ~~did-~~ different orders you can reasonably take the word as being, as reasonable possibilities of interpretation. And, if you want, I do not object you looking at other translations of the verse. They might give you suggestions and if ~~you do~~ they do, use your judgment as far as ~~ot-~~ order of words are concerned, decide ~~k~~ whether the order of words ~~are approximately-~~

1  
# 8 (contd.)

is a possible interpretation. The second part of that assignment was to look specifically at the way the RSV translates the verse and to note that there are elements in it which are entirely possible, equally possible ways of interpreting the way ...but to see ~~it~~ if there is any particular word in it that you feel ~~x~~ is definitely not a possible interpretation and if so, what is that. That is the ~~D~~- way of ~~the~~ translating one of the words in a ~~wh~~ ~~x~~ way which you see no warrant for, and ~~x~~ that you feel is wrong. You see...You might find reason to think that the translation in the RSV is equally possible, but I am sure that you will find one ...in the RSV which will immediately impress you as a marked change from this. Well, now...it relates only to one word. When you notice this, ask yourself the question, just what evidence is there for the RSV ~~inter-~~ interpretation on that. Now, it ~~is~~ ~~just~~ isn't just out of the air. There are cases where the RSV just throws ~~x~~ away the Hebrew and puts something else. Like Psalm 2 where it says , Kiss the Son, lest He be angry. The RSV says Kiss His feet...but I do ~~x~~ know the RSV just throw the Hebrew aside and puts something else, and you find evidence of the fact that the footnote doesn't say...They just say Hebrew uncertain. What they have has absolutely no warrant at all. ... They say the end of Psalm 2 is purely ...~~wh~~ well, there is no ~~evidi-~~ evidence for it. It is so wild that they don't even alledge that there is, but in this case there is a ground on which to base it. And looking in Brown, Driver, and Briggs, you can find that noun, but I don't think it is arranged...If you find somewhere that a word means ...and then you find five cases where it means...that's pretty good proof. But we don't care what Brown, Driver, or Briggs think the word means, but we care tremendously what evidence they base it on. If they say ~~x~~ a word means ...If they say a word means large and they give you ...so you can feel that a number of cases probably proves, but this

WORD which ordinarily means large, they in five cases that in these 5 cases the word means sympathetic. Well, you say, large can ~~be~~ mean large-hearted. Well, that's a presumption, but it is not an impossibility. I think it ought to take more than 5 cases to prove it. Look up the participles (?) and see if you feel that the meaning ..large would absolutely not fit , but if you think that large in those cases might be just as sensible as ...see what I ~~mae-~~ mean. It is not a big job-- it shouldn't take you ~~ma~~ more than an hour at the most. But if I didn't make that clear before, I am not surprised because I touched on it very lightly, but I would like to make it definite now. And if one of you would mention to Mr. Gregory and Mr. Mackey the assignment, I would appreciate it, so they ~~wa~~ will be sure to have this and also to Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ if you can. Well, we will continue there next time.

# 7a

As we have noticed,  
 /Here we have a very definite problem. \_\_\_\_\_ we have ~~taken~~ up our study of Isaiah 40 to 55, and I don't expect you to have the answers to these problems altogether, but until the \_\_\_\_\_ is finished, but we ~~are going to xxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxxx~~ gradually get \_\_\_\_\_ of the answers and certain points clarified. These chapters are the best chapters known in the Christian world. But we find that Jews interpret them as the return from the exile, ~~Ø~~ the Christians interpret them the prediction of as/the coming of Christ. Now the return from the exile is very clear enough. I don't know of any verse that the Jews say that is the return from the exile, and the Christians say that it is the coming of Christ. They are different sets of verse. How are these verses related? We jump from one thing to another. We jump from this one to the other. There is an organic relationship between them. In addition to that, we must not assume that the first in ~~the~~ Isaiah say going to the book, and ~~are going to learn~~ now I want to learn about Christ.

What are we going to read about him? That is not ~~a~~ the opposed to the person who ~~these days~~ says. We are opposed to \_\_\_\_\_. (1.50) Here is the exile condition. What is ~~its relation to~~ the message in relation to it? The question is <sup>ing</sup> how does the message deal/with the exile? come to mean to a wonderful prediction of Christ? So, here we have a very vital problem, the problem of the interpretation of the beginning of ch. 42. As I pointed out to you, I feel that we are entirely justified in saying that from the viewpoint of Isaiah's day that here is an explanation of what is given in chapter 41. Here is \_\_\_\_\_, too. \_\_\_\_\_ (2.20)

(2.80) What is the task that must be performed? \_\_\_\_\_.

All must perform the task. The Israel must perform the task. Israel must perform the task. How the Israel came to be involved is something that is not immediately apparent. That needs a further light on it as we move on. Now \_\_\_\_\_ in this <sup>the interesting thing</sup> ~~task~~ task is.... I might ask this question/ What do you ~~have~~ find stated <sup>sometime.</sup>

in ch 42 here that the servant is going to do for Israel? What do you find clearly stated that the servant is going to do for Israel? The answer is that we do not find anything that is clearly stated/ that the servant is going to do for Israel. Because this is the fifth of the worst <sup>st</sup> four verses which Israel has been involved. Now, you may say that the thing is clear that he is going to do for the Gentiles that Israel is going to do. The thing that he is going to do for the world is, \_\_\_\_\_ (3.10), but ~~is~~ it is not the exception which was made in the past.

So that a person is entirely ~~is~~ justified in coming to the passage for the first time in claiming that this is the picture of the work of which is to be done for the Gentile world, for the world as a whole, in order to accomplish which Israel was set apart, and for the accomplish <sup>the</sup> ~~wh~~ ment of which God has done these wonderful things/ ~~that~~ through ~~the~~ Israel throughout the centuries up to the time of the \_\_\_\_\_.

that

Of course, we would say that he will continue, /too, in order that the work ~~might~~ may

be accomplished. ~~It~~ It is God's \_\_\_\_\_ God does not say this is what you

must do. This is what he wants me to do. Israel is God's servant. But the work

is a work which God does, but God has laid on Israel the responsibility, and it

must be done through Israel, because that is what God has said. Now, do you

have anything more about the truth in this chapter? Mr. Grafton, do you have

anything more about the truth? Now, the verse 17 sheds a little further light on

the picture we have in the first four verses. This gives a further light. This

does not say in verse nineteen, who is talking, doesn't say whom he is talking

Is he

Is he

about ~~it~~ speaking about the servant? talking about the servant? This is no

valid ground. Now he ~~is~~ is talking about one and now he talking about ~~the other,~~-

another. It might be people who put the original He in the King James Version.

~~This is no valid~~ Whatever rebuke you find, there is certainly plenty rebukes.

in the

rebuke for Israel's sin. Israel is condemned for his sin. In whatever ~~prophets~~

you find blessing, you say, God's blessing upon his servant. God's blessing

upon his servant. All the verses, all the rebukes are given to the Israel, and

all the blessings are given to the ~~servants~~. Well, we cannot just argue

instead of \_\_\_\_\_ (5.20) Everything that is good )5.40)

some day

I remember ~~one day~~ there was an athlete, Look at that athlete (5.50)

What a strong fellow he is! See how able he is to win all the games he has

entered into contest. My such an able athlete! This athlete is given to

drunkenness.

Now would you say that I was talking ~~about~~ about one athlete in the first place,

and another athlete for the second time? I could that, but there should be a

~~transi~~ transitional statements. There must something. I ~~could~~ could say to you,

want to

"I ~~will~~ tell you about two athletes, and now look at this athlete, \_\_\_\_\_

42:17?

I just describe him, and then I say, this athlete is given to drunkenness, and then I am pointing to another one. That could be that he would not \_\_\_\_\_, because you don't see the hat. You just hear the word, but there is, you cannot necessarily \_\_\_\_\_ anything like that(Q) Mr. Mackey? That is an entirely possible interpretation.

But in addition to that, what Mr. Mackey has just ~~h~~ said, point out the very vital h  
 ting that is definitely in it. That is to say that the beginning is the idea, it is the path, it is that forward Israel has been calling to Israel. it has been deserved. It is that this task should be performed. So ~~that~~ there is not necessarily a contradiction  
 there is,  
 between the first and the last; however, at least in appearance, there is task described. He not merely says, my you have got this list of tremendous storm. You have to lift it up and get that out of way. That is what you ought to do. He not only ~~easy~~ says that, but he says, Look, what you are going to do, you are going to step out to the storm without any tremendous effort, without any ~~having~~ heavy breathing, any great tears, and just lift your hands on it, and just lift it up and put it over there.

That is the picture, that is the picture of the Servant that is accomplishing the task without undue exhaustion, difficulty, disturbance, and \_\_\_\_\_. Nothing like that enters into his \_\_\_\_\_. With perfect confidence he fulfills it. This is God's assurance that the task will be done. The servant has to perform that is to be done. And it is not only going to be done, but also it is going to be done ~~with absolute~~ in complete assurance and confidence. But then he says, "Who is blind, but my servant? ..." He says, how can you immediately \_\_\_\_\_ (7.90) How can this servant who is in this condition do that? What is his answer? How does he answer? Well, the one answer to the immediate ~~suggestion~~ question is that: is this one who is in this condition is going to do the coming \_\_\_\_\_. \_\_\_\_\_ (8.00) if this is the right answer. we look for righteousness, but at least this

is true that the third part is a true picture, a true description of that which is going to happen. Here is Israel, to whom God has given a task, not given to an every individual. No, that is ridiculous. Not every individual of Israel is going to do the task.

But the purpose of Israel's existence is to get this task done. And so the Israel as a whole the Servant, in the sense of the responsibility laid upon all to get this task done. But what part of the Israel is actually involved in the actually performing of the task? ~~of the servant?~~ servant? the one that performs the task which is the Israel's responsibility. Is it composed of the two thirds of the nation? Is it composed of half? Is it one tenth of the nation? Or is it one individual out of it? WE must know.

You have noticed the tone of it, and \_\_\_\_\_ (9.00) It doesn't prove, but it does suggest it. But then we come along to the end of the chapter, and here we have one of the basic problems of the book. I don't mean a student's book, but the book presents to us a / a problem for an answer, calling for an answer.

Israel has this responsibility. Now, not only has Israel been given this responsibility but God has certified that it is to be performed. But you look at the Israel, and you say, how can this Israel do? You don't ask that from this viewpoint, but the way it is presented does not adequately state the viewpoint. Look at Israel.

Somebody may suggest that it is the interpretation. But as you look at it, it is given in the opposite order. The order given is, here is a task which is going to be done.

Look at Israel. How can Israel perform the task? And so, the problem in the previous chapters of Isaiah we constantly have rebukes of Israel for his sin. Turn away from your sin, and why should you perish? ~~turn away from your sin, and~~ <sup>or</sup> God will let you go on exile. ~~Rep-~~ So, repent, and turn back to God. Then he turns to the godly, and he says, no, you go on, God still has purposes of blessing. That is a recurring / expression in Jeremiah. And only in the early parts of Isaiah.

But we don't have that here. Here is \_\_\_\_\_. Here is people who are already in suffering and in affliction. God does not come to that point of \_\_\_\_\_ yet, He comes to it, when he comes to \_\_\_\_\_. And He says, "I will do wonderful things for you. I have called you to a great task that is to be done. This great task is going to be done. Here is what the Servant is going to do in power. Then how can this thing be done by the servant? How can this get to be done? Look at the condition. Look at how you are. And then we get the question, ~~how we~~ why have you done it. And, therefore, instead of ...approaching these sinners and saying , Oh, you wicked people, turn from your sin. The approach is , oh, you poor people , ~~you wicked people. -- Turn from your sin~~ you suffering people, you people that ~~have~~ have fallen into terrible situation, God is going to deliver you. <sup>of sin</sup> But, why did you get into this situation. And so, the problem is introduced as a questionnaire , a thing which proceeds to become vital, rather than being the primary thing with which to make things hopeless (?) And, of course, there is a wonderful lesson in that about ~~tack in~~ ~~dealing with people~~ tack in dealing with people . Find out where they are and deal with them from the place they are. Like the Holy Spirit goes to rebuke in Matt., and says You , poor , oppressed people, you need a king to deliver you from the Romans. God is going to give ~~you~~ you the king who will free you from the Romans, and set up a reign of righteousness and peace. He goes to the ~~Roma~~ ~~Roman~~ Romans . He doesn't say, You people that are ruling the world are going to be dispossessed~~x~~. He goes to ~~them~~ them, and he says You are having you tremendous problems about getting ~~them~~ things done as it should be done. Here is the Church, the one who can do the things right, the ~~one~~ one who accomplish as ~~not~~ no other could and then , ...you will prophesy that the Servant and that you must hand your throne over to him, but the approach is to approach you in the point of you and ~~me~~ me and then lead you on. Rather than a ~~an~~ approach

La carta

~~that~~ that will drive ~~us~~ you away. It's like the pope , instead of calling us all heretics, wicked people, ~~we~~ he is now calling us the separated brethren. We are ~~us~~ the poor people who are confused in our minds and don't realize it, ~~It's like the pope, - instead of - calling us - at~~ the great doctrines that...proclaimed.

It is an ~~approa-~~ approach that is much more likely to succeed. ~~K~~ There is the contrast between the beginning ~~k~~ and ending of 42 and you notice how this contrast is carried on here in 46. He says Who is blind as my servant or as deaf as my messenger, and then he talks about that, and then he says in verse 6-21 , the Lord is going to do the work. The Lord is well pleased for His righteousness' sake. He will magnify the Law, ~~and~~ but then we read that this is the people lost and ..., they are all ensnared in holes. You say ...~~K~~ God is going to carry out his wonderful purpose ~~of~~ righteousness. Yes, but how can he . We are ~~us~~ in holes. We are entraped. We are encaged. We are in captivity. How can we do it.

What is God's answer. Verse 24 , 25: Who gave Jacob for a spoil, and Israel to the robbers? did not the Lord, he against whom we have sinned? for they would not walk in his ways, neither were they obedient unto his law. Therefore he hath poured upon him the fury of his angeer, and the strength~~x~~ of ~~bat~~ battle: and it hath set him on fire round about, yet he knew not; and it burned him, yet he laid it not to heart." In other ~~works-work-~~ words , the problem of sin is what you lead up to , rather than what you start from in his sin. You are in need, dire need, well, God promises comfort, promises blessing, but then he says, You are in this need, how did you get there. So he brings the problem and as the chapters go on, we are increasingly brought to realization that even though God will deliver he promises, yet, if ~~that~~ that is all he does, nothing is accomplished, because people are still sinners and ~~for~~ there will have to be another exile. ~~N~~ The answer to ~~is~~ it is , while

42:24

it is a vital problem , yet there is a greater need to get rid of the cause of which produced the exile. So ~~he~~ He is gradually , tactfully ~~wonder~~ wonderfully adeptly bringing this in in chapter ~~k~~ after chapter until it looms larger and larger in the minds , and comes to be the big problem .

## # 8

In the first five or six ~~h-oh~~ chapters this same problem are stressed in view, because he is not coming to them, saying this is the problem , I am going to explain it to you: A,B,C,D. He is coming to people in dire need, in terribly emotional overwrought, and he is coming to these emotionally overwrought people and he is ~~g~~ bring them the answer to their problems. The answer is First, be confident, I am going to help you, but then in giving that confidence, then he says , How can ~~we~~ <sup>you</sup> help ~~you~~- us... shows the folly of idol worship, and he goes from one to the other, back and forth, ~~he~~ ~~here and there and he stresses this ability to predict the future, shows the folly of idol-~~ ~~3~~ He stresses this emotional need, until you might say that need reminds him of another, and ~~g~~ he goes one ~~fr-~~ to another among these four, but as he does it , he gradually read it the realization of the importance ~~of~~ ~~of~~ of other problems and ~~graduatl-~~ gradually brings you to an emotional feeling of the importance of the ...so that the whole ~~ex~~ first question, from chapter 41 , after the... , ~~thro-~~ through 47, is a dealing with these emotional problems, repeating in various things four great wonderful truths, and he brings in these other elements, until you reach your great climax of deliverance in 46 and 47, that is, the great climatic deliverance from Babylon , with all of 47 given over to a description of the peace of the Babylonian gods and their utter annihilation , the end of the power of Babylon. By the time ~~of~~ you finish 47 , this problem has been added. You don't need to spend any more time talking about this ~~subject-~~ subject after 47. Of course this is the big problem in education, indealing with the ~~large at-lar~~ world at large, you have to arouse the

The Servant passage of 42:19 ...I don't think it has any relation to this. They shall be turned back , they shall be greatly ashamed that trust in graven images, ~~x~~-they that say to molten images, Ye are ~~x~~our God, Hear, ye deaf, And look , ye blind that ye may see. There ~~he~~ he is talking to the heathen who worship the graven images, and he is saying to the heathen, Ye are blind and deaf to worship these graven images. How foolish of you. But then in 19 he says, Here is my servant who should be able to show you the folly of idol worship and to lead you into the light . He is going to bring you- light to the earth. The isles wait for His law. He is my servant, he is blind too, so that He is just talking about the blindness of the ~~heatt-~~ heathen and then suggests that Israel is blind too. Verse 18 is the heathen, verse 19 is Israel. And ~~then-~~ now when you take ~~5~~ 43 that we just spoke about. He tells in 43 about God's wonderful mercy to Israel, in verses 1-10. but ~~then~~ in verses 8 and 9 he returns to the heathen gods to show how useless they are, that they cannot do anything. Ye are my witnesses , you are my servant whom I ~~shv~~ have chosen. He is contrasting again what Israel should be ~~wh~~ with what the heathen are. Back in the previous verse, He recognizes the fact that Israel should be entirely different from the heathen actually is blind too, but ordinarily and the deaf are used of the heathen , or of the heathen gods. There are so many interrelations, so many thoughts that you learned ...there is just no bottom to it. There is so much to get out of it, but you have to get you main /...if ~~x~~ you are going to get ~~your-~~ the details. (Q) Well, if you start with 18, but if you start with 17...you mean this would/~~th~~ <sup>be</sup> the Israelites had fallen into heathen ~~x~~ worship. They shall be turned back, they shall be ~~x~~ greatly ashamed that trust in graven images. You have to interpret them. You have to see what would ~~th~~ be the idea in the minds, of the person, not merely in the verse, but in the context. Verse 16 is in a different area. Verse 16 is the promise of a blessing. I don't think you ~~could~~ <sup>can</sup> relate the blind of 16 with the blind of 19. (Q) Well, the people in 16 are Israel. (Q)No, this great passage here that ends in 16 is God's wonderful mercy offered. Now, He doesn't state ~~spee~~ specifically that He is talking to Israel. It may ....It is a marvelous Word of Comfort and His comfort

43:1-10

includes bringing the blind by a way that they knew not. You have it way ; back in chapter 40, the general thought of God's mercy upon the people who are suffering and are in misery, but ~~★~~ between the section here and ~~the-se~~ verse 17 you have the ~~cecept~~ concept of what God can do and what the heathen do. God says I am able to deliver you, but these graven images, they ~~★~~ can't do anything. Whoever trusts in graven ~~ix~~ images, they are going to find that they can do nothing. ~~★~~ It's the theme of idolatry and ~~whoever~~-having proceeded from the theme of comfort to the theme of idolatry, which is 17 and 18, then you have something that doesn't fit in ~~★~~ with ~~any~~ ~~★~~ none of our four standard themes, you have the failure to fulfill the ...and it may be just a verbal connection. Here you have , Who is blind but my servant. It doesn't seem that my servant is the blind one I am ~~eeafe~~ comforting and leading and I don't think it means my servant is the blind one that is worshipping idols. ~~★~~ I think that He means my servant is the one who should be standing up bravely ~~that,~~ against these things and witnessing , and instead of/the heathen suffering and in misery and just can't see the way out , just hopeless in exile and need God's deliverance. Instead of being a servant who is leading others out, he is one who needs. leading himself. (Q) No, you cannot dogmatically say it ~~isixix~~ Israel isn't mentioned in the ~~pasa~~ passage. The theme/~~ef~~ <sup>is</sup> comfort , and since up to here we have had no comfort for anybody but Israel, except in the ~~pree~~ promises in the beginning of 42 of being- bringing light ~~■~~ to the Gentiles, and the isles shall wait for His law,-~~expe~~ except for that, we have had ~~■~~ no promise for anyone but Israel, therefore, since this is comfort it would be reasonable to assume that He is continually giving comfort to Israel. But in the ~~eeuse~~ course of the comfort to Israel there , the expression bringing the blind in a way that they know not is not a specific reference to some particular people but is the general idea of those who are in need and helpless, God delivers them. (Q) It 's not a convertive (?) ~~★~~it's a reproach. I don't think.. I think it is parallel with , in 41 where , verses 23,24 : "Declare the things that are to ~~come~~ the hereafter, That we may know that ye are gods; Yea, do ~~★~~ good or do

evil, That we may be dismayed, and behold it together. Behold, ye are nothing. And your work is a thing of nought; An abomination is she that chooseth you." The futility of idols lead him naturally to the shame and failure of the idol worshippers. I don't think that is the theme of this chapter. I don't think that He is saying here to Israel, turn away from idols and follow/ the true God. I don't think that is the thing that is being stressed. That is the by product of the chapter, that any Israelite that- who had ... is ~~was~~ shown that he should not do that, but the theme of the chapter here is Israel has been suffering in ~~his~~ bondage because the Babylonians had been able to overcome ~~them~~ and they have destroyed the temple of God, therefore it looks as if their gods ~~are~~ are stronger than the God of Israel. So he is trying to tell ~~them~~ No, God is the one who has created them, the idols would never have been able to .... if Jehovah ~~is~~ had not permitted it. Jehovah is the one. The can ~~not~~ do nothing. The people that follow ~~them~~ them can only do as far as Jehovah lets them. There is another thing that comes in there. How foolish you would be to go off and worship those idols, but that is sort of a side issue here, ~~it's~~ it's not a thing that He comes directly on. He assumes that Israel is following the ~~their~~ law, but perhaps following hesitantly, perhaps tending to think now After all, wouldn't we better off if we were ~~is~~ following these idols. The theme of these chapters is not an apostate ~~is~~ nation that has repudiated ... but it is a captive nation that seems to be ~~is~~ in a hopeless situation. ~~is~~ I don't think there is ever an inference in these chapters that the people to whom this comfort is brought are people who ~~is~~ have ~~actual-~~ actually blasphemed the name of God but are likely people who are saying, Well, now, what's the point of going ~~is~~ like this. God hasn't been able to protect, us... He ~~may-~~ He says No, Be comforted, God is going to bless. He would n't say that to .... (Q) I would say that .... I would say that 18 is ... Look how foolish it is to worship your God. It 's a continuance of the great call at the beginning of 41. Come ye heathen, lets examine the matter and see who is the real God. It's a ~~is~~ plea to the idol worshippers --not so much a plea as a demonstration. (Q) Yes, but I think you would have to see what is the theme of the text, where there is a break, but you have the theme of ~~their~~

ISAIAH # 9

the theme of comfort actually from verse one, continuing right up to verse 16. But ~~in~~ under the theme of comfort you have this marvelous message that the ~~S-EVERE~~ Servant is going to do a work, that God assures them, God will accomplish~~xxx~~... but there is the new theme ~~x~~ of the servant being brought in, but then He tells us how God is going to do marvelous things, Let the inhabitants of the \_\_\_\_\_ sing, let them shout, let them glory in the Lord. The Lord is going to work and accomplish these wonderful things. I have been quite- quiet a long time, now I am going to cry out. I am going to be sorry, I am going to do tremendous things, I am going to bring the blind by ~~axwy~~ a way that they know k not. It is ~~highly-~~ highly figurative language which can be taken by the person in that situation to seem simply further assurance that he is going to be delivered from exile, that God is going to accomplish these marvelous things, and yet/<sup>when</sup>one goes back and reads this the second time he finds that exile is not specifically mentioned and therefore it is an assurance of God's great deeds, including the exile but also including much more. And then after telling of the tremendous things He is going to do, then in verse 17 He goes back to a little touch on the theme that He has so often touched upon, that .... whenever He ~~deals-~~ deals with His greatness, there is abt to be a little touch of this theme, the futility of ~~is~~ idols. And-then the word/<sup>blind</sup>~~ORXXXX(f)~~ is dealt with a number of times but I don't think/<sup>blind</sup>~~OR~~ is the key ~~x~~ here, I-don't-think-that-blind men-are- think that blind enters ~~n~~ in-here- in various connections. That is one think you have to consider in ~~is~~ studying any ~~x~~ chapter, ~~what~~ find what the keys are and very often ~~x~~ you will find something ~~x~~ that is used in various connections that isn't the key, they ~~key~~ key may not be ~~is~~ obvious at all of course, but when you get to the key that gives you the lines to it. And here I don't think the key is blind, (Q) I feel that ~~is~~ in the passage, in the whole structure of the book you bring comfort to Israel, but yes, that this is ~~specifiae-~~ specifically talking to~~isa~~ Israel, I don't think you ~~said-~~ could say that. I think that the comfort to Israel

42:14-16

may be included a great many more. (Q) Yes, verse 18 could be just an exaggeration. These people who are not doing this , ... (Q)

ISAIAH # 10

It's like somebody says I am going to destroy Hitler's armies and release the nations that are in captivity. It's two sides...It's God coming forth to deliver His people and His~~x~~ coming forth with force against ~~the~~ His enemies and then this ...I feel that ~~h~~ you ~~x~~ have a continuous passage in these verses from 13-16, a continuous passage of ~~some~~ comfort. It's not a passage of rebuke but it is comfort because He is going to see to it that like chapter ~~1~~ 47 is a chapter of comfort, though ~~is~~ it is a chapter of destruction, because it is the destruction of idols.~~x~~ God and Babylon~~x~~, but it is all about the idols of Babylon but the theme of chapter 47 is the destruction of idols, ~~w~~ the theme of chapter~~x~~ 47 is the deliverance of Israel, and it is giving to us the ....how they ...into captivity. Well, we just have a minute or~~x~~ ~~w~~ two more. Next week I have to be away...Two weeks from next week we will have the test. ~~New-- the-best-way-to-do-that~~ ... I wonder if we should have a test ~~on~~ the next Tuesday/ or if we could ... I do not want to ... If we I could give you an hour test then, we .... No, any time during the week will be convenient for me. I would not~~worrr~~ worry about that. ... We could make it on Monday or Tuesday. Or we could give it ~~next-week~~ about ten days later or two weeks later.... Would you rather... All right, then let's have it next Tuesday. And consequently we ~~plann~~ on working it out at an hour at different time, since we do not have a regular class, and so we won't meet at all at the next class period. Probably next Tuesday we probably .... Now the ~~the~~ best way to do that is to ... Then get that information two weeks ~~h~~ from now, then. Now, ~~w~~ I must not forget to give you a work ~~to-do~~ for you to do while I am away. I have not been doing much in the way of specific assignment, instead of ... There is only one really specific assignment given, and I do not remember just what that was. That was one verse in chapter ~~51~~ 41, in which I asked you to make a careful study of the Hebrew words in

ISAIAH #10

in the first half of the verse in order to see what possible different translations could be made of that could be a translation, Is. 41:2. And I did not ask you to write it out, but I expect you to have in mind, and I am going to ask you for it next time. The different possible translations for it. If you say, the dog the man he ~~did~~, hit. The man hit the dog. The man hit the dog. Or the dog hit the man. ~~If-it-~~ If you say, the man he ~~willed~~ the horse, --He-killed-~~it-~~ that he saw. That could be the man whom he saw the horse. The man whom he killed the horse saw the horse. Or it could be the man killed the horse he ~~wa~~ saw. Three different possibilities. There are certain things that= could not be any other thing, but there are certain things that might be other things. What are the possibilities are, and look into a few different translations that show you how different ~~pee~~ people take it. But I want everybody to look into the RSV, and see how RSV takes the first half of this verse, and reach ~~to~~ a judgment as ~~if~~ to how much of this translation is ~~going-to~~ <sup>perfectly</sup> be-valid, and how much of it is not at all valid. If it ~~is~~ is not at all valid, why? For instance, if there is a word that is translated "killed," and they translated, "slaughter," then I will say, it is perfectly possible. But if one translated it "killed," and they translate it "punish;" you will ask if the word ever means to "punish". And then you look into the Brown and Driver, and Briggs, and see if there it ever means punishment. If they give 50 words killed, and 50 words/<sup>mean</sup>punished, and then you say that is a sufficient evidence. Surely it can mean either one. If they mean 50 words mean to kill, and three or five mean punishment, then you will say, maybe these all mean kill. Let us look them ~~it~~ up and see what the evidences are. What are the grounds whereupon they can every mean \_\_\_\_\_. Well, let us come back to this verse later. ~~Let us be-sure-that~~ But I want to be sure that everybody ~~get-~~ has got the point clear. Mr. \_\_\_\_\_? \_\_\_\_\_ recommended the Standard Version, but unfortunately, they have got a lot of \_\_\_\_\_ they do not have any warrant. And they have, and there are many cases where ~~it~~ ~~it~~ renderings are excellent, but then there are other cases where there is no notice at all, and there are thousand places where

ISIAAH #10

without footnote saying CN which means correction. They have ~~em~~ made changes, they have abandoned, thousand \_\_\_\_\_ in the Old Testament, so that it is not a dependable verb, though sometimes it makes some excellent renderings, and so I can recommend it sometimes, ~~but~~ because of its excellent renderings, but I do think that the advanced students of the Old Testament should be able to ~~ave~~ have an opinion on it. I think that is necessary. ~~You can have you-r-own---~~ ~~Either~~ Here you can have your own rendering.... Here is a Moffatt's translation.

How about the so called ~~the~~ American Version? This is an American translation made by the University of Chicago. It is the translation of the Old Testament. This was made about 1925. And the Jewish version was there, but that probably is old like the King James version. I doubt if there is much.... If you look into some commentaries, a lot of the commentaries have their own translations. A lot of them do. If you look into particularly a recent translation, ~~you-de~~ there are more \_\_\_\_\_ rendering. (11.00) The English translation? Well, <sup>in</sup> 1881 just the New Testament. Then I think that later the Old Testament was translated.

In the United States the New Testament was ~~translated-~~ translated published in 1901, though the New Testament was published earlier. But the original committee had members from England and from the United States, and then the American members did not agree with some ~~of~~ of the decisions the English members made, so they issued their own, what we call, the ASV. The American Standard Version. But I think that RV would be that English committee work, and we do not often come across that. It would be about like the ASV, and there are some places where I might prefer, and in another I would.... But it would not be like Greek- the ~~of~~ Greek. It would be... it does in general ~~the-translation-of~~ follow the same interpretation with the King James Version. There might be an occasion ... Well, you can get hold of one of these, and I am sure. ~~that~~ I do think it necessary to be able to speak intelligently on the RSV. Of course, you cannot say ~~that-Dr.-MacRae--~~ to read Dr. MacRae's little track ~~ent.~~ on it. I think I have given some good evidence there.... ~~shw~~ showing

ISAIAH #10

some substantial evidence there still when  
 that it is not a dependable version. But/it is coming to be quite-~~q~~= wise  
 sold  
 widely used, why-a-person and they say-that a million copies were sold last  
 year, I believe, why, a person wants to be able to feel personally about  
 it, and \_\_\_\_\_ examine it, so I would think that an-advanced-person-should if a  
 person is going to do advanced work, it would be wise to have a copy and to be able  
 to compare it, and see what the \_\_\_\_\_ has to say. xI would not recommend to  
 of a church  
 an average person / that he should. But a person who is to be a Christian leader  
 I think, he should be informed of it, and be able to tell here it follows definitely  
 the Hebrew, and here it does not, etc. ... \_\_\_\_\_ that particular assignment.  
 And I would like to have you get these chapters, let us say, ch. through ei. through chapter  
 48. get an idea, and I do not think that it will take a long time to ~~it~~ run hastily  
 through the chapters, noting every ~~was~~ verb, or a part of verb which falls in one  
 eight  
 of the four categories... I think I did that through the/whole chapters in an  
 A good way to do it would be to  
 hour or so. Please take a sheet of paper, and write out on the top of the paper,  
 write next to it, you might say,  
 write, comfort, and then/deliverance, and then they are really same themes, ~~the~~  
 theme  
 what is more specific then? comfort or deliverance? Then for the second../ the  
existence of God, the greatness of God. And then the third theme is the idolatry,  
 the folly of idolatry. Then the fourth theme is the prediction as the evidence  
~~for~~ eh- the Divine existence and the power. I find that sometimes people are- get  
 confused on that, that- and they do not realize what is meant by that. When  
 that- but  
 they say that the idols cannot predict, when he says ~~that~~ I have predicted and  
 -it is coming it is coming to pass, and I am getting \_\_\_\_\_ not it is not as  
 theme.  
 an extensive as the other three, but it is a very important/ But whatever  
 does not go in one of these themes, you can put under a separate ~~do~~ column.  
 If you find several themes there, and they go together, then why, make a new  
 subdivision, so that a good way is to do is, except one or two,... because it  
 may run together, write down in columns, and write down the headings ~~in~~ across way.  
 the page, and then put the verses under it, but do not put under one heading,  
 verse 1, 7, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, and then under the next verses, in between

ISAIAH #10

PUT THEM DOWN IN COLUMNS, so that you can see at a glance, where you put <sup>them</sup> it down the column, where the other comes in, so that you can go down the column, and see how the thought goes from one to the other. ~~You-can-go-down-the-column-and-see-- Or how--the-~~ you can pick one column and see and pick out ....inaudible.

ISAIAH #11

If you say that The the United States is going to defeat Germany, you do not mean individually, you are saying that something that is done as a nation ~~on~~ as a whole, but that is actually by done by a certain part of the nation. When you say that the ~~United~~ States has declared that it will/~~not~~ attack Cuba, you will ask right away who is the United States \_\_\_\_ing? \_\_\_\_ is not going to take over Cuba? Do they ever give any thought on that? Does it mean just one man? or does it mean that a few men are watching? What does it mean? When you say that \_\_\_\_\_, people are too easy to believe that the Servant must be Israel, the ~~Servant~~ must be the Christ, that does not mean that every individual, it does not even mean nine-tenth of the Israel. It does not even mean one man. It means that ~~it~~ some way Israel is responsible for it. In some way God is Israel using Israel for this purpose. <sup>the</sup> But/~~actual~~ ~~d~~ carrying out of ~~the~~ it has to be only part of the nation. ~~An-in~~ One individual, or part of ~~the~~ Israel. The whole nation of course is involved in God's purpose of bringing Israel into the world, and in protecting them, and caring for them, <sup>to prepare</sup> and ~~was/preparing-~~the way for the coming of His son, born of Israel, according to flesh, he was an Israelite, He is doing the work for which Israel was brought into ~~the-world-~~ existence, There is no question to that. Now, that is not obvious, but is thoroughly logical. And perfectly reasonable. It is the whole purpose ~~of-it.~~ in bringing Israel into the world. ~~He-is-~~ Israel is to prepare the way for the coming of Christ, He was to br brought into the world. And how much the work of the servant of God relates to the whole nation of Israel or one up to this point, ~~and-how~~ much the work ~~of-the~~ it is repeatedly referred to,

Isa 10 contd.

--what is the work of the servant. So in 42 He tells us what the objective is

--what is the ideal. What is the accomplishment? This must be done, and on

( account of this, Israel is going to be delivered from exile. That is, the accomplish-  
ment is that judgment is to be brought to the nations and that God's servant must

bring judgment to the nations and in bringing it to the nations , He will bring it

in a certain way, and we have the description of the way in which it is to be brought.

And so, we have the goal, the ideal, the ~~obe~~ objective for which ~~Isra~~- Israel is

No. 10 Isa.

There is a relation. (Q) I wouldn't say it exactly that way. Israel is to be God's instrument to do a work. ~~There~~-Therefore, the responsibility is laid upon Israel to do this work. It is a description of that which the nation Israel has the responsibility... It raises the problem. ~~The problem is~~ You present the truth and then you say, We need another application (?) in order to understand the truth more clearly. It's ~~all~~ true thus far. Well, I say we go further on in the ~~work~~ book to see if we find further ~~tru~~ truth that justifies that. But we are first... Israel is to be saved because it is a servant, then we have a picture of the ~~work~~ world, which Israel is to perform, and we read in the ~~scrip~~ scriptures. We say My, ~~no wonder~~ that's wonderful, no wonder God is delivering Israel, because <sup>Word work</sup> Israel has its ~~to~~ do. Then, you say, Oh my, how can Israel do this work. It looks beyond that way--you... see only the power of God. The power of God promises that this work will be done. Then you read it and you say, Well, my Israel has to do this, that's why God is saving him, how is he going to succeed in it. You might say, You tell me, Here's the work that ~~g~~ has to get done. You have to do these things. Well, I work and toil ~~an~~ all my life and I don't get it complete and as a result, Maybe if the Lord ~~x~~ wills, my ~~son~~ shall complete this, maybe my grandson --my responsibility is going to pass on ~~to~~ to my descendants. But, it is for that that I... and this is what the work is, ...God says this is going to be accomplished, and He gives you... which leads you to begin to wonder just how we are able to do that, and you don't know just ~~how~~ how you can but you read on in the book to see whether it gives you further light on it. You get a problem and then you go on and see if you can get more light. (Q) He says it is going to get done, He doesn't say how long it takes but it is going to be done not by a sudden, big ~~spurge~~ spurge of tempestuous effort but by a constant, steady moving forward

with certainty toward the goal. Now, you read that and you say, might, that doesn't sound like Israel. But that's the goal, that's ~~what~~ what Israel has been called upon to bring, to ~~accomplish~~ accomplish. X (Q) The ~~two~~ two figures that are ~~k~~ referred to there are figures used of God's enemies. They are used of God's enemies in order to show that they don't amount to anything. These are the different ...and these ...They are the enemies of God, shown to be weak, but here I don't think he is talking about enemies. Here I think he is ~~is~~ talking about those who are ~~try~~ trying to do something good. And he is saying that these that seem to be so weak and ineffectual, the servant isn't going to ... He is going to move ahead constantly ~~in~~ in such certainty of accomplishment that he doesn't ~~need~~ need to ...It's the picture of a ~~personab~~ personality that has ... (Q) The two figures of speech there used ~~as~~ as the same figure for something else. Here they are used to show weakness. Well, before ... (Q) But on the other hand, I don't think the Bible is just a ~~lot~~-lot of scriptures thrown together with ...until later ~~one~~ you have to ~~look~~ look back and see how they Made out (?) I think that the Bible is a book in which people are taught what God wants them to know and as he teaches them, they ~~so~~ should be able to get the ~~great~~ great bulk of ...but in the course of it He will introduce suggestions, new ideas. He will give little indications which later on He will explain and announce about, so it shouldn't be ..nonsense. ~~Let~~ It should be something that is meaningful and understandable but later becomes still more meaningful as you have more light to ...~~g~~ on. I think that is true of most teaching. When I'm discussing a subject in Church History. I will very often make ~~remarks~~ remarks about the individuals or the movements or things which don't fully ....., but ~~they~~ they are anticipating things that will be developed ~~later~~ later; I ~~expl~~ explain the thing in a way which will be

most ...but I make an ~~exp~~- emphasis on this aspect, and an emphasis on this aspect, and you listen, and you say, Well, why are you discussing this.

X Why does he speak of this, ~~why~~- It ~~is~~ lays the foundation. I don't think the Lord lays the ~~ground~~ foundation for things, but in general ~~is~~ it should give a clear meaning to the people who read it. But they find more ...when they have more facts to bring in connection with it, and they may find that in some places they have previously understood, but ~~the~~ when they find that they previously mis-understood, they should be able to ~~is~~ say, Well, we didn't see that now look at it close, it's perfectly plain, like the Lord ~~say~~ said to people on the Emmaus road, He said, Fools and ~~slow~~ slow of heart to believe ~~that~~ all that the prophets have spoken. Ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into His ~~go~~ glory. He didn't say to them, Now, look, here's something that is brand new, nobody ever thought of it before. He said, No, this was there, you should have been able to see it. You didn't see it, because it isn't easy to see, but yet, it should be possible to see. And ~~I'm s~~- I've tried to figure ~~te~~ out, what should they be able to see in Isaiah's day, and then as ~~is~~ we go on we get new ideas and new points presented as we go on which ~~is~~ explain some of the things that would seem to them to be problems when they come to this, and thus they get the picture made clearer ~~is~~ and more ~~con~~ concrete and more definite as they go ~~is~~ on. But if we take the ultimate thing ~~that~~ that we know from the New Testament and we put it back into the O.T. at this point, then we miss the value of the succeeding things that come, that develop that idea, ~~so as as~~ and show us how it is really there. (Q) Of course, God can completely change a person. He can change a personality. He took those weak disciples and he made them great, strong apostles. God can make so many changes, It ~~is~~ just seems like such a tremendous change, you wonder how it is going to be done. And then while you are wondering

No. 10 Isa.

how it is going to be done, then in the ~~42~~ end of 42 he says , Who is blind but my servant. He himself points out your weakness and your inability to ~~any~~ carry it out, and then you wonder all the more, well, he says because we are His servants, he says because there is a work to ~~it~~ be done, we have a responsibility to get it done, how is He going to cause it to be done. When I went over these passages originally, I was quite ~~discurse~~ disgusted because it seemed to me that He would be ~~ask~~ talking about this, and then He would jump to this and he would jump to that. And if he were going to use that kind of method --why , anything can mean anything. A person could interpret it this way, or that way. But, well, D. . , he says the Servant of the Lord is like a pyramid. The base of it is the nation of Israel, the middle part is the godly remnant, and the top of it is Christ, Sometimes you look at the ~~boot~~ bottom , sometimes at the ~~mid-~~ middle , sometimes at the top. Well, you say they are ~~did~~ different things, you put them together , sometimes this, sometimes that--well, why should it be. Why ~~seul- whoul-~~ should look at sometimes one and sometimes the ~~eter~~ other, and if you do, wh y don't you say so. It seems to me there might be a logical context that all fits together logically, but there~~ere~~ is a reason why you deal with different aspect of the concept, and thus clarify the idea as you go ~~along~~ <sup>on</sup> and ~~connects~~ it forward a ~~clear~~ becomes clearer as you go ~~off~~ , and you get certain aspects brought to your attention. \_\_\_\_\_ different aspects brought out \_\_\_\_\_ (11.50)

(Q) Well, I would say it is Christ, too. I agree thoroughly with that. (Q) I would say that Is that, is ~~that~~... ~~Isaiah~~ \_\_\_\_\_ what goes to \_\_\_\_\_ (12.00) Isaiah not that how the New Testament writers were justified in taking this and that, and the other, but to see how the readers of Isaiah would find it justified ~~and it~~ in getting the meaning of it. And how the New Testament writer then would not

No. 10 Isa.

DEPART from \_\_\_\_\_ this is the cross, this is the cross, but to explain ~~it~~ it in the context and draw anything out of \_\_\_\_\_ (Q) Yes, I am trying what to see ~~if~~-we can see from the \_\_\_\_\_ instead of what we find in explaining the \_\_\_\_\_, Now, next, we must go rapidly here. We have not gone near what I have asked you to ~~do~~ survey. So, go on and survey more, and get the general idea what the general trends of it as far/as it has gone, and ~~go further~~ a little further, but then also please take ch. 41:2. Look at verse 1 of 42 in the Hebrew, and make an absolutely literal translation of 41 verse 2 in the Hebrew. From the Hebrew, the very literal translation. Now, in... you know ~~when~~ <sup>if</sup> you say, Abraham, Isaac \_\_\_\_\_, you <sup>can</sup> translate Abraham through Isaac, or Isaac/ through Abraham. Either one. You can say, Abraham and Isaac \_\_\_\_\_ (13.80) In other words, there is a good <sup>deal of</sup> possibility ~~that~~ of interpretation, because the order in English carries the meaning in Hebrew. So, I want you to try to get ~~it~~ exactly what the Hebrew words mean, and then I want you to see in what different you can logically take that, and then try to make ~~how~~ <sup>can</sup> two or three different possible translations of the text. And then tomorrow we ~~will~~ look at different versions to see how ~~you can~~ they have got, because there is quite a variety in some words. Look at RSV for instance. They are very different from KJV. And to how great an extent it is justified to have such translation, and try to see- spend some time on that; and then \_\_\_\_\_

41:2

The United States is going to ~~prosep~~ ~~prese~~ prosper, you don't mean every ~~in~~ individual. If you say the United States is going to defeat Germany, well, you don't mean every individual ~~k~~ in the United States. You are referring to something that the nations themselves as a whole but it is actually done by a certain part of the nation. When you say the United States has declared that it will not attack Cuba. You ask right away, Who is the United States. ~~How~~ Has Mr. Downs declared he isn't going to attack Cuba? Has Mr. Gregory declared it? Have they even given any thought to the matter? ~~Does it mean that one~~ ~~one-man-~~ Have they even given any thought to the matter? Does it mean one man as such? Does it mean a few men are watching? What does it mean, so when you say the Servant, the servant must be Israel or it must be Christ?

The servant is Israel ~~is~~--you can't get away from it. It ~~rea~~ repeatedly says The servant is ~~isre~~ Israel, that doesn't mean that it is every individual. It doesn't even mean that it is ~~9/10s-ever~~ 9/10s of the nation. It doesn't even mean that it is even 1/10th. It means that in some way ~~isre~~ Israel is responsible for this. In some way God is using Israel for this purpose but the ~~actual~~ ~~early-early~~ carrying out of ~~k~~ it has been only a part of the nation and whether it is ~~ix~~ one individual or a group ~~α~~ or what it is, that doesn't matter, we see what --up to the present at this point we can only say that the whole nation of course is involved. According to ~~the~~ flesh He was an Israelite, He is ~~den~~ doing the work for which Israel is ~~be-~~ brought into existence. Now, that would not be obvious but it is ~~thx~~ thoroughly ~~lobi~~ logical, and it is the whole purpose of bringing --is to prepare the way for the coming of Christ. And how much the ~~word~~ work of the Servant relates to the whole nation is the point up ~~thx~~ to this point repeatedly referred to in ...but we have in this ...you have a suggestion but it is certainly not proven. As far as anything we have had thus far the ~~x~~ Servant

~~that~~ does the work could prove to be 10,000 <sup>people</sup> /...as far as anything that we have had thus far. But as we read the beginning of the chapter 42 ~~x~~ it doesn't sound likely that it would prove to be 10,000, but it's not impossible. It should not be difficult to pick out the places wherever the servant is mentioned--and, also of course in doing this you ~~who~~ should have over at the right ~~x~~ hand side a problem column--what ~~proble~~ problems do you ~~stri~~ strick. What verse do you strick that you are not sure what they mean. What ~~x~~ verses do you strick that seem to you to be real problems deserving of very careful investigation. Through these chapters --chapters ~~41-56- 41-56~~ 41-46; in fact, including ...you will ~~for~~ find as mentioned last time a constant movement from one of these things to another. ~~There is~~ You see new ideas that are developed until that great idea of ~~delib-~~ deliverance reaches that great climas in 47/ and 47 is definitely deliverance even though there be very ~~lit-~~ little mention of Israel, in fact , I am not sure ~~the~~ that Israel is mentioned in the chapter at all. It calls God the ~~w~~ Holy One of ~~Isre-~~ Israel. But it is only a mention of Israel in reference to God. The chapter is entirely due to the overthrow of <sup>Babylon</sup> ~~darkness~~, but the overthrow of \_\_\_ is ~~x-interesting~~ of interest to ~~x~~ us simply as a sign of God's deliverance of Israel. The whole ~~x~~ chapter ~~is~~ comes under deliverance and it is the climatic chapter in this theme of deliverance. After this you have very ~~lit-~~ little specific name of deliverance in the sense of being brought out from the power of the Babylonians. So you do have after this the mention of deliverance in the sense of ~~brou~~ brought home ~~from-~~ to Palestine from Babylon. But I think that 1-47 makes a definite unit, and I would like ~~xxx~~ you to study 1-48, but our emphasis will be here on the first part , but in 48 you have repetition and you have a beginning of a further development, and ~~ia~~ I am ~~xxx~~ and anxious for you to see how it developes. Well, now , at our last

42:15  
meeting we ~~had~~ had some very stimulating questions raised. I thought It was very helpful, very intersting and very valuable. These questions were raised and I felt that ~~some-~~ne~~~~ an excellent point was made that in chapter 42 verse 15 , is quite difficult to be sure whether ~~ix~~ He is speaking to the people that worship the images or whether He is speaking to the people of Israel who are apt to be ~~mislea~~ misled by the people who ~~worsh~~ worship. It is pretty difficult to be sure. I would ~~like~~ like to get definite ...Certainly we know definitely what is meant by t e verse before . We ~~do~~ know definitely ~~h~~ what is meant by the verse after. Which of the two does this go with. ~~ix~~ Of course you have ~~some~~ some thing that will cover both. ~~but-~~this~~~~ It is not a major question but it is an interesting question. I would very much like further light on it. Now we notice then how 43 parallels 42. In ~~43-as-~~ 42 ~~and-in-~~ as in 43 we ~~so~~ start with God's wonderful blessing upon His people that He is going to deliver and then in 43 we have ~~details~~ details given ~~as~~ beyond what we have had before. 42 begins with the Servant that is going to do the ~~word-~~ work. The great ~~wee~~ work is to be done. Soon He is going to open blind eyes, bring ~~out~~ out prisoners , and you are not quite sure in that whether you are ...There is a problem in the verses 5-8--it's difficult to be quite sure. But ~~in~~ in 43 ~~ix~~ ~~ix~~ it is very definitely deliverance--you ~~find-~~ find an interesting verse there in verse three. First verse one we ~~are-saying-~~ He would say He is definitely talking to Israel wouldn't we? He that created thee, O Jacob and formed thee O ~~ix~~ Israel. Fear not, for ~~I~~ I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by thy name. Thou art mine. Israel is going to be delivered. And when you get to verse two you have something that seems so general you are inclined to think My, this is a wonderful promise. Any-one of us could claim it. This is a promise ~~of-~~ to God's own, that He will take

43:2  
 care of them. When thou walkest through ~~the~~ the fire that wilt not be burned --  
 neither will the flames kindle upon thee. Well, we don't take that literally  
 but we do take it as meaning that no one can hurt us unless it is God's will  
 that it hurt us, for His own specific purpose. We have a promise here that  
 when we are doing His work that we feel justified in moving forwardly fearlessly  
 knowing that anything that comes either we will be wonderfully delivered or  
 that He has a purpose in it. But in the ~~contes-~~ context He is talking specifically  
 about Israel. (?) I'm ~~a~~ glad you make a reference to the Red Sea, this would  
 be a wonderful promise for the Red Sea but it seems to me that here He is echoing  
 the Red Sea. They know how ~~there are~~ their ancestors were brought the Red  
 Sea, now they say when they pass through ~~the~~ the waters they shall not overflow  
 thee. He is promising that His grace ~~is~~ which He gave ~~to~~ to His ancestors ~~is~~  
 is going to continue to the end, that they are going to be ~~is~~ delivered. There  
 are cases where you ~~is~~ can date a thing quite exactly and ~~tha~~ there are other  
 cases where you can't. We don't object to the ~~possibl~~ possibility of dating things  
 by historical methods. We fully admit the ~~possibl~~ possibility of that but we say  
 in case after case, the critics go way beyond the evidence alledging that they  
 do ~~say~~ such a thing. If you were, for instance to ~~seem~~ come across a statement  
 where a man quotes about the hergo. Now, ~~sometimes~~ someone today  
 here in America writes about a hero. Somebody here today refers to \_\_\_\_\_  
 But if you found something, some body says, " this is what was written back  
 1896 when McKinley was running for President. He said, Let's not follow the  
 the Furor They called McKinley the ~~theory~~ Furor Because you could say that is  
 a  
 a term applied to Hitler in Germany. During the ~~world~~ war it was widely, widely  
 used as a reference to Hitler. Now, I don't see how ...but it could be possible  
 that it might have come from Germany or some other ~~k~~ kind of early appearance

11.00

Isaiah # 11

- 43 -

but quite unlikely. Now if you find a specific reference to Hitler, you could be quite sure that wasn't before 1930s, -These- at least not before 1920. Who~~er~~ ever heard of Hitler before . . . and whoever heard much about him before 1930. If somebody says that this was written in the time of George Washington Somebody says we have to free America from the George Burns and the Napoleons and the Khrushchevs, you say nobody wrote that before 1955. Now ~~we~~ when we find here that he says Cyrus is going to do so and so. Well, you say right away that couldn't be written before Cyrus came, -and unless you have reason to ~~thing~~ think that as a special and marvelous ~~miracle~~ miracle, God chose to reveal the name Cyrus in advance It is only as you ~~don't~~ consider it to be a special, miraculous prediction ~~that~~ that you can ~~possibly~~ possibly consider that that could be ~~written~~ written in the time of Isaiah, but I say if you have a lot of references here I think you would have a ~~big~~ big argument against the ~~Isaiah~~ Isaiah authorship. When you have ~~one~~ one outstanding figure named twice, it is a divine miracle to authenticate what God was speaking to ~~Isaiah~~ Isaiah. And, therefore, if you believe in predictive prophecy you can believe in that one thing. If you had a lot of them, I would want a very specific statement . . . You ~~don't~~ don't find ~~David~~ David mentioned in Genesis or Solomon either. God could predict by name. He does predict David in Numbers but not by name. Now, he could do that. I just think that the critics ~~go~~ go much too far in their placing . . . back in 1450 - . . . \_\_\_\_\_ took the so-called creed of one of the early popes and the donation of Constantine, which Constantine was supposed to have given to the Pope and \_\_\_\_\_ shows by internal references ~~that~~ evidences that there were references to all sorts of things that happened long after these people and therefore were forgeries. And he proved it so thoroughly that it was admitted by everybody, and nobody has questioned it since. The ~~FC~~ Church

admits that those were forgeries of a later century. They were not originals.

Well, ~~we~~ when ... And of course the ~~XX~~ RC Church gave up the claim that this donation of Constantine was valid, but they kept the ~~claim~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~ing~~ things that they claimed that Constantine ~~a~~ had given them. So ~~that~~ was a valid ~~a~~ argument--so there is such a thing. It's very important. The critics go way beyond what is possible in that ...

### ISAIAH # 12

This verse then is quite a general verse, but in context it is a wonderful promise of deliverance to Israel. Now, you look at the third verse and what do you think that third verse means. Mr. Abbott, what would you suggest that verse three means. It clearly shows the greatness of God. I am the Lord thy God, the Holy ~~a~~ ~~ONE~~ of Israel. And then He says I am thy Saviour, ~~God~~ and you notice deliverance there God is going to deliver them, but what about the last half, what does he mean there. This is a ~~descrip-~~ description of deliverance ~~of~~ from Egypt. What do you think it does count. That is what we have been having, deliverance from captivity but it doesn't seem to fit with that. What are Egypt and Ethiopia and Sheba have to do with deliverance ~~to~~ ~~from~~ from captivity. How many of you have an idea on it? Mr. Gregoy has an idea that I don't think he got out of his head? In other words we have evidence here that Mr. Gregoy has consulted commentaries, is that right? What is the idea then on the ... Yes, ~~we~~ well, now, just a word on that, you can't tell a great deal from the Hebrew text. The Hebrew tenses, as you know are not ordinary time. ~~a~~ The Hebrew imperfect shows action referring or beginning and is quite usually used as a subject in the future but very often refers to something habitually done in the present. We say that I ~~do~~ go is the English present --it isn't at all. The English present is I am going. I go is the English \_\_\_\_\_.

ISAIAH # 12

I meet Mr. Brooks here walking down ~~tows-~~ town. I say where do you go.

He wont know what I am talking about. I say , Where do you go to school.

He'll say, I go to Faith Seminary, even though he may be walking in the opposite  
direction. If it were the present sense it would be a lie, but it isn't a present

sense, it is a frequentitive. Y<sup>u</sup> say, where are ~~ix~~ you going. You mean what  
are ~~x~~ you ~~deint-a g~~ doing at this moment. And then he might say , I am going

to the shoe store. That would be a specific statement of present fact. Now,

in the Hebrew, the imperfect is the ~~freg-~~ frequentitive which made ~~be~~ used to

show ~~acten-~~ action occuring in the ~~fur-~~ future, and it is even used for action

beginning in the past, and the perfect in the Hebrew shows a completed ~~act~~.

And this then is what ~~ix~~ ~~happening-~~ has happened in the past ~~ix~~ is now a

completed situation. But the perfect may be used for something that is planned

for the future so definitely that is used very often in God's promises--~~they~~ are

given as a completed fact. So when ~~he~~ He said , I gave this for thy ransom~~m~~.

This may mean something that happened long ago, but equally well may mean

something that is so definitely decided by the Lord to do that it is just as much

a fact as if it were already done. That is sometimes called the Prophetic Perfect.

Mr. ~~Gregoy~~ Gregory ~~x~~ recalls~~x~~ that when Sennacherib fought there, there is reference

there to the King of Ethiopia coming up against Him, and so you have both~~x~~ Ethiopia

and ~~ix~~ Egypt. Sennacherib heard the King of Ethiopia come and the King of Ethiopia

was king of ~~ix~~ Egypt at that period, and therefore he ~~x~~ gave up his p esent plans

to come to Jerusalem and wre t ~~den~~ down there to meet the forces of Ethiopia, but

thestory he ~~head-~~ heard wasn't true, ~~they~~ weren't ~~come~~ coming yet, and eventually,

we don't know for ~~ix~~ sure whether he was trying to meet them or ~~th~~ trying to ~~met-~~

meet Israel, but it was one ~~toh-~~ other situation where there was a great number of

for- folks who died. and there is an Egyptian story which says that an Egyptian army went up to Southern Palestine and faced Sennacherib and when they were facing Sennacherib that Sennacherib was going to invade Egypt and ~~the~~ while they were waiting a great host of mice went into the Assyrian army and ate up all the bow ~~stri-~~ strips ~~we~~ so that they couldn't be ...well, the Bible tells us that a great number of his men died in the night and he gave up the attempt to take Jerusalem and went back to ~~the~~ Assyria the same time about Sennacherib, and many scholars think that what ~~actu-~~ actually happened that the mention~~ed~~ of ~~mich~~ mice fits with~~k~~ the idea ~~gh~~ that there was an outbreak of the Bubonic plague which the mice would carry, and of course we can't say that ~~isx~~ those are the facts because we ~~con't~~ don't know, but ~~is-~~ it is a guess, and there is nothing against the Bible... because God might ~~h~~ very well have used that plague as the means by which the Angel of the Lord killed ~~thoug~~ thousands of these Assyrians in the night. We don't know what the means was ~~tht~~ were used, and it says the ~~Angle~~ Angel of the Lord went forth to kill thousands of these people in the night. We don't know ~~k~~ what the ~~man-~~ means was that God used. It doesn't ~~necessar~~ necessarily mean that he ~~ez~~ came like a man with a ~~swod~~ sword and ...Divine agency ~~prode~~ produced it. It was a miracle of God. What means were used ~~x~~ we don't know, but at any rate the existence of that story by the ~~Egyptains~~ Egyptians at ~~thi-~~ this time doesn't sound as if Sennacherib defeated the Egyptians or the Ethiopians. We have no evidence that he ~~did~~, but that reason, , but this sounds as if somebody is going ~~ted~~ to defeat them. Either has or will, and if somebody has or will, who is that somebody apt to be. Who do you think would be likely the one that God is speaking of here ~~k~~ that ~~eigh-~~ either has or will defeat the ~~Egyptains~~ Egyptians and the Ethiopians. Cyrus would certainly be the one in view over and over <sup>as</sup> ~~in~~

ISAIAH # 12

God's instruments to deliver Israel, and so ~~wh~~ now when God says that I have given Egypt and Ethiopia and Sheba for your ~~ransom-~~ ransom. He says I have given this as your ~~ransom-~~ ransom. It would be ~~qu~~ quite a reasonable thing, but what it means is that God is going to lead Cyrus to release the Israelites and let them go home, ~~an~~ but he is ~~also-~~ also going to enable Cyrus to conquer Egypt and Ethiopia and we know that Cyrus did. ~~After-~~ After that Cyrus or his ~~son~~ son Cambyses, one or the other of them, succeed in conquering Egypt and Ethiopia and that being an historical fact and this statement occurring twice in these chapters, it is a reasonable inference that the teaching of it is that God said, that Cyrus ~~isn't~~ isn't... so that that is the ~~x~~ ~~ix~~ interpretation which I believe that all scholars give to this passage. the reference to Cyrus' later conquests of those places. It is a ~~w~~ reference ~~x~~ written by those ~~makei~~ making it all up some years after the deliverance ~~k~~ from exile, when Cyrus conquered or to be given as divine prediction of what ~~actuall-~~ actually happened. Mr. Brooks? No, I am saying that one and two ~~x~~ say that God is going to deliver Israel, and ~~ther~~ three says it is a part of his ~~delie~~ - deliverance ~~that~~ ~~x~~ Egypt and of Israel, Ethiopia and Egypt are going to ~~x~~ ~~beg~~ given as a ransom for Israel. The ransom is given to the person who lets them go and pays for the ransom. And we have already been told that Cyrus is ~~going-~~ going to be God's instrument in letting them go and we find Cyrus conquered Egypt so it is a ~~declara-~~ declaration that God gives a ransom, that is, if you interpret it that way. As far as I know that is the way that every commentator interprets the passage. I know of no other suggestion. I haven't come ~~across-~~ across any ~~x~~ other that has any basis whatever, so I wouldn't say we should be 100% dogmatic, but we can go pretty far... here is a very reasonable interpretation of the word and here is an interpretation

ISAIAH # 12

that would fit the historical sense. (?) It is a comparison; that is to say, when Charles V, the King of Spain, captured Francis I, King of France, in a battle, he took him to Madrid and held him there as a prisoner and it was necessary that France pay a tremendous sum of money to Spain in order to have Francis I given back to them. They had discussion as to how much ransom to give to get the King back. When the Duke of Windsor, Prince of Wales in England- England, he tells in his memoirs how he joined the army in 1914, and he was in the army there and then one day they got an order that Edward was to be withdrawn from his company and transferred to another company, so he left the company and went to the other company and the next day he heard that company had been sent off over to France. He was with the other company for a few months of training and then he got an order transferring him . . . .about the third time that happened he went to the Prime Minister and he said, Look here, I've got several brothers. Suppose I should be killed in France, one of them could take over just as well, why can't I go to France with my company instead of being kept back here. He said the Prime Minister said to him, If you could guarantee that you would be shot in France, we wouldn't hesitate to let you go, we are not afraid of your being killed, we are afraid of your being captured. And if he were captured there would be a tremendous pressure in England to give up most anything in order to get their heir apparent back, they would do anything for him. You read today in the papers that some child is seized and there is a ransom notice. You Here God says to Israel that Cyrus is going to release you. Well, He says I am going to give this for your ransom. In other words Cyrus went loose out by the releasing him. God is going . . .(Q) Jesus paid the ransom that delivered us from Satan. I don't

ISAIAH # 12

think actually that Satan has any ~~riht~~ right over us. It's a ~~fx~~ figure of ~~speek-~~ speech, but ~~h~~ yet it is a figure which conveys an element of ~~true thr~~ truth. He paid the ~~penaly~~ penalty of our sin. It is more nearly the correct idea, but of course it is a ransom. He paid that which delivers us ~~x~~ from the power of Satan. So in this case he says I gave this for your ransom. Well, you ~~x~~ wonder what on earth does this mean, and it wouldn't have any ~~ev-~~ effect on the situation, but it would mean that after it happened, after Cyrus let the people go back to their own land, and after Cyrus led his army down into Egypt and then you hear how Cyrus ~~led~~ or his son Cambyses conquered ~~Et~~ Egypt and Ethiopia, you say why Isaiah said those lands were going to be the ransom for us. He who let us go has got them. God ~~euase~~ caused a ransom to be taken, and so it was for the Israelities a proof of the fact that God was predicting --there was a knowledge in advance that could not ~~g~~ ~~bx~~ be gained by human beings, a supernatural knowledge that God had actually spoken. I have ~~mea x many-~~ heard many a ~~mai~~ missionary and other ~~Chrus- Chru-~~ Christian leaders say that in ~~1948-~~ 1943-4 they said that the way that the American Army is being respected in China and the way the American Red Cross is helping the Chinese people and the Chinese ~~as~~ are so grateful to all America , and ~~one-~~ once this war is over the gospel will have such opportunities in China that they never had in history. ~~z~~ The Gospel will spread in China beyond what ~~x~~ anybody ever dreamed of. Well, they were making guesses, but if anybody ~~sa~~ said that they were predicting the future by-the-Divine Inspiration you have pretty good proof today that they weren't ~~bease~~ because they left out of account altogether that ~~the~~ Truman and Marshall would permit the Communists to take over and . . .so that instead of the gospel ~~haveing-~~ having a greater opportunity in China ~~that~~ than it ~~k~~ has ever had it has less opportunity

than it has ever had in hi story, the exact opposite of what they ~~x~~ predicted.

Well, somebody says look how the Bible was able to predict the ~~fur-~~ future ~~somebody~~ but you read Isaiah ten years later ...

ISIA ISALAH # 13

43:4  
 And you notice the next verse which says, Since thou wast precious in my sight thou ~~x~~ hast been honourable and I have loved thee; therefore, will I give men for thee and people for ~~thy~~ thee... Well, he is going to turn these over ~~x~~ to Babylon as payment for His having let the Israelites go. Then, you will again have in verse nine ~~ten-~~ and ten, don't we have the idolatry. Bring forth the blind and ~~te~~ the deaf--let all the nations be together and let the people be assembled. Who among them can be ...and show us former things, who is there among these Gods of the heathen who can say I predicted these ~~the-~~ things in advance. Who is there that can say that ~~these~~ are the things that I ~~x~~ said were going to happen. Let them bring forth their witnesses that they ~~my~~ ~~is~~ may be justified. It isn't ~~just~~ justified in the sense of showing~~k~~... It is exactly the sense of justify in the New Testament. He justifies them by showing that they are right; t at is to say, it is a legal ~~transla-~~ transaction rather ~~than~~ than a sanctification that is ~~x~~ covered by the word justify. The Hebrew and the Greek agree. Let them bring forth their witnesses that they may be ~~just~~ justified. You are my witnesses, says the Lord and my servants whom I have chosen. Let the witnesses bring forth their witnesses, ~~ef~~ but you Israelites who have this book of Isaiah, you are my witnesses. You say, Look a here what God predicted. You are my servants ~~wh~~ om I ~~x~~ have chosen. ~~X~~ I have raised you ~~y~~ up for a specific task, making Him known God and His righteousness. YOu can be my witnesses ~~x~~ now.. Well in the sense of witnessing --in the full meaning of this ~~we-rk-~~ word servant, just how big a part

43:9,10

spend a lot of time on it. 47 is very simple. So it is actually 41-46  
and 48. 48 after you have done the rest of them you will be ready to tackle  
48 but if you can have 40 to 48 written out and all the servant passages indicated.  
If you can have that ready a week from next ~~Monday~~ Monday we will be ready  
to have some discussion and then the following week.

- 1 "Double" = equivalent Is 40:2
- 2 Sin or rebellion
- 3 Change in meaning or words--prevent, suffer.
- 4 translators or KJV
- 5 Jas. Moffat's translation  
KJV excels in English expression
- 6 Scofield Reference Bible  
Israel as God's servant
- 7 Israel will do the job  
of America beat Hitler in WW II
- 8 Israel's representative will do His work
- 9 Is 41:2 study word order for possible ~~trava~~ translation
- 10 KSV trans of Ps 12:12
- 11 Is 40-50 interpreted by Christians as the return of Christ
- 12 Is 42
- 13 Is 42:17  
illustration of same or two different athletes
- 14 servants east of accomplishment
- 16 way the problem is stated is lesson in tact
- 17 Proper approach gets far more done  
Like Pope's calling us "separated brethren" rather than wicked people  
Is 42:24
- 18 climax of deliverance in Is 40-41

be sure exactly what they mean, and this is ~~particular~~ particularly true ~~then~~ when you ~~z~~ get into poetry as we have here. The first question that I asked you was the exact form and meaning of these words. And as to that, what does the first mean. It is either the sign of the definite object, or it means with. It is one or ~~toher~~ other of these two are the possibilities. Now, the next one. Doro is His generation, and what is generation, what do we ~~me~~ mean by genea generation --you can say, of course, that if you put certain chemicals together, ~~ix~~ it ~~formed~~ forms a certain combination. You can say the generation is the forming of this chemical--generation used in that sense, but it's ~~now~~ more common meaning of ~~the~~ this English word ~~is~~ ~~refers~~ refers to those who come into existence, human beings usually, at a certain time. When we think of the ~~x~~ word generation, we think of the people who are living at a certain time, but actually the ~~ori~~ origin of the English word is ~~ox~~ of course their coming ~~th~~ into existence, ~~be~~ their being generated. Yes, here it is sometimes is rendered period, but ~~peride~~ period ~~of~~ is sort of a derived idea. You wouldn't say the ~~pe~~ riod of ~~Roose~~ Roosevelt's presidency, but you wouldn't call that a ~~genea~~ generation. A generation is about 30 or 40 years, about the ~~ti~~ ~~e~~ time that it takes for one group of people to be the main group when they are in ~~a~~ their ~~prim~~ prime until they pass ~~on~~ ~~to~~ off the scene and are ~~se~~ succeeded by another group. You usually ~~thing~~ think of a century as about three generations, something like that, but a generation you usually think of as ...and now this word Dor is derived from the root dur which means to dwell and so it is occasionally found in the meaning of a ~~dewe~~ dwelling place, but that is comparatively rare. BDB lists it as having four ~~meanins~~ meanings: they say first a ~~peride~~ ~~pei~~ period, an age or a generation, a duration in ~~a~~ the past occasionally but usually a duration to come. From generation to generation. Then they say the second use of it is the men living at a particular time ~~th~~ and they say that is

used of a future generation especially. And then, third, they say a generation as a class of men, like you say, this crooked generation. This evil generation, and then, ~~for~~ fourth they say, ~~de-dewil- dew~~ dwelling place. Well, that is how this word is used and it is used fairly commonly. Now, what about the next word after that, Mr. Kim. It is the ~~sigh- sing~~ sign of the question, the interrogative? And it is used to ask a question. Now, we have already had this word used ~~one~~ once or twice in our section of Isaiah. Every time we have had it so far it has been a ~~rx~~ rhetorical question. It has not been asking the name, it's been asking the question... Like you say, Who would have thought such a thing would have happened, as if to say, Nobody would have thought it. If Isaiah would have said, Who would have thought of such a thing, ~~well- it-wel- would-~~ and you said, Mr. Faucett ~~would~~. It would sound ridiculous, because I would not have been giving the question for ~~information~~ information, but a rhetorical question, but ~~thou- -thou-~~ this could be either one, either a question for information or a rhetorical question with an implied answer. Now, what about the next word. What ~~woud~~ would you say about that ~~woud~~ word. This one that we are now looking at is the only one in the King James Version translated declare. It is muse, to meditate, or to complain, to talk about thy wondrous works. Not that is not the idea of considering in the sense of trying to think a thing out. It is more the sense of marvelling at it, or complaining about it. ~~Theus-~~ Those are all the uses of it. There are only two polels, one in Psalm 143, where it says I muse on the ~~words-~~ works of thy hands and then this one. ~~k(?)~~ Whenever you have a verb used in a different ~~from~~ form from another, like polel instead of qal, you immediately ask does it have the sense of qal or different use. Well, if ~~it~~ is a polel, that's like a piel. Something intensive ~~erf-~~ or causative. You see if you can get that idea into it, because ~~ix~~

but it wont necessarily be that . In this case where you only have two appearances of the polel you don't have enough evidence to tell just what the polel does to it. It would seem to perhaps be different but from the ~~qiax quat- qu x-qt- qal~~ but just how much ...Well, now, I asked you to look at these different renderings and we look at the King James Version.

ISAIAH # 34

In the King ~~Ja~~ James Version we noticed that it was translated in verse 8, Who shall ~~be glad-~~ declare His generation. Well, the who is certainly ~~is-er-~~ all right. Declare is a word that we haven't found anywhere else. Maybe who will complain. Who will muse, or mediate, but to declare sounds as if you ~~are a~~ were making a pronouncement, making a ~~deleat-~~ declaration. ~~-you-~~ It ~~x~~ doesn't quite seem ~~to~~ get the idea of th s verse. And then this generation. Well, ~~x~~ how do you declare a generation. Now, if you say who will ~~dele-~~ declare his generation you might mean who will ... But this word Dor is not used in that ~~ses~~ sense  
(?) In the K.J.V. what would this mean / Well, it is translated that ~~in~~ way many, many times. /  
( ) It is a common meaning of the word. You notice that the BDB refers very frequently ~~refere-~~ refers says it refers to a ~~furte-~~<sup>13</sup> ( It is also used to designate a dwelling place. Who will declare his dwelling place?) . . . thousands of generations. There is an idea of future is not necessarily / but it is ~~used-it-is-~~ also ~~used~~ with ~~that-sense-~~ a future sense. Well, now this what the King James Version says. We notice that the English Revised ~~v~~Version says, As for his generation who will among them consider that he was cut off out of the land of the living? Now, there, there are two problems. One means <sup>is: what does it</sup> to consider? who will consider them, <sup>who will meditate them</sup> ~~to~~ muse or ~~to consider?~~ consider is not too bad.

ISAIAH #34

Then, as for this generation there seems to be ~~sp, e-~~ some difficulties. One actually is that ~~the nominative~~ a nominative adjective like that introduces a \_\_\_\_\_)12.4

But I do not know of any ~~case~~ in Hebrew. A \_\_\_\_\_ usually, (or normally) introduces an accusative, not a nominative. As for this translation, there ~~is~~ not much warrant in Hebrew/ for it. Sometimes we can get that idea by \_\_\_\_\_ out of generation. It says here as for his generation who among them? ~~among them~~

It does not mean ~~among~~ them, it means with. If you want to get the meaning of among, you should ~~get~~ \_\_\_\_\_ or something like that, rather than \_\_\_\_\_ (eth).

But I think it has some real difficulties even among the commentators, and it is not entirely impossible, because so many commentators are inclined toward it, but it has a real difficulty. Now, next, ~~in~~ the Jewish version, we notice that.... (Q) Yes. No. There are some commentators who take it that way.

But the question on what ground do they take that, and I would say that if you could point to a few ~~good~~ good other ~~comen~~ <sup>usages</sup> \_\_\_\_\_ in Hebrew, then you have some basis on which to develop that, but I do not know that. (Q) Well, to do

that I may ~~have~~ to read the whole Old Testament in Hebrew to get \_\_\_\_\_ the question in mind. <sup>SAnderson</sup> Alexander says, Rosenmueller, Gesenius, and others follow \_\_\_\_\_ in making this an absolute nominative. To this instruction

Hengstenberg objects that \_\_\_\_\_ (eth) seldeom ever notes the subject of a verb, and also that וְאֵלֶּיךָ is not left without an object. He says that ~~thi-~~

neither this objection lies in ----- the modification of the same exposition which makes the \_\_\_\_\_ (eth) a preposition, for the trouble is

that it seems to me that to make a ~~preop-~~ a preposition, you should have a preposition that has such a meaning. I do now know that it does. Here again

ISAIAH #33 34

you have to look for all the \_\_\_\_\_ (eth). It is pretty much like \_\_\_\_\_ because a lots of things can ~~ht~~ happen in any language. But you have no right to build an argument that ~~ti-~~ it does unless you have some evidence ~~yat~~ that it does. (Q) ~~Bi~~ No, I would say that if some one says he does, ~~and a~~ I will tell them, let him bring some evidence. The fact that Rosenmueller, Keil, or Alexander or somebody says that it proves nothing, unless they ~~sha~~ this is shown or this can be by such a verse ... If ~~y~~ they bring some evidence, then we examine them. I have not looked into all ~~these~~ these books on this particular thing. I am not sure ~~if they~~ but what they can give, some of them, but I have to check them. very good, and all I can say from my reading, having come across that translation, that I do not recall ~~if that is --~~... Then the Jewish version takes it that, that, with his generation who did reason? With his generation who did reason? Well, what does that mean? If you are going to say, here is a man. Here is one that is judicially murdered. Will you say ~~that~~ with ~~his~~ his generation who did reason? You would not say that with his ~~geen~~ generation, ~~with~~ you would say with judges. with juries, ~~with~~ with people who were \_\_\_\_\_. You would not say with his generation, would you. It seems to really belong there. And I am not sure if ~~we are -- the expressions~~ these words muse, complain, or meditate really means \_\_\_\_\_. The main problem is with the ) \_\_\_\_\_ (goor). Then we notice what the ~~Am~~ American Version so called, what Gordon did, he took it as Who gave his thought to his fate? gave ~~high~~ his thought to ~~His fate?~~ -- is fairly ~~pretty bo~~ good, but I do not think ~~thought means --~~ ( goor) ever means fate. So, he tried to make some sense, but he did succeed in making some sense, but this is not what the Hebrew word says. (Q) Then here is Moffatt's version, he calls it the same ~~as~~ as Gordon, but only it is \_\_\_\_\_.

ISAIAH #34

er to it,  
 If you take the word literally as to the extent of its nearest to it, the King  
 James , Who meditated upon, who mused upon rather than declared his generation?  
 What does that mean? To my mind here is a suggestion that a good number of  
 commentators ~~make~~ have suggested, although many have rejected, it seems to  
 me to be ~~fairly~~ <sup>fairly</sup> reasonable to say, if he was cut out of the land of the living,  
 who would have thought that the generations to come ~~af~~ after him would be  
 so affected by it? Who thought that he had any effect upon the coming generation?  
 on the coming age, on the coming period? on the coming generation of ~~man~~ ~~kind~~ ~~?~~ ~~--~~  
 Who humanity? Who, who, of ~~gen~~ his generation? Remember, \_\_\_\_\_  
 We thought this was He who would re deem the Israel? Now, they ~~to~~ ~~to~~ took  
 him ~~and~~ ~~and~~ killed him. Who would have thought there would be any outcome,  
 any future, any posterity, any generation following th~~a~~ t would be affected by him?  
 To get exactly, to get exactly in English is .... But this idea is , /this is the  
 idea that you get out of this King James has, it seems to me that it seems to be  
 a great advantage to it to go on a few verses, and you read, you read in verse  
 ten, when thou shalt make thy soul an offering ~~of~~ <sup>for</sup> sin, he shall prolong days,  
 he shall \_\_\_\_\_ (6.00). Both of these words are getting on seeing some  
 posterity or generation following affected. You see him cut out ~~ee-~~ of the ~~the~~  
 land of the living. Who shall declare this generation? Who will think that  
 he is going to ~~affect anything~~, do anything that he had done, what he did \_\_\_\_\_ (5.75)  
 Here ~~P~~ <sup>W</sup> saw many great works, and \_\_\_\_\_ and now all' ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> gone  
 people ~~thought~~ he was wonderful, now he was dead. Who would  
 have thought that he would have any experiential \_\_\_\_\_. Now they say  
 the word \_\_\_\_\_ (gor) does not , ~~do~~ s not posterity, does not mean it, but  
 it does not generation, and ~~if~~ = it often

it is often used as God's mercy shall last from generation to generation. He blesses the people from generation to generation. The word comes to be used as a great deal with that idea of future existence, future effect. And so, while not directly the idea of posterity, yet is near it. Who would consider --who would complain as to whether he is going to have any effect on coming generations. He ~~did~~ died without children, without intellectual children, ~~wh~~ without spiritual effects, without anything having been accomplished in the world. He was cut off out of the land of the living. He's gone. That's the complaint of the people in the early part of this, they don't see any hope of any results. But then you get on to this verse ten and you find yes, ~~they~~ it ~~pe~~ pleased the Lord that this should happen. He caused it, ~~k k~~ He hath put Him to grief. When thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin, He shall see His seed. The His is in italics. He shall prolong days. There is going to be a generation ~~effect~~ - affected by Him. There is ~~gon~~ going to be a posterity, ~~the~~ a spiritual posterity, the result of what He has done. There is going to be a new generation that is ~~ge~~ greatly ~~aft~~ affected by what ~~He~~ does. He has not died without effect as a person thinks who says, Who has believed our report. Who expects anything important to come from this. ~~It's God. He's~~ He's gone. He's dead. there is not ~~furut-futue~~ future, yet there is going to be results. He shall see His seed --He shall prolong days. But in ~~k rea~~ - relation to content this idea ~~x~~ which the King James interprets, it seems to me has much to be said in ~~hi~~ its favor and fits the context, as the exact parallel in the later part where he is declaring the fulfillment of that which seemed unlikely to be fulfilled as

they saw it happen. They felt everything was ruined by His death, and then they found instead of being ruined , it was actually was the foundation of salvation. And that of course is thread that runs all through this passage of 52 and 53, people feeling that this is not-~~going~~ going to accomplish anything and then finding that actually ~~is~~ it is God's way of ~~doing~~- bringing salvation.

(Q) Some say ~~that~~ that there is no object. It's pretty ~~had~~ hard on the ...to say it can't have an object. But you have the ~~sid~~ sign of the object...and you might say, what does happen is that generation after generation , ~~con~~ continuing ~~prosperi~~ prosperity on, but as they look at it, they don't think there is going to be even one generation. Who can see any ~~x~~ results , because he is cut out from~~the~~ land of the living. Well now , let's look at our English Bibles again ~~for~~ on another matter. There in 52 you notice ~~that~~ we had in verse 13, which makes one a rather complete thought, that it refers to a general exaltati on or specifically to ~~his~~ His being ~~lifete-lifet-~~ lifted up, and then we notice 14 ~~that~~ there is ~~ne~~ one thought just as something happened, then so something else is going to happen , and then in 15 there is another ...~~the~~ result of this thing happening is that ~~h~~ He ~~shap~~ shall sprinkle many nations. Now, the first divisions~~x~~ are not original, they were put in later, and sometimes they are very, very bad. There are cases ~~wh~~ ere you have two paragraphs, there is no question of it, where you have two stanzas and the ~~lans~~ last ~~x~~ ~~x~~ line of one and the ~~fr~~ first of the next are put in one verse ~~with~~ ~~next-~~ which makes no sense at all. Let's just look quickly at what to me is the most striking instance of that type --the 19th Psalm. What possible sense does verse 4 make. Read Psalm 19;4 just by itself.

I would say definitely that in the first three verses He looks to the Gentiles. The barren that previously never bore, those ~~that~~ that were the desolate, they that were outside. He looks to them now, ~~and~~ shows the results coming to them of what Christ had done, and then after three verses of that, then He looks back to Israel and of course our big emphasis is on \_\_\_\_\_ all through Isaiah, but we also have these definite emphases upon the Gentiles, and here three might be very difficult to understand in that time. It would be hard to see. It doesn't seem to make sense on any basis of ~~a natural~~ that would seem natural to them, but then when Paul comes he quotes ~~from~~ from other passages that are no greater ~~or~~ than this one to show God's mercy to the ~~X~~ Gentiles, as predicted already in the Old Testament, and this fits right in, this one which ----(Q) I don't know whether He did or not. He may have understood it. He may have thought, "I ~~do~~ just don't understand what this verse means.!" ~~There~~ They are a wonderful aspect of what God is going to do that are clear in the message that God has given but there are certain suggestions here that I don't quite catch. Because ~~the~~ Peter says the prophets ~~was~~ were questioning what or what manner of time the spirit which was in them did signify when he prophesied beforehand of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow, and ~~that~~ when the thing comes then you see how the thing fits together, and then Paul and Peter and the others can say, Look, this is what you would expect. Jesus said to the men to the Emmaus Road, You think that everything is a failure. You thought that <sup>he</sup> ~~you~~ were going to be the one to redeem Israel and here He died and you call it failure, and you think these are old ~~wif~~ wives tales ~~-that is, about~~ that somebody \_\_\_\_\_ but he says this is ~~what~~ what the prophets says, that the Son of ~~a~~ Man ~~is~~ must suffer and die and be raised again the third ~~to~~ day, well, it was there in the prophets but they hadn't understood it.

Now, many had understood it we don't know, but most didn't, but Jesus said they should. He said, Fools and slow of ~~th~~ heart to believe all the prophets ~~sia~~ said. (Q) I would say it is that way. There are quite a number of passages which can only be understood on that account, that the thou , the addressing one. Fear not thou who ~~a~~ hast done so and so. Don't be afraid...and you have to tell from the words who is the antecedent~~y~~, and Ordinarily , I quite agree with you --~~if~~ that when you find a thou, look back into the earlier context and see ~~y~~ if you have light on who the thou is, like on the end of 52 where we compare Him with ~~ex~~ thee and we have thou as an ...and it shows exactly ~~wh~~ at it is , but~~x~~ there are quite a number of facts where he speaks of one and then he turns his attention to another--~~we have to~~ you have to gather it sometimes. (Q) I would think ...the nations not being one of them~~of~~ or it can be ...and Israel is also spoken of as a nation on occasion too. Well, the word Gentiles here--there is no specific word Gentile, the word Gentile is the Greek word that means nation, no, not necessarily other ~~a~~ than ~~Jes~~ Jews even. The word is singular--Is called a goa in the Bible--it is a nation, but since there are many , many other~~x~~ nations. There is only one nation, when you speak of the nation.

But if you can speak to one nation and say you will reach out to others, because you can speak to a group of people from the nations and speak of their reaching out to other nations equally well. That is, the word Gentile here does not prove that the one addresses is not a gentile. I would say simply this, verse 5 is very clearly addressed to Israel. "For thy Maker is thine husband; the Lord of hosts is His name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel; The God of the whole earth shall He be called. Verse six is very definitely to the Jews, "For the Lord hath called

thee as a woman forsaken and ~~griev~~ grieved in spirit, and a ~~wif3~~ wife of youth, when thou wast refused, saith thy God." Now that is Israel in 5 , 6 and 7.

Who will ~~for-go-with~~ four go with? Will four go with what precedes or with what follows, and since four speaks of widowhood and I don't think you could speak of the widowhood of those who had not been united with God at all anyway. Therefore it would seem to me that the word widowhood there would suggest that that is the place where the break comes. I would say that the last two verses of chapter 50 is addressed to all the people of God as a unit, to all those~~x~~ who believe in the Servant as a unit. I would say that is true of the last verse. Then I would say that the first verse is undoubtedly addressed to the Gentiles who come to believe, that small group of Gentiles who come to believe, comparing them with those who had been God's chosen people before, but in between there are many verses referring to Israel, now to decidex exactly where the transition comes may require very careful attention. ( I wish we had three or four hours to work over the details of it, but my present feeling is that ~~the King James~~ between three and four is where one of the \_\_\_\_\_ comes, but the biggest aspect of it.. we can be definite, that all the people who were saved through the suffering servant --that verse one is the Gentile believer, and that verse 6 is Israel, and then the transition is --but those I think we can be definite on , verse one, verse seven, and verse 20. (Q) Well, I have no idea yet, but the exam will try to ~~come~~ cover what we have discussed in class. ~~-Now-~~ Not the Hebrew of the whole section--40-56, but ~~wheat-~~ whatever we have specifically assigned , that would be the normal thing. It's a little hard to know what to select out of that. I haven't given it too much consideration. You mean of the other? (Q) If I should find that there is a question in which several in the class have complet4ly misinterpreted what I say,

if I should ask the same question again, I would certainly try to avoid . . .

I have to be in Baltimore all day Thursday, preparing a couple of broadcasts for a nation wide hookup . . . (Q) the Reproach of thy widowhood, now ~~x~~ what could that phrase mean, reproach of thy widowhood, well, one cannot be a widow who has not first been a wife. I don't think you could speak of the widowhood of those who had ~~v~~ ~~nee~~- never been a part of the people of God. It would ~~sem~~- seem to me that that would have to refer to Israel, that would refer to those who seem to have been ~~ve~~ forsaken, ~~or~~- God had let His temple be destroyed, the capitol of the people who were His worshippers, ~~the~~ left in ruins, the people carried off into exile, they ~~say~~ seem to be like a people in widowhood. And He says God has forsaken me. Where is the bill of your mother's divorcement. I haven't forsaken you, it is on account of your sins that I have sent you ~~x~~ into exile. It's part of God's plan to purge , to cleanse them, to fit them to be the people through whom He is going to bring the Messiah into the world and through whom He is going to keep alive the knowledge of God until that time when the Messiah comes. This widowhood is figurative to this extent, that it means a ~~repro~~- reproach of seeming to be in widowhood, ~~wh~~ rather than actually being, of course the ~~whod~~ whole idea is a figure because they are not the widow of God in any literal ~~fashin~~ fashion but because it speaks of Israel ~~x~~ as His wife, Hosea particularly has that idea of the one who has an erring wife but is nevertheless true to and does so much for, and the same figure is here. It doesn't seem that that could refer to anyone but Israel, so that I feel rather definitely ~~tha~~ t verse four is a reference to Israel, but I don't see how ~~anyone~~- verse one could possibly be. (Q) Thy ~~seed~~ seed in verse three could be your literal children, it could be that, or it could be your spiritual children, those that you bring to the knowledge of the Lord. It ~~x~~ would have to be one or the

other, and of course we do have the term used of Abraham, we have Abraham's literal seed, frequently used of the descendants according to the flesh, and then we have the reference to the seed of Abraham, those who are His spiritual seed- seed, so thy seek seed could be either way, so if this is a reference to a return from exile and becoming numerous again back in their own land, then it would stand for physical descendants, but in the context it would seem that it stands for spiritual descendants that are brought into the knowledge of the Lord. And the parallel then is back in 49 where we are told that as a result of the action of the work of the servant that the word is going to go forth so that these will come from north and west, and these from the land of Canaan. Where Paul there in Galations spoke that not of seed as many but of seed as of one, very unfortunately that passage has been used over and over by people as a proof of verbal inspiration that he used the singular instead of the plural when he doesn't say that at all, it is an exegesis of Paul, not a proof. You are proving an argument, building an argument on the fact that it is singular, because right in the very same passage, God says to Abraham, Thy seed shall be like the sand of the seashore, then thou canst count thy seed, then it is singular and collective, but Paul thinks that this singular word in this case does not mean .....

ISAIAH 36 -----None

*It is very possible that  
 Nothing recorded on record 36)  
 Reads 35 & 36, which have just  
 been typed, are from a previous  
 course in Isa., the course which  
 covers especially Isa. 40-56.  
 M.P.*

Now then we learn in verse 6 this would seem to be people right near the time of the crucifixion, because the Romans had not seen Him perform miracles but as a whole ~~of the~~ picture, that would be a very real part. Here were some who knew that He had performed these great miracles, had seen Him do it, yet did not believe as they should have. They thought that He was merely suffering ~~because~~ because He couldn't help Himself, but the answer is in verse 5. He was ~~x~~ wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities ~~is~~ --the chastisement that makes our peace, that produces our peace, that was what was on Him, and His stripes are the means of our healing. As unlikely as all of this would appear, improbable as it would be, this is the way that salvation would come and we see that this is the way that it did ~~x~~ come. So in verse six, it continues the thought of verse five the declaration of the atonement and ~~the~~ what it means to those who ~~have~~ have received and it describes then from their viewpoint why they needed it. All we like sheep have gone astray, we have wandered this way and that. We have turned everyone to His own way, but the Lord has caused our iniquities to light upon Him. Some say this is much too weak. The Lord has caused this to strike on Him, and it is true that in one or two cases where ~~the~~ this word \_\_\_\_\_ is used in ~~the~~ the sense of striking on something else, unfortunately ~~or~~ for that exegesis which you find in a number of commentaries, the word \_\_\_\_\_ is also used for simply to be ~~laid~~ laid upon, so I don't think they are right in just saying that the translation is too weak, and yet there are other cases where it does mean to cause something to strike, and so it would not be wrong to say, the Lord has caused ~~out~~ our iniquities to strike on Him, to hit ~~h~~ Him, ~~h~~ that would not be wrong but it is not ~~so~~ required by the word that some commentaries say it is, they have not looked up the ~~use~~ usage when they say that is implied, but they are right in saying

that it can mean . . .the only question I can say about the question of how much Isaiah understood is to turn to I Peter 1:10, where it says, "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently.." so we know that Isaiah knew, ~~the~~ he was prophesying about the salvation God was going to bring to them, "of which salvation was prophesied the grace ~~th~~at should come unto you." So the grace that comes is prophesied in the Old Testament, but then ~~the~~ we read, "They were searching what or what manner of time the Spirit which was in them did signify when He testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and ~~g~~ the glory that should follow, so there is much they did understand. ~~and~~ And then it continues, "Unto whom it was revealed that not unto themselves but unto us they ~~were~~ did minister these things, so we know that Isaiah knew he was telling about some wonderful things in the future ~~and~~ - of God's plan of salvation, we know that, when we read this chapter we find pictures of suffering and pictures of glory ~~of-gl~~ following . But just how ~~new~~ <sup>clear</sup> ~~near~~ an understanding Isaiah had I don't think we can say. It is altogether possible that God gave ~~Him~~ him a very full understanding. After all, Jesus said, "Abraham ~~said~~ saw my day and was glad." And we have far less evidence about Abraham's knowledge than we have of Isaiah's knowledge, but just how complete we don't know. It ~~may~~ may have been very complete, it may have been comparatively scanty, but at least God directed them in writing these words, but it was part of God's instrument in leading His people in getting an understanding of what was coming to such a point that Jesus could say to the disciples , Fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken. Ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into His glory. But the fact ~~rea~~ - remains that those called Fools and slow of heart , none

of them did. So that just how clear it was to them, we can't say. They should have understood it. Isaiah should have understood but might there is many ~~of~~ a person today ~~who~~ to ~~be~~ whom you will present it to 10 times and they still don't understand, and we have no evidence that any of the disciples understood. There is the obtruseness of the human mind with ~~the~~ effect of sin upon it which keeps all of us from understanding anything like what we should , and Isaiah was a man of like ~~passive~~ passions as us. He was a man whose mind was not a divine mind at all but it doubtless was a very wonderful ~~mind~~, but just how much of it he really understood, we just don't know. Peter brings out ~~very~~ clearly here ~~the~~ that the author said things they didn't fully understood, that Peter brings out. Peter said that they were ~~was~~ searching ~~of~~ what or what manner of time the Spirit which was in them did signify; in other words, the Spirit of Christ ~~said~~ things ~~that~~ to them which they didn't fully understand and they were trying to figure out ~~things that~~ ~~they didn't~~ what these words meant which God had given, so that there is much in the Old Testament which goes way beyond what the men understood ~~xxxx~~ when they sent it. Well, that's what Peter says. Well, here is one side ~~was~~ over ~~the~~ here, Here is the Lord Jesus Christ who is God. He knows everything. He understands everything. ~~Not~~ Anything that He says He knows the full implication, the full relation to everything past, present, and future. Now that is true of Christ, but that is not true of anyone of us, of any human being ever lived. We do not have a fraction of the knowledge of the full understanding that Christ . Anything that we say has error, it has misunderstanding, it has confusion. Anything that any human being says, except Christ, because ~~it~~ He was not a human being but God. But on the other side you have ~~the~~ secretary that writes down what he is told and

writes it donw exactly, Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ told me that when he was in Holland he wrote poetry and- in Dutch and it was coming from the press and that he would find mistakes in it, as you do ~~xx x~~ in anything that you would do for the press, and he would have to correct them and to send them back... And then he came to this country, and in this country he wrote some ~~x~~ Dutch poetry, and he- the printer didn't know a word of Dutch and when Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ got it back there wasn't a single mistake in it. They were much more accurate here ~~th~~ than they were in Hollard, ~~but~~ for the reason that they ~~xx~~ had no idea what he was talking about. So all they ~~x~~ had to do was to read the letters, and it is very easy to look at letter, letter, letter, to see if it is just right. It ~~x~~ takes a lot of time, but no particular abilit, but when you understands~~x~~ what it means a little bit, then you get all kinds of implications and possibilities in it and it is much easier to make mistakes. Now between the-~~are~~ pure mechanical over there and Divine knowledge over here, no human being that would right anything in the scripture <sup>l</sup> would be that \_\_\_\_\_ or this/\_\_\_\_\_. But all is somewhere in between. And how far they are in between ~~the~~ and ~~how th~~ ~~far they are in~~ ~~between them~~ --- ~~sin~~ vary, since a great deal in the case of the individual one. Here is now David who ~~write~~ wrote the 22nd psalm which is the ~~not~~ most marvellous picture of certain aspects of the crucifixion. But just how much about the crucifixion they can understand we do not know. We just have no way of knowing absolutely. When the prophet came in the I Kings 13, and said that, there will be born a man of the house of ~~the~~ David who will burn <sup>t</sup> men's bones on/his altar. When he said that, did he any idea that this would not-~~have to~~ happen until ~~the~~ three hundred years after it he ~~spoke?~~-- had spoken? Maybe he did, and he did not. I doubt very much if he had any idea whether it would be five years later, or fifty, or ~~th~~ hundred years <sup>500 years or a thousand years</sup> later. That was not revealed.

ISAIAH #37

And all the possibilities are ~~so~~ so limited that any human being understands the small fraction of the meaning of ~~the~~ any phase of ~~the~~ God's revelation.

(Q) Yes, we have to do our best we can, but we cannot know exactly, anything <sup>being's</sup> exactly. Every human/mind has all sorts of gaps that we do ~~not~~ not know. Take for instance ~~the Apostle Paul.~~ ~~The Apostle Paul was~~ Marco Polo, the great Italian traveler who made a trip to ~~of~~ China, and he came back from China, and he was thrilled with wonders that he had seen in China. And he told the Europe <sup>that they had</sup> about this marvellous thing ~~of~~ in China. They had paper money. They did <sup>you</sup> not have paper money in Europe. If/wanted to buy \_\_\_\_\_, you had to ~~carry~~ have four or five big wagons full of money to carry in order to pay for it. Here ~~they~~ in China you can have a piece of paper. And Marco Polo <sup>to</sup> was thrilled, but he did not bother ~~evening-mentioning~~. He did not even ~~mention~~ know. That is hundred times greater than the paper money. The fact that the paper money he saw in China was ~~pretty~~ printed. Europe had no ~~print~~ printing. They didn't discover printing until two or three centuries after Marco Polo .... Marco Polo had seen printing all around in ~~China~~ China but he didn't even notice it, didn't even think of its ~~importance~~ importance. Now, when we read about Marco Polo, the ~~think-think~~ thing that impresses us is that what Marco Polo wrote is something that he didn't even notice, and every mind sees through a glass darkly, there is only a comparatively small part that we see, but God fits the pieces together in such a way that if we compare scripture with scripture we can get understanding from it ~~that~~ the original writers of any one part couldn't possibly have. I was rather disgusted at a statement that came out in the Alumni paper ~~at~~ recently. I got a letter from Cal. this morning telling me about it, that this man was upset because the



When the New Testament wants to say that Jesus Christ was ~~entob~~ entombed for three days, it ~~don~~ ~~x~~ doesn't say three days. It says three days and three nights. The word there is not a twenty-~~four~~ four day. Day is a portion of light between two portions of darkness. And in a more general sense it is ~~ape~~ a period of time which ~~may~~ may be of any length. That is the way it is used in the Bible. And to say I am not taking it ~~He~~ literally is ~~x~~ simply not right. I am taking it strictly literally when I say that day in Genesis may mean millions of years. ~~Wh~~ When Jesus said that Abraham saw my day and was glad. Was he talking about a 24 hour day. Certainly not. He ~~x~~ was talking ~~x~~ about the whole period. Day does not literally mean 24 hours. Day in the ~~stricth~~ strictest literal sense means the period between sunrise and sunset and it is only a recent idea that it means 24 hours so when they say we are not taking it literally, I don't like it. Of course, I don't think you have to take everything in the Bible literally. I don't think you get the sense of it to take it all ~~ix~~ literally, but I think you should take most of it literally. I think that ~~most~~ you should take the bulk of it literally. I ~~thing~~ think that most of it is literally or the ~~think~~ thing make no sense, but now to continue then. We have Isaiah seeing through a glass darkly but seeing wonderful things and in the light of what actually happened we are able to interpret that anybody could at the time, ~~Pr~~ probably better than Isaiah himself. I don't think Isaiah was just a mechanical writer. I don't think that any of these Old Testament writers were. I ~~shoud~~ shouldn't say any. There may have been cases where there were. God ~~say~~ said to Moses. Here are ~~te~~ the commandments. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not commit ~~x~~ adultery. Thou shalt not murder. Didn't Moses just write down mechanically what God said to him. Was M~~o~~ses doing any ~~x~~ thinking? He was simply taking what God gave

gave him. And many ~~in~~ parts of the Old Testament and of the New are doubtless simply what God ~~gave~~ gave. But in general the human mind is very active in the writing of the Bible, the human style, ~~but they~~ but to my mind a very great part of inspiration is that God guided the human mind and that God caused that the writers should ~~omit~~ omit in their ~~writings~~ writings a great many of their ~~erroneous~~ erroneous ideas and ~~erroneous~~ erroneous words. Here I am going to describe something and I say here comes a boat ~~an~~ or here comes a ship. And as I understand it a boat can be anything from this long to a quarter of a mile long, but a ship is a big ~~boat that that~~ one, a boat is either one, usually used for a ~~little~~ little, but can be used for ~~either~~ either one. I was going to describe it. I ~~thought~~ thought it ~~was~~ was a ship. ~~Actually~~ Actually it was too small for a ship. I might think it was a ship but I could just as well say boat, it wouldn't make any difference to me. Inspiration would mean that the spirit of God would keep me from using the word that would ~~be~~ be an error in the book. It wouldn't necessarily mean that it would give the full understanding but between two words which I might use, one of which would be accurate, the other inaccurate, he would keep me from using the inaccurate. I don't mean that he would make me use the most accurate but there are many cases in the Bible ~~where~~ where ~~there are~~ you have parallels of one . . . and either one equally true, but one is more accurate, more precise. Now, Isaiah then in verse five describes the reason for his suffering. Whether Isaiah understood that this would be like crucifixion, I don't know. I am inclined to ~~question~~ question that he ~~had understood~~ understood it very much, ~~because~~ because in Isaiah's time, nobody ever heard of the crucifixion, ~~and~~ and that God explained <sup>would</sup> to Isaiah that the Persians centuries later/introduced a terrible method of execution that nobody thought of before, and the Romans would take it over and use it widely --I question ~~it~~ very seriously that Isaiah had that understanding, but Isaiah did ~~not~~ know that the ~~Servant~~ servant of the Lord was going to suffer, and His suffer was going to

bring cleansing and redemption to those ~~w~~ for whom He suffered. And though He expresses this thought very clearly in verse five and then in verse six he describes as a reason why it was needed because men had fallen into sin and we have no thought previous to this verse in our passage . And then in verse seven--have we looked at seven in the Hebrew yet. I don't know as we have, because I don't ~~believe that~~ remember ~~ste~~ stressing the meaning of the second word in verse seven. Let's ~~quicly~~ quickly look at verse seven. Mr. Curry could you very carefully read us the beginning of verse seven. There is here tremendous emphasis on the ~~seend~~ second phrase. Now, what is the point of saying Alas, He is afflicted. What is the point of emphasizing affliction. It does not make ~~mc-~~ much sense to put in He before he was afflicted, but the words translated afflicted is not incorrectly translated that way but it can also be translated He humbled himself. It does~~n~~ occur elsewhere in the scripture with a definite meaning of humbling oneself. Shall I humble myself before you. It is ~~equat~~ ~~q~~ equally possible interpretation and if you interpret it ~~tha~~ t way it gives you a reason for the emphasis --he was oppressed, but what did He do about it. He was oppressed but He, He humbled himself.-~~He~~ That is the way He took the being oppreseed,~~he~~ He humbled himself and never opened His mouth. Alexander doesn't like to take the meaning humbled himself , I don't know ~~why~~ why, because it is perfectly evident by uses ~~ex-~~ elsewhere in scripture, but Alexander says what it means is (the meaning of the who is) is that He was ~~opprees~~ oppressed but as for Him, He let Himself be afflicted --He didn't open His mouth. Well when you say that, you are saying He humbled Himself, but it is kind of reading into it to say He was afflicted that He let ~~h~~ Himself be afflicted. ~~ix~~ It is not ~~impossibel~~ impossible but it is reading something into it. And when the word can just as well mean humble Himself , you get exactly the ~~manin-~~ meaning that ~~n~~ Alexander ~~wna~~ wanted. And as a sheep is brought to the

slaughter, and the female ~~sheep~~ sheep ~~is~~ then is dumb ~~&~~ before the ~~fact of~~ face of her shearers, also, He does not open His mouth.

An ~~ex-una~~ unexpected thing about this one who suffers. He is brought ~~&~~ as a lamb to the ~~&~~ slaughter. As a sheep before her shearers is dumb so ~~this is~~ he openeth ~~&~~ not His mouth. Unfortunately, I have never sheared a sheep so I am not in a position to give a judgment on it. I have seen sheep under other circumstances, but I have never seen one sheared. I wonder if any of you have. Have you ever seen a sheep sheared? You have. My observation of sheep, other than shearing, is that they are always bleating and making a racket. I have not been able to hear them from a mile off, when there has been fifty or hundred ~~of~~ sheep from where \_\_\_\_\_ going down the mountainside. There is a little group of ... you think of a tremendous number. They seem to me to be a terribly noisy crowd. <sup>So,</sup> When you say that the sheep before her shearer is dumb I do not quite know what it means, because I cannot quite imagine the fact that the wholesome shearing .... you cut her wool off, and the sheep is quick bleating and become dumb. So, I am inclined to think that the problem is easily solved by interpreting it as a relative clause. We are speaking about the sheep being brought to the slaughter. Certainly sheep are frequently brought to the slaughter. And then you think of the poor stupid sheep. You say, like a sheep <sup>that her</sup> before ~~&~~ a shearer is dumb. Take it that way. Like not that sheep, that all sheep ~~is dumb~~ before her shearer is dumb. ~~dumb~~ You imagine the <sup>poor</sup> ~~four~~ stupid sheep that can not help himself, but is just led off to the slaughter, and then he will grab hold of the sheep, and you are going to cut it, and ~~here~~ you say that here is a sheep that, like a particular sheep that makes no noise in front of a shearer, just ~~there is not~~ does not know

ISAIAH #38

what is )coming. Of course, it is quick and dumb in the modern sense, stupid  
would perhaps make a better sense. ~~But as a slang She just does not know~~  
~~what is coming~~

ISAIAH #38

As a slang expression, in the Bible it means that he is quiet. The sheep cannot help himself. \_\_\_\_\_ (2.00)

A sheep like a ~~particular~~ sheep that makes no sound before her shearers. So

Whether he doesth not \_\_\_\_\_ ~~If~~ there are many sheep like that I do not know.

I was led to think that Because ~~in the middle age~~ they were made to think that they were noisy bunch,

of not ~~a~~ \_\_\_\_\_ that would be dumb before any body. But if you take the slaughter first part of it ~~a~~- if any sheep is brought to a ~~shearer~~, then the next part of it is ~~the~~ relative like a sheep that is ~~Brought to a~~- before her shearer is dumb.

It is just in a helpless condition, and there is ~~not much~~ nothing much you can do about it. So, he ~~h~~ opens ~~it~~- not his mouth, and perhaps then it is all right.

I have not looked into a great deal of commentaries on this particular verse, but

I have discussed it, and raised ~~a~~ that particular problem, but I think that I

noticed that some of the translations the translators have done right. Like a sheep that ~~is~~ before her shearer is dumb. Now, some of the commentators, \_\_\_\_\_

(1.00) the commentator some centuries ago, \_\_\_\_\_ I think he is a Roman

Catholic, ~~a~~ but I am not sure that like a sheep he will come before her shearer, does and ~~not~~ open his mouth. And then what would Christ ~~sheer up?~~ shear ?

He took away his position and his standing, and so on, but the commentary all

I thought would be further \_\_\_\_\_ after \_\_\_\_\_ her shearer is definitely \_\_\_\_\_,

Why should that ~~the~~ be the problem of saying what the shearers are and so \_\_\_\_\_ I think that was rather particular... But this

other one does seem to me to be a interesting problem. I think, however, you do not need to be bothered by it, if you take it as a relative clause. Then before her shearer....

ISAIAH #39

I am not assuming ~~that the~~ in the suggestion that any word has been a \_\_\_\_\_.  
it would

But now perhaps / be that I have spoken of the possibility of a relative clause  
pronoun

in ~~which~~ the relative ~~clause~~ is omitted. I do not think that is quite a right  
way of saying it probably, because when you say you omit something you mean  
to

that it belongs/~~this~~. But if I say that that is the man I saw yesterday, I have not  
omitted anything, because it is  $\checkmark$  a perfectly proper way in English to give a  
relative

relative clause without the use~~age~~ of the ~~proper noun prep~~ pronoun. In English  
it cannot be done ~~except~~ in a few particular situations.  $\neq$  I think ~~in English~~

~~except in~~ it is ordinarily where the object of the verb in the relative clause  
and also the main verb is an accusative. I think that is the case. You have to  
is the case.

think that through. It is strange ~~that all these~~ how we use all these English  
grammaticals ~~and~~ all the time, and very few of us know what ~~they are~~:- any of  
are

them are. There are in our subconscious mind and/used indirectly, but we could  
not explain it. We do not unde~~ar~~stand it, but we never stop and think  $\checkmark$  to see  
different sentences

~~what~~ what is done and what is not done. But in English we do have  $\checkmark$  relative  
s Like

clause/~~without~~  $\checkmark$  a relative pronoun. /That is  $\checkmark$  the man I saw. ~~No~~ English  
speaking person would question what I meant. that I saw with a relative clause.

~~and That is~~ and that is understood, but I would not say ~~ht~~ that this  $\checkmark$  omitted,  
because it is perfectly proper thing to use in that way. In Hebrew, you can

say, the wonderful \_\_\_\_\_, the man who brought my suit looks quite \_\_\_\_\_

If you say in Hebrew the man , he brought my suit ~~cal~~== case, you could  
interpret it as ~~are~~ relative, but you could not do that in English. In English

there you have to have who, but in Hebrew you can have a relative clause without  
any expression of ~~the~~ a relative pronoun. Of course, if you want to get into  
of it

the fine points/ $\checkmark$ , you ~~have to~~ examine the very relative clauses in Hebrew, and  
make it sure that you have an exact analogy. I do not have one right at hand.

ISAIAH #39

13.75 but I don't think you would have difficulty finding one. It would be just about like this . . . Vigi Vitringa says before his shearers He was like a sheep, but the trouble is that the shearers is her shearers. It has a feminine ending, so it couldn't refer to Christ. The word in Hebrew here is a female sheep --I don't know of any word in English for a female sheep. A ewe lamb. We are not closely associated enough with sheep to know the specific word. But I don't know of any word in common usage that indicates a female sheep, but this Hebrew word is only a female sheep. Does a male sheep make an awful racket when they try to shear them, and a female sheep just sit by. I don't know, but the word used here means a female sheep and that is important to us because it says before her shearers . The Hebrew ending is the feminine. So it can't be that before he before his shearers is dumb like a sheep, because it is her shearers so it must be , He is dumb like any sheep before her shearers or like He doesn't open his mouth like a sheep before her shearers is dumb. That's a terrible small question but yet of course if no sheep is ever dumb before her shearers then it is a pretty poor analogy, but it is the idea that they are not speaking of a fact of sheep nature that they don't make any noise but you are think of a sheep as a thing that can't help itself, and you grasp the sheep and you hold it and you cut it and there's nothing you can do about it. And you say He is led as a lamb to the slaughter and then you say - Imagine a sheep who is in this helpless situation is like a sheep who before her shearers is dumb. so he doesn't open his mouth, and it may be that there are lots of sheep. And Mr. Curry's experience is close to mine, - and - yet it does seem to me that a lot of these commentators must have lived in countries where there were lots of sheep so it is strange that nobody thought of that problem. I would think

that a big scissors would be a rather ancient invention. I would rather question that was a modern , recent invention. And my guess is that they just take the big shears and just cut off the wool . I know when my-lik boy had his first hair-cut , you would have thought they were going to cut his legs off for the howl he set up. I would imagine ~~the~~ that there would be sheep that would just be terrified when somebody grabbed them and start cutting off their wool. Sheep may think they ~~w~~ are going to cut off their legs next. Of course if it is done by ~~somebo~~ someone the sheep knows well, you take a dog that is in the family and the ~~x~~ dog is accustomed to you, you can grab that dog and ~~y~~ do all ~~thi- k~~ kinds of things with it, and the dog never raises the slightest objection, and if he does it is just a little bit of a whine, ~~x~~ but never any objection to it. It wouldn't be my impression that a sheep would ordinarily be sheared by ~~some~~body...~~k~~ My impression would be that a man who had sheep would keep a lot ~~es~~ of sheep and ordinarily, her shearers. Now, if you said that a sheep before her~~x~~ shepherd , when he shears it is dumb, it might be that the man who took care of it and all that he wouldn't raise any fuss. That of course is a different picture, because he is not being killed by those who are his close friends, it is ~~he~~ his enemies. So that it seems to me ~~k~~ that probably ~~you~~ the problem is solved if you take it as a relative and that there are sheep that are that way. You are raising the proposition that in Hebrew if you are describing sheep, then you have to have the article. A sheep means all sheep and on the other hand it may be that if you ~~ma-~~ mean all sheep you put a colon. And when you say sheep it could ~~k~~ mean all. Now that is an interesting suggestion but to get ~~some~~thing ~~defin-~~ definite you have to look at relative clauses and find some kind of proof one way or another. I haven't spent a week or so looking at all the cases in this regard --I can only speak for my general impression. My general impression is that either

a sheep or the sheep ~~is~~ should be used here. I think that you have a very good point there. I think that it is quite commonly used --word in the construct which would not take the article but ~~the~~ which ~~is~~ would be modified by a clause after it. I think that is --there ~~is~~ ~~is~~ ~~is~~ quite a few cases . Of course you can almost say that practically all present day scholars claim that in the beginning of Genesis. In the beginning ~~of~~ ~~---~~ ~~you have~~ God created the ~~he~~ avens and ~~the~~ the earth, because there is no article and they say it is in the construct. They say it must be taken that way and there was an article in the Baltimore Sun that Professor William F. Albright --a noted ~~Bible~~ Biblical scholar at John Hopkins ~~is~~ University had said that in ~~our~~ our new discoveries of the Ancient Near East we are now in a position to ~~inter~~ translate the Bible far better ~~is~~ than anyone ever was before. He says we are ~~not~~ now absolutely certain that what ~~the~~ that means when God began to create heaven and the earth, then the earth was without form. They are basing ~~that~~ on the fact ~~the~~ that the so-called Babylonian story of creation starts that way, "When ~~is~~ ~~is~~ from above there was no heavens there was . . . .that is ~~that~~ the way it starts. It doesn't mean that is proof that ~~the~~ it has to be taken that way, but it ~~is~~ <sup>among</sup> is almost universal ~~in~~ present day Hebrew scholars to say that it must be taken that way. I personally think that it must be that our ~~is~~ translation is permissible , because ~~is~~ all the ancient ~~verse~~ versions have it , but I can't ~~believe~~ believe that they are completely ignorant of Hebrew syntax, but ~~is~~ that is used of a construct which I think this ~~is~~ could be. I'm not saying this couldn't be but I am saying I question that it has to be. Now, Mr. Curry, like a sheep who has come ~~is~~ before ~~here~~ shearers, but of course it could be like the sheep before . . .It could be either way. . .Now, that is not a very great problem but it puzzles me that I haven't ~~is~~ come across it. in any commentary --I just thought of it myself in my own small but not very ~~is~~ ~~is~~ pleasant experience with sheep. But then we come to what is much more of an important problem. I wonder

Mr. Curry if you could explain us what is meant in verse 8 by the statement which in our English translation says, He was taken from prison and from judgment. If you prefer I will read you what various versions say first or if you ~~way-~~ want to give us an explanation right now, I will read the verse back. You take then the from prison and from judgment as being the place from which ~~he-~~ He was taken. You take the Min as place from which and you take prison as referring to the place from which He was taken and judgment as a word describing the crime. ~~X~~ He was taken from the ~~prin-~~ ~~pr-~~ prison and from the ~~crib~~ crime. That would suggest that the crime took place in the prison. ~~If~~ Of course in the ~~acu-~~ actual case of Christ, the thief on that ~~even-~~ evening and if I recall ~~k~~ correctly. They took him right from there --didn't ~~x~~ they take ~~k~~ Him to Herod's court? Pilate sent Him to Herod. Herod sent Him back to Pilate, then He was before Pilate, then the ~~sh-~~ soldiers took Him out. He wasn't in prison before that at all. And ~~the n~~ afterwards He was taken from there. The soldiers took ~~h~~ Him out of the platorium and they put the ~~erocn~~ crown of thorns on Him...there would be very little time that you could actually say He was in prison. I am not even sure that you could say any time. So the word prison doesn't ~~nh~~ have a great deal of significance...This word 73'y starting with an Ayin is ~~gin~~ given ~~k~~ in the Englishmen's Hebrew Concordance as referring three times, as translated in Psalm ~~32:~~ 37:39 as oppression, brought low through oppression. Translated in Proverbs ~~36:~~ 30:16 as barren , the ~~bre~~ great and the barren ..., translated in Isa. 53:8 as .\_\_\_\_\_, and then there is a similar word , not \_\_\_\_\_ but \_\_\_\_\_ translated ~~majesty~~ in \_\_\_\_\_ and it is derived from the verb \_\_\_\_\_ which is translated restrain or withheld...

Under the circumstances quite an argument made of the meaning prison is only a ~~g~~ guess and not necessarily a very good guess. The word means to restrain --to retain. It is used of women who are unable to ~~h~~ have ~~ehilder-~~ children. Genesis 16:2. The Lord hath restrained thee from baring. Genesis 20:8, The Lord hath ~~a~~ fast closed up ~~the wom-~~ all the wombs of the household of Abimelech. It is used in Job 29:9, The princes refrained from talking~~k~~ It is used in I Kings 14 Him that is shut up and left in Israel. I Chronicles 21:22, that the flight ~~a~~ may be staid. Psalm 136:30 and so the flight was ~~sa-~~staid, ..to restrain, to retain, or to stay. Of course a prison is a place where one is kept, but it does seem rather strange ~~tht~~ that in the whole of the Old Testament ~~the-~~ there ~~is no part-~~ should be no~~k~~ other case ~~k~~ where this particular word should mean ~~prs~~ prison. Now, it might be interesting to note what other verses do with it. We notice in the King James it says prison. Now, here I have the Douai Version, the RC version made 300 years ago. That says He was taken away from distress and from judgment which doesn't seem to make as good sense as from prison, but it may be nearer~~x~~ to the original word. Now Moffatt sometimes doesn't pay any attention to original words --I don't know how much stress we need to lay on what he says, but sometimes it is very good. He says, They did away with Him unjustly and who heeded how He felt. You laugh and yet you may not laugh. Now this the Old Testament-- an American Translation, put ~~a~~ out by a group of scholars under the general supervision of the ~~Unier~~ University of Chicago, says, Who ~~vien-~~ violent in judgment was taken away. Now, ~~vien~~ violence seems quite a jump from to ~~a-restrian--restr-~~ restraint but through ~~k~~ violence in judgment seemed to them best. Here is \_\_\_\_\_, the Jewish version, of 1917, that says, By oppression and judgment ~~k~~ He was taken. You notice that ~~by~~ a lot of ~~thee-~~ these have by instead of from. Is that bad, in what

11.75  
 sense? ~~It~~ The RSV ~~sy-~~ says , By oppression and by ~~n~~ judgment He was taken away. And the Berkely ~~w~~ Version ~~sayw~~ says, From ~~thi--~~ distress and from judgment He was ~~the~~ taken . You notice that in all of these the King James is the only one that translates it prison. That seems to ~~make~~ a very ~~god~~ good sense. He is taken away from prison to judgment, particularly with the modern idea that probably with the most ancient situations, too, though I do not know if it fits his particular situation of Christ. The idea of prison seems to fit well there, but the word was never jused for prison. To be restrained would be a natural place where the restrain is to be made. It is not so used ~~in~~ elsewhere in the Scriptures. It is a kind of jump. They restrained ~~and~~ <sup>ment or distress</sup> or something like that. Now the difficulty for that is, of course, if you take the word from in the usual sense of the word ~~from~~ place from which, \_\_\_\_\_ very common, a place from which he is taken away from distress, as if he was relieved. He was distressed in judgment, but now he got out of it. He is rescued from it. Many a person when he dies, he is rescued, that certainly ~~does~~ not fit the atonement of Christ. That he is rescued from distress. Why, this does not fit it at all. of course, you notice that there are quite a few of these are translated from. by or through. Now, is that from? What do you think? There are ~~ma~~ ~~god-~~ ~~god-~~ good many cases where the word from is used to indicate not a place from which, but a source from which, and therefore, cause, or it is often used to mean ~~it~~ cause or means. It is the source ~~of~~ from which, and so that the idea fits perfectly with it, even though we do not often \_\_\_\_\_ use the word from in English in that sense. And as a matter of ~~of~~ fact, prepositions ~~does~~ not correspond in ~~these~~ any two languages at all. The last thing you can

ISAIAH #40

exactly

GET/In any language is the prepositions . The prepositions represent the wide areas . In English from does not mean the means or cause. Yes? (Q) You say, in great suffering here is a man, here is somebody who has suffered and died. He is taken away/ from the great suffering. He is relieved from his suffering. That is not the means whereby he was taken away, but ~~that he is~~ the thing he was rescued from. This does not show certainly the picture of Christ, It does not show him to be from prison and rescued from suffering. He is taken away/ from judgment. Now personally I am inclined at the ~~meem-mee~~ moment very strongly to the idea that Moffatt expresses this idea very well, even though this idea is not very literally expressed. That is, what Moffatt says is that , he says that he did away with him unjustly. And that is ✓ a very free rendering. I am inclined to think that the idea that is involved here is an expression of two different thoughts/ <sup>with</sup> and which go together. We have quite a few cases/ where two thoughts make up one thought, and they are combined by and instead of some other way which is more \_\_\_\_\_ (7.10) in English. So, I am inclined to think that the words to say from distress or restraint ✓ that which/ is tied up/ <sup>and</sup> with judgment / <sup>meaning</sup> being from a judicial \_\_\_\_\_ which was conducted unjustly: from an unfair means, by means of, and an unfair judgment he was taken away. This is the source and/ <sup>this is the</sup> means leading to/ crucifixion. <sup>the</sup> He pretended to- judgment . It was a suit before a governor, but Pilate himself said, I find no fault in him. Why should he not be released? But he was afraid of the people. He did not want to cause the disturbances, and ~~not~~ a few of them made/ noises ~~and yells-~~ such yells and that he thought that they were all against him. He did not want to cause disturbances. He said that-, well, let him be killed. He said, I find no fault in him. /B Yet he did permit him to be wrongly convicted. So that from distress and ~~at~~ judgment would

ISAIAH #40

would mean not the condition of distress which is evil, but a judgment which was a restraint, \_\_\_\_\_ where there is no real judgment. Judgment was

----- like a judicial murder. \_\_\_\_\_ (5.50)

So, I am inclined to think that Moffat, though ~~extremely freely~~, did give us an exact idea of it. I would venture to say that I reached that conclusion before

I consulted Moffat's translation. According to the Jewish translation, as if he were delivered from it, but he was taken away, he was taken, but the source of his being taken in was the oppression, and the case, the form of

the judgment was... It was not that he was ~~taken~~ out of the judgment, but

it is not that. It is by means of a judging judicially, but it is not a judicial case, which was \_\_\_\_\_ judicially. So, by the oppression of the judgment

he was taken away. It is a sort of near the idea that, ... except in the modern English we are not allowed to put two words together with and, and it is usually

from /... subordinated. Yes? (Q) Who mediated? It is rather a

brief translation, but it is rather close to the possible ~~temptation~~, Who shall

meditate over his generations? /I think generation here means that which follows - will

follow, but generation usually \_\_\_\_\_.

A usual interpretation of generation is - - - - - from generation to generation. From generation to generation God's mercies endure forever.

(Q) In other words, that physically moved from here to ~~there~~. But causally you move from that to \_\_\_\_\_. It is a cause from which a result comes. ~~That~~ But causally. Well, this has often puzzled me, and so it is only reasonable /

3.05

ISAIAH # 40

Well, then this has often puzzled me, this phrase. It is only recently that I came to this conclusion which it seems to ~~fit~~ ~~me~~ ~~that~~ ~~to~~ ~~fit~~ ~~it~~ fit the context much ~~is~~ better. That is, ~~by means of a fit~~ it is by means of a false type of judgment, a restrained judgment, restrained in the sense of prevented from being done in ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~ the right way that it should be done. Pilate was suppose to be a fair judge and we are told ~~is~~ very clearly in the gospels that he gave a judgment ~~the~~ that he did not feel was right because ~~his~~ his main interest was in keeping the people kind of orderly and avoiding ~~is~~ any kind of disturbance. So it ~~is~~ ~~is~~ certainly was an ~~and~~ unjust judgment. And then as ~~is~~, who shall declare his generation because he was cut off out of the land of the living. Of course, ~~who~~ Moffatt said, Who cared how he felt. Now the Hebrew is Who will muse, or who does muse. Who ~~meditates~~ ~~not~~ meditates ~~is~~ over His fate. Who cared how He felt. It's rather free if you take \_\_\_ as fate, you get that idea ~~is~~ out of it. But I take it as meaning as ~~is~~, Who will meditate over any results coming from Him, any future generation, any posterity, any effect on life, and I admit that generation is not used strictly in that sense. But I think that we have warrant for it in the passage so often used of ~~God~~ God's continuing relationships ~~is~~ to His people from generation to generation. I think that you have ~~is~~ warrant for it, and in this context I feel that it is justified because of the answer to it in verse 10. It says, He shall see His seed, He shall prolong His days. In verse 8 it says it looks as if ~~we~~ He accomplished nothing. Life just ends ~~is~~ with nothing done at all, yet there are results, He will see His seed, He will prolong days.

Of course we know that the \_\_\_\_\_ and we know that there were great multitudes that followed ~~h~~ Him at the time, so I would rather ~~x~~ question that interpretation of it. I would rather question whether the word generation is used ... (Q) ~~People would definitely mean declare--~~ ~~H~~ The Hebrew word doesn't really ~~me an~~ declare but to think about it, to ponder over it. Who felt that there was any generation going to result from this, why did they think this? Because He was cut off out of the land of the living. Here was going who isn't going to have any effect in life, because He has been cut off as a young man, and that's the end of ~~it~~ it. This word ~~Dor~~ ~~that~~ we were just speaking of, ~~let's~~ Here according to Young's, the word dor is translated generation, age :120-123 times; posterity: once. Now you see how posterity would fit in naturally here, but this isn't the place translated posterity. I didn't realize that it was ~~tran-~~ translated posterity. Let's look and ~~see~~ see what the context is. Here, it says, Numbers 9:10. If any ~~x~~ man of you or of your posterity shall ... Now that is the word here translated ~~poster-~~ generation. If you translate it generation. Any ~~man~~ of you ~~or~~ or of your generation. You seem to be just ~~x~~ saying the same thing. Anyone of you or of your generation, so that the King ~~James~~ James translators in Numbers 9:10 interpreted this meaning, Any one of you or of the generation that comes after you; that is, ~~x~~ that is born of you. And of course the Lord said that He shows His mercy to thousands of generations ~~that~~ of them that love Him. ~~Here-~~ Here ~~that-~~ there are those that love Him. So the idea of futurity is ~~present~~ present very frequently, and I feel that gives the King James Version warrant for translating this this ~~way~~ way in Numbers ~~9:10~~ 9:10. It is perhaps not posterity in the strict sense, but in the sense including that, ~~the-~~ which would come after you, that which will ~~result~~ result from your activity. Who would say that

He had accomplished anything lasting, ~~because~~ because He was cut off from the land of the living. He was too ~~young-to-~~ young to do anything ~~ak~~ lasting. It looks as if He ~~has-~~ is going to do a great thing. ~~thx~~ They say We thought that He was the one ~~woul-~~ who would redeem Israel. He did wonderful works, He accomplished tremendous things, ~~but He was~~ and then He was just taken and ~~kile-~~ killed, and all seemed to be ended. So it seems do me th~~a~~t that is wh~~a~~t is meant in verse 8 and in verse 10 we get the answer. Yes, but the ~~x~~ Lord did ~~give~~ give Him a posterity. He shall see seed. He shall prolong days. His activity isn't over. He seems~~x~~ to be cut off out of the land of the living, but actually there is a ~~rela~~ real continuing. And then the last part of this verse 8 is ~~trans-~~ translated for the transgression of ~~x~~ my people was He stricken, and immediately as it ~~xx~~ stands in the English you say, Here is a clear statement of the Atonement. Well, I think that it is important that we recognize that when we have a Biblical truth it is good to see everything, but I think that ~~xx~~ it is also very important that we make sure that we have statements of Biblical truth that are unquestionable --it is possible to prove ~~xx~~ something to you by 10 arguments, all of which sound good, ~~x~~ ~~gx~~ but no one of which is water tight. And if you get ten arguments, all of which have loopholes in them, they wont prove to you a single thing. If you find 20 people who think they ~~say~~ saw a man in a certain place at a certain time, but no one of them is sure that ~~He~~ they ~~sayx~~ saw him there, they all think they did. It's not nearly as good an argument as for one person ~~k~~ to say, I saw him very clearly and I know it is he. One witness like that is ~~far-more-~~ worth far more than 20 that may be ...so I think that it is important that we see what are  
in the Bible  
the statements/~~that~~ very clearly present a doctrine, and then we take it from those

and we do not build our doctrine on any questionable ~~q~~ places , and then having ~~done~~ done the things ~~that~~ that are ~~abs~~ absolutely sure, then we look at other places and interpret in the light of ... and they add to our understanding but let's be sure that we have watertight evidence on which to build our arguments. Now, you take this statement here, For the transgression of my people ~~was~~ He stricken. As it stands in English it seems to be a very clear statement of Atonement. Now, you might raise a little question on the view of context; that the context in verse 8 is speaking of the apparent failure. And then verse ~~10~~ 10 shows the real success of the mission, so you wonder why does it ~~mean~~ mention at that point . He was cut off out of the land of the living. For the transgression of ~~my~~ my people was He stricken. What does Atonement fit in right in that particular verse. But far more important than that is to look at the Hebrew and to see ~~what~~ what is the Hebrew word that the King James verses ~~that~~ translates for . and how often is that Hebrew word translated for. Here is an important point. In English we say For as a ~~preposition~~ preposition and for as a conjunction, and the two are different. In Hebrew for as a conjunction is Ki and for as a preposition is never Ki. Ki is ~~always~~ always a conjunction , never a preposition. In this ~~particular~~ particular case, it says ~~that~~ Who shall declare His generation , for He was cut off out of the land of the living, and that is for. But that ~~is~~ is not what I am talking about, I am talking about the next one. For the transgression of min. How often is Min translated for . I am not sure that I have ever seen a place where min is ~~translated~~ translated for. What does Mn ~~mean~~ mean. Min is ~~from~~ from, so ~~literally~~ literally this is from my transgression of my people was He stricken. Now, it is perfectly obvious that that can't be a place from ~~which~~ which He was stricken, so min must have other meanings. And so the meaning of for is doubtless ~~is~~ the meaning there, but when

you translate it for you are ~~gee~~ getting only source in, you are getting in something else. If you would say, As a result of the transgression of my people you would be getting source. And that would be, I think a very good accurate translation as a result of the because it doesn't tell in what way it was a result and then Min doesn't tell in what way it was a result whereas for does tell. For seems to say, This is that which was done in order to make atonement for the transgression of my people. But that is not a min. Min says this is the cause from which it came, Now, it could be the cause from which it came in ~~the result result~~ that the result that the people having transgressed, God decided to make atonement for the transgression and therefore He ~~ik~~ decided to let Him be stricken. But ~~a to~~ that is quite a long jump. I'm just wondering if this is more accurately rendered by ~~six~~ saying that He was taken away by means of an unjust judgment and it was a ~~g~~ transgression on the part of ~~ix~~ my people, those who should have been supporting Him, that caused Him to be crucified, that it was their sin, and their ~~wick~~ wickedness ~~with~~ that led to His death. Who shall declare His generation. What is He going to accomplish. He was cut off out of the land of the ~~land~~ living, the people who should have supported Him turned against Him and as a result of their ~~trna~~ transgression ~~the people~~ He was handed over to the ~~Roma~~ Romans and was killed. We have the Atonement very ~~xx~~, very clearly in the chapter, but in this particular case I am inclined to think that ~~this~~ the meaning of this 4th verse is to show the seeming failure to be followed two verses later by a ~~stame-stae~~ statement of the success and the reason for the success which ~~is~~ was that God did it, rather than ... I am inclined to think that the King James translation simply took a superficial interpretation, the ~~wh~~ole chapter being so wonderfully about atonement.

they simply take atonement in this particular verse ... Well, I thought that we would finish this chapter... maybe we can finish the chapter tomorrow and to be ready to go on in chapter ...

Well, if we have some ~~po~~ proof that all sheep are ..before shearers then I think that as a sheep, that is, as a female sheep & before her shearers is dumb. Maybe the male sheep make a ~~noix~~ noise and the female don't. If all female sheep don't make noise , then that is fine, but even 1/4 of them do, then I think it is better to ~~a~~ say, As a sheep which before her sheares is dumb, restricting to those ~~ix~~ which don't make noise. If there is only one that doesn't make a noise, if Mr. Taylor's should be the only one in the world that way, why , it would still fit the ~~ve4se~~ verse, as long as you take it as a relat~~vtive~~, but if 3/4s of them are that way, then the relative is still safe. But if you make it ~~absolute, not--~~ relative --not absolute, it would have ~~k~~ to be an almost universal rule ~~ix~~. Well, if ~~ix~~

<sup>Q</sup> it is comparison to the ones that ... then if there is only one or two like that ~~it's~~ it's allright. But if it is made an ~~abs~~ absolute way, why , it would have to be.. if you were to say, even as a Philadelphian policeman is stupid, so this man didn't show any sense. Well, if one/fourth of the Philadelphia policemen were stupid, the other 3/4s would greatly resent that ~~statm~~ statement. ~~W~~ If you said, Even like a Philadelphian policeman who is stupid, restricting it to the stupid ones, then it would be allright. I don't think you could say, Even like a Philadelphian policeman is ~~stupid~~ stupid, unless it was ~~k w~~ well known that most are. ~~X~~ And of course I don't know whether they are ~~are~~ or not, I haven't had experience like that. But with the ~~real~~ relative you are perfectly safe, and I think that the Hebrew permits the ~~xt~~ relative, but the relative wouldn't be ~~save~~ safe if ~~ne~~ ... so we know the relative is safe because Mr. ~~Ma~~ Taylor...

specialist.  
 Well, I know that Mr. Taylor is a very excellent tree ~~surgeon~~. Anything about trees I would certainly ~~trust him~~ talk to him about, but when it comes to sheep, I just don't know if he knows as much. Well, now we have ~~the~~ this comparison. This verse eleven shows his humility. He is brought as a sheep to the ~~a~~ slaughter, and as a female sheep before her shearers is dumb, ~~k~~ His humility, His self-abnegation, ~~his~~ He says, They ~~don't~~ do not take my ~~lx~~ life from me, I ~~lie~~ lay it down of myself. That certainly is the thought expressed in verse seven. And then in ~~the~~ verse 8, the first part of verse 8, it seems to me that we are quite right in taking the word, the oppression and ~~the judgment together~~ together. Two words taken together as expressing one thought. And taking them as ... means of an unjust judgment He is taken and there seems to be no result. Who is going to meditate or ponder over the results, because He is cut off out of the land of the living, as a result of the transgression of ~~them~~ those which should have been His supporters, His helpers, but did not recognize Him. He came to His own. He made His grave with the wicked, and ~~k~~ with the rich in His death. This phrase, With the ~~rig~~ rich in His death, is one which all non-Christian interpreters find absolutely ~~ix~~ impossible. It doesn't make any sense at all. There must be one of two grounds for it. Either God directed the prophets so that the prophets would write the things which to the people of His ~~ix~~ own day would be quite an enigma, until ~~x~~ they saw how in the actual fulfillment it exactly fits. or else, there is a mistake in the text. Or ~~est~~ else the word rich has something that we don't know about. Of course these later two is what most non-Christian interpreters take. They say that rich must be a synonym for wicked. This is the writing of some socialist who thinks that all rich are very evil and that rich is a parallel for wicked. And ~~there~~ you certainly expect a parallel here. He made the grave with the wicked and the rich in His death. You expect a parallel. He is showing how the poor fellow is cut off, taken away and mistreated

even though He voluntarily humiliated Himself. There seems to be no result --He is ~~x~~ buried with the wicked and with the rich ~~xx~~ in His death. And yet all of our ~~Manuscript~~ Manuscripts have it. So of course it ~~mae~~ makes a definite problem. Now, it is very interesting ~~xx~~ here that the Jewish translation, the one ~~make~~ made ~~x~~ in 1917 which is up to the present the standard English-Jewish translation, and it is ~~efe~~ often spoken of as a very ~~x~~ excellent translation. But the committee that worked on it worked four years solidly, putting in a full day together every month for four years and then a great deal of time ~~x~~ individually in getting the first five books of Moses done, so at the rate they are going, they wont get to Isaiah until about 1973, but they are going very, very, slowly and just how far they will get it is hard to say, but this one was made by a group of men , of whom Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ of ~~x~~ Dropsie College is Chairman, and he is considered as a very good scholar. Although the new one will differ muchly from this and in many ways will be an improvement. In other ways it ~~may~~ show bias that makes it less desirable than this. This is still the standard Jewish translation aside from the Pentateuch. And here it is very interesting that it says, "They make His grave with the wicked and with the rich His \_\_\_\_\_, And for a Jewish translation to say his tomb ~~which~~ fits the case of Christ even better than our King James Version which says with the rich in His death, is a very interesting thing indeed. Well, now, why did they do it that way. Why did a Jewish translation read it With the rich in His tomb. I ~~k~~ don't know what the RSV says to that. I'll think I'll take a look. The RSV said, "And they made His grave with the wicked, and with the rich man in His death."! It follows like the King James. Let's look at the Hebrew there and see exactly literally what it says. It is interesting to note that the letters used in verse 9 for wicked and the letters of the word

used for rich are ~~in-~~ identical , just in a different order. In poetry it is common to use ~~ov-~~ words that sound alike but as far as meaning ...Verse 9, Miss Chung will you read it very literally, please. In English , you say a man went for a walk in the woods. There is no meaning there. We very often say, He likes to go climbing in the mountains, What mountains? Why, ~~-andy-~~ any mountains. He walks up the street. We throw in thees allover. I ~~semeth~~ sometimes ~~thing-~~ think we would save an awful lot of printing expense to just leave out the word the altogether and in about 9 cases out of 10 it has no meaning at all. But ~~somehi-~~ sometimes it does have a very definite meaning. But in this case the wicked just means with some wicked people. It ~~eea~~ certainly doesn't mean all the wicked people in the world. The the here means the ones with whom He was placed, wicked ones, that's all the the means and it isn't in the Hebrew at all. There are cases where the article in the Hebrew doesn't have it; there are other cases where it ~~does~~ adds a good deal, but in this case ~~there-~~ where there is no ~~thee-~~ the makes the Hebrew much more accurate than the English. ~~o~~ You don't ~~think-that-~~ take all the wicked ~~pe-~~ people and then put him with them. There were two malefactors. There were two wicked people hung up and He was placed between the m. You might say he was intended to be ...At any rate He was there with two wicked people. ~~We-~~ With wicked people would be a ; much more accurate translation than with the wicked. ~~He-gave-~~ You can take the He in this case as an ~~id~~ indefinite -- indefinite which in German would be one did this, one did that. But in English it is commonly they. We say , They say, we ~~rex~~ mean really, It is said, And so the they is an idiomatic way of saying it, He gave His grave with ~~the~~ wicked people There is a noun meaning death and in the ~~cont-~~ ~~xx~~ ~~x~~ construct His death...but this is \_\_\_\_\_ ~~pWe-~~ If you take this as ~~plx~~ plural, it is in His deaths, and that

is a very strange thing. ~~Youx~~ With ~~x~~ a rich man in His death. The yodh is written there in the manuscripts, as the Jewish Version evidently thought was correct. In His death wouldn't make sense. One person only has one death and it should not be taken as definite, but instead he should see if there is some other way of taking it. There is a word ~~h~~, which means a high place and the plural of that would be \_\_\_\_\_ and on the idea of a person being buried in a high place, the suggestion has been made ~~tht~~ tht it ~~mae~~ makes a parallel. . . They gave His grave with the wicked and His high place His tomb with a ~~rich~~ rich man. And there are difficulties either way. In his death there is the plural thought, which ~~deers~~ doesn't seem to ~~belong~~ belong. His high place, taken as ~~two~~ tomb, some commentators say we don't have any proof that high place is ever used simply to mean tomb, ~~xxx~~ though it was often ~~xx~~ customary to bury in ~~hth~~ high places. There are many places in Palestine where there is ~~xx~~ remains of an ancient palace and there is a hill there now ~~ans ad~~ and you would ~~like~~ like to excavate it, but you don't get ~~x~~ much to tell you about it, ~~becu~~ because the top of the hill is where the city hall would be and up there there is a little cemetery and you are not allowed, the ancestors of the people ~~live n~~ living in the area are up ~~the~~ re and they ~~wel~~ wouldn't allow you to dig up those tombs so, consequently, that place is not ~~avil~~ available for excavation where you would get the best ~~xx~~ remains of the . . . . There ~~xx~~ have been places where excavation making has been greatly hampered by that habit, by taking a burial place right on the top of the hill, but where there is sufficient warrant to take this word ~~hiss~~ hill as meaning His tomb . . . but of course the putting in of the ~~rig~~ rich man there is a very strange thing, and it is very difficult to think that Isaiah out of His own ---he has ~~x~~ wonderful logic, but how did He get the rich man in here, it's pretty hard to account for it unless the Lord ~~let~~ led him to put it in, the full significance he would not see ~~wh~~ ~~w~~ but when the time was to come, the ~~pee~~ people would see

a very remarkable thing, one who was hung between two thieves would be buried in a rich man's ~~h~~ tomb and see that ~~the~~ ~~is~~ that was the very statement that Isaiah had ~~h~~ made 700 years before. I ~~wa~~ saw an article in the ~~pa~~ per recently that ~~we~~ was sent me ~~h~~ from Baltimore that Dr. Albright had written con a new set of commentaries on the Old Testament, which he has been editing, which had been for about 10 years now, but he thinks the first 3 volumes will come out next year, and he calls it the new translation ~~he~~ but I know very ~~wee~~ ~~x~~ well one who is ~~denia~~ - doing one of these ~~volumes~~ - volumes and I know that he is making a new translation, but most of the book is a discussion, the commentary. So it is a set of commentaries, and Dr. ~~A~~ Albright says, ~~the~~ re are many translations made but most of the translators have no basis upon which to ~~mae~~ make the translations. They don't have the acquaintance with the literature of the Near East, and from that literature we can now understand the true meaning of all sorts of ... that we couldn't understand before, and he says ~~whay~~ ~~he~~ what he has to do is to get into the minds of the writers and see ~~what~~ they meant. Well, ~~th~~at is ordinarily what you have to do in the translating, but here ~~we~~ when you translate the Bible, you are complicated by the fact that it isn't just what was in ~~the Bible~~ minds of the original writers. ~~Rathe~~ Rather, what was in the mind of ~~the~~ God as He led the writers to ~~wv~~ - ~~writexxx~~, and, therefore, even if... and then ~~x~~ put that in English. Well, ~~that is ordinarily what you have to do when you make a translation --~~

So here we have this passage which on a purely natural idea, ~~x~~ it's pretty ~~had~~ hard to know why He would bring a rich man , but if you take the wonderful fitness of the chapter ~~x~~ as a whole , and then you see how this word fits so definitely too, and it's in the Hebrew this way, and was at least 200 years before the birth of Christ, it makes a marvelous thing of how ~~x~~ God led in ~~givei-~~ in giving a prophecy , and so this still does make a problm., ~~xx~~ in any event there is a point forward to a specific event which happened which was ~~write~~ quite unusual. At the time of Isaiah nobody had heard of it. There were ~~g~~ a great many who heard of it. At the time of ~~th~~ Christ there were a great number who were crucified, but one who was crucified ~~betw~~ between two malefactors and buried ~~x~~ in a rich man's ~~hom~~ ~~x~~ tomb is a thing which would hardly have been thought of. I ~~don't-~~ haven't given a great deal of thought ~~xxx~~ ~~xxx~~ myself. In fact I haven't given it any thought. I haven't extensively studied commentators on that particular point ~~x~~ to see whether they have suggested. I have come across the objection, based on that preferring ~~my place because-~~ high place because of the objection ~~xx~~ that death wouldn't make ~~ses-~~ sense ~~xxxx~~ but if it's high place why would you want plural either, why wouldn't you want singular then. I'm not so sure that it is necessarily decides between the two, ~~because-~~ of course, it is only ~~x~~ the difference of a yodh, and most of our in the yodh and the waw are vowel letters. That ~~wx~~ would be interesting to look into the evidence of the manuscripts to see whether the yodh is in all the manuscripts . But this is not what ~~eye~~ you would call simply a vocalization. You come to a vocalization , like a shure~~xq~~. You have the shureq written or not, it doesn't matter, and a hiriq too in the middle. But ~~xxx~~ this is an ending which indicates ... But we do have a striking ~~x~~ fact that the rich man is mentioned here in connection with the death and burial and the fact of the ~~apple-~~ application of it in the light of Christ. And then, right after that,

~~for~~ we do have , I believe the end of the ~~is~~ sentence. I feel quite ~~is~~ sure that we should stop our sentence ~~is~~ at that point, and here it is showing how ~~there-~~ ~~he-~~ there seems to be no future for Him and so we end up with the grave, the death, and end at this point. And then we start a new section of the book. The wicked I think refers to the crucifixion between the two thieves. The rich man was Joseph of Arimathea who ~~gave~~ had the body taken down from the cross and put in his own ~~is~~ tomb. Yes, that is a strange thing, that ~~is~~ it speaks of the grave with the wicked . Of course, actually what happened~~ed~~ was that he was killed , you might say headed for the grave. Some try to get around that by ~~is~~ translating it this way. And they assigned ~~is~~ Him His grave with the wicked but actually He is buried with the rich man in His death. But I believe that it is Alexander that is supplying an ~~aw-~~ awful lot. That you really need more expressed if that is the idea ~~and~~ than what is expressed here, and ~~is~~ the \_\_\_\_\_ would fit very ~~we-~~ well with the idea of assign and one assigned His grave with ~~is~~ the wicked, but ~~then~~ He was buried with the rich man in His death. It's a pretty big jump. It would make pretty good sense , but it's a pretty ~~is~~ big sense. Still, it does perhaps make better sense than most others. The fact of ~~is~~ what ~~happene~~ happened is that he was ~~cut-~~ crucified with malefactors and natural expectation would be that they would be put in a common grave. Certainly it would have been if it ~~is~~ were not for Joseph of Arimathea's intervention, and of course there is this too, from an apologetic viewpoint , God ~~chose-~~ choose to choose to put this into Isaiah's statement to point ~~is~~ forward to Christ, that ~~is~~ that was indeed the crucifixion that was here referred to . Another thing is that if Joseph of Arimathea had not ~~is~~ made his grave available for Him there would be no proof of the resurrection, if ~~is~~ He ~~is~~ were simply dumped into a common hole where the malefactors' bodies ~~were-~~ were thrown , there wouldn't be much proof of the resurrection

but He was put into a tomb and then had the stones rolled away. That prepared the way for the evidence regarding the crucifixion so the Lord caused ~~it~~ that that should happen and here is given an intimation of it in advance. How much of it Isaiah ~~re~~ really understood we just don't know. He ~~may~~ may have understood a tremendous lot, He may have understood only a little. But then I feel that we start a new sentence definitely and this phrase here ~~it~~ begins with the word וְ which is ordinarily a preposition and it is used hundreds of times as a preposition in the Bible. It is only used a half a dozen times as a ~~conju-~~ conjunction. But here it is used as a conjunction, there is no question. But what does ~~it~~ וְ mean as a ~~con~~ conjunction; literally וְ means upon, and the upon. There is one verse elsewhere where the upon is translated because, where it makes very good sense. There is another case in Job where it very definitely means although and where the ~~it~~ context requires that sense. You might say in a way it is like the word with. You might say in the last world war the United States fought with Germany, or ~~in the~~ somebody else would say, During the last war the United States fought with Great~~er~~ Britain ~~ga~~ against Germany, using the with, it's just association, but ~~the associa-~~ it's ~~an~~ association in two very opposite ways, association as enemies and ~~associa-~~ association as friends. Well, now, וְ shows a very definite relationship. It's interesting that we have another conjunction a little later which is וְ, underneath, and in that case the underneath is a result, but ~~it~~ here the וְ could be ~~it~~ because, as our King James Version has and it could be although, and in the context ~~it~~ I think the although makes better sense, but I don't think either the although or because logically follows the burial with the wicked ~~in his~~ ~~His~~ and with the rich, but it does logically relate to the 10th verse. Although He ~~had~~ ~~and~~ had done no violence

and there was not any ~~deceit~~ ~~any~~ deceit in his mouth, yet , it pleased the Lord that He should be smitten. He has made Him sick. He has given Him infirmities. He has stricken Him... as you see it is not the ~~distinction~~ distinction that we have today between a sickness that comes from germs and a sickness that comes ~~form~~ from \_\_\_\_\_ is not expressed in the Hebrew. ~~The~~ He has put Him to grief is perhaps a good general word covering both. It could mean to make one sick, which would be the most literal use of the word here. It could be to ~~cause~~ cause one to be injured, but of course the trouble is <sup>it</sup> ~~you~~ could also have other meanings. Surely, ~~mea~~ mental ~~x~~ illness or disappointment or anguish which are certainly not contained in the word. Literally, He has made Him sick, ~~and~~ but the ~~x~~ important thing in that is that it is the Lord who has done it. Though He had done no evil there was no deceit ~~x~~ in His mouth. He was truly an Israelite in whom was no ~~guile~~. guile. He was of all men the one who did not deserve a miserable death. Yet the Lord choose that this should happen. So it is part of the Lord's plan. We previously had the emphasis on His voluntarily laying His life down. No man takes it from me. I lay it down ~~x~~ of myself, but we also read that God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son. God sent Him to the cross. He went to the cross voluntarily, God sent Him. The Romans crucified Him but they were acting as God caused they should act. It was a divine act that was done here. God caused that He should have ~~the~~ this suffering and this death. And then verse 10 goes on and shows how it was not a meaningless failure. It was a great accomplishment followed ~~by~~ with success instead of failure. As to the Lord, verse 10 says, It pleased Him to smite Him. He hath made Him sick. He has caused injury to Him. And then reading on there, verses 10, Mr. Kim would ~~you~~ ~~you~~ you read on there, please. It ~~pe~~ pleased the Lord sounds as if ~~tha~~ this is the thing ~~ta~~ that that gave the Lord happiness, but actually an English

idiom , would say , it pleased him to do it, doesn't mean that it gave Him happiness, but it means that this is ~~the~~ what He choose to do . The Lord choose that He should; that is a common expression. I think in speaking of rulers, it pleased him to do so and so; that is, this is what he decided to do. It might even be something that didn't please him in the sense of giving Him pleasure, but it was His will. But this Hebrew word \_\_\_\_\_ is my impression usually does have the idea of pleasure . Let's look for a second at it. I think we can safely ~~k~~ say that the word \_\_\_\_\_ means <sup>choice</sup> ~~showing~~ but with an aspect of pleasure , but it is that which He desires, that which He chooses to do. YOU might say, Yes, the Lord ~~ch~~ose to bruise Him. The Lord would not choose to do it ~~us~~ unless there was some purpose in it, a purpose which was pleasing in His sight. It pleased the Lord, taken in the most literal sense, is ~~at~~ hardly a good translation, taken in the way that ~~w~~ the word is often used in English.

(Q) The sign of the object I don't believe is ever required in Hebrew; it is optional --it is very generally used but not required. It may be omitted at anytime. It is an optional use rather than a required use. Moffatt says, ~~The~~ But the Eternal chose to vindicate His Servant, rescuing His ~~x~~life from anguish. I think that is quite different than , It pleased the Lord to ~~br~~uise Him. I think it might be a better translation to say that The Lord chose to injure Him. He caused HIM to endure this suffereng. (Q) Moffatt was a very noted ~~Sehet~~ ~~K~~ Scotch theologian, a Bible scholar, who ~~dies~~ about 20 years ago. He was on the RSV committee when they began ~~to~~ their work and ~~th~~ he died before they had gone very ~~x~~ far. And he was a very good linguistic scholar and I've had this ~~expreie~~ experience repeatedly --~~the~~ that I've taken a Hebrew word and I've figured out exactly what it means from the original and tried to put ~~in~~ it into English ~~but~~ and you can know exactly what it means, but how to say it in English is difficult. And ...

And then I've looked at the Moffatt translation and I've found exactly in the English, and I found time after time he ~~ah~~ has a verse translated better than I've found time after time he has a verse better ~~er~~ than I've ever found ~~ay~~ anybody has translated it, but then you look at the next verse and maybe he throws the Hebrew entirely aside and just ~~n~~ puts in what he thinks they ought to. In other words he ~~hw-~~ was ~~n~~ not a ~~man~~ who believed in the Bible, and he very often did remarkable work in ~~the~~ <sup>getting the exact</sup> ~~er~~ sense of the passage but then in another passage he would put just what he thought they ought to. So, for anybody to find out what the Bible means by studying ~~n~~ Moffatt I think would be very foolish. I would say 3/4s of it is absolutely undependable, but ~~his-~~ that his use of English in getting exact ~~ma-~~ meaning and his ability ~~in~~ at times to take the Greek and the Hebrew and find exactly what it means is remarkable, so ~~fo-~~ often he is very, very, helpful. I think he is much more useful than the RSV or than the New English Bible. In ~~n~~ both of ~~the~~ ~~m~~ you have scholarship which is far inferior and ~~you-~~ ~~thy~~ they stick much more ~~st-~~ ~~ee~~ closely to the Hebrew than Moffatt does but they are not dependable at all. But from Moffatt you can get a great many helpful suggestions. Dr. Armstrong of the Faculty of Princeton Seminary when I was there ~~and-~~ or shortly after was a ~~ma~~ member of the committee to make the RSV and ~~eh~~ he was very much impressed with the fact ~~tht-~~ that Moffatt who was on the committee insisted that they stick by the ~~K9~~ King James ~~Versei-~~ Version. ~~If-~~ He said his version was for individual ~~ra-~~ reading but he said for use in the Church you want to use the Old English and make very few changes. Well, they started the RSV years before they did much on it. They got started. They ~~n~~ had a few meetings. I heard Dr. Armstrong tell about it. And then the thing kind of languished and was forgotten for quite a little while and ~~think-~~ then I guess the \_\_\_\_\_ put the money into it, and then the committee got together, those who were still

living ~~were--~~ and they added others to them and they pushed the thing ~~ag-~~ ahead and they got the translation. But Moffatt does have at times a remarkable understanding. So I think he is always profitable to look at, never safe to trust. But then after all, anything in English is just a suggestion. Somebody told me that years ago at Wheaton in a class in which they used the Scofield Bible a great deal and the teacher in this Bible Class asked the question one day, said, What does this ~~ix~~ verse mean. ~~ix~~ Well, let's open the Bible and see what it mean, meaning at the notes. And the teacher got the idea that they were confusing the notes with the original Bible, and therefore that it was ~~ix-unwise~~ ~~uns~~ unwise to use a Bible with comments right on the page because people would confuse it, that we ~~sharpt-~~ sharply distinguish between what is the Bible, and what are human comments, but the difficulty with that attitude is the fact that the translation has an awful ~~ix~~ lot of human ideas, any translation, ~~unlew-s~~ unless you are going to ~~ix~~ get to the original, definitely you are tremendously at the mercy of those who have made the ~~transa~~ translation, their ideas, their ~~intrep~~ interpretation of the ~~thei-~~ thing as a whole. Anything that you have in the original language from the original involves a good bit of interpretaion, well, even take the fact of the verse divisions. They are not in the ~~orig~~ original. They are in our Hebrew Bible, but they were not ~~ix~~ written originally. Very often they throw you off. And the chapter divisions throw you off, so we have suggested interpretations of people who we have confidence ~~ix~~ in, but I don't think we can just say, Let's just use what's the Bible, and then we are safe. We have to learn to distinguish ~~wh-~~ between what is God's Word and what is human interpretation, like a chapter division or a verse division or a heading on ~~ix~~ a page, or anything like that, or a translation. What is the human aspect ~~that-~~ of it ~~tha~~ t we have to try to get behind and find out ~~wh~~ at

it ~~k~~ really means. And when you have a group of ~~ged~~ Godly ~~ma-~~ men like the King James translators, you can put much more trust in them, that they will take ~~th~~ what the original says and fairly try to give you what the original says, but I have been amazed in this chapter, more ~~an~~ than any other I have ever studied how often it seems to me they just take a superficial interpretation instead of trying to really get ~~k~~ into it and just see what it really says, but I don't think they every~~x~~ just cast it aside. ~~Even~~ Sometimes when they couldn't make any sense out of it they just translated the words. It didn't make sense but it corresponded to what was there, ~~that~~ that's a lot fairer than ~~doein~~ doing what the RSV ~~s~~ does. If they don't think it makes sense they throw it away and put in something that they think ought to be there and then put a footnote, Hebrew uncertain. They often ~~k~~ do that where the Hebrew ~~dis~~ is not a bit uncertain. Well, now, this says that the Lord, People said, He want produce anything. He's gone. There's no resolve, but this was the Lord's doing and the Lord did it for a definite purpose. And so we read In God's <sup>יְהוָה</sup> יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה and those four words can equally well be translated in either of two different ways. And anybody who has had as much as two months of Hebrew should ~~immediatelly~~ immediately be able tell the two possibilities. What are they? What's the first one? יְהוָה is if, or when. And then you have יְהוָה, and what form is it? When I taught Beginning Hebrew that whenever~~x~~ you saw a preformitive יְהוָה and no sufformative, say it is either ~~2n~~ 2ms or 3fs and that or is very important, because otherwise you grab one of two or three possibilities and then you don't think of the other possibilities and you often get confused that way. So always when a form has ~~a~~ two possibilities it should be parsed with both possibilities given and then we can see which fits the context. Other~~w~~ise we take one and we try to make sense out of the verse with the one and we never think to go back and see if the other will fit. Now it can



and also please look at the English of ~~the~~ chapter 55, not chapter 54. Chapter 55 and please make an outline of 55 to turn into me at the beginning of the hour. Make an outline dividing the whole chapter into three, four divisions and each of them into two, three, or four divisions according to thought, expressing the outline of the general meaning of the chapter, you don't have to ~~spend~~ ~~spend~~ ~~spend~~ spend a lot of time on it, but do that for chapter 55 and if ~~or~~ you find it ~~diffi~~ difficult to make a good outline, make two or three alternate outlines and turn them in at the beginning of the hour next time.

Yes, as you mentioned, it is construct. The word is in the construct, and as construct it has to be translated with an of whether it is the labor of or a matter ~~of is~~ that depends upon the word following and we haven't yet reached that word. So if you are simply asked to translate this word you have to put in the or. You say, A labor of, or the labor of. You translate the two ~~together~~ together and you see ~~whether~~ then you know whether it is definite or indefinite. The word is ~~is~~ not simply \_\_\_\_\_. There is more to it than that. How would you ~~transla~~ translate the whole word. Now, the word from means what? Now, there are two possibilities aren't there, the Hebrew word (1) very frequently means from in the sense of ~~leafi~~ leaving something and ~~pred~~ proceeding to some other place. ~~Or~~ That you translate from, away from, going ~~forth~~ forth from, or it ~~cha~~ can be from in the sense of a source or a ~~cas~~ cause. It is hardly from in the sense of an instrument. It is not the instrument with which you do something, like you struck him with your hand. You ~~wouldn't~~ wouldn't say you ~~struck~~ struck him from ~~his~~ your hand, but you might say you struck him from a false sense of judgment. You could have the reason, the source, the impelling thing can have the from because that is the thing from which the ~~is~~

~~thing from~~ incentive comes or from which the force comes, or the ~~comp-~~compulsion comes but not the means along the way. That is not 7-11. So there are ~~w~~ two literal possibilities here. ~~X~~ If you say from that is from, that is very ~~little~~ <sup>literal</sup> (?) but whether it means away from ~~or whether it means~~ by means of leaving or whether it means from as a result of the source ~~le~~ from which something comes. That of course, by, suggests instrumentality, therefore by is not so good, but there are ~~ox~~ cases in English where ~~the~~ the source is fairly well expressed by by, but for the moment just make it from, ~~and~~ leaving open the question which it is, Away from or as a result of, the ~~wo-~~ source from which. But continue then very literally. Read everything that is in each ~~ox~~ word. 9711 is to be filled or to be satisfied. Now, you said ~~F~~ from the labor of His soul or life He shall see ~~?? w~~ What does that mean? You are taking it then as a result. As a result ~~clac-~~ clause, that this, the labor of His ~~would~~ soul will result in His being satisfied, now, in that case, if you take it that way, the \_\_\_\_\_ will be taken or go together with He shall be ~~satisfi-satif-~~ satisfied. You might say, He shall see satisfaction. He shall experience a condition of full satisfaction, two words as expressed ~~togeth~~ together to express one concept. It is certainly an entirely possible way to do it and certainly very definitely suggested by the ~~fat-~~ fact that the word and is not expressed. It suggest~~x~~ that the two words go together. The way the King James <sup>e</sup>V<sub>e</sub>rsion says, He will see of the labour of His soul. What does that ~~mena-~~ mean. He will see of the labor of His soul~~x~~. Does it mean that He will see the ~~x~~ result. What does it mean? He will look at the labor of His soul~~x~~. It seems to me that it would make much better sense to take the see with the be ~~x~~ satisfied than it is with the result of the labour that leads Him to see ~~satisfac~~tion. Of course it could be ~~tae-~~ taken as contemplating that through which He has gone and He will feel

\* satisfaction, having contemplated what He has done, but in that case I don't quite see why you would have a ~~med~~ mend there. He will look at the labor of His soul~~x~~ has done and as a result He will be satisfied. That would be a perfectly possible thought but I don't see why ~~ex-why~~ you would use a 70. The 70 can be used not ~~one~~ only to express the place ~~for~~ from which or the ~~source~~ source from which but it can also ~~be~~ can be used to express that out of which a selection is taken. And that is ~~certainly~~ <sup>certainly</sup> what is/suggested by the word labour in English. In English you see out of ~~his-labour~~ the travail of his soul would suggest that horror ~~that~~ <sup>in what</sup> you see. \_\_\_\_\_ (min) can certainly be used in the sense of part of something. That certainly does not fit here at all. If the people would see the travail of his soul, he will see the whole labour of his soul through. Look ~~that~~ at that! That is the result of his labour/ I would certainly expect that either no preposition or the sign of an accusative. I do not see how \_\_\_\_\_ (min) could possibly ~~give-us~~ <sup>fit with th</sup> that idea. So, it seems to me that we are confronted with two ideas, either ~~from~~ away from or the source from which. It seems that either of them is possible. Away from the travail of his soul. In other words, having finished the travail of his soul, having ~~gone~~ done with it. All ~~having-done-with-it,-or-then~~ <sup>while</sup> being ended with it, then he will look at the the satisfaction. Something that is ~~worth~~ <sup>while</sup> ~~is-~~ has been now accomplished. Now all the misery has ended. That is entirely possible. / But it is equally possible as the source from which. I think perhaps ~~that~~ <sup>would be involved in the word \_\_\_\_\_ (min)</sup> both ideas ~~are-possible~~. He goes through this terrible agony. He has this suffering. The word \_\_\_\_\_ (ahmahl) is ~~not-a-word~~ <sup>a good</sup> ~~that-is~~ used ~~-----Because it is not a word~~ to use here, because it is not simply something that is passively borne, but it is something that he actually gives himself. He actually goes through himself. He endures things for our sake.

ISAIAH #45

He performs this tremendous labour in our behalf. And when the labour is ended, away from it it is ended, as the result of the labour, the source from which, he sees ~~the~~ satisfaction that his labour has accomplished in ~~his~~ purposes. It seems to me that the verse makes a tremendous sense, if you take the \_\_\_\_\_ (min) in the normal meaning, and if you note that there is no and there, and if you ~~tk~~ take the word \_\_\_\_\_ together with \_\_\_\_\_ as expressing one idea that he will see a condition of a complete satisfaction. He will be entirely satisfied with what has been accomplished. The atonement is finished and it is completed. It is all that could be expected or desired. And so, if you take the words as they stand in the Hebrew, you get a far more of real significant idea than you just do from the way that the English says, You feel the travail of His soul and shall be satisfied. I don't think that many people who express that word. They express ~~a~~ it and they have an idea, yes, He is going to have suffering/ He is going to have satisfaction. These are two great ideas in it, but beyond that how it fits together. What the verse means, I doubt that people understand, when they say it in English, but if you see it in the Hebrew, you have very definite thoughts ~~expressed~~ expressed here, which I think could be ~~expressed~~ expressed far better in English than ~~it~~ is done in those particular words. The \_\_\_\_\_ of is not something disconnected with the satisfaction. They are expressed right next to each other in the Hebrew, there is not even ~~and-an-in-~~ an an in between. Now, this word \_\_\_\_\_ which ~~wex~~ we have been looking at, which Mr. Kim has ~~tk~~ translated labor. The verb from which it is taken is ~~uxk~~ used a great many times. They labor in ~~k~~ vain that build, except the Lord build the house. Eccl. uses it many times. (that is, 8 times, but that is 3/4s of the times that this verb is used). What has a man for all the labor that he labors. And then the word is used in the...the noun

7-50

is used ~~in the~~ much more. The noun is used about 30 times, but of those 30, ~~ma-~~ maybe two fifths are also in the book of Ecclesiastes. Vanity of vanities, the labors of pouring yourself out and getting nothing from it. I considered . . . It is the word that is expressed for the frustration for the lack of accomplishment, for the heart toil with no results. And ~~is~~ it is expressed very often with ~~that~~ sense, and ~~he~~ He goes through a frustrating, terrible suffering that seems to those about Him to bring no result. The ~~die~~ ~~die~~ disciples said, We had thought ~~that~~ that He would be the one to redeem Israel. It looks as if it were all in vain. Wicked hands took Him and killed Him. He went through all that but when It is finished, He can look back on what was done and see it was not in vain. He is satisfied. ~~It~~ ~~die~~ It ~~die~~ did accomplish the purpose for which He came. So the ~~xx~~ use ~~fx~~ of this word is a very significant word. Now the English word ~~trava~~il is a word which in Old English was ~~w~~ used occasionally for that sense of a frustrating type of miserable effort but in modern English it is used for only one specific kind, and consequently in modern English it loses a good part of the meaning of this, ~~lux~~ ~~for~~ or perhaps imports into it an additional idea which is not in the Hebrew, for this word \_\_\_\_\_ is never used in the Hebrew of a woman suffering in connection with childhood. It is not the word ~~ef~~ ~~th~~ for that. There are other words to express that idea in the Hebrew. ~~Isa.~~ Jeremiah 20:18, says, ~~When~~ Wherefore came I out of the womb to see \_\_\_\_\_ that is not describing his mother's suffering. That is describing the ~~xx~~ ~~fx~~ frustration of his life. Why was I born, to reach this frustration, ~~the~~ this labor and agony that seems to accomplish nothing. It is even translated in ~~Jeh~~ Job as wearisome. ~~Wearims~~ Wearisome nights are appointed unto me. It is a word in the Hebrew for labor that seems to accomplish nothing, and that is just exactly what is the ~~x~~ whole thought of the 53rd Psalm which is dealing with the Servant of God which seems to the people

to be who has believed what we have heard. To ~~we~~ whom is the arm of the Lord revealed. You wouldn't think that anything would come from this. It is just wasted. It is just lost, but we see that there are tremendous results from it. That thought is all the way through, and this word sums it up very remarkably. He ~~wit-~~ will see that, apart from that, now that it is finished and is over, He will look back and see that that is indeed the force from which full satisfaction comes. It is a tremendous thought which is expressed in the selection of the ~~Heb-~~ Hebrew words and which has not been very well carried over into English in this particular ~~the-~~ translation. I did not bring Moffatt along so I cannot say at the moment ~~which~~ whether any of them ~~god~~ got the particular idea ~~thatn~~ than the King James has. But this phrase I wanted you to get now and then the next thought follows directly after. That is a very good question and ~~is~~ one which I hope that you all will know. Anytime you come to ~~a~~ a question like that and you are not aware of the answer, be sure to raise the question. This fourth word in verse ten, as you look at that word, you ~~immediated-~~ immediately see it ~~is~~ starts with a ו and the next letter has a sheva under it. When you have a ו with a ~~hiriq-~~ hiriq under it or before a guttural that hiriq ~~is~~ changes to a ~~seh~~ seghol you immediately think of a Hiphil perfect. It immediately suggests that, and then you ask, Can this be a Hiphil perfect. Well, if it is a Hiphil perfect, the normal Hiphil perfect of the verb שָׁוַי would be שָׁוַי וְיָוַי. <sup>b</sup>ut in ~~is~~ this case you do not have a final vowel expressed, and when you have a ~~very~~ verb in the Hebrew which has no ~~vow-~~ ~~w~~ vowel, we call it a Lamedh He verb. Now, there are real Lamedh He verbs but those have a dot in it to show that it is a ~~rela~~ real He. Where you have a He simply as a vowel letter, there we know that ~~eriz-~~ originally in the root, ~~either~~ was a ~~vewe-~~ waw or a yodh and consequently, ordinarily it just ends in

י  
י

ISAIAH # 46

There are a few cases in ~~x~~ which the Hiphil , instead of having the final ~~י~~ in the perfect or ~~י~~ in the imperfect, has the yodh for the waw ~~x~~ actually expressed. And so in this case it ends in ~~י~~ just like ~~י~~ it would end in ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~. And so ~~י~~ is from the verb ~~י~~, the final ~~He~~ being simply a vowel letter, ~~x~~ representing an original yodh which is usually lost but ~~which~~ not in this particular form , so He caused Him to be sick. He put Him to injury. That was a good ~~gramat~~ grammatical question. It ~~rust~~ trust that all of you will remember the answer to it. There are many points in Hebrew which are important , nor ~~x~~ for the particular verse but for other verses you read, and I am ~~gle~~ glad to have them asked about as you come across them. Now, then Mr, Kim suppose you read on a ~~le~~ little bit further for us. Continue in the verse. In the Hiphil twice. ~~The-w~~ You take the word ~~for~~ to drink and you put it in the Hiphil, it means ~~ox~~ to cause to drink, which may mean to irrigate. But if you say to cause to irrigate you are translating the Hiphil portion twice, so in here you want to ~~x~~ translate the Hiphil ~~on~~ portion once, and do it either one of the two but not ~~the~~ both. You say, In His knowledge He shall ~~x~~ justify my righteous servant. That suggests what we put on the board, ~~exp~~ except I put a Beth ~~inse~~ instead of a ~~Lamed~~ Lamedh. How many of you translated it many. Did you all translate it many. How many ~~gave~~ gave just one meaning and that meaning was Many? In other words, you ~~did~~ differed with the King James Version. Well, we will come to that. At any rate you all translated it many, ~~x~~ except Mr. Curry also suggested great. Now, are ~~x~~ you going to translate this He will justify great ones or He will ~~just~~ justify many. That would seem to be a possibility , wouldn't it. He will justify great ones. And after ~~w~~ all,

we began the chapter ~~we~~ with reading about the Kings who shut their mouths at Him, great ones are involved, but the objection of the translation of great is that the word is used many, many times and ~~it is very~~ at least 10 to one ~~is~~ it is translated many, or much. And of course if you speak of much strength, or much prestige or much standing, you eventually get the idea of something that is much in quality, and there you get great. And so it does occur in a very ~~x~~ few very clear cases ~~maning~~ meaning great, but ordinarily it means many, and so I feel that in this particular case here we would not be justified in doing what the King ~~Jem- Mx M~~ James does and translating it great, but we should follow the usual interpretation of it ~~and~~ as many, and so in this case Mr. Kim says, In His knowledge shall my righteous ~~servant~~ servant justify many, and there are a number of questions in this ~~which~~ are good to investigate. One is that in Hebrew you ~~x~~ say My righteous Servant ~~is~~ Which one comes ~~x~~ first. Servant comes first in ~~Heb-heb~~ Hebrew, and the adjective ~~which~~ which follows ~~must~~ must agree in number, gender, and definiteness, My servant is ~~den~~ definite, so the word righteous has to ~~x~~ be definite also. It has to be My S<sub>e</sub>r<sub>v</sub>ant, the righteous one. This is a righteous man, my servant, and I think we are also ~~justifite~~ justified in ~~take~~ taking it in apposition, you could of course say it ~~separa-~~ separately. You could say my servant should justify a righteous man. But that would leave the many at the end with nothing to relate. And since you have the ~~man of~~ to say who is going to be justified, it is altogether possible to say that this is in apposition, and it means a righteous man, namely my servant, and that certainly individualizes the servant of the Lord, very definitely, more ~~that~~ ever before. We are ~~grad-~~ gradually coming all through these last 15 chapters to see that the servant of the Lord is not a whole nation ~~x~~ but an individual, and now we are shown more ~~pa-~~ plainly than

ever yet. A righteous man, namely, my righteous servant. It ~~mae-~~ makes it  
 very ~~strick-~~ strictly individual. / Of ~~course~~ <sup>(Q)</sup> course prepositions are the hardest  
 things to translate from any language to any language. Just ~~about-~~ about every  
 language, prepositions have a wide range of meanings. I ~~saw~~ saw a wonderful  
 illustration of that ~~a~~ in a book ~~one~~ once by a man from Australia, I forget his name.  
 Suppose his name was ~~a~~ Smith. He wrote a book called, Literature by ~~language~~ language.  
 He ~~wa~~ says, What does this mean, Literature by language. Well, he says, we  
 might make a sentence to show ~~wh~~ at literature by language means. I will say  
 By literature, by language, by Christmas, by hook or by crook. In other words,  
 the word by has a tremendous range of meanings. Now, in German the word zwei  
 is ordinarily translated in English as the word two, but I had a student card when  
 I was a student in the University of Berlin, and on that student card was my picture,  
 and underneath it said where I was born. It said \_\_\_\_\_. Now, we would  
 say at, they use to. I don't know how ~~a~~ they get that out of two but that is the  
 way they use it, and in every language prepositions. Each word ~~a~~ has a range  
 of meaning, and it is very difficult to translate a ~~sen~~ preposition from ~~ne~~ one  
 language into another. In fact the word by,--you go by the side of the road, you  
 go by train, you do it by night. There are all kinds of meanings. Now, the word  
 through. Whether the word through could ever ~~represte~~ represent the Hebrew Min  
 we don't know. You would have to get the precise meaning and see if that is the  
 meaning that Min could ~~give~~ give and if that is the meaning Min could give and if  
 that is the meaning that our English through could give. I would only ~~a~~ say that  
 in most cases, I am quite sure that through would not translate min, Off hand I  
 would question whether it would ever translate it. But there ~~a-man~~ may be a case.

~~Ordinary~~ Ordinarily I would think of through, that one fairly common use of through is for means, for means of doing something. I don't believe ~~tht--~~ that Min is ever used for means, but min is definitely used for source and sometimes it is difficult to distinguish between source and means, and therefore, I can't say it is impossible that Min could sometimes in English represent Min but I don't know of any place, and off hand I would question the probability, but I can say there might be some places where it might be done. (Q) Through the travail of His soul He will be satisfied, that is, the trouble is that through suggests ..now it can be used to convey cause, ~~cause~~ cause often cause and means can be quite ~~seep~~ separate in our ideas, but Min means cause, not means. You can't separate them sharply, ~~throug-~~ though they are close enough together. Through gets in English so near the idea that you can pretty well ~~wa~~ say the idea of the ~~verys-~~ verse ~~is~~ can be expressed in English by through, but I don't think you can say that the idea of Min can be expressed by through and so therefore I feel as if you avoid a little danger ~~xx~~ if you get some other preposition that could be cause as well. <sup>U</sup> B<sub>11</sub> t perhaps through makes ~~n~~ better English than most of the other. I certainly wouldn't consider through wrong but I would have it definitely in mind that it is not ~~te~~ the meaning, but of course the ~~cau~~ cause that produced it is the means which He uses in order to produce it, so the two ideas are very closely related. (Q) No, I take the object here as being involved in combination with ~~en-~~ another verse, ~~k~~ meaning that He will ~~wee-tha~~ see ~~that~~ which is expressed in the other verse, that He will see Himself fully ~~satif=~~ satisfied, I take the two of them together to express one idea. Otherwise, you are quite right that ordinarily ~~the~~ look ~~w~~uld be a different word than see. Ordinarily see requires an object to know what He sees. But not always, the blind man said, Formerly I was blind, now I see. He doesn't say ~~wh~~at He he sees. But of course that is suggesting that a man

previously didn't see anything, now he sees. From the labor of His soul he sees. It doesn't mean that now he is no longer blind because he ~~w~~ never was blind, but it means that he sees satisfaction. (QQ) I wouldn't say that the object is omitted, I would say it ~~x~~ is combined with the following verses to express the idea. Continuing in verse eleven, we are not half way through eleven and more than half the hour is gone. ~~We--~~ We say, A ~~rightou-~~ righteous man, My servant, by His knowledge will justify many. Now, there are two very serious questions there. One is His knowledge, and one is justify. I think Moffatt ~~say~~ says will make ~~na~~ ny righteous, but certainly that is the natural interpretation of the verse. \_\_\_\_\_ is to ~~make-right~~ be righteous. Would not the Hiphil then to make righteous. He will make many righteous. Why do they say justify. Does justify ~~man-~~ mean to make righteous. Does justify every~~x~~ mean to make righteous in English. Yes, it ~~ik~~ does, but only in printer's lingo. A ~~prin-~~ printer takes a piece of line and puts them together to make a page. And then he ~~just-~~ justifies them, which is his term ~~ef~~ for mean~~ing~~. He make s it straight all the way down --that the printer calls justifying. But that makes to make it correct. And I don't know any other case in modern English where we use the word justify ~~x~~ in the sense of making straight or right or righteous. When we use the word justify we mean to make something be considered right. You justify yourself by ~~wh~~ at you did? We don't mean you make yourself righteoxus. We mean ~~ylu~~ you make people ~~thing-~~ think you right in ~~thx~~ what you~~d~~ did.

ISAIAH # 47

Can this modern ~~ma~~ meaning of the word justify be properly used here. For the ~~Hib~~ Hiphil of the word רַחֵם which means to be righteous. And we find that some commentators tell us, No, this must mean to make righteous, just as they say in Dan.12:3 where it says they that turn many to righteousness. That

is the hiphil of יָרַם which would mean to make righteous, to turn unto righteousness. But that is the only place they can point to in the Old Testament where the Hiphil of this word is translated to make righteous. This word, just like the corresponding word in the New Testament does not mean to make righteous, with this one possible exception in Dan. 12:3, it means to cause to appear righteous. Cause something to be seen as righteous, rather than to cause something to become righteous. And we have it used in the Old Testament, in the Hiphil in quite a few cases, and in every other case it is used to... God forbid that I should justify you. Exodus 23:7, he says, I will not justify the wicked. I won't pretend they are righteous when they are not. It is translated justify in almost every case in the Old Testament and just like the δικαιώσῃ in the New Testament is not to make righteous but to cause to be seen as righteous, in the forensic sense, it is not the infusion of righteousness, but it is the imputation of Christ's righteousness. And therefore, that is very important about the use of this word here. And so, it is by His knowledge that He will justify many. In other words, He will know so much that He will know how to justify. It is that what it means by His knowledge. You have an automobile and it won't go and you try this and that and you can't make it go, and some man comes along and you think he knows a lot about cars and you say, Can you make my car go. By his knowledge, he just reaches in and takes a hold of something and off it goes because He knows how to do it. Is that what it means here. It is just as if a person were to owe a sum of money, and you owe that sum of money, and you have no credit because you owe this sum of money that you have not paid. And then somebody goes in and pays it for you and it is wiped off the books as far as you

are concerned. You have not paid it. You are not different than you were before, but the charge against you has been ~~rev-~~ removed. Something ~~x~~ else that you did not supply has been put to your account and you are free from that ~~debt~~ debt. Then you can go in and purchase more things and your ~~xxx~~ credit again becomes ~~x~~ good, and the payment which is owed to God's righteous law for sin is paid by someone else. Therefore, as a ~~rest-~~ result of that, ~~-there-~~ this one who is still an unrighteous man, before the eyes of God's righteous law is seen as a righteous person, ~~bu-~~ because the penalty has been paid ~~and~~ that is, justification, which is very distinct from sanctification. If there is justification, inevitably sanctification begins. The one who is justified will be sanctified, but sanctification is a long continuous process. ~~Justid-~~ Justification happens instantly, at one moment ~~the-ole---~~ he owed a debt to the law of God, the next moment that is completely paid because that has been ~~x~~ put to His account, because Christ has paid the penalty, so he justified but ~~he~~ is not made just. The Roman Catholic Church says, there is infused into him righteousness and by virtue of that ~~x~~ righteousness, which God sees in Him, ~~H~~ God delivers Him from the penalty. But That is not what the Bible says, the ~~bible~~ Bible teaches it is true that God enters into our heart to sanctify us but our justification is entirely the ~~rest~~ result of His laying to our account what He did on the cross, to bear the sins of all who believe on Him. And it is not ~~becuse-~~ because He knows so much ~~that~~ He does. By His knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many. It does ~~x~~ not convey the idea in modern English, because in Modern English the word His in a case ~~like~~ like this normally means ~~that-~~ either a possessive Genitive, the knowledge that he owns or a ~~sub~~ subjective judgment, the knowledge that He knows, but there are ~~ma~~ many other cases where a Genitive will be an objective Genitive like he would say,

~~It~~ How long did ~~it's~~ its building take. And you mean an objective Genitive, the building of it. You say, How ~~long--~~ long did his building of his house take? You have a subjective genitive or an objective genitive or a possessive genitive. Any one of the three is grammatically possible, but in this case the knowledge of the whole chapter requires that the His be taken as an objective genitive and we do not have objective genitives in modern English on the word \_\_\_\_\_. ~~It~~ ~~Wew~~ would say the knowledge of Him. So, this is a knowledge of Him. This is not what He knows, but what people know about Him. So, it is by people's coming to know about Him, that He is the righteous one. My servant will justify Him. So, it is an object genitive, by knowledge of Him will the righteous man, my servant justify for many. (Q) Yes, that is a different use which ~~view~~ of knowledge, which I question whether in this particular chapter fits. this fits. in His knowledge, the word in is thre preposition ב (be), ~~but~~ in Hebrew, with/ has two senses, that ~~which~~ /n which something is. If you say that he did this in his dream, he did it in his knowledge, you mean that he knew about it, that He knew ~~q~~ about it. I do not think that particular sense conveys much sense in this ~~verb~~ <sup>verse</sup>. This is an objective factor that happens in the real world. Now, the other sense of the word is instrument ~~by means of his knowledge, by~~ <sup>x</sup> means of his knowledge will he get the final \_\_\_\_\_. And I would ~~think~~ <sup>be inclined to</sup> that the thought which you have suggested which is very interesting, and which is a very true thought is rather in accordanced with this now than by means of his knowledge or ~~by means of his~~ <sup>said</sup> within his knowledge. Consequently I would question whether that idea ~~that~~ <sup>is</sup> /n this particular verse. I would be inclined ~~th~~ to think that ~~by~~ <sup>us</sup> is better here, because it is the instrumentality which is used to bring to Christ, to bring ~~to~~ the knowledge about him.

(Q) Yes, that is to say, if it were genitive, (6.00) it would have to there, but the genitive can be equally well be an object. It can be subjective or objective or possessive, all three are possible with genitive. And the subjective genitive and objective genitive frequently occur in Hebrew, and good many times in English, but not so much as with this word, knowledge, now ~~wait a minute~~, we would say, by the knowledge of mathematics one can advance in engineering. That is an objective genitive. You know mathematics, and his knowledge actually means the knowledge of him. It does have to be. That is equally possible. No, there is a difference between min and ber. min (min) is the source, min is the source of the heart is what He suffered on the cross. It is ~~true~~ true. that through his labour that people are saved. It is through His labour that He sees satisfaction. That is the cause, the source is the means, not the cause. We are saved by faith, we are <sup>not</sup> saved, because our faith ~~causes~~ <sup>not</sup> causes us to be saved. The thing that causes us to be saved is the <sup>not</sup> great atonement of Christ, what Christ did on Calvary. But faith is the means which God uses / of bringing \_\_\_\_\_ (4.50) It is through faith, through here again, as an instrument. you say, by grace, or ~~through~~ through grace we are saved. / Through the knowledge that comes to us, when we are told about Christ. of the source ~~and~~ and the cause is what Christ did on the Calvary's cross. Here we have two prepositions, \_\_\_\_\_ but (min), and \_\_\_\_\_ (ber) Now our time is up, and we have not got ~~more than~~ these two words yet, which is too bad, because our semester does not run \_\_\_\_\_ We are now almost over ~~the~~ half the semester. For the next time, anyone of ~~you~~ who did not give me your paper, therefore today, giving the outline of Isaiah 55, and be sure ~~and~~ to give to me for the next Monday. Please be sure to turn them in. Those who did give me your outline, please get me another outline, i.e., a different outline. <sup>Please give me possible</sup> That is two or three different

ISAIAH #47

outlines of the chapter before the ~~X~~ next Monday.

... the eleventh verse that hiphil of \_\_\_\_\_ (ssadack) is translated in Daniel, in 12:3, I believe, many did they turn to the righteousness, but every other case that I know of in the Old Testament it means to cause to be considered to be made righteous, rather than to cause ~~or make~~ righteous, except in that one, that is one is a real exception. In the other cases the right corresponding ~~to~~ words in the New Testament words it means to justify, to cause to be considered righteous rather than to cause to be righteous. That is a rare ~~use~~ case- use of the hiphil. ~~That is~~ a- But there is an abundant evidence in ~~this~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~ case of this particular word, and their Rarely, it would be ~~the~~ iniquity it is he who will take them away, who will ... \_\_\_\_\_ (sav saval) means to carry, to lift up, to take away. Our English word bear can have the meaning of carrying in the Old English, but in the present day English it is rarely used in the sense of carrying. There is today more in the sense of holding or enduring, but this word \_\_\_\_\_ (saval) does not mean to endure. This does not mean that He will suffer for their iniquity, but it means he will take away their iniquity, and particularly the punishment of their iniquity as a result. He will free them from it, he will take them away from them. The thought of His enduring or His suffering is not in this particular verb, rather thought of taking away from them, and hence, of course, it is taking away from himself, ~~it~~ ~~is~~ moving from them, rather than enduring or suffering as ~~was~~ ~~thought~~ of by people....

ISAIAH #48

That is of course their attempt to make a sense out of it, ~~but~~ to make \_\_\_\_\_ complete/ but I think that you ~~can~~ can get the ~~same~~ sense by putting the \_\_\_\_\_ with the verb satisfaction. That of course, ... He will accomplish He will see satisfaction, very interesting, they put a word, \_\_\_\_\_

As the King James version suggests, he will see travail of his soul, and seeing that he will be satisfied, as a result of the travail of his soul, he will see satisfaction. So, / I think that the RSV has the meaning, then, ~~so-it-is-very-literal~~ though/ it/ is not very literal in its expression. (Q) I do not think that is so good by knowing him. It can bring out the idea. I am not sure whether we can say that or not. But it does bring out the fact that the him is the objective genitive. To that extent it is good, by knowing him, through their knowing him/. He will bring justification to many through their knowing him. Yes, in the English language, the word ending in ing /~~s~~, I feel personally is very ambiguous. The word running in English, what does it mean in English? English? Well, it does have two distinctive meanings. Two very distinctive meanings. I thought it brought out very clearly by an illustration that I heard at a lecture at the University of Pennsylvania, /in which some years ago the ~~A~~ man tried to ~~kill~~ show the language that people had. He wrote a sentence on a board. The sentence ~~That was li-~~ this: "Visiting relatives can be a nuisance." Now, he said, in this sentence, visiting relatives can be a nuisance, he said, this sentence can have either ~~of~~ one of two distinctive meanings. And the ~~which~~ could be visiting can be a participle ~~or~~/an adjective, that is, the relatives who visit, can be a nuisance, or it can have a ~~meaning~~ meaning of an infinitive. He sometimes calls it a gerund. The word visiting in that sense has exactly the same meaning as the phrase, to visit. To visit relatives can be a nuisance. My, if you once start visiting your ~~friends~~, relatives, your time is not left for visiting friends....

ISAIAH #48

My wife said, I mean my mother said, don't tell your father that you are going to this place. He will want you to look up all ~~your~~ <sup>his</sup> relatives up there, there won't be any time left for you to see your friends. That will illustrate this verse. Visiting relatives can be a nuisance. Taken in either sense, it can be a pleasure, too. But the thing is that it can be an infinitive, "visiting" can exactly mean the phrase, "to visit." Or it can be, if it is a participle, an adjective... The word, to visit, and in that sense of the word, visiting, it is absolutely identical with \_\_\_\_\_. Running is a good exercise, too. It means exactly the same thing. So, I prefer personally not to follow the different things from infinitives, but just follow the infinitive. There is a participle, and there is an infinitive. And the participle in English ends in ing. The infinitive in English may be a simple form of the verb with to before it, ~~but~~ or ~~it~~ it may be with ing, and in English both means the same thing. So, when you have a word which has ing in it, it is ambiguous. It is an awful nuisance that way. Now, the way you translated it, ~~e~~ to take it as an infinitive, knowing him, by knowing him. Of course, the word actually in form is ~~not~~ in it. or is it? I guess it is derived from infinitives. It is a noun, but it is derived from an infinitive, by knowing him. I guess, it could be translated exactly that way as ~~it~~ the infinitive. It is derived from infinitive. By knowing him. So, I guess, it could be translated exactly that way as infinitive, though it is more ~~gener~~ generally taken/ as a ~~nku~~ noun having the essential meaning of the infinitive. The only thing when you say that by the knowledge of him, you are not thinking of so much of the fact that they know ~~th~~ him as the things about him. There is a little different idea. The things that are known rather than the fact of knowing him. (Q) That might not be so bad, ~~But it is understood that it means~~ provided that it is understood

ISAIAH #48

that it is the doctrine about him rather than doctrine of ~~teaching-~~ of his teaching.

It does not ~~simply here mean that it is the tea-~~ mean that simply hearing the

teachings of Jesus, his teachings or his doctrines will save. His teaching is

very important, but our salvation is not what he taught or what he did. So, here

in the context, it is the knowledge of what He did rather than the particularly

96<sup>0</sup>

things that were taught by Him. It is \_\_\_\_\_ the way salvation. Paul

taught it much more fully and clearly than he did. \_\_\_\_\_ the  
\_\_\_\_\_ skipings

fact that it was made available. This then the objective genitive, through the  
Him, through the knowledge of \_\_\_\_\_ it is \_\_\_\_\_ simply through the  
knowledge of/what He has done, I think ~~that this is simply~~ more than/personal

knowledge of Him. \_\_\_\_\_ it is of course true that in salvation you have to

know about it, but I think that on the whole context here knowing what He has

done. And this particular thing should be kept in mind \_\_\_\_\_ personal

knowledge of Him as ~~in~~ an individual. Through knowing him in the sense of

knowing what He has done for us. He will justify, that is, ~~he~~ a righteous one,  
\_\_\_\_\_ will \_\_\_\_\_ the \_\_\_\_\_ for the many.

~~nam~~ namely, my servant / ~~WeH,-/~~ justify for the benefits of/many, Now,

this could be translated for the great one. And of course, that ~~can be true-~~ would

be true, because Jesus has brought justification to many great people as well

as many little ones. But the word, \_\_\_\_\_ (ravav) means, large in size,

and sometimes it can come to mean large in the sense of having great many particles,

large in the sense of being tall. or strong, or something like that. And consequently

great ones as many are both possibilities. But in the context, it would seem

as if many more is thought here, expressed here, rather than great ones.

Of course, here the kings shall shut their mouths at him. You might say that

parallel to this, he will justify the great ones. Certainly his justification is not

combined to great ones, but ~~it is~~ includes great ones, but includes far ~~by~~ *greater*

ISAIAH #48

~~lesser-ones~~ number of lesser ones. So, I ~~finally think that~~ am inclined to think that many is a better translation, particularly since the word means many and maybe three quarters of it would be the idea of great ones much less than the idea of many. So, there are very few clear cases where it is absolutely unquestionable. . . . But ~~if~~ they are not enough to . . . . . Much less than the idea of many in the . . . . . Yes, yes, yes, I am not sure, if you can lay down specific grammatical rules in Hebrew that all verbs are either transitive, or intransitive. I am not sure ~~if~~ if that is possible. kind of definite categorization would be possible. That in Hebrew all verbs are either transitive or intransitive, without \_\_\_\_\_, unless you make a definite categorization like that, ~~unless~~ like in English, if you say, I dreamed a dream last night, that in Hebrew you would not have to say, I dreamed a dream, but just say I dream. I dreamed, and in my dream I saw such and such. . . . That is the distinction that I do not think <sup>you carry</sup> ~~can be carried~~ through absolutely strictly in English, that every verb must be entirely ~~this or that~~ a verb that takes an object or that does not take an object. There are good many which the ~~object~~ <sup>may be</sup> objects may ~~not~~ be expressed or understood, but I think in this case that it is . . . you can take <sup>the</sup> many, certainly ~~it does have the sense of~~ the many certainly has a sense of object, but in a way it is the sense that he does this for their benefit, for the <sup>Because</sup> benefit of the many he brings justification. /Actually they are justified, but you might say it is not justification like the Roman Catholics say, . . . It is rather a setting down on the books, the removal of the penalty which God ~~has~~ never does for anyone, unless he has \_\_\_\_\_. (5.20) These two are definitely separated by Paul. I am inclined to think that in this chapter the emphasis ~~on~~ is on the justification rather than on sanctification. But he bore for ~~our~~ us rather

ISAIAH #48

than has changed us or ~~mak~~ made us \_\_\_\_\_. He justified for many, and the last you notice the emphatic pronoun. In Hebrew you do not need any pronoun.

You just say, he justified, my righteous servant will justify. But here you have \_\_\_\_\_ (hoo) which expresses ... and their iniquity/ies. The word is/used generally

used- for the actualy iniquities, but sometimes for the punishment which the ~~Eane-Cain~~

iniquity brings like where ~~the kings~~ says my iniquity is greater than I can bear.   
not

But there he is/expressing the confession of sin, but declaring that the punishment that God laid upon him was too great for him to bear. \_\_\_\_\_ (4.00)

So the th~~ough~~ thought very often moves over in this word, ~~the~~ Through the punishment which the iniquity itself through the punishment that iniquities

bring with it. The \_\_\_\_\_ you might say, their guilt he is going to take

away. Then we come to the twelfth verse. Yes? (Q) Right here, where God

says, How shall I justify myself? It is perfect evident that God is not saying

that, how am I goin to make muself righteous? And then where it speaks of

a man, God says, that you fail to justify me. It is evident that ~~the man is~~ what it

means that the man does not show to other people that God is just. It is used

in the sense of having to appea~~r~~r righteous. Quite a few times in the Old   
but

Test~~me~~ment, dikaiooo in the New Testament, ~~it is used in~~ the sense of

making righteous... is the only case ~~where~~ m in the Old Testament where we

can say that that would seem to be clearly what is the case where the King James

translate that they turned many to righteousness... 2.98

because it would hardly seem that they are speaking of individuals whom God is going to bless as they have justified many, so of course it may mean that they have brought those to the knowledge of Christ that has led to their justification so it may mean that the actual making ~~righto-~~ righteous ~~is a-~~ isn't necessarily even an \_\_\_\_\_. Yes, I think this is a very safe question that ~~k~~ you have raised. How are we going to know what anything means, in any language. There is only one way to know, and that is the study of that language as it is spoken at the time when the sentence is broken or the thing is said. That is the only way to know with certainty what anything means. Now, ~~we-~~ when we begin to learn any language we begin with translation, and our knowledge of the Old Testament began with ~~transp-~~ lation, ~~a~~ namely with the Septuagint. ~~We-~~ With the Septuagint we saw how they translated the Old Testament. We said that is what this means, but ~~ifx~~ any translation is inaccurate. There is no such thing as an absolutely accurate translation, and when you ~~g~~ begin to learn any language, people begin to tell you well, this means this, and they give you in your language what this means, but ~~w~~ before you go very far you find that the two don't exactly ~~correx-~~ correspond. You can't get a word for word translation. You say this means that, ~~and~~ like the man who thought that the word hide meant. ~~H<sup>E</sup> waw~~ saw how a horse has a hide, so he told a woman he met she had a very beautiful hide, and he told them we don't ~~say~~ say that in English we say skin, so then he sang the hymn, Hide me, Hide me ~~and-~~ in the rock and he said skinning me in the rock. Well, you get into ~~ix~~ all that kind of problem because words don't exactly ~~core-~~ correspond in any two languages, there are all kinds of

ISAIAH # 49

When you want to learn a language ~~is i-~~ it is possible to learn a language with no translation, but it is ~~an x~~ a long, arduous task and in most cases you begin

with a translation but we very soon learn that the translation doesn't prove what the language means. The translation cannot be exact and consequently it merely gives us an introduction to it, and it suggests to us meaning and then as we go and learn to know the language better, we learn how many ways it is different from the language that has been translated and we find that our translation was in many cases very ~~inac~~ inaccurate and so ~~we~~ translation doesn't prove, it suggests, but it is important ~~beca~~ because you get a ~~Septa-Sept-~~ Septuagint translation and you find those Jews when they made this translation thought this Hebrew meant that. Well, that is very helpful and you do find the words used 100 times in the Old Testament and 99 times ~~ix~~ and all of ~~x~~ it means a certain ~~x~~ meaning and then you find one place where the Septuagint translated very carefully, you are pretty sure to say that the Septuagint ~~ak~~ has made a mistake then, ~~but there~~ it may not but there is a ~~x~~ strong deduction that it has. And the second way to determine meaning is by etymology, and ~~may~~ many people ~~the~~ can tell you what things mean by etymology and it used to be tremendous lined up with it, but ~~twody~~ today scholars have come to realize that etymology, like translation, suggests but does not prove. Because in the course of ~~the~~ time, words change ~~and~~ their meanings and to know what their root is can give you a valuable hint as to their possible meaning but does not prove what the meaning is, so etymology, while very helpful is never proven. But the way in which ~~w~~ you can prove what anything means is by getting enough instances ~~xxx~~ that you have the usage clear. If you read, A man ~~want~~ into the house, that doesn't tell you ~~an~~ anything about the house. It is something that a man went in to. But if you read that a man and his family lived in the house, that gives you a better idea of what is meant by house. And you go on ~~x~~ and you get the usages, and in Hebrew the word house has a much broader ~~w~~

meaning than it does in English, like the house of God. We use that ~~description~~ mysterious type of phrase, but in Hebrew, it is a broader meaning than it is in English but ~~you~~ there are many cases in any language where you can't tell ~~me-~~ much from context about a word but there ~~re~~ are cases where it is absolutely clear what the word means from the context. So you get those cases and on those you build your knowledge of what the word means. If you find ten uses where six are rather unclear, it could be a lot of things, but in four of them it is very clear, ~~when~~ why then you see if the meaning of the four will fit the other six, and if it does, you say that is the meaning unless you find other clear teachings where it shows the meaning of the word is broadened, so in this case this ~~x~~ word, the Hiphil of \_\_\_\_\_ there are many cases where the meaning ~~of~~ May \_\_\_\_\_ can't possibly ~~fit~~ fit, but the context requires the ~~man~~ meaning, Cause to appear righteous. Now, we use the King James Version ~~it~~, not as proof of anything but we use it as a suggestion, ~~and~~ and as a very helpful suggestion. We find that the King ~~x~~ James translators have ~~not~~ translated a word 250 times as do and 100 times as make and 19 times as show, we immediately say ~~that~~ that is so different to show a thing and to do ~~x~~ or make it. You have all these cases for do or make, does the word ever mean show. And then when ~~you-~~ we find that  
19  
in every one of these ~~le-~~ cases where it is used with mercy. It says I the Lord will show ~~me~~ mercy, etc. we raise the conclusion ~~that-~~ that in Old English that word \_\_\_\_\_ meant what we would mean today by showing mercy or being merciful and ~~x~~ consequently, you cannot ~~pro-~~ prove that ~~we-~~ when it says that creation is a ~~x~~ vision Moses had over seven days, ~~but-~~ because in seven days God made heaven and earth and the word \_\_\_\_\_ is often translated show, and 19 times ~~it~~ it is translated show mercy, which doesn't mean to give you a picture at all but

means to do & something, and so the translation in the King ~~X~~ James Version is a tremendous help in suggestion but to prove you have to look at context, but they were great scholars who translated it and when they translated it do or make hundreds of times like that , you can take it that that is pretty good evidence that the word can mean do or make. But in a few ~~x~~ cases you want to be sure and look at context, ~~y~~ if you have a very important thing, then you want to look at all the cases. You don't want to take another human being's interpretation as ~~fi~~ final , but you look at the ~~o~~ntext and ~~y~~ou see ~~w~~hat the context proves. In every language that is the way , that is the way to determining the English, by studying the context. The people have realized that in the last 20-30 years and I think that is pretty well accepted among laymen today, that ~~sk~~ it is context usage that determines ~~x~~ meaning, and ~~ne~~ nothing else, but other things ~~as~~ are ~~he~~ helpful and if we are going to ~~axk~~ look at all the context in every case it would take forever, so we use the King James usage and the great help but ~~on~~ not as a proof , and when I say that in all the cases but one it means appear righteous. Now, it depends how much study , but in ~~k~~ looking at the usages ~~of~~ in the concordance, I feel quite justified in making that statement. A person is always at ~~liberty~~ liberty to check these cases, ~~an~~ but a person is always at liberty to check these things and see if I have overlooked them. And I've read that statement in commentaries , in BDB in all cases but one it means to cause ~~x~~ to appear righteous , ~~a~~ that one exception is Daniel 1:3 . Now, we look at D niel 12:3 and see if ~~x~~ it is an exception or not, and I just wonder, when you think of it. /~~Many~~ that turn many to righteousness. ~~Do~~ - Does it mean they that infuse ~~ri~~ghteousness --they that change their character, or does it mean they that cause them to turn to Christ and be ~~just~~ justified, therefore, they that bring justification. Do you have

on the basis of the one case to say the word has a different meaning or do you say that God caused Daniel to use the word which has a meaning that really fits much ~~me~~ better than if you twist it into another meaning that doesn't occur.

This ~~x~~ is a very basic point. Looking ~~down~~ down at verse 12, Miss Luke will you start ~~if~~ it for us please. Yes, the word חָלַק is to divide up into shares. ~~The word divide~~ I don't particularly like. The word portions ~~חֵלֶק~~ - I like better. I will apportion, I will ~~x~~ cause that He shall ~~x~~ have a certain portion, ~~now~~ not like you take an apple and you divide, ~~x~~ but you apportion, you cause that a certain portion will ~~give~~ come to Him, with the great, why do you say with the great when the word is used maybe 100 times translated many, and only ~~20~~ 2-3 ~~translated~~ translated ~~k~~ great. Well, now BDB gives a very excellent argument for making it great. They give an excellent argument but they give it in a very contract fashion, so unless you are familiar with their indication you don't catch it. But BDB gives you maybe a hundred times when this word רַב means many and about 3-4 where they say it means great, and they give a argument. Does ~~x~~ somebody ~~rea~~ recall. They make two lines standing up straight and ~~k~~ after those ~~x~~ two lines, they say ||. That is the symbol that is ~~gx~~ used in geometry. It means ||. ~~atx~~ This line is parallel to . AB is parallel to CD. Well, in BDB they say Isa. 53:12 parallels + ||, and that means that you have two ~~ph~~ phrases here in the Hebrew which are parallel with each other. -BCG BDB very frequently under a word as proof of it ~~smea~~ meaning, or suggestive about it, the statement used in a parallel with ~~another~~ another word, and that is very helpful. As we translate this, Therefore I will apportion to him with many, and coninuing? It's a plural ~~wo~~ so you could say with the mighty gets the idea but this mighty ones is more accurate. And with mighty ones He will apportion spoil. God is

to H<sup>I</sup>m

GOING to apportion/among many and with many ones He will apportion spoil.

~~You say, This man is going to get one o-~~ In other words, you are giving ~~w~~ two opposite statements. You say, This man is ~~going~~ going to get one of two ~~oth-~~ other portions, with many. And with mighty ones He is going to get a portion. Well, are there that many mighty ones. If you are stressing that He is going to apportion the spoil with mighty ~~one~~ s, there is nothing ~~k~~ added to say that the Apportionment is ~~a~~ going to be done with great numbers of people. The importance of it ~~here~~ here is not many but that the fact that ~~max-many~~-- he is going to apportion with ~~th-~~ those who . . . .The next portion says with mighty ones He ~~s~~ is going to take portion. He is going to seize a portion of the spoil with mighty ones He has ~~been~~ to contend with to get it. Well, ~~the~~ n God is going to apportion it ~~k~~ would seem in the light of the parallel to be reasonable to say ~~tha~~ t the ~~strees-~~ stress is not going to be one of the ~~re-~~ great many who get portions but rather on the fact that He is going to get portions which great ones would like to have for themselves. So, in this statement we have the statement ~~a~~ that He is going to apportion spoil with mighty ~~k~~ ones. We have also the thought ~~Q~~ that God is going to apportion with great ones. And ~~yes-~~ yes, Miss Chung. ~~k~~ As mighty or ~~sto-~~ strong but I never thought of it meaning numerous or anything like that. I didn't look it up. I just felt that it was definitely strong. ~~Numerous-~~ Numerous, is that what you mean. You want to see the adjectives on that. Well, I would ~~w~~ want to look in a concordance or to look ~~x~~ in ~~REX~~ BDB and see if the meaning countless or ~~number-~~ numerous does occur. If it is justified, it is a ~~p~~ opposite meaning, with mighty ones or ~~number-~~ ~~nume-~~ numerous ones (it is just the opposite). And I am rather skeptical of ~~tha~~ t.

ISAIAH # 50

I would say that this part of the chapter is telling the results of the Atonement, and the result is that He is ~~going to~~ going to divide spoil with mighty ones. And it means

that He is going to accomplish great things in the Atonement, but it is not a universal Atonement. I would say the mighty ones here would be <sup>shaken</sup> ~~be taken~~ and His emissaries, and they are mighty. They seem to hold this ~~work~~ world in their grip. There is no way of escape, but because Christ has performed the Atonement, Jesus is ~~going~~ going to take away from Satan a portion of the spoil ~~which~~ which He has, in other words, it doesn't teach that He is taking away everything away from Satan at all. It teaches that there are those who will believe on His name and be ~~rescued~~ rescued from Satan's hand, they will be apportioned to Him by the Lord and be seized as spoil by Him, the result ~~of~~ of that which ~~has~~ he has done. I don't ~~know~~ know of any other means. Have you heard of any other. If you take them both as numerous. Therefore, I will apportion to Him among many --the last part can be with or sign of the accusative. He will apportion mighty ones as ~~for~~ spoil. That would be a possible rendering ~~that~~ t ought it hardly seems an accurate one. I think it is much more natural ~~to~~ ~~see~~ especially to take ~~the~~ the 97 as with, that is the mighty ones who ~~looked~~ looked as if they would take all the spoil. He is going to take a portion away. AW-- (Q) That is an excellent question. On what basis do we say that the I is God. Well, what are the various ~~possibilities~~ ~~posi~~ possibilities. Therefore, I will divide him a portion. I ~~do~~ do not see any other ~~im--~~ case in the immediate vicinity where the Lord speaks in the first person, He is spoken of in verse 10 ~~as~~ that It pleased the Lord to ~~be~~ bruise Him, and at the end of ~~x~~ verse 10, the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand. The Lord certainly in mind here, and the Lord very, very frequently in Isaiah is spoken of in the 3rd person, the fact that we do not have any other case in ~~this~~ this chapter where I is used for the Lord. Just ~~gl~~ glancing at it I don't see any case ~~except~~ ~~ee--~~ except in chapter 53 where it is clear that the ~~per~~ 1st person is used to mean God. Yes, there is in verse 11. By His knowledge shall my servant, who is the my. My righteous

servant , I hadn't thought of the problem . And I couldn't think of anything else the I could mean. Here my servant is spoken of twice in the chapter. Certainly that isn't Israel but God's ~~v~~ servant. Kings shall shut their mouths at Him. There are a great many kings who ~~refuse~~ refused to accept Christ and who belong to Satan, but the knowledge of this, ~~obscure~~ obscure sufferer way back in the back woods somewhere , the knowledge of that is going to reach ~~see~~ some of the great kings, and some ~~fe-the~~ of them are going to be saved but not all of them. It says the in the English doesn't it. Kings shall shut their mouths at ~~them~~ Him, but I don't believe there ~~x~~ was any the kings in the Hebrew, I am quite sure it is just Kings....The ~~knowle-~~ knowledge of what He has done is going to come to many great ones. It is going to come to ~~some~~ of all nations, ~~and~~ Certainly, between the time of Christ and today , ~~ix~~ it has not come to ~~ax~~ the majority of the people of the world. And certainly not the majority of the great kings and the great leaders, but there ~~x~~ have been a very sizable number of individuals among them who have accepted our Saviour, and here I don't believe that the Universalists teach that as a result of the Atonement of Christ, all people are saved can properly be sought from this chapter at all . It is only some who will believe , as Paul says in Roman~~s~~ , Not all believe~~e~~, for Isaiah says, Who has ~~beliee~~ believed , , , it is mistranslated ~~ix~~ report in the English. It is very interesting in the Greek there it says, Paul says Not all have ~~x~~ believed , Isaiah says Who has believed our ακουω so then faith comes by ακουω ~~M~~ and in English we say who has believed our report , so then faith comes by hearing. ~~But-~~ What does hearing have to do with report. But in the Greek the word akoua means hearing or it means the thing that is heard and that is exactly like the \_\_\_\_\_. Who has believed the thing ~~the~~ that we heard , and that is exactly like

the Hebrew here. Who has believed the King that we heard. So then faith comes by hearing. When you get what the words ~~man~~ mean, Paul makes a lot more ~~see~~ sense, than he does simply in the English. Who has believed our hearing, who has believed what we have heard. Faith comes by hearing. Not everybody believes ~~is~~ but very, very few have believed who have heard. Of course the word Kingdom is used in various ~~see~~ senses. I would say that the Kingdom of God in the full sense includes everything that happens. Satan is a part of the ~~king~~ kingdom of God because Satan can't lift a hand unless God permits it. So the Kingdom of God includes ~~is~~ everything. There is another sense in the ~~chapter~~ scripture in which Satan is rebellion ~~k~~ against God, and those who are Satan's followers are in rebellion against God, and therefore, in this sense, the kingdom of God includes all who are seeking to do God's will, and they are members of the kingdom of God ~~becaus~~ because they are recognizing their King and trying to follow Him. And there is a sense in which ~~is~~ ~~is~~ this kingdom of God, in which Satan has no place will be established all over the whole world. So, the people have the kingdom age, = Christ rules here. And his rule is to be all throughout the world, and no one can ~~disobey~~ disobey him, and we will have it ~~then~~ then, and the word kingdom will include all these three aspects, the universal, absolute power of God, the power of God as expressed today to those who believe, the absolute power of God, the power of God as expressed today to those who believe, the power of God as expressed through Christ. During the reign the Satan is bound. I am afraid our time is up, and we have to finish this verse first. I like to \_\_\_\_\_ verse 22. The way every body was coming ~~is~~ at the beginning of the hour, I was wondering

ISAIAH #50

if it would be .....

A dictionary is an extremely useful thing, useful as a tool, not used as  
 an infallible source. A little dictionary, a pocket dictionary <sup>can be</sup> ~~is~~ an extremely  
 useful thing, and also extremely misleading, because no one <sup>word</sup> ~~in~~ one language  
 exactly corresponds to a word in another language. ~~Y~~ I well remember when  
 I have been in Germany for a short time, there was one word that I kept hearing  
 people saying, and I had no idea what it meant. I used to carry a tiny, little  
 dictionary in my pocket, and I looked up the word, and it gave the meaning for it,  
 toerable, the word ziemlich. ~~Otherwise,~~ The word was ziemlich. They would  
 say, Are you warm enough ziemlich? Is it , ... did you get much sleep last  
 night, ziemlich? How many of such things did you accomplish ziemlich?  
 Everything was zimelich. And the dictionary said, tolerable, and I ~~simply~~  
 could not think quite a while what it meant, until I finally found out ~~that~~ the  
~~catec~~ <sup>you</sup> context I gave ~~just now probably show-~~ will show you , ... it took ~~of~~ me  
~~of~~ quite a while until I got on that subject. This word ~~men-s~~ means a ~~fiar-~~  
 fair amount. A certain amount, but not a great deal. But a fairly good ~~of~~ amount.  
 And that is the word the dictionary did not give me any clue ~~for~~ a long time.  
 That is exactly what it meant. One time when I first entered into a restaurant,  
 probably I have mentioned to you already, I wanted my bill, and I did not  
 know what the bills ~~was~~, and so I looked up in the diction, and it gave me  
 two words, ~~and-i~~ <sup>the word</sup> It gave ~~Rechnung-and~~ Rechnung, and Schnaber ~~1~~, but I was  
 afraid ~~of-getting-it-out-and-ask-them,~~ <sup>2</sup> get it out and ~~wh-~~ out which one of them  
 and ask them, and so I looked both of these words in back, and I found out that  
 Rechnung was what I <sup>my account</sup> wanted <sup>1</sup> /but the word Schnabe is a bill or \_\_\_\_\_.(3.05)

ISAIAH #50

if-So, if I had said, "~~Bring me~~ Bringen Sie mir \_\_\_\_\_ Schnabel , a bill or a piece of \_\_\_\_\_, they would have had no idea at all what I was talking about, when I wanted a bill for my food, for my meal. It would not suggest any/ such thing to them. A little dictionary can be a tremendous help, but can be extremely misleading. If any body can get into the second year Hebrew, it is very foolish to make any use of a little dictionary, because it will lead you astray more often ~~than~~ and even harmful. Now this dictionary like Brown, Driver and Briggs' is extremely helpful, not because it is an infallible guide or rule, but it <sup>gives</sup> ~~has~~ more evidence, and it gives ~~a trial more definitely~~ and it has tried to ~~give you a~~ more definitely to give you an exact idea as to what is meant by the word. But you have to get back to the dictionary makers, if you are going to know what the fact is on certain things that are all obscure in any language. You have to find what is the ~~dea-~~ <sup>their</sup> ~~data~~ on which they make/conclusions. <sup>I have just noticed</sup> ~~You notice a very interesting thing here~~ in the Brown, Driver, and Briggs. <sup>much,</sup> You look up <sup>q</sup> the word in here, \_\_\_\_\_ (rav) which is an adjective, /many, great, under that and so on, number one is much in substance, gold, silver, and quite a few under that great many , and then in number two, \_\_\_\_\_ often or great. a. of space, space quite a few, b. specifically, strong, and they get ~~two~~ or three, and then they say, Isaiah 53:12, \_\_\_\_\_ parallel to ( \_\_\_\_\_ (assummi). Brown, ~~D~~river, and Briggs here ~~9:13-~~ <sup>on</sup> page 913 it says, the word \_\_\_\_\_ (rav) usually means <sup>al</sup> many, or numerous, and in a few cases, well twenty or thirty cases ~~put~~ together, means great, but it is small comparatively ed with many cases where it means many. And only once instance they give as being , they say, \_\_\_\_\_ (sorabim) as substantive, Isaiah 53:12 parallel with \_\_\_\_\_ (assummi). Here they say that approximately it is parallel with \_\_\_\_\_ (assummi). Here it means

ISAIAH #50

~~it means~~ here great rather than numerous. That is what they say on page 913.  
Now if you look back here on page 783,

ISAIAH #51

You find there on page 783 the meaning of \_\_\_\_\_ (assum) which it says  
(ravvim)  
here you can tell here ( \_\_\_\_\_ (assumi) means great, ~~it-~~ because it is  
parallel with \_\_\_\_\_ (assumi), but if you look for \_\_\_\_\_ (assum),  
they say that it is an adjective which means mighty or numerous, and then there--  
~~is- pro- they- proceed-~~ they proceed to give you a great many cases under  
where people  
number one, /it means mighty, and especially /strong in numbers and waters, mighty waters,  
His mighty one ,  
his mighty water, for instance a clods of a lion. They say that number meaning  
they say  
numerous or countless. They say, all of these /are cases of-~~para~~ where it  
is used in parallel with \_\_\_\_\_ (rav). And the only cases which they list here  
are four cases. Only four cases where they say it means numerous or countless,  
they say that in the way  
~~they put~~ all of them /they know that it means numerous or countless., because it  
is parallel with \_\_\_\_\_ (rav). But over in the other page they say that in once  
means  
case they know that \_\_\_\_\_ (rav) ~~is-~~ strong because it is parallel with \_\_\_\_\_  
(assum). And here under the cases where assum means numerous or countless,  
because it is a~~p~~ parallel with \_\_\_\_\_ (rav), they give that very case, and they  
a  
say that as /substantive it equal/s many, Isaiah 53:12, where as in the  
other page- \_\_\_\_\_ (ravvim) as substantive ~~it-~~ equals strong , equals many, great  
So,  
~~Isaiah 53:12.~~ because it is a~~p~~ parallel with \_\_\_\_\_ (assum), Is. 53:12. They  
have the exactly opposite things under the two cases. Each of them usualy  
means something, but occasionally means different ones. ~~Each of them~~

ISAIAH #50 51

And each of them once means the other meaning, because each of them ~~are~~ is parallel with the other one. It is not at all surprising that the tremendous work of this dictionary like this ~~which~~ on which three men worked on ~~on~~ put a great deal of time for many, many years, that there should be such a ~~con~~ contradiction, not at all surprising. I imagine there might be many instances like this, but it simply brings out the fact that you cannot ~~∕~~ take the dictionary as if it were God's word, saying, it says ~~/~~ so, and therefore that is true.

You take it, when it says, like it says, \_\_\_\_\_(rav), it means many, and gives you a great many instances, while you say that with the instances it is very unlikely that there are some errors, and there might be so, and extremely unlikely.

when  
And/they give you the word, \_\_\_\_\_(assum), mighty or numerous, and they give you quite a few instances where \_\_\_\_\_(rav), meaning many, quite a ~~size~~ sizable number, and you notice also that the word \_\_\_\_\_(assum), the noun similar to it \_\_\_\_\_(ossow), means a bone, or substance, or self, derived from it, and there ~~is~~ are two other nouns that are similar to it, and which means mighty or strength, one which means defense, you gather that they are put together

for saying that the meaning mighty is ~~definitely~~ a definite ~~∕~~ meaning for this word. But does this word ever mean numerous?/And one of them you know because

it is parallel with \_\_\_\_\_(rav), and then (rav) they say sometimes means strong, and ~~one of the cases~~ the proof is that it is parallel with \_\_\_\_\_(assum). Well, it is not at all strange that ~~words have all kinds of meaning~~ the word has various

Look at meanings. ~~Our~~ English word, light. I imagine. I do not know ~~English~~ enough ~~to~~ about the Anglosaxon English, but I imagine that our English word, light, represents ~~the~~ two different words that are formed together. Because light

ISAIAH #51

color and light wave are so different. You can take a heavy book, and you can say a light book, I want the light book, not the black one, not the dark one. You can take a black one, a small one, then you say, I want the light one, meaning that it is the black one, because it is small too. /Very, very different meanings that our word light ~~may have fa~~ has, maybe two different words ~~have formed together one word~~ are fallen together. But very often a word <sup>s</sup> develop/in (10.50) can such a way that it develops ~~to~~ two very divers meanings as it is used into two different directions/ that are quite different from each other. But to be sure, I would say that the word \_\_\_\_\_ (assum), the word has ~~a~~ one unified clear meaning , until you find the proof that you have more than one meaning. That ~~is,~~ I think, is a safe rule to follow. And ~~you notice that~~ ordinarily in these instances it does not make much differences. You take the instances which they give here/ under assum it is mighty or numerous. <sup>a</sup> in a very <sup>number of</sup> in/large number of cases, ~~it is a rather~~ sizable /cases, but then the meaning numerous or countless, they give only four instances ~~where~~ to prove that they can never mean that. <sup>Now</sup> /The first one ~~is~~ of these cases is in Amos 5:12, and ~~there~~ we read, in Amos 5:12, /"For I know your manifold transgressions, your mighty sins," now they say that since manifold means ~~many~~, therefore, they say that the King ~~James~~ James is wrong ~~in saying~~ in saying that it is mighty sins, because it is numerous. But mighty would make just as good sense here. I know your , there are two ideas ~~as to~~ are very well put \_\_\_\_\_ (9.25) ~~And also they are great, the~~ ~~sins~~ are ~~many~~ many, and they also are great, and so there is no reason there to say that \_\_\_\_\_ (assum) has to mean many, ~~an~~ It just can as well mean mighty. And it does not ~~make~~ make much difference to the sense of Amos , which of these two mean. And the next one is in Ps. 35:18, and there in Ps. 35:18 we read,

ISAIAH #51

"I will give thee thanks in the great congregation, I will praise thee among much people," and the word much has a marginal note there: it is strong. I will sing among the strong people. And they translate \_\_\_\_\_ (assum) here as  
or  
many, much people, but the margin ~~sa~~ also says/strong, and as a matter of fact it does not make a great difference. Does it mean ~~that~~ I will praise thee among

many different nations? or does it mean that I will praise thee among strong nations? Does it ~~meak~~ make much differenece, does it? or does it ~~mean that I-~~ , but I do not ~~✓~~ see how you could prove

it in that case. And then the other two they give, and one of them is found in  
is the one

Isaiah 53:12, which ~~has which has to go on~~, about which we are concerned now, as to what it means is ~~not proved in one way or in another.~~

8 and then ~~the other~~ it certainly does not prove in one way or the other. The

thing that we are trying to investigate, and then the other is Probers 7:26,

where it says, "For she hath cast down many wounded: yea, many strong men have been slain by her." It does not say that it is because many were wounded.

Therefore it must also mean many or numerous. It cannot ~~b~~ mean strong. It

should be many. In parallel, why can't you have two ideas, one of them numerous

~~n~~ one of them strong so they give only four ~~n~~ instances for the meaing of numerous

from it. I question whether any one of the four is at all in the nature of a proof

--that is to say, the word means in ~~msn~~ many, many cases mighty. There are only

four cases that ~~k~~ they say proves the meaning ~~numb-mn~~ numerous. Everyone is

questionable. Mighty could do just as well in any one of them. So that I believe

in the case of 777 we have definite evidence that ~~whic~~ while it usually means

~~numberou~~ numerous , it might mean great. In the case of 789 we have definite

evidence that it ~~is~~ usually ~~means~~ means mighty. I'm not ~~is~~ ready to say it could

never mean ~~numb-~~ numerous, but I strongly question whether there is any evidence

that it can ever mean numerous. Of course this is not a matter of two absolutely

water-tight things, because when you ~~is~~ speak of a great nation. The nation is

You can say the nation is great because it is numerous, so when you speaking of a nation, either the two meanings are standing for same thing. A great nation you might say is a ~~numbe-~~ ~~n~~ numerous nation. A ~~numbereu-~~ ~~numerouxs~~ nation is pretty abt to be a mighty nation. The idea is so close when you are ~~thing~~ thinking of large aggregations, that is easy to see how the meanings can fit together, but when you ~~sap~~ speak of individuals, then it ~~mea~~ makes a big difference. Does he have many automobiles, or does he have powerful automobiles. That would be a very different idea. Now, in our country, it could be a ~~ste-ste~~ strong ~~axb~~ army because it had many tanks or because it had strong tanks. The strength of the tanks could be made up of their number or ~~k~~ it could be made ~~α~~ up of the strength of the individuals. When you speak of the army as a whole, and so we have a real problem with this verse ~~that~~ we are looking at now. ~~The~~ <sup>AS</sup> it is translated ~~k~~ here in our King James ~~Verse-~~ ~~V~~ersion we read. There fore I will divide Him a portion with the great and He will divide the spoil with the ~~stea-~~ strong, and we notice that it does not say the great or the ~~g~~ strong in Hebrew. It is perhaps ~~the~~ better to leave out the word the though it is very difficult to ~~exa~~ctly correspond the use. Latin got ~~an~~ along without any the at all. But some ~~a~~ language we throw them in everywhere, but I think you get a little more accurate and literal when you don't put in the that isn't expressed in the Hebrew here. Say, ~~but~~ but it is plural, therefore, will I divide Him a portion or I will apportion Him with ~~ste-~~ strong ones or with great ones and He shall apportion the spoil with strong ones. It's plural and there is no ~~k~~ definite statement in it. It is great ones or strong ones. Now, which is it. It ~~is~~ it numerous ones. Can you make them both numerous. You want to make one numerous and the other mighty, or do you want to do ~~what~~ what the King

~~X~~James does, to make them both mighty. I would say ~~tha~~ the first one could be ~~numb-~~ numerous, no question. I think that we have proof that ~~is~~ it is not impossible that it means great ones or strong ones. The second one ~~is~~ there is absolute proof that it can mean ~~sto-~~ strong ones. I question very seriously whether there is any proof that it can mean numerous, so I ~~th~~ would think that the possible translation would be either as the King James, I would divide a portion with the ~~grat-~~ great ~~tax~~ and He will divide the spoil with the strong or I will divide Him a portion with many different ones and He will divide the spoil with the strong. There are those two ~~possibilite-~~ possibilities. I question very seriously whether it is a possibility, therefore I will divide a portion with many and He will divide the spoil with numerous, I question very seriously. We have when we have stated this goes as far ~~a~~ I believe as linguistic study can take us, and I think we should see just ~~ha~~ how far it can take us. Exactly what forms are the ~~points~~. Exactly what can we tell from the meaning, and when you get that far, in almost any language you reach a point where there are certain possibilities of interpretation and then you have to see which of these possibilities make ~~esen~~ sense and which don't, ~~a~~ because you can ~~te~~ take almost any sentence in a newspaper and interpret it in such ~~a~~ a way as to make no ~~ix~~ sense ~~a~~ whatever. You ~~hve~~ have to interpret it in such ~~as w-~~ a way as to make sense, but when you find a ~~wy~~ way that does make sense, then you find the way that fits the context. And so let us consider of these ~~p~~ three possibilities. Really two I would say, Let us consider what sense they would get. ~~ix~~If this ~~would~~ meant therefore I will apportion him a division with many different ones, what would it mean? Well, we have our context. This is one, who had no deceit in ~~k~~ His mouth and yet He ~~die-~~ died. It pleased the Lord to bruise Him. He has put Him to grief but this one is going to prolong His days. The ~~k~~ pleasure of the Lord shall ~~spe~~

x prosper in His hand. He will see satisfaction as a result of the travail of His soul. Through Him will many be justified. He is going to bear their iniquities. Now, what sense do you get out of these ~~did~~ different possibilities. That is our next problem.

ISAIAH # 52

I have not up to the present ~~xxx~~ moment seen any suggestive interpretation that takes the first one as numerous or many to which I have sense a ~~xx~~ sensible meaning that fits the context . That doesn't prove there isn't one at all . Anyone of us can overlook things . And there ~~x~~ may be a ~~xx~~ meaning that will flood ~~x~~ of light on the whole passage , once we catch what it is , with taking it in that sense. I doubt of the ~~hundreded~~- hundreds of people who know Isaiah 53, it's one of the most beloved chapters in the Old Testament. My guess that 3/4s of them , maybe 9/10s of them, have never stopped to think , what does this mean. ~~Is~~ will apportion Him. I will divide Hima portion with the ~~grat~~- great and He will divide a portion with the strong. ~~e/10s of them would have never stopped,~~  
I imagine  
~~and thought~~ 9/10s of them/never stop and think, what does this word mean any way? The word before is very clear. The word word after is very clear. They rejoice in the great blessing of the chapter. But they do not stop to think what these words mean. And if they would stop to think of it, it is not at all impossible that some of them would come up with an interpretation that I would have never thought of it. But the only interpretation that I have been able to find ~~is~~ seems to make sense is the interpretation that God is saying that this one who is going to perform this tremendous act of performing this atonement is  
a  
as a result of it going to be able to take away ~~the~~ portion of that which certain

ISAIAH #52

very strong ones have in their possession. And the only strong one<sup>s</sup> can think of would be Satan and his servants. I do not know what else it could mean.

I do not see how numerous may be considered, but I would be very much interested in any suggestion. (Q) Yes, we are heirs, even joint-heirs with Christ.  
Pickette, Miss

We are heirs before God. This word... where is this word joint-heirs. Yes.

I do not see how this would fit in the teaching of ...Rom. 8:17? "And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together." We are heirs with Christ, then, with the great power and grace of God. Christ has accomplished so much, ~~by~~ ~~but~~ by his atonement that he is going to share with many his prey. It seems ~~that~~ <sup>to me</sup> that he is rather winning us than we can share at all, rather than sharing away from any one of us(.) Maybe there may be a way that I have seen it. Many for the verse is stronger than \_\_\_\_\_. That is of course, the most common meaning.

I do not think that the second meaning is/ strong is so common. But the first one, there is a/ good proof that it can mean great, though many is ~~far f-~~ by far usage. a strong he most common meaning. But there are few cases where God seems ~~into~~ <sup>quite</sup> ~~mean~~ to be/ a definite meaning. Of course, you think of something as being \_\_\_\_\_

(rav). That is not numerous, but big. Of course, the big ones is the idea ~~is~~ there. The size of the word, \_\_\_\_\_ (kovrin), means all or anything. or it It can mean a lot of individuals and can mean one individual- thing in its entirety.

There is a distinction between the two meanings, but it is not so conspicuous. ... But it does mean.... It would be far clear. There is no question of that. Taking it as meaning that satan is taking it away, \_\_\_\_\_ instead of the world. with the great ones, with the strong ones. There seems to be a definite case of plural usage. Does it make a bit difference? Now, some have suggested

ISAIAH #52

Therefore, I will give him a portion consisting of many, but I do not think the word, \_\_\_\_\_ carry that idea. (9.90) I will give him a portion among the many. It would sound as if many will get portions and he is one of them, rather than that many are given to him as a portion. It hardly seems to be \_\_\_\_\_ ( ) as a proper preposition is used in that sense. Of course, in the second part we have \_\_\_\_\_ (aph) which could be a \_\_\_\_\_ that he will apportion even with the might ones, he will take some of the might ones. That does not seem to be the case. It is rather awkward, but certainly not impossible. in parallel with \_\_\_\_\_, it might be better w/ to take ti \_\_\_\_\_ rather than \_\_\_\_\_. Well, now, you all better think about it, and then some times later you can bring in some suggestions to the class. To me, it would seem I would have no question as to <sup>fore</sup> what it means. There ~~is~~ God is going to take away from that which Satan has, and I am going to give to Christ. But it would seem to me that this fits the ~~min~~ meaning of the whole passage that as a result of his atonement some that Satan holds in his power is to be taken away from Satan and given to Christ. With the mighty strong one, Satan will divide the portion. But it is plural. Who would be the other strong ones beside Satan? It is my impression that Satan has quite a few subordinates. There is no other .....

(8.00) Now unless somebody has an idea there, if you do not have it, why bring it later to the class, ... we will examine it, and see if it stands the text of a careful examination. \_\_\_\_\_ k Please be sure to have in mind exactly what this Hebrew word means. You know this Hebrew word is used in both phrase. יָחַד-לְפָנָיו I will divide for him, I will apportion for him. And then he will apportion, פָּדָה spoil. Well, let us look into

ISAIAH 52

the Englishman's Concordance, and see what we find in the passages that we use the word. This word, פָּצַח, to apportion something that belongs to one part of, or \_\_\_\_\_ or \_\_\_\_\_. Now the verb פָּצַח he says in Deut. 4:19, The Lord thy God has divided it.... God has given you this land. ~~Jeremiah~~ Nehemiah 13:13 says:: "... their office ~~to~~ was to distribute into their brethren." Joshua 22:8, "... divide the spoil of ~~much raiment~~ your enemies with your brethren." That is to take the spoil, and then distribute among them, apportion them among ~~them~~ those who will \_\_\_\_\_

29(30)

II Sam. ~~9:13~~ 19: "Thou and ~~thy~~ Ziba \_\_\_\_\_ ~~take the land and~~ divide the land ~~between~~---, taking the land and / dividing it between. It is translated partner in

/Prov. 29:24 ~~24~~ : "Whoso is partner with a thief. If it does not mean who is

6:25

stealing with somebody else, but ~~we~~ who is dividing up with a thief that ~~which~~ ~~wj~~- which has been sold. Now, of course divide here is the Piel. It is ~~is~~ in the ~~pe~~- piel quite a few ~~thi~~- times. Genesis 42:9, Genesis 49:7, I Kings 18:6, etc. ~~Psalms~~ Micah 2:4; Psalms 68:12. I think the idea is ~~the~~ taking of something and dividing it up into sections ~~ix~~ and giving it to different ones, particularly after a marauding expedition or a ... where you take what they have and they partial it out, but I ~~x~~ feel ~~w~~ that we have here a picture of Christ as the strong man who has ~~oe~~ overcome Satan by His atonement and who is God is going to take away from Satan some of what Satan has and give it to Christ, and Christ is going to ~~divid~~- divide up with Satan. There Will be strong ones. They are too strong for human beings. We are ~~tok~~- told we cannot resist the ~~Devild~~ devil. Submit ~~ours~~ our selves to God, then resist the devil and he will flee from us. Even ~~te~~- the archangel dared not to give a railing accusation, because ~~the~~ Lord rebuked him. Satan is much too ~~ste~~ strong for human beings, but in the power of the Lord we can overcome and he through

this world, he is the  
 Adam's fall has taken ~~the~~ prince of this world and he holds it in subjection and  
 certainly the ~~var~~ events of the last few days if anything will show how complete  
 he is holding great sections of the ~~peop~~ people of the world in his ~~force~~ and  
 blinding their eyes lest they should see the truth. But our ~~k~~Lord by His ~~acr~~ atonement  
 does not immediately destroy the power of Satan. In the end his power will be com-  
 pletely destroyed and he will be cast into the lake of fire, but some of those, many  
 of those whom Satan has taken captive will also go into the lake ~~of~~ fire with him,  
 He does not still have any control over them but they are not ~~delivered~~ delivered from  
 him, but men are delivered as a result of . . .But to my mind the meaning of this passage  
 would be very very clear if it were singular instead of plural. I am not a hundred  
 percent satisfied but I can't think of any other interpretation that ~~will fit~~ seems to  
 fit the preposition. We are referring to the Jews. And ~~he~~ he , the he in the second  
 part surely means the Servant of the Lord rather than the nation as a whole . If we  
 had ~~not~~ no versions in ~~this~~- this chapter which seems to be nations . It is he that  
 is ~~doing~~ doing the work for which the Israelite nation is called. By the time we get  
 to this chapter I think we are pretty well individualized on the one servant of the  
 Lord. I ~~doubt~~ doubt if the Jewish nation could be the He. I will apportion him could  
 conceivably be therefore, because of what Christ has done . Therefore , I will give  
 the Jewish nation a section along with many other nations. It could be but there  
 doesn't seem to ~~be~~ much else in the chapter that fits with it but ~~it~~ it ~~could~~ could make  
 pretty good sense with the first one . My ~~greatest~~ greatest difficulty is that it doesn't  
 seem to have much else to relate to and many ~~of~~ other passages it would ~~be~~ be a very  
 natural , logical . . . .Speaking of the principalities and powers, that's indicating  
 not just one but Satan and His emissaries , the . . .it is not ~~thinking~~ thinking . . .

giving us the warrant of ~~thing-thinking~~ thinking that in this case it is not ~~thing~~ think-  
 ing individually but principalities which include many. But from these many ~~por-~~  
 tions that are leading ~~m~~ human beings ~~astray-and~~ astray and leading them in the  
 road of perdition, Christ is going to rescue ~~them-from-the~~ many from out of death  
 as a result of ~~k~~ what ~~he~~ He has done on ~~the~~ the Cross. At any rate there is no universalism  
 here. There is no statement that all are going to be saved. Christ saved all those  
 who believed on Him.

ISAIAH # 53

...and then, when Christ seizes something from Satan it can again become spoil )?)  
 which is taken away from Satan by force, but of course the force is the accomplishment  
 on ~~the~~ the cross and ...He is as a result of that ...~~α~~ Christ ~~sea seized-~~ seizes a  
 portion of the spoil which Adam had ....They could have said that ~~they-will~~ God will  
 recapture all that Satan had taken, but it does not say that. It says ~~that~~ they are  
 going to divide rather than that He is going to ~~res~~ rescue from Satan. And of course  
 that is the teaching that you will find in the New Testament that all who believe on  
 Christ ...My inclination would be to feel that everything in else that Satan has taken  
 is to be ~~g~~ recovered and therefore I would think that if other things are ~~k~~ referred to  
 He will deliver them or he will rescue from Satan or something like that rather than  
 that He will divide from Satan. The division seems to me to apply only to humanity  
 --I know of no ~~reateson~~ reason to think that there is anything else involved. Lost  
 humanity that doesn't believe ~~k~~ in Christ, ~~as~~ as far as they are concerned, Satan ~~ha~~ s  
 accomplished His will in leading them into ~~perfp~~ perdition. And while they are ~~no~~ in  
 no sense under his ~~power~~ anymore after ...It does not directly say that. It rather  
 suggests that he is able to take over from Satan ~~that-~~ as a result of what he has done.  
 Therefore, he will be able to take a portion of what he has ~~as-~~ accomplished on the

cross. And it goes right on of course and says ...This is going to happen because He has poured out His soul unto death, and was ~~numbered~~ numbered with the transgressors and bare the sin of many. This is how He is able to divide the spoil with strong ones. It ~~is~~ doesn't seem that numerous ones fits at all. But strong ones or mighty ones does fit very well.

Now we look at chapter ~~12~~ 52 and what is the comparative in the chapter. It is addressed to a group of people is it not. It is not addressed to any individual. It is addressed to a group of people and this group of ~~a~~ people is thought of as a unit. And ~~is~~ this ~~unit~~ unit is called Zion, and from the context I think we can safely say that this is addressed to the people of Israel in exile, unless you are going to say this ~~going to~~ is ~~going~~ looking way on beyond the exile. But I think that most of us will agree that it is addressed to the people of Israel. What is the next imperative, Mr. Kim? And who is that addressed to? ~~is~~ It is a collective, addressed to a group of ~~pe~~ people thought of as ~~a~~ a unit and it is definitely Israel. The next one, ~~Miss~~ Miss Chung, you have awake and awake, and put on thy beautiful garments. These four addressed to the saints. It would seem to be ~~as~~ addressed to Israel, thought of as a unit. Collective address is it not. And you have, Shake thyself ~~a~~ from the dust, and take your seat. Loose yourself from the bands of thy neck, You ~~have all~~ ~~these imperatives in these two verses and they are addressed to Israel thought of~~ Verse two is surely addressed to Israel in exile. It would ~~seem~~ seem to be in these two verses used interchangeably. I don't say that ~~they there~~ you might not in some cases use one of them in a different sense than the other. Of these two verses the two ~~is~~ seem certainly to be used interchangeable. Miss Luke what is the next imperative? We have looked at verses one and two and we noticed a number of them in verses

one and two , all of them addressed ~~α~~ to a collective group of individuals, the people of Israel. None before nine. Alright in verse nine, to whom is ~~αα~~ it addressed? In other words in verse nine it would ~~seem~~- seem to be a figurative expression, would it not. A rhetorical command. Not given to people perhaps but ~~given~~- given ~~α~~ to a place. Given to a place which is thought of as ~~haven~~- in desolation as a result of the captivity and now as if it rejoices that it is no longer to be a place of ~~desol~~  
de desolation but a place of joy, and so it is a figurative expression addressed to certain bits of material, the places which were ~~α~~ one time places of joy are now become places of desolation ~~α~~ and are going to become places of joy again. So it ~~is~~ it really have relevance to Israel but is addressed <sup>figuratively</sup> to these places rather than people. Mr. Kim , the next one. This would mean that the ruins of Jerusalem. <sup>b</sup> It was not the place. Speaking of the place as being happy on account of all the joy of the people and being sad because it is left in ruin and the people are all gone. And ~~not~~ now it is told to rejoice again. It is a figurative expression. The meaning is very clear. It is saying that Israel is again going to have joy. This ~~is~~ is a figure of ~~speech~~- speech by addressing material things. And the next one Mr. Kim. Every case in verses one and two is addressed in the singular ~~feme~~ feminine because the people are thought of collectively as a woman, a collective term to refer to the people of ~~α~~ Israel, but now in verse 9 we have a plural . We are speaking to the many different parts of Jerusalem. Instead of a collective being ~~all~~-altogether in the singular, possessing them individually as a plural but one plural expression, and while verse eleven is very different from verse 9 because it is not addressing places. It is addressing people and it is not addressing places in Palestine but people in Babylonia, yet is it ~~agrees~~-agrees agrees with verse 9 in that it is plural again, it is not a collective addressing something thought of as ~~α~~ one unit, ~~α~~ but it is ~~one~~ plural addressing a number of individuals who come in one category, and what is the category ~~α~~ in which

~~these~~ these people come in verse eleven. Who are the people in distress? Well, I don't think necessarily it is only they. ~~There~~ They're included, ~~yet~~ yes. Well, you might say but I think you could be ~~x~~ more specific than that. Who was he talking to? The Babylonians. He is ~~spek~~ speaking in the beginning of it surely to the people of Isreal. Depart , go out from ~~the mid~~ them. Go ~~x~~ ye out from the midst of ~~tx~~ her. He is speaking to the individual people of ~~Isre~~ ~~Isre~~ ~~Israel~~. Now, naturally, it is the Godly people that he thinks of. There is a progress that ~~ix~~ He ~~x~~ thinks of. It starts in People are told ~~ix~~ to leave. ~~God~~ Go out from Babylon. The inference being that you can get out, you are not being held in subjection. Or, you might say this is addressed to all the ~~ep~~ people of Israel, inviting them to leave Babylon, but then they are told be ye clean, ye that bear the ~~x~~ vessels of the Lord. Now, does that mean, here are twenty thousand people that leave Babylon ~~and~~ come to Jerusalem and He ~~Oh~~ says let those ~~the~~ those thirty that bear the ~~theing~~ things for the temple let them be clean or is ~~ix~~ he not thinking of the whole group as the group is carrying the vessels of the Lord, even though a few of them are the actual carriers. They all are bringing them, so He is thinking of all of them, surely. They are the people that are ~~x~~ ~~bir~~- bringing the ~~vessles~~ vessels of the Lord back ~~ix~~ from Babylon to ~~x~~ Jerusalem and He tells all these multitudes of people who want to ~~eee~~- come home that they should be clean that they should start in, that they should take advantage of the opportunity to go back from Babylon and they ~~w~~ should be worthy of people who are carrying the vessels of the Lord, not just the few who are actually handling them, but the whole group thought of in ~~x~~ general. . So this is the ~~ix~~ return exile. The first part of the verse speaks of all those who had a chance to come out, but the last part speaks of those who actually come. Ye that bear the vessels of the Lord. So here we have

not a collective addressed to groups thought of together as one but an individual plural addressed to many individuals who are in the group, the ~~x~~ returning ~~exile-~~ between exiles. You see there is not so much difference in meaning/~~to~~ a collective and an address to individuals. But there is a big difference in form, and there might considerably be great difference in English.

ISAIAH # 54

Now we go on then to the next point. You are jumping from 52:11 to 54:1, that is a big jump. Anybody see any imperatives in between. I think that we can consider that that verse is covered. Depart and Be clean. Yes, the narrative form with the \_\_\_\_\_ makes a prohibition or a negative request. We call it differently from an imperative but ~~x~~ I think that we can include it under the imperatives. A ~~ge-~~ negative request, so that verse 13 you ~~g~~ begin this section about the Servant of the Lord and in this section I take nobody has ~~x~~ found an imperatives. You have imperatives in the section leading up to this, first addressing Israel as a unit under a 2nd feminine form and then expressing the ~~indivi-~~ individuals ~~as a~~ in Israel as ~~a indivi-~~ individuals but addressing all of Israel and then narrowing it down to those people who return from exile. "Be ye clean that bear the vessels of the Lord." The people d'nd't have to handle the vessels to be thought of as bearing the vessels but they certainly have to come to be thought of that ~~wy~~ way, that could not have include people who stayed in Babylon, and then you have none you say all through 53 and 54, Miss Pickett ~~sub-~~ suggests that 54:1 ~~sat~~ starts with an imperative and what form of the imperative? Singular or Plural. This is a feminine and is this then a 2nd ~~feminit-~~ feminine singular imperative. Is it addressed to some individual or ~~si~~ is it a collective. A collective, that one cannot tell from the ~~fef-~~ ~~fromf~~ form, one has to make a judgment on the basis of context but I imagine that all interpreters that it is here a collective.

SINGing, break ~~forthe~~ forth into singing. Cry aloud with joy. Three imperatives and they would all be thought of doubtless as a collective addressed to some ~~individual~~ group of people which are thought of as a collective, and therefore addressed in the feminine ~~fe~~ singular. And who is ~~this~~ this group of people who are ~~the~~ here . \_\_\_\_ .

The Gentiles, you mean all the Gentiles as a unit. \* That would be one suggestion --would anybody have another suggestion. The suggestion that more ~~come~~ commentaries make is ~~Israea~~ Israel. Now, just reading the first statement. Sing, O barren, that didst not bear, one immediately says what makes you think that this is Israel? Had not Israel not been God's people which ~~a~~ had borne ~~abund~~ abundantly for Him.

How can you address Israel as the barren ones which did not bear. There is a ~~reference~~ reference here in my Bible to Galations 4:27 and when you look at Galations 4:27 you find that the Apostle Paul says that in verse 22 it is written that Abraham had two sons, one by a bondman and the other by a free woman. And verse 25 says that Hagar is Mount Sinai in Jerusalem and answers to Jerusalem which now is \* and which is in bondage to her children ~~a~~ but ~~wh~~ Jerusalem which is above is the Mother of us all, ~~but~~ for it is written Rejoice thou barren that barest not , ~~make~~ forth, ~~and crieth that travaileth~~ Break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail; For more are the children of the desolate than the Children of the married wife, saith the Lord. - " I'm not sure ~~th~~ that you can say that Paul is saying ~~that~~ break ~~f~~ forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband." Now ~~a~~ we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. " I'm not quite sure whether you could say that Paul is here saying that he is speaking to the Gentiles. But he is including the Gentiles in those to whom \* he is referring. He is referring here to those who are finding salvation through Christ, those that are the children of promise, those that ~~ae~~ are not under Law but under grace. So He is here ~~for~~ referring to those that are under

grace as being the ones who are to break forth and sing for more ~~ix~~ are the children of the desolate than she which hath an husband, but I don't see how it can refer to grace compared to the law ~~une~~ unless it is referring to Gentiles as compared to the Jews, I don't see ~~how~~ any other way ~~ix~~ you can get them, I don't see how you could say that the one that barest not, that travailest not, the desolate one is those that are spiritual ~~x~~ alive but the y are the people who were formerly not the people of God but who have now come to be the people of God, it would fit them perfectly and that would be the Gentiles. So it would seem to ~~be~~ me that Paul does not specifically say that it is ~~x~~ the Gentiles but it is impossible to see the relevance in his quotation unless it is the Gentiles to which it is referring, unless it is , in other words , a parallel to what he says in Romans 9 where he says that Israel which follows after the law of righteousness hath not attained the law of righteousness because they sought it not by faith, but by the works of the law. And he says the Gentiles which follow not after ~~x~~ righteousness hath ~~th~~ attained the righteousness of faith, that is what he says in the end of Romans 9 and over here in Galations 4:27, he says that Rejoice ye ~~bare~~ barren that bearest not. Now, the Old ~~x~~ Testament translated ~~ix~~ it Thou that didst not bear. Actually, the form is a participle ~~ix~~ and so it ~~x~~ doesn't say that barest not or that which didst not bear. The one that didst not bear is to ~~rejoice~~ ~~rejoice~~ ~~ref~~ ~~ref~~ rejoice because she is bearing, that ~~id~~ doesn't make much sense so it would seem that the Old Testament translation in our King James ~~make~~ making it a past makes more sense. ~~Refo~~ Rejoice , thou barren that did not bear, because more are the children of the ~~desolate~~ ~~del~~ desolate than of the ~~married~~ ~~married~~ married wife. Now, most commentaries try to interpret ~~Isaiah~~ ~~Is~~ Israel which is now in exile and ~~x~~ consequently can be thought of as barren is ~~going~~ ~~going~~ going to have more spiritual accomplishment than ~~the~~ ~~they~~ they had before and therefore you say, More are the children

of the desolate than the children of the married wife. It seems out of ~~harmy~~ harmony for Isaiah to think of them as desolate in that sense because he says later on, Show me the mother's bill of divorcement, what do you mean by saying that God has cast out off . He hasn't ~~a~~ cast you off. They are just as much Jehovah's wife as they have ever been, and so to say that this is Israel at two different times doesn't seem to make much sense. So many commentaries interpret and it ~~isx~~ seems to me that Paul very definitely takes ~~as~~ Galations 4:27 parallels Isa. 9 and takes it as meaning the Gentiles, that the Gentiles who receive the Word of God. And therefore, he takes it as after you get the ~~post~~ position of the sufferings of Christ , you then have the declaration that He is going to go out to all the world with the result that those who were formerly not thought of as ~~a~~ the people of God at all are going to have more spiritual ~~childre~~ fruition than the ones who ~~pre-~~ previously were considered.

(Q) I think that we can safely say that this first one is definitex a collective and it is a collective of a group who are ~~though-of-~~ thought of as those who are barren, those who do not bear , those who did not bear. They are to sing for more are the children of the ~~desl-~~ desolate than the children of the married wife. You think you are cast off, but you are ~~not-~~ not. ~~Surely the-~~ Wh Show me the bill of your mother's divorcement. You are not cast off. They are to have more children than the one who has the husband. (Q) That could very well be done; that is to say, there is a contrast made. ~~This-~~ They seem not to have brought forth any spiritual food . They seemed not to have accomplished anything for the Lord, or it can be carried a bit further and be simply those that are in shame, ~~acutall-~~ actually, they were in exile . You get to the last part of the verse, which shows that ~~isx~~ it is not simply a condition of shame, that it is referring to, More ~~an-~~ are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife. The one who has a husband. It is certainly not a reason to ~~k~~ rejoice

not  
 that one who ~~is~~ has a husband has more children than one who does. That can't be it. So there must be a contrast . One seems to be outside. And the one who is thought of as the Lord's wife is receiving the Lord's blessing, they are the instrument to bring Grace to the world, to ~~speak~~ speak His word and now another group... He doesn't say that they ~~is~~ don't accomplish, He says more are the children of the desolate than the children of the Married wife. We want to return to this chapter later, at present I want to continue with the matter of the imperatives but we notice that ~~is~~ it is a collective addressed to a group which formerly was ~~is~~ not a recipient of God's blessing but which become very particularly God's blessing and more so than certain other ones with whom they are compared.

ISAIAH # 55

We will say today that ~~France~~ France is very proud of what she has accomplished, getting more territory , making atom bombs and what not. We ~~would~~ wouldn't say France is proud of what he has accomplished. We use the feminine feminine and the collective , if we speak of the nation ~~is~~ as a unit . WE wouldn't say...we use the feminine for a collective for a nation, particularly when the figure of the nation is thought of as one which is suppose to accomplish , to have spiritual results, and therefore it is thought of as ...But we have the feminine back in the previous chapter particularly when we spoke of Zion and ~~Jerusa~~ Jerusalem . The feminine feminine figure was used for ~~the~~ the nation. (Q) I don't think that it stresses the exile at all but we will come back to that later. The thing that I ~~is~~ am stressing ~~not~~ now is that ~~is~~ it is a collective. It is a collective addressed to a group of people, and this group of people is compared to another group of people. One group of people is thought of as desolate. the one ~~is~~ which did not bear , the other group of ~~is~~ people as being the married wife. There are two groups of people. Now, whether ~~is~~ it is comparing Israel now ~~is~~ with Israel of a previous time, saying that Israel ~~is~~ was

a married wife but isn't now, or whether it is comparing some other group with Israel which has always ~~be~~ been the married wife, the one that God called , and yet He is after showing the Atonement, ~~the events showing the~~ he is then showing an extension of the blessing at a larger area. But we will come back to that.

Now, we ~~are~~ want to look at the imperatives. (Q) I think that most ~~are~~ disagree disagree with the Apostle Paul but I think that ~~it~~ is the Apostle Paul. I haven't looked at a great many, but those ~~are~~ that I have looked at most of them is comparing Israel after the exile with Israel ~~are~~ before the exile. and calling the one ~~before the exile~~ - at the end of the exile the one that is desolate that did not bear and Israel before the exile the married wife and saying that the Israel at the end of the exile is going to have ~~greater~~ - greater blessing than Israel before, but it would seem to me that that would be the most natural interpretation of the ~~passage~~ passage although a strange one is I don't see how one in the time of Isaiah ~~could~~ would think of any other interpretation. But I think that later one you can ~~look~~ ~~at~~ - look back at the words and see that it exactly fit what did happen later on. The one which is God's center of accomplishment becomes less . \_\_\_ than one which formerly did not bear. Well, we will come back to that later. What is your next imperative after this? Verse two, singular or plural? It is ~~feminite-feminit-~~ feminine again. Again ~~it~~ it is a collective. It would seem that the one addressed in verse two is the same one which is addressed in one. And I believe that we have the Atonement shown in 53 and then in ~~53~~ 54 you have the picture of the way in which the result of the Atonement goes out to ~~the~~ - the Gentiles, out to a greatly enlarged group so much so that the ~~children~~ children of the desolate are actually more than the children of the married wife. And ~~actually~~ actually they come to be more from the Gentiles ~~background~~ background than from the Jews coming into the ~~the~~ Kingdom of God, and then you are told, "Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch ~~forth~~ forth the curtains of ~~the~~ thine ~~habita~~ habitations: spare not

lengthen ~~the~~ thy cords, and strengthen thy ~~xx~~ stakes; " and in England 150 years ago there was a man who said we should send missionaries out to this land, and he preached a great sermon which resulted in the beginning of the modern missionary movement and the text which he used for his sermon was this book. And I think that it is very interesting to see that he did not simply ~~grab~~ grab a verse out of the Bible and make this an excuse for spreading the gospel, but he grabbed a verse which ~~actu-~~ actually means in the context ~~mea~~ exactly what he took from it, and he called upon God's people to spread the message of salvation which is given in the chapter right before. Well, we have here this collective in verse two ~~7-El~~ Enlarge, spare not, strengthen thy cords, let them stretch forth--that is in the plural, to the individuals that make up the group. What is the next imperative after that, Mr. Kim? Then a collective expressed in the feminine ~~x~~. What is the next after that ~~Miss~~ Miss Chung? We said that in verse two there were several ~~k~~ of ~~the~~ m. Did you find any Mr. Curry? That is the imperative with 2x which is a negative of command. But we have included several already under. Mr. Kim called out attention to that fact. In chapter ~~52~~ 52 we had. It is not imperative in form... Now you don't find any more in chapter 54. Verse 4 Yes, that is parallel ~~k~~ to fear not. In chapter 54 verse four, we have several just like we have several in verse one and two. After verse 4 we don't have any more imperatives. We have here a masculine plural in chapter 55, and we have already had a few mascul~~ine~~ine plurals, but in this case, this is quite different from the previous. The previous ones that we had were in chapter 52:11. Depart ye, ~~dea~~ depart ye, refers to everyone in a certain category. And then when he says, Be ye clean, ye~~x~~ that bear the vessels of the ~~Lord~~- Lord. But now who <sup>m</sup> is he speaking to here, Come ye to the waters, in 55:1. He is speaking to the poor. But is he speaking to all the people in a certain group? Yes, a general invitation--a plural form, a general invitation, and

this general invitation is stressed ~~vers~~ very strongly in these first three verses. ~~Ever~~ Come ~~w~~ everyone that ~~thirsteth~~, every thirsting one. That is singular. Every thirsting one is addressed, but in an address you can address a ~~many~~- great many people and then he gives an imperative to all of these people, to ~~bx~~ whoever had need. And then the next one? The ~~s~~ first part of it is ~~addressed~~ addressed to all who are ~~ar~~- thirsting and many don't know they are thirsting. You might say ~~the~~ they are not included, but if they are recognized that they are included then they ~~are~~ come to be included, and then the ~~k~~ next verse. Yes, He ~~hath~~ that hath no money, ~~coe~~ come ye, ~~but~~ and eat, and now that is addressed again to those who realize their need. He that hath ~~o~~ no money, come ye but and eat, and consequently ~~ix~~ it is addressed to all human beings in the world who realize the need but not to those who think they are self-sufficient, and are able to take care of themselves.

It is the first requirement that one should realize one's need. So, this is addressed to everyone who has this need, and realizes <sup>that he has</sup> this need. So that, it is a universal invitation, ~~in~~ an invitation which may not be realized, so that it is a universal invitation, but an invitation which may not be realized \_\_\_\_\_ like that \_\_\_\_\_

For it is addressed to all those who realize this need. And so, it is different from any imperative that we have \_\_\_\_\_ a universal invitation, an invitation addressed to all people, but an invitation that is addressed to individuals, which gives individuals an opportunity. We do not have any invitation of that nature.

He says, depart ye, depart ye. Well, you might say that ----- depart... Depart ye, depart ye, go ye out from thence, touch no unclean thing; go ye ~~out~~ out of the midst of her; be ye clean, that bear the vessels of the Lord." Here they ~~are~~ all are ordered... here they all are invited. They ~~are~~ all are invited to receive something that could not be ~~brought~~ <sup>for</sup> brought ~~with~~ money. It is the greatest gospel

ISAIAH #55

invitation that is not found anywhere in the Old Testament. We have quite a number of wonderful invitations in the New Testament, but we do not have so many in the Old Testament. In fact, we have more in this chapter than in the rest of the Old Testament. We have a great many of them. "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price... Incline your ear, and come unto me: hear, and your soul shall live; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David...." Verse 7: "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." A general invitation extended to all people to receive freely the grace of God. There is hardly anything ~~that is~~ like that anywhere.

ISAIAH #56

53 then expresses the wonderful work that the servant of the Lord is going to do in opening up a way of deliverance for all in fifty-three, and then 54 shows the results which God is going to bring through the atonement performed by the Servant of the Lord, to bring upon the world. Thus here we have the great result that God is going to bring in 54 summarizes verse 17 at the end of it, where it says, "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord, and their righteousness is of me, saith the Lord." Their righteousness is of me. Of me is not a good translation, I think. \_\_\_\_\_ (meitttee) from with me, of me is a very weak translation. There- their righteousness is mine, their righteousness belongs to me. But it is much stronger in Hebrew than ....

ISAIAH #56

Their righteousness is from with me. In other words, they have no righteousness of their own. Their righteousness comes from God/ imputed to them. And they are told of the tremendous results that God is going to perform before them. In chapter 54, but as to the giving, as to the declaration of what God is going to do as the individual result of the work, then he proceeds to a great/invitations of individuals for all that are thirsty or those who have no money, or who are wicked, to turn away from wickedness, and be clean and know that they will be received of the Lord. It is a tremendous chapter of invitation. And the meaning of 55 is so clear and the relationship with 53 is so clear, although there are individual points that we want to accept, but the meaning is so clear and its relation to 53 is so clear that I think that we should look at it first or at 53 54 because we must interpret 54 I believe in the light of 53 and 55 together, so that in 55 then we have this marvelous gospel invitation and we have the invitation of verse one, a tremendous general invitation, the same with verse two, a tremendous general invitation, the same in the first half of verse three, a tremendous general invitation, and then in verse six, a marvelous general invitation and in verse seven an invitation to receive free pardonning from the Lord. So that all of these verses contain a tremendous invitation but again we have in verse eleven, paralleling chapter 54 the assurance that God is going to accomplish something through this, it is not simply something that is sent out into the world and may accomplish and may not. No, He says My word will not return to me void but will accomplish that which I please, it will prosper in the thing whereto I send it. So I see it is predicted in 53 that He shall see His seed. He shall prolong His days and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand. I will divide Him a portion with

the great. Here the individuals are given the ~~g~~ free invitation and conceivably they might all say no, but He gives the assurance they will not. That His work will accomplish what . . .so 55 is the great chapter of the invitation . And yet it is more than simply an invitation . . .we are assured that ~~D~~God is going to bring results, that it is going to accomplish what He pleases, that His ~~k~~ purposes are going to ~~k~~ be <sup>fully</sup> ~~thoroughly~~ accomplished through the invitation. So we have a tremendous chapter here in 55 and we have all of these verses ~~in~~ of invitation, the great outstanding thing ~~g~~ here, the marvelous gospel invitation, given to everybody without any limitation ~~w~~ except recognition . . .no limitation otherwise and ~~w~~ ~~the~~ -- those who have no way to please the Lord, the people who are wicked -- those who are ~~unrighteous~~ unrighteous are invited to come ~~k~~ and assured that there is nothing that they can do to receive God's mercy, simply to respond to the invitation. I don't think you will find any condition in chapter 55, this would seem to be exactly parallel to ~~the~~ your New Testament invitation. There is no condition. Nothing in my hand I bring, simply to thy ~~eh~~ cross I cling. It is an invitation with no payment, no return, but of course your New Testament ~~invitation~~ invitation results in obedience--the one who really comes has the Lord's spirit in His heart, teaching him to obey the moral law and so in the end the result of the invitation of the Old and New Testament is identical, but the expression is given in this marvelous aspect of the great. . .It is made clear in the New Testament in a way that could not in the Old. . .And so the invitation is the same but this marvelous aspect of it, the free grace of God is more strengthening in the New Testament than the old.

I think that the prophets were definitely teaching God's <sup>grace</sup> /...I think the New Testament men were definitely preaching God's judgment too. But the ~~great~~ grace is made clear after a salvation. Our time is about up; let's study more on 55 for tomorrow and ~~thing~~ think of particular phrases and interpretations...

We have one or two things yet to look at ~~the~~ in that last verse of chapter 53 that we had not completed so let's look at that last verse of chapter 53 for a minute. And in that verse we have ~~a~~ looked at the first part, ~~thereof~~ therefore I will apportion to Him with the mighty, or among the mighty ones. The more usual meaning is many but mighty seems to fit the context much better here and we have evidence elsewhere that it can be used. And with all the ones --this word is occasionally translated numerous but very rarely and it is very ~~questin~~ questionable whether it ever does it, but ~~is~~ its meaning ~~as~~ as mighty or powerful is quite common, and with powerful ones you will divide spoil, because, (under that, on account of, as a result of) (it's not a reason given so ~~me~~ much as a cause from which a result occurs). He is able to divide this spoil to see part of the ~~pric~~ principalities of evil have ~~h~~ taken --He is able to do that because He has poured out unto death His soul. ~~It~~ It is a word which is difficult to translate. We have no word in English which is an exact equivalent. In Hebrew there is the word רוח which means a ~~is~~ spirit, it speaks of the spirit of man, and נפש is the part of the man ~~when~~ ~~ehi~~ which continues after the body is laid off, that is the \_\_\_\_\_ and that is ~~trans-~~ translated spirit. Now, the word נשמה in Hebrew expresses a concept which we do not exactly have in English. In the King James Version it is 428 times translated soul and 119 times translated light, so you see it is ~~trans-~~ translated light ~~about~~ about 1/4 as many times as they translated soul. They translated body several times, according to the ~~sa-~~ statement of ... But in every one of these four ~~is-~~ it is a dead body. ~~It~~ it is translated heart 15 times

pleasure 4 and person 30. Now, there are cases where a word ~~α~~ has ~~α~~ two distinct meanings, like our English word light which as an adjective can be either lacking in weight or lacking in color. Of course as a noun it can be that which ~~mae~~ makes it possible for us to see. That's ~~proba~~ probably related to lacking in color .

But at which we have two entirely different words which ~~α~~ have ~~fe-~~ fallen together. There is always a possibility of that in any language. You have one word which has two or three different, ~~org~~ original words that have fallen together so that the y are pronounced identically although they are ~~different-~~ quite different words.

We have many instances of that in English , of course, words that have no connection but are yet sounded absolutely alike. It seems to me that I have heard that in Chinese they ~~hae-~~ ~~han~~ have some ~~x~~ kind of a monosyllable which ~~αα~~ has as many as a hundred meanings, but every meaning has a different way ~~ov-~~ of writing, but the pronunciation I suppose ~~has-~~ at one time might have been different, but ~~they-a~~ just ~~αα~~ as in English they have lost meanings , etc. they have in Chinese, too, and these words have fallen together, so that now we have the same ~~prene~~ pronunciation for all of these words. Now there is that possibility with a word, that ~~tkh-~~ they may have two or three unrelated ~~wo-~~ roots , and there is a good many cases where that is true, but wherever possible it is wise in a language to see whether you can find in a word whether you can find ~~withe-~~ whether a word has one meaning, a meaning which might have certain ~~ag-~~ angles of it emphasized, or <sup>2</sup> must develop in a certain way. But that you ~~ha~~ actually have one word that has developed in certain directions.

You get the content of the word but I believe in this case that the word \_\_\_\_\_ ~~wx~~ you have one word , I don't believe you have two or three different meanings, but I believe you have one word which may have to be translated in different ways in ~~X~~ English , there is no English word that is exactly represented. But \_\_\_\_\_ is a word which

seems to be used only for a complete personality, a person who has both a body and a spirit. The word \_\_\_\_\_--there is never such a word as Nephesh as apart from the body or spirit, but the word Nephesh seems to have more in common with the body aspect than with the spirit aspect. It seems to have more in common ~~with~~ with the idea of the ~~spirit~~ natural appetites, the ~~h~~ natural feelings, the feelings, the relations with other people, the hunger, etc. Consequently, ~~ne~~ I'm not at all sure that Nephesh as a rule fits the translation of ~~this word~~ this word Nephesh.

### ISAIAH # 57

In the Old Testament the word soul is most usually used to translate this word Nephesh, but ~~ix~~ the difference between soul and spirit in our English, the way it is commonly used in English is pretty hard to prove any very definite difference between, ~~th-~~ but the word spirit would often--what we speak of ~~k~~ as the soul is more what the Hebrew used for spirit. And the word Nephesh and the word \_\_\_\_\_ in the Greek, both of them, refer to a spirit in a body and with more <sup>emphasis</sup> ~~emphaisse~~ on the body than on the spirit ~~x~~ aspect, certainly not a ~~ix~~ body without a spirit. That would never be. It is a living ~~x~~ body, not a dead body. It may be a body, . . . in some cases so life <sup>is</sup> a very good rendering, so when it says, He poured out His soul unto death it does not give a picture of an immaterial spirit being poured out, nothing of the kind, but it means that he gave his life. ~~ix~~ I think that life in this particular context would be a better reference than the soul. He poured out His life unto death. ~~ix~~ His ~~live~~ life vitality, ~~ix~~ His life strength, the suffering that He endured, the whole effort was poured out in death. Yes, the word ψυχή is ~~ue~~ used of the immaterial portion of a human being. God is a spirit, and man is also a spirit, but man on this earth is a ~~ix~~ spirit with a body, and Paul says that ~~one~~ without the body is unclothed/.

It is not the normal thing for a human being to have a spirit without the body, it is a temporary situation which ~~xx~~ exists after death prior to the Resurrection.

In English the word soul and spirit are ~~x~~ very often used interchangeably and the Hebrew and the Greek, I doubt ~~ix~~ if it is exactly interchangeable. But there are many cases where you refer to a person without thinking particularly of one aspect, and to that regard it might be interchangeable. Well, I personally ~~con-~~ sider tricotomy and dicotomy and polycotomy, all of them wrong. That is to say, I consider that ~~hex~~ the human being is a complete ~~ere~~ ~~organix~~ organism which is indivisible, you cannot divide the human being into three parts. When you take away the life, you have nothing. You can't divide him into three parts, but you can look at ~~ix~~ him from different aspects. And you can look at him from two aspects, or three, or five, or ten. Like when we are ~~x~~ told to love the Lord with all our heart, and with all our soul, and with all our mind, and with all our strength. These are all different aspects, but there is no such thing as a body without a spirit. It's a corpse, it's not a ~~ix~~ body anymore. A body has to be living, it has to be united with a spirit, or it is not a body. And so you can't say man is made up ~~xx~~ of spirit soul and body, three parts put together. You can't say He is two parts, spirit and body put together. He is not two parts or three parts. He is one ~~organism~~ - organism but that one organism can look an ~~essentila-~~ essential, ~~ve-~~ vital factor, and then he is unclothed until he receives ~~x~~ the resurrection body.

I don't think the body consists ~~ix~~ simply of certain ~~chemich~~ chemical elements, there is still something in the spirit that preserves the essential features of the body.

Well, like a picture does. The body never could have come without the ~~spirts-~~ spirit.

In ~~fat~~ fact, ~~ix~~ in the case of Lazarus, exactly what happened we do not know, but we know something tremendous happened, because he had been there ~~two~~ two or three

days, and the human body just for a few minutes with no oxidized ~~fresh~~ blood coming to the brain, and that brain...and even though ...can restore a person, they are an idiot. The brain is unworkable if ~~the if~~ it is left ~~beyed~~ beyond a very brief time without oxygen being brought to the brain. But as ~~Lazara~~ Lazarus sister when you open up the grave, she said Lord, by this time he stinketh. A human body left under ~~the~~ those conditions would be greatly deteriorated. But in this case the Lord certainly ~~came~~ caused a miracle that the body should be restored, or else he caused ...but ~~once~~ once the spirit is gone the body is just like ... a person is not complete without the body, and a person who is ...I would say that the personality ...~~M~~ Well, the word Metaphysical means after physics, ~~Ari-~~ thg section after physics, and it really doesn't ~~rea~~ convey the meaning. ~~What~~ It is something real, it isn't imaginary. The spirit is real. You can cut off the ~~let~~ leg and throw it away and your personality will be ~~x~~ affected, but you can go ~~x~~ on ~~an~~ and be a complete person. You can loose the whole body and go on but it is not a normal ~~bey~~ body until the Lord gives us the resurrection ~~x~~ body. 1

But the ~~continance~~ I would say is with the Spirit rather ~~ta~~ than with the body. With the spirit there is something that preserves the essential features of the body. When I was in college we got a new president who was a modernist, and he raised the question. Now, of course we ~~asl~~ all believe in the REsurrection body, but how does it come to pass. Here is a man ~~wo~~ who dies at sea ~~tha~~ and they throw his body overboard, and the body is eaten by ~~fist~~ fish, and the fish are caught and the ~~poe~~ people eat the ~~fist~~ fish, so those chemical elements which were him are ~~not~~ now parts of other ~~x~~ fish. ~~X~~ Now, just how can ~~this-be-the~~ there be a resurrection body. I don't think he ~~ble~~ believed in it, but he didn't admit that he didn't believe in it. He was just trying to teach us to think he said, but actually

he was trying to tear down ~~h~~ belief. Well, I said, they tell us that every ~~x~~ cell in our body is changed in seven years, and ~~x~~ yet there is a continuity ~~h~~ about it, there are changes that take place. There is a ~~simi~~ similarity. There is continuity. It's the same body, even though there be not a ~~sim~~ single chemical element in it that ~~there~~ was there ~~w~~ seven years ago, so when the spirit no longer has the use of these chemical elements which I am using now, ~~ins~~ a way ~~that~~ you can say that I am no different than the fact that I no chemical element that I had seven years ago, and all these ~~w~~ will have to go, but still the spirit goes on, and when God gives the spirit a ~~resurre~~- resurrection ~~x~~ body, ~~x~~ I don't think it means to take and hand something to the spirit, but I think it ~~meas~~ means that <sup>5</sup> ~~you~~ he gives developing out, or showing out / the species which are . . . ;. the possibility of ~~going-out~~/of the ~~spirit-that-is~~/there in the personality, which are preserved with the spirit. It is real, it is not metaphysical in the sense of being imaginary, <sup>nothing</sup> ~~re-or-something~~ like that. But that it is real does not mean that it is something that can be touched, <sup>that</sup> ~~They-say~~ or ~~they~~ can be felt. They say that this is claimed, as I understand ~~it-now~~, ~~it-is~~ even now, at least \_\_\_\_\_ that you could have another \_\_\_\_\_ universe with different weight / than we ~~hve.~~ have. \_\_\_\_\_ (4.45) Two ~~o~~ can exist on the same spot, and neither of them can ~~exist~~ see the other. They could just be there. (4.50)

This solid matter ~~isno~~ isn't so solid. It's 99 and 9/100s empty space, ~~x~~ but the thing that holds together is not the solidity of the ~~mater~~ ~~mate~~ matter. It is some principles that the Lord has put there. <sup>A</sup>nd there are certainly principles in the spirit but they are not spacial principles in the sense that . . . Now, you might say that is all ~~meth~~ metaphysical in the sense that it is ~~kwh~~ what you discuss physics but it is real. It is real and definite. So this word Nephesh is a word which in ~~the-~~ this particular case does not mean that the Lord gave up ~~x~~ His soul for us. He was the second person of the trinity and he always will ~~contine~~ continued to be and

as seen second person of the Trinity, ~~he~~ He could not die, but it means as the Godman He poured out the life that He had , He endured the suffering, He paid the penalty for us . He underwent all this in performing the great act of the Atonement.

(Q) ~~Why~~ Why, I would say in all ~~k~~ cases the word Nephesh indicates the whole person, but ~~the~~ with the emphasis ~~on~~ on the body aspect. The soul that sinneth it shall ~~ide-~~ die. The Lord is declaring that that individual is going to suffer physical ~~da~~ death, but also that individual is going to suffer something else that is called death. There ~~is~~ it is speaking of the individual. The ~~individual~~ individual will be different after this body is lost, but there is certainly a ~~resuc~~ resurrection of the body of the wicked too. And the second death is a body suffering , which the wicked endures. It is not simply a spirit suffering, ~~ix~~ it is a ~~body-~~ bodily suffering. I would say ~~tha~~ t was completely incorrect. I would say ~~tha~~ t is ~~definitely~~ definitely incorrect. He bore in the sense of the disruption of the disruption of the human personality . There is much more than simply physical suffering, but it was not the giving up of His divine spirit. ~~He~~ His divine spirit-~~particiu-participa-~~ Participated in the suffering, participated in the \_\_\_\_\_ which He went through, Miss Pickett? Yes, it is very easy to \_\_\_\_\_ you can take isolated verses out of context and you can get any number of various ~~gh-~~ thoughts out of it, but when you study them together in context, you study the meaning of the words, you get a different meaning altogether.

(Q) Yes, the Lord says don't fear the one who can bring you physical suffering i this ~~hie~~ life and t at is all, but fear the one that can lead you into that which results in suffering through all eternity. It is not an iron ...It is mental suffering,

Well, then, He accomplished this . He takes the spoil away from ~~different~~ the

principalities and powers of evil who have spoiled humanity by leading Adam into sin. He spoiled humanity. He took humanity as spoil. He takes away a part of this spoil from them. There is no universalism here. There is  $\alpha$  no complete restoration. But there is a ~~restoration~~ restoration of those the Lord is going to save. He is going to take them away from the evil powers who have secured domination over them, because because He poured out His ~~liv-~~ life unto death. And ~~the n the - k~~ transgressors, You can take it as an accusative, if your next word were a qal or a Hiphil, but the ~~w~~ verb is the niphal and consequently we are justified in saying the \_\_\_\_\_ here is with ~~k~~ rather than the sign of the accusative. He was numbered with transgressors. ~~Sim~~ Here we find something more about it, not merely does ~~k~~ He pour out His life unto death. Not merely does He suffer death, a disagreeable physical experience, but He suffers a shameful death. He is numbered with the transgressors. He  $\alpha$  is counted among them. He takes upon Himself, the shame and reproach of our sin being included with transgressors, and ~~the n~~ the result of it. and He, He lifts up, He carries up, He \_\_\_\_\_ bears away the sin, again the sin of all humanity but the sin of many, ~~in the context here it -~~ now the word could ~~k~~ mean ~~g~~ great one, but in the context here it undoubtedly means many. He ~~bera~~ bears the sin of many, ~~k~~ including the great ones, of course. And that, I think, ends the main part of the verse. And through His atonement, as a result of what He does on the cross, of pouring out His soul unto death, of His being numbered with the transgressors, He is able to bear the sin of many, but He does not stop with the Atonement. He bear the sin of many. This is in the perfect. It represents the standpoint of which the ~~po-~~ prophet makes of looking forward to ~~the w-~~ those that can look back upon the cross.

as an accomplished fact. He has borne the sin of many. It is finished. He has ~~perfoeme~~ performed the Atonement, the ~~task~~ - task is done. They are saved through what He has done, but He does not stop with that. He continues to work. And so we read on, And for transgressing ones, He \_\_\_\_\_, and this word is a difficult word, we had it earlier in the chapter where it said the Lord caused the ~~inig~~ - iniquity of us all to light upon Him. But here it says that He strikes or lights for our transgressors (.) and it would be very ~~had~~ - hard to get any meaning out of it except that we have the LXX in various ~~x~~ places. In a few places it translates \_\_\_\_\_, not as caus~~ing~~ to light ...and it does mean in a few places in the Hiphil, but translat~~es~~ it as intercede, and that seems like a big jump, and so you wonder whether ~~xx~~ the ~~w~~ two words have fallen together. BDB ~~had~~ have an excellent suggestion, they take the word \_\_\_\_\_ here --they say to meet, to strike, and then they say to ~~k mm~~ - meet for good. That is to meet with prayer for good and therefore to intercede there is no question that that is what it means, and yet ..and showing ~~t-t~~ that is the tradition that has passed on, but we have in the context that that is ..as when a man says to Jeremiah (?) I will intercede for you...~~It would~~ with the King that he take you out of the dungeon. He certainly doesn't mean I will strike the king for you that he take you out of the dungeon. But he ~~ma~~ - means I will bring to bear upon the King a request on your behalf, and I don't know who originat~~ed~~ that suggestion. But ~~k~~ I thought it ~~x~~ was an excellent suggestion of bringing ~~to~~ what seemed to be quite unrelated meanings of words ~~together~~ together, and He intercedes for transgressors, but ...so ~~th~~ here the meaning intercede, seems to be fully justified here. The ~~interestig~~ - interesting thing~~s~~ about it is that it is an imperf ect and

we just had a perfect. And when you have two phrases, one is a perfect, and one is an imperfect, the meaning is evidently not a parallel in which it simply repeats the same thing, but it is a continuation in which it goes on and shows another . . . He has borne and He will make intercession for ~~the~~ ~~the~~ transgressors -- ~~He~~ it shows the completed act of Christ, it is finished. And then it shows the continuing work of Christ, ~~and~~ as He is at the right hand of God making intercession. And so we have two aspects in this last part of the verse and it's very strange that they don't bring that out in the translation, though it is <sup>clearly</sup> ~~very~~-imperfect, and on the word . . . and it fits so exactly with the New Testament speaking about Christ, they always seem to translate it, Because they poured out His soul unto death, and He was numbered with the ~~the~~ transgressors and ~~He~~ He bare the sin of many, and made intercession with the transgressor, s making it a repetition of what is before and it very clearly is not but a continuation of His work. His work is ~~finid~~ finished . The atonement is complete ~~but~~ but His work continues. He interced~~es~~es for His own who are ~~xxx~~ saved . . . and now we were looking at chapter 55 and 55 ~~has b~~ can't be understood except in relationship with ~~53~~ 53. I think that means by their knowing what He has done . I believe that ~~s~~ -- is what the knowledge of Him means. I don't ~~think~~ think it means He knows how to do it, but by their ~~receiv~~ receiving the message of what He has done, ~~h~~ they will come to ~~receiv~~ receive the justification. That is definitely in it too. They know what He has done, but they appropriate to themselves . They come to know Him, not simply as an intellectual matter but to ~~xxx~~ enter into personal knowledge and relationship with the Lord. That is a very common use of the word \_\_\_\_ in the book of Hosea. We should follow on to know the Lord. Not simply knowing about Him

but of actually knowing Him. ~~If it is not~~ Here it is not by His knowing Him, but by their coming to know Him that they are justified. And then we have 55 which follows ~~immediately~~ immediately after ~~to~~ 53. There is something in between that is of great importance also, but from 53 there follows 54 and there ~~comes~~ follows 55. They are both directly related to 53, and in 55 we have this gracious invitation --this free invitation which is ~~a~~ hardly to be paralleled, at least not to such a length as this anywhere in the Old Testament and it is \_\_\_\_\_ repeated over and over--this free invitation to receive what is needed. This idea of invitation is found --is given three ~~times~~ times in the first verse. Come to ~~w~~ the waters, come, buy and eat, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price. A free invitation urged upon. / <sup>Verse</sup> Chapter 2, the last part of it, Hearken diligently unto me and eat that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness ~~and~~ an invitation to receive what is good, and then in verse 3 the first half of verse 3, Incline your ear and come to me. Hear, and your soul shall live. Invitation, and then in verse 6, Seek the Lord while He may be found. Call upon Him while He is near. The while ~~He~~ He may be found, while He is near is an expression of the possibility of the ~~servant~~' search resulting satisfactorily, it is a declaration. It is easy to receive an answer from the Lord because He is now near and ready to look to the one who calls upon Him. ~~Let~~ Let the wicked forsake His way ~~and~~ and the unrighteous man His thoughts, and let him return to the Lord and He will have mercy upon Him. Let ~~him~~ him return to our God and He will ~~abundantly~~ abundantly ~~a~~ pardon. Thus we have maybe 15 times we notice this idea of invitation which has been stressed in these verses. I don't think you will find as many ~~verses~~ verses continued ... anywhere else in the Old Testament, and the fact that it is a free invitation stressed, particularly

in verses one , two , and seven. He th~~a~~ t hath no money . Bu~~y~~ without money and without price. Why do you spend money for that which is not bread, your labor for that which does not satisfy. Let the wicked simply forsake His way and let him return, the freedom of the invitation, and that has to be understood in relation ~~to~~ with chapter 53. I remember hearing ~~Cam~~- Cambell Morgan talk, how he had gone out as a young man, doing evangelistic work and he wa~~s~~ was talking with some miners in England and trying to bring them to accept the free grace of God, and one man he was talking to just couldn't understand, How could something wonderful be simply free. How could something ~~wo~~ as wo~~n~~derful as ~~ou~~- you describe this salvation as being be something that I can just reach out and take , it just simply does not make sense. And finally he said he thought of an illustration, he got the idea from the man. I think the man gave ~~k~~ him the illustration. The man said, I'm down in the mine, and he said all I ha~~v~~e to do is step into the skip--the little cart that is ~~put~~ pulled up ~~k~~ by the cable , ~~may~~-~~ma~~b-maybe half a mile out of the mine. He says all I have to do is to step into that and sit down. And I don't have to do anything , but that cable pulls me up half a mile out of the mine ~~n~~ into the bright sunshine, and he says it doesn't cost me a sense, but it cost the company ~~x~~ an awful lot. Somebody else has paid a tremendous price, and so the invitation is free in the sense that ~~te~~ the person who can ~~accept~~ accept it has nothing to pay for it, ~~k~~ but it is not free in the sense that it is just something ...it is something that cost the Lord the gift of His son, ~~k~~ ~~is~~ it ~~x~~ is something that is expense~~s~~ive but the expense is in chapter 52- 53 and the free invitation is in 55, and you can't understand 55 without having 53.

So we have in this chapter then the thought of the invitation, which is repeated over and over here , the thought that it is a free invitation which is expressed ~~ste~~ strongly in these verses. Then we have the thought of the folly of seeking what we need in the wrong way. We have that in the first half of verse two. Why do you spend money for that which is not bread and your labor for that which satisfies not. Coupled with the invitation is the comparison ~~wh~~ with the inadequacy and ~~understa-unsatisfactory-~~ unsatisfactory nature ~~that-all-other~~ of all other methods of satisfying human needs and human design, and this ~~ee~~ of course immediately suggests to our mind at the end of Romans 9 where the Apostle points out ~~the-~~ how the ~~T~~ Gentiles who followed not unto righteousness ~~x x~~ have attained unto righteousness which is of faith, but Israel which followed after the law of righteousness has not attained unto the law of righteousness . Wherefore because they sought it not by faith , but as it were, by the works of the law. Wherefore, do you spend money for that which is not bread and your labor for that which satisfies not. There are many, many people trying to get satisfaction. Many people trying to get peace of heart and mind in the wrong way and not getting it. And so we have our great gospel thought that a man cease from his great striving which can ~~x~~ never bring him what he ~~at~~ needs and he rests in the Lord and proceed to get what the Lord has purchased for Him at such tremendous cost. It's nothing to just ~~kin~~ kick around and say , Oh, ~~hre~~ here it is , it is something that is tremendously expensive , tremendously difficult to provide, but which the man himself cannot possibly pay for but simply receive, and of course ~~t-at-~~ that is the ~~gra-~~ great \_\_\_\_ of the R<sup>E</sup>formation, when K- Luther and the others grasp that idea --there is a difference between justification by faith and seeking to get it by the works of the law. And so we have the folly

of seeking in the wrong way , at the beginning of verse two, and then we have the ~~quest~~ question , To whom is this addressed, and we look at that a bit, we noticed yesterday these ~~ve-~~ ~~a~~ various imperatives , and how the most of our imperatives of 52 and 54 a singular feminine addressed collectively to a nation or to a group , and then how some of them were in the ; masculine plural addressed to the members of a particular group , but in this case we have ~~in~~ it in the plural addressed to all people, addressed to every one who has a need, ~~is~~ addressed to everyone regardless of background, race, training, ~~anything~~ anything, everyone who is thirsting , who needs ~~wh~~ ~~at~~ ~~ky~~ God is offering, and so here ~~hwe~~ ~~he~~ the general invitation addressed to all men, addressed specifically to those who recognize the need, and even addressed to ~~thowe-~~ those who realize their wickedness ~~and~~ are not excluded from this invitation. Verse seven: Let the wicked forsake his way , and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return to the Lord and He will have mercy upon Him. It is true that all who recognize their need regardless of their--in fact, they have no deserts, they deserve ~~is~~ ~~is~~ nothing of themselves. ~~And~~ the question , What is offered? This is expressed ~~in~~ to quite an extent in a rather general and rather figurative language. Everyone athirst come ye to the waters , Well, you are not saying I give you anything you ~~a~~ ~~wa~~ ~~t~~ --when I went three and a half days without any water i the hot son, I tell you I was mighty glad to get some water. And it made a wonderful picture of what this means. It is a figure for something else. Come ye, buy wine and ~~and~~ ~~and~~ milk without money and without price. Wine ~~ad-~~ and milk is symbol of that which is pleasant and that which satisfies or that which fills one's needs, a figures that is not meant literally. ~~And~~ ~~the~~ ~~n~~ wine and ~~and~~ ~~and~~ milk , Hearken diligently unto me

and eat that which is good. That which is good, that which is desirable, that which is satisfying. Again, a general statement, and let your soul delight itself in fatness. A ~~g~~ figure for that which is satisfying and very delightful, And then in ~~x~~ verse ~~thee~~ three, Hear, and your soul shall live, this is getting more specific --there is life, eternal life, incline your ear, and come, and your ~~soul~~ soul shall live, and then the one who hears, the one who comes, he says, I will make an everlasting covenant with you, ~~and~~ He doesn't ~~x~~ say ~~x~~ you come and make a covenant and make a covenant with me. Man can not make a covenant with God, at least a covenant that amounts to ~~anything~~ anything, that is worth ~~anything~~ anything, because man has nothing to give God. God makes a promise to man but man can ~~re-~~ receive receive this covenant simply through listening and coming, and ~~agin-~~ again it is ~~efe~~ offered a covenant here, and the covenant ~~are-~~, even the sure mercies of David, ~~the~~ this word ~~merie~~ mercy here is TOT and I mentioned to you that Young's Concordance is translated 428 times soul and 119 times light, but when it comes TOT ~~young~~ Young simply says Loving kindness 30, kindness 38, merciful kindness 2, good deed 1, favor 3, and so on, and it says mercy, freq. Well, now if they say that Nephesh means soul, and that TOT is translated mercy frequ. whether that means that it is more frequent than Nephesh I don't know, but I think that it is ...but at least it is very, very ~~tran~~ translated mercy in the King James Version, and I am inclined to think ~~tx~~ in the American Standard Version of 1901, it is never ~~trans-~~ translated mercy, I am not sure of that, but in the King James it is 40 times translated loving kindness. It is my impression that most of the times in the American Standard Versions it is translated loving kindness. The mercy to us today suggest the idea of pardon, the idea that when you have someone at your mercy, someone you ~~enx~~

could really do whatever you ~~wat~~ want to and you don't do it, but I don't think this is what this word TOY means--it is the idea of loving kindness and benevolence. It is the good deed, the kindly act of God that is involved here, it is the loving kindness that is shown in connection with David, the sure mercies of David, the sure loving kindness of ~~Daive~~ David. I don't think that mercy in this connection gives the idea, of course those that receive justification through Christ are pardoned from their sins but I don't think that is what this word means in ~~the~~ this connection. But of ~~eu~~- course we have the idea of pardon further one. Another thing that is common to those that ~~aef~~ accept the invitation is in verse five. Thou shalt call a nation that thou knowest ~~k~~ not. There is expansion and extension, and then there is ~~gloy~~ glory for the Holy one of Israel, for He hath glorified thee. And then pardon is promised in verse seven. He will have mercy upon him, for He will abundantly pardon. This is different --this is a \_\_\_\_\_ which really means compassion. He will have a merciful feeling toward him and ~~α~~ He will pardon. And then you have still verses 12 and 13 showing the result of the invitation. He shall go out with joy and ~~wh~~ he shall be led forth with peace. The hills shall break before you into singing and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands --instead of the firn shall come up the fir tree , and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree. The result of the acceptance of the invitation, and so there is a chapter in the Old Testament that have the marvelous ~~int~~- invitation of God , presented quite the way it is in the chapter . It cannot be understood except in relation to ~~the~~ chapter 52 . It is what has been earned at ~~ge- greated~~ great expense in 52 that is offered ~~ixx~~ freely in ~~α~~ chapter 55. Then, so the invitation is free, but it is expensive, and then these are what are offered but included among what

is offered here we also have something of the result ~~that~~ that ~~occ~~ occurs in verse three, and of course in many other verses too, Incline your ear and come unto me, Hear and your soul shall live, and I will make an everlasting covenant with you. In other words, it is not simply a matter of ~~com~~- coming and receiving water, not simply a matter of getting but of entering into a ~~conve~~- covenant which God makes with those who believe. I will make an everlasting covenant with you, and so that is not suggested until you get ~~xxx~~ to verse three-- there is always tremendous emphasis on the free nature but then we are told that those who accept the invitation, God will ~~ma~~ make a covenant with them and that covenant is ~~a describ~~- described described as an everlasting ~~covenatn~~ covenant and it is a covenant that is called even the sure, loving kindness of David. And immediately you have the question, what kind of a genitive ~~a~~ is this --is it a subjective genitive, is it an objective genitive, or is it merely a possessive ~~have~~ genitive. Perhaps it makes quite a difference to express and it is worth some thought to decide how you are going to take the relation of the \_\_\_\_\_ to ~~a~~ David and of course the sureness, the steadfastness, the ~~dependable deb~~- dependable relation. Now, this word \_\_\_\_\_ is ~~ofent~~ often used ~~with~~ in connection with covenant. He presented the idea that the word \_\_\_\_\_ means the tearing out of the ~~real~~- relation of a covenant, not simply in the strict way of fulfilling ~~way of~~- the prophets but carrying out the full spirit of it. Dr. Montgomery of the Un. of Penna. ~~xx~~ used to often speak ~~abot~~ about that, which he thought was a very illuminating ~~suge~~ suggestion. I looked up \_\_\_\_\_ all the cases ~~just~~- and didn't find that it fit in the great bulk of them, and so I came to the conclusion that it was a \_\_\_\_\_ which ~~a~~ was not really warranted. It is related very frequently ....

So that , then , we have the ~~everlasting~~ everlasting covenant that God makes as a result of chapter 53, He makes an ~~everlasting~~ everlasting covenant, even the sure mercies of David. And there surely we ought to think of two things, think of the promise God makes in ~~Genesis~~ Jeremiah 31:2, 3 about a new covenant that He is going to make. What are we told about the covenant there. Has it any relationship ~~&~~ here. Another question, Is it the mercies which are shown to David, the object of Genesis, to see how God cared for David, and that he will similarly care for those who believe on Him. Well, that is a possible interpretation, but when you go on to verse four, Behold I have given Him for a witness to the people, a leader and a commander to the people. Surely it suggests more than this is involved. That ~~is~~ it is not just --God treated David nice and how he will treat you nice. Maybe it is the sure mercies that David shows, the sure mercies that are in some way brought to us through David, and so we think of the ~~promises~~ promises of II Samuel that he will always have a son to ~~sit~~ sit on his throne, there in the 89th Psalm the ~~promises~~ promises ~~that God~~ about the continuance of the Davidic line for a ~~witness~~ witness to the people as a leader and a commander , those that accept this invitation are incorporated into the Covenant with David and incorporated through what is done to the promise of ~~David~~ David, and so we get a tie up here with the Messianic prophecy also which you have the one ~~&~~ side--but ~~there~~ here we have a tie up with the other two. And That is worthy of consideration, but our times ~~is~~ is up now.

We have been looking at this 55th chapter here and we notice how it starts out with this wonderful gospel call, ~~this~~ this call which is expressed ~~&~~ to every individual which ~~has~~ has everyone athirst, ~~or~~ certainly it extends very widely. And then in verse 7 let the wicked forsake his way and the unrighteous man his path. It certainly is a very general call which is given. The first , even if you have the two invitations

in verse one and two , ~~a-dn~~ and then it goes on to express the Lord's promise through verse five, and then we start with invitation in 6 and 7 and then you have discussion in the succeeding verses until verse 13. The thought of ~~k~~ verse one is that God is making a free offer , without money and without price to everyone ~~k~~ who has need. In verse two , people are ~~reproace~~ reproached for expending effort on that which does not accomplish anything for them, doesn't secure any results and are told that God will give the m something far better than anything they can gain by any effort of their own. And in verse three we are told to listen and they will ~~life~~ live and He will ~~make~~ make an everlasting covenant with them. Then there is some discussion ~~d~~ of this covenant, about two and a half verses, and then again the call to seek the Lord while He ~~may~~ be found, ~~ix~~ the call to look for pardon and righteousness from God in verse seven. And this verse eight--did I tell you about my experience in West Chester Teacher's College in connection with verse eight. It was about six years ago, I got a letter from a young woman who was a student in West Chester's ~~x~~ Teacher 's College and he said we are required to ~~rx~~ read a book here in the college and to study a book which is required of all second year students, and she says that the professor ~~sasy~~ says that this is the book given to teach ~~ax~~ but he doesn't seem to know a tremendous lot about it, and she said the ~~book~~ book just tears into the Bible and she said ~~Idonx~~ ~~xs~~ wonder if you will come down and ~~sk~~ discuss it with us, and he might even come. And we can ~~me-in-the~~ meet in ~~g~~ the Bible Presbyterian Church, which was at that time just a block from ~~where~~--the school and so I said , Send me a copy of the book. And it just tore into the Bible all through, and it was very easy to take the book and show how utterly unscientific it was , which I did ~~nox~~

and they showed a great deal of interest. But I just took up various statements which were utterly ~~xx~~ ridiculous and yet the college student wouldn't know, it showed the history of ~~religious~~ religion and how people believed in ~~g~~ different kinds of gods, and then it said there came the god of the second Isaiah, a God who is so distant from humanity that He is not interested in anything that man does, ~~hex~~ He is far removed and remote. He says, My ways are not your ways and my thoughts are not your thoughts, for as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher ~~hex~~ than your ways and my thoughts ~~a~~ than your thoughts. Of course in that case I simply read the book and see what this says, ~~k~~ and this is the God that isn't interested in people at all, and you read the verse and it says, Let the wicked forsake his way, ~~the~~ and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return ~~hex~~ to the Lord and He will have mercy upon him and to our God for He will abundantly pardon, for my thoughts are not your thoughts ~~axx~~ neither my ways your ~~was-~~ ways, saith the Lord. In other words, God is saying a human being ~~g~~ wouldn't show this kind of pardon and forgiveness to somebody who has wronged. But I am not like you, I am ~~give-~~ giving you this marvelous offer of ~~part~~ pardon and grace ~~and--~~ the exact opposite of what the ~~a~~ book says, instead of showing that God is so far removed that ~~he-~~ He is not interested in man, God is so close that He is tremendously interested. And it is amazing how frequently when people come to you with problems in the Bible, or difficulties, that the Bible says this, that, or the ~~to-~~ other thing, you just say let's look at the passage. In nine cases out <sup>of</sup> ten, the context will show that <sup>immediately</sup> the attack on the Bible is without foundation. The professor in this <sup>in Rochester University</sup> ~~very~~ fine <sup>book</sup> ~~textbook--~~ <sup>request</sup> uses this ~~textbook--~~ now if they are taught that sort of stuff, <sup>---</sup> what difference does it make if they read a few scriptures at the beginning of the day or the end, That may take care of ten minutes of the day but ~~h~~ the rest of the day is teaching unbelief to those children.



ISAIAH #60

as are the forces of nature. The farmer plants, and knows that something is going from what to grow, ~~when~~ he sows. He plants it, and he knows ~~it=~~ that something is going to grow. He plants it, and he knows that the forces are there to bring growth. God give them invitation with the assurance that this invitation is ~~on~~ not going to be a different thought unanswered. It is ~~difficult~~ altogether from verse 10 on from what we have in full.

You might say that what is before is a condition, what is before is optional. It is giving people a free opportunity. Why do ye spend money for what is not bread? What do you not take advantage of this marvellous opportunity that is made available to you? This is from verses 1 through nine. Now, he says that this invitation is not merely an invitation, it is an invitation which is ~~of~~ certain of an answer. It is an invitation which is going to accomplish His purpose. God has determined who ~~is~~ definite going to ~~sa~~ be saved. He has determined that there are going to be the ~~just~~ results. It ~~which~~ He shall accomplish ~~which~~ that which I ~~de~~ree decree, It shall prosper in the things \_\_\_\_\_. So, we have two sides here. We have the side of free offer, take or leave it. Then we have the side of the assurance that He will accomplish what the Lord . . . .

ISAIAH #61

We had a man speaking once in our chapel, and he said that one time a minister spoke to a rather general congregation, and he said that whosoever will may come. The is An invitation was given to all, everyone is free to come, and accept the Lord, and receive His mercy. And he said, all the Arminians looked happy, and he smiled when he said that, and then he said, ~~h~~we went on, and said, God/fore-ordained who is going to be saved, and all the Calvinists liked that. But actually, he said, the Calvinists should have been happy at ~~the~~ both remarks, because, he said, Calvinists'

ISAIAH #61

and foreordination  
teaching is involved not merely in the predestination/of God, equally in the fact  
the  
of reality and sincerity of /Author of God to offer-\_\_\_\_\_ and no one is  
as a  
\_\_\_\_\_ except for the result of his own refusal to accept the offer of salvation  
which God has- gives. No one is punished by the arbitrary act of God. He is just  
punished for his sin. He deserves punishment. But, nevertheless, God has ordained  
who are to be saved. We do not understand-and it, but to take it-one side of it  
twisted  
without the other leads to falsehood, and crooked idea(?). Both are clearly taught  
in the Scripture, and they have been very clearly taught in the catechism. These  
on the "Let  
wonderful verses /of free offer of salvation ~~that~~-the wicked for sake his ~~wicked~~  
ways/, ... God will abundantly pardon." No one has any excuse for not accepting  
it. But also God has promised that He is not just throwing out the offer, and no  
boyd knows whether there is going to be any result or not. He says that just as  
the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but  
watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the  
sower, and bread to the eather, So God's word is not going ✓ to return to Him,  
but is going to accomplish what he is-please✓s, and God is going to intervene  
whether to be sent. Here, so, we have a definite promise that God is going to  
save those whom He ordained for salvation, and, of course, a person goes out  
with this definite promise...  
with a message of the gospel/. It is not just a matter of whether ~~or not~~ people have  
sense enough to see the ~~truth~~ truth of what he gives or whether he has ability  
enough to present it well, but it is also that God has given the promise, and God  
is going to bring the fruit. Paul said, Paul planted, and Apollo watered, but it  
the  
is God who gives growth increase. ... ..(Some noises from other classrooms?)  
... There then is a promise that God is going to accomplish what he says will be  
accomplished.

ISAIAH #61

It is wonderful that it is included ✓ right here, the statement of the gospel call, the promise that there will be fruition from it, that is to be accomplished, what he pleases. Now there is... I was reading an article in the Christianity Today in the latest issue, by \_\_\_\_\_ a \_\_\_\_\_ has \_\_\_\_\_ bishop, the head of ~~the~~ German church, who ~~retired~~ recently, and he speaks about \_\_\_\_\_ going somewhere as a Reformed preacher. He evidently belongs to a Reformed church rather to a Lutheran church. They were, however, united by the order of a king into one church, but \_\_\_\_\_ he was a Reformed, and he ~~said~~ says the Lutheran did not come here to preach.

... But he says, he has noticed a great difference between the ~~Reformed church~~ preaching and the Lutheran preaching, because, he says, the Reformed preacher <sup>s try</sup> ~~tries~~ to get the message crossed <sup>and get it</sup> to the hearts of the people, ~~but the Lutherans~~ and he says, the Lutherans say, Why do you preach like that? It is God's word that has the power. You give the word and God's word has power and Spirit, and there is no point of your acting and pushing and toiling .... It is the Word of God that has the power. Of course, it is right that it is the Word of God that has the power. But God wants us to utilize <sup>every bit of</sup> ~~the~~ ability that we <sup>can</sup> ~~have as much as we can~~ to get the word across. He says, certainly Isaiah did also ✓ in the language that he used. So that I am sure that Luther would have never spoken it that way, or thought that way. But that is <sup>es</sup> the Lutheran emphasis, the emphasis of the Word ... has led in no church <sup>in</sup> Germany that is strange... where did I hear? The minister has no responsibility to try to get the message crossed. I have had a friend in ✓ Presbyterian church in California had been in ~~ski-~~ \_\_\_\_\_ two years ago, who ~~used to preach~~ when he was in college, and he was very, very effective in it, and he had a wonderful way of putting his ideas across, and he was

ISAIAH #61

a good singer. But I heard him preach not long ago in a small, low (8.90) tone of voice...

The human emphasis upon the Word of God, ~~th-~~ he thought, was wrong.. It would be dramatical, artificial to handle the word of God that way... to try to get ideas across.... I think the Lord wants us to utilize every possible means we can to get the word across, but Finney has written a sermpnon on how to preach those who convert no body. I think it is true that the Lord wants us to use every possibi~~lit-~~le ability that He has given us , that the Lord has given us a task, and it is up to us to do it, but ~~to do it-~~ He wants us also to do it, ~~but he wants us also~~ in such a way that it will bring forth the best possible ~~reul~~ results....

So, here we ha ve both ideas very well expressed/ in this chapter. Then after verse 11, then you have ~~tee-~~ two very interesting verses, "For ye shall go out with  
....."

joy, and be led forth with peace: the ~~mountains and the hills shall break-forth before you into singing,~~ and ~~all the trees of the field shall clap their hands."~~

~~all= the~~  
Now who is ye here? We have been looking at/pronouns, have we not? It is interesting now to look at the very beginning, Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, (7.25) That is to all, come ye. Verse 2: Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread? Verse 3."Incline your ear, and come unto me: hear, and y-your soul shall live; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David." Then the verse 5 says, "Behold, thou shalt call a nation

....."  
that thou knowest not, ~~and nations that knew not thee shall run-unte thee because of the Lord thy God,~~ and for the Holy-One-of Who is thou? Is that just everybody? Is that an individual thing addressed to an individual people? Is it collective? Does that indicate Israel, thou? Does it indicate a nation? Does it indicate the people of God? Or does it indicate an individual? Thou there in verse five causes an interesting problem. Now you go on to verse six, and again it speaks

ISAIAH #61

in general of, "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found... Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts:..." This is general. Verse 8:

"For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord." - that your thoughts are general, and God's thoughts are not those of a human being. So my way<sup>s</sup>/higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.

- better than the thoughts of human beings. Then ~~next~~ the next section is in verse 12: "For ye shall go out with joy, and be led forth with peace...." Now who is ye here? Who would you say is ye? Would you say that ye here is those who have accepted the Saviour<sup>of it</sup> - invitation. This is telling what the result<sup>is</sup> going to be.

Now, first in this passage, first in this context, when we believe that ye shall go forth, ye we cannot help thinking of the exile, because back in chapters 40 on to 47, we have a constant emphasis upon the return from exile, and here, you remember in chapter 52 we have a return from exile ~~f=~~, "... go ye out of the midst of her; be ye clean, that bear the vessels of the Lord." So, we cannot help thinking ~~that~~, Does this mean that the exile, ~~he~~ <sup>ye</sup> shall ~~fo~~ go forth out with joy, and be led forth with peace: the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, "and all ~~h~~ these things are going to happen, as the exiles will be leaving Babylon, and going back to Pa~~e~~lestine. You cannot help asking the question. But I am inclined to think that between 52 and here the whole environment has brought it out to the point where now he is (5.04) speaking to those ~~tho~~ - who ~~hv~~ have accepted the invitation rather than to the returning exiles. And then I do not think that in these verses we actually have anything to tie with the return from exile, except the phrase, "Ye shall go out." But, "Ye shall go out," is an interesting statement. Where are they going to go? What do they mean? What does it mean for them to go out? Does it mean that you shall separate yourself? You should go out from the National Council?

ISAIAH #61

(4.65) .. Or does it just mean a general course of life? He ... Ye shall go out

✓ In  
with joy, and be led forth with peace... /Your course of life in-your d conduct

is going on. I would think that it is probably what it means. That would  
their

include ~~a~~ separation from evil force . They are going out tomorrow, more  
But

comprosmising ... every thing like that.. It is just through the part of the

regular course of life, surely. Ye shall go out with joy, and be led forth

with peace.... God is going to <sup>lead in the</sup> give you an/ordinary course of life . The

✓ mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of-t-  
of the fields/ shall clap their hands. " Of course, this is figurative. We do

not believe that the mountains and the hills are going to sing. We do not think that-th  
he takes

that the trees are going to clas/p their hands. Somebody says that /everything

in the Bible is-literal. Suppose they take the verse 12 literal. Surely, in ver se

12, the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing,  
an figurative

... this is an expression for all nature uniting for joy for the redemption

of the people of God... . It is figurative, but it is quite clear what the figure

is. It is not a vague expression, but then when you gent- get into thirteen

I just can't quite see that it is all just figurative: instead of the

thorn shall come up the fir thx tree and instead of the briar shall come up

the myrtle tree and it shall be to the Lord for a name , for an everlasting

✓ sign that shall not be cut off. What does verse 13 mean. Does it-jsu- just

mean that in your life everything is going to be x pleasant. Will the Christain-

Christian find everything pleasant in life. Christians have disease, they have

afflictions, they have misfortune. You don't know ~~xxx~~ what the Lord is x gx

going to permit to come into our lives. Instae-Instae Instead of the thorn

shall come up the fir tree . Does this refer to heaven--the joys of heaven

--it wouls would be a very strange way to describe heaven . And it shall be

to the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sigh sign that shall not be cut off.

I can't get away from the feeling that in verse thirteen we have a promise of the eventual results of the Atonement of Christ in the removal of the curse from nature. ~~Instae~~ Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree and instead of the briar shall come up the myrtle tree. God told Adam that because of ~~thi~~ his sin the earth was going to bring forth thistles, that there was a curse upon nature on account of man's sin. Now, if verse thirteen ~~is~~ is not some general expression of general goodness on the part of God, and it seems to me that we shouldn't interpret it ~~that~~ that way, although I know very good people not very far ~~h~~ from here that do interpret ~~it~~ it that way, why, surely, this is the removal of the curse. It seems to me that upon ~~thethis~~ this earth where the thorns and briars are, there is going to be a removal of that which comes on account of man's sin. It doesn't seem to me that verse would be a way of saying this ~~is~~ earth ~~is~~ is going to be destroyed and you are going to be taken off where there is none of the miseries. It will be a very ~~is~~ very clear way to express that, and Isaiah may have not known very much about what was going to happen, but ~~es~~ certainly the Lord knew and the Lord directed Isaiah here, and I don't see ~~how~~ how you can reasonably ~~interepre~~ interpret verse thirteen ~~xxx~~ except in the millennium it shall ~~be~~ be to the Lord <sup>earth</sup> for a name for an everlasting sign, it shall not be cut off. This/verse becomes what God made it to be, a place ~~w~~ in which righteousness covers the earth and in which there is removal of the curse, all the result of the atonement, which are to be shared in by those who accept of God's grace.

Now of course those who take an amillennial view ~~in the--inssi~~ ~~xx~~ insist that there is not going to be anything any such thing upon this earth, but they have to reduce phrases --now, I know of a man who is very godly, Christian~~x~~ man but he would reverted to amillennialism when he was in Seminary, when he was one of my students, by the way, but I was only teaching Hebrew ~~x~~ at the time, and I ~~wa~~ saw a series of arthi-articles that he wrote in a religious magazine on Gog and Magog ~~xx~~(Ezekiel 39:9) and he said some people say that it is Russia and Germany, some people say it is this, and he went through and he looked up a lot of books--some of them ~~x~~ written by ~~erand-~~ cranks ~~xx~~ undboutedly--they were crazy ideas, and he presented one after the other, and I didn't read it carefully to see if he had read- reason-~~sufff~~- sufficient in every case, but he gave enough ~~different~~ different interpretations to make it look as if it were a hopeless ~~xx~~ case to find something that would correspond to something that was going to happen in this world, and then the conclusion was that these don't mean any particular nations or anything ~~x~~ like that but that this simply is showing what great enemies the church is goig going to have and we should not worry because we have a great God who is greter than the enemy, In other words,   
 ✓ he reduces two chapters to a ~~g~~ vague statement that the church is going to have great enemies~~x~~, and it is given so specifically , I would say that I do not know what that means, but it means something, it means something definite, and when the time comes and it is fulfilled, people will see exactly ~~the~~ how it was fulfilled, and God--- God's ~~w~~ Word was specific and ~~xx~~ real. It contains figures of speech but figures are not just vague things --they are definite~~x~~ presentations only in symbolif form, and nothing is pure from symbolism-- There must be preineip principles--part of it must be literal or it is just ~~xx~~ hot air. Anything can mean anything, if you try to take it like one ~~beed-~~ book on ~~the~~ Revelation, it says everything in Revelation is symbolic therefore ~~everything~~ nothing in Revelation stands for what it says it is --everything is a symbol for something else. Well, you look at the book and you find

it is impossible to carry it out. But that is the attitude-- the Amillennial ~~attitud~~ attitude, and-I-was as I was saying to a man this morning I don't think it is tremendously important to know ~~xx~~ what is going to happen after Christ ~~x~~ returns to this earth, whether we believe ~~xxx~~ that there is going to be a millenium after He returns or not. Every Christian will find out when He comes back, we-don't- I don't think it is tremendou~~ly~~ important to know whether there is going to be a ~~mile~~ millenium or not, but it seems to ~~be~~ me that the teaching of the Mile-- Millenium is so expressed in the ~~the~~ Old Testament that if ~~you~~ you interpret it away and get ~~g~~ rid of it, you go much further than the modern~~ist~~ go in saying that the resurrection of Christ is the principle of permanence of personality, and ~~modernistic~~ if ~~your~~-are you are logical, you can take the/~~modernism~~ position right down the line, so I think it is very dangerous as a method of exegesis, and I know people who are A -millennialist, and who are very godly people and who stand for the great fundamental ~~doctrien-~~ doctrines, and I thank God they are illogical, I would much rather they be illogical than be logical and give us those ~~doctrien~~ doctrines, but I do think that the Lord wants us ~~the~~-interpret- the interpreters of His ~~w~~ Word to use sound methods all through. And so I feel that the Premillennial view is very important, not so ~~much~~ much for what is involved itself, as for the fact of the sound methods of interpretation, and in this verse 13 it seems to me that any reasonable interpretation is that we find the removal of the curse, which is the millenium, and ~~xx~~ if we ~~taek~~ take it in another way, it is just words, just words, and it doesn't say ~~x~~ anything. It seems to me that ~~the~~ ~~x~~ ~~xx~~ that is quite important. Now, there ~~xx~~ might be some special significance to the myrtle tree, I don't know enough~~x~~ about it, if it is, I think it definitely means that which is good and helpful, , instead of that which is sharp and annoying. The one thing that we have skipped over is the last verse of verse three, and verses four and vi-- ~~xx~~ five, and those verses are not extremely easy, and I~~xxxx~~ would like to get a lot further into them, ~~xxx~~ exactly what it means, of course, it says, incline

your ear and come to me, Hear and your soul shall live, and I will make an everlasting ~~covenatn~~ covenant, I think that is important. I ~~x~~ hate to hear people talk about people being for or against the Covenant Theology, because definitely the Lord says here He is going to make a covenant with those who accept the ~~true~~ truth, and therefore, how can anybody accept the teaching of salvation through Christ and ~~now have these~~ not become ~~in~~ members of the Covenant in relation to \_\_\_\_\_. The ~~x~~ term Covenant Theology is used in ~~relation~~ three or four different senses, and people are very much concerned -you are no good if you are not a covenant theologian and some ~~x~~ are quite convinced you are ~~xxx~~ terrible if you are a covenant theologian and they use the term in three ~~xx~~ or four different senses, and it doesn't ~~clair~~-- clarify it at all, but after the fact of God making a covenant of those who accept Christ, certainly this verse makes that absolutely clear--not ~~x~~ only that but many other verses, that the one who accepts Christ does not simply say, Well, good, I accept Christ's free pardon, now, I go and live any way I want. No, he enters into a covenant relationship --He becomes a member of the family of God--it is an everlasting covenant. One does not simply accept pardon from sin, and then go on and tomorrow he goes out and with his sins. He becomes a member of an everlasting covenant, he accepts the offer of salvation that God has made through what Jesus Christ did on the cross, and so I will make an everlasting covenant with you, and every Christian must believe in a covenant relation with God, Now, some people take the term and they read into it all kinds of terms which ~~xxx~~ irritate ~~oth-e~~ - other people and they ~~xy~~ say they are against it all--that is very unfortunate, because it is so very definite that there is a covenant between the believer and the Lord. I will make an everlasting covenant--not a covenant that can be made and ~~in~~ broken but if you are in it you are in it, you don't have to worry about your covenant relation. Then he said the ~~x~~ everlasting

covenant that He makes with those who accept His free offer of salvation is the sure mercies of David, and let's look at this word in the Hebrew--the sure mercies of David. (Q) The word \_\_\_\_\_ according to ~~NBDB~~ ~~lesi-~~ lexicon is ~~x~~ used 285 times in the O.T., so we see it is a common word. It 's translated covenant 260 times, confederat~~2~~ 2 , league 15. So it is a very ~~gm~~ ~~genear-~~ general word. Joshua 9:15, He made a league with the; ~~m~~, and let ~~they~~ them live~~t~~. now ~~j~~ Joshua ~~make-x~~ made a league with the Gibeonites. It's the word covenant , I don't know why they translated it league there. He ~~mak x~~ made a covenant ~~x~~ with them ~~sees~~ to me to make more sense than a league, ~~butx~~ and then he found out that the Gibeonites had ~~mistr~~ misrepresented to him and had told him that they lived way, way, off and they wore old shoes and they carried old , worn out food, and God had said-~~destry~~ Destroy ~~x~~ all the people in this area and Joshua had made a ~~x~~ ~~x~~ covenant with-~~thelm~~ them to let them live, the ~~x~~ covenant was made under false ~~x-pres~~ pretenses on their part, but ~~x~~ when he found out that it was fals pretenses, God rebuked-~~Jesua~~ Joshua ~~h~~ for having made a ~~evenann~~ covenant with people when he wasn't suppose to ~~mak~~ make a covenant with them, but Joshua was required to keep the covenant, and ~~the~~He ~~make-~~ made the Gibeonites ~~hews-of~~ hewers of wood and draw~~ers~~ of water but he did not destroy thelm, and 300 years later ~~inx~~ David's time when there was great trouble in the land and David inquired what was the trouble, and he was told that the covenant that had been made ~~x~~ with the Gibeonites was not being kept. That the Israelites were not carrying out the Cove~~nant~~ and they had to make ~~the~~ things right to the Gibeonites; in ~~xx~~ other words God ~~mak~~ held Joshua responsibl~~w~~ e for the carrying out of the covenant, and whel- when God says to us , I will make an everlasting covenant with you , ~~and~~ well, surely, He has obligated ~~h~~ Himself to it in a permanent sense, even as Joshua had obligated himself to the Gibe~~on~~ites, the only difference there is that ~~Ge~~ Joshua was deceived by the ~~Geo~~ Gibeonites, but nevertheless was ~~oblig~~ oblided to carry out the ~~evenan-~~ covenant that he had made. And the Israelites were punished when they broke it.

When God makes a covenant with us, God is not deceived at all. God knows everything about us, and so I don't like it when I remember hearing a woman say to her daughter--~~she~~ she~~said~~ said, Now, she says, You are born again... I said, to myself, How do you know that somebody ~~else~~ else is born again,--~~Someone~~ ~~can~~-- How do you know whether someone else is born again. A person can say things, we can deceive other human beings, but if we in ~~our~~ sincerity of heart have accepted God's offer of salvation, and we have ~~received~~ received Christ into our hearts, have accepted God's offer of salvation and we have ~~received~~ received Christ into our hearts, God knows and we know. Our people may be fooled, but God has made an everlasting covenant, and He has offered Himself to us. He has made a promise and He says the promise will never be broken. There is a period of change as Paul says He ~~graphs~~ graphs out natural branches ~~out~~ out of the olive tree and branches graphs in/~~some~~ from the wild olive tree, but he says the branches of the natural tree are going to be ~~grafted~~ grafted in again, Paul ~~says~~, says, by God's mercy. As far as individuals are concerned, there are individuals who are saved and individuals who are lost, but God obligates Himself to Israel, and that Israel's obligation stands, and God ~~has~~ has obligated Himself to every individual ~~who~~ who accepts His offer. The condition is the faith that God gives us and then fulfills, but I do not ~~believe~~ believe that you can find in this promise of giving an everlasting covenant, the idea of being in the ~~covenant~~ covenant today and out of it tomorrow. I think that many people may ~~think~~ think they are in it now, ...I will make with you an everlasting covenant. This is dealing with everyone --everyone that ~~thirst~~ thirsteth--~~and~~, and your soul shall live, and I shall ~~make~~ make with you an everlasting covenant. God puts this ~~new~~ new life in our souls. If we are born again, we ~~haven't~~ have this ~~covenant~~ covenant--we may drift, but we will not drift beyond His love and care. He will hold us, we don't have to say, ...

Well, here is this promise then that I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David. Let's look at that phrase, the sure mercies of David. That is doubtless ~~ix~~--the even is inserted, to show the belief of the translators that this is in apposition. And he said and I will cut for you a covenant. Now, this is an interesting ~~phrase~~ phrase in the Hebrew. ~~Sn~~ And I will cut for you a ~~v~~ covenant. Whenever it speaks of making a covenant in the Bible, it is literally to cut a covenant. There is another phrase, To cause a covenant to stand. That makes use of ...but when it comes to the making of the covenant, they ~~als~~ always use to cut a ~~coven~~ covenant, and that seems to be a taking over of a phraseology that was very common in those days, as we find from various ~~cut~~ cuneiform tablets, that the making of a covenant was made by the cutting of animals\_\_\_\_\_ to show the desire that anyone who breaks the covenant shall ~~sox~~ be so shattered as these animals were shattered. There is that promise ~~to Abram~~ that we were reminded of ~~in Abraham~~ Abraham in Genesis where he cuts these animals that the Lord commanded and God made this promise to Abraham and His mercies would be with him forever, and that his seed would continue forever, and Abraham had this t...The phrase ~~was~~ is regularly used to cut ..and here God says that you simply accept the free ~~invia~~ invitation and I will cut a covenant with you. A covenant between two men, but when God makes a covenant, God obligates Himself. God binds ~~him~~ Himself to this country. The last part of the verse, \_\_\_\_\_ This is from from the root of to believe, or to ...It is translated in the King James as the Faithful and the sure mercies of David, those which can be believed in. Certainly that God will stand by His promise, the dependable mercy or benevolence of David.

Does this mean that God will cut with you an everlasting covenant which is like what he- He did for ~~a~~ David, the sure mercies which God ~~a~~ gave to David. If the passage ended here , I would certainly think that that is what ~~is~~ it is , I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the wonderful blessings I gave David. But the way that it goes on, Behold, I have given him for a witness to the people. Or, does he mean I will make an ~~a~~ ~~everlasting~~ ~~in~~ ~~K~~ everlasting covenant with you, which is the loving kindness that David showed. Is it in some way, David the mediator of the covenant, and is David here representing the seed of David. There is nothing in the statement about the Servant of the Lord that suggest that He is the ~~D~~ ~~a~~ Son of David. The reference is in connection ~~is~~ with the Son of David is in connection with the great King who is going to come. But this gives us an ~~in~~ inkling that the great king and the great ~~serv~~ ~~v~~ servant are the same one after all, because here ~~is~~ we have David brought in, the ~~sure~~ ~~in~~ sure mercies of David. He has been given for a witness to the people, a leader and commander to the people. This connecting up of Isa. 53 with Isa. 11, and Isa. 2 where we have the ~~promises~~ promises of the coming of the Son of ~~Daiv~~ David who is going to reign in righteousness. I have given him for a witness to the people , a leader and a commander to the people . Thou ~~shall~~ shalt call ~~on~~ nations that thou ~~a~~ knowest not, nations that ~~ke~~ knew not thee shall run unto thee, because of the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel. Who is the thee, ~~N~~ now? If we have just been talking to Israel, we would say that the thee is Israel, the Holy one ~~es~~ of Israel. Israel is ~~going~~ going to call a nation that ~~isa~~ Israel did not know . Nations that did not know Israel are going to run unto Israel, but in our ~~a~~ context we have this general ~~thought~~ call to everyone that thirsts . It comes immediately

after it, so ~~it is~~ it is not worthy of ~~easy~~ consideration that the thou here is a collective, but a collective here refers not to the physical Israel but refers to those who have accepted the ~~invitation~~ invitation and ~~have~~ have entered into the ~~premises of God, and~~ covenant with God and formed the new people ~~w~~ of God, ~~in-~~ including some who are Israel and some who are ~~k~~ not. ~~KK~~ I know there are people who make a rule that there can't be anything about the church in the Old Testament, but ~~where~~ where do they get the basis for that rule. Does God ever say ~~anyth~~ anywhere \_\_ -- He certainly says ~~plea~~ plenty about Gentiles' salvation. (Q) The suggestion ~~th~~ that instead of the thou being a collective, at the beginning of verse, that the thou is addressed to the Son of David, the one who is a ~~k~~ witness to the people, a leader and a commander. David is promised that he will always have one to ~~sh~~ sit on the throne, one who is to ~~sig~~ sit on the throne of David was given this marvelous promise, in Samuel, and in Chronicles and in the Psalms, that he is going to call a ~~speciv~~ specific nation, those that had not known. Thou shalt call a nation that thou knowest ~~k~~ not. A very interesting ~~suggesting~~ suggestion, one well worth consideration. I don't think that ~~the-~~ He hath glorified thee ~~k~~ necessarily proves because we read in ~~Romans~~ Romans that Whom He called He justified, and whom ~~He~~ He justified, He ~~glorif-He-~~ glorified. I ~~w~~ read a review just recently about a new ~~beed-~~ book by Bernard Ramm on glorification. It does seem that we have -- this is an interesting thing to think through. Are these thous addressed to an individual, if so, Christ would be the one. Is ~~isx~~ it addressed collectively to those who accept the ~~invitation~~ invitation. He is glorified all who -- well, we have some interesting problems still to look at here, and this matter of \_\_\_\_\_ we want to look further at. I would suggest that if ~~ou-~~ you have time, you

look in BDB where there is a section on the ~~x~~ covenant, and it says first covenant between man and man. He gives many man to man, and then He ~~gives~~ --- he gives all sorts of illustrations. After all, if there are 285 uses of the words, we can't look at all of ~~the~~ those. And then he gives the prophetic ~~x~~ covenant, a separate section, and under the prophetic ~~x~~ covenant he gives about 20 ~~pre~~ references, which I ~~ha~~ have copied, and I think it worthwhile to look at all these references and see how much ~~relevant~~ relevance they may have.

We ~~mx~~ will not meet again after ~~today~~ today until three weeks from today, and so I might ~~suggest~~ suggest about assignments at the end of the hour, ~~but~~ so I better do it now, and would you please pass the word on to those who are absent ~~and~~ if you see them prior to that time. When I started to speak there were two absent. There is only one now, but if you see Mr. Kim would you ~~x~~ pass the word on. The next meeting ~~is still~~ isn't until several days after school starts, after Christmas vacation. It starts on ~~Thursday~~, we don't meet until next Monday, and then we will have only four more meetings of this class, so I would like ~~x~~ everyone to be ~~thour~~ thoroughly prepared for next time, and we will want to take up chapter ~~x~~ 54 and in 54 try to think of every verse, ~~what~~ is it talking about and who is it talking about. What does it promise, what does it say is going to happen, what is ~~ix~~ its relation to the context, and to whom is it spoken. There ~~are~~ aren't many possibilities to pick between. But ~~I~~ think very definitely, is it a general statement given to whoever is thirsty. Is it a collective given to a nation, and ~~w~~ tell what nation. Just exactly what is meant in each verse, take each verse by itself and see what ~~conclusins~~ conclusions you can reach about it, and then see what light it throws on context, ~~and by~~ In Bible study, and in ~~x~~ anything else, if we are going to make

progress you are going to have to go ~~take~~ from what is clear to what is unclear. And that doesn't mean that you can start at one end and go right straight across. You find things that are ~~clear~~ clear here ~~x~~ and here and here and here, and what is clear make clear, and what relation that it ~~k~~ has to the things that are left. And thus the clear helps to interpret the less clear. All too often ~~the~~ Bible sessions ~~leple~~ people try to take up a ~~diff~~ difficult verse and try to get a definite idea on the verse, and then they try to explain ~~w~~ away the clear on the basis of the unclear, instead of getting the clear explained and then explaining the unclear by the clear. We go forward in that way and get more and more clear. In this case ~~y~~ don't think you can start at either end of the chapter ~~and~~ with equal clarity --take each verse as a unit and study it ~~and~~ and see what all the possibilities of it are. Now today rather than get into 54 much we had better ~~for remain~~ remain with 55, and we notice in verse 13 what ~~a see~~ seems to me to be very definitely a promise of the removal of the curse of ~~the~~ the work of Christ at Calvary. The point to come, not immediately but it is promised that it ~~we~~ will come eventually.

ISA. 64  
Then we notice the last part of it, from verse ten on is a declaration of the certainty of ~~accomplish~~ accomplishment through what he did. It was not just thrown out into the world to see whether anything would be accomplished. It definitely says His word will ~~x~~ not return unto him void but will accomplish what he ~~pleas~~ ~~per~~ pleases. It is God's plan of recreating this world which has fallen under the dominion of sin, of reclaiming humanity from the terrible state into which it ~~for~~ fell as a result of Adam's sin. The death of Christ produces the basis for it, ~~de~~ God declares that the it will be worked out on this basis, that the results will definitely come. Now, that the part that we have not discussed, the last half of ~~the~~ three and four and five. Miss Pickett made a suggestion about verse five which was new to me, which I had

not thought of before, which I believe deserves very definite consideration.

Who is the thou in verse five? Is he talking to Israel? Is he talking to the Gentiles? Is he talking to the ~~Chr~~ Church? Is he talking to the one who is thirsty? Is he talking to the Servant of the Lord? The Servant of the Lord is never mentioned again after 52. Never ~~gain~~ again in the ~~Book~~ Book of Isaiah do we have the word ~~Ser~~ Servant. We have statements such ~~x~~ as in 54:17, ~~x~~ This is the heritage of the Servants of the Lord. The phrase Servants of the Lord is used My Servants, His servants, it is used quite a number of times in the Book of Isaiah and would seem to refer to ~~th~~ those who were the followers of the Servant, those who were saved through the Servant. But although the Servant is not specifically mentioned after 53, he is very much in the backgr ound of our thought in ~~ix~~ 54 and 55 and it would not be at all impossible that here in verse 5 that the Lord ~~ix~~ turns to the Servant and addresses him. Behold, Thou shalt call a nation that thou knowest ~~ix~~ not. Jesus Christ knows every nation. How could He call a nation that He knew not, but Jesus Christ according to the flesh would be the seed of Israel. Jesus as the Servant of the Lord was fulfilling Israel's respons~~ib~~ility, so the nation that thou knowest not could perhaps be inter~~ex~~preted as the Servant of the Lord as He was thought of in His relation.

A root out of a dry ~~x~~ ground, yet ~~ix~~ kings are going to shut their mouths at him. He is one that is given as a leader of the people, a leader and a commander, and he is going to call nations that during his earthly ministry see~~x~~ m to have no connection with it at all, and the next part--nations that knew not thee shall run ~~ix~~ unto thee. For He hath glorified thee--certainly in the fullest sense He hath glorified thee, would refer to Christ. He is the one who was humiliated and He is glorif~~ix~~ied. He is the one who ~~ix~~ gave His life, He gave His life a ransom for many and who divided the

~~strip~~ spoil with the strong. While He hath glorified thee, could perhaps refer to the followers of Christ, it ~~is~~ fits better with Christ Himself. As between these two interpretations of verse five, I am not at all sure definite. I see points pushing in both directions. ~~Of~~ Of course verse four, I ~~have~~ have given Him as a witness to the people, a leader and a commander to the people--that seems to fit in with it being an individual. A nation would fit in ~~with~~ with it being a greater son of David. The one who previously was mentioned as the great conquering King but here there are two concepts together. They say that some of the Rabbis interpret that there were going to be two ~~Mesi~~ Messiahs: the ~~Ms~~ Messiah Ben David, and the ~~Messiga-~~ Messiah ben Joseph, and the Messiah Ben David was the conquering King and the Messiah ben Joseph was the suffering servant. I haven't checked that, but this would fit with that idea that the ~~sex~~ suffering servant was not previously tied up with David and here ~~is~~ is expressing the tie-up. He did His work as the suffering Messiah, representing Israel and accomplishing Israel's work, but the ~~fulfu~~ fulfillment of the work will mean the carrying out of His place as the Son of David, as the one who shall reign over all the world. So that <sup>may</sup> ~~Account~~ accounts for the mention of David following by the words, I have given Him for a witness to the people, a leader and a commander. There are a people here, The word ~~an~~ <sup>AY</sup> is often used of Israel in the Bible, but it is also used of any nation. I am not at all sure that you can use ~~---~~ <sup>AY</sup> of all the people in the world. It is frequently used of a particular nation and that is most often ~~referee-~~ referred, but it is used of Egypt and the people of Assyria, and so the word <sup>AY</sup> may refer to the people Israel, now just ~~before~~ before that, in verse three, If we incline our ear and hear, then we are given a pardon ~~until~~ which lasts until we commit our next sin. The Romanist idea that if you are baptized you are saved from all your sins ~~up~~ up to that minute. But then after you were baptized, you go on to sin, and these sins have to be made up for by a repetition of the sacrifice

of Christ in the mass. And you have penance and you have suffering in purgatory for your sins committed after baptism. Something of this idea must have been in the mind of Constantine, for although he presided at great Christian assemblies and showed great ~~sh~~ interest in the Christian Church and presided at the great Council of Nicea, yet he refused to be baptized until the day before he died. He wanted to be sure that all of <sup>his</sup> sins were before him rather than after. If one comes, one hears, and one is ~~savied~~ saved, he is then saved from the penalty of all his sins, past, present, and future. They are all ~~a~~ laid on Christ. Paul said what shall we do then, shall we sin, that grace may abound. God forbid. A person who would simply ~~use~~ use it as an excuse for sinning would prove that he ~~nee~~ never had been saved. But the person ~~we-~~ who comes to Christ ~~then~~ then falls again and we keep falling through our ~~liv-~~ life but through the sanctifying grace of Christ we fall ~~le~~ less often and less slow each time, if we ~~ex~~ keep our eyes on Him we are made more and more into His image, but the ~~is-~~ self salvation through Christ is not a thing we get today and loose tomorrow, it is a coming results and our shall ~~live~~ live, and we become participants of a covenant, even the sure mercies of David. We mentioned yesterday that Covenant is related to the word which is used in the Babylonian and is used in connection with various people who are used in varying area of Palestine and Syria and Northern Mesopotamia who would make a covenant following a ceremony, sort of like ~~a~~ Abraham used when God told him to cut the pieces. He would kill certain animals and divide them up and ~~they were~~ we are not sure of the significance there but it is generally thought that it is to show what they were calling upon ~~to~~ to happen to them. We have quite a few ~~instan-~~ instances of treaties between nations, that were solemnized by the ~~g-killing-kin-kilo~~ killing of animals among these Canaanite people. Hebrew is the making of a covenant.

is usually the word Kareth, to cut, which would seem to point to something similar in the connection with the making of a covenant,--this word Bareth occurs a good many times in the Old Testament. As an ordinary covenant it is used ~~285~~ 285 times according to BDB, and ~~for~~ translated confederacy twice, and league 15 times and ~~a~~ covenant 260. ~~The--if~~ the word is used as an ordinary ~~k~~ ~~xxx~~ covenant --it is used with ~~Jos~~ ~~husa~~ Joshua and the Gibeonites, it is used with the agreement of ~~Jacob~~ Jacob, it is used as ~~Jeh~~ Jonathon--but then it is used as an agreement between two people. But then it is used ~~xxx~~ a great deal as an agreement between ~~k~~ God and the people. And it is suggested by Thayer that it was ~~xxx~~ a fact that ~~the~~ Bareth so often in the Old Testament represents a covenant between God and man which is a ~~xxx~~ one-sided Covenant, because God makes the terms. Many says I will do this, but God ~~xxx~~ lays down the terms, it is a one-sided ~~xxx~~ covenant-- it is like a decree in a way, ~~xxx~~ and therefore, Thayer suggests that ~~the~~ that may ~~the~~ be the reason why the LXX 200 years before ~~k~~ Christ, the word Bareth is regularly translated by the Greek word           . There is evidence ~~from~~ from ~~Constant~~ before 400 BC the word            was ~~xxx~~ used a contract between individuals, but after 300BC we have no further evidence as           . It seems to be the regular word from 300BC among ~~the~~ these widely scattered Greek people of the Hellenistic people for a will that one makes, which one lays down the condition as to what would happen after his death with his property. And Thayer suggests that possibly because of this ~~being~~ Bareth being often what God ~~xxx~~ lays down, that the LXX translators 200 years before Christ translated ~~xxx~~ it by Diatheche. Now the word Diatheche is not used in the N.T. ~~is not used in the~~ anywhere as commonly as the ~~Greek~~ Greek in the O.T. In the N.T. in the King James Version is ~~used~~ used as Covenant 20 times and Testament ~~30~~ times, and the 20 times it is ~~t-r~~ translated

Covenant, the margin says testament. So if you change those six to testament ~~x~~ you would have \_\_\_\_\_ ~~times~~ translated covenant and ~~x~~ \_\_\_\_\_ times teatament . But the idea of the ~~tea~~ testament instead of the covenant, seems to be the idea of Diatheche ~~is~~ in Greek, but ~~he~~ yet it is used in the LXX to represent Bareth, which is a very interesting thing~~x~~.

ISAIAH # 65

Now the BDB lists a great many of these 285 cases but it list~~s~~ about 20 cases under a particular ~~he~~ heading called the prophetic ~~x~~ covenant and these which it callse the prophetic covenant --it seems to ~~w~~ me would be worth our looking at in connection ~~ix~~ with our present verse, ~~x~~ to see what light it would throw. I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David. He says in Isa. 55. The first instance in Isaiah which BDB lists under the heading of Prophetic Covenant, which they list~~s~~ not to indicate, and I ~~think~~ <sup>don't</sup> that the authority of these modernist~~ic~~ gentlemen determin~~e~~s the matter by any means, but simply to indicate that I have not looked at all the occur~~re~~nces in the order to select them. I have ...which of course is not original with them. They reach this conclusion, and the conclusion is worthy of investigation and often will stand up under careful investigation, so it is amazing how many of the modernistic interpretations of the RSV ~~ix~~ are ~~k~~ based upon a view expressed ~~into~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ BDB, that may not be expressed as the only view. But this verse that they give, what they call the prophetic covenant , is Isa. 42:6 and that is very interesting because that is where the first passage of any leng~~th~~ <sup>5</sup> length which we have about the S<sup>E</sup>rvant of the Lord, the one who reaches the great clim~~ax~~ in Isa. 53. and here in Isa. 42 we find that he says that I the Lo d have called thee in righteousness and will

hold thine hand ~~w~~ and will give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light to the Gentiles, now that is a ~~x-very~~ ~~very-~~stea~~~~ strange phrase. I will give thee for a covenant, a very strange phrase. I will set thee ~~x~~ up the ~~ISAIAH # -cove~~ for a covenant, for a light to the Gentiles. Now, does people here mean the Jews as contrasted with the Gentiles, a covenant with the Jews. I don't know. Not necessarily, because we notice that people often mean Gentiles, I find nothing else in this passage ~~wit~~ which refers to the Jews. This passage should all be about the Gentiles, but he will set him up as a covenant of people. That is very interesting when we compare it with 55 here, where he says Here and your soul will live, and I will make an ~~ee~~ everlasting covenant with you. The covenant is the blood of the servant of the Lord. Now, it's interesting that the next instance that ~~BG~~ BDB gives of it, is also found in one of the long passages; that is 49:8. Where we have the soliloquy by the Servant of the Lord. And the Servant ~~α~~ says, Thus says the Lord, In an acceptable time I heard and in a day of salvation I have ~~held~~ helped thee, and I will preserve thee and give thee for a covenant of the people, to establish the earth, to cause to ~~int~~ inherit the desolate heritages. He is going to ~~res~~ re-establish what has been destroyed, to rebuild what has been demolished--He is a covenant of the people. Same phrase in ~~connet~~ connection with 42 and 49. And then another instance that BDB gives is our present passage in 55:3 and ~~there~~ then there is one in ~~59:29~~ 59:21. ~~Thee~~ There in ~~59:29~~ 59:21 we have the Lord saying, As for me this is my ~~xxx~~ covenant, saith the Lord, My spirit that is upon thee, and my word which I have put in ~~the~~-thy mouth which shall not depart out of thy mouth ~~of~~ or out of the mouth of thy seed or out of the mouth of thy ~~seed's~~ seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and forever. This is the Lord's covenant with them, that His spirit will remain in them ~~xxx~~ and in their seed from henceforth

and forever. And this would seem here to mean to be Israel that He is speaking of because the verse before says that the Redeemer shall come to Zion and to them that turn from transgression to Jacob, saith the Lord. Here He is saying to them that He is going to make a covenant with Israel that His ~~See~~ Spirit that His ~~x~~ Spirit will remain with them and His Words ~~x~~ in their mouth. Well, that fits with the passage in Isaiah, I mean Jeremiah, which we ~~still~~ will soon come to. But first one more in Isaiah listed here, Isa. 61:8. ~~x~~ There we have in Isa. 61:8 for I the Lord love ~~justive justice, I hate~~ judgment, I hate ~~rob~~ robbery for burnt offering; and I will direct their work in truth, and I will make an everlasting covenant with them. Speaking here of Israel and telling of the ~~be~~ blessings to come in , of an everlasting covenant with them. Now, ~~the next~~ next instance that BDB is Jeremiah 31:31. This is the passage which is quoted in the N.T. Jer. 31:31 ~~begin~~ begins ~~x~~: Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I ~~will make~~ will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah. Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord. But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will ~~lx~~ put my law in their ~~inwr~~ inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. ~~And~~ And they shall teach no more every man His ~~ne-ni~~ neighbor and every man his brother saying , Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, ~~for~~ from the least of them unto the ~~gra~~ greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will ~~x~~ forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more. Now some say that this is here a prediction of the coming of the gospel. When people will no longer ~~x~~ be judged by their works but will ~~x~~ be treated according to their faith , and they will

have the Holy Spirit living in them. And so this is a prediction of the ~~gosp~~-gospel age, and if it is a prediction of the gospel age, how is verse 34 fulfilled today. They shall teach no ~~man~~ more every man his neighbor and every man his ~~br~~- brother , for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest of them, saith the Lord. I ask a great O.T. scholar that one time, just how this is fulfilled in the gospel age, ~~there~~ that no one says to his brother , Know the Lord for they all know ~~h~~ Him. How is that fulfilled now. Well, he says, ~~that~~ means if one Christian says to another , Know the Lord, because all the Christians know the Lord. Well, then, what it ~~amount~~- amounts to is ~~this~~ this, No man who knows the Lord shall say to another , who knows the Lord, ~~X~~ Know the Lord, for everybody who knows the Lord shall know the Lord. ~~X~~ In other words, it reduces it to utter ~~k~~ nonsense. This is very often ~~quoted~~ as if it simply were a ~~prec~~ prediction of the gospel age, and it quite naturally should be so predicted, because it is used in the N.T. , ~~quoted~~ in the N.T. in ~~wh~~- ways ~~k~~ which ~~superfici~~- superficially interpreted would lead you to think that that is exactly what is being talked about. ~~There~~ One instance of that is in Hebrews 8, and ~~there~~ we find the writer of Hebrews says, that ~~k~~ in ~~verse~~ 6, But now He has ~~an~~ a more excellent ministry, by which He also ~~k~~ He is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises, because if that first covenant had been faultless , there should no place have ~~x~~ been ~~sou~~- sought for the second, but finding fault with them, He says, Behold, the days ~~x~~ come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant to the House of Israel and to the House of ~~judg~~- Judah, not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the days ~~x~~ when I took ~~h~~ them by the hand to lead them out of ~~Egypt~~- Egypt , because they continued not in my covenant and I regard<sup>3d</sup> the not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the House of

Israel after those days, saith the Lord, I will ~~ma~~ put their ~~lawa~~ laws into their mind and ~~wit~~ write them in their hearts and I will be to them a God and they shall be to me a people and they shall not ~~teach~~ every man his neighbor and every man his brother saying, Know the Lord, ~~fre~~ for all shall know me, from the ~~least~~ - ~~ix~~ least to the greatest. Verse 13, says that In He says Anew covenant, He has ~~mea~~ made the first ~~k~~ old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away. Now, ~~superficial~~ superficially reading this in Hebrew, it ~~seut~~ - sounds as if ~~in the Old~~ Under the old dispensation, people were saved by their works. If they kept God's law perfectly, they were saved, if they didn't they were lost. But unde the new dispensation we are saved because God puts His spirit in our hearts. He has our ~~law~~ law in our minds and ~~our~~ His spirit in our hearts and we are saved but in order -- They shall not teach every man His neighbor and every man ~~h~~ ~~his~~ his brother saying Know the Lord, for all shall know me from the least to the greatest. Now, just how is that ~~fulvi~~ ~~ix~~ fulfilled in the gospel age. - ~~if it is ful~~ Is it fulfilled in saying every true Christian, Well, it doesn't mean anything because it is just ----if ~~ix~~ it is fulfilled by saying that everybody ~~is a~~ in the professing Church knows the ~~Lord~~ Lord. Somebody in the professing Church tells somebody else in the professing church Know the Lord for everybody in the professing Church ~~ix~~ is a ~~tru~~ true ~~Chris~~ - Christian, well, it just ~~don~~ doesn't correspond to any church of our day. There is every church who has those in it who are not true Christians, so certainly this church does not find any sensible or adequate fulfillment in the present day, so we have an interesting problem here--what is the relation of this new covenant, just how is it new. Of course one thing about it is that it is a spiritual ~~&~~ covenant. The Old Covenant was not spiritual? Does that mean that the relation

was purely a physical relation before. It doesn't say in the book of Hebrews In those days you could be saved through keeping the law but now you are ~~not~~ saved through what Christ did. ~~Hebrew-Romans--Romans~~ Romans says no one can keep the law. Hebrew says the blood of bulls and goats cannot take away--it doesn't say it used to take away but it can't now. The sacrifice of the Old Testament prefigured the death of Christ, therefore, anyone who was saved in the Old Testament was saved through the sacrifice, saved through the lamb of God, saved in exactly the same way that anyone is saved today. And therefore the promise of the N.Covenant cannot be a change from works to faith. What is the new note in it. It is the universality --is it not. Is not the new note in the new covenant the promise that God is going sometime to save all of Israel, that all of Israel will be saved so that there will be ~~many~~ no need of any of them to say, Know the Lord, for they all shall know ~~them~~ - him, and they all will have the Word of God in their hearts as some ~~had had~~ have it before and some have it in this present ~~ant-~~ age, and certainly the new note should be made universal. But the spiritual note which is stressed in it, in discussing the new covenant is something which is present in the Old also and is vital today.

ISAIAH # 66

You ask about II Samuel 23:5 and there we find that--this is where ~~David~~ David --~~this~~ the God of Israel spoke to me... ~~&~~ Although my house be not so with God; yet he hath made with me an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things, and sure: ~~for a~~ ~~g~~ very good similarity to what we were looking at in Isa. ~~53-~~ 55:3, isn't it. An everlasting covenant, and sure, for this is all my salvation and my desire, ~~all~~ ~~it~~ although he make it not to grow. Does not this mean that God has made a promise to David, the everlasting and sure promise that he will always have one upon his throne and there is coming to be the one, the climactic one of this marvelous promise

who is to be the one who will ~~reigh~~ reign in absolute righteousness. My house  
 is not so with God. David knows that he is a sinner, he knows that he ~~had~~ has  
 done wrong, that he has fallen, he knows his son and his immediate descendants  
 are going to do wrong and that ~~eh~~ they ~~x~~ cannot possibly find work. They cannot  
 possibly by their own deserts have the position ~~of~~ as ~~rx~~ rulers over God's inheritance,  
 but God has made him an ~~everlasting~~ everlasting promise that God is going to  
 keep His Son on the throne and He is going to bring the greater son of David who  
 will reign in absolute righteousness and ~~this~~ it is through him that David's salvation <sup>comes</sup>/  
 He is His desire to whom He looks forward and Peter said on the day of Pentecost.  
 He said ~~I will not lew~~ Thou wilt not leave my sould in sheol, nor let my flesh see  
 corruption, and Peter said , Let me speak frankly about the ~~para-~~ patriarch David.  
 He has been buried . We have ~~x~~ his ~~toe~~ tomb here . We are not ~~x~~ talking about his  
 tomb here. ~~-We are g--~~ He is looking forward to the ~~gra-~~ greater Son, the Lord  
 Jesus Christ , who will not be allowed to ~~x~~ remain in death nor will his flesh see  
 corruption. In other words, God enabled David to get a glimpse of his distant son,  
 which David could not possibly have in any earthly ..and of course that is the  
 very thing that makes it impossible ~~x~~ for modernists to make a decent translation  
 of the Old Testa~~ment~~. Modernists can make a very good transla~~tion~~ of the New  
 Testa~~ment~~ Testament. You take a group of modernists who get tot~~x~~ work and ~~x~~ write  
 the RSV~~of~~ or a group over in England to write the New English Bible. And either  
~~x~~ group can read the N.T. and say whay silly ideas these people had. Here was  
 a man who was also ~~go~~ God. And a man and his death, --his dying ~~of~~ on the cross  
 would save people. They ~~x~~ may think it, they may say it. But they find that that  
~~is what e-~~ it is ~~ung~~ unquestioned that that is what the writers of the New Testament  
 believed. And so they can make a translation of the N.T. that will ~~cut~~ ~~qx~~ ~~the~~

show what the writers of the New Testament believed. And while there ~~we-~~ will be minor points they can as a whole make a pretty good translation, but when they take up the Old Testament, they ~~a~~ cannot translate the Old Testament in any accurate way because to them it is utterly inconceivable that men like David and Isaiah could ~~see-~~ look forward and see things ~~thousands-~~ hundreds of thousands of years later, and express things in a way that no one in their ~~day~~ would fully understand but could be understood later on. ~~-Sp-th-~~ So they would take a place where you would take the Hebrew of the Old Testament and you take it exactly as it stands and it is perfect picture of Christ, and ~~ty-~~ they will put a footnote Hebrew obscure and they will twist it around to make it entirely different--they admit that there is no foundation for it, because they are trying to get ~~k~~ what they think was in the minds of David, and Isaiah and ~~they-~~ they can't imagine that those people had any idea of anything ~~until~~ that nobody even dreamed of until the time of Christ. They ~~k~~ can't imagine. And that is why the RSV in the Old Testament has taken such ~~obj-~~ ~~ev-~~ obvious things and twisted them around and ~~xxx~~ put a footnote Hebrew obscure. When the ~~X~~ The New English Bible of the Old Testament comes out, it will ~~na~~ be much worse ~~that-the-~~ than the RSV. And I was thinking not so long ago, Isn't it wonderful, Here the RSV --they've try to put over on us as the Authorized Bible that we are all ~~ee-~~ suppose to ~~na~~ adopt and the National Council stands behind and we ~~ga~~ have to take it-it is there, and I ~~thou~~ thought that My Satan ~~overread-~~ overreached himself, ~~for-as-~~ because as they were trying to put that big argument of ~~w~~ how the RSV was authorized, then comes another modernist Bible and that gets a wide sale. And that certainly cuts down the people's idea of how the RSV is the Authorized Version that they all have to use. But ~~yere~~ yesterday I decided it wasn't that way at all, Satan ~~and~~ had been ~~inordinan~~ inordinately clever, because he ~~tre-trief-to~~ ~~triefd~~ to P<sup>U</sup>sh the RSV down ~~pee~~ people's throats and we all

got busy and pointed out the errors of the RSV Old Testament, how wicked it is, and many people drew back from it and didn't ~~accepe~~ accept it as the authorized version, and there was a great deal of ~~uncere~~ ~~und~~ uncertainty about and then along came the New English Bible and they say they ~~are~~ have sold millions of copies, and ~~th~~ all the opposition has gone against the RSV and not against the New ~~English-English~~ English Bible. And Satan diverted all the attacks against the RSV. I was talking to one man who is today an active editor of a great ~~Christain~~ ~~Christe~~ Christian Journal, and he said to me a year ago, when the ~~Box~~ New English Bible came out I wrote a ~~k~~ very favorable ~~ref~~ review of it, but he said during this year I have ~~ben~~ been reading it more and notice more and more that I don't like it. If I were to write ~~therewi~~ review today, it would be entirely different. Now today, even a man like the professor of New Testament at Princeton Seminary who is ~~stren fr~~ strong for the RSV will say the New English Bible is not ~~usag-usb~~ usable by ~~k~~ people who want to know what the New Testament says, they have not ~~tre-xx~~ tried to follow in any ~~wya~~. However, when they think of the ~~mill-~~ millions of people who think of it as wonderful, well, this is the situation. Here are these words of David, and it's interesting ~~fx~~ that this phrase of an everlasting covenant, ~~order~~ ordered in all things and sure exactly corresponds to what Isaiah says, I will make thee an everlasting <sup>U</sup>covenant, even the sure mercies of David. And it ~~xxx~~ ties up the work of the servant with the promise of David to rule and ~~reigh-~~ reign ~~an~~ in righteousness. Although he make it not to grow. ~~k~~ Hebrews 8-- ~~ix~~ I am inclined to think that it must be paralleled to the beginning of the verse, although my house be not so with God. Although I don't deserve it, yet he hath ~~made~~ an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things, and sure, for this is all my salvation, and all my desire, even if he does not now show me, in Solomon or

David or Rehoboam, or the ~~the~~ next ones in the line. The perfect King that ~~he~~ he promises. That is a little bit of a jump from the phrase, although He made it not ~~to~~ to grow, but it is not a tremendous jump and I don't think . . . ~~The~~ ~~It~~ ~~It~~ ~~would~~ be interesting to see what commentaries say. The trouble is that ~~the~~ most commentaries skip the hard questions and deal with the easy ones. That's a very interesting ~~verse~~ ~~verse~~ verse and so he make it not to grow. Now ~~here~~ here is a case where I am quite sure the King James Version ~~it~~ translated it--they didn't know exactly ~~what~~ what it meant so they took the Hebrew and they put it down just as they found it --the translators of the ~~the~~ NEB AND the RSV have the position , We must find what was in their thoughts. We must express it in the language of today. And the kind of translation that they ~~do~~ do , you ~~can't~~ can't translated something that you don't understand. There is a ~~good~~ big element of truth in ~~there~~ their method. Dr. ~~Spie~~ Spizer I have often heard say, ~~Tras~~ Translate not from word to word but from ~~idion to~~ idium to ~~id~~ idium. In other words, you find out what those words meant then and you take the words today ~~and~~ that ~~will~~ will mean what those words meant then but you never the less there must ~~be~~ be a big element of literal translation, particularly when you get into things that are difficult. Else you assume that you are capable of fully ~~understandin~~ understanding exactly what they meant and many things that the King James people I'm sure did not understand and they ~~just~~ just kind of read the words literally and then people studied and pondered over and related it to other passages , but they don't feel ~~we~~ we have what it means when they didn't know ~~what~~ what it meant, but with the ~~NA~~ NEB and the RSV they've got to put in what they ~~thing~~ think is the sense, like in the RSV where Ezekiel ~~ta~~ tells of a figure that has a certain face on the right side and a certain face on the left side. He says of course he has a face of a man, <sup>in the front.</sup> He has the face of a lamb

he has the face of a man. He has the face of a ~~lion~~ lion on the right side. He has the face of an ox on the left side... Now the RSV says he has the face of a man in the front, the face of the lion on the right side, the face of an ox on the ~~left~~ left side, and the face of an eagle on the back. And then he has a foot note ~~and~~ under the front. Hebrew omits the ~~back~~ back. They thought they knew what Ezekiel meant to say and where ~~Ezekiel~~ Ezekiel couldn't ~~say~~ say and they put ~~it~~ in what they think it ~~should~~ should be. But of course we are dealing with the Old Testament, we are dealing with a book in which God led people to write what they understood, what they thought. But ~~that~~ He kept them from writing down what they thought was erroneous. And ~~that~~ He did lead them to the putting down of facts beyond what they knew and beyond what they understood that ~~would~~ would ~~become~~ become meaningful to a later ~~day~~ day and if you have ~~any~~ any doubt ~~in~~ in that it is ~~very~~ very clearly expressed in the New ~~Testament~~ Testament, including the RSV New Testament, it says ~~they~~ the prophets inquired ~~did~~ diligently ~~what~~ what or what manner of time the spirit of Christ which was in them did ~~signify~~ signify, when He testified ~~beforehand~~ beforehand the ~~sufferings~~ sufferings of Christ and the glory which should follow. ~~they~~ they

In other words, Peter said, ~~he~~ he did not understand all that they said. ~~Now~~ That of course is the context that is ~~impossible~~ impossible to understand by the modernism today ~~which~~ which makes it impossible for them to make a satisfactory Old Testament translation, although they can make a ~~fairly~~ fairly good New Testament translation.

So we have this~~x~~--I certainly ~~n~~ appreciate this verse being mentioned here which is extremely important in this connection because of the close verbal similarity with the verse in Isaiah 55, but then we have this quotation in Hebrews of this verse in Isaiah, this great passage about the new covenant which~~is~~ must be that the new~~covenant~~~~of~~ factor of the covenant is this universality, that the covenant is the same covenant as originally, that God's ~~n~~ covenant of grace was with Abraham, Jacob , and with Moses . His Spirit was in their hearts but that there was an external ~~covean~~ covenants~~x~~ of the representation of spiritual ~~tr~~ truth, of physical things such as the sacrifices and the tabernacle and all these things--that is the external covenant which will vanish away and replaced by new figures, circumcision and the sacrifice being ~~repa~~ replaced by baptism and the Lord's Supper and there is a new . . .in the external things of the covenant but that the promise is given that all Israel shall be saved and that no one shall say to his neighbor , ~~I~~ Know the Lord because there will be ~~one~~~~me~~ among them the universal knowledge of the Lord, not simply ~~the~~ at ~~k~~ it is in this representation of an individual here and there . When I used to speak in an institution where they were very strongly a-millennial they were constantly criticizing the pre-millennialists whom ~~then~~ they called ~~dispensal~~- dispensationalists and alledged that ~~k~~ we believed that people were saved by keeping the law in the time before Christ, now are saved by grace. ~~They~~ There are places in the Scofield Bible which give that impression in the footnotes, although other places make it very clear that that is not what is meant, ~~x~~ that is not the true meaning at all. But they ~~we~~ would alledge that we were dispensationalists and they believed~~d~~ in the unity of the covenant of grace , yet they would interpret this new covenant as a prediction, ~~new~~ not of the millenium but ~~of~~ as

a prediction of the present Gospel age and in so doing they interpret it in a way that make people say By works before and salvation by grace be something new. So I used to say They were the real dispensationalists in the erroneous sense of the term. I asked one of their leading theologians one time what do you think of the new covenant means. He said , Well, that's the hardest problem. (Q) When I was at Princeton , and the ~~studen~~<sup>n</sup> students were a good many who were post - millennial. ~~There~~ A-millennialism looks back to quite an extent to Dr. Vos at Princeton and takes his book and his writings a good deal, but it is a mis-interpretation of Dr. Vos, because Dr. Vos whom I knew ~~very~~<sup>fairly</sup> well reacted strongly against post-millennialism and his a-millennialism really was a denial of the teaching that the gospel is going to convert the world in this age, and he did not adopt the pre-millennial position, but he was denying the post-millennialism ~~a-d~~ and his teaching was a positive looking for the coming of the Lord at the ~~eng~~<sup>end</sup> end of this age, and he ~~a~~ had very ~~loo-~~ little to say about ~~that-previous~~ his attitude ~~toward~~ toward pre-millennialism ~~but--~~ it was mostly his trying to show the importance of the ~~immen-~~ imminence of Christ , and then ~~thow k~~ those who took the real ---took the negative attitude toward pre-millennialism and then used him to show the error of ~~ps~~ post-millennialism , and I feel that ... Charles Hodge I believe was post-millennial. Dr. Warfield ~~wad-~~ was definitely post-millennial. Dr. Warfield says where it speaks in Rev. 19 of the ~~beast~~ birds shall eat the flesh of captains and ...The emphasis here is in the completeness of the victory. ~~Th4~~ The sword goes out of the mouth, that proves the gospel that it is ~~spek~~ speaking about , ...before the Lord comes back every woman, child and man is to be converted --that was his position but I don't see the scriptural evidence. Certainly the Lord could do that if He chose but we have no evidence that He chose to do it.

Now, Dr. Machen said one time. He said that pre-millennialists say that the Lord is going to come back to an ~~uncove~~ unconverted world but I cannot feel that the Holy Spirit is unable to ~~convert~~ convert the world. I don't feel that the Spirit ~~w~~ is unable to convert the world either, but it is the question of what the Lord intends the ~~Spe~~ Spirit to do, and I think that the scripture ~~that~~ clearly teaches that the Holy Spirit is going to say Come ~~sk~~ out of the world rather than that He is going to convert the whole world, and Dr. Machen was giving courses in the New Testament and going through, and I said Oh my, when he gets to Revelation, with his clear, logical interpretation he will certainly take a pre-millennialist's attitude, I had no question, but unfortunately he died before he got to Revelation. But Dr. Stonehouse taught Revelation and ~~he~~ he had strong arguments against the Pre-Millennialists in Revelation but the trouble ~~s~~ was that Dr. Murray who taught Theology(?) was just as strong against Pre-millennialism as ~~Dr~~ Stonehouse, sharply differed with every one of the ~~argu~~ arguments, the ~~g~~ thing that Stonehouse argued against Pre-~~m~~ Millennialism ~~is~~ ~~Rev~~ Rev. Murray didn't accept at all.

In this reading of this last chapter of Isaiah 54:4 Mr. Kim translated ~~lit~~ literally what is there in the Hebrew, Thou shalt ~~forget not remember~~ forget the shame, thou shalt not remember ~~repe~~ reproach. Now, the King James Version is not translated literally, because the King James in omitting one word ~~he~~ has reduced two possibilities to ~~o-e~~ one possibility. Of course that is always a problem in making a translation. In a translation you find ~~ey~~ out what the original means and then try to put it in your own language what they mean, but the problem is that in your language there will be certain ideas brought in no matter how you struggle that are not in the original and there will be ~~certain~~ certain ideas in the original that you leave out, you can't help it. But you want to keep it to ~~a~~ a minimum, and so when the original is ambiguous on

something ~~x~~ you want to keep it ambiguous in your language, if it is a good translation. Unless it is absolutely sure that there is only one of the two possibilities. For instance, suppose I <sup>were</sup> ~~was~~ to say, I just saw an interesting person go down the hall. Well, now, suppose you were to translate that into some other language but the translation that you made was I just saw an interesting ~~girl~~ girl go down the hall. ~~X~~ Now, that might be an exact translation ~~of~~ of ~~the~~ what I ~~said~~ said, but it might not be. It might be a girl and it might be a man. My word person doesn't ~~x~~ tell which, and you want to try to get a word in your ~~tan~~ translation that allows the two ~~possibilities~~ possibilities, that doesn't decide between them, unless from the context it is made absolutely clear which it is. If I say, I just saw an interesting person go down the hall and I am quite sure that that is the girl that visited ~~x~~ our class three days ago. Well, if I said that <sup>there</sup> ~~there~~ would be no harm in translating it, I just saw an interesting girl go ~~down~~ down the hall because it makes it absolutely sure it is a girl, but if you didn't know which is what, the ~~tran~~ translation makes it more specific, ~~and~~ you see, why then your translation is introducing an idea that the original does not contain. The original has more possibilities than your translation. Now, supposing that I were to say ~~that you~~ You look very intellectual with your hand up on your chin that way. You look very uninterested looking in your suitcase the way the way you are. Now, if I were to make that remark you would be perfectly clear that I was ~~x~~ talking about what he was doing and what you were doing, and you would see my hand turn and that would make it perfectly clear that I looked <sup>in two</sup> ~~into~~ different directions, but if you had it on a tape or written in a book it would not ~~inde~~ indicate the turn of the head. Now, if I were to say You look very intellectual with your ~~x~~ hand on your chin that way and you look extremely uninterested looking in your ~~suitcase~~ suitcase the way

you are . You see if I were to say ~~that~~ and keep looking at him all the time , you would think there must be a suitcase down low that you can't see that he is looking at, or if it were just written and you can't see the picture, you would assume that they both refer to him. But ~~what~~ when I say the you and repeat the you it leaves two possibilities, that I ~~sa~~ am speaking to the same person or that I ~~x~~ am speaking to ~~x~~ two different persons. But if I leave out the second you , then it ~~mae- me~~ makes it absolutely clear. I say , You look intellectual with your hand on your chin that way and very uninterested in the lecture-~~lookig~~ looking down in your suitcase that way, well, you see, I have left out the ~~sa~~ second you and therefore my statement has made clear that I am talking to the same person. Now, in the ~~Hebere~~ Hebrew it says you ~~sa~~ shall forget the shame of your youth and you shall not remember the ~~repora~~ reproach of your widowhood any more. And the word in the Hebrew it is perfectly possible that he looked at one person when he speaks about the you and the other person when he speaks about the widowhood. They ~~made~~ may be the same person. This person had shame in ~~you~~ her ~~youth~~ youth and she has had a ~~repora~~ reproach in her widowhood. But it may be two different persons. One person is comforted about the shame of her youth. Another person is comforted about the reproach of her ~~x~~ widowhood. Both are possible the way the Hebrew stands. And if the ~~X~~ King James ~~Vrs~~ Version had repeated the Thou it would leave the two possibilities. It would not prove it one way or the other, but when the King James Version omits the second thou it means that the translators felt that they were talking to the same person. They had introduced something into it that is not in the original and if there is ground elsewhere for doing it , I ~~want-~~ wont criticize them for it. It is very, very difficult to avoid in a ~~trans-~~ translation ~~that-~~ introducing ideas that are not

in ~~is~~ the original and if there are in some ~~is~~ other part of the original then ~~is~~ it is justifiable , in many cases, but it should be avoided if at all possible and you see what I am trying to bring out here is that in interpreting the ~~verbs~~ verbs we want to get to the Hebrew and find out whether there is a vowel in both cases or not , and there is in the Hebrew. The English has left it out and thereby ~~selecting~~ selected one of two possible alternatives.

I've raised the point and we will discuss it further here today or next time. (Q)"

On what do you base that, do you have ... If I should say this, I was very glad to see you in class in such ~~x~~ good season today, and awfully disappointed in seeing you get here so late. Now, if I said this , you would know perfectly well that I spoke of two different people. Common sense would show that I ~~did~~ didn't blame ~~a~~ a person for ~~te~~ getting here early and blame them for getting here late in the same sentence , so you would know that I ~~was~~ was talking to two people. You would know that I was ~~x~~ shifting my head in the course of it. Well, if you speak of a person as having the ~~sa~~ shame ~~fo~~ of her youth and a reproach of her widowhood. That could be the same person and it could be two different persons. Like I could say, I enjoyed the King ~~of~~ & parade Director of the /...well, that could be one ~~oe~~ person, but if ~~k~~ I ~~is~~ said I enjoyed seeing the King of the Parade and Director, there could be a director who directed ~~and~~ it and there could be someone in a position of a King on one of the ~~flota~~ ~~fla~~ floats or something. It ~~ea~~ could be two different persons, and my sentence would show which it was and you would have ~~th~~ to tell from context and in this case the question is , Is the shame of youth and the ~~repara~~ reproach of widowhood are they the same thing. It's kind of funny to express the same thing by two different statements. It is true that a person is ~~some~~ ~~the~~ ~~son~~ sometimes a widow at the age of fifteen, but it is not usual. Usually you think of a widow ~~an~~ as much older. When

7/6/8

- ?

you ~~sa-~~ speak of the shame of youth you are usually not speaking ~~in the sense that~~  
~~k-you are~~ of the same thing that you are when you speak of the reproach of widowhood.

54:4-5 I just wanted to bring out that in this verse as the Hebrew stands there are two possibilities.

Let me read you verses four and five. Look at them in the English and just imagine  
 that there is no verse division, because the verse divisions are not in the original  
 --they were put in later. Let me read it now. What do you think of this. ~~X~~ "Fear  
 not , for thou shalt ~~t/~~ not be ashamed. Neither be thou confounded for thou shalt  
 not be put to shame, for thou shalt not forget the shame of thy youth and thou shalt  
 not remember the ~~reproach-~~ reproach of thy ~~x~~ widowhood ~~in~~ any more. For thy maker  
 is thy husband , the Lord of Hosts is His name , when I put the break there instead  
 of where it is , it would make it perfectly possible ~~tht~~ that I have spoken to one  
 person who has been described in ~~cert~~ certain terms and then I have turned my attention  
 to another person. It is entirely possible, and if anybody questions whether it is  
 possible to have a break in thought in the middle of a verse I ~~sus~~ suggest that they  
 look at Psalm 19. That's one of the silliest verse divisions in the whole Bible.  
 Psalm 19:4. Their line is gone out to all the earth and their words to the end of the  
 world. In them has He set a ~~tabernacle~~ ~~sk~~ for the sun. People read that in ~~responsible~~  
 responsive readings over and over and it is utterly silly. ~~W+~~ - The way that it is maked  
 in the ~~Engls~~ English it ~~k~~ has a period ~~x~~ after world. You ~~h~~ave two stanzas here. You  
 have a stanza. <sup>#1</sup> First, the heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth  
 his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speach and night unto night showeth knowledge.  
 There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone  
 out to all the earth and their words to the end of the world. Now you start a new  
<sup>#2</sup> stanza. To them hath he set a ~~tabernacle~~ for the sun which is as a bridegroom  
 coming out of his chambers and rejoiceth~~x~~ as a strong man to run a race . His going  
 forth is from the end of the heavens...~~k~~ <sup>#3</sup> And then you have a third stanza, and the

between the second and ~~te~~ the third stanza you have a verse division ~~you have~~ but ~~x~~ between the first and the second, the ~~in~~ last line of the first and the first line of the second come right in the same verse and they simply end verse four with a comma and a period in the middle of it, which shows how utterly ridiculous that verse division is. And I believe that the Lord intentionally allowed this ~~silly~~ - silly verse division to be made here in order to call to ~~the~~ our attention the fact that the verse divisions in the Bible are convenient things for finding places and are in no sense inspired, but is to be taken as a continuous narrative and we study the statements in order to see where the ~~x~~ verse divisions ~~he~~ should be made. and where the changes are, because verse division is something that has been introduced into the ~~x~~ Bible, and so there are many other proofs that could be given but I think that Psalm 19 is the best one. In Isaiah ~~4~~ 54 there are in that particular verse as far as the Hebrew is concerned, there are two possibilities. And it is a matter of ~~interre~~ interpretation which of the two we are going to take. It could be, I could say, You will forget the ~~x~~ courses you failed in grammar school, and the courses you failed in college--two different times. I could say that or I could say that You will forget the courses you failed in grammar school and you will forget the courses you failed in college. I could say it that way, either way is possible. And if you put in the knowledge ~~go~~ both places, the interpreter studies the context and ~~decide~~ decides on the basis of the evidence which way to take it. But if you leave out the thou in the second ~~kyou~~ - you make it clear. If ~~x~~ Isay that you will forget the courses you failed in grammar school and you will forget the ~~course-you~~ courses you failed in college, and don't put in a second you, then it shows that it means the same person. But the Hebrew as a second person and as far as the Hebrew is ~~con~~ concerned it does not say. It's a matter for study. 8,,

(Q) Yes, I would say that ~~this~~ in this case the King James had very definitely allowed an interpretation to come in in such a way that it adds to the thought of the original, and therefore can be confusing. Now, I'll show you another little one where there is a very , very interesting thing. Now, let me show you a very interesting case here ~~ok~~. Look at ~~Isaiah~~ ~~Isaiah~~ ~~Isaiah~~ Isaiah 29: Woe to Ariel, to Ariel, the city where David ~~de-~~ dwelt! (Now, that's Jerusalem, isn't it). Add ye year to year; let them kill sacrifices. Yet I will distress Ariel, and there shall be heaviness and sorrow: and it shall be unto me as Ariel. And I will camp against thee round about, and ~~and~~ lay seige against thee with a mount, and I will raise forts against thee. ~~And~~ And thou shalt be brought down, and shalt speak out of the ground, and thy dust and thy ~~fe~~ voice shall be as one that ~~hat-a-~~ hath a familiar spirit, ~~a~~ out of the ~~gou-~~ ground , and thy speech shall whisper out of the dust. ~~More~~ Moreover the multitude of thy strangers ~~ah-~~ shall be like small dust, and the multitude of the terrible ones shall be as chaff that ~~ap~~ passeth away: yea, it shall be at an instant suddenly. Now, what does that word <sup>"</sup> moreover <sup>"</sup> mean at the beginning of verse five. Five starts with the ~~low~~ word ~~mov-~~ moreover which says you are going to be in terrible condition, moreover the multitude of thy strangers shall be like small dust. It sounds as if it is going to ~~g~~ be a strange people from a distant ~~k~~ surrounding ~~th-~~ that are going to be ~~seige~~ you. There are going to be so many ~~they~~ are going to be like small dust, and the multitude of the terrible ones are like chaff that passeth ~~w~~ away. yea, it shall be at an instant suddenly . What does that have to do with it? In the English translation it makes ~~absout-~~ absolutely no sense. This passage in chapter 29 is undoubtedly a prediction given some years ahead of Sennacherib's attack on Jerusalem when Jerusalem is besieged and it looks

as if it is hopeless, Sennacherib will soon come in and ~~x~~ gather his armies round ~~abet~~ about and ~~pt-~~ put an end to Jerusalem. There is little hope for the nation but suddenly the Lord ~~macks-~~ makes the great army of Sennacherib like the chaff that passes ~~as-~~ away. At an instant suddenly the multitudes that fight against Jerusalem. Some of ~~then~~ them are like the dream in the night and they disappear and so if you translated verse ~~xx~~ five, as but instead of moreover you would have the idea. He is describing the terrible ~~conditor~~ condition of ~~xx~~ the ~~xx~~ misery in the first four verses. In the next four he is telling how God delivered them, but would make the ~~transitor-~~ transition clear but <sup>//</sup> moreover <sup>//</sup> obscures it, but you look at the Hebrew. And the words at the beginning of verse 5 are \_\_\_\_\_ which means ~~it-~~ and it shall become. If you ~~would-~~ were to say , and the multitude of ~~x~~ your strangers shall become like ~~sha~~ small dust, ~~like~~ chaff that passes away the meaning would be clear but in the King James they have taken the and which can mean moreover and can mean but and they have taken one of two alternatives and ...but when they take it ~~morece-move-~~ moreover they ~~siml~~ simply ..and I would venture to suggest that out of 50 people who read Isa. 29 there isn't one in 50 that catches what verse five means, and if they had translated it but, <sup>//</sup> I think everybody would catch what it means. Translating it and, I think it leaves half that would know what it means, but the ~~mov~~ <sup>//</sup> moreover <sup>//</sup> completely confuses you, and it is a problem...you can't expect a translator to understand ~~what-~~ all that the original meant but they should ~~x~~ try to keep ~~clearing~~ <sup>//</sup> from clearing ambiguity. Now, we ~~ee~~ don't have a great deal of time left, and I went to the bother of bringing this <sup>//</sup> magazine, more ~~x~~ about 55 than 54. Here is an article called Laconia burns at sea and the article starts this way. This Life Magazine for Jan. ~~and-the~~ and the article starts this way, in this Life ~~Magan-~~

Jan. 3,  
Magazine for 1964. It says, Ages past all reckoning. The creature that was  
to become man came dashing out of the sea. Never could he forget his home...  
In water he baptizes his children... Yet, man is mortally afraid of the sea, even  
though he expires in the desert... Now, that's nonsense. But to say that the  
reason chapter 55 says, Ho, everyone that thirsteth, Come ye to the waters is  
because the creature that was to become man is of all the utter nonsense. To  
introduce an evolutionary idea which isn't even believed by ordinary evolutionists,  
and on account of that men still baptize with water .

Chapter 55 starts with Ho, everyone that thirsteth , come ye to the waters. And it is because that we need waters. It is important for our life. We would die without it. It is a tremendous part of man's whole existence, and the evolutionary reference there is utter nonsense. It is amazing that the ~~edice~~ editor's of a magazine such as this let such ~~and~~ junk get through. It is used here for a ~~grog~~ figure of the ~~wonder-sond~~ wonderful thing that is made ~~avie-~~ available. Ho, everyone that thirsteth , come ye to the waters, He that hath no money , come ye, ~~butan~~ buy and eat. We have in chapter 55 the ~~wonder-~~ wonderful gospel call. Chapter 53 we have the basis of the gospel, and between the two we have 54. 54 must be interpreted to 53 and 55, unless ~~isi-~~ Isaiah is like the critics say, a lot of separate poems ~~throu~~ thrown together with no relation of ~~mena-~~ meaning. There are ~~ap~~ people who publish ~~n~~ books of poems in ~~k~~ which there are all completely separated but there is no evidence to think that Isaiah was writing anything like that. ~~Every-evidence~~ There is every evidence to think that he continues the discussion and relates to each other . And ~~k~~ chapter 55 is ~~certin~~ certainly very ~~eloe~~ very closely related to 53 . You have nothing like 55 anywhere else in the ~~n~~ Old Testament. ~~%~~ 55 is a wonderful gospel ~~cla-~~ call, but then how interesting that in this wonderful gospel call, starting with the call to ~~eme-~~ come and get what you need so much. Come ye to the waters. Ye that have no money, come ye, ~~but~~ buy and eat, ~~but-wi~~ buy ~~winde~~ wine and milk without money and without price. The necessities ~~k~~ of life to be had without effort. Wherefore do you spend money for that which is not bread and your labor for that which satisfieth not. The frustration of man stuggling to get what is ~~worthivi-~~ worthwhile and not finding it, when God ~~a~~ has made it ~~availba-~~ ~~aba~~ available in <sup>vs. 3</sup> (chapter 52) Incline your ear, hear and come unto me, hear , and your soul shall live and they will make an ~~everyla~~ everlasting covenant with you.

The relationship of God with those who accept His offer of salvation is not merely a relation of getting something. It is an entrance into a covenant relation, and we find this brought out in the two previous main passages ~~about~~ about the ~~x~~ Servant of the Lord. First, an introduction of any length of the Servant of the Lord comes in Isaiah 42, and in chapter 42 where it tells about, Behold, my servant, whom I uphold, and mine elect, he says in verse 6, I the Lord have called thee in righteousness and will hold thy hand ~~w~~ and will give thee for a covenant with the people and a light to the Gentiles. And then in chapter 49 where the Servant of the Lord speaks. <sup>12</sup>, The servant ~~sta~~ says in verse 8, Thus says the Lord In an acceptable time I have heard thee and in the day of thy salvation have I helped thee and I will preserve thee and will give thee as a covenant to the people and will establish thee and cause thee to inherit the ~~des~~ desolate heritages ~~and~~ thou may~~s~~est say to the prisoners, Go forth. And then chapter 53 is the last great passage on the Servant of the Lord doing his great redeeming work and 53~~isx~~ it says, Incline your ear and come unto me, Hear, and your soul shall live and I will make a everlasting covenant with you~~k~~, even the sure mercies of David. It shows that the relationship of salvation enters into a covenant with God. I ~~thing~~ think that it is very unimportant the term Covenant~~t~~ Theology. It is used in ~~xx~~ about as many different senses as there are people ~~wh~~ to use ~~ix~~ it. It is used in many ~~did~~ different senses and some people use it in an extreme way which drops the vital point ~~and~~ that no one can be in this covenant with God ~~except~~ except ~~k~~ with a personal acceptance of ~~E~~ Christ as Saviour, and people often sometimes use it in a sense in which the ~~ix~~ important aspect of the Covenant is forgotten. Hear, and your soul shall ~~life~~ live. The Covenant is ~~x~~ not an artificial thing, it has to be accepted for one's self, and then as a result some people act against it and there are many people who think the worst thing in the world is ~~X~~ Covenant Theology and there are many people who think the best thing ~~k~~ in the world is Covenant ~~Theol~~gna

Theology and ~~g~~ you get 40 of them together ~~and~~ from both viewpoints and ask them to define it , you ~~ka~~ would have 50- different definitions , because it is used in so many different senses, but it certainly is made abundantly clear ~~an~~ that there is a ~~v~~ covenant between God and those who receive Christ and the relationship into which we enter is not a temporary fragile thing ~~k~~ but it is a permanent , close relationship in which God <sup>has</sup> assumed certain obligations which are ~~everist~~ everlasting which are never ~~brog~~ broken or abrogated in any way. That would be a vital, ~~central~~ ~~part-of-~~ essential part of Christian teaching which everyone who accepts the scripture should hold to and I ~~believe~~ <sup>think</sup> that all sound Christians do hold to ~~-.--Now,--you--hae--~~

Now , you have your Hebrew Bible open and I don't care if you have the King James Version or not because I am going to ~~read~~ ~~the~~ you the King James ~~Ve4s~~ Version and I want you to follow it in the Hebrew, and I want you to indicate on the paper if you think at any point it is not a literal translation or it is not justified. Just what is your idea of the King James Version ; 54:1. Is it ~~an~~ <sup>an</sup> absolutely literal verse, or does it part from the original at certain points; if so, at what points, and does it still give its meaning even though it departs. Now, I will read you them and you can follow it in the Hebrew. "Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into ~~singing~~ singing and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child. For more ~~at~~ are the children of the desolate than the children of the ~~a~~ married ~~wie~~ wife. S ith the Lord. Now, please write on your paper if the K.J. is absolutely literal, or if it is literal with a few places where it is not literal but still gives the sense, or if you think it reads into it something that isn't in the Hebrew. Take about one minute to write your opinion on that. Below that on ~~ou~~ your paper please write RSV. Now, I want you to keep your Hebrew Bible open before you and if you want to keep your K.J. open too I have no objection.

I am going to read you the verse in the RSV and I ~~x~~ ~~wa~~ want you to note the same thing. Does the RSV give a pretty literal translation. Is it in some ways not literal but still represent the idea, or does it give something that has no warrant at all. Let me read it to you. "Sing O barren one that did not bear. Break forth into singing and ~~x~~ cry aloud, you who have not been in travail, for the ~~x~~ children of the desolate one will be more ~~x~~ than the children of her that ~~x~~ is married, says the Lord. The next one I want to read you ~~is~~. ~~Put down~~ American Translation. This is a translation published by the Chicago Press some years ago with different men translating different portions of the Bible. They call it the American Translation. And on the whole it is rather liberal in its approach. ~~In sm~~ But in many places it is a very good translation. Now, let me read you the same verse. ~~Keep~~ Keep your Hebrew open if you want ~~x~~ keep the King James too. See what you think of this translation. Is it a literal translation. Does it depart from the literal, is there something in ~~x~~ it that is unwarranted. ~~Sn~~ "Sing O barren one, you ~~hav~~ who have borne no children. Break into singing and cry aloud, you ~~ks~~ who have not ~~x~~ travailed, for more are the children of her ~~ks~~ that is desolate than the children of her that is married, says the Lord. James Moffatt says O barren soul who never bore, Sing songs. Break into songs, O childless one, for when she is forlorn she has more sons than when she was desolate. The order is quite changed around but that isn't the important thing. ~~Something~~ Sometimes quite a different word is used to express the same ~~x~~ idea. I wouldn't worry too much when that occurs, but is there any thing really quite ~~different~~ different from the King James Version. First we look at the King James. Looking at the Hebrew, very literally the King James is Sing (2 fs) ~~of~~ O barren one, which is ~~feminie~~ feminine also, she has not borne, and ~~is~~ it is altogether proper to consider that that is a relative clause. So to say that who has not borne or has not had children, we can't translate with

exact literalness here. Thou that ~~didst~~ didst not bare. The only difference there is that it is changed to the 2nd person. It very clearly refers to the woman addressed. Whether it is second or third makes no difference in the meaning. I think that in modern or present day language you would say, You who have not --they make it second. The Hebrew is third but it really doesn't affect the meaning. Break forth ~~th~~ into singing and cry aloud. He has not travailed. There again ~~is~~ it is very literal. The King James says ~~trai~~- travailed with child. Travailed with child you might say is an addition. But we use the word travail ordinarily to mean ~~to~~ endure the . The word \_\_\_\_\_ in Heb. can ~~be~~ mean <sup>write</sup> in agony, not ~~neces~~ necessarily from childbirth, but in the context it is very clear that it is speaking of childbirth. Travail with child while it adds a little, in Hebrew ~~th~~ doesn't change the thought at all. The only difference is that it is 2nd person instead of third, and it does affect the meaning slightly, but when we read for ~~am-x-a-am~~ many or more are the sons of a desolate one literally sons of a desolate one. The King James says more ~~are~~ are the children of the desolate one. It is sort of customary in English to throw in ~~the~~ everywhere without much meaning to it. It is a little more literal to use them here but I don't ~~thing~~ think there is any harm in putting them in. The two relative pronouns in English are both in italics in the King James. It shows it is an interpretation as a relative clause and I think it is a rather good idea.

### ISAIAH # 70

No, they are both singular, and it clearly represents one woman, but the one woman may be a figure of speech for many . It is not many ~~desolate~~ desolate in the sense of the ~~desolate~~ desolate ones, ~~but this one~~ ~~is~~ it is the desolate one, but this one may be a figure of speech for a whole nation. But as it is literally, it is one . Like you would say, France is gathering her armies together ~~into~~ - in order to fight against

Germany. There you are using the her , ~~personif~~ personifying France. This is personifying . ~~W~~ In modern English when we use the desolate, we always use the plural, but in the Old English the ~~desi-~~ old English the desolate is singular . The desolate is singular. It is singular. The ~~King~~ King James is the Old English and it is quite true that someone might misunderstand that. The children of the desolate --they might ~~thing-think~~ think that they mean the children of all the desolate people but it doesn't mean that. The Hebrew is singular, and the Old English can ~~be~~ mean the desolate ones, neither one. In modern English ~~xx~~ it only means the ~~desolate~~ desolate ones. Very ~~pe~~ few people realize that because we don't use it in the singular in modern English. Almost every other language I know of can use it ~~isr~~ in the singular or plural. But then of course most other languages have a difference in the article or a difference in the ending. Since ~~Englis-~~ English doesn't we ~~jut-~~ just ~~speciali~~ specialize on ~~the-~~ having ~~ix~~ it ~~pu~~ plural in modern English. That would be more literal --there are more sons of a ~~x~~ desolate ~~ox~~ woman. More are sons of a desolate ~~one-~~ woman. But it is one particular woman. But she is a woman.--~~Then~~ than sons of a \_\_\_\_\_ woman, says the Lord. Now ~~tha~~ this has the one form \_\_\_\_\_ ~~w~~ and what form is \_\_\_\_\_. Yes, the word has a feminine ending on a participle. It is the qal passive participle. The one who is or was or will be \_\_\_\_\_, and what is \_\_\_\_\_ --that is taken ~~frn-~~ from the verb \_\_\_\_\_ which means to master. The same word is Baal, which is the term used master, so ~~k~~ baal is the story of ~~Eli-~~ Elijah and Elisha. This is the passive, the woman who is literally ~~in-~~ mastered, but in the context it is quite clear that what it means is ~~the-~~ occupying a relationship ~~toward-~~ toward a husband --the one who is married. The king James says the married ~~wif3~~.wife. Well, married wife ~~x~~ is the same as a married person, it is just a little longer way of saying the same thing. The King James is really very literal. The only point where it supplies something

is when it says more are the children, and it puts the <sup>are</sup> in italics because there is no time given. More ~~x~~ children than children, more this than that but it is more are or more will be. It doesn't say, but the one thing that is definite is that it is the ~~ee-~~ one who ~~x~~ has not borne . It is the one who has not borne, the <sup>one</sup> own who has not travailed. That is ~~ap-~~ passive . That is not a present participle. It is not a participle which could be present or past, the one who is travelling. It is perfect in both cases. The one who has not had children is what it says, Sing , thou ~~h~~ who has not had children, who has not travailed. It is definitely past, but the last part ..Sing ~~x~~ O barren, thou that didst not bear. Break forth into singing and cry aloud ~~th~~ ~~o~~ thou that didst not travail with child. In modern English we don't usually put a subject at all with an imperative. You bring forth into singing , you ~~x~~ cry aloud. It could be two different persons, it could be one, but whether you would express the you wouldn't make ~~x~~ any difference. There is the possibility that he ~~h~~ is speaking to two different people. But I don't think there is anything in the context to suggest, ~~xx~~ You say , Thou hast done this --thou hast done that, it is clearly the same ~~me~~ thou, but if I say, Go, ~~the~~ get my notebookk and shut the windwo , I can address two different people just by looking at different ~~nd~~ directions, I wouldn't have to put in a you. You ~~g~~ get my ~~notebook~~ notebook and you shut the windwo. If I say Please get my notebook and please shut the ~~xx~~ window. You could still have the idea of two or one in the imperative, it would depend on the context, I don't think ~~x~~ you have to put the you in. But ~~lets~~ go now to the RSV. The RSV says Sing O barren one that didst not bear, The KJ says O Barren , thou that didst not bear, who did not bear. It's exactly the same except ~~is~~ it is third person ~~is~~ ~~ste~~ instead of second. It is slightly more literal. Break forth into singing and cry aloud. You that have not been in travail. Thou that ~~didst~~ ~~'not~~ ~~travail~~ ~~travail~~ with child. It's identical. ~~xx~~ I would find no difference thus far in the RS, <sup>✓</sup> then the children of the

desolate one ~~will~~ will be more than her that is married, says the Lord. The children of ~~the~~ the desolate one than the children of the wife. The only difference is that the RSV makes ~~the~~ it will be and of course if it is are, he is picturing a situation, and if it is will be. and there is no ~~be-~~ verb in the Hebrew. You can not tell which ~~is~~ it is but in the RSV it says ~~Ø~~ Sing, O barren ones, that ~~didst~~ didst not bear. Break forth and sing aloud, you who have not travailed. The introduction of the word one would suggest that it is singular. In fact who did not bear is nearer the Hebrew than Thou who didst not bear, because didst not is 2nd person and did not is ~~is~~ 3rd person. It is identical.. Then the ~~se~~ next part where the children of the desolate will be more --yes, that is identical again. Than the children of her that is married. Yes, the KJ has ...it is ~~unnecessarily~~ unnecessary repetition. The Hebrew says the married woman, in the KJ it is quite ~~and-une~~ unnecessary. The RSV ~~x~~ doesn't do that, it just says her that is married. So ~~k~~ on this verse it is a very good rendering. Now, we look at the American translation and in that ~~verse~~ version, we found but not quite as good English, For more are the children of the desolate than the children of ~~k~~ her than the children of ~~th~~ her ~~lx~~ that is married, says the Lord. It ~~speaks-to-the~~ sticks to the are ~~lx~~ like the RSV; otherwise it is ~~identical-~~ identical. But when you get Moffatts you get a sharp difference. You find that Moffatt says, O barren soul that never bore, sing songs. Well, that is no change. It changes the order, but of course --but if you say the poor soul, ~~lx~~ he has a ~~bas-~~ bad cold today. ~~That-~~ That is sort of an ~~idi-~~ idiomatic statement --a colloquial expression. Maybe that is what he means I don't know. But aside from that, it is perfectly literal. Just the same as the others but just a different order. O break into song, O childless one. You who have not travailed. It is not so literal but it has the same ~~k~~ meaning. But then it says

For when she is forlorn she has more sons than ~~when~~ when she was wed. And this introduction of the word when is something ~~h~~ that has no warrant in the Hebrew, and is not found in any of the other translations. So ~~isx~~ it is ~~ix~~ interesting to notice ~~hx~~ how the American ~~tx~~ translation and the RSV follow the Hebrew here and don't introduce the idea that this is the same person. It sounds in the KJ and the RSV and in the Am. Translation as if this is ~~two~~ two different ~~women~~ women, but most of the present day commentaries will say that ~~ix~~ is comparing Jerusalem in exile with Jerusalem ~~in the~~ before. They say that and Moffatt says that thing which they say it means and he puts it in the text. And he says ~~more~~ For when <sup>she</sup> ~~she~~ is forlorn she has ~~more~~ more sons than when ~~she~~ she was wed. It puts the idea in there that they thing <sup>is</sup> is what it means. They don't translate it that way. I'm glad to see that ~~this~~ the RSV has not in this ~~case~~ case as it has in others thrown away the Hebrew, putting in what they think it ought to mean. ~~h~~ The Hebrew says it sounds like a comparison of two different women. Not a treatment of one woman at two different times, yet most of the recent ~~commentaries~~ commentaries ~~ix~~ take it that way, and I feel that it is utterly unwarranted to take it as one person at two ~~period~~ periods in her life. More are the children of the desolate one than the children of the ~~w~~ married woman. That is a pretty poor sort of comparison to ~~make~~ make. It is the comparison of one woman at different periods in her life. In this wonderful, ~~ix~~ she has more children now ~~than~~ that she ~~down~~ doesn't have a husband than when she had a husband. It ~~down~~ doesn't make much sense in that way, and furthermore, when you look back in Isaiah you find in Isaiah 50 he is answering the claims of the Israelites, it says God has forsaken us, there is nothing to it. Isa. 50:1 says Where is the bill of your mother's ~~divorv-~~ divorce that I put away, and to whom of your creditor's have ~~ix~~ I sold you, for your

iniquities have you sold yourselves. In other words, He is still true to Israel ✓  
 even though Israel has sinned. That is the whole thought of the previous chapter. |  
 The Lord has followed Israel with ~~x~~ His love and mercy and He is going to bring  
 her back. To ~~com~~ compare Israel before as a married wife and now to say that  
 she isn't, she is going to have ~~x~~ more children than she had before when ~~she~~ she  
 was well. That is the interpretation that all the recent commentaries give. It doesn't  
 make much sense. Of course the reason for that is that we must translate it in a way  
 that it will ~~x~~ make sense in the time that it was written, but if you do ~~x~~ that I don't  
 see how you will get much sense at all. ~~There is~~ We have to recognize that ~~there~~ there  
 is an element of revelation, and that even though ~~x~~ the scripture is given in a situation  
 and deals with the situation, there are elements in it that the person at the time couldn't  
 possibly know that God has put in there to reveal ~~x~~ His truth to prepare the way for future  
 revelation at a later ~~the~~ time. And here you have a comparison and ~~is~~ it is difficult to  
~~know~~ know what to do with it, but the whole chapter 53 is difficult.

ISAIAH # 71

I don't think Moffatt's translation is ~~there~~ here ~~accept-accept~~ acceptable ~~because~~  
~~he--~~ because he makes the two be one woman. More are the children when she is desolate  
 than ~~when~~ she was married. The first verse ~~x~~ I think is ~~not~~ acceptable in all of them.  
 That is entirely ~~not~~ acceptable. ..it is past, it is the barren ~~one~~ woman who has  
 not had children in the past. She is to rejoice and sing because she will have children.  
 Undoubtedly the relative ~~is~~ clause is omitted here, that is to say, there is no relative  
 clause, ~~one~~ has the right ~~x~~ to try to interpret it in another way, but I don't know of any  
 other way that would make sense. And since we have many cases in the ~~Hebr-3~~ Hebrew  
 Bible where there is a relative clause without the relative ~~x~~ pronoun being expressed.  
 I think ~~x~~ that is a better way to express it than that is omitted. All are present ~~xxx~~

I would say that ~~ix~~ it is omitted. But when you have many cases where the relative ~~x~~ pronoun is not used, I think you are justified in saying that the relative pronoun is simply not expressed. It is relative clause without giving a relative pronoun. It is like when we say, That's the man that I saw yesterday. That is ~~x~~ just intelligible in English as if I said, That is the man whom I saw yesterday. It is not necessary in English to use the ~~rea~~ relative pronoun if it would represent the accusative, but in Hebrew you can omit it under other conditions as well. Yes, it is also the perfect. So that here we have the ~~lll~~--all these translations except M offatt translating it in a way that is two women. And then when you look at the ~~tim~~ interpretation that the Apostle Paul gave of it, you will find that he took it as ~~te~~ two women. Paul in Galatians 4 quotes this, and he ~~w~~ quotes a number of O.T. passages. He states, starting with verse 22, For it is written that Abraham, had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free woman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh. but he of the free woman was by promise. He doesn't say that he had a son by her when she was a bondwoman another one when ~~she~~ she was a free woman. He is talking about two different women. And ~~whi~~ which things are an allegory, two covenants, one from Mt. Sinai, which ~~x~~ is under bondage, which is ~~x~~ Hagar, this is Mt. Sinai in Arabia, and answers to Jerusalem, which ~~ix~~ now is and is in bondage to her children but Jerusalem which is above is free which is the ~~note~~ mother of us all, for it is written, Rejoice, thou barren, that barest not, break forth and cry ye that travailest not, ~~bu~~ for the desolate has many more children than she ~~she~~ which has a husband. He makes a comparison of two women. Of course one is like the Jerusalem which now is ~~ra~~ and the other is the heavenly ~~ix~~ Jerusalem and ~~x~~ one is like Hagar and one is like Sarah. One here is the desolate and one is he which has a husband. So he ~~comp~~ compares the two and while he does not specifically speak of the calling of the Gentiles

in this passage, he does put a ~~stree~~ stress on a ~~comparison~~ comparison on those who are receiving the message through faith and those receiving it through the ~~form~~ forms ~~and~~ and ~~ceremonia~~ ceremonies of the old law. And so Paul ~~make~~ makes this comparison here and when we have it ~~the~~ immediately following Isa. 53 and 53 is the picture of the Atonement of Christ, and then we have 55 with the gospel ~~of~~ call of salvation, it seems to me that if we take it literally as it ~~is~~ stands it ~~make~~ ~~per~~ makes perfect sense to say that he is here saying that those ~~we~~ who have never borne, there is going to come a great spiritual ~~heritate~~ heritage, he doesn't ~~say~~ say that ~~thow~~ those who did previously are not going to have any. He says more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife. In other words, <sup>s</sup>trange as it may seem, Israel which is God's people, is going to have a spiritual ~~progen~~ progeny. There were many who came into the knowledge of the Lord from Israel, yet more even will be those who come from that which is considered desolate, and outside the pale, knowing ~~is~~ nothing about God, never having had any spiritual progeny. It makes perfect sense, taking the words as they stand, coming right after Isa. 53, and fitting in ~~with~~ with what the New Testament shows us actually happen. So if we take the passage as it stands, we have a prediction of the calling of the Gentiles. And if we try to make this be ~~Jeru~~ Jerusalem that is <sup>now</sup> ~~not~~ desolate, and Jerusalem was the married wife, certainly while Jerusalem is desolate ~~is~~ she is not going to have any more children. She ~~want~~ want have children until she becomes the married wife, and to say that the Jerusalem, that didst not bear, ~~there~~ They are in exile ~~not~~ now, they certainly had been ~~in-exile-be~~ God's people before in a very real sense.

you have to twist the verse all around to get that idea out of it, but if you are going to make it a description of Israel coming back ~~from~~ from ~~et~~ exile, that's about the only way to ~~make~~ make ~~xx~~ sense out of it is to do what these present day commentaries do, but if you take the verse in the context and take it literally as it ~~xx~~ stands it seems to be comparing two women, and then when you take the N.T. and find the fulfillment of this verse and the gospel ~~x~~ call of 55 you have ~~x~~ exactly that, the turning to the Gentiles. And so, it seems to me that William Carey was not simply grabbing a verse out of the scripture at random and saying that this is a verse in which we will take the words out of context, like the man I heard, wonderful preacher, preached in ~~Phia~~ Philadelphia, <sup>n</sup>Thou shalt say unto her, <sup>p</sup>No, the power of saying no, ~~The~~ a wonderful sermon but the ~~tes~~ text was a wicked heathen oppressor of Israel telling a heathen woman to tell a lie. He used that for a text to preach a sermon. He did ~~x~~ more harm, misinterpreting scripture than he did by the ~~wonderful~~ wonderful moral lesson. But in this case we are taking it as it stands, and we find here that it is a prediction of the ~~callig-~~ calling of the Gentiles. And so William Carey when he preached his ~~tre-~~ great missionary message which began the great modern missionary movement preached on Isa. 54:2 ~~Enlarge~~ Enlarge the place of thy tent and let them ~~ste-~~ stretch forth the curtains of thy habitation. This is not saying, When the Jews come back from exile, they are going to have a ~~x~~ bigger city than they ever had before. It is not saying anything of the kind. It is saying that the Word of God as presented in Isa. 53 and 55 is going to go forth, is going to reach out to all the world and it is right that the missionary work ~~shoud~~ should carry that message and extend the place of thy habitation, extend thy cords, and strengthen thy staves. But the question is, Is the whole chapter speaking to the church, or is part of the chapter speaking to Israel. What is the meaning of the rest of the chapter. Most of

the ~~em~~ commentaries say this has got to be Israel coming back from exile. I don't think we can interpret ~~this - this - three - this way -~~ 53 this way, & I don't think we can interpret 55 that way. You can't & interpret this verse that way unless you twist it to get that meaning. But the calling of the Gentiles is very natural and the way that the Apostle Paul ~~men~~ meant is quoted in Galatians. Is all the ~~tree~~ rest of the chapter speaking about the church being predominantly & Gentiles or is the rest of the chapter speaking about Israel and what is our & attitude toward the rest of the chapter. Now that we have had this time getting into it, some further study will enable you to tell me which verses are about Israel, which are about the Gentiles.

As you look at 53, 54, 55 I ~~thing~~ think there is no question that the three of them belong together, as you look at ~~53:12 to~~ 52:12 to 53:12 which forms a ~~defint~~-~~define~~ definite unit. This is ~~predit~~-prediction of what God is going to do through the Servant of the Lord. As you look at chapter 55 it is an offer. 53 is definite prediction of specific events that is going to happen. 55 a marvelous offer made on the basis of what 55 says--53 says it is going to be done. And then the last part of the chapter declares that ~~the~~ the offer is not going to be given in vain, but there will be those who will be recipients and to whom God will give tremendous blessing. Now, ~~as predicted in~~ we have prediction in 53 and offer in 55, what is 54. Well, 54 is surely promise. You might say prediction, promise, and <sup>offer</sup> proffer. They are proffered something in & 55. Something is predicted in 53 and 54 is prophecy and so the thing that immediately enters is to whom are these promises given and that is & what I ~~want~~- want you to write down. The first question is <sup>1)</sup> In which verses in chapter & 54 is it specifically stated that the promise contained in that verse is & being given to the nation(s) of Israel! In which verse is that specifically stated. That's question one. When you are looking for your answers ~~in~~ to question one, you can also be looking for the answers to the other

two or three questions, so you might as well get all the questions at once. This  
 x is question two, In which verses of chapter 54 is ~~xxx~~<sup>2)</sup> it specifically stated that  
 the promise given in that verse is given to the Gentiles. Question three<sup>3</sup>, In which  
 verses of 54 is some~~x~~ other specific statement made, as to ~~wh~~- those ~~w~~e who are  
 the recipients of the promise therein contained, and what is the statement made.  
 If you find something that is not 100% specific, you say 80% specific, all right, but  
 if it x is a vague classification, preserve it for further discussion.

ISAIAH # 72

That in my opinion is very important . In any exegesis ~~that~~- we get what is specifically  
 stated before we deal with any conjecture, interpretation, or guesses , no matter how  
 valid they may be. We first get what is specifically stated, and that is all I am interested  
 in ~~w~~ right now. Perhaps I should before asking you to write this , Ask this question  
 Is it Isaiah 's custom to let us know who he is talking to or does he just leave us  
 to infer. Well, look at chapter 40, which is ~~xx~~ the beginning of the Book of Comfort,  
 and notice 40:27, Why sayest thou, O Jacob, and speakest, O Israel, my way is ~~he~~  
 hidden from the Lord. There He is speaking to Israel. Chapter 41:1, ~~Keep~~ Keep silence  
 before me, O Islands, He is speaking to the distant ~~Gentile~~ Gentiles, but in ~~h~~ verse  
 8 ~~he~~- He says, But thou, Israel, art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, that's  
 chapter 41, and in chapter 42 I am just picking at random now. I don't notice in 42 but  
 certainly in 43, But now, ~~say~~- saith the Lord who created thee O Jacob, and He that  
~~form~~ formed thee, O Israel, That is very definitely definitely speaking to Israel and  
 in verse 22 of chapter 43, But thou hast not called upon ~~the~~ me O ~~x~~ Jacob, Thou ha st  
 been weary of me , O Israel. Chapter 44 , Yet now hear O Jacob , My servant , and  
~~Isa~~- Israel whom I have chosen. Chapter ~~x~~ 45 , Thus saith the Lord to His anointed

--He is speaking to Cyrus there and chapter ~~5-45~~ 46 :3 ~~Hear~~ Hearken to me, O house of Jacob, and all the remnant of the house of Israel. 47--come sit in the dust, O virgin daughter of ~~Babylon~~ Babylon, ~~sit~~ sit on the ground. Verse 5 sit ~~is~~ silent in the darkness O daughter of the Chaldaens . Chapter 48:31 Hear ~~he~~ ye this O house of Jacob. verse 12, Hearken to me ~~of~~ O ~~jae~~ Jacob and Israel. Chapter 49:14 But ~~Zion~~ Zion said, ~~xx~~ The Lord hast ~~forsaken~~ forsaken me. My Lord has forgotten me. In chapter 50, I don't happen to notice a ~~simia~~ similar thing ~~xx~~ but in chapter 51:2 Look unto Abraham your Father and unto Sarah that bare you, for the Lord shall comfort Zion. Chapter 52:21 Awake, Awake, Put on thy strength O Zion. Put on thy beautifuly garments, O Jerusalem. ~~Deck~~ Shake thyself from the dust, Arise, Sit ~~down~~ down. Loose thyself from the bands of thy neck, O captive ~~daughter~~ daughter of Zion. Verse nine. Break forth into joy. I ~~x~~ have just picked at random as I have gone through. How specific, how definite, how clear. Now, in chapter 54 how many verses did it specifically ~~x~~ designate the nation of Israel as the one addressed. Mr. Curry how many did ~~x~~ you notice. Verse three says, Thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles, so it would take the Gentiles as meaning the non-~~Israe~~ Israel nations. Then the only ~~x~~ ones who inherit the Gentiles would be the non-Gentiles or Israel. However, the Hebrew word \_\_\_\_\_ which is often translated Gentiles is also often translated nation, and therefore it could be used of any Gentile ~~x~~ nation that would inherit other Gentile nations. And so I think that Miss Chung has a very good point that this is one verse to ~~invee~~ investigate to see whet~~er~~ whether this is an assurance that ~~he~~ He is speaking to Israel but I don't think we could say at first sight that He is speaking to Israel. Verse 5 , Thy maker is thy husband, the Lord of Hosts is His name. My redeemer , the Holy One of Israel . Well , it does ~~x~~ mention Israel. Could not ~~he~~ He say to the people of Greece , Your redeemer is the Holy One of Israel.

The nation of Israel is spoken of as a woman. The nation of Babylon is spoken of as a woman. The nation of Egypt ~~of~~ is spoken of as a woman. It is quite common to address any ~~xxx~~ nation as a woman. It is a figure of speech rather than- common.

(Q) I'm asking whether it is specific. Now, Mr. Kim suggests that the statement Thy maker is thy husband suggests that it is talking in the feminine ~~gener-~~ gender of some nation, and this ~~mu-~~ must be a nation then of which ~~the scripture-we~~ somewhere in the scripture find the teaching that that nation has God for a husband, and so this gives a good clue to investigate. It's very important, but it is not a specific designation of Israel. I do not think in this chapter that we have any case where it specifically says that He is talking to Israel. And we have that in so many chapters, so we are not asking for something ~~xunusual~~. It is rather interesting ~~tht-the~~ that there should be no ~~esse-~~ designation in chapter 53. There is none in chapter 54. In ~~chapt-~~ chapter 55 there is ~~not-~~ none. You ~~x~~ cannot earlier in the Book of Comfort (from chapter ~~x~~ 40 on) find any case of three chapters in ~~wh-~~ ~~x~~ which there is not some verse which specifically says he is talking to Israel. We have it ~~asx~~ at least every other chapter, probably more than that. But these three chapters don't, and this whole chapter of promise has no such ~~x~~ specific statement. That doesn't prove it isn't. But it is interesting that it does not have a specific mention of Israel. What about Gentile nations. ~~x~~ Does it anywhere ~~x say-~~ say it is talking specifically to Gentiles. There is no specific statement either, so it does not take much writing to indicate all the verses specifically ~~as~~ addressed to ~~Is-~~ Israel or to Gentiles. Now, my third question. Is there any verse then, which is specifically addressed to some designated group which declares that the promise is contained is ~~inted~~ intended for some designated group. Is there any such verse. Yes, verse 17. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord. Is that not a rather definite ~~des~~ designation. The servants

of the Lord. Well, if he ~~say~~ says this is the heritage of the servants of the Lord. Would that not include all. If He were to say, This is the heritage of the Israelite servants of the Lord or this is the heritage of the Gentile servants of the Lord or this is the heritage of the red-~~haire~~ haired servants of the Lord or this is the heritage of the ~~male~~ male servants of the Lord. But when He says The servants of the Lord, it would seem to me to ~~mean~~ mean all, and what, if you want a further clue as to what servants ~~are~~ are indicated. You can ~~continue~~ continue. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord and ~~their~~ their righteousness is of me, saith the Lord. Does that not mean that those servants of the Lord of whom He is speaking are servants who secured their righteousness from God. Is that not ~~justiv~~ justification by faith. Their righteousness is of me, saith the Lord. We are told what God is going to do through His ~~serva~~ servants in chapter ~~40~~ 52:13 to 53:12 how He is going to atone for the sins of all the people whom He will seize away from Satan, those whose sorrows He ~~sill~~ will bear, those whose pain He will take upon Himself. Then we read This is the heritage of the Lord and their righteousness is of me. It seems to me that you can say that verse 17 ~~se~~ specifically declares that all of those who have the ~~blessing~~ blessing of chapter 53 can say that no weapon formed against them will prosper and every tongue that shall rise against thee thou shalt condemn. They are given freedom from condemnation. They are released from the condemnation that they would deserve for their sins, because of what God did for them in chapter 52. and this is the heritage of the servants of the Lord. (Q) From chapter 41 to 53 we have the words Servants of the Lord used about 20 times. Never again in the book of Isaiah is the word servant used at all after chapter 53. But about 6 times in the rest of the book we have the word Servants of the Lord, or My servant, the word of the servant is finished in chapter 53. The heritage of the servants of the Lord is described ~~in~~ in the ~~br~~ rest of the book of comfort and is alluded

54:17  
 to at various chapters in the ~~the~~ rest of the Book of Isaiah. So that we have a ~~spei~~ specific statement in verse 17 that verse 17 refers to those whose righteousness comes from the Lord. Now, of course the RSV, my guess is, that it says ~~vict~~ ~~α~~ victory or vindication but the Hebrew word is righteous, ~~har~~ having righteousness leads to ~~vindiae~~ vindication but it is an incorrect ~~α~~ translation, I have no hesitancy in saying. (Q) Their ~~rightou-rihe-~~ righteousness is of me. I am not sure that the RSV translates it victory but they do in other places, so my ~~α~~ guess is that they do here. (Q) I ~~wol-~~ would say that verse 17 is very definitely dealing with all those who are the followers of the Lord ~~descrip-~~ described in 53, that all of those who are His followers are referred to as the servants of the Lord, and those whose righteousness is of me, saith the Lord. Because He bore their sin on the cross and gave for them His life, so that would include all ~~α~~ who are saved through Him. I would say that that would definitely apply to all ~~who-~~ of verse 17, ~~-but-~~ As to how far back it goes, ~~tha~~ t is a question to investigate, but I would say definitely that verse 17 is the only verse ~~α~~ in the chapter which could ~~fit~~ specifically declares who is included in those whom the promise of ~~the-~~ this verse is given. I would say without question.

ISAIAH # 73

Now, we see that at the end of the ~~chp~~ chapter then. At the end of the chapter He is talking about all of ~~these-~~ ~~thos~~ e who are saved through the Servant of the Lord described in 53, all who were the followers of the Lord, all of them receive the blessing of verse 17, and chapter 55 is ~~certain-~~ ~~ea~~ certainly addressed to all of them. Because chapter 55 is everyone who thirsteth, it is not ~~just~~ the Israelites who thirst, it is not just Gentiles who thirst. It is everyone who thirsts, chapter 55 never says that it ~~is-an-~~ in any way ~~limit~~ is limited to Israel or that in any way Israel is excluded. It is addressed to Individuals, all individuals who come to the <sup>become</sup>

Servant of the Lord through Jesus Christ, and therefore 55 is the offer given to all regardless of nations who will accept the servant of the Lord ~~and their sins~~ as their sin bearer and Saviour. 54 ends with the blessing given to them. Now, at the beginning of 54, ~~i~~ the first verse of 54, we have two people mentioned. And the present day commentaries, practically all of them, try to make it out that ~~th~~ you have one person addressed ~~and~~-- but that makes no sense whatever, and in addition to that Paul says in Galations 4:17. He quotes verse one and ~~He~~-- ~~x~~ he says We are the children of promise, and 54 ~~is~~- describes ~~two~~ two of whom one is designated by Paul as the children of promise. ~~The~~- Now, in verse one there are two individuals referred but the one of them who is addressed is the one who has never borne. The one who has ~~never~~ never been the instrument of God's spiritual ~~blesis~~- blessing to the world, and so to say, Sing O barren, for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife means you are fortunate ~~not~~- now that you are barren and ~~desolate~~, desolate, you have more children than you had when you were a married wife. That is utterly absurd because they can't have children unless they again become a married wife and so it is ridiculous to say more are the children of the ~~desolate~~ desolate than the children of the married wife, if Israel is thought of as divorced, no longer being the wife of the Lord in exile. You can't say ~~Israe~~ Israel in that condition produces more spiritual fruit ~~than~~ than when ~~w~~ she was a married wife. The only way that she could do it would be to again become the wife of the Lord. And so you would have to say, Sing O barren you who have not recently borne, because you ~~have to~~ are going to be taken back and again to bear more ~~xx~~ than you did in the former days, but to say more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife and have the desolate be the same one as the one spoken of as the married wife doesn't make ~~x~~ any sense at all, but practically all the present day commentaries try to do this with the verse, try to make it Israel at different times of its existence. And it doesn't make

sense. And in addition to that , in earlier chapters, between 49-51 the prophet is comforting Israel. And they are saying We are cast off, God is not interested in us any more, and ~~they-~~ the way the prophet gives the answer, Where is the bill of your mother's divorcement, to whom ~~are-~~ have I sold her. I haven't sold her. She sold herself. You sold yourself for your sins. In other words, you are not in this situation because God has cast you off. You are still in a relationship to God. He is your God, just as much as He ever was, and the fact that you are not ~~x k~~ suffering is the result of your own sin, it is not ~~α~~ because God has cast you off. After ~~have-~~ ~~ha-~~ having repeatedly insisted that Israel which had been in a position which could be called the bride or the wife of Jehovah, is still in that position. He is still following with His mercy, He is still going to bless her. And then to turn around and ~~spea-~~ speak of her now as the desolate has more children than the married wife, just ~~does-~~ doesn't make sense. It is , I think very clear, ~~that~~ there are two different individuals referred to in verse one, and of those two individuals one has been the great instrument of God's blessing. He uses a figure of ~~spea-~~ speech. More are her children. He is using ~~n~~ it of the spiritual blessing ~~whih-~~ which she has brought into the world. There is one of these which has been a great instrument of spiritual blessing in the past. There is another one which can be spoken of as barren and as having never borne~~d~~. As being desolate, as being the one who ~~ah~~ has been outside the pale , outside the area of God's blessing. And then He says This one, which was outside the area of God's blessing is going to be wonderfully blessed that ~~x~~ it will produce more blessing than will be produced by the one that is the married wife. And so it is surely a prediction --not in such clear language as the people in Isaiah's time could fully understand, but such as-- that when the events come to pass that the Gentiles receive the work of the

Servant of the Lord in greater proportion than the Jews. You can say this was ~~x~~ predicted by Isaiah. He looked forward to it and he saw it. Paul specifically said, in Romans 10, that in Isa. 55 it predicts the calling of the Gentiles. He quotes from a verse showing God's blessing to ~~g~~ the Gentiles, and then he quotes the next verse as showing God's rebuke of Israel, so Paul ~~x-definit~~ definitely says Isaiah predicts this and it seems to me that this verse predicts it as clearly as anything anywhere in the Bible. So I believe that we can dogmatically say that in 54 we have two women ~~referred-~~ referred to, each of them is a figure. One is a ~~x~~ figure for the ~~Gentile~~ Gentiles, the other is a figure for the nation of Israel. And ~~xx~~ he is addressing the Gentile believers in 54:1 and calling upon them to sing and rejoice because God is going to make them a ~~trm-trd-~~ tremendous instrument for His blessing to the world. And then in verse two addressing still the one that ~~th~~ He addressed in verse one, Enlarge the place of thy tent. Let them stretch forth the curtains of thy habitation, for thou shalt break forth~~k~~ on thy right hand and on thy left and thy seed shall inherit the nations, and make the desolate cities to be inhabited. Now, the phrase "make the desolate cities to be inhabited" reminds me very ~~much~~ much of promises to Israel of return to exile earlier, where there are found desolate cities which have been destroyed, but I don't think the similarity of phrase ~~requires~~ requires that this verse be the same thing as that. I think that He is speaking here of ~~the-~~ those that have never known the Lord, those that have been ~~so-~~ outside the ~~pla-~~ pale of His blessing, because the whole ~~wh~~ world shut God out of their ~~conscie~~ conscience and tried to forget His existence, and then God in His grace choose Abraham as the instrument through which He would keep alive the knowledge of the true God and prepare the way for the coming of His son into the world, but then when His son comes and the marvelous predictions of chapter 53 are fulfilled, then He will ~~x~~ let ~~this mee-~~ message go out through all the world and all the desolate cities where God was ~~on-~~ not known shall be inhabited by those who ~~known~~ know Him. I think thy ~~x~~ seed

are those who are the continuing generations of believers. I would say that verse one is very specifically addressed to Gentile believers and verse two would logically carry that on and verse three also. I would say that verses one to three are very definitely addressed to the Gentile believers. And then you ~~sa~~ start verse four Fear not, what reason do you have to make a change. There is nothing in the ~~verse~~ verse to show to whom it is addressed. Fear not, ~~for~~... why should it not be the same ones addressed in the ~~fir~~ first three verses... neither be thou confounded ~~but~~ for thou shalt not be put to ~~shap~~ ~~on~~ shame, for thou shalt forget the shame of thy youth. What ~~ti~~ is the shame of thy youth. Does it mean that we look back. I look back, wild fighters on the hills of Scotland, worshipping the Gaelic gods or ~~the~~ my ancestors on my mother's side, worshipping the ~~R~~ Teutonic gods, living in heathen darkness. Surely that is ~~te~~ the shame of our youth, our heathen ~~back~~ background that we all have. Who are ~~x~~ we to look for any blessing from the Lord ~~comi~~ coming from an ancestor that has worshipped heathen gods in ~~the~~ this way. Thou shalt forget the shame of thy youth. Why, because of ~~th~~ what God has done described ~~throug~~ ~~in~~ in 52:13 to 53:12 as the result of that our sins are taken away, we need not be ~~ash~~ ~~x~~ put to shame. We ~~want~~ wont be ashamed. We can forget the shame of our youth. The shame of our ancestors that ~~di~~ knew not God, put God out of their mind and worshipped wood and stone. But then when you look on to verse five, the question may be raised about verse five, For thy maker is thy ~~husta~~ husband. We are often ~~x~~ ~~ted~~ told earlier that God has a relationship ~~x~~ of a husband to Israel. Is verse ~~x~~ five speaking to Israel now. The Lord of Hosts is His name, ~~the~~ thy redeemer is the Holy one of Israel, the God of the whole earth shall He be called. I am not sure that we can prove that verse 5 ~~x~~ is speaking to Israel rather than to the Gentile ~~x~~ believers, for surely ~~one~~ once they have believed in Christ, their Lord is in a very true sense their husband but yet

it sounds as if it may be Israel He is speaking to in ~~xx~~ verse five. Look at verse  
 6~~x~~. The Lord has called thee as a woman forsaken and/a wife of youth when thou  
 wast refused, ~~&~~ For a small moment have I forsaken thee, but ~~with~~ with great mercies  
~~will~~ will I gather ~~tee~~ thee. That sounds like Israel. It doesn't specifically say Israel  
 but it surely sounds like Israel. There is nothing in verses one , two , or three, ~~that-~~  
 except that little bit , there is ~~nothing~~ nothing in ~~vers~~ verses one or two that ~~suf-g~~ suggest  
 that he is speaking to Israel. It would suggest the contrary, because He is speaking  
 to the one to whom He compares with Israel. But here is ~~S~~ With a small moment have  
 I forsaken thee, but with great mercies ~~will~~ will I gather thee. This could be that He  
~~&~~ forsook us for a small moment, but yet ~~we-~~ when you think of the many, many ene-  
 centuries that have past the small ~~moment-~~ moment ~~small~~ sounds more ~~th-~~ like the Jews  
 in exile than ~~when~~ of ~~thing-~~ thinking of all the ene- centuries since our ~~&~~ ancestors  
 --~~α~~ probably soon after Noah's time refused to follow Him until there was ~~had-~~ hardly  
 any true faith left , and He called Abraham ~~and he-~~ and as an ~~instu-~~ instrument to keep  
 alive the knowledge of God, so it sounds much more (verses 7,8) as if He is speaking  
 to Israel, and if He is now speaking to ~~Israel-~~ Israel, just where is the ~~trans-~~ transition .  
 I feel that we can say positively that verse one is speaking ~~&~~ to ~~gh-~~ the Gentile believers,  
 I think we can say ~~posib~~ ~~ix~~ positively that verse 7 is speaking to all believers, and I  
 think that we can feel quite strongly that verse 6-8 is speaking to Israel. Where then  
 are the transitions .

155.74

There is a very interesting phrase at the end of verse four. "Thou shalt ~~fort-~~ forget the shame of thy youth and shalt not remember the reproach of thy widowhood. It surely is...it's hard to think of the two together. They sound so different. How can they be synonyms. I would be inclined to think that the shame of thy youth is speaking to Gentiles who, all through their history have forgotten God and turned away from Him, while Israel, who has ~~xx~~ been specifically called and followed with His blessings and called back to Him every time He apostacized for many centuries, but the ~~repora~~ reproach of thy widowhood sounds as if Israel seemingly cast off, Israel turning away from God, ~~Isreal-Isreal-Isreal~~ Israel cast into exile, as if that might be Israel, so I would be inclined to suggest without at the moment any dogmatism, suggest that the part speaking to the Gentile believer, ~~and with the~~ would end with the ~~pra~~ phrase, the shame of thy youth. Fear not, thou shalt not be ashamed, neither be thou confounded, for thou shalt not be put to shame, for thou shalt forget the shame of thy ~~so~~ youth, as if ~~the~~ there he ended the passage ~~and~~ specifically for the Gentile believers, and looking forward to ~~g~~ the ~~distan~~ distant future of course and not really fully understood until the time came when Paul ~~k~~ pointed out that these things had come to pass exactly as predicted, but then ~~we~~ when he turns his attention, and it wouldn't be, and shalt not remember but ~~he~~ turns his attention and thou shalt not remember the ~~repora~~ reproach ~~oe- k~~ of thy widowhood anymore, for thy maker is thy ~~husbe~~ husband, the Lord of Hosts is His name. You will not feel deserted ~~of~~ or abandoned. You ~~are-no~~ have no longer one who cares for you. You will cease to feel that way because ~~ack~~ after all, your husband is your maker, the creator of the universe, the Lord of Hosts. He has not cast

you off. You will no longer remember the reproaches that you felt. So I would be inclined to think that right at that ~~is p 91~~ point is where the transition takes place. Now, I would not be dogmatic if that were the place, but I would feel quite positive that verses one to three are to the Gentiles, and I would be inclined to think that the phrase , the ~~sm~~ "shame of thy youth fits that better than to say it looks back to some episode in an earlier . . . And I would ~~in~~  $\alpha$  incline very definitely toward feeling that verses 6, 7, 8 ~~and~~ sound like Israel, and then when you come to verse 9 it seems to me to sound like Israel again, "Fee- For this is as the waters of Noah unto me, for as I have warned that as the waters of Noah shall no more go over the earth, so ~~k~~ have I sworn that I would not be wroth with you." Surely, that is speaking of Israel, for Israel has been a people and Israel has ~~followed~~ fallen into sin, and God is going to bring them ~~back~~ back, but God is not turning His mercies away from them, even ~~te~~ though they sin again, yet His mercies remains with them. The mountains shall depart, but my kindness shall not depart, neither ~~k~~ shall the covenant of my people. There are those who say God used Israel as the means to bring Christ into the world and when Christ came into the world , Israel had fulfilled its function, Israel is ~~not~~ now cast off and forgotten. I do not think ~~ye~~ you can interpret the Bible . I think the Lord very ~~specific~~ ~~spe~~ specifically says , His promise is ~~th~~ to Israel, and in blessing I will ~~be~~ bless Him and in ~~cur~~ cursing I will curse and ~~one~~ it is just as valid today as ever. I would say that verse one to three are clearly the Gentile believers and that verses ~~5-0-5-9-~~ 5-8 seem to me to be Israel, so I would incline to think that the ~~two~~ -- three fourths go with ~~th~~ what precedes and the last 3/4s is the transition. That would be

54.9

ISAIAH # 74

my ~~in~~ inclination. (Q) Yes, the statement, "thou shalt not remember the reproach of thy widowhood any more," and there the Authorized version has obscured the sense by not putting the pronoun, thou. The translation of the word thou . . . when you look at the Hebrew, ~~there should be~~ you see that it can, . . . just as well as you use the word thou there. . . . certainly there has been a different direction.. these transitions occurs in the Prophets, and some-times rather sharply and sometimes rather ~~shaply-~~ sharply. Yes? (Q) Yes, I would be inclined to think that the verse 9 concern the Israel, because it would seem to me to be that verse 9 is ~~th-~~ a description of \_\_\_\_\_ to the exile. The ~~comp-~~ exile is comapred with the ~~✓~~ flood. I do not think that he is here specifically pseaking of the flood as such. "... this is as the waters of Noah unto me...." He is referring back. He says, "for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth; so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee." I am inclined to think<sup>a</sup> that that is ~~the-~~ promise to the Israel that ~~israel-~~ there is to be no more permanent turning aside from the abandonment of Israel.... Yes? (Q) What is that? I would not say that it is impossible in verse nine. Very true. I think that verse 17 is referring to all believers. And whether verse 9 or verse 17, ///... I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee" come to my people . . . whether it goes with verse 17 or it goes with five or seven, is a matter of <sup>ly a</sup> consideration. This is a definite/matter of consideration. Verse 10 is the <sup>continuing</sup> promise of God's ~~gentine-kingdem~~ blessing. That certainly applies to all believers. That does not mean that it is necessary-~~here~~ ily here referring to all believers. It could be speaking to Israel. But it could not be referring to Israel alone. B ut when you can verse 11, "O thou afflicted, tossed with tempest, and not comforted, behold, I will lay thy stones with fair colours, ..." I am inclined to

54:11 think that verse 11 is addressed to Israel. I am inclined to think that the whole book is mainly intended to comfort the suffering Israel. up to chapter 40. , to comfort Israel suffering in exile. I am ~~em~~ inclined to think that when he says that "thou afflicted, tossed with tempest, and not comforted..." well, here he is giving a general principle that can be applied to any people of any time. That his specific reference is Israel. Then I would be incined to think that the promise that I ~~would~~- will make thy windows of agates, and thy gates of carbuncles , and all thy borders of pleasant stones ,"

54:13 of the Lord. "And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord; ~~add~~ . . ." ~~Certainly~~ That certainly is the promise given specifically to Israel in Jeremiah and in other places. But it is also given to all of the believers of all times. So that, whether the verse goes to Israel or ~~ot~~ to all believers, it is hard to say. It is specifically not Gentiles. And ~~in~~ verse 15, we are told ~~that~~ "Behold, I have created the smith ~~that bloweth the coals in the fire, and that bringeth forth an an instrument for his work; and I have created the waster to destroy.~~" "Behold, ~~thy~~ they shall surely gather together, ~~but~~ not by me: whosoever shall gather together against thee shall fall ~~for thy sake.~~" on account of thee." Does that refer to Israel or to \_\_\_\_\_ ?

(5.50) ~~It~~- It certainly is not just the Gentiles. "Behold, I h. ve created the smith that bloweth the coals in the fire, and ~~tha~~ that bringeth ~~forh~~- forth an instrument for his work; and I have created the waster to destroy." Here God is declaring that He controls all things. I think that this is a general~~l~~ statement of the sovereignty of God. Well, yes?(AQQ) All right. No, we cannot take it in every situation, ~~because there is certainly~~ <sup>has</sup> Certainly the servant of the Lord/suffered terribly. ~~e~~ persecution. And Israel has suffered a terrible persecution. And the Gentiles think they have suffered a terrible persecution . So, that , it must be with

in  
 that ~~they shall~~ permanently... Shall/the end be crushed? It must mean that.  
 Otherwise, it would be untrue. I think that that is what it is saying. It is saying  
 in the end \_\_\_\_\_ be the Gentiles. Those who do not belong to the Lord will  
 in the end perish. I think that is what it says. That they will not be \_\_\_\_\_ \*4.00)  
 to the Israel or to the  
 put to an end, ~~for they are~~ believers. It is what it says. He is going to completely  
of the Jews  
 destroy them. He dealt with six millions, but today, we have the nation of Israel.  
 We have the Jews in many parts of the world. Certainly the nation has not deceased.

(Q) I am not sure, ~~I am inclined to think that...~~ ~~where~~ whether it is referring  
 specifically  
 to ... I would be inclined to think that it is meant/of all believers, but that ~~it~~  
 Israel cannot be destroyed.  
 it ought to refer to Israel.. /but I guess our time is up. Look this over for  
 tomorrow.... (3.25) and see if you have further question/on it, and if you have  
 further time we like to look further the matter to cover.... (Q) I am not dogmatic  
 on that, no. I say verse. 17, is all believers, and verses 6 and 7 are specifically  
 Israel, and I say verses 14 and two are specifically the Gentiles believers, but  
 just where this transition comes in I am not in a position to be dogmatic about  
 to speak dogmatically on that at all.  
 at all. For I am not prepared ~~for that...~~ I am not sure if there is a sharp  
 transition or not. ~~In the first place,~~ There may be a gradual one. In the first  
 place, please, yes, please do not forget to turn in the papers.

#75 We were looking last ~~day-~~ time at these chapters which have been  
 noticed  
 the subject this semester for Isaiah/ 52 to 55. And we ~~noted~~ that chapter / 52  
 is dealing with return from exile. And that is the subject up until verse 12.  
 But in the course of this, the \_\_\_\_\_ is touched upon, that  
 The return from exile. ~~It is true that the~~ subject of sin, ~~that is the subject of -~~  
 Go/ye from them thence, touch no unclean thing." It is rather quietly touched  
 has been being  
 upon, but it is definitely there and it ~~has is being~~ brought through the previous

chapters of this book of comfort that important as it is that he is going to deliver them from exile, deliverance from exile will never solve their problems unless this matter of sin is dealt with. It ~~is~~ <sup>was</sup> sin that sent them into exile, and it- other exiles, which are to . . . . if sin is not dealt with ~~there~~, there will be ~~another exile~~. So, ~~this being the~~ <sup>through</sup> that this \_\_\_\_\_ which has been touched upon/~~in this chapter~~- these chapters the theme of they were brought to the front in verse 11. And in verse 13, he takes up/~~the~~ servant of the Lord~~that~~ that he has dealt/~~with~~ with so much in these prev~~ious~~ chapters, and when the two together shows how the work of the servant of the Lord which is usually one of presented as/~~delivering~~ his people from exile, being light to the Gentiles, helping those that are indifficulties, ~~and it is actually~~ that it ~~is actually able to take~~- He is actually going to be able to solve the sin question. "So shall he sprinkle many nations;~~the kings shall shut their mouths at him~~-. . . ." There are sins. He was wounded for our transgressions. He will justify many for he will bear their iniquity. So we have in chapter 50 this great prediction of how God is going to solve the great problem, the exile problem, the problem of sin. And in chapter 54, we have the promise made. There is <sup>There is</sup> no offer in 54,/<sup>asking</sup> No ~~na~~ body has ~~asked~~ anything so that they can say, yes or no to. They are told ~~that~~ of the wonderful blessings that God is going to give them, ~~Unless~~ the book is just a lot of miscell~~aneous~~ sections all thrown ~~into~~ together. . . into something, why, there must be a problem in this ch. of 54. . . . . And I believe that we are thoroughly justified ~~in~~ <sup>in</sup> saying that 54 is based upon 53, and all the more so, for the 53 ~~✓~~ tells us what the Servant of the Lord does, and the 54 ~~says that it~~ ~~it is~~ ends with a statem~~ent~~ that ~~it is~~ this is the heritage of the servatn of the Lord. The followers of the servant of the Lord are given great promises contained in chapter 54. And then there are specifically designated that"their righteousness ~~is~~ of me." So, we do not have other evidences in the chapter. ~~This last chapter will~~ ~~whole chapter~~- This last chapter would

ISAIAH #75

lead us to think that the whole chapter was discussing the followers of the Servant of the Lord.

The servants of the Lord here ~~w~~ in 54 are the subject of the entire chapter. And then of course, chapter 55 is the great offer, the individual offer whereby one can enter into this covenant relation and become one of the <sup>se</sup> servants of the Lord with the assurance that at the end of the chapter that it is going to be fulfilled that God ~~is-~~ 's word ~~∕~~ will not return <sup>unto Him</sup> ~~∕~~ in void. In this course, we have not looked at the chapter 56 at all, but I think \_\_\_\_\_ (11.25) we should mention that the first eight verses of chapter 56 continue to be the part of the Book of Comfort.

And with verse 9 of chapter 56 an entirely new section of Isaiah begins, and so these ~~vir-~~ first eight verses of chapter 56 are the declaration that God is going to extend the <sup>the</sup> evidences - \_\_\_\_\_ of/believes in God that he is going to bring in many <sup>strongly</sup> who/~~seem~~ to be outside the Israel \_\_\_\_\_. That is the theme of chapter 56:1-8.

56:8

It is taught very clearly in the last verse. "The Lord God which gathereth the outcasts of Israel saith, Yet will I gather others to him, beside those that are gathered unto him." <sup>Two verses before:</sup> "Verse 6/~~∕~~"... Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him...." Verse 7, "Even them will I bring to my holy mountains/~~∕~~ and make them joyful in my house of prayer...." So, in the beginning of 56, which is the end of the Book of Comfort, we have this note touched upon which is <sup>so</sup> stressed in chapter 54. After the completion of the Servant's work/~~∕~~ described in chapter 53, the extension of the area of the servant/~~s~~ of the Lord to include many of the Gentiles/~~∕~~ as well as many of the Jews. It is not easy in the Bible to distinguish between <sup>places where</sup> those ~~who are~~ <sup>is addressed, and where</sup> Israels as a nation, ~~∕~~ and Israel as <sup>as</sup> Godly men. That is to say, God deals with Israel as a nation, as a national group, but he also deals with those of Israel who follow him, and who believe on him. And of course, we know that those of Israel who rejected him, ~~th~~ rejected the new covenant, we know that they are cast out, but we know that God's promise was given to Israel as a nation... and Israel



ISIAH #75

study of 53, 54, 56, which surely catch on ... this shows that His mercy is to be extended to another group, even beyond what it had been extended to Israel in the past. So, certainly verse 2 is speaking to the one that is spoken to in verse 1.

This is the Gentile group which comes to be the servants of God, which has not been--  
e k has  
born/spiritual fruit in the past, which ~~seemed~~ to be outside Israel, but now is in God's  
as described  
standing as a result of what Christ did/in chapter 53. They are told in verse 2,

"... stretch forth the curtains of thine habitations: spare not, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes: for thou shalt break forth on the right hand and on the left; and thy seed shall inherit th Gentiles, and make the desolate cities to be inhabited."

A- It is a prediction that after the work ~~Ch~~ of Christ ~~ia~~ was done as described in ch. 53, then the blessings derived from this ~~is~~ will spread out to nations all over the world, that is, the prophecy that went on~~t~~ and it is still going on. It is something that God commands to be done, and then in ch. 55 he shows the offer which is involved, and then in verse 4, "Fear not; for thou shalt ~~it~~ not be ashamed:" ~~neither be thou~~

~~- confounded; for thou shalt not be put sh-shamed~~ we have no reason to say that this is addressed to anyone else than to the one who is addressed in verse 1. "... neither be thou confounded; ...." It would be impossible for him to stop speaking in verse 3 and then turn to Israel. It would be impossible, as far as the first two phrases are concerned... "Fear not; for thou shalt not be ashamed: neither be thou

confounded; for thou shalt not be put to shame: for thou shalt forget the shame of ~~th~~ thy youth, ...." And to tell the Israel in exile, "thou shalt forget the shame of thy

~~th~~ youth" would not have much point to it. Repeatedly in this book of Comfort, <sup>ing</sup> Israel has been comforted by remembering their youth, remember/how God brought <sup>remembering</sup> them~~nt~~ out from Egypt, ~~How~~ how he opened up the Red Sea/~~how~~ to bring them through, and how He blessed them, and how He brought them into the promised land.

ISAIAH #75

This would fit much better with the barren, the one who had <sup>s</sup> not been the medium of God's blessing ~~in~~ to the world. This one is to forget the shame of her youth, because she entered into the full blessings of God. But then, the last part of it, "... for thou shalt forget the shame of thy youth, and shalt not remember the reproach of thy widowhood any more." They surely are two different things: the shame of thy youth, and the reproach of thy widowhood. I do not know anywhere the reproach of thy widowhood would refer to the ~~by-true~~ <sup>new</sup> believers, the one that was formerly barren, the new people from distant areas who come into the knowledge of the Lord that are described in verse 1. So, I am ~~not~~ coming more and more to feel that <sup>after the comma there</sup> the shame of thy youth, that he turns to the other one of the two who are <sup>mentioned</sup> described in verse 1. The children of the desolate than the children ~~of~~ of the married wife. He is speaking of the one that was formerly desolate, and then ~~the~~ He has to give her the blessings, then he turns to the married wife, and says, "and thou shalt not remember the reproach of thy widowhood any more. For thy Maker is thine husband; the Lord of <sup>hosts</sup> ~~hosts~~ is his name;..." The married wife is to be <sup>over</sup> shadowed ~~for~~ for a time by the ~~one~~ that is- will come to/ the Lord ~~that will come~~ through the one that was formerly outside the ~~one~~. That ~~means~~ does not mean the married wife cannot come. Not at all. But "thy maker is thy husband; the Lord of hosts is his name..." The God of the ~~former one~~ whole earth is going to the great blessing to Israel, and through Israel to the nations of the world. ~~Israel in future~~ He is going to bless the earth through the Israel/ in future. So, he turns to Israel, and he assures Israel that he will be brought back from Israel. He says, "... The God of the whole earth" ~~shall he be called~~ is going to continue to work out the ~~blessings~~ great blessings promised in chapter 54 to Israel. So, he says, "For the Lord hath called thee as a woman forsaken and grieved in spirit, and a wife of youth, when thou wast refused, saith the Lord thy Redeemer." The barren one would ~~be~~

~~more - pde - productive than the children of the~~ bear ~~off~~ more children than the wife of youth, ~~than~~- She is the one who was in her youth outside the family of God, because all the nations cast God out of their minds, and of course, God has called ~~Israel~~- called <sup>alive</sup> Abraham in order that he ~~could~~- should do his sense of duty to keep ~~the~~ memory of the true God, preparing the way of the coming of the Saviour of the world~~y~~. to deal with the problem of sin. But this one whom He has called, he has refused ~~for~~ for a time, on account of her sin, verse 7:"For a small moment have I forsaken thee; but with great mercies will I gather thee. In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moement...." That is not true of the great Gentile world. For they put God out of their heart, ~~which~~ and which for thousands of years had no knowledge of God. This is Israel which ~~sin~~ned against God, and God sent them into exile. "In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a ~~moement~~; but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith the Lord thy Redeemer." So, verses 5 through 8, I would think that they are definitely speaking of Israel, and my guess is that the last phrase refers to the \_\_\_\_\_.

ISAIAH #76

Is your question ~~is~~ that if that refers to Israel? No, .... (A) Yes, yes, it is a very good question. This is a very excellent question. The reproach of ... these are figures of speech. But that does not mean that that can mean anything at all. They have to fit. So, let us see how they fit. This is a very excellent suggestion to check it. If he says in verse 5, "Thy maker is thy husband; the Lord of hosts is his name," <sup>54:5</sup> How can he then refer to her widowhood? To have a widowhood, the husband should be dead? If he is dead, he cannot be the Lord of hosts. So that, the figure does not quite... no figure fits exactly, but there is a point there where a figure has lack of literal entity. A figure must ~~really~~ have a real application. If you say, Well, I am going to use figure of speech now, just anything to represent anything... that is not ... there must be some similarity to that. He is fighting like a lion. It is perfectly obvious ~~that~~ -- what you mean. He was a lion in the \_\_\_\_\_.

~~You mean that~~ You do not mean that he went out and chewed enemies with his teeth/ or he \_\_\_\_\_ ed with his finger nail. You mean that he fought ~~is~~ vehemently, courageously .... It is similar to our general idea of a lion. If you would say, He was a \_\_\_\_\_ in fight, you would have no idea as to what he is talking about. The figure would not convey an exact idea. Now when he says / the reproach of thy widowhood, ~~it suggests that~~ the suggestion ~~is~~ certainly is that this has had a husband, and now is in a situation having previously had a husband, in a situation of <sup>not</sup> now / having ~~none~~. Well, how could that fit in ~~is~~ with Israel? Here it is sp~~h~~oken of <sup>then</sup> God as in the relationship of God... God is not dead, ~~then~~ how could Israel be a widow? Israel is considered .... that way, is thought of that way, because ~~is~~ <sup>mercy</sup> She, having formerly been the recipient of God's blessing, has been sent into exile, has been, has seemed to have ~~had~~ no God ~~with her~~ -- any more that existed in the temple that was destroyed, no visible sign of God's existence. It seems like one who

ISAIAH #76

had formerly thought she had God to care for her, ~~seems like one who had formerly~~ now does not have. He says, "You will remember this reproach of ~~thy w~~ -- your widowhood that was yours. Your maker is your husband...." He- You ~~Y~~ You now suffer the reproach of widowhood, but ~~now it is actually a wonderful reproach.~~ actually it was a false reproach, and now you are in such a condition that you do not have to even remember that bad situation which you went through, because you realize who He is, and what He is going to do. ~~I~~In his wrath, in a little wrath He hid his face from you for a moment; but ~~He~~ He is going to give you everlasting kindness... He is going to give you an everlasting covenant... even though you thought that you had forsaken Him. This fits with Israel perfectly, but I do not think see how this is going to fit with the Gentiles. Of course, it does not fit exactly literally, but I think that it fits in with Israel closely enough ... you can see a real development. (Q) (A) No, I would say that the one that is called widow in verse 4, she is not called a widow. In verse 5, she is ~~called~~ told that her maker is her husband; the Lord of hosts is his name; and ... He told her that she should forget the reproach of her widowhood. ~~Now that--~~ Now that she was in the condition where she seems to be a widow, but she tells her that she was not really a widow. She was not really a ~~widow~~ widow. She thought ~~wa-~~ she was a widow. More than other people thought she was a widow. They thought ~~w~~ she had been ~~was~~ a widow, she thought she had ~~been a widow--~~ had a great God, but now she ~~none, no protector~~ does not have ~~any~~ at all. She was in exile to Babylon ... but actually, God says, ~~still~~ I am ~~interested in you~~, ~~-I am simply interested in you-~~ I sent you there, because of your sin, but with the intention of ~~bringing~~ bringing you back \_\_\_\_\_. (9.55) You seem to be a widow, but you are not. I am not being dogmatic on this, but am ~~simply in~~ saying ~~the~~ that that ~~hoe~~ w it looks to me, and I am appreciative of-- tremendously of whatever suggestion you ~~raise~~ raise, because I am anxious to work on ... Yes?

ISAIAH #76

How can he tell her to forget the reproach of her widowhood?, ~~she~~ when she has never been a widow at all? He goes right on, "... for thou shalt forget the shame of thy youth, and shalt not remember the reproach of thy widowhood any more. For thy Maker is thine husband; the Lord of hosts is his name...." If the Lord of hosts is her husband, how could she be a widow? Either there is a break between the two verses, in verse five it is talking about some one different than in verse 4 which is not impossible at all... for there are sudden changes in the prophets, that is not impossible, but

It is either that or else, ~~it~~ he is saying that you have some terrible reproach of widowhood, that is, being deserted by the one whom you consider to be your husband, but it was a falsehood, because she has not been a real widow, for her Maker is ~~her~~ her husband, and his name is the Lord of hosts. ... Then... don't hesitate to ~~it~~ raise some questions. If there is any better suggestions I will be ~~of~~ very grateful. Then he speaks to ~~the~~ Israel definitely, I would say in verses 6 through 8 without question. I think surely in also verse five, and ~~when~~ I am inclined to believe in the last phrase of verse four, but verses 1 to 3, I think, are ~~the~~ <sup>definitely believers</sup> Gentiles. And I am inclined to think that 4 also is up to the words... the King James Version.. ~~but~~ translated it... but it is just impossible to read thou shalt not remember the reproach of thy widowhood, as suggested, shalt not, but it is just impossible to read, thou shalt not remember the reproach ~~the~~ of thy widowhood, and suggest that we read, thou shalt not ....

In English you see, when you put the word, "thou," once you say the verb you say in the same verb. But in Hebrew, the ~~word~~ is not expressed, but they are both in the imperfect, and ~~consequently~~ they mean, <sup>a</sup> the same one or different one... and so it is entirely possible to look into another direction. There are ~~number~~ of cases like that in the Prophets. I believe that it is quite definite that you have to

...

... or else it does not make sense. And so, we have the first part, I believe the Gentile b/eliervers... this part is addressed to the nation of Israel/ with emphasis ~~en~~ of course on the individuals of Israel. ... He is saying that he is going to get blessing from Israel as a nation, not as individuals as believers... Israel as a nation. And verse 5/ ~~o~~ 9, he says, "For this is as the waters of Noah unto me: for as I have <sup>54:9</sup> sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth..." What is the connection with the waters of Noah? Well, the waters of Noah signifies the judgment which God gave. "~~... the waters~~ And God swore that "the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth; so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee." Well, this verse makes certain difficulties, because we have been told that we have had much ~~d~~ about ~~the~~ the people that have been \_\_\_\_\_. Now, ~~we are saying~~ - He is saying, I ~~am going to~~ send them into exile, and now I am going to bring them back and never leave them again ~~and/~~ , and never again send them into exile. That is just the history of Israel, because they have gone into exile, , , into far greater exile, into farther exile... And so, you cannot regard verse 9 as referring very ~~sep~~ specifically to God's immediate promise as to what is going to happen when they come back ~~er~~ from exile. It must look ~~fe~~ further into the future, but <sup>no</sup> of course, there is ~~a~~ great problem in thinking that \_\_\_\_\_ does not look into distance into the ~~the further~~ future... but ~~of course~~, when you consider the chapter 53 is looking up to the atonement... chapter 53. . . . If chapter 53 is future, ~~then~~ - some of them here, while verse 9 may be ... not so much, ~~not so much~~ there is not ~~sin~~ - going to be another exile... there is not going to be an end in God's relationship with Israel. They will climb up the mountain when there will never again be another exile. It is a rather difficult passage, and I know of no other way of interpreting this.... There is a wonderful blessing from God. There is a verse of rebuke. God is against all sins. ~~There~~ - This is a general, sweeping way of ... there may be times of

when we can do any better~~than~~ than that, but I think that ~~it~~ in most cases,  
we can get ~~something~~ more specific means out of \_\_\_\_\_ interpretation.

Some years ago,

then somebody else said, and then he has got evidence to show ~~that~~, -a- this, and

~~then he has~~ then somebody else said, \_\_\_\_\_ \*(2.75)

Then he ended up by saying that all these ~~cond~~tradict each other, and it does not  
make any sense what the meaning is. Well, the meaning is that \_\_\_\_\_ does not

represent~~ed~~ the countries at all. ~~T~~/ All that it ~~d~~ shows is that the church is going  
to

~~we~~ have a great emphasis. There is going to be much opposition to the church, but  
even ~~have to~~ have to worry

we do not know \_\_\_\_\_ because our God is a mighty protector. Well, I do

not think that it is proper to just ? \_\_\_\_\_ general terms like that. <sup>When</sup> ~~For~~ the

Lord speaks about God, when he uses such a specific language, we may not know

exactly what it means, and we ~~may~~ not ~~knew~~ have the means to know it, but

it means something definite. And when the time comes, it will be clear~~ed~~ what it means.

ch. 53

If we cannot find... it is just like saying... is this talking ~~and~~ about Isaiah?

is he talking about

~~Or~~ Jeremiah? Is he talking about the nation of Israel? Is he talking about the

salvation of Israel? Well, it is ~~sh~~owing that God's salvation is to the world....

I do not ~~think~~ so at all... I think that it is specifically talking about ~~the~~ glory

about the activity of ~~Isaiah~~, Christ, ... Peter says that it is definitely referring

to the glory of God... Is it the time of Isaiah? It might ~~of~~ be../. Let us ~~see~~  
<sup>hard to see what ....</sup>

what it is.... Maybe things in the prophets may not be clear, and will not become

clear, until the time comes, ~~until~~ ~~we can~~ surely we can understand much more

And when the time came, we ~~see~~ see that Christ fulfilled every bit of what is

~~contina~~edained ... I do not feel that we should ...

the original Aramaic of the New Testament... exactly thought of ....

ISIAH 77

And Land's translation. He has got the whole Bible commentaries, and first he got out the New Testament commentaries. He made the translation of both Old and New Testament from the original, the Gospel from the original Aramaic, and there was not any original Aramaic, ... but they had written an article thirty years ago some of which ... deals with the interpretation of the Scriptures. There are not many people who have \_\_\_\_\_ but there are many people who have \_\_\_\_\_ About five or six years ago \_\_\_\_\_ translation of the whole Bible. There-- But the worst part of the translation was his spiritualization, e.g., when it says that Jesus walked on the water, he says that the Aramaic word, "Ael" upon can ~~mean~~ also mean "by". So, what he tries ~~to~~ to intend to mean here is that Jesus walked beside the water, not upon the waters. And when he said that Jonah was in the ~~belly~~ belly of a whale three days and nights, he says that the word belly in the Old Aramaic word, meaning . . . that he was in difficulty. So, he did not go into Nineveh, and so he was in difficulty, it was a problem, it was a tough situation, and they expressed it in such a way as in the belly of a whale. Well, I asked him, I wrote a review of it on \_\_\_\_\_ at that time, and was hardly out ~~at that~~ ... was not even distributed / before Lansdale's translation ... looking for me / about it. I guess the \_\_\_\_\_ press must have got the copy of the new \_\_\_\_\_ immediately, and immediately got / in touch with him, and he immediately came to me, and he said I could not prove anything wrong in his Bible, and he is paying away the \_\_\_\_\_ outline. Of course, I knew that you could ~~not~~ not ~~prove~~ prove anything to his satisfaction, so there is no use of assessing that, but he said that Jonah gives the impression of being in difficulty, and that it does not mean that he actually fell in Jonah's belly. Well, I said, let us look at the book of Jonah, and see ~~how it tells,~~

Isaiah #77

how it tells, and see how they threw him out from the ship into the water. Then a whale swallowed him, and then the whale threw him out... while he was praying he spewed him up.... Oh, he said, oh, well, that is just an allegorizing on the phrase... that he was in difficulty, as if in the belly of a whale.... Well, it is matter a ~~kind~~ of interpretation. , 2.30 Anything can mean anything when you ~~x~~ use that method. I am willing to say that there are many things in the Bible that I don't understand, but I think that we can insist ~~the~~ that there is a definite meaning in everything ~~x~~ in the Bible . The more that we ~~x~~ learn to understand the more we can be a blessing to others~~s~~. (Q) Of course it is utter nonsense but most people have not even ~~head-har~~ heard...and they believe anything that anybody says, and it is very sad. When his whole Bible came out (Lamsa's?) I looked up ~~an~~ number of passages and checked the mss. He had no~~x~~ newmss of any kind, just a late Syriac translation~~x~~. And one clear proof that it was a late clear Syriac was the use of the word καθερε, taken right from the Greek. He says the Greek is a translation of the Aramaic, then why does the ~~Aramaic~~ - Aramaic use that word in Greek. I just thought of that as a good ~~illustratin~~ illustration of this matter that when he says this is as the ~~m~~ waters of Noah, for as I have sworn the waters of Noah shall go no ~~more - n-move-~~ more over the earth, so have I sworn that I would not be wroth nor rebuke thee. Now, after Isaiah's time we find the prophets wroth with Israel and rebuking them severely. We find God ~~rebuding~~ rebuking them in the strongest ~~st~~ language. After that time, we find Jesus Christ rebuking them in the strongest language. But ~~k~~ here is this phrase. And how are we going to interpret this? Surely the ~~me-~~ meaning of it is looking forward, meaning that there is a continuity --they never will be destroyed. There is a continuance for Israel. They will never be permanently alienated from them. For the mountains shall depart and the hills be removed. People talk about the eternal hills, so it makes a good illustration.

The mountains and the hills will be removed , but my kindness will not depart from thee . Things that ~~look~~ look so stable will disappear but God's loving kindness will continue . Neither will the covenant of my peace be removed saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee . Surely He is here speaking to Israel . Now the only alternative  
 /...of speaking to Israel would be that verse 17 where it speaks of the servants of the Lord, that that ~~transition~~ transition might be made ~~in~~ somewhere back here . I feel that verse 17 that this is the ~~heritage~~ heritage of the servants of the Lord is surely speaking of the whole \_\_\_\_\_ life of the believer, it is speaking of the spiritual Israel, which includes both Jews and Gentiles . It is the whole body of true believers . And when he is speaking of national Israel back here, and the Gentile believers in the first part, there must be a transition between each section to the next . I feel that the first ~~transition~~ transition is toward the end of verse four . I am not ready to be dogmatic on that, but I am inclined more and ~~more~~ more that way . Where is the transition between the second and the third . On that we have to study the passage and see what it is like . (Q) I don't think that there is any question that the covenant of David~~s~~ is in chapter 55: , I will make an everlasting covenant with you , even the sure mercies of David . That is the offer that is given and ~~and~~ all those who accept that offer become part of this , the servants of the Lord . And if verse 17, if the transition ~~is~~ has come back as far ~~a~~ back as verse 10, then that is probably what it means . But if the transition is later than that I am not sure . I am inclined to think that it means something different . That it would rather mean...I am not ready to give a definite answer . The reason why I am inclined to question it is because verse 11 seems to me , unless he is ~~looking~~ looking on to the group of the servants of the Lord and the misery that they are to pass through before the Lord comes back in verse 11 . Maybe that is a reference to God's ~~the~~ true people as they go through ~~misery~~ miseries in this world . I will lay thy stones with

fair colours, ~~I will make thy gates of~~ and will lay thy foundations with sapphires,  
 make thy windows of agates and ~~thy~~ gates of carbuncles. Maybe this is looking  
 to the New Jerusalem, described in the end of Jerusalem. And ~~at~~ all of thy children  
 shall be taught of the Lord and great shall ~~the~~ be the truth of thy children. Maybe  
 that  
~~God~~ is speaking of the whole group, in which case the transition would be some where  
 earlier. In righteousness shalt ~~thy~~ thou be established. Thou shalt be far from  
 oppression, for ~~thy~~ thou shalt not fear, and from terror, for it shall not come near  
 thee. This is surely looking a long distance in the future. Certainly Israel has  
 been subject to frightful terror through the last many centuries. Through the Middle  
 Ages the persecution that Israel went through was frightening many times. And ~~as~~  
 even as recent as Hitler, and this ~~x~~ could not certainly be said ~~of~~ Yes, it has  
 come to pass. Neither can it be said that it has come to pass as far as the true  
 believers were ~~con-~~ concerned. Think of the way the Chinese ~~xxx~~ communists  
 are murdering Christians. Think of the persecution that Christians have gone through  
 in Russia. The Russia<sup>ns</sup> talk a great deal about the Great Baptist ~~h~~ Church of half a  
~~x~~ million people in Russia which they sent carefully picked emissaries over to this  
 country. But it is my impression that when the Bolsheviks took over they had about  
 $\frac{1}{2}$   
 $\frac{4}{4}$  million. I don't know how many were liquidated, or sent to Siberia, and killed  
 them off. Certainly they were not far from terror. Some people call the idea that  
 the church is to be raptured before the ~~tra~~-tribulation rocking chari Christianity,  
 which is a ridiculous idea, because the ~~el~~- only questionable difference between  
 pre-tribulation ~~ex~~ and post-~~tribulati~~-tribulation rapture is, Will the Church go  
 through the great tribulation. It doesn't say the Church will not go ~~the~~ ~~thoug~~

~~the~~ - through many tribulations. It has gone through many tribulations, and ~~it~~ may go through more. But there is one great one, ~~after~~ according to the scripture I believe, after the <sup>rapture</sup> tribulation. The term ~~certain~~ certainly does not ~~x~~ fit. It is ridiculous. The question is not what would we like to have ~~x~~ but what does the Bible say. I think that the Bible very clearly says that ~~there~~ is to be an outpouring of God's ~~writ~~ wrath, after the Church has been raptured. But before ~~the~~ that the church may go through many tribulations. During the Middle Ages, we don't know what may be ahead. So this verse 14 ~~certain~~ certainly has not been fulfilled, either of Israel or of the body of believers. In righteousness shalt thou be established, thou shalt be far from oppression. Thou shalt not fear and from terror, for it shall not come near thee. That certainly does not describe somebody suffering under the tortures of the Inquisition. It does not fit that, but it is a wonderful ~~x~~ peace that God gives His own. Those that are born ~~an~~ again. He lives in their hearts and gives them wonderful peace. But it is not the teaching of this particular ~~x~~ verse. This verse is talking ~~about~~ of the time, not when one has freedom from fear but one in which there is nothing around to meet the fear. Behold they shall surely gather together. This is saying that ~~there~~ is going to be adversaries but not by me. Whoever shall gather together against thee shall fall ~~far~~ for thy sake. That of course can be true even of today. It is true of God's true ~~bele~~ - believers and it is true of Israel. There are those who persecute the godly. Verse 16, Behold, I have created the smith that blows the fire and brings forth ~~an~~ an instrument for his work and I ~~x~~ have created the waster to destroy. That can go with 15. It can show that regardless of the consequences, God's ~~hand~~ hand ~~is~~ is in it and God protects His own. No ~~x~~ ~~wax~~ weapon that is formed ~~agi~~ - against thee ~~x~~ shall prosper. That doesn't say that it will not be victory of the forces, but that there will not be permanent success and

everyone that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn. This is the heritage of the Servants of the Lord ~~and~~ and what an interesting phrase that is, and their righteousness is of me.

<sup>#78</sup>  
Isa. ~~#88~~

Now, I brought along the Revised Standard Version and Moffatts, thinking it might be ~~helpful to~~ interesting to see how they render certain phrases . I wonder what they do with this one, Their righteousness is of me. Here is the RSV. Yes, the RSV says This is the heritage of the Servants of the Lord, and their ~~ven~~ vindication is from me, says the Lord. Now, the ~~work~~ word does not mean vindication. The word means righteousness, but of course, when you say your righteousness shall be established , that may mean that it will be shown that you are righteousness, so it ~~can~~ can mean vindication, but ~~it~~ that is not going ~~to~~ back and saying you have the right to translate the word , and especially in a context like this. Their ~~ven~~ vindication is from me , says the Lord. And what does Moffatt say about it. He ~~says~~ says such is the lot of the eternal servants, thus the eternal promises do I maintain thereby. Their righteousness is of me. Do I maintain thereby. That's really getting away from the original , but the Hebrew is Their righteousness is of me , and it seems to me that in the light of this ...that it is surely it is ....rather than a promise of... and they are the ones to whom God's righteous righteousness is ...Of course , that's a great problem with translation, if you don't believe the N.T. doctrine, you ~~may~~ may the N.T. writers showing ~~what~~ foolishness they believed, but if you don't believe then you ~~are~~ certainly don't believe the Old Testament writers had any idea of the subject. And , therefore, these unbelieving translators have to twist to get what they do, and that's why I say you can't call the RSV a Holy Bible. When in the N.T. they have quotations which say, These things came to pass, as ~~it~~ it was spoken by the

the Old- prophets and you have a verse which ~~exz~~ exactly fits what happened, and you have a footnote there telling you where it is in the Old Testament, and then you look it up in the Old Testament and ~~n~~ you find it translated entirely different, not fitting at all. I talked to a group of Princeton students, and we had 200-300 out, and I ~~sais~~ said some of the people may have intentionally trying to destroy and ~~to~~ others ~~may~~ have been led of Satan. And a man came up afterward and told me that he was sure these men were demonically-~~inspri~~ inspired because he had studied under them at Yale Divinity School and he knew they were not. So I had ~~first-hand~~ first hand evidence on that, but I still think that ~~k~~ they either were intentionally twisting or they were misled by Satan. I don't see how you see anything else, and the New English Bible, they have very carefully diverted our attack against the RSV to such an extent that they slipped in the New English Bible and a lot of people are taking it. When the New Testament of the New English Bible you the literary style is way ahead of most recent translations, but it ~~differez~~ differs from the original in point after point, and if they are as free as that with the New Testament, think what will happen to the Old Testament. Well, what others ~~problem-~~ problems are in these chapters do you think we should take up in the three minutes that we have. I have ~~x~~ not by any means solved all the ~~problexm~~s with 54 but ~~we~~ if we had a few more hours to discuss . . . Yes, verse 15, it says, Whosoever shall gather together against me shall fall for thy sake. In the first part it says, Behold, they shall surely together. Behold, they shall surely gather together, but not by me. In other words, they are going through tribulation. They are going to go through persecution, but it will be Satan ~~rat-~~ rather than God. God says He sent His people into exile for their sins. He ~~sk~~ says they shall gather together against me but not by ~~ex~~ me. When you find a group of Christians who says that the ~~jews-~~ Jewish

54:15

International Bankers finance communism. They had better watch out, ~~but~~ because the Jews are still God's people and they are in unbelief and there are wicked people among them as there are among Christians, and there may be ~~x~~ individuals who... but to gather against the people as a group ...is gathering together against the nation of Israel in ~~a~~ a way that God says is punishable. I ~~had~~ heard yesterday of a woman who is very convinced of anti-semitism , very convinced that communism has all been financed by the Jews , but she says don't say anything ~~about~~ about it. She says we all know ~~is~~ it is true, but she says the minute you raise any discussion , they will clamp right ~~down~~ down on you and will destroy you. Even ~~yes~~ if you know it is true . It is too bad that there are people ~~x-who-distrib~~ distributing these ideas around but I say let the Christians beware of getting themselves mixed up.

- 339 Machen on the millennium  
Stonehouse  
Isa. 54:4 KJV not literal  
Problem of making translation
- 340 The original may have more possibilities than the translation.  
Illustration given is good.  
The one who had shame in her youth and had reproach in her widow-  
hood may or may not be the same person. Heb. permits either.  
KJV makes it the same person.
- 343 Is. 54:4-5  
Ps. 19:4 poor punctuation
- 344 Is. 54:4 has two possibilities  
345 KJV adds to the thought of original  
Isa. 29:1-5 The 'moreover' on KJV makes no sense.  
Isaiah's prediction in advance of Sennacherib's attack on Jerusalem  
Verse 5 should be trans. (but) rather than (moreover)
- 346 LIFE magazine (June 3, 1964) on Laconia
- 348 Isa 55 The Gospel call  
349 The covenant relationship and covenant theology  
350 Isa. 54:1 cf. RSV
- 351-2 3rd person vs 2nd person. 'Sons of a desolate one'
- 352 Are sing. and represent one woman but this one may be a fig.  
of speech for a whole nation
- 353 'The desolate' is plu. in mod. Eng. but sing. in old Eng. and  
so is the Heb. sing.
- 353a Could be speaking of two diff. people, or could be one.  
Context must decide.
- 353b Is. 54:1 and Moffatt's translation. RSV keeps Heb. meaning here.
- 354 Not one person at two diff. times in her life. How could  
she have more children now that she has no husband than before  
when she had a husband?
- 355 God is still true to Israel even though Israel has sinned.  
Moffatt's trans. unacceptable--it makes the two to be one woman
- 356 Paul took it to be two women in Ga. 4:22. One is like Hagar, the other  
like Sarah.
- 357 A prediction of the calling of the Gentiles
- 358a Isa. 54:2, Wm Carrey's missionary text. Is the whole chapter  
about the church, or does part speak about Israel?

- 358a Chs. 53,54,55 belong together. Ch. 55 is an offer based on a specific event described in ch. 53. Ch. 53 --prediction  
Ch. 54 -- promise  
Ch. 55 -- proffer  
Three questions to answer in ch. 54
- 359 **Usamah** generally lets us know to whom he is speaking
- 360 Isa. 54:3 we can't be sure he is speaking to Israel  
54:5 'thy maker is thy husband'
- 361 AAM does not think in this ch. we have any case where it specifically says he is talking to Israel. Same true of chs. 55 and 53  
Neither any vs. to indicate it is addressed to Gentiles. But 54:17 indicates a promise for designated groups.
- 362 54:17 The heritage of the servants of the Lord  
'servant of the Lord' used c. 20 t. in chs. 41-53, after that in plu. -- or 'my servant.'
- 363 54:17 the only v. in the ch. that tells specifically to whom the promise is given.  
Ch. 55 not limited to Israel. Addressed to everyone
- 364 54:1-2 two individuals are addressed
- 365 Two diff. individuals are addressed
- 366 Isa. 54:1-2 Gentiles  
54:2 'make the desolate cities to be inhabited'
- 367 54:1-3 addressed to Gentile believers  
54:5 Israel?
- 368 54:6 Israel
- 369 54:4 'shame of thy youth' -- Gentiles
- 370 54:1-3 to Gentiles  
54:4-9 to Israel
- 371 54:9 promise of no permanent abandonment of Israel  
54:10 promise of God's continued blessing for all believers  
54:11
- 372 54:13-16
- 375 Servant of the Lord 56:9 begins new section  
56:1-8 God will bring in many who are outside Israel
- 376 54:17
- 377 54:2-4

- 379 54:7  
380 54:4-5 Reproach of yor widowhood. Your maker is your husband  
381 54:5 You seem to be a widow but you are not.  
382 How be a widow of the Lord ~~and xaxax~~ if He is her husband?  
382a 54:9 'be waters of Noah' i.e. judgment  
384 Lamsa's Aramaic translation. Does away with God's miracles  
Says Jonah in belly of great fish means he was 'in difficulty'  
386 54:10  
54:17 servants of the Lord. A transition here  
387 pre--and post--tribulation rapture  
388 54:16  
389 54:17 'their vindication is from me' so RSV? NIV. Better  
'their righteousness is from me' (KJV)  
390 New English Bible  
Those going through the tribulation  
391 antisemitics