

000663

A

I believe I will entitle our course this time, Isaiah's book of Emmanuel. That title is not quite a complete designation of what we're endeavoring to cover, but it is rather close to it. That is to say, in the book of ~~Isaiah~~, there is a section that is often called the book of Emmanuel, that is Isaiah 7-12. Now in this class we are going to study Isa. 7-12, and also Isa. 28-39, and this material from Isa. 28-39 has a very close relationship to the material from 7-12. So although we're calling the course the Book of Emmanuel, which would only be those six chapters, ~~yet~~ it is really not an erroneous title, it is all closely related to what is in those six chapters. Now if a person were to take up the book of Isaiah, having never seen it before, and to be asked to divide the book into three parts, there would be one reasonable, logical way to divide Isaiah into three parts. That would be Isaiah 1-35, as one section; 36-39 as a second section; and 40-66 as a third. That would be the reasonable way to divide the book, for this reason, that the material from 1-35 is what you might call prophetic material, that is to say, it is made up of exhortations, prediction, all sorts of the sort of material that you expect from a prophet. He is talking to his contemporaries about their duty and their need, or he is telling them of the wonderful promises of God for their future. It is very different from the material that you find in a book like Genesis, most of Genesis, or Kings, or Chronicles, or Samuel. But when you come to 36-39 you have a section that is very different from all that precedes and follows. It is a historical section, rather than a prophetic one. In 36-39 you have maybe a third of the material is quoted as ~~what~~ what Isaiah said to the king. And this material, some of it rather long sections, is exactly what we call prophetic material, the prophet declaring the will of God, but it is embedded in a historical ~~concept~~ context. It is a narrative from 36-39. It is different from all the rest of Isaiah, so if we were to divide the book of Isaiah according to context, this would be the logical division. As you know, people often speak of the 2 Isaiah, beginning at Isa. 40. If they meant simply the second main part of Isaiah, there would be nothing wrong with the title. Because, between 39 and 40 is one of the two major divisions we have just noticed in the book, and the material from

36-39 is more related to what precedes than to what follows. That is to say, 36-39 deal with events which take place during the period when parts of what precede has been given. 39 looks forward to the going to Babylon, and that naturally looks then to the prophecies of the return from Babylon which are contained from 40 on, but there is a sharp break actually between 39 and 40, in subject matter. Now then as to type of material, 36-39 are distinct, and 36-39 are closely related with much material that precedes, so we're not going to start today with chapter 7, we're going to start with chapter 36, going to look at this historical section. So if you open your Bibles to Isaiah 36, you find there that 36 and 37 put together describe one of the most dramatic events in all the history of the Old Testament. They tell of an event which caught the imagination of the people of Old Testament times as very little else did, and indeed it should, because it was an earth-shaking event of the sort that occurs comparatively rarely. This account in chapters 36 to 37 is so important that we find great sections of these two chapters to be duplicated in parts almost word for word, in 2 Kings 19, or in 2 Chron. 32. So we have three accounts of this great event, and this great event is so important in all of the book of Isaiah previous to chapter 40, that it is a good place to start this semester and see what this event was, the greatest political military event in the lifetime of Isaiah, was this one described in 36 to 37. Now in these chapters then we read that Sennacherib, King of Assyria, we read in chapter 36.1, came up against the defended cities of Judah and took them. And the King of Assyria sent his Rabshakeh, his chief cup-bearer, literally--in other words, one of his leading officials who had that honorific title--from Lachish to Jerusalem. What would this tell you about Lachish? This would tell you that Lachish was in the hands of the King of Assyria, wouldn't it? And Lachish we know was the second greatest city of Judah. Well, it said in verse 1 that he came up against all the defended cities of Judah, and took them. We know we can't take that all absolutely literally, because Jerusalem was the greatest of all the defended cities of the kingdom of Judah, and that of course he had not yet taken. But it means, the next verse shows in the sending of to Jerusalem, so it means

all except Jerusalem, and the second greatest was the city of Lachish. So the King of Assyria sent his messenger from Lachish to Jerusalem, ~~the~~ to King Hezekiah, with a great army. Now this, "with a great army", I don't know how literally that is to be taken, because this is not a conquering expedition. This is an expedition bringing a message. He sends this messenger to convey a message, and consequently instead of just sending a herald with a flag of truce, he sends a high official with what he calls a great army, perhaps a great number of retainers, something to impress the power and greatness of the King of Assyria, but it is not an army such as would attack Jerusalem. He comes, they come with him, and then we read in verse 2, here, he stood by the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field, and that is a very explicit description, isn't it? Where did the representative of the King of Assyria, he stood by the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field. Now do we care exactly where he stood, when he gave his message of defiance? You might say it doesn't make a great difference where he stood, but as we go on in the course, we will find the same phraseology used again, and the fact that two interesting events took place at the same place, makes the place important. So here is a place just outside Jerusalem which is considered important to designate where he stood, in the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field. And then there came forth to him, out of Jerusalem, certain of Hezekiah's officials, and Rabshakeh said to them, tell Hezekiah, you might as well surrender to me. Why should you trust Egypt for success? Egypt is like a broken reed, which if a man leans upon it, it will go into his hand and pierce it. There is no point in your trusting Egypt. So what does this tell us? This tells us that Hezekiah was, or at least the King of Assyria thought him to be, trying to play power politics. He was trying to play off Egypt against Assyria. Assyria is the great empire today, Judah is the comparatively small land, but Judah is a long distance from Assyria. Assyria controls at this time territories that come right to the edge of Judah. It is a long way from the headquarters of the King of Assyria.

And now Hezekiah has on the other side of him another great empire, the empire of Egypt. So just like some little country today that says to the United States, you give us a hundred million dollars to build a dam with and if you don't we'll go to (9 1/4)

They say to Russia, you give us ^{some} a great big wonderful military planes, if you don't, we'll get them from the United States. And each one is so afraid that they'll get something from the other that they both give them everything they can. And the little power that couldn't stand up to either one of the two, becomes strong and secure through playing them off, one against the other. Well, evidently, Sennacherib thinks that Hezekiah is going to try to do that against Assyria. And now he has conquered all of Judah except Jerusalem, he has taken all the other fenced cities. Well, he says to Hezekiah, why should you think that Pharaoh is able to befriend you, instead of saying, here I'll give you more than Pharaoh gives you, he takes a more sensible course, tries to tell him how foolish he is to trust Pharaoh, and that it is better to make a choice between the two of them and then see what'll happen. So he says you're foolish to trust in Pharaoh. But then goes in, in verse 7, and says, if you say we trust in the Lord, why, he says, your God won't be able to do you any good. You can't depend on him to protect you. He says, you're just a little portion compared to me, he said, surrender to me. Well, there are many interesting things in the rest of this chapter, but I won't linger over them now. Simply this speech of defiance, and of calling on the Jews to surrender is what we have in chapter 36. And it would sound like a very reasonable thing too, to ask them to surrender, because he has taken all the rest of the fenced cities of Judah, and he has taken all the other countries round about. And you get over to verse 19 and King Sennacherib says, where are the gods of all these other towns? Where are the gods of Hamath and Arphad? Where are the gods of Sepharvaim? Have the gods of Samaria delivered it out of my hands? Were the golden calves able to protect Samaria? The implication is that at this time Samaria is in the hands of the king of Assyria, as of course we know it was, at this time. He says, who among all these gods have been able to deliver their land out of my hand, will Jehovah be able to deliver

Jerusalem out of my hands. But verse 21 tells the answer. They held their peace and answered him not a word. The King's commandment was, answer him not. But here is a situation which threatens terrible danger, to the people of Judah. The other fenced cities all taken, Jerusalem in great danger, a messenger come from Sennacherib calling on them to surrender. And how long were the people of Jerusalem in this situation? We're not told that explicitly here but we can get a pretty good idea from the next chapter. How many of you would be able to make a pretty good guess as to about how long it was after this messenger came, before God delivered the people of Jerusalem from Sennacherib's attack? How many of you would say that it was as much as five years later? Nobody? How many would say that it was within the next week? Nobody is an extremist here. Well, let us say how many would say it was within the next month? How many would say it was about three years later? Well we have quite a variety then of opinion. How many would say it was about a year later? Who/ would say about two years later? Well, a variety of opinion. Well, we look on, and see if we get any light on it, from the ^ocripture here. ~~The servant~~

We find here that a message was sent to Hezekiah, chapter 37, and the servants of Hezekiah came to Isaiah, and verse 6, Isaiah said to them, thus shall ye say to your master, Thus says the Lord, Be not afraid of the words thou hast heard, wherewith the servants of the king of Assyria have blasphemed me. Behold, I will send a blast upon him, and he shall hear a rumour, and return to his own land, and I will cause him to fall by the sword in his own hand. You don't need to be afraid. He says that God can't deliver you, the gods of the other countries couldn't deliver them, neither will your god be able to deliver you. He says I am going to send a blast upon him and he'll hear a rumour and return to his land. This word "rumour" is just he will hear an account, he'll hear a message and return to his own land and I will cause him to fall by the sword in his own hand. Well, this is God's prediction then, and then we find that the messenger returns in verse 8, and found the king of Assyria warring against Libnah, and he heard say concerning Tirhakah king of Ethiopia, He is come forth to make war with thee. So here he ~~hears~~ that there is danger from

another source greater than the force of Hezekiah. The king of Ethippia, Tirhakah, has now become king also of Egypt. ~~The~~ Ethiopia could hardly make war up in this area, it is too far away, Egypt between...

M.2 (1/2)

...Tirhakah, at this time, king of Ethiopia, has also become king of Egypt, and he, the king of Assyria heard here, has come to make war against Sennacherib and Sennacherib had better face this greater enemy before he worries about Hezekiah, but he wants to be sure Hezekiah doesn't make him any trouble in the rear, so he sends messengers to Hezekiah again, and he says, let not thy God whom thou trustest deceive thee, saying, Jerusalem shall not be given into the hand of the king of Assyria, ~~have~~ the gods of the nations delivered them which my fathers have destroyed? And then he sends this message to Hezekiah, Hezekiah goes and spreads it in the house of the Lord, before the Lord, and then we have Hezekiah's prayer, and then we have in verse 21, Isaiah the son of Amoz, comes to Hezekiah and gives the Lord's message, saying, God is going to deliver Jerusalem, Sennacherib is not going to be able to take it, and we find in verse 29, he says to Sennacherib, because thy rage against me and thy tumult is come up into my ears, therefore will I put my hook in thy nose, and my bridle in thy lips, and I will turn thee back by the way by which thou camest. And this shall be the sign unto thee, ye shall eat this year such as grows of itself, and the second year that which springs of the same, and in the third year, sow ye, and reap, and ~~plant~~ vineyards, and eat the fruit thereof, and the remnant that is escaped of the house of Judah shall again take root downward, and bear fruit upward. How long is it going to be before God delivers them, next week, next month. Well, if he delivered them the next week or next month, why on earth would they ~~not~~ plant, sow, and harvest that ~~//~~year, or the next year/? He says, in verse 30, this is a sign that this year you'll eat only what grows itself, in other words, you're in Jerusalem, you're safe until the king of Assyria comes and breaks your walls and breaks in, or until he besieges you and starves you out, you're safe in there. But how can you get any food there in Jerusalem? There is

not much room for growing things inside of those walls. What can you do, well, you can go outside the city and you can pick what is growing naturally, ^{but} ~~if~~ you can't sow and can't reap because the bands, the raiding parties of Assyria, will be coming through now and then, you can't stay long enough to do much planting or much sowing, or reaping, but only to rush out there and grab what you can, of what has just grown, left over from the seed that remains from the previous year. So that is all you can do for this coming year, and the second year, again, only what springs up itself, can be had, but when the third year comes you're going to be able to sow and reap and plant vineyards and eat the fruit thereof. The third year you'll be safe. So that here is a period of at least a year and a half, maybe two years, in which the people in Jerusalem, are going to be in constant danger, unable to get out and carry on regular ^{agricultural} ~~activities~~ work in the country, ~~able~~ to go out when there is no Assyrian in sight and pick what is growing itself, but not able to stay long enough to do any plowing, sowing, and so on, in order to produce a harvest. That means they are going to be in rather straitened circumstances for two years, but the third year they will be able to plant in ordinary fashion, they will be still in straitened circumstances the third year, until they have gathered their crops, so that it means about two and a half years of straitened circumstances, and maybe two years or so, before Sennacherib's forces are out of the way. So this is the prediction that Isaiah makes, a rather specific prediction as to the length of time, that they are going to remain in this danger. But he says, in verse 33, thus says the Lord concerning the king of Assyria, He will not come into this city, nor shoot an arrow there, nor come before it with shields, nor cast a bank against it. By the way that he came, by the same shall he return, he shall not come into this city, saith the Lord. For ~~I~~ I will defend this city to save it for my own sake, and for my servant David's sake. Verse 35 is the last verse of the message that ^{Isaiah} ~~Hezekiah~~ brings to Hezekiah, which begins in ~~verse~~ verse 24. That's 35. But what about verse 36? Does 36 relate to the same day in which 35 was given? Or the next day or the next year, or when?

36, then the angel of the Lord went forth, the "then" I suppose in Hebrew is simply "and", simply, and the angel of the Lord went forth, but when did he go forth, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians a hundred and fourscore and five thousand, and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses. How could they rise if they were all dead corpses. That is a rather unfortunate English translation, I am sure. When they arose they were all dead corpses. / In the English we don't use the "they" in the indefinite sense quite as much as in Hebrew. We do use "they" quite a bit. People are always telling me, they say this, they say that. I say who says, who is the they if you can't tell who the they is, it isn't worth listening to. But "they" can mean anybody or nobody. But that is the indefinite they we use in "they say" and sometimes in what is customarily done, they do. But otherwise we don't use the "they". It was time when they go to work in the morning. We would say it was time when people go to work, we use another term for the indefinite, not simply the "they." Like Hebrew sometimes does. So this verse would be much nearer to give its idea in English if you were to say, and then people began to get up early in the morning, behold, these--I believe there is a definite "these" in the Hebrew, these people (they is ordinarily carried just by the verb), behold these, that is, the 185,000 who had been slain, these were all dead corpses. People began to get up and they looked around and found lots of people lying dead, there had been a rapid end put to the lives of all these people, the angel of the Lord smote them, what does that mean? The angel of the Lord came with a big stick and hit them over the head? It doesn't have to mean that at all. It means that it came from the Lord, and it resulted in their death, under the Lord's command, angels doubtless carrying it out, but what was it that the means was that they used, this is not stated. All that the people saw was, the people saw, they didn't see the angel of the Lord. Did Hezekiah see the angel of the Lord, no Hezekiah was way up in Jerusalem, he didn't know anything about it, till he heard about it later. Did Isaiah see it, he was up in Jerusalem. Did any of the Israelites see it? None of them were anywhere near, this was Sennacherib's

army, certainly none of Sennacherib's people saw the angel of the Lord. But what Sennacherib's people saw ~~was~~ when they got up in the morning, there were all these corpses where there had been strong soldiers the day before. So we have here a great catastrophe in Sennacherib's army, of sudden death, of 185,000 soldiers, in verse 36. Now how much space between verse 35, that is, the saying of verse 35, which is part of the message which begins at verse 21, and the doing of 36? 36 ~~you~~ you might say is the fulfillment of the prediction in 35. God says I will defend this city, 36 He defends it by destroying the Assyrian army, but between His prediction in 35 and His doing in 36, do you think there was a whole week in between? How many think there was less than a week? How many think there was as much as a month in between? Nobody? How many think less than a month? I guess not many people think. The question was, in v.21 it says that Isaiah brought a message to Hezekiah, this message ends in v.35, I will defend this city, God says. V.36 tells what God did, fulfilling the prediction made in 35. How much time was there between this message that runs from 21 to 35, being given to Isaiah and passed on to Hezekiah, and the fulfillment of it in the action described in verse 36, how much time passed in between? How many would have an answer to that, will you raise your hands? We have now four. I would think we would have more because I stated it myself a few minutes ago. The verse 30 is part of the same prediction which includes v.35, and verse 30 predicts what is going to happen before this deliverance, and it says it is going to be about two years before it happens. V.36 tells how God delivers them, well, if God delivered the next week would they have remained in Jerusalem and not come out and planted for another two and a half years, and if it was delivered and they went out and planted then Isaiah was a false prophet if what he says in v.30 wouldn't be a sign at all. Surely it is very clear that if this prediction was given by Isaiah at that time, and the sign was there would be about two years before these things happen, then when they happened it was about two years later. So there is a space of about two years between v.35 and v.36.

You wouldn't get that just from the statement in English. They don't say, and then two years later this happened. They say, "and"--or the English translation, "then"--but the "then" is two years later. Well then he went forth and smote these people and there were all these dead corpses and v.37, so Sennacherib king of Assyria departed, and went and returned, and dwelt at Nineveh. How much time between v.36 and v.37? Anybody think there was two years between 36 and 37? If there was Sennacherib would hardly have been able to depart at all. You can imagine that when his army was reduced to small measures, like this, he departed rather soon. If the people of Jerusalem should get word that this king of Assyria who had destroyed all these cities and taken all these people from Judah captive, that now his army was reduced to practically nothing, why they would mop up the rest of them pretty quick, you can be sure of that. Once this happened, he probably didn't start that day, it took a little while to get things under way, and get the orders around, and get things gathered up, maybe they buried a lot of these people, maybe they left and let the Jews bury them, we don't know. But at least they had some arrangements to make before they could start the long trip home. So we can say that I would think it very unlikely there was more than a week between v.36 and v.37. But Sennacherib departed and went and returned and dwelt at Nineveh, and it came to pass as he was worshipping in the house of Nisroch his god, that Adrammelech and Sharezer his sons smote him with the sword and they escaped into the land of Armenia and Esarhaddon his son reigned in his stead. How much space between 37 and 38? A week? A month? How much does it say? It doesn't say. The only way we can find out is to read Sennacherib's annals and when we get the records that have been discovered within the last 130 years of ancient Assyrian history and put them together, we find that after Sennacherib's return to Nineveh there was about another 20 years that went by before he was assassinated. God had made the prediction back here in v.34, was it 34--no, this prediction about him was made way back in the previous chapter, the prediction that God would deliver him, no, it was this same chapter, but v.7, he says, he will return to his own land, he will hear a message. The

message was that all these people were dead. His army was reduced to practically nothing. That he will return to his own land and I'll cause him to fall by the sword in his own land. But God didn't say when he would fall by the sword. Between those two clauses of v.7 there is 20 years. And here between v.37 and 38 there is about 20 years. Now we wouldn't know that from the Biblical account, but we know that from the historical records we find, and that is a valuable warning in interpreting prophecy, that when it says this happened and that happened, we don't say it necessarily happened at the same time. There may be a space in between. You say the United States is going to have some great presidents, going to have some great men like George Washington, Abraham Lincoln and John Fitzgerald Kennedy, as its presidents. Well, now if somebody made a prediction like that 200 years ago, you might say these three men are going to be one right after the other. But you would be quite wrong, it would be naming three men, but not saying there was anybody between them or not, and it is very important that we do not read a declaration of things coming together into a statement, unless it says they happened together...

M.3. (3/4)

...about the return of Christ, which said, is there one return of Christ, or two. The idea was, this idea of pre-tribulation rapture is all nonsense, because according to that, Christ comes to this earth, and gets His saints, and then about seven years later He comes back to this earth with His saints. Well, that's two returns, the Bible says Jesus is coming back, well that's one return. Now how crazy it is to get two returns. Well, that is reading into the Bible. The Bible nowhere says there is one return of Christ. It says Christ is going to return. When was the first coming of Christ, at the conception of the Virgin Mary, was it at the birth of Christ, was His first coming when He began to preach? Was His first coming when He was crucified? And then, after He died, He went off for three days and then He returned, was raised from the Dead. Wasn't that a second coming right there? That was a return surely. We have a number of events clustered in a general period which is called the first coming of Christ, and another group of events in

the second coming of Christ. To try to make either one of them a point is simply reading into Scripture something that is not there. We have to take the Scripture and see what it says and stand on it, but when it says this happened and that happened, it doesn't even necessarily say what order they're going to have, certainly not if they're going to happen at the same time. Well, these are little points by the side. The big point--yes? (2 1/4) ...happened before Sennacherib comes back. Sennacherib is there, down in the Philistine Plain, maybe 30 miles from Jerusalem. No, he was at Lachish, that would be only about 12 or 15 miles. He is there at Lachish, then he went off into the Philistine Plain, which is a little further. Sennacherib may have returned to Assyria two or three times in the course of it, but his army was there more or less continuously, for this space of time. And Sennacherib's army is down in the Philistine Plain and doubtless he is sending groups of soldiers to keep the whole land in confusion, and to keep the people shut up in Jerusalem. Because there is somebody in Jerusalem who says I am going to go out and plant my field, he says, we're going to starve if we don't get some work done in the field, so he leaves Jerusalem, and the ^{were} people ~~would~~ that naturally would leave the city normally and go out and work in the fields through the day and come back at night, behind the walls for protection. But he says, I'm going out in my field, 3 miles away from Jerusalem, and I'm going to get a good crop laid in. He starts in and begins plowing, and works two-thirds of the day and all of a sudden a band of Assyrian soldiers descends on him and grabs him and his workmen and carried them off into captivity and they're carried way off across the desert to Mesopotamia. So when the people in the next field to his, who hadn't got out that day, hear what happened to him, one of the workmen escaped and got back to Jerusalem and told them what happened to him, and they never see this man again. You can be sure that they don't go out during the day. So the next time, they just don't dare go out long enough to do any plowing or sowing, they are--the Assyrian forces are coming through every few days, a group of them come ~~g~~ through, maybe not large groups, not large enough to meet an army, but large enough to keep the people from doing the work.

And the people in Jerusalem are expecting every day , after these threatenings of Sennacherib, why tomorrow we'll see the whole Assyrian army come, and they'll be attacking Jerusalem. And then we'll be shut up in a difficult siege, some of them say, we might as well surrender now. Sennacherib says surrender, and we know that if people surrender to the king of Assyria, he takes the ringleaders and he hangs them up around the city, but the rank and file he doesn't treat so badly, but if we resist him and make it necessary for him to fight against us, why he may treat us all pretty bad. They say, why look what he did up in this town, ^{they} remember ^{where one of} how the Assyrian kings describe how there was a town that held out against him for a long period and when finally he took it, he says, ten thousands of the people, I stuck sticks through them and piled them up outside the city on these stakes, he says, others I flayed them alive, took their skin off; Others I cut off their heads and made great big heaps of heads, and he describes these cruel ways he treated the people of a city that had resisted him a long time, in order to scare other people and get them to surrender quickly, and all this talk is to get the people of Jerusalem to surrender to Sennacherib, and they're expecting any minute, or any day, that the attack will commence. But Sennacherib, down on the Philistine Plain there, ^{hears} ~~is sure~~ that Tirhaka is coming from Egypt, so he sends another strong message up to scare the people still further in Jerusalem, make them think he is coming real soon and then he goes off to meet Tirhaka, in the Philistine, so Isaiah said to the people, I'm going to take the king of Assyria, it says in v.29 , and I'm going to turn him back by the way by which he came. But he says, in v.30, this shall be a sign to you, you will eat this year such as gros of itself. In other words, this year, you haven't been able to sow because of the Assyrian army down there. Now you're going to have to keep getting along on what you can grab, what just grows in the fields without having been sown. You take any field that grows a good harvest and you leave it and you'll find the next year a little growing. Not a great deal, but some, because a certain amount of it remains. And it is nothing like what it is if you can sow, but enough to keep you from~~s~~ starving. But he says, that's all you're going to get this year, and then

he says, the second year, again, that which springs up of itself, without your having worked on it, but he says, in the third year you can sow and reap and plant vineyards and eat the fruit thereof. In other words, in the third year you won't any longer be fearing the king of Assyria's forces, he will have gone back by the way in which he came. And therefore, then, you will be safe to go out and work all day. Of course when night comes, you will go to Jerusalem behind the walls, because you don't know what brigands may be out there, but you won't have an organized army of a foreign power, marching through the country, making danger for you to be working your fields in the daytime, after these two years. The third year you will sow, plant, reap a regular crop. ^(stu. 7 1/4) Yes, I would think so. I would think you would have to put 36 before the third year, because otherwise they couldn't go out there to sow and reap. So then we have here described in chapters 36 and 37 a tremendous great deliverance. Now I glanced around just before I came over here for my copy of Byron's poems, and could not lay my hand on it, but in Byron's poem, there is a very beautiful poem beginning, "The Assyrian King, down, like a wolf on the fold, His cohorts were gleaming with silver and gold," and it describes the great force of the Assyrian army coming in order to make this attack against Jerusalem, and then it describes how they disappeared, in the blast of the Lord, and how this great danger was reduced to nothing. It is a beautiful pictorial description of this event, by Byron, in that poem. It is described rather fully in 2 Kings, 2 Chronicles, the political and historical event, just as fully as here, perhaps slightly more, the words of Isaiah much more briefly, comparatively small part of it included in those other two chapters. But you have the three parallel accounts of this event. And it is such a tremendous event that through the last few centuries, the tendency of Christians would be to say, isn't this marvelous the way God works, the way He delivers His people, delivered little Judah from mighty Assyria, by this intervention of the angel of the Lord, but the general attitude of the unbeliever would be to say, oh well, it is just a fairy story. How do we know that such a thing ever happened? Somebody made up a beautiful story in order to make God appear to be strong

and able to deliver His people. And then about 1830 we began to discover Assyrian antiquities, and Dr. Pritchard got out with the Princeton University Press these two great big books, Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Ancient Near Eastern Pictures, and then he took a selection from the two ^{big} books and put them in one smaller volume, The Ancient Near East--an Anthology of Texts and Pictures. And this smaller book anybody who is going to do any work in Old Testament ought to have this smaller book, and anyone who is going to do a lot of work in Old Testament ought to have the two big ones. But this smaller is a selection from the bigger books, which selects the greater part of the material that bears directly on the Bible. These pictures, many of them Dr. Pritchard took himself, in museums here and there throughout the world. The text he did not translate himself, he got leading scholars in America to take different sections of them and make new translations. And he got on the whole, pretty good scholars, some much better than others. Some sections of it are very excellent, and some of them are good, but not excellent. They vary. But on the whole it is an excellent collection of what we have found of the texts in the ancient near east, Egypt, and Mesopotamia, and the area between--a good selection of that that has a relationship to the Bible. And in this one, he has quoted here from the larger book, a passage from Sennacherib's annals. I have in my office a copy of the cuneiform, of the original prism of Sennacherib on which he tells about his campaign. And here he tells, I made my third campaign, he tells how he came as far as Tyre, and attacked these various cities in the east here, and then he says, on p.199 of this book, the translation in English says, ^{"in} the continuation of my campaign I beseiged Beth, Dagon, Joppa, (11 1/2) cities belonging to Zedekiah, who did not bow to my feet quickly enough. I conquered them and carried their spoils away. The officials, the patricians and the common people of Ekron (one of the Philistine cities down on the Philistine plain, southwest of Jerusalem) who had overthrown Pati their king into fetters, because he was loyal to his solemn oath, sworn by the king Asshur, and had handed him over to Hezekiah the Jew, and Hezekiah held him in prison unlawfully, as if he, Pati,

be an enemy, and become afraid, and had called for help upon the king of Egypt, and , and the bowmen, the chariot corps, and the cavalrymen of Ethiopia, an army beyond counting, and they had come to their assistance, and then he says that he met these folks, and then he tells of his conquests of many great cities, but then he says, as to Hezekiah the Jew, he did not submit to my yoke, I laid seige to 46 of his strong cities, walled forts, and in the counties, small villages, in their vicinities, and conquered them by means of well-stamped earth ramps, and battering rams brought near to the walls, combined with the attacks of foot soldiers using mines, (12 3/4)

I drove out of them 200,250 people, young and old, male and female, horses, mules, donkeys, camels, big and small cattle beyond counting, and considerable booty.

There he tells how he took 46 of Hezekiah's strong cities, 200,000 people captive, all these animals, then you wonder, what did he do with Hezekiah? It goes on: Himself, I made a prisoner in Jerusalem, his royal residence, like a bird in a cage. And that sounds pretty weak after telling how he destroyed all these great cities, he made him a prisoner like a bird in a cage. I don't remember any other time any of the Assyrian kings telling how they shut a king in a prisoner in his city, like a bird in a cage. They say, I conquered his city, I took him prisoner, ~~and~~ I led him off , a captive, to Assyria. He made him a bird in a cage, I surrounded him with earthworks, in order to molest those who were leaving his city gates, his palace which I had plundered, I took away from his country, and I increased his tribute, and so on, Yes? (13 3/4) Earthworks, he would have fortifications around it. So Sennacherib's statement that he shut Hezekiah up like a bird in a cage sounds pretty weak after all that Hezekiah has done against him, and all that he has done against these other great cities, and you can't expect Sennacherib to admit a failure, but it comes about as close to it as anything could, when he boasts of something that is so trivial. So it is generally considered as a pretty good evidence of the truth of the Biblical story, that that's all he could find to boast of. Mr. Cohen? ---

...yes, it could be, but he could have done what he says without contradicting what Isaiah said. He didn't actually come with the army and attack the city and make an attempt to destroy the city, because that happened, this happened. Now there is an Egyptian story which was passed on, and we learned of it some centuries after this, according to which Sennacherib, in southwestern Palestine, met the armies of the Egyptians, and they were meeting there and night came and a big battle was expected the next day, and a lot of field mice went into the Assyrian army and ate up their bowstrings, so that their men were rendered helpless, and they gave up the battle and retreated. And there are those who have said that this Egyptian legend fits with his being unable to conquer Jerusalem, that something happened, that when it looked as if the great Assyrian force would conquer both, something happened to prevent it, and the reference to mice they had, suggests that it was the bubonic plague, of which mice are carriers. Now that is purely a guess. It might very well be that when the angel of the Lord smote them, the way he did it was to spread bubonic plague among them, possibly by mice. At any rate, whatever happened, it was not by human force, wasn't human effort, human fighting that did it, but by something which took these great masses of Assyrian soldiers and caused them to die, and left King Sennacherib helpless so he had to return to his own land. And now you find another very interesting thing throwing light on this incident, in this book here, in the front part of the book is the copies of texts contained in the larger volume from ancient times, translations of them. In the back part you have pictures and here is plate 101 and 102, are details of a great big bas relief, which was found in Sennacherib's bedroom in Nineveh, and there on the wall he had this great big bas relief, and this bas relief shows great numbers of his men attacking a city, coming with great shields and spears, and then standing behind the big shields and shooting arrows, and attacking the city, and then it shows the prisoners coming out of the city, and the king sitting on his throne, and the people bowing before him and kneeling, and asking him to spare their lives, and underneath he has an inscription, and he says that this picture shows the great attack which Sennacherib made upon the city of Lachish,

and how he conquered it and destroyed it, took all its people captive. We have all these details of ~~these~~ this great beautiful picture of the conquest of Lachish, and you think why on earth did Sennacherib put all of this up to celebrate the conquest of Lachish, because after all, he had conquered great capitals of mighty kingdoms, bigger than Judah, and Lachish wasn't the capital, it was the second most important city in Judah, a less important city by considerable than Jerusalem. But of all the great cities that Sennacherib conquered, the one that he chose to put up in his palace where everyday he could see what a tremendous victory he had in capturing this great city, was the city of Lachish, the second greatest city in Judah, and so I call it Sennacherib's consolation prize, he wanted to forget that he had been unable to take Jerusalem, and so he reminded himself of his great victory over the second greatest fortress in Judah, the conquest of Lachish. So you have this great monument in his palace in Nineveh, with the inscription saying specifically that it is the conquest of Lachish that is there shown, and two parts, there is much more than is shown here, but two sections of this are contained in this book, The Ancient Near East, an Anthology of Text and Pictures. In the bigger book, which is Ancient Near Eastern Pictures, I imagine he would have all details of ~~this~~ from Lachish, but it is pretty good evidence of the accuracy of the Biblical account, the account which is considered so important that it is given to us three times in the Old Testament, and from a political and military viewpoint, this was the greatest event in the life of Isaiah, described in these two chapters. Mr. Abbott? (5 1/4) Now that of course gets on to a different area. I think it is worth, though, a couple of minutes. I would say this, that a person coming to know the Lord through seeing himself as a sinner, ~~is a lot simpler than~~ ^{as a lost sinner, and} seeing Christ as his only hope of salvation. A person is not ~~know~~ ^{won} by argument on the accuracy of the Scripture to the Gospel. But I would say, that there are many, many people who are failing to pay attention to the Gospel because their mind has been filled with the idea that the Bible is a lot of myths and legends and it is not true, and that any good illustration of the fact that the Bible is dependable removes a certain part of that obstacle, doesn't win anyone to the Lord, but it removes a

certain part of the obstacle that keeps them from looking at the claims of Christ. The attempts to prove to answer all objections and show the Bible is free from error, is a thing you could deal with for years, with an unbeliever, and he can just refuse to believe anything he wants. But just giving him a few good instances, even if he seems not to be affected by it in the slightest, can make him far more likely when he has some trouble to think seriously of the claims of Christ, than he would otherwise. So I don't expect to have cases where these people are won to the Lord by this illustration or that, or the other, but I do expect there are many cases where these illustrations have removed a certain amount of the fog of doubt that has been placed there, and have made them more open to hear the Gospel. Yes? (7) Oh yes, definitely, there is no question of that, because they don't go on and draw their conclusions on it, but they certainly do--it certainly changes people's attitude toward the Bible, no question of that. Many instances of that. Dr. Robert Dick Wilson who wrote much in defense of the Pentateuch against the higher critics in his day, was very much thrilled one time to show me an article that had come out in some magazine which told that Sir William Wilcox the great English Civil Engineer in Egypt who had been very active, very prominent in British government in Egypt, and Sir William Wilcox in college had received the teaching of the higher criticism, and had given up his earlier intention of devoting his life to Christian work, became a great outstanding civil engineer in Egypt, and then, he came across Dr. Wilson's ^{writings} and was convinced by them that the higher criticism was not true, and that the Bible was true after all, and this article told how he, after years in Egypt, in which he learned to know the customs of the people in Egypt, and their language, and everything, very thoroughly, now he decided that the Bible was true, and he decided to ^{retire} ~~retire~~ from his governmental work and devote the rest of his life to spreading the Gospel, in those lands, and Dr. Wilson said to me, if my whole life had had no effect of any kind except the reaching of that one man, to get him to consecrate the rest of his life to the Lord, he said, my life would have been worthwhile.

Well, our time is just about up, we meet again tomorrow, so little time between now and tomorrow I'll wait till then to give you an assignment~~ment~~ for next week. Of course, I meet the graduate students two hours from now. (9)

(10) ...in this class we are examining a section of the book of Isaiah, a section which is very different from the section which was examined ~~that was~~ in the course last semester. We then dealt with chapter 40-56, with the looking forward to return from exile, and way forward to the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow. Now, however, we are in a section which relates more directly to the time of Isaiah, and in this section which runs from chapters 7-12 and then from 28-39, in this section there is one great historical event which towers above every other contemporary event, as far as its military and political significance was concerned, and that event we looked at last time, chapters 36 and 37 of Isaiah. We looked at some of the details of the event last time, and it would be interesting to take more time and go more carefully into these two chapters. We might do that at the end of the semester if we have time, but there is some extremely interesting material in the prophetic sections there, I want to be sure I have ample time for. So I'm not going to spend much time on these chapters now. Thus, last time we noticed some very important interesting details, but more important than any details in these chapters is the big main thrust of them, that Jerusalem was attacked by a force far superior than anything that Judah could ever bring together. Such a tremendous force that humanly speaking there was absolutely no hope for them, and that in that situation God delivered them in a way in which they themselves could do nothing, they sat back and waited and the deliverance was accomplished, there was nothing they could do to do it, it was a great miraculous intervention of God. We saw that there is contemporary historical evidence that such a great deliverance did take place, but that 's not our big point in this class, we're not interested here so much in corroboration of the Scripture, or in archeological background as we are in the prophetic utterances and the understanding of those utterances. And in order to understand them, we must have a realization how in these days when Isaiah was active

in the time of Hezekiah, this tremendous occurrence made an unforgettable impression upon people's minds and hearts. It was one of the great events of the century, perhaps of the millennium, that is, the thousand-year period. There was very little to compare with this. But God permits Isaiah to look forward to this event, at previous time, and that's what we are interested in here, now. We look at the very end of our section, chapter 36 and 37, to see what the event was. Now we want to go back and look at the predictions that Isaiah made about it, but before we do that, I want to just glance with you for now, very briefly, at 38 and 39. These two chapters we may also have time to look into more fully at the end of the semester. I'm not going to spend much time on them now for the reason that what you would get from them, interesting as it is, is not closely related to the big thrust of our interpretation of Isaiah's marvelous prophecy in the earlier part of the section, and that we want to have plenty of time to go into very thoroughly, so that we will for the present be content with merely a glance at chapters 38 and 39. Now you notice that 38 says that Sennacherib went to Nineveh, lived there, and while he was worshipping in the house of Nisroch his god, his sons smote him and they escaped into the land of Armenia, and Esarhaddon his son reigned in his stead. Well, that was the end of chapter 37, and 38 begins "in those days was Hezekiah sick unto death." What is the Hebrew phrase which is here translated in those days?...

M.5. (3/4)

...translation, the beginning of 38 is a very good representation of what you find in the Hebrew. "In the days" , what days? (3/4) the days of which we have been speaking. You know if you begin speaking about something in Hebrew, you will say (1) this, the one I'm pointing to, but then after you speak a little, you want to refer back to the same thing, you say who, that thing, not to which I have been pointing, but of which I have been speaking. So here we have "those days", that is, the days of which we have been speaking. Now what does this tell you then, when it says, the chapter before, says, Sennacherib was killed and Esarhaddon his son reigned in his stead,

"in those days was Hezekiah sick unto death." Does ~~the chapter before says Sennacherib was killed and~~ that mean that right after Sennacherib died and Esarhaddon became king, that Hezekiah was sick unto death? Does it mean that It doesn't , does it? Does it mean right after Jerusalem was delivered, he was sick? It doesn't, does it? It means , in the general period of which we have been talking, so I would say that we just referred forward clear to Sennacherib's death, so there is a period of 20 years after the great deliverance, we have just been speaking of , but mainly speaking of the three years involved in Sennacherib's attack. Well, we may be in those three years, it may be within the 20 or 30 years after, or it may be within ten or twenty years before, in that general period. Now which was it? Well, this does not say. We do not know, as far as this verse is concerned. We know that it happened during the lifetime of Hezekiah, we know it happened during the reign of Hezekiah, he was king when this occurred. But beyond that, we cannot say when 38 came. Does 38 follow 37? Well, we don't think it at all likely that it follows the last verse of 37, that we think extremely unlikely. Does it follow any particular part of ~~verse~~ 37 or does it even precede, we just don't know.

Well, this chapter tells us of an ^{incident} ~~interest~~ in Hezekiah's life. Well, why on earth should you tell of an ~~incident~~ in Hezekiah's life, after you tell about the great deliverance , if the incident took place before? Why wouldn't you tell it in the order in which it occurred?

Well, the answer to that is, that the chronological is only one way of arranging material. Material can be arranged in various ways, and somebody might say, might tell you, I was down in Washington and saw the inauguration of President Kennedy, and then he would describe the inauguration. He would say my Mr. Kennedy has changed since the last time I saw him, that was over in the Pacific when he was commander of a PT boat. And he would go on and give an account of an experience he had when he saw Kennedy over there. He wouldn't necessarily start in here and tell you about the experience of a PT boat, and then tell you how 20 years later he saw him inaugurated, he might put it in one order or the other. That is the chronological is one order of arrangement, the logical is a different one. And there are reasons why a logical order may be chronological or may be reverse

chronological, or maybe with no reference to chronological at all. If you are going to describe the history of the World War, you would be very foolish to try to tell what happened each day, one day after the other. You jump from Japan over to Europe, and then perhaps over to the United States and then perhaps over to Russia, and ~~then first~~ ^{back and forth,} and a person would be completely dizzy. You would take a certain area and talk about it, and you'd take another area and talk about it, and try to arrange it in a way that would make it clear and easy to follow. Now in this case, we have the great overwhelming event which had such a tremendous impression on Isaiah and his age, told in chapters 36 and 37. And now he wants to tell us about an incident in the life of Hezekiah, and this incident in Hezekiah's life does not have any world-shaking effect. It is a very interesting episode, it is of great spiritual significance, the relation of Hezekiah to God, and the healing that God gave to Hezekiah. It is an incident of real interest for our spiritual lives, but from a political viewpoint, it is far inferior in importance to what preceded. If you were simply writing an account of Hezekiah's reign, you would probably arrange it in chronological order. But this is not an account of Hezekiah's reign at all, this is the book of Isaiah's prophecies, in the middle of which he inserts four chapters of history, and in his four chapters of history he begins with describing that great stupendous event, which is so important in all of Isaiah's outlook and experience. And then after he does that, then he tells you about an incident in which Hezekiah was sick and God marvelously healed him.

There are other very important events in Hezekiah's life, his reformation, the great passover that he had, many important incidents which are mentioned in this historical section, but this is of interest in the book of Isaiah because Isaiah personally had an important part in it. Isaiah personally brought the message to Hezekiah about that God would heal him. This is not a life of Hezekiah. You might find that in Kings or Chronicles, this is an account of Isaiah's work, and so in Isaiah's work, after telling about the great tremendous political events, then he tells you about an event concerning ~~ing~~ ^{ed} with his relation with Hezekiah, and Hezekiah's relation to the Lord. So we say then that we do

not know, as far as chapter 38 is concerned, looking at 38 and comparing it with 37, we do not know whether 38 precedes 37 or whether it follows. Then we look at chapter 39. And chapter 39, how does it start, what are the first words of 39. In the English? Mr. Coher-

(7) There is a very interesting point. 38.6, I will deliver thee and this city out of the hand of Assyria, and I will defend this city. Well of course he still defended it after the ~~great~~ deliverance, it still was God's defence that made it safe for the continuing years. So that could've been said after the conquest, but it certainly seems to incline more in the direction of being before rather than after. It inclines to look as if it is a time when Hezekiah is particularly concerned with ~~whatever~~ ^{whether} the king of Assyria may take the city, and after the ~~great~~ deliverance, God might say I'm going to keep on protecting you, the king of Assyria will not come back with sufficient power to take the city, so I don't think it ~~excludes~~ its being after, but I think it looks very definitely in the ~~direction~~ ^{direction} of its being before, and as to how far before, well, near enough that the possibility of the king of Assyria ^{taking the city} is a very definite reality to Hezekiah's mind. Otherwise, God wouldn't say, I'll defend you, deliver you and the city from the hand of the king of Assyria. He said I'll protect this city and keep it safe, something in general terms. The specific mention shows ~~that~~ that is in mind. But this verse does look as if it is before rather than after. Now the 39 in relation to 38, and to 37. 38 starts with what word in the English, Mr. Cohen? (8 1/2) At that time, and that again in the Hebrew is like the previous one. Previous was, in the day (8 3/4) in the time of which we have been speaking. In other words, in this general period, something else happened of interest, so whether 39 precedes or follows 38, we do not know from the first two words of 39, but how about the first verse of 39? Does that tell us whether 39 precedes or follows 38. Mr. Gregory what do you think? (9) If you take the whole first verse, it says that this king Mero-dach-baladan, king of Babylon, sends letters and a present to Hezekiah, for he heard that he had been sick, and of course Hezekiah may have been sick some other time, but when we have such an important account and a particular sickness in the chapter just

before, it would be very unreasonable for this to refer to anything else than that particular sickness, ^{especially} when we have no other mentioned in our book. So that it would seem as if 39 followed 38, that would seem pretty definite. But does 39 precede or succeed 37, we are not told. 37, 38, and 39 form a unit together. 39 comes fairly soon after 38. It wouldn't be ten years after 38, but rather soon after 38, 39 occurs. Yes? (10) ... is one of the later kings of Assyria, regarding whom we have a very great amount of information. We have extensive records from Assyria, in which the kings tell of their reigns and what cities they conquered year by year, and so on, and also we have lists of so-called limus, a limu was the man whose name was given to identify a year. That was an Assyrian custom. So that this was the limu this year, so-and-so- was limu, that means that all records in this year when so-and-so was limu, the king is limu in the first year, of his reign, and then it may be some of his leading councilmen, then governors of provinces, and mayors of cities, and so on, depending on how long he reigns, so that we have long lists of these limus, so that Assyrian events can be dated rather precisely. But, as far as our present investigation is concerned, we are not interested with the precise date, but we are interested in the general date, ^{and} ~~but~~ we can say that general date can be given with absolute accuracy, we know when Sennacherib reigned, we know that. And this of course is previous to the assassination of Sennacherib and Essarhaddon succeeded him. Yes? (11 1/2) The matter of the death of Hezekiah would be a matter on which we would have to take all the dates in--not dates, but the lists ϕ in our book of Kings, that so-and-so reigned so many years and he died, so-and-so reigned so many years and he died, so-and-so reigned so many years and he died, and if you take all those of the kingdom of Israel, and all those of the kingdom of Judah, and add together both of them, you find ^a ~~the~~ difference of quite a few years. And it is very natural to have a difference because supposing that a king becomes king in January, and he dies in July. How many years you going to say he reigned ϕ ? Another king, the other one begins to be king in July, then he reigns until March. How many years does he reign? And there

are different methods of counting, and it used to be said, 20 years ago, that here was a case where the numbers were just a hodgepodge, there was absolutely no way of reckoning. But, he's a 7th-Day Adventist, isn't he--Professor ^{Thiele?} Kiel? He wrote a thesis at the Univ. of Chicago on the chronology of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel, and Professor Irwin who is an outstanding liberal, who was then Professor of Old Testament at the Univ. of Chicago, wrote an introduction to ~~the~~ Thiele's book, in which he said that it used to be the ~~the~~ very most confused hopeless jumble in the Bible, with the dates of the kings of Israel and Judah, and now he said Thiele has shown that everyone of these numbers may be a reliable one. That was a tremendous thing for Irwin to say. Now I don't think Thiele is necessarily correct in all his interpretations, but at least he has worked out a method of interpreting which is able to convince one who is unfriendly to Biblical accuracy, that you don't have to just say it is a lot of junk, you can say, this way, you can interpret and it makes good sense. But then there are others who have made other attempts to arrange them. So we know of course that--the approximate time Hezekiah died. I mean, we'd know within 30 years, there is no difficulty of that. But to know the exact date we have to study these synchronisms, and work it out, and I think Thiele's dates are fairly well accepted now. But a little back there was very considerable difference. In the Davis' Bible Dictionary, Prof. Davis tried to put the dates together, and he, in fitting them together, tried to work on the principle of a man making his son co-king with him, so that you say that Uzziah reigned 52 years and say Jothan reigned 20 years say, well, we know Uzziah was stricken with leprosy and confined to an upper room, well maybe Jothan immediately became king, so the 20 years overlapped the 52, and by ~~an~~ making overlappings that way, he worked out a system. We have no doubt there are some overlappings, just how many we don't know, but he worked out a system in which we have Uzziah becoming a leper, making Jotham king, then we have Jotham making his son Ahaz, king with him while he is reigning. And then we have Uzziah reigning longer than Jotham according to Davis' system, and Prof. Allis, with whom I was formerly associated, was very much concerned about the

honor of King Jotham. He had no independent reign according to Davis. He felt it was important to make a great effort to prove that this was entirely wrong. Personally, I don't think the honor of Jotham is as tremendously important (15 1/4) and anyway there is no reason it couldn't be that way. I don't say it is, it's no reason it couldn't. I thought of a recent event--Henry Ford was founder and president of the Ford Company. He retired and made his son Edsel president...

M.6 (1/2)

... you would read somebody 15 years from now, or even today, something Henry Ford did when he was president of the Ford Company, and then something Edsel did, and they'd say well of course Edsel is later, they just wouldn't realize. Henry Ford was before Edsel, he was also after. So the exact date of Hezekiah's death, according to Thiele's figure would not be difficult, and I think that most would agree with that today. But I wouldn't say we could be dogmatic about it. There still is possibility of certain points at which a different interpretation might be ^{interpreted.} encouraged. But approximately we can get very close. In the discussion here we have seen 39 follow 38, that we're definite on. And of course 37 follows 36, there is no question of that, 36 and 37 are a continuous subject. 38 is followed by 39. Now does 38 and 39 come after 36 and 37, before it, or at more or less the same time? Well, you read in 39 and what happens? In 39 this king of Babylon comes to, sends people with a present for Hezekiah, for he had heard he had been sick and was recovering. That was very, very nice of the king of Babylon to send these people all this distance across there to send a present to Hezekiah, wasn't it? And you immediately say, what a kindly person this king of Babylon was, to show this interest in him, way over there across the desert, and of course Hezekiah appreciated his kindness, because we read in the second verse that Hezekiah was very happy about this, and received them and showed them every fine thing he had, took them all around, and just received them as close friends, and ^{showed} ~~took~~ them everything, and then Isaiah the prophet came to King

Uzziah and said what did these men say and where did they come from, and Hezekiah said they are come from a far country, even from Babylon. And then he said what have they seen in your house, and Hezekiah answered, all that is in mine house they have seen, there is nothing among my treasures I have not shown them. And Isaiah said, Hear the word of the Lord of Hosts, behold, the days come, that all that is in thine house, and that which thy fathers have laid up in store until this day, shall be carried to Babylon, nothing shall be left, saith the Lord. And of thy sons that shall issue from thee, which thou shalt beget, shall they take away. This doesn't mean son in our present-day sense, ^{39:5-6} one who is your immediate son. In Hebrew son can mean descendant, it means one who is either his son, his grandson, or his great-grandson. Of your descendants ~~is~~ who have come from you, who are descended directly from you, they will take away and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon. Then said Hezekiah to Isaiah, Good is ^{v. 7} the word of the Lord which thou hast spoken. That's God's will, we are reconciled to it. I don't know as "good" is a very good translation here, it means he was reconciled to it, he recognized whatever God did was good. He said moreover, for there shall be peace and truth in my days. In other words, this is terrible, what the Lord has predicted, but he says, at least it is not coming in reign, because He says it is going to come after that. And why is chapter 39 placed where it is? Well, I think we can find an easy explanation. That 39 is a most wonderful prophecy of Isaiah, that this great king of Assyria who has been a tremendous enemy, is not going to take Israel captive, but another nation across the desert, a nation that Hezekiah says "from a far country," from Babylon--they are the ones who will eventually take Judah captive. And this happened around 700 B.C., and somewhere around 700, and it was 586, at least a hundred years later, maybe 120, that Nebuchadnezzar from Babylon came and took Judah captive, and took the great-great-grandsons of Hezekiah and carried them off into exile, to be eunuchs in his palace, so this was literally fulfilled. This very remarkable prediction that Babylon is the one that is going to take them captive, and it introduces our new section, coming after 40.

Because chapter 40 starts with the wonderful promise of deliverance from the Babylonian captivity, which can be, though it is a tremendous jump forward in time, it can very logically come right after the marvelous prediction they are going ⁱⁿ to captivity, ~~not~~ to Assyria, but to Babylon. So there is a very logical reason to have 39 arranged just where it is. Now as to the meaning of 39, why on earth would Isaiah rebuke Hezekiah simply for showing these people what was in his house. Was this Hezekiah's vanity, was it his pride that is involved? I don't think so, I think there is something much more to it than that. And the usual attitude of interpreters of Isaiah on this chapter 39, I believe to be the correct one. And that is, that this king Merodach-baladan was not particularly interested in congratulating Hezekiah upon recovery from illness, but he used it as an excuse to send an embassy to him, which embassy could make a favorable impression on him, and then could make common terms with him, because they were both of them subject to Assyria, and we know from Assyrian records that Marduk-baladan was the leader in the Babylonian revolt against the King Sennacherib, which resulted in Sennacherib's attacking Babylon, and as Sennacherib tells us in his record he took the city of Babylon, drove all the people away from it, knocked down the buildings, reduced it to absolute desolation, he drove a chariot and a plow across it to signify that it would be just desolation from now on, never again be a city, but his son Esar-haddon was very enamoured of the culture of the ancient Babylon, and rebuilt it finer than it had been before. But against Sennacherib there was a coalition of many different nations in revolt against him, Sennacherib had a tough time of it for a while, till he succeeded in putting it all down, and the ringleader of it all was Merodach-Baladan of Babylon, but the leader of the revolt in the west was Hezekiah, so Hezekiah has made common terms here with a distant man who he thinks has the same enemy he has. In other words, it is just the same situation we were in in the last war, when we faced Hitler, and we were so determined to destroy Hitler, that when we found Stalin was against Hitler too, why we just joined

in with Stalin and made the friendliest and closest cooperation with him, gave him all our atomic secrets and everything else. And we just opened everything up to him, he is from a far country, we have nothing to fear from him, but he is our ally against Hitler. And that is what we did and that is what is ~~is~~ being done here, and so it had a lot to do with putting Hezekiah into the situation where it requires God's marvelous intervention to deliver him, described in 36 and 37. So it would seem likely that 38 precedes 36; and then of course if it does--I mean 39, if it precedes 36, 38 must precede 39, so if this was the order, chronologically it would be ~~36~~, 38, 39, 36, 37, but it is arranged, not in a chronological order, but in a logical order. Now that is in a way an introduction to 40-on, which follows, rather than introduction to what we are dealing with in this class. So we are not going to take much time on it, but I wanted to make clear to you the relationship there. We won't take time to go into the details of these particular chapters, but now, having seen the greatest political military event of the time of Hezekiah, before going ^{on} to see another very important event in Isaiah's day, which took place quite a few years before this great event, ~~we~~ ^{we} want to just look back into Isaiah's prophecy and see if God permitted Isaiah to foresee this tremendous event in advance. And the passages that we are now going to look at are passages which we will later in this semester examine in careful detail in their context. So we are now not interested in examining this in full detail, but simply in getting an idea of this question. As you look into earlier prophecies of Isaiah, do you find what would seem to be predictions of the situation which is historically described as it occurred in 36 and 37? And the first of those passages to which I called your attention is chapter 29, and now we're not going to go into full detail now, we want to do that later in ~~contrast~~ ^{context}, but now just to see the reflection in Isaiah's predictions in advance of this great event, and we've already seen how the event occurred,

Chapter 29.1, Woe to Ariel, to Ariel... What is Ariel? Well, it's a name, an artificial name. What does it mean? Woe to Ariel, the city where David dwelt! Well, what city

did David dwell in? He lived in Jerusalem the greater part of his life, he was king in Jerusalem. He was king in Hebron but that was only a third of the kingdom. Now he had the whole kingdom he reigned in Jerusalem. He had previously lived among the Philistines a brief period, he had lived as a boy in Bethlehem. But where he reigned mostly was Jerusalem. So we can say we are talking now about this city of Jerusalem. Woe to the city where David dwelt, add ye year to year, let them kill sacrifices. In other words, here is Jerusalem. The word "ariel" may be made up of the words "the lion of God," or it may be "the heart of God." Both are possible interpretations of the word. But the latter, "The heart of God," fits well with the end of the verse. Let them kill sacrifices. Here is the heart of God, the burning place, the furnace before the Lord, the place where they make their burnt offerings. And here they have these tremendous numbers of sacrifices. Well, he says, let them kill a great many sacrifices to the Lord, but what good are these sacrifices going to do them? In spite of all this, I'm going to distress Ariel, there will be heaviness and sorrow. It shall be unto me like an ariel, like a heart of God. I will camp against thee round about, and will lay siege against thee with a mount, and I will raise forts against thee. It doesn't say Sennacherib is going to build forts right around the city, necessarily, but it says God is going to have a something coming (11 3/4)

It may be that Sennacherib has his forces in other parts of the land and that he is looking to them as if any minute he'll come up and begin making siege works against Jerusalem. And lay siege against thee with a mount, and I will raise forts against thee. And thou shalt be brought down and shalt speak out of the ground, and thy speck shall be low out of the dust, and thy voice shall be as of one that hath a familiar spirit, out of the ground, and thy speech shall whisper out of the dust. Well, certainly that is a vivid description of exactly what Jerusalem experienced, when Sennacherib's army was down ⁱⁿ the ~~and~~ the ^{Plain,} Philistine and they expected any day that it would come up and would attack Jerusalem.

The people must have been in terrible misery of anticipation and of uncertainty and of course, with great lack of material things, they couldn't import anything from a distance, they

29:2-4 couldn't even grow very much, they just had to pick what they could rapidly, rushing out into the country round, and picking what grew of itself, so it certainly is a vivid description in verses 2-4 of the condition into which Jerusalem would fall and did fall, in the time of Sennacherib's invasion. V.5 is rather unfortunate, the way the King James has translated it: Moreover the multitude of thy strangers. The Wau "and" may be moreover, the addition of another vital fact, but ~~waw~~ waw can also be "yes" or "but." It may be a slight additional fact, it may be a very important additional fact, or it may be a fact pointing in a different direction, something in spite of this, something different. So in the light of what we find in 5, it is much better to translate the waw as "but." But the multitude of thy strangers (the people from a distance)--does this describe the invading army? They will become like small dust, and the multitude of the terrible ones (you certainly don't describe the people in your own city as the terrible ones).--This makes it pretty clear that it is the invading army that is described, they will be like chaff, that passes away, yet in an instant, suddenly. What more vivid description could we get of the fact that here is this great army down in the Philistine Plain, threatening to come up and destroy Jerusalem, and then in a night God kills thousands of them and they're reduced to just nothing, and Sennacherib had to pick up and go home without taking Jerusalem. It will be in an instant, suddenly, like chaff that passes away, and this of course would like a tremendous event which occurred...

M.7. (1/2)

...a tremendous event which occurs when God intervenes in this mighty way and so we have a figurative description of the power with which God performs this, thou shalt be visited of the Lord of hosts, with thunder, and with earthquake, and great noise, with storm and tempest, and the flame of devouring fire. The great forceful intervention of God, bringing an end to the terrible crisis through the city passed. What other time could this fit but the time of Sennacherib's invasion. And v.7 carries on the deliverance from Sennacherib, and the multitude of all the nations that fight against Ariel, even

29:7
 all that fight against her, and her munition, and that distress her, shall be as a dream of a night vision. When they look at it it'll seem just ~~z~~ like a dream. One day, here is Jerusalem, we expect the army to come any time, and attack us, this great enemy round about, and they don't. It never really happened. Was it just a dream? So complete is the change, it seems as if it were a dream. Now he makes the invading army like a dream, the way it suddenly disappears, but now in v.8 he makes it not a dream, but a dreamer. The enemy Sennacherib will be as when a hungry man ~~dreams~~, and behold he eats. Here is Sennacherib, he is dreaming, boy, I'm going to just step right up there and take Jerusalem. I'm just going to seize it, very easy to do it now, won't be any great effort, lose a few hundred men maybe, of his forces, but he'll take it over. He has conquered far greater cities, but he awakes and his soul is empty. Wakes up in the morning and the multitude of his army are dead, and his army is insufficient to take Jerusalem, they have to give it up, and go home. And his soul ~~is~~ empty. Or when a thirsty man dreams, and, behold, he drinks, but he wakes, and behold, he is faint, and his soul has appetite. ~~One-time~~

One time in California I walked up into the mountains to a section I had been in several times before, very beautiful section, they called it Barley Flats, up back of Pasadena. I walked up there to Barley Flats, there is a road up there now, but there wasn't in those days, and I hiked back to that place and I got in in the evening, and I got to this place where I used to camp and I walked down the hillside a little ways, ~~z~~ to get a drink of water and found the spring was dry. And I'd walked all day, was quite tired, and I didn't know of any other spring within ~~ten~~ miles of there, and I had had no water for a long time, hadn't carried any because I figured it was right there, and the previous place had been along in the middle of the morning. And I went to sleep and that night I dreamt I saw a stream of water going over my head. I'd open my mouth and none would come in, and in the morning, no water there. However, I followed it down the hillside, the path of the spring and found that there was a little water coming out

further down, half a mile, so I did get plenty of water, but it was a very vivid impression that night, as I dreamed of plenty of water, but just none to drink, none at all.

Well, here is a man who dreams, and he's drinking. He's got everything he wants, but naturally he is going to take Jerusalem, and he wakes up, and it's all a dream. He can't do it, his force is gone. And he says, so shall the multitude of all the nations be that fight against ~~our God~~ mount Zion. The nations have disappeared like a dream. But to Sennacherib their leader, it is just like a dream ends and there is nothing there. Well, now this is a description which certainly can be a vivid description, prediction of exactly what happened as described in 36 and 37, and I know of nothing else it may be a prediction of, unless of course someone wants to say, well, Isaiah is looking way ahead into the great distant future and describing something that's going to take place in the last times. I don't say that there are not passages which are ~~not~~ like that, in this book, but when you find a passage which fits exactly something that happened a few years later, and with which the prophet is greatly interested, and which he describes fully, like he does in 36 and 37, it seems the most natural way to take it, that that is what he was there describing. Well, now, we'll look at this in context later, Now I want you to look briefly at chapter 30.

And in chapter 30 we look at verses 2-7, and there we read: Woe to the rebellious children that walk to go down to Egypt, and have not asked ~~at~~ my mouth; to strengthen themselves in the shadow of Pharaoh. And verses 2-7 are telling about people trying to get help from Egypt. V.7 says for the Egyptian shall help in vain and to no purpose. And this reminds you of how in chapter 36 Sennacherib said to the people, he said, Egypt is a vain thing in which to put your trust. He says, Egypt will not be able to deliver you from me, which shows that Hezekiah had been trying to get help from Egypt, and Sennacherib said, no use your trusting Egypt, they won't be able to deliver you from me. So here God describes them going to Egypt to get help, and God says, Egypt won't profit you, they won't be able to deliver you. You should look to God instead of looking to

Egypt. Well, that's in 2-7, but look at verse 31 in this chapter. For through the voice of the Lord shall the Assyrian be beaten down, which smote with a rod. How will the Assyrian be defeated. Because the Israelites will come with their great force and they will destroy them? No. Through the voice of the Lord shall the Assyrian be beaten down. The victory, a tremendous victory accomplished by the work of God in a supernatural way without human intervention. Now chapter 31, in which we will look more in detail after about six weeks or two months from now, chapter 31 is very closely parallel to 30. 31 starts again with the same note. Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help. And here we have several verses showing the Egyptians as the source to which the people are looking for help and God says, no, you must look to the Lord for help. And then the Lord gives his answer. Verse 5: As birds flying, so will the Lord of hosts defend Jerusalem; defending also he will deliver it, and passing over he will preserve it. Some people say that's a prediction of airplanes in the last days, but personally, I don't think that it has anything to do with airplanes, because it is not describing what men do but what God does. It says, as birds flying, will God defend Jerusalem. People in those days couldn't get up to those birds. They had no guns, there was no way they could get at the birds. The birds fly over your head, too high for you to hit with an arrow, or to throw at, they fly over your head, there is nothing you can do about it. And it's going to be just like that, the power that is going to defend Jerusalem, like birds flying, ~~by~~ God's intervention by forces beyond your control. God is going to defend you, it is not human effort that is going to do it. But as birds flying, God is going to defend Jerusalem, so v.8 says: Then shall the Assyrian fall with the sword, not of a man, and a sword not of a human being shall devour him, but he shall flee from the sword, his young men shall be discomfited. So here we find the ~~king of the~~ Assyrian army falling not by human acts, ~~not~~ by a human sword, but because of a divine intervention which kills great numbers of the forces of Sennacherib, so he has to flee because the force left is insufficient for him to accomplish anything, or even to be sure of continuing safety, so far from his home

31:5

31:8

base, and he passes over to his stronghold for fear. So here, in chapters 29, 30, and 31, are predictions of divine deliverance from the Assyrians. Now if you look back to Chapter 10 you find another chapter of a vivid picture of what would happen if the Assyrian comes down from the north and attacks. Chapter 10.28, we imagine the Assyrian, if he is going to attack--now if he attacks, if he is in the Philistine Plain we would naturally expect him to come up from the Plain, up to the hills, but normally the attacks come from the north, and if an army comes from the north, as that of Nebuchadnezzar eventually did, well, how would it come? Look at these places north of Jerusalem, you can just see the invading army coming. He's come to ^{Alath} ~~Al~~, he has passed ^{Migron} ~~Amigron~~. At Michmash he has laid up his carriages. They're gone over the passage, they've taken up their lodging at Geba; Ramah is afraid--that's Rama Zion today, just 20 miles north of Jerusalem--Gibeah of Saul is fled. Gibeah of Saul is only 5 or 6 miles north of Jerusalem. Lift up your voice, O daughter of Gallim, cause it to be heard unto Laish, O poor Anathoth. Anathoth, the city of Jeremiah, just a little bit north of Jerusalem. Madmenah is removed, the inhabitants of Gebim gather themselves to flee. As yet he remains at Nob that day, he shakes his hand against the mount of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerusalem. You can just imagine if the Assyrian army comes, how it gets nearer and nearer, and the dagger gets closer and closer and you expect that the Assyrian army will just completely destroy Jerusalem and take it, that is a vivid picture of what they expected, what they thought would happen, and they had no question, this was going to happen, any one of these days we'll begin to see it happen, but what happened? Look at verse 33:

10:33

Behold the Lord, the Lord of hosts, will lop the bough with terror, and the high ones of stature shall be hewn down, the haughty shall be humbled. He shall cut down the thickets of the forest with iron, and Lebanon shall fall by a mighty one. This tremendous army of the Assyrians which is compared to the forest of Lebanon outside the Promised Land, not the little trees like you have in Israel, but the great big cedars of Lebanon, this tremendous army representative of the great force of the Assyrian Empire, it falls

by divine intervention, when humanly speaking it appears that nothing can be done. A vivid picture given 20 years or so in advance of the way that God is going marvelously and miraculously to deliver Jerusalem from what seems to be certain destruction. So that I want you to have in mind this great event which God had in mind as he enabled Isaiah to prophesy in the course of events in years, quite a few years before Sennacherib's invasion. Mr. Golin? (10 3/4) ... passages which we want to look at in context, our interest of course is in what Isaiah says that is vital to our spiritual lives, and what does Isaiah say that is vital to the future long after' Isaiah's time? What does he say that is relevant to the first coming of Christ? What does he say that is relevant to the second coming of Christ? ~~What~~ But these matters, Isaiah is not someone who goes off in an ivory tower somewhere and sits down and has a vision to tell him what is going to happen 3000 years later. Isaiah is one who is interested in events of his day and is speaking to the people of his day, giving them God's message, telling them to turn from their sins, to turn to God, and comforting the people of God who tend to give way to despair, as they see the way that the nation as a whole is falling to follow Him, and as they know the certainty of the dooms that are promised, that God declares are coming. So Isaiah has a message of rebuke and a message of comfort, and in the course of this, he reinforces these messages by giving glimpses of things God is going to do long afterward, which will be a blessing to those people, but will continue to be a blessing to the people of God, through all the centuries so far. And we are most concerned with what Isaiah tells us of these distant future things, but we'll understand them far better if we see their relationship to the near things, which are the immediate occasion of giving it. And it is for that reason we are trying to start with the near things, and I'm giving you the picture of this great historical event of his time, and then the picture, then calling your attention to some of the places where it entered in so vividly into Isaiah's prediction. Now I'm not looking at the parts in between these now, which do look way beyond them, some of them to our own day and some much beyond our own

day. Mr. Cohen? (stu.) I do not think at this place that that note is correct. I feel that there are descriptions of those matters in the Old Testament books, but I feel that we get to understand a book better by first seeing what there is that can be adequately and clearly explained by relation to their own day, and then seeing what else there is that is ~~the~~ ^{best} explained in relation to that. So that I would, in this particular case, I would not think that that was the correct place for this note.

Well, now, this was the great event of Isaiah's day, and the second, the other, the next greatest event from a political and military viewpoint, is an event which is described in the beginning of chapter 7. In the beginning of chapter 7 we read that in the days of Ahaz, the son of Jotham, the son of Uzziah, king of Judah, that there came an invasion, or the threat of an invasion, yes, actually an invasion, and this invasion came, and Isaiah spoke about what was going to happen in connection with this invasion. There is a very little bit of history given us at the beginning of chapter 7, and then it doesn't tell us much more of the history there. Now I want to give you an assignment at this point.

Wanted to ask you before next Monday to have ready for me a paper which will take the historical statement you have at the beginning of chapter 7, just the first few verses there, and you put down these verses...

M.8. (1/2)

...the passage that we are studying this semester we call the Book of Immanuel, and of course we are particularly interested in its prophecies about the time of Christ and about times that are still very far in the distant future, but Isaiah never sat down to give us a picture simply of what is going to happen 700 years later, or what is going to happen 2700 years later. He stood up to speak to the people, and to tell the people what God's message was for them then and there. And in connection with giving them the message about God's will for them there, and the situations they were then facing, he brought evidences and assurances and encouragements from pictures he gave of the distant

future. Our primary interest is naturally in looking at these pictures of the distant future. But before we are able to understand these pictures of the distant future properly we have to have an idea of the situation that Isaiah faced, and the things that he was talking about right then and there. This being the case, we are at this point in this course, interested, I will say 99% of our interest right now should be upon Isaiah's day and the situation then, and Isaiah's relation to that situation. So last week we looked at chapter 36 to 39, the historical section of Isaiah, and we saw that great event which happened toward the end of Isaiah's time, as prophet, toward the end of Hezekiah's time as king, when God delivered Hezekiah from King Sennacherib, and we saw the wonderful evidence we have of the truth of this story, we saw what a frightful danger it was that Jerusalem faced and how God miraculously delivered them. That we looked at last week, and now we are jumping back at least 20, maybe 30, years, to a period earlier than that, in order to see an event which is less important politically and militarily than the event we looked at last week, but an event which looks forward to that event, and therefore an event which is tremendously important in relation to Isaiah's prophecy. So we're skipping back to this event, the other specific historical situation described in the book of Isaiah, is described at the beginning of ~~chapter 7~~, and as you discovered in your preparation of your work that's been turned in today, there are parallels to this in II K .16, and in II Chr.28, and the parallels are not extensive in Chronicles to this early period. The event that we looked at last week which is also covered in your assignment for today, the parallel, that the parallels are very outstanding, as you noticed. But in this, in Chronicles, there is a brief parallel but not very complete, but in 2 Kings there is quite a bit of material,

Now we turn for a minute then to see this exact situation. We notice how Isaiah introduces it in chapter 7. He says: And it came to pass in the days of Ahaz the son of Jotham, the son of Uzziah, king of Judah, that Rezin the king of Syria, and Pekah the

son of Remaliah, king of Israel, went up toward Jerusalem to war against it, but could not prevail against it. And it was told the house of David, saying, Syria is confederate with Ephraim. And his heart was moved, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind. A very vivid picture of the terrible danger that is facing them. We have the same situation described at considerable length in Kings, and somewhat more briefly in Chronicles. Chronicles gives a good many other events of the same period, which are not given in Kings, and shows--in Chronicles you see what a great danger there was to the kingdom of Judah from this ~~same~~ king Pekah, the king of Israel. We read in 2 Chronicles 28, about Ahaz' wickedness, and then you read over there in verse 8 that Pekah the son of Remaliah slew in Judah 120,000 in one day, which were all valiant men, and we read, continuing names of important people he killed, and the children of Israel carried away captive of their brethren 200,000 and brought the spoil to Samaria. So we read of the terrible ~~thing~~^{danger} that was faced^{by Ahaz and} the kingdom of Judah, from this king Pekah, the king of the northern kingdom, kingdom of ~~Israel~~. Then when we come over to the next few verses, they tell us further details about the fighting, but then we read in v.16 what Ahaz did in order to get deliverance. We read in verse 16: At that time did king Ahaz send unto the king of Assyria to help him. And verse 20 says: And Tiglath Pileser, king of Assyria, came unto him, and distressed him, it says, but strengthened him not. Now you get the picture of this in Kings, back there in chapter 16 of Kings, you get the picture of the situation there in Judah, when King Ahaz began to reign at the age of 20 and reigned 16 years and did^{not} that which was right in the sight of the Lord his God, like David his father. ¹tells of his wickedness here for two or three verses. Then it says in verse 15 then Rezin King of Syria, and Pekah son of Remaliah, king of Israel, went up to Jerusalem to war and they besieged Ahaz but could not overcome him. At that time they besieged but couldn't overcome him, Chronicles says they took 200,000 people captive, they didn't overcome him but they certainly terribly devastated his land and people, and they placed him in a position where he would^{think} they

2 Chron 28:8-16

would certainly over come him. Well, that certainly is parallel to what we had at the beginning of Isaiah 7, you remember. It said in Isa. 7, that they come up toward Jerusalem to sar against it but could not prevail against it. And it was told the house of David, Syria is confederate with Ephraim. His heart was moved and the heart of his people, as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind. You have a situation ^{then,} ~~through,~~ in which you have the kingdom of Judah with its capital at Jerusalem, with a kingdom to the north which is three times as large (7 1/2) in territory, which has perhaps three times as many people as the kingdom of Judah. Now that doesn't mean that Israel is three times as strong as Judah, because Jerusalem in Judah was commercial-ly very advanced, their textile mills were very, very excellent, and they had a very extensive trade, and the wealth per capita of the kingdom of Judah was doubtless far greater than ^{that of} the Kingdom of Israel, nevertheless, ~~Israel~~ Israel was not backward by any means, but simply not as advanced as Judah. So that Israel, having three times the population, three times the territory of Judah, they had ten tribes as against two, they had at least fifty percent more strength, that's one and a half, maybe even as much as double the strength. That is a war between Judah and Israel is something which might be so evenly balanced that you couldn't be sure which would win, but as a rule it was Israel that won, because Israel was definitely stronger than Judah. But in this case they are told, not only is Pekah the king of Israel attacking them, but the king of Syria beyond him, is joining with him in the attack, In most of the previous history you have the king of Israel facing the king of Syria, Syria with its capital at Damascus, that was the great enemy of Israel and was larger and stronger than Israel. God delivered Israel from Syria a number of times, but it took God's deliverance, because they were definitely stronger. Stronger but far enough away that they couldn't bring their strength to bear fully, so Syria was stronger but not a tremendous lot. Well, now, Judah ~~here~~ ^{hears not only is} Israel going to attack us, which have done this tremendous damage, now they're threatening to attack Jerusalem too, but Syria is allied with Israel and both of them are about to attack. We

get a little further hint of the situation in Isaiah, which is not given in Kings or Chronicles. We get that hint in what Isaiah said, ~~for~~^{where} he went out to speak to Ahaz. He says in verse 3, the Lord said to Isaiah, Go forth now to meet Ahaz, thou, and Shear-jashub thy son, at the end of the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field, and say unto him, Take heed, and be quiet; fear not, neither be fainthearted for the two tails of these smoking firebrands, for the fierce anger of Rezin with Syria, and of the son of Remaliah. Because Syria, Ephraim, and the son of Remaliah, have taken evil counsel against thee, saying, Let us go up against Judah, and vex it, and let us make a breach therein for us, and set a king in the midst of it, even the son of Tabeal; Thus saith the Lord God, It shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass.

So we see there that Syria and Israel were determined to do away with the house of David. They were going to remove the king of Judah and put another king in his place, the son of Tabeal, as he is called here. We get that information from Isaiah in addition to what you get in Kings and Chronicles. So it is a very serious situation that faces them. Here is Judah which time and again has had to face invasions from Israel to the north, and which has been overcome by Israel on various occasions, not conquered by Israel, not placed where it is taken over by Israel, but placed where it has had to face severe reparations, has had great damage done to it from Israel, faced now not only by Israel, but also by a kingdom beyond Israel which is stronger actually than Israel, so it is a frightful danger that now faces Judah. And in the face of that danger, King Ahaz works out a very clever scheme. We were told in Chronicles what that scheme was, and we are told it also here in Kings, that Ahaz, we read in v.7 of Kings, so Ahaz sent messengers to Tiglath-Pileser, King of Assyria, saying I am thy servant and thy son, come up and save me out of the hand of the King of Assyria, and out of the hand of the King of Israel which rise up against me. And Ahaz took the silver and gold that was found in the house of the Lord, and in the treasures of the king's house and sent it for a present to the King of Assyria, and the king of Assyria hearkened to him, for the king of Assyria

went up against Damascus and took it and carried the people of it captive to ~~the~~ Kir and slew Rezin. Now this statement you read here that Ahaz sent messengers saying, this, and Ahaz took the silver and gold in the house of the Lord and sent it for a present to the King of Assyria, and the king of Assyria hearkened to him. Now let us suppose that on February 15 that--for the sake of a definite point of reference, --that Ahaz made a ~~definite~~ decision. He got a few of the leaders of his kingdom together, he discussed the matter with him, he said what can we do against Israel, and against Syria, which is stronger than Israel, and the two of them attacking. Let us send to Assyria, to Tiglath Pileser, and tell him we will be his vassals. We will be subject to him, we will send him tribute, here we send him tribute now, extensive tribute, and then he will come and deliver us from him. Now let us suppose that he had a meeting of a council of state, on February 15, very privately of course, it was something that was not to be given out to the people naturally, a decision of this kind, but very private, secret decision. Suppose he had that on February 15, and suppose that he moved with all possible speed to send this great amount of material that is described here, as tribute to the king of Assyria. Do you think that it was on February 16 that king Tiglath Pileser, decided to attack Israel and Syria, and that on February 17, his armies marched into Syria? How many would think that? Well, what would your guess be, as to the relative date?...

M.9. (1/2)

...and it says the king of Assyria hearkened to him and the king of Assyria went up against Damascus, and took it. Well, the distance from Jerusalem to Damascus, is about 250 miles, and 250 miles in those days, carrying all this stuff, for tribute, would be something that if you made 20 miles a day you'd probably be doing pretty well. You might be able to push it vigorously enough to make 40, but I doubt if you'd make much more than 40, so we'll say it took at least six days to get up to Damascus, and then to get to Nineveh, the capital of Tiglath Pileser, you've got to go clear across the desert there, a distance of several hundred miles, so that it would take a long time for the messengers

with the tribute to make their way across and to get to Tiglath Pileser and then of course Tiglath Pileser was not sitting in his palace waiting for messenger from the king of Judah, he was concerned with battles and wars all over, trying to enlarge Assyria, and to conquer everything he could in every direction, very active. Many scholars think that the reason these countries attacked Judah ~~was~~ probably ^{because} they had tried to get Judah to join with them against the king of Assyria, to try to stop his aggression, and that Judah refused, and that consequently they were going to remove the king of Judah and put a puppet in his place who would stand with them. Now that is pure conjecture, we have no proof of that. But we do know this, that they joined together, which was rare, for them to join, and there must have been some reason--very likely they wanted to get ready at least before the attack from the king of Assyria, which they thought might come one of these days. And then the king of Assyria gets this message from Judah and that gives him a good excuse to move for the support of his ally, so he marches across there and he has got to take a force that will be sufficient to do anything against Syria which is quite a sizeable power, though not a fraction as strong as Assyria, he's got to go all that distance across the desert.

Someone was remarking to me just the other day, he said, until the age of steam, up until after the Napoleonic wars, he said the speed of moving soldiers, moving an army, the speed of communication was just about the same as it had been, let's say 3000 B.C. The armies of Pharaoh could move practically as fast as the armies of Napoleon. The armies though those thousands of years could move at just about the same rate, and then it was the advent of steam about 130 years ago, that things began moving faster, till today we cross the ocean in a few hours, but it took nine weeks in the time of the pilgrims. But this was a slow process, there was time involved. But Ahaz had made the decision and Ahaz had doubtless not made the decision entirely on his own. It would be impossible for him to gather all this tribute and to ship all this tribute off without somebody knowing about it, but he had a few of his nobles doubtless

who were aware of the situation and who joined with him in the decision. In fact, one of them may have even suggested it, but Ahaz took the responsibility for it. Well, this is the situation that we find described here in the Bible, and then in Kings, it tells us in verse 6 that the king of Assyria hearkened to him, for the king of Assyria went up against Damascus and took it and carried the people of it captive to Kir, and slew Rezin. It doesn't say there anything about Pekah, the king of Israel. But it speaks about the king of Damascus who slew Rezin of Damascus, and he took Damascus and took its people captive and carried them away into captivity. And then we read in verse 10 that King Ahaz went to Damascus to meet Tiglath Pileser at Damascus, and saw an altar at Damascus, and King Ahaz sent to Urijah the ~~pattern of~~ ^{priest the fashion} of the altar, and the pattern of it, and Urijah the priest built an altar according to all that King Ahaz had sent from Damascus, so Urijah the priest made it against king Ahaz came from Damascus. And when the king was come from Damascus, the king saw the altar and approached the altar and offered thereon, and burnt his burnt offering and his meat offering and poured out his drink offering, and sprinkled the blood of his peace offerings, on the altar. And he brought also the brasen altar, which was before the Lord, from the forefront of the house, and put it on the north side of the altar. King Ahaz commanded Urijah, on the great altar make the burnt offering. But he said the brasen altar, at the end of verse 15, shall be for me to inquire by. Then verses 17 and 18 tell about the great precious things in the Temple that King Ahaz cut off in order to send further tribute to the king of Assyria.

Now this doubtless means that when the king of Assyria captured Damascus, then he sent a messenger to Jerusalem, said I have protected ^{you from} ~~Jerusalem~~, Rezin, I have destroyed him, you're safe from him now, you come up here and appear before me. So Ahaz went up and did homage to the king of Assyria, and the king of Assyria said, now as a sign of this homage, there is this altar, I want you to adopt this form of an altar, put it up in your capital as proof you are subject to me, so Ahaz did it but he kept the Lord's altar too in spite of it. He wanted to still get the benefits of following the Lord in the spiritual

sense, but to get the physical benefits and the political benefits of following the king of Assyria, and worshipping the king of Assyria's god. So that this is what Ahaz did, he was a thoroughly wicked man. He is one who is very strongly condemned in the Scripture, he is of the house of David, and God promised that David would ~~always~~ have a son to sit upon his throne, and Ahaz is of the house of David, but he is one of the most unworthy sons of the house of David that ever sat on the throne of David. And Ahaz has worked out this very clever political scheme to protect Jerusalem, against the attacks of Israel and of Syria, and his scheme has succeeded, because he no longer needs to fear Syria.

The King of Assyria has conquered Syria, well happens to Israel? That is told in Kings here over in the next chapter. See the book of Kings here is now telling about Judah, so it tell us what happened to Judah, but then in, I guess it's in the next chapter, or I guess it's the previous one that tells about it, chapter 15, we read that, In the fifty-second year of Azariah king of Judah, that is the old man Uzziah who is the leper and isn't reigning but you can date by him, still nominally king--Pekah the son of Remaliah began to reign over Israel in Samaria, and reigned twenty years. And he did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord, he departed not from the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin. In the days of Pekah king of Israel came Tiglath-pileser king of Assyria, and took a lot of cities there, that's the greater part of Israel he took. And verse 30: Hoshea the son of Elah made a conspiracy against Pekah and smote him and slew him, and reigned in his stead, in the twentieth year of Jotham the son of Uzziah. So here we have Pekah having Tiglath-pileser come against him, but evidently Hoshea decides that he will ~~with~~ ^{win} Tiglath-pileser's favor by killing Pekah, so Hoshea reigned. And we find ^{2K 17:1} what happened to Hoshea told in chapter 17, that in the 12th year of Ahaz king of Judah, began Hoshea the son of Elah to reign in Samaria over Israel nine years. And he did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord. Against him came up Shalmaneser king of Assyria, and Hoseha became his servant, and gave him presents. And the king of Assyria found conspiracy in Hoshea, therefore the king of Assyria shut him up and bound in prison.

Then the king of Assyria ~~sent~~ ^{came up} throughout ^{all} the land and ~~besieged~~ ^{went up to} Samaria and besieged it three years. In the ninth year of Hoshea the king of Assyria took Samaria, and carried Israel away into Assyria, ^(9 1/4) ~~takes them captive~~. So now you have the situation chronologically in mind. You have Pekah king of Israel, joined with Rezin king of ~~Assyria~~, attacking Judah. You have Tiglath-pileser ^{Shaz} sending for help to Assyria. There must have been quite a bit of time after he made ~~that~~ decision, before the help came from Tiglath-pileser. But then in time, probably fairly quickly, but yet it might have been a period of weeks or months, Tiglath-pileser comes with his army, conquers Samaria, overwhelms a large part of Israel, but in Israel someone else kills Pekah and takes over control, and then he is subject to Assyria, and now Ahaz submits to Assyria, and nine years later, this new king of Israel is attacked by the king of Assyria and destroyed and Israel assimilated into the Assyrian empire. So the situation that you have then is a situation where Ahaz is faced by a tremendous danger, at one point. The danger is removed because the king of Assyria comes, takes away Rezin, makes Hoshea subject to himself, and then nine years later he takes away the northern kingdom altogether. Now that of course, God knew what was going to happen, but Ahaz couldn't tell, Ahaz is faced with this tremendous danger. Now suppose you were in Ahaz' situation. And you have sent secretly, asking him to come and help you. When you're facing this tremendous danger. Now what would you do? Would you sit quietly and do nothing and wait for the king of Assyria to come and deliver you? Well, if you did, there'd be none of you left to deliver when the King of Assyria came. Because the king of Israel ~~has~~ already done you tremendous damage and is threatening to conquer Jerusalem and destroy it, and put a new king in it, and Ahaz would be gone. And suppose Tiglath-pileser does come, and conquers Israel, and Syria, there'll be no Ahaz left anyway. So that the thing that Ahaz has to do is to hold out against Israel and Syria, until Tiglath-pileser gets there. That's his big objective. So now, first he has made a decision, and the first action of the decision is to send to Tiglath-pileser in Assyria to get him to come and deliver him. The second action of it

ts to hold out and resist until Tiglath-pileser comes and relieves the pressure on him from Israel and from Syria. That's the situation. Well, now Isaiah doesn't like that. Isaiah says why should the king of Judah faced with danger from Israel and Syria, why should he look to the distant Assyrian powers for protection. The Assyrians are not followers of the Lord. Nor are the Assyrians kindly people, they are cruel, they are barbarous, they are wicked in every way. Yes, but they are no danger to Judah, Judah doesn't need to fear them, it is just exactly the situation we were in in the last war.

In the last war we declared war against Hitler, and here we were fighting against Hitler. Well, previous to that time many people had spoken about the tyranny of the Bolsheviks, had spoken about the wickedness of the Communist regime, but now when we were facing Hitler, Russia was ^{way off,} ~~worried~~ nothing we should fear about Russia, but if only Russia will fight strong on the other side against Hitler, with us fighting on this side, think how much better chance we have of escaping of conquest by Hitler. So that, I remember very well that six months before Russia and Germany were at war, in this country the feeling toward Russia was almost like it is today. But six months later, they were our allies, they were the great noble allies, standing with us against Hitler's brutality and wickedness, that was the attitude, and Roosevelt just opened everything up to them, turned everything over to them, gave them the secret of the atom bomb, everything else, they were our great allies, formed the United Nations, to be formed of peace-loving nations. That was the charter of the United Nations, only peace-loving nations must be in it to preserve the peace, and we welcomed Russia into it. After all, they must be peace-loving, because they fought against Hitler.

Well, that's exactly Ahaz's feeling, Ahaz says here beyond Syria, way off so far from us there, are the Assyrians. Well, he says, if only they come and deliver us, it's worth our paying a tremendous tribute to them. It's worth our doing a lot to get Tiglath-pileser to come and help us. He takes the altar of God eventually out of the Temple and puts, substitutes a heathen altar there, keeps the altar of God for divine rites. Because

after all, we've got to survive, we've got to do what is necessary, in order to survive. Well, now that's Ahaz' ~~is~~ attitude, and that's an attitude against which Isaiah writes many chapters, and it is in the course of those chapters that he makes those great predictions of Christ, which is the alternative for it...

M.10. (1/2)

...Isa.7 with the situation before^{us}, and we can understand better the meaning of what we are told there in the chapter. It came to pass in the days of Ahaz that this story came that Pekah and Rezin are confederates against Judah, and they've already, as Chronicles tells us had terrible battles with the northern kingdom, Israel has defeated them badly on one or two occasions, now they have Syria added to them and there is great danger of their taking Jerusalem, and putting an end to the house of David, and in that situation Ahaz has secretly sent his messenger to Tiglath-pileser, saying, I'm in your hands, you take me. The people of Judah don't know this. I'm in your hands, you come and deliver me, I'll give you great tribute, here is all this that I am sending you by the messenger, already, and I'll give you a lot more if you just come and deliver me from these who are attacking. Well, this is known to Ahaz, known to a few nobles, but not known to the rank and file of the people, and they don't have any reason to think that Isaiah knows it, because Isaiah has no access to the palace at this time. It's not like later when Hezekiah's king, he welcomed Isaiah, and goes and asks Isaiah's advice. Ahaz, this godless young fellow, has no use for Isaiah, and so the Lord doesn't say to Isaiah, go to Ahaz in the palace and tell him you have a message for him from God. Maybe Ahaz wouldn't even let Isaiah into the palace, but at any rate, God wants the message given, not just to Ahaz, he wants it given to all the people, and so he says, in verse 3: Go now to meet Ahaz, thou, and Shear-jashub thy son, at the end of the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field. Now what a specific description of where he is to go! This is outside of the wall. At the end of the conduit of the upper pool, in the highway of the fuller's field. Why should he go out there? Well, the reason ought to be perfectly

obvious. That's where Ahaz is. He has to go where Ahaz is. To go out there because Ahaz is there, and why ~~do they have~~ ^{is Ahaz there?} He is on a defense inspection tour. He is out there, trying to encourage the people to vigorously build up the defenses of Jerusalem, in order to protect the city against the attack that is expected in the near future, from Israel and from Syria, so that they will be able to be safe until they get there. Yes? (3 1/4) Yes. The first reason that he goes out here is cause that's where Ahaz is. Of course, Ahaz may be anywhere at different times. God tells him where Ahaz is now. The second reason he goes is to get Ahaz in a public place, where Ahaz, where he has access to Ahaz, instead of in the palace. The third is to get him in a public place where there will be a lot of people to hear what he says. And then, of the various places on the inspection tour that Ahaz is making, God selects one specific place for him to meet Ahaz in order that something happens at that place, Isaiah gives a message, and then when things come out exactly as Isaiah now predicted/they would, twenty or thirty years later, this will have been the place where something else would happen, which God tells.

So we read last week in Isa. 36 how later on when Ahaz' clever scheme had materialized and the king of Assyria had destroyed Damascus, destroyed Syria, destroyed Israel, so now the buffer states are removed, no longer does Judah have any danger from Israel and Syria, no, but Assyria, force many times as great as those two put together, reaches now right to the very borders of Judah. And now, that is, 30 years later, Sennacherib comes right up to the walls of Jerusalem, he sends his messengers and they stand at this same spot, so it is described in detail here exactly where, so that when you get to 39 you can see it is exactly the same spot where the messengers of the king of Assyria stand and say, surrender Jerusalem, ^{to me,} you have no power to resist. And doubtless there were people standing there hearing them, who remembered that's the very spot where Isaiah stood 30 years ago and said we should not trust Assyria, but we should trust the Lord, and how look what's happened because we've paid no attention to him. So that is doubtless the reason why the precise spot is so minutely detailed in these two places. So now Isaiah

goes out to that place, and he is to give a message to king Ahaz, so God tells him what to say. And we read in verse 4: And say to him, Take heed, and be quiet, ~~far~~ not, neither be fainthearted for the two tails of these smoking forebrands, for the fierce anger of Rezin with Syria, and of the son of Remaliah. Because Syria, Ephraim, and the son of Remaliah, have taken evil counsel against thee, saying, Let us go up against Judah, and vex it, and let us make a breach therein for us, and set a king in the midst of it, even the son of Tabeal. Thus saith the Lord God, it shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass.

Well, Ahaz doesn't want to bother with this old fool, Isaiah. He isn't interested in this fellow who claims to be a prophet of the Lord, and goes around telling people that they should live kinds of lives that Ahaz wasn't interested in living, and that he shouldn't oppress the people the way he wanted to oppress them, and enjoy the luxuries that he loved to have. And live in defiance of God. He didn't want Isaiah around. But Isaiah comes and speaks to him publicly at a place that he is on a defense inspection tour, where he is interested in two things, Ahaz is interested in having the defenses strong, but he is also interested in the morale of the people. He wants the people of Jerusalem/ to be ready to resist, not say oh the king of Assyria is coming, there is nothing to worry about. He'll defend us. Well, if they submit now Israel will come in and maybe if the people submit Israel won't mistreat the people too much but they'll certainly do away with Ahaz. Ahaz wants the people to stand solidly and strongly and fight and resist the people of Israel and of Syria, until Tiglath-pileser gets there. So when Isaiah steps up and begins to speak, well it's pretty hard even if ~~Ahaz~~ ^{Isaiah} is an old fool, why the people don't think so, many of the people consider him a prophet of God, and after all he's got to encourage the morale of the people, well if religion is an opiate for the people, something to keep the people orderly and so on, he doesn't want to get the people all upset by mistreating their prophet, and everything that Isaiah has said thus far is pretty good. He says to the people don't fear, God says, it won't stand. Well, that's good, you can't fight very strongly when you know there is no hope. But here God says it'll stand, well, they won't be able to

conquer you, that's good, let's fight valiantly and work out the thing that Isaiah says God is promising. So Ahaz doesn't feel like interrupting him, and in fact it would be very impolitic to interrupt him. If he stopped Isaiah from ~~speaking~~ speaking here, why it would make it difficult to encourage the morale of the people the way he wants to. So Ahaz says nothing, and Isaiah continues in verse 8, for the head of Syria is Damascus and the head of Damascus is Rezin, and within 65 years shall Ephraim be broken, that it be not a people. And now Ahaz thinks now the old fool is getting into real nonsense. He says 65 years the northern kingdom, ^{Ephraim} of Israel, will be broken that it's not a people. Well, what difference, what do we care what happens 65 years from now? He says if we can't resist them now within 65 days we'll be gone, not 65 years. He says, what good does that do us, why argue about what's going to happen 65 years from now. So Ahaz thinks now Isaiah is getting off into one of his long talks, telling us, next you know, he'll be telling us that we should quit some of these practices that we enjoy doing, and we should start having regular services even right in the king's palace, he says it is time for us to get the fellow shut up, so he begins to look kind of irritated, and thinks well now if I look displeased and the people around him were taking their cue from him, why he thinks maybe he'll have sense enough to move away, or maybe the people will get enough irritated that they won't object when I tell him, get out of here, we appreciate the good word you've said, now, but now we've got to go on doing something that matters, getting our army strengthened so that we hold out against Israel. Yes? (10) Yes, I'm basing it on that, and, well there are some things in interpretation which you get specifically stated. Many things specifically stated, there are other things where you have this thread and this thread, this indication and this, and you try to fit them together to make a coherent picture. And I find many different aspects of it which fit together on this assumption, you see. Now that doesn't prove the assumption is correct, but these various aspects which I explain in view of this assumption, I don't think are easily explained otherwise. And we go through and you see where I explain different things in the text on a certain assumption, then when you get through, if

you don't think that that has been worked out correctly, you try to take a different slant, but there must be a reason for it, they must fit together on some interpretation. And this to me makes sense, not only what I've just said, but as we go on, to see what happens. Yes? (11 1/4) I base that on the fact that it's outside the city. I don't think in this situation he ~~is~~ was out on a fishing trip. It is outside the city and in the very area where Hezekiah later says shall the king of Assyria come and find water and he closes up over the water and makes a conduit underneath to bring the water to the city. Yes, Mr. Cohen? (11 1/2) It is outside the city but right next to the city, and a king in these dangerous times would hardly be there alone and the reason for his being there, and in this day, with the great danger just described, he certainly would be busy with getting ready for the attack, so that I think it is reasonable that it was an inspection tour.

Well, in that situation then this wonderful promise is made: 65 years more and you don't need to worry about Israel at all. But you know I think that when Belgium was attacked, let's say, in the last war, when Holland was overrun, if somebody said, well now don't you worry, 65 years from now Hitler's Germany won't even exist, I don't think the people would've been much enthused. I don't think, when the Japanese came in against the Philippine Islands, if you had said oh don't worry, 65 years from now there won't be a Japanese force, I don't think it would've encouraged them very much. So that in this situation it is rather natural that we find the last half of verse 9 quoted. He says, If ye will not believe, ~~ye~~ surely ye shall not be established.

Now why would he say a thing like that? If you will not believe, surely you shall not be established. Well, it's plain, nothing untrue. You go up to somebody on the street and say, if you won't believe surely you won't be established. Well, that's sensible. Faith is necessary, yes. But here we're in a definite historical situation, and Isaiah is dealing with the present great danger, and Isaiah says, well, if you won't believe surely you won't be established, the implication is there is some evidence they are not believing. So it seems to me that we are justified in assuming that the look on Ahaz' face and the

faces of his courtiers ~~here~~ is such as to make it evident that they're trying to get rid of this fellow Isaiah before he starts on a long talk that they'll have three or four hours of listening to a sermon, and get that much back on their building work and also the people get all confused, and maybe think that this prophet things that Ahaz isn't such a good leader after all. So when Isaiah says this, it to me reflects their actions. At any rate, this is what God had said to him to go and do and verse 9 ends it, now had he told him to say all this, or had he told him part of it, and told him the rest there? ...

M.11. (1/2)

...whether all this was told Isaiah in verse 3 when the Lord said go forth to meet him and say this, whether He told him all this to say or whether He told him in general what to say, and gave him the further words there, we don't know that. But in verse 10: Moreover the Lord spoke again unto Ahaz, saying, -- now Isaiah has just been speaking to Ahaz, he says if you won't believe surely you won't be established. But we read and the Lord spoke again to Ahaz saying, and surely that means here is a message that Isaiah did not contemplate before he went out there. This is not part of a set message, and my guess is the last thing in verse 9 isn't either. Not part of a set message, here is a message, you go give it. But there is a set message which Isaiah goes out to give at a public place to Ahaz and now when Ahaz shows an attitude of hostility and disgust and lack of interest, the Lord gives a further message to give him, and here is the message he gives:

Ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God, ask it either in the depth, or in the height above. Well, I think we can easily imagine the situation, Ahaz is showing lack of interest in what Isaiah is saying. Isaiah says don't worry, the plan won't stand, it won't come to pass, just 65 more years and Israel won't even be a nation, and then Isaiah says if you won't believe surely you won't be established, and then he says, the Lord spoke again saying ask a sign of the Lord, ask it in the depth or in the height above. But Ahaz said, well now this fellow is trying to get me into a -- look at the disturbance this fellow is making! First he comes out here and starts giving a sermon and slows up the people from their work

of preparing the defenses, and lowers their confidence in me as their leader. But then in addition to that, he says let's have a sign. What are we going to do. What happened when Elijah said to king Ahab, the Lord will give you a sign, why they had to go all up to the top of Mt. Carmel and there they had to wait and make an offering, and see whether Baal would send fire ~~on~~ or whether the Lord would send fire. Well, if you're going to go through some rigamarole like that, you won't ever get the defenses built, the Israel army will be here, and conquer us. We've got to find some way to head this business off. So Ahaz made a beautiful statement, look at it in verse 12, isn't this a beautiful statement:

But Ahaz said, I will not ask, neither will I tempt the Lord. And can't you just hear Ahaz saying to himself, boy, that was a clever one. He says that was slick. He says what a pious statement I made. He says, that'll stop Isaiah in his tracks. The people around will all say, my that man Ahaz is pretty good, we used to think he was sort of an irreligious fellow, but look, I will not ask, neither will I tempt the Lord. Well, you remember that ~~when~~ the people asked--when Satan, wasn't it, asked Jesus for a miracle, He said I will not tempt the Lord my God. And He told the people, ~~He~~ says, an irreligious generation seeks a sign, there shall no sign be given but the sign of the prophet Jonah. Here Ahaz--he hadn't read Matthew and Mark, and he didn't know that part of it, but he had some of the same idea. He says boy I've got a really clever one, I will not ask, neither will I tempt the Lord. Now what can Isaiah do in the face of such beautiful pious hypocrisy. ~~He could~~ ^{He could} say well of course I wouldn't want you to tempt the Lord, you just go ^{on} with the defense building, and you know that God says you're going to be successful, and these people won't come. No, listen to what he says, and you cannot understand verse 13, unless you make the assumption I have made about 12, that ~~what~~ Ahaz said was pure hypocrisy, and probably said in a tone of voice that made it rather evident to Isaiah that it was. Because verse 13 says: Hear ye now, O house of David; Is it a small thing for you to weary men, but will ye weary my God also? Isn't that a strong denunciation of the king which he gives?

Well, the people say the king has just made a beautiful statement, a beautiful, pious, religious statement and this old fool of a prophet comes out with a strong denunciation of it. He must belong to the other political party of something. Certainly he is misrepresenting, misunderstanding the king when he does that way. Well, I think that it must be as hard as Ahaz tried to sound pious, he just wasn't in the habit, and the result was that, I won't ask, neither will I tempt the Lord, it was perfectly evident to everybody that the king was just trying to get an excuse to get rid of him, and perfectly evident, and Isaiah comes out with this strong denunciation. He says, hear ye now, O house of David, and he goes on and gives a sermon which lasts for another 20 verses and Ahaz had to listen to it anyway. He didn't dare interrupt it and upset the morale of the people at this time. But he says, therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign. Now he says, suppose a child is born, you've been talking about 65 years--that's too far off to be of any help to you. Well, he says, let's imagine that a virgin conceives and bears a son, and this son is born right within the next few months, let's assume. What's going to happen to this son? Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good. Now that ~~is~~ "that he may know" is a very poor translation there. It is the regular phrase which is used in expressing the time something happened. Butter and honey shall he eat, when he knows, or by the time that he knows to refuse the evil and choose the good. Why? Because before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings. He says, you don't think 65 years is near enough to be worth anything. You don't think that's any help. Well, he says, the Lord Himself is going to give you a sign, and he doesn't say this just to Ahaz, he says it to the house of David. He is not here to comfort Ahaz. This is what all the critical books say. They say Isaiah is comforting Ahaz. How would the birth of Christ 700 years later be any comfort to Ahaz. Well, Isaiah isn't comforting Ahaz. Isaiah is rebuking Ahaz, he rebukes Ahaz in verse 13 in the strongest language. He is rebuking Ahaz. But now what is the rebuke to Ahaz. The rebuke to Ahaz, is the Lord is going to

give you a sign, but is also going to deal with this immediate situation. You say 65 years off is too far. Well, suppose even a child should be born in the next few minutes, and then supposing that that child gets to be old enough to know to reach for the warm milk instead of for the hot stove, suppose he gets old enough to know to make simple choices, to refuse but not to reach for the thing that is going to cut him or burn him or something, but to reach for the thing that's pleasant, before he is just a fairly small child, but within the next three or four years he says, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings. And you say what does that mean, butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good. There are commentaries that say, this is a prediction of the simple life of our Lord. Eat butter and honey. Well, now this butter and honey, it doesn't mean anything to us, much, but these Hebrew words aren't butter in our sense today anyway. As they would say on the TV it is not the expensive spread that we use here. It is not quite our sense of it what he is describing here. But he is describing certain common articles of food. Now let's go on a little bit, look down below, and he tells us that there is going to be a time of disaster in the land. Look at verse 22, It shall come to pass, for the abundance of milk they give he shall eat butter, for butter and honey shall every one eat that is left in the land. And it shall come to pass in that day that every place where there were a thousand vines, or a thousand silverlings, it'll be just for briers and thorns. With arrows and with bows shall men come thither, because all the land shall become briers and thorns. And all the hills that we now dig with the mattock, you won't be able to go in there even for fear of briers and thorns, it'll be for the sending forth of oxen and sheep and goats. In other words there won't be people left in the land enough to carry on normal agricultural operation and the land that you have carefully tilled and crops grown, there will be all a great expanse for just a few cows and sheep to wander over and a few people that are left in the land, that'll be enough to give them all the butter and honey they want, but they won't have the things that take human effort to grow. It is a time of devastation, a time of depopulation, a time when the multitudes of

Israel are being taken off into exile, so that is what is predicted that is going to happen. Depopulation and the depopulation begins right soon because v.15 says, that before a child born within the next few months, will be able to make simple choices, that they will be -- the produce of the animals, the proportionately the number of the people will be more than usual, and the other products that take human effort, growing and taking out the weeds, they will be lacking. Yes? (10 1/4) No, the king of Israel and Syria, King Rezin will be gone and we read that the king of Assyria smote Rezin and killed him, and the king of Israel is called by Hoshaa, who raises the conspiracy, Hoshea says what's the use of standing here with Pekah, fighting the king of Assyria, and all being killed. Let's kill Pekah and make peace with the king of Assyria. That's what often happens in a nation when they're in their last stand, the leader gets killed, by somebody who thinks he can make peace terms with the enemy. Yes? (10 3/4) Well, that is a very important question, but it is not one which can be answered in 35 seconds, and my objective here is for us to get a very good idea of the immediate situation, before we worry too much about the distant references. The distant references are what we're most interested in by far, of course, that is our objective in the course. ~~The~~ But to properly understand them we have to see the immediate situation and so we don't dare take time now for that but we look into that tomorrow. (11 1/2, stu. Is that a child or the child?) Well, it's the child we've just been talking about, whatever that is. ...

M.12. (1/2)

...before we go on with our lecture, we had better note the assignment for next time. Now we are beginning our investigation of the book of Immanuel's prophet, that is Isa. 7-12. We haven't really begun that because we are at present looking at the historical background, but we will very soon be in that, and consequently I would like to assign to those who are taking this for undergraduate credit, by next Monday's class, to please turn in to me a statement in which they look through the material from 7.1 to the end of 12, glance through that material and ask yourself this question. How would I logically divide

the material into its most important sections. Where are the big breaking points? Do I think for instance that this is divisible into two main divisions, or would I--three, or four, or five, or six, or seven? How many would you make? Not less than two, nor more than seven main divisions. Then look into each of these main divisions, and within it note, for instance, if you only divide it into two, why then see within each of the two--~~do~~ you think it logically divides into two, three, four, five, ~~six~~, or seven? See what I mean? Now if you should find that it divides into seven, in your opinion, why then look at each one of them and see if you think it divides in turn into two or three, or maybe if it's a unit that you don't see any important division in. You see the assignment, for the undergradu=ates? I'd like this turned into me by the beginning of the class hour next Monday.

Question? (2 1/2) Where you think there are natural divisions. Now the chapter divisions may be right, may be wrong--I wouldn't worry about the chapter divisions, see where you think there are clear divisions, either of type of material, or of general subject matter, or what it might be. How would you divide this into natural division? Of course, if you should think there are, that it is as many as five or six or seven, then naturally that is your judgment as to where the chapter divisions really~~ly~~ should have been. You might even think they are right as they are fixed. That is to say, whatever you think. But if you should divide it into two, if ~~you~~ for instance, you think three form a unit, and three others form a unit, that's too long for a chapter division, so it would be reasonable then to think that there should have been subdivision under it. ~~But~~ But I'm not interested in how long chapter divisions should be, I'm interested in what the divisions of thought are, or the divisions of type of material, either one. Whatever you think are the reasonable divisions. The main divisions first, and then the subdivisions under these. If you make as many as seven main divisions, why then it's all right to say in the case of ~~several~~ several of them, you think they shouldn't be any subdivision, but in some of them at least you would find two or three subdivisions. But I don't want you to divide it up into two or three

verse groups or anything like that. But for the graduate students, their assignment on this is not as extensive as the undergraduates. For those taking this for graduate credit, it is merely to make the first main division, not less than two, nor more than seven. Not to go further into ~~the~~ detail than that, because I want you to have the rest of your time available for other work. So the other work I want you to do is first, to look at Isaiah 7.14,15,16, and those three verses look at as many commentaries as you can, and write out briefly what their opinion is of the interpretation of each of these three. Who do they think is the child there described, and that in place by the middle of the morning, Monday, so I can glance over it before class. That's the second part of your assignment, and then the third is to continue in the Hebrew from the point we reached last time. Those are the three parts of the assignment to the graduate students. Now we continue then with our examination. We are thus far, as you know, not really examining the book of Immanuel, but examining the historic background. We have not made a thorough study of Isaiah 36-39. But we have looked over those historical chapters and noticed a number of rather important points about them. We may return to them in the latter part of the semester and spend more time on them, may or may not, depending on how long we take on the other parts. We are most interested in the directly prophetic parts in this class. And consequently the careful examination of 36-39 will depend on how much time we have left, after we give as much time as seems profitable for a class of this type in the earlier chapters of the book of Immanuel and related material in chapters 28-35. However, we have looked at 36-39 and noticed ^a~~the~~ number of very important features of them, in order to see the most important events in Isaiah's lifetime from a historical and military viewpoint, which was described in 36-37. Then yesterday we looked at the second most important event in his lifetime from a political and historical viewpoint, the event which was referred to in chapter 7, and this event we looked at last time, the parallel continues in Chronicles, we saw the historical situation there and we saw what it led to, and this is tremendously important in the understanding ~~of~~ of Isaiah. Now in this class, our greatest interest is in Isaiah's

predictions about the distant future. We're interested in what he says about Christ, in what he says about the Millennium, interested in that which he gives which relates more directly to our lives than what he says about the situation of his own day. But the situation of his own day is vital for the understanding of these other matters, given in relation to it. So at present our interest is concentrated on the events of his own period. At present anything relating to a later time we merely glance at in passing, do not try to explain. So we noticed last time this historical event referred to at the beginning of Isaiah 7, and described in somewhat more detail in 2 Kings, with certain additional features added, though many of these omitted in the account in 2 Chronicles, and we have realized a little of the situation which was faced by Isaiah as he went to this ungodly king Ahaz, in order to bring a message to him, which the king was not interested in, and tried to sidestep listening to. Now this message as given here then in Isaiah 7 has two points of the future prediction of the fairly near future. First, that within 65 years Ephraim would be broken so it would not be a people, and we know that it was a lot closer than 65 years, we know that about nine or ten years after this time, the king of Assyria conquered the northern kingdom and took the people off into captivity, and never again has the northern section been a nation, so that what he said would happen within ~~65~~ 65 years happened within nine or ten, but nine or ten would have been long enough for Ahaz to have been wrecked completely if there hadn't been anything nearer. And then of course we know that the second prediction he gave was that if a child was to be born in the comparatively near future, v.16 ~~is~~ tells us that before such a child would be able to make simple choices of what is helpful and what is harmful, before that time, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings, in other words, the area of Israel and the area of Syria, those two great powers, both greater than Judah, which were allied against Judah, both of them would have lost the kings who were now the leaders in making the attack on Judah. And of course we know that within two or three years at the most Tiglath-pileser had made his attack, and this attack which Tiglath-pileser made ~~it~~ resulted in the destruction of

Syria, but resulted in the case of Isarel in reducing it to a petty puppet state with its own king but pretty much subject to Assyria, and Pekah was dead, and Rezin was dead, and we have Assyrian records which tell us of these two events. The death of these two kings both of whom are named, and we have the very interesting historical corroboration of the political factors. We are interested in this course not in corroboration but in interpretation. Question? (9 3/4) Two or three weeks before we have interest in that question at all. But it is more important than perhaps anything else in the chapter but there are other things that are preliminary to it and those are what we are dealing with now. We are now dealing with the historical background and with things that relate to the next few years. There are those who say that this was Hezekiah's (10 1/4) son of Ahaz. But the chronology doesn't quite work out. Furthermore, Hezekiah was not born of a virgin. He was already born before this time. There are those who say that this child is the child mentioned in the next chapter, Mahershalal-hashbaz, the next child of Isaiah, but there are good reasons to ~~feel~~^{show} that that is not so. But that is a matter for later, of great importance, but we're not ready for it yet. Yes? (10 3/4) We are now interested in the use of this child as a measure of time, and we are not told when the child will be born but we are told very clearly in 7.16 that before reaches the age of making simple choices, this event will take place. Well now, that makes it perfectly clear that --to those who hear-- that if this child should be born within the next year, before this child reaches that age, this will take place. Now suppose this child isn't born within the next year, the prophecy would be meaningless to the people, as today, if that alters its import. As far as they're concerned. Now you say, suppose we say this, there is going to be a child born 700 years from now, and before that child reaches the age of 4, Pekah and Rezin will be dead. Well, why say before the child reaches the age of 4, why not before he reaches the age of 30? Why not say before he is born. I mean it has no meaning. But you don't know when the child is going to be born, but if the child, if the mother is ~~almost~~ already pregnant now or in the very near future, if the child is born within the present year, then before that

child would reach this age these things are going to happen. So you don't, the question of when the child actually comes is a different matter. But the thing about the local situation is, the time at which these kings will be gone, this is the immediate assurance that God is going to protect from them, Within the next five or six years both these kings, Rezin and Pekah will be gone. And that of course is an assurance to the people that they don't need to worry. Not an assurance to Ahaz he doesn't need to worry, it's an assurance to the people. Books say, what a comfort to Ahaz, and this, that, or the other. He is not interested in comforting Ahaz. He is rebuking Ahaz. He says, Oh house of David, is it not enough that you have wearied men, but you weary my God also. In v.13 he has no interest in comforting Ahaz, he is rebuking Ahaz, but while he is rebuking Ahaz, He is giving the people who live there, the assurance ~~that~~ they don't have to wait 65 years for safety from this attack. That within five years at the most the two kings will be entirely out of the picture, the two kings who are making them the present danger. ...

M.13. (1/2)

...well that is the assurance then given to Ahaz but Ahaz of course is not much interested as you've noticed. Ahaz is greatly interested ~~//~~ in maintaining the morale of the people, so that the people will fight valiantly to protect Jerusalem, and especially to protect him, from an attack from Syria and Israel, who want to do away with him as king. He is greatly interested ~~in~~ that, but if only they will fight enough to hold the Israelites and Syrians at bay, until Tiglath-pileser comes, he knows he is safe. And he has sent this great tribute clear across the desert to Tiglath-pileser, with the message, I am ready to be your vassal, I will be entirely subject to you, you come and help me and protect me from these people who are attacking me. And Tiglath-pileser, like Stalin and ~~Khrushchev~~ Khrushchev is always very glad to have somebody look to him for protection, and give him a chance to conquer somebody else, whom he wants to conquer anyway, and is looking for an excuse. So that, Tiglath-pileser came and Ahaz had no question but what he would come, but Ahaz ~~had~~ not told the people about his plan, there's nothing told us in Isa.7 here about the

plan Ahaz made. That came to light later and is told in Kings clearly, but Ahaz ~~has~~ made this secret alliance and has sent his representative and his council of State knows, of course, they doubtless were in on the plan made and suggested it to him, but the people don't know. So Ahaz knows that it's true that within five years these kings will be gone. He probably thinks it's a good thing to have the people told that, because they won't have desperation against a force three or four times as big as they are coming against them, they'll know that within a few years that force is doomed anyway, if they can just hold out, God has promised they'll be doomed, but as far as Ahaz is concerned, he knows they're doomed because he has made this wicked alliance with the ungodly power of Assyria to come in and attack them on the other side, and deliver him from them.

But then Isaiah, after he gives this statement of rebuke to Ahaz, of comfort to the people, in v.17 he continues, the Lord will bring upon thee and thy people in thy father's house they that have not come from the day that Ephraim departed from Judah, even the king of Assyria. Now this is the first mention of the king of Assyria here, and Ahaz probably thought well what does Isaiah happen to know about the king of Assyria? Has Isaiah gotten, is there some leak from the council of state, that he heard from them about this? Molston, in his Modern Reader's Bible has a note that at v.17 Isaiah stops talking to Ahaz, and turns his attention away from him, to the king of the northern kingdom, Israel, and assures the king of Israel that the Assyrian king is going to attack. Well, how would Isaiah do that? How would the king of Israel have any idea of anything Isaiah said, out here, outside the walls with Ahaz, who is on an armament inspection tour, just when they're expecting this ~~vigorous~~ vigorous attack from the northern kingdom. I don't think there is any question that he is continuing his rebuke to Ahaz, and he says to Ahaz, the king of Assyria is going to come against you. Well, we read in Kings and Chronicles that he sent to Tiglath-pileser for help but Tiglath-pileser did not strengthen him (4 1/4), we read this. He delivered him from the fear of Israel, and Syria, yes, but he made him come up to Damascus, made him submit to him, probably his army, eventually, when they overran the land, did not merely

stop at Israel, but went into the borders of Judah to some extent. There is no question, I think, to some extent, he is still talking to Ahaz. If he was talking to the king of the northern kingdom, why would he say, days that have not come, from the day that Ephraim departed from Judah? That was a day of calamity for who? For Judah. So he talked to the king of Judah, said you had a great calamity then, you've never had a (4 3/4)

now there is another just as bad as that. The Lord will bring this on you, even the king of Assyria. And it's going to come to pass in a day that is in the future. Now in that day, there are those who say (5) in that day, is a technical phrase which refers to the days of the Lord. I do not think that is a valid method of interpretation. You may find frequently that a certain phrase is used referring to a certain time, and therefore consider the questioning of a case whether perhaps that is what it refers to. But, in that day, we'll find many cases, where it doesn't have to refer to the day of the Lord. It just means in the day that I am now going to speak about, in a certain future time. There will be a time when this will happen, that's what "in that day", what that particular phrase means in its context. Now I'm just making that statement to you, not asking you to take it on my word, but if you will look it up in the concordance and examine the places where it's used, I'll be very much surprised if you don't come to the same conclusion. Otherwise, as you notice as you go on, we'll come across sufficient cases, I think, to make it perfectly clear, but don't worry when some commentary says, in that day always refers to this. I don't care what a man's view is, whether he is premil, postmil, amil, or what he is, I can point to the commentaries of that view that fall into that error, of thinking you can take two or three words, and these words always have this ~~meaning~~ technical usage. You may use words in certain technical usage always with a certain thing, but let's find clear proof of it, before we jump to any such conclusions in any particular case. Very easy to jump to conclusions without evidence. But this phrase simply means in the day I'm going to tell you about, the Lord will hiss for tly in the uttermost part of the rivers of Egypt, and for the bee that is in the land

of Assyria, in other words, ^{armies} armies are going to come from Egypt, ~~from~~ Assyria, and they will come and rest all of them in the desolate vallies and in the holes of the rocks, among thorns and on all bushes. He is looking ahead here, ~~for~~ the result of Ahaz' brilliant scheme Ahaz is going to deliver Judah by getting the king of Assyria to come and destroy the Syrian and Israelite~~s~~ kingdoms. Wonderful scheme, delivering himself from these by bringng in a greater one. Isaiah is saying in effect, ^{you} ~~we~~ are going to get rid of the buffer states between you and them. You'll place you directly next to them, you will put yourself in a situation where there is going to be very serious calamity come as a result. Now is he referring here to immediate thing, or is he looking ahead thirty years or so to when Sennacherib comes and makes his great invasion? I would think the latter is probably the case, at least it describes the situation in Judah, when Sennacherib, we read in chapter 36, takes all the fenced cities of Judah, and most of the land is in his hands, and Jerusalem is in great danger, and the people could only eat what grew of itself, they couldn't go off and plant and till the soil, so he says that it's going to come to pass, there~~s~~ is going to come the time when armies are going to come from Assyria, and from Egypt, and you remember in chapter 37 how we read that he'd heard a rumor, a story that the king of Egypt was coming with an army and actually he met this king of Egypt, in southern Palestine. The Egyptian armies also were brought in, they got rid of the buffer states with the result that they were immediately facing the great Assyrian Empire and the great enemy of the Assyrian empire on the other ~~side~~ side is going to meet it and they form a battlegroudd, so that actually Ahaz' scheme seems very clever for the immediate situation but is very foolish for the more distant situation. It's just like Roosevelt's clever scheme, joining hands with Stalin to destroy Hitler and the result is that you have a worse danger and a greater power than Hitler ever was, not separated from you by Hitler, but facing you directly, and nothing neutral in between. So Isaiah goes on here, and they will come and rest in the desolate valleys, in the holes of the rocks, and ~~on~~ upon all thorns, and on all bushes, in the same day shall the Lord shave with a razor ~~that~~ that is hired, namely, by them

beyond the river, by the king of Assyria, the head, and the hair of the feet, and it shall also consume the beard. Now is this literal? Some people say they take the Bible literally. Every word in the Bible is literal, even (9 1/2) all the covers, because they believe it is the Holy Bible. Well, that's beautiful pious talk but I don't think it shows much careful study of what it's all about, or what the Bible means, because actually you can't take any book literally that ever was written, you can't take the Bible entirely literally, or anything else. But anything you have to take predominantly literally, you have to, when in doubt, try the literal interpretation, and realize that the great bulk of it is literal, with figurative speech scattered here and there, else it makes no sense. You reduce anything to nonsense if you say everything in this is a figure, as some do with the book of Revelation, reduce it to utter nonsense. It can include many figures, but the bulk of the words must be literal, ~~for~~ it reduced to nonsense. But here, you take this literal, the Lord is ~~going~~ to shave. What does that mean? The Lord is going to shave? Well, is the Lord going to shave the king of Judah? The Lord will shave with ~~the~~^a razor that is hired, it's quite evident that what it means is that just as you shave off that which has grown on a person with a razor, that the growth, the prosperity of Judah, is going to be shaved off, and the Lord is going to cause this to happen. And how will it be shaved off? With a razor (that's a figure of speech of course) that is hired. What does he mean? Ahaz immediately thinks my that fellow has got some inkling of my scheme, of what I've been doing. He knows that I sent all--he probably doesn't know much about it, but probably some little word has slipped of the fact that I have sent all this tribute to Tiglath-pileser, to hire him to come on down and deliver me from Israel and Syria. I am hiring a razor to protect me from Israel and Syria. But Isaiah says a razor that is hired, the Lord is going to use to injure me, not simply to protect me, but to injure me. Ahaz would catch the meaning of what ~~is~~^{Isaiah was} driving at, even if he'd say the old fool is trying to interfere in political things that he is simply not up to, he doesn't understand these great matters of state, and we can't be impolite to him now, with all these people around, whose morale we want to keep

high, and they think of him as a prophet of God, but we'll instruct a few of our men, next time we're out on inspection tour, if they see him coming, to put a barrier in front, and not let him get near it. So that Ahaz understands what Isaiah is saying, even if he doesn't believe it. The rest of the people make a guess at what he is saying, they ^{understand some} ~~rest of the people~~ of it, and as time goes on, they come to understand it and be assured that he was a real prophet, and as it goes on it describes exilic conditions. We had already looked at those latter verses in connection with the meaning of the phrase, butter and honey shall he eat, which is not a description, as some commentaries say, of the simple life of our Lord, but is a description of the conditions of depopulation, as is shown by the use of the very same phrases in the latter part of this chapter, in these verses we looked at yesterday. But our present interest is not in studying this chapter to find some truths in it which are most important for us, but to get the historical background of this chapter and of other chapters, which will be of value to us as we approach the more careful precise study of the words in it. But we want to glance now simply from the viewpoint of historical background, to glance briefly at chapter 8. At the beginning of chapter 8, we find the reference there to another message that he gives. Isaiah says that he is to have himself a child, which is a little later, this is a younger child than the child referred to in chapter 7, and he says in verse 3, call his name Mahershalal-hashbaz, which means hurry the booty, hasten the spoil. Because before the child will have knowledge to cry my father, and my mother, the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria will be taken away before the king of Assyria. You notice that is a shorter time, not till he able to make simple choices, but till he is just barely able to mouth the simplest words that a child will ever say, Daddy and Mother. Before he is able to do that thing of making those simple sounds, abba, and umma, before he can make those simple sounds, why the riches of Damascus and the spoil of ~~Samaria~~ Samaria, will be taken away before the king of Assyria. So he continues the Lord says, for as much as this people ...

8:6 ...the walls of Jerusalem there, the ~~walls~~ waters of Shiloah that go softly, and rejoice in Rezin and Remaliah's son (Rezin the king of Syria, Remaliah's son, you know, the king of Israel, Pekah). Now therefore, behold, the Lord brings up upon them the waters of the river, again, this does not mean there is a flood, this is not literal, but a clear picture, a figure of a picture, very clear in the context what it means, he brings on them the waters of the river, strong and many, even the king of Assyria, and all his glory, and he shall come up over his channels, and go over his banks, and if Ahaz heard this, which he probably did, this chapter, if he did, he thought, well, the king of Assyria, strong and mighty, comes and overflows his banks and delivers us. Destroys Syria and Israel. But no, he says, he says, even the king of Assyria shall come up over his channels, and over his banks, and he shall pass through Judah, he shall overflow and go over, he shall reach even to the neck. The stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel. And so the king in later days, when Hezekiah was reigning, and Sennacherib came and filled the land with his army, they saw, ^{how} what Isaiah had predicted was precisely fulfilled, the terrible ~~th~~ result of the plan, clever plan as he thought, that was made by Ahaz. Now we skip over for a moment to chapter 17.

Now chapter is outside our area for this year, but the background of it is the same. The burden of Damascus, you immediately say well this whole chapter is about Damascus isn't it? You read on and find it isn't, there isn't much of it about Damascus. The burden of Damascus. Behold Damascus is taken away from being a city, it shall be a ruinous heap. Verse 3, the fortress also shall cease from Ephraim, and the kingdom from Damascus, and the remnant of Syria, they shall be as the glory of the children of Israel, saith the Lord of hosts. And he tells of how Damascus and Israel the two enemies now that are causing them difficulty, they are going to be overthrown by ^{the} great Assyrian force that will come. Now more than that, now, we're interested in chapter 28, for historical background, and in chapter 28, you have to study into it a little, to see what the situation is, but when you

28: do you find you find clear evidence that the situation of 28 is that there is a banquet of the nobles, probably a day or two before or after what happened in chapter 7. And these nobles are holding a banquet and the people of Judah may think it rather queer for the ~~people~~ ^{nobles} to hold a banquet and have a happy feast, because they're afraid of their lives that the forces of Israel and Syria are going to come and attack, and this is a time for gathering forces and resisting, not a time for a banquet, but after all, nobles have banquets every now and then, so it is not strange if they won't altogether desist in a time of national calamity. But the nobles have a special reason for wanting a banquet because they know about the clever scheme that Ahaz has made. They are privy to it, they're in his council, they understand, they're not telling anybody about it, but they know that they're going to be delivered from Israel and Syria, because the king of Assyria is going to come and deliver them. Now all this I'm telling you now we gather from the chapter, you'll see how, as you go on, how it fits, it is the key that unlocks the chapter. But here is what happens in chapter 28, just as we saw in chapter 7, how Isaiah went out there and got access to the king, when the king didn't want him to, and gave him the message, which the king wasn't interested in hearing, but also got it to the people, here we have the nobles, and they're having a banquet to celebrate the clever scheme that has been worked out, the fact that the mission has already departed secretly to carry this heavy tribute across the desert to Tiglath-pileser to get him to come and deliver them from Israel and Syria. So here they are in the banquet and Isaiah steps in, and the nobles are ~~probably~~ ^{kind of} half drunk. If they were wide awake and sober, they probably wouldn't ever let Isaiah come in, but they never dreamed of this pious prophet Isaiah ever stepping in to their drunken banquet anyway, so they hadn't given word to the guards at the door to watch and keep them out, and of course they are letting a lot of the people--in a banquet like this there is always a lot of (5 1/4) ^{thrown} to the ordinary people, even some fairly good things given to them, people who are partakers of the banquet. The banquet is sort of half open to the public, but the nobles are there, sitting at their great tables, having their great feast, and in comes Isaiah and faces

the crowd and begins to speak, and they say what's this fellow doing, coming in, is he going to give a sermon here at our banquet, throw him out, but before they have time to say throw him out, they hear his first few words, and they sound pretty good, so they let him go on a little. Woe to the crown of pride, to the drunkards of Ephraim, whose glorious beauty is a fading flower, which are at the head of the fat valleys of them that are overcome with wine! Oh the drunkards of Ephraim, oh the wicked people up there at Ephraim, that are attacking us and going to try to destroy us, and we want the people to fight and try and hold them back and this fellow Isaiah isn't quite as bad as we thought he was, he is giving a good patriotic speech now, we're rejoicing how Ephraim is going to be destroyed, and he is going to lead the cheering for us. That's good. So woe to this crown of pride to the drunkards of Ephraim. Behold the Lord has a mighty and strong one, which as a tempest of hail and a destroying storm, as a flood of mighty waters overflowing, shall cast down to the earth with the hand. The crown of pride, the drunkards of Ephraim, shall be trodden under foot. And the glorious beauty which is on the head of the fat valley, shall be a fading flower, and as the hasty fruit before the summer, which when he that looketh upon it seeth, while it is yet in his hand he eats it up. Israel just going to swallow like that. Ephraim their northern kingdom, their present enemy. Well, that's all right. That kind of a patriotic speech isn't bad. We don't mind, even if he is a kind of an old mossback that's giving it. They settle back at their tables, take another drink of wine. This is all right, let's hear the old fellow for a few words anyway. So they settle back and are listening. And in verse 5 he gives them some pious words about the Lord of hosts. That's all right. He'll probably get back to the patriotic theme pretty soon. So they settle back and are not particularly disturbed now, but verse 7 is not very well translated. Says but they have also erred. Well, now if you say they have done something in Hebrew, you know, you simply use a third masculine singular perfect, or the wau conversive with the third masculine plural imperfect. And that's what you use, you don't need to say "they." But here it begins

"But the" would be a much better translation. It's emphatic. Just "they" have done it, the verb carries "they have done it." But this has the "the", the (7 3/4)

which could "they" but it's emphatic, it's stressed. But "these" and can't you just see him stretch out his hand, and he points to the nobles there at their tables. But these also have erred, through wine and strong drink are out of the way. Oh well, it was nice to hear him speak about the people of Ephraim, but is he going to speak about us too now? Well, maybe we should have thrown him out when he first came in. But now he has gotten under way and he is really talking, straight ahead, and it's kind of hard to get up the initiative now to jump up and say "throw the bum out," when he has already been going a little and you've let him talk this long, well if he doesn't get any worse than this, maybe we can listen to a temperance speech for a few minutes and then he'll get back on the patriotic theme again. But these also have erred through wine and strong drink, are out of the way. The priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink. They're swallowed up with wine, they're out of the way through strong drink. They err in vision, they stumble in judgment, for all tables are full of vomit and filthiness, so there is no place clean. Well, that's just pretty strong language, but of course he saw that they were half drunk anyway, and if he had started that way, they would have thrown him out right away, but now he's got them kind of listening, and they let him go on a little further, and however, in verse 9, we find them beginning to get disturbed. And I think it is proper to say that v.9 is probably not Isaiah talking, but that it is the nobles objecting. They turn to one another and say, who is he going to teach knowledge to, who is he trying to make understand doctrine? This baby talk, you mustn't use liquor and get drunk and all that sort of thing? Them that are weaned from the milk and drawn from the breasts. With precept on precept, precept on precept, line on line, here a little and there a little. Is he talking to us just like baby talk with this morality that is good for little children? Doesn't he realize the strong men that are going to carry on the battle against Ephraim, have got to have a little relaxation? And in v.11 Isaiah answers, answers what they're probably saying to each other,

and yet some of the people could hear what they said. Isaiah could hear it undoubtedly, because he picks it up and says in v. 11, but with stammering lips and another tongue, will he speak to this people. That is, you won't listen to the simple straight childlike presentation of the truth. You say, that's baby talk, we don't want this simple talk of your old-fashioned doctrine. Well, he says, with stammering lips and another tongue will he speak to this people. What does that mean? It means the Assyrians ^{that talk a language} ~~will talk a sound to~~ that sounds to them like stammering, another tongue, ^{they can't} ~~another~~ understand what they're driving at. He says these people to whom he said, in verse 12, this is the rest wherewith ye shall cause the weary to rest and this is the refreshing, they would not hear. So he says the word of the Lord has got to be to them precept on precept (picking up the nobles' words), precept on precept, line on line, line on line, here a little and there a little, that they may go and fall backward, and be broken and snared and taken.

Wherefore hear the word of the Lord, you ~~s~~ scornful men that rule this people which is in Jerusalem. Here it is very clear ~~who~~ ^{one} is talking to, the nobles who rule the people in Jerusalem. Because you have said. Now they are thinking about their arrangement with Tiglath-pileser. They're thinking about it, they haven't told the public about it, they don't think he knows about it, but he says because you have said, we have made a covenant with death and with hell are we in agreement-- ~~When~~ the overflowing scourge shall pass through, it shall not come near us, for we have made lies our refuge and under falsehood have we hid ourselves. We've paid a good sum to Tiglath-pileser, we've told him we'll be his vassal, now he'll come with his great force and sweep across Syria and Israel, and destroy them, and it won't hurt us. Therefore, says the Lord, behold I lay in Zion for a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation, he that believeth shall not make haste. If you're putting your trust in God, you wouldn't have to be going with these clever human schemes of making an alliance with an ungodly nation and sending these tributes to Tiglath-pileser to get him to come. He that believeth shall not make haste, but you have made your clever scheme, with hell you are in agreement, and you've made a covenant with

28:17
 death. Therefore he says, in v.17, judgment will I lay to the line, and righteousness to the plummet, and the hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies and the waters shall overflow your hiding place, and your covenant with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell shall not stand, when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, then you shall be trodden down by it. And in v.20, he again pays his respects to the agreement that they're making with Tiglath-pileser, he says in v.20, for the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it, and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it. A vivid picture of the fact that this clever scheme, they think, is going to protect them from Syria and from Israel, and make them safe from the great aggressor of Assyria, because they will be his vassals and his slaves, actually isn't going to work. The hail is going to sweep away the refuge of lies, they'll find the bed is too short, the covering too narrow, to deliver them from the attack that is coming. And so this, we notice in chapter 29 now, how in 29 he looks forward still further, and sees the result of Ahaz' clever scheme further. Woe to Ariel the city where David dwelt. He says the situation is ahead, that you are going to have this terrible calamity of Jerusalem in constant danger of destruction, this terrible situation, but he says God is going to deliver you from it. Looking forward to Sennacherib's invasion, which the door has been opened for by Ahaz making his alliance with Tiglath-pileser. And so we have these two parallel passages in ...

M.15 (1/2)

...we have these two parallel passages at the beginning of chapter 7, we have the Isaiah appearing before the king and telling the king, that God is going to punish them because they won't trust God, the implication being, you are trusting Assyria, and then going on; a razor that is hired is going to sweep over you and going to actually cause terrible damage to you. Now in chapter 28 he talks to the nobles, he tells them, your agreement with hell will not stand, your covenant with death will be disannulled, the covering is too narrow to wrap yourself in it, the king of Assyria is going to sweep over the land, and Jerusalem is going to be reduced to that terrible situation from which, he says in chapter

28, God is going to ~~miraculously~~ miraculously rescue Jerusalem. So you see how the section of chapter 7 ff and 28ff are parallel --same time, same historic situation, same general line of discussion, but addressed to different people. One to the king, one to the nobles. And as you have that in mind you notice other places where the parallel is there, but there is a difference because in one case it is the king he is concerned with, the book of Immanuel (1 3/4) and in the other case it is the nobles and the people as a whole he is concerned, but both in the same situation and both looking forward in general to the same future events but from a little different viewpoint, and with the stress on different passages in it. So you notice how in chapter 28 here as I went through it, as you have these factors in back, you have the key that unlocks it, it just falls in line, the chapter makes perfect sense, but if you take the chapter without this knowledge of the background, you look at 28, and you take verse after verse and what does it mean? It is meaningless to you, you have beautiful verses, but to put them together to get sense out of it, to see what it means, you'll say we got a lesson in this verse, another lesson in this, another lesson in this, but there is no continuity, no integration, no real meaning to it, until you get to that. Yes? (2 3/4) Use of figurative language is a thing which to some extent is universal. All people use figurative language to some extent. But there are people who are particularly adept in the use of figures, people who use a great many figures and use them excellently, and then other people try to imitate them and make an awful mess of it. Use figures in a foolish way, in a flowery way that is just all flower and no meaning. But a person that is expert in the use of figures is, it's typical of them and it's typical of Isaiah to use figures. His whole book is full of beautiful figures. But a figurative language does not necessarily mean obscure or unclear language. In fact, figurative language often is clearer than direct language. You say, that the soldier was a lion in the fight. You don't mean that he went up to the enemy and chewed them up with his teeth, you don't mean that he clawed them to death with his fingernails, you don't mean anything like that, but it is not literal language, it is figurative. But it is perfectly

obvious what it means, you mean that he showed the characteristics of bravery, courage, of tremendous force and power, you say it all in ordinary language and it 's not beautiful, you express more meaning in the one statement, he was a lion in the fight, than you have given in a whole paragraph of attempting to state it in ordinary prosaic language. There is nothing that is necessarily unclear about figurative language, that is, unless you put too much of it in, and then it gets to the point where there is no meaning to it. ~~/~~ To me, figurative speech is like a little ~~/s~~ salt that you put on a dish. Here is this stuff cooking on the stove, you take a little salt, sprinkle it on, it adds greatly to it, but you take a whole bunch of the salt and pour it in, you ruin it. And if you take a passage and say this is all figurative, there is one commentary I could show you on revelation, everything in it is a figure, nothing stands for itself, everything is a symbol of something else. Well, that reduces it to utter nonsense, when you use figurative language to the extent that you try to make everything figurative, you make it all nonsense. But the few figures interspersed here and there, add to meaning, add to clarity, and add tremendously to beauty. And it is typical of Isaiah to use beautiful figures, to use a great deal of excellent figures. Well, of course we have to learn to understand the figures, and we don't have headings, in the manuscripts that say, this is the historic background of this, this is the situation when he spoke, that is not explained to us. Often we have sometimes, like in Isa.7, we have a little introduction the first three or four verses, tying it down to the situation, often we have to go into it and see what it says, and see what it relates to. But it is one, 300 years ago there were men who went through these predictions in Isaiah and wrote long commentaries on them showing how here was the 30 years' war, here was the attack of the Margraeves on Brandenburg, here was the attempt of the pope to resist, here was the interference of the Duke of Bavaria, they had all the history of their century just given in Isaiah. And that attempt to make it all a prediction of precise events in the future, naturally had something to do with the reaction among those ~~///~~ ~~/~~ who say, no, Isaiah is dealing with the politics of his day, and make it all dealing with that. The fact

of the matter of course ~~is~~ that Isaiah is tremendously interested in events of his day, but the important thing in relation to the events of his day is to show God's answer, and God's answer to a large extent relates to God's plan for the future. And so we have in these sections wonderful promises about God's king and God's people as they are to be in the distant future. And we ~~have~~ all sorts of direct declarations for the future but not given just in a vacuum to tell you something about the future, but given to give those people there the message God has for them, and at the same time a message which will be vital for all of ~~us~~ ^{God's} people in all subsequent times, so that as far as we're concerned, this (7 1/4)

is interesting and illustrates many things that are vital, but that which is most vital is in the midst of it, and in connection with it, what he says about God's king and God's people in days to come. And there is a great deal of it, But when we take isolated verses we get many very interesting things, and then when we interpret those in connection with what we already know about God's plan, we can use them as proof texts to hang some beautiful lessons on. But when we take them in the light of context and see what he is really dealing with, we get the true meaning of them, which is often exactly the same meaning as we would get if we take our New Testament as our starting point, but we are getting it in a way God gave it, instead of our taking something and reading it back into it. And we also get a great deal ~~of~~ ^{out} of it that we don't get when we simply go ~~th~~ these words to get something we already know from the New Testament. We get what is there, and then we see how it fits together with the New Testament. So that I think perhaps this covers the historic background sufficiently for introduction to the book of Immanuel, and then next time we look at chapters 7 and 8, as far as ~~we~~ get, much more in detail. Please go over chapters 7 and 8 ~~//~~ rather carefully, and be ready to look in detail ~~into~~ ^{8 1/2} their precise meaning. (record starts again at 9 3/4)

...we have ~~been~~ ^{been} looking at the historical background of the (9 3/4) Syro-Ephraimitic invasion, after having first looked at the historical background of the later invasion of Sennacherib, and we noticed a number of chapters where you could see either one of these as the

important thing in the background of the discussion. Now I asked you for today to look over chapters 7-12 and to divide it into its later sections. And I'd be interested to know what sort of division you made. What is your first major section here? Mr. Gblin? It would certainly be difficult to make a major division anywhere inside of chapter 7. There is pretty definite unit there. The only place one might be suggested might be at the end of verse 16, but after all, there are many points of connection, between what follows 16 and what precedes. It seems to make a pretty definite unit, but when it starts with chapter 8 it deals with a new series of events, not having the king so specifically in mind, and it would seem a rather natural place to make a division, at 8.1. How many of you made the division at that place?

Well, of course the term major, there is a question, how big you're going to make it, but what I mean now is, oh, I asked you to take the section from chapters 7-12 and to divide it into not less than two nor more than seven, didn't I? And Mr. Gregory's suggestion was that of the group he made, which is not more than seven or less than two, chapter 7 would be the first division. Now if you were dividing only into two sections, you certainly wouldn't make it here, would you? So it depends how you divide it. Did you make a larger division, Mr. Miller? (11 3/4) No subdivisions at all? (stu) No, but to make major divisions, not less than two. One is less than two. (stu) Sure. Now that's the way I meant it, if the whole thing could be one division, then what would be your next step on it: seven, or six, or two, or what? That's what I meant. And of course it is possible to have six chapters so tightly bound there, you can't make any division, but I think that unlikely. Now the rest of you all agree that the end of 7 would be the major division, now where did you make your next, Miss Luke? (12 1/2) The whole of chapter 8 a unit, ending at the end of chapter 8. How many agree? Two. Mr. Abbot, what did you make? (stu.) Very suspicious of any division at the end of chapter 8. It's pretty hard for me to see how you're going to make a subdivision between v.22 and v.1. Now in the Hebrew Bible they make their subdivision a verse later, they have chapter 8 having

23 verses and chapter 9 begin with the next. It seems to me that if you're going to make a division here, verse 2 would be a much more reasonable place to make a division on the basis of the type of material than the beginning of verse 1. Of course you say we find in the New Testament, that verses 1 and 2 of our present, verse 23 of the Hebrew, other chapter, plus one of this, are quoted together. Therefore, according to Matthew they go together, therefore, that being the case we will make our chapter division either before or after that division of two verses. Now that is very reasonable, but on the basis of quickly looking at the type of material you have here, you could imagine yourself very easily starting a new section. The people that walk in darkness have seen a great light. That could be thought of as starting a new section, but take 22 and 23, and ~~make them~~ ^{they shall} look into the earth, and behold trouble and darkness, dimness of anguish, and they shall be driven to darkness. Nevertheless the dimness shall not be such as was in her vexation, when at the first he lightly afflicted the land of Zebulun. How do you get a division between those two verses? It's very very difficult to find any reason whatever for a division there, it's just the fact that the archbishop put one there, and he was not inspired, of that I am certain. And I certainly don't see any reason whatever for a division at this point. Now you might argue a division somewhere near this point, but to point one at this point, I just see no grounds for it whatever, except the fact that we have a chapter marked here in our Bible. The material of verse 1 of this new chapter and the last of the previous chapter is identical. And so I would say if you're going to make the division here, it would be between verses 1 and 2 as the Hebrew Bible has it, but since Matthew says there is no division there, he says those two go together, then if you're going to put it before, I'd put it not just before the two verses, but further back. Yes? (15 1/2)...

M.16 (3/4)

...change direction between v.1 here and verse 22, in what direction? What change do you find between v.22 and v.1? What change of direction? You're using the KJV, aren't you? Well, do you see any change of direction? Behold, trouble and darkness, dimness

of anguish, they shall be driven to darkness. Nevertheless the dimness ~~shall~~ not be such as was in her vexation, when at the first he lightly afflicted the land of Zebulun and the ~~land~~ land of Naphtali, and afterward did more grievously afflict her. ~~by the way~~ It's all looking back to what it was in those days, and comparative dimness, you just mentioned the dimness, now you compare the dimness ~~again~~, the vexation--why on earth would you make a division there? (skt) 1 3/4) What is there that's better? The dimness will not be such as was in her vexation. Instead of pitch dark, it will only be nine-tenths dark, wouldn't it be? There is no light in that verse. In the English. Of course there is: he lightly afflicted the land, but that was at the first, and then later it was more grievous. It is getting worse rather than better, isn't it? As it stands in the KJV? (1 3/4) It means it's getting brighter, the thing he is saying is getting brighter, is the thing he has just been talking of. And there is nothing in the KJV to suggest a sharp break with the new section, but rather perhaps something of a change of direction, perhaps a very slight change of direction, but if you want a change ~~of~~ direction, look at verse 21, they look ~~upward~~ at the end of that. Why don't you have your change of direction right there? Or go back to 19. My Bible has a ^{paragraph} chapter division at 19, well it ~~certainly~~ would seem perhaps as if there is something, a ^{paragraph} chapter division between 18 and 19, perhaps if they took a chapter division they would have translated that "while" as "nevertheless." Nevertheless when they shall say to you, Seek to them that have familiar spirits, and to wizards that peep and mutter--now going on to talk about how you're not to follow these soothsayers, and these evil spirits, there is nothing about them before. That might be a break, your new subject, or you can find a relation between this and the one before. But between 22 and 1, if the subject is that the dimness and misery they had before is a little bit less now, it still is the same misery, just a slight change of direction to make a major division within our passage there, would seem to ~~me~~ to be without any evidence. Yes? (3 1/4) It is getting, I mean it is the same thing making a gradual--and you take in the morning here and it's pitchdark and then you begin to see a little light in the sky, it gets a little

brighter and a little brighter and gets brighter and all of a sudden the whole thing is light, you can see everything. But where are you going to make the sharp division when the sun comes up over the hill, and you see that sun, there's a sharp division. The way we make it usually is we get somebody on the edge of the ocean, or somewhere, where the ground is flat, and when he sees the sun come up, you say that's the division, but unless you're right at that point on the ocean, it differs, it'll differ 20 minutes, depending on whether you're beside the high mountain, (4 1/4)

whether you're up on top of the mountain looking down--to make a sharp line, it's very, very difficult. Now if you're talking about conditions in Ephraim, and then you stop and talk about conditions in Judah, or you talk about Ahaz and then you quit and start talking about the prophet's wife, or if you're talking about a condition of darkness and then you say now there is a sharp contrast and there is a condition of light, well, that might be a sharp division but it gradually changes. It would seem to require a continuous narrative, and the whole impression here, if there is a sharp change, the natural place to find it is between verse 1 and 2. Because v.2 is all light, and there is between the misery that you seem to find in v.1 and the bright light that seems to be in v.2, there would seem to be perhaps a sharp break. But between, it's immediately, it's possible to interpret that v.2 has the bright light which begins to shine in v.1, but you can find perhaps suggestions of its beginnings in v.22, certainly in v.21, there's a gradual movement there, that it is pretty hard to make any sharp line in. Well, what was your next division after that one-- Mr. Abbot didn't make one till 10.4, he put all this together. Now did the rest of you go from 9.1 to 10.4, or how far did you go? Mr. Gregory? (5 3/4) 7 and 8 of chapter 9, you think there is a division there as important as the division at the end of the chapter? Between 21 and chapter 10? (stu.6) When you look at the material from v.8 on and the material from back of v.7, say from 2-7, you find 2-7 is a marvelous prediction of wonderful good things in the future. And you don't find even the slightest hint of any such a thing between v.8 and v.21, that I know of.

Verse 8 and 21 is very very different in material from v.2-7, very different. So different, what I would incline to think one would be much wiser, instead of having divisions at the beginning of chapter 9, or of 10, that you have a very important division here, between 7 and 8. Not only that, but at this point we go right back. We've been looking way into the future, haven't we, in v.6 and 7, way into the future. The zeal of the Lord of hosts is going to perform this, going to give us a wonderful thing way in the future, but in v.8 we come right back to the time Isaiah is talking, and he talks about Ephraim which is attacking them, and the inhabitants of Samaria and all their side, and they didn't last much longer after this, another ten years and they're gone, so this is a really primary division right here. And whether you're going to take 8.1 up to 9.7 as one section or whether you're going to make a break somewhere in between, might be--I don't know, you might make it one section to 9.7, but if you're going to make a break between, I would think one of the worst places to make it is the place it is. I would incline to think that v.19 might be a decent place for it, although you can find a similarity between the wonders and signs God gives in v.18, and the human evil type of signs in 19, so you might feel there shouldn't be a break there, you might feel it is better to go back say, well, somewhere earlier, I don't know. It's pretty hard to find a good place for a break, where there is a real sharp change of subject or type of material between 8.1 and 9.7, but at 9.7, between there and 8 there is a sharp change of material and it's indicated by a whole new introduction, the Lord has sent a word to Jacob and it has lighted on Israel-- introduction to a new section. This would be quite an important division. Now how many made a division at the beginning of chapter 10? (8 1/2) Why did you do that? A continuous discussion of this important theme of the matter of the Assyrians, God's instrument for His work, and the pride of the Assyrian, and so on, starts in v.5, and goes right on through at least to the end of the chapter. That is a very primary division there. Very important division, at chapter 10.5. But before that, the previous four verses are rebuking the people of either Judah or Israel, for their sin. It doesn't say which, but it

certainly is God's people ~~He~~ is rebuking, and if you'll notice, if you'll start with v.8, of chapter 9, you have God's rebuke to the people of Ephraim for their pride, and v.12 it has the words: For all this his anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still. Then from v.13 on, you have the sin of Israel pointed out, the end of 17, you have a refrain: for all this his anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still. Then v.18 follows, has the words of the poem of rebuke for their sin, and the end of 21 says, for all this his anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still. And then 10.1: Woe to them that decree unrighteous decrees, and so on, again rebuking the sin of the people, and ending in v.4; for all this his anger is not turned away but his hand is stretched out still. You have a ^{poem} ~~form~~ of denunciation and ending with a refrain which is four times repeated with just about the same distance before each one. So you have a definite unified poem here, on the ~~same~~ theme running all through it, and with the refrain at the end of it. So from 9.8 to 10.4 is very definitely a unit, which whether at 9.8 is a major or minor division, it certainly is a very definite ~~divi~~ and vital division, and it starts a specific poem, ^{with} ~~and~~ four stanzas and a refrain at the end of each stanza. Yes?

(10 1/2) The last part of chapter 8 is telling the people that God is going to deliver them from Damascus and Samaria, which will be overcome by the king of Assyria, and then he goes on, in v.5, v.6 and rebukes them for their human plans to get protection, instead of looking to God's protection and tell how God is going to bring against them the king of Assyria, and so we have rebuke now, against the people for their sin, which continues most of the time up to 10.4, but which is interrupted by a marvelous picture of God's future mercy upon them, at the beginning of chapter 9. (stu.) Yes, they're closely related, no question about that. Of course, the whole book of Immanuel is closely related, but in this section which is closely related, you come up to a climax. You look up to a marvelous vision of the future, that's the climax, then you start again with your rebuke, and this rebuke doesn't reach a climax but goes along on a level. But there are two passages of rebuke and a passage of (12) blessing, and the blessing forms a climax to previous

passage of rebuke from which there is no sharp separation, while the following one has a sharp end to the wonderful future picture, and then we start right back in the present with our rebuke, so there is quite a marked change of attitude between v.7 and 8, even though the general theme is the same. ...certainly an important division, end of chapter 4, and v.5 starts his discussion about Assyria, and this discussion of Assyria now, you have a chapter division at the end of 34, and there is a change of scene, but whether you make this much of a ~~major~~ ^{major} division here, question might be raised, because you have such a close connection, between the two. There you have the mighty Assyrian empire, which is pictured like a great ~~forest~~ ^{forest}, like the ~~forest~~ ^{forest} of Lebanon, this mighty empire, what happens to it? V.33, the Lord lops the boughs with terror, the high ones of statue shall be hews down, the haughty shall be humbled. He cuts the tickets of the forest with iron, and Lebanon shall fall by a mighty one. Here is the great Assyrian empire far off, but there comes forth a rod out of Jesse, the Branch grows out of his roots. The mighty Assyrian empire, which is like the forests of Lebanon, falls and is ended, but the little stock of Jesse, this little root which seems to have been dead, this one sends forth a new shoot, a new thing comes up from it, there's a conflict between the downfall of Assyria and the rise of the kingdom of the descendant of Jesse, which is very marked there, so that there is a very close relationship between chapter, the early part of chapter 11 and the last part of chapter 10, so that while there is enough of a change of subject to make a division there, a big argument might be made for continuing right on, from the picture of Assyria, to the contrasting picture of David's greatness. And then again when you get to the latter part of chapter 11, there ~~is a~~ ^{are some} sections that are a little bit hard to be just sure what they refer to, whether they are back to the present again. Surely you'd all put chapter 12 in a separate division. ~~§~~

Chapter 12 is surely quite distinct from what precedes, it is a brief song of joy, and quite distinct from what precedes and here is one of the four places where the King James Version used the word Jehovah, 12.2...

...for this rapid summary of this. Now we saw the background in chapter 28, and in the --as well as chapter 7 of the Syro-Ephraimitic invasion, and the clever scheme of Ahaz to gain protection by buying off the king of Assyria, and then he saw how this was--God rebuked him for it, and told him to take one evil to protect him from another evil, might sound like a clever human scheme, but ~~th~~ was nothing for the servant of God to do, and in the end it would backfire on them and bring them more harm than good, even though it brought temporary good, and then that terrible harm that would come, God would protect from it, but purely of His mercy and His grace, as a sign of His protection. Yes? (1 1/2)

I would say that the break between chapter 6 and 7 is a marked break, and the break between ^{chapters} 12 and 13 is a marked break, this is a major division of the book, but now to take this division and divide it naturally into sections, chapter 12 seems pretty definitely to form a unit, and chapter 7 pretty definitely makes a unit. Then it would impress me that chapter 10.5 there is a very marked division, perhaps that is the clearest division in those four chapters, that one right there, then the next clearest I would think is 9.8, and the, probably a division should be at the beginning of the chapter (2 1/4) but I wouldn't see any at the beginning of chapter 9. ~~X~~ I would find it too difficult to know where to put it.

There is a change, a big change, but a change that is gradually introduced, and you can't say where it comes, If you're going to make it sharp you have to make it v.2, but I don't think you have to make it sharp, I think it can very easily be understood as coming gradually, but you can't prove where it comes. Just can't tell, it's like when it is gradually getting light, you say now the night is ended and the day is begun. Unless you get beside the ocean where you can see the sun come over the horizon, there is just no way to tell. You say the day begins when it first begins to get light, well, too much depends where you are, whether you're in narrow streets, or out in the flat desert, or in the mountain region, wherever you are when it begins to get light, you couldn't say.

And if you're going to say it's when the sun first comes right on^{you,} well of course it has been light quite a while before that moment. And how to make that division? You know,

now you're here and now you're here, but where in between do you leave one or the other is very difficult. But when you come to 9.7 you reach a climax and then you start back here again, and between reaching the climax and starting back again on the rebuke is very (3 1/2)

You have to change your tone of voice at least, just about have to imagine he's starting now to give a second discourse on the same subject. We're not so interested in trying to make a final outline, that is the proper division, because sometimes a writer writes with such a fixed final outline in mind and other times he doesn't, so we're not anxious to stick to an outline on something unless it's there, but we're anxious to find what is there, and to see where the real points of transition are. And then we go back to chapter 7 which we see is pretty definitely a unit, even though 7 is very closely related in thought with what follows in 8, because in both 7 and 8 God is declaring that Ahaz' scheme is not going to work and He is rebuking the people for making this scheme. I think if you're going to make an argument against the division in the middle of 9, you could make a bigger one against the ~~beginning of division~~ ^{division at the beginning} of 8, because the subject is exactly the same in 7 and 8. Only that he is talking to the king in 7 and he isn't in 8, but he is talking about exactly the same thing. There's this clever scheme of Ahaz to get deliverance, the scheme isn't going to work, going to backfire, that's the theme of both sections. The people have turned against God, the Assyrian is going to come as a result of this scheme, but God will deliver them from the Assyrian but still the people are headed for misery, that's the theme of the two chapters, and it's unified all through the two chapters, and then his complete, ultimate deliverance, at the beginning part of 9, and then starts over again, beginning with 9.8.

So now in chapter 7--chapter 7 is of course one of the very best known chapters in the whole book of Isaiah, and it is one of the best known simply because of one verse of it, v.14, that is --to Christians that is one of the best known verses in the whole Old Testament, probably there is less known about the context of it than there is of many, ~~most~~ most other favorite passages, most people know very little about the context of it, but the verse

itself is an outstanding verse, no question about it. And of course the critics say, that it is ridiculous to find Christ in this verse, because they say what comfort would it be to Ahaz, that 700 years later Christ would be born? The two kings that are causing all this trouble, they'll be gone before this child is here, well anybody knows they'll be gone in 700 years and a whole lot of other worse ones will be gone too. That doesn't prove anything. Why worry about this? How can this be talking about Christ, they say? This must be a sign for Ahaz, a sign of comfort for Ahaz, that is what they say. And the superficial reading, very, very superficial reading of the chapter finds in it, Isaiah went out to give Ahaz a sign, and he says, Ahaz, do you want a sign? Ahaz says no, I won't ask for a sign. All right, God will give you a sign. Within this length of time, there is going to be a child born and within this length of time there is this deliverance, so that you've got your sign to comfort Ahaz. But of course that is a very superficial examination because Isaiah is not the least bit interested in comforting Ahaz. ~~Is~~ Isaiah is rebuking Ahaz. He says hear ye now, O house of David, is it a small thing ~~for~~ for you to weary men, but will ye weary my God also? Therefore the Lord Himself will give you a sign. Is the purpose of the sign to comfort Ahaz or is to rebuke Ahaz, or is the purpose of the sign to give an assurance to the people, to give them an assurance, an evidence of the truth that God is there, that God is speaking, to give them a better understanding of the whole situation, and to include a rebuke to Ahaz. ~~There is~~ all that involved? And I would think all of that is. And what would Christ have to do with that? Well, who does he talk to? Does ~~He~~ He talk to the house of David. Here you have a house of David. Well, what is the house of David? The House of David is those whom God has promised will always have one to sit on His throne. And why does God say there will always be one to sit on his throne. Because David is so true to God. Because David is a man after God's own heart. Because David seeks to turn away from his wickedness, and to follow the Lord and to be His and rest entirely upon the grace of God. Well, then, David's house is a continuing thing. And hear ye now, O house of David, is it a small thing for you to weary men, but you weary

my God also? Well God has said the house of David will always have one to sit on the throne, the house of David is going to have God's blessing. Isaiah says that's what the house of David should be, but the house of David today is represented by a most unworthy son, the leader of the house of David today is one who is not ~~interested~~ interested in the Lord's will, not interested in the Lord's promises, is resting on his own selfish clever plan for his own protection, for his own continuance, and he is looking on Isaiah as a nuisance, he uses this very pious language, which he doesn't mean a word of, "I won't tempt the Lord," he just means let's get through with this business so we can get on with the material things that matter, instead of this spiritual hogwash that you're presenting to us, and ~~that~~ is the type of man he is and God says will ye weary, is it enough for you to weary men, you'll weary my God also? God is going to give you a sign, God is going to replace this unworthy representative of the house of David, with one who will truly carry out the marvelous promises to David. One who will be a man after God's heart, one who will follow God. God will not always be satisfied to have the house of David, directed and led by men so unworthy as this. And therefore O house of David, hear, God is going to substitute for Ahaz, one who will be a true representative of God; in fact, who will be so truly a representative of God that he can be called Immanuel. Now when Jesus came they didn't tell his mother the name of Immanuel, they said name him Jesus for He will save His people from their sin. So His saving His people from their sins is a more important aspect of his character than his representing "God with us." But this also is an important element of it, a very important element of it, and with this one, Ahaz, who says let's forget God, God is way off there somewhere if He even exists, let's go ahead with our clever schemes, God's on the ~~of~~ side of the strongest battalion, why he ~~is~~ over against that, this is the one who is God's true representative is going to be actually God with us. Well now of course a person at the time might think that simply means God is caring for us, God is with us, he represents God. We find eventually that it is even more literal than that, that it actually is God with us, His name is Immanuel, He is indeed

"God with us." And now this one, Immanuel, who ~~is~~ introduced here then, Immanuel is not simply an imaginary somebody in the distant future. Even though ~~He~~ does not yet come, and we don't know when He is going to come, He is one who actually is the real representative of the house of David, He is the one who really is the ruler of this area, even though He is not yet here visible, and so we find over in chapter 8 that v.5 says, the Lord spake also unto me again saying, forasmuch as this people refuses the waters of Shiloah that go softly and rejoice in Rezin and Remaliah's son, now therefore behold the Lord brings up upon them the waters of the river, strong and many, even the king of Assyria, and all his glory. He ~~says~~ ^{shall} come up over all these channels and go over his banks, shall pass through Judah, shall overflow and go over, shall reach even to the neck and the stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel. Immanuel here then is a real person. He may not be here yet visibly, but ~~He~~ is a real person, such a real person, that this land is His land, and it is in defiance of God's promise that the Assyrian comes, but the Assyrian comes because it is necessary to rebuke the unworthy representative of the house of David. So it is called Thy land, O Immanuel, in 8.8, which is a rebuke very tightly tied with chapter 7. And then the Lord has pictured how the king of Assyria, Sennacherib is going to come into Judah, say, 30 years later, going to come even right down into Judah, going to attack Judah, going to fill that land with ~~his~~ army, the king of Assyria is, and the result of Ahaz' clever ~~w~~ scheme which backfires and results simply in removing the buffer states and putting Judah right next to Assyria, where one of these days Assyria will come and attack Judah, he is going to come right in to Judah, and so then God addresses the Assyrian, in v.9, with his mighty army. He says, Associate yourselves, O ye people, and ~~ye~~ shall be broken in pieces; gird yourselves, and ye shall be broken in pieces. Take counsel together and it will come to nought, speak the word, and it shall not stand. What an assurance in 9 and 10, that the great attack of the king of Assyria is in the end to be a failure. It is not going to be successful, we are told about six times in

these two verses, that it is going to be wrecked, God will not allow it to succeed, and why will God not allow it to succeed? Well we're given the reason in v.10 at the end, "for Immanuel." Now we have the word "Immanuel" at the end of v.8, and it is transliterated, O Immanuel, but in this case they translate it and put a word in it, you notice it is in italics, inserted, "for God is with us." And of course that brings us to the old question...

M.18 (1/2)

...name, shall you transliterate it, or shall you translate it? Often very hard to know. And there we have Immanuel twice within four verses, and in one case the King James Version translates and in one case it transliterates, and it's exactly the same thing, word for word. Now of course to the Hebrew of the time hearing it, Immanuel means God with us. Whether you say God with us is a name or whether you say "God with us" as a declaration is immaterial. The same word, Immanuel means "God with us." And if you want to say God is with us, in Hebrew there is no word, you just say, "With us, God/" And that's your way to say God with us. So that in Hebrew when you say Immanuel you don't whether you mean God is with us or whether you're giving the name of one who is called, "God with us." You don't know, of course, you wouldn't maybe think of ~~there~~ there being anybody with the name "God is with us," but you've just been told in the previous chapter there is going to be someone. So this is a problem which is very difficult for the translator to know what to do, and when uncertain, well, let's do both, let's do one one time and one the other, and that's all right if you know Hebrew and you immediately recognize that that's what is done, but for the English reader he doesn't see that it's exactly the same thing, and they've done it one way one time and one the other. Fact of the matter is that we must connect the two because it is the same thing, we have ~~Ø~~ Immanuel three times in these two chapters, the child is going to be born and thou shalt call His name Immanuel. That is the command, so we have a person called Immanuel introduced in chapter 7. Now we are told He is going to fill the breadth of thy land, O

Immanuel. What sense would it make to say he'll fill the breadth of thy land, God is with us. It wouldn't make any sense. It is quite evident it must be a proper name and we've already had the (2 1/2) But then we go three verses further and we say: speak the word, and it shall not stand, for Immanuel. Well in English that doesn't make any sense because Immanuel doesn't convey to us the meaning, God is with us. But the meaning must be not simply the statement "for God is with us." But, "for this is Immanuel's land." We are told three verses before he'll fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel, but now we're told Immanuel is going to protect His ~~and~~ land. He -- it will not stand, for Immanuel. It is true, it is because God is with us, ~~but~~ it's more than that, it's because this is specifically the place where God is particularly with us, because this is the land of Immanuel, this is the land of the sons of David who is going to be true assurance of the fact that God is with His people, who is going to be the true Immanuel, so Immanuel is introduced in chapter 7 and twice referred to here in chapter 8, and we can rightly call the whole six chapters the book of Immanuel. So we have evidence in chapter 8, O Immanuel, for Immanuel--if you're going to take the text as it is, well, ~~to say that~~ ^{to say that} this Immanuel in chapter 7 is just a son of Ahaz, or son of Isaiah or somebody born at that time, there is no warrant for the use of Immanuel twice in that ~~chapter~~. And neither would it be any rebuke to Ahaz, which is what the situation calls for, and of course, the way it's introduced, the almah will bear a son, and this word "almah" is a comparatively rare word, a rather unusual thing to say, the almah will bear a son, the word is only used about 8 or 9 times, in the Old Testament. ~~There are~~ ^{it is a} comparatively few uses of it, ~~they're~~ rather uncommon word, it's quite out of the ordinary, to use this particular word. This is something out of the ordinary, to use this particular word, this is something out of the ordinary, the almah is going to bear a son. Well, now, when it comes to what does that almah mean, --I was up at Campus-in-the-Woods, and there were some girls there from Wellesley College, and they're--Wellesley was founded by a very godly man who wanted to form a school where women could get good thorough Christian training, so he founded

that college to be a place where it should be required that they should have to take a lot of courses in Bible, all of his money was given with that express stipulation, so today it's one of the most stylish colleges in the country, one of the leading women's colleges, and they have to take more Bible than any other woman's college in the country, at least any other woman's college of any age, but the Bible is all taught by rather extreme modernists, and so they go there, and some of them from pretty good Christian families and get their faith pretty badly wrecked, and there were a few there in connection with the Inver-Varsity representative in that area, who at that time was a graduate of Faith Seminary, and who was talking to these girls and who managed some of them tide over so that they kept their faith, in spite of that teaching they had in class, and then up at Campus-in-the-Woods, I was able to help some of these girls, giving them answers to some of their problems, and this one question they ~~af~~ raised to me was this: that our professor says that the idea of ~~versions~~ virgin here just comes from the Septuagint. It's not in the Hebrew, no word virgin, it comes from the Septuagint, and as that's given, it comes from the Septuagint, not from the Hebrew, well it sounds like a devastating argument against the prediction of Christ, but look at the facts of it. When was the Septuagint translated? about 200 B.C. Was it translated by Christians? No, it was translated by Jews, about 200 B.C. And these Jews come to this word here and it's not the word for young woman, the word Naarah for young woman occurs over and over in Scripture, but they come to a rather uncommon word almah, and they translate this word by the regular Greek word for virgin, ~~h~~ what does that mean? As the Jewish member of the RSV Committee said, that the Christians have perverted the Septuagint and have changed ~~the~~ it and put Christian things in it like in this case. There is absolutely no evidence of any such thing, every copy of the Septuagint we have has virgin in this place. And if these men thought that virgin was the best way to translate that word there, it means that to them that was one of the characteristics involved in this word almah. Now it doesn't mean that this word is the specific word for the fact that the woman is a virgin, the emphasis in the word is not necessarily on

virginity, it is a description of a woman, one of whose characteristics is that she is a virgin. You read in the New Testament ~~ab~~ about the ten virgins who went, ten wise virgins and the ten foolish virgins. Well the emphasis there isn't on virginity, virginity is not a vital point in that passage, it's one of the points, they were ten young women, ~~the~~ associates of the bride, and they were young women, doubtless unmarried young women, they ~~w~~ speak of them as virgins, but in Old English, the word virgh was used a fair amount simply to mean a young woman, ~~who~~ who was a virgin, but the ~~em~~phasis isn't on the fact ~~tha~~t she is a virgin. Now I think the word maid is used in English quite a bit in that sense. Seems to me King Henry VIII, ~~or~~ ^{or} one of the kings told of some woman whom he married, and when he ~~ma~~rried her he said he found she was no maid, by that he meant he found she was not a virgin. ~~In other words~~ ^{Now the word} maid today I think has lost that significance. But this is not the specific word, there is another Hebrew word, which is the specific word for ~~virg~~ ^{virgin} but this word is the word for a young woman who has as one of her characteristics that of being a virgin. I was much interested to see a little pamphlet put out when ~~the~~ the RSV first came out, put out by Prof. LeSor of Fuller Seminary on the word almah in Isa. 7.14, and Prof. LeSor said, in his pamphlet (maybe 20 pages long) that if--he started in with the statement, that if conservatives are to have any standing in the scholarly world, we must recognize those things which are established and which are recongized, and he said you look in our three best Hebrew ~~d~~ictionaries, and they all say, that almah means a young woman of marriageable age whether married or not, therefore, we must accept that that is what the word means. I think, is it "young woman" it says ~~in~~ the RSV? And it says Footnote: //or "virgin." But he said we must accept that if we're ~~going~~ going to be scholarly. Well, he mentions in the footnote his three leading Hebrew dictionaries, and they all three were editions of Gesenius, three different editions of Gesenius, and one of them that he referred to was the edition of Gesenius by Tregellis, the great English scholar of the last century who was a very, very godly man, and when Brown, Driver and Briggs was out of print 30 years ago, just couldn't get copies of it, Eerdmans here reprinted Tregellis'

translation of Gesenius' dictionary, and it was reprinted and available, I got one at that time, and I looked up in it immediately and I found it said "almah, a young woman of marriageable age, whether married or not," Square brackets, and there is a square bracket of four lines, which has Tregellis' initials at the end of it, it says, "the above meaning is an indication of the anti-supernaturalistic bias of Gesenius in interpreting the word this way. Actually the word means 'a virgin.'" Signed Tregellis. And LeSor gave that as one of the three Hebrew dictionaries which insist that the word means a young woman of marriageable age whether married or not. And evidently he didn't look very carefully into his dictionaries. But then the funny thing was, he went on in his article, first thing if we're going to have any scholarly standing we've got to admit it ~~because~~ because all three of the leading dictionaries say it. Actually a dictionary doesn't determine what a word means, usage does. Examine the facts, see what the evidence is. Well, he went on then and gave some very, very involved arguments on the basis of etymology, to try to prove, from the basis of the root that it can't mean a virgin. But then etymology doesn't prove what a thing means, you can't prove by etymology, all it does is to suggest, because words change their meaning in the course of the years. ~~By~~ Etymology never proves, merely suggests. He gives this long involved argument from etymology and then after he does that, strangely he takes up the case where it speaks about Solomon and about the women, the wives and the concubines and the almahs in his court, and he says, now in this case, the word must mean virgin because whatever other class could there be? And actually if you're going to determine what a word means, the only way to determine it is usage, so he gives a good argument against his major thesis, in his argument, which was very confused and strange sort of thing. But now Dr. Robert Dick Wilson, forty years ago, wrote an article on the meaning of almah in the Princeton Theological Review, he took up all the cases and looked into them, and he felt that he proved from these few cases that there is no case it is used where it is not, well, where we are not justified in considering that it is referring to a virgin. There is no case where you can prove that

it is a married woman, or that it is an impure woman. Prof. Raven of New Brunswick ~~said~~ Seminary, when I had the course in Prophets from him at Princeton Seminary, he said that this word almah, he said there is one case where he thought it sounded very much as if she wasn't a virgin, but that is the case where it speak about the way of a man with a maid, and I thought he was reading an awful lot into the passage to feel that that looked as if she were not a virgin. Of course as you go on and look at the succeeding verses which are rather cryptic you can interpret them that way, but I don't see that you have to. But the tendency of the liberals a few years ago, was to get rid of the supernatural element altogether and say "young woman" in Ahaz' time, and that's that. But then Prof. Greshman in Germany, representing a new mythological trend, he began to say that it must mean virgin, that the whole context is one of marvelous supernatural birth, and that was his approach to it and the commentary on Matthew by Plummer, not the one in the ICC series of which Plummer is an editor, but which is written by a different man, but Plummer wrote a commentary ~~to~~ ^{on it,} himself ~~which is~~ he quotes with approbation ~~on~~ from Skinner upon this. But it's an unusual word to use in that connection, and it's pretty hard to be dogmatic that we can absolutely be ~~dogmatic~~ certain this word could never mean anything but a virgin. But the evidence is very strong in that direction and the fact the Septuagint translators 200 years before the time of Christ would translate it virgin seems to be a pretty strong evidence, before they had ever heard about the virgin birth of Christ, that's the way they took the word, and so I think we are fully justified in thinking that should be the translation in this case. But this is a declaration to Ahaz that God will not always put up with this sort of leadership for the house of David, but that He will provide His own leader of the house of David, who will truly be God with us, and this is Immanuel's land, and after all, that's why God's mercy was there in Palestine, all those years, it was preparing the way, for the coming of Immanuel, for the coming of Christ, the coming of the one who was promised, who would bring salvation, well, we continue there tomorrow...

...
 we are continuing now in our examination of ~~Ex~~ Isaiah 7, and we have noticed the relation to the historical background and there are one or two questions about the precise relation apart from this, to the historical background that we need to look a little bit more closely into. The first verse connected up with the situation shortly before the Assyrian conquest of Israel and Syria, and the conquest of Israel, you remember, was not made a complete conquest, a puppet king was allowed to remain for a few years, and then he rebelled and then the attack came, and it was incorporated in the Assyrian empire. Damascus ⁱⁿ ~~and~~ Syria was immediately incorporated shortly after this, so we know that this occurs about ten years before the actual end of the northern kingdom. In v.15 we are given the promise that the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings, within a comparatively brief time. So this actually took place within a very few years, we know, after this first deal between Ahaz and Tiglath-pileser, because Rezin king of Damascus was killed, by the Assyrians. Pekah king of Israel was probably killed by some Israelite~~s~~ who thought their only hope of escape from the Assyrians was in turning against the king who was fighting the Assyrians, at any rate, both of these kings were killed within a very brief length of time. So that this specific prediction of v.16 was then fulfilled. Now we have, as we noticed yesterday, v.14 is the rebuke to Ahaz, but the promise of blessing to the house of David. Rebuke to the house of David for having an unworthy sion now, promise that God's wonderful promises of blessing to the house will indeed be carried out, that there will be a member of this house, a head of this house, who will truly represent the fact of God's presence with His people, who can--His proper won't necessarily be Immanuel, but this will be a designation of His character. He will truly represent God's presence with His people, when it actually took place, we saw that it represented it to a fuller degree than perhaps anyone would have imagined, among Isaiah's hearers, because actually, He is not merely a sign of God's presence, but He actually is God present with the people. He is God with us, the man. Now we have 14 then, having this purpose of bringing this assurance of carrying out the promises to David, and this rebuke to the un-

worthy sion of the house of David who is there now. We have verses 15 and 16 are continuing to give a sign, an evidence, of the fact that it is God who speaks, an evidence of that in^{the} fact that the prediction ~~was~~^{is} literally fulfilled, that within a very few years, the two kings are gone and are no longer a menace to Judah. There is, in its time relation, a sharp jump between verses 14 and verses 15 and 16, and this sharp jump of time has been a great problem to many interpreters. There are those who try to explain it by doing away with any supernatural in it, any looking forward to the future, they say how could Christ's coming be a comfort to Ahaz, forgetting that in the context Ahaz is not offered comfort, but rebuke. But they say, how could Christ's coming 700 years later be any comfort to Ahaz, facing the Assyrians, therefore, they say the virgin here is just any young woman, and the child promised here is the son of the king or some other son, some other child born at that time, perhaps the son of Isaiah or somebody, and they say that he is introduced in order to give this time measure, showing an extra year. Against that, of course, is the fact that it is given as a rebuke to Ahaz, not a blessing, that the phrase "a virgin shall conceive" is one which, even if it isn't the specific word for virgin, nevertheless does convey very strongly the suggestion something very striking, something very remarkable, something very much out of the ordinary in, and it certainly is very much out of the ordinary if it is an actual virgin birth. We know nothing of that day, we have no knowledge of (5 1/4) to be compared to this. And that the son who is promised is called Immanuel. This name being an indication of God's presence with His people. And the fact that this Immanuel is personified over in chapter 8 in two expressions, this land is Immanuel's land, for Immanuel is an individual of great importance in the whole situation. Mentioned to you yesterday, I believe, the two references in v. 8 and in v. 10, the fact that the land cannot be destroyed, this whole thing can't be brought to an end, because it is Immanuel's land, so there is strong reason to think that v. ¹⁴~~13~~ is a prediction of some marvelous event that is to take place that will

prove God's presence with His people but does not say when it will take place. But as far as ¹⁵14 and ¹⁶15 are concerned there is no question that they take place immediately, and I would put them together. Well, some people try to say there is one child in v.13 and there is another child in v.¹⁵14 and ¹⁶15--or I mean one son in 14 and another child in 15 and 16. But if so, who is this other child? We know of no one who fits it. Hezekiah would seem to already to be a young man, at least a sizeable lad at this time, it could hardly have been Hezekiah. The son of the prophet would certainly not fit this situation, and anyway one of his sons was already big enough to come with him to this meeting, and the other son was not yet born till some time later, not yet conceived until some time later. So, that, just who the son could be is quite a problem. To my mind the problem is best solved, by saying, as I think I stated yesterday, the promise ~~is~~ is given of the Wonderful One coming, it is not said when He comes. Therefore, when you go ahead to use His age for a time situation as a sign in this immediate situation, it would seem to be understood that if he was conceived right now, if he were to be already in the womb of the virgin, that then before he would reach such an age, this situation would have taken place. Now there is an interpretation of it which is quite common, and that is what is called the double fulfillment interpretation, and I have even heard people talk about the law of double fulfillment. I have never been able to figure out what is meant by a law of double fulfillment. Does it mean that anytime you have any prediction it is going to be fulfilled twice? I don't know really what it does mean, the law of double fulfillment. But we must readily admit that it is possible for a prophecy to be fulfilled more than once. Jesus said there will be wars and rumors of wars. Well, there have been probably a hundred wars since that time. So that's been fulfilled not twice but a hundred times, and when you predict something which is a series of events, that series of events which is predicted naturally involves more than one occurrence. So that anytime you say that things are going to happen in a fuller way, then there remains the possibility of two, three or even a hundred fulfillments. But when you say that a specific thing is going to happen, I do not feel that

you have any warrant to say that it is going to happen twice. It may be God's plan for it to happen twice. But it doesn't seem to me that the prediction necessarily has any relation to it in such a case. If someone ~~were~~ to say there is a student--if someone had said two months ago a man who was a prisoner of the Communists in China is going to come as a student of Faith Seminary--well, you were ~~were~~ in chapel last Tuesday heard Mr. Chen tell very briefly, in very brief fashion, about the torture he went through when he was a prisoner of the Chinese Communists, and how marvelously the Lord brought him out, you ~~could~~ now say that prediction made three months ago has been fulfilled. But somebody else would say, oh, no, there is to be a double fulfillment, there is going to be one like that next fall. Well, there might be one like that next fall, but as far as that prediction is concerned, that prediction doesn't prove there will or won't be, that prediction has been fulfilled.

But now suppose I had made ~~that~~ prediction three months ago, I said to you there is going to be a student here who was tortured by the ~~Chi~~ Chinese Communists and God marvelously delivered him and he is here, and then supposing that instead of Mr. Chen coming this ~~sem~~ester a man had come who had been ~~a~~prisoner of the Russian Communists, and who had been tortured by them but whom God had marvelously delivered, you might say well this has been fulfilled here. You say, no, Dr. MacRae predicted one tortured by the Chinese Communists, this one was by the Russian Communists. Well, you'd say, I guess there is going to be a double fulfillment then, the other will be next year. Well, that would be unlikely. It would be ^{that} if I had said ^{--if} ~~that~~ I was an inspired prophet, and I said, by the Russians, and the one was by the Chinese, you'd say this is not the fulfillment of ~~that~~ prediction, the fulfillment is still future. It ^{would be} ~~is~~ one or the other. If I ~~said~~ there are going to be students who have been, then one wouldn't fulfill it, and when two came, you couldn't say it hadn't been fulfilled, but you couldn't say it had, you ~~wouldn't~~ be sure. But you'd know it was more than one. In other words, if a prediction is given as a specific individual prediction, we have no right to say it's got to have two fulfillments.

There must be some indication of such a thing, and I feel that a tremendous lot of confusion has been introduced into the Scripture by taking predictions of Antiochus ~~Ep~~ Epiphanes ⁱⁿ ~~and~~ Daniel and saying these are adumbrations of anti-Christ, these are predictions of anti-Christ, but they're not, they're predictions of Antiochus and they were fulfilled in him. But along with the predictions of Antiochus, ^{Epiphanes,} which are wonderful in Daniel, made 300 years or 400 years ahead of time, marvelously describing exactly what he was like, along with them, there are other predictions which do not fit Antiochus, predictions which I believe are definitely predictions of the anti-Christ, but we have to, I feel, to say is this a prediction of Antiochus or is it a prediction of the anti-Christ, and we will find some of one ^h _C type, some of the other. When you find a prediction that God is going to bring the people back to the land, you look at the terms of it and see just how great a thing it is described as being, and then you may say, isn't it marvelous how this prediction here was fulfilled, when the news came back to Zerubbabel after the Babylonian captivity. Somebody else says no, that was a marvelous fulfillment of certain prophecies but this prophecy is too great a thing, it is far greater than that, it (12 1/4) from all over the world is in a way that that wouldn't fit. This must be another coming back later. As someone could have said 20 years ago, the Jews are yet going back to Palestine in great numbers, because there are predictions of a return which were not fulfilled in the return to Israel, but there is no double fulfillment. It is one or it is the other. If you have an individual specific prediction. Now in this case, of all cases, the idea of double fulfillment is not applicable, because a double fulfillment doesn't fit at all here. You take the first, v.14, that is a prediction of prophecy, it ~~ex-~~actly fits Christ, it is not a prediction of anything that I know ^{of} that happened in the time of Ahaz. I know nothing there that you can say is the fulfillment of v.14. You look at 15 and 16, and 15 and 16 give a marvelous statement about something that is going to happen in the time of Ahaz. They are fulfilled at that time. I know of nothing in the life of Christ, that can be considered as a fulfillment of these two verses. So when

someone says we have double fulfillment they have to assume somebody in the time of Ahaz, of whom we know nothing whatever, as that side of the double fulfillment for v.14. And assume some relevance of these phrases to Christ, of which we have no evidence, for the second part, and to my mind it is much simpler to say v.14 refers to the distant future, 15 and 16 to the immediate situation. How are you going to explain the jump? Well I explain it by saying that we don't know when ~~he~~ he is coming. If he is coming now, this would be the situation. Some try to explain it this way and say in v.14 he describes Immanuel, in v.15 when he says butter and honey shall he eat, he points to Shear-jashub his son there, --butter and honey shall he eat when he is able to choose the good and reject the evil. And he is pointing to him. Well, that is not impossible, but my guess is that if that is the case he would have an emphatic pronoun in Hebrew instead of an ordinary verb, which would seem to carry on what was stated ...

M.20. (1/2)

...now maybe he was just a babe in arms and carried, but it seems to me likely that when he said go and take Shear-jashub your son and go out there and give a message like this, a man wouldn't ordinarily carry a babe in arms. It seems to me most likely he was a young lad, but there is still something of a mystery in this, but I think most of it is pretty clear. I think that what it means is quite --just that one problem of the transition between v.14 and 15, ~~here~~ ^{which} still remains something of a problem. Yes? (1 1/4)

Well, it depends what you mean by a type. If by a type you mean an illustration, if you mean a similar figure, he is undoubtedly that, and Daniel is occupied, about half the prophetic sections of Daniel, are occupied with describing the situation of Antiochus Epiphanes, and about half of them are occupied with describing the anti-Christ. Some chapters specifically speak about the situation in the time of the Greek supremacy which is when Antiochus Epiphanes was there. And then there are others which speak of four kings, of which the Greek is the third one. Of course the critics try to make out that the Greek is the fourth one, and that the writer imagined a ~~an~~ ^{Median} immediate kingdom which never

existed as a separate unit. They try that way to imagine that they're both Antiochus , but unless the writer was completely confused on his history, why, the fourth one is the Roman empire, and if the fourth one is the Roman empire then it couldn't be Antiochus Epiphanes, must be some later ~~phase~~ ^{figure,} and there are chapters which talk about this later figure, and there are chapters which talk about the figure in the time of the Greek empire. And the two are so similar that it is a very good reason to tell about both at the same time, to make the prediction of what is going to be 400 years later and the prediction of what is going to be maybe 2000 years later. But I do not believe there is ^a ~~the~~ chapter in Daniel which has a lot of material on one of them, where there is any confusion as to which one it is, it is made quite clear. The one place where there could be confusion is in the 11th chapter where you have the course of the history detailed up to Antiochus Epiphanes, and you tell about Antiochus' character, how he becomes king, his general activity, and his end, and then again you say he will be, and you describe character, general activity and end. And it has been the view of many Christian interpreters, going back as far at least as St. Jerome, that this last continuous he will do this, that, or the other, which follows the first α' is anti-Christ and that the writer jumps forward a couple of thousand years from speaking of Antiochus to speaking about anti-Christ. The critics say it is all anti-Christ, and then they say the last part of it, the character there does not fit Antiochus, it is similar but not identical, some things that don't fit ^{anti-Christ.} The career definitely doesn't fit anti-Christ, doesn't fit Antiochus, and the end doesn't fit Antiochus, so they say that the writer was confused and said things about Antiochus that weren't true because he didn't know, and that he made predictions about the future. He was writing during the (4) and he made predictions about the future which didn't work out. But they don't say that about the earlier part which fits Antiochus exactly (4) and to my mind there is a definite jump forward there, and it's very interesting to see the commentary by Edward J. Young at Westminster on the book of Daniel, and in this book he is

constantly tearing into the interpretations of the dispensationalists, constantly. He is very strong anti-premillennialist. When he says dispensations I think he means premillennialism, but of course the term dispensations is used in many different senses, by many different people. But here, when he comes to this chapter he gets to--the first part is Antiochus, there is no question about that, but then at this point, he says there is a jump forward. Now he says, what does the rest of this mean? He says many views, now, there is the view of these people, the view of these, the view of these, different ones, and among them, he says the views of certain dispensationalists who say that this is a ~~view~~ Jew who is anti-Christ. And there is the view of certain other dispensationalists who say that this is a Gentile who is anti-Christ, and then there is the view of other people who say it is Antiochus and different ones, he gives all these false views, then he gives his, the correct view, that it is anti-Christ. The correct view is that it is anti-Christ, the false views include one that is the view of those dispensationalists who say that it is a Jew who is anti-Christ and the other that of those dispensationalists who say it is a Gentile who is anti-Christ. So he says the two dispensational views are false, so I'm just wondering how his view that it is the anti-Christ, how he can be neither a Jew nor a Gentile. It's rather amusing. It shows how people, when they let their prejudices run wild, where it's apt to carry them, even people who are in general quite careful in their statements. Once in a while they go haywire. Yes? (5 3/4)

In that case, now that is a very important case. People come to Moses and they say to Moses what are we going to do when you're gone. How are we going to know what to do? Moses says to them, a prophet like unto me will the Lord raise up from among your brethren, him, unto Him shall ye hearken. Well, now, what happened? They went into the land of Palestine and they had prophets, God sent prophets like unto Moses, and these prophets gave them God's message. Sometimes they hearkened and sometimes they didn't, and there was a series of these questions, and these prophets were good men, and they did good work for God, but they all had their faults. Now Moses had his

faults too, but no one of these prophets was as great as Moses was, and so the prediction, the question was how will we know during the centuries to come what the Lord's will is? The answer is the Lord will raise up a prophet. In other words one prophet isn't going to live through all the centuries, it's a series of prophets. I don't like the word "prophetic office", I don't believe there was an office, but I believe--now Young does believe that strongly--but I believe that the Lord raised up a prophet here, a prophet here, a prophet here, in different situations, none of them as great as Moses. And as time went ~~on~~ on the people would see, this prediction of the way in which we are to know the Lord's will, its being fulfilled, as He promised, in the time we are in the promised land, ~~by~~ prophets coming, and they are like unto Moses in that they are men who receive God's message and give it to us, but they are inferior to Moses. Now when he said like unto me, we have reason to think that he means not only that the series is going to be somewhat like him, but that there will be one who will be the prophet, the one who will be like unto Moses, in fact, even superior. And so when John the Baptist was out in the wilderness, we read in Jn. 1 ~~that~~ that the Jews sent messengers asking him who are thou, art thou that prophet, and he said I am not. When they say, that prophet, they mean the prophet predicted in Deuteronomy, the one who is to be like unto Moses. And so there is a case of a prediction of a series reaching a climax, and the situation in the question which is being answered, so that the answer in that case is not an individual, but a succession. But a succession reaching a climax, in one individual who towers way above the rest. It's an interesting case and an important one, I'm glad you raised it. I've given a course in Daniel two or three times and there are a lot of interesting problems in connection with that, so this (8 3/4)

Mr. Golin? (9) I would say that when we look at v.15 to know what it means we find a little difficulty, now the Hebrew there isn't butter that you go down ^{to} the store and buy, not the expensive spread, that is here being designated, the Hebrew word can just as well mean curds. It indicates a pastoral product, the product of the cow, and of the bee,

curds and honey shalt thou eat. Well, now the chances are that in a settlement in which there are a lot of people living rather crowded together, as there would be in most of those towns, that around the town the people are cultivating the land quite intensively, and the bulk of their food is made^{up} of the grains that they grow, and the vegetables, the product of the soil, and the product of the bees and of the cows are less common, and are something of a delicacy. But when you get a great depopulation, so that there are less people to ~~have~~ have the demands for these products, of the bees and of the cows, and you have also less people to grow the crops and the land goes to thorns and thistles, and so on, why it's much easier then to raise the cows or to hunt for the honey that the bees leave, than it is to go through the long process of growing the crops, and there are less people to use them, and the result is that the normal situation is turned around by

(10 3/4) and what was the delicacy becomes the fairly common thing, and what was the common thing becomes something that is harder to get. So we have a situation described in v.22, which shows that condition. We read, let's start from 21 and look from there to 25, to see the description of the situation. And it will come to pass in that day, that is to ~~day~~, there is going to be a day. This phrase in that day, I'm quite sure means there will be a day. The way I used the phrase, the way I have always used the phrase, I mean the word that, "that" has meant the thing^{of which} I have just been talking,~~about~~, unless (11 1/.2) That's the way I've always used that, but I waan't married very long before I found that my wife often uses "that" in a very different sense, I don't know whether it was the group she was brought up with used it in a little different sense than I had, but she often uses that as something she is now going to talk about, which has not previously been in the ~~o~~ conversation. She very often uses it that way. I never had before, till we were married. ~~But~~ looking at the usages in the Hebrew, I came to the conclusion that while 'in that day' may mean in the day that we have been talking about, it is more apt to mean in "that day" the one I am now ~~goin~~ going to come to, which I am pointing ahead to, in "that day." There is something

I ~~am going to~~ call your attention to, that is going to be like this. It is a designation that something is going to occur sometime. It does not say necessarily related to a past occurrence. There is one case here in Isaiah, I don't have in mind just exactly where it is, but there is one place here where we have the phrase used about four times in a row, a few verses apart, and I believe that two or three of them are clearly the one just spoken of, and one of them is very clearly a different one from the one previously spoken of, which I think makes it absolutely certain, that it is used of--the day I'm going to tell you about now is like this, "that day." Now there are people who say "In that day" is the technical term to point to the day of the Lord. Now it is possible for anything to come to the use of a technical term, we can use anything as a technical term, we fall into the habit of it. In most sciences you deliberately decide that you will use this as a term for this thing. When I had botany we had a teacher who got great joy from telling us that a strawberry was not a berry. He got great joy out of telling us that, and he had two or three such statements. (Mr. Cohen: It's an aggregate.) Yes it is an aggregate, it's not a berry. Well, now, it was called a strawberry long before it was ever called an aggregate. The scientist has a perfect right to say I am going to use the word "berry" for the specific sort of thing, having said that within the limits of that science, it is incorrect to call something by that name which does not fall within that. He is adopting it as a technical term, but then it has no right to go back to a book written by somebody before that technical was adopted and say when that man spoke of a strawberry he was talking about something different from what we mean by strawberry now, because our present strawberry is not a strawberry but an aggregate. Yes? (stu.14 1/4)...

M.21. (1/2)

...that is a very important problem to which you've called attention, I mean it's the same thing, the matter that we have a right to take a term within a science and make a technical term of it, but having done so, doesn't mean that people outside of that science are required

to be explained in accordance with that rule, and if you want to find what a word in any document means, you see how the people of the age or surroundings when that was written, used that particular word. So we find that the word "fish" used in the time of the Israelites meant something that lived in the water, and under that definition, a whale would be a fish of course. Under our present biological arrangement we find that most of the creatures that live in the water are built in a certain way. So we decide to take that word fish and use it for creatures built in this way, ^{which} ~~we~~ have sufficient similarity that the theory is adopted that there is a relationship between them, we can't prove the relationship but the assumption, the things quite similar are related. Well, then we find something that lives in the water that is quite different, but that has more features in common with mammals which ordinarily live on land, therefore from our definition it is not a fish, but we have no right to take this definition back and ^{insist that people} should have used this definition before it was adopted as a definition for a particular word.

Just like the debate that I read one side of a year or so ago, between Harry Rimmer and Riley, head of the school in Minneapolis, you know who I mean, don't you--he was a noted fundamentalist leader, W. B. Riley, yes. A very fine fundamentalist leader and a very active man for a number of years there, and there was a debate between him and Harry Rimmer on the question of the days in Genesis. Are these days 24 hour days, or are they long periods of time, and Riley took the position they were long periods of time. I've seen Riley's side of it, but I was sent a copy of Rimmer's side, which Rimmer answered. And Rimmer started saying how happy he was that this was a debate between Christians over a difference of interpretation simply, and that it wasn't a bit like the debates that both of them had with unbelievers, over vital points of faith. This was merely a matter of interpretation, which it is. But then he goes ahead and very cleverly makes fun of Riley and Riley's outlook. It's very comical how he does it but not particularly logical. But Riley points out that during the first three days the sun, moon and stars have not yet

appeared. They appear on the fourth day, and therefore, Riley says, how are you going to have 24 hour days if you don't ~~have~~ sun, moon and stars. And Rimmer in his answer, says, well suppose that the earth is surrounded by a mass of clouds so that you can't see the ~~se~~ sun, moon and stars at all, the whole earth is so completely surrounded that there is no alternation of light and darkness even. He said that doesn't make any difference, because he says a day isn't a matter of what you see, he says, ~~a~~ day is the length of time that it takes the earth to revolve once on its axis. And he said this is exactly the same whether there is light or not. Well, I'd like to ask Moses whether that is the way he would define a day. I'd like to ask the people who listen to Moses whether that's what they meant by day. The word day means what the people meant who used the word day then. And if you look at Genesis 1, you find that he calls the light day and the darkness night, and there is never a day in that sense of 24 hours long, they vary from a few minutes to perhaps 23 hours, or something, in certain parts of the world. Well, maybe at the north pole it might be six months, I don't know. You'd have a hard time finding a day that was 24 hours in the sense of the light, and then of course they have the definition in Genesis 2 where it says that these are ^{the} generations of heaven and earth in the day when they were created, which is covering the whole thing in one. It is the use of day for a long ~~period~~, unquestionably, and Jesus said, Abraham saw my day and was glad, Which day did ~~he~~ mean? He didn't mean one day, he meant a period, very obviously.

But then the word day came to be used when people would hire out to work for six days they would work for six light periods, and they came to use the term for the light period with the dark period that preceded it, and it's my impression that up till about two, or three hundred years ago, day was regularly used everywhere ^{or at least in most places,} ~~for~~ the dark period ~~plus~~ the light period. And the dark period plus the light period, not more than twice a year, ~~at~~ the least, would equal 24 hours. It is always a little different, because our days are always getting longer or ~~always~~ getting shorter. They wouldn't be exactly

24 hours. It is--and ~~most~~^{those} people didn't even know the earth revolved on its axis, to say nothing of their having a specific technical term for the time it takes the earth to revolve on its axis. They use a day for the dark period, plus the light period, and that's why he said there was evening and there was morning, the first day. It is--we use it as a technical term, and sometime within the last couple of hundred years, ~~we~~ decided to take the dark period, divide it in the middle and give half of that to the day after and half to the day before, ~~it~~ instead of doing like they used to do, ~~have~~ the dark period first and then the light, and among the Jews today, the--for religious purposes, the older system is still used. I met a young woman on the train once, who told me she was connected with a group that put on ~~w~~ some kind of plays in New York, and she said they didn't start until 9 o'clock at night, on Saturday night, so that people in Brooklyn could look up and see the first star and know the sabbath was over, and then it would be all right for them to take a subway to come to New York, to come to the plays, and they're using ^{it} in the sense in which everybody used it up till the last couple of hundred years. Now we have a technical usage there, but we have no right to fasten our technical usage upon the speaking of it before the technical usage was introduced. Yes? (7 1/2) The common use of the term is for the light period, that is the most common use. (stu) Well, now that's getting a little remote from Isaiah, but I think we can take a couple of minutes on it. To point out very briefly the way I deal with ~~that~~. I say in Gen.1 the word day is used, several ~~times~~, now what does this word day mean? Well we find in Gen.1 it is used for the light period, and we find in Gen.2 it is used for a long period of time, and later on in the Bible it is used for a dark period, plus a light period, and we find it is used for long periods of time, and for the light period alone. Now which of these three does it mean in Gen.1? Well, I say the way to find out, I say in the first place, we can't be dogmatic and say it must be one of the three, there all three used, we must look for evidence which of the three it is. You can't say the word must be (8 3/4) but we look at ~~what~~ He says about it and we ask which of the three does it mean. So we look at

the very beginning, God said, let there be light and there was light. Well, right away, you say, that doesn't take any long period of time. Why should it take God more than 24 hours to make light. But I say why should it take ^Him 24 hours to make light. Why should it take ~~H~~im more than one instant. So as far as that case is concerned, your day might be ten minutes long, there is no knowledge how long it is. But then you look along a little bit, you don't know how long these different ones take, verse 4, let the waters of the heavens be gathered in one place. And it was so. Well, what does that mean? Let the waters be gathered together? Did all of a sudden these waters which were here be here, just like that? The Lord can do it that way if He chooses. Or did He say now let all these waters come (9 3/4) like this with a tremendous bang, so it's accomplished within 15 hours or did He say let these waters gradually come over so this change is made and this other condition occurs? Well, we can't say, we're not told. But then we get on to verse 11, and here we find that He says, let the earth be covered with grass and earth and trees, trees with tree rings in them, as if they were a hundred years old. Let the earth suddenly be covered by all these, and it was so. That's not what He said. He says let the earth bring forth grass, the earth-yielding seed and the fruit tree yielding fruit after its kind. And the earth brought forth grass, the herb yielding his kind and the tree yielding (10 1/2) fruit after his kind. And the same thing is true of the sea animals. Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creatures, and It doesn't say let it be covered with them. God could in one instant say, let there be trees all over the earth, standing very high, hundreds of tree rings in them, let all this be here instantly. He could say that, but that's not what He did say. He --the picture is one of gradual rise of these things, gradual dissemination, gradual coming out of these things, that's the picture. Well, now God could say let these trees sprout right up, just like a rapid movie that condenses into an hour what would take a year to show the growth of something, let them just grow up fast like that, ^{He}~~you~~ could do that if He chose

but there is no word here in the passage to suggest it was done in an unusual strange way like that. To me these sound passages sound much more likely as if what occurred in the coming of the grass and the trees and what occurred in the coming of the sea animals, and what occurred in the coming of the land animals, was a long slow process, which might conceivably take millions^{or billions}/of years. So on the basis of what Moses described, I feel that his picture sounds to me more as if what he [?]imagined happened was something which occurred over a long period, than what he would think of as happening within the period of one alternation of darkness and light. So that my feeling is that on the words as they're stated there, the impression given if you look exactly at what it says, it seems to me is much more as if it was millions or billions of years, than as if it was a period of 24 hours. God could have done it the other way, He could have done it in 12 or 6 seconds, why ~~should He take~~ ^{does He need} six days. We are just told we have a succession of periods, and there are six divisions, six cycles you might say. Yes? (12 1/2) My personal opinion is that if Moses has thought of it as having happened within 24 hour days, he would either say, and it came up very rapidly, or something like that. These things sprung up with lightning speed, or something like that, or else that he would say, and there the earth was covered with trees, let the earth be covered, rather than let the earth bring forth. (stu.)13 Well, ~~it~~ could be revealed through documents, if it was revealed through documents, I would think, it's not impossible, but I think highly improbable that someone in the time of Abraham, when the Babylonians and others were busy writing imaginary stories of creation, wrote these stories which was more or less true, and that God led Moses to omit the incorrect portions of the story and to keep the correct in such a way that God enabled Moses out of this imaginary stuff to construct a true history. Now I think that is possible but highly improbable. I think it much more probable that God did one of two things, that He either dictated the account, so that Moses put down the very words God gave him, or that God gave Moses a vision in which ~~if~~ he saw these things happen. And that Moses described the vision which he saw. And I would think that is

perhaps the most likely, that the Holy Spirit led Moses to take words out of His own vocabulary to give the description of the things he had seen, which was God's revelation to him of how the things happened, and that he described a small part of the whole business that he saw, but ~~that~~ he did it in words which were kept free from error by ^{the} Holy Spirit. (stu.) Yes, as far as the days are concerned the Babylonian account of the seven tablets of creation, some have said is where the seven days of Genesis comes from, but the seven tablets of creation are tablets which are read on seven successive days of a festival. They do not describe events of the seven days. They describe a battle between various groups of gods which probably took a few months, and actually there is very little similarity to Genesis. Except that out of this battle, sort of as an afterthought, they made some people to feed them a sacrifice. It is very--the "seven" connection is not the time (15) it's just the seven days that they read them...

M.22. (3/4)

...yes, which is pure guess. There is absolutely no basis on which to rest it except one man's ignorance or Hebrew, and I'm not talking about Ram when I say that, I'm talking about the man who originated it. An air commander, a commander of a wing in the British Royal Airforce, who is a very godly Christian man, wrote a book on the relation of Babylonian, to the Bible. He read some books on Babylonian, and they were good books, only some of them weren't, but you don't learn something about Babylonian, just from reading books on it, you have to learn the language and get into it. And but anyway, this man said that Moses had a vision which took seven days, and the reason he said that is that in Deuteronomy it says for in seven days--or is it Exodus, I forget which--you're to keep the sabbath because in six days God made heaven and earth and the seventh day he rested, and the word used to say "he made" is (1 3/4) and he looked up in the Concordance and found that the word which means "do" maybe 470 times, I forget just how many, and "make" maybe 260 times, means "show" 21 times.

So he says therefore the word $\frac{3}{4}$ means shew, so he says, what it really means is that we are to work six days and rest the seventh, because in ~~seven~~^{six} days God shewed Moses creation and on the seventh day He rested. Would God be so tired after six days of showing Moses that He'd have to rest for a day. I mean it doesn't make much sense.

I was very disgusted to see a review of his book by F. F. Bruce who has quite a fine reputation as a scholar, and F. F. Bruce said in his book, that, in this review of the book, he gave about a dozen different reasons why the theory doesn't work at all, but his very last was the exegetical foundation for it is extremely thin, because the word $\frac{2}{3}$

doesn't mean shew. Well, I would say that should be the first instead of the last, and if it doesn't mean that God showed, there is no foundation for it whatever.

The fact is if you look in Young's Concordance, you will find that $\frac{3}{4}$ means shew, and is so translated in the King James about 21 times, but every single one of these 21 is to shew mercy, God who shows mercy to thousands of people. Well, does that mean that God makes an exhibit of mercy, God gives them a picture of mercy? It is very clear that the word "shew" in Old English, used in that connection, shew mercy means do mercy. It doesn't have anything to do with showing, but it is action, it is activity, and so, when in six days God showed mercy about heaven and earth, doesn't make any sense.

God did $\frac{3}{4}$ God made heaven and earth. So that it's very easy for a person that doesn't know a language to take a concordance and throw a few things together, if he's careless, and get a new theory. But even such a person, if he is careful, shouldn't get a theory like that. And Ramm has quite a fertile mind and tries to cover a tremendous big field, and reads an awful lot and doesn't have to guess, and it's too bad $\frac{4}{4}$ he should say such a thing because there's no foundation for it. Absolutely none.

But that book, Ramm has written some books which, from what I hear, are pretty good. I haven't really gone into them but I did go into his book on science, and the impression I got from that book was that he took the attitude, anything any scientist says, is the last word. And anything in the Bible must be twisted to fit that, because the Bible must

be twisted to fit science. Well, he takes what any scientist says, and that's the last word on it, and actually of course there are many things that are so clearly proven that all scientists agree on, but there are a tremendous number of things on which you'll find many, many different opinions among scientists, and the more uncertain they are, the more dogmatic they're apt to be in writing of them, just like theologians, and I thought that book was very, very unfortunate the way he ~~w~~ twisted the Scripture around, to try to make it say nothing about science at all. I was very sorry about that book. Well, we were saying that this phrase, "in that day" then, we do not have grounds for saying it is a technical term. I don't say you can't prove something is a technical term, but I say that if you have proof, the burden of proof is on you to prove it. Not to assume it without proof, and so there is going to be a day which will be ~~as~~ as described here in this last part of the chapter, and I'm afraid we won't have time to look at all of verses 21-25 now, we'll have to leave that till next month. But these other things, while not directly on Isaiah, I think are quite important for Old Testament ~~study~~ study and also are methodologically vital for interpretation ~~for~~ of Isaiah, so I don't feel that it was out of line to take time out for it...

M.23. (1/2)

...Isa.7 last time, a very important chapter, and we notice how the idea of double fulfillment, except where the Scriptures specifically state that there is a series of things, or that something is to occur ~~tw~~ twice, it just introduces confusion, into everything, and how it particularly does not work at all in Isa.7.14-16. 7.14 is speaking about the years around 4 B.C. and a little later and can have no relationship to the time of Isaiah. Verses 15 and 16 are speaking about approximately 730 B.C. and can have no relation to 4 B.C. They are talking about two different things, there is a transition between them, and to simply assume that each of them is double and imagine ~~th~~ a fulfillment for the first at the early time and a second at the later time, when there is nothing that fits it whatever, doesn't improve our understanding of prophecy but simply confuses it.

Mr. Gregory? That's a very good question. What was in the mind of Isaiah when he spoke it? Well, I would say, in the first place, in answer to that, that I would call attention to v.13. He says, hear ye now, O house of David, not talking specifically to Ahaz but to the whole house of David. Is it a small thing for you to weary men but will you weary my God also? Therefore the Lord Himself will give you a sign. I think that makes it very clear that what Isaiah had in mind, or what he understood the Lord to have in mind by the word, was something that was in some way a rebuke to Ahaz. Not simply a promise of deliverance for Ahaz, but a rebuke to the house of David. I don't think there is any question of that. Now whether Isaiah specifically knew that means that sometime the Messiah is coming, a rebuke to David, this unworthy sion, I would think he did. Whether he knew when he was coming, whether Isaiah knew whether he might come the next year or the year after or whether it might be even a hundred years later, I don't know. But that would be the first element I would point out, in relation to that and the second I would point out would be 1 Peter 1. Because there we read the statement, 1 Pet.1.10, Peter said, of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you searching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when ~~he~~^{it} testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow, unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us, they did minister the things ~~that~~^{which} are now reported unto you by them that have preached the Gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven, which things the angels desire to look into. So clearly there is a good deal about this that the angels desire to look into that isn't at first obvious to them, but it's very clear here that the prophet was searching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ did signify when he testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ. So this is given to us as a specific message that God has given Isaiah to give, and it would seem to me from what Peter said, rather definitely said, that Isaiah understands that he is making a prediction about that wonderful promise to David that from him will come the one who will be the great leader

of God's people, Ahaz has fallen ~~own~~ ^{own} ~~dismally~~ on this, and he is predicting the coming of the true one. ~~I~~ would think that that would be clear, but what manner of time, Isaiah didn't perhaps have much idea. Perhaps he wondered himself exactly what the words mean. Now if he is coming immediately, right now, he ~~make~~ ^{make} a good measurement. If ~~he~~ is not coming for a long time, since nobody knows ~~he~~ is not coming for a long time, why you ~~can~~ ^{can} still ~~make~~ ^{measure} it from the time that would be taken, if He were to come right now. Just how far Isaiah went in his seeking into that, we have no way of knowing, but it is very clear here that the liberals are completely wrong when they say, ~~Isaiah~~ was interested simply in giving encouragement to Ahaz, telling him that soon these kings will be removed, the previous makes it very clear he wasn't, he ~~was~~ rebuking Ahaz, and I don't see what possible rebuke there is in it, except the rebuke that the Messiah is coming, who will be an entirely different man than Ahaz. Just how much the prophet understood is difficult for us to know. The prophet certainly was thinking, he was active, he ~~was~~ dealing with affairs of his time, but in addition to his activities, his thinking, there was--the Lord was ~~s~~peaking through him and giving him many things which he never would have thought of himself, and which he had to think over and try to understand, and perhaps didn't fully understand. I think that (5 1/2)

But now as we look at it, in the light of our understanding of the situation in that day, I think it is very clear that v.14 is rebuke for Ahaz, and of course it also is comfort for the godly who are disgusted with having the house of David represented by a man like Ahaz who was leader at the time. But then the next two verses are comfort for the godly and at the same time they contain a suggestion of continued rebuke to Ahaz, that his wonderful scheme isn't going to bring them ~~prosperity~~ prosperity, but in the end calamity. There is deliverance from the immediate danger, but there is a calamity along with the deliverance. So we have these verses 15 and 16 here, which give us the statement that butter and honey shall he eat that he ~~may~~ know, I think, is a possible translation, but I don't think that it's the ~~usual~~ usual way of saying "that he may know," to have just a lamech with

the infinitive, that's more apt to be or with the imperfect, either one you could Just a with infinitive could be that he may know, but it's not the usual way of saying it. The usual way of giving something that expresses the time is put a ke with infinitive. In or as, I don't see any reason why "to" in relation to can't be just suitable for that. I haven't checked through to see if it has exact parallel but it would seem to me that it's the only interpretation that makes sense, ^{that} butter and honey shall he eat, when he reaches the age of knowing to refuse evil and choose the good. Not in order that. Why would butter and honey give particular wisdom? That's fish food that does that, not butter and honey. I mean according to today's superstition it's fish food, I don't know whether there was a superstition then about butter and honey, but if there was, I don't think the Lord gave any particular support to it in His revelation. Well, v.16, I think certainly brings out the idea that it is at the time not in order, because 16 says, for before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, and if you take 16 that way, as translated in the King James, what sense does "that he may know" make? I don't see how you'd fit it together and make sense. But "when he knows," makes perfect sense. For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings. You take this measuring stick, before a child now conceived, about now, before such a child reaches the age of making simple choices wisely, before he reaches that age, within the next few years, these two kings that you're so afraid of, they'll both be gone. And then in v.17 he continues. Yes? (stud. 8 1/2) This prophecy is given in the southern kingdom, but the prophecy means that within the next two years the northern kingdom is going to be desolate. Well, just how does that affect the southern kingdom? I don't know whether we can give a certain answer, but I can make certain suggestions on it and I'd be interested to know what you might find in various commentaries. Most of the commentaries simply copied one another, but occasionally you find one that has ~~some~~ something that is really helpful. I don't want you to think that I'm like the minister who, when Christmas came, one of the

parishioners brought him a great big bag of luscious expensive potatoes. He said she did it because so often she heard him say in a sermon that the commentators didn't agree with him. But I don't study comment^{ries}~~aries~~ as much as I might because so much of what you read is quite disappointing. I find I get much more as a rule from the Hebrew and the examination of passage and comparing them. As a rule, it is far more helpful than most commentaries. But I think any commentary now and then gives something very valuable. And ~~from~~ some of them have a great deal that is very valuable, and here is a specific question which they may not have even thought, but ~~if~~ they have, some of them may have had some good suggestions. I haven't looked with this particular thing in mind, but I would have certain suggestions regarding it, for one thing I would say, while this is a descendant of the House of David, who is referred to undoubtedly, the head of the House of David, would most likely come from the southern kingdom, but he is going to rule over both kingdoms, and so you cannot completely rule out the possibility that he might even be thought of as living in the northern kingdom, that is, the whole country is in mind. Perhaps. Rather than just the southern kingdom. Another thing is that the distress which comes in the northern kingdom results in a decreased production of those things that require a lot of human effort, and give opportunity for more production of those things that animals produce, that don't need so much care, and with the land depopulated, there would be -- these pastoral products, a certain amount of that extra might easily become available to the southern kingdom, with the northern kingdom gone. Or the army, the fighting may result in a certain amount of injuries to the crops and depopulation of the southern kingdom. And then, the most reason for suggesting it is to introduce what follows, there will be a certain amount of disruption of the economy, even in the southern kingdom, though a tremendous amount in the northern kingdom, in connection with the death of these two kings. But the result of Ahaz' activity is going to be that sometime in the not-too-distant future, there will be exilic conditions in the southern kingdom, and consequently this situation is going to come in the southern kingdom a few years from now. It will come

in the northern kingdom within the very next few years, very near, and to how great an extent it is felt in the effect on the southern kingdom or to how --or whether even it can be thought of with the country as a whole in mind, rather than just the southern kingdom. Those are just considerations that I suggest, but it's a very good question, and too much, altogether too much attention is paid to commentaries. Just picking a verse and dealing with the words of that verse, without trying to take it in connection with the passage as a whole, and questions like this which take the passage as a whole, in consideration, are very important.

Now let's look on at the next verses then. The Lord shall bring upon thee and thy people, and here is where Prof. Moulton, as I mentioned to you, in his modern readers' Bible said, here Isaiah stops speaking to Ahaz and speaks to the king of the northern kingdom, imagines himself talking to him. Well, I don't think that that is necessary here, I don't think that that is what is involved. I think he is speaking to the southern kingdom here and particularly since at the end of the verse it says, they that have not come from the day that Ephraim departed from Judah. Sounds like you're going to have the worst commandment you've had since Ephraim left Judah. Well, now to the northern kingdom that's not a calamity that they left Judah, that was gaining their independence. To the southern kingdom, which represented Solomon reigning over the whole ten tribes, and his son Rehoboam getting only two left, or one and a half actually, why that was a great calamity, but to me that sounds like He is talking to the southern kingdom, rather than the northern kingdom, and of course he has just above addressed the house of David, and the northern kingdom rulers can in no sense be thought of as involved in the house of David, they are usurpers, as far as this is concerned. Ahaz is the rightful heir by way of birth, but is utterly unfit and unworthy, so he continues there, I think, speaking to the representative of the house of David there and thinking now particularly of Judah, he says it will come to pass "in that day," and I think the "in that day," doesn't mean in the last days of the age, but it means, in the day, a day that is yet to come, and that is the day of which v.17 is

already speaking. He looks forward to this and says, now I'm going to tell you what is the effect ~~that~~ of Ahaz/ ...

M.24. (1/2)

...clever scheme which Ahaz is so proud of though he isn't telling anybody he is proud of it. Only he and a few of the nobles know of it, but this scheme, he is sure, is going to mean the end of the northern kingdom, and also the king of Damascus. Once this powerful king of Assyria comes with his forces to rescue Ahaz. Isaiah is saying, this clever scheme is not going to result in peace and prosperity for the southern kingdom, but that there is a day coming, 20 years later actually, when the southern kingdom will feel the sad results upon it of what Ahaz has now brought upon the northern kingdom, and the removal of the buffer states of Israel and Syria, from between them, and the power of the great Assyrian monarch.

So he says the greatest calamities since you've ever had since the time of the destruction of the kingdom are coming. And he says, the Lord will bring ~~w~~ even the king of Assyria, and of course Ahaz says, when he hears that, well how does he know anything about the king of Assyria having anything to do with it? Most of the people of Judah, Assyria is a very distant land they've hardly even heard of, and what do they mean by saying the king of Assyria is coming? Well Ahaz knows the king of Assyria is coming because he has already sent a large amount of tribute to him to get him to come, ~~so~~ though he hasn't yet had definite word. But then Isaiah goes on, this will come to pass, there is a day coming when the Lord shall hiss for the fly in the uttermost of the rivers of Egypt, and for the bee that is in the land of Assyria. In other words, from the land of Assyria, and from the distant portions of Egypt, there are going to come forces into the land of Judah, and of course that's exactly what happened in the time of Sennacherib, when Judah seemed about to become the battleground, with Sennacherib down there, with his Assyrian army, and he heard that (2 1/2) Tirhakah, the king of Egypt is coming with ^{a force,} ~~his force~~ and it

looks as if Judah is going to be the battleground, all torn into confusion by this, but the king of Assyria, took 46 of the great fortified cities of Judah captive, practically all of them except Jerusalem. He carries away thousands of people into captivity from Judah, just about 20 years after this y' time. So that now Isaiah points out that this wonderful scheme of Ahaz is not in the end a means of prosperity and joy to them but is going to result in misery. So he says these forces are coming from Egypt and from Assyria, verse 19, and they shall come, and rest all of them in the desolate valleys, and in the holes of the rocks, and on all thorns, and on all bushes. He is still carrying out the figure of the fly and the bee, still using the figurative language but of course it stands for a human army. Yes?

(3 1/2) . . . goes forward I would say about 20 years. He is the--the real press of what Isaiah

is saying is Ahaz

As faced with a terrible danger from Israel and from Syria, is going right to build the fortifications and strengthen the armies and be ready to try to defend himself, yes, but beyond that, beyond doing the best he can in the situation, he should look to the Lord and pray to the Lord for help and look to the Lord to work it out in some way, rather than try to scheme by making an alliance with a wicked power, the other side of them, and get this power to come in and help him, thinking that that way he is going to play off the wicked powers, one against the other, and is going to be saved. That that kind of wicked scheming in the end does harm rather than good and that in this particular case, it is going to do a great deal of harm, so what Ahaz does seems to give deliverance now, but Isaiah says it is only a very temporary sort of deliverance. He says in the end you're going to have you land--you and your father's house are going to have far more misery than you would possibly have even if Israel ran over your land. So he says that they will come and all over there will be these armies and he says in the same day shall the Lord shave with a razor that is hired. Now of course that is a reference to the immediate situation. Ahaz hired the razor, Ahaz brings in the Assyrian by paying a big tribute, but the Assyrian is not going to stop at doing what Ahaz wants him to do. He is going to continue here and to

actually injure Judah, eventually. Now of course he won't still be a razor that is hired then. He is now a razor that is hired, but the razor that Ahaz thinks he can hire for his own purposes, in the ^{end} will turn against Judah and do Judah terrible harm too. Sort of like the situation the Poles were in in 1939, when the Germans were about attack Poland, and the different ones said to the Poles, why don't you look to the Russians for help, they are the great enemies of the Germans. Well the Poles said if we're going to be subject to one ~~of~~ or the other, we can't pick between them, we don't want try to be delivered from one by being subject to the other, so they refused to do it, and the result was that Germany and Russia went together to defeat the Poles. But Poland knew that if they looked to Russia for help, Russia would give them help but then Russia would swallow them up, which in the end the allies let Russia swallow them up anyway, but they couldn't have foreseen that in 1939, so that, the one who is hired now is eventually to prove terrible danger. He is going to shave, the Lord is going to use them to shave the head and the hair of the feet, and it shall also consume the beard. It is not going to bring death, not going to bring destruction to Judah, but it's going to bring tremendous calamity to it, it's going to shave their glory, their luxuriance, going to injure all parts of it. And it shall come to pass in that day, that a man will nourish a young cow, and two sheep. And it'll come to pass that the abundance of milk that they give, he'll eat butter (or curds) for butter and honey shall everyone eat that is left in the land. Won't be many left, but those who are left are going to have plenty of the things that don't take much human effort to raise. It shall come to pass in that day, he says, that every place where there were a thousand vines at a thousand silverlings, it shall be just briers and thorns. Where you had these agricultural things that require a lot of care, a lot of constant pruning out, getting rid of the weeds that will come up and caring for these things that produce so much, there will not be the manpower to take care of it. They will become, just a land, an area given over to briers and thorns, with arrows and bows shall men come thither, because all the land will become briers and thorns. What good are arrows and bows for

plowing, for hoeing, they're no good for that. You just have to, there won't be manpower enough for plowing, for hoeing. You would just have to go in as if you were fighting against an enemy, forcing your way in to this area, instead of plowing and planting and harvesting, but you can use it for your agricultural animals which do not take much manpower to take care of. Yes? (8 1/2) Yes, I would think that he is saying, that he is now going on to show the ultimate result, but he is saying that there'll be a beginning of this situation within the next two years, that there is depopulation, in Syria--great depopulation. In Israel, considerable depopulation. Probably a little even in Judah. And the economic dislocation which it will produce will be visible within the next few years. ~~But~~ ^{But} this economic dislocation will reach a far greater situation as a result of Ahaz' scheme, a number of years later. (9 1/4) stu.) Yes, that is a situation which comes within the next three or four years in Syria, and to some extent in Israel, these 3 or 4 years. That comes overwhelmingly in Israel about ten years later, and which probably comes into Judah a little bit immediately, to a little greater extent ten years from now, but which twenty years or so from now becomes very widespread in Judah, as well as (9 1/2) Yes? (9 3/4) I'd say that v.15 shows the beginning of something which is a result of Ahaz' activity, but that v.22 shows its development to where it becomes a tremendously widespread thing. Mr. Gregory? (10)

Now this last verse on the chapter I can't feel is translated just right. On all hill that shall be digged with the mattock. Why do you say shall be digged? Maybe in Old English that meant something, but I would say that the imperfect there certainly should be better translated there as a preclenative. All hills that are customarily digged with the mattock. The regions which are given over to careful thorough care, to agricultural work, are digged with the mattock. There shall not come thither the fear of briars and thorns. What does that mean? I can't make much sense out of it as it stands. I would incline to think that it's better that the hills that are digged with the mattock, that either the mattock will not come there, or that the person will not be able to come there, because

of the briars and thorns. That the result of all these briars and thorns which grew up, that the weeds get ahead of the few people there are, there are too many weeds for the people to ~~keep~~ it in cultivation. So all this land that used to be dug with the mattock, that used to be cultivated carefully, this land gets covered with briars and thorns, covered with weeds, covered with that which grows up of itself, it's ~~not~~ good for the growing of the crops that require careful attention, but it shall be for the sending forth of oxen, and for the treading of sheep and goats. In the Bible, lesser cattle means the smallest, the smaller animals that are used for human purposes, like sheep and goats. The large cattle are the cows and the horses, the small cattle are the sheep and the goats. And "lesser cattle" today means nothing, we don't use the term. Today cattle is just cows. But what it means here is very clearly, is the cows and the sheep, the goats, the animals that you can take and go out and on territory that you don't have to do a lot of planting and a lot of cultivating, they can eat what is there, and then move on to the next area, as long as you've got plenty of areas to move them through. And it means, with the depopulation, proportional to the number of people, there will be plenty of ground available for the -- more animals than they can profitably consume. It doesn't mean there'll be more probably than there is at the present time, at this time, there was a great deal of land cultivated with great care, but there probably was other land which was used for cattle and sheep and probably more of them, being a larger population. But in this later time, the goats proportional the population will be much greater than they are now. Just like today, you take your meat bill today and you pay a tremendous lot for beef, but now let us suppose half of the people in the country were killed, and you had the same, ^{but} suppose you had 2/3 or 3/4 as many cows. Proportionately the people there--beef would become much cheaper, much more common, and there of course, there was a far greater percentage, as 9/10's of the people were taken into captivity, probably half or three-fourths of the cattle taken too, but there is more cattle proportionately and there is loads of land for the cattle, because there aren't the people to cultivate.

So the big direct teaching of chapter 7 is, Ahaz thinks he has a clever human scheme whereby he can use wicked forces to protect the land, this scheme will not work. God says trust me and I will protect you, and he says I'll give you a sign, ask me for a sign. Ahaz gives a spurious pious statement to get rid of him and go on with his work, God knows that Ahaz has his clever scheme...

M.25. (1/2)

...God says within the next few years this present danger will have disappeared. Well, Ahaz knows that, Ahaz has taken means to assure it will disappear. But God says Ahaz' scheme is going to result in far greater dangers in the future than anything they've seen as yet. So that the theme continues right on, but there would seem to be a break in time, and I think a chapter division is very properly put here. Moreover the Lord said unto me, I imagine it is properly put here. Now the "moreover" is just Hebrew "and." Just as well say, and the Lord said to me, but "again the Lord said," previously we had "the Lord said" quite a while before. It seems a reasonable place for a division and yet you could perhaps make it just as well at v.5. And the Lord said to me, take a great roll and write in it with ^{man's} a pen concerning Maher-shalal-hashbaz. Now what does that mean? Well Maher-shalal-hash-baz means "hasten the booty, hurry the spoil," and ~~that~~ ^{that suggests} war and confusion and upheaval. It doesn't say much specifically about it, but suggests it very strongly. So Isaiah took faithful witnesses to record, and he got these witnesses, and he got this roll and he wrote it, concerning Maher-shalal-hashbaz. What does that mean? Well, evidently God told Isaiah more, he knew more what it did mean, he went to the prophetess and she conceived and bare a son, and she was no virgin, she is not the fulfillment of verse 14. This is not a miraculous birth, this is not a birth that concerns the House of David particularly, this is another sign altogether. But I would think it is another sign for this reason, that it doesn't fit the conditions of the previous statement at all, but another reason I think so is because the time measure connected with it is a ~~diff~~ ^{different} time measure than the time measure connected with verse 14 to 16. He says for before the

child will have knowledge to cry my father and my mother, before the child not reaches the age of making simple choices but is even able to make simple sounds, before he is able to say abbi and ummi, the simplest sounds, the first ones that a child can make. The very first sounds, daddy and mummy, before he can make those, why the spoil of Samaria, the riches of Damascus have been carried off, ^{before} ~~for~~ the king of ^{Assyria} ~~Syria~~. We have the same things as described before, the land thou abhorrest will be forsaken of both her kings, the riches of Damascus, and the spoil of Samaria taken away before the king of Assyria is the same thing but with a closer sign, so it would seem to be a different child, a second sign of the fulfillment of the first part of the prophecy, that the two enemies that are now threatening Judah are going to be removed, but then the Lord gives him another message which is again related to this just as this is related to what precedes, but perhaps more closely related the first four verses than they were related to what preceded.

And he speaks to him again, forasmuch as this people refuseth the waters of Shiloah that go softly and rejoice in Rezin and Remaliah's son. Immediately you say well what on earth does that mean? Who is this people, who is this people that are rejoicing in Rezin and Remaliah's son? ~~Who~~ is Remaliah's son? Everybody knows of course that's Pekah. Pekah is the son of Remaliah. And by the way we're going to hear a lot more about Pekah in the near future, because a professor in ~~a~~ Biblical Seminary has written a book which is not yet published, but copies of it are being distributed for review. I didn't get one of the copies, but I was informed about it by ~~a~~ man who did, copies are being distributed for review, a book published by Eerdmans, by this teacher in Biblical Seminary, which he thinks is going to change the attitude of all evangelical Christians toward the Bible. Very enthused about it I understand, and the book is to show that it is wrong to say that the Bible is inerrant, ~~and~~ that the Bible contains errors and that which is most clear is the case of Pekah. The dates of Pekah are so definitely wrong ~~that~~, the ~~a~~ dates of his reign, in the Bible, that no one can any longer hold that the Bible is inerrant.

Well, there have been many people before that in history that thought that their book was going to revolutionize opinion, and the Bible has still been purchased in spite of them, so I guess that this book will not accomplish near what its author thinks it will. But Pekah is the key point, I understand. I haven't seen the book but what I've been told I understand Pekah is the key point in his argument. But of course that is ~~it~~' particularly connected with what this says about Pekah, the son of Remaliah, but it says that people rejoice in ^{Rezin and in} Pekah. Now who is rejoicing in the king of Damascus and the king of Israel? Are the people of Judah rejoicing in him? I don't know why they should be, they were fearing him, they were afraid of their lives of them, that he would come and take Jerusalem. Seems to me as if he surely must be talking here about the people of Israel, rather than of the people of Judah. Of course, he has just said that the spoil of Samaria is going to be taken away, so surely that's who he is talking about. That the people of Israel which after all is part of God's people, that these people refuse to take the waters of Shiloah that go softly, that is a reference to a stream that flows just outside, right next to the temple in Jerusalem. And therefore a figure referring to the influence that comes from the temple at Jerusalem, it refers to the trusting in God and following Him and reminds us of the fact that Jeroboam had put up a border at Bethel to keep the northern people from coming down to Jerusalem, and to try to separate them from any relation to the Jerusalem temple, now he says these people of Israel, instead of realizing, establishing relations with the God of Israel who had brought them out of Egypt, they are rejoicing in Pekah this wicked king of Israel, and in Rezin the king of Damascus with whom he has made alliance, the heathen king. So he says, now therefore behold now the Lord brings up on them the waters of the rivers, strong and many, and this doesn't mean a flood, this means this is a figure of speech of course, but it is a figure of speech which explains who it stands for, the king of Assyria and all his glory. And the king of Assyria is going to come over all these channels and go over all its banks, and we don't know where Isaiah said this, in verses 6 and 7, but it would have been very appropriate to say to king Ahaz there,

outside the wall, because it would describe the situation that was coming when the southern kingdom is going to be free from the difficulty of the menace of the northern kingdom, the northern kingdom, the people there that rejoice in Pekah and in Rezin, they are going to have the king of Assyria overflowing. Of course Ahaz knows that's what's going to happen, and he'd feel very happy if he heard this verse, but he would feel very unhappy to hear Isaiah continue, and he shall pass through Judah. The Assyrian king won't stop with Israel, he's going to pass through Judah. Well, how much he passed through Judah right then, we don't know, but we do know that 20 years or so later he came against Judah and captured all the fenced cities except Jerusalem, and took thousands of people captive. So that this scheme of Ahaz' which is supposed to put an end to Israel's power to hurt Judah by bringing the king of Assyria, so he goes over his channels and over his banks and floods across into Israel, it's not going to stop at Israel, whether immediately, or 20 years from now. At any rate in the fairly near future, it's going to pass through Judah, he will overflow and go over, he will reach even to the neck and the stretching out of his wings will fill the breadth of thy land, and so you think well Judah's gone too, Israel is going to be taken, Damascus is going to be taken, Judah is gone too, the end for all of God's people, but no he will the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel. This is Immanuel's land, this is the land of the one whose name means God is with us, this land belongs to Him, and therefore the Assyrian cannot possibly call it his land, unless God should choose to permit it, but the mention specifically that it is Immanuel's land is a pretty good hint that the Assyrian is not going to take it, at this time, because it's Immanuel's land. And that's a pretty good hint that this Immanuel who is mentioned in the previous chapter 14 is not just some son of a prophet, or son of some person we don't know anything about in the kingdom, but that it actually is the Lord of Glory, because this is His land and therefore the king of Assyria cannot take it unless He should choose to let the king of Assyria take it and that he does not choose to do. So that just that word in there, "will fill the length and breadth of thy land," it shows the misery that

is ahead as a result of Ahaz' plan, but when you say "thy land, O Immanuel," you immediately say well that's like in the previous chapter where we read that it's going to shave off the hair of the head and the hair of the feet and cut off the beard too, consume the beard, it doesn't say it's going to bring death. Here there is disaster but there's not destruction. And just a tiny suggestion of the fact that God will deliver from Sennacherib. Then He goes on, having made that tiny suggestion in the O Immanuel in verse 8, then He turns His attention to that and brings it out clearly in verses 9 and 10. Associate yourselves, O you people. All these multitudes come and attack God's land, but what's going to happen? You'll be broken in pieces. Give ear, all you of far countries, gird yourselves. Yes, do the best you can, but it won't accomplish your purpose, you're going to be broken in pieces. Gird yourselves, and you'll be broken in pieces. You see, there are several different elements entering into Isaiah's prediction. There is punishment for Ahaz, there is immediate, --for the immediacy there is deliverance from the immediate situation, but that the scheme backfires, there is punishment, but that the coming of the Assyrian is not destruction, that God is going to deliver. And the marvelous deliverance through Sennacherib. All that is suggested in these pages.

So now as he looks at one aspect and another and another, then he brings them all together. So he says, take counsel together, and it will come to nought. Yes, do the best you can, it won't succeed. Speak the word, and it shall not stand, for Immanuel. The word is exactly the same as at the end of verse 8 and as at the end of verse 14 of the previous chapter, Immanuel. You can't take this land, it's Immanuel's land. God may permit you to bring great harm to it, He may permit you to destroy a great deal of it, take many captives, but you cannot capture it, it is Immanuel's. Now our English version, as we noticed, translates Immanuel here, for God with us, and they put in an "is" to make a sentence out of it. For "God with us," and two verses before they don't translate it, they say, "thy land, O Immanuel," they don't say, "thy land, God with us."

But actually you cannot make it perfect, into English. If you put Immanuel both places, it doesn't seem to make sense here, if you put the "God with us" it doesn't seem to make sense in the first two verses, before. You have to have the Hebrew idea in mind to ~~FR~~ understand these two verses. That the same Immanuel means God is with us, Immanuel is the assurance that God is with ~~us~~ His people, but Immanuel is a real person. He is a person who is going to be born sometime in the future, but He is a person who exists already, He is a person who actually is the Lord of Glory, and who is--these are His people, and this is His land and nothing can happen to it except as He permits it, and so with that idea that you can get from it, the Hebrew word very clearly and definitely, it is very intelligible. In the English they are just two rather unrelated verses. In fact, in the English why you should thy land, O Immanuel, is hard to tell anyway. Yes? ...

M26. (3/4)

...Ahaz calls in. Ahaz calls him in. Ahaz thinks ~~is~~ that he's going to be delivered. He calls him in. As far as they're concerned, they're not coming to help Ahaz. The tribute ~~te~~ (3/4) leads them to do something a little earlier than they would do it otherwise, but they're going to attack anyway, just like some small nation today faced with a menace and thinks they can get deliverance by calling in Khrushchev to help them, to MaoTseTung, they're very glad to come to help them, gives them an excuse, but once they're in, you needn't think you're going to get rid of them now. Thank you for helping ~~me~~ ^{us}, thank you very much, goodbye. No, they don't say goodbye. They swallow you up. And that's what the Assyrians wanted to do, and Ahaz' clever scheme is just not going to work out, so there is a very strong unity between everything in 7.1 right through verse 10 of chapter 8. Now we have another minor break. "For the Lord spake" again, a break, ~~For~~ the Lord spake thus to me with a strong hand and instructed me that I should not walk in the way of this people. The Lord says this is Immanuel's land, it's going to be protected. The "For" does not go with what immediately precedes. "For the Lord spake," it doesn't go with verses 9 and 10. It refers back to the verses before that, this is rebuke

rather than blessing. The Lord spoke to me with a strong hand, and instructed me not to walk in the way of this people. He says, these people have gone into sin, there are terrible results ahead, and what they've done, don't you get implicated in it. Say ye not, A confederacy, to all these to whom this people shall say, a confederacy. Don't you say it's your ally, when they think they can call in the wicked force of the Assyrians to give them protection. I remember exactly:

I was in Chicago when the Germans and the Russians started fighting in 1940, and first there was lots of talk against the Russians, just before that time. Then I remember that when --first on communists there. I ran onto every day the main secretary in the office there, who was an out-and-out avowed communist, very outspoken for Stalin, and then when Stalin made his peace, his non-aggression pact with Hitler, for about two days she couldn't say anything, she was just aghast, she'd been knowing Hitler so hard. Now she didn't know what to say. After about two days then she recovered her equilibrium and told everybody what a clever fellow Stalin was, how wonderful his diplomacy was and what he was doing. But after, that was '39, well in '40 a year or a year and a half later, when all of a sudden the Russian-German alliance busted, and Hitler began to attack Russia, I ~~remember~~ ^{made a} remark to a different person there, about criticizing the communists, oh she said but they're our allies, and immediately then the thing was, they are our allies, we must stand with them, we must support them now, they're right with us

(4) Well, I didn't say it to her, I said to myself, they're not my ally, and never will be. And that's exactly what he says here.

8:12 Say ye not, a confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say, a confederacy, neither fear ye their fear, nor be afraid. Don't put your trust, your (4 1/4) your relation as being afraid of being displeasing to those who are wicked and hostile to what you stand for, simply because through some clever scheme you think you can get their help. It's strange how often opposites do meet. I remember in the orthodox

Presbyterian church, the group that has Westminster Seminary there, its leading source of supply, and most of the members of the Westminster faculty are members of it--some years ago there was a group of ministers in the church, who were very much, in their churches, who were very much disturbed by the strong emphasis on ^{certain aspects of} Calvinism which the Westminster faculty was making. And they were very much disturbed, it was interfering with--I mean, it was an attitude that evangelism was quite out of place, there is no use for evangelism, if the Lord is going to save people He will save them, and that's that. And, it's much more important we make sure everybody gets every aspect of doctrine just exactly right, ^{than} ~~and~~ that we try to reach the lost. Well, that was, I don't say that's the attitude of the leadership, but it seemed that way at least. It was in that direction, and so quite a few of these pastors felt very much oppressed under that, and quite a number of them left the orthodox church, Presbyterian church, and went into the southern church and other churches like that, but those who stayed in it were trying to resist it. Then the group that they ~~w~~ felt they were being oppressed by, began a big offensive against a man who is considered to be a hyper-Calvinist, went further on his stress on the sovereignty of God, much further than the Westminster leadership, and immediately all of these pastors rallied around him, and for about five years you had the orthodox Presbyterian rent by a sharp division in which you had the middle group against the two ends, and it really was utterly illogical, and it continued very strong, and the middle group, which was ~~was~~ quite a bit one-sided, but ^{comparatively} ~~quite a bit~~ in the middle, they won out quite completely. But the other was an unstable alliance, it was people who thought they were too far this far, giving their whole support to someone who was way over there. And it just doesn't work.

So he says here, don't say a confederacy, don't join in with the scheme that is not logical, that is uniting you with those who are not the next ones to you, not --certainly there are many places in the Bible where we find people who have differences uniting, for a common cause, or people who are near each other, uniting against those who are far

away in viewpoint. But here it is uniting with those who are most distant in viewpoint, because geographically they're at a distance and they happen to have the same enemy. And it's just like our uniting with Russia in the war. There were people at that time who said we ought to stand on the side~~✓~~ in this and not let either Hitler or Stalin win, let them kill each other off. Oh, people were horrified, ~~people~~^{what a} terrible idea. No, we should do everything to destroy Hitler, everything we possible can, and the Russians are our~~✓~~ allies. That was the whole (7 1/2) Now we're reaping the fruits of it. So--I was lecturing at that very time on this very passage, and it was so appropriate, exactly fit.

But here he goes on now to show what is the effect on Judah, on the people of Judah, of this attitude that is being taken by Ahaz and the leadership and which affects the mass of the people, even though it doesn't show itself in clear understanding of this situation, the attitude of indifference to God, and looking to human clever schemes, instead of to trusting God for their victory. Well, guess we have to stop till next time... (break in record, 8 1/4)

(9 1/4)...last time we were looking at the 8th chapter of Isaiah and we had some interesting problems there. There is a section which I think we must consider definitely as a unit, and this, though we have some minor subdivisions that we looked, we got through verse 8! 11 11 and from verse 11 on, the speaker is speaking particularly of Isaiah, speaking of Isaiah and his followers in the situation in which they find themselves. We have just had, in verses 9 and 10, the declaration that God is going to bring to nought the result, the immediate results of Ahaz' clever scheme, that though it will put the land in tremendous danger, it will not mean destruction, because God is going to intervene and to save the land. It is Immanuel's land, and God is going to protect it yet further. However, there is a situation in the whole land in which Ahaz' attitude has become the attitude of a great many, and therefore, as a result of not simply Ahaz' act, but of his attitude, and the others who participate with him, there is great difficulty and trouble ahead, now consequently, in verse 11 on, Isaiah's attention turns to the people of the land as a whole, and

particularly to the godly as they look ~~few~~ forward to the distant future, and as he looks forward, he says, in verse 12, say ye not, a confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say, a confederacy, neither fear ye theri fear, nor be afraid.

In other words, don't think that your whole future depends upon whether Ahaz' scheme works out or not, or whether you're able to work out schemes that will advance things as you think wise. He says don't make this your fear, your reverence, your objective, v.12, but in v.13, instead of it, sanctify the Lord of Hosts, let Him be your fear. And let Him be your dread. Put your eyes on Him, instead of on these earthly political situations, he says. Let Him be your dread and He shall be for a sanctuary. That really is part of v.13. Sanctify the Lord of hosts Himself, Let Him be your fear, let Him be your dread, and He shall be for a sanctuary. You can't help these things that Ahaz is doing, you can't help the nobles going with him in it, there's nothing you can do about the fact that the nation~~s~~ as a whole, even though they know nothing of Ahaz' plan, have come into such a frame of mind, that they would be with him in it. Don't make this your fear and be afraid of what the results of this are. Sanctify the Lord of hosts, make Him your fear, and let Him be your dread, and He shall be for a santuary. So v.13 is an exhortation which the first part of 14 tells you the result of, if you follow it, that the Lord can~~be~~ your sanctuary, He can be your protection. If your hearts are fixed on Him, no matter what comes, you can be secure in Him and with Him. Well, now maybe the verse division isn't so bad as I suggested for a second, because I said 13 and the first part of 14 is talking to the (12 3/4)

Let us say it another way. V.13 is exhorting people to put their trust in the Lord and v.14 is telling what the results will be whether you do or don't. If you take it that way, the verse division isn't so bad. The first part of 14 tells what would happen if you follow 13. The rest of 14 tells what will happen if you don't follow 13. 14 is the result. Sanctify the Lord, let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. What is the result, if you accept Him, if you follow Him, trust Him He will be a sanctuary. But if you don't, and the mass of the nation was now going on into

apostasy and unbelief. But he will be a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel, for a gine and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And so we have here in v.14 the information that the nation as a whole is not going to put its trust in the Lord, but is going to go on in the direction in which Ahaz has been going, even though it doesn't necessarily show itself in that same way, and the result of that is that there will be a rock of offence and a stone of stumbling to the house of Israel, and a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. That's getting in pretty close to home, and 15 continues that, that many among them shall stumble and fall and be broken, and be snared and be taken, and so when you get a situation like that, what are the godly to do...

M.27. (1/2)

...the answer to that question is contained in v.13, they can sanctify the Lord, let him be their fear and their dread, and then He'll be for a sanctuary. But in addition to that, facing the situation where the bulk of the nation does not do this, then he said, v.16, bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples. In other words, if you can get the message out to the nation as a whole, wonderful, do all you can for that. But do not dilute it so thin that it has no effect. Bind up the testimony and seal the law among my disciples. Let--if the nation turns against the Lord, maintain the testimony by a little group standing true to Him. Bind up the testimony, seal the law, keep it pure, keep it alive, keep it from contamination and preserve it through the difficult days which may come. And he says, I will wait upon the Lord. Notice he says, my disciples. Who is saying, My disciples? Is this Isaiah referring to Isaiah's disciples? He says the Lord spoke thus to me, up in v.11. The Lord said this. Is it Isaiah's disciples, is it the Lord's disciples? Who is this Lord who spoke to Isaiah? It is Jehovah. The original of course gives the name of God. Well, Immanuel means God with us. We have just had Immanuel mentioned twice, just before, in v.8 and v.10, now the Lord speaks this way, is this Immanuel speaking? Is this God speaking as distinct from Immanuel, or is this Isaiah speaking? Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples. And I will wait upon

the Lord, that hides his face from the house of Jacob, and I will look for him.

Now v.17 sounds more as if it might be Isaiah than as it ~~was~~ God. Does it not? But is it possibly Immanuel? We've just had Immanuel spoken of, we have ~~this is~~ what the Lord said to Isaiah, is this Immanuel speaking? Speaking of his disciples. He says I wait on the Lord who hides his face from ~~the~~ house of Jacob and I will look for him, Behold, I and the children whom God has given me are for signs and for wonders . Now wonders here doesn't mean miracles, doesn't mean something supernatural, necessarily. That may be involved in it, because it means a sign, an indication, something that should prove the truth, something that should give an evidence of it. We are for signs and for wonders in Israel, from the Lord of hosts who ~~dwells~~ dwells on mount Zion.

Well, then , behold, I and the children whom the Lord has given, is this Isaiah and his disciples? Or is this Immanuel and his disciples. Yes? (3 1/2) No, v.11 says, the Lord spoke to me that I should not do so, saying, end of v.11. So what follows is what the Lord says to Isaiah. The Lord spoke to me, with a strong hand and instructed me, saying. So then v.12 is what the Lord said to Isaiah. But of course it's also to the people as a whole, but it is the Lord speaking to Isaiah. Now there might conceivably be a change to where ~~Isiah~~ Isaiah speaks in his own person, instead of his giving the message specifically that the Lord has given to him. It's the Lord's message in any case, but is it thought of as Isaiah speaking, or is the Lord speaking, or is it thought of as Immanuel whom we ~~just~~ had shortly before? Which is it? Well, as we noticed, the 17th verse looks more as if it was Isaiah than God specifically, but 17 could be Immanuel, God with us, and so we are left here, at this situation, not able to say, specifically, this must be Immanuel speaking but certainly with the possibility clearly suggested that it might be Immanuel who is here speaking, and we wonder if the New Testament has anything to say about the matter. And so we turn to the book of Hebrews, the second chapter and the 13th verse. And when we come to that place, we find that the Lord said, in v.9, but we ~~we~~ Jesus, and v.11 , for both he ~~which~~ ^{that,} sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all

one for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying I will declare thy name unto my brethren and in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee. That, I believe, is taken from the 22nd psalm, the description of the crucifixion of Christ and the glory that shall follow. And again, I will put my trust in him, and again, behold I and the children whom God hath given me. So this quotation in Heb.2.13 would seem to be given, not to tell us something about Isaiah, but to tell us something about the relation of Christ with His people, and that would certainly indicate that the writer of Hebrews felt that back here in Isaiah, it was Immanuel who was speaking, rather than either Isaiah or the Lord God as distinct from Immanuel, God with us. The matter of New Testament quotation from the Old is a very interesting one, of course, and there are those who have the attitude of course that any time a New Testament writer finds three words in the Old that fits his purpose, he just grabs them out, without relation to context. Now I'm quite convinced that is utterly false. Sometimes the New Testament says this is so because, and then it quotes three words, and you say, what on earth do those three words got to do with that? How do they prove that? Well, they don't. The three words don't prove it. The three words remind you of the passage that teaches this in the Old Testament.

So the New Testament quotations are not usually a quotation, here are three words, or here's a verse that proves this, but a reference, here is an Old Testament passage which proves it, which is a much more reasonable way to do things anyway, but it is the way, I'm quite convinced that the New Testament does, and so it is not that those three words prove something about Christ, but that the writer of Hebrews says this is what Isaiah teaches here. And a great many of your difficulties in New Testament quotations disappear, I believe, when you recognize this fact. I saw a writing by a very fine man one time, trying to prove verbal inspiration, he says by ^{fact that the} the New Testament rests a whole argument upon one letter of the Old Testament. It represents a whole argument upon the fact that it is singular rather than plural used in the Old Testament where it says to thy seed will I give this. And the fact of the matter is that the word

seed in the singular is collective, it may be individual, it may be collective, ^{so} ~~but~~ there is no argument resting upon the fact singular is used. You don't use the plural, it is not an argument based on a form, it is an interpretation of the form, saying what he means here. In this particular case he is not referring to a whole seed but referring to one individual out of the group, and then he said, verbal inspiration is proven by the fact that the New Testament rests the whole argument upon the fact that the present is used instead of a past, where Jesus said, quoted I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but in one of the two gospels where that is given, the word "and" is in Italics, showing it is not even in the Greek, so there is no "and!" in the Greek. In the Hebrew there is no verb, it is just a subject and object together, and there's no present in ~~the~~ Hebrew anyway. So how would the New Testament base an argument on the fact that a form in Hebrew was present rather than past. There isn't any such thing. So that it was an unfortunate thing but I found those arguments in some of the best men, they evidently just copied them from other people without thinking. Men who know Hebrew and Greek well have used those arguments. There is nothing to them. The New Testament does not build an argument on one letter, one word, or one form. It builds its argument on the teaching of the Old Testament, and it refers to the passages in which these matters occur. So that we then have here this wonderful prediction of Immanuel, of the coming of the Lord Jesus in v.18. Behold, I and the children whom the Lord hath given me are for signs and for wonders in Israel. And then here we have the reference to Immanuel, the one who is God's greatest subject of revelation, it also is true, what it said, of those followers of Christ who were followers of Isaiah, that is to say, Isaiah and his followers are also included in the passage, but it includes much more than Isaiah, they are referred to, ~~not~~ because they are followers of Isaiah, but followers of ~~the~~ Lord whose representative Isaiah is. So this in v.18 refers to the method of revelation from God, of signs and wonders, which He gives, which consist of the godly people, who are following His work, obeying His truth.

And so in v.19 He gives the contrast to the other sort of revelation which the people are seeking, and when they shall say unto you, seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep and that mutter, he says, should not a people seek unto their God? Now in the King James you just read "for the living to the dead?" and that by itself, I don't think means anything. You think it through, you can find what it does mean. Does not a people seek unto their God. Should a people seek for the living to the dead. I feel it would've been much clearer if the words, "should a people seek" had been repeated in italics, they often do that sort of thing in translation of the King James Version. They put in words in italics to make clear what it means. For the living to the dead? What does that mean? It means should they seek for the living to the dead? No, to the living God. Not to people who are dead. It is of course a criticism of spiritism, criticism of soothsaying, of all that sort of effort, of trying to find out what the truth is by other methods than going to the living God, or to His word.

So in contrast to v.18 you have v.19 there. Should not a people seek to their God, should they seek for the living to the dead? And then the conclusion to this part is v.20, To the law and to the testimony. The word of God is the place to get the truth. If they speak not according to this word, it's because there is no light in them. Yes? (11 1/4) In v.19, and when they shall say unto you. Well, anybody can be speaking there. I mean that is the Lord speaking, but whether it is the Lord in the person of Immanuel, speaking through Isaiah, or whether it is Isaiah speaking as the Lord's messenger. Oh, when they shall say unto you, that is when the people around, when these people who are not trusting in the Lord and following Him, say to you, here is the way to get your guidance, to get your truth to know what to do, why speak to the wizards that peep and mutter, them that have familiar spirits. ~~And~~

My aunt had a brother who lived up in Montana, and he and his wife, they had departed for a long time from the faith of their parents, they did come back toward the end of their lives, but this time they were not believers, and they were looking into every

sort of a cult and ism and everything you can think of, and my aunt was taken ill with cancer of the breast which spread into the lungs, and from it she died. She was in Los Angeles. Her sister-in-law, up there in Montana, knew that this woman's husband, the brother of my aunt, was coming down to Los Angeles to see her. ~~She~~ ~~was in~~ ~~the~~ this illness with cancer from which she died, and the woman went to a spiritist, a medium, and she said that as soon as she came into the room the woman who was supposed to be possessed of the spirit put her hand to her breast right ^{to} the place where the cancer was, and she said ohhhh and went through writhings of agony as if she had pain right in this place where this woman's sister-in-law, 1500 miles away was suffering. And then she said, she spoke of the agony, she says, but I don't see any death. And three weeks later the woman died. So that the spirits who ~~w~~ spoke through her, were able to give her information of a present fact, whether because these spirits knew what was happening in Los Angeles themselves, or because they could read the mind of the woman, and could tell what she was worried about, which was 1500 miles away, but they could not predict the future at all. They could not diagnose how serious the disease ~~y~~ was or what its effects were going to be. And I thought it was a very interesting evidence of the fact that there is a lot of--in spiritism--there is a lot of ~~fake,~~ ^{fake,} ~~faith,~~ unquestionably, but that there is that which is not fake, there is that which is demonic activity, no question of that. But the demons are not omniscient, they are not God, they cannot predict the future, they may know more facts than we, and therefore make a better guess about what the future is going to be, but they cannot predict the future, and He says here, should we look for the living to the dead?

Sir Oliver Lodge the great English (14 1/4)

during the first

World War lost his son in the war...

...and thereupon we became greatly interested in spiritism, and seeking unto these wizards, familiar spiritis, wizards that peep and that mutter, and Sir Oliver Lodge wrote a book telling about, think he called it "Raymond" after his son who had died in France, in the war, and telling how he heard through these mediums, ~~who~~ about his son, what kind of cigarettes he was using on the other side, and what sort of experiences he was having there, and all that sort of stuff. And he was, I think Lodge became the head, or one of the leaders at least, of the Psychic Research Society, in Great Britain. Well, shortly after that, he came to Los Angeles and spoke and I heard him speak, and he gave illustration, after illustration, to prove that really there was something to it. But one of the illustrations that I thought was most illuminating to show how deceiving the whole business could be, --he said that quite a number of the leaders of this Psychic Society, had agreed that what they would do in order to prove they were communicating after death, that it was really they and no trickery to it, no fake or no fraud, they would write some message, write some words, anything they ~~of~~ took a notion to, might be some poetry, might be a declaration, might be anything, they would write that and put it in a sealed envelope and it would be sealed up there in the office of the Psychic Society, there where nobody would have access to it, and then after their death they would plan to send that message through some medium so that they would get the message which nobody knew, and that would be absolute proof there was no trickery, that ~~nobody~~ ^{they really} sent them.

So he said that one time the VicePresident of the Psychic Society was up in Scotland on a vacation, and while he was gone, a message came to a medium in India, and this message to the medium in India was copied down and sent in to the Psychic Society in London, and they looked it over and there were three or four sentences, didn't make any particular sense, they couldn't figure, well what on earth is this driving at, what that spirit is trying to communicate with us, who is it? What are they trying to prove by this message? So he said they couldn't figure what it meant, ~~##~~ ^{##} Somebody said, well, Sir so-and-so, Vice-president of the Society, is off on vacation now, he is

very good at interpreting the spirits' messages, when he come he ~~probably~~ will tell us.

Well, he said the man got back from Scotland, came into the office, and they said to him here is a message came through a medium in India, will you tell us what this means, can you figure it out? He looked at it, his eyes opened wide, he said, why that's my posthumous message. He said those are the words that I wrote and they're in an envelope, nobody knows what's there by myself, they're sealed up in here to prove that after I die that I am the one who sends it back, and here he was living up in Scotland and it came through a medium in India. Well, it was, Lodge was a hundred percent convinced of all this spiritism, he was a sincere man, you see, he told these things he'd seen and heard and knew, and he told this one, it seemed to me it went pretty far to disprove the whole contention. If the man ~~were~~ had been dead that would've proved that it was he who was sending the message, but he was still living, so that very evidently there were spirits who were able to read his message either when he was writing it or (4) in the sealed envelope, and I guess one of them was possessed with a queer spirit of fun and sent it to him while he was still living, but it certainly destroyed the whole thing they were contending for, that it was actually dead people who were sending these messages back. But here we are strictly commanded not to do it, just like the command we have back in the book of the covenant, in Exodus, or which the very first law given to Moses, the book of the covenant, says thou shalt not suffer a witch to live, and of course that was used in Europe time after time in the Middle Ages, as the reason for believing that women were riding through the skies on broomsticks and doing all kinds of terrible things, and these women were killed in ^{cruel} ~~very~~ ways and there was just a brief small period of that same attitude taken in New ~~W~~ England, in Salem, but that gets more publicity than all the hundred or thousand times more of it that preceded it in Europe. But it's interesting in the book of the covenant there to know how various types of wickedness are described, and that this type of wickedness, that dying he shall die, he shall surely be put to death. This one, it says, you shall destroy it. But when it comes to the

witch, that is, the feminine of the sorcerers, it says, thou shalt not cause or permit a sorcerer to live. It seems to me it's a different form altogether than used in other cases. And it does not seem to me that the primary teaching of it is, as it was misinterpreted I think there, to search out people whom you would think you could prove guilty of this, and to kill them, but would rather refer to the fact that at that time in all the countries they had these women, who had their headquarters where people would come to learn about the future and to find out what they should do. You remember Saul ordered that they should be done away with in Israel, they should not have them, but they were common in all other countries, and it is that in Israel, if Israel is a holy nation, such establishments are not to be allowed to exist, you shall not cause or permit to live a sorcerer.

It is refusing, preventing the establishment of this sort of organization which would bring all sorts of evil things into the community. Well, now, yes? (6 1/2)

I would think that is the continuation of the same, the message to the people is, don't try to get your information as to what you should do, by looking for familiar spirits and wizards that peep and mutter, don't go to these soothsayers, and these spiritists that claim to be able to give you wisdom which is really either a fake or is demonic. Should not a people seek to their God. The place for you to get it is to come to God to get it, and God often speaks of Himself in the person. The commandment thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, that was given by God to Moses. He speaks of Himself in the third person this way. In fact, I even heard a man on the radio within the last few days, on the radio saying, so-and-so thinks this, so-and-so does this, and using his own name, which is letting people know who it is that's speaking, getting the message out, tying them up to the broadcast, it's a very effective thing, and the Lord does it a great deal, in the Bible. Speaking of the Lord in the third person doesn't necessarily mean that it's someone else speaking about ~~them~~^{the Lord}, though of course the Lord does speak through people. // Yes? (7 1/2) That is an indefinite. It is when people say, when those around you say, when the ungodly try to lead you into things. When you get into trouble

and you don't know what to do, and your neighbors say, well, come over here to the sorceress and ask them, they will tell you. (8)stu) No, this is his answer to it. He says, when the people say this, don't pay any attention to them, and he continues: should not a people look to their God, why ~~w~~ould they look to the dead for the living? Look to their God. It is the argument of the one who says, when they say. (stu.8 1/.2) I would say, the prophet says, when people say to you, seek them that have familiar spirits, the prophet continues, should not a people seek to their God? Why should you look for the living to the dead? It's all the prophet, or God speaking to the prophet, all except the specific quotation, "when they say unto you," the specific word, "seek ye unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep and mutter."

You remember even when that godless king Ahaziah, in the northern kingdom, sent his messengers to go to Beelzebub the god of Ekron, to find out whether he could recover from his disease. You remember that Elijah said, is it that there's no God in ~~Israel~~, that you send to Ekron, it did not mean that God would give help to this wicked king, but it did mean that the wicked king who did not follow the Lord, made his wickedness all the more by looking to false ^{gods} for that which, if his heart was right, he could have secured from the true God. So he was going to the oracles of Ekron, but there there is a much greater break than comes at the end of the chapter, comes after v.20, I don't say there should be a chapter division there, but it does seem to me that a paragraph division would be quite in place. 20 is our conclusion of what we've just been saying, To the law and to the testimony. God's word is the source of knowledge, not that you open it and grab a verse to see what it tells you. Not that you expect some magical way of giving it, but that you learn the principles God has in His law, and in His testimony, this is your source of truth, this is your basis of understanding, this is your measuring stick. If they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them. That which is in accord with the Scripture is dependable, and that which contradicts is false, and that which is aside from it, neither agrees nor contradicts, just

is not specifically related to it, there we test and see what the evidence is on which it's based, it may be so, and it may not be so. And of course great damage has been brought to the cause of Christ by people jumping to conclusions on various matters, which the Scripture doesn't deal with, saying Scripture says this, it says that in six days God made heaven and earth and on the 7th day he rested, and we should work six days and should rest the 7th day, ours are literal 24 -hour days and therefore those must be too. Which of course is ridiculous, it nowhere says in the Bible that God rested a literal 24-hour day. Why would God rest a 24-hour day? After His tremendous effort of creating this universe, was He only tired enough that one day's rest would put Him in shape again? Why did it take Him any rest? It doesn't mean that God needed rest the way we do. It means that God ceased from His creative labor, and the cessation of God from His creative labor is still here. He did not rest one 24-hour day, He is, the 7th day we are still in, today. The period in which God has ceased from His creative labor, and we have the six periods before. The Scripture doesn't tell us anywhere how long they are, they could be ten seconds long, they could be ten billion years, we don't know. And to think that out of all the millions of planets in the universe God would be restricted by the length of time it takes this particular one to go round ~~the~~^{one} sun in the solar system, that would have to be ~~his~~ His measuring stick, as to how long He would spend in different aspects of His creative activity is something that's just unwarranted in the Scripture, but people have said it says days, it must be a 24-hour day, that's that. And then when the Geologist comes along and points to material that must have taken, if it was slowly laid, and it's rather hard to imagine its just being thrown down in some way and getting into anything like the condition it's in, if it was slowly laid, it would seem it must have taken a very long time, and they say here, millions of years it took this to get in shape, well, people say it contradicts the Bible and they lose their faith in the Bible because they have read in or out of the Bible something the Bible didn't deal with at all. It tells us nothing about the length of time involved since the creation of the world, or since the

creation of Adam, we just don't know. I feel myself it is very important when we go to any Scriptural passage that we do not say, is this the truth or the contrary, what does the Bible say? But that we say, does the Bible say this is the truth, does it say the opposite is the truth, or does it not give us light on this problem? ^{That we} ~~He~~ always asks ~~three~~ questions, rather than two, about everything. In order to find what the Bible does definitely give us and stand on it, but to be sure we're not reading into the Bible information on any one of the millions of subjects on which the Bible just doesn't speak. There is ~~plenty~~ it does speak on, but on those which it doesn't speak on, ~~the~~ if we can find evidence in science and observation, good solid evidence somewhere, we can depend on that evidence to some extent, but let's not jump to conclusions on it, and let's not become too excited one way or the other, on matters on which the Bible does not speak. But when it comes to all matters of spiritual life, all matters of religious life, of relation to the Lord, we cannot say, this is it, unless we find it in the Scriptures. To the law and to the testimony. If it is not in this word, if it is not derived from and clearly in line with the Scripture, nobody knows. Because the best knowledge you can get today...

M29. (3/4)

...they may point to one thing, and when we get the little further knowledge we can prove that it's something very, very different. Any knowledge that is not based specifically on the word of God is only true up to a certain point. ^{There is always} ~~It is always~~ the possibility of new discovery proving that it was a wrong way of looking at it all

8:20-21 the time. But now 20 then is a tremendous verse. In a way it is too bad that it is buried away here. If it was the last verse in the chapter it would stand out more, or at least the last verse in the paragraph. But 21 takes up a different subject, not a new subject, but a different subject from that in 20. We have been, verse 14 says, he will be a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel.

Verse 15, many among them shall stumble, and fall, and be broken, ~~an~~ ...

Then in 16 we went on to look at the godly and what they were supposed to do, but 21 takes us back again to the nation as a whole, and now we see the nation as a whole in the situation in which they are to be placed because of their failure to follow God's word, their turning away from it, their ignoring it, and because of the outworking of that in this plan of Ahaz, which has brought in the Assyrians presumably to help but actually by removing the buffer state, has put them into a much more serious situation than they were before, and in the result of all this, now Isaiah takes a glance forward through many centuries and he sees a general picture of the situation of the ungodly or of the nation as a whole, looking through centuries ahead but including a period rather near, when the Assyrian armies begin to march into the land of Israel. So he says in verse 21, And they shall pass through it--these are the people who have refused to follow the Lord,--hardly bestead and hungry: and it shall come to pass, that when they shall be hungry, they shall fret themselves and curse their king and their God. . . Up to this point, utter desolation, utter darkness, utter misery, nothing else. But then ^{they look upward;} they curse their king and their God, and look upward. There we have the beginning of a little light. It is not all darkness. It is not all misery. It is not all desolation. There is the coming of light. They will look upward. That is just a little suggestion of improvement in the situation, a little light coming amidst the darkness. That's if you take the verse alone, and whoever made the verse division thought you should take it alone, and the fact, it doesn't say they look up, look down, look all around, and don't find any help, it doesn't say that, it says, look upward, and then it says and they shall look to the earth, and it is a different word used for look. First one is they face upward, which could very well show the beginning of a turning to God. They face upward, a new light. But then it says, they shall look steadily (4) it is more of a hunting for something, unto the earth. They don't look up very long. They look to the earth. Or if you run the two verses together, you can say, they curse their king and their

God, and they look up, and they look to the earth. In other words, they look in all directions, ~~to make sure~~ ^{and they see} nothing but darkness and misery. So if you ~~run~~ the two verses together, and ignore the fact that you have two verses instead of one, which (4 1/2)

could be used in such a case, you have just a continuous picture of darkness, but as it stands there is a possibility that there is a suggestion of a coming of light, just this little bit at the end of verse 21. Now we go on to 22, we still have darkness, yes, but they look to the earth, and behold trouble and darkness, dimness of anguish, and they shall be driven to darkness, still darkness, gloom, misery, the nation has turned away from God. But ~~is~~ ^{is} God going to allow them to continue forever in darkness? Is ~~he~~ going to do that or will He bring them light out of the darkness? Will He give them deliverance? as part of His election of grace, for His own purpose of preparing the way for the coming of His ~~son~~ ^{son} into the world? Well, the last phrase in this, in the KJV, "they shall be" is in italics. It is not there. darkness, dimness of anguish, driven to darkness. Well the participle in it can be past, present or future. ~~But~~ What they behold is trouble and darkness, dimness of anguish, driven to darkness. Do they behold driven to darkness? Are they driven to darkness? The ~~words~~ ^{word} actually, however, does not mean driven, it means "driven away," to darkness. Well, there is no "to" in it, it is actually "darkness driven away." But you can take that darkness as an accusative of direction, you can take it, it does not have an ending on which would indicate direction, but you don't have to have that on necessarily. In fact, this particular form being a feminine already, it would be difficult to put ~~it~~ on. So it may be that they're driven to darkness, but it is not altogether satisfactory. Maybe it means the darkness is driven away, and if it does again you have--here you have all this darkness, gloom and anguish, and the darkness is driven away. A suggestion at the end of this verse of light coming, a better suggestion than the one that ends the verse before. A look upward.

Now these are suggestions here. Are they real? Is there a beginning of a piercing of the clouds, a beginning of the coming of light? We can't be sure. I think the words are intentionally used. This is not a mathematical formula, this is a literary ~~formula~~. They are intentionally used to create a certain impression. To create in us the impression as we read that maybe in the midst of all this darkness, God is starting to bring light. Maybe, we can't be quite sure, but we have a suggestion that perhaps He is. Well, what about the next verse?

Well, according to the KJV, the next verse is all darkness too. By the way, the Hebrew, you know, calls the next verse #23, starts with the following verse as the first of the new chapter, and actually there is no reason in the world for a chapter division here. It is better to have it one verse later, ~~or~~ like the Hebrew does, or still better to have it two verses earlier, the beginning of a paragraph. Nevertheless the ~~dimness~~ shall not be such as was in her vexation--oh, does that mean it is going to be a little lighter, the dimness won't be such as it was. Such as it was when? ~~✓~~

"When at the first he lightly afflicted the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, and afterward did more grievously afflict her by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, in ~~the~~ Galilee of the nations." This is how the King James renders it. The King James states it, this is then showing the coming of the Assyrian army. First they enter through Zebulon and Naphtali and perhaps they're rather courteous at first when they come in, they don't meet much opposition, they just come in, but then they take over and the people begin to realize what ~~is~~ is happening, and as they go further and come to the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the nations, they afflict them more severely. At any rate, it is all darkness, the way the King James Version has it, but 60 years ago a new translation was made, the American Standard ~~Version~~ Version. In some regards it is an improvement over the KJV, in other regards it isn't as good, but it was made on the whole by godly men, who sincerely tried to figure out what the Hebrew meant, and to put it into English. And I have known very godly Bible teachers

who have felt ~~felt~~ the ASV was the best translation into English. They have been very devoted to it. It doesn't have quite the literary value the KJ does, unfortunately. I used to think, well, maybe they're right, maybe I should turn to the ~~S~~ ASV instead of the KJV. Because I knew so many godly men who always seemed to prefer it. But ~~Then~~ I was in a class teaching Hebrew, and we read in Judges, about Abimelech, and I looked it up in the ASV and it said, he gat him up to the top of a hill, and I thought the Hebrew is just "he went up." Well, I thought, in the KJV made 300 years ago, if they say he gat him up it is understandable, but for something made 60 years ago when nobody used such language, to put it "he gat him up," I thought if they can't do any better than that, I'm going to stick to the KJV. So I have not made so much use, since that experience, of the ASV as I tended to before.

But where the ASV differs from the KJV you can take it that there is some pretty good grounds for considering another possibility of interpretation. And it may even be that it is a ~~more~~ ^{correct} ~~direct~~ rendering. I don't take it. If the ASV has it I take it rather than the KJ note, but I say if the ASV differs it is worth your looking in the Hebrew, and seeing which of the two you feel is right, and knowin g that the chances are there are good grounds for both. There are a few cases where the KJ has departed from the Hebrew, in ~~view~~ view of their understanding or of some New Testament quotation, where the ASV is a ~~lit~~ little more literal. But in this case it is amazing to see the difference. I hope that you have your KJ before you now with the verse I just read you: chapter 9.1. If you have, follow it as I read you what the ASV has. The ASV says: But there shall be no gloom to her that was in anguish. Isn't that different? But there shall be no gloom. That is real light. Nothing like that in ~~KJ~~. There it says: in the former time he brought into contempt the land of Zebulon and the ~~land~~ land of Naphtali, but in the latter time hath he made a glory. Quite different from: he did more grievously afflict her, as the KJ says. In the latter time he made his glory, by the way of the sea, beyond the Jordan, Galilee of the nations.

And the fact of the matter is that it can be translated the way the AV has, or the way the ~~§~~ AS has. Both are possible from the Hebrew. So you see, we have verse 21 ending with perhaps the suggestion of light. Maybe not. Maybe so. Verse 22 ~~ending~~, perhaps the darkness driven away, the suggestion of light. Perhaps not. We can't be sure. Verse 23, or 9.1, perhaps it is all gloom like the KJ but perhaps instead of its being, of (11 3/4) being "more grievously^{afflict}", perhaps it is "he made his glory," ~~isn't over~~ it could be translated either way, and actually if you're going to build a whole theology on this verse, you better not do it, because it is too uncertain what it means. But if you're going to interpret the context and find that he used language which again shows continuation of the darkness and gloom, and yet suggests that perhaps it does mean glory is coming, that glory is coming in Galilee, in Zebulun, in Naphtali, in the place where the Assyrian armies first entered and brought darkness and misery to the land, you have a background there for going on to the next verse where the light shines in fully and the people that walked in darkness have seen a great light, they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined.

I believe that we have here a case, not of sudden sharp transition but of a gradual transition from the terrible darkness of verse 21, showing that this darkness is not the end, God has for His people, purposes of blessing and of glory, and as you go on you think you see light begin to come, you're not quite sure, you think you see glory, is it glory, or is it greater affliction, you're not quite sure, and then all of a sudden the light bursts in full intensity upon you, the people that walked in darkness, the people in this area where the Assyrian army came marching in and brought the beginning of the times of the Gentiles to Israel, the beginning of the gloom and misery that lasted so many centuries--right in that very region light is going to begin to be seen in (13 1/2)

So that I feel that you could make an argument for following the Hebrew

Bible and saying a new chapter starts. Light. Everything before is darkness, ^{until} ~~and~~ the new chapter starts. But I don't think the argument would be conclusive. I think it is much more reasonable to say here is the transition between the present darkness, which Isaiah described, to the great outpouring of light which is to come in that very region, and when in that very region, there the light began to shine in the form of Jesus going about there and giving His great term, bringing the light of the world to the people, Matthew says these things were done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, and then he does not read the full meaning of 9.1, he just indicates the geographical places: Zebulon, Naphtali, Galilee of the nations, and then he says, upon these people, the light has shined, ^{the people} ~~before~~ that was ~~dark~~ in darkness have seen a great light. Yes? (14 1/2)...

M.29a. (3/4)

...that's the ASV translation of . The Authorized says "nevertheless the dimness shall not be such as was in her vexation." The ASV says, "but there shall be no gloom to her that was in anguish." To take the phrase just alone it is rather hard to be sure what to get out of it. I incline toward it, yes. It is a picture of darkness, gloom and misery, not as bad as it was when the Assyrian army first came in, but still it is a region of darkness, a region where they suffered from the Assyrian invasion, and perhaps the very region where all subsequent invasions first enter the land, and where they suffer from that, but in this very region the light first begins to shine. There is no organic connection between the fact of the darkness beginning there, which (1 3/4) and of the light beginning there, but it is just an interesting thing--you might say, almost a coincidence, that the Lord points out 700 years in advance, so that it's just an added indication that that is the one He is referring to, when it actually happens. Well, it is a very interesting chapter and the transition between 8 and 9 I feel is intensely interesting, leading us up to the future life that is coming, the

darkness comes from Ahaz, but the light comes when the true Emmanuel comes, the one of whom ~~ew~~ we have spoken earlier in chapter 8 and in 7, the great light comes when he comes and His coming and its effect are described in those next few verses in the wonderful section which I'd better leave till next time.

M.30. (3/4)

...great difficulty to Jewish interpreters 50 years ago. I have recently heard quite a bit of the new translation that the Jews are making this year. They have been working on it several years~~s~~, the new translation of the Old Testament. They've been working about 4 or 5 years on it, have finished the Pentateuch, except that they have to go over it all again, once more, and they are really doing some excellent work ~~and~~ getting some fine interpretations at many points, but when it comes to the Christian predictions ~~that are~~ ^{in it, they} have got some very clever new ways of evading them, pushing them aside, some very clever ways, so I wouldn't be a bit surprised that if when they come to Isaiah they find some kind of a new clever way to evade this one.

But certainly Professor Margolis of Dropsie College, when he made what is today the standard Jewish translation of the Bible, when he did it, he did not see any very satisfactory way of evading it, so what he did was simply to transliterate, ~~to~~ the Jews who have the holy Scriptures, open it up to this version to read: For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon ~~his~~ shoulder: and his name shall be called (1 3/4) , , ~~and~~ , and shal Salom. And there is that long combination of sounds that would mean nothing to him, that's His ~~name~~. His name was (2)

now His ~~name~~ is

But he ~~does~~ have a footnote which says something like this, "or, the might God, the everlasting Father, the prince of Peace, ~~the~~ is counselling a wonderful thing. Now of course that evades it too. The ~~translation~~ in the footnote, but as it stands His ~~name~~ shall be called, and then we have a list of names which is very ~~evide~~ ntly

not a name in the sense of a designation, to be used as a handle in calling a person, but rather a descriptive name, a name which describes His character and His attributes.

I have just received with a request that I should review it, a new translation of the last half of the Old Testament, called the Amplified Old Testament, Job to Malachi, and ~~there~~ they're issuing the second part first, they say the first part will follow. And in that I noticed that instead of having as it is here, wonderful, counsellor, it says wonderful counsellor. Well, now, that of course simply shows the utter ignorance of Hebrew of those who were responsible for that ~~the~~ particular paragraph. Because the, as it stands in the Hebrew, as you all know, ^{if you use an} ~~it gives you the~~ adjective in Hebrew, and attributive adjective always follows the term, and consequently to say wonderful counsellor you'd have to say counsellor wonderful in Hebrew, but the order of this is wonderful, counsellor, that is the order. It might seem to us more logical, you've got four names, each of them with two parts, so the first one would be wonderful counsellor, but that is not what the Hebrew has. The Hebrew has (4) wonderful, or wonder, and then a counsellor, not a counsellor wonderful, which we would translate a wonderful counsellor. So that that lack of a comma is quite incorrect as far as its being in any sense a translation of the Hebrew is concerned. Well, some have tried to take it as a conflux, say, a wonder of a counsel, and that's not quite so bad, though it doesn't seem quite right to me. I think the best way is undoubtedly to do as our KJV has and consider that here you have ~~not~~ four ~~things~~ names with two parts in each, but five names, the first two having one word, and the last three having two. Yes? (4 1/2) We were saying that this name is ~~not~~ I believe considered as having five elements instead of four, and He is wonderful, not just that He is a wonderful counsellor, not just that this coming child is a very fine counsellor, but that He is wonderful, He is a wonder. Isaiah said I and my children are for signs and wonders. He is one who is wonderful in every way, one who is transcendent.

He is one who goes beyond all other s ~~w~~ who ever lived. It is not just a wonderful counsellor, it is wonderful He is. And then of course He is a counsellor. Here is a very great part of His activities, Jesus Christ as prophet, His words, His advice, He is counsellor par excellence. And His teaching such as no other man has ever had. He is indeed a great counsellor, and this is very fitting, to have some reference to that stage of his activity, because that is what we have back in verse 2, the great light that comes is His preaching, it is not yet His death, it looks forward to His death, but is not yet there when He preaches in Galilee. And then it calls Him the mighty God, and that is a tremendous thing to call a child. No wonder that Margolis says in a footnote, the mighty ~~G~~od, the everlasting father, the prince of Peace is counselling a wonderful thing. But such--I don't know of anyone else in there who got a name quite that long. It certainly is not just a series of attributes, the way he takes it, as we have it-- His ~~name~~ nature, because that wouldn't be describing anybody's character to say that the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the prince of Peace is counselling a wonderful thing. There are many gods, many names in Babylonian and other sources from the old times, that such a god is helping or has done a great thing, or has given a great gift, ~~or~~ something like that, but they none of them have the god named in three long phrases like this. And the name of the god would naturally come first rather than last. It is quite without parallel as a long name like that, and certainly not the order in which you would expect to find anything like that. So it is an attempted evasion. The fact is that quite (7)

that this one is going to be born who will actually be wonderful, a counsellor, and the mighty god, (7 1/4) the word is often used for a very strong man, sometimes translated "a hero," so some a god, a hero, but that doesn't make much sense, a god of a hero, (7 1/4) but it doesn't mean the mighty God, the powerful God, is nearer to the natural interpretation of those words. Of course that is a tremendous thing to call a man, it is ^{very} surprising ~~to~~

people in Isaiah's day to read such a thing. They might have thought well surely there is some mistake in text. How can a child be called the mighty God? But they preserved it and it lasted and is in all the manuscripts. Yes? (7 3/4) To make a sentence of the thing you'd want to put the whole thing into one sentence but to take one of the four sections of it and make a sentence would be pretty hard to fit into this as a whole. He is god of a hero, or better, he is the mighty God, He is the (8) God, the God that is powerful. Yes? (8) I have not paid a great deal of attention to those accents because the accents are quite late anyway, they come from the Massoretic time. We believe that the vowel points were handed on by tradition, and being handed on by tradition, some errors have come in but we think it wonderful, how accurate the vowel points are on the whole. The consonants were written, the vowels simply remembered. We think they are wonderfully accurate on the whole, though occasionally errors have come in, in the vowels. But when it comes to the accents, that would be the way they pronounced it, or the way they thought it ought to be, it would be pretty hard to keep the accent purely from generation to generation that way. So we note where they put in end of a verse sign, or where they put the note which they think indicates the principle break within the verse, but, and the other, the system is quite complex, there are many of these different accents, and we usually don't pay a lot of attention to them. That would show what they thought. But some particular man, we don't know who, ~~was~~ thought. But we don't know how far back that tradition might have gone, it certainly wouldn't necessarily go to Isaiah's time, but then, the next phrase: the everlasting Father, there it is literally the Father of (9 1/2) . That would surely be a . The Father of and I'm not sure that everlasting is quite so good for that, because, while he is everlasting, of course, I'm not sure the word necessarily goes that far. It shows a long, long, long time. It shows that. But the philosophical idea of endlessness, I am not sure is included in the word. I heard people say, well, it

must be, what other word have they got for endless? Well, you ~~think~~^{take} an ordinary person, you go through five years ~~and~~ take all the different things he says, how often do you find the word "endless" ? Unless you have the theological concept of eternity. It is nothing that would occur in daily speech, so why would there necessarily be a word for it? The ordinary word, of course, is ola, which expresses a long, long period. And the fact the olam does not express endlessness is proven by the fact that sometimes they say (10 1/2) That is, the age of eternity. Eternity of eternity. You take this long, long stretch, far ~~as~~ as you can see, and then you say, just as many as there are of that, that many more stretch as long as this. Well, it still doesn't say endless. I believe it teaches that, but I don't think it is necessarily right within the particular word. But here, he is the Father of eternity, and that doubtless means that he is the one who characterized by the Father of eternity, not that ~~he just~~^{it suggests} here the creation of eternity, but the one who has no beginning or no end, or at least as far as you can possibly look in either direction you don't see any beginning or any end. Now there is another word that means booty that has this same sound, and so some take it ~~part~~ Father of booty, but of course that is going pretty far from the whole thought of the passage as a whole, to get Father of booty into it. There you get back into the mythological realm very clearly, any kind of a spiritual interpretation, Jewish or Christian, ~~would~~ certainly not be satisfied with calling ~~this~~ this word, Father of booty. But of course it is a tremendous name to give to a youngster. This is one of the verses that for Jewish evangelism is just very, very hard to evade. Here it is, in Isaiah, in all the Jewish Scriptures. Of course, the average Jew knows nothing about the Bible. The orthodox Jew pays great attention to the Talmud and very little actually to the Bible. Jesus said you have made the word of God of no effect by your tradition. Well, the tradition is supposed to be based on Scripture, but it puts a tremendous lot over it and around it, and puts the attention on that rather than on the Scripture. Mr. Golin? (12 1/4)

The construct is very often used to indicate that the ~~one~~ word is followed by a characterizing word, like a stick of gold, a chair of wood, that it is something which characterizes the ^{one who is coming, is} ~~word itself~~. And it usually takes ~~a #~~ exactly as the KJ takes it, that the Father of, entirely, or very, very often, is the father, the one who is distinguished by it, so the everlasting Father is quite a good name.

Now of course in modern Arabic, Father is very often used for possessor, possessor of eternity, for instance. I read about one Arab, for instance, who was very, very excellent at sitting at his desk for long hours doing very fine work, but he had what the Germans call (3 1/4) sitzfleisch, result he could sit and work for long hours, so the Arabs just called him by two Arab words which meant "the father of the two brothers." In other words a man who ~~would~~ was characterized by his ability to sit long times without getting tired, but Arabic uses the word Father very frequently that way to indicate some quality, or some attribute.

Now one might suggest that there was a similarity here, that the Father of eternity meant the eternal one, but I don't think there is a parallel use to any great extent in Hebrew, but I would incline to think that it rather means actually, the eternal Father. Of course it is very hard when you just have two words together like this to build a tremendous lot on them. They can--you don't have much contact with this idea (14) You might say like a bolt out of the sky, here is what this one is going to be. And you say what a tremendous thing, how can this ever fit any child that is going to be born. But the verses before show very clearly that it is a wonderful child, something tremendous, it is not just any ordinary thing that is going to happen. But this goes beyond the wonderful, this goes into the realm of the transcendent. And of course when we get to the New Testament we find that is exactly what did happen...

...last meeting together we had finished chapter 8 and we were just starting chapter 9. We noticed a gradual transition between 8 and 9. The Bible is not a book of mathematical formula. It is not an attempt to put things in ABC proposition in such a way that they cannot possibly be misunderstood. It is a great literary work in the course of which God endeavors to get through to our hearts, not merely intellectually, but also emotionally, and He tries to drive home thoughts to us and to give them in ~~with~~ such a way that they will reach many different kinds of people at many different times, in many different situations, and the result is that there are many things that are crystal clear in Scripture, there are other things that we may not know until we get to glory, and then there are other things in which there are all sorts of percentages of certainty as to what the meaning is, and sometimes I have no doubt there is an intentional impression created rather than simply a series of logical theories. And so here we have the description of the misery that is to come, to these people who are following human expedients ~~o~~ instead of seeking the Lord for their help, and these --we see them going ~~ti~~ in darkness and gloom but gradually we see suggestions of light breaking through. And eventually in verse 2 of chapter 9 in our English arrangement, 1 in the Hebrew arrangement, we have the light there, tremendous force, tremendous power. But ~~the~~ verse just before that is very difficult to know whether it is all darkness or whether there is the beginning of light, already, and in the two previous ones there is a suggestion which maybe the coming of light and may not. If we only had these three to go on, we could not be dogmatic at all, but when we have verse 2, a tremendous light, we are justified in saying that there is a gradually becoming aware of the light, until suddenly one realizes it has broken upon him in full force. And of course that is true with every great advance in civilization. It is true of every new idea, it is true of every great presentation of God's will, that it comes gradually to different people at different times. One man has a great idea. He thinks it's wonderful and it may be completely wrong. And he gets a lot of people

to follow him, but it does out. ~~And then~~ Another person has a great idea that is exactly what the Lord wants people to have, but he has a hard time getting people to follow him, but gradually understanding comes, gradually it is spreading, and then when everybody has accepted it they don't know how people could have been such fools as not to see it before. That is always the way. When we get to understand something, then we just don't see why everybody couldn't understand it before. But here in verse 2, the light, there is no question, the light is there, in great power. The people that walk in darkness have seen a great light. Who are these people? The people of Zebulon and Naphtali. People beyond Jordan, Galilee of the nations. The people in the area where the Assyrian armies first entered, where the darkness of the turning over of Israel to the Barbarian control, those people where the darkness first entered, those are the people where the great new life first began to shine, and Matthew said that Jesus Christ began His preaching in that very area in order that this passage here might be fulfilled. The coming of the light there was the preaching of our Lord in that area, and ~~that~~ it was poured out there exactly as Isaiah had predicted. Matthew said these things were done in order that ~~it~~ it might be fulfilled. Well, that is true, but ^{other hand,} ~~one~~ it is even more true to say these things were written in Isaiah because God knew that's what He was going to do later, and therefore He predicted it in advance, and it gave an ~~of~~ incidental inorganic prophecy, a little certification that Jesus Christ was the ~~of~~ one who was predicted, that it began right in that place here mentioned, something that would have been very hard to predict in advance, ~~of~~ but when you see it, ~~you~~ ~~of~~ see how it fulfills this fact. Where the darkness first came, there the light comes, first begins to shine in its fullness. And so in verse 3 we have a statement which is read in two different ways, one version says, thou hast multiplied the nation ~~and~~ not increased the joy, the ~~other~~ says thou hast multiplied the nation and hast increased his joy. The two are exactly opposite, and nobody on earth can tell which is right. Absolutely no way to prove it. It is my

impression that the ASV has increased its joy, the KJV says has not increased the joy. The thing is that the word "lo" can mean the joy to him, or it can mean not increase. It depends whether it should be written with an aleph or with a wau, and as to that position fitting. We don't know which actually was in the original manuscript, the aleph, or the wau, the pronunciation is exactly the same and one could spend a long time trying to decide, but it does not affect the passage as a whole very greatly. As you continue, this verse 3 is all joy, just as verse 2, verse 3 is all joy. they joy before thee according to the joy in harvest, and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil. ~~For~~ Thou has multiplied the nation. We ~~kind~~ of wonder why we should say, has not increased the joy. If this verse was back before verse 2, it might be quite reasonable. The nation has multiplied but with the multiplication has come misery rather than joy. They need the light that He will bring. But this comes after the mention of the light, the last half of the verse is full of the expressions of joy, I don't--if there is no proof one way or the other, it seems more reasonable to think that it is an expression of joy, the second phrase, than that it is an expression of the lack of it. So I would incline ^{to think} that in this case, perhaps, "increase his joy" would be more probable, but it does not affect the teaching of the fact of the whole actually, whether we have here again a little flyback to the darkness that preceded, or whether you are now entirely in the realm of light and joy. They rejoiced. Why did they so rejoice? Verse 4; For thou hast broken the yoke of his burden, and the staff of his shoulder, the rod of his oppressor, as in the day of Midian.

I think that one writer has said that the "staff of the shoulder" is the ceremonial law, and the "rod of the oppressor" is the civil law, and I think it quite unnecessary to read that into the passage at all. It would seem to me that actually he is referring to what he has been referring to right along, to the war, the tumult, the misery that comes when Ahaz turns away from God's plan and tries to use his human expedients in order to deliver his land from the attacks, attacks more on him than on the land,

and this constant difficulty has continued from that time right up/ to the time of the Roman conquest, and of course that is continued through this present day, but when the preaching ~~time~~ comes, the preaching of the Prince of Peace, there is presented that ~~which~~ in principle which will eventually, in actuality, put an end to war, and bring the universal realm of peace, a realm which will come with the Lord's actual return, and so verse 4 I think we are justified in saying is referring specifically to human war and physical injury ~~rather~~ rather than to anything specifically ~~good~~ ^{spiritual}. ~~Now~~ Thou has broken this "as in the day of Midian." What is the "day of Midian"? I am sure every Bible student says immediately that is Gideon, that refers to the way that, in the time of Gideon, there was a sudden tremendous destruction of the enemy through God's power. God had the army cut down to only 300 and with these 300, in a very special way, he won the tremendous victory. And God is going to bring in universal peace, not by ~~universal~~ great human plans of the United Nations, or League of Nations, or Disarmament Conferences, or that sort of thing, but by divine intervention, he is going to accomplish it in a sudden drastic way, much as He gave Gideon the victory. He is going to bring that then in a sudden drastic way which man has nothing to do with, and when this preaching comes, described in verses 1 and 2, this preaching is presenting the declaring, the ultimate complete reality of the end of war, but it is presenting that war, all that is wicked is in principle ~~pro~~ soon to be destroyed through the action of the Prince of Peace, the one who destroyed the power of the devil. So that I am quite certain is the reason for verse 4, not a declaration of freedom from the ceremonial law or anything of the kind. And then verse 5, certainly backs up this interpretation of verse 4, very strongly, for verse 5 goes right on to refer specifically to physical human war, "for every battle of the warrior is with confused noise, and garments rolled in blood." The terrible misery of human warfare. The confused noise, the garments rolled in blood, the frightful things that exist in every war, you can read about them today in VietNam, the terrible tortures that are being done, that sort of thing,

you can read about Algeria, how just today, or yesterday I suppose it was, the French Secret Army// threw bombs on a French army barracks. I don't know what they ever thought they'd gain by that. They certainly couldn't destroy the French Army and if they did it wouldn't give them the ability to destroy ten times their number in Moslems. Utterly confused, as it says here "with confused noise," but it's typical of the anarchy and war and misery which is the result of sin in this world. But the deliverance from war, deliverance from all this, is to come in the first instance not through a great conqueror coming, that is to be a part of it, but a later stage, not the first stage. So we have that surprising verse 6, a surprising verse and yet a verse which can take us right back to chapter 7,14, Immanuel is to be born, a child who is to be born is the answer to the problem, and of course up in verse 1 and 2, we read of the great light that comes, the light comes because of the preaching of this child, but it is not because of his wonderful teachings, wonderful as they are, or of his great ideas, but because of who He is, and what He is eventually going to do, so we read:

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given;" and of course this phrase, "unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given" is typical Hebrew parallelism, and very frequently in Hebrew parallelism you have the same thing said in two different ways, two parallel phrases and the difference between the two has no particular meaning, it is the central fact emphasized and stressed by the parallel. But there are cases when the parallel shows two different sides of one truth, and I don't believe there is any doubt of that here. I don't think that would be obvious enough that a person reading this for the first time would necessarily see it, or that a person could prove it from this. But once we have proven from other facts that this child who is born has two very contrasting aspects to His nature, then we can see how this verse very definitely points forward to that. Well, unto us a child is born. Here is a human being, a child born under normal processes, a true man in every way. But unto us a son is given. He is not merely born, He is given, He is the gift of God,

the Gift of His own Son, the One who is indeed fully man ~~w~~nd who is fully God.

~~They~~ ^{As I} say you cannot prove the doctrine of the person of ~~Ø~~ Christ from ~~this~~ verse.

Nor would a person in Isaiah's time be expected to understand that from this verse.

But when he sees what happens he should be able to say why ~~w~~ that ~~exactly~~ fits with what was predicted, the land which is to be taken, even more literally than I ever would have dreamed of before, exactly suggests the two aspects of ~~His~~ nature...

M.32. (3/4)

...by these tremendous things, you might say, metaphysics. He is the one who has the being that's eternal, He is the one that (1)

tremendously important, but we end with the practical, and the Bible is always

practical. He is the Prince of Peace. He is the one who establishes peace, He is

the one who controls peace, He is the one from whom and from Him~~alone~~, peace can

be secured. And of course peace is right in our whole context. The darkness ~~that~~

was from the Assyrian invasion, at the beginning of this chapter, the wars described

in ~~verse~~ 5, the end of wars described in ~~verse~~ 4, He is the Prince of Peace, He is the

one who does not merely talk but He acts. He is the one who does not merely say ~~He~~ be

~~is~~-peaceful, like these students that are picketing the ~~White~~ House, let's throw

away all our atom bombs, cause if we have an atom bomb why everybody is going

to be killed so let's throw them away, let's let the Russians walk in and take us.

As Bertrand Russel says, better to be red than be dead. ~~The~~ thing they forget when

they say that is that they will all be dead if they're red, because the reds will kill

off everybody that is of capitalistic background, that is to say have a father who owns

as much as a cow, why he was a capitalist and they will be killed off, so that the

slogan, "better red than dead," is a slogan that only the poorer type of laborer could

possibly use, and in Russia they did kill off the whole class of the ~~Ø~~ Czarist days,

all of those who in those days had anything. Of course they were a comparatively small

percent of the population but still they were at least ^{a few} million people, they just killed

them off entirely~~ly~~, or if they didn't kill them off they told the children you cannot get any education, you cannot have any opportunity to do anything except the poorest type of menial labor, and it ended all future whatever, for them, and that's what they would do here, if they got control, but the Prince of Peace is not the one who ever takes peace by surrender. Peace by giving into what is evil, but the one who will establish peace by doing away with what is evil, and bringing it under control, so it is fitting that the practical aims that apply to the problems that are here in view, as Ahaz is trying to get peace by his wicked~~ness~~ methods, and God says you can get peace only through trusting God and through the true method that He gives, that it is to come and is to come through a child that is to be born, who will be indeed the Prince of Peace. Then we have this statement of the increase of His government and peace, here shall be no end, and that of course would be a wonderful post-millennial verse. Take it by itself and say that there is a gradual increase as His government spreads over all the world, and there will be no end to it, but it does not have to be interpreted that way. It fits perfectly with the postmillennial interpretation, but it does not require postmillennial interpretation. Calvin had excellent commentaries on the Bible, they vary tremendously in quality because some of them are commentaries that he worked over and over, revised, studied, and tried to make excellent commentaries, while others are just his expository lectures that he gave with very little special effort as he went through the Bible and they were taken down in shorthand by somebody who heard them and some of them heard it without his even getting time to look them over, so that you have tremendous variations among the different volumes of his commentaries. ^{Those that} ~~So he says~~ he worked over thoroughly are of course extremely fine. The others vary greatly, but even Calvin was sometimes affected by what is called the Rabbinic method of interpretation ~~and~~ here is ~~the~~ a verse where he was. Because in your Hebrew Bible, where it says increase of His

4:7

government and peace, the word "increase" is written with a final name at the be-
 ginning of the word. If I recall correctly it is the only case in the Bible where we
 have a final name[□] at the beginning of a word, so in his commentary he asks why do we
 have a final name[□] at the beginning of the word, and he says the answer is because
 the name has a hole in it, the name[□] as you write it is open, while the final name[□] is
 closed, and consequently this is closed to show the absolutely final nature of the
 increase of His government and peace which nothing can stop. Well, that is what
 we speak of as the Rabbinic method of interpretation. We don't find much of it
 in Calvin. We don't find many people who use that sort of an interpretation today,
 but it's interesting that you do have this one instance of it in his commentary. "Of
 the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end." Now the fact
 that there is no end to it does not mean it just keeps on increasing through all eternity,
 because certainly He is going to control all the world and it couldn't go any further.
 There shall be no end. Surely nothing can stop it. Nothing can stop it until it has
 succeeded in taking everything under its thumb. So of the increase of His government
 and peace there shall be no end upon the throne of David, and this ties right back
 to chapter 7, where he told the whole house of David of the Immanuel who was coming,
 Yes? (6 1/4) I would incline to think that somebody felt sleepy when he was
 copying, wrote a final a in the wrong place. That is, I do not feel that we have a
 Bible which God has given us these letters precisely as they are today, they've gone
 through a long period of copying. The vital thing is the ideas in it, the ideas that are
 expressed in words, the words have been kept remarkably free from error, but yet
 some errors have crept in. Well, now of the errors that have crept in, I think a
 comparatively minor one is to get final name in the place where an ordinary name
 occurs, and the fact that it might have happened very, very early, but the fact that
 they kept it absolutely the same, they preserved it, they copied it, they find a final
 name^{man} there, it doesn't belong there, but they copy it. That is a wonderful evidence

to us of the care they took in copying. ~~What~~ they found in their manuscripts they tried to copy, but my guess would be it's an error in a case like that. I don't think the Lord intended to give us a meaning by the fact that a particular letter was written in a special way. Yes? (7 1/4) We don't know how far back the final ^{mem}names go. We don't know just when they were introduced. There is one case in Candlee where a sentence just doesn't make any sense, and where, on the assumption that the ^{mem}name that should be at the end of a word has been by a wrong ^{division}~~division~~ of letters, has been copied at the beginning of the next verse. You get perfect sense out of it, and also get what the Septuagint has. So that whether the final ^{mem}names go back extremely far, I don't believe we know, and also, ^{if you ever}~~you never~~ do any writing for publication, you'll be amazed how easy to overlook matters that are much more striking than that. Oh, it's the hardest thing to get rid of errors.

That little article 30 pages on Archeology and the Bible, that was in the ASA publication that I wrote in 1948, the VanKampen Press sent me the stuff for proof-reading and they evidently hadn't done any proof-reading, and I must have averaged two mistakes to a line, for the whole thing, that I found, and I read it through probably 15 times and every time I found two or three errors in the setting. Every single time, and even the last time. It is amazing how you can overlook.

I was editor of our college paper for a year and I had to read proof every week on it, and at the end of a year I could look at a paper like ^{this}~~that~~ and spot a typographical error like an ink spot on the table, but it's amazing how the average person never notices it. You see a word, you recognize the word, you don't notice that the word is actually spelled quite wrong, you don't notice it. ~~I'm not so sure~~

I'm not so sure people would have noticed it necessarily until it has been there a while and then they think it is part of it. Well, ~~that~~ is not a vital point of exegesis of Isaiah, but it is an interesting one here, that there'll be no end of the increase of His government and peace. That is, that it cannot be destroyed, we

read about the kingdom of Christ, it cannot be destroyed. No one will be able to destroy it. Now some people say how can there be a millennial kingdom, a millennial kingdom has an end by definition. It has a thousand years, it has an end, and yet, of His kingdom there is to be no end. I don't take this to be no end, this means there won't be changes in administration, or end of one stage and beginning of another phase, or even turning over everything to God the Father, that God may be all in all, but that nothing is going to be able to destroy it, to bring an end to it, and upon His kingdom, to order it and to establish it, with judgment and with justice, from henceforth, even forever, again the word "forever" I don't think in itself means with no end, on and on and on, but it does mean on and on, as far as you can see, and probably involves that there is ending, but I don't think it is specifically stated. And then the zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this, this is something which God's power will establish, it is God's doing, nothing that men can do. War is going to come to an end, peace is coming, it is not going to come by these clever human schemes, all of which in the end backfire, get twisted up, each foolish situation, it is going to come because God intervenes with His own marvelous power. And here is a break that is far more important than the break at the beginning of 9 or at the beginning of 10. Surely right here is where you should start a new important section. But I incline to think that very likely this is the main division in the middle of our book ^{of} ~~the~~ Immanuel, is right here. Everything has moved along very smoothly from the beginning of 7 through this point. But now here we have a rather sharp start again, that looks forward to the wonderful climax of it all, now we go back again and look at the beginning of it, the Lord will send a word to ~~Jacob~~ ~~to~~ Jacob and it lighted on Israel. There again you see the use of terms, you see the two names, simply parallel, there is no difference here between Jacob and Israel. It is not that one document has "a word to Jacob," and the other document had "it lighted on Israel," it simply is a (12)

in having two that mean substantially

the same thing in parallel. And all the people shall know, even Ephraim and the inhabitants of Samaria, --you see, we have looked forward into the future, up to the time of the coming of the Prince of Peace, Now we come back right to the time of Ahaz, and because it was during Ahaz' time that Samaria was destroyed, it couldn't be after that. But right during his time, we look again at Samaria, and they say in the pride and stoutness of heart, the bricks are fallen down,, we'll build with hewn stones, the sycomores are cut down, we will change them into cedars. Wonderful statement, you admire the pluck who when they're down they're not out. They lose a lot, they start and rebuild and go ahead. Verse 10 would be a wonderful motto for most anybody to take in life. It is something which is very, very commendable, but the thing here which makes it not commendable, but deserving of ~~commendation~~ ^{condemnation} is that this wonderful thing is said in pride and stoutness of heart, because the catastrophe that comes to them is not a natural catastrophe which is wonderfully plucky of them to ~~not~~ be downed by, but lift up and go forward, but it is a catastrophe which God has sent because of their turning away from Him, therefore, they're saying that here, instead of turning to Him in contrition and seeking His forgiveness and His leadership makes this thing which would otherwise be wonderful be a matter of pride and stoutheartedness. So it is too bad that we can't lift the wonderful verse out of there and use it because it is such a wonderful verse, but it is with the wrong background and purpose, and therefore becomes bad. It is in the pride and stoutness of their heart that Ephraim says we are going to go on and pick up where we are, and carry on, continuing to forget God in the future as we have been doing in the recent past. Therefore the Lord is going to send enemies against them and they will devour Israel with open mouth, for all this His anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still. I guess we have to stop there until tomorrow...

9:10

...we have here then this series of stanzas of this poem, and you notice that the poem starts--we look at those wonderful verses last time about the coming of the wonderful child, which is described at the beginning of chapter 9, and then we notice that at the end of verse 7, there is one of the major changes in the chapter, one of the major turning points. We have gone up from starting with Ahaz, we have gone ^{right} up to that great climax which we reach, "in the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end." Looking way forward into the future, into the complete victory of Christ. Then we come back again into the immediate situation. And now we have four stanzas, we have a stanza from verse 8 to 11, another from 13 to 17, another from 18 to 21, and another ⁱⁿ ~~from~~ chapter 10.1-4, and why on earth a chapter division is ever put after three stanzas and before the fourth, as if in one of our hymns they have the first three verses on one page and the fourth verse on the next page. It just doesn't seem to make any sense at all. But here are these four stanzas and every one of the four ends with this declaration, that for all this His anger is not turned away, but His hand is stretched out still, and so in the first of them, as we mentioned at the end of the hour last time, we have in the first of them, that wonderful verse showing real determination, verse 10. The bricks are fallen, ~~but~~ we'll build with hewn stone. The sycamores are cut down but we will put cedars in their place. We've lost all our good things, we're going to make better ones. It is a wonderful determination but it is expressed in the wrong situation. The previous verse says ~~in~~ pride and stoutness of heart they did it. So the Lord is going to bring enemies against ~~Israel~~ ^{Israel} who will devour them with open mouths, and perhaps, "in spite of" here would seem to fit perfectly, ~~wouldn't~~ it? It could be because of, and go back to verse 9 and 10, because of their pride and stoutness of heart, the Lord's anger is not turned away, His hand is still stretched out, or with what immediately preceded, in spite of all they're going through in this, with these enemies attacking and devouring them with open mouth, in spite of that, it is God's

9:8-21

4:13-17
anger still

. Then the second of these describes the condition in Israel, the wickedness within Israel, the people have not turned unto Him that smote them. Neither have they ~~smote~~ ^{sought} the Lord of hosts. He has brought this punishment on Israel, and Judah sees what is happening to Israel, he has brought chastisement upon them, they have not sought Him, not turned to God, when He has chastised them. Therefore, the Lord will cut off from Israel, head and tail, palm branch and rush in one day. The elder and honourable is the head, and the prophet that teaches lies, he is the tail. I don't know just what the figure really means, altogether. The head of course is the honorable man, the elder, the leader, but what does it mean that the prophet that teaches lies, is the tail. Certainly there is a condemnation of a prophet that speaks lies, but how is he at the opposite extreme from the other? I don't quite know, am quite curious, any suggestions any of you have about it. But, verse 16 is a great verse, they that leave this people cause them to err. The people are at fault, they that are led of them are destroyed, the people are coming into terrible results, but it is due to they that lead. And of course that is exactly our ~~situation~~ ^{condition} in America today. You go into the bulk of our churches, and the people who believe that the Bible is true, most of them wouldn't go to church if they didn't believe that, they think the Bible is true, they think Christ is God, they do think Christianity is vital, and important, but their leaders have mostly today been trained in schools that have taught them that social improvement is all that matters and we can't be sure about these religious things anyway and after all the Bible is full of error, and so on, and the leaders, the ministers, the heads of churches, they may not say this, but it is implied in an awful lot they say, and it is gradually influencing the people, half of them drift out of the church, and don't come back any more, except in times of calamity, the other half becomes attached to this unChristian teaching, and the people as a whole, you can say, are not responsible. It is not they who did it, it is the leaders, but it is having an effect upon the people, and the people will inevitably

suffer for it, and that's exactly the condition he describes here, he puts the blame where it belongs, on the prophet that teaches lies, on they that cause His people to err. Therefore, he says, the Lord will not rejoice over their young men, neither will he have compassion on their fatherless and widows, for every one is profane and an evil doer, and every mouth speaks folly. That is pretty strong language, every one. It certainly the great bulk, it certainly does not mean every religion. Mr. Cohen?

(5 3/4) An interesting suggestion that the prophet who speaks lies here isn't simply a prophet who likes to say what is false for the sake of saying false things, but a prophet who is winning his position, his money, his approval by doing what the people in established leadership will be pleased by. That is a very interesting suggestion. Very interesting. I can't quite feel that the prophet is saying that the prophet who tells lies is bad but the leaders and the elders are good. If the leaders were good I don't think God would be punishing the nation. I think they are included in the wickedness, in fact, they are to quite an extent responsible for it, they that cause this people to err wouldn't just be the prophets, but surely the particular leaders. But this idea that Mr. ^{Tourville} ~~Cohen~~ has suggested, that maybe the prophets are time servers, as it were, trying to get the leaders approval, and therefore he speaks of them like the tail that wags, that is a very interesting suggestion. Yes? (7)

I would incline at the moment toward that interpretation, it is a little hard to be sure, but it is true that the next verse does suggest it very strongly. The leaders, the honorable men and the elders, they are leading them wrongly, ~~they~~ Ahaz, for instance, is making this wicked alliance with Syria, they are leading the people wrongly, and the prophet is one of those who is led wrongly and not only led wrongly but he is giving aid and comfort to it, he is helping to mislead the people, but doing it in the direction that the leaders want it. So that that, I think, has a lot to be said for it. Well, the Lord says, ~~all~~ the people are going to suffer, even the fatherless and the ~~and~~ widow,

even the ones who would say, you would say, these poor people, what can they do, up against ~~us~~ it completely, won't you have compassion on them? He says, no, the whole nation is going to suffer, as a result of this evil leadership, which has been permitted to gain control over it. And so he says, here is certainly the cause of it fits very well, wouldn't it, because of all this, his anger is not turned away but He is keeping on, his hand is still outstretched, or it could be in spite perhaps, but it doesn't seem to be much to suggest "in spite" in this particular sense, does it? Mr. Gregory, what were you going to say? (8 1/2) It is hard to say, because the word Israel means all the descendants of Jacob, so that all of both kingdoms are Israelites, but the northern kingdom being the larger kingdom, the northern kingdom is often called Israel, in distinction to the southern kingdom named after its principal tribe, called Judah. However very frequently when they call the southern kingdom after its principal tribe Judah, they call the northern kingdom after its principal tribe Ephraim, and they refer to them as Ephraim and Judah, and then once the northern kingdom has gone into exile, the southern kingdom takes over the title Israel, which really belongs to it just as much as to the northern, except that it's smaller, once the northern is done, it is the Israel, so it calls itself Israel, after that. So under the circumstances, our first stanza speaks very specifically about the northern kingdom, doesn't it, speaks of Ephraim, and Samaria, the first one, so that would seem to suggest that it is the northern kingdom in the first stanza, but in this second stanza here there is nothing that would tie it necessarily just to the northern kingdom and it, as far as the terminology is concerned, I think it could fit either one equally, and as far as the fact is concerned, the northern kingdom had its wicked leadership which was leading it to disaster, and Ahaz represents the same thing in this other kingdom, so whether the second stanza is supposed to be restricted to the north ~~or~~ or restricted to the south, or to cover both, is hard to be dogmatic. I would incline a bit toward that it covers

both. (10 1/4) Yes but in the first stanza it is the ~~Assyrians~~ Syrians that are before and the Philistines that are behind. Well, now I am not quite, of course the Syrians were next to Ephraim, not next to Judah. But ~~w~~ere the Philistines next to Ephraim? Were they not ^{more} next to Judah? Not quite sure about that. My inclination ~~is~~ — they were certainly very definitely next to Judah. They were in the southern region. Now whether they also were against Israel ^{enough} ~~is nothing~~ to warrant binding that to Israel, I don't know. But of course then you take the next verse, yet the people have not turned to him that smote them. Does that mean ~~th~~at the people of the northern kingdom who have had these effects, will not, have not turned to God who sent these, or does it mean ~~the~~ people of the southern kingdom, seeing the northern kingdom go through all this misery have not turned to him that has smitten the northern kingdom. The pronouns like that are rather definite to say must be one or the other. We don't use a noun, just use a pronoun. Therefore the Lord will cut off from Israel all this in one day. Well, as a matter of ~~fact~~, he did that to the northern kingdom and he did it to the southern kingdom later, a hundred years later. So what you can confine to the northern kingdom, I think it is very doubtful, particularly when it fits the southern kingdom so very excellently. Now in the third, you have the northern kingdom involved again.

The third stanza, wickedness burns as a fire, it ~~but~~ devours the briars and thorns, kindle in the thickets of the forest, and they roll up together in a column of smoke, through the wrath of the Lord of hosts is the land burned up, people are as a fuel of the fire, no man spares his brother. What is he talking about? Northern or southern kingdom? One shall snatch on the right hand, and be hungry, he shall eat on the left hand, and they shall not be satisfied, they shall eat every man the flesh of his own arm. Manasseh, Ephraim, Ephraim, Manasseh, they're in the northern kingdom. But, and they together shall be against Judah. For all this his anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still. Is he here--he is certainly here deal-

ing with the northern kingdom, but is he thinking of the south, or is he thinking of the two, under the one, people of Israel, the people of God. Yes, Mr. Vannoy?

(12 1/2) I do not ~~think~~ think there is any suggestion here of mercy in this verse. His anger is not turned away but (12 3/4)

Could be, but I think you'd have to have more to make it bring in a different idea like that, I don't think the word would do it alone. He asked for mercy, fine. It expresses that the stretched-out line usually expresses power, using of force, rather than-- I stretched out--all day/^{long}have I stretched out my hand, unto a people that would not accept. The stretching out of the hand is a picture often of mercy. But the stretching out of the arm is a picture of power, perhaps of destruction. We read that God brought the people out of Egypt with an outstretched arm, so the beating of the Egyptians, forcing them to let them go, I think it is more a picture of power than of compassion.

Now that again is the ~~of~~ sort of a matter you have to look at cases. I give~~you~~ you my impression I had of it, added them up...

M.34. (3/4(

...well the third stanza then, and it shows confusion and turmoil in the land, and when you get to the fourth stanza, there you have the social unrighteousness, which is in the land. Woe unto them. Maybe ~~instead~~ instead of starting like the others, the Lord send a word to Jacob, yet the people have not turned to him that smote them, for which (1)

It starts differently. Woe unto them. Well, the archbishop thought this must be a chapter division, but the refrain shows it is a continuation of the same line. Woe to them that decree unrighteous decrees, and to the writers that write perversely. I don't think that in the light of the whole context,

^{you can say} he is simply talking about the northern kingdom. I think his emphasis is on Judah, he is talking to Judah, he is living in Judah, he is dealing with the people of Judah,

he can very well some times, showing God's wrath against the northern kingdom but I incline to think that when He does He is going to make it absolutely clear, that otherwise it is His own people mainly that He is talking about, and He says these ~~are~~ that write perverseness and turn aside the needy from judgment, rob the poor of my people, of their rights, that widows may be their spoil, and the fatherless their prey--he says , woe to them. What will ye do in the day of visitation, --what is the day of visitation? Is that the day when the committee comes to investigate, or just when somebody comes to make a call? What is the day of visitation? That's an old English phrase, I don't believe we use it much any more. Visitation, here, the day of a powerful change, the day of a strong (2 1/4) coming in, historically, not merely investigation (2 1/4)

Question? (2 1/2) I think, it doesn't have to be. Now let's look at the Hebrew of that. That is chapter 10.3. This noun here in verse 3 translated visitation is derived from the verb (2 3/4) which verb is translated visit, I don't think it ever means visit without a modifier. It is an intervention by a higher power, and when a government (3)

an intervention of a higher power over a lower. It represents the activity of a government (3 1/4) a ruler, a prince, a leader, over those under him, controlling, or as gods over those who in comparison to him are very weak. They say, that the Lord has visited His people. Now that doesn't mean that He has made a call on His people and forced the people into (3 1/2)

~~It is a word that~~

It is a word that is heard a good many times. In Isa.24 it is and in the new Amplified Old Testament, in Isa.24, the last verse, the word here translated, visited punishment, is a different word from the word (4)

and it is an intervention of a higher power for the purpose of either making a change in condition either for the

better or for the worse, it can be either. In Isa.24 I'm sure it means for the better, rather than for the worse (4 1/2)

Well, the day of visitation. What will you do in the day of visitation, very clearly means an intervention, a change for the worse. And ⁱⁿ the desolation which shall come from far? to whom will ye flee or help? and where will ye leave your glory? They shall bow down under the prisoners, and shall fall under the slain. For all this--what does for all this mean--for ~~all~~ this mentioned in verses 1 and 2, and for all their wickedness? On account of all their wickedness His anger is not turned ~~away~~? His hand is stretched out still? Or in spite of all this, this is going to happen, His anger is still there? ^{Things that} ~~fit~~ fits with the "in spite of", ~~it~~ seems to be nearer in the third and first, than the things that fit with "because of." In the second it is "because of." I'm not at all sure how you get the "in spite of" out of (5 1/2) unless you can find a parallel, which I doubt. I would incline to think (5 1/2)

Then those four stanzas are this little poem, and certainly ought to have been a chapter by itself. Surely it is long enough to be a chapter, 18 verses, representing one definite poem, ~~with~~ ^{but} the last half of one chapter and the first verse of another, is a very queer unsatisfactory combination. Yes? (6 1/4) I would incline to think that here the wrath indicated God's continual purpose in judgment, and that this judgment is not satisfied by anything that has yet happened, this judgment has to continue because the greatness of sin (6 1/2) and these were things you see, which you feel very sorry about, they are not --they do not ~~atone~~ for sin, sin is too great to be forgotten about, (6 3/4)

And of course Judah, after Assyria comes into Israel and takes Israel captive and takes thousands out of Judah captive, Judah is still nominally independent but subject to Assyria. So we go on now to a new

chapter which begins here with verse 5 of this chapter, and it is a new subject, it should be the start of a chapter, and it runs either to 11.10, a natural place for it to run to, because that is quite unified. There is a progress and a contrast, and a further progress, it could run to 11.10, but it is a pretty/^{good}stopping place, where the 11th chapter begins, because there certainly is a vital contrast between what precedes and what follows, but I think they surely should be understood together.

Now verse 5 which begins a very definite section is a theodacy(?). It is a section in which the ways of God are justified to men. It is a section which studies the dealings of God with His people, and explains them. There are the people of Israel, they are sinners; there are the people of Judah, they are sinners. But if you compare ~~the~~ the people of Israel and the people of Judah, with the people of the other nations round about, you say what wonderful people, what pure people, what people of lofty character, what people of fine benevolence, what people of splendid antecedents. Now their attitudes were abominable when compared with the divine will, and they were abominable in comparison to the standards which God had set down, but they were an awful lot nearer those standards than the attitude of the heathen round about them. And so the Lord is dealing with His people, who have greatly benefited by His law, His instruction, in fact, the people as a whole are definitely affected by it. Now you take the United States here, look at our sin, look at our wickedness, look at our turning away from God, you wonder how God judges such character, but then you compare on the average the moral life, on the average, the decency of the average American with most other countries, and you will find it very definitely superior. The word of God has had its influence upon people's character, upon people's general attitude. You take the way people here are talking about how we should throw away our bombs and just make ourselves just be nice for fear you'll hurt anybody else, no matter what danger it puts us in. You won't find many nations where they'd even tolerate anybody talking that way. England comes the nearest

to it of any nation, and of course they also have much the same background as we have. But most nations wouldn't even tolerate a thing like that for a minute, the people wouldn't even think of it. There is a lot of liberal, humanitarianism which is illogical and not Biblical faith, but which does show an attitude which is a by-product of true Christian character, which you will hardly find in other places.

You do have a real effect of the gospel, but the Lord doesn't deal with us on an absolute basis, He deals with us on a relative basis. And He deals with us in relation with the opportunities we have, to what we should come up to. In a way, you might say the difference between one of us and another, is like the boy that stood up on a chair and said to his brother, "I'm nearer the moon than you are." Well, he was, but in comparison with the great distance which he stands from God's standard, there is not much difference between them. And so the Israel and Judah, from an absolute standpoint, they were very much better than the nations round about, but in comparison with God's standard, they were way down below^{it} and they were more culpable than the others because they had more light, more opportunity, and so he is going to cause them to go into punishment, into misery, and immediately as in the prophet Habbakuk, He says--the prophet Habbakuk starts in with, look at the sin, the wickedness of His people, what is going to happen? Why the Lord says, I'm going to send the Chaldeans, a wicked people, to destroy them. Oh, but Habbakuk says, the Chaldeans, these wicked people, they're much worse, how can they win in a war, how can a wicked people win against the godly, how can they? How can God's enemies win against God's people, it is impossible. Well, the Lord answers it in this passage here.

What is the Assyrian? Is the Assyrian the great wicked enemy of the people of God? Is the Assyrian the great aggressor that destroys everything that gets in his way? Is the Assyrian the one that we just ought to sweep off from the face of the earth,

because of his terrible attitude and action? God said, O Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, the staff in whose hand is my indignation. In other words, God says, these Assyrians may be very wicked, they may be very disgusting, they may be harmful people, but He says they are my instrument, they are the staff in my hand, the rod of my anger. So we read elsewhere in the Scripture that God makes the wrath of wicked men to praise Him. God uses that which is wrong as His instrument, and here is this great and wicked Assyrian empire, and God is using it as His instrument. So He introduces this theology, this explanation of the ways of God to men, with the words, Ho, Assyrian, the rod of my anger, the staff in whose hand is my indignation, (13 1/4) Ahaz things he has brought the Assyrian in by paying ^{them} a big tribute in order to deliver them from Israel and Syria, but God says, no, Assyria is my instrument which I'm going to use for my purposes.

So He says I will send against you a profane nation, against the people of my wrath, that's Old English, in Hebrew, you wouldn't say in modern English, the people of my wrath, in modern English you would say the people whom I am angry with, the people of my wrath. Will I give him a charge, to take the spoil, and to take the prey, to tread them down like the mire of the streets. But here, verse 7, shows us the attitude of the Assyrian. He says, howbeit he meaneth not so. The Assyrian is God's instrument, but the Assyrian does not think that he is going to serve the Lord. He thinks ~~if~~ he is serving himself. So here we have a situation with the Assyrians, God's instrument, used of God for God's purpose, but the Assyrian thinking that he is the end in itself, he is doing what he wants to do, for his own purpose, and so you have a confused and involved situation. They are God's instrument to do His will, therefore God's will will be done even though a wicked instrument be used, but they are not God's willing or voluntary instrument, God uses them but not because they place themselves in His hands to use. He uses them without

their knowing about it, even in spite of what their desires would be, therefore, the wicked thing they do deserves no favor on account of his being in line with God's purpose. They accomplish what He wants, but they don't deserve any credit, in fact they are just as culpable as if they were doing what was contrary to God's will...

M.35. (3/4) 3/5/62

...chapter 9, and we were looking at that form which ends with the refrain that in all this, His anger does not come to an end, His arm is still stretched out for judgment, and we notice that this poem runs through four stanzas of which the last one ends with verse 4, and then we started where chapter 10 really should start, with verse 5, and here we have the justification of the ways of God, it is in some ways parallel to the book of Habbakuk, because in the book of Habbakuk we have the prophet mourning at the sin of the nations and what can be done about this, and the Lord says I'm going to bring the Chaldeans, a terrible people who will destroy and do all kinds of injury, and then that's the answer to the first problem, but now the problem comes to Habbakuk, how can the Chaldeans, a wicked people, far more wicked than Israel, be God's instrument to punish the Israelites, and the book of Habbakuk is directed to the consideration of that problem and God's answer. One of the books much quoted in the New Testament (1 3/4)

Now here we have the statement of God's attitude toward the Assyrians, and in this statement here of His attitude toward the Assyrians, He starts out with a definite statement of the purpose of the Assyrians and of God's purpose in relation to them. O Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their hand is mine indignation. In other words, you are entirely wrong when you think that God is the God of Israel, Jehovah is the God of Israel, Asshur is the God of Assyrian, there is a contest between the two to see which can protect his people, and in the contest you will find which is the strongest, which of the two can protect his people best.

The Assyrians are enemies of Jehovah, therefore God will naturally give support to His own people and will hold back the Assyrian attack. No, He says, Assyria is the rod of my anger, the rod of my anger~~x~~ of course means the rod that is used by my anger. The rod that is available as an instrument for the expression of my anger. Not the one I'm angry against but the one I use to exert my anger, and the staff in their hands, the hand of the Assyrian, is my indignation, so that God says I'm not simply the God of the little country of Judah, or the somewhat larger country of Judah and ~~the~~ the northern kingdom together, I'm not simply a god of this little area that has to meet enemies from greater regions, I actually control Assyria, this great brutal aggressive world force is actually an instrument for the accomplishment of my purpose. So that is a ~~transcendent~~ claim made in that third verse, a claim which the critics will agree, you would hardly find anybody holding until the time of the second Isaiah. The second Isaiah, you come to the great understanding of Monotheism, the claim that God is the creator of the universe, that God controls all things. But the first ~~Isaiah~~ thinks of God simply as the majestic king of ~~His~~ own people, and had not reached the point of believing that the other gods do not exist. He would hold that they should only worship Jehovah, but ~~that~~ the other gods ~~also~~ exist and if they worship Jehovah enough maybe He can try to protect them from the other gods. Well, you can't get that out of this, so of course that is very easy for the critics to answer, all they have to do is to leave this verse in the chapter, and put it over to the time of the second Isaiah. Of course that is what they do. They put all the passages of what seem to them a primitive idea of God together, and all the passages that seem to have an advanced idea of God together, and then the passages of the primitive ~~idea~~ idea of God are early and the passages of the advanced idea of God are late, and then having dated them and arranged them, then you see the development of the idea of God right from the primitive to the more advanced. It is arguing in circles actually.

Because the dating is done to quite an extent in view of the idea, and then you claim you see an evolution of ideas from the date that has thus been given to them, but we do not have anything in the Bible actually that has what we're entitled to call a primitive idea, but we have many statements which have fuller expression of God's character, than others. We have--the critics say that in the J document that God breathed, He talked, He moved His arms, He takes the dust of the earth and He fashions a man, that's all very low and anthropomorphic, while in P you have the great abstract advance (5 3/4) Well, of

course we don't admit that one was more advanced than the other, but we take it one shows one aspect ^{of God's activity,} ~~and the~~ (6) the other shows under a different figure, a different aspect.

When you say that God is the God of Israel, you are not saying God is the God of the whole world, but you're certainly not saying He isn't, so if you speak of God as the God of Israel, you can say there is God as God of a small section, God as creator of the universe is a loftier conception of God, but the difference is you are looking at a different part of the account. If you said He is only the God of Israel, He did not create the worlds, that would be a lower conception, but you don't find that. You find partial statements which they say claim to mean that there is nothing more to it. Well, here is one of the most tremendous use of God's (6 1/2)

that even this greatest force of the time, this tremendous world-shaking empire of Assyria, was simply a rod in God's hand, which God could use (6 3/4)

And the next verse refers to the people of Judah and Israel, and says that Assyria is going to come against them, that He is going to use Assyria to take spoil, to take prey, to tread them down like the mire of the street, the Assyrian is going to do terrible damage to God's own people, because it is God's purpose to use them in that way. But then verse 7 you get to the other phase of the problem.

"Howbeit he meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so;" ~~be~~ the Assyrian

does not recognize that he is God's instrument at all, in fact, he does not recognize God at all. He does not think of himself as God's instrument, he thinks that he is the great powerful one who can destroy and devastate as he chooses. It is in his heart to destroy and cut off nations not a few. He says, are not my princes altogether kings? Are not my leading ones the greatest of kings of these nations, opposing ^{thee?} ~~me?~~ Is not Calno as Carchemish? is not Hamath as Arpad? is not Samaria as Damascus? Are not these places I haven't yet conquered in the same category with those I have? As my hand has found the kingdom of the idols whose graven images were far greater than those of Jerusalem and of Samaria, shall I not, as I have done to Samaria and her idols, so do to Jerusalem and her idols? What had he done to Samaria and her idols? Well, of course, the correct answer to that question depends upon when this was stated. If this chapter is written at the time when Isaiah went and spoke to Ahaz, the time of chapter 7, then the Assyrian had not yet done anything to Samaria and her idols. He does that in the very near future, after, so this might conceivably be two or three years after (9) but I don't think it is necessary to think so, it can be that it is looking forward and picturing the Assyrian over succeeding years, after he overwhelms. He overwhelms Damascus at the time of Ahaz, and Samaria he has practically in his hand, but he allows Hoshea to continue as a puppet king and then 9 years later he destroys Samaria, and this can be looking forward to what the Assyrians said. The ^S Assyrians conquered Damascus, they conquered Samaria. Is not Samaria as Damascus? Then he says, as I conquer Samaria, I'm going to conquer Jerusalem too, same way. So he is looking as at a picture over the future, not necessarily a picture right at the time of chapter 7. I don't think we have to say that the passage is written later on, but it is looking forward over the procession of years. Now the Assyrian is going to do away with these two kings of whom Ahaz is afraid, the king of Damascus, the King of Samaria. The king of Samaria is succeeded by another who is a puppet king under the Assyrians. Nine

years later he does away with him, destroys Samaria, so that the Assyrians would naturally say, shall I not, as I have done to Samaria and her idols, so do to Jerusalem and her idols? Picturing the on-moving of the Assyrian power which people could see coming forward, irresistible, settled, taking section after section, and as it comes the next in line after Samaria is going to be Jerusalem. May be they won't take it right away but eventually they certainly would plan to take it. Shall I not, as I have done to Samaria and her idols, do to Jerusalem? But the Lord said, Wherefore it'll come to pass that when the Lord has performed his whole work on mount Zion and on ~~Jerusalem~~ Jerusalem, I will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria, and the glory of his high looks.

God is going to use the Assyrian to punish Samaria and destroy the northern kingdom, God is going to use the Assyrian to punish, to do God's work on mount Zion and on Jerusalem, to put the people into a state of panic, seeing what they face, and to take great parts of Judah captive, but the whole work that God is going to do now is far short of the work He is going to do eventually, when He brings a different people altogether from Assyria, the people from Babylonia, and when they come, and conquer the southern kingdom, 150 years later, but now He says, the Assyrians think they're going to take Jerusalem, but the Lord says, I will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria, and the glory of his high looks. For he says, -- now who is speaking in verse 14, Mr. Abbott? (12) In our English manner of printing the Bible, as in the Hebrew from which it is translated, there is no indication of the change of person, change of speaker, and the Lord of course is speaking in verse 5. The Lord says, Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the Lord continues to speak in 5-7, but then the Lord quotes the king of Assyria, vss 9-11. Then in 12, the Lord is speaking specifically. I will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria--you notice how He speaks of Himself in the third person and in the first person in the same verse.

When the Lord has performed His holy work I will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria, That I of course is not the prophet, that is the Lord. The prophet of course does not claim to be the king of Assyria, but the Lord speaks of Himself ~~as~~ in the third person and in the first person, both in one verse. But then verse 13, For he says, --so here is the Assyrian quoted by the Lord again, showing the Assyrian's attitude in verse 13 and 14, but in 15 it is not the Assyrian talking any more because it doesn't fit the Assyrian at all. It is very evident that the Lord's quotation from the Assyrian ends at the end of 14, and that 15 continues the Lord's declaration. Now that is the sort of thing that you have to notice in reading or it doesn't make sense. A person reading this right straight through, it just doesn't make any sense, and it is all the harder for the ordinary person to read, because in our English we use quotation marks and other indications like that, to make clear ~~not~~ the transition, but it makes a tremendous difference to the sense here.

But vs.13-14 then is again the Lord continuing to speak, and , or rather the Assyrian continuing to be quoted by the Lord. The Lord says, the Assyrian is the rod of my anger, I am using him for my purpose, but the Assyrian said, by the strength of my hand I have done it, and by my wisdom...

M.36. (3/4)

...for I am very skilful, and I have removed the bounds of the people, and have robbed their treasures, and put down the inhabitants like a valiant man. The Assyrian tells what he has done. He has conquered nation after nation, he has done it with his valiant power, ^{his great strength} ~~his great strength~~ ^{wisdom.} ~~strength~~. And my hand ^{--this is part of} ~~will punish~~ the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria (1 1/4) and as one gathers, my hand has found as a nest the riches of the people--there is a figure of speech, as if a man goes out and finds a nest somewhere in the woods, my hand has found the riches of the people, there is nothing to stop me when I come to it,

and as one gathers eggs that are left, drive the bird away from the nest and take the eggs, so I have gathered all the earth, and there was none that moved the wing, or opened the mouth, ~~or~~ or peeped. The figures are used, the figure of expression doesn't mean no person moved wings, isn't referring to the wing of the airforce, it is a reference to the animal, it is a figure of speech to show that the Assyrian (2)

Just like a person goes into a flock of birds and takes what he wants, so the Assyrian is conquering the nations one after another, and if you read the Assyrian annals (2 1/4)

But then after this most of the tone was criticizing v.12, the stout heart of the king of Assyria has been illustrated here, then the Lord gives His judgment upon it. God is going to use the Assyrian as the instrument to punish Israel, but that does not mean that He is not going to punish the Assyrian also. Shall the axe boast itself against him that heweth therewith? or shall the saw magnify itself against him that shakes it? as if the rod should shake itself against them that lift it up, or as if the staff should lift itself up, as it it were not something simply made of wood? God says it is ridiculous for the Assyrian to boast when it is simply God who permits it for God's own purpose, like the New Testament says, what hast thou that thou hast not received? A Christian, if he works hard, and studies hard, and prays much, may be used greatly of the Lord, but when he tends to think that he is such a wonderful, that he has done it and accomplished things, that it's his will, his cleverness, and his ability, pretty soon the Lord throws away that particular one and uses this instrument. And so this picture applies to all instruments that the Lord uses, the staff is not to boast itself against the one that uses it.

Therefore, shall the Lord, the Lord of hosts, send among his fat ones leanness; and under his glory he shall kindle a burning like the burning of a fire. And the light of Israel shall be for a fire, and His Holy One for a flame: and it shall

burn and devour his thorns and his briars in one day. There is a figure, a picture, of the sudden calamitous destruction~~ions~~ of the Assyrians force. This picture is given, a sudden calamitous destruction of Assyrian force, and since it is tied up before with the statement that the Assyrian thinks he can conquer Jerusalem, as he has Samaria, God says, shall the axe boast himself against him that uses it. I'm going to destroy it in one day, you think of the sudden destruction and you look for an instance where this suddenness of God's intervention against the Assyrian~~and~~ was fulfilled, and to your surprise you find two of them, you find there was a beginning of destruction, of manifestation of destructive power against the Assyrians, in the failure of Sennacherib to take Jerusalem, and God suddenly killed thousands of the Assyrian troops in the night, left the Assyrians helpless. So if we're thinking simply of whether the Assyrians can conquer Jerusalem, the end of it, the fulfillment of this would be in the destruction of Sennacherib's force, which happened maybe 20 years after Isaiah, or if he is thinking of the ultimate destiny of the Assyrian empire, he can be thinking of a century later, when not in one day exactly, but in a very short interval, there was a destruction of the greatest empire of the time, and its absolute end, to where people two or three hundred years^{later}/didn't even know where its capital was, Nineveh completely disappeared from sight, one of the greatest cities, and the empire lingered on another 7 or 8 years, and then it was defeated at the battle of Carchemish and never amounted to anything again in all of history, so that here it does seem as if the fulfillment is more exact to the failure of the Assyrians to conquer Jerusalem, rather than to the ultimate end of the Assyrian empire, but that both of them share in this one quality of a sudden tremendous overwhelming destruction. God doesn't say here precisely (6 1/2)

That the light of Israel will be a fire and it will burn and devour his thorns and his briars in one day. Of course that could mean any action of the Lord, so it could

refer to the attack of the Medes and the Babylonians together a century later than this, but probably ~~in~~ view of the previous references to Jerusalem, the immediate reference is to the destruction of Sennacherib's (7)

1041^c
But then he goes on and says, and shall consume the glory of his forest, and of his fruitful field, both soul and body, and they shall be as when a standardbearer faints. Well that probably could still describe the destruction of Sennacherib's hosts, or it could be that between ~~vs~~ 17 and 18 it jumps forward from the destruction of Sennacherib's hosts, but looks to a century the destruction of the ~~whole~~ empire.

V.19 and the rest of the trees of his forest shall be few, that a child may write them.

Well, that could fit either one but perhaps it fits the immediate one best, because thousands of the army were destroyed, Sennacherib found such a small number left, there was nothing for him to do but ~~leave~~ Judah and go back to Nineveh. And the rest of ~~the~~ trees of his forest were few--it's a figure of speech, but the figure is very clear. The trees of the forest mean the forces over which he had control. The empire is spoken of as the forest, and the trees of the forest would refer to his power of control. So few that a child shall write them. And it shall come to ~~pass~~ in that day. Now again we have the phrase in that day, and again I suggest that the best ~~correct~~ interpretation of it is that there will be a day coming, it will come to pass in the day which I am ~~now~~ about to see. In our ordinary English we think the most natural ~~way~~ of taking it would seem to be, in the day of which we have just been speaking. But if that is so, it certainly was not fulfilled, because in the day when Sennacherib's host was destroyed, Judah was tremendously relieved, ~~so~~ ^{but} I don't think you could say this verse was fulfilled then, and also in the day ~~when~~ the Assyrian empire fell, you certainly couldn't say it then because within a very few years ~~ag~~ after that, God sent the Babylonians to conquer Judah and to take them ~~///~~ into exile. So that this verse 20 must refer not to the day just spoken of but to a day to which the Lord is going to refer. Many say, in that day, is a specific technical term meaning

"the day of the Lord." I think the evidence is too small to make a definite statement like that, that it is a specific term for "the day of the Lord." I feel that it is much better, in view of all the uses of it, to consider it as a general reference to some time that is sure to come, a time as I described. So that it will come to pass that there will be a day when the remnant of Israel, and such as are escaped of the house of Jacob, shall not more again stay upon him that smote them, but shall stay upon the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, in truth. This is a strong rebuke to Ahaz.

You notice how exactly this refers back to the situation that we had in chapter 7. Ahaz, instead of trusting God is trusting in the Assyrian to deliver him from Israel and from Syria, and those the Assyrian will come and smite Israel, and Syria, but will also smite Judah, and eventually will try to smite Judah very hard, and instead of trying to play off human powers one against the other, and to try to work clever human schemes, instead of that the time is coming when they will put their trust entirely in the Lord the Holy One of Israel. (11 1/4)

that they

turn away from this sort of human scheme of fighting fire with fire, thinking, like we did, in the last war, when we thought we could destroy Hitler by making alliance with Russia, and then we would be absolutely safe from Hitler, and we would stand together with Russia, and Roosevelt thought he could jolly Stalin into being a good boy, and after that the Russians would be democratic and everything would be wonderful. And what it amounted to was to remove the buffer state and put us face to face with Russia, with nothing in between, and it did exactly as in this case what it did to Judah when it put them face to face with Assyria, with nothing in between.

And if we would stand on principle instead of on these clever schemes, we would be further along in the end, they generally backfire as they did in that case. But He says a day is coming when they won't do that anymore. Now is he speaking of Israel? Well, Israel certainly has not yet reached that point. Is He speaking of the

church? I don't see any evidence in the passage of the church He is speaking of, but I ~~don't~~ certainly don't think you can truly say it is of the church either, because the church up to the present time has been full of elements relying on clever human schemes. I remember hearing a story 30 years ago.

Dr. Barnhouse down here was accused by the Modernists of the Presbytery. They were accusing him that he was interfering with their crowds and with their people, because he would go out to Darby and speak in a theatre on Sunday night. And they said that hurt the attendance of their churches, and some of their churches that had 20 people in ordinarily it may cut down to 10, and he was there and he'd have 800 or 1000 in the theatre, and he would speak, and they had all kinds of charges which they were bringing against him in the Presbytery. And these charges, they were threatening him with, and finally they scared him so that he completely capitulated, but at this time he was standing rather strongly against them, and it looked as if the thing would go to the presbytery and then to the synod, and that would take place in the next few months, and then ^ayears and a quarter or a year and a half, the matter would be before the General Assembly. So it came to the election of the representatives of the Presbytery, to the General Assembly, and there was a modernist elder in one of the modernist churches of the Presbytery, and that church had not been represented in the Assembly at all, for several years. The fundamentalists had been electing ~~ing~~ their representatives to the Assembly, so Dr. Barnhouse said to a few of his friends, let's all vote for this man as representative this year, then he'll go to the Assembly this year when things aren't so serious, there is nothing important coming up, that we know of, and then he says, next year he'll be out of the way and we'll have a fundamentalist elected to the assembly that considers my case (14 1/2)

So that's what they did and they elected this man to the Assembly to get him out of the way. What happened when he went to the Assembly was that he was there elected

to the permanent judicial committee, so that if the case had gone to the Assembly he would have been one of the ones to act upon it. ...

M.37. (3/4)

...Dr. Machen. I remember Dr. Machen was very much upset at that time. He said that he couldn't vote for a modernist on principle, that to vote for a modernist to get him out of the way he thought was wrong. Dr. Barnhouse thought he would accomplish his ends by this but in the end it would have had the exact opposite result. So often that happens. The Lord said the time is coming when we will not do that. The remnant shall return, even the remnant of Jacob unto the mighty God. For though thy people Israel be as the sand of the sea, yet a remnant^{of them} shall return, ~~even the~~ That doesn't make very good sense, does it? ...yet only a remnant. Though thy people be as the sand of the sea, yet only a remnant, or is the figure the sand of the sea, of the sand being overwhelmed, means it won't be completely so, there will still be a remnant left. At any rate, that is the idea of it, there will be a great destruction, but there will be a remnant delivered. The consumption decreed shall overflow with righteousness. The destruction, the chastisement that God is sending is going to be very complete, but is going to go just exactly as far as God desires. (2 1/4)

As Jesus said, the very hairs of your head are numbered, every detail is under the Lord's control. (2 1/4)

There is to be then a great calamity in Israel and Judah, there is to be a tremendous catastrophe before the time when these wonderful promises take place, a complete loyalty to Himself, a complete turning away from (2 3/4)

There is going to be a great calamity but the calamity is not going to be complete, there is a remnant to be delivered, and the Assyrian is God's instrument but the Assyrian himself is going to be punished. We have a lot of thought in this chapter, some rather involved complex thoughts interlaced together in this chapter. So there

he expresses , he summarizes this with giving an exhortation to his people, therefore, thus says the Lord of hosts, O my people that dwell in Zion, be not afraid of the Assyrian. Put your trust in God and make your fear of doing what God does not want, rather than fear of the Assyrian, because the Assyrian can go just as far as God permits him and no further. Yes? (3 1/2) But here is the exhortation, v.24, be not afraid of the Assyrian. The Assyrian was a force at that time. Of course the Assyrian was such a great aggressor, such a terrible enemy, cruel, that it could come to be used as a figure for any such great enemy of future time. It could be used today properly as a figure of speech for any great enemy. But I think that the effort should be made to take it literally first, before you decide to take it as a figure (4 1/4)

that the people there in Ahaz's time, when they see the Assyrian come down and destroy Israel, destroy Syria and Israel, they are right next to them then, and see that Ahaz's clever scheme had the opposite result from what Ahaz intended, made them more (4 3/4)

that then they realized that now they should be filled with terror at the Assyrians, but that they should put their trust in God. Don't be afraid of the Assyrian. ~~He~~ He says, the Assyrian is the rod in my hand, an instrument for my purposes. He is making a consumption but it is a consumption in righteousness, that is, in exact direct control by God, so that it goes exactly as far as God intends it to go, not a bit further. (5 1/4)

So it seems to me that it fits perfectly with the immediate situation. I see no reason to think that he is speaking of another at a later time. Not in this particular passage. He says, for yet a very little while and the indignation shall cease and mine anger in their destruction. And this 25th verse, like the verses 17 -19 , was literally fulfilled, that when the Assyrians came and attacked under Sennacherib, called on the people to surrender and said there was nothing they could do against him, it was a

very little while, within a period of four years, that the Lord destroyed Sennacherib's hosts to where there was nothing he could do about it. The indignation ceased, my anger in their destruction. And in another century the Assyrian ceased to be a force at all, was entirely destroyed by a sudden destruction.

10:24 So therefore thus says the Lord, verse 24, be not afraid of the Assyrian, he shall smite thee with a rod, shall lift up his staff against thee, after the manner of Egypt. As the Egyptian seemed such a terrible danger when the Israelites were fleeing them, then God opened up the Red Sea and allowed them to escape, similarly the Assyrian seemed a danger from which there was absolutely no escape, but God is going to, in His own wonderful way, give (6 3/4) , give
 10:25 deliverance. For yet a very little while and the indignation will cease, and my anger in their destruction. And the Lord of hosts shall stir up a scourge for him according to the slaughter of Midian at the rock of Oreb. Now this of course refers back to Gideon.
 10:26 To the time of the great hosts of ^{the Midianites} ~~Gideon~~ was in one night suddenly overwhelmed. And the whole situation changed, after many years of being subject to them, they were completely powerless, completely destroyed ~~and~~ in a very brief time, and again it is a good figure of what was to happen 20 years later when the Assyrian danger reached its height in Sennacherib's attack which seemed certain to take Jerusalem and God gave the marvelous deliverance in one night. The wonderful deliverance there parallels the deliverance from the Midianites under Gideon. (7 3/4) According to the slaughter of Midian at the rock of ~~Oreb~~, and as his rod was upon the sea, so shall he lift it up after the manner of Egypt. Again pointing back to the other sudden deliverance of which we spoke a minute ago, when the great Egyptian force came against the Israelites, and God opened up a way for them through the Red Sea ~~and~~ the Wilderness, and His rod was on the Sea then, so shall it be now. And it shall come to pass in that day, again there is a day, there will be a time, not necessarily the precise time (8 1/4)

but there is a day coming when his burden ~~wh~~ shall be taken from

your shoulder and his yoke from your neck, the yoke shall be destroyed because of the anointing. (8 1/2)

God is going to deliver the land from the Assyrians. The deliverance took place under Sennacherib, but though the Assyrian empire lasted another century, the Assyrians never did (8 3/4)

and it is only after the destruction of the Assyrian empire that Jerusalem was taken first by Pharaoh Neccho of Egypt, and then by the Babylonians. So that we have another sharp break between v.27 and v.28.

10:28-32 And the passage of 28-32 is a difficult passage, it is very similar in detail, but difficult in its overall presentation. And I have an interpretation of it which I believe to be the correct one, but which has certain difficulties. I think there are worse difficulties in any other interpretation that I know of, but I think there are still difficulties in the view I present. It may seem to some of you insuperable, but here is the passage, we have the passage--and what does the passage say? There are certain things that are absolutely clear in the passage. Well this is clear of course, that there is not a complete change of subject between v.27 and what follows. That is very clear. 27, his burden shall be taken away from off they shoulder, and his yoke from off they neck. V.33, the Lord, the Lord of hosts, shall lop the bough with terror, the high ones of stature shall be hewn down, the haughty shall be humbled. Wouldn't 33 seem to parallel 27? Wouldn't that suggest that what goes from 28 to 33 is a parallel to what goes, to what is described in 25-27? It seems to me that it does/. But that may not appear to some of you quite so clearly.

However, whether it does or not, at least the similarity is sufficient that you can't say, well with v.27 we finished our discussion of \S Assyria, now we're on a brand new subject. That hardly seems reasonable. But we do start a brand new paragraph, because in 27 we have the taking off of the yoke and in 28 we have victory on the part of a foreign conqueror. That is quite plain. You look at these places mentioned from 28 to 31 and they are all places which can be identified, and they are

places just north of Jerusalem. There is no question that what is described here is the triumphal progress of an army down the central ridge of Palestine, from the north toward Jerusalem, through the towns that are quite near to Jerusalem, that is what is pictured. It is a very vivid picture that is given. He has come to Aiath, he is passed over to Migron, at Michmash he has laid up his carriages, --remember Michmash where Saul was, just north of Gibeah, where he had a great victory. They are gone over the passage, they have taken up their lodging at Geba, Ramah is afraid, Gibeah of Saul is fled. Lift up thy voice, O daughter of Gallim, cause it to be heard unto Laish, O poor Anathoth. Now Anathoth is a town of Jeremiah. You remember that when the Babylonians were besieging Jerusalem, and their armies were almost to the edge of Jerusalem, that Jeremiah went and purchased a piece of land in Anathoth his own village, the town from which he came, which was only a brief distance north of Jerusalem, and he did this to show his confidence that the time would come when they would again be buying and selling land, in the territory which was now controlled, by the Babylonians who were threatening to conquer Jerusalem and did a short time thereafter, as Jeremiah said they would, the Babylonians were going to conquer Jerusalem, but that is not the end, God has a purpose, He has a remnant of grace, this region of Anathoth is still going to be worth something, and so he did not simply --you know, if the Russians were holding New York in their hand, and a man comes up to you and says look at here, I own the Empire State Bldg, and I'll sell it to you for \$100,000, if you had the hundred thousand dollars to buy, you'd say a hundred thousand! I'll give you \$5,000 for it, what good is it to you, the Russians have got it, you'll never (13 1/4)

But when Jeremiah goes and buys something that is in the hands of the enemy it is the evidence of his faith that it is going to be worth something in the future, that it is not going to remain in enemy hands forever. And that of course is the picture there in Jeremiah, but the town is mentioned here, as he mentions these towns, one after another.

I came riding on horseback down through there with Prof. Albright on ~~fe~~, and he pointed out these different towns, the different tells which represented where the different towns had been. As you came down toward Jerusalem over this route.

Well, the picture ~~here~~ then is a very vivid picture of an army coming down. They lay up their baggage at this place, they cross over the path here, the people of Gibeah flee, Anathoth is taken, they're in subjection. Madmenah is removed, the inhabitants of Gebim gather themselves to flee. As yet shall he remain at Nob that day, he shall shake his hand against the mount of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerusalem. And ~~here~~ you see the people of Jerusalem, looking out over the walls and seeing the army of the enemy coming almost to them. Well, now, I don't say it is impossible that this is a picture of something that is going to take place in the last days, but if it is, it hardly seems to me proper to say it is a picture of going to Armageddon, because Armageddon is way north and west of this. Armageddon is way up near Mt. Carmel, a long ways from Jerusalem. And this is a progress away from the direction of Armageddon, heading down toward Jerusalem, coming right through the edge of Jerusalem, a vivid picture of the progress of an army in that direction, and this army comes right to the edge of Jerusalem, and then he shakes his hand against the mount of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerusalem. Behold, the Lord, the Lord of hosts, shall lop the bough with terror, and the high ones of stature shall be hewn down, and the haughty shall be humbled, and he shall cut down the thickets of the forest with iron, and Lebanon shall fall by a mighty one.

Surely this is a picture of a victorious coming of a great...

M.38. (3/4)

...well, I think that, thus far, is speaking of what is certain. It is a progress of an army toward Jerusalem, an army that seems to carry everything before it, an army that looks as if it is going to take Jerusalem, it gets right to Jerusalem, and the Lord lops the bough with terror, and the high ones of stature are hewn down.

Well now if this is a literal picture--the only situation that I know of that would exactly fit it is the coming of the Babylonians who came down that northern part, took Anathoth--remember, Jeremiah was in Jerusalem at the time, and came out and then took Jerusalem, so that it ended not as (1 1/2) so that it can't be a picture of the Babylonian attack on Jerusalem because that ended in Jerusalem being taken. The whole context there is about Assyria, and my personal inclination, which I arrived at after a good bit of cogitation, is to think that we have here a picture not of what happened, but of what the people feared and thought would happen. In other words that the coming of an army along the line from which we would naturally expect a hostile army to come was exactly what the Israelites expected would happen during those three years when they were shut in with Sennacherib's army down in the Philistine plain, to the west and a little south of them. And Sennacherib's representatives coming up and standing outside the wall and speaking to Hezekiah and to the people on the wall, telling them they'd better surrender, that the Assyrians would utterly destroy them, and they'd better give up. Hezekiah give up to them. How can he possibly resist them. That this is a figurative presentation of the attack on Jerusalem which they expect to take place. Since the army was down in the Philistine Plain I'd sort of expect them, if they attacked, that they'd come directly up from there, rather than go way to the north and come down again from the north, but if you're coming direct from Mesopotamia that's the way you come, because you can't cross the desert straight across, you go up to the north along the edge of the desert and then you come down from the north and you would come down this very route as the Babylonians did. But they are expecting to be taken, they vividly imagine what is going to happen/^{as} one time ~~fight~~ after another falls, he gets right to the edge of it, but then just at the last minute God intervenes and destroys the Assyrian forces, and of course He actually did intervene and destroy the Assyrian forces, but He destroyed them down in the Philistine Plain. And there He caused that Sennacherib's

should be stricken in the night and as the borders of Lebanon toppled he was left with only a few (3 3/4)

(break in record beginning again ^{at} with 4 1/2)... yesterday we were looking at the 10th chapter of Isaiah and we noticed the great picture of the oncoming of the Assyrian toward Jerusalem. Whether this is a picture of an actual march of the Assyrians that proceeded down and stopped just short of Jerusalem, or whether it pictures what the people of Jerusalem thought was about to take place at any time but which God stopped, as described in ~~vv.~~ 33-34, we have no historical evidence upon which to know the certainty. The fact that in Isa. 37, 36, the Lord says that they will not come to the city nor raise a battlement against it, and that there is no statement in any of those three places ~~that~~ tell us about Sennacherib's defeat, telling of his army actually moving toward Jerusalem, but a good many telling about his threatening to do so, leads me to incline to think the latter rather than the former. But we have no way of

(5 1/2)

We do know this though, that the Assyrians were in the position where destruction by them of Jerusalem seemed certain, humanly speaking. Humanly speaking, nothing can stop them, and we know that God intervened with His mighty power and destroyed the great body of the Assyrian army to where they were helpless and Sennacherib had to go back, and then we noticed that Sennacherib never again came to harass them and that his successor did not make an attempt to conquer Jerusalem, during the next century, but Assyria itself fell before the Medes and the Babylonians, and it was Babylon, not Assyria, that was conquered. So we have vv. 33 and 34 which can be taken as covering two as, first, the Lord lopped the bough. The high ones of stature He brought down, the haughty were humbled. He humbled Sennacherib. He brought down his force, he made him unable to take Jerusalem. Then, not only did He humble Sennacherib, but a century later He, as described in v. 34, completely destroyed the Assyrian empire, so that Lebanon fell by a mighty one. The thickets of the forest were cut down with

iron, the Assyrian empire fell to the ground, never again to rise. This had been one of the greatest factors in the near east for two thousand years, and which for nearly 500 years had been the great empire, the great forest, ~~where~~ for a far longer time than the British empire was of any importance in the modern world, this fell with a sudden crash, and never rose again, so 33 describes exactly what the Lord did to Sennacherib's army, 34 describes what happened to the Assyrian empire a century later. It crashed, it did not destroy Jerusalem, but it crashed itself and never was rebuilt.

How would 33 and 34 be fulfilled? Well, the bough, high ones, the forest of Lebanon, what does that stand for. It could stand for many things. In the context, just speaking about a great army, in the further context, in a few chapters further, where the Assyrian empire is the great force, it is a reasonable guess that the forest stands for the Assyrian ~~force~~ force, that is, this is the great forest outside the land of Palestine, it is ⁱⁿ the foreign area and a tremendous force, and it is a natural figure for great world empire, which is a great factor at the time. Now it wouldn't have to be, but in the light of the context that would seem to be the most likely interpretation, in fact, there is no other suggestion that would have anything that would be even probable in comparison to this one, for what that stands for. Now what we're told is that that's going to fall, by the Lord's action, with a great destruction. Now how it's going to happen, when, all that, we're not told, but we learn ten years later, what did happen, and then a century later what happened, and when we found out what happened, we considered back, and say that fits exactly with the Isaiah prediction. You wouldn't know that but there are many other predictions all pointing to that thing. You get them all together, you could (8 3/4) (stu)

Isaiah had said, the Assyrian army is going to march down the central hill country of Palestine, going to come down, going to make an attack, come right up to the gates of Jerusalem, but then God is going to bring it to defeat, if it says ^{that} then it would be a

false prediction if the Assyrian army did not come down, but he does not say that, he doesn't say anything. He does not ~~w~~ say who is coming, he gives us a vivid picture rather than a specific prediction. There is a vivid picture of an army marching down, and coming nearer and nearer with all this, a vivid picture of that occurring and then a vivid picture of its suddenly coming to destruction, and you say, what does this mean? Does this describe the event that is going to happen to the ~~§~~ Assyrian army, or does this describe the danger which the people of Jerusalem are going to find themselves in, the situation in which they expect at any minute that this attack is going to start, from any one of several directions but most likely from that direction. It is a message to assure the people first of the fact that Ahaz' clever scheme has put them into terrible danger, and ~~that~~ that they are to face a period of very great danger. To assure them in the second place that this great danger which is coming is one which will not reach its climax but which God will bring to an end, and in the third place that this great force with which they're dealing up to this, is one which God is going to completely destroy, in His own time. That is definitely taught, but as to specific statements, if he says the Assyrian army will come, so-and-so, I would say it certainly had to be fulfilled (10 3/4)

but we ~~have~~ no evidence that it did, and the indication, it looks as if, while the emotional situation is exactly (11) the people of Jerusalem, faced with this tremendous menace which is threatening to destroy Jerusalem, and it looks as if any minute it is ~~going~~ to attack and take Jerusalem, holds them in that suspense for nearly three years and then suddenly (11 1/4)

Well, these last two verses then are very figurative, we find about trees cut down, the great forest, but in the situation, in that time, knowing nothing about the future specifically, we could ~~quite~~ definitely say, this seems to ^{me to} be the Lord's provision,

that this great Assyrian menace that Ahaz has brought in, which after all, God is using as His instrument to accomplish His purpose there, this Assyrian force, God is going to bring to an end. They are very proud, He is going to punish them for their pride, punish them for thinking themselves ~~the~~^{so} great, punish them for their cruelty, and carrying out the things He desired to be done, but certainly not in the ~~crual~~^{way} way they did them. He is going to punish them for it, and He is going to destroy them utterly, and you wouldn't know whether it is going to happen next week, next month, a year from now, twenty years from now, a century from now. Actually, it happened suddenly.

Now of course it could conceivably ^{have} been put off by 100 years, but we do find things that happen twenty years hence that exactly fit with 33, things that happened a century hence that exactly fit what is said in v.34. Mr. Golin? (12 1/2) The city of Nineveh, the great capital of the Assyrian empire was the capital from which Sargon, ~~king,~~^{came,} who conquered the northern kingdom, and from which Sennacherib came, who made the attack on the southern kingdom. This city of Nineveh was attacked by its enemies in 612 B.C., and destroyed. They used to say it was 606 till about 30 or 35 years ago new tablets were found which proved it was 612 when it happened. Then after the city of Nineveh fell, the remnant of the Assyrian empire established a new capital at Haran on the Euphrates, the place where Abraham had lived centuries before. And there in Haran they were able to maintain a capital until 604, then in 604 Pharaoh Neccho of Egypt came up to help the Assyrians, ~~that~~ is, he came up two or three years before this, but he was trying to help them in 604. The Medes and the Babylonians were attacking, and ~~the~~ Assyrian-Egyptian coalition was completely defeated at the battle of Charchemish in 604, and as a result of that battle, the Egyptians went ~~for~~ fleeing pell mell down the coastal valley of Palestine toward Egypt, and Jeremiah in Jer.46 has a vivid (14 1/4) over the Egyptians as they had this defeat and as they fled. That gives that date and you see, it is 721 B.C. when the northern

kingdom fell, so about 730 B.C. is the time when Pekah died, so this prediction would be about 735, somewhere between \approx 735 and 730. Yes? (14 3/4) Well, I would say that there is no question that is a poetical setting forth, of that there is no question. It is a very high quality of poetry, a vivid poetical picture, not given as a simple straightforward prediction of an event, but as a poetical description, highly figurative, like this about the boughs and the forest and all, of the situation as given then.

Well now you might say it is undoubtedly describing an enemy of Israel because they're coming down against Jerusalem, there is no question of that, so there is no question there is a poetical restriction of the enemies of Israel attacking and God intervenes to deliver them. But as to what enemy it is referring to, I think there is no question that it is specifically referring to the Assyrian enemy, and that it is in...

M.39. (3/4)

... some people take it as something that is a mere bit of poetry and that means that it can mean anything or nothing, just like some people think of something as figurative, well, what does that mean, figurative? Revelation is just a symbolic book, you can't believe Revelation, it is just a symbolic book. Well, that is nonsense. You can express truth in symbols, you can express truth in figures, you can express truth in poetry. Only that in the types of presentation, you do not use as precise language, you are giving an emotional picture, rather than so much as a specific statement of technical fact, but your poetical picture has definite ideas to present and study of the (1 1/2) study of the background, study of the situation, gives you the basis on which to discern. It is quite difficult to tell just what is meant. One thing that I feel ~~th~~ is tremendously important in approaching the Bible, or any verse, is not to say, does the Bible teach it this ~~way~~ or that way. I think that is one reason why a great amount of error ~~that~~ has come into existence, and a great amount of

unnecessary

Some people

think, well, does the Bible teach that Christ ~~was~~ crucified on Friday or on Wednesday? Which does it teach? Well, if it teaches Friday, and you believe Wednesday, you can't be in our church. If it teaches Wednesday and you believe Friday, you can't be in our church. Well, if the Bible explicitly ~~said~~ Christ was crucified on Friday, it ~~would~~ be ridiculous to say Wednesday, but it doesn't say it. The question is, does it say this, does it say that, or does it actually settle this particular question? Because there are thousands of questions ~~of~~ you could ask that would take hundreds of books to even give a brief answer. And the question is, does God intend to give us an answer to this specific question. And we may not know (2 3/4) on examination whether God is going (2 3/4) or not, but let's, as we look at any question, ask three questions. Does it say yes, does it say no, or to say that the Bible does answer this specific question. Maybe it does, but let's not say it does till we find sufficient answer.

Well, Isaiah then shows the downfall of the Assyrian empire and I think a serious question could be raised as to whether a chapter division should occur where chapter 11 begins. A very serious question can be raised about that for this reason. That it is tightly tied to what precedes it. He does not give chapter 10 and then, now we're going to start again and ~~discuss~~ another chapter and give chapter 11. There are ~~places~~ where that occurs, sometimes in the middle (3 1/2) We finish a subject and we start a new chapter. At the end of chapter 11, we are dealing with prediction, with prophetic statement, and then chapter 12 is a song of praise to God. There is a sharp transition between 11 and 12, a sort of a benediction at the end of the book of Immanuel. It would be the proper place for chapter division. The archbishop was entirely right in ~~making~~ a whole chapter out of just six verses in chapter 12. And back in chapter 10 in v.5 we have an ~~end~~ of the poem, the repetition of its refrain, the last of its stanzas, we have a new ~~start~~, that would be a reason

for a new chapter. You could start right there, you don't need what has preceded, but with the beginning of chapter 11, there is an implied relationship, important connection to what has preceded. We have a picture of a great forest, and this forest falls. A mighty empire topples and is destroyed forever. But chapter 11 shows a new beginning. And the new beginning is not from the forest of Lebanon, but it is from a different reason altogether, and there shall come forth a rod, a little shoot, a little branch that comes out of a tree, that appears to have completely disappeared. There is a tree that has fallen like the forest of Lebanon, fallen, the tree is ended, but you can't tell (5) whether it is ended or not. If you watch it over a period of time, nothing goes up, it is decaying, the tree was dead. But now the tree can be destroyed and yet there can be real life in the root, and from those roots a new shoot can spring up and a new tree can grow, out of those roots, and here we have exactly that picture. There shall come forth a rod, a little shoot, out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of this root. ^{Is this showing} ~~this shall~~ a rebirth of the forest which toppled in the previous two verses? Is it a reestablishment of the tree which God lopped off in 33? Quite clearly not, because that was definitely stated of Lebanon, that was outside the area of God's dealing. That was an external thing, a great powerful force, a mighty tree which fell. Here is a much smaller tree. This one is called the stem of Jesse, and that makes absolutely clear what we are talking about now. We are not now talking about any great heathen power, about any great world empire of that time, we are talking about the house of David, which (6 1/4) and we are implying that the realm of the house of David falls, and of course it did fall (6 1/2)

but more than a century later the house of David fell and there has not been again since that time a king reigning visibly upon this earth from the house of David. So that there is an implication in the first verse of chapter 11 that the house of Jesse is also going to fall, like the forest of Lebanon. It is going to be reduced to where

it seems to be dead, and after the destruction of Jerusalem in 586, hundreds of years went by and there was no man of the house of David ruling, you might say the stem of Jesse was absolutely dead. But then we are surprised by finding that a little shoot comes up from that stem, that a branch comes up from the roots, and this branch that comes up from the roots there, proves that there is continuance to it, there is life to it, and that of course is what we would expect being familiar with God's promises to David, the house of David is to have a continuous line, and of course back in chapter 7 we read that the house of David is told that Immanuel is coming, there is coming this one whose land this is, chapter 9 tells us, this one whose name is the mighty father, the everlasting God, the prince of peace, that one is coming, you don't know when he is coming. V.1 tells us nothing about his coming, we know that there will be quite a fall first because it was like the Lebanon before only it is not dead, there is life there.

And so this one comes, so we are now in the realm of empire. Now of course it is possible in comparison with an empire to bring something else of somewhat different nature, but at least the first expectation that it will probably be something is somewhat related to that with which it is (8 1/.2)

The great Assyrian empire falls and dies, the end. The little kingdom of Jesse falls, but a new shoot comes up, the branch grows out of the tree. And this word Branch, then, in the connection, is capitalized in my copy of the Bible here and very properly, because it would seem quite definite that it is a figure of speech, figurative language. I just got a letter asking from a man in Swarthmore College asking me to tell how to relate the literal interpretation of the Bible to the findings of evolution. (9 1/4)

Well, I'd say the literal interpretation is a rather unfortunate phrase. I mean that the Bible is true, not that it is literal. But it is true and we have to find what the meaning is, and as in any other book, if you're going to get meaning instead of confus-

ion out of it, you have to recognize that it is overwhelmingly literal, that the great bulk of it is literal, but in the literal there can be figures of speech, and here we have them in this verse, this is a tree represented, it stands for a family, there is a branch growing up which stands for a man. That is quite obvious. This branch means a man, a man from the house of David. It is a reasonable thing to think this will be the same Immanuel described in chapter 7, and that this will be the same wonderful child described at the beginning of chapter 9. So we have this man, and what about Him. V.2 makes it very clear that it's not a tree we're talking about, because there we have more literal language. V.1 is very figurative, but the meaning of it is very clear. Figures^{ative} of language doesn't necessarily mean obscurity or lack of clarity, but it may mean equal or greater clarity with a beauty which literal language cannot have. The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him, and now six characterizations of this Spirit are given: the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of ~~know~~ knowledge and of the fear of the Lord. These six characterizations are given to the Spirit of the Lord, certainly not separate spirits, the spirit of the Lord is described with six types of description. And this Spirit is going to rest upon them. Now if He is Immanuel, He is God with us, why does he need this Spirit of the Lord. We find in the New Testament that Jesus, though He was God, lived His life in the power of the Spirit. The Spirit rested upon Him, without measure, the Spirit entered Him like a dove, rested upon Him. Mr. Golin? (11 1/2) Knowledge, wisdom, and understanding are quite similar. Counsel is quite similar, but might is quite different, and then knowledge again is quite similar to wisdom and understanding, but the fear of the Lord is very different. So that we have of these six, we have four that represent different aspects of intellectual ability, but we have one which represents power and one which represents the relationship to God, so that I would say that they are six distinct aspects, but four of them are

closely related to one another, and it would be very interesting to take those four words and look at, not the English, but the Hebrew, and see how those Hebrew words are used elsewhere and what further light it gives them, on the nature of the Spirit of God and upon His activities in relation to Immanuel. And then we read in verse 3 that this Spirit is going to make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord, and you notice how the understanding now and the fear of the Lord are tied together. Proverbs tells us that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, so the fear of the Lord is closely related to wisdom but yet a distinct quality.

Shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears. Here is one man who has an ability to understand things in a way that is beyond what you can get from your mere human sense. We read in the gospels that Jesus did not need anyone to tell Him what was in man because He knew what was in man. He said behold an Israelite in whom is no guile. Nathaneal said, whence knowest thou me, he said. When the Lord saw him under the fig tree like that, he said, thou art the Son of God, thou art the king of Israel. He said, do you say that just because I knew this about you, because you'll see greater things than that. But He spoke not like the Scribes and Pharisees, He spoke with authority, because He knew what you would not guess by ordinary processes of gaining knowledge...

M.40 (3/4)

...so then we have this one who has far more ability to think things through after Him, to understand things, to deal with them correctly. Now someone will say, are these three verses a picture of the first advent of Christ. And the answer is no, these are not the picture of an advent, these are a picture of an individual. These are, it is Himself that is described thus, not what He does. It says He won't judge Israel, He won't reprove Israel. It doesn't say what He will do, but it says what He can do. It is a picture of His character, it is a picture of His spiritual

power. We do not have a picture of particular events as yet but a picture of an individual. This Immanuel is going to be like this. We are told, in verses 1 and 2 and 3, what He is going to be like. He will not do these things according to purely human knowledge, judge after the sight of his eyes, nor reprove after the hearing of his ears, but what will He do? He will judge poor with righteousness and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth. Well, now is that a picture of His first coming? Well, He certainly spoke not like the Scribes and the Pharisees. He gave wonderful teaching such as no man had ever given. He did marvelous things in His first coming, but are they properly to be expressed by this language--to judge the poor, and reprove for the meek of the earth? The language sounds more like a king who is active with power than like the teacher who is going about with wonderful messages. It sounds more like, it doesn't quite seem to fit what Jesus did at His first coming. It suggests that something more is involved. I don't think we can prove (2 3/4)

Yes, Mr. Golin? (2 3/4) As the natural interpretation of these words would seem to be a situation like, let us say that you are here in Philadelphia and you are a poor man, you have a little bit of land here, you are working on this land, getting support for yourself and your family, and there is a powerful man who owns a hundred times as much land as you do right next to you, and he is putting up a building, and his building, in order to build it the shape he wants he takes over half of your land, which leaves you with insufficient. What can you do? I come walking along. You say, will you judge for me? I say, sure, that man has no right to do that. I tell him, you shouldn't do that. Well, he says, that's what you think but I don't care what you think. I could judge the poor, and I could reprove with equity for the meek of the earth, but nothing would be done about it. The implication is that it is one who steps in and says look at here, this man, even if he doesn't have power, he has rights, he has right to just treatment, and you have to give him the just treatment to which he is entitled. It seemsto imply action with power behind it and with authority, rather

than simply be the expression of beautiful truths, no matter how beautiful and how wonderful they may be. That seems to be the implication of this part of the verse, but then we go on to the next part of the verse and we find even more a suggestion of power, and He shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. Shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. Is that what Christ did on His first advent? Well, Grossius, in his commentary, says, this describes, this the breath of his mouth smiting the earth, the ~~breath~~ rod of his mouth, the breath of his lips slaying the wicked, this describes how Hezekiah prayed with the breath of his mouth, and as a result Sennacherib's army was destroyed. So Hezekiah with the breath of his lips smote the earth and slew the wicked. Well, that was taken quite figuratively, and of course, if you're convinced that the rod that comes out of the stem of Jesse is Hezekiah, maybe that is what it means, but we note that it does mean power (5) and perhaps the breath of his lips might express prayer. It is a figure for something, certainly. We don't (5 1/4) if somebody falls over, you don't smite the wicked with the breath of your lips in that sense. There is something, exactly what this figure means might be difficult to say, and commentaries have various statements about it, but the strange thing is that the bulk of ~~the~~ the commentaries look for Scriptural evidence. If you want to interpret Scripture the best way to interpret Scripture is by Scripture. Scripture is its own best interpreter. So we take this phrase and say what does this phrase mean: to smite the earth with the rod of his mouth and slay the wicked with the breath of his lips? Well, do you find a similar statement anywhere in the Old Testament. ~~No~~ I don't know of any. However, we know, that as Augustine said, "The New is in the Old contained, the Old is by the New explained." We can look at the New Testament and see if it says that throws

and very naturally we come to Rev.19. There we read of one of whom it says in v.15 that out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations and he shall rule them with a rod of iron, and then you look on to v.21 and you read after the great battle that he had that the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, a sword proceeded out of his mouth and all the fowls were filled with their flesh. Well, here is a similar figure, does the figure here throw light on the figure there? Well, the danger is, you have two figures and you don't know what either of them mean, you can explain one by the other and you just make the ignorance worse, that's the danger. So we want to see if we can tell what this figure means. Well, who is this one we read of in Rev.19? This section of Revelation starts with v.19, chapter 19. I saw heaven open, behold a white horse, he that sat upon it was called faithful and true, his eyes were as a flame of fire, on his head were many crowns. He was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood, and his name is called The Word of God. V.16, and he has on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS. Well, there is no question then that that is the Lord Jesus Christ described. It is impossible for a Christian or even for a non-Christian who ~~sees~~^{reads} Revelation as a whole and sees what it talks about, to say that this one who comes on the white horse, and is described by these terms, can be any one other than Jesus Christ, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Lamb that was slain before the foundation of the world. Well, now, if this is Jesus Christ, then, John sees heaven open and sees Christ come on a white horse, and He leads His army and calls on them to beat the armies of the beast and the false prophet, and defeat them, and v.21 says, and the remnant were slain with the sword of him that ~~sat~~ sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth, and all the fowls were filled with their flesh. If we can tell what the sword proceeding out of his mouth, with which he smites the nations, means here, surely it will be a help in understanding what Isaiah means, that is, the figures--you can say, you have a tree

used somewhere in the Bible, that doesn't prove what a tree means somewhere else. But when you have as an unusual figure, it would seem quite likely, I ~~would say~~ won't say a hundred percent likely, we must not be dogmatic, unless you have evidence on which to be dogmatic. But it would seem quite probably this throws light on that, and especially that talking about Immanuel's coming, this is talking about the Lord Jesus Christ, another coming back. Well, Warfield, who has written many very wonderful things on systematic theology, occasionally got outside of his field, and then his language was still beautiful but his thoughts were sometimes turgid. And he wrote an essay on this portion of the book of Revelation, and he did not write a commentary on it as a whole, just dealt with this book, and there we turn to him to see if we can learn something from it about what this means, and we find that Warfield says in his article which is reprinted in the book called "Biblical Doctrine," which I was unable to lay my hands on my copy, my books of that type have that grey painting cover over them, and we can't get at them, and I went up to the Library and the book seems to be out there. Otherwise I would have brought the book to read to you from it. But to briefly summarize, Warfield ~~w~~ says that this one is the Lord Jesus Christ, and he ~~says~~ when it describes Him leading an army and conquering and destroying it, why he says that everything in Revelation is symbolic so he says you don't expect to find actual direct statements, everything is symbolic, and nothing is what it says it is, it's all a symbol for something else. Well, then, why isn't the Lord Jesus Christ here a symbol for something else? He takes it as actually the Lord Jesus Christ. But he says Christ here is symbolized as having a great victory. Now how does Christ gain a great victory. He wins the victory through the preaching of the gospel, therefore, the sword proceeding out of His mouth is a picture of the gospel. And it shows that Christ's word goes forth with the preaching of the gospel, and the gospel ~~says~~ spreads through the world, and conquers the whole world, and he says that in the passage the most important thing in the passage is the last verse in which it says that the remnant ~~w~~

were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth, and all the fowls were filled with their flesh. He says the important thing is the ϕ completeness of the victory. Therefore, from this passage in Revelation, we know that the gospel is going to conquer the whole world, and every man, woman, and child on this earth, is going to be converted. By the gospel. Well, that is the interpretation, a thoroughly post-millennial interpretation which Warfield brings out of this last part of chapter 19, and it is ^awonderful hope, if the Lord has really given the (11 1/2) ϕ on which to rest that hope, but it is a very discouraging hope if we look at the condition of the world today and see that today there are more non-Christians in it than there were a ~~century~~ ago, before the great outspreading of the modern missionary movement, that there are more non-Christians in the world today than there were then, partly due to the ~~tremendous~~ tremendous population increase, but even among the real Christians, apostasy has spread to such an extent that great wonderful churches founded by the most godly people you'd ever know, in which the gospel was preached with power, are today under the control of leaders who deny the gospel, deny the Scripture, and the people are like sheep without a shepherd, wanting the truth, and thinking they're getting it and getting a stone, and in a situation like that, you say, well, the gospel is going to conquer the whole world. If the Lord definitely promises it will, fine, we can trust Him to know that what He promises will be done, but does He promise it? Well, we can't build that promise just on this very ~~figure~~ figure, according to Warfield, section at the end of chapter 19 of Rev. But let's not let our observation of conditions of the world decide our interpretation of the Bible, let's look at the Bible itself to determine what it means, and so we ask ourselves does this figure appear anywhere else in the Bible? And immediately we find that not only does the figure appear but the figure appears in a form even more like what we have in Isaiah than what we find in Revelation, and not only is it a form more like what we

find in Isaiah, but it specifically refers to it as something already past. Revelation doesn't do that, Revelation might conceivably be entirely unrelated to Isaiah, the same figure is ~~used~~ used but that doesn't prove the two are the same thing, but this other passage, 2 Thess., is a passage which we cannot leave out of consideration because the figure is so strikingly similar and not only that but the apostle specifically says this is something already known, and now referred to. And so we find that in chapter 2 of 2 Thess., that the apostle says, 2.7 or looking back a little further, to the end of 3 and 4, describes that man of sin, and the son of perdition, who Paul says is still future, and now he says, in v.6 now ye know what withholds it that he might be revealed in his time, that is this man of perdition. There is something that is not yet revealed in Paul's day, something that is still future. And who ~~ks~~ knows this one? Well, v.7, the mystery of iniquity already ~~works~~ works, although he who now hinders will hinder until he be taken out of the way. Who is that? The Berkeley Version has a footnote that says that's the Roman Empire. He that now hinders will hinder. He says that is the Roman Empire which is spoken of elsewhere as the son of perdition, that raises himself up against God. Well, how does the son of perdition that raises himself against God hinder the revelation of the son of perdition that raises himself against God? I think Dr. Verkuyl got his figures a little mixed when he put in that particular footnote. There are various interpretations of he who hinders will hinder...

M.41. (3/4)

... ^{my own personal} interpretation of it is that he who hinders the coming

is not simply the Holy Spirit, but the Holy Spirit acting through the church, that the Holy Spirit is God, the Holy Spirit is everywhere, the Holy Spirit can't be taken away, He is always there, but the particular influence of the Holy Spirit can be taken away, just as the Holy Spirit didn't come on Pentecost as if He wasn't here before. He is God, He is everywhere, He was always there, but at Pentecost He manifested Himself in a particular way. When a person is converted the Holy Spirit exerts a special

control over their life, he exerts Himself in a particular way. So he who hinders will hinder until he is taken out of the way, the effect, holding back the force of wickedness, which would reduce the whole world to utter (1 3/4) the greatest force holding it back is the effect of the Holy Spirit's work as shown in the church, shown through those individuals who have the Holy Spirit controlling their lives, and when that is taken away, then wickedness can reveal itself in a way that never ~~would~~ was possible before, and when that is taken away, the son of perdition can be revealed, the man of sin. And so we find that Paul says, in the next verse, then, when that one is taken out of the way, then shall that wicked be revealed. Now that's old English, "that wicked," notice Wicked is capitalized here, then shall that ~~W~~icked be revealed. You don't say in modern English, then shall that Tall be revealed, then shall that Short be revealed, it would then become that Short one, that small one. So this is that wicked one, that wicked individual, that wicked one, will be revealed, that wicked one whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth. What is the spirit of his mouth? Well, the Greek word could just as well be translated "the breath." It is a word that could be translated spirit or breath and I would think "the breath of ~~the~~ his mouth" would make more sense, than spirit of his mouth, but it is interesting that the Hebrew word used in Isaiah 11 can also be the breath of his lips, it can also be "the spirit of his lips." So that ~~is~~ is an exact parallel, he shall smite the earth ~~of~~ with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. Then shall that wicked one be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth and shall destroy with the brightness of His glory. So Paul said, there is one who is not yet revealed, and who cannot be revealed until he that hinders is taken out of the way, but after that he can be revealed, and he is the wicked one, whom we have already been told about, that wicked one whom the Lord is going to destroy with the breath of his lips, at His coming. So Paul, very specifically says, that Isaiah^{'s} prediction of what he is

going to do is a prediction of something that Immanuel will do in connection with His second coming. Not something that He did in connection with His first coming.

Paul makes that absolutely clear, but it is amazing how commentaries ~~look~~ overlook it.

(4 1/4)

Perhaps in New Testament commentaries on Thessalonians you would find it clearly stated. I don't see how they could avoid it. But commentaries on Isaiah, some of them overlook it. But Paul said, this prediction in Isaiah ^{//}4 is still future, it is yet to come, it is coming in connection with a certain sign, it cannot happen until after that which now hinders is taken out of the way. And then when Paul had specifically said that, then surely you have a basis on which to interpret more accurately Revelation ~~4~~ that the one who comes on a white horse, conquering, and conquers, and who is called THE LORD OF LORDS AND KING OF KINGS, is Jesus, not (4 3/4)

So that it seems to me that if we thus let Scripture interpret Scripture, explain Scripture by Scripture, we can find what it really means, and so we are now speaking in the last half of verse 4 about the second coming of Christ and the first part, as we noticed, doesn't seem to describe the meek and lowly Jesus going about giving wonderful teaching, but rather describes One who is going to come with power, and authority, at the second coming. That is what is there found, ~~and~~ we have a further description of Him in verse 5, and righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins and faithfulness the girdle of his reins. The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together. What a clear, clear ~~selection~~ selection of verses. Doesn't it seem that the archbishop made the chapter division at the wrong place, he should have made it at the end of 5? Righteousness will be the girdle of his loins, faithfulness the girdle of his reins, end of a chapter, we start a new discussion, talk about animals. What have animals ~~got~~ got to do with the stem that comes up out of Jesse? It is a complete change as far as words are

concerned. It talks about something entirely different, and is it a brand new start of a new section, perhaps a new book, or is it properly interpreted as related to what precedes? Well, if it is interpreted as related to what precedes, there would seem to be only one way to interpret it, and that would be that the result of what was done is the establishment of the situation which is described in (6 3/4)

So either we have a complete break in a brand new section starting, which seems rather unusual, or else we are now told what is going to be the result of the activity of this wonderful one, as a result of his activity, the wolf will dwell with the lamb, after the wolf eats up the lamb they naturally ~~are~~ dwelling together, but the lamb is dwelling inside of the wolf. The wolf will dwell with the lamb. The ~~leper~~ leopard will lie down with the kid inside of him, they lie down together. The calf and ~~the~~ young lion and the fatling together, the young lion is ~~going~~ to get a lot to eat, both the calf and the fatling. But then a little child shall lead them, how does that get in there? How can a little child lead them? Well, perhaps because the lion has got all he can eat already ~~and then~~, having eaten the calf and the fatling, ~~so~~ he won't bother with the child. (stu.7 3/4) The lion is galloping after, and the little child is leading. And the cow and the bear shall feed, and their young ones shall lie down together, and the lion will eat straw like the ox. Why will the lion eat straw, like the ox? What do we care what the lion eats. Well, what it means is the lion isn't eating the ox. They're both eating straw. The way the world is now, the ox eats the straw, and then the lion eats the ox, but then, the lion will (8 1/4)

There is going to be a change, a biological change. Well what do we care about that? What is the point of all that? That is a question we have to face and try to see if there is a reasonable answer to it. Well, we continue then, the sucking child plays on the hole of the asp, and the weaned--well what is strange about that? *I* I was out in New Mexico and a man told me, he said I was out in the desert and he said there in a little cabin there in the desert, I was sitting in the back room reading, and he said

in the front room of this little cabin my little child was sitting there on the floor, in the front room, and he said I heard a sound of something hitting, and then I heard a sound of something harder hitting, and then he said the little child would laugh with glee, having lots of fun, and he said then again there was a sound of hitting, and then something twice as heavy hitting. And the little child just laughed in delight, he said that kid is having a real good time, but he says out here in the desert you don't know what is around, I'd like to find out what it is all about. So he came up very ^t quietly in back of the child and looked in and he said his blood nearly froze, because outside of that door there was a great big rattlesnake and the little child saw the rattlesnake and the door was just a screen door, and the child would look at the rattlesnake and then take his hand and hit the screen door and it would fly open and the rattlesnake would give a swing and hit the screen door and the door would shut with a bang and the child would laugh with glee. So if anybody says that this is a prediction for the distant future, that the sucking child can play on the hole of the asp and the weaned child put his ~~finger~~ hand on the top of his den, there was one right there that wasn't a bit afraid of the rattlesnake but ~~wasn't~~ was having a good time playing with the rattlesnake. But some way the father wasn't happy about it, you know, he said he grabbed his gun, he rushed out the back door and went around to the front, and shot that snake, just hoping to get there quickly before that screen broke and the snake came through and struck the child, or maybe the child would hit the screen door and it would fly open too far and this time the screen door wouldn't be in the way when the snake struck. It would seem that the meaning of this goes beyond the English words. Not just that the child played with the dangerous poisonous serpent, but that it can play with it without involving danger. You just take the words in their simple literal sense, they mean nothing. But if you take the words in the reasonable implication, it means the removal of danger, and that is what the whole passage means, the removal of external danger. Well, we have to stop there now, we continue next Tuesday.

...we have been looking at Isa. 11, a very important chapter in the development of the book and its presentation of future events, but we have just about finished the section that was clear, when you examine it carefully. That was the great section which begins the chapter running from verse 1 through verse 9. We had just a very little more that we might say about verse 9, where we read that the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea. What does this mean? The waters cover the sea? There must be some meaning to the phrase, the sea is made up of water, but the sea has water in it, well that is not saying anything, it wouldn't be a sea if it didn't have water in it. So what do you mean when you say the waters cover the sea? The only interpretation of it that makes much sense is to think the sea here as meaning the bottom of the sea. By the bottom of the sea you ~~mean~~ any area, extensive area that is covered with water. So you mean just as the large areas of the earth's surface that are ~~covered~~ with water, are covered with water. In other words they are completely covered. It is not thinking of islands, which is not considered as part of the sea. It is thinking of the sea simply as a watery section, great bodies of water, but there are not little parts of the bottom of it which are free from water and other parts that are covered. Not like a marsh, where you have a little wet and a little dry, a little wet and a little dry, it all varies, this is a continuous body that is similar and homogeneous in some special regard. And that surely is what this means, that the knowledge of the Lord will cover the earth as the waters cover the sea. It is not at all a picture of Christianity having Christians in every nation on earth, with individuals in every country you want to enter, who know the Lord and who are interested in His law. It is a situation in which the law of the Lord is an active vital force, very strong in the consciousness of every individual, within the area. And in that sense, this passage cannot possibly be said to have been fulfilled up to this time. If someone wants to say this means that people are changed from being wolves to being lambs, they're no longer lions, they're cows, they're harmless, they don't

injure others, well, it wouldn't fulfill the passage unless everyone were thus changed. They will not hurt or destroy in all my holy mountain, does not mean that a few individuals, or even many individuals who used to be very destructive are no longer so. It means that destructiveness will no longer be a danger, it is speaking of the removal of all external danger, because every individual there will be affected by the knowledge of the law of God, and so under these circumstances there has never been a city in the world's history of which this could be said. The passage has never been fulfilled at all, ~~and~~ There may be certain similarities to certain parts of the passage, but never has there been a real fulfillment of this passage at all. It must be definitely future. Well, that ends the section, v.1-9, and the fact that we have a new section is indicated by the phrase "in that day." The phrase "in that day" I think you can quite clearly say is ~~that~~ not meaning in the day of which we have just been speaking. It could mean that perhaps, but is more apt to mean "in that day" in the Hebrew usage, in the day of which I am about to say.

There is going to be a day which will be as follows. It seems to me to be the meaning of "in that day." We might before the semester is ~~we~~ over give an assignment to look up the uses of the phrase "inthat day" and see how many we find clearly fit the idea of in the day we have just been speaking of. And how many there are which could not fit that and therefore would have to have the interpretation I just gave. The interpretation I have just ~~given~~ could fit any of them. But the question is are there instances where the other interpretation would not fit, thus proving the necessity of this one. I think you would find quite a number. But in this particular case, it is hard to be sure whether verse 10 is saying in the time we have just described, the time when the earth was full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the Sea, there will be a root of Jesse which will stand for an ensign of the people, that is a banner, something that attracts their attention, and to~~o~~ this the nations will come, and his rest, the place where He is, will be glorious.

Whether this means that this is connected with the days just described, and it fits with the description of the Millennium, chapter 2, where we found the people going up to the mountain of the Lord, with the Lord's house established on the top of the mountain, whether that is what is here described, whether it is describing that period or whether it is referring to an earlier period, when people are attracted by this root of Jesse from many nations, is hard to prove. The only way you could prove it is that the Millennial period is, if the phrase "in that day" means the day we've just been speaking of, but I don't think that it necessarily ~~means~~ that. Now in this phrase, in this verse, the last statement that is of interest to us, ~~his~~ rest shall be glorious. What is a rest? The word nuaph in Hebrew is used in two senses. It means to rest in the sense of regaining strength, cessation of labor in order that the body may be refreshed, rebuilt. That is one sense of rest. And we ~~extend~~ it to a person who is dead, often saying he has gone to his rest. Whether rest really belongs in that sense at all is a question, because rest^{if rest} is simply ceasing labor, stopping, you might say any cessation is rest, but if rest means stopping in order that you can get built up again, in order to do more effort, then we would hardly think of death as being a rest. ~~At~~ rest from their labors, they cease from their labors, they no longer get weary, but ordinarily rest has that idea of becoming refreshed. Well, in this case, there are translations which translate it, his resting place, it has the name, they translate it "his sepulchre." His sepulchre shall be glorious, and of course the Roman Catholic Church makes a great deal of the holy sepulchre in Jerusalem, one of the most holy places, according to them, and the great purpose of the Crusades was to recover the Holy Sepulchre ~~of~~ from the Infidels, and so they sometimes make something of this verse, this sepulchre will be glorious. But I don't think it has^{to} mean rest in any such sense at all. I question whether sepulchre really is rest in the proper sense, such as rest, and anyway the Hebrew word nuaph has the two senses, to rest in the sense that you rest from your labors, and in the sense that the pencil rests on the book.

And there are two different forms of the hithphael, one of which is used to indicate to rest in the sense of being refreshed, the other used in the sense of causing to rest, the hithphael, in the sense of placing, causing it to be there. I would incline to think that this "his rest~~ing~~ shall be glorious," means the place where he is, the place at which he places his headquarters, I would think, rather than the place where he rests. That is a comparatively minor thing in the interpretation of the passage but a rather important thing in relation to the Roman Catholic Church. Now again we have a new start in verse 11, and if you're going to divide the chapter in two parts, the question might be raised, should the new paragraph begin as indicated in this Bible here with verse 10, or should it begin with verse 11? Verse 10 begins, "in that day," but verse 11 says, "it shall come to pass in that day." As far as a start is concerned, it might be either one.

Verse 10 may be something that is not so much the millennium as the period that precedes the millennium, and yet it certainly has a close affinity to the statements in chapter 2 which definitely refer to the millennium, and so that makes one wonder whether perhaps it really goes with precedes. But verse 11 is more of a place than 10, not just "in that day" there shall be, but "and it shall come to pass in that day." Well, now, I haven't checked those right now in the Hebrew, they may be identical, perhaps it would be good to take a second to check that. It is very interesting that the Hebrew is identical in verse 10 and verse 11, but the KJV translates it "and in that day there shall be," and then, "and it shall come to pass in that day." Which would lead me to think that the KJ translators thought the first one went with what preceded it, and that the second was a new start. It ~~is a case~~ ^{indicates} more of a break, I think, what they have here in 11 than the way they start 10, but of course the Hebrew is identical. We have a picture, verses 1-9, then we say there is going to be a day when something happens, maybe that is the same day as what preceded, but another aspect of it, maybe it is describing what has preceded it. But it would certainly seem to me that

verse 11 precedes the passage from 1 to 9, it certainly seems to me to be the case, so ~~it just repeats~~ verse 10: ~~And in that day there~~ ^{it will come to pass in that day--} there is to be a day when it will come to pass-- that the Lord will set His hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people, from all these various sections of the world. Is that going to come after the millennium, or does that precede the millennium? And he shall set up an ensign for the nations and assemble the outcasts of Israel, gather together the dispersed of Judah. Here they have three groups, the nations, the outcasts of Israel and the dispersed of Judah. They're all to come from the four corners of the earth. Is that a description of the millennium, or of something that precedes the millennium? Verse 13 speaks of a situation within God's people, the envy of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off, and Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim. Doing away with the division in the divided kingdom, doing away with the disagreements between different parts of the people of Israel.

Well, you can say, if you take this literally, verse 13 shows the ending of disparate groups hating one another among the Jewish people, if you take it literally. If you take it in a general rough way, it certainly could be a figure for all of God's people, reaching a stage where there no longer are groups among them that are at sword points with other groups. I don't know whether the ecumenicists have taken this as an important verse for their movement, or not. Chances are, two or three of them are familiar with it, particular sections, more or less, to mean much to them, but this verse taken alone could certainly fit in with that very well. But look at verse 14:

And they shall fly upon the shoulders of the Philistines, they shall spoil them of the east together, they shall lay their hand upon Edom and Moab, the children of Ammon shall obey them. Does that sound like the millennium? Or does that rather sound like a picture of something before the millennium? That might

perhaps the present situation where the people of Israel, 3 or 4 years ago, captured the Gaza strip and went with their armies down into Suez and seized all this territory to the west and -- or it might refer to the present situation where they're attacking Syria, I don't know ~~W~~how far that has gone but it began at least, was it yesterday-- it might become something big, it might be just a small skirmish, but it might describe something that would develop out of a local situation there, I don't know, but is it a description of a situation in the millennium? ~~It~~ It hardly seems to fit into the millennium, it seems surely as if verse 14 describes something previous to the millennium, rather than anything that is described in the Bible as happening during the millennium. Now verse 15, the Lord shall utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian sea, with his mighty wind shall he shake his hand over the river, and I believe that this is speaking of the two directions, Egypt and Assyria. People were taken captive into Egypt, taken captive into Mesopotamia, now we find the Lord destroying the difficulties in both these directions. It refers back to the crossing of the Red Sea, it reminds us of that, that picture of future event of similar nature, whereby God reveals the obstacles in the way of the return of his people, and verse 16 looks forward from Isaiah's day to the going into exile. It would not be literally true, a highway from Assyria, because Assyria was destroyed before Judah was taken, but in the time when Isaiah was living, the northern kingdom was taken to Assyria in captivity, later Assyria was destroyed, the southern kingdom was destroyed, the southern kingdom was taken by Babylonia, but Assyria being the first conqueror, taking the northern kingdom, the words could be used to cover all the eastern conquerors, that if this could refer to the return from the exile, quite satisfactorily, it wouldn't be a case of a precise statement pointing to the fact that they've come back from Babylon rather than from Assyria, but a general statement pointing to the fact that they will return from the oppression, from the exile which was begun by the Assyrians. It could be that, and therefore, it could be looking simply to the return from the exile, or it

could be looking beyond that to some greater return, but it does seem as if from verse 11 to 16, is before the millennium, rather than being the millennium itself...

2 (3/4)

...it is often said that the prophets looked forward and see the two advents as one. I am rather skeptical. I think that they look forward, like in the beginning of chapter 11 here, he is seeing the person of Christ rather than an advent, the first two verses. And what is said about His character could fit either advent, but certainly what is described, all of this from verse 5 on, certainly is describing the condition after the second, there is no specific relation to the first except insofar as ^{His}~~the~~ character is the character which could be seen at any time, but as to the precise thing here described, it surely is the second coming, rather than the first coming, and I would incline to feel, I rather incline to think it is a picture which may not mean much to those of you who have not lived in a region with any high mountains, but it may not even mean anything to somebody who lived in Los Angeles in recent years when there was lots of smog, but in the days when I was there when there was no smog, you would look up and you would see a range of mountains and then there was another range right behind it, and there is a big valley between the two, but if you look from a distance you see the mountains in the front range and you see the mountains in the back range and it often was difficult to tell which mountain was in the front range and which was in the back range. So if you were to describe what you saw there you would describe this mountain range, this one, this one, you'd go along, and you wouldn't necessarily be always able to tell which was in the front range, which was in the second range, which was in the third range, ~~how~~ the highest ones would stand out if you were some distance away, so it seems to me that often the prophet looked forward from a logical rather than from a chronological statement, that is, they're taking some subjects and looking forward and seeing what is going to happen in relation to this subject in the future, and relationship to that they might describe something

in connection with the first coming, something in connection with the second coming. But that the first and second would be so blended that the same words would refer to both, or that the picture would be ~~just~~ just a composite picture, I am rather skeptical. I incline rather to think that they deal a little with something in one and then they deal a little with something in the other. (stu.2 3/4) But there are those who think they are so blended you can't distinguish them. I don't think that is so, although I do think that there may be places where he deals with one and then with the other and where you wouldn't be able to tell where the transition came, if you didn't have your New Testament evidence as to what one of them was like, and then you could see how far it fit that and where it ceased to fit. The fitting goes back and forth rapidly, there are so many right in the one picture (3 1/4)

Well, the picture then in chapter 11, the first 9 verses are tremendously important in our whole understanding of Christ and of His work and of His future plans, they are tremendously important, the first 9 verses. The 10th verse is not quite so clear but rather clear, and certainly fits in with New Testament teaching very well, when you come to the 11th through the 15th I would incline to think that they are a description of events that would take place shortly before the return of Christ, rather likely. But I feel that way particularly because of verse 14. Verse 15 could describe a change which would take place rapidly but it wouldn't necessarily be a figure of the picture of the removal of obstacles against the return of people to Palestine. You might, somebody might have said 15 years ago, well, how would the Jews in Yemen ever get back to Israel, how would they ever get up there, they're way down in southern Arabia, they have a tremendous desert area in between them, very difficult to cross, filled with hostile marauding tribes, how could the Yemenites ever get back to Israel? And of course after Israel became a nation they hired the American Flying Tigers, an American airline, to bring the Yemenites up to there, they had been kept,

held under by the Arabs of Yemen, they were very oppressed by them, they were in very bad condition than, and they had never seen a wheeled vehicle, the first wheeled vehicle they ever saw, were airplanes. In fact, they were so unaccustomed to wheeled vehicles completely, that they say they put them in these Flying Tiger airplanes and flew them over into Israel and there occasionally this would happen, that a man would be in a (5 1/4) he would simply walk to the door and open the door and step out, because he wasn't familiar with a wheeled vehicle, he didn't realize the danger of this situation at all, they had only donkeys down there (5 1/2) no wheeled vehicles at all. They jumped from a very primitive situation right into the middle of the 20th century, but the difficulty in the way of getting back from Yemen up to Israel, were removed in a way nobody could have predicted in the time of Isaiah. A marvelous way which could be a fulfillment of what the Lord said here that he would utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian Sea and with his mighty wind shake his hand over the river and smite in in the seven streams, make men go over dryshod. There shall be a highway for the remnant of his people which shall be left. It describes the removal of all difficulties in the way to their getting back, and it is marvelous when you think that today there are people here in Philadelphia who will go over to Israel for a week or so at a time, it just was unimaginable even 30 years ago to think of going for a weekend, in Israel, or to go just for a week. Now that--it may be that there are specific geographical changes here, which would take place at the beginning of the millennium, making specific movements which would correspond in more features of the literal relation to them, but the central idea is the return to Israel and the returning with God removing obstacles which formerly seemed almost impossible. Yes, Mr. Cohen

(7) Of course they didn't actually go on eagles' wings at any rate, but the getting on an eagle and being flown back with an eagle is something which the Lord could bring to pass but ~~which seems an~~ ^{is} extremely unlikely ~~thing~~ ^{that He} would choose to do.

The figure, Flown back on eagles' wings, shows a removal of obstacles in the way, taking them back with an ease never before dreamed of, and he gets nearer to it by the going by plane than anything else you're apt to think of but (7 1/2)

But doubtless a fulfillment in a most remarkable way. Well, that section then, I don't know how much more meaning we can get out of it, this last part, than we have. I don't know how much more specifically we can understand it than we've noticed yet. It does seem to be a prediction of events probably including the return of the Jews to Palestine, but describing events I would think before the millennium rather than during it.

Now ~~the~~ the passage of course continues, chapter 12 is one of the shortest chapters in the Bible. We actually clearly saw that chapter 13 begins a new section, the burden of Babylon, you have a series of burdens--it starts with the word burden of such-and-such. So, we saw there should be a break at the beginning of 13. Well, he could have made 11 and 12 one chapter and that wouldn't have been an overly long chapter, but it was quite obvious to them that 12 is quite different from what preceded. It is a song of praise and before there had been specific predictions of future events, and so it seemed to him appropriate to make a chapter out of these few verses. But they surely are closely connected with what precedes. We had in that day what's going to happen in verse 10, again it shall come to pass in that day, verse 11, and then in chapter 12.1 we read in that day thou shalt say. And what is the day that is now spoken of? I don't think you can say this is the same day as verse 11 on, and that is the same day as verse 10, and that's the same day as here. I believe all we can get out of the statement is, there is going to be a day when He will say. And what will they say--now that day may be the one spoken of, but I don't think it follows from (9 1/2)

What will they say? O Lord, I will praise thee, though thou are angry with me, thine anger is turned away and thou comfortedst me. Surely that is a picture of salvation. It is a picture of one who was under God's wrath and now the wrath has

been taken away. God has changed his sorrow into joy. He will praise God because of this tremendous change in relation to God, and this theme of salvation continues in verse 2, behold, God is my salvation, I will trust and not be afraid. For the LORD JEHOVAH--one of the four places I believe where the authorized version takes the word Jehovah, usually this combination they translate as the Lord God, GOD in capital letters, to stand for the (10 1/4) For the LORD JEHOVAH is my strength and my song, he also is become my salvation, surely the stress is on the salvation of those with whom God was angry. Now has His anger turned away from them. He is their salvation and they are trusting in Him. And it begins with, thou shalt say, surely an expression of the personal relationship to God which can be attained through the root of Jesse, which is to be an ensign of the people and to which the nations are to seek. In Him they are to find relief from the anger of God, in Him they are to find the salvation, in Him they are to find One in whom they can put complete trust. Surely salvation by faith is very clearly in this chapter. Therefore, with joy shall ye draw the water out of the wells of salvation, certainly not a usual way of saying, therefore you're going to overcome the Philistines and no longer be subject to them. There is much more to it than that, (11 1/4) to draw water out of the wells of salvation, surely this chapter is stressing what the son of Jesse is going to do as he makes salvation available to all who will trust in His name. And in that day shall ye say, you notice the great word of verse 3 again, repeated. Does that start a new section with verses 4-6, which is different from what precedes? Or is it simply another section of it? Well, it is the continuation of the song of praise, so it would seem most likely it is the same time, though you can't prove that simply from the phrase. And in that day shall ye say, praise the Lord, call upon his name, declare his doings among the people, make mention that his name is exalted. Certainly the thing for one to do who is trusting in Him, who has had His anger turned away from him, is to praise the Lord and declare His doings, to witness to Him among the people.

And to make mention about His exalted name. Sing to the Lord, for he has done excellent things. Now what about the last part of that? Let's look at the word (12 1/2) in the Hebrew, what was the form of it? 12.5. In other words, when the Massorete puts vowel marks in the Hebrew Bible they stuck to the consonants that they found in the majority of their manuscripts, but in some cases they thought the consonants they found in the minority of their manuscripts were the correct consonants, and in that case while the majority of the manuscripts had what they didn't think were the correct ones, they kept them in the text, they put in the margin the (13 1/4) what they found in the minority of manuscripts, what they thought was correct, they put in the margin, and then in the main text, where they put the vowels in, they put the vowels that go with the text they put in the margin, the (13 1/2) instead of what is written, which is the consonants. And so that dot ⁱⁿ ~~and~~ the jod makes absolutely no sense, it cannot be a doubling of the jod because it has no vowels preceding, they're all following, you can't double a vowel without a full vowel preceding and a full or half vowel following. So that the dot there is not a doubling of the jod but is a (13 3/4) it is a dot over a wau, and you look in the margin, it says suray, and then it has name wau, there...

3 (3/4)

...the real reason I wanted to call your attention to this in Hebrew there is is to note the fact that there is no expression of time in connection with the participle, it doesn't say this has been made known, it doesn't say this is being made known, it doesn't say this is going to be made known, it does not indicate which it is, and every participle is, a participle does not express time itself, you have to either have something with it, to tell what the time is--I was living, I am living, I will be living--you have to have something with it to tell the time in English, or in Hebrew, or else in Hebrew it may not express the time, then you have to infer from the situation of the verse from context. In other words you are left free to consider various possibilities of time.

So it could be this has been made known, this is being made known, this will be made known. Now there is added feature. This is not a niph'al, this is a hophel, but there is a peculiarity of the niph'al participle which occasionally is also found in the hophel participle, and that is that the niph'al participle on quite a number of cases corresponds to a lack of (2 1/4) in other words, a form which says not what is but what ought to be, what is going to be, what there is some compulsion about its being, and in Gesenius' grammar, when he discusses that, he gives one instance where it is a hophel which carries that (2 1/2) And you find one instance of it where Joab goes to this town in northern Palestine where the people are protecting the man who made a rebellion against David, you remember, after Absalom's rebellion, and the city was shut in and Joab came with his army and besieged the city, was going to destroy it, and this woman, ^{it} says a wise woman, called out from the wall, and she said to Joab, why are you going to destroy a mother in Israel. Well a mother in Israel is the same as our present ~~way~~ phrase, a metropolis, a large, a mother city, a big town that has a lot of stuff in it. Why are you going to destroy a mother in Israel, why are you going to destroy one of the big cities of Israel? And Joab said we haven't got anything against this city, we don't want to destroy it, but he says it's this man here who is being protected in the city, we have ~~come~~ to get him, and then the woman, his head--I think it's a niph'al participle, it's either that or hophal, I think it's niph'al--throw from the wall. Well, it's the gerondum, this is what the solution ought to be, that his head should be thrown from the wall--the gerondum idea.

Now there is another instance that he gives where Joash was a boy, and Athaliah his grandmother decided to kill all the seed royal when she heard that her son was dead, but a nurse stole away Joash the little baby from among the children--either niph'al or hophel participle--being killed, among the being killed ones. Not from among the children that were killed, she stole away him, but from among the children that were to be killed, of whom there was a certain compulsion, a necessity, a

determination to kill. He was stolen away before they got him, and so that gerundum idea may be in the hophel or the niphah. Now in this particular case it seems to be that that gerundum idea would fit very well. Because it says, sing to the Lord for he has done excellent things, known ~~this~~ to be in all the earth. This shall be made known, this is the message which must be brought to all the earth. Not simply that all the earth knows about it, but that all the earth must be informed--it can't be dogmatic, but it has to be apathetic, certainly a strong possibility. Now of course if it should be that the Hebrew has been incorrectly transmitted here and that the Greek was correct, (5 1/4)

that would be a very good parallel to what precedes. Sing unto the Lord, He has done excellent things. Make this known in all the earth. That would make a good parallel. There seems to be quite a bit of change in the letters as they stand, so I incline to think that the other is more accurate. This is to be made known in all the earth. Or else this has been (5 3/4)--we cannot be dogmatic which.

1216
But then it continues with the imperative: Cry out and shout, thou inhabitant of Zion, for great is the Holy One of Israel in the midst of thee. Is this a song of praise given in the millennium to the Lord, or is this the song of God's true people prior to the millennium, as a great climax to this section of Immanuel's showing the joy of those who trust Him and who receive salvation through Him. A song of praise like this, it is pretty hard to be dogmatic, but either is according to true facts of scriptural teaching, but I incline at the moment toward the feeling that this is a description of the joy of those who see the root of Jesse standing as an ensign for all the nations who have found salvation through Him.

Well, ~~that~~ completes this section, and I was very sorry today to have to hold the class for an hour when two members can't be here. I think Mr. Vannoy is probably working on his thesis, the first draft has to be in by this week, and I know he is pretty jammed with it, but there were two members of the class who have another class at this hour, and I was very sorry for their sakes, to move it from 1:30 to 2:30, though I

did feel that it was important that I should get to a meeting that was held I thought I would get some information very much worth having, and since this hour was the Graduate Hour I thought it wouldn't hurt this time to have the undergraduates have that hour. I'm sorry that those two had to miss it, but I didn't feel that this section was near as important as what preceded it, the first part of 11, which I particularly wouldn't want them to miss. But now we have to go on and probably not spend more time just at the moment on the book of Immanuel, unless you have some particular question about it, but to go on to the other section that we're dealing with in this course, and that other section starts with chapter 28.

Now if I just give a few minutes introduction--we have only five minutes more-- if I give a few minutes to chapter 28, I hope it is possible for Mr. Gregory and Mr. Golin to get this rapid introduction from some of you before the next meeting, because we want to get into this new section. Someone might say, why in this course do we jump around, take 36 and 39 first, then we jump back to 7-12 and then we jump up to 28-35. Well, it's not quite as jumpy as it looks, because 28-35 comes immediately before 36-39. Nevertheless we are making a big jump from 12 up to 28. Well, first place, why did we start with 36-39? Because it gives us an idea of historical background which is very important for considering 7-12.

But you remember that we noticed in connection with it some passages in 28, 29, 30, 31, we pointed to quite a number of passages in the beginning of the course in these four chapters. In other words, section 7-12 and section 28-35 deal with the same general situation. They both are affected by what follows. Now I think we can safely go beyond that, we can say that chapters 28-35 are dealing with exactly the same situation, as 7-12, and you notice it is a rather complex situation.

7-12 we start in ~~with~~ with the situation in 7 where Ahaz in order to defend his nation from the Syro-Ephraimitic attack is calling in the Assyrians. And then we look forward and see the results of that, the results of that will mean an Assyrian

attack with the buffer state removed, with great danger to Israel, and we see that God will for a time deliver them from this attack by a most miraculous means. Now that is a rather complex situation which is involved in background of 7-12 and you can't really understand 7-12 without having that in mind. Well, exactly the same background is there in 28-35. There is this difference. That in 7-12 enough of the background is stated that you might be able to figure it out fairly well for yourself from 7-12 without knowing a lot about the 36-39. But I'm not sure you could in 28-35. 28-31 you would be in a maze of difficulty, a lot of isolated verses difficult to understand, if you don't have that historic background clearly in mind. With that in mind, you find even more here that is explained by the background than you found in 7-12, but it is ^{pointed out,} not ~~distinctly~~, it simply is assumed, and so for that reason these chapters and 7-12 belong together, deal with the same historic situation, the same great lesson, general spiritual lessons are contained in both sections.

Now there is a difference between them, there is a difference of emphasis, in chapters 7-12 there is constant emphasis on the coming king. Immanuel in chapter 7, the wonderful child in chapter 9, the root of Jesse who is going to bring in the millennium in chapter 11, constant emphasis on the wonderful coming king who is the answer to the problem of God's dissatisfaction with the present unsatisfactory king. Ahaz. Now Ahaz does not figure in chapter 28-35, but in 28-35 our attention is not upon Ahaz the head of the nation, but upon the men just below Ahaz, the trusted counselors. It is upon the trusted counselors, upon the leaders, and upon the nation insofar as it reflects the character of these leaders, and that is what our attention is now focussing. In the same situation, the same spiritual lessons, the same general development, but a focussing on a different portion of the people (12 1/2)

That is, I think, the vital introduction to this section and if you could pass that on to Mr. Golin and Mr. Gregory, before tomorrow, I'd appreciate it greatly, and we'll get on into this material tomorrow...

...I had to switch yesterday the other class to the other hour because that meant that two of them had another class at that time. I would not have done it if we had been on one of the most important sections, that previous material on 11, I would have skipped ~~that~~ ^{class} altogether rather than to have two of them have to miss that, but the latter part of 11 is not nearly as important as that earlier part, and ~~what~~ ^{while} I hated to have you miss it I thought it was well worth it in order that (1)

So though I'm sorry you missed that I think you can get some idea from some others of what we generally covered, and while it's an interesting section it's not nearly as important as the section we had just before. Now I'd like to ask the Graduate students to return to their time (1 1/2)

and then I'd like to mention about the assignment for our next meeting. You have the rest of this week to get the assignment, there is no need

but since we meet the first day after vacation why I thought I should mention it now.

The assignment for next time, for the undergraduates, the four, if you read over chapter 29 very carefully, make an outline of it, and state as well as you can what it is talking about in this section. Try to have as good an idea as you can. Now you may have some pretty tough problems but don't worry about them. I'm not asking you to make extensive investigation, but to get a good idea of the general content, a general outline, and of the problems involved in it, and turn it in, ready at the beginning of the hour please.

That is for the undergraduates. Now for the Graduates--you have a much larger amount of required work to do, so your next assignment will not deal with 29 but with 30 and 31.

And I would like you to compare 30 and 31, that is to make an outline of 30, and then make an outline of 31, and see if you can find a parallel between the two chapters, if you can see whether they fall in more or less the same line of thought, and if so, which verses of one correspond to which verses of another, and what are each of them talking about? Study that as fully as you can in the time available, looking into commentaries, whatever amount you think would be helpful or necessary in connection

with it. That is the assignment then for our next meeting.

Now the last five minutes of our last meeting were particularly important because in that time I mentioned the fact that we were now leaving the book of Immanuel, 7-12, and skipping over to chapter 28, the material from 13-27 is of quite a different nature. ~~The~~ In fact, one rather wonders why it is arranged the way it is. This material is of a different nature, probably was written, some of it, at the same time, but much of it at a different time. Possibly it was to avoid a certain monotony in the book, that it was arranged this way, because 7-12 handles a certain definite subject, and then 28-35 handles a very closely related subject, retracing a fair amount of the material of 7-12, though with much change and related to quite a number of facts that are quite different, but the same general viewpoint, I would think, written at just about the same time, but instead of going through the same thing twice, perhaps it seemed better to put in something of quite a different nature, and then come back to this again, I don't know. But for purposes of study and of careful understanding of it, it is much better to study the two together, and each of them throws light upon the other subject. Particularly the 36-39 and 7-12 throw light on 28-35. In 7-12 he is speaking in the situation which involves a number of elements. First, with the Syro-Ephraimitic invasion, with the frightful fear that it engenders. Second, the clever scheme of Ahaz and his nobles to get safety from this. Third, Isaiah's assurance to Ahaz that this scheme is a something that is absolutely contrary to God's will and is going to backfire and bring harm to the land rather than good, because it does away with the buffer state, brings them right back to the Assyrian empire, places them in tremendous danger, which is going to result in great catastrophe for Judah. That is the third feature of it, is his assurance to them of that. Then the fourth feature of it is, that assuring them it is going to bring tremendous danger so that Jerusalem will get to where it seems certain to be destroyed, yet that God is going to protect His city, and the Assyrian is not going to be able to take it, but God will wonderfully protect it.

Now that is ~~a~~ quite an involved historical course but all ~~that~~ is included, as you noticed, in 7-12, in the promise that God gives ~~to~~ ^{through} Isaiah to the people, promise and rebuke, mingled together, given to the people in the time of King Ahaz, looking forward into the future as far as the deliverance from Sennacherib, and then with occasional glimpses here and there, far beyond that time, into the much more distant future, as he makes wonderful promises to the people of God. Now that is a summary of 7-12, which also is a summary of 28-35. They each make a new start and then go through this. There is of course a great difference between 7-12 and 28-35. 7-12 has its central feature, the King Ahaz. Ahaz is an unworthy son of the house of David. Ahaz has proven utterly unworthy. God is going, in His own time, to replace Ahaz by His Son Immanuel, God with us, and so the big figure in 7-12 is Immanuel, God coming King, the Son of the house of David, who is going to do what is needed for this whole world. That is not in 28-35 to any great extent. That is the great central figure of 7-12, lacking in the main in 28-35, but the historical situation is all the same.

Now what ~~take~~s the place of the central figure of King Ahaz ~~who~~ is rebuked and assures that God is going to deal with the kingship of ~~the~~ son of Jesse, replacing it with His own son of Jesse, the great Immanuel. What ~~take~~s the place of that in 28-35? I don't think you study very far into 28-35 before you become aware of ~~that~~ which is nowhere plainly stated but I think it is clearly involved in it, that what is dealt with here is not the king, but the nobles. It is the nobles, the leaders of the people. It is the nation rather than the king that is in mind. It is the people of God rather than the king over God's people that is now in mind. So he is dealing with the people rather than the king. Now of course he is dealing with them about the same thing, in relation to the same thing, and consequently there is much in common. But the emphasis is different. ~~And~~ yet there are many ways in which the message is strikingly similar. And you will be amazed to go through, once you get this key, and to see how they

correspond. Now to get this key you have to study into it quite a bit. We can't take time this minute to have you folks study into ~~it~~ it with no guidance, and work into it and try to find the evidence that points to this key, but the best we can do is for me to give you the material that I have found, giving you the key, showing you how it fits, having you see it fits and work out further details yourselves, but also of course checking constantly that this is the correct key because I don't want anyone to take my view for anything. The Bible is the standard, not what I say or what any other man says. And I may be wrong on anything I say and I want you to check. For purposes of marking it is necessary that you know what I hold and why I hold it, it is not necessary for you to agree at all, but to know what it is, and to know what the reasons are why I hold them. If you feel these reasons are insufficient, don't hesitate to say so. But particularly I'd be happy to have you say so if you have a substitute idea that is definite. I don't think you will have on the major things, but on some of the minor things you might have very helpful improvements to what I ~~am~~ give. And if it should be that in the major things I have some strikingly wrong interpretations, I would be much happier to have the class find them than to have some more hostile people find them later on, if I put them in print. So don't hesitate to mention anything you think is weak or not sufficiently substantiated.

So now we are going into an area here which is much harder to interpret, 28-35, than 7-12, and that's why we take a section. We take the other first and learn much of methods of interpretation, learn much of the progress of thought, learn much of the relation to the historic ~~background~~ background, learn much of the way in which the ultimate future is brought in and related to immediate situations. So that it is, with what we learn from 7-12, not so much of matter, perhaps, as of method and general approach. We are in a position to look at 28-35 and get out of it what we would not expect to otherwise.

I remember one year going through this, with a fellow, and he said chapter 28, he first read it, it was just a mess. He says, "it's just a mess, just a lot of confusion."

No idea of what any of it tells us. But when we open it up and have the key, it is most logical, most clear presentation, once you have the key. Now the key is not clearly stated, there are certain things we have to figure out, but I believe we have figured them out on the basis entirely of evidences in the chapter. I'm going to give you these matters of background, you will see how the words come to life, when you have these in mind. But if you go on you will see the evidences for them, and I believe you will feel that you could yourself, with sufficient time, have looked into the chapters and seen these evidences, which give meaning to the chapter, the key that fits.

Now the first aspect of the key to 28 is one which I got from a commentary by George Adam Smith, who has all sorts of critical ideas on Isaiah, and many things that I don't agree with at all, but who occasionally has very clear insight, and whether he is original in this or whether he took it from others, I don't know. But the more I look into it the clearer it seems to be, ~~that~~ the beginning of chapter 28 is a Banquet Scene, ~~that~~ there is a banquet there of the nobles, and that Isaiah has come for this banquet, and there in this banquet he is speaking to these nobles and they are not anxious to have him speak. He comes in there and speaks to them more or less against their desire, but it is difficult for them to keep ~~it~~ from permitting him to speak. So the chapter begins with a situation where I think we are warranted to imagine it, the nobles of Judah, having been with Ahaz in the council, in the determination of the plan, know that he has sent tribute off to Tiglath-pileser, and they are convinced that Tiglath-pileser will come, in payment for the tribute and deliver them from Ephraim and from Syria. They're quite convinced they are coming, they're definitely expecting him to come. And in that situation, expecting them to come, they of course are facing the grave danger, the Syro-Ephraimitic invasion, they want the people to fight valiantly, to ~~take~~ ^{protect} the city ~~and~~ ^{until} the rescue comes, but they have no doubt the rescue is coming. And so they're holding a banquet rejoicing, but the people don't know what ~~it~~ they're rejoicing for, but they know. They're rejoicing in Ahaz' clever scheme with which they

have joined. And as they rejoice in this they are at the same time in their banquet trying to raise up the morale of the people so they will fight well in order to hold off the Syrians and the Israelites until Tigath-pileser gets there. So that the chapter starts with Isaiah, uninvited, walking into the banquet hall and beginning to speak. And it was customary for the prophet to stop at a street corner or anywhere they felt like and start to talk. And this is not simply a little group of friends, the banquets which the nobles liked to give were more or less open to the general public to step in and enjoy some of their bounty. They could step in and make themselves free with some of the food and wine that was there offered. They were entertaining the city to some extent. But the nobles are sitting there with their rejoicing and their big celebration. Without having told the people what they're celebrating. So Isaiah steps in and he looks at the nobles and says, **Woe** to the crown of pride, to the drunkards of Ephraim, whose glorious beauty is a fading flower, which are on the head of the fat valleys of them that are overcome with wine! Behold, the Lord has a mighty and strong one, which as a tempest of hail and a destroying storm, as a flood of mighty waters overflowing, shall cast down to the earth with the hand. The crown of pride, the drunkards of Ephraim, shall be trodden under feet.

And you can imagine Isaiah came inside...

7 (3/4)

going to be a situation where .. one rumor comes after another, and you don't know to think, the result of Ahaz' clever scheme, and verse 20 is an interesting figure of speech, thoroughly a figure of speech. Take v.20 alone, what has it got to do with the rest of the chapter, what has it got to do with the book of Isaiah? For the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it. What's that? And the covering is narrower than that he can wrap himself in it. Somebody says I take all the Bible literally, every word of it I take literally. How does he take this word literally? What is it talking about? You should have longer beds so he can be comfortable. That's certainly not the message of the book here.

The message is the figure of speech for the way that these people are trying to protect themselves from Syria-Ephraim, and thinking they're going to be safe from the waves of the future sea. He says your scheme is insufficient to accomplish it, it's like a bed that's so short you can't stretch yourself in it, it's like a covering that's so narrow that you can't cover yourself. It is a vivid figure of speech which would mean much to people in those days when ~~it~~ it was difficult always to get proper accommodations. Mr. Miller, you had a question? (1 3/4) That's not a terminology. The word literal as usually expressed means that when you say a bed you mean a bed, you don't mean a scheme. When you say a sun, you ~~mean~~ mean a sun that's in the heavens, you don't mean some kind of a prince, and of course we do have those who allegorize the Bible to where you don't know what anything means. And that is utterly wrong, and produces nothing but confusion, and in reaction against this figurative interpretation that reduces it to nonsense, many good people go to the other extreme, and say I take the Bible literally, every word literally. But it simply doesn't make sense. And when we go, going away from an evil position, when we go in the opposite direction, and go to a (2 3/4) position, even though it's not immoral, not wrong like the evil position is, from which we're fleeing, it is not efficient, it's not safe. It puts us in a position where we're easily destroyed. Yes? (3) My guess is that he walked in, that's my guess. And my guess is that there is a possibility that he continued and gave the whole of the 7 chapters, but I think there is a bigger possibility that at some point in it it was interrupted, and he went out and continued it outside, to ~~of~~ those who followed him.

I think that the whole thing is what ~~he~~ would have given in there if not interfered with. The whole thing, from this to 35, but my guess is that he only gave a part of it, and that he gave the rest outside to those who were interested with possibly some who were (3 3/4)

That's my guess, that's a very good question. We don't know for certain. It is not impossible Isaiah just sat in a room imagining ^{he was at} what the banquet, and made it

all up, but I think that is very unlikely. (break in record, starting again at 4 3/4)
 ...now I believe I asked you to have some work ready for today, that is, really you had plenty of time before vacation, I gave it nearly a week before vacation. How many have it ready? Only Mr. Gregory? Mr. Abbot, do you have it? Yes. That was the outline of which. We weren't quite through with 28. Let's take 28 and then let's discuss that together as soon as we finish 28.

We noticed that chapter 28 is the start of a new section and that it parallels chapter 7, that it is the same historical situation exactly as that in 7 but he is dealing with a different group, he is dealing with the leaders, the nobles, rather than with the king, specifically. And he tells them that this plan is not going to be sufficient to accomplish the objective they had. Because v.20, for the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on, and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it. In other words, making an alliance with Tiglath-pileser and thinking that under Assyrian alliance they can be safe from Assyrian aggression is the sort of a thing that just won't work. In the end they'll be worse off than they would have been before. And of course, we had exactly this brought out in chapter 7, and there he said the result of it is to destroy the buffer states, to bring Assyria right next to you, to put you in such a grave situation that there'll be no human escape for you, you will be on the verge of being utterly destroyed, but then he says, when the great attack comes, God will deliver you by His own power, to show His great power, He will deliver from Sennacherib, and then he says the Assyrian empire will fall, and Israel also will fall but from the seed of Jesse will come forth a new branch. That was the wonderful promise in chapter 11.

Now here in chapter 28, after being told that this will not work, v.21 says, for the Lord shall rise up as in mount Perazim, he shall be wroth as in the valley of Gibeon, that he may do his work, his strange work, and bring to pass his act, his strange act. That is very strange language in v.21, and I doubt very much if it could be fully understood by anybody at the time at which they heard it said. The Lord will rise up as on mount

Perazim and be wroth as in the valley of Gibeon. Do you recall what these would be apt to refer to, these references. Mr. Cohen? (7 1/4) Don't think that was Gibeon. (stu) Let's look at that. I remember Ajalon but not Gibeon. ^{Joshua} 10.12 says, sun, stand still upon Gibeon. Now the suggestion made here in Ellicott's commentary, is that Gibeon, 1 Chr. 14.16, and they smote the host of the Philistines from Gibeon even to Gazer, when David was king. You notice at this particular that you have also a reference to that perazim, because here you have in 1 Chr. 14.8, how the Philistines heard David was anointed king ~~over~~ over Israel and they went up to seek David, and David inquired of God, shall I go against the Philistines, wilt thou deliver them into mine hand, and the Lord said, go up, for I will deliver them, so they came up to Baal-perazim and David smote them there, and then we read further on, that they smote the host of the Philistines from Gibeon even to Gazer. Now there we have both the words together, Perazim and Gibeon, which are mentioned here in Isa. 28.21. Now you have one of the two words, Gibeon, in the case where the people were pursuing in the time of Joshua, and when the Lord caused the sun to stand over Gibeon. Both would be alike in that it would be a marvelous intervention of God. God intervening on behalf of His people and giving them victory. But it certainly doesn't sound like just any ordinary activity, and you notice it says the Lord will rise up in mount Perazim, He will be wroth as in the valley of Gibeon, that he may do his work, his strange work, bring to pass his act, his strange act.

The people would gather, I think, that the Lord is going to deliver, but what would be so strange in the Lord's delivering. It surely is a suggestion that there is going to be something very unusual. Something extremely different from the ordinary. And it seems to me that it probably is a hint ahead of the deliverance from Sennacherib. Here they are told just before, that your scheme won't protect, if the Assyrian comes they'll flood through, the waters will overflow the hiding place, but he says, the Lord will rise and he will wroth and do his strange work. I question whether for the Lord will rise up is the correct translation here. The bed is shorter than that you can stretch

yourself on it, for the Lord will rise up. Why will the Lord rise up because your scheme is a bad one. It doesn't seem to make sense, does it? If you said the Assyrian plan is insufficient for the Lord will rise up and do his strange work, that would seem reasonable. Or if you said that you are going to fail in what you're endeavoring to do, because the Lord will rise up, then it would be the Lord doing something against them, but you can't get out of Perazim and Gibeon here, the Lord doing something against the Israelites. It seems clearly to imply for the Israelites, doesn't it? So that it would seem to me that in the context, the "for" is not very good rendering. Now what is--a good many cases where (11 1/4)

and it seems to us to be quite an opposite meaning, it is putting quite a bit together into one word, to get those two possibilities, but the "but" would certainly fit here.

Your scheme is going to be insufficient to protect you, but the Lord is going to protect you, the Lord is going to be wroth both at the enemy and at you, but the Lord is going to protect you. This 21st verse certainly is not a logical continuation of v.20, but it is the statement that in spite of the fact that your scheme to protect yourself is not going to be able to do it, that nevertheless God is going to do a great work. It is not rendered in such a way that these nobles would be able to work out all the details of it there, but it is in such a way that when you study it carefully you can see how it exactly corresponds with what really happened, and then he continues in v.22 now therefore be ye not mockers, lest your bands be made strong, for I have heard from the Lord God of hosts a consumption, even determined, upon the whole land. Doesn't seem to me earth is a very good rendering there. I would think that land or area would be much better in this case. Let's see what it is, yes it is area, upon the whole land. (12 3/4)

can mean the whole world or it can mean a country, in this case surely it is the country. He is not speaking here of great judgments on the whole world, but he is speaking of the fact that Israel is going to suffer a great exile, a great punishment eventually, but before it comes, the Lord is going to do his great remarkable supernatural work of deliver-

yourself on it, for the Lord will rise up. Why will the Lord rise up because your scheme is a bad one. It doesn't seem to make sense, does it? If you said the Assyrian plan is insufficient to accomplish the purpose for the Lord will rise up and do his strange work, that would seem reasonable. Or if you said that you are going to fail in what you're endeavoring to do, because the Lord will rise up, then it would be the Lord doing something against them, but you can't get out of Perazim and Gibeon here, the Lord doing something against the Israelites. It seems clearly to imply for the Israelites, doesn't it? So that it would seem to me that in the context, the "for" is not very good rendering. Now what is--a good many cases where (11 1/4) and it seems to us to be quite an opposite meaning, it is putting quite a bit together into one word, to get those two possibilities, but the "but" would certainly fit here. Your scheme is going to be insufficient to protect you, but the Lord is going to protect you, the Lord is going to be wroth both at the enemy and at you, but the Lord is going to protect you. This 21st verse certainly is not a logical continuation of v.20, but it is the statement that in spite of the fact that your scheme to protect yourself is not going to be able to do it, that nevertheless God is going to do a great work. It is not rendered in such a way that these nobles would be able to work out all the details of it there, but it is in such a way that when you study it carefully you can see how it exactly corresponds with what really happened, and then he continues in v.22 now therefore be ye not mockers, lest your bands be made strong, for I have heard from the Lord God of hosts a consumption, even determined, upon the whole land. Doesn't seem to me earth is a very good rendering there. I would think that land or area would be much better in this case. Let's see what it is, yes it is area, upon the whole land. (12 3/4) can mean the whole world or it can mean a country, in this case surely it is the country. He is not speaking here of great judgments on the whole world, but he is speaking of the fact that Israel is going to suffer a great exile, a great punishment eventually, but before it comes, the Lord is going to do his great remarkable supernatural work of deliver-

ance, in the time of Sennacherib. He is going to give them another chance by a purely divine miraculous intervention. And then comes a very peculiar section ~~here~~ of this chapter, vv.23-29, Give ye ear, and hear my voice; hearken, and hear my speech. Four full repetitions, you could get four different documents there, couldn't you? And he says, does the plowman plow all day to sow? does he open and break the clods of his ground? When he has made plain the face thereof, does ~~he~~ not case abroad the fitches, scatter the cummin, and cast in the principal wheat and the appointed barley and the rie in their place? What do you think about vv.24 and 24, what is the meaning of these two verses? Just above this we have the judgment (14) we have the overflowing scourge pass through, but then we have the Lord delivering, and then we have a consumption after that. We have changes in God's manner of dealing, and he says, now I want you to think for a minute, how is it agriculture. Is it just the same thing done over and over, no, it's a purpose, there's something accomplished by it...

8 (3/4)

...here we have the claim that the human being who was in agriculture got some divinely given wisdom. He has a purpose, an objective, in what he does, for the fitches are not threshed with a threshing instrument. Here is a cartwheel turned about upon the cummin, but ^{for} the fitches they use a staff, for the cummin you use a rod. Bread corn is bruised, you don't want to thresh it, you don't want to break it with the wheel of a cart, or bruise it with the horses, you have different methods, to deal with different agricultural things. That which is very excellent in one case would be utterly destructive in another case, and what the farmer does is adapted to the purpose that he has in mind. God says this also comes from the Lord of hosts, who is wonderful in counsel and excellent in working. You don't need to think that things are just going to go the way whatever you decide to do, that your method is going to be worked out and whatever you think is going to happen is going to happen. God has a purpose,

God is like a farmer who is trying to accomplish something, God has a purpose in Israel, and therefore for this purpose He is not going to just destroy Israel, He is not going to tear it up, on the other hand He is not going to let you go ahead and do what you feel like, and feel that He is going to protect you in order that you can enjoy yourself, that you can have a good time, and you can get what you want, He has a purpose in Israel, He is going to accomplish His purpose, and He will send chastisement, He will send a bruising, He'll send a crushing if necessary, to make the good grain. This has to be ground, has to go through these processes, you might say He's just going to wreck it, well, ~~now~~, He is not going to use a method that just wrecks it, but the method that fits it for the purpose He has in mind, and therefore He ends this chapter with the statement that all this is going to happen. You think you have your schemes of how to carry on your life, and you're going to make this, --fight fire with fire--and make your deal with Tiglath-pileser whereby you gain your purpose, but God says if you're going to succeed in life, the only way to do is to trust Him, and follow Him and do His will and that way you will be much better off than any other way, and He is going to accomplish His purpose, and if you won't fall in line with it voluntarily, if you are essential to this purpose as ~~is~~ Israel is, He will force you into this, to accomplish His purpose. He will send the chastisement, He will send the judgment, He will deliver before they are destroyed, ~~and~~ He will do that which will accomplish the purpose that He has in mind. So I think the meaning of these verses when we once begin to look into them and see what they are talking about and compare ~~it~~ it with the situation, it becomes quite obvious. But simply the way it is given, you pick out two or three of these verses and ask somebody what they're talking about, you wouldn't have any idea. And the average person who just reads 28 and 29, you say what a sharp transition. The transition is not a sharp transition, it is a further development of the same thing. But the exact inferences are not stated, the thing is so given that the inferences can be easily gathered from it,

but they're not spelled out in ABC language. So the chapter division between 28 and 29 is purely a matter of indicating place. You have a definite paragraph division, the agricultural just given and the picture of the hearth of God that follows, are two distinct paragraphs, but they are not two distinct sections that follow, it continues straight on. God has a purpose and God will accomplish this purpose. His purpose is not destruction, His purpose is purification. His purpose is cleansing His own, fitting them to do the purpose that He has in mind. So He continues:

Woe to Ariel, Ariel--and what does Ariel mean, do you know, Mr. Gregory?

29:1
 (5) ^{as we continue} in the context it becomes very clear, from what follows, that Jerusalem is what he is talking about. But why does He call Jerusalem Ariel? I think I went into that but I didn't discuss it. Do you recall that? Ari, in Hebrew, there are two words that are pronounced and spelled Ari, one of them means a hearth, a place where you burn things, where you warm your place, or where you cook your food, the other ari is ^{a lion.} ~~alliance~~. So the word can either mean the lion of God or the hearth of God, either one. And you think of the lion of the tribe of David, you think of the lion of Judah. Ariel as the lion of God would seem quite appropriate, and perhaps a little of that is in the mind of the person speaking, as they think of the lion of God, Jerusalem. The lion of God, but as they go on you find that the figure he has in mind is not the lion but, as we have pointed out, it is the hearth. We find that clearly because that is brought out in the next few words here, the reference to it is as the place where they kill sacrifices, the place where there is the fire, the place where the Lord performs His great work. Now right here, I asked the undergraduates who are taking it for undergraduate credit to give us an outline of the chapter, and do two of you have it, or three? All right, Mr. Gregory, give us...kind of thing, simply on the ground of content, that we would say that vv.1-8 is specifically speaking of a situation, something that is going to occur in the future, something that is going to occur to Ariel.

29:1
 Woe to Ariel, v.1. Ariel, v.2, and continues talking about it, v.7; and the multitude

of all the nations that fight against Ariel, ^{it shall} even be as--and then he stops his speaking in the third person about Ariel, and starts talking, addressing people in v.9. I would think that from 1-8 is a future event which is going to happen in connection with Ariel, 1-8.

Then you come to 9 and the suggestion was made that you have a dealing with people's spiritual condition, which would seem to be in 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, wouldn't it? That's in those verses. Now whether you'd find anything that would go under that same head later might be questioned, but certainly the bulk of what there is after verse 13 deals more with what God is going to do than with what the people's attitude is. So that it would seem to me you have three main divisions from the viewpoint of content. 1-8, something is going to happen to Jerusalem. 9-13, the spiritual condition of those whom he has just criticized, and then 15-24, what he is going to do to the people whom he has criticized.

Now that's not so different, a little different in words, but the division points are pretty much the same, as were given by the different ones. Now we want to go more into detail though and I think we will notice in the detail ~~it~~ quite a bit that isn't on the surface, but it's quite important, particularly when we have in mind the comparison with what we have in chapter 7. Now in the beginning here, the first section, 1-8, we looked at the beginning of that section 1-8, and we read that, *Noe to Ariel, add year to year, let them kill sacrifices. Yet I will distress Ariel. What have the sacrifices got to do with this, Mr. Grauley? (8 3/4) That's it, exactly. He says, go on year after year, make a lot of sacrifices, do a lot of forms, and yet I will distress Ariel. All your formal religion, all your sacrifices, all this, if that's all there is to it, what good is it going to do. As long as you're trusting Tiglath-pileser instead of trusting God. You're not going to get saved through all these sacrifices. What is the good of all the forms of religion, if there is no meaning to*

it, if you're not trusting God, if you're trusting Tiglath-pileser? What good is it going to do you, yet I will distress Ariel. Make all the sacrifices you want, it won't do you any good. You're going to be distressed. So he says, in spite of anything you can do in this way, of formal religion, Ariel will be distressed and there will be heaviness and sorrow, and it will be as unto me as Ariel, that is, it won't be just a place where they're making sacrifices, it will be a place where there is real burning. A place where there is real destruction, a place where there is real upheaval, not just a place that includes hearths, but a place that is on the whole one great hearth.

Mr. Abbot? (10) Very good, v.13 is expressing in specific relationship to the people's spiritual condition, the very thing that is implied in v.22. It is a formal external thing rather than a real relation of the heart. So you do all the sacrifices you want, yet that won't win God's favor, you have turned against Him in ~~speaking~~^{seeking} human earthly means of advancing yourselves, instead of in the face of something you can't possibly overcome, in your own power, looking to God as your source of deliverance. So he says, yet I will distress Ariel, there will be heaviness and sorrow, it shall be unto me like just a hearth of God, a place where there is real burning, real tension, real turmoil, real difficulty, And that is shown in v.3 of course, and I will camp against thee round about, and will lay siege against thee and I will raise forts against thee. Whether that literally is ever fulfilled, I mean fulfilled in the time of which he is now speaking, or whether it is fulfilled in the sense that the land is filled with an enemy which may at any time come and erect forts against Jerusalem and destroy it, at any rate, it shows Jerusalem getting into terrible danger, as a result of their plot, of their alliance with Tiglath-pileser. It shows them getting into terrible danger as a result of it, of being in a situation where destruction appears imminent.

Yes? (11 1/2) I'd say that where there is a prediction of a specific event, and the specific event occurs which fits the prediction, I would say that that is the fulfillment of the prediction. Now if you were going to say you are going to have experiences

29:3

like this, then the first can be an example, but I see no reason to say that something which has been fulfilled once is to be fulfilled again, unless you find clear, specific evidence to that effect. I mean in the specific case, I don't think you have a right to assume as a general rule that everything is going to be fulfilled twice. God said to Isaac that there are two children in the womb of Rebecca, there are two striving and the older will serve the younger. Well the children were born and the younger, Jacob, assumed eventually the preeminence, and eventually the Edomites the descendants of Esau came to be subject to Jacob. The elder was inferior to the younger. Does that mean that ever after, whenever ~~after~~ there are twins, or wherever there are two children the elder is going to serve the younger? Does it look forward to the last days and show something that is going to happen then ~~that~~ which will be fulfilled in the sense of the elder serving the younger. I know of nothing to which it could refer. It is very easy if you know something about a distant thing, you know something about a near thing, you find a similarity, to say there is a relationship. Well, there may and may not be. But I say let's not assume it unless we have definite evidence. Now if we have something given as a prediction of something to occur, and we cannot see that it has yet happened, then we are justified in saying it is yet to happen, but if it has already happened, there is going to be the virgin will bring forth a child, Jesus will be born, there is fulfillment of first coming. Is that a prediction also of second coming. Is something in connection with the second coming revealed here? I see no warrant. I think every prophecy has to be looked at to see what is prophesied. Is it describing a series of events, or is it a prediction of a specific event? If it is a specific event, it either has been fulfilled, or it is yet to be fulfilled. I don't think we can say it is both, has and to be, past and future. That is, if it is an event. Now if it is the movement, something like that--God says I will pour out my spirit, does He mean once He will pour out his spirit, or does He mean over the different ages, there are going to be various times when He will

pour out his spirit? With perhaps one of them being the greatest up to that time, the one at Pentecost, and there being a still greater one perhaps in the millennium. That (14 1/2)

I will pour out my spirit, could refer to a series of pouring out, or it could be a specific event, but if you say Jerusalem is going to be defeated and God is going to deliver it, well, if you say this is going to happen over and over, fine, but if you give it as one specific prediction, I don't see any reason to look for more than one fulfillment. I think you just introduce confusion. What right do you have to say that about this and not about the elder serving the younger, not about the virgin birth, not about His preaching in Galilee, ...

9 (3/4)

... the Scofield Bible like any other human work has got a little that's good, or much that's good, or a great deal that's good, but no human work has everything that's good. Any human work is going to have flaws and weaknesses, and the easiest way for flaws to come into any human work is when we get a good idea which is very excellent to bring out, and then we carry it to an extreme and apply it not only to many places where it excellently works but to others where it doesn't fit. That is the human failing that occurs in almost everything, but we have to make allowance for it, in other people's work and try to avoid it in our own.

Well, now, this then in v.3 says, a siege is coming, you might say this siege is going to be the result of human people's attitudes like that of these nobles in the time of Tiglath-pileser, you might say that. A person can make an argument that way. I don't personally feel any such argument is necessary here. I feel that here it is specifically dealing with this particular attitude. Now if you find evidence later, somebody, when you get a similar attitude, similar results come, yes. But This now, I think it is talking about this attitude at this time and showing the result that is going to come from this attitude at this time. And that result I believe is the specific attack of Sennacherib. The culmination of the Assyrian, the result of the

Assyrians being placed right next to Judah by the added action of Ahaz and the nobles in destroying the buffer state, by inciting Tiglath-pileser to conquer what's between, and get right next. So that as a result there is going to be a time when Jerusalem will be in tremendous danger, which he describes here as if there was actually a siege. Well, they are just much in danger as if the siege had actually come, and the siege ~~may~~ come as far as anyone can see, at any time, and v.4 shows what is going to happen to them, and thou shalt be brought down, and shalt speak out of the ground, and thy speech shall be low out of the dust, and thy voice shall be, as of one that has a familiar spirit, out of the ground, and thy speech shall whisper out of the dust. Crushed, down, whispering, on the verge of utter destruction, that is the situation they come into as a result of Sennacherib's attack. That is certainly an exact prediction of what's going to happen, and he continues the terrible prediction of the situation they're going to get into, moreover, the multitude of thy strangers will be like small dust, and the multitude of the terrible ones as chaff that passes away, yea, it shall be at an instant suddenly. Is this 5th verse a good description of the further details of the further misery of the scene? How many think that it is, would you raise your hand? How many think it isn't a great description? How many don't think? When you say are there other possibilities, you imply that this is a possibility, and that is something that I would like explained to me, is how this can be possibly a description of the horrors of the siege, what does it mean? Verse 5. Really I am perplexed as to what the authorized translators were thinking of, when they translated it this way, there is just one word that I think they should have translated utterly differently than they did. One word. I ~~have~~ have no objection to anything else they translated in the verse, except ~~this~~ this one word, but I feel that most readers just see the one word, and as a result of the one word interpret the whole verse utterly fantastically. Like ~~X~~ if I would say, some baseball team is going to

29:5

go down and down, they're going to be defeated by this one and to be defeated by this one and defeated by this one, and they're going to play with this other one, and when they're playing with ~~this~~ other one, they're going to make ten home runs and to end with a score twice as great as that of the one they're playing with. Well, the and would be quite out of place because I'm giving a series of going down and then I go on in the same tone of voice but actually say the exact opposite. ^{I've had} ~~That's~~ a rather silly attitude for the last 30 or 40 years of rather enjoying saying a thing in a tone of voice ~~of~~ that said the exact opposite of what the words meant, just to notice how often people say yes, yes, isn't that right, when your words say the exact opposite. It is amazing how often they will do that. Well, I tried to do it just now with this verse, because I want you to look at the words and see what they're really saying, what is involved here. What is the terrible state of siege, which, suppose you were to say the people of what city in the last war was besieged for quite a while. Well, take when MacArthur was in Bataan, and you say you were in Bataan, and you are going to get so hard up for food you're going to have to eat mice and rats and going to be so near out of shells that for every ten shells the ~~of~~ enemy shoots against you, you can only shoot one in return, it's going to look absolutely hopeless, and those who are attacking you are going to just be exploded to pieces and utterly destroyed until you find there is nothing left of your attackers at all. Now you see it wouldn't make any sense at all. Now who is he talking about in the next verse? Moreover, the multitude of thy strangers--what are your strangers, when you're besieged? What is the multitude of your strangers? Isn't that the enemy, the people that are strange to you, the people that aren't part of you, but are part of your enemy, the multitude of your strangers, well, they will be like small dust. You might say that shows how many there are, like small dust--small dust is numerous. Why is small dust particularly numerous? You can have a little small dust or a lot of small dust. I don't think that small dust necessarily means it is numerous, it would be more apt to show something

else about it, but ^{let} that pass and go on to the next point: and the multitude of the terrible ones, what is the multitude of the terrible ones? Is that the ones you're afraid of, the ones that are all around you, what's going to happen to them, they will be like chaff that passes away, yes, at an instant, suddenly. Is not the whole point of v.5 that the enemy that is around you and seems as if it is utterly going to destroy you, will be annihilated and disappear? All of sudden, and if the way that begins v.5 instead of being translated "moreover" would be translated "but" which it could just as well be, the next step after the terribleness of the siege you were in, is that the siege just ends, all of a sudden, the enemy disappears, your siege is over, your danger is over, at an instant, suddenly. That's the only change I feel is necessary in the verse is the change "moreover" to "but." Of course in our English it is immediately obvious that strangers means enemy, because it certainly doesn't mean friends, and it isn't immediately obvious that the multitude of the terrible ones means the attackers, but when you're in a siege you don't think of yourself as the terrible ones, you're more apt to think of the people attacking you ^{--that is} ~~as~~ surely what is meant here. But at least when they say that like chaff it passes away, and in an instant suddenly, if they would say, moreover, the multitude of your friends are going to be like small dust, and all of the leaders of your community are going to be like chaff that passes away suddenly, that would mean your siege was going to end suddenly with your total destruction. But the terms used here seem to refer to the one who is attacking, rather than to yourself, so that I would feel that while verses 1-8 form one section, a future event related to Jerusalem, that between 4 and 5 there is an extremely important division in it. This Bible I have in front of me here has a paragraph division at v.7, which I think certainly ought to be at v.5 instead of v.7. Verse 7 says the same thing in plain language. The multitude of all the nations that fight against Ariel shall be as a dream of a night's vision.

I went over this briefly last fall in --no, last February, in the beginning of our discussion about the historic background, and showed how this was Sennacherib's attack and God's deliverance. And in the ~~quest~~ I asked you to name passages that described the deliverance, remember, but of course it is quite a while ago we've had it, it's not surprising that it didn't stick. ~~But~~ I want it to stick from now~~on~~, I want to make it emphatic, because it is a very vital part of this section of the book is God's deliverance of the people, of Jerusalem, from the attack of Sennacherib, and it is vv.4-8, Now we noticed v.5 and 7, v.7 is almost identical with v.5, except that it is in clearer language, but v.6 says that it is God who is going to do it. Thou shalt be visited of the Lord of hosts, with thunder and with earthquake, a great noise, with storm and tempest, and ~~flame~~ of devouring fire. This is figurative language. It means an intervention by forces which you could not bring and you could not prevent. It is an intervention with forces which only God could control, and of course the sending of the pestilence when thousands of Sennacherib's army died in the night, that is described very clearly in vv.5-7, though v.6 I think is undoubtedly a stressing of the supernatural aspect of the deliverance that is coming from the attack, that it is God's miraculous intervention that will deliver. Yes, Mr. Gregory? (11 1/4)

29:16
The question here~~d~~ that you've asked goes partly back to how much of this wording is Isaiah's and how much of this wording is dictated? Isaiah is inspired, kept from error, but more than that, he is an instrument of God's revelation, he is God's prophet, God said in v.7, go to meet Ahaz and say this to Ahaz, and then God said, when Ahaz answered and tried ~~to~~ to get rid of him, God said to him, say this, O house of David, you do this men, will you do it to my God also. Therefore, God will give you a sign, a virgin shall conceive and bare a son, thou shalt call his name Immanuel. How much did Isaiah know? Did Isaiah know that 700 years later there would be a virgin-born Messiah? Did Isaiah think that perhaps this was going to happen in the next 50 years? We don't know how fully Isaiah understood it, but we know that there was more to the

prophets' words than they themselves understood because 1 Peter 1 tells us that the prophets when they spoke of the sufferings of Christ and the glories that should follow, were searching out and trying to understand what and what manner of time the spirit of Christ that was in them did signify. So we know that God put into the words of prophets, often, meaning beyond what the prophet understood, but how much and how far ~~we don't~~ his own understanding of it went, we don't know, but the words were so different, that the people hearing the words would get a message from God, but the people later on reading the words would get this message the people got before plus added insight that would not be available before (13 1/4)

And so I would think, I can't say what Isaiah would have done, but I would say that a person listening to ~~Isaiah's~~ voice would know this, that Jerusalem is going to go through a time of terrible danger when it looks as if destruction is absolutely certain but that this is going to come to an end with a sudden divine intervention which will destroy the enemy so that they will just seem like a dream, as if they had never been there, and it will come when the Lord will send thunder and earthquake and great noise and storm and tempest and devouring fire. You might say, well now is that figurative language or all these different kinds of calamities mentioned are all going to happen at once, or when he uses all these, thus it seems that perhaps it isn't actually any one, but that they are a figure for the fact that it is divine intervention by superhuman power, which no man possibly could have produced in a way which only God could do. We don't know for sure which. Perhaps there is going to be an earthquake and thunder and a storm and a tempest and a devouring fire, all coming at once, perhaps, but perhaps it is a figure for ~~something~~ of which it can possibly be a figure, but he wouldn't know. But then when the event occurred, I think it would be made absolutely clear that it was a figure for the (14 1/2) a figure for divine power that man could not be given, you could tell us about this storm that was coming in New Jersey, you could have warned us two months before, but there was nothing

we could have done to prevent it. We could have gotten the people out of the way, so they wouldn't be injured, ahead of time. We could have tried to strengthen the houses, it probably would've been impossible to strengthen them to such an extent there wouldn't be at least half as much damage done. It was power beyond what man could resist, and I think we must say, in view of what happened, that that is what is meant. But those are very good questions? Let's try to figure exactly what these words mean because I think there is a lot of teaching there, a lot of teaching, not only about the immediate ~~figure~~^{situation,} but about God's manners of dealing with men in general and also about principles of interpreting...

10 (3/4)

...he said your strangers, he said your terrible ones, now he says the nations that fight against Ariel, so it is pretty clear here that it is the strangers and the terrible ones, they're not saying themselves who are in such danger, but the people who are attacking them, and making them be in such danger. He says that these people are going to be just like a dream in a night vision, and it will be as when a hungry man dreams and he is eating, he wakes and his soul~~s~~ is empty. Or a thirsty man dreams and behold he drinks, but he wakes and he is faint and his soul has appetite.

So shall the multitude of all the nations be that fight against Mount Zion, they're going to just seem like a dream that fades. Israel, does it seem like they're eating and drinking, when they're in this terrible calamity? Well, the answer is that probably the one having the dream isn't the people of Israel but it is king Sennacherib. He is just about to reach out and take Jerusalem, and ~~this~~ force is gone, can't do it, he was going to eat and drink, has to flee ~~back~~ to home before people realize how weak his army has become and come and attack him, just like he is dreaming. Of course, it is in a way, like a dream to them too, the calamity seems almost unbelievable to have been, to have even been there, once it is gone. You go down to N. J. today, you look out there at the peaceful quiet shore, can it be there was such a storm, water

up this high and all that? It just doesn't seem possible until you see the houses there in their wrecked condition, and then you admit that it must have been. Yes?

(2 1/4) I think that the thing is that the Assyrian empire had already conquered a dozen or more nations and these nations were incorporated into the empire and their forces were utilized, and so that it was actually an attack, not of one country being attacked by another, but one country being attacked by another which has in its army a dozen nations which it has conquered, so that "the nations" is not out of place.

Well, I guess we have to continue there tomorrow then. Look over the rest of the chapter and think a little more about its contents and try if you can to see the progress of thought in line with what we have already been talking of. Does it go back again to the siege of Jerusalem now described, or does it look on to the future beyond that? Does it have any similarity to what has been said about King Ahaz? Back in 7? We are not talking about Ahaz now, we're talking about the nobles, but does it have anything to do with them? This must be a very sleepy hour... (3 1/2)

(starting again at 4 1/4) ... a development of thought which once you see how it is moving impresses me as one of the most interesting to be found anywhere in the entire book of Isaiah, yet one which is comparatively little known. We have noticed how the chapter proceeds directly on from chapter 28. Ahaz' scheme in 28 is not going to be effective, it is going to fail to accomplish what Ahaz wants to, it is going to backfire against him, and yet God is going to rise up in His wrath, and to work His perfect will. Neither is the scheme going to result in good, it's going to do harm, but neither will the harm work out as it naturally would, because God is going to intervene and prevent it. So we start at chapter 29 and have a chapter which divides rather naturally into three parts, and the first of them, vv.1-8, describes an event which is to occur at Jerusalem and the first half of that tells how Jerusalem comes into terrible danger, it seems to be just about to be absolutely destroyed, and then the last four

verses of it show how God is going to intervene and to rescue by a marvelous, miraculous intervention of God, how He is going to rescue Jerusalem from this so that it will not be destroyed but be delivered there from the terrible danger that faces it. This is the specific thing he is going to do about 20 years after the time at which Isaiah makes the prediction. Then as the rest of the book, of the chapter rather, can be considered as being summarized in two verses, vv.13, and 14. V.13 says, Wherefore the Lord said, Forasmuch as this people draw near me with their mouth and with their lips do honor me, but have removed their heart far from me, and their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men; 14 says: therefore, behold, I proceed to do a marvellous work among this people, for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid.

Now we have then two verses here, the first of which describes the condition, the second shows the result, what God is going to do on account of this danger. V.13 describes the spiritual condition of the leaders of Israel, that is of the southern kingdom. V.14 describes what God is going to do about it, we are reminded of the book of Immanuel, chapter 7 and 8 where God rebuked Ahaz for his wickedness, showed how he was an unworthy sign of the house of David, God was going to replace him in His own time, with His mighty Immanuel, the true representative of the house of David. Here we have the nobles, the leaders of the people, people who are showing, going through lip service toward the Lord, honoring Him with their lips, but remove their hearts from Him, God is going to do certain things as a result. How much is the parallel in this to what was said about Ahaz? Well before we come to seeing how much of a parallel there may be in that, we want first to look at the first section, the description of the spiritual condition of the people, that runs as we've noticed from 8 to 13. ~~complete to~~ With v.13 summarizing what precedes it and 14 summarizes what is going to follow. So we say what is ^{this} that is here summarized here in 13? Well, v.9, he turns directly to the nobles again, and says, Stay yourselves, and wonder, cry ye out,

29/13-14

and cry, they are drunken, and immediately we remember how in the previous chapter he faced the nobles and said in v.7 of chapter 28, but these also have erred through wine and through strong drink, are out of the way. The priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink. They are swallowed up with wine, they are out of the way through strong drink, they err in vision and stumble in judgment. Isaiah points there to the table filled with filthiness, he points to the nobles who have made their clever plans of delivering their land from the attack of Ephraim and Syria by bringing in the Assyrians, he points to them and here they are with ~~the~~ this great crisis facing the nation and they're sitting there in drunkenness, sitting there and gazing in this drunkenness and ignoring the word of God. That's what he said then but now he goes a step further, he says there they erred through wine and ~~we~~ strong drink, instead of humbling themselves before the Lord, instead of praying the Lord to give them the best possible wisdom to ~~go~~ face the emergency, praying the Lord to give them a sober spirit and handle the difficult δ situation, they are giving way to celebration of the wonderful victory that they think they've secured through their clever scheme then, but now he says, they are drunken but not from wine, they stagger but not from strong drink. Does he here contradict what he said a chapter earlier. No, verbally, it is a contradiction. Anybody says the Bible doesn't contradict itself has never read the Bible. Every book ever written contains ~~number~~ numerous contradictions, but the contradictions in an intelligently written book are contradictions verbally rather than in inner thought. A cleverly written book may have very few verbal contradictions, but be full of contradictions of real thought, but one which is really intelligently written goes into things and there are all sorts of contradictions in life, contradictions because we don't see the whole story, we see one side and then we see the other side, they seem to be opposite. Actually it's like Gen.1 which starts with a watery chaos, and Gen.2 which starts with a dry wilderness. They start at different points, at one point one is true, at one the other. It's just the opposite. No contradiction if

29:9

you see the real significance. So also here. They have erred through strong drink. Instead of being seriously given over to the great task to which as leaders of the nation they should be devoting their time and attention, they are giving themselves up to a wicked type of relaxation, celebrating the victory they think they've had. But now he says it is not strong drink and wine that is producing the trouble. They are drunken not with wine, they stagger not with strong drink, these are merely symptoms, they are not the cause, they give themselves to this strong drink and to the wine because there is already something spiritually wrong with them which leads them to do this. This is a minor symptom rather than a major cause. The major cause of their staggering, of their drunkenness is not that they use a drug which puts them in that shape but it is that they refuse to pay the proper attention to God and His commands and they are in a spiritual condition which is the real cause of their plight.

So he goes ahead here and describes the spiritual condition which has led to their clever scheme to get Ahaz, the spiritual condition which leads to the drunkenness, the spiritual condition which eventually will get them into a situation where Sennacherib seems on the point of utterly destroying them, and that spiritual condition he describes, but before giving details about it he says in v.10 For the Lord has poured on you the spirit of deep sleep, and has closed your eyes, the prophets and your rulers, the seers he has covered.

Well, what do they have to do with it then, how can you blame them if the Lord comes. The Lord has poured out these griefs upon them, the Lord has covered the prophets and the rulers and the seers, the Lord has sent them this spirit, how can you blame them for it? That's the old argument. Well, I can't help it, it's the way I was made, the way I was brought up, it's my environment, my heredity, my unfortunate situation, not my fault. And the answer is that there are many things that people can't help, but nobody is ever in a situation where he can't help some things. There is a--
the person who has the greatest possible opportunity of environment and heredity and

everything, can utterly fail to take advantage of his opportunities and go bad, and the person who has the poorest possible heredity can strive and do his best to rise above his background, and so the argument is, people are--they can't help themselves, they're pawns in God's hands. Well, God says, the person that rejects the truth, God gives over to believe a lie. The person that goes against God He permits to go further into sin, He sends strong delusion upon those who refuse to accept the truth. There is a definite hardening activity of the Spirit of God, as well as a blessing activity. Somebody said wherever Paul went there was either a riot ~~or~~ or a revival, there was one effect or the other, it was impossible to remain neutral. So the word of God which brings joy and help to some, brings misery to others when the indifference, the easy sensation of just sliding with the current is no longer possible. And here it recognizes the fact ^{of} ~~that~~ God's sovereignty, the fact that no one stands still, the fact that ^{those} ~~no one~~ who reject ~~the~~ the word of God will inevitably go into that which is far worse. They have rejected God and now the Lord permits them to ^{go} further on in the direction in which they have deliberately gone. ~~So~~ we have that very interesting description in v.11 and 12...

11. (3/4)

29:11-12 ...in verses 11 and 12 we read that they are like children, or no, not yet, they are like people to whom a book is read, and here is a sealed book which is handed to some one who can read, and they say to the man who can read, read that. He says I can't read it, it's sealed. Well, if it were sealed and the people that gave it to them had no right to break the seal, and he didn't either, very proper not to read a private communication, but the fact that they go to him and ask him to read it, shows that they are supposed to have the right to break that seal, and when ~~they~~ they come and say here read this, he is expected to open up the envelope and read it. And he says, I can't read it, it's sealed. So then they go ~~to~~ another man who can't read and they say read

29:11-12
 29:13
 this, and he says I can't read it, I can't read. In other words, everybody will give any kind of an excuse rather than pay attention to the word of God. The person who is ready to keep the word of God can find it. The person who is ready to give heed to the light that he has, God will give more light to him. It is the spirit of the indifferent, the spirit of honoring Him with their lips, but their heart far from Him, that do not bother, they always have an excuse why ~~they~~ ~~should~~ follow along to know the Lord. So he gives the very interesting comparison of them, people making any kind of an excuse rather than to study your word. Learn to read if you can't read, learn how to break ~~the~~ seal if you don't know, but get into the word and see what it means. So he concludes in v.13, therefore, the Lord said this people draws nigh~~ly~~ with their mouth and with their lips they honor me, but they have ~~removed~~ their heart far from me, and their reverence toward me, their ceremonies, their attitude is following men's commands rather than following God's way. They do it this way because their ancestors did it, they do it just the way people say, rather than because this is what they find in God's word, and what He wants. Yes, Mr. Miller? (2 3/4) Yes, you've raised a very interesting question of hermeneutics. You take a verse by itself, and very frequently there are many ways in which it could be interpreted. It is true in almost any sense, in almost any discussion. You take a sentence by itself and there are different ways of understanding it, some sentences, there is a great deal in it, but it is so clear, there is no question about it. In others, there is quite a variety of possibilities of interpretation. But just about every sentence has to be interpreted in the light of context, and you have to see what is the basic idea in the context, and then see, does this fit into that, does it represent a departure from it, does it represent a change of thought, does it add to the understanding, does it illustrate, what is its relation toward the central thought in the context? Now the central thought in the context here is v.13, and the previous expression is vv.9 and 10.

And in those the whole note is denunciation of people because their heart is far from God. And therefore the vision is become to them, he says, like this, this we will expect then, will be an illustration of that which is stated in plain language before and after. Now if we find that it isn't then we have to investigate and see whether this represents a change in thought from what precedes and follows, or whether we have perhaps misinterpreted what precedes and follows, there are always those possibilities. And it is true that as you look at the excuses which are given there, it would ~~be~~ they sound very plausible, they sound very plausible, and it might very well be that instead of 9 and 10 and 13 being like this, you might say, these people are in a very unfortunate situation, they have no access to the word of God. The word of God in their country is in such a situation that the king and the church have forbidden people to read, and therefore the people who are learned, the Bible is a closed book to them, they are unable to read it because it is sealed, they are forbidden to look at it. On the other hand, in this country there are people who have access to the Bible, but these people are unfortunately people who can't read, and therefore, ^{though} they can look at the pages, it means nothing to them, they can't read it. That is to say, these two verses could fit very well into that type of context, because each of them can be interpreted as a valid excuse, but since what is before and after describes a people whose eyes are closed and their ears are covered, they're in a deep sleep, they're staggering but not with strong drink, and then the Lord condemns them for it and says, they draw near with their mouth, but their heart is far from me, it seems to be necessary then to put the stress in what is--in the middle, not on their being valid excuses, but on their being hunting around for something for an excuse, and it impresses me that therefore we are required to say, well, these people who say they can't read it because it is sealed, there is some way they could get it unsealed, it is an excuse rather than a reason, and these people who can't read it because they can't read,

well they could get someone else to read it, or they could learn to read. In the context it seems to be required that the excuses are not valid excuses. It could be, those two alone, I think, very readily, could be a picture of people in a condition where they have no appetite for the word, they're cut off from it, but with the denunciation after, it seems rather to be a picture of people who are taking their disability and being satisfied with their disability and not trying to remedy it, but making them an excuse for not following the words of the Lord. Mr. Abbott? (6 3/4)

29:13
 A new start and a brand new subject in 13. If the chapter ended there it certainly would not be impossible, but v.13 says wherefore the Lord says, and he denounces them. It would seem to require that the thing that he is denouncing them for is what has immediately preceded, and what has immediately preceded is a description, an example of that which he is here generalizing. It is a matter of interpretation in relation to context. Now of course if you leave out vv.11 and 12, you take 10 followed right by 13 and say the Lord has poured out upon you the spirit of deep sleep, and has closed your eyes. 13, wherefore the Lord said, Forasmuch as they draw near with their mouth, with their lips do honor me, but have removed their heart far from me,-- then you are faced with a problem. God has done it, and yet he rebukes them. But you are faced with that problem any way you read it. There is an element in it of a situation which multiplies, and which God Himself contributes to, but there is also a definite denunciation, which implies that the people ^{are} ~~had~~ deliberately taking an attitude of indifference, and failure to follow on. Mr. Miller? (8) We have to assume that from the context, this 13, that shows that this is a picture of a wrong heart condition, that the excuses, though they have a great measure of apparent validity are yet insufficient to account for the failure to read the book that the Lord has given. That reminds me of an English official, his name slips me, he was an English governor of Jerusalem, and then Governor of Judea, then they transferred him to Cypress and he was governor-general of Cypress, and he told how when he got to

Cypress, he found that the people in the government office were working 6 hours a day. He said that he said they should do two more hours work, so he said some of them came to him and said well we can't, we can't start earlier than 10 in the morning, it is absolutely impossible, we can't get in from our places where we live, into the offices, before 10 in the morning. He went to others and they said we can't possibly work more than 6 hours in a day because we have to leave at 4 in the afternoon for our golf courses, it would be impossible. And then we found they were having a long lunch hour he says how about cutting down on the lunch hour, and they said that's impossible, absolutely. In this hot climate we have to have the relaxation of the lunch hour, and so he said they all had reasons why they couldn't work more than so many hours. So he says, all right, let's forget the reasons, we won't argue about it any more, we just say that you put in 8 hours. So they put in 8 hours. They all had excuses and they were good excuses, and he couldn't answer them all. Nevertheless the object had to be met and it was up to them to find some way around, and that was the way he expressed it, and I think that is what the Lord is saying here. If we really put Him first, we can find a way to serve Him. We can. We have valid excuses, we have valid reasons for not putting the Lord first, but ^{their validity} ~~there that~~ is not of account when you compare it with the magnitude of the obligation. It is sufficient validity for many ordinary things, but for the obligation to follow the Lord with your heart and make your ^{life} ~~heart~~ count for Him, the excuses given are not sufficient. So his conclusion is that we draw near with our mouth, and with our lips we honor Him, but our heart is far from Him. Like the salesman I heard of who said that he was in a very hospitable area and he would come through there every week and stop at the different places, and there was one place he always stopped at 12 o'clock and got their order and every time they'd say well now won't you stay to lunch? Please stay to lunch, and he ~~had~~ said they were so very hospitable but he always had to hurry on. So he said oh I am so sorry I can't, and he went on, but he said one time

I thought, I guess I will, so when they said , won't you stay to lunch, he said, why I guess I will, thank you. Oh, they said, we didn't mean today. Their hospitality was a hospitality of the lips, not of the heart. It was a beautiful gesture.

A man was in Cuba, was it, and ^{visited} ~~lived~~ in a Spanish house, and he saw a picture, a beautiful picture. My, he said, I love that picture, it is so lovely. Take it, Senor, it is yours, take it. So he sent the porter over from the hotel the next day, to get the picture, and they were quite indignant, they never dreamed of giving him the picture. It was just good Spanish politeness to say take it , it's yours, when you admire anything. There is a lot of that that is understood to be politeness and nobody ever things of taking it seriously, but God doesn't want to be treated that way. He wants us to draw near, not with our lips, but with our heart. Yes? (12) There is in the immediate statement no evidence of drawing near with the lips but I think it is implied that they are. (stu.) Well you have to assume the situation . He says, Forasmuch as this people--he is describing their whole situation, and before he has been simply illustrating one aspect of the situation. Their not drawing near with the heart, but we can assume they say an awful lot more than (12 1/2)

Although of course, even 11 and 12 can (12 1/2) they're drawing near with their lips. You say, read this, please read it. Oh, he says, I'd so like to read it, ~~but~~ Here is this man highly educated, knows several languages, Oh, I'd be just tickled to read it through, I'd just love to, but you see, it is sealed. I couldn't do that, I couldn't break the seal. I'd just love to do it. They're very, very polite in the ir language, and then you come up to this other man and you say, will you please read this to me, and oh, he says, sure, he says, unfasten it. No obstacle. I'd be very glad to read it, I'd like to do anything I could to help, but I'm just so sorry, I just never learned to read, can't do it. They've always got an excuse, in other words, rather than seeking to find ~~another~~ a way around the excuse, and I think there's an implication when you say, read it,

and he says I can't, for this reason, ~~no matter~~ ^{that} how much he ^{'d} like to, how very happy he is to help you. It isn't expressed, but I think it is implied...

12 (3/4)

...so we have here then an attitude which is similar to that of Ahaz. Ahaz says I will not tempt the Lord. Beautiful. What kind ^a of /lowier expression of piety can you ask? Isaiah says ask a sign of the Lord, ask it in the heights above or the depths below, ask a sign of the Lord. Ahaz says, I won't tempt the Lord. He is a beautiful pious man, very, very loyal to the Lord, except that he won't do anything to ~~serve~~ the Lord, he just has beautiful language, that's all. So Isaiah turns on him and says, oh, house of David, is it not enough that you weary men, but will you weary my God also? Now here he turns to these nobles and says, this people draws near to me with their lips, but with their heart far from me, therefore, I will proceed to do a marvelous work among them. A marvelous work, a marvelous work and a wonder. 29:14 Something that is most unexpected, surely this language means. This isn't just an ordinary thing, why look at this boy here that I've asked to chop some wood and to clean out the porch and so on, and he has done nothing ~~about~~ it, I'm going to paddle him good. All right, you say, but you wouldn't say, I'm going to do a marvelous work and a wonder. You don't use those terms, there is something very unusual. He is not simply going to chastise, He is going to chastise in a very unusual way. There is something very remarkable when there is a ~~marvelous~~ marvelous work among these people, even a marvelous work and a wonder, something very unusual. Well, we had the same thing back with Ahaz.

God will give you a sign, a virgin will have a child, this is a marvelous thing that is going to happen. Ahaz, the unworthy sign of the house of David is going to be replaced by a worthy one to sit on his throne, who is indeed to be Immanuel. Now what's going to happen to this people? Well, it's a marvelous work, what is it? The wisdom of their wise men will perish and the understanding of their prudent will

29:14
 be hid. What is so marvelous about that? What is so wonderful about that? What is so out of the ordinary about that? Well, the implication is, there is something that is very unusual, very unexpected, something strange. What is the strange thing that is going to happen? Well, a portion of it is that the wisdom of their wise men ~~per~~ishes, a portion of it is that the understanding of their prudent men shall be hidden. We have been told that in v.10, the Lord has poured a spirit of a deep sleep on them, the Lord has closed their eyes, but now we're told a remarkable thing is going to happen, the wisdom of their wise men will perish. What is it that's going to happen?

Well v.15, Woe to them that seek deep to hide their counsel from the Lord and their works are in the dark. Who seeks to hide counsel from the Lord? The nobles are making the clever scheme along with Ahaz, not telling the people about it, not telling the ecclesiastical leaders of the nation about it, but they are going around, behind everybody's back, to hire Tiglath-pileser to come in and thinking that is going to protect their nation. They are trying to hide their counsel from the Lord and are putting human wisdom ahead of God's Revelation and of the protection that God can give. Well, what's going to happen about this, what's ~~God~~ going to do?

V.16, surely your~~y~~ turning of things upside down, you turned things upside down, you put human wisdom on top and used God's wisdom merely as an excuse, you're reversing the true order, instead of coming in prayer and in careful study of the Word, to know what God wants you to do, you make your plans then you ask God to bless your ~~plans~~, you make the decision and then you look to Him to bless it and to enable you to carry out what you think is wise, instead of seeking the divine wisdom contained in the Word, to find out what you should do, ~~you're~~ ^{your} turning things upside down shall be esteemed as the potter's clay--unusual phrase, what is the potter's clay? The potter's clay, as Jeremiah tells us, the potter takes the clay and he makes the vessel, and then the vessel is marred in his hands, and he changes it and makes a different kind of a vessel. The potter has complete control over the clay, to make out

of it what he wants, but these people are trying to use God as a sort of a magical thing to carry out their devices, instead of God's being the Lord and their being His servants, they are ordering God what He is to do, and we try to do that so much in our prayers today, such a tendency that way. We want to do this, we may think this is the greatest thing for the glory of God, but we're going to do it the way we think it ought to be, and so we turn things upside down. ~~Isaiah~~ says that is wrong. Shall the word say of him that made it, he made me not, or shall the things framed, say of him that framed it, he hath no understanding? No instead of making these clever human schemes we should look to the Lord and trust Him and try to find out what His will is and get ourselves in line with it. They say, during the Civil War, somebody said to Lincoln, Lincoln, do you think that God is on our side? Lincoln said I'm not half so interested to know whether God is on our side as to know whether we're on God's side. And that's what Isaiah says here, if we are on the Lord's side, if we are following what He says, His word, then we can be sure that He will carry things out according to His will, and it is a much more important question, are we on God's side? Because if we are on God's side, then we know He is on our side, and if we're not on God's side we have no right to ask Him to bless our clever schemes, and our plans and our wisdom, so He says what He is going to do. What is He going to do? Is ~~it~~ ^{it} not yet a very little while and Lebanon shall be turned into a fruitful field, and the fruitful field shall be esteemed as a forest? This is what He is going to do, what God is going to do? What is He going to do? He is going to turn Lebanon into a fruitful field. And He is going to make the fruitful field be esteemed as a forest. Well, somebody says here is an improvement in both. God is going to make Lebanon become a fruitful field, going to make the fruitful field become a forest. Everything is going to improve. That is good post-millennial doctrine, but I don't find it in this verse. It seems as if the verse, Lebanon certainly is the forest of Lebanon, there is no question of that, there is a parallel here, of two things in one order and then in the

29:17
10:34

reverse order in the next. One is changed and the other is changed. That which was wild country becomes a fruitful field, that which was a fruitful field becomes wild country. Now what is Lebanon? What does Lebanon stand for? Well, we had Lebanon just back in chapter 10, and you remember that there in chapter 10 we found that he spoke about the Assyrians, and the Assyrian, the great enemy, he said, would be cut down and v. 34 says he shall cut down the thickets of the forest with iron, and Lebanon shall fall by a mighty one. The forest there was not a figure there for that which is uncultivated, but for that which is strong and powerful, but more important, which is outside. It was that which was outside of the land of promise. It was the great forest outside the area of ~~of~~ Israel which God had promised ~~at last~~ (8 1/2) this is going to fall. But from Israel, the stem of Jesse, the kingdom of David which has fallen, out of that a branch is going to grow up out of his root, so Lebanon there stands for that which is outside of the area of God's blessing, of God's people, of God's message.

Well, now here surely in v. 16 we read of your turning things upside down, certainly they have turned things upside down, now God is going to turn things upside down. How? He is going to take Lebanon which is outside the area of God's promise, Lebanon which is the untilled forest, the uncultivated forest, the region where the trees grew up wild and he is going to make that like a field that has been carefully cultivated and is producing fruit, and you remember how we read in the New Testament about Jesus said that he had a vineyard and he let it out to husbandmen, and he came to them and asked whether the vineyard was producing, and you remember the fig tree he said is not producing figs as it should be, and he cursed it, his fruitful field is supposed to be producing, and when he finds that it isn't, it is apt to be cursed. But here that which is outside and is not cultivated, and is not expected to be producing, is going to become a fruitful field, and that which is inside, which has been

cultivated, and which one would expect would be the place which was producing, it is going to be considered as if it were a forest, as if it were something outside the area of God's plan. Well, this is the marvelous thing that he is going to do, the marvelous work among His people, the marvelous work and the wonder which involves the perishing of the wisdom of their wise men, and the hiding of the understanding of their prudent men, and in Isaiah's day, I'm sure people would read this and say what is the marvelous work that is going to come? Are these Assyrians going to become God's people? Are they going to become the ones whom He teaches His word to and are the Israelites going to become like the Assyrians? Is that what it means? And they wonder and nobody knew for sure exactly what it meant. So they pondered over it until the apostle Paul said, here is what was predicted, here we see it, that Israel who has been following God and saying the words He gave, and performing the ceremonies, they have not attained to their (11 1/4) that they should have attained, because they have been seeking it, not with faith, but with forms and ceremonies, while the Gentiles who have not been seeking, to them He has brought the message of salvation and among the Gentiles, a sizeable group which would become larger than the group from among the Jews who had accepted it, who were receiving the message of salvation, and so we had in Isa. 7 the prediction of the removal of the unworthy leader, the unworthy sign of the house of David, and the substitute for him of God's own appointed One. And here we have, speaking to the nobles the declaration of the removal of the grace of God from the nobles and the leaders who should have been the leaders of God's people, but who had been following Him with their lips instead of with their heart, and the substitution of others who by God's marvelous grace, are selected from among those who had not had the same equal opportunities. Of course, neither one is complete, it doesn't mean that all of one is rejected, or all of one accepted by any means, there are many Gentiles, innumerable ones who are not elect and there are innumerable Israelites who are

elect, but it means a change of the leadership of God's people, a change in it from these who have proven themselves unworthy to a different group, and so this is the marvelous work that he is going to produce. Marvelous means not just something that you can't imagine how it will be done, but something ~~that~~ is very strange, very different from what you would expect would be done. Something that you wonder at because it is not what would normally seem would be the natural thing to occur, and so He continues, He speaks about these who have been outside the pale completely, these who have not known the truth, He calls them the deaf in v.18. He says the day is coming when the deaf will hear the words of the book, and the eyes of the blind will see out of obscurity, and out of darkness. Ye who were quite outside of the family of Israel...

13. (3/4)

...knew nothing of God's Word, ye who were blind and deaf, they are going to speak of salvation, and many of them are going to rejoice. The meat offering, those who seem to be, those who were not proud of taking their places as leaders yet, but those who are humbly desiring to know the Will of God, they will increase their joy in the Lord, and the poor among them will rejoice in the Holy One of Israel. For the terrible one is brought to nought, and the scorner is consumed, and all that watch for iniquity are cut off, that make a man an offender for a word and lay a snare for him that reproves in the gate, and turn aside the just for a thing of nought. Therefore thus saith the Lord, --who is the Lord?-the Lord is the one who redeemed Israel. Why did He redeem Israel? Redeemed Abraham? You might say, why does God redeem the people of Judah. Because they're children of Israel, they're descendants of the one whom God has blessed, they are the ones who deserve it, because they're His descendants, then why did He bless Jacob or Israel? Because He was Isaac's son. Why did He bless Isaac? Because he was the son of Abraham, the friend of God.

But He doesn't allow any of those answers, because He calls Himself, very unusual, not the God who has redeemed Jacob, but the God who has redeemed Abraham, and there is absolutely nothing in ancestry to account for the redemption of Israel. Abraham is one ~~who~~ who is grabbed from out of the miscellaneous mass of ~~Eden~~^{heathen}, and who is the recipient of God's wonderful sovereign grace. He is the one whom God calls out from the wicked city of Ur and brings Him His blessing, so this is stressing the sovereignty of God in redemption. Not the one who is fulfilling the promises he makes to the fathers which He will fulfill, blessings to thousands of generations that follow Him and that do His will. No, this is the sovereign grace of God receiving ^{the} one who who could have no possible claim upon him, the one who redeemed Abraham. What does He say about the house of Jacob? Jacob will not now be ashamed, neither will his face wax pale. Well, why won't it wax pale? Jacob is God's, the head of God's people, he looks at his descendants, they should be the leaders of God's people, he sees them turning into ~~this~~ clever scheme of alliance with the wicked Tiglath-pileser, using their human schemes in order to advance their ideas, and thinking they get deliverance and peace in that way, Jacob is ashamed, his face waxes pale, but he says, he will not now be ashamed, nor will his face wax pale. Why? He sees them turning off into paths of wickedness, he sees them headed for destruction, naturally he would wax pale, but he is going to see something else, he is going to see his children, the work of my hand. He is going to see the true Israel of God, that is the Israel who are the work of God's hands, those who have enjoyed the wonderful blessing of God's sovereign election, those who have had the redemption that God has given them, those whom He has selected whether Jew or Gentile, He sees them in the midst of him, He sees them in a great number of the Israel of God, so Jacob no longer waxes pale but he sees what God has made. Remember, Jesus said, that God can of these stones make those to praise Him. Well, everyone that is a true believer is a stone made into a child of Abraham, because it is only God's

sovereign grace that made anyone, Jew or Gentile, to be a true believer, a member of the family of God, so ~~we~~ sees his children, the work of mine hands, in the midst of him, he sees the greatly increased multitude of his descendants but the multitude ~~was~~ enlarged, because the true Israel had been enlarged by those whom God had brought in. It is as the olive tree in Romans, a picture of the olive~~x~~ tree, when you say, in which the wild branches have been grafted in. He sees these and they shall sanctify my name and sanctify the Holy One of Israel, and fear the God of Israel. So we have here a marvelous picture in these verses of God's future plan, just as Isa. 7 gave us His marvelous future plans in substituting for the leadership of the house of David His own Immanuel. This shows us His marvelous future plan in substituting for the leadership of His people simply those who thought they had a hereditary claim, in moving for a time the center of His blessing to a people who are drawn from outside, from Lebanon, the forest outside, but who are the work of His hands, and graft it in to the Olive Tree, His true revelation. And I see, and it would be possible to interpret v. 24 as a continuation of what has preceded, but I feel that in line with the teachings of Paul about the Olive Tree, and in line with the previous whole picture where man goes so far and then God intervenes, I feel that v. 24 represents a new idea, a different idea than has been given before. In v. 18 we have the dead and the blind, those who can't help themselves, they're outside the ~~pal~~le, but God in His marvelous grace, permits them to see and to hear and to learn His word, and to become as the children of Jacob, the work of His hands, but now we have not those who were blind, not those who ~~were~~ ^{are} deaf, not those who are outside the family of God, but those who have erred in spirit, but those who have erred in spirit, those who have ~~w~~andered astray, those who were physically Israel but who have wandered astray, they are going to come to understand, and they that murmured shall learn doctrine, and that it seems to me is a parallel to the last part of Paul's picture of the olive tree where Paul

says that if the casting aside of the natural olive tree branch and the grafting in of ~~the~~ ^{the} wild branches, if that had been salvation and blessing for the world, what will be the regrafting in of the natural branches but resurrection from the dead, so here we have, I believe, the grafting back into their own olive tree of Israel as a nation born in a day, at the end of the age, as so described in Romans where Paul says, and so all Israel shall be saved, and Christian interpreters through the ages until recently ^{have practically} ~~all understood~~ that as meaning that all of Israel is going to be a nation, born in a day, brought into the kingdom at the end of this age by a marvelous act of God's wonderful grace. There are in ~~these~~ recent days certain amillennialists who write books in which ~~they~~ say it doesn't mean anything like that at all. When Paul says, So all Israel shall be saved, he means that this is the way that any of Israel who ~~will~~ were saved, will be saved. So, so all Israel will be saved means no Israelites are saved except those who are saved through accepting Christ, but in the context, Christians have through the ages accepted it to mean that a great outpouring of God's grace upon Israel as a whole at the end of the age, and if you take it that way, that most Christian interpreters till recently, and I think the bulk today, have interpreted, it seems to me that this parallels to them. So that in this last verse we have that final step in the process as God permits Isaiah to ~~glance~~ ^{glance} forward into the distant future, as to His dealing with the people of God ^{through the distant ages.} So you see why (8 3/4)

29:24
 look at this 29 th chapter is a very wonderful chapter with its picture of God's dealing with His people, in His plan of the coming of Christ and through the whole of the present age and on through the future. Mr. Vannoy? (9) Yes, I feel that generalized dictates as to what you can or can't do are simply false method of reasoning. I feel that you have to take the facts and see in the light of context what is taught, and I would say that Israel as a nation of individuals of a certain blood, and Israel as the true believers in God, have to be distinguished as to which is in mind in any particular passage, but the two overlap to a very great extent, and they cannot be distinguished in the sense of

being completely separated. There are times when they overlap very largely, and there are times when they overlap to a ~~very~~ considerable extent, and there are times when they overlap only a very little. But to put them in two categories, I see no warrant for that anywhere in Scripture. But I've heard people say, that there are God's earthly people who were promised land, and there are God's heavenly people who were promised salvation. Well, what good would land be to anybody without salvation? I think that is ridiculous nonsense. God called a people to be the medium for giving of His word, and preparing the way for the coming of His son, the purpose was spiritual, ~~the~~ land was a minor but important feature of the spiritual purposes, but the vital thing is the spiritual purpose, not the land, and in the original calling to Abraham there is nothing said about the land part, the land as time goes ^{on} ~~is~~ stressed a little more than before, but that's not the major thing at all, and as to just what distinctions there may be in the millennium, why we can't tell a lot about it, there will be distinctions of certain types, of course, there is specialization in the Lord's work, inevitably, but to get it right down into very simple divisions, why you just don't have the data, and those lines don't usually work out like that anyway. I would feel that there are those who explain away the millennium, all through the Scripture. They say it is simply the preaching of the gospel, that's all. Well, I think that is entirely wrong, and then there are others who want to find the millennium in every verse. I ~~think~~ that is equally wrong. And I ~~think~~ we have to take each passage and see what it is talking about, and decide. And where I used to teach, before I was here, you had a great task to persuade people that Isaiah 2 was talking about the millennium. I think it is very clear, there is no question it is the millennium, but then when I began teaching prophets in this seminary, I found people were aghast when I pointed out that Isaiah 4 was not a picture of the millennium but a picture of the present age, the picture is antithetical to that in 2. There are two different pictures, different situation altogether. One is a time when there is no external danger, the other is a time when

there is protection from the external danger that is all around. They are utterly different pictures, and the people who say there is nothing about the present age in the Old Testament. Well, you show me one place in the New Testament where it says there is nothing ~~about~~ the present ^{church} age in the Old Testament, and I will say if that is God's Word of course it is true, but until you find such a statement it is purely imagination. And this passage and quite a few other passages make perfect sense when you see them as pictures of God's plan for the ages, and if not why you're almost as bad off trying to interpret them as you are trying to interpret the millennial passages from an amillennial viewpoint, where you get into other matters. (stu.13) I don't think the linear figure quite fits. If you use the word dispensationalism in a harmful sense, in a sense of making false divisions which just don't exist, I think amillennial- ism is the most dispensational view there is, in that sense, that's my criticism.

I think the word is an unfortunate word, because it stresses certain very wonderful things and can be interpreted in such a way as to stress certain misinterpretations. It can be used in a good way or a bad way, I think it is an unfortunate word. I think the same way with covenant theology, it is used in a bout 50 different senses, some of which are excellent, and some of which are terrible, and the two of them have to be defined, but I think the thing is to see what is in the word and stand on whatever you find there, wherever you find it. And I believe we find the millennium very, very clearly and I think we find the course of this present age depicted as the prophet glances

(14 1/2)

I think God gave marvelous ~~hints~~ glimpses

and this chapter I think is one of the finest of the

I think this interpretation I've given, everything falls in line, it just words straight out, it is very clear, and otherwise you've got a lot of words, a lot of rather unrelated sentences. ...

...at that place I think that particular note is in error, I don't think this is a description
(3/4) and

I think v.24 is the very end of this section. Yes? (1) Yes, thank you very much. It is better to give it to you now than to put it on the board Friday because you have much more time to work on it, and you can do a much better job. The assignment has 3 parts to it. The first part is this, please write it down rapidly, I meant to give it to you at the beginning of the hour. The first part: briefly examine Isa.13.1, 15.1, 17.1 and 19.1. Just see what those verses mean and what do they have in common. Very quickly done, nothing to write. Number 2: write a brief discussion of Isa.30.6, just brief, with emphasis on that which is like the verses you've looked at before under #1. That brief discussion I'd like turned in. Isa.30.6. Number:3:write a full--this is not brief, 3 is as much as 1 and 2 put together and multiplied by 10--write a full outline and discussion of the progress of thought in ^{Isaiah} ~~Isa.~~ 30, entire chapter. Now this one, the people who are taking this for undergraduate credit I would say put at least 4 hours on this assignment for next time. 2 credit class, 2 hours of class, four hours outside, and some weeks we have not assigned anything, so if anybody wants to do more than 4, that is optional, but I'm assigning it four for undergraduates. For graduate students six. Assignment is the same, but the graduate students do 2 hours longer. Next Monday morning by 11 o'clock, please have them in my box so that I can look them over. Thank you. (3 1/2, break, record starting again at 3 3/4--4/9/62)

...I think everything falls in place, the passage makes perfect sense. It gives a consistent picture of God's plan, fits in with other parts of the Bible, every word in it, has a purpose in the conveying of the truth that is there included. Now we went straight through it and I believe I brought out all the vital points, but before going on, I'd like to ask if there is anything that isn't clear, any question, any particular aspect that we should look at a little further? Anybody have any such?

...factors in which there are quite a few verses that I have to say well now

I'm just not sure what ~~that~~ means, but I don't feel that way about 29. I feel as if once you get the key, see how it fits together, how it relates to what precedes, how it relates to Isa.7, and what the parallel is to the New Testament teaching, it seems to me that every ~~ew~~ word falls in place, that there is no real problem involved in it, but the interpretation I gave you, going straight through, I have not come across in any book. Of course I haven't looked up every book on it, ~~it~~ it may be some where, but I haven't seen it. But if everything is perfectly clear on that to you and you have no questions or problems on any part of it, then we can go on to chapter 30. If not, I'd like to look into any problems anyone has to raise. Everybody seems to understand it perfectly, that is wonderful. Then we go on to chapter 30. Oh, I just get a glimpse of Mr. Gregory once in a while, when he pokes his head around, that's better. All right, now let's look at chapter 30.

Ch. 30
 Now in chapter 30, we start in with a title which seems to go back to the section that ran through verses 9-13. It has the same sort of a criticism of the people's character and attitude. It ties us back then immediately. We are not tied up to the end of the chapter where we have this picture of God's plan, this turning things upside down, which runs from verses 16-24, we are carried back to the place where he began his discussion of the character of the people, a character that is quite similar to the character of Ahaz. We are not only, however, carried back to the beginning, ~~to~~ this middle part of chapter 29, we are also carried back to chapter 7. What is there in this verse ~~that~~ particularly carries us back to chapter 7, Mr. Golin? How does v.1 of chapter 30 which takes us back, not to the previous 8 verses but to what was the section that preceded them, how does it carry us back also to chapter 7? Hope everyone is looking either in your own English Bible or your own Hebrew Bible. Yes, Mr. Abbott? (7) You say, as far as the time is concerned that we're moving forward, but I don't ~~say~~ any reason to think that we have moved any distance yet, here. In chapter 28 he attacks the clever plan which Ahaz and his nobles have made, to

rescue them from Ephraim and Syria, and he says instead of that you should have looked to God for help and trusted God. Your plan is going to bring you into terrible situation where Jerusalem will be about ready to be destroyed but God will deliver. Then, he comes back to that same attitude again here. He says woe to them that look for counsel to men, not to me. He is going back I would say to that same theme. Now of course he is looking forward to a continuance of the attitude on the people's part. But I see no reason in the world to say that he is cutting off (7 3/4) at the time of Ahaz. Yes? (stu.) Well, now that's the next verse. We are not to the next verse yet. We're on v.1 ~~now~~ now. V.1 shows the people saying we are going to get Assyria to help us against Ephraim and Syria, that's the way we're going to get deliverance. God said your scheme for deliverance is going to backfire, He said it's going to simply do away with the buffer state, you'll have Assyria right next to you, Jerusalem is going to be like Ariel, going to be reduced to a terrible condition, where disaster seems immediately ahead, but then God says, I'm going to intervene and going to protect Jerusalem from the situation into which you bring it. But then He goes back to your character that is going to bring that on it, and criticizes their character that turn to these schemes instead of following God, in the middle section of chapter 29. Then in the latter part, just as he told Ahaz, Ahaz I'm going to replace you by a true descendant of David, a true leader of the house of David, here He says to the leaders of God's people who were looking to men instead of to God, I am going to replace you with another ^{people} king. I'm going to turn things upside down, replace you with another people, as the center of the carrying on of the work of God, but then eventually I'm going to bring you back in to the olive tree. Now He continues on the same theme.

He says in this verse, Woe to them that, rebellious children, that take counsel, but not of me. The nobles and Ahaz, they take counsel together, they don't ask the

Lord what He thinks, what are His principles, what does He have in mind they should do, instead they work out their clever schemes, and then their clever schemes that they work out, that they think is going to succeed, he says won't succeed, so He says this is the situation you're going to be in, you are facing Assyria, with nothing in between, you're in far worse danger than before, and then they answer, they say -- now maybe they immediately answer--they say, well, if that happens this is what we're going to do. Maybe, however, he looks forward to what they will answer when the situation gets into that. Here they're faced with Israel and Syria. Trust in God, He will deliver you, if you put your heart entirely in His will. They say, no, you can't see God, these beautiful platitudes, but we've got to have helpers, somebody that has got some force. Let's get Assyria. So Isaiah says well, you go to Assyria, next you know, you'll have a worse enemy than these, you'll have Assyria. They say, well, all right then, if we get facing with Assyria, we'll do the same thing we did before, we look to Assyria to protect us from Ephraim and Syria, now with Assyria against us, now we look to Egypt, we'll play off the great powers, one against the other, that way we'll be safe. That'll be our next step in doing exactly the same thing we were doing before, but doing it in the next step when we find that scheme backfires, we'll make another one exactly like it. We will look to Egypt for help, so he says, woe to the people that take counsel, but not of me, that cover with a covering--he told them in 28 the covering is too short to cover you, the bedding is too narrow, to wrap yourself in, cover with a covering, but not of my spirit, that they add sin to sin. You have been blameworthy before God, you have had sin in looking to Assyria instead of God, for help against Syria and Ephraim, now you're going to add sin to sin, you're going to look to Egypt for help, instead of trusting God and following Him, against Assyria. God will deliver you from Assyria, by this tremendous thing that He has promised to do, that is to deliver you by a miraculous protection of Jerusalem, but no, you've got to go to Egypt for help.

Well, did they ever look to Egypt for help? Well, as we find in Isa. 36.6 in the section with which we began our examination of this passage, this semester, we found that in Isa. 36.6, that he said, that the King of Assyria said to Hezekiah, Lo, thou trustest in the staff of this broken reed, on Egypt, whereon if a man lean it will go into his hand and pierce it. So is Pharaoh king of Egypt to all that trust in him, that is what Sennacherib's representative says to Hezekiah about their trusting in Egypt, which shows very clearly that in the time between the failure of Ahaz' plan to deliver them by having Assyria come, and Assyria has removed the buffer state, now between that and the time described in chapter 36, they have been doing exactly the same thing as before only with a different people, they have been looking to Egypt for help against Assyria, just as before they looked to Assyria for help against Syria and Egypt. So here in this 30th chapter of Isaiah, here, we just started looking at this 2nd verse and we find how it fits in with the statement in chapter 36...

15. (3/4)

...Sennacherib's representative is going to say to them, when he is actually come, Isaiah here, I would guess, still in the time of Ahaz, though it may be that these chapters were added on, rather than all being given immediately at the time of the banquet, my guess would be that he is right at the banquet. My guess would be that this is at the very time in which in chapter 28, we had Isaiah going into the banquet and rebuking the nobles for their trusting Assyria instead of trusting God, and that here now they are saying, well, if that works out the way he says and we have Assyria as our enemy, we'll just look to Egypt, and we'll get help from Egypt. That would be my guess. Now it's possible that instead of that Isaiah wrote it five or ten years later, in addition. But it seems to me more natural that right then God permitted him to look on into the future, and that he either said this at the banquet, at which chapter 28 occurs, or else that he, having made a start at the banquet, and then finally

gotten thrown out before he got it all said, he went on and wrote down what he would have said if he'd gone on talking an hour or two. At any rate I think it relates right to that situation, they're looking to the next step. He said, the Lord said, you're not asking counsel of me, you're looking for your own clever schemes to protect yourself, they won't work, Assyria is not going to simply deliver you from Ephraim and Syria, you'll have a worse enemy in front of you than you had before. They say, well, then we'll look to Egypt, so now we find that in these next few verses he is dealing with this matter of Egypt. V.3, therefore shall the strength of Pharaoh be your shame and to trust in the shadow of Egypt your confusion. That is exactly the idea that is brought out so forcibly by Sennacherib's representative in that interesting figure of speech, that he uses in 36.6 where it says, Egypt is a broken reed, trust in it and it will go through your hand, pierce through your hand,

So here he is saying the same thing in advance, they're going to find it does not work and Sennacherib's representatives will (3) Now he says, your princes will be at Zoan and your ambassadors come to Hanes, these places in Egypt, but you will find that it won't help. The strength of Pharaoh will be your shame, trust in the shadow of Egypt your confusion. They are all ashamed of a people that could not profit them, nor be an help nor profit, but a shame, and also a reproach. You won't get anything out of this looking to Egypt, they'll take all you give them, but they won't give you any real protection. Now v.6 begins with a verse and I asked you today to look up certain verses. I asked everybody, didn't I? The whole class.

All right, the first of those was 13.1. The burden of Babylon, the thing lifted up or carried, about Babylon. You go on and there is God's message of rebuke regarding Babylon. The next time we find that expression is in 15.1. Did you look at that, Mr. Cohen? Well, what do you think it means there? (4) You look at 17.1, what does that mean? Against Damascus. A message which the prophet has relating

to Damascus. Actually the chapter relates more to Egypt than Damascus, but it does relate to Damascus. And then did I mention 19.1? What did you notice in 19.1, Mr. Miller? Yes, what does it say? What does that mean? Mr. Grauley, what do you think about v.6 of chapter 30. You get light on the problem by the Hebrew word? The answer is, no, the Hebrew word is different. And therefore Mr. Gregory is quite right in considering that the fact that the word burden is used in many other cases, to mean a strong message which God has against someone or some thing, establishes a presumption that in a similar phrase here the word is used the same way. Then you examine the presumption and see whether it is justified, and in examining the presumption, Mr. Gregory came up against a tough problem. How would you think of Egypt as being the beast of the south? And the problem that that establishes is a very, very difficult one, how would this be a way to express Egypt, the best of the south? And the answer to that is the answer which Mr. Grauley has already given us. That though the word here is an identical word, it is here used not in the somewhat figurative sense of a burden namely a message of woe that the prophets have from the Lord, but in the strictly literal sense of something that is carried. You see, if you read this chapter without having read anything of the prophets before, you should have no problem, the burden of the beasts of the south is what the beasts of the south carry. But a person shouldn't read this without reading what comes before, because we have the word used in the other sense in Isaiah several times before, and therefore a person normally approaching this, having looked at all the previous passages in Isaiah, will immediately ask, well, what's the message about the beasts of the south, what does that stand for? But actually, you don't find any sensible answer, and so you come back to the strictly literal interpretation in this case. As Mr. Golin said, it is something carried. Now when he says the beasts of the south, what are beasts of the south? Camel, the beast of the south. § Do you think somebody in South Africa would say the camel was the beast of the south? I think he'd say the camel was the

beast of the north, don't you? Camel is the beast of the desert, but he is not the beast of the south, unless you happen to be north of him. This might be camel, I'm not saying it isn't a ~~camel~~, but what I'm saying is, what is the beast of the south? Is it the beast that comes from the south? Is it a ~~beast~~ that is particularly characteristic of the south? Or what does it mean in this case? What would you think, Mr. Grauley? (7 1/4) It is found there but I don't think that is the meaning of this. What do you think, Mr. Cohen? (7 1/4) This is, I believe, the beasts that are going to the south. The burden of the beasts of the south. In other words, Isaiah gives a vivid picture. He says to these nobles, well, you say, you sent this heavy tribute to Assyria, Assyria is going to protect you from, going to deliver you from Ephraim, and Syria, well, they will, but they will destroy them, then you will be faced with Assyria, in worse danger than you are now. Well, they said, then we'll look to Egypt and Egypt will ~~protect~~ us from Assyria, we could play our international politics a step further. If we don't like Hitler, we'll make alliance with Stalin against Hitler. Well, all right, then suppose you and Stalin together get rid of Hitler, then you're face to face with Stalin, what are you going to do in that case? Well, we'll just make a few more missiles then. If we'd start trusting God in the first place, we'd be better off. We can't say now there is some other dictator we'll look to for help against Stalin because there isn't any, we've reached the end. But they thought they hadn't reached the end, they had Egypt to look to. Well, he says, you may look to Egypt and you think you'll get help from Egypt, well, I'll tell you what's going to happen, he says: the burden of the ~~beasts~~ of the south. If you're going to get help from Egypt, you are going to be sending great amounts of your material off to Egypt to try to get their support, so you're going to be impoverishing yourself, and weakening yourself, in order to get Egyptian support, and then when you get it you'll find it isn't worth anything. So he gives a vivid picture, he says, the burden of the

beasts of the south. This is what is going to happen. Just look at the burden. The burden of the beasts of the south. Into the land of trouble of anguish, from whence come the young and old lion, the viper and fiery flying serpent. Is that Egypt, the land from whence comes the young and old lion, the viper and fiery flying serpent? I don't think there he is referring to Egypt, I think he is there referring to the region between Palestine and Egypt, into which they go on the way to Egypt, and you recall how when the Israelites came up out of Egypt, down south of the Dead Sea there, they came into the area where there was a ~~where~~ where there were great numbers of these fiery serpents that bit the people, and God gave them the brazen serpent to look to and trust in ~~and~~ find, through God's provision, find deliverance from the poison of this world into which they had come. That was the region into which they're going to have to send their animals with their heavily laden burden, on their way to Egypt.

When Lawrence of Arabia came, with his forces from Arabia up to Palestine, he came through that region and he describes in his book how they were camping at night, and he said it was filled with serpents, and he said they'd lie down on the ground to sleep at night and he said in the morning the first one that got up each ~~morning~~ morning would have to get up very, very quietly, and move himself very gradually ~~and~~ lest he should excite a serpent that might be lying right straight against him and scare it and it might bite him, and then if he got up safely he would go and take a big stick and come around and pull the serpents away that were lying up against the others for the ~~vanth~~ warmth of their bodies. And he describes that region through which the Israelites came and through which now they're going to send all this great amount of materials in order to get Egyptian help. He says, you can look to God, make your heart right before the Lord, see His provision, but instead of that, you're going to play off your clever human schemes, this is what it's going to lead to, you're going to impoverish yourselves ~~and~~ it won't do you any good anyway.

So they are going to go into the land from whence comes the young and old

lion, the viper and the fiery flying serpent, they will carry their riches upon the shoulders of young asses, and their treasures upon the bunches of camels, to a people that shall not profit them. For the Egyptians shall help in vain, and to no purpose. I don't know as that is a very good English expression of it. The Egyptians will promise to help. You will seek Egyptian help in vain and to no purpose. Therefore, have I ~~cried~~ cried concerning this, their strength is to sit still. Egypt a thousand years before had been the greatest force in the middle east, and just a word that the Egyptian army was coming was enough to make most people submit, because Egypt was so powerful, a thousand years before. But Egypt had declined and declined in its strength until now it was just a shadow of its former self, but there was a very vigorous shadow. It was like when the Spanish American War began, Spain had been the great power which held all of South America, ~~except~~ Brazil, in its hands, and held the Philippine Islands, it was the greatest empire in the world, and all the world had been rather terrified of Spain. And Spain had continued that way for some centuries, but it has been getting weaker and weaker while outwardly it seemed to be just as strong as ever, and when the Spanish-American War began, they say that there was hardly a country in Europe that thought the United States had a chance against Spain, they thought it was very foolish of this little upstart country over here to think they could defeat the mighty Spanish empire, but when the American troops attacked the Spanish in Cuba and in the Philippines it soon became apparent that Spain was just an empty frame inside of which the strength was largely gone, the people hadn't realized it for decades they had been simply going on the strength of their name.

Well, Egypt was in more or less that situation now, and they say we'll look to Egypt, we'll get our help. He says, yes, Egypt will take all the plunder and all the money that you want to sent them, to get their help, but he says, when you get ~~thru~~ through with them, you will find that their strength is to sit still.

And so we have these seven verses, the theme of which is that the same attitude be taken against Assyria, you continue by using Egypt as your means of getting human help instead of help from God, and in the end you'll find it doesn't do you any more good than the previous one, although the reason is a different reason. Yes, Mr. Abbott?...

16. (3/4)

...(stu.) Yes, it is. The parallel is very striking and the parallel is so striking, I'm glad you raised the question, Mr. Abbott, about this chapter 6, verse 1. It is quite an unnatural way, to start telling about sending a lot of tribute to Egypt, with the words, the burden of the beasts of the south. And there are two explanations of it, I think. One is that it is a very vivid picture, instead of a statement. Here is a picture. The burden of the beasts of the south, see the beasts going down there, one after another, with this mighty burden that they are carrying, it is presented in pictorial vivid form that will get the theme across much more than a simple declaration of it. And it's true, you think back over the sermons you've heard, you will probably all of you find you've heard many very wonderful explanations, expositions of Scripture, some of which have stayed in your mind, and some haven't, but you will find that among the sermons you've heard are some very simple sermons which have contained a very vivid picture and that picture has stuck with you, and sometimes people say one picture is worth a thousand words. Well, it is if you know what the picture means, ^{for sure,} but it usually takes the words to explain the picture. But the picture may make a more vivid and lasting impression, so he has given a picture. But I also, in view of our having the phrase so many times before, that the fact that he uses it again, in exactly the same form, where a different meaning is intended, perhaps is a rhetorical device, to cause the reader or the listener, to stop, expect something like before, then see that he is giving something different, and then realize that though it is something different, that there is still a similar idea, that

it is not a burden of woe upon the beasts of the south, no, the woe is upon them for trusting in Egypt, but that it is a message of woe for those who are doing what is contrary to God's will, and so it calls back some of the emotional feeling of the previous statement, even though in actual meaning, it is very different. But probably that is one reason for the use of that particular thing. But then he goes on and these first seven verses of the chapter are dealing with the folly of looking to Egypt, and thus making exactly the same mistake they did before in looking to Assyria. He says that it will not help. But then there is --the next section is verses 8-12, and vv.8-12 are similar to vv.9-13 in the previous chapter, they are simply a declaration of the attitude of the people. They are a pointing of the character of the leaders of the people, a character which is here being tremendously criticized by the Lord through His prophet. He gave that vivid characterization of it in chapter 29.9-13, and then showed in vv.14-24 how God was going to take away the kingdom of heaven from them and give it to a people who would really bring forth the fruits thereof. He was going to turn the thing upside down. Here He shows their character and then shows what He is going to do about it, so He shows the character in vv. ~~8~~ 8-12. He says, write it before them in a table, and note it in a book, that it may be for he time to come for ever and ever. In other words, this is a continuing characteristic of people who have the marvelous blessing of having "God's Word, having the opportunity of knowing Him, and then who have fallen away from making full use of it, who have, as he said back in 29.13, honored him with their mouth but removed their heart from Him.

So he says the result of it is going to be, or further he describes the conditions, he says, note in the book, write it in a table. In other words, what he is going to give is something important, this is important enough to write down so that in the times that come people can know it. Now we had some of his statements about Israel quoted by our Lord, in the New Testament. We have statements about the character of people quoted from these sections of Isaiah, later on. Is it for that purpose, he

says write it down? Or is it to write it down in order that the result is going to come from it, when it becomes apparent, will draw our attention to it, and make us to stop and realize that exactly the same fate can come to us, if we, having great privileges from the Lord, great opportunities, simply honor Him with our mouth, but our heart turns to be far from Him. Mouth honor of the Lord isn't going to give any blessing to anybody, in the end, and the greater the opportunity the greater responsibility. So he says write it down in a book and I think one reason to write in a book is that when you see the result, you'll see how it is fulfilled, what is going to come. So we want to see what the result is, but first we look a little further at what the rebuke is, what is their attitude he describes. This is a rebellious people, lying children, children that will not hear the word of the Lord.

Now he said back in chapter 29, that they make excuses to get away from studying God's book, one says I can't read it because it is sealed, the next says I can't read it because I'm unable to read. They make excuses. Now he says, they tell others not to give it to them, which say to the seers, see not; and to the prophets, Prophecy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophecy deceits. Give us something, it doesn't mean by deceits, give us something that is a lie necessarily, but give us something that is not the thing the Lord wants us to have. Give us something that'll make us happy, give us something that will amuse us. I once heard a pastor of a very large church speak, he was asked to speak in a Christian school I was attending, on doctrinal preaching. He came and gave a message on doctrinal preaching, and he said, people in my church came to me and they said, Dr. Smith, won't you give us a series of doctrinal messages, give us some doctrinal sermons. Well, he said, I said to them ^{do} if you think I want to have my church emptied? Why should I do that? Well he said, they'd ~~say~~ said, we'd like to know what we believe, give us some doctrinal messages. Well, he said, I don't want to

empty my church, he said, they urged him, he ~~said~~, I'll tell you, I'll preach one, and see what happens. He says, you know, I preached a doctrinal message and instead of people going away, we got bigger crowds, so I gave a whole series of them.

Well, it struck me, but he was an orthodox man, but what was he preaching for? He was preaching to amuse the people, to keep them comfortable, the important question was will the people come? How big will my crowd be? He gave them a true message, but there was not much of an ardent and sincere desire to give the Lord's message to the people, to give what they need, as what he of course wants to give it in a form that will keep them coming, and getting more, there is not much point in giving the Lord's message in an empty desert, nobody listens in an empty room, but his objective was to please them rather than to get the message of the Lord to them. When he found they really were interested in the message of the Lord, he kept on giving it. Well, in other words, he thought that they had the attitude that it describes here. Prophecy to us smooth things, give us something that will make us feel confident, instead of pointing out our needs to us and causing us to turn to the Lord for help, to see the wickedness of our ways.

Get you out of the way, turn aside out of the path, cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before us. In other words, don't follow the word, follow our desires. Therefore, thus saith the Holy One of Israel, because you despise this word, and trust in oppression and perverseness, and stay thereon, --you see, he is still speaking to the nobles as he was in chapter 28: to trust in oppression, you wouldn't say that to the people as a whole. The people as a whole wouldn't be trusting in oppression unless they were a strong masterful, you might say, over another people that they were oppressing, but it is the nobles, the leaders who were oppressing the others. Therefore, --now in v.13 we begin our statement of what the result is going to be. 13-14, therefore this iniquity shall be to you as a breach ready to fall,

swelling out in a high wall, whose breaking comes suddenly at an instant. And he shall break it as the breaking of the potters' vessel that is broken in pieces; he shall not spare; so there shall not be found in the bursting of it a sherd to take fire from the hearth, or to take water withal out of the pit.

Here is the statement of what is going to happen but in vv.13-14 we don't have very much specific, do we? What's going to happen? Calamity. That's about all you can say. There is going to be calamity. There is one more thing, the calamity will come suddenly. There is sudden calamity for those who turn away from God, for those who fail to take advantage of the opportunity given to them, there is sudden calamity. Well, you might say, what's this? This is just ordinary preaching, you can say to anybody, if you don't follow the Lord, you'll have calamity. Maybe not immediately, the longer it's put off the worse it tends to be. If you don't follow Him there is calamity ahead. All right, this is very general. What is there^t specific about this? Well, in the previous chapter, you had that tremendously specific declaration of what is going to happen. ~~¶~~ ^{That} God would take away the kingdom of heaven from them and give it to a nation which would utilize the fruits thereof. We had a specific declaration in the previous one, well, do we have one here? Well, we look on and see what we come to. He says that there is going to be sudden calamity, vv.13-14. Now we return for a verse and a half, I guess you could almost say two verses, let's say for a verse and a half, there is a further statement of the attitude of the people. For thus says the Lord God, the Holy One of Israel, in returning and rest shall ye be saved, in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength. That is a wonderful verse, isn't it? Thus says the Lord God, the Holy One of Israel, in returning and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength. It's a wonderful verse, but it's not the whole of the verse. I think it is quite justifiable to quote that much of the verse, because the way it's used in the verse, it is clearly implied that this is a message which he has given in the past.

30:13-14

30:15

I doubt if "thus saith" is the correct interpretation of the beginning of the verse. Now of course in the Hebrew where it says, thus the Lord has said, we regularly translate it in ~~English~~, thus the Lord said, because what He has said is of continuing validity, therefore, over and over it says thus saith the Lord, where the Hebrew is, thus the Lord hath said. But in this case, I think the literal rendering of the Hebrew would fit the sentence then. As it is, you see, it doesn't make a great deal of sense, for thus saith the Lord...and ye would not. Why, what sense is that. ~~Thus~~ Thus the Lord has said, but you would not. That is the verse. For thus the Lord has said, here is the wonderful promise God gave you: in repentance and rest, v.15, in repentance and rest shall you be saved, in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength. This is God's promise to His people, which Isaiah gave in chapter 7, and said, Ahaz, ask for a sign, and Ahaz, in mock piety, said, I won't ask a sign, I won't tempt the Lord, then he rebuked Ahaz for his insincerity. And here he thinks this is the promise which God gave, that you could trust Him and follow Him and have confidence that what He would bring to pass would be what was right and was best and what was best for you, and He gave you this promise and instead of doing it, you have looked to Assyria for help in your clever scheme, that backfired, and now you're going to look to Egypt for help, and that isn't going to help you either, he said. ...

17. (1/2)

...so he says this was the wonderful promise that God has given, not a promise given here, it's a promise that he is here referring back to, as having been given before. But ye would not, of course in Hebrew--And ye would not, is a perfectly good word, here translated "and" but ~~q~~ frequently translated "but," in the Old Testament. It could just as well mean but as and. So our English and is sometimes used to express the idea but, with a little different accent. I think that is altogether proper, essentially ~~o~~ "but" would make the sense of the verse clearer. ~~Not~~ That ^{is not} reading into

the verse, that's perfectly obvious if you examine it closely. But you would not. So he says, what did they say. Well, first they said, we're ~~safe~~ faced with Syria and Ephraim, either one of them bigger than we are, we're going to look to Assyria, perhaps, with this secret, wicked plan of Ahaz. All right, he says, that won't do you any good, remove the buffer state, you'll be in great danger, Jerusalem will be reduced to condition described in the beginning of chapter 29, only God's power will deliver you. He says, well then, we're in that situation before Assyria, we'll look to Egypt for help. He says, no, that won't do you any good, you'll find their strength is to sit still. Then they say, no, but we will flee on horses. He says, therefore, you will flee. Notice this 16th verse is a combination of what they say and what He says. But you say, no, we'll flee on horses, therefore you will flee. If this is your attitude, you think you can get away, well, you'll have a chance to try, therefore you will flee. And you say, we will ride upon the swift. He says, therefore shall they that pursue you be swift. You think you'll get away because you have such swift means, well, they'll be swift too. And then in v.17 he gives his climax to this section: In v.17 he gives his declaration of what the outcome is going to be. They are going to look to Assyria for help, it does away with the buffer state, puts them in terrible danger, then they look to Egypt for help, their strength will be to sit still, then they think they're going to flee. All right, he says, you're going to start a process that they'll be no end to. One thousand shall flee at the rebuke of one, and at the rebuke of five shall ye flee. I think that makes--if you're going to put in "shall flee" in italics in the first line, to show what is implied in the verse, but not expressed in the Hebrew, why not put in the word "all" here, it would ^{make} it much better. At the rebuke of one, one thousand shall flee; at the rebuke of five you'll all flee, till you be left with nobody left at all, you are going to be reduced, you are going to be decimated, you are going to have terrible losses in war, in persecution, in difficulty, from the Babylonians and on through the ages from attacker after attacker, and persecutor

30:16

after persecutor, yes. This will be done until you're wiped out off the face of the earth. But that's not what he says. Not that you shall be wiped out off the face of the earth, but all right, until what happens? Till you're left with only a few remaining, hardly any of you left. Well of course, that idea is in here. But it is a very unusual way to express that idea, isn't it? You notice what he says. Till you ~~are~~ are left as a beacon on the top of a mountain, and as an ensign on a hill. What a strange statement God makes in the time of Isaiah. Well, suppose that you don't find that in any predictions to Egypt, or to Assyria. Here is this mighty Assyrian empire, ~~what~~'s going to happen? God is going to destroy you, you will be completely destroyed, they won't even know where Nineveh was, for two thousand years. The place will disappear, it will be just--the Assyrian empire is the greatest empire in the world, and five years later, the Assyrian people have practically disappeared from the face of the earth. Never again a force to be reckoned with. Nation after nation God rebukes and says you will be utterly destroyed and that's the end, but here he says, you will become, be left like a beacon on the top of a mountain, and an ensign on a hill. You don't run up the top of a mountain for safety, (5 1/4)

to the whole world, do you? You don't run up there, do you, where everybody can see you? You go off and hide in a valley somewhere if you want to get away, but he says you're going to be left like a beacon on a mountain, and like an ensign on the top of a hill. You're going to be left so that everybody knows you're still left. There will be few left but they will be visible to everybody. They will be conspicuous, those who are left, not only conspicuous, there is more than that, look at the terminology used, a flag, an ensign, a beacon, something that is visible, something that is observable, something that is prominent, something that causes attention to something, what does it call attention to? And it is a remarkable thing, that here in the ancient world, you have all these different nations, you have Edom, you have Moab, you have the Canaanites, the Amotites, the Jebusites, the

30: 17

30:17 Assyrians, the Ishmaelites, the Midianites, the Babylonians, and you have the Jews, you have all of these, and they disappear. They disappear from the face of the earth, are absorbed into other nations, they fail to be of any importance as history changes, and time changes, and peoples get mixed up and all that, but this one nation there, in 700 B.C., God says of them you'll be left as a beacon on the top of a mountain, or as an ensign on top of a hill. You will be left in such a way that everybody will know you exist, you'll be left visible everywhere, and you go off into the heart of China, you go way down to the southern end of Arabia, you go anywhere in the world just about, and you find evidence that this little nation of the ancient Jews, they still exist, they are there, they're an ensign, they're a beacon. Once they say, that the unbelieving king of Prussia, Frederick the Great, who was a close friend of Voltaire and was always scoffing at everything that was sacred, Voltaire turned to his court chaplain, because his people were very religious people, they were a very earnest Christian people, but they were very loyal to their king, and Frederick the Great organized them into ^{very effectual} ~~various sectional~~ armies and left a great influence in the world, great changes many of which were for the good, but Frederick the Great once turned to his court Chaplain, he went through the forms of religion and his chaplain preached real Christian messages to his people, and Frederick the Great though, then, would privately like to rather chaff at the chaplain, make fun of him, ridicule him a little, though publicly he maintained the dignity of the state service. He turned to this chaplain, he says give me in one word a proof of Christianity. The chaplain said, "The Jews." And it is interesting that God predicted in 700 B.C. that this people through whom He brought His message into this world, this people who as a result of their sin were to be driven into exile, were to be subject to such a fate as came to all the other nations of that (8 1/2) were not to be ended by that fate as the other nations were but were to become like a beacon on top of a mountain, like an ensign on a hill, were to be conspicuous, even though cut down, even though

suffering for their failure to follow God as they should, they were to be conspicuous, were to be visible and an ensign, a beacon, isn't merely something that you see, but something that stands for something, that indicates something, to be an indication of the truth of God's Word, that He had spoken to Abraham, that He had given His message to Moses, that He had prepared the way for the coming of His Son, and that His message in the book is true, we have this visible evidence of it, in the preservation and the widespread existence, a few here and a few there, but conspicuous. And mutely, often, against their will, witnessing to the truth of God's word.

I think that is a tremendous verse there in Isaiah, that He would use this particular language as the climax of these predictions to show what God's will was to do regarding the future of this people, and then He goes in the next section and in vv.18-on he refers to other events in the future of the people, what's going to happen to them, how they are not going to come to an end, how they're going to go through a long period of adversity, but a period in which they are to turn away completely from idols, completely from idolatry, they are to--that is to be entirely eradicated from them, the nation, and it is a marvel how through the centuries Israel has maintained ^{this} testimony to the spiritual nature of God. They often fell into idolatry in Old Testament times, but after the time of exile, they were so true on this point. Then, until the time comes when the Lord will bind up the grief of his people, in that time when the light of the moon and the light of the sun will be sevenfold as the light of seven days. That picture comparing with the pictures of the glory of the millennium, when God will bind up the wounds of His people and then He ends the chapter with coming back to the immediate situation and declaring as He had in 29 that God is going to deliver them from the Assurians, and that this terrible thing Ahaz and his people have done is not going to mean disaster, it should, but it's not going to, because God is going to marvelously intervene and deliver them from Assyria. We continue there tomorrow...

...any question about Isa.29 and there seems to be none, so in the section with the Graduate students, I asked them a few questions about it, and after I asked them a few they had a lot to ask. So we'd like to find out how well the other four understand Isa.29. Mr. Abbott, could you explain to us just what is the similarity ~~and~~^{and} the difference between chapter 29 and chapter 7, what points of contact are there, or what differences? (1 1/4) Ahaz is told that he will be put down and God will put His own man in his place. Wouldn't you say the same thing in 29? The leaders of Israel are told that they're indifferent, ~~they~~^{their} failure to follow God with their whole heart is going to receive punishment and that God will turn over the leadership of His people to another people. So you have a great similarity between the two chapters. But your fundamental difference is that one is talking about the king being replaced by God's own provided king, the other is speaking about the leaders of Israel being replaced in the leadership of God's people by those whom He by His sovereign power will raise up from outside. Mr. Golin (1 3/4)... 11 and 12 show a people who have the power to get the truth, they have the word accessible to them, the word is in their hand, it is delivered to them, it is available, to them, and they're too indifferent to study ~~it~~

(2) They're not blind, they're not deaf, they have access to it, but though they have access to it, they take no advantage to the access they have, they make excuses, they'd rather watch the television than study the Bible. It is something else that amuses them, they prefer to that which advances their knowledge of Christ, they are indfferent, they are not (2 1/2)

They are not like the people in distant lands who have no Bible, don't know a Bible, they are people who have it but they don't use it, they're indifferent, but you wouldn't call them blind or deaf. So who would you call blind or deaf, or sick? They would be the ones who had never heard, the ones that have no access. Yes? (2 3/4) Yes, so the one who has access and doesn't take it is the fruitful field which is going to be turned into a forest, and

the one which has no access, has no power to get it, is like Lebanon, and ~~there's~~ ^{they're} going to be turned into a fruitful field, and so we have exactly what χ is said in the first half of v.17 said in v.18, that the deaf will hear the words of the book and the eyes of the blind will see, they who would not have any access to it, they are to be given access. It is God's sovereign power extended to those who were previously outside the pale. Yes? (3 1/2) Chapter 7 has Ahaz with his clever scheme, neath of which clever scheme he thinks that he is going to deliver his land from the attack of Israel and Syria. ~~God~~ says I am ready to deliver you, trust in me, he says for a sign, proof that you can trust Me. Ahaz sidestepped it, he gives a very pious statement, he won't ask for a sign, but it really isn't because he is pious, but because he isn't interested, he is indifferent. And so Isaiah says the Lord Himself will give you a sign, he says not just to Ahaz, but to the whole house of David, the house of David is now in the miserable situation of having an unworthy man at its head, one who is indifferent to God's grace, and as a result of this man's scheme, resting on human wisdom instead of following the Lord, as a result of those, the land is going to come, the rest of the chapter tells us, into very serious difficulty. But eventually, we're not told when, God is going to provide His own king, the substitute for this one, so now we find in chapter 7 what this one is doing, and what the effects of it are going to be, and chapter 8 continues that thought, until at the end of chapter 8 and the beginning of chapter 9 we have the coming of terrible darkness and misery as nation after nation sweeps over Israel as the result of Ahaz/'indifference in turning away from God, and that result just when it seems to reach its very darkest, then the Lord is going to intervene and bring the substitute for Ahaz, the one who will be God's proper head of the house of David, the one through whom all the misery that came through the sin of Ahaz and ^{of} the people is going to be cleared up. So he says in v.2, the people that walk in darkness have seen a great light, in the very area where the Assyrians began their march into the land, as a result of Ahaz'

summons, in that very area, the successor to Ahaz is going to start preaching and bringing light where Ahaz' clever scheme brought darkness. So the only hope of deliverance from the situation into which Ahaz leads with his clever scheme is the coming of the substitute for Ahaz, the child ~~that~~ is to be born, who is going to govern in the power of the Lord and in the wisdom of the Lord instead of, as Ahaz did, in indifference and human ideas. That ties 7 and 9 together and gives the attitude toward the king, which is paralleled over in 28 and 29, by the attitude toward the leaders of the nation. Yes? (6) Vv. 4 and 5 describe the suffering of the war which sweeps over the land as a result of Ahaz' scheme. They are facing enemies who the men could not possibly protect themselves against, but God said trust in me and I will protect you from them. Ahaz, instead of trusting in God, trusted in Assyria. The result of Ahaz' trusting in Assyria, is that the danger he feared from the coming of the warriors from Syria and from Ephraim, is going to be multiplied many times with the coming of warriors from greater enemies, Assyria, Egypt, the Persians, and eventually the Greeks, and eventually the Romans, so they sweep over the land and their battles with confused noise, the boots of the warriors marching through, the ~~garments~~^{rolled} in blood, but God has claimed to give all that over to burning and fuel of fire, He is going to break the staff of the oppressor, and the way He is going to break it is by sending His own Immanuel, as described in v.6. Just go back, anything we didn't make ~~it~~ clear at the time, but unless there is further question on 7 or 9 we turn to 29.

And in 29 then, we notice how 18 repeats what is in 17, in more literal language than 17, although with still with some figures of speech, and then 19 and 20 and 21 describe the joy of the true believers at the carrying out of God's will and these verses could fit with any declaration of God's wonderful mercy, though they don't prove a great deal of what the passage is talking about, they simply show that God's true people, ~~it~~ (8) are going to rejoice in these developments. Yes?

(stu) ...if we can speak dogmatically on that as to whether it is Satan specifically or whether it is those wicked people who are carrying out Satan's policy. It does not give us a ground on which to decide between the two, but it certainly is the defeat of God's enemies (8 1/4)

but whether it specifically states them it would be hard to say without some mention in the context. Yes? (8 1/2) yes, I would say that 19 was probably simply those

who see this happen will rejoice in the Lord, and my guess would be that the actual fulfillment of it came in v.18 when the gospel began to be proclaimed, and to the surprise of those who were doing, greater numbers of Gentiles began to come in than of Jews, and as greater numbers of Gentiles began to come in, there were those who questioned it, but the true believers, the meek, the poor among men, they

29:19 were rejoicing to see the extension of God's mercy, both to the Jews who were believing, and also to that great number of Gentiles. So I would not think that the meek here meant the new people who were coming, but meant the followers of Christ, the ones who were already ~~meek~~, who were rejoicing at the development. I would incline to think that that would be the way (9 1/2) (stu).

The Holy One of Israel is the Lord. (stu) Not necessarily. It could be the triune God. The triune God is the Holy One of Israel. Now ~~of~~ of course Jesus is God so that you can find a fulfillment of it in the rejoicing in Jesus, but I don't think that anyone at this time would have to consider that it was anything other than simply God, the Holy One of Israel. (9 3/4)(stu) 19? No, oh, the whole verse, you mean. Yes. The meek rejoice in the Lord, the poor among men rejoice in the the Lord, the Holy One of Israel. I'd say it was just a parallel, but of course when the time comes, you can say the Holy One of Israel, which is God, is perhaps most specifically the second person of the trinity, the Lord Jesus Christ, but I don't think in advance that in this verse you would have to say, well, there is a new thought brought in there. This is referring specifically to Immanuel. I don't think anybody would have to say that, because

the Holy One of Israel is frequently used just for God. Of course, Jesus is God.

So then we have the general fulfillment of God's overcoming of evil and His establishment of righteousness in vv.20 and 21. That could fit any time when God works in a marvelous way. It does not necessarily point to any particular time the way that vv.17 and 18 do, but then when you come to 22, what do you think about 22, Mr. Golin? What do you think that talks about? (11.stu) Why it says, the Lord who redeemed Abraham, instead of saying the Lord who redeemed Jacob? (stu)

Going to fulfill (11 1/4)

that's what he says here. But

it looks as if he isn't, doesn't it? Jacob will not be ashamed, nor will his face wax pale. When Jacob sees his descendants turning away from the Word of God, forgetting the truth, showing indifference, not studying the Word, God turning aside from many of them. That would be plenty of reason for Jacob, for his face to wax pale, for him to be discouraged and disheartened, wouldn't it? But this says, Jacob will not be ashamed, nor will his face wax pale, why won't it? (12.stu.)

Speaking about here? (stu) Does he speak about any part? (stu) I doubt if he is in this verse speaking of any part. I think he is here speaking of the people of God, but I think he is speaking of the fact that Jacob, seeing great numbers of his physical descendants turning away from the Word of God and refusing to accept it, might be expected to grieve and his face turn pale, but to his surprise he sees their numbers made up, in fact increasing, he sees his spiritual descendants multiplying tremendously. And he sees in the midst of those who are his physical descendants who are also his spiritual descendants, he sees in the midst of them great numbers of new ones, who are not his physical descendants but are his spiritual descendants, and these are referred to, not as those who are descended from Jacob, but those who become Jacob's children because they are the work of God's hands, because God with His marvelous sovereignty has got them into the kingdom as described up in the verse 17, and 18, they are the blind and the deaf who have--God has marvelously given (13 1/2)

and so God calls them specifically the work of my hands, and these whom He calls the work of His hands because He has taken them from an unbelieving background and has brought them into the family of God, made them part of the witness, part of the people of God, these whom He mentions thus in v.23, He had in mind specifically I think when he mentioned Abraham in 22, because you might think, simply say that the Lord says, concerning the house of Jacob, Jacob will not be ashamed, you don't need the phrase, God who redeemed Abraham, why do you need that? The thought is complete without it, but you put it in to show that the way Jacob got into the kingdom in the first place was because God redeemed Abraham, then He redeemed Jacob also. But you might say Jacob...

19. (1/2)

...you might say Jacob is Abraham's child, Jacob is the heir of the covenant, Jacob is the child of promise, Jacob receives these blessings because God has promised Abraham, His friend, that his descendants will be blessed. You might say that. It is also true that God specifically redeemed Jacob. But this aspect of it is true, but this aspect does not enter in with Abraham at all. Abraham is taken from his kindred, from his family, from his connection, from his upbringing, the call to separate from it all, and to go out into the land that God will give him, he is called away from all of his background, he is specifically in God's sovereign power, brought into the kingdom, and so he refers specifically to Abraham, when He says to Jacob, Jacob is going to rejoice when he sees his true spiritual descendants tremendously increased in numbers, by the sovereignty of God, by God's bringing individuals who were part of Lebanon rather than of the fruitful field. He is going to rejoice in that and is going to realize that the God who did that is the God who redeemed Abraham, the God who brought Abraham in from an unbelieving background, so that is the sovereign power of God to choose whom He will, is now shown in His turning

to Lebanon and for a time away from the fruitful field. (stu) you

suggested is practically identical with mine through v.24, 21 I mean. But then the only thing is you come to 22, and 22 says Jacob will not be ashamed, but why will he not be ashamed, v.23 says because he will see his children, the work of mine hands, in the midst of him. And the question is what that means? (stu) Isn't "his children" in apposition with the words "among them" , wouldn't it look that way?

That would be the

(stu) The phrase "Holy One of Jacob," which is here in v.23 is identical with the phrase of 19, the Holy One of ~~Israel~~, the two of them are regular terms used often by Isaiah, occasionally by other writers, for the Lord God. He is called the Holy One of Jacob or the Holy One of Israel, and of course Jesus is God so the term that can be applied to God can be applied to Jesus, but I doubt that there is evidence to say that it is specifically ~~to~~ applied to Jesus here. That is, I would think that it is rather applied to the triune God, rather than specifically to Jesus in these two passages. I don't see anything in the context that would require that it is specifically Jesus. There is no specific mention of Jesus in the context here. I think it is in the background, but whether that was understood by Isaiah or not, I don't know. (stu.3 1/2) Mr. Golin, what was your question? (3 3/4) Yes, I incline to feel that the picture ~~of~~ in v.22-23 is a picture of Jacob thought of looking down on his descendants, and seeing his descendants who are descendants according to the flesh but who also are the people of the promise, the people through whom God is going to bring blessing to the whole world, and he sees these people and he sees, as described earlier in the chapter, many of them indifferent, many of them uninterested, many of them turning aside from carrying on the work of God as they should, and consequently the number of true believers among them is becoming less and as a result of that you would expect ~~them~~ ^{him} to be ashamed and his face wax pale, but the promise is given that he won't wax pale, because while we see the diminution in the number that are true believers who follow the Lord, yet he

sees this diminution made up by a great increase, and that number, that increase, would be the children, the work of mine hands, who are placed in the midst of it. When he sees the children who are the work of my hands, the children who are not simply his physical progeny, who were not his physical progeny, who were the work of mine hands, these put into the people of God, and greatly increasing their number, when he sees this, he will rejoice (5 1/2) and if so, that would be a parallel with v.18 to carry on the same idea, from just another aspect. Mr. Abbott? (5 1/2) Yes, so I will redeem them. As I redeemed--as the people of God, the family of God, started in the first place, not with Jacob, Jacob is the great father, the great but Jacob is the third in line, and Jacob has great blessings because of God's sovereign action in Jacob's life, but in addition to this, Jacob was also the repository of the promises given to Abraham and Isaac, he is, Jacob is the grandson of the one to whom the promises were given, but he is reminded of the fact that the way that the whole group started was by God's picking Abraham out of a heathen environment, taking one from among the heathen and with his sovereign power, telling him to come out and be separated from him, and found the people of God. So he is saying I am going to make a great increase in my people, from the forest, from grabbing those who were outside, by the sovereign power of God, by the work of His hands, bringing them in, so that just as Abraham was redeemed from outside, similarly Jacob is going to be among his physical descendants, that is among those of them who are part of his spiritual ones, who are the true Israel of God, among them he is going to be a great number, as by the sovereign power of God bringing them in from outside, just as He brought Abraham in. Yes, Mr. Gregory? (7) I had not really thought a great deal about 21 before. I have simply taken 21 in a general sense of God's overcoming evil. I take it in a general sense, but now that you suggest it, I see that the specific type of evil which it speaks of, is the type of evil which was involved in the

crucifixion itself, so it is altogether possible that it does involve that particular aspect of evil, used as a figure for all evil, but using that one as a figure which exactly fits with (7 1/2) I think that is a very interesting idea which I hadn't thought of before. Mr. Cohen? (7 3/4) V.20 and 21 you might take in a very general sense, they're going to rejoice in the Holy One of Israel because He is overcoming iniquity, he is destroying those who do terrible things, who do wicked things, such as some of these leaders of the people have been doing. You can take it in that very general sense. But he does describe a specific kind of evil, and he does bring it in ~~w~~ right in connection with the rejoicing of these who see out of darkness, the deaf and the blind, who are to be enabled to see, and the meek are going to rejoice in the Lord, now why are they going to rejoice? That the terrible one is brought to nought. Now it may be just a general statement of God's victory over evil, but what if you think of the possibility at this time of the turning ^{ing to} of the gentiles, of specific reference being in it, and see whether it can fit ~~of~~ or not. Why, if you try to fit that in, the terrible one brought to nought could certainly refer to the smiting, the bruising of the serpent's head, the terrible one brought to nought. What the Lord did on Calvary. They are rejoicing, they see out of darkness, the Gentiles come to see the truth who before were absolutely in utter darkness. add the reason is because the message is brought to them, that Satan has been bruised through the tremendous act of the Lord at Calvary. Now that is not specifically stated (9 1/4) but it fits as far as time is concerned, and consequently one can examine it and see if it could be, not merely a general reference to God's overcoming of evil, but a specific reference to the way in which he particularly will overcome evil at that time, so if you do, the terrible one brought to nought could fit. Now, "the scorner" being consumed, that would hardly be a description of Satan I wouldn't think, but that "and all that watch for iniquity are cut off" could be a

general reference to the Lord, His ~~making~~ that which is going to draw a sharp line between those that follow Him and those that continue in evil. And here it speaks of the scorner, you think of the scorners and those who are involved in the crucifixion and in the persecution of him, and you read, those "that make a man an offender for a word, and lay a snare for him that reproveth in the gate;" and you think right away of how he was rebuking the scribes and the Pharisees for their wickedness and they laid a plot for him, to get him at night when the people wouldn't see him, and to bring him and to get him condemned as a traitor against Rome, and make him an offender for a word, he said that he would rebuild this temple if we destroy it, and he said he was greater than Caesar, and so on, and turn aside the just for a thing of nought, and of course they gave 30 pieces of silver to get him turned over. Whether there is any specific reference in that, it certainly would not be clear enough for anybody in Isaiah's time to see, but which when the time came you could see him exactly fit; whether there is or not I'd have to give a bit further study to, but it's an interesting suggestion which I had never thought of before, and since I'm quite convinced we have the turning to the gentiles in vv.17 and 18, and also I believe in vv.22 and 23, it is an interesting thought that perhaps in the verses in between we have given in rather veiled language, but yet somewhat specifically things which might fit exactly that which then occurred, at the time when he turned to the Gentiles. So it's an interesting suggestion, which I'd have to study a bit further before I'd be ready to be sure it was right, but I certainly couldn't be at all sure it's wrong. That was very interesting. Mr. Miller? (11 3/4) ...that it wouldn't fit with the attitude which I found exemplified in a minor way in a fellow I was talking with a few years ago, who is now a teacher of ancient Babylonian in a great university in the far west, and he was telling me then about how he said he was the firstborn in his family, and he said that the firstborn were required on certain days to fast, and he said they didn't like to fast, so he said, there was another law that said

that when you finish reading a section of the scripture then you rejoice and feast because you rejoice, so he said when the day came when the firstborn had to fast, he said, two or three days before they would start reading in a section of scripture, in such a way that they would just finish the section of scripture the day before they were supposed to fast, so he said having one law that the firstborn was supposed to fast on that day but the other law that if you finished a section of scripture, you're allowed to feast and rejoice on that day, they could proceed to feast and rejoice.

Well, that's the watching for iniquity I would say, I don't think it is iniquity of the terrible type, but it's the indifferent type of using the scripture simply as an excuse to get your own pleasure out of it. It is watching for iniquity, isn't it? Looking for a chance to utilize things that should be ends in themselves, simply as means for your own comfort....

20 (1/2)

...the proper way to approach it is to take the word, take the phrase and see what else we find in the prophets, or in the Old Testament, which would have a parallel here and would therefore throw light on it, and we might find something which would throw great light upon it. Now here is where your commentaries are apt to be helpful. I find that the commentaries are very disappointing on the whole in their failure to take passages as a whole, what they're really trying to give us, and what their real meaning is, but that many of them are very good at taking a word and finding a parallel, finding a precise use somewhere else, suggesting interpretation, even if the interpretation they suggest isn't the right one, it calls your attention to something which you can consider and see if it throws light on it. Now that is the proper approach to any phrase like that. Now there is one other method of approach, but that is the proper approach. Yes, Mr. Cohen? (1 1/2) Yes, there is an interesting possibility that the same, what I just spoke of as this usage of getting around the law which they considered meant they should fast on a certain day, then ~~where~~ swear by the

gold, they say if you swear by the temple it's no good, but if you swear by the gold in the temple that's valid.

There's a story they tell about William the Conqueror, that William the Conqueror wanted to become the king of England and Edward the Confessor was king, and the next relative of Edward the Confessor would be either Harold the Saxon or William the Conqueror. William had a claim to it, and William had more power than Harold did though he was across the channel, over in England. And Harold was visiting William, Harold was planning to succeed Edward the Confessor as ~~king~~ king of England. William the Conqueror wanted to take over, so Harold was in France, in Normandy, visiting William the Conqueror, and William said to him, now he said, Harold, I feel that when Edward dies I should be the king of England, and he said will you swear that you will support me and help me in getting this? And Harold thought well he thought, ^{William} ~~Edward~~ said here is a piece of the true cross, if you would put your hand on this and swear why I would be so glad to have you do it. Well Harold knew William was a man of violence, he had rudely treated many before. If he told him that he was going to try to get to be king himself, William might kill him, at least make it impossible for him to get back to England, and he thought oh, that's supposed to be part of the true cross, it isn't at all, it's a fake, consequently an oath taken on that it is absolutely worthless, and perfectly all right to swear on that because the oath is meaningless, you don't have a real relic that's genuine.

So Harold said certainly I'll be glad to swear, give you every help I can toward it, so he put his hand on this piece of the true cross, which he knew was a fake, which William knew he knew was a fake, he puts his hand on that and makes his oath. And then as soon as he finished his oath, William the Conqueror lifts up the tablecloth and shows that under the cloth he has got some relics that are genuine relics, of which there is no question, and consequently he has sworn on genuine relics which makes his vow one that is absolutely binding, when he thought he was only saying

words because this wasn't a genuine relic. Well, that is of course, that sort of making a man an offender for a word, well, I think that perhaps comes more under the line of watching for iniquity, watching for a chance of iniquity. I would incline to think that making a man an offender for a word is more likely to mean causing a man to be convicted on the ground of a word which is ~~widely~~^{idly} spoken or misunderstood by the hearers, or something like that, but there again you'd want to find a parallel to these. But that would be my inclination to think that that particularly would fit under the watching for iniquity rather than under making a man an offender for a word. Yes? (4 3/4) I think our law today would consider that a promise made under a compulsion is not bidding. I think that would be a principle of law. If you grabbed a man down here and put a knife to his back and said sign this pledge that you'll pay me a hundred dollars a month for the rest of your life, and he would have your signature on that, your solemn promise, I think if you could prove that he put a knife to your back and made you do it, that it would not count as binding in law.

But whether in this there is a specific reference or not, I don't know, I never thought of it before, it's worth a bit of investigation to see whether it could be so interpreted, but if it can be so interpreted, it would be the sort of interpretation that when the time comes you see how it fits, not the sort that could tell somebody in advance what is going to happen. Because I don't think anybody at the time of Isaiah would figure this is talking about the Messiah, or about the redeemed, I do think they could tell, a man at that time carefully studying this, could tell that it is a turning to the Gentiles and substituting another group for the Jewish leaders as the real leaders of God's people. I think they should be able to get that out of it, but any reference here ~~should suffice~~ to Christ would be something you'd only see when the time came, if it fit, and it may be there. I am struck with a number of points which look very much in that direction. Well, we went back a bit but I think we got some ideas that were useful, and helpful, and perhaps even more than

what--Dr. Robert Dick Wilson used to say, I'm not interested in teaching Exegesis, but in training Exegetes, and I have the same feeling when it comes to telling you what I think every chapter in the Bible means, we could take the next fifty years and you'd get a lot that wasn't right anyway, but I am interested in teaching you to develop sound methods of interpretation, so that you can go on the rest of your life studying the Bible and finding out what it means. So perhaps from that viewpoint today was more fruitful day than the days when I do 95% of the talking. Oh, I didn't announce the assignment. (break in record, starting again at 7 3/4)

...a very interesting suggestion last time, which I hadn't thought of before, that when it tells about the calling of the Gentiles that then those two verses in vv.20 and 21 are referred specifically to that time, a very interesting suggestion, because otherwise they seemed ^{rather} ~~very~~ general verses, you just wonder how they do fit in the whole context, but the meek is going to rejoice in the Lord, when the deaf hear the words of the book, and the eyes of the blind see out of obscurity, it seems very reasonable, but then v.20, for the terrible one is brought to nought. Does that mean a special defeat ministered to the devil? Or if not, just what does it mean? And the scorner is consumed, ~~that~~ could of course be parallel. But all that watch for iniquity are cut off--is a very peculiar phrase, and any interpretation of the passage--if it means the end of all people connected with wickedness, why then it would certainly, unless it referred to the very end of the age, refer simply to that which was done in principle, and it was done in principle (9)

I don't know of any other time that could possibly refer, except the very end of the age. And those that watch for iniquity, but then going on, that make a man an offender for a word, and lay a snare for him that reproveth in the gate, and turn aside the just for a thing of nought, that verse could certainly describe exactly what was done by the enemies of Christ, exactly how they treated him. Of course, it is not given here in the sense of expressing a description of those great events which are coming,

but the selection of these particular things to mention is very peculiar, and just how it would specifically with Isaiah's time I don't think we have any way of knowing, any evidence whatever. Many things it might have been said, the picking up of this specifically, to say at this point would fit very accurately with Christ, I would think, and I don't know, of the many things that might be said as to the wickedness, just why this particular one would be selected to put here, unless that was the reason, so I thought it was a very interesting suggestion, and while I can't say that I feel that ~~we have~~ it is proven, I must say that I feel at present as if the balance of probability is in that direction very definitely. And it is a suggestion I want to look into further.

But then the passage goes on with v.22 which I feel, well, did we discuss 22 last time? I know we did time before last. But last time we discussed 22? What did we say 22 meant, or what did we feel, Mr. Grauley, that it meant? (10 1/2) Try to put it in a couple of words, I would incline to say something like ~~that~~ this: at the time of the turning to the Gentiles, Jacob, thought of as the father of the faithful will not be ashamed, that is to say, at the time when the fruitful field is esteemed as the forest, at the time when God's mercy seems to turn away from Israel, Jacob the father of Israel will not be ashamed, because he will realize that though for a time being, many of his (now this goes into 23) natural progeny will be outside the camp, yet that the true olive tree, the true descendants of Israel, will be vastly increased in number. But when he sees his children, the work of mine hands, when he sees the new addition, that is, that when, as you see the mercy of God seeming to depart and many losing out, as you see the characteristics described in the verses earlier, coming out to their natural effect, you would think that he would be ashamed, ~~to~~ to see this result, and he should be, except that God is introducing an offsetting factor, which is going to result in his not being changed, because the misery that this brings is offset by a new great joy, and what that great joy is, there

is preparation made for it, in v.22, with referring to Abraham. God who redeemed Abraham--it lays the foundation for it, but doesn't yet tell us what it is, and in v.23 we are told what it is, so that v.22 I would say it is the negative, ~~you~~ he won't be ashamed, but that 23 gives the reason why, that is, that he rejoices in the great extension of God's people. I would say, for instance, that in 22 the important part in 22 isn't Abraham, it is Jacob, but Abraham is introduced as a preparatory thought to what follows. It lays foundations for 23, it actually, as far as 22 is concerned, a minor thing. The great good God has done it. If you described the great, good God, in such a way as to remind you of the fact that in the past He has acted without reference to the family, and ~~has~~ in His sovereign will picked out the founder of all this family out of a background of heathenism, and so you're just incidentally told that that's what the great good God has done in the past, but the big thing you're told now is Jacob isn't going to have the great disappointment that you would think he would have to have, when you think of all of the misery that would come to him from seeing the failure of his natural descendants. ~~E~~ Then you go on in 23 and see why you won't because he has a great number, a tremendous number of spiritual descendants, making up 30 times over numerically for the ones who are lost for the time being, from the physical viewpoint. Yes? . . .

21. (1/2)

. . .in mind certain parallels. I feel that taking it just as it stands, it lends itself to the interpretation I've given, but when that feeling is based simply upon the words here or upon my recollection of certain parallels, I'm not sure. Let's just speak of the words for a minute, apart from the parallel. The way the words alone impressed me is thus says the Lord, Jacob will not now be ashamed, neither will his face now wax pale, the implication seems to me is, you would expect he would, when a fruitful field is turned into a forest, when God does a marvelous work among these people ~~w~~ so the wisdom of their wise men perish, and the understanding of their prudent men

is hid. And ~~they're~~ ^{their} turning of things upside down is ~~a theme that the father~~ ^{esteemed as the potter's} clay, you would think that now when God does these things Jacob would be terribly ashamed and his face wax pale, but it won't be, the way you would expect, it won't be that way because of a new factor, which is going to the subject. Now the reason I say that, let me, before we part from this perhaps just finish this thought, that it impresses me that I would get that thought just from the words alone, but maybe I wouldn't, maybe in saying that, I am basing it upon my recollection of parallels. Let's look at the parallel I have in mind.

I have a feeling that there are quite a number of parallels but I don't think of them now. But there is one I think of very definitely, and this one may be what is in the back of my mind that makes me feel that that is the right way to interpret it. That is, if you turn to Micah 4, you find in Micah 4 that in v.8, it says, and though, O tower of the flock, the strong hold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion; the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem. There is going to be a great worldwide rule, with its headquarters in Jerusalem. That is a wonderful promise. Now he immediately follows up that promise with "Now why dost thou cry out aloud? is there no king in thee? is thy counsellor perished?" He is saying, that now is referring to a different time. He says now there is a certain time we're going to think of. Why is there going to be a time when you're in such misery? Well, he says, "Be in pain, labour to bring forth, O daughter of Zion...for now shalt thou go forth out of the city" ~~and then He is~~

(3)

Thou shalt dwell in the field, thou shalt go to Babylon; there shalt thou be delivered; there the Lord will redeem thee. Then he says now also many nations are gathered against thee. When? When they're in Babylon? Certainly not. And I don't think this refers to the time before they go to Babylon. I think this refers either to Sennacherib, which is most likely, or to the Maccabeans, but it's another time introduced with not. Now also many nations are

gathered against thee. And he describes that and then he starts the next verse, --next chapter: Now gather thyself in troops, he has laid siege against us, that's pointing to the Babylonian conquest. He refers to three different times, introducing each with

(3 3/4)

By now, meaning ~~now~~, in the time of which I am speaking, the time which I picture before you. And that's my feeling from ~~this~~ case, that now, in the time when these things are done ~~we've~~ ^{he has} been describing, now in that time when I picture, the result will not be what might be expected. Jacob will not have the sorrow one might expect, because although there is a decline to his physical descendants, a decrease in the number then who in the family of God, for a time. Yet there is an offsetting factor, which would make the true Israel rejoice, in an offsetting factor, a tremendous increase, when Lebanon is turned into a fruitful field. Mr. Grauley? (4 1/2) I hadn't thought of that as being included in it, but it certainly could be a fact. As he would see his descendants following the characteristics described in vv.9-13, and of course if he would see Ahaz' scheme in forgetfulness of God and all that, he ~~would~~ be ashamed, but it seems to me that the being ashamed and his face turning pale, is probably not thinking so much of a moral reaction as, you might say, a disappointment, that is, a decline. If you take it in a ~~moral~~ material way like that, ~~it~~ would be simply the turning away from Israel as a whole for a time. But it is true, that if you think of it in the moral direction, which may be the right way, I hadn't thought of it before, but it may very well be, that you're thinking that all this description he has given, forasmuch as this people honors me with their mouth but their heart is far from me, that Jacob has been greatly ashamed, on account of all this, but now he will not be ashamed, because God brings in a new factor. I don't know, between the two, I think I incline a little more towards the other, I see a little difficulty each way but perhaps a little less ~~this~~ way. (stu.5 3/4) It is the imaginary, well I don't know as you'd say imaginary, we don't know of course, how much one who is dead knows about his posterity, how much direct interest he has

in them, so that I can't say it is not the actual but I would
 think of the picture rather as being an imaginary picture of an ancestor thought of as
 looking upon the state of his descendants, and from that viewpoint thinking of him
 as the father of physical Israel, but even more as the father of the people of the
 (6 1/2) the ancestor of the true Israel, the father of all those who are
 God's people, who are in the land of promise. And, that we should be justified in
 drawing from it that Jacob personally, as a real entity, is in mind, I think would
 be going ~~far~~ther than we are entitled to. I think, that we think of it as a figurative
 mode of expression, which may be literally true, perhaps ought to be, but I don't
 think that's what's in the prophets mind, necessarily, as he speaks. Because we
 don't read often about Jacob's reaction to this, that and the other thing that happened,
 but when you say, Jacob, though not now is he embarrassed, nor not will his face
 wax pale, you think of how the imaginary ancestor, if he sees these things, how
 naturally he would feel, but yet you say there is a new factor so that he need not
 feel that way, he can rejoice because of what God has done. The God who redeemed
 Abraham supplies him with new children, the work of God's hands. Well, Mr.
 Grauley, what was ~~your~~ suggestion? (7 1/2) I incline to think that that suggestion
 would be very excellent if it said now saith the Lord who made the covenant with
 Abraham, but when it says the Lord who ~~of~~ redeemed Abraham, it seems to me the
 emphasis is on redemption, rather than on covenant, and of course we don't find many
 specific statements in the scripture about God redeeming Abraham. The great
 emphasis is on Abraham as the friend of God, ~~Abraham~~ as the man who followed as
 God led, Abraham the man who was the pilgrim and a stranger upon the earth, and
 Abraham the one with whom God made a covenant that he was going to bless all nations
 through his seed. But the thought of God as the redeemer of Abraham is one that we--
 God is the one who redeemed Israel out of Egypt. There are many aspects where we
 find God as the redeemer greatly stressed. In Isaiah, in 40-66 it is often said to

Israel, God is your redeemer, but I just don't recall it being said much about Abraham's children, so it seems to me that the, here the emphasis is not simply on Abraham but on Abraham as how God redeemed Abraham, and that brings in the thought that he redeemed him not because there was any family factor entering into it, in that case, because God promises to extend His mercy to thousands of generations of those that love Him. God deals very definitely with families, that's very clear. But in the case of Abraham that would not enter in. He dealt with him as out of an ungodly family, in an ungodly day. So it is not just the word Abraham, but the redeemed Abraham, that leads me to think that that is what is here being stressed. That when he says ~~the~~ children, the work of his hands, Abraham was the work of his hands, Of course, Jacob was ~~also~~ too, Jacob was a marvelous instance of God's sovereignty when he took a man who was naturally more selfish and naturally so inclined to ~~self~~-self-seeking in every way as Jacob was, and redeemed him and regenerated him, and made him one who could be called a prince of God, that is in a way a greater illustration of God's sovereignty than his treatment of Abraham, but as far as the family point is concerned, you might say the goodness ^{to} of Jacob was fulfilling a promise to Abraham, while the goodness to Abraham was pure grace. That would be my inclination in that case. Any further questions?

Well, then, v.23, but when he sees his children the work of mine hands-- there certainly is a stress there, that is a very unusual phrase, his children the work of my hands, in the midst of him. If it isn't a reference to bringing the Gentiles in to the family of God it is very peculiar phrasing. And it fits that perfectly, I don't know what else (10 3/4)

They shall sanctify my name and sanctify the Holy One of Jacob, and shall fear the God of Israel. Who is the ~~it~~ "they" there, when he sees this, they will-- it would seem to me, since it is tied up with the "he" there, it should include the "he." Surely the "they will sanctify my name" means Jacob and all the others who are the

leaders of the family of God, leaders of the people of God. Who else is the "they" otherwise? Jacob is going to rejoice and praise God for what He has done, but not only will Jacob, so will Abraham and Isaac, so will all the leaders of God's people. They will ~~praise~~ praise God for ~~what~~ what He has done. But then we come to v.24, and what do you think, Miss Luke, v.24 is talking about? Yes, I would incline to feel that way for two reasons. One is an inadequate reason, the other I think is an adequate reason. First, let me mention what I think is an adequate reason, that is if you contrast v.24 with v.18. V.18 says the deaf, those who have no natural ability to do it, they will receive a wonderful gift of God's grace in being enabled to see out of darkness. And this is the contrast, these are not those who are unable, but those who have been unwilling, those who have wandered, those who have erred, and this would seem to tie back with the attitude of the people who refused to read the book, who honor with their mouth but their heart is far from Him. There is a contrast there which seems to me to justify thinking that verse 24 is a different group from the group in the previous verses. I would incline to feel that we're justified in that by the contrast between the erring and the actually being deaf and blind, that it is going back to v.17 when Lebanon becomes a fruitful field, and a fruitful field becomes a forest, and saying ^{well,} this fruitful field that has become a forest is going to again become a fruitful field. And that would tie up with Romans where it says, so all Israel shall be saved ^{with} the references ~~to~~ to Israel as a nation ~~being~~ born in a day. Now I incline to think we're justified in that interpretation from the context, between this verse and v.18, and its likeness to the thought of the previous verses. I am not sure however that I would have thought of that, if it were not for the fact that I incline to think the King James translators thought of it first. Or maybe if they didn't, maybe they copied, maybe St. Jerome thought of it first, and they copied him, I don't know, I haven't looked it up in the Vulgate to see, but the word "also" seems to me to say that we have now been talking about the Gentiles, then also those who

have erred in spirit, but what basis is there in the Hebrew for the "also?" ? How much basis do you find in Hebrew for an also? . . .

22. ~~(13 2)~~ (1/2)

. . . by simply saying "and" the ones erring in spirit shall know understanding. (3/4)

And shall fear the God of Israel,

and the ones erring in spirit shall know understanding. So that as far as the Hebrew is concerned there is no actual warrant for the "also." It is not wrong though. Instead of saying "and" they shall, you could say "they also shall", but it does imply very strongly that there is a change of thought, and we had the same thing back in chapter 29 where ~~he~~ he said "moreover." It was just a wau. The King James translates it "moreover." It seems to me that in modern English, instead of moreover, "however" would be much better. Maybe in Old English, "moreover" meant what we mean by "however" now, I don't know. But there is a "moreover" starting at a verse early in chapter 29, which is just a wau, Now in this case there is just the also. But the fact they use the also, I'm not sure the King James interpreters thought this way, but I incline to think they did, ~~the~~ and if the "also" were there, I would think there were two strong reasons for thinking this was the Jews, this verse, so one is the contrast with v.18, and that the other is the "also," but since the also is purely a matter of translation, we have to base it on ~~just~~ just one reason, and that weakens it, considerably. Although, I incline to think the "also" must have come because somebody saw it this way. Whether it was the King James translators, whether it was Martin Luther's, because they used Luther's Bible a lot in making their translation, whether it was Tyndale in this translation, which they say three-fourths of the words of the King James Version were taken directly from Tyndale, 80 years before, 90 years before. Or whether it was St. Jerome, because after the Vulgate ~~was~~ (2 1/2)

I don't know. It would be an interesting little paper. But the "also" certainly fits with the idea, that now we have a change. And if you just say "and the ones erring,"

well, you don't have that idea at all. Yes? (2 3/4) Because they have not translated the "and". If they said, "and they also," the also would have to be attached, because the wau would be translated by the "and." But they have translated the wau by an "also" which is perfectly possible but a bit unusual. And since they have not done so, very much before, you take v.18, starts "and in that day shall the deaf hear"-- you could have said "also in that day shall the deaf hear," or "in that day the deaf also shall hear." But it doesn't. And I don't think it should because I think that 18 is just saying what was said in 17. But they have chosen to translate the wau by an "also," and doing so, it represents a word of the Hebrew. Of course this matter of italics is a difficult one. There are many cases where in English we have to have a certain word to make sense. You don't have to have it in the Hebrew but the Hebrew implies it. Well, then why put it in italics, it is required by the Hebrew, the Hebrew means it. It is a question. It is very difficult to know when you should put it-- well, let's put it this way. There are many cases where there is no question, italics should not be used, you have a Hebrew word represented by an English word, ~~which~~ should not be used. There are cases where you put your Hebrew words together and it is very hard to make sense out of it. And in order to make sense you have to assume something, and it is rather uncertain what you should assume, but you have to assume something or it makes no sense. Therefore you assume something and you do your reader a great favor by putting that in italics, so that he knows this is your assumption, this is not to be considered as if it was God's word. But then in between there are many cases where the Hebrew definitely requires something to get the thought across in English and where it is perfectly obvious from the context that that is what it meant and the Hebrew reader would understand it fully, and in those cases, since there is no specific Hebrew word for it, you can see you have to put it in italics, and on the other hand, since the Hebrew does definitely mean it, you can say putting it in italics is confusing, so that there are those cases, many cases where

there is no question, italics are right, but there are cases where there is question of whether you should use italics or not. So that the result is that some people like the Revised Standard Version, they say, why put it in italics, it doesn't add anything, they don't put it in any italics. And if what they put in is clearly unrelated to what is in the Hebrew, they put a footnote and say, "Hebrew omits" so and so. And Hebrew never omitted, they just added it, but they say, "Hebrew omits." I think the italics are a little better than that. But in this particular case, the question of whether to say "and" or whether to ~~take~~ / it "also," is a question of discretion, but it is a very considerable exercise of discretion, and certainly we have no right to build an argument on the English fact that it's altered. Except to say that is what the King James writers thought. Whether they thought (6 1/4)

copied it from some previous man who got it, somebody ~~made~~ ^{thought of} a highly/translation of the Bible, but I consider there was a break here, rather than just a continuation. Mr. Gregory? (6 1/2). In v.23 there, that when he sees his children the work of my hands, I don't see grammatically how you can parse it other than that what he sees is his children and that what he sees is the work of my hands. In other words, he sees his children who are the work of my hands, and therefore that he is seeing children that are different from the normal children. (6 3/4)

that he sees something wonderful that God has done which causes him to rejoice, and then he is reminded of the fact that in the previous verse, in a little parenthetical phrase, he reminded them of the fact that Abraham ~~wax~~ called by God, the work of God's hand, called by His ~~sovereign~~ grace, rather than showing his continuing resting upon a family. And similarly His sovereign grace is going to bring into the family those from outside, just as Abraham ~~was~~ brought in to the family of God. That's very important in my opinion, in the interpretation of the whole passage, to have that clear. The last part of the verse, I find it a little bit awkward that it changes to a "they" instead of a "he." Three verses in the "they." But I suggest that it includes

with Jacob the others who are thought of as the leaders of God's people. I know of no other explanation for the "they." But when Jacob sees his children in the midst of him, his children will sanctify my name, and sanctify the Holy One of Jacob, and fear the God of Israel. I don't say it's impossible. It might be. Jacob will not now be ashamed nor will his face wax pale, but when he sees his children, he will see them sanctifying my name, sanctifying the Holy One of Jacob, fearing the God of Israel, and then, implied, therefore he will rejoice. That's not impossible. In fact, it may be better, I'm just not sure. There is an interesting change there. It seems a little strange to say ~~they~~ won't now be ashamed, neither will his face wax pale, but when he sees his children the work of my hands, and then just stop, implying that he will rejoice instead of being ashamed. It seems as if it requires a further statement about Jacob, but it may be implied in why he does being because he sees what these children are doing. It is a little difficult either way, I'm not at all sure. ^(stu.) He and the children rather than he and and the leaders. Now that's interesting idea here. When he sees these children. He and these children will do that. I don't know, it's very interesting. There is a third point that --and I'd like to have a decision between the three, but I don't at the moment feel able to make one. Yes, Mr. Miller? (9 1/2) **Don't** do much with it. I don't think they do. I was thrilled ^{when I saw} this, in this, all these different strands seemed to me to fit together, that this is what he is predicting. And then the parallel to Isa. 7 seems to me to be a strong assurance that it is correct, that what he tells there in relation to the king there, here he tells in relation to the leaders and the nobles. And all these little strands seem to me to fit together and to give it. But I doubt if you'll find many commentaries that give it. There is this tendency--I find commentaries on the whole quite disappointing because the tendency of most commentaries is to take a word and tell you some interesting things about this word, or this phrase. This word here is found also there and there, and they bring in some very interesting things about it,

but what the passage means, what the progress of thought really is, I find most of the commentaries quite disappointing. Now I believe you would find some that would bring out at least to some extent the progress of thought as we have here, but I can't say with certainty just which ones. I'm not at all sure you'll find any that have worked out in detail like (10 3/4) But I think we have a full warrant for not thinking it strange if we find such a thing, because if the statement in § 1 Peter says that when they prophesied of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow, they searched, trying to determine what and what manner of time the spirit of Christ that was in them did signify, when he testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. We have no warrant there for believing that there is specific teaching relating to the work of Christ and the things connected with the work of Christ, ~~in~~ the Old Testament, which would not have been obvious to the writers when they first wrote it. We have specific warrant for that. Now we don't to read things in, but when you read a passage and you say well what did you talk about, just general exhortation, or is there some specific meaning? Well, this sounds as if there is some specific meaning (12)

It doesn't sound like just general exhortation.

What is the specific meaning? There are many places where I don't know what the specific meaning. But I believe there is ^{one, and in this case,} ~~a specific meaning~~ it just seems to me that so many different factors converge and fit together and I don't know ~~ow~~ of any real problem with this interpretation and I don't know any other interpretation that makes it anything other than just a series of more or less unconnected verses. But I don't think the problem, the difficulty that the Jewish commentators have had with it is any greater than the average Christian commentator. They don't find, I think, what is really (12 3/4) Yes, Mr. Abbott? (As between ^{toward the one} ~~the~~ three possible interpretations, you incline then rather strongly ~~that~~ it is the children? (stu.) Except that they won't do that when he sees them in the midst,

they'll do it all the time. Yes. I am very uncertain between those three. I can see advantages to each one. I can see very great advantages the way you're speaking. Very great. I think over the one I had previously taken it, that it was Jacob and the other leaders, Israelites, there is a great advantage over that, because the language, it doesn't say then you will rejoice, or then they will rejoice, but then they will sanctify, they will fear the name and so on, that seems to fit the children, more than it does him, on the other hand, from the logical progress of thought, it seems to me that you more or less expect an opposite to (14) that he will rejoice. You sort of expect what he is going to do. So that I'm just not sure, but I am ^{inclining} ~~finding~~ a way from the one I suggested before, toward either that or the other suggestion Mr. Vannoy made, that (14 1/4)

(stu) No. (stu.) I feel a little difficulty grammatically, but I would like to find a grammatical parallel. If you can find another passage that is grammatically parallel to it, that would settle it, but that's not easy. If you have the problem in mind, it's hard to know where to look to find such a parallel to a thing like that. But if you have the thing in mind, then when you're studying and reading, all of a sudden some time you come across something that's remarkably parallel to this, and then you look at it and you see how it fits. It may be dealing with an entirely different subject, but grammatically, it may be quite parallel, and then you'll see that and you'll say my that that gives warrant for this, or that gives warrant against this. One won't prove it, but one will strongly urge one against the other, if you find three or four, it would probably prove it...

23. (3/4)

...I think we're justified in considering it as the conversion of the Jews at the end of the age. Jacob rejoices in the new addition of the family of God from the wild branches which are grafted in to the olive tree, but that in addition the natural branches will again be grafted in, which is certainly strongly implied in Romans 11, that's not

clearly expressed there but certainly strongly implied. Then we take up v.30 and here surely the archbishop made a change of chapter division at a correct place. The, 29, flows straight along continuously, and it would be very hard to make a break in the thought because it is tightly bound together, but when you start with 30, you are, well, v.1 of 30, maybe I spoke too rapidly, v.1 of 30 could just be tied right up to v. 1 of 29. V.1 of 30 could be a direct continuation of the first half of 29, so that whether there is such a sharp break here, he is moving forward in thought, he has looked ahead to the distant, not extremely distant, he's looked ahead maybe 30 years, what 's going to happen to Jerusalem when Ahaz' clever scheme brings its bitter results, in the attack of Sennacherib. And then how God is going to intervene and deliver them. The real --perhaps actually you might say it would be more logical to start chapter 29 at v.9, because the first part follows so logically on from everything in 28, but then in 9 he directs himself back to the rulers again, discusses their character, discusses their attitude, shows God's eventual turning to the Gentiles, then he comes back to the immediate again, discusses their character, why does he bring Egypt into it, what's Egypt got to do with it? One ~~was~~ answer that is given to that is to say , now, we have added on material he wrote five years later, ten years later, this is not part of the same (3 1/4) discourse. ----- The other interpretation which impresses me as more likely is that he is continuing in the same discourse, but that in the same discourse, he is dealing with the same answer which they give to the situation. The answer which is in their minds. He says, you think you'll get deliverance from Israel and Syria by calling in Assyria to help, but it won't work. You should have trusted God in the first place. Well, they say, he says, you'll be face to face with Assyria, you'll be in terrible trouble. They answer, well, if that comes the way you say, you're a prophet of doom anyway, aren't you, trying to look on the dark side of things. Here we're going to get relief through friendship with Assyria, isn't that wonderful. You say Assyria is going to injure us, well, if they

do, we'll trust Egypt

So he says, well,

all right, so you turn to Egypt, what good will Egypt do? So he deals with their questions. They're carrying on the same method that they're using now, only they're extending it a little further. Yes? (stu.) (4 1/2) That is an interesting question. It is closer, but it's in the opposite direction. When the British, now I had an illustration, about Poland, oh yes:

When the British said to Hitler, don't attack Poland, they said, in 1939, Hendrickson said to the British, he said don't attack Poland, it is bound to us with an alliance, why should you attack Poland. They said, be friends with us, look at Russia, look at the Great Bolshevik enemy, attack the Bolsheviks, that would be more sensible than to attack Poland. Well, Hitler's foreign minister took down a tape recording secretly some time before this, what the British Ambassador said, and then he played it to the Russians, and ~~when~~ ^{Poland?} the Russians heard it that helped them to make their alliance with Russia. But when Hitler began attacking Poland, the British said to Poland, we'll defend you against Hitler, well, now the British couldn't help Poland against Hitler. The British declared war against Germany because Germany attacked Poland, well, what good does it do Poland, here the British--Hitler just went in and conquered Poland. But the Russians also, the British said to Poland we'll help you against Hitler, the British asked Russia, won't you help the Polish? Russia said, sure well be glad to help the Poles, they said to the Poles we'll be glad to help you against Russia, just open up your border, let us bring our troops in and we'll deliver you from Hitler. Well the Poles said we're just as much afraid of you as we are of Hitler. They said if we let you come in to our land we might as well let Hitler come in. See what I mean to say is Poland was between Russia and Germany, and the only way Poland could get protection through Russia from Germany was to let the Russians come right in. Well, now, you might say that in this immediate situation Israel is between Egypt and, I mean Judah is between Egypt and Ephraim and Syria, and the

thought, you say to the ~~Russians~~ ^{Egyptians} down there, you help us, the only way you could help is to bring their forces right into your land, and that's a pretty dangerous thing to do, but you say to Assyria over the other side, you protect us, they come in and attack from the rear, they take them (7 1/4) you're not in danger, so that as long as you had your choice between the two, the thought would never occur to you to go to Egypt for help if you could get it from Assyria. But then when he says now Assyria is going to be right next to you, well, they say, we'll play the powers off against each other, we'll go to Egypt. They might have gone to Egypt in the first place, but I think that's the reason why it wouldn't even have occurred to them at first. Well, I guess we have to stop until tomorrow.

(break in record, starting again at 9:)

...discussing the 29th and 30th chapters of the book of Isaiah. And after we noticed how the 29th chapter begins with that marvelous prediction of God's deliverance of the people from the attack of Sennacherib, by His wonderful power alone, and then we saw that criticism of the character of the people who were not following Him as they should. Then we ~~enter~~ ^{ended} with the glorious promise of God's calling, turning to the Gentiles, calling out from the Gentiles those who would be members of the family of God during this age, ending in the 24th verse with the conversion of Israel as a nation at the end of the age.

Now in chapter 30 we noticed that we can consider 30 as a continuation of the address which Isaiah gave at this banquet of the nobles who were celebrating Ahaz' ungodly scheme. Or we can consider that he wrote a continuation of it at a later time. I don't quite feel we should think of it as something written years later and unconnected, because the problems are so closely connected and there is such a continuation of thought, but the first verse of 30 would seem to have a reminiscence of the plan of Ahaz to get deliverance from the attack of Israel by a means other than that which God wanted him to have. Where do you find this reminiscence particularly

Mr. Abbott? Something in that first verse which also refers back to the error he is criticising. What is that, Mr. Abbot? (10 3/4) "...take counsel, but not of me"-- there the Lord is criticising them because they are not looking to Him for their guidance, for their leading. In those days God sent His prophets to tell His people what to do. And the main burden of the prophets' message is, follow the Lord and put Him first, instead of your human ideas of human advantage. In these days the Lord does not ordinarily speak directly to us, He speaks to us through His ~~word~~^{word,} but He wants us to get our counsel from His word, rather than from what seems to us to be the effective way to do ~~some~~ something.

30:2 Then we go on to v.2 here, and in v.2, Mr. Gregory, what is the theme there in v.2?/ (stu. 11 1/2) He points out that in v.2 here he is going further with the discussion of Ahaz. Of course not directly with Ahaz, but it's the idea that Ahaz has ~~success~~^{discussed} with the nobles, he is either showing what they think then, or what they will think later, which they certainly did. If this plan didn't work, then they seek another similar plan, if Assyria, protecting them against ^{Israel,} Assyria comes against them, then they'll go to Egypt, and so how far does he go on talking about this matter of looking to the Egyptians for help, Mr. ~~Gregory~~? (12) Through v.7, yes. Through v.7 is all one united theme. The discussion of the looking to Egypt for help against Assyria, and he points out that this will not succeed. God says their strength is to sit still. You trust the Egyptians, they've got a big name, a big reputation, but God says the day of Egypt's greatness is over, Egypt won't be of much help to you.

There is also another lesser and yet vital objection that he raises to going to Egypt. Mr. Golin, could you tell us what that is? (12 3/4) Well, yes, that's the thought though that is brought out in v.7, isn't it? Their strength is to sit still. There is another point. Mr. Gregory? (13 1/4) Well, that of course is the big point here, that they're not to look to that which is ungodly for their help. It is--they're God's people, they should use God's methods, and do what God directs, but--that's

the big main point, but the specific point for Egypt is, you're looking to Egypt to help, Egypt won't profit you. As He says at the end of v.7 and at the end of v.6 in this chapter, Egypt won't be able to do as you expect them to. But then there is a lesser point also that's brought out in the middle of these verses, quite a different point. Mr. Golin, do you have that in mind? ...

24. (1/2)

...well, that is the point just given, that Egypt is weak, it looks strong, but they're weak. But still a different point. Let's get at it this way. Mr. Vannby, what is the point of v.6. (1) Yes, but what's the point of it? He says in v.6, the burden of the beast of the south, and describes animals going to Egypt, one after another, going this long difficult trip, going through this difficult country there, making that long trip down there, and what is the big point that he is stressing it for, just that it's a beautiful sight, camels wending through the desert? What is the point of it? Well, that's the point we've already got. They're going to a people that won't profit them. The Egyptian strength is to stand still. But there is another point. Why talk about all the animals, why all the treasure, what is the stress in all that, Mr. Abbott? (1 3/4) Yes, it's expensive. His point is you are expending a tremendous lot on this scheme. That's his point. His point is that you are sending all these treasures off, you're sending camel after camel, animals, all this (2) it's expensive sending these animals, it's expensive buying all this treasure to send, it's expensive doing all this, after you do it all, it won't profit you, that's the big point, it won't profit you, that's expressed in verse after verse here. But the subsidiary point is, not only will it not profit you to look to Egypt to help but you're going to spend an awful lot while you're going it. And that is a point that Christ brings out. He says, what shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul. In other words, what He says is, if you are expending all sorts of effort and struggle in order to get what won't profit you anyway, you lose your soul,

what good is it to you? Your life, without your soul, your whole existence is worth-
 less, but you are spending a lot for that. Here is a man ^{is lazy and} who sits around and loafs
 and takes it easy, and he has a little pleasure of this type ^{and} ~~of~~ that, but he doesn't
 amount to anything. Well, ~~we're~~ we're very sorry to see it, and we say that man is
 not ~~serv~~ing the Lord, he is not doing anything worthwhile, he is lost, his life is
~~wor~~thless, and we feel bad about it, but we feel twice as bad, at least I do, when
 I see somebody who is really out there trying to do something, he is working hard,
 he is pushing, struggling, he is working up a brilliant scheme, and I know that he
 is working for the bread that perishes, and history ~~is~~ full of examples of men who
 have worked and toiled and struggled, and shown most admirable perseverance and
 most wonderful initiative and energy in trying to accomplish things, and it was all
 for an ungodly purpose, for their own self-aggrandizement, for their own pride, for
 their own luxury, or something that wouldn't last, wouldn't amount to anything, it
 was for something that wouldn't profit, and they put all this energy, all this effort,
 all this expense on to it, so he stresses here, you think you're going to look to
 Egypt for help, well, Egypt won't profit you, Egypt won't give you the help you want,
 but he is also stressing the fact, that in looking to Egypt, you're going to have to go
 to an awful lot of expense. You're going to have to send tremendous amounts of
 tribute down to Egypt, you can send a little bit up to Tiglath-pileser, it's a fair amount,
 but I mean it is not a tremendous amount, because Tiglath-pileser wants to get rid
 of these people, he wants to get ~~so~~ he is right next to them, but when you go down
 to Egypt, you're between Egypt and Assyria, and you asked Egypt to come up and help
 you against Assyria, well Assyria is out of their way, doesn't do them any ^{great} good to help
 you, so they will charge you a tremendous amount of of booty and then when they get
 it, you'll find they don't profit you any anyway. So that is stressed all though
 here, that if the people, v.5 says, that will not help nor profit, v.6 says to a people ~~th~~
 that will not profit, v.7 says the Egyptians will help in vain and to no purpose, there-

fore have I cried concerning this, Their strength is to sit still. In other words, you are looking to a false place to get what you need, but not only that, you're looking there is going to cost you ~~not only~~ a tremendous expenditure, and when you get through with all this expenditure, you just won't have anything to show for it. So that is his big theme in vv.1-7 here, you think you'll find protection from Assyria in Egypt, well God says that Egypt won't give you it, you'll go to tremendous expense trying to get it and when you get through, it'll all be just a lie. You will not get what you want from Egypt. And then in v.8 he says, now to write it in a book, write it in a book. Why does he say this in v.8? Do you think that this means that the ~~verse~~ before about the Egyptians not profiting is one of the most outstanding statements in the Bible, and therefore it should be spread, that this should be written in a book for the time to come? Is that why this verse is here, or why do you think it's here? Mr. Gregory? (5 3/4) A very good point. Yes, this is something which will take time to fulfill, you spend, and you spend, and you spend and you spend, and then when the time comes you look back and somebody says, well, Isaiah told us this all the time, another says oh I don't think he did, his emphasis was different than that. He says here is something that you will see the proof of at a later date, so write it down in a book, have it here definitely before them, the witness, so there is no question about it. Our Lord Jesus Christ tells us when He was on earth here, gave many wonderful predictions that aren't in the Scripture at all. You remember when he saw one of the disciples just before he was called and he said, behold, an Israelite in whom is no guile, ~~and~~ John 1, and the man said, where did you know me? He said, before you were called, when you were under the fig tree, I saw you. The man, said, ~~Master~~, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel. Jesus says, do you say that because I noticed you this way, and knew this about your heart? He said, you'll see greater things than these. In other words, Jesus gave a proof right then of the fact that He was God because He was able to have knowledge that nobody else had.

And we have a few of them in the gospels but He probably did that sort of thing many, many times. But when He gave a prediction about what was going to happen thousands of years later, when He described the end of the age, when He gave things like that, it was important they be written down in a book, for the time to come, so that as they're fulfilled you can see that what Jesus said actually is coming to pass. We can see the proof that He is what He claims to be, that He is the Son of God. It isn't so necessary on the immediate things, the prophets probably gave many things that weren't written down, but something that was going to deal with ~~w~~ things a few years off, it is good to have written down, so that it is definite, and that is one reason, there are other reasons why--yes, Mr. Vannoy? (7 3/4) I don't think you can confine it necessarily to one or to the other, unless you have some clear evidence in the passage. If it refers to what is before, there is a good reason for it that Mr. Gregory just gave. If it refers to what is after, that is something he said in several other passages. That is said many times in Isaiah, why should he say specifically, write that in a book? What would the reason be in that case? (8 1/2) Yes, I incline to think that there are two reasons for having ^{this} ~~it~~ written down. I incline to think that one reason was that what they've predicted about Egypt, and also what they predicted about the deliverance from Assyria at the beginning of 29 and at the end of 30, will take a few years before it is fulfilled. But I incline to think there is also another reason which relates to what follows. That they are rebellious people. On account of that write it down. I incline to think that it is about at this point perhaps that Isaiah was put out of the banquet hall. Perhaps he was giving the message to the nobles there that starts in 28, and you notice how cleverly he speaks in such a way as to get their sympathy, and to get their interest, and then he turns on them and then he turns on things that they'll approve of, and then he turns on them, and it is a question how long they'd let him stay. Now he has gotten their interest aroused, not their s particularly, but the interest of the people who were there, the

mass of the people heard about what Isaiah did, how he went in there and rebuked them to their face, they're interested in hearing the whole message. Now he says, this is a rebellious people, they won't let me give all the message to their face, write it down so they can read it in writing that this is a rebellious people, so that it is available for the whole land to hear. So it seems to me that if it points to what's after it refers to his being unable to get these oral hearings that he was getting previously in the banquet hall, if it refers to what precedes, it looks forward to the distant time when this will be fulfilled, and my guess is that both are involved in it. Well, now he goes on then and speaks in v.8 and following, v.9 and following, about the character of the people who bore the name of God, but who don't want to follow Him.

V.10, people who say to the seers, see not, and to the prophets, prophesy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophesy deceits. If you want to get a nice big church, if you want to have a good opportunity to live an easy life and yet thing you're serving God, why follow this verse, go into a big pulpit and tell the people that they're mighty fine people and they're doing a wonderful thing to come to church on Sunday and God is going to bless them and God is going to protect them on account of it, and if they'll just come out to one service they can go home and live the way they want the rest of the week, you can give them, and many, many a pulpit does, just that sort of a message, and it demands a good speaker who can get a high position in the church perhaps, he can be looked up to, can be highly regarded, he is fulfilling this request. Prophesy to us not right things, speak to us smooth things, prophesy deceits. He could be highly regarded in the church, but how much will God regard him, in the end? What is the value of it, if he just wants to get reputation, to get a name, to get money, to get standing, why doesn't he go into some other work, instead of into the Lord's work. If he is going into the Lord's work, his purpose should be, not to please the people, but to please the Lord, he

wants to please the people enough to keep them coming, to get the Lord's message, but he wants to please the Lord and if he doesn't please the Lord, there is nothing gained with please^{ing} the people. So these criticisms here given against the people there could fit people later just as well, they fit any people who go by the name of God, but who drift into the attitude of putting their own desires ahead of God's ~~pre~~ purpose. So he goes on in this passage, and we notice that he first speaks of their character through v.12 and then he speaks of what is going to follow from it. This iniquity shall be to you as a breach ready to fall, swelling out in a high wall, whose breaking comes suddenly at an instant. He tells how there is going to be a calamity and destruction for it, and then v.15 says, thus say s the Lord, thus did the Lord say, notice that in v.15 "thus saith the Lord" would be much better literally translated, wouldn't it? It gives a false idea here. If you leave off the last four words, this would make a good verse, for thus saith the Lord God, the Holy One of Israel; in returning and res t shall ye be saved; in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength. That is a wonderful verse, a wonderful promise of God, put confidence in Him, trust Him and do His will, and you'll be saved, but that's not the purpose here as shown by the last four words. This is not here a promise of blessing, it is a rebuke for not having availed themselves previously of a promise of blessing that was given, and so it would be much better if we followed the Hebrew literally here and instead of translating the perfect in Hebrew, as saith, as we do so often, if we here translated it, "thus said the Lord." This is what the Lord said to you, and you would not. It would be much better. As it is, I 'm sure many people are greatly puzzled by it, ...

25. (1/2)

... simply because the Hebrew is not literally translated. We don't literally translate (3/4) ordinarily. We translate it in the present, because what God has said is valid today and therefore saith is not an incorrect translation, but in this context the past is the thought, and therefore translating the verse we usually do simply

gives a false idea. Question, Mr. Vannoy? That's a very interesting thought, and I think the thought is true but I don't think it is what the words mean. That in returning and rest shall you be saved, that in quietness and confidence shall be your strength, this word returning, is the very word which is often translated converting, changing, turning about. It means in returning from putting your trust in earthly things, to putting it in God. Now of course it is true they are putting it in Egypt, and to turn away from putting your trust, but return sounds like literally come back from Egypt, but the leaders weren't going to Egypt, they were sending all this tribute down, so that is, I think, the commentaries bring out a true idea that the whole reliance on Egypt is in mind here, but is fastening undue stress on the literal rendering of the word, yes? (1 3/4) No, if it could be implied. Yes, I think his whole thought is, you're foolish to trust Egypt, well, that implies, quit doing it, quit sending it, but you couldn't bring back what you've already sent, that the Egyptians have got. You are just out that, and as far as bringing back the ambassadors is concerned, they sent ambassadors to ask help, but they would come back anyway when they had made their request. I don't think bringing back the ambassadors hardly expresses the thought here. He is not urging them to break off relations with Egypt, he is not urging them to ~~get~~ fight Egypt, or anything like that. Ordinarily when you bring back your ambassadors, it means you're breaking relations. But of course the special ambassadors, you bring them back, but they'll come back anyway. Of course, if he is writing today, you might say you could send a message, send a telegram, come right back, a quick message, but you couldn't do that then. If they've gone, they've gone, they'll give their message and they'll come back. But I don't think ~~they're~~ their returning literally fits, but the idea fits certainly. Mr. Gregory? (3) He is addressing people who should have put their trust in quietness and confidence in the Lord, and he is saying to these people as he said back in chapter 28 and chapter 7, that if ye will trust the Lord and do His will, you can receive blessing through Him.

Look at 28.16. Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation; he that believeth shall not make haste. In other words the one that is trusting the Lord doesn't need to be looking to Assyria ~~at all~~ for help against Israel. And now, as you look forward, you say well if Assyria becomes our great danger, we'll get help from Egypt. Well, the same thought applies, you shouldn't look to either one of them, but look to the Lord. So he then as we noticed in the next few verses, here, he says to them, you should put your trust in God and you would not, v.15, you wouldn't turn aside from earthly methods of thinking you're going to advance what is right, and put your trust in God, you won't do it, you say well if this goes as bad as you say it is, well, we'll flee on horses, v.16. We'll get the quickest thing we can find. You don't find so many horses in Palestine, Ordinarily they use the donkey, or the camel for the beast of burden, they ride on the donkey, even the king, when he (4 1/2) ~~He~~ came sitting on an ass, on the colt, the foal of an ass. Jesus didn't ride a horse in to the triumphal entry, he rode a donkey. The donkey was the regal animal and it was the common beast of burden too, and when I was traveling in Palestine for three months in 1929, we saw donkeys everywhere, some camels, lots of donkeys, we rode on horses, but the minute my horse would see another horse, he didn't bother with a donkey, but the minute he saw another horse he reared up on his hind legs and began to kick the air with his front feet, he wanted to fight, because he didn't see enough horses to get used to them, they were fairly uncommon there, at that time.

Well, at this time the horse was thought of, not as the ordinary animal that you use, not as the regal animal that had the style and luxury and all that, but he was very specifically one thing, he was the fast one, the swift one, the one that would be brought in to do a special task that needed speed, he might be used during war, he would be useful in carrying the message speedily, and that was the purpose of the horses, for fighting or for speeding. So they say, we'll flee on horses, these nobles,

they have the means available to get away from this, they don't think of the poor people who will be left for the Assyrian juggernaut to roll across, they're going to get out of the way, they're going to flee on horses, and that's the ordinary human method of desperation, we try our human expedients and then when they don't work, well, we'll just flee away, and you take your common literature today that is so much touted by the world and much of it is the literature of desperation. You take Franz Kafka whose writings are much discussed today, and what does Kafka write? He wrote about people who were caught in a world situation in which they found no help, no means of escape, it's just absolutely hopeless, and that's the stress, and not only in Kafka, but so many other writers today, that is the thing, we are in a world situation that we just can't get out of, we're just caught hopelessly, and people seem to get a pleasure out of reading that sort of thing and feeling, well, we're all in the same boat together, and it's just hopeless. B

But these leaders, these nobles, they say, well, we'll get out of this situation, we'll just flee away. You won't catch us, if it goes wrong, it goes wrong. We won't turn aside from our wicked lusts, or follow the Lord, we'll work our schemes and we think they'll work, but if they don't, we'll flee. And so they say, we'll flee on horses. Now this is interesting, this v.16. Did they say this? "But ye said, No; for we will flee upon horses; therefore shall ye flee?" Is that what they said? Does that sound to you like what they said? It is an interesting verse here, because this is a verse in which we have the speakers very clearly differentiated and yet it is not indicated. It is there. It is perfectly plain, but it is not indicated, and there are many times in Scripture when that is the situation. When they do not put in designations of the speakers, but when you can tell them from the context with no difficulty, and you have to tell them, to make sense out of it. What sense does that make? "But ye said, No; for we will flee upon horses; therefore shall ye flee." Doesn't make any sense at all, does it? You have to read it in a different

tone of voice. You read, he says, But ye said, No, for we will flee upon horses. End of quotes. This is what you said. If Assyria will protect you from Israel and Syria. Well, if Assyria turns against us, we'll look to Egypt. Egypt will protect us. Well, he says, Egypt will prove to not profit you. Their strength is to stand still. Then they say, oh, well, we'll flee on horseback, Anything but to trust the Lord and turn away from the anti-God objectives of this wicked age. No, he says, we'll flee on horses then. So he says, the prophet says, therefore shall ye flee. Yes, you're going to, and again, what ye said. It doesn't state it, but it's clear. And again what did they say? We will ride on the swift. We have got good enough horses to get out of the way. We can still be safe. We will ride on the swift. He says, therefore, they that pursue will be swift. So you have three changes of person in this. There is a quotation of the people, there is an answer, there is another quotation from them, and there is an answer. Now this may be a quotation of something they actually say, more likely it is a quotation of what they're thinking, what they would say if they entered into dialogue, and he answers the thought in their minds, just as Jesus so often did, when people would say, among themselves, can this man forgive sins? They probably didn't say that audibly but it was in their minds. He knew what was in their minds, and he turned to them and answered the thought in their heart. Yes? (9 3/4) I wouldn't think in the context. The thought of Egypt might suggest horses because at this time Egypt is where the best horses come from. Maybe they were getting horses from Egypt, but (stu.10) yes, but they weren't getting help from Egypt in order to be able to flee, they were just getting help from Egypt in order to be able to protect themselves. The fleeing is a last resort. They're not sending all this treasure to Egypt just to get a few horses. (stu.) No, I think the emphasis on the horses is if the Egyptians fail them, then they'll flee. See, first they say, we get protection from Israel and Syria by looking to Assyria. They don't say that but that's what they're doing, so he criticizes that. Then he says, Assyria

won't help you. That is, it'll help you temporarily, but you remove the buffer state, you're face to face with the tremendous Assyrian danger. Then, they say, well, we're face to face with Assyria, we'll go to Egypt for help. He says, oh, yes, I see what'll happen then. The burden of the beasts of the south, all these animals going to Egypt, all this, you're sending all this to Egypt, in order to get Egypt to promise to help you, but he says you're sending it to a people that won't profit you. He repeats that three times. He says Egypt's strength is to stand still. You think Egypt can protect you but Egypt is past its day, Egypt is not in its decline, so you won't get help from Egypt. He says what you should have done is to trust the Lord, He said to you "in quietness and confidence shall be your strength," but you won't. The Egyptian scheme won't work, well, the Assyrian scheme ^{doesn't} ~~won't~~ work, all right, we'll look to Egypt. Now the Egyptian scheme doesn't work, we still won't turn to God, we'll flee on horseback. ~~he~~ Of course, they may have gotten the horses from Egypt but it is a very, very small part of the help from Egypt (11 1/.2)

We'll flee on horses then. And He says, well, He says, that's what is going to happen to you. He says you're going to have to flee as a result of ~~this~~ attitude you have, and then we have this very striking thing where they say, we'll ride on the swift. He says, ^{yes,} ~~and~~ the ones that pursue you, they'll be swift too. He says, here is what is going to happen. One thousand will flee at the rebuke of one. At the rebuke of five all of you will flee. They say, well, this is hopeless then, Isaiah says it's hopeless, you better trust the Lord. If you don't, it's just hopeless, there is no answer. No, that's not what Isaiah said, that's part of it, but that's not all of it. Isaiah says it is hopeless to get deliverance through your human schemes, but Isaiah is implying all through, God has a purpose in Israel, and God's purpose is going to be accomplished, and whatever they do, He is going to accomplish His purpose, and He comes back to ~~this~~. The Assyrian, He says, you'll be faced with this great enemy, what can you do? But He says, God is going to intervene, going

30:17
 to protect you, earlier. Now here He says, you will flee, a thousand will flee at the rebuke of one, at the rebuke of five all of you will flee. Well, it is hopeless, in other words, we are just lost. Till ye be left, how As a beacon on the top of a mountain, and as an ensign on a hill. He uses this very vivid language, the beacon, and the ensign. Why does He speak of being left as a beacon and as an ensign? Somebody might have said, in the Civil War, might have said to the South well you think you're going to divide up the nation, you're going to have your own section down here, that will carry on the law the way you want, regardless of what the rest of the country wants. You ~~w~~ think you're going to do that? Well, you'll find when it comes to a clash of strength, that you won't get anywhere, you think England and France will come over and help you, you'll find they don't. They'll give you a lot of words, and a little help, but not much. They won't do anything in the end. You will be left absolutely destroyed. Your allies will flee and there'll be nothing left of them. But he never would have said, till you be left as a beacon on the top of a mountain, and as an ensign on a hill. Who would think of using language like that to a country, to say you're going to be defeated, you'll be left this way. It wouldn't be true. They weren't.

Some commentaries say, this shows the prophet is saying, they'll be left so there are no two together, they are just individuals separately. Well, that didn't happen, that's not what (14)

Why does he use this language? Mr. Gregory? ~~A.Y.~~...

26. (1/2)

...yes, we don't know. (stu) I don't think so, because I think he is looking further into the future. I think that here he is looking beyond that. He is looking to the very distant result. I think that, simply because of the language here. He is going to deliver Jerusalem, and the other cities (1) but I don't think that is involved here. I think what he is stressing here is, that they will flee and

you'll think it's hopeless, you'll think there is nothing left of it, but that won't be true, there will be something left, something very important left, what will be left will be a beacon, and an ensign. Although, instead of calling it an ensign, call it a flagpole if you want, it still is the same thing. It is that which stands as a lesson and more than a lesson, as an indication that ~~that~~ which represents something. And what he is saying is God has a purpose in Israel and the purpose of Israel is to keep Israel alive, to keep the memory of God alive to them, as the people through whom His Son will come into the world, but He says, you leaders of the people are turning against God, the people as a whole are implicated with you, in what you're doing, you are trying these ungodly schemes, one after another, in the end, it will result in failure for you, in dispersion, in being scattered throughout the world, but it will not result in complete destruction, and it will result in a testimony, in a sign, in an indication, which Frederick the Great's chaplain could point to, when Frederick the Great said, "Give me in a word some evidence of Christianity." In other words, he says, I don't want a long sermon from you now, trying to give some closely spun arguments to prove that Christianity is true, give me something brief, in one word, that will mean something. And the chaplain took Frederick the Great at his word, it is a good thing to take him at his word, because you might lose your head if you didn't, but he took him more literally than Frederick probably meant it, and the chaplain said, "The Jews." And suggested something that is unique in the word. All the nations of antiquity have disappeared. They're the great nations. The people have gone. Look at the great Egyptian power, the Egyptians today are Arabs, they're not Egyptians. There is a lot of the old Egyptian blood in them, but the continuity of culture is gone, the whole relationship is changed, the Arab conqueror has come in and taken over the country of Egypt. The Assyrians, the great empire, they disappeared. What has become of the ancient Romans? What has become of the great cities of ancient Greece? They have all gone. And here is a nation which was much smaller

than any of those. You could find a dozen nations as great as Israel ever seems to be, which had their day and disappeared. The people were scattered, were divided up among other peoples, and forgotten, except somebody who is going into tomes of ancient history, but though the leaders of the Jews turn away from God, though they flee, though they're divided, though a few chase a thousand, so that they're scattered abroad, you think there is nothing left of them, yet they remain, they continue their existence, they continue their distinctiveness, and they stand there as an indication to the world that God's word is true, that God's testimony is true, and that He has worked something very unusual, very remarkable, as an indication of the fact that He did set them apart for a special purpose, and that His word is indeed the Word of God. So they, though they are scattered, though they are divided, though they are driven away, they remain as an ensign on a mountain, as a banner on the top of a hill, an indication that cannot be hid, that stands out there, as something that has lasted down from ancient days into this present age, and found all over the world, indication of the truth of His word. And then you have v.18.

30:18
 After 17, v.18 is one which if you do not see the purpose of the chapter as a whole you don't get a great deal of sense out of 18. But if you see the chapter as a whole there is a great deal of meaning in v.18 here. And therefore, will the Lord wait, that he may be gracious unto you. ~~Some~~ say well therefore must skip back to what precedes, therefore will the Lord wait because of your rebellious spirit, because of your failure, he will wait, in order to be gracious unto you. I think that is a wrong interpretation of the "therefore." I think the "therefore" means "for this reason." For what reason? For the reason of the carrying out of history. For the reason of the ensign, for the reason of the pointing to God's purpose in Christ. Therefore, will the Lord wait, in order that He may be gracious unto you, therefore will he be exalted, in order that he may have mercy upon you. How can the Lord be gracious to those who are sinners? How can the Lord have mercy upon those who

turn away from Him? How can He? He only can through fulfilling His purpose in the Lord Jesus Christ. Only through doing what He brought Israel into existence for, in the first place, can he do it. It is by the working out of His plan, that the Lord can do this, and we have an occasional verse in the prophets pointing to the fact that God has a plan, looking on through the ages, from Isaiah's time on, a purpose which is going to result in carrying out His gracious purpose of mercy to the whole world. It is a plan which leads up to the coming of the Lord, who is going to bear our sins. And it is all related to that. They are to be, not simply destroyed, not simply reduced, but rendered like a beacon on the top of a mountain, an ensign on a hill, a sign of the Lord's activity, the Lord's control, a sign that these were the people set aside for Himself, and that the misery that comes on many is the result of the quality of forgetfulness of Him, which they have, which they're not unique in having, which all the world has, except those who are really true to the Lord, but which becomes particularly deserving of punishment when there is opportunity ^{of} ~~for~~ knowing the Lord's will and when they represent a turning away from light that is given them. But it is not simply destruction, it is making them a sign, an indication of what the Lord's purpose is, and what is His purpose? His purpose is to be gracious. Here He is sitting here, doing all this, you won't trust the Lord, therefore you're going to flee, therefore those that pursue will be swift, and then all of a sudden, He says, the Lord's purpose is to be gracious. Yes, the Lord's purpose is to be gracious by doing that which makes it possible for Him to be gracious. Why will He be gracious? For the Lord is a God of judgment. How can He be gracious and be a God of judgment? Because He works out His purpose and makes it possible for a just God to be gracious. His purpose that makes it possible for Him to be just and also the justifier of them that believe in Christ. So He looks forward to the great blessings that He is going to bring, through the carrying out of His purpose, for the people shall dwell in Zion at Jerusalem. Thou shalt weep no more. Isn't that a sharp change from you're going to

30:17 flee, until you become a beacon on top of a mountain. You shall weep no more. Yet, when will you weep no more? There'll be plenty of weeping in Isaiah's day, and still more in the day of Jeremiah, the weeping prophet, and still more in the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, and still more at many times through the ages, but the time is coming when you shall weep no more, a time is coming when the Lord will have worked out His plan, so that He can bring His wonderful grace to all the world, beginning at Jerusalem, and going on to Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth. Thou shalt weep no more. He will be very gracious unto thee at the voice of thy cry, when he shall hear it, he will answer thee. We did not stop on the last of v.18: "Blessed are all they that wait for him." The Lord is going to wait, that he may be gracious. Blessed are all they that wait for Him. The same Hebrew word is used. Those that he is--the word is to look with expectancy. This, the Lord is going to wait that He may be gracious unto you, He is going to look for the fulfillment of His marvelous ^{plan} ~~promise~~ for the working out of it, which involves the ensign, the beacon on a hill. He is going to wait, to look with expectancy, to the fulfillment of His plan. Blessed are all they that look with expectancy to Him, that put their trust in Him, that have their strength in quietness and in confidence. And then in v.20, you see the change of the time you look at. Thou shalt weep no more in v.20; though the Lord give you the bread of adversity, and the water of affliction. Well you'll certainly weep when you have the bread of adversity and the water of affliction, won't you? You will weep. He looked at a different time. Though you shall do this, yet shall not thy teachers be removed into a corner any more, but thine eyes shall see thy teachers. And thine ears shall hear a word behind thee, saying, This is the right way, walk ye in it, when ye turn to the right hand, and when ye turn to the left.

God is going to give His word, His means of knowing the truth, He is going to provide His spirit to lead those who wait for Him, who look to Him with expectancy.

30;21
 This is the right way. When ye turn to the right hand and when ye turn to the left-- why should He say that? Why doesn't He say this is the right way, turn to the ~~w~~ right or turn to the left. Why does He say it this way? Mr. Miller, do you have an idea on that? (11 1/.4) The point of it is, not that he is going to say, you turn this way, you turn that, but that He is ~~g~~ going to indicate where you've gone wrong, when you turn out of the way, He will show you how to get back into it. Reminds of Psalm 32, be not as the horse that must be held in with bit and bridle, that must be forced in this direction, but learn to have Him lead you with His eye. It is a call to learn from the word the way that God wants you to go, and then to know that if you are trusting Him, that when you start to go in the wrong direction, He'll nudge you back to the right way. There'll be a voice saying, no, that's the wrong way, you get back to the direct way you were going. Because every one goes wrong, there is no one who has been redeemed from sin who always goes in what is right. We are always taking wrong steps, but if the Spirit is dwelling in us, He says, no, no, you're turning wrong here, get back to the direction God wants you to have. Man's life is a series of, you might say, of revivals, a series of drifting and then being brought back. Drift and then being brought back. Naturally, we go down. It is God's mercy that brings us back. It is God's intervention in our lives, when we start to go astray, and if we are listening for the voice of the Spirit, looking for what He wants us to do, if we put out of our minds that which is our own selfish desire, and learn to look for His purposes, He promises that He will enable us to hear the voice of the Spirit saying, no, not this way, no, back to here, not over here, no keep on, keep on following Him, don't turn aside to the right or to the left, from His paths, and His purposes.

So that v.22 now is an interesting verse. What do you think 22 is about?...

30:22

...yes, there is a promise that there is going to be a real loyalty to God, but I think vv.21 has a great note on the personal leading of those who are really true to the Lord, while 22 is more general in nature. In 22 he makes a specific prediction which would've been hard to make in view of the history of Israel, because you read in Judges and Kings that people were constantly falling into idolatry, they were going after the abominations of the Sidonians, and of the Ammonites and of the different people, they were falling into idolatry repeatedly. But God says you are going to flee, going to be scattered like an ensign on a hill, but, He says, you are going to defile the covering of your graven images of silver, you're going to cast away out of the temple and say get thee hence, the idols and the images, and how much since the time of the exile has ~~Israel~~ been characterized by idolatry. People have fallen into many errors, as all people do. There has been much that they could be criticized for as there is of all of us, but the loyalty and fidelity of on this vital point, which was not characteristic before the exile of the Israelites has been carried through ever since. They have been characterized by their loyalty to the spiritual nature of God and to the great principle of monotheism, and refusal to have any compromise with idolatry in any form. They have been characterized by that wherever they've been scattered throughout the world, and that is a marvel, and something that no one knowing their past history would have predicted, but Isaiah predicts it here very definitely, in v.22. You're going to flee, you're going to be an ensign on a hill, you're going to be subject to all of this, but he says, you are going to defile the covering of your graven images, and the ornament of your molten images, you're going to cast them away, you're going to say, get thee hence. And this has characterized the Jews ever since, a marvelous loyalty on this one extremely important point. And it is a marvelous evidence of the accuracy of Isaiah's prediction, that Isaiah would pick out the one thing on which they had been so disloyal in the past, and on which they're going to be so loyal in the future. Of course, he doesn't

say immediately, starting in his time. You get on to Ezekiel and you find Ezekiel carried ~~the~~ ⁱⁿ vision to Jerusalem and seeing the people worshipping (3 1/2) and worshipping these images in the temple and all that, the idolatry in Ezekiel's time had come right into the temple, but after the exile, this very important stand was clearly taken by Israel and characterized them through the centuries (4) and it is a marvelous prediction of Isaiah on this.

Then in v.23 he looks forward to the material blessings of the millennium.

30:23-26
 There are going to be material blessings of the millennium, described in 23, 24, 25, and 26, material blessings of the time when God is going to have put an end to the evil of Israel and established His reign of righteousness upon this earth, and when there is going to be great agricultural blessing, described here, wonderful prosperity which is going to come, this figure, the light of the moon, the light of the sun being so greatly increased when the Lord binds up the breach of his people, and heals the stroke of their wound. Revelation says there will be no night there, it doesn't mean we won't have refreshing, it doesn't mean we won't have the strengthening we need, that we get from sleep, but it does mean that there will be a tremendous increase in energy and strength and blessing in every way, during that wonderful millennial kingdom. And Isaiah just has a brief glimpse of it here, up through v.26, and then he comes back to the nearer time and looks at the nearer blessings that God is going to give, and we have to discontinue there until next week, but look over chapter 30 and 31 tomorrow and see the parallel between the two, how they fit together, and see these latter verses of 30, try to be sure just what they're looking to, are they looking to an immediate situation? Are they looking to the present age? Are they looking to the Millennium? Just what are they looking toward? (break in record) (continuing again at 6 1/4) ...at our last meeting we were looking at, still at chapter 30, a very interesting chapter. These chapters, by the way, when you start with Isa.28, once you have the background, the historical background of 28, everything

just falls into line, quite simply. We get to 29 and we have one rather startling new thing we find, but once we find it, I think it falls into line. In 30 we get a little bit more that is difficult I'm sure. And when you get to 32 and 33 I think we're in a much less solid position, there is a good deal we can tell very definitely, but there are many more details that we find it difficult to be sure about than there are in the earlier chapters, but unless you have the historical background well in mind, and also the long distance matters that the Lord is interested in revealing to Isaiah, most of these chapters are just a lot of words, they don't convey much of a message, unless you have these two things in mind: the historical background in relation to Isaiah's day and the distant things that God has revealed to us elsewhere that we find suggested, hinted at, that we find these related to. We don't want to read into it anything because we find it elsewhere, but we want to take suggestions we find elsewhere, and see how they fit, and whether they give the key in places which otherwise would be very difficult to understand. Now in chapter 30, we were looking I think at the end of the hour at that 18th verse.

We might have glanced a little further ahead, but the 18th verse is a very interesting verse. It seems to me that it ties tightly to the 17th verse. I'm not sure that this has been much noticed except by expositors, this relationship, but it seems to me that it is a very vital proof to the understanding of the whole material, therefore, will the Lord wait that He may be gracious unto you. I don't think it means, the reason the Lord is going to wait is so He can be gracious unto you, maybe it is that way, but I incline to think that He waits to be gracious to you in order that He may fulfil His purpose of the beacon, of the ensign, His purpose after all which is the purpose for which Israel was called in the first place, the purpose of being a witness to His message, and that is what Israel has witnessed to right from the time of Abraham, It is a witness to His message, it is that which through which He brings His message, and by which He presents it to the world. So the ensign, the beacon, are not just

figures but they are figures which convey their real natural significance, the significance of proclaiming something, and it is the proclamation of God's purpose, and the outworking of His gracious purposes and also for the whole world, that He may be gracious, that He may be gracious because He works out His purpose which involves establishment of bases upon which He can be gracious, and involves eventually bringing an end to all that is wicked in this world. Therefore, will He be exalted that He may have mercy upon it, He is not just one, like an indulgent parent, that simply gives the child everything that he wants regardless of whether it is for his good or not. God is a God of judgment, He is a God who loves His children, but a God who loves righteously, and justly, and His perfect plan involves working justice, judgment, righteousness, and at the same time, providing for the gracious loving merciful gift that He gives of His own mercy alone, not through any desert of ours. So from v.19 on, we carry on this note of the mercy, this note of the graciousness of what God is going to do, up to v.27, through v.26, we have the constant stress on this note of God's graciousness. You find it in 19, He will be very gracious unto thee, in 23--He will give the rain of thy seed, the increase of the earth, fat and plenteous, cattle feed in large pastures; 24--the oxen and the young asses, the domestic animals are to have plenty to eat, the blessings He is going to give; 25--streams of waters on every high hill, rivers and streams of waters, the deserts to blossom like the rose; and 26--the light of the moon like the light of the sun, the light of the sun sevenfold, in the day the Lord binds up the breach of his people and heals the stroke of their wound. The graciousness then is , after a break of a few verses, is continued in v.29 and 30, where there is to be a strong song of joy, the glory of the goodness of God shown in His protecting power, now. There is a break after 26 but yet the gracious note is not ended, it continues very definitely with 29 and 30. Then, this graciousness then is introduced with a theme, God's marvelous blessing in the future for His people. His people are being punished for

their sins, they are being told of the terrible denunciation in the first part of chapter 30, and yet there is marvelous blessing ahead of them. God ~~knows when~~ ^{is going to wait} to be gracious, and blessed are all they that wait for Him. Here surely is a justification by faith, here is the gracious mercy of God given without any desert on our part. Blessed are those who look expectantly to Him, those who put their trust in Him, those who enter into an intimate relationship with Him in which He is Saviour and Lord. And then in v.20 we have a glimpse of the fact that the marvelous blessings that He promises in v.19, the people will weep no more. ~~That means~~ ^{Does} that from now on they'll never weep any more? Well, there was a great deal of misery then. But the time is going to come when they will weep no more, the time ~~is~~ going to come when His great graciousness will be shown, but that time is not necessarily immediately, because v.20 shows that there may be first before the marvelous graciousness of God, when the people weep no more, there may be first a time when they have to undergo the bread of adversity and the water of affliction. This time may come first, before the marvelous graciousness, but He is going to wait before His being gracious and showing His marvelous love, and inbetween there may be a time of bread of adversity and water of affliction, because He has not only punishment to bring to those who turn away from Him...

28. (1/2)

...but He also has lessons to teach those who were waiting for Him, those who were true to Him, and it may be His will that we have the bread of adversity, and the water of affliction, it may be His will for any of us, it is quite different, the whole atmosphere of v.20 from the atmosphere of the verses from v.8, say, up to v.17. There is denunciation and punishment, here is chastisement, and care for His own. They may have to go through hardships, they may have to do these things, and yet if they do, if they are truly waiting for Him ~~//~~ they can know that it is part of His purpose for them, and they should rejoice in it. There is no excuse for-- well, I

don't like to say in such strong language, in a way, there is no excuse, because we don't want to condemn others for faults which we may not have, and we may have other faults that they haven't, but in God's sight, let us say, there is no excuse for the Christian getting ulcers. In God's sight there is no reason for it. Now we all have our faults, and I don't condemn a man who does, I probably have great faults that he doesn't have, but what I mean is, that we fully avail ourselves of the blessings that God provides for His children, if we are waiting expectantly for Him, if we are looking to Him, we should be able to learn to do His work with our utmost energy and ability, but to leave the results officially in His hands, that we do not have the nervous tension that produces ulcers. Of course, I have far more respect for the man that gets out and does something, accomplishes something and gets ulcers as a result, than for the man that lies under a tree and does nothing. I have far more, but I mean that the Christian should be able to do the work to the very utmost of his energy, and then when he has disappointments, when things go wrong, when he is just not sure how it is going to turn out, when this particular one he has worked so hard with, just doesn't seem to get anywhere or turns against him and does what he didn't expect, to just lean on the arms of the Lord and leave the result with Him, and not be himself scathed by it, it is a high ideal and an ideal which none of us fully reach, but in God's sight, I say, there is no need for the Christian to suffer from nervousness. Of course, the worst thing is the laziness that does nothing, that certainly is far worse than having the nervous tension, but what I mean is the Lord wants us to realize that when the bread of affliction comes, if the water of affliction comes, well, those those who are His, it is part of His purpose for them, and He had a blessing for us in it. He has a meaning for us in it, and the meaning might not even not be for us, He might have a meaning of having us glorify Him by having the bread of affliction, and the water of affliction. Whereby we would suffer as Job did, not as a punishment to Job, not as a chastisement to Job, but as a means of showing

forth God's wonderful grace, and showing how Job took it, how Job retained ~~h~~his loyalty to God through it all, even though he didn't understand everything. God never explains~~d~~ everything. At the end of Job, we see how great and how good God is, who are you to question His will. But we are told when Job starts ~~that~~ there was a real reason in the spiritual world for it, that something very definite was accomplished for God's will by Job's undergoing this misery. But Job wasn't told, it says the great ~~question~~ ^{blessing} for Job was, not to have everything explained to him, but to be able to wait upon the Lord, and know that he could fully trust the Lord, and the Lord was able to (4 1/.2)

So this verse here, when we start, turn to presentation of God's wonderful gracious goodness to His people in v.18 and 19, then to have 20 ~~w~~ stuck in with the bread of adversity and the water of affliction, seems at first sight as if he is oscillating. After looking at the judgment upon sin in vv.8-17, as if now--which ~~God~~ uses for His own purposes of goodness--that ~~now~~ ~~He~~ ~~was~~ after two verses of graciousness, oscillating ~~back~~ again. Of course, that's not the case. This is a description of His gracious good purposes to His people. That before the covenant of the time when the marvelous material blessings are to be given, that are suggested in v.19 and described rather fully in vv.23-26, that before that happened, for the one ~~who~~ is waiting upon the Lord, there may be a period of severe testing, a period of chastisement, a period of training that is very difficult while it is going on, but that God promises that the one who is truly waiting upon Him, will not have his creatures removed into a corner, but that He will have the word available, his eyes will see (5 3/4)

He will have the full word of God available, which God is preparing, was preparing through Isaiah, had been through others before, that the word will be available to ~~Him~~, to get the message that God wants to give, and to see that whatever the material situation, that God provides for them. There is the spiritual blessing of the nearness of God, and the leaning upon Him and the

30:21
 feeling the assurance that He is leading. Then, thine ears shall hear a word behind thee saying, This is the way, walk ye in it, when ye turn to the right hand, and when ye turn to the left. This doesn't mean He is going to make us into a robot that He can press a button and we'll turn right, He can press a button and we'll turn left, He wants us to learn to use our minds to figure out what way He wants us to go, but to give the assurance that as we study the word and learn principles and as we study situations and figure out how we can glorify Him more fully, that when we make a wrong turn, He will in some way move things about so that in the end we'll be able to look back and see that we were just the way He wanted, that He will lead us, even though we hear Him through a voice behind us. He does not give us that clear sight that He gave some of the prophets of old, at some times, when He said, go to this place, go here, go exactly there. He wants us to learn to be guided with His eye. Yes, Mr. Abbott? (7 1/4) I would say very definitely that vv.8-17 are punishment upon those who are a rebellious people, who are turning against the Lord, saying as in v.10, saying to the seers, See not; and to the prophets, Prophecy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophesy deceits. That is the condemnation of the attitude also described in chapter 29, of seeking our own counsel instead of God's and using Him as a means to help us, instead of desiring to be His servants, to bring ourself in line with Him. That is a definite condemnation in those verses. I wouldn't say condemnation of the nation, certainly not, but condemnation of the wicked leaders of the nation, and of all leaders who would follow in the footsteps of them. Not of all the leaders by any means, but condemnation of those leaders who follow in this direction, with the assurance, in v.17, that God's punishment of them is not like the punishment of the Assyrians, a destruction, but a punishment that involves carrying on of His purposes, and accomplishing His blessing, that He will do His work through us or in spite of us, but He will use us for (8 3/4) He makes the wrath of wicked men to praise Him, so, you see, it all seems to be

simply punishment, destruction, vv.8-17, and then we find it is advancing His great purpose, even so . And He called Abraham for a great purpose of goodness to the whole world, and that purpose is going to be accomplished. And then of course, when we get to vv.19 and vv.20, 21, I think we're in an entirely different atmosphere, because the ones there are promised definite spiritual blessings. You couldn't promise spiritual blessings to the people in 8-17. They are promised definite spiritual blessings, but told that this blessing may be accompanied by material hardship, and by severe chastisement. Mr. ? (9 1/2) The way that I would figure it out was, that vv.17,18 turn to the unbelieving, or at least the leaders who--I won't say not believing intellectually, but who are refusing to follow the Lord, trying to use Him for their purpose. It is a rebuke to them which looks ahead and sees how God is going to use this, even though there is punishment, God will use it, and then v.18 refers specifically to His own people, His own people of Israel, with I think inclusion of His own people who are to be added to the tree, who are not of Israel, of earthly Israel. I don't think you can tell that, just from this part of Isaiah, but of course you have that definitely taught in 29, so we have, here there is no emphasis on that whatever, but there is the inclusion of it in the blessing. This is the blessing upon the true Israel of God, upon God's true people, and His true people are told they are to weep no more in 19, but this "weep no more" is the culmination and then in 20 I think we look back before the culmination, which is in the very distant future, and it says, if before that time, you have chastisement, you have material suffering, if you are one of those ~~who are~~ described in the end of v.18, who are waiting for Him, who are looking to Him and following Him, then you may know that the misfortune is not a punishment but a chastisement. You may know that He is blessing you even if you have adversity, that in the adversity, you can praise Him and you can know that you will look backward afterward and say, praise the Lord even for that. I couldn't see it at the time, but I know I was following Him, I know that I was looking

30; 19-21

to Him,
~~He~~ waiting for Him, so even though nothing turned out the way I expected or wanted, I know it was His will. He was guiding and He was leading me, in order to accomplish His purpose. It is a different atmosphere altogether from the previous. And then having given this 20 to 21, then we have a statement made in v.22 in which I think he is looking at this intermediate period which is covered in vv.19 to the end of 20 or 20 and 21--he is looking at this intermediate period and at this intermediate period, he is declaring an attitude which his people are going to take. It is an attitude of turning away with vigor from one thing that had been a characteristic and downfall of Israel in earlier days. Time and again they had fallen into idolatry, but he says you are going to say to the idolaters, Get thee hence, you are going to defile the covenant with the graven images, you're going to turn utterly away from it, as something you will have nothing to do with, and of course that's the thing a person should do toward idolatry, but where he predicts, this is what they're going to do with it, right in the midst of ~~the~~ his promises of blessing here, it is a prediction I think that has been marvelously fulfilled. ~~It~~ Just like we have the prediction to Egypt where Ezekiel says, there shall no more be a prince out of the land of Egypt, and Egypt had had a succession of 26 dynasties and native princes, and Ezekiel says there is going to be a change, Egypt is going to be ruled by foreigners, and for 3000 years they had always had native princes and now for the next 3000 they practically always had foreigners, and here Israel has fallen in this particular direction repeatedly in the Old Testament. This is going to be the great characteristic of the people in the future, their solid stand against idolatry, for which they've been known through these last 2000 years. It is a characteristic of all of God's true people, but it is a characteristic which again makes a wonderful evidence of God's authorship of it as you see it in His physical people, the people of Israel, you see how they have carried this out. I'm afraid you don't see it very well carried out in the Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox Church, this particular phase, that is. If

30:22

you take the teachings of their leaders, there is no idolatry. But if you take the view of their common people, it is pretty hard to distinguish from idolatry, their attitude toward a lot of their images and ikons, but ~~it~~ is an error that Judaism renounced, and turned away from with vigor, as this verse describes, and has continued that attitude, right up to the present day...

29. (3/4)

...and this of idolatry and complete turning away from it as given in the vivid language of v.22, then we have the continuation of the graciousness, the picture of the specific material blessings which he promised, with the emphasis on agricultural blessings, and these blessings are mentioned in. vv. 24 and 25, and there is a promise of a very great fertility of the land, a very great material increase. Your cattle will feed in large pastures. A series of promises which could perhaps be taken in a rather general way of the fact that though God's people suffer adversity, yet over the long period of time, they enjoy material blessings and wherever a people is true to God you find that over a period of time the material blessings come. You find that the material (1 3/4) level raises. It could be taken in that rather general way, vv.23 and 24, and perhaps 25. I incline personally to feel that instead of taking it that way, ~~that~~ it is a specific promise of millennial blessing, given in agricultural terms. I incline to feel that it is looking forward to that which comes after the waiting, that He may be gracious, that it is what is described in v.19, thou shalt weep no more. The marvelous time of millennial blessing, which is often in the Bible described in agricultural terms, that with the abundant rain given and the increase of the earth, fat and plenteous, the cattle feeding in large pastures, the oxen and the young asses that plow the ground would have plenty of good provender, and a picture of great material blessings, I would think probably the millennial blessing at the end of the present age, and I think of that view as rather strengthened by v.25, because otherwise 25 is a rather hard verse to fit in here. It has got one or two suggestions

30:24

that fit perfectly with that interpretation. Otherwise it is a little hard to explain just what does 25 mean? "And there shall be on every high mountain, and on every high hill, rivers and streams of waters," well that's plain enough, great agricultural blessing. The desert will blossom as the rose. Wonderful. But look at the last of the verse. When will all this be? In the day of the great slaughter, when the towers ~~fall~~ fall. Well, if they're promised to have such wonderful blessing, how does the great slaughter have to do with it? What does the falling of the towers have to do with it. That is a real problem in that verse. Just what are you going to do with those? Well, the simplest explanation I know of is to take it that in the terrible days in the end of this age, the day of the outpouring of God's wrath, the day of the great flood, the day when the towers fall, that that will be followed by the great millennial period of blessing, such as the earth has never seen. It seems to me that that interpretation gives a real reason for these references here, and I haven't thought of any other that fits with the interpretation that seems to me to run through the passage as a whole.

30:26
 And of course when you look at the next verse, you have figures which are used elsewhere in the Scripture, for the time of millennial blessing, the time when the Lord binds up the girds up the breach of his people, and heals the stroke of their wound. This time, when the light of the moon will be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun will be sevenfold, as the light of seven days. You take it too literally, it is a ghastly picture, such a blinding light as that you couldn't stand, it would wreck you completely. If you take it as a picture of the light that God has so tremendously increased that there is no darkness at all, there is just light and joy and an end to all suffering, surely 26 is along with the previous four verses, a promise of God's marvelous blessing, to His people, which is at the end of this present age, to which we look forward, that God is waiting that He may accomplish His great purpose. First, He is waiting that He may fulfil the atonement

which is the necessary foundation for them all, then He is waiting that He may carry out His purposes of grace, to bring in the complete outworking of what is won by the atonement in the millennial age. I don't think there is much, is there, of problem in specific statements in these verses otherwise? Than what we've looked at? I feel that if you get what the general purpose of it is, what it is leading to, and what it is dealing with, that just about ^{all} the words fit quite nicely into place, and I don't see any great problems with taking it this way. Mr. Miller? (6) I would say so. I would think that it is the day of the Lord which begins with the great promise, or which comes after the great promise. (stu.) Yes, certainly not a 24-hour day. It is a period. I would say the period which begins with the great promise. The period which is characterized by peace, by complete lack of (6 1/2) but which begins with the great flood, and when the towers fall, what does that mean? What towers fall? He isn't here talking about the Babylonian conquest of Jerusalem taking the people off into exile, it doesn't fit with that at all.. He is looking forward to a time when the human means of defense are brought to an end, when they beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks, because they are no further of any use to them, the human means are destroyed to a great extent in the tribulation, but they are completely abolished as unnecessary when Christ rules with a rod of iron, but in absolute justice and mercy all over the world. Otherwise I just don't see how you fit it together, except they're just a lot of isolated verses. It seems to me that in this approach you have a connected concerted picture of the future that all fits together and fits into the teaching of the rest of Scripture. Mr. Vannoy? Mr. Cohen? (7 1/2) I was saying that we cannot picture, but that it is a picture, I don't know how literal it is, exactly, but it is the sort of a picture that we have given in connection with the millennium, quite a bit. What is the picture at the end of Isaiah 24? There the moon shall be confounded and the sun ashamed, and the Lord of hosts shall reign. Maybe that is the opposite, I don't know, but at

least it is a mention of the moon and the sun in connection with the glory of the millennial age, and the time when there is no darkness at all, when everything is just shining light. I think that it is a figure which includes within itself the removal of the curse, and the introduction of great material changes in this world, material blessing, but exactly what they will be, to put in physical or chemical terms, I doubt if even our most advanced scientists are in a position properly to do that. I certainly wouldn't be. I say, just take it in the most immediate literal ^{sense} sound and it just sounds terrible, but take it as the figures are given regularly and it fits in to a figure of something very wonderful. Yes? (8 3/4) That is an interesting suggestion, connecting it with Joel's the stars falling from heaven and that sort of thing, but I don't get out of it, it doesn't seem to me a picture of commotion so much as an increase. I don't quite feel that it fits with that. It is a change which is pictured as entirely to the good. We know literally it is a little hard (9 1/4) (stu.) Yes, it certainly would. But, say, now there is an interesting idea, I hadn't thought of that. The usual interpretation of 2 Peter is that the day of the Lord in which the elements will melt with fervent heat, is a day of a thousand years, a period of a thousand years, at the end of which comes the melting, because people say, well, how could there be any earthly millennium after all this has happened, on the other hand, Theodore (10) considers that the promise of--and Harnack said he was the most learned Biblical scholar of the last ~~d~~ century, as I recall. (10 1/4) was a very conservation man, a very godly man, a very great intellect, but Zahn(?) holds a view of revelation a little different from most interpreters. He holds that after you have the picture of the millennium then as it goes on and says a new heaven and a new earth, it is not describing what follows the millennium, but describing the millennium, that that is the new heaven and the new earth, that it is a regenerated earth. And if he should be right, then 2 Peter might refer to the removal of the curse at the beginning of the millennium, to the changing of conditions of this earth, with

the elements melting with fervent heat, it sounds to me thought a little more like destruction rather than regeneration. I don't know. But I know as far as revelation is concerned Dr. Zahn I thought made a very convincing argument for it (11) revelation, and I once had a meeting with Dr. Buswell and Dr. Harrison in which I rather strongly espoused Zahn's view, and they rather disgustedly opposed and criticized my attitude on the matter. We took it all down on the sundscr^{iber}, the evening of discussion. And I was a little sorry to see them^{both}/get quite so emotional about it, because I felt as if there was a lot to be said for Zahn's view, I thought he expressed it very well, but I frankly was unable to decide between the two. But they seemed to feel something was at stake and holding that Rev.21 comes after the millennium, it isn't a picture of the millennium. Now they may be right, it may come after, but I just can't ^{yet see}~~get~~ how something is so vitally at stake in holding (11 3/4)

I think that Rev.20 comes after 19 is very important. I think something is at stake there, because 19 describes the return of Christ and 20 describes the millennium, and there are those who say 20 describes the intermediate age prior to the return of Christ, ~~is~~ in the end of 19. I don't think you can just say a priori it can't be, but you examine the evidence and you find that the end of 19 the devil is cast--no, at the end of 19, the beast and the false prophet are cast into the lake of fire, and then in 20 you have Satan bound for a thousand years and then loosed for a season and then it says that he was put into the Lake of Fire where the beast and the false prophet are, which ties it up with 19 and says this comes later, but I don't think you have any such tie-up between 20 and 21. But I don't feel dogmatic at all, I would say I incline a little bit toward following Zahn, but even if you do follow Zahn, to say that 2 Peter is the beginning of the millennium. I am not ready to say it isn't but I'm just a little bit hesitant. Well, you get into a lot of interesting lines in these connections, but I think the vital thing is, like in Isaiah here, is to see what we can tell with certainty just from Isaiah alone, what he is talking about,

then to see what with ^{light}he added/you get from clear teaching elsewhere, what can we say further about what Isaiah predicts, then having done that then we see what added light can we get from Isaiah, and further details that we can bring in relation to those other things . But we must proceed very carefully upon it, and personally, I think getting emotional, as between various views that are both equally possible for Christians, ~~can~~ ^{tend to} make it harder for us to find the truth, rather than to make it easier for us to find just what the Bible is really saying.

I've often found in classes in the Prophets, in the ~~past~~, we take up...

30. (1/2)

...wonderful promise of the millennium, and I would find my students who came from premillennial background rejoiced in the clear evidence I'd find in Isa. 2 of the millennium, and then when I'd get on to Isa. 4, in which it seems to be an entirely different picture, Isa. 2 is a world in which there is peace, there is no more fighting, there is no more war, it is all done away with, they are under their vine and fig tree out in the open, there is nothing to fear . It is a picture of the millennial glory, the millennial peace, but when you get to ~~chapter~~ 4 you have a picture of the time when they have a ~~pavilion~~ pavilion for protection, they have protection from rain and from storm, and you have figures that are drawn from Israel coming through the wilderness. It seems to me that in 4 you have a picture of the pilgrimage journey of this age, with God's protecting hand on them. It is an entirely different picture from what you have in two, but I found students get very emotional about this. Two is millennial and four has got to be the millennial too. Well, the millennium is clearly taught in Scripture, but that doesn't mean that every prediction of the future has got to be the millennium, we can find pictures of other things clearly given in the Bible, but I have had much more, with my students, difficulty convincing them that four was not millennial than I ever had convincing them that two is the millennium. If you went over there to Westminster, you'd have the opposite (2)

I don't know, even there, though, a great many of their students come from the same background as our students. But the teaching there is very much against any (2 1/4) so they would joyously accept what and they would get the emotional reaction there too. It seems to me we shouldn't go to the Bible to find in it one particular view but take each passage and see what it is, see what is there and see how it fits into God's plan, as we find it elsewhere. Well, these verses then, through 26, seems to me form a pretty definite unit, and that the progress of thought is quite easy to trace. But when we get to 27, we have a sharp change, we have a new section, behold, ~~wo~~ something is going to happen. What is going to happen? There comes anger, there comes indignation, there comes a dividing fire, there comes a sifting of the nations. Well, you see this picture of 27 and 28, and you immediately say is this a picture of the day of great slaughter when the towers fall ~~that~~ is described in v.25? I think that is the immediate natural suggestion, but don't think it is the correct one. I think that that is one possibility when you take 27 and 28 by themselves.

30:27

Here is this situation at the end of the age, God has come with fire and indignation to pour out His wrath upon all that is wicked. Well, vv.27 and 28 would fit perfectly with that, but as we go on we may find that something else with which they fit equally well is what is really pictured. And we must remember, I think, that Isaiah always keeps his relationship to the background. He is in the immediate situation, from it he looks forward and sees various aspects of God's plan for the future, but he never gets too far away from his immediate situation, He returns to it repeatedly. And so the question is, in 27 and 28, is He in some way returning to His immediate background, or is He dealing with the end of the age, the day of the great slaughter, when the towers fall? Which is He dealing with in 27 and 28? And I doubt if anybody could prove which He means, from these two verses. The figures of it, it is a figurative passage, it is very plain the figure means decisive

action by the Lord. Action, showing His anger and His indignation. Vigorous action, it is action which fits the nations, and I might suggest that He talks about pouring out His wrath on the nations at the very end of the age, but it could fit with something a lot nearer. I just think that the Old English confuses us at the end of v.27, or 28 rather— where He says that there shall be a bridle in the jaws of the people, causing them to err. Why would God cause anybody to err? I don't think that is what it means? The Hebrew word meaning to wander or to turn aside, and I don't think it means to err from that which is right, to do that which is wrong, but it means to wander from that which they desire to do, to turn them aside from that which they had intended (5 3/4) causing them to turn aside, to wander. Wander is the idea of err. To wander. But when we say err, we don't mean simply wander, we mean wander from the path of righteousness. This means to wander (6) and I think it means that He put the bridle in the jaws of the people so that they have no--Hitler started out, he had his definite purposes, he knew what he was going to accomplish, it looked as if he was going to do it, but God put a bridle in His mouth and caused him to fail, caused him to make a few rather bad mistakes, and caused him in the end to wholly and completely fail. And I think that is what this means here.

But then v.29, in v.29 we have a verse of blessing, but it shows us what I think we could get out of vv.27 and 28, that the indignation of the Lord there is ^{directed} is/ not against God's people, but against the enemies of God's people. There is a bridle in the jaws of the people, causing them to err, this is not God's people. You have God's indignation against the earthly people, early in the chapter, we have His indignation against those who use His name and do not follow as He desires, but here we have His own people rejoicing, v.29, greatly rejoicing, coming to the mountain of the Lord, to the Holy One of Israel, rejoicing in the outpouring of God's indignation in vv.27 and 28. Now when do they do that? What is it fitted here beside? It seems

to me there are ^{only} two possibilities. It is the end of the age when the towers fall, or it is coming back to his immediate situation, which has (7 3/4) so large in previous chapters. And v.30 again doesn't tell us what it is.

The Lord will cause his glorious voice to be heard, and show the lighting down of his arm, with the indignation of his anger, and with the flame of a devouring fire, with scattering, and tempest, and hailstones. Is this a physical, literal statement of what God is going to do, or is this like the figure in v.27? His tongue as a devouring fire. Is it figurative language showing decisive destructive action on the part of God against His enemies? The great divine force. Well, v.31 tells us what it all is: For through the voice of the Lord shall the Assyrian be beaten down, which smote with a rod. And of course you could say the Assyrian was the great enemy of God, great enemy of God's people, the Assyrian is used as a figure of speech for all the enemies of God, in future time, and it can be used that way, but in this context I don't think it is, in this context I think it means specifically the Assyrian, because that's what we have in our previous three chapters. It is the danger that comes from the Assyrian as a result of Ahaz' clever scheme, they get into this great terrible danger from the Assyrian and at the beginning of chapter 29 we had pictured how man gets into terrible situation because of his clever schemes and forgetfulness of God, but God by His mighty power enters in and delivers him. So this, it seems to me, is an exact parallel to that. God will beat down the Assyrian by giving His people great armaments and tremendous force to accomplish things. He does that at times. But that's not what this verse says. Through the voice of the Lord will the Assyrian be beaten down. It is an act of divine power, which puts an end to the Assyrian. And of course you have, in Isaiah's day, you have the Assyrian empire, the greatest empire on the face of the world, Hitler said, that his realm would endure for a thousand years, and the Assyrian in Canaan certainly looked as if it would last for a thousand years, it was the solidest, most firmly established thing, ruling with

cruelty, over most of the known world, and reaching out for other sections, and within a century after it, they just disappeared completely. Completely ended. And of course that was prefigured, the complete end of the Assyrian empire, by the end of ~~the~~ Sennacherib's great attack upon Jerusalem, when Sennacherib was there with his tremendous army, on the Philistine plain, it looked absolutely hopeless, what would Jerusalem ever do? Once he took the notion to march up there, he could just take the city, and that's the end of Jerusalem, but the angel of the Lord smote thousands of the troops one night, the army melted away, and Sennacherib had to head back, as quickly as he could, head back home, before people would realize quite how weak he had become, and attack him. So through the voice of the Lord will the Assyrian be beaten down, which smote with a rod. After our look into the glorious future, through v.26, we come back to the immediate, and say Ahaz has got his clever scheme, the nobles are in with him, and this shows the attitude these nobles are taking, God is going to punish it, but ~~He~~ is still going to use it for His purposes, to make a great beacon on the mountain, this great ensign, but He still has His marvelous purposes of grace, He is waiting that He may be gracious, He is going to have this marvelous period of material blessing that is coming, but now the immediate result of the scheme of the nobles and of Ahaz, which looks hopeless, and God is in this case intervening, with His marvelous power, and through His voice, He is going to beat down the Assyrians, which smote with a rod the Assyrian. Comes with His physical power, which was very great, very (12) But God simply with His voice puts an end to it (12) The Assyrian smites with a rod, God simply uses His voice, beats them down.

Yes Mr. Cohen? (12) No, I'm referring to the leaders of the nation. The ones who had the banquet in chapter 28. I feel that we are still in that situation, whether Isaiah is still talking of the banquet, I doubt if they would have let him go on this long, but that he concludes his message, either verbally to his friends, or in writing,

or both, he continues the message he started in that situation, going on and dealing with God's relationship to the leadership of the people, which is at one with Ahaz in the scheme. I don't think Ahaz was a man like DeGaulle, who they say, you ask one of his cabinet, what is the policy of the French Government toward such-and-such a country, and he says, well, I knew half an hour what it was, but I haven't talked with DeGaulle since, and he determines and they follow, but I don't think Ahaz was that sort of an unusual able man, he doubtless had his group work with him, pretty closely. Yes, Mr. Cohen? (13 1/4) No, I don't think this was a specific, I certainly don't think they were hereditary leaders. There may, some of them, have been men who by virtue of their money or their power, had leadership in the nation, some of them may have had hereditary power and influence, but they were the men who you might say were Ahaz' close associates, they were the leaders of the people, and the people had to suffer for their attitude, as every nation does. Well, I guess the time is up and we haven't finished the chapter, but we're mighty near there...

31. (1/2)

...chapter 30 at our last meeting, and we are noticing how in the end of which, that latter part of the chapter, we had a section which, after the graciousness of the Lord, and His goodness, and what He is going to do for His people in the future, clear on to the very end of the age, then we had the expression, "the indignation of the Lord," and this indignation of the Lord certainly is not after the wonderful millennial blessings described in the previous verses. It is not after, nor at the same time, it must be before, but is it immediately before, or is he coming right back to the problems that are before him in this whole section, and dealing thus with events not 3000 or more years later, by saying maybe 20 years later. Well, we couldn't tell from vv.27 or 28, and then in v.29 we have great joy in what's going to happen, so it was definitely tied up in some way with the people of God to whom He is speaking. It associates with the great joy that they are having, and it is not it would seem

just a general outpouring of God's wrath upon the world but a definite deliverance that He is giving these people, something that very specifically relates to them. And then in v. 30 you have a rather general expression of what the Lord is going to do with His voice, but it is a great tempestuous, tremendous, sudden, exertion of His power that is going to occur. And in 31 it is tied up to present situations with the name of the Assyrian. Now of course, as we noticed, the Assyrians could be used, being the great aggressor of that day, it could be used as a general figure for great forces in the future, it could be. But it is not proven to be the ^{immediate} future by the use of the term Assyrian, but it certainly is at least suggested, and what you get from it, a sudden overthrow, which brings great joy to God's people and which is accomplished by a tremendous act of God's power alone, through the voice of the Lord, the Assyrian is beaten down. The Assyrian is beating with a rod, using human force, human effort, which is superior to anything that Judah or Israel could bring against him, but God is going to use His voice to overcome the greatest human force you can get. It exactly fits with Sennacherib's invasion, and God's deliverance. Just exactly fits with it, fits with the prediction given at the beginning of chapter 29, just precisely, and we have nothing taught elsewhere in the Scripture which it would necessarily fit well with for the last days. It does fit exactly with the immediate situation, the thought that is constantly coming back to his immediate situation, it seems to me that it is a reasonable interpretation of ^{verses} ~~chapter 20~~ 27-33.

Then we have the full section, 27-33, summarized in this verse 31, through the voice of the Lord shall the Assyrian be beaten down, which smote with a rod. And then the next verse is a rather general verse, which combines the power of the ~~Lord~~ Lord, and the joy of those of the observers who are delivered by it. In every place where the grounded staff shall pass, which the Lord shall lay upon him, the Lord (3 3/4) His power against the Assyrians, those who are delivered will be rejoicing with tabrets and harps, and the joy of those who are delivered, the power of the God who

delivers them, very fine, except that the last phrase I just don't know what to do with, --and in battles of shaking will he fight with it. One commentator suggests that the battle of shaking refers to the power of God and the pouring out of His wrath as being ^{like} the base of a great orchestra, and so he said, you have the soprano in the tabrets and the harps and you have the bass in the sound of the shaking that comes with the Lord's battle. Well, now whether his imagination is running rather freely on that, I don't know, but I personally am not prepared to say what this last part of the verse means. I don't think my ignorance of the meaning of this last part of the verse in any way casts doubt on the interpretation of the passage as a whole, but I would like some ~~inf~~ further evidence as to how to put that in, and in battles of shaking will he fight with it, ^{as you can see,} the words are such that there could easily be some other sort of a translation of these words here, fitting them together--will he fight with it, is a very general phrase, but exactly what it means, I don't know. Perhaps there is some parallel elsewhere in Scripture, perhaps some other use of one of these words, perhaps there is something that will make it very clear, perhaps there is something somebody can think of, the explanation of these words, that will throw further light on the whole situation and fit in with the situation as we find it in the rest, but up to the present time have not observed.

Well, then v.33 is an interesting verse: For Tophet is ordained of old. What is Tophet? Tophet is a place just outside Jerusalem, where they used to burn refuse, and the fires ~~flam~~ flamed up from there, and there was a story that before that, when the Canaanites has the place, that they used to pass their babies through the fire to the ~~of~~ god Molech, at that place, so that there was the human sacrifice offered at that place, Tophet, and Tophet is used as a figure for ~~in~~ternal burning, in the Scriptures. I believe it is the same as the Valley of Hinnom, referred to in the New Testament (6)

and Gehenna is the Greek form which it has taken. But it says Tophet is ordained of

old, yea, for the king it is prepared. Now is this the king, or is this melachir, is it really Molech? Is it really the Molech who was formerly worshipped there when they had human sacrifices to Molech, or is ^{it} perhaps a play on words, in referring to a king which has the same consonants as the former god Molech had.

At any rate, if you relate this to the present situation, the king would seem not to be the king of Israel surely here, but the king of Assyria, and if the king of Assyria, that Tophet is prepared for him, well, Sennacherib didn't go there, Sennacherib went back safely to his own land, lived there 20 years, and then was assassinated by his sons, so that the only way that it seems to me it can be fit into that situation, is that it refers to the ultimate destiny, that for this wicked aggressor, God has His ultimate purpose, His ultimate plan, he is going to lose out in this world, through the voice of the Lord will the Assyrian be beaten down, but eventually he is to pay for his misdeeds, that Tophet is ordained for him, the pile of fire and much wood, the breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone, kindles it, that it is the picture of the ultimate fate of the king of Assyria, the great wicked aggressor here described.

Now that seems to me to do justice to the words here, and to fit into the thought quite generally, but perhaps there is something of a jump in bringing it in, we have not had much similar in other passages to parallel. So that if any of you come up with further evidence to prove this is right, or with an alternative explanation of it, which might fit better, I would be greatly interested. I feel that it is quite clear from 27-31 and that 32 and 33 seem to fit in with the same general interpretation. But I hardly-- it hardly seems to me that 33 can be taken as purely a figurative statement, the king of Assyria is going to lose out, seems to me that there must be more to it than that. He is going to lose out, he has a downfall, destruction for him, put in these vivid terms, it seems to me there must be more literal to it than that. And if so, the relation to his ultimate destiny would seem to me to be the most scholarly interpretation. It is interesting that we have this section starting in 29, with the hearth of God,

they kill sacrifices, the place where the flames are, here we have the breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone kindling, the pile thereof is fire and much wood, and you get to the end of chapter 31, and there you read about the Lord whose fire is in Zion and his furnace in Jerusalem. It is interesting, this stress on this particular idea, which may to some extent tie it together, but the idea of a picture of eternal destruction right here, while it seems to me probably to be justified, we don't have enough parallel to make me feel certain that it is (9)

Now in chapter 31 it seems to me that we have a definite break between 30 and 31. We've been talking about Assyria, and now we're talking about Egypt. It is not a tremendous break, we're still in the same area, we're in the same general situation, we're dealing with the same people, but it seems to me that 31 is to quite an extent a recapitulation of 30, that we have here a parallel right through 31 to 30, as if the prophet said, now I've gone through, I've given this great message for the future, looked to Egypt for help, Egypt doesn't help them, this spirit of always looking to someone else instead of God for their aid, this spirit is going to result in destruction and difficulty for them, but they will remain a great indication of God's purpose, a great witness to Him, a beacon, an ensign on a hill, but God is not through with them, He is going to be gracious to them, God's purpose is yet going to be fulfilled in the world, He has a marvelous millennial blessing ahead for all these people, and before the millennial blessing, He has great spiritual blessing along the way, but now we come back to the immediate, the danger from Assyria, that is brought in, they're going to send to ~~S~~ Egypt for help, Egypt will not be able to deliver them, but God is going to deliver them by His mighty power. Even though they've made these mistakes, God still has His purpose in Israel, God is going to accomplish His purpose through us, if we let Him, in spite of us, if we don't, so He is going to accomplish His purpose here, so He is going to deliver from Assyria. Now we've had those four elements here in 30, and you might say the prophet stopped and he thinks well, now, I've

given some marvelous glimpses of the future, I look way ahead to the great blessings God is going to give in the end, will the listeners lose the immediate message that is so vital for now? Had I better recapitulate the immediate message to be sure they get that? So he says, all right, let's recapitulate the immediate message, without recapitulating the marvelous glimpses^{of} to the future. So he starts in at the beginning of 31 and he recapitulates the first part of 30, and in fact he says, in 30, I told them that if they get help from Egypt, it's going to be terribly expensive, they're going to have to send a great deal of stuff to Egypt to get it. Well, I dealt with that sufficiently, I don't need to stress that again, but I have said that sending to Egypt is not going to help because the Egyptians will not really give them help, they will sit still and do nothing, and they will, all they spend is going to be worthless, well, he says I'm going to recapitulate and put a little more stress on the element of the fact, that even if the Egyptians do give them help, the Egyptians are only men, the men are not gods, they should look to God for their help, not to mere men like the Egyptians. So he starts in, woe to them that go down to Egypt for help, and put their trust in horses, and chariots. I don't think that "stay on" probably conveys the idea of the present-day meaning of stay on horses. Put their stay, put their trust, it's a parallel to trust (12 1/4) their trust in chariots, stay on horses. It doesn't mean that they're able to stick on the horse no matter how much they buck, they won't be thrown off, it means they're putting their trust in a horse, and in modern English it ~~does~~ just doesn't carry it. I didn't notice that, unfortunately, in going over our Scofield, so I didn't make a suggestion to change that word there, but I wish I had now, because I think stay is certainly here archaic. Trust in horses and in chariots, and in horsemen, they say these Egyptian horsemen are strong, got lots of chariots, they put their trust in great amounts of human resources, instead of looking to the Holy One of Israel, seeking the Lord, and He has, ~~that~~ this is the big thought all through, it is in the Holy One of Israel, it is in the Lord that you can find help, not in ...

...human sources, not to God. He says, yet he also is wise and will bring evil. Will God bring evil? Is God the author of evil? What does it mean, God will bring evil? Does that not contradict our whole teaching about God being a good God? I think evil here is physical evil, and my personal conviction is that the word, raph, the Hebrew word that is translated "evil" or "bad" is a word which describes physical harm or destruction, rather than moral evil. There are other words that describe moral evil. This word can be applied to moral evil, as we can use that which is physical as figurative, that which is spiritual, but its primary application I believe is ^{to the} physical. Like when this word is ~~is~~ used when Jeremiah brought out the figs to show to people, and it says that he had two bags, one of them ~~was~~ ^{were} delicious, lovely figs, and the other one were naughty figs, so naughty that you couldn't stand them, naughty you couldn't eat them. Well, the word naughty there is the Old English translation of the same word "raph." They were evil figs, naughty figs, but in our present sense, both of them mean moral, and what this means, the figs aren't moral, aren't morally bad, the figs are simply spoiled, they are an illustration of that which is morally bad, or an illustration of that which is weak and not good for much, but it is not in itself moral. And it is like the good cows and the bad cows that Pharaoh saw in his dream, the good healthy fine cows, and the worn-out, good-for-nothing cows. They represent the years of famine and the years of plenty, it is not moral. So here it doesn't say God is the author of evil, but it says that God is going to bring harm, God is going to bring harm, is not not going to call back His word, the harm is going to come, but God is going to deliver from it, God will arise against the house of evil doers, and against the help of them that work iniquity. Now he says the Egyptians are men and not gods, why do you trust the Egyptians instead of trusting God? Yes? (2 1/2) There is--what is the "he" in the Hebrew? ...them that work iniquity. It seems to me that it is describing that which the Lord would do, and that just before we had Egypt mentioned, we had the Lord mentioned, we haven't had any

specific Egyptian mentioned. We have God who is one mentioned before, so it would seem to me that from the viewpoint of grammar there would be a presumption it was the one mentioned, the Lord, rather than the nation mentioned, Egypt. A presumption but not a proof, but it would seem to me the proof would be in the content, that the content describes what the Lord does rather than what the Egyptian does. It is not a thing you can dogmatically say, this is now going to talk about the Lord, it doesn't say the Lord. The "he" you have to decide from context always, but in this case the content of the verse, rather than the context of the previous verses, would seem to me to warrant our saying it is the Lord here spoken of. Yes? (3 3/4) Yes, the Lord had said that you make this scheme with Assyria, to get deliverance from Ephraim, and ~~Ass~~ Syria, they had made this scheme, God says that the covering is too narrow to wrap yourself in, the bed is too short to stretch yourself on, He says this scheme of yours is not going to work, it is going to backfire, you get rid of the states in between and you're in tremendous danger from Assyria, and they say, well right, we will trust in Egypt then, ~~Egypt~~ will deliver us from Assyria. He says, yet God is wise, God says He is going to bring harm, He'll bring it and He won't call back His word, what He declares is going to stand, he said you're wrong to make this alliance with Assyria, He is going to see that you get the harm that He has predicted, He will not call back His word, but He says, nevertheless He is going to rise against the ~~house~~ house of evildoers, against the help of them that work iniquity. Now you could take the last part as still referring to Israel, the evildoers were making alliance with Assyria, God's going to rise against them. I incline to think that it's better to take it ~~simply~~, since we have it so abundantly taught in the other chapters, near, that it's going onto the second phase of God's wrath. God is going not to call back His words,

(5) but God is going to deliver you from it, He is going to rise against the house of evildoers. I appreciate questions being raised on this thing, we want to examine the evidence carefully, this is not the

simplest part of the Scripture by any means, but I do think that when we examine it carefully we find a clear guidepost to show what is being given. Yes? (5 1/2)

Yes, the help would probably be the Egyptians, the house of evildoers, the Assyrians, and then you think the Egyptians will deliver you, that their help will deliver you, well, God will cause that neither one shall. I would incline that way.

Now we continue, v. 3: Now the Egyptians are man and not God; their horses-- you've got a lot of horses, tremendous lot, only he says their horses are flesh and not spirit. When the Lord shall stretch out his hand, both he that helps shall fall, and he that is holpen shall fall, good Old English, like in Luke 1, the Lord hath holpen His people Israel. He that is holpen shall fall down, and they all shall fail together. The Lord says, you're not going to get deliverance through Egypt or through Assyria. He says, this thing of playing off one human deliverance against another, is in the end going to fail. We have to break (6 1/2) sometime, break this alliance, and turn to God, turn to the only source of permanent help. He that helps and he that is holpen shall fall down, and they all shall fail together. For thus the Lord hath spoken unto me, like as the lion and the young lion roaring on his prey, (I'm getting oriental, roaring on his prey) when a multitude of shepherds is called forth against him, he will not be afraid of their voice, nor abase himself for the noise of them. What is this a figure of thus far? Well, we wouldn't know. Is he talking about the Assyrian coming? What is he talkigg about? Well, the end of the verse tells us. So shall the Lord of hosts come down to fight for mount Zion, and for the hill thereof. And you might say, are we justified in saying that the end of v. 2, "will arise against the house of the evildoers," mean God arises against the Assyrians and the Egyptians to deliver? Well, you ~~could~~ certainly couldn't draw it from the end of v. 2 alone, but it's a possible interpretation, and it is what is given clearly, explicitly in v. 4. So shall the Lord of hosts come down to fight for Mount Zion, and for the hill thereof. There is a clear statement that the Lord is going to

31:4

deliver Jerusalem. You can't deliver them by getting help from the Egyptians, that won't work, your human schemes are going to fail, but you're not going to go under, because God still has purposes of grace that He is going to work out. He is preserving Israel with the intention~~s~~ to ~~pre~~pare the way for the coming of His Son into the world, no matter mistakes Israel does, no matter how they feel, no matter what tremendous forces come against them, God's purpose is going to be accomplished, and Israel cannot be taken captive till God chooses Himself for His own purposes to permit it to be done. So he says He will deliver like a great lion that nothing can stop. So, he says, no matter how many shepherds ~~he~~ ^{you} call~~s~~ together, to do your will, thinking your plans are going to work out, the Lord is like a great lion, roaring on His prey, He will come down to fight for mount Zion and for the hill thereof. He will deliver Jerusalem. He doesn't promise to deliver Judah. He doesn't promise to deliver Israel. The Assyrian takes Israel captive, then Sennacherib captures all Judah except Jerusalem. But the Lord delivers Jerusalem, which after all, was the main large city, the greatest thing, the central stronghold, and meant that when the Assyrian marched back, the rest of Judah was available to them, and they had nearly another hundred years before they were taken captive. And then, not by the Assyrian but by the Babylonian. So that you have your transition from first, the Egyptians can't protect you, but the Lord will protect you. The transition occurs here between vv.3 and 4, but I think you already have, in the last half of 2, the groundwork laid for what is explicit in 4. And then v.5 declares again, back in chapter 31 we read that through the voice of the Lord, the Assyrian will be beaten down. It was through His voice, not a physical sending an army or something like that, it is through the voice of the Lord, it is by a superhuman, mysterious, supernatural way, God is going to do it, and to give another figure to express the same thing. And in v.5 he does not give a prediction of warfare with airplanes in modern ~~times~~, as some have drawn from this verse, that is not what he is giving here, any more than back in Isaiah, at

the end of Isa. 3, he was predicting the tire shortage during the war, as the Governor of Texas declared in a public address. That is not his purpose here at all. He is here describing the way he is going to deliver from Sennacherib, and he says that there will--it will be like birds flying. Well, in those days what could they do about birds flying. The birds fly up over head and you might be able to hit them with rocks, or with arrows, but they can fly high enough that you can't reach them. The birds fly overhead and there is nothing you can do about it. And that's the way God is going to deliver Jerusalem, going to deliver it by a power beyond your reach, something which doesn't seem to you to be a tremendous forceful attack of an army, or anything like that, it is the divine intervention by an unusual method, ^{just as where he said} that the voice of the Lord will beat down the Assyrian ~~which~~ smote with a rod. Here, like birds flying, the Lord will descend, the Lord covers you might say like birds over (11 1/4) their young, over their nest, like the bird flying, that's how, by the power that you can't reach, the Lord accomplishes, and of course the way He accomplishes it, we're told in chapter 37, through the angel of the Lord killing thousands of them, in one night. Yes? (11 1/4) The 4th verse, yes, the Lord of hosts will come down to fight for mount Zion, and for the hill thereof. That's part of it. (stu.) Well, that particular picture, the 4th verse, doesn't particularly fit (11 3/4) the young lion roaring on his prey, or in the 5th verse, --the 4th verse, the stress in the 4th, is on the power, the irresistible power. The young lion roars on his prey, and they call forth a multitude of shepherds against him. He is not afraid of their voice, he doesn't abate himself for their noise. It is the picture of people before they had guns, when a lion would come against them and all they could do is run. Even if you get a bunch of shepherds. What could they do, without a gun? All they could do is run. The lion comes through and they're ~~not~~ ended. And he says that's the way the Lord comes. It is the irresistible power of God that is pictured in v.4. But the lion roaring hardly fits with the quietness of it, that fits (12 3/4)

the birds flying over, is again the irresistible power, but it is the irresistible power of a type that could not represent a human army. The quietness, the irresistible power of God in an unexpected way, but in 4, simply the irresistible power is brought out, under this vivid picture of the lion. A very different picture from the picture of the birds' flying....

33. (1/2)

...then we have the rest of v.5, the Lord defending them, he will deliver them, in passing over, he will preserve them. The general idea of the passing over, makes you think perhaps of the Passover in Egypt, how the Lord smote the Egyptians and He passed over those who were under the blood. Passing over he will deliver them. Again it fits with the birds flying, defending them in general terms ^{which} fits with this kind of protection, but which would more usually be used with the more forceful army-type protection. But it could fit.

So then we have the folly of trusting Egypt, ~~but~~ the fact that God will deliver. These, of which one is brought out in the beginning of chapter 30, the other not till the end of 30, they are both brought out here in these first five verses of chapter 31. And the second of them, the deliverance from the Assyrian, by the mighty power of God is brought out very clearly in vv. 8 and 9, at the end here, that which is limited to the last part of 30 is here brought out in the early part of 31 but again ~~at~~ at the end very clearly, --Then shall the Assyrian fall with the sword, not ~~of~~ a mighty man, and what is the Hebrew word translated here "mighty man" Mr. Cohen? (2 1/4) Yes. He took it right out of his head, he has got this whole Hebrew memorized. Of a mighty man. And the sword ~~of~~ not of a mean man shall devour man. What is the mean man, Mr. Grauley? (2 1/4) Good, he's got it memorized too, very good. So we have eash and arah, here. Now how do you get mighty man out of eash and mean man out of arah? Well, you know Adam was a mean man, he took the apple his wife gave him, instead of refusing ~~it~~ it. He was mean, wasn't he? But that's not what

the English word mean means. Here it means low, here it means one of little power, but why does (2 3/4) mean of little power? I don't think it is a good translation. To get the idea sufficiently, though I don't say the verse is at all misrepresented by the translation, but the word each is a man compared with a ^{wo}man, here is a man (3) and the woman So speaking of the man who they say is not as physically well put together as the woman, women on the whole live longer than men do, they have perhaps a better physical constitution than men, but the man has the stronger muscles, he is muscularly strong, and the medical aspects of it probably weren't known to people in those days, but the difference in muscles has always been, so that (3 3/4) is not erroneous at all, to call it a mighty man, but he doesn't say "a mighty man." That would be (3 3/4) of a mighty man, but here it is just a man. But when you say an (3 3/4) or an well you mean the same thing. (3 3/4) is humanity, it means man regardless of sex, it means humanity, and you say it is just a parallel, it means no kind of a man, so if you say, not a mighty man, nor a mean man, you're saying the same thing, not a big man, nor a little man--not any kind of a man, but the precise meaning is not in the Hebrew. The Hebrew is just two words for a man, not any kind of a man. So it seems to me that the King James Version gets the sense of it exactly, but that it can hardly be called a literal translation, in this particular case. I doubt if the King James Translators would have taken that much liberty with the text. My guess is that probably in the Latin or in the Greek translation you would find that somebody else took the liberty and the King James Translators followed them, I don't know. I think very often that is the case, when you find (4 1/2) like that. They're following an old tradition, because I don't think ordinarily they would take that much liberty with it, they tried to be as literal as they could, with the Hebrew. And in this case, ^{literally,} it would be to take them both man, any kind of man.

31.8
 Not a man, nor a human being, that would be the most literal. Not from a man will they fall, not from a human being will they fall, that would be an exact rendering. But of course, what does it mean? The Assyrian won't fall with the sword of a mighty man, of a man, the sword of a human being won't devour him, but he shall flee from the sword, there is a Hebrew word (5 1/4) --he shall flee for himself, which doesn't make much reason, why should he have to flee for himself? Why put in a (5 1/2) there, as some of the manuscripts have, instead of which seems to me to have considerable to be said in its favor, that it's not that he shall flee from the sword, but ~~that~~ he shall not flee from the sword. He won't flee from the sword of a man, he won't flee, he won't be destroyed by the sword of humanity, no sword is what will destroy him, but he will flee. Well, now, if you change he will flee into he won't flee, maybe that isn't so good, so perhaps it's better to stick to the "him," and say, but he will flee for himself from the sword, and his ~~young~~ men will be overwhelmed, that it's not a human sword that devours the Assyrians, it is the angel of the Lord who comes down and kills some thousands in the night, the pestilences the Lord uses destroys the Assyrian army, and then the king of Assyria, who himself is not destroyed in the pestilence, knows that with the small group that is left to him, once the Jews find out what has happened, he'll be in mortal danger. They would certainly attack and wreck him, after that, so he'd better get out of there in a hurry, so he flees for himself from the sword, after his ~~force~~ has been destroyed not by the sword of any kind of a man, but by God's intervention, and his young men, the young men that weren't killed with the pestilence, they better flee with him, because there is too few of them to do anything now. So the Assyrian defeat, not by human power, but by divine intervention is described repeatedly in these various verses. And v.9, he will pass over to his strong hold for fear--some try to take that as "his rock," literally, that this means he goes into his own territory, gets to his first fortress, but it seems--

to me it's better to take the rock as standing for his capital city of Nineveh, or for the power of his empire as a whole, that he gets away from this distant place, to which he had come in order to destroy Jerusalem, then he heads back to what is his actual domain, of strength, his rock, where it would be pretty hard to get at him. And for fear, in view of his small number of men he had left, he heads back to his strong hold, and his princes are afraid of the ensign--interesting to bring in the banner here, Hebrew word is (7 3/4) literally banner, they are afraid of the ensign, afraid of this sign, this indication of a supernatural power which has protected Israel, makes Israel an ensign, a sign that it is God's instrument for His purpose. He is afraid of the ensign, says the Lord, whose fire is in Zion, and his furnace in Jerusalem. We had the fire, we had the furnace, at the end of v.33. I don't see that this is a parallel to that at all. This refers back to the beginning of 29, the hearth of God, this place in Jerusalem is where all these tensions (8 1/2)

but the greatest force of the day comes there and vows to destroy Jerusalem, but God delivers Jerusalem by His own power. It is the place where His mighty purposes are worked out, it is His hearth, the place where there is fire and his furnace, not fire and furnace in the sense used in 33 of the previous chapter, of the destruction but of the tensions, the great changing forces. Reminds of 1959 when I got into Berlin, and I immediately went to the Free University in (9) to see if-- I was only going to be there four days--I could hear some good lectures. And I found that the lectures that day in the University didn't interest me particularly, but they had, that evening, in the Institute for Political Science, which was further down town, they had advertised out at the University, a lecture that evening, on Berlin (9 1/2) Berlin, Burning Point of Europe, so I went to the lecture that night and I was so sleepy, having been all the night before on the plane -- it was all I could do to keep my eyes open, but I heard a lecture, a 40-minute, 50-minute talk on all these crises that are coming together in Berlin, the tensions of

the different countries of Europe, all showing themselves there. ~~It~~ Don't think they even dreamed that two years later the wall would be put straight across the middle of the city, but you could feel the tension there. Berlin is the (10) point of the present situation because the tensions are coming together there, and showing themselves there, and Jerusalem was the place where the tension between the power of God and the power of evil is displayed and the people turning against God and not carrying out His purpose, but God intervened with His mighty power, showing to all the world that His purposes will be accomplished, and so we have chapter 31 ending with this note which began 29, so although we have a unit that runs from chapter 28 to the end of 35, within that unit, you might say we have a subordinate unit, a unit which runs from 29, 30, and 31, which is dealing very specifically with this situation, the outworking of the scheme they made, to bring in Assyria into their situation, outworking in terrible danger for them, but in God's deliverance to them, and looking ahead on to the distant future, as we had in chapter 29 when he shows his turning to the Gentiles, he shows the wild olive branch as being grafted in to the olive tree, and in chapter 30, it shows the Israelites being the beacon on the hill, the emblem, the ensign to show, to witness to God's power, and he goes on there to look forward to the ultimate graciousness is to show to the Israelites and to all of these people, and he in 31 had this one verse, in v.22, which shows that forceful action in which the people from the exile on are going to turn utterly away from idolatry and say to the idols, "Get thee hence," and so now in 31 we notice the beginning and the ending, but we skip two verses, and these two verses represent the whole middle half or two-thirds of chapter 30. In that middle half and two-thirds of 30 he looks forward to the ~~time~~ ^{millennium,} he looks to the period just before the millennium, and he showed the removal of idolatry among the Israelites from the exile on. Well, here, he just devotes two verses to that whole long section, and deals with that which is most immediate, he says turn ye unto him from whom

the children of Israel have deeply revolted. For in that day — in other words, for a day is coming when every man will cast away his idols of silver and his idols of gold, which your own hands have made unto you for a sin. The turning away from idolatry, which is described in 31 and characteristic of Israel all through this age, this is the one element in that long passage in 30 which he recapitulates here in 31 at this place...

34. (3/4)

...now after this section that runs from 29 through 31, he continues in four more chapters of which the last two are rather unified, and perhaps not so difficult to see what the purpose of them is, the last two. They look way on to the future, but before these last two that look way on to the future, we have the two chapters that come first ahead of those, chapters 32 and 33, and of these two chapters, chapter 32 starts in a most interesting way, so I would like to ask you to look into 32 and 33, particularly 32, for next time, look into both of them, but hand me in a written piece of paper by 11 o'clock next Monday morning, a written statement by Monday morning at 11, and on that written paper, you need deal only with chapter 32, but try to get 33 also a good deal in mind so we can probably get to it by Tuesday. But Monday turn this in written about 32.

And I'd like you to look at these verses of 32, and ask yourselves this question, here we are in this book dealing with the nobles, dealing with the leaders, do we have any direct statement specifically referring to the political situation of Isaiah's day? The immediate or a little later in Isaiah's time, in each verse, ask yourself about each verse. Secondly, if the verse about that, does the verse deal with God's plans in the very distant future, or does He deal with not quite so distant? That is to say, is the passage talking about the Ephraimitic-- Syro-Ephraimitic alliance, and Tiglath-pileser's dealing with him, is it talking about their getting help from Egypt, is it talking about the time of the exile, is it talking about

the first coming of Christ? Is it talking about the period after the first coming of Christ, or is it talking about the millennium? Do you find clear evidence in the verse, what particular time or situation it is talking about. That's number 1 about each verse.

Secondly, who is the verse talking to? Is it talking about God's own, His true believers, regardless of racial background? Is it talking of people of a certain racial background regardless of whether they're believers or not? Or what exactly is the meaning of the particular verse? And thus see if you can't work out what is the trend of thought here. Now do that for each verse of 32 for next time. There are 20 verses in that and 24 in the next, so that's a fairly even division. And then study into 33.

But now in 32, it's interesting how it begins, begins with a very interesting verse, behold, a king shall reign in righteousness. What have we had about a king reigning in righteousness yet in our present section, from 28 on? We have had nothing, have we? We had in 33 of 31 that Tophet is prepared for the king, that's no king who reigns in righteousness. Our emphasis has not been on kings from 28 on, we are dealing with the nobles, we are dealing with the leaders of the people, not with the kings, but now we have a promise which **would** certainly seem to remind us of the promises of Isaiah 7, that Immanuel is coming, God with us, and the Assyrians can't destroy this land because it's Immanuel's land, and the government will be upon His shoulders, Immanuel's. Now is this referring to that or is it just a prediction that Hezekiah is going to (4 3/4) ? Well, you may vote one way or

the other on that if you want, but I will at least say this, listen to the verse now:

Behold a king shall reign in righteousness and princes shall rule in judgment.

We have 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 --I have noted seven passages which have similar promises in. If you have others to mention why just jot them down on a piece of paper and give them to me after class, but I have these seven to note. Now we have five minutes

left, I think I can read the seven. Listen to them closely and when I get through with them, tell me whether you think there is anything in this verse that is markedly different from every one of the seven parallels to which I ~~know~~ direct your attention. Here, I read to you again: Behold a king shall reign in righteousness and princes shall rule in judgment. There in Jer.23.5 we will read these words: Behold the day is coming that the Lord thou wilt raise unto David, ~~the~~^a righteous branch and a king shall reign and prosper and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. I won't take time now, since there is little time, to read much of the context, but you notice how similar it is to 32.1, behold a king shall ~~reign~~ in righteousness and princes shall rule in judgment.

Then to Isa.9.6,7, and there in Isa.9.6,7, there is a very familiar verse, for unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulders, his name shall be called wonderful, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the prince of ~~pe~~ ace, of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom to order and establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever. And 11.4, Isa.11.4:

But with righteousness shall he judge the poor and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth, when he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked, And Isa.2.4 and 7 say:

He shall judge among the nations, to rebuke many people--you're familiar with that, of course. Isa.2.4.

And Micah 4.4 is the parallel to it, and Ps.110.2 is the wonderful promise which says the Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion, rule thou in the midst of thine enemies, And one more:

Isa.24.23, where we read that verse, then the moon shall be confounded and sun ashamed when the Lord of hosts shall reign in mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before His ancient glory. Now we read (break) .. ⁷/_{are} parallel to this I believe: behold,

a king shall reign in righteousness. What is there in our present verse that found no parallel in the other? Mr. Abbott? Yes, our present verse ~~is~~ -- all these other wonderful promises, Immanuel's coming, he is going to reign, the nearest to it is 24, where the Lord of hosts, which is Christ, there, is going to reign in mount Zion, and before his ancient glory. But there it doesn't say they reigned ~~with~~ with him, it says he reigns before his (8 1/4) glory. But this one says, a king shall reign in righteousness and princes shall rule in judgment. Why here alone, in all the wonderful promises of Immanuel, do we have the princes here? Because, while the great outstanding thing is that Christ is going to reign, and that's so important, everything pales into insignificance in comparison with it, yet this section here, from chapter 24-35 is dealing not with Ahaz, and the king, the house of David, but primarily with the leaders of the people, primarily with the nobles, with those who were associated with the wicked plan, and he is telling us that there will be leaders of God's people who will be entirely true to Him, and they are to have rich blessing, they are to rule with Christ, and of course we're told in Revelation 24.6 how they shall rise again, those who are his and they shall reign with Christ, a thousand years. It is a truth which is brought out later, clearly brought out in Revelation, but it is a truth which is so secondary in comparison with the far greater truth of His reigning, that ordinarily you don't even read sources, but in this one place it is brought out because here that is the emphasis of our passage, it is on the leaders of the people, rather than on the king specifically. I thought that was a very interesting point which I only noticed this noon, which I never thought of before, so I looked up all these verses, found it works out, but I think it is quite valid, if any of you thinks it isn't, please write out a statement why, and give it to me next time...

(break in record from 10 to 11 1/4)

...passage now that we were starting last time to look at. We are not at all, as if we had a chapter absolutely detached to try to interpret. We have many clues, or

much help for its interpretation given by the context which has preceded it. We have no reason to feel that there is any sharp break between this 32nd chapter and the chapters before. We have no reason to think such a thing, we have every reason to think that it will continue in relation to what precedes. As we have already noticed, v.1 seems to fit exactly with the whole context of the preceding. Of course, it is the first bringing in of the idea of the king. We have been dealing with the people, with the leaders of the people, rather than with the king, but in the parallel section, in Isa. 7-12 the king is what is in the foreground, and the general idea about the king there is the general idea about the leaders of the people here, so v.1 is very natural in relation to what precedes, as being you might say, a resume of what you find in chapter 7, the whole ~~same~~ situation referred to the king, but of course, not starting with the king. Because there is this other verse which deals with...

35. (1/2)


... which deals with the matter of the leaders, princes shall rule. We have no (3/4) of princes anywhere that I recall ~~anywhere~~ in chapters 7-12. There it is the king alone who is in mind. Well, we've been thinking of the nobility, of the leaders, of the ruling class, up to the present point, and we continue speaking of them, princes will rule in judgment, not like these here, but we have the king also brought in. So that v.1 of 32 would seem to fit very nicely with what precedes, and as we go on in 32 we have every reason to think it is connected with what precedes, and if it is, then we think of what are the possibilities? One possibility is that the prophet might at any time turn his attention away from ideas of the future, to an immediate address to his own contemporaries. That is always a possibility in prophecy. He is talking to the people there, he might say something directly to them. That is one possibility, another possibility is he may speak with very definite reference to the historical situation, which had been discussed rather fully, he may refer to it,

he may deal with it specifically, though it has already been discussed quite fully. But then in dealing with the historical situation he has looked on beyond this, and seen things that are going to happen in the distant future, which are logically related to the more immediate situation, and having already stopped at that, it would not be at all unnatural if he were to continue looking on into the future. It will be quite unusual for a prophet to start with that, a prophet does not often in the Bible simply start in and say now I'm going to tell you what's going to happen 2000 years from now. That is not the usual approach, the usual approach is dealing with immediate situations, with rebuke for sin, or with blessing upon people if they will follow the Lord, some way of dealing directly with their situation, and then bringing added argument from glimpses of the future, or added explanations of God's attitude from something in the future, and thus we have had already in our section, we've looked forward in the immediate situation to the coming of Sennacherib, and God's delivering them from Sennacherib. We've looked on to the leaders fleeing and then being reduced to being a beacon on the top of a mountain, we've looked at that, we've looked at the ~~cause~~^{calling} of the Gentiles, to the continuation of the spiritual blessing of the Lord, but with the transfer of the center of emphasis from these Jewish leaders who are proving unworthy to a new group of spiritual leaders. Now what follows may then at any time, he may take any one of these different aspects for his starting point, or his point of ~~entry~~^{emphasis}. He may do it. It is altogether possible to introduce some other entirely new idea, but we will require very definite proof if we do. Otherwise it will be rather natural if we are continuing the same discourse, to expect it to fit in with one of the main emphases already recognized. So we looked at v.1 last time, and noticed that in v.1 we have something which would seem to look to the distant future. Some commentators say this is a prediction of Hezekiah, and it is true that Hezekiah was a great improvement over Ahaz, he was indeed a righteous king, but in the context, the context would seem to look for something much greater, much more important than

Hezekiah. It would seem to look these great wonderful promises of the more distant future that he is stressing, and if you take it in its fullest meaning, certainly that must be what is involved here. The Immanuel spoken of in 7-12 He is going to reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment. If that is what you're speaking of then this looks forward to the very end of the present age, looks forward to the millennial period when ~~He~~ will indeed reign in righteousness. So there you have two possibilities regarding this, first a specific looking to Hezekiah which we cannot completely rule out. But either that or the definite promise of Immanuel who with his princes shall rule in righteousness. When we look at v.2, and v.2 seems to tie up with v.1, I think that a certain question may be raised, is v.2 speaking about the same time as v.1, or is it speaking of the same individual, but at a different time? That would be a possibility. And it's rather difficult to see how the first two would refer to Hezekiah. If Hezekiah rules in righteousness and his princes rule in judgment, well, ~~that~~ is fine, it is excellent to have as good a king as you have in Hezekiah, but are you justified in using such language as in v.2? Well, if you read what the King James translators said about the great wonderful sun that rose on the land of England when King James came to be there, great king and all that, the preface that is in many of our books, you will think that they could have written this about Hezekiah, but I incline to think that most of the Biblical writers are a little more chaste in their language, a little more sober in their expression, a little more true to historical fact than the fulsome dedicatory epistle which the King James translators felt they had to do in order to continue the favor of that slobbering ^{2.} pedant who asked them to do the work.

So I cannot feel that this v.2 is Hezekiah. A man who is a hiding place from the wind, a covert from the tempest, rivers of water in a dry place, shadow of a great rock in a weary land. It seems to me this must be the true Immanuel that is here spoken of. And if this is the true Immanuel, that would fit very clearly, very definitely,

with the first being Immanuel rather than being Hezekiah. But if this is Immanuel you could describe the activity of Christ as He reigns in the Millennium in these figures, but I don't think you'd be apt to do so. This seems to fit with Isa.4 more than with Isa.2. It seems to describe not a time when there is not external danger, as the millennium is described as being, but rather a time when there still is external danger, there is wind, there is tempest, there are dry places, there is a weary land, but in this there is a shelter, there is a shade, there is a refuge, there is a wonderful opportunity for those who put their trust in Him, so my inclination would be to feel that in v.1, we look forward to the wonderful consummation in the millennium when the true son of David reigns in true righteousness in a world from which all danger has been removed, but then to see that same one who is going to rule in righteousness during the period before that being a hiding place from wind for those who put their trust in Him, being rivers of water in a dry place for those who truly know Him.

So I would incline to think that v.2 is describing Immanuel's relation to His people in the time previous to His establishing His time of ruling with an iron hand, over all the earth. And if we take that of v.2, then v.3, the eyes of--it is interesting how these three verses look at three different things, isn't it? Seem to be related but it's not a repetition, there is a lot of repetition in 2, under different figures, but there are three very distinct ideas in 1, 2, and 3, related but distinct. And the eyes of them that see shall not be dim, and the ~~he~~ears of them that hear shall hearken. Is that a description of the people in the millennium time, having access directly to God's truth, or is it a description of those before that time, who shall have greater access than ever before, because the word will be complete, we have the whole word of God, and we have the knowledge of so many things that we saw through a glass dimly, through a glass darkly, but now face to face, as Paul says, because we know how the Old Testament prophecies were fulfilled, and thus we have the ability to see much more clearly than before. I incline toward this latter which 

would put it with two rather than one, but not strongly. I feel something could be said both ways. Mr. Gregory? (9 1/2) I'm not sure that it would necessarily have a direct relationship to either one, because there we had those who were blind and couldn't see who were enabled to see, and then we had those who could see but refused to see. They were punished for it, but who later ~~knew~~ do see.

Well, here it seems rather to be individuals who want, well, the ears of those that hear shall ~~hearken~~. Say, there is an idea. The first one might be those who couldn't see, the second, those who wouldn't see, Those who see shall not be dim, they won't be unable to see. And the ears of those that hear will pay attention (10 1/4)

it could include both together. Yes? ...feel that there is a start in that direction in Hezekiah's time, but I would doubt if v.2 could fit there, and I would feel as if the others used language that was pretty much beyond. That you might in Hezekiah's day (10 3/4) that you are getting, and then

find that it was a start in that direction, but not actually

I would incline that way. I don't like the word (10 3/4) "double fulfillment"

much. If something is a plural thing, if it is predicted that there will be occasions of a certain type, then there could be five or six, and there may be, there are cases where something is a type of something, but ordinarily, as far as possible,

I like to say (11 1/4)

exegetically. Well, the three verses then seem to have quite different ideas in them, but when you come to four, perhaps four is close to three. Do we perhaps in four have again a parallel to the two parts of three, the heart of the rash will understand

knowledge, and the tongue of the stammerers shall be ready to speak plainly. Well,

I'm not sure whether 3 is inability, changed to ability, or whether to some extent

unwillingly changed to willingly. I can't tell for sure, but I incline to think that this

is inability instead of unwillingly, in this verse. But then we start a section which

seems to run together, vv.5-8 seem to be fairly continuous, it is closely related to

what precedes, but it seems to me that you have several different ideas before, now you have pretty much one thing you discuss from 5-8, and the 6th verse, as translated in the English, is a bit baffling. The 5th is quite clear, the vile person shall no more be called liberal, nor the churl said to be bountiful...

36. (1/2)

...attitude of today, the statement that no more will black be called white, things will be seen as what they are. That ^AI don't think is yet fulfilled, it may have been fulfilled to a slight extent, in times of revival, like Hezekiah's time, but when ~~you~~ he says, no more, to cease this double talk for a brief period and it comes back again as long as sin is widely rampant, and today it is worse than it ever was. Karl Barth believes in the bodily resurrection of Christ, not the spiritual resurrection, no, no, he believes in the physical bodily resurrection of Christ, but of course, he says, what became of those temporal elements (1 3/4)

Well, that certainly is double talk, to say a thing and then you take it back, or like when Karl Barth says another time, he says, I believe in the resurrection of Christ, and I believe in the second coming of Christ, but he says, the resurrection is not something that happened 2000 years ago and the 2nd coming isn't something that is going to happen in the future, they are both the same thing and they're both right now. When he says that, he better say I don't believe in them. Maybe he believes in them and interprets them in such a way that it is entirely different from what any reasonable reading of the Biblical narrative or of the creeds of the church would ever suggest. That is double talk (2) but here

it says, this is going to decline when this is brought to an end. So here I would incline to think that you have a fulfillment over a period. But you have a people come to know the Lord, you have a turning away from this type of thing. You are beginning to see things in black and white instead of just a variegated gray. Beginning to call things by their right names, beginning to turn away from sin and call it sin, and then

of course in the millennium you have

things are clear and sharp

Mr. Gregory, you had a question? ... comes to interpretation, I think that Alexander has a tendency to a certain vagueness, putting things together unnecessarily. I believe he is determined not to find any millennium anywhere, and that enters into the (3) gives him a certain vagueness, and a certain figurative-ization that often, I think, leads him astray, but he was a good student of Hebrew, and very evangelical, and he read all the standard German commentators of his day and he refers to many of their views, so he has a great deal of but on that particular point, I find him to be bad, because often he explains things away in what I would call a spiritual (3 1/4) Yes? Just how much premillennialism (3 1/2) I don't know, but certainly nothing like as much as but he does have very much of a spiritualizing attitude, which I don't like. But I do like his evangelical attitude, and I like his careful scholarly work, so I find it a very useful work up to a point, but I think he often misses some of the most important points. But on this particular matter of the stammering, he has, says, nothing about the words that would be helpful here. He says, some interpreters suppose this last metaphor relates to scoffers of religion, who were elsewhere represented as stammering and derision of the prophet's admonition, but it seems more natural to understand the bodily defects here mentioned as denoting others of intellectual and spiritual nature, neglecting ignorance of spiritual matters. The minds of man shall begin to be directed to religious things and delivered from ignorance and error in relation to it. Well, that doesn't add anything of importance (4 1/2) But looking up the Hebrew

word and checking on its use in other places and so on, one might get some definite further insight on the verse. Yes? Mr. Gregory? (4 1/2) I think putting yourself back in Isaiah's day, when he gave it, and reading this, I think that is a very excellent suggestion that you made. A person in Ahaz's day might say, this looks to

me most likely what is going to happen, that what will happen will be that there will be a godly king succeed Ahaz, rather soon, and when he comes, people will chafe. And when they see then the deliverance that is described in 29, people will turn to the Lord and the power of the Lord will extend to the Assyrians as well. I can see a very natural way to interpret it at that time, Against interpreting it that way, at that time, there would come to mind the fact that in chapter 30, he tells how they say they're going to flee and he says, yes, you will flee, one will chase a thousand, five will chase all of you, and you'll become a beacon on a hill, and so on, well, it suggests that there is going to be a period of reversal, and a period, and then of course the prediction of the turning to the Gentiles, I don't know just what that means, but it does mean at least that there are some pretty dark days ahead for them, and so the suggestion of these rather dark days and this fleeing and all that, which is given, wouldn't fit very well with the idea that there's going to be under Ahaz a son, this wonderful turning to God that will introduce this grand situation where righteousness will reign and the king, righteous king, will--this will continue from that.

Well, that might raise a question, but all a person could do in that day is to say I question if this is quite that soon, because we have these other things definitely promised, or definitely (6 1/2) Therefore, I question it is that soon but I hope I'm wrong. I hope we'll find it is that way. And then Hezekiah comes and Hezekiah is a godly king and has a marvelous passover and stands for the Lord and does so much that it is so wonderful, but then Isaiah says to Hezekiah who were these men you made alliance with, you showed everything to? He says, they come from a far country, from ~~Babylon~~ Babylon, and Isaiah says, your descendants are going to be carried off to be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon, they're going to take all your treasures. Well, that sounds as if these wonderful promises are not yet to be fulfilled. And then Hezekiah dies and is succeeded by his son Manasseh, one of the wickedest kings they ever had, in whose reign the scripture is completely lost, has to

be rediscovered in the temple by Josiah, and in his days they have heathenism all through the land, they have that awful period, and the Assyrians~~///~~ does not turn to the Lord at all, but Sennacherib tries to comfort himself for failing to take Jerusalem by putting up a great big picture in his palace of his capture of Lachish, and makes a lot of that and tried to forget his defeat, and actually^{I think}/then the reader of Isaiah would say , my, it would have been nice if this (7 3/4)

yet the Lord says this is going to come, and then we read 7-12 and we see those marvelous things said about the Messiah, about Immanuel, and we say, well, Hezekiah was a wonderful man and a great king, but he fell far short of what was predicted about the Messiah then, and this must be (8 1/4)

So I think in the~~end~~ we would come to the conclusion, I think, by the reign of Manasseh we would be in a position to come to the conclusion, that it could not be Hezekiah. Though I think in advance that would be the hope that it would be Hezekiah. The hope would be that Hezekiah would be Immanuel, but he proves to be a very wonderful man but hardly comparable with Immanuel. So that we are looking forward then to something that is way off, I believe we are looking to the millennium and that which was shortly before the millennium, and yes, Mr. Abbot? (8 3/4) I would say that v.1 is definitely the millennium, I would say that v.2 is the millennial king, as he is in relation to his own during the whole period before the millennium, after He is known, that He is the hiding^{place} from the wind. He is the shadow of a great rock in a weary land, or during all the periods ever since He has been known at all. And then in v.3 that we have the wonderful blessing that can come to all who believe on Him, up to the time of the millennium, and that will be available to a far greater number during the millennium, and then in v.4 I would incline to think the same thing, that all those who come to Christ can find themselves able to speak much more plainly than they could before, but that it will get its fullest expression when He is actually here. And then 5, we hope, I would say, that wherever groups really turn to the Lord,

and follow Him, you find an increase in their truthfulness in speaking, and a decline in the attitude of double talk, you find that, but ~~we~~ we don't have it fully in force in any group prior to the millennium, but we have a tremendous ~~step~~ step in that direction, and it is most interesting, I have been reading some of the literature of England during the last century, when they were under the effect of the great revivals of the 18th century, and ^{then} the so-called Victorian Age is the time when the great increase in Christian character, and in Christian faith, and Christian living throughout England had affected the general standard, so that a century ago, you find in England an attitude toward truth and duty and these things, that is hard to ~~parallel~~ almost anywhere. You find a willingness, a risk, a national, everything, for the sake of what they consider to be right, what they consider to be true, even on the part of those who have no faith. But I think that it is in them a by-product and a result of the tremendous spread of Christian character and Christian teaching that had come as a result of the revivals of the previous century, which continued on indirectly.

So I believe that it is true that wherever you have real Christians, doubletalk is tremendously cut down, truthfulness and true appraisal become greatly increased. But of course it doesn't reach its real full expression until you (11 1/2) but it's interesting to have here that prediction of that effect of the divine teaching upon the life, of making people no longer call a churl, a liberal, and no longer use this double talk, though all fallible human beings do it to some extent. But it is one of the results of true godly ~~people~~ teaching to cut it down and eventually do away with it altogether. But then you come to v.6, and v.6 for anyone who knows a little bit about Hebrew, is a very simple verse, but for anybody who knows nothing about Hebrew, v.6 would be a tough problem. Look at these wonderful promises of the future in v.5, the vile person shall no more be called liberal, nor the churl said to be bountiful. No, what is going to happen? Isn't this wonderful, the vile person is going to speak villainy, and his ~~heart~~ heart is going to work iniquity. Isn't that a marvelous

promise?...

37. (3/4)

...the imperfect in Hebrew is not a future, the imperfect of Hebrew may be used as a future, and in fact is ^{used sufficiently of the} future that for an ordinary conjugation, that is perhaps the simplest way of giving it in English. But that doesn't mean that it is ^a ~~in the~~ future, that it is ^{an} imperfect, and the imperfect can be used to indicate an event in future time, but another very common use of imperfect is what I would call a (1 1/4) _____

Now you spoke of (1 1/4) the present. Now in English, very few people I've ever met know anything about English grammar, because our grammar is usually simply based on Latin, it is difficult to get. We take a form and we say that's English present, but it ~~isn't~~ isn't. I sit. We say that's present but that isn't present. Present is I am sitting. I sit is frequentative. You meet somebody who is walking away from here. You say where do you go to school. He says, I go to Faith Seminary, and he is walking out the gate. It is not a present but a frequentative. It is a statement of his customs, his habits, a frequentative.

So this is not a statement of something that is going to be in the future, not a statement ^{of something} they are ~~going~~ at this present time. But something which it is their habit to do, and so what we miscall our English present, which is really English frequentative, is the exact (2 1/4)

He says that this is going to be changed, he says that the vile person ~~will~~ speaks villany, his heart works ~~in~~ iniquity, his heart practices hypocrisy, utters error against the Lord, he causes the drink of the thirsty to fail, these are the things which the vile person does. In other words, a person whose heart is vile performs vile actions, and a person whose heart is good performs good actions. Just as the Lord said, He said that it is out of the heart that the mouth speaks, and it is the matter of the type of person and by having a wicked person start in to act in a kind apparently helpful manner, merely enable s him to put on a pretense that makes him all the more

dangerous. You have to change the heart, not

He says that ^{person whose} the heart is deceitful and desperately wicked and turned against the Lord, that is what that person is and the only way to remedy it is to make a thorough-going change of the heart, not merely an external change of manner. He says that there is the churl, there's the wicked person, and the wicked person does wickedly, and it is the heart that counts, and the actions follow the heart, and you've got to make a change in the person, not merely a change in the actions. So, after these three brief verses, suggestions of previous things, 1, 2, and then 3,4 together, of wonderful results of Immanuel's coming, now we have a stress on His relationship to the heart of the people, that the person is put in the category in which he belongs, he is not just reformed slightly, he must be completely changed. The instruments of the churl are evil, he deviseth wicked devices to destroy the poor with lying words, but the liberal devises right things, and by right things, liberal things, he stands. There are the two categories, and the Lord can change (4 3/4)

from one category to the other, but it takes a thorough-going change and not just a little change of actions. Yes, Mr. Gregory? (5) The word liberal, ~~I don't~~ ^{is about} as wide from the modern ~~know why they~~ English there is. From meaning unbelieving to meaning generous, kindly, advanced, it means all kinds of things. It is an unfortunate phrase because it just simply has tremendous breadth of meaning, and it is used very dogmatically by different people in different connections. (stu.) I don't think this refers to (5 1/2) I think this is referring to people who are affected by (5 3/4)

(stu) Yes, of course, it is true that he represents the good character to the ultimate, and to that extent the word could doubtless describe him, but I don't think in this verse it is talking about him, I think it is talking about those who are here described. But "liberal" is a rather unfortunate translation but of course in King James' day they probably didn't know how many different ways the word would come to be used later.

Well, then vv.1-3 I don't think we have very difficult time getting the general sense of it fairly well in mind, there are particular details that could profit with further investigation, but as to the general thought I would incline to think that one to eight might be considered as a wonderful conclusion to what precedes, suppose that this were the end of chapter 31, you have these wonderful promises in previous chapters, you have the destruction of Sennacherib, and then you have God's wonderful purpose in the end, and you could think of it as a conclusion to 31. In v.9, there is a paragraph mark in my Bible. Do you think that a paragraph mark is justified at this point? Mr. Abbott? (7 1/4) Why? You have pretty condemnation also in vv.5, 6, and 7, don't you? Yes, well, why can't this be? (stu) Yes, v.9. (stu) Whom is he speaking to in v.1? In general, yes. Whom is he speaking to in v.9? Well, I think you can be more specific than that, can't you say Jewesses? He makes a change of grammatical gender, and that is a rather marked thing, isn't it? He has been talking in a general way in the third person, and all of a sudden he changes to second. He has been talking, his emphasis has been on men, of course it includes everybody, he is not specifically speaking of men, but it is in the masculine, there has been no specific feminine at all, I don't think in all we've looked at lately. Now, all of a sudden he addresses women, and he speaks right to them, we've had very little direct speech until now. Till you get back to where he says you will flee, and indeed you shall flee, there is that, but since that there has been very little direct speech. Now all of a sudden, after talking about (9 1/4) he starts speaking to some of them directly. He denounces the church in those ~~three~~ verses, but now he addresses somebody. So there is quite a change of manner. Now you can have as marked change as that in the middle of one discourse, but it's not ordinarily. When you get as ~~marked~~ marked change in manner, it is ~~at~~ at least a paragraph, and perhaps a greater.

And now he has been talking here about wonderful things that are going to happen

when we get to the millennium, or during the period before the millennium, but now who is he talking to? Do you have any reason to think he is not talking to his contemporaries? Does he now, after this wonderful picture of the future he has given, does he now come right back and talk to people right then and there? Well, if so, there is quite a marked change. So we have--all you have pointed out is true, but I just (10 1/4) is a little more obvious and should perhaps be that there is all this evidence of quite a definite break, that a paragraph division is certainly in order, I would incline to think maybe even a chapter. It is quite an important break. But so then now, he addresses some people, and how long does he keep on with ~~this~~ second person address? How far does it go? Mr. Golin? (10 3/4) 14? What is in the second person in 14? (stu.) V.14, you say? My Bible has only a semicolon. That is a matter of interpretation, but (stu) Yes, yes. Mr. Gregory? (stu) He started talking in the banquet hall. Whether he got kicked out and then wrote out the rest of his message he wasn't able to give, or whether he continued and gave it to people out on the street in front, I don't know. But I think that it's the same continuous discourse (11 1/2) (stu) So that could fit very well with his not having just been kicked out, still being right there. Very interesting, very good. Yes? (12 1/4) (break in record, starting again at 13) ...yes, you would define the thing as a little too long to have been delivered there. Yes, it's hard to tell, if they were getting pretty drunk, they might (stu)-- it is hard to tell. At least, I think in thought it is one discourse, whether he was able to give it all at once or whether he finished up later in writing, or whether he gave it out in the front, or whether he gave it in one side of the place. Or what he did. It is one continuous discourse for a definite specific situation, and dealing with all its various facts. (stu.) The suggestion, just as he said before, that these tables have I (13 3/4)

He said when they said line on line, jot on jot, he said

it is just possible that something there gave the proper...

38. (record is blank--not used)

401

39. (3/4)

32!

...let's see, we were on 31, no, it was 32 we were on, wasn't it? And we noticed the beginning of 32, and we noticed the first verse of the millennium, I believe, second verse, Christ before the millennium, I believe. I don't see how it could fit the millennium. Third and fourth verse, the wisdom through Christ that those have who trust in Him. Fifth to eighth verses, the clear views we get through Him of right and wrong. No longer calling white black and ~~wh~~ black white, and then 9th verse, he reverts to the present situation, talks to the--for a time turns his attention away from the leaders and looks at the rank and file of the people, these women that are at ease, and speaks to them, rebukes them for their indifference, which is the same thing he had rebuked the leaders for, and says how they are going to lose their present prosperity, and going to sorrow for it as they look back upon it, but looking forward through the age ahead, when the indifference and worldliness of the people, is punished by the Lord, and it then goes on to look at details of this, the exilic condition, thorns and briars in 13, I don't think we--yes, we spoke a little beyond that, didn't we? To v.9 only? Yes, then when the graduates met later we looked a little beyond. But in this class we looked to v.9, and we noticed what I just spoke of, the character of the people in general, vv.9-11. He speaks specifically to the women, but it seems to me that he is here using the women as representatives of the people as a whole, aside from the leaders. Doesn't that strike you as reasonable? I don't think it is women as compared with men, so much, as it is the fact that the women were typical of the people who were not the leaders, and the wives of the leaders would be included who were not taking an interest in the vital progress of the nation, but they were simply enjoying the finery and the luxury ~~w~~ that they had as ~~w~~ives of the leaders, and then to some extent representing the mass of the people who were indifferent to the great things of the kingdom of God and interested only in their own personal pleasures, or misfortunes. So he addresses them from v.9 on, and simply speaks

of the character, the carelessness principally, in vv.9-11, but the end of 10 speaks a little bit of the coming loss of prosperity, where he says that the vintage ~~that~~ ^{will} fail, the ingathering will not come, and then in v.12, they are going to lament for the loss of the prosperity, the produce of the cows, the animals, the pleasant fields, and the fruitful. Or it is sometimes taken as being that they will feed upon the ~~grass~~ breasts for the pleasant fields and the fruitful vines, the Hebrew could be translated either way there, and it is pretty hard to tell which is the real meaning in that case. It comes back to the same thing though. I think that is very important in examining Biblical interpretation, is to notice how sometimes there are slight differences in the interpretation of words, which actually make tremendous differences in the meaning of a passage. And other times there are tremendous differences (4 3/4) in the meaning of words, and yet you find sometimes that tremendous differences in the translation of a phrase of a verse will nevertheless end up with ~~the~~ exactly the same thing as far as the meaning of the passage is concerned. Now I think it is very important to, well, to see exactly what we can get out of a verse, or a passage, what is there that is sure? And don't try to be any surer than you can be. A word in any language, words have various possibilities of meaning. Now of course when you are going to present your final results ~~you~~ you have to do it with definiteness, if you are just presenting your doubts and your uncertainties, you get nowhere. But find the things that are definite and present them, and see what the things are, where there is an ambiguity of word, an ambiguity of expression, you find this in every language, just determine where it is, and then when you determine (5 1/2) instead of spending too much trying to decide which of two meanings, if it isn't clear fairly soon, which of the two it is, then see what the results will be, and very often you find that whichever of the two you take, the passage means exactly the same thing, whether the verse reiterates what was two verses before, or whether it gives in advance what is two verses ~~after~~ after, if the interpretation is between the two,

it makes no difference to the meaning of the passage, which it is. So then there is no need of spending a lot of time. But if you find that there are two possible interpretations, one of which makes a tremendous difference in the meaning of the passage, then it's worth a good bit of time to decide between the two. And of course in such a case you want to look at other passages, to see whether you can rule one of the two out, whether you can prove that it is well authenticated by a parallel somewhere else.

Now, I think Miss Luke had a question? (6 1/2) In chapter 12, you say? Yes, I would think so, quite definitely. Chapter 3, verse 16 to the end of the chapter has the prophet's rebuke against the worldly women of his time who were thinking only of worldly adornment and human pleasure, and he gives God's judgment upon these people in very strong language, in vv.16-26, ending up with the exile which is coming as a rebuke against them. Now that is a general thing in this portion of Isaiah which is a rather general introduction to the whole book, and ties up with this whole situation, but not very much with any one immediate historical situation. Now over here, we have the same message substantially, but it is tied up specifically with the particular situation, where the leaders of the people are doing this way, and he is criticizing them for it, and then he applies it to the women, at that time. The message is substantially the same of the two, but there is a little difference in approach because of the content. So naturally in studying either one of them it is very helpful to bring the others into comparison. Then ~~is~~ in vv.13 and 14, we have the prediction of exile: Upon the land of my people shall come up thorns and briers, yea, upon all the ~~houses~~ houses of joy in the joyous city. Because the palaces shall be forsaken; the multitude of the city shall be left; the forts and towers shall be for dens for ever, a joy of wild asses, a pasture of flocks.

Now when he says shall be for dens forever, it immediately gives you the suggestion that he is here describing a permanent situation. But the word forever translated "forever" here (8 1/2) the is a parallel

to and these words are not specifically eternal, they do not mean endless. I saw a long book written by a man once who based his whole teaching of eternal punishment in the book on this word (9) Now this isn't olam but this is a definite parallel to it. He bases his whole book on this, his whole teaching of eternal punishment, that there is no other word for endlessness, therefore this must be. Well, that doesn't prove it. Because actually, how often in daily life do you have need for a word for endlessness? It's a philosophical content, which there may be a good philosophical word for it that will express it exactly, but it may not do you much good in speaking to a group of common people like people who are not highly educated to use a word that will mean nothing to them. You have to use words that have a meaning in their vocabulary, and there may not even be such a philosophic term in a particular language, it's a philosophic idea. You never say that child is going to keep on going forever. You never say we're going to build this house, it is going to last forever, or if you do, you don't mean endlessly. If you do, you're using a hyperbole. But the specific idea of endlessness is not in these words (10 1/4) olam and ~~and~~ we can prove by the fact that they are used for ~~that~~ which occurred long, long ago, but yet in historic times, we have instances of that. So that these two words, I feel, we can quite safely say are words that indicate a long, long period of time. You would not use them for anything ^{with} in your lifetime. It is like the picture of the railroad track if you stand at the end of a straight track and you see it going on and on and on, until the two rails ~~w~~ seem to meet, way off in the distance, so distant you can't really see it, but you just know it goes on, you don't see an end to it. That's the idea of these words. That does not deny endlessness at all, it just means that these particular words do not have, --and the fact that they will say that something goes on forever, and ever, shows that there is something longer than just forever. It is stressed, for way on as far as you can see, and that much more, it is way off. But the specific idea of endlessness, though I think it is definitely

taught in Scripture, is not contained in a specific word. Consequently when this says they will be dens forever, it does not mean this land is going to become--that is, as far as the word is concerned, it does not mean this land is going to become just a ruin and it's going to stay that way, and there will never, never, never be any change to it, but it--neither does it mean that the thing is going to be conquered and going to be left a ruin and then ten years later somebody is going to come and rebuild it. It means something that lasts on for a long, long time. So when he says that these will be made dens for ever, he is suggesting a condition which is going to last for a long time. The Lord is looking to, I would say, the end of the Davidic kingdom as it then existed. He is looking to the end of nations! Israel settled on the land as a theocracy, as a kingdom, monarchy, whose kings were the descendants of the one appointed of the Lord, as it then existed. There is going to be a long time of ruination. Now do we think of this ruination then as ending at the return from exile, when the little group came back and started in struggling to rebuild, is that the end of this, or does this refer to a period which is going to continue on...

40. (1/2)

...after the little group comes back, there is a very considerable return but there is not a rebuilding in the former sense, there is a continuation of the period which you might call the times of the Gentiles. The period of a different sort of general organization in the world, a period which is characterized to a great extent by ruins and by wandering.

Well, I merely suggest those as possibilities in relation to this word "for ever" here, because I feel that the picture here is not Isaiah--saying, I'm going to tell you history in advance, I'm going to give you a lot of specific details about the future, but he is giving certain details definitely, like Sennacherib's deliverance, but then he is giving them the broad picture of God's future plan as it is going to work out. And here we find that this condition is occurring now, and going to continue until

something happens, and possibly it's going to continue

that is to say, there is God's plan all through it, and ~~he~~ He punishes indifference, He punishes turning away from His will, failing to follow His definite purposes, He punishes all this, but ~~it~~ all is ~~pa~~rt of His plan in preparing the way for bringing the great salvation to the whole world. Just as we had back in v.18 of chapter 30, where He tells about their fleeing and becoming like an ensign on a hill, therefore will the Lord wait ~~that~~ that He may be gracious unto you. All this has a place in God's plan for the world, and so now He says in v.15 this happens until the spirit be poured upon us from on high, and the wilderness be a fruitful field and the fruitful field be counted for a forest. And here you have the same figure that you had back in chapter 29. The wilderness becomes a fruitful field, the fruitful ~~field~~ field becomes like a forest. In other words there is going to be the outpouring of the spirit, there is going to be the change in the leadership of God's people, the former large group that were their leaders being grafted out of the tree, and in the main leadership being brought in from what was formerly a wild olive tree. And so this change is going to take place, described in chapter 29, ~~there~~ are entirely with a matter of God's ~~rebuke~~ rebuke, but here ~~being~~ ^{joined} with the idea of real blessing. Because connected with it is the spirit being poured out upon us from on high. And then v.16 says what is going to happen and our question is does v.16 ~~describe~~ describe what happens at the same time as 15, or does 16 look beyond it to a later time? Then judgment shall dwell in the wilderness, and righteousness shall abide in a fruitful field. I don't think ~~remain~~ remain is quite the word. Remain suggests it is there and it's going to stay there. I don't think that's what it means. I think it means to be there continuously rather than the idea of staying there after having been there. Judgment will dwell in the wilderness. There is the outpouring of God's mercy among the Gentiles, as we had suggested in the ~~previous~~ previous verse, but righteousness will abide in the fruitful field, as that looks to the regathering, the regrafting of the olive tree natural branches back in to the olive tree. I would incline to think

32:15

32:16

that it does, though I'm not sure I could be dogmatic about it. Mr. Abbott? (4 1/4)

A very good point. It is a matter of the interrelation of figures. You have the specific physical literal land of Israel, described back there in 14, which becomes barren. That is the specific literal prediction in vv.9-14, made particularly clear in 14. Then ~~when~~ we get into 15, there would be the possibility of interpretation, ~~that~~ it is the same thing talked about, as in 14, that it is the country that has become a wilderness again becomes a fruitful field, that would be a possibility, and in fact I would incline to think that that would be the most likely possibility, if we had only this chapter to interpret, but we do have in the verse, not merely the wilderness becoming a fruitful field, but we have the fruitful field becoming a forest, and what is the fruitful field? If you only take this chapter into account. If Israel has become a wilderness and becomes a fruitful field, what now is the fruitful field? Does it mean the next step is this that becomes fruitful, again becomes a forest? ~~Or~~ does it mean something else? We don't have anything in this chapter to interpret it by. But if we look back to chapter 29 we find there that this precise figure was used back in 29 and that there it was used in v.17, is it not yet a very little while and Lebanon shall be turned into a ~~fruitful~~ field, and a fruitful field shall be esteemed as a forest, and there in the context it becomes quite apparent that what is here described, one side at least, has yet been described in the previous two or three verses in literal language, and there it ~~seems~~ means the Gentiles, the outside, becoming a fruitful field, and it means Israel being grafted out of the olive tree for a time. That is perfectly plain, I think, in 29.17, and the identical figures are here used with that, the parallel, the contrast, and everything. And if you take it in that sense, then in v.15 here, you do not have a reference to an agricultural situation in the physical land of Israel, but rather a figure used to compare ~~with~~ Israel which even if in exile is thought of as God's vineyard, God's fruitful field, which as Jesus described, it was let out to husbandmen, the husbandmen refused to bring forth the fruits of it, and

32:14-15

they drove away the owner and even killed his son, so if that figure used in 29 and in the gospels, if that is the figure here, then we're no longer talking of agricultural Israel, but we are speaking of Israel in contrast with you might say Gentiles. And of course not Gentiles on the whole, but a portion of them, that this condition lasts up to, it doesn't say stop at, but lasts up to the time, and longer too, up to the time when the Gentiles are brought into the kingdom, and Israel itself ceases to be the center of God's revelation but becomes outside of the main line of God's revelation. Yes? (8) Yes, very good. The "upon us" is the introduction of a first person which we have nowhere else in the chapter. And of course the changes of person occur in the Bible in a way that is rather foreign to our usage, we are apt to be more consistent with our persons, but we do have changes between third and second and first person. In a way, in the Bible, it is sometimes rather confusing, so it is possible ^{to say} that it is just a change of person without a specific reason for it. But I incline to think that even if we can't find the reason, there is some sort of a reason in scripture, and in this case the reason seems to me to be easier to find than it is in some others. That is, in this case, I feel that Isaiah is speaking here as one of the people of God, and here he speaks to the nobles, he speaks about you wicked leaders, and then he speaks about the nations as a whole, they, the nations, if the city. But here, he speaks of "us" as he does in another place, where he says behold, in chapter 8, wasn't it, or nine, eight: behold I and the son whom the Lord has given me. We are (9 1/2)

He is speaking of the godly people, and here he doesn't mean that he is looking forward now to the time when the whole nation has the spirit poured out upon them. Not in this verse looking to the time when a nation is born in a day, when the whole nation is converted at one time, at the very end of the present age, but he is looking to the time when the godly in the nation, symbolized by him and his disciples, receive a very special outpouring of ^{the} ~~his~~ Spirit of God, and an outpouring which, however, does not as they might expect continue to stretch out until the whole

nation is one with Christ, but reaches out over a substantial number from the nation, but then to their surprise reaches out to the Gentiles, and brings in great numbers of Gentiles until eventually the church is in its majority Gentile, rather than Jew, and has the problem to explain, how could this happen, and he explains it with God having grafted out the natural branch, for a time, it says they will eventually be grafted back in again. So it would seem to me that the ^{"us"}~~we~~ is a little touch which suggests, the spirit is poured out, not upon you wicked, no, not upon you women that are at ease, not upon them, the nation as a whole, but upon us the godly in the nation, eventually becoming the ~~godless~~ godly regardless of physical background.

(10 3/4) I wouldn't say the reason, I would say a reason. I would say that the figure here of the land, the figure of a fruitful field, the wilderness, might conceivably be used in several different ways, even in the same chapter, but that here we have not merely one figure, we have two figures, we have the fruitful field, and the wilderness contrasted, and the statement made of the interchange between them. And that is quite an unusual concept, something which you don't often find, and therefore if I found it here and found the same thing over in Ezekiel, I wouldn't say Ezekiel proves what this must mean, but I'd say it rather strongly suggests an interpretation, to see if it won't fit. And when we find this unusual combination, and the suggestion of the interchange of the two, with the same figure, with not just one thing, but with the two different things, and the interchange between them, expressed right in our same main section of the book, the same discourse, a little before, I would think that we were just about compelled to think that here it has the same meaning...

41. (3/4)

...say that this is the same thing ~~that~~ exactly as 29.17. (stu.) Yes, I would say so. That is to say, in 29.17 you have Lebanon becoming a fruitful field, and a fruitful field becoming a wilderness. (3/4) Becoming a forest. Here you have a wilderness becoming a fruitful field, and a fruitful field becoming a ~~we~~ forest.

It is identical in three of the four things mentioned. The other one, one case says Lebanon, one case says wilderness, and I would incline to think when we looked at Lebanon, that Lebanon was a figure for that which is outside the land. It is that which is unfruitful as far as producing ordinary crops or flowers, but Lebanon there was the figure of the powerful thing that is outside the land, there they were thinking of it from the viewpoint of power, here the thing was from the viewpoint simply of wildness, not producing. But the other three being identical and Lebanon the land outside the fruitful field, being very close in idea to what you mean by the wilderness, it seems to me that we are justified in (1 3/4)

And particularly as the thing described in 29 exactly fits the context too. Yes?
 (1 3/4) No, I'm not sure I would specifically say pentecost, I would include pentecost I would say that it describes the coming of the Holy Spirit for service upon the people of God, right through the early days of the church, because there is such an emphasis on the turning to the Gentiles, which didn't happen for maybe five or ten years after that, so that would certainly I think have to be included in it, though I think it would definitely include pentecost also. It would be the beginning of the time of the special outpouring of God's wonderful grace which comes following His death and resurrection. But not confined to one day or one month, but to the period in which they were turning to the Gentiles. Probably a picture of say the first 30 years. (stu.3) I think here that it refers to the time just before the millennium because I don't think there is any interchange there, I think 16 might. 15 I think is the time of the turning to the Gentiles, identical with 29.17, but 16 might very well be the millennium or just before. I would think that entirely possible. I incline to feel that, because if here, after you've had the two interchange, then you have the blessing on both of them, and that's the way chapter 29 ends, with renewed blessing upon the fruitful field, so I incline to think that 16 is the millennium or just before, but I don't feel it likely that 15 is, because I don't think there is anything comparable to turning to the Gentiles,

that I know of, in prediction, just before the millennium, that is, rather, the bringing the grace back to Israel, just before the millennium.

And then in v.17 we have a picture which I don't think refers to the millennium. I think it refers to the whole period when the spirit is poured out upon us, the whole period when Isaiah's followers, the godly people, are living in close relation with the Lord, the Lord is blessing them. Even though there is agricultural lack of prosperity even though there may be persecution and suffering, and misery in many ways, yet that there is a work of God within the heart, a work of righteousness shall be peace and the effect of righteousness quietness and assurance forever. It is blessing, peace within the heart. That I think is 17, I think that is the present rather than the millennium. Now 18, I would incline to think is looking forward beyond that to the millennium, because it speaks of the peaceable habitation, sure dwellings, and quiet resting places. I incline to think that blessing there is on the habitation rather than on peace in the heart, if so, then in 15 you see the present age, 16 you look forward to the millennium, 17 the present age, 18 looking forward, and 19 back here again. Well, whether you oscillate that much, quite, I don't know. I don't think it's impossible that 18 can, like 17, refer to the present time. If you think of the habitation, the sure dwellings, and the quiet resting places, more as a figure of the situation in the heart, rather than of the external situation, I am a little loth to do that because we do have definite promises of a time when the external situation will be one that will be free from all external danger and that of course is the millennium.

But v.18 of course is whether now or the millennium or covering both, but 19 I think is quite definitely the present time. That is to say, in 18, we seem to have absence of external danger, well in 19 we have external danger. In 19 we have catastrophe, we have difficulty, we have trouble, it hails coming down on the forest and laying low the city. There is trouble, there is difficulty, which the Lord says, in the world ye shall have tribulation, but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world.

We can expect tribulation if we belong to Him. In some periods it is very slight, in other periods it is very great. But all that live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution, you can expect that. If the world thinks well of us and has nothing to say against us, we better begin to question whether we are really serving the Lord effectively. Salvation Army went out and preached the gospel of Christ and was stoned and persecuted, and mistreated, but they stuck to the gospel and did a tremendous work, and then they got to where they were putting their emphasis on social service, brotherliness, instead of on the gospel, and today as far as I can see, they're pretty largely just a social service organization, as far as I know, everybody speaks well of them, all the modernists get behind them and give them gifts to help do some good social service. That's good as far as it goes, but it is not doing the work of Christ for which they were started, and it is certainly a farce to call it a salvation army if they're not putting their stress on salvation. And in this present age, we are not promised freedom from difficulty but we're going to have-- Jesus said, there will be wars and rumors of wars and there will be trouble for all of us. It may be His will that we personally don't have to go through them, and it may be His will that we have to go through a great deal of it, that is something that cannot be predicted in the individual case, but it is characteristic of the present age to have trouble, difficulty, persecution, and wars. And consequently v.19 seems to me to be a description again of the continuing situation of the present age, ~~which~~ We had it back in 11-14, there was trouble, there was misery, there was persecution, well, we have seen wonderful spiritual blessings but we have a continuation of the condition to make us realize that we have no continuing city here, that our citizenship is in heaven, and remains so until heaven is brought here in the millennium, and v.20 impresses me as the most wonderful statement about the period mainly described in the previous verse, a wonderful practical exhortation dealing with that period. Now there are two ways it could be taken. One is in the strictly literal sense. Here we have

32:19

had up in the verses above, the land becomes infertile, the place, dens for ever, a joy of wild asses, you're agriculturally badly off but my, those who don't put up with this, those who get out and plant a good field anyway and do their best, wherever there is any little bit of water they begin to plant a garden and they try to produce things and they send out the ox and the ass. Well, that's good advice from a practical worldly viewpoint, but hardly seems to me to be what Isaiah's talking about. So it impresses me we are justified in taking v.20, the figure ~~the~~ rather than the literal statement. Of course, we have many figures in the Bible, if you take it all figure you have nothing but nonsense. You cannot translate anything, it is all figure. But you have figures scattered here and there, in most any writing that amounts to anything. You have to decide whether a thing is figurative or literal. And I incline to think that v.20 is figurative. And that v.20 is saying in this time when the hail ~~comes~~ comes down on the forest, and the city is devastated, and demolished and laid low, in this time when there is great blessing of peace in the heart, calmness of mind as we put our trust in the Lord, who has saved us, in this period, well, if we sit back and say oh what a blessing we've got in the Lord, isn't it grand, let's just praise Him and be happy, and sit here and hope we'll survive, we're not satisfying Him at all. He wants us, though in this period, to get out and do something for Him. He wants us to sow ~~beside~~ beside all waters, He wants us to send out the ox and the ass, He wants us to use ~~we~~ every reasonable means we can have to get the precious seed out. To get the message out, to reach others with the blessing that He has given us. It is quite figurative but it seems to me that it is a very natural reasonable figure and that it fits into the thought of the context perfectly and that it fits exactly into the situation of the present day when that is the primary task that God gives His people, is to sow the precious seed to bring out the truth, and this being the age I believe that is discussed in the previous verses, I feel that that is what this verse is talking about. Now the average commentary will have a nice little discussion perhaps on

the difference between the ox and the ass in agricultural work, a discussion perhaps of what kind of water this means, but when it comes to getting into what the verse is talking about and how it ~~relates~~ relates to the other verses, I find that most commentaries ignore it, don't give you anything that is really helpful, and I don't want to imagine something, try to read in what isn't there, but it seems to me that we are justified in considering that there is a continuous discourse with a continuous thought, and we must try to find it. And we try to see if the figures and the literal statements and the expressions will fit into a continuous presentation. And I believe it does. And I believe that we have a chapter here of tremendous blessing for us today, if we read it with the whole context in mind, the whole situation. Mr. Abbott? (12 1/4) ...

42. (1/2)

...these figures, these statements, could be used to express that meaning quite well, but I think they have a different wording for this. Blessed are they that send forth thither the feet of the ox and the ass. Why say blessed are they that do this if what you mean is, you mean well they are (3/4) fortunate. How lucky to live in a land when you've got plenty to eat, lots of places for your oxen to pasture. Ordinarily when you say blessed, you're not meaning it that way, you're meaning this is the way you ought to be, this is the way you'll get blessed. (1 1/4)

Take the beatitudes. Are the beatitudes a statement, my, aren't these people fortunate that have these good qualities? Or is it a statement that if you want to have God's blessing, try to develop these. It would impress me that that is the real meaning of blessing there. So I would incline to think the interpretation I have given is the one that fits in the context, rather than another, but anybody who is going to interpret the whole Bible from some viewpoint has got to fit in the different sections from his viewpoint, and if a person says, as some do, there is nothing in the Old Testament about the church age, well, some of these verses, I think you have got a

difficult job to make any sensible interpretation out of them if there is nothing in them about the church age. And I don't know what right we have to adopt the principle like that, there is nothing about the Church Age. Who says there isn't? Did Jesus Christ say when you read the Old Testament, remember there is nothing in it about the Church Age? Well, of course I will immediately say well then I won't look for it there. But I don't know any time He ever said that. He opened up the Scriptures to them and showed them things concerning Himself. And Peter says that the prophets prophesied of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow. Did they mean that would follow during the next ten days and then during the period 2000 years later? Skipping over what is between? Well, if they did, I mean, they could, but until we say that that's what they mean, we should have a definite statement to that extent in Scripture. Or somebody can say there is nothing in the Old Testament about the Church Age because he has gone through the Old Testament and examined every verse and found there is nothing. He can say it on that basis, but if he is saying it on that basis then I have a right to look at the verses and see if I come to the same conclusion. And I find a number of passages in the Old Testament which seem to me to be very clear descriptions of our present situation. And for that matter, when they had the great council in Jerusalem, on the matter of circumcision, the thing that decided it was James says, to this agree the words of the prophets, and he quoted from (3 1/4) Amos, and (3 1/2) the teaching as to whether they needed to be circumcized. Well he certainly doesn't sound as if they thought, well, the Old Testament has nothing to say about our present age, it is only talking about the future, and the past. It seems to me we have no right to lay down dogmatic generalizations which we think we have to follow. We have a right to make observations and if we observe in many cases, then we have the right to see whether you can consistently carry this through. But we have no right to say you must (4) until you find that that is what it means. So that we were going yesterday and today

to look at chapter 32 and 33, I asked you to study both of them for these two days, and then we have one more week to do 34 and 35. So that doesn't leave us much time today for 33, even if I'd been able to get here on the very minute class was supposed to start, we still wouldn't have a great deal of time left for chapter 33.

But I have not yet reached the point where I feel nearly as sure about the interpretation of 33 as I do about 32. I feel quite sure about just about everything in 32 now. 33 I do not at all feel that I am in an unknown world where I don't know what it's talking about, certainly not, but neither do I feel quite so sure. I think there are some very clear things, now if I had each one of you interpret two verses and you discussed it for 20 minutes in each case, we won't get through this hour. I'd like to do that. We did quite a bit of that yesterday with 32 and I think it was very profitable, but I think in view of the end of the year coming so soon, we'd better just glance at a few outstanding things, quickly, now.

Isa. 33
 It starts: Woe to thee that spoilest, and thou wast not spoiled, and dealest treacherously and they dealt not treacherously with thee! Who is he talking to there? Well, don't you think that's the Assyrian again, who else do you think it's apt to be? It seems to me that if it is, the archbishop made a very correct chapter division here. Because it is a paragraph, it is not a main division, but it is a break in thought from his looking forward to this period ahead, after the exile starts, a period that runs until the spirit be poured out upon us from on high, and on through that time. He now comes back to the present and says God is going to punish the Assyrian for his sin. Then we have the first person again, O Lord, be gracious unto us, we have waited for thee. Be thoug their arm every morning, our salvation also in the time of trouble. Here we have the godly seeing the situation with the coming in of the Assyrian, coming because Ahaz and the nobles have called upon him to come and deliver them. They have takn council but not of God, they have found their own clever scheme as a means of solving

their problem, but the Lord says this is bringing misery to the nation, but Isaiah says we have waited for him. The nobles have not put their trust in God, they have not waited for Him, but Isaiah says there are a lot of us that have. We are putting our trust in God. We know ~~th~~ we are part of the nation and are implicated with the nation, and are going to suffer with the nation, but O Lord, be gracious to us, we have waited for thee. Be our salvation in the time of trouble. I don't wish to speak about the "their arm every morning" right now, maybe you can give it a little thought. It is a little strange for "their" in that.

Now: At the time of the tumult the people fled, at the lifting up of thyself the nations were scattered, and your spoil shall be gathered like the gathering of the caterpillar. Is this still description of the Assyrian, or is it looking forward a long distance? Well, our time is very short today, let's look on, we have exile, the highways lie waste, the wayfaring man ceases, the earth mourns, and so on. Then we have back to the condition of the people now, v.13. 14 the sinners in Zion are afraid, difficulty is coming, that the Lord sends. But then in v.17 we have again a change to God's wonderful blessing. Thine eyes shall see the king in his beauty. We've only had one reference to the king before, here is another one. That is, unless this is the Assyrian king, which I don't think it is. Thine eyes shall see the king in his beauty, they shall behold the land that is very far off. Some people say this means they are going to see the Assyrian king and be taken off into exile very far off. But I don't think so, I think it is the coming of the blessing from the Lord, they see the king in his beauty, and they behold that which is now very far off, but which is coming.

33:17
 Thy heart shall meditate terror. What does meditate mean? I think here it means shall recollect terror, shall look back on the terror after it's over, because v.19 is thou shalt not see a fierce people, a stammering tongue that thou canst not understand. This is surely after the Assyrian and Babylonian difficulty is over, and when they don't see it any more. Previously we were told they would see it, now

we are told they will not see it. It's looking beyond it, and /you might say well the "not" doesn't belong in 19, it'll fit exactly without the "not" in the declaration of the difficulties that are coming, but look at 20: Look to Zion, the city of our solemnities; thine eyes shall see Jerusalem a quiet habitation, a tabernacle that shall not be taken down, not one of the stakes thereof shall ever be removed, ~~and~~ neither shall any of the cords thereof be broken. Surely that is the new Jerusalem. That is looking beyond so I think the "not" is correct in the previous verse, and that to meditate means to recall rather than look forward to. There the glorious Lord will be to us a place of broad rivers, and streams, the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver. We did have great difficulty though: Thy tacklings are loosed, they could not well strengthen their mast, --those things have been gone through, but now there is joy afterward.

Well, our time is about up, next time, we have only two more meetings with this group. We have only one more with the graduates. We have chapters 33, 34, and 35, and I suggest you look at 35 first, and my guess is that you can quickly reach a conclusion about the main things in 35, and having done so, in ~~view~~ view of the shortness of time, let's not spend more time on 35. Let's look back then to 34, see what you can do with it, and then I hope that some at least of the graduates will have time to look at 33 and do some good work on it, for next time. ...

May 7, 1962 record #1 (1/2)

...that we are dealing with this semester. It had been thought that possibly we'd finish this section up and still have time to spend some more time on the historical section. But we didn't get that far, some of the sections of it took more time than I had figures on, but I think it was wise to put that time on. ~~Some~~ of those sections particularly between chapters 29 and 31 have so much in them that is very clear when you examine them carefully, and not obviously, until you do that it was well worth the time, but now we're sort of rushed getting through these three chapters. Mr.

Grauley? Take a couple of minutes on it. Yes, oh, the development, I see. Didn't get the general survey of the whole book from that viewpoint. Yes. Oh, surely, well, we could say a word about that. The book of Isaiah as you look at it, chapters 36-39 are different from most everything else. They are historical while others have comparatively few verses that are narrative, or history. Most of the rest of the material is prophecy in the sense of discourse, and consequently they made a division of the book, there is no question of that. There are three natural divisions of the book, 1-35, 36-39, and 40-66. No question of that. 36-39 is a unified section. Then when you take the last part of the book, it starts immediately in with the vision beyond the exile, so it seems quite reasonable to take it that from 40 on the primary outlook is on the distant things of his day, that is, a hundred years or more after his time. And I think of it that after the great prophecies of the first part of the book, that he saw the nation going on in wickedness and sin, the godly following Isaiah knew that his predictions of exile, must come to pass, there was no escape ^{because the} ~~if the~~ nation as a whole was heading on in the direction it was going, and therefore that the last 27 chapters are given to the godly of the nation, those who dissociate themselves from the present situation, but who were nevertheless against their will implicated in it. While the first part of the book is primarily addressed to Isaiah's own day. That I think is the main division into three parts and I find among the three a great unity of approach, of expression, of manner, but a difference as to the objective. First 35 being written right at this time, and the last 27 being projecting forward to the time of the exile. And all of it of course, first and last, having many glimpses into the distant future. Then it seems to me that the first part naturally divides into the sections we have been looking at this term. The book of Immanuel, 6-12, and the condition of the nobles, under the same situation as the book of Immanuel looks at the king--28-35, which leads, in before the first of those, 1-6, general prophecy, and between the two of them 13-27, which deals with the, starts in with

various particular foreign nations, and ends up with a great apocalyptic discourse looking at the future of the world as a whole with particular emphasis on the foreign nations. That's the first part. The last part of the book, we looked last semester at 40-55, the beginning of 56, which is looking forward definitely to the suffering Saviour. And then at the middle of 56 he comes back either ^{to} the immediate present, or to the condition of sinful Israel returning from exile. And deals from there on again with judgment and blessing interspersed, as he has in the first part of the book, and that (4 1/2) until he reaches his great climax in his visions of the millennium and the ultimate glory and the ultimate destruction of wickedness in chapters 55-66.

Now that's just a very rapid survey of the unity of the book as a whole, which seems to me to be very clear, once you look even slightly below the surface. Did you have something further in mind or does that cover your question. (4 3/4)

...of course who divide Isaiah up into 40 different writers. Where do you get men of this genius, or this great ability, (4 3/4)

It is much more reasonable to think of one great writer, looking at different situations. It's like saying that Shakespeare's plays were written by 20 different writers. Where are the men that would have the ability to write Shakespeare's plays? I don't think anybody holds that view about Shakespeare. There are those who hold 'Shakespeare did not write them, somebody else did, but they pretty well hold to this one person. One person has the great genius shown in Shakespeare, and Isaiah is unique, in his style, in his imagination, in his outlook, he has a native genius far above that of any other of the prophetic writers. The general critical attitude is, many different writers, at many different times. Now of course if you divide it up and have all sorts of little sections, you can have all sorts of separate poems and there is no unity whatever, but once you recognize the great unity there is in these particular sections you've looked at, it is only reasonable to consider the possibility that there is a similar

unity in the book as a whole. So the critics who deny the unity of the book as a whole also deny it to these sections, and once you start dividing things up, a verse here and a verse there, and a section here and a section there, why you can make anything mean anything. You don't get meaning out of it but you've looked at it to try to find in it meaning you already think you know. There was a man teaching in a Christian college who one time told somebody there, he said, I look at things entirely different from Dr. MacRae, he looks at it as a unity, united progress, I look at it as a series of separate poems. Well, (6 1/2) from the training he took at an ungodly university for his advanced work, but once you do that you don't get much meaning to it (6 1/2), it's just a lot of isolated different things. But Isaiah has so many instances ~~but Isaiah has~~ of wonderful unity, that it's not much of a jump to expect to find it in the book as a whole, and where you can't see it to figure that you simply need to study more, that it is there. And of all the sections of Isaiah, one of the most difficult to see the precise meaning is perhaps the very section we're looking at now. I wish --I mean what we're just going to, not we've had. I think what we've had is quite clear, but we still have left of this section, these three chapters, are chapters which at first sight do not yield a great deal of specific meaning. They are chapters which are worthy of a good bit more study before you are ready to be nearly as sure of what their precise meaning is as the chapters that we have been looking at, and consequently to look at them in any decent sort of way, we really need three or four weeks rather than a few days. But we can see a few major things in them which will be very much worth while. The 33rd chapter, ^{and} 34, 35, while just at a casual reading they seem to be unrelated, yet, with just a little examination there seems to be quite a unity among the three, even if we're not sure of the precise details. You have a good many notes that are stressed in one of them and continued on into others of these three. You have two main themes in these three chapters. One theme ~~is~~ is the theme of punishment upon God's enemies. And here we're not thinking, as in some

Ch. 33-35

earlier chapters, of God's dealing with His people who should be true to Him, should be closely following Him, but of the external enemy who is attacking them, those who are entirely hostile to God, and of God's overthrow and punishment of them. That is one of the big themes in these three chapters. The other ^{theme} ~~big thing~~ is God's ultimate blessing to His own people. These are the two great themes. [^] And we find _a that each of these themes occupies approximately half of chapter 33, and then the chapter 34 is given over almost entirely to the first of the themes and chapter ³⁵ almost entirely to the second of the themes. So that we can see a unity in the three chapters, with a theme stressed strongly for half of the chapter, first chapter and all of the second, and then another theme stressed strongly for the second half of the first chapter and all of the third. Now exactly what is this theme which is stressed, in the half a chapter and then the second chapter. That's a little harder to determine than just what the theme that is stressed in the last half of it and also the third. In fact, I would say, quite a bit harder. At first sight, it does not appear difficult, because you look at chapter 33 once, you have a clear break between 33.1 and 33.20. There is no question that that ^{is} the right place for a chapter division. Chapter 32 ends that section where we look forward through the period between the first and second coming of the Lord, and saw the spiritual blessing upon God's people, spiritual blessing but not necessarily physical blessing, but blessing upon them, those who sow beside all waters. And use every means possible to get the precious seed out. But then in 33 we turn to a different direction altogether; Woe to thee that spoilest, and thou wast not spoiled, and dealest treacherously, and they dealt not treacherously with thee! When thou shalt cease to spoil, thou shalt be spoiled, and when thou shalt make an end to deal treacherously, they shall deal treacherously with thee. Who is he there speaking to? Well, in view of what we have had in the previous five chapters, 28-31, there shouldn't be much difficulty in deciding who he is speaking to here. This is quite evidently spoken to the Assyrian aggressor, and here then we would

seem to be back in the major emphasis of our whole section. Ahaz and the nobles by their clever scheme bring in the Assyrian aggressor, as a terrible danger against the land. They have brought this on to the land, God is going to punish the land through it, it is there, but yet God is going, for a time, to deliver them from it, and of course eventually to give a complete deliverance, but for a time now he gives them a deliverance from the Assyrian aggressor, he is going to marvelously deliver Jerusalem and so there is no question, I think, ^{that in v.1} we are speaking to Sennacherib, whether individually or his representatives. Woe to thee that spoilest, and thou wast not spoiled, the Assyrians are not coming against people who have injured them, they are coming against those who simply are there and they want to take (12) or more, they are aggressors in the full sense of the word. Thou that spoilest without cost, thou wast not spoiled; and dealest treacherously but not with the excuse that somebody else dealt treacherously with you first, but the Assyrian force is reaching out and are conquering more and more territory. ~~That~~ That dealest treacherously and they dealt not treacherously with thee. When thou shalt seek to spoil, thou shalt be spoiled. That is to say, your spoiling is going to come to an end, but that's not all, you will be spoiled yourself, and when thou shalt make an end to dealing treacherously, they shall deal treacherously with thee. Does this look simply to Sennacherib's attempt to conquer, and his failure, because God intervened, or does it look forward to the end of the Assyrian empire when the empire was overcome by its enemies, the Babylonians and the Medes attacked it, and utterly destroyed Nineveh, and completely ended the Assyrian empire. Probably it looks at least beyond the immediate situation, seems to cover more than ^{simply} Sennacherib's failure to take Jerusalem. Then we have a word of prayer, in contrast: O Lord, be gracious to us, we have waited for thee, be thou their arm every morning, our salvation also in the time of trouble. I don't know just what to do with "their arm." "Be thou their arm every morning." Does it mean the arm of the defender? Just what does it mean,

33:1

33:2

I don't know. But except for the "their" the verse is very simple, very clear, In the face of this great Assyrian danger, the Lord is called to for help. But then we have a continuation of God's victory over the Assyrians. At the noise of the tumult the people fled; at the lifting up of thyself the nations were scattered. God overthrows the army of Sennacherib, great numbers die in the night, in the morning Sennacherib sees the situation, there is nothing he can do but flee back to his own land. Not at the coming of an Israelite army, ~~for~~ or help from Egypt but at the lifting up of the Lord, at the lifting up of thyself the nations were scattered. And your spoil shall be gathered like the gathering of the caterpillar, as the running to and fro of locusts shall he run upon ~~th~~ them. Here was the Assyrian who had come in to the land expecting to take great booty, with him, has to leave with barely enough force to defend himself safely on his return and probably a great amount of material had simply to be left. Reminds you of the story of the Assyrian army that attacked Israel in the days of Elijah when God caused the Assyrians to hear about...

#2 (1/2)

33:5-6 then 5 and 6 leave the stress and just for a brief instance they look at the Israelites who are delivered. The Lord is exalted; for he dwelleth on high; he hath filled Zion with judgment and righteousness. And wisdom and knowledge shall be the stability of thy times, ~~and strength~~ ^{-- who is he} talking to now? Is he talking to Hezekiah, is he pointing out how Hezekiah is going to have peace now ~~that~~ ^{from} he is delivered ~~to~~ the Assyrian? Of course Hezekiah was told, that his things were going to be carried off by the king of Babylon and his descendants are going to be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon. Hezekiah says well it is good there ~~is~~ will be peace in my time. It was not a selfish idea like the king of France who said , after us ,the deluge. Let's enjoy ourselves while we can, we know the revolution is bound to come, but at least let's hope it won't come in our day. I don't think Hezekiah had that spirit at all. But he recognizes the truth of God's prediction, that the punishment is coming, but rejoices

that God revealed that it is not at least coming in his day. So here he has stability in the rest of his day, and the fear of the Lord was indeed Hezekiah's strength.

33:7
 Now v.7, the verse alone is easy to understand but just when it applies to is not so easy. Behold, their valiant ones shall cry without: the ambassadors of peace shall weep bitterly. The ambassadors of peace shall weep bitterly is a picture of those who are pleading for peace, those who are in terrible anguish and misery because they cannot get the peace for which they are pleading. The ambassadors shall weep bitterly, the ambassadors who are seeking peace. Their valiant ones shall cry without. It is the--but just to what time does it refer? Does it refer to the situation before God delivers from Sennacherib, pointing out again what are going to be the results of Ahaz' scheme, leading^{to} the Assyrian army coming right into the land, and causing this misery. Ahaz sent his ambassadors to Tiglath-pileser, with great amount of booty in order to get him to come and deliver him from Israel and Syria, but the time is going to come when you will have to send ambassadors for peace to the Assyrian trying to get mercy and then you won't be able to get it, and you will weep bitterly. It may describe exactly the situation as Sennacherib was coming, or just before he came. I don't know whether that is really what is pictured here or not but it certainly would fit that very excellently. It is either that or it is something to do with the downfall of the Assyrian empire later on, and which of the two, maybe some of you could come up with an indication, an observant indication of (3 3/4)

At the moment I incline toward thinking that it looks back at what was given in the earlier part of the chapter, back at the situation which is brought into the land, and certainly it would fit with that to read v.8, what happened when the Assyrian came into the land. Highways lie waste, the wayfaring man ceaseth, he hath broken the covenant, he hath despised the cities, he regards no man. Certainly that was the condition in Israel for three or four years when Sennacherib's armies were there, nobody could venture far from Jerusalem, the other cities had been taken, captured by

33.8
 the Assyrians. The wayfaring man had to cease, there was no safety, no possibility of getting any distance from Jerusalem. The earth mourns and languishes, Lebanon is ashamed and hewn~~ed~~ down, Sharon is like a wilderness, Bashan and Carmel shake off ~~the~~ their fruits~~ed~~. Here is certainly described what happened at the time of Sennacherib. The countries of the north were quite in the hands of the Assyrian kings, the area to the west was, Lebanon is to the north, Sharon is the west, Bashan is to the east, northeast, and Carmel again is ^{to} the north. And all this is in the hands of the Assyrian. Yes? (5 1/4) Explain a little further what you mean now. (stu) I don't know whether that would be possible or not. The ambassadors of peace, the people that Ahaz has sent up to Assyria, to get Assyria to come and produce peace for Ahaz, through overcoming the enemies they are facing, they are going later to weep as they see the result of this act. That is not impossible, it is a bit involved. I incline to think the simpler interpretation is the ambassadors of peace are those whom Hezekiah has sent to try to keep Sennacherib from coming. I incline more in that direction. Of course, we have no mention of the (6 1/4) but I would imagine. What you said would be certainly a fulfillment of Isaiah's whole picture, the mistake of making this alliance and the results that were going to come from it, but it seems a little too elliptic to express all that in just a few words, I would incline to think. Mr. Golin? *5* (6 1/2) 2 Kings 18.37 shows a situation where Ahaz/ men who want peace are weeping bitterly, but the trouble is, I think, that the ambassadors, oh--I would think of the messengers of peace are those who go to try to get peace, whereas these men are the men who are in Jerusalem when Rabshakeh comes to them, and says, make peace and be subject to me then. I'll take Hezekiah and do what I feel like with him. Makes them all kinds of promises, and whether it could fit that--they don't quite seem like the messengers of peace, they're the messengers to Hezekiah of misery, rather than of peace. Mr. Cohen? (7 1/4) Now there is an interesting thing. Sennacherib in his writing claims that it was after he went away that Hezekiah sent

him this money. The Bible presents it that he sent it in advance. Well we certainly would believe the Bible rather than Sennacherib, but taking it, as the Bible says, that would fit with the idea of that being ambassadors ~~speaking~~^{seeking} peace, sending tribute, and they would weep bitterly, because he takes the tribute and gives them nothing, going to take all the rest. And then later on when he can't get the rest, he tries to make it look in his annals as if this, as if after all Hezekiah succumbed to this extent, saying--but the Bible does explain he was sending that before the attack. That is certainly a suggestion that he actually did send messengers of peace. You see the difficulty, Mr. Golin, with the other? They don't seem to be people he sent as messengers, but people who received the message. And I don't think you could call Rabshakeh a messenger of peace. He was a messenger of surrender, calling on them for surrender, and these men told Hezekiah about the terrible things to expect. They were indeed weeping bitterly, I think there is no doubt of that. Someone else? Mr. Miller? (8 1/2) 8 and 9 would seem to me to describe the condition of the land during the period when Sennacherib is already there. That is, I would incline to think that ~~when~~ the ambassadors of peace weep bitterly, it means because they can't get the peace they're trying to, except on conditions that of course (9)

(stu) Tiglath-pileser. (stu) Yes, but I don't know that the highway is laid waste at that time. I would incline to think that that is a picture of after Sennacherib's army actually comes to the land. As far as our evidence goes. At any rate, I think it is referring to that period, to the times of Isaiah, rather than of future time. It does seem to be describing what happened here in the land, and consequently most likely we have the chapter beginning with verses 1-6, a --the story of the defeat of the Assyrians, and then we start again with 7 with the situation before he is defeated. We look at that which is before, from 7 on, that seems to be rather definite. All of our suggestions fit with that. Mr. Gregory? (10 1/2) I incline to think that between 6 and 7 there is a new paragraph, that 6 looks forward to the defeat of Sennacherib, and to the stability

of the times of Hezekiah, and so you have the stability of 'thy times'; and then perhaps Hezekiah is referred to in the 3rd verse, "the fear of the Lord is his treasure." But then when you start 7 you're starting a new paragraph. And here you're looking, I believe, back at the situation before Sennacherib was defeated, when Sennacherib was just going to come, and then when (11) ^{"their"}~~there~~, you are referring to the leaders of Israel, "their valiant ones." You are back to your immediate dealing with these leaders of Israel. "Their valiant ones," their ambassadors, the ones they have sent. You're not just thinking of the king, but before you think, not of Ahaz, but of Hezekiah, and the blessing God gives him. That seems to be most likely.

Well, if we then are justified in saying that the, that we have a paragraph, 1-6, looking to the ~~de~~ destruction of Sennacherib's host, and God's blessing to ^{the rest of} Hezekiah's reign, and then looking back to the period before Sennacherib's ^{destruction,}~~deception~~, starting with v.7, with that which brings up to it, and then v.8 would seem to be mostly description of the situation, while Sennacherib's host is there, he despised the cities, he sees these various cities of Judah, and he regards no man, he says, lest anything get in his way of accomplishing his aggressive purposes, and nobody dares to go out and travel, the highways lie waste, the wayfaring man ceaseth, the land mourns and languishes, and he has not only taken in the cities of Judah, but he has taken the country to the north, Lebanon, and Carmel, and the country to the west, Sharon, and the country to the east, Bashan, all this area round about he has taken, only Jerusalem remains, so v.9, you have the situation when Sennacherib is there. The country is desolate, afflicted, tormented, looks as if the next thing is to take Jerusalem, everything else in the whole area is under Sennacherib's thumb. When this situation comes to pass, God says in v.10: Now will I rise, says the Lord; now will be exalted; now will I lift up myself, --and then he addresses Sennacherib and his people. He says, you shall conceive chaff, you shall bring forth stubble, your plan of taking Jerusalem is ~~is~~ not going to amount to anything. You are going to fail utterly in it.

Your breath, as fire, shall devour you. Just what does ~~that~~ mean? Your breath as ~~fire~~ fire shall devour you? Does it mean that you are not going to be destroyed by the army, by an army from ~~Y~~ Israel coming to attack, or by an army from Egypt coming up to give deliverance. It is not a human force. Your breath, as fire, will devour you. Would it perhaps fit with the idea of the pestilence ~~of~~ the Lord sends when the men are feverish, and their breath is hot, and a figure of speech showing people dying with no visible cause, you might say, almost, dying from their own breath. Their breath as fire shall devour them. The falling of the people, we're told the angel of the Lord slew them in the night, but here is another aspect of it, the method of their destruction. It is not a human attack, it is a pestilence sent by the Lord...

#7 (1/2)

...a number of destructions of Edom at various times, but Petra, this situation, I think, was after most of the destructions. It was largely during the Roman period, and the reason was that there were great caravans which came up from Arabia, bringing spices, and Petra was a wasteland on the way, a place going through a long area with little of accommodation or food, water, and so on, ^{here was a wasteland,} so it made possible a great caravan city, and then when the caravan trade was cut off, it destroyed the possibility of continuing. That is, my impression was that Petra was not destroyed through an attack, but rather through a drawing up of its economic (1 1/2)

But Petra itself, while it is in the land of Edom, I think it was a section of it which became very important after the Old Testament times, rather than

Well, some other suggestions. (1 3/4) The phrase "the day of the Lord" like many a phrase in Scripture, many people tend to say, must be a specific technical term, which always means exactly the same thing. Now the fact of the matter is that even such a term as faith does not always mean the same thing in Scripture. ~~But~~ What James says about faith and what ~~Paul~~ Paul says about faith flatly contradict each other.

Paul says, Abraham was saved by faith alone, without works. And James says,

Abraham was saved by his works, not by faith alone. They contradict each other flatly. But when you read the context, you see that they are using faith in different senses, and if you take what each means by faith, there is absolutely no contradiction, they mean exactly the same thing. When Paul says faith, he means a living faith, no amount of works will ever save anybody, but a faith that doesn't produce work is not a true faith. And James by saying (2 3/4) means a declaration that you believe something which doesn't show itself in your life, which is therefore just an empty (3) or declaration, faith without works is dead, it isn't faith at all. So that there is absolutely no contradiction but there is not the use of a word as a technical term, precisely defined and used always in the same sentence. And that's one thing in the scripture, you can't find a word, some people say, here is the law refers to Christ. You find this word (3 1/4), how it is used first, that gathers how it's used all through the scripture. Well, it's not true. The words are words of their day, and the words may come to be used in such a way that later (3 1/2)

Now the Day of the Lord I would say is undoubtedly in its early uses, used simply as a general term for the idea of any time when situations are completely beyond the control of human forces. We are facing a great earthquake, a great invasion of locusts which we cannot meet, which just devours us, and eats us up, destroys everything we have. A situation from a power far greater than our own, something which we cannot do anything about, actually. We are in the Lord's hands. It is the day of the Lord. That is the original use of the term, but then the term is used to look forward to a special day of the Lord, a special day when God's power will be so manifest that it will be particularly obvious that man can do nothing of himself, because the power that is there displayed is so much beyond him. So the term comes to be used quite a good many times to refer to those great world-shaking events which come immediately before the return of Christ. It says the day of the Lord, in Thessalonians,

I believe, but the better texts have "the day of Christ." And there the term would seem to refer to the day of Christ in the sense of Christ's reign. They say that the Day of Christ is already here, that is, the Thessalonians thought Christ had already come, and they had lost out, they weren't in his kingdom. Paul says that that won't come until the rapture comes first and then the declaration of the man of sin, and these events come before the actual reign of Christ, but the Day of the Lord seems to be the period which of all times is a Day of the Lord, the one which comes just before His return. Yes? (5 1/2) Yes, well, it seems to me it's the Day of Christ there, (stu) Well, of course, now you see there there is a real problem. In 2 Thessalonians there --1 Thessalonians tells us very, very clearly about the rapture, coming at time when no man knows when it's coming, and the Lord intervenes in His marvelous ^{way,} ~~grace~~, and gives us the resurrection body. Then in 2 Thessalonians, we find that the people are greatly disturbed. In chapter 2, we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you be not soon shaken in mind, as ^{if} ~~at~~ the day of Christ is right here. This word "at hand" is the word used in the papyri to indicate the present tense, the present. It doesn't mean it's coming soon, it means it's already here, let no man deceive you. Christ isn't here reigning and you've lost out and you're not in His kingdom. No, because that day can't come, except what happen? Well, our English says there come a falling away first. So that won't come until there comes an apostasy, and the revelation of the man of sin. Here are the two great things which must happen. And then v.8, then shall the wicked be revealed. Well, first, he that letteth will be taken out of ~~the~~ way, and then the wicked one revealed whom the Lord will consume with the breath of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming. All these things have to happen before he returns. Well, Paul says to the Thessalonians, don't you worry as if the Day of Christ was already here, it won't come till there is an apostasy. What kind of a sign is that? Already when Paul went to Thessalonica there was an apostasy. There had been fallings away already, and

there are other worse ones through the years. So if he means you folks don't think that the day of Christ is right here now, Christ is here, because He can't come till first the apostasy comes. Well, what good is that for them? There have been apostasies already, and it wasn't long after they had terrible apostasy, so the apostasy is no--Jesus said repeatedly, be ready for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh. You be ready right now, He didn't say you wait till the apostasy comes and then start getting ready. So it's not a good sign. That's a problem. The Greek word is apostasia, but it's not a good sign, and if he says, don't worry because before the Lord comes the man of sin is revealed and first there has got to be a falling away, see, it makes a tremendous problem. But this word "apostasia" Dr. Schuyler English found, a few years ago, that in the--that (8 1/4)

Greek dictionary gives as one of the meanings for apostasia, it gives "departure."

So Dr. English suggested, does this mean, this will not come except the departure come? The departure come. And then after the departure the man of sin is revealed and so on, and then he says, just below, that you know who is withholding, only ^{he} who now letteth will let till he be taken out of the way. That would be the departure too as the Holy Spirit acting through the Church, the Holy Spirit is everywhere, you can't take the Holy Spirit away, but you can take away the action of the Holy Spirit through the Church, ~~with~~ by taking the true Church away, so he that lets will let till he be taken out of the way, and then after the Church is taken out of the way, will the wicked one be revealed. Well, now that rests upon that word apostasia there meaning departure. Well, now, I looked it up. Dr. English wrote six people, of whom I was one, and asked us what we thought of that interpretation, and three of them simply looked up in their ordinary dictionaries or commentaries, and said, no, nothing to it. Three of them. But I was one of those who didn't do that, tried to get into the source and examine the real facts. I found that the noun apostasia is derived from the verb (9 1/4)

and the verb is the regular word to depart. It says the angels took

Peter out of prison and then they departed from him. Not they fell away from him, they departed. It is the regular word for depart, the verb. Now the noun then means some kind of a departure. Here it is translated as a falling away. Well, the noun apostasia is used in the Greek, in Greek, quite a bit to mean a change of allegiance from one country to another, something like that. Not so much a falling away as a rebellion perhaps, it is used also ^{I think} for certain (10) the distance, the departure of one for the other. But this specific meaning, physical departure, I was not able to find ~~what~~ but one case of it, but that one seemed to be a pretty definite case, that was in a commentary on Aristotle, and in this commentary on Aristotle, it referred to a piece of paper which is wet and then which after a little while becomes hard and crisp instead of being soft, and it says that this is caused by the apostasia of the water. And it would seem very definitely that what he is saying is the departure of the water from the paper causes that which was flexible and loose to become hard and crisp. So there is only one case that I found, but it is a clear case, and (11)

think it is a clear enough case that they gave that as a definite meaning of the word. And if you take the word in that sense here, it makes the whole passage understandable, while otherwise the passage seems to contradict the next verses, and seems to contradict 1 Thessalonians, and leaves you with a sign for the Lord's coming that is not usable as a sign, because there have been so many apostasies. Some far greater than others, and some far less, but there have been some very, very great (11 1/2)

So I wrote an article expressing this view on the rapture, but when our Scofield committee met I advised putting it into the text and there were not sufficient to ~~stand~~ with me, so it will not be in the new edition of the Scofield Bible, if I recall correctly. But it seems to me that there is much evidence in favor of it, and it makes sense out of the passage. Otherwise ~~you're~~ you're left with a tough problem, how to place this with other passages. Yes? (12) No, I would just say till the departure, till the

departure comes, and if somebody wants to say, until _____ comes, but it isn't a falling away, it is the apostasia, the word "the" is there, see. Until--except there come first the departure and that man of sin be revealed, and then you read down a little further, and it says that the mystery of iniquity does already work, only he who now hinders will hinder till he be taken out of the way, and then shall that wicked one be revealed, and above it says, until the departure and the man of sin is revealed. So the two are exactly parallel, so it seems to me that taking it in its strictly literal sense, the departure, it is reasonable to say, that means departure of the saints from the earth, which is what--I have no doubt that that is what is meant by, he who now lets will let till he is taken out of the way. I know nothing else that can mean. ~~Of course~~ Verkuyl says it is the end of the Roman Empire, which I think is certainly nonsense, but that's what he says in the footnote of his Berkeley Version. But ~~then~~ it makes a perfect parallel here by taking the word in its literal sense, but the word isn't normally used in the literal sense. But if you translate it departure somebody can take it, the word departure, in a ~~fig~~ figurative sense just as well as falling away, but a falling away can't represent the rapture. Departure gives exactly what the word is and leaves the possibility of interpreting it in a way to bring unity to the passage instead of contradiction. (stu.13 1/2) Yes, well I feel that at any rate, what he's telling them is, don't you worry about these things, you'll be gone, when they happen. It won't come in when you don't know anything about it. If you really believe in Christ you'll be gone when this appears. So you keep your eyes on (13 3/4) and don't worry about that. That would be my interpretation....

- 1 The title
- 1/3 Division of the Book of Isaiah
 1-35 prophetic
 36-39 historical
 40-66
- 2/3 Start with ch. 36
- 2/5 Material duplicated in 2 Ki. 19 and 2 Chron 32
- 2/7 Description of greatest political military event in lifetime of Isaiah
- 2/8 Lachish - second greatest city
- 3/5 Importance of conduit of upper pool in highway of fuller's field
 (Recounting the historical account)
- 4/3 The little power becomes strong by playing off strong powers against
 each other.
- 4/5 36:7 Speech of definance
- 4/8 36:19
- 5/1 36:21
- 5/3 How long were the people of Jeru. in this situation?
- 5/5 37:6
 7 "blast" "rumour"
- 6 Tirhakah
- 6/5 37:21 (comments on each)
 29
 30
- 7/7 In straitened circumstances for two years and a half
- 7/8 37:33-25
- 7/10 Does vs. 36 relate to same day in which vs. 35 was given?
- 8 37:36 "then" equals "and" here
 "they" in Heb. used in indefinite sense at times more than in English
- 8/7 Meaning of the Lord smote
- 9 37:36 How long between prediction in vs. 35 and fulfillment vs. 36?
- 9/8-10 About two years
- 10/3 How much time between v. 36 and v. 37?
- 10/7 Hardly more than a week
 How much time between vs. 37 and vs. 38? c. 20 yrs
- 11 37:37-8 Space of 20 yrs - known from historical records other than Bible
- 11/4 Illustration: Prediction that USA would have some grt. presidents
 naming 3 many years apart. Might think would be one right after the other.
- 11/7 Return of Christ - two returns? or one? NB
- 12 Sennacherib at Lachish
- 13 People in Jerusalem expecting an attack any day now

- 13/7 Sennacherib hears that Tirhaka is coming from Egypt
 13/7 37:29
 13/8 37:30
- 14 In 3rd yr. you won't need to any longer be fearing the Assyrians
- 14/6 Byron's poem
 Three Biblical parallel accounts of this event(Isa., 2 Ki., 2 Chron.)
 14/10 How know it's not a fairy story?
- 15 Dr. Pritchard's Ancient Near Eastern Texts
- 15/8 Sennacherib prisim
 16/1-10 cont'd - his boasting of what he did
- 17 Egyptian story of the mice eating up bowstrings.
 17/4 Perhaps like bubonic plague
- 17/8-10 Pritchard's ANET
- 18/1-5 Sennacherib's consolation prize in capturing Lachish
 18/6 Pritchard's Ancient Near Eastern Pictures
 18/9 Unsaved not won to Gospel by argument on accuracy of Scripture
- 19/1 Anything that shows dependability of bible helps prepare objector's heart
 19/5-10 R. D. Wilson's influence on Sir Wm Wilcox
- 20 ch. 7-12, 28-39 Isaiah's time
 20/7-10 God's miraculous intervention
- 21/8 38:1 "in those days"
- 22 Tells of an incident in Hezekiah's life
 22/7 Material can be arranged in other ways than chronological. May be
 23 logical or reverse chronological
- 23 Reason for giving this personal event in Hezekiah's life
- 24/1 Do not know whether 38 precedes 37 or follows it
 24/2-7 38:6 Before or after the conquest of Jerusalem?
 24:8 38:1 "at that time"
- 25:3 Assyrian limus facilitates dating
 26 Accuracy of dating.
 Different methods of counting
 26/5 Prof. Thiele
 Know approx. time Hezek. died
- 26/7 Davis Bible Dictionary
 26/10 Prof. Allis concerned about the honor of King Jotham
 27 Henry Ford and son Edsel
 Henry was before Edsel; he was also after.
- 27/7 Does ch. 38-39 follow 36-37 or come before it? or at same time?

27/9	39:2	
28/4	39:7	sons = descendants
	39:8	good = to be re
28/7		Why is ch. 39 placed where it is? Babylon not Assyria to take Judah captive. Introduces ch. 40.
29	40:	Promise of deliverance from Babylonian captivity
29		Hezekiah makes common terms with distant King of Babylon who both have Sennacherib as common enemy.
29/10		U.S. sided with Stalin against Hitler
30/3		Likely ch. 39 precedes ch. 36, & 38 precedes ch. 39. Chronological order is 38,39,36,37
30/8-10	29	Ariel
31	29:1	" - lion of God, or heart of God
31/5	29:2	
6-10	3-4	cf. Sennacherib's army
32/1	29:2-4	
32/3	29:5	Wau - "but"
		The invading army
32/8	29:6	God's destruction of Sennacherib's forces
32/10	29:7	Invading army like a bad dream
33	29:8	Sennacherib - the dreamer
33/7		Barley Flats in California
34/1-6	29:7-8	Isa. describing events of ch. 36 & 37
7-10	30:2-7	cf. 36:6,19
35/1-2	30:31	
35/3	31:5	Jerusalem defended by forces beyond her control
8	31:8	Divine intervention
36/1	31:9	
36/2-7	10:28-32	Describes the Assyrian army approaching nearer and nearer
36/8	10:33	Assyrian army falls by divine intervention
37/2		Vivid pictures given 2- years in advance
37/3-10		Isa. interested in events of his day
38/4	7:1	Invasion spoken of
39		Important historical events in Isa. 36-39 and ch. 7
39/10	7:1	
40	7:1-2	cf. 2 Ki. 16; 2 Chron 28
40/4		2 Chron 28:8-16; 28:20

- 41 7:1-2 Strength of the confederacy against Judah
- 42/2 7:3-7 Judah's frightful danger; Ahaz's clever scheme
9 2 Ki. 16:7-8
- 43/1 2 Ki. 16:9
How long did it take Tiglath-Pileser to go into action?
- 43/8-10 Distance from Jerusalem to Damascus and from Damascus to Ninevah.
- 44 Distances involved, time involved
44/7 Invention of steam, 130 yrs ago and improvement in travel.
- 44/10 Ahaz' decision
- 45 2 Ki. 16:9-18
45/8-10 Explanation of above passage
- 46 Ahaz a wicked king
46/6-8 2 Ki. 15:27-30
46/9 2 Ki. 17:1
- 47 Chronology involved. Ahaz' danger and his decision
- 48 Ahaz' situation compared with that of US in W.W. II.
Hitler and Russia
- 48/9 Assyria brought in to help against Judah's enemies.
- 49 Historical situation in which Ahaz sends secret messengers
to Tiglath-Pileser
- 49/8 7:3 The upper pool
- 50/1-5 Why Isaiah goes to the conduit of the upper pool
50/6-10 Cf. with situation in ch. 36,39 thirty years later
- 51 7:4 Ahaz doesn't want Isaiah around but the people consider
him God's prophet.
- 52 7:8
52/8-10 Assumptions in interpretation
- 53/1-4 Reasonable to assume it was an inspection tour
53/5 what encouragement is there in being told what will happen
65 yrs. hence?
- 53/8-10 If you won't believe surely you won't be established.
54/1 The look on Ahaz' face.
Isaiah's words reflect the actions of Ahaz and his associates
- 54/4-10 7:10-11
- 55 Ahaz not interested in having a sign; he wants to get on with
7:12 building the defenses. So makes a pious statement
- 55/7-10 vs. 13 not understandable without the assumption given
regarding vs. 12, i.e. that what Ahaz said was pure hypocrisy.

- 56/4 7:13
7:15 "that he may know" a poor translation. When or by the time he knows..
- 56/9 Isaiah is not comforting Ahaz; he is rebuking Ahaz
- 57
57/6 7:22 Butter and honey
58/1-3 Describing certain common articles of food produced without much effort of cultivation
- 58/3-5 Often leader is killed by someone who thinks he can make better peace terms with the enemy.
- 59-60 Assignment
- 61/5-10 Two points of the future prediction for the near future
Ephraim and Syria both would lose their kings
- 62 7:14f
7:16 Not Hezekiah, son of Ahaz, nor Isaiah's son
Use of this child as a measure of time
- 63 While Isa. is rebuking Ahaz he is assuring the people that they don't have to wait 65 yrs. for safety from this attack. won't have to wait over 5 years
- 63/9 Ahaz had not told the people his plan to invite Tiglath-Pileser
- 64 Ahaz thinks Rezin and Pekah are doomed within 5 yrs. because of his secret alliance with Assyria
- 64/7-10 7:17 Isa. is still talking to Ahaz
- 65/4-10 7:18 Meaning of "in that day" - in that day I'm going to tell you about
- 66 Ahaz is going to deliver himself from one enemy by bringing in a greater enemy. By getting rid of the buffer states, he was putting himself in position for a serious calamity to come
- 66/8 Ahaz' scheme seems clever for immediate situation, but is very foolish for more distant situation. Cf. Roosevelt's scheme of joining hands with Stalin to destroy Hitler with resulting worse danger.
- 66/10 7:20
- 67/ 7:20 Is this literal?
The hair of the prosperity of Judah is going to be shaved off with a razor that is hired i.e. Assyria instead of protecting Judah will injure her
- 68/2
68/4-5 7:22 Ahaz understands what Isa. is saying even tho he doesn't believe it.
Butter and honey - not a description of the simple life of our Lord, but of conditions of depopulation
- 68/6-10 8:
69 8:6-7 Shorter time notice given than in 7:16
Not a literal flood.
Fulfilled when Sennacherib came and filled the land with his army in Hezekiah's time.
- 69/7-9 17: Same background. Damascus and Israel are to be overthrown by Assyria
- 69/10 28: Banquet of the nobles. They are privy to Ahaz' clever scheme
70 Isaiah gets into the banquet

89/8	8:9	Assyrian addressed
89/9	8:9-10	Attack unsuccessful
90	8:10	cf. vs. 8
90/5		Immanuel - translation problem
90/10	8:8	
91	8:10	"for this is Immanuel's land" must be the meaning of "for God is with us" here.
91/7		almah
91/10		Wellesley college students
92/1-5		Argument given these students that "virgin" came from LXX, not from Hebrew
92/6-10		LXX trans. made by Jews, not by Christians
93		Discussion on meaning of almah (cont'd)
93/5-10		Prof. LaSor
94/1-5		Gessenius ed by Tregelles
94/6		Etymology does not prove meaning; it merely suggests
94/8-10		R. D. Wilson on Almah
95		Raven on almah Gresham on almah
96	7:1, 15-16	
96/6-10	7:14	
97		Sharp jump between vs. 14, 15 and 16
97	7:14	Reasons for taking this to be virgin birth
97/10	7:14	Not told when this takes place
98	7:15-16	Takes place immediately
98/5		How the problem is best solved.
98/6-10		Double fulfillment (or multiple fulfillment)
99		No double fulfillment illustrated
99/10		If a prediction is given as a specific individual prediction we're not justified in saying it has got to have two fulfillments.
100		Antiochus Epiphanes predictions not to be confused with predictions re anti-Christ
100/8	7:14	Israel's return to Palestine; no double fulfillment.
	7:15-16	Not fit anything that happened in time of Ahaz. Fits only Christ. Fits with time of Ahaz and not with life of Christ
101	7:14	Refers to distant future
	7:15-16	Refers to immediate situation
101/3		Explanation of the jump between 7:14, 15-16.

ISAIAH

- 101/7 transition between 7:14 and 15
- 101/8 Antiochus, a type?
102 Antiochus Epiphanes. Dan. 11
- 103 E. J. Young on Dan. 11 and the antiChrist being neither Jew nor Gentile
- 103/8 Prophecy re test of a true prophet (cf. Deut. 18:15 ff)
- 104 A prophet like unto Moses.
A series or an individual?
- 104/9 7:15 butter = curds
- 105 In depopulation butter and honey not a delicacy but a common thing
- 105/6 7:21=25 Use of "that" - past or future?
The day I am going to tell you about i.e. that day
- 106/6 Strawberry not a berry but an aggregate
106/10 Technical use of words
- 107 Using 'flesh" in non technical sense
- 107/6-10 Debate between Riley and Rimmer on days of Genesis
- 108 debate cont'd. Day = period of time
- 109 Discussion on "day"
Common use is for a light period. Also used for a long period of time. And for a dark period plus a light period.
- 110 Meaning of "day" (cont'd). Gen. One discussed. Sudden or gradual process?
- 111 "Bring forth" may suggest a long period.
111/7-10 Method of way this knowledge of the creation came to Moses. Either by dictation or by a vision.
- 112 Genesis vs Babylonian account
112/6-10 Origin of idea that Moses had a vision which took 7 days
- 113 F. F. Bruce on why the theory is unsound
"shew mercy" an activity not showing a picture
113/10 B. Ramm unsatisfactory
- 114 Ram's book on science unsatisfactory
- 114/4 "in that day" - no proof for being a technical term
- 114 7:14 Double fulfillment not found here.
Concerns c. 4 B.C.
7:15-16 Concerns approx. 730 B.C.
- 115 7:13 Isa. had in mind a rebuke for Ahaz.
- 115/10 Isa. understands he is making a prediction re a wonderful promise to David.

ISAIAH

- 116 7:14 f Liberals wrong when say Isa. interested simply in giving encouragement to Ahaz. No is rebuke: that Messiah is and he will be an entirely different man than Ahaz.
- 116/7 7:15-16 Rebuke to Ahaz; comfort to the godly
116/9 Hebrew construction.
- 117 Butter and honey. Was there a superstition about butter and honey giving wisdom?
117/5 7:16 Not "that he may know" BUT "when he knows"
Take this as a measuring stick: before a child now conceived reaches the age of making simple choices wisely, these two kings you're afraid of will be gone.
- 117/8 Prophecy given to S. Kingdom, but means that within the next two yrs. the No. Kgdm. is going to be desolate.
- 117 Anecdote about minister and the commentators
- 118 Answer to the question of how this affects the southern kingdom.
1. The whole country (both kingdoms) are in mind since the descendant of David's House will rule over both.
 2. Depopulation of N. Kgdm. makes these pastoral products more easily available to the S. Kgdm.
 3. The fighting may result in injuries to crops and depopulation of S. Kgdm.
 4. Disruption of the economy even in the S. Kgdm, in connection with death of these two kings.
- 119 7:17 Sounds like he's talking to the southern kingdom
119/9 Meaning of "in that day"
- 120 Ahaz' clever scheme will not result in peace and prosperity, but great calamities are ahead for you
120/8 7:18
- 121 7:19 Goes forward in time about 20 years.
Ahaz' wicked scheme will do more harm than good in the end.
- 122 7:20 Cf. with situation the Poles were in in 1939
Will shave their glory, but not bring about their death and destruction.
- 122/7-10 7:21-24
- 123 7:15,22 Depopulation and economic dislocation in 3 or 4 yrs. to Syria.
Beginning of something as result of Ahaz's activity, and then its development in these two verses.
- 123/7 7:25
124 The land that used to be dug and cultivated carefully, gets covered over with briars and thorns. No good then for crops that require attention, but the lesser cattle can eat what is there and so there will be more meat to eat.
- 125 God says: in a few yrs. the present danger will disappear but Ahaz' scheme will result in far greater future dangers.

125/4	8:1	
125/8	8:3	
126	8:4	cf. 7:16 Same thing but with closer sign
126/5	8:6	
126/7-10		Prof. at Biblical Sem. has written book on Pekah' to show the Bible is not inerrant.
127	8:6-7	
128	8:7-8	
129	8:9	
129/7-10	8:10	
130	8:8, 10	Immanuel & God with us not interchangeable in these verses
130/8	8:11	
131/3-8		Russian - German alliance
131/8	8:12	
131/10		Illustration from history of OPC how often opposites do meet
132		
132/9		People who have differences sometimes unite with those most distance in viewpoint.
133/7	8:9-11	
134	8:11-12	Turns attention to the godly
134/4	8:13-14	Relation between these two verses
135/1-4	8:14-15	
135/5	8:16	Notice "among my disciples"
136	8:17	
136/6	8:12	
136/9		Heb. 2:13
137	8:17	Immanuel seen to be the speaker
137/7		N.T. quotations from OT
138		Fallacious argument for verbal inspiration; seed; present tense of vb.
138/6		NT does not build an argument on one word, letter, or form, but on the teaching of the OT
138/7	8:18	
a138/10	8:18	Refers to God's method of revelation
139	8:19	"for the living to the dead". A criticism of spiritism
139/6	8:20	
139/9		story of aunt's brother in Montana
140		Faking and fakery of spiritism
140		Sir Oliver Lodge's story
142		cont'd
143		Not to suffer a witch to live
143/7		Speaking in the third person
144	8:19-20	
145		Damage in jumping to conclusions viz. 24 hr. day ?? God resting

146/1-3		Three questions to ask in approaching any Script. passage
146	8:20-21	
147	8:21	Situation of the ungodly or of the nation as a whole
	8:21-22	Two different words for "look" here
148	8:22	Meaning of phrase translated "driven to darkness". Maybe "darkness is driven away" -- suggestion of light coming
149	8:22	KJV vs. ASV
	9:1	
150/1-5		ASV has some obsolete expressions
150/6-10	9:1	KJV vs. ASV
151		Both KJV or ASV trans. are possible from the Heb.
151	9:1	Gradual transition from the terrible darkness of 8:21 to the light of 9:2
152		Transition between ch. 8 & 9
153		Darkness comes from Ahaz; Light comes from Immanuel
153/3-10	9:6	Jewish translation of Isa. 9:6
154	9:6	Amplified OT has wonderful counsellor in conflict with Heb. grammar.
	9:6	Five names, not 4 with 2 parts each.
155	9:6	Not a series of attributes, but names
156	9:6	The accents - would not go back to Isaiah's day.
156/8		"everlasting" - not idea of endlessness in the word. OLAM, not idea of endlessness, but a long time
157/7		Father of booty (?)
158		Arab who sat for long without tiring and was called "Father of the two brothers"
158/5		Father of eternity
159	8:21- 9:1	Description of misery to come for those following human expedients instead of seeing God's help. Gradual transition from darkness to light
160		Understanding of a new idea may come slowly
160/4	9:2-3	
161	9:3	KJV vs. ASV "increased the joy"
161/8-10	9:4	
162	9:4-5	
163	9:6	Heb. parallelism
164	9:6	Prince of Peace
164/8-10		Communist "peace"
165/5	9:7	

165/9		Calvin & the Rabbinic method of interpretation
166	9:7	"increase" - final mem. No end; nothing will stop it.
166/7		Errors - inspiration
167		More on final mem
167/5		Proof reading of an article
167/10	9:7	No end of the increase of His govt. & peace
168		How no end to a millennial kgdm.?
168/8	9:8	
169	9:10	A wonderful motto -- only it is said in pride of heart, so cannot be used for that.
170	9:8-12	Four stanzas
170/8	9:9-10	wonderful determination but wrong motive
171	9:13-17	
172	9:15	Prophet that speaks lies is the tail -- time servers. Speaks like the tail that wags. Does what the bad leaders want.
173	9:9-11	N. kgdm.
	9:13-17	Both N. & S. kgdms.
174	9:18-21	N. Kgdm.
175/1-7	9:18-21	
175/8-10	10:1-4	Chapter division. Talking to Judah
176	10:3	Day of visitation. Change for the worse
177	10:1-4	cont'd
178	10:5	New subj. for new chapter. Ways of God are justified before men. Fruit of illogical humanitarianism.
178/7-10		
179/3-7		Absolute & relative standards relating to Judah
179/9	10:5	The Assyrians -- God's instrument
180		People of my wrath -- Old Eng. for people I'm angry with
180	10:7	
181		God's attitude toward the Assyrian
182		The Assyrian
183/1-4		No "primitive ideas" in the Bible.

184	Isa. 10:7-9	
184/5-10		Time when written
185		God's use of the Assyrians
185	10:14	Speaker /?
186	10:13-15	
187	10:12,15'	Speaker?
188	10:17	
189	10:18-19	How fulfillment was made and when
189/5		"trees of the forest" - fig. of speech
189/10	10:20	"in that day"
190		"in that day" = a time sure to come
190/5		futility of human scheming & of fighting fire w. fire
190/8		need to stand on principles rather than on clever schemes
191		Barnhouse manouever of getting a modernist voted representative to the General Assembly
192/4-10	10:22-23	
193	10:24	Be not afraid of the Assyrian
	10:25	literally fulfilled
194	10:24-25	
	10:26	refers back to Gideo-n
	10:27	"in that day" - not necessarily the precise time
195	10:27-28	sharp break between
	10:28--33	
195/8		change in subj. between vs. 27 and vs. 28
195/9	10:28-31	identifiable places
196		triumphal progress of an army described
196/4		Anatoth and Jeremiah who buys it
197		come down to Jerusalem by this route
197/5		Picture of an invading army. Not armageddon
197/8		The army progresses toward Jerusalem
198		A picture not of what happened but of what the people thought(feared) would happen
199/1-5		-- cont'd
199/6	10:33-34	He humbled Sennacherib, then He destoryed the Assyrian empire.
200	10:33-34	How it would be fulfilled
201/5-7	10:33-34	Message taught three things
202		Figurative language
		Time frame for fulfillment
		Fall of Ninevah

203		Truth expressed in symbols
203/9		Interpretation
204/7	10:34-11:1	Chapter division
205	11:1	Connected with what precedes
205/5		Tree of Lebanon - heathen power
		Stem of Jesse - House of David
205/10		House of David also to fall like forest of Lebanon
206		Life remaining in roots of David
206/8		Literal interp.
207	11:1	Branch = man from House of David
207		Six characteristics of this man
		4 relate to intellectual ability
		1 represents power
		1 represents relation to God
208		Understanding tied to fear of the Lord
208/8	11:2-3	Not the picture of an advent, but of an individual.
		A picture of His character and power
209/4	11:4	Lang. appropriate to a king rather than to a teacher.
		Fits second coming
209/5-10	11:4	Illustration on power to effect justice
210		Interp. Script. by Script.
211		Rev. 19:15-21 similar figure used
		"
212		Warfield on the second coming. "Everything in Rev. is sym bolical" Then is Jesus Christ a symbol too?
213		Is the Gospel going to con quer the world?
214		2 Thess. 2 uses same figure as in Isa. 11 and Rev. 19. What "hinders"? Berkeley Version in error
215		2 Thess. 2:8 = "spirit of his mouth"
216	11:4	Has to do with second coming, not with first.
216/7	11:5	
217	11:6	Will be a biological change
218		Story of child in New Mexico plaing with serpent.
219	11:9	Meaning of "waters cover the sea"
220/5	11:10	Begin new section with "in that day". Meanigng of phrase here.
221		"in that day" (cont'd)
221	11:10	"His rest shall be glorious". RC's make "his rest" == His sepulchre.
222		Two senses of word "rest". Two hithpael forms.

- 222 11:10,11 Break could be at either verse
 222/5 11:10 May be a period preceding millennium
 Heb. identical in vs. 10,11 for the phrase "in that day there shall be" . . .
- 223 11:11ff Is this a description of the Millennium or of something that precedes?
- 224 11:13 May refer to present situation
 224/4 11:14 Seems to describe something previous to the millennium
 224/5 11:15 Time frame discussed
- 225 Prophet sees the Person of Christ rather than an advent
- 225/6 Two advents cf. to mt. ranges.
- 226 Not a composit picture [What's the diff. between calling it one picture with many transitions so you can't tell where one leaves off and another begins, and saying it is a composit picture?]
- 226 11:11-15 Takes place shortly before Christ's return.
 226/9 Jews in Yemen getting back to Israel
- 227 God removes obstacles for Jews return to Israel
 228 11:11-15 Describes events before Mill. rather than during it.
- 228/4 12: Closely associated with what precedes
- 228/7 "in that day" = there is going to be a day
- 229 12:2-6
 230 12:5 Heb. of "this is known" discussed. Participle form -- past, present, or future?
- 231 Meaning of "a mother in Israel" = a large metropolis, a mother city.
 Cf. with Heb. form in 2 Sam. 20:21 and in 2 Ki. 11:2
- 232 "ought to be known". "This is to be made known"
 232/6 12:6 Is this premil or millennial?
- 233 28: Ch. 7-12 and 28-35 deal with same situation
 234 Background of ch. 7-12 and 28-35 is the same.
- 234/6 Diff. of emphasis between ch. 7-12 and 28-35
- 235 Assingments
 236/6 Setting of ch. 7-12
- 237 Diff. between ch. 7-12 and 28-35
 237/7 Nobels repalce Ahaz in ch. 28-35
- 238 Ch. 28 not a mess if you have the key to it.
 239 28: A banquet scene
 240 Isaiah is uninvited; walks in, and begins to speak.
- 240/8 28:20 Literal interp. of Bible.
 241 Danger of extremes.

242	ch. 28 // ch. 7	
242/8	28:21	
243	28:21	Hint of deliverance from Sennacherib
243/10	28:21	Poor translation
244	28:21	"But" instead of "For". In spite of your bad scheme God will do a great work
245	28:23-29	God adapts His method to the purpose He has in mind.
246		God's method fits His purpose
247	29:	Paragraph breaks but not a big break in thought
247/3		Meaning of Ariel
248		Change in person speaking
248/1	29:1-8 9-11 15-24	A fut. event Spiritual conditions referred to What He is going to do to these people
248/7	29:1	Formal religion
249/3		Ariel
249/4	29:13	Formal, external not real relation of heart
249/7	29:3	
249/9		Fulfillment of prediction
250		Double fulfillment. Case of birth of Jacob & Esau.
251		No double fulfillment
251/5		Scotfield Bible
251/7	29:3	The Siege
252	29:4-5	
253	29:5	Tone of voice opposite to words spoken changes meaning
254	29:5	Refers to attackers, not to attacked Change the "moreover" to "but" -
254/8		Sharp Division should be between vs. 4 and 5
255	29:5,7	Almost identical
255/4	29:6	Figurative lang. of what God will do His miraculous intervention and deliverance
255/6		How much of Isa.'s wording is dictated?
255/9		How much did Isa. understand?
256		Fulfillment of the event makes plain whether the lang. used is fig. or not.
257	29:7	Dream of King Sennacherib?
258/1-3	29:8	
258/4-5		Questions for assignment
258/7		Direct connection of ch. 29 with ch. 28 Ahaz' scheme will backfire

258/9 259/3	29: 29:13-14	Divides naturally into three parts vs. 13 describes the condition; summarizes what precedes vs. 14 describes the result; summarizes what follows
260 260/9	29:9	verbal contradiction with ch. 28 cf. Gen. 1 & 2
261	29:9	Strong drink the symptom, not the cause of trouble Spiritual condition leading to drunkenness
261/8	29:10	Personal responsibility cannot be avoided God's sovereignty and human responsibility
262/7-10	29:11-12	People making any kind of excuse for not studying Word
263/5 264	29:13	Interpret in light of context Stress on invalid excuses rather than on real valid ones
265 265/5	29:13	A case of satisfaction with one's disability. A matter of interp. in rel. to context
265/7 265/9 266/1-6	29:13	Picture of wrong heart condition Story of Eng. Gov. of Jerusalem His employees all had excuses for not working 6 hrs day
266/7		Insufficient excuses
266/8		Salesman who always stopped at a certain plate at noon. But the hospitality offered him was only of the lips.
267 267/7-10		Spanish politeness to give you what you admire, but in word only. Polite hypocrisy
268		A similar attitude to that of Ahaz'
268/5 268/9	29:14	Will chastise in an unusual way -- "marvelous work" God's sign to Ahaz
269/1-4 269/5-10	29:14 29:15-16	What God is going to do.
270 270/7-10	29:16 29:17	Important thing: Are we on God's side?
271 271/8-10	29:17	What Lebanon stands for Jesus' parable of the vineyard
272 273	29:14 29:18	What is the marvelous work? Discussion of. Meaning of marvelous. Marvelous work toward those called "deaf" and "blind"
273/7-10 273/9	29:20-21 29:22	Why did God redeem Judah?
274	29:22	The God who redeemed Abraham. His sovereignty in redemption
274/7		Jacob is ashamed

274/8 274/10	29:23	No longer waxes pale when sees what God has made Every true believer is a stone made into a child of Abram.
275	29:23	Picture of God's futu. plan -- grafting into the Olive tree.
275/6	29:24	Not those outside the family of God, but those who have erred in spirit. Physical Israel who strayed.
276 276/4		Regrafting Israel back into own Olive tree. Amils interp. of "so all Israel shall be saved."
276/7	29:24	Connects this with Israel's salvation at end of age
276/9		Israel as a nation to be disting. from Israel as true believers
277		No warrant for an earthly people vs a heavenly people
277/7		Extreme teachings on the millennium
288/1-4		Pres. age is in OT. Dispensationalism. Amil is most ddspensational view there is. Cov. Theology also use in many senses.
279/1-8 280/5 281	30:1 30:1	Assingment Carries us back to ch. 7 Going to get Assyria to help us against Ephrain and Syria.
282	30:1-2	What nobles think they will do if situation gets worse
282/6		Will look to Egy. if scheme with Assyria backfires Amounts to covering with a cover too short. Add sin to sin by looking to Egy. for help
282/8		
283 284 284/8	30: 30:3 30:6	Fits situation in ch. 36 and ch. 38 cf. 13:1; 15:1; 17:1
285 286/9	30:6	Meaning of burden - <u>literal</u> or figurative. "Beasts of the south" - material sent to Egy. to get help
287 287/5	30:6	Referring to region between Pal. and Egy. Lawrence of Arabia & the serpents there.
288	30:7	Egypt's strength had declined cf. Spain.
289 290/4 291	30:6 30:8-12	Vivid picture given Important enough to write down Write it down so when you see the results ----
291/4	29:11-12	with 30:10
291/7-10		People who wanted their pastor to preach doctrinal messages. He was only concerned abbut effect on crowds.
292 293 294	30:10-11,13 30:13-14,15 30:15	Thus the Lord has said

294/10	30:15	but ye would not	
295/4	30:16-17		
296	30:17	Beacon on a mountain. Conspicuous & observable.	
297	30:17	Story of Frederick the Great and his court chaplain	
298/5	30:18	Future of Israel.	
299		Similarity and differences between ch. 29 and ch. 7	
299/10	29:17	cont'd	(summary)
300	29:17-18	cont'd	(summary)
301			
302	29:19	The meek	
303	29:22-23	Jacob ashamed	
		Spiritual descendants	
304	29:22-23		

- 305 29:23 "his children" in apposition to "work of mine hands"
Holy One of Jacob
Jacob looking down on his descendants
- 306/3 29:22 God's choice of Abraham
306/9 29:21 The specific type of evil spoken of may well be
the crucifixion
- 307 29:21 The crucifixion ?
307/9 29:22 The scorner
308 29:21 (cont'd)
- 308/9 Good illustration on "watching for iniquity" - getting
around the law
- 309/5-9 On the right approach to Scripture
310 Wm the Conqueror tricking Harold the Saxon into
swearing on the true cross
- 311 A promise made under compulsion is not binding
- 312 Teaching exegesis and training exegetes
312/4 29:20 "Those intent on doing evil" being cut off refers to the
end of the age
- 313/4 29:22 Meaning of Jacob not being ashamed
313/7 29:22 Important thing here is not Abraham but Jacob.
314 Jacob not going to have all the misery you'd think he
would have for failures of his natural descendants.
Parallel in interpretation cf. Micah 4:8
- 315 Micah 4:8 Why will there be such a time of misery?
315/5 Refers to time before they go to Babylon.
315/9 Micah 4:8
316 29:22 Jacob being ashamed refers more to disappointed
- 317 Imaginary picture of an ancestor looking on the
state of his descendants
- 317/7-10 God redeeming Abraham
318/1-7 Abraham
- 318 29:23 children the work of my hands
319 "they will sanctify my name", meaning of. Who are
the "they"?
- 319/3 29:24 Contra. v. 24 w. v.18
These are those who are not unable but are unwilling
- 319/6 29:24 is a different group from the group in the previous vs.
319/9 Significance of the "also"
320 cf. 29:5 "moreover"
320/8 3/4 of the words of KJV were taken from Tyndale's
- 321 29:18 doesn't translates the wau by an "also"
Use of italics, problems concerning
- 322 RSV and "Heb. omits"
- 322 29:23 sees his children who are the work of his hands, and
are therefore different from other children.

- 322/8 29:23 Abraham was called by God the work of God's hand
Sovereign grace brings into the family those from
outside.
- 322/10 323 "they" seems strange instead of "he" but may include
Jacob
- 323/3 29:23-24 implied - then ~~the~~ will rejoice
323/5 He and the children rather than he and the leaders
- 323/9 324 Disappointing tendency of most commentaries
Do not bring out the progress of thought.
- 326 30: transition between ch. 29 and 30
326/4 More logical to start ch. 29 at vs. 9
327 Illustration re Hitler, Poland, Britain, Russia
- 328 30: A continuation of the address Isaiah gave at the
banquet of nobles who were celebrating Ahaz' ungodly
scheme.
- 329 30:2
- 330 30:6 Very expensive scheme that will prove unprofitable.
331 Egypt won't profit you, and means a lot of expense
looking to her for help.
- 332 30:8 Write it in a book
Important to write it to have for a witness
- 333 30: Two reasons for writing it down.
Take a few years before it's fulfilled
They are a rebellious people
- 334 30:8-9,10 The character of the people who bore God's Name
but don't want to follow Him.
30:10
- 335 If the Lord is not pleased there is nothing to be
gained in pleasing the people.
- 335 30:12-15 Not a promise of blessing, but a rebuke
- 336 30:15 "returning" = converting, changingg, turning about
Not the idea of bringing back ambassadors,
- 337 30:15,16 Few horses in Palestine. For fighting or speed.
338 Literature of desperation - Franz Kafka
- 30:16 Speakers clearly differentiated, yet it is not
indicated.
- 339 30:16 Three changes in person
339/8 Horses for flight
- 340 30:16-17
- 341 30:17 beacon and an ensign
- 342 ensign = flagpole. Despite Israel's failure she is
left to be a testimony, a sign.
- 343 Tho Israel is scattered yet she remains in existenc
They cannot be hid; they stand out as beacon on hi

343	30:18	Meaning of "therefore"
344	30:17,18	
345	30:17-20	
346	30:21	
347	30:22	Prediction that Israel will not be characterized in the future by idolatry. The point on which they had been so disloyal in the past they will be loyal in the future.
348		Does not happen till after the exile.
348/3	30:23-26	Blessings of millennium
349/1-6	30:29	
349/7	30:18	He waits to be gracious
350	30:18,19 23-20	
351/3	30:20	
352		On having ulcers; nervous tensions.
352		cf. Job
353	30:19,18	
354	30:21	
354/6	30:8-17	condemnation
355	30:19-21	God blesses even your adversity
356	30:22	an intermediate period a prediction that has been fulfilled
357	30:24	agricultural blessings. A specific promise of millennial blessing
358	30:25	a problem verse. wrath followed by millennial blessing (?)
358/6	30:26 26	light of the sun will be sevenfold brighter
359	30:25	the time when the towers fall i.e. time when human means of defense is brought to an end.
360	30:26	Is this to be taken in connection with Joel's statement of the stars falling from heaven?
360/8		T. Zahn and 2 Pet. 2 - removal of curse at the beginning of the millennium.
361		Zahn's view Not ready to say that 2 Pet. is the beginning of the millennium, as per Zahn.
362		On getting emotional as between various views that may be equally possible for Christians to take.
362		Isa. 2 & 4 are different : with ch. 2 the millennial scene, and ch. 4 the pilgrimage journey through this age with God's protection.
363	30:1-26	definite unit; sharp change with vs.27
363/8	30:27-28	Is this the immediate situation or the end of the age

- 364 30:28 meaning of "causing them to err" - not to wander from what is right, but from what they desire to do cf. Hitler
- 364/8 30:29 blessing.
27-28 the indignation is directed against the enemies of God's people.
- 365 30:30 Literal or figurative?
Means the Assyrian. What man gets into because of his schemes and forgetfulness of God.
- 366 30:26 the immediate situation re Ahaz' clever scheme
- 367 Ahaz probably unlike DeBaulle
- 367/6 30:30 the indignation of the Lord. When is it?
- 368 30:30,31 the voice of the Lord
Fits the immediate situation of Sennacherib's invasion.
- 368/8 30:31
- 369 30:32 "battles of shaking" , Not sure of meaning of phrase
- 369/8 30:33 Tophet is ordained of old.
- 370 30:33 Ultimate destiny of Sennacherib
More than figurative statement.
- 371/2 31:9
- 371/4 Definite break between chs 30 & 31
Ch. 31 a recapitulation of ch. 30.
Summarizes contents of ch. 31
- 372/3 Ch, 31 recapitulates ch. 30
- 372 31:1 stay on horses -- trust in
- 373 31:2 Meaning of God will bring evil. Physical evil.
Naughty figs - same Heb. word. Not morally bad.
Cows in Pharaoh's dream
- 373/9 31:2 The "he" describes what the Lord will do.
- 374 Content of v. points to the Lord as the "he"
God is wise; he is going to bring harm
- 375/3 31:3 Playing off one human deliverance against another
will fail in the end
- 375/7 31:4
- 376 31:4 The Lord like a lion
- 376/7 31:3-4 Transition occurs between v.3 & v. 4
- 377 31:5 as birds flying
4 irresistible power
- 378 31:7,8-9 deliverance from the Assyrian
- 379 mean man i.e. one of little power
Discussion on mighty man and on mean man.

- 380 31:8 he will flee for himself from the sword
- 380/9 31:9
- 381/3 ensign (banner)
381/8 Lectures at Institute for Political Science in Berlin
- 382/3 Jerusalem - place where tension between power of God
& power of evil is displayed.
382/4 Chs. 29-31 a subordinate unit
- 383 Turning away from idolatry
- 383 32: Assignment on ch. 32
- 384 32:1 king shall reign in righteousness
- 386 chs. 24-35 deals primarily with leaders of people
387 No sharp break between ch. 32 and what precedes
- 388 unusual approach
388/9 32:1
- 389 32:1 reference to Hezekiah ?
32:2 not Hezekiah
- 390 32:2 still a time of external danger
The One who will reign in righteousness in millennium
(v.1) is One who is a hiding place from wind & storm
now (v.2)
- 390/5-10 32:3 relates to present age & v.2 rather than v. 1
- 391/6 double fulfillment
- 391/8 32:4 heart of the rash. Inability changed to ability
- 392 32:5 K. Barth's double talk - on resurrection of Christ
- 393 32:4 tongue of stammerers. V.has to do with ignorance
of spiritual matters, & error in relation to it.
- 394 interp. of chs29 and 30
- 395 32 v.1 is the millennium; v. 2 the millennial king
v.3 is the blessing that can come to all who believe
on him, before & during the millennium
v.4 those who come to Christ can speak plainly
v.5 wherever men turn to the Lord there is an increase in
their truthfulness in speaking & decline in double talk
- 396/3 England's victorian Age
- 396/7 32:6
397/2 hebrew imperf. may be used as a fut.
5 Present tense as disting. from frequentive
32:6 Frequentive imperfects used here.
- 398 Change of heart necessary, not just a change of actions
32:5 "liberal" in KJV
- 399 32:9 paragraph division
change from third to second person

- 400 32: continuous discourse (not clear what is)
- 401 32:1 The millennium
2 Christ before the millennium
3,4 wisdom thro Christ that those have who trust in Him
401/ 5-8 Clear views we get thro Him of right & wrong
9 Reverts to present situation
401/7 women - represent people as a whole, aside from the leaders.
- 402 32:9 Careless character
9-11
- 402/6 A word having various possibilities of meaning & what to do about it.
- 403 3:16-26 cf. 32:9-14
- 403/7 32:13,14 prediction of exile
- 403/10 32:17 "forever"
- 404 eternal punishment and olam
- 404 endlessness
- 405 a long time of ruination ending with return from exile
- 406 32:15
16 Does v.16 describe what is going to happen later than v.15 or does it happen at same time as v.15?
- 406/8 16 Remain - better "abide"
- 407 32:14-15 "fruitful field" cf. 29:17. Meaning of the figure.
- 408 Not agricultural Israel, but Israel in contrast with the Gentiles.
- 408/4 32:15 "upon us" - the reason for the introduction of the first person
- 408/10 the time when the godly in Israel receive a special outpouring of God's Spirit.
- 409 Spirit of God poured out on the godly
- 410 wilderness becoming a fruitful field and fruitful field a forest
- 411 32:17 Not millennium but whole period when Spirit is poured out. Present rather than millennium.
32:18 Millennium - absence of external danger
19 Present time - external danger
- 412 Salvation Army mistreated when preached gospel. Today with emphasis on social service, everybody speaks well of them.
- 412/7 32:19 Present age
- 413 32:20 The figure rather than the literal statement
Relates to task of sowing seed of word of God.
- 414/5 32:20 Meaning of "blessed"
- 414/10 OT and the church age
- 415 Use James made of OT in Acts 15 indicates OT has something to say about the church age.

- 416 Not as sure of interp. of ch. 33 as of ch. 32
- 416/5 33:1 Clear break in thought
- 417 33:1-2 The nobles have not trusted Thee, but a lot of the people have. Be gracious to us, for we have waited for thee.
- 417/3 33:3
- 417/6 33:17
- 18 terror -- that is recollected
- 418 33:19 the "not" that seems not to belong at first sight.
- 419 ch. 36-39 historical while most of rest are prophecy
Three natural divisions in the book of Isaiah
- 419/7 ch.1-35 primarily addressed to Isaiah's own day
chs. 40-66 project forward to time of exile.
- 420 Structure of bk. of Isaiah continued
One grt.writer looking at different situations
- 421 Unity of Isaiah
- 421/8 chs. 33-35 have a unity. Have two main themes:
1. Punishment on God's enemies
2. Blessing on God's people
- 422
- 422 32:20 division 33:1
- 423 33:1 addressed to Sennacherib
33:2 prayer in contrast
"their arm"
- 424 33:5-6 May be talking to Hezekiah
- 425 33:7 ambassadors who are seeking peace
what is the historical situation?
- 33:8 Fits what happened when the Assyrian came into the land.
- 426 33:8 Ambassadors of peace are those Hezekiah has sent to try to keep Sennacherib from coming
- 427 Sennacherib - Rabshakeh
- 427/8 33:7
- 428 their valiant ones
- 33:1-6 looks to the destruction of Sennacherib's host
- 428/6 33:8
- 428/9 10
- 429 33:11 your breath like fire shall devour you
- 429/6 Petra
- 429/8 Day of the Lord -- not a technical term used always in the same sense.
- 430/9 Used of a special day when God's power will be peculiarly manifest
- 431 2 Thess. 2:1-2 discussed. Meaning of "at hand."
The "apostasy" spoken of
- 432 Apostasia = the departure, rapture.
- 433 " regular word for depart.
- " as used by Aristotle
- 434 " means departure of saints from earth.

- 1) Divisions of the book
- 2) Three accounts of same event
Isa.36-37; 2 Ki.19; 2 Chron.32
- 3) 36:1-2
- 4) Playing off one power against another
36:7
- 5) 37:6-8
- 6) 37:14-30
- 7) 37:30-35
- 8) 37:36 "they" used indefinitely
- 9) gap of 2 yrs. between 37:35 and verse 36
- 10) short time (1 wk.) between vv.36 and 37
20 yrs. between vv.37 and 38
- 11) 20 yr. interval in v.7 and between vv.37 and 38
the return of Christ
- 12) Sennacherib's seige of Jerusalem
- 14) 37:30-31
Byron's poem
- 15) Dr. Pritchard's works
- 16) Sennacherib's boast re Hezekiah
- 17) 37:36
- 18) Sennacherib's consolation prize
Value of arguments re the Bible's dependability
- 19) Effect of R.D. Wilson's defense upon Sir Wm Wilcox
- 20) Review
- 21) 38:1 time reference
- 22) 20 yrs. after the great deliverance
different ways of arranging material
chronological, logical, reverse chronological, no chronology at all
- 23) Incident in Hezekiah's life
- 24) 38:6

- 25) ch. 39 following ch. 38
The general date
The death of Hezekiah
- 26) Prof. Thiel's chronology (dates)
- 27) Matters of chronology
- 28) 39:8
A remarkable prediction
- 29) Reason for Hezekiah's league with Merodach-baladan
- 30) Chronological order 38,39,36,37
- 31) 29:1 Ariel - heart of God
Sennacherib's seige
- 32) 29:5-7
- 33) 29:7-8
AAM's dream of water but none on waking
- 34) 30:2-8
- 35) ch.31 parallels ch.30
31:5,8
- 36) 10:28-34 Assyrian attack pictured
- 37) Isaiah has a message for his day
Understand his description of fut. events better if see first
his relation to things near
- 39) 7:1
- 40) 2 Chron.28:6,16,20
- 41) 7:2 the situation militarily
- 42) 7:3-4,7
Ahaz' clever scheme
- 43) Assyria takes Damascus
- 44) Rate of army movements until 130 years ago
- 45) 2 Kings account
- 48) Parallel situation of U.S. making Russia our ally against Germany
- 49) Reasons why Ahaz goes to the conduit of the upper pool
Ahaz is there
Gets Ahaz in a public place
Many people hear what is said
Sennacherib's messengers stand at same spot 30 yrs. later

- 52) Isa.7:4
The scene recreated
- 53) Ahaz on an inspection tour
7:9 indicates this background
- 54) 7:10
- 55) 7:11-13
- 56) I:15-16
Isaiah isn't "comforting" Ahaz
- 57) 7:22-25
- 59) Assignment
- 61) Isaiah's two predictions in ch.7
- 62) The child is neither Hezekiah nor Mahershalahashbaz
The child is a measure of time
- 63) 7:13 not comfort but rebuke for Ahaz
- 64) 7:17
- 65) "In that day" not a technical phrase
- 66) The result of Ahaz' clever scheme
- 67) Taking every word in the Bible literally
7:20 "shave with a razor"
- 68) 7:15 describes a condition of depopulation
- 69) Isa.17 burden of Damascus
- 70) Isa.28 the drunken banquet of the nables
- 71) Isa. speaks to the drunkards
28:1-7
- 72) 28:8-11
- 73) 28:11-16
- 74) 28:17
ch.7 and ch. 28 have parallel sections
- 75) Use of figurative language
- 76) Attempts to find predictions of events 300 yrs. ago in Isaiah's prophecy.
- 78) Major divisions in chs. 7-12

- 79) No divisions between 8:22 and 7:1
- 80) 9:2-7
- 82) 9:8-21
- 83) 9:8-10:4 a definite unit
- 84) Changed at 9:7 and 8
ch.12 distinct from what precedes
- 85) Difficult to make division here
- 86) 7:14
- 88) Immanuel 7:9-10
- 91) Almah, meaning of
- 94) No case where you can prove almah means married woman
- 96) 9:15 end of Grecian kingdom
9:16 fulfilled
- 97) Sharp jump between vv.15 and 16 of ch.7
- 96) 9:5 and 16
- 98) no double fulfillment
- 101) 7:15-16
- 103) E.J. Young's view on the anti-Christ
- 104) Deut. 18:15
- 105) Not an individual but a succession
Depopulation anticipated
Meaning of "in that day"
- 107) Debate between Ramm and Riley
- 108) meaning of "day" in Gen. 1-2
- 109) Three uses of the word "day"
- 110) Gradual change indicated in Gen 1:4,11
- 111) How the facts of creation were revealed to Moses
- 112) British RAF commander's book on relation of Babylonian to Bible. Took Heb.
as "shew" rather than "make".
- 113) "shew mercy" = do mercy.
B. Ramm twists Bible to fit science

- 114) Double fulfillment introduces confusion
- 115) What was in Isaiah's mind when he wrote 7:14?
A rebuke to the house of David
A prediction re the Son of David
- 117) 7:15 not "in order that" but "when"-----
child is measuring stick
7:17-18
- 121) 7:19-20
- 122) Compared to the situation the Poles were in in 1939
7:21-24
- 123) Israel's depopulation
its beginning v.15
its development v.22
7:25 --better translation
- 125) Central teaching of ch.7
8:1-4
8:6
- 126) Biblical Seminary Professor re dates of Pekah
- 127) 8:6-7
- 128) Immanuel's land
- 129) 8:9-10
- 130) Unity of 7:1 through 8:10
- 131) Stalin-Hitler alliance and its effect on U.S.
- 132) How often opposites meet, viz.
Controversy in OPC and opposites ends allied together
- 133) 8:11
- 134) 8:12-14
- 135) 8:14-16
- 136) 8:17
- 137) NT quotation from OT
- 138) Faulty arguments to prove verbal inspiration
8:18
- 139) 8:19